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ABSTRACT

The term ‘producers of IIOC’ refers to individuals who create or are involved in the creation of indecent images of children. This thesis is a qualitative analysis of 22 interviews undertaken with individuals who produced IIOC.

The production of IIOC is not a new phenomenon. However, producers of IIOC are a group about which little is known, even though they supply a large market. With the advancement of modern technology and the development of the internet, IIOC has become more readily available and easier to produce. Accordingly, it is important to gain a greater understanding of those who create such material in the interests of prevention, child safeguarding and detection. Law enforcement and the legal system worldwide are chasing the ever-advancing means of sexually abusing and exploiting children. Research and safeguarding organisations regularly highlight the exponential number of new IIOC available and the apparent increasing demand for such material. The low-age range of victims of IIOC and extreme abuse being perpetrated have been noted in seized material, and live streaming of child sexual abuse is a concerning development.

The participants in this study emerged as a heterogeneous group in terms of social demographics. Their early life experiences were marked by prevalent issues such as neglect, abuse and exposure to violence. A large proportion of them had never had a long-term adult relationship and many others were either separated or divorced. Their grooming techniques were many and varied, and they presented as being able to adapt their grooming process depending upon the environment and victim. IIOC of both known and stranger victims were produced, demonstrating a variation in the relationships between perpetrators and the children who were exploited.

The methodology employed to produce IIOC was examined, covering both remote and adjacent producers, as well as those who were covert about their behaviour. The cognitive distortions that supported the behaviour suggest minimising of harm and distancing techniques. The function of the production behaviour was not found to be exclusively sexual and included a variety of other motivating factors, ranging from commercial gain to social status. However, all participants acknowledged a sexual arousal to children.

This research has found that the process of producing IIOC appears to be evolving. The advancement of technology, in particular the internet, makes it easier to produce IIOC and share such material with others. As sex offenders seem to be capitalising on new equipment and the increasingly mainstream culture of photographing and recording almost unreservedly, so too must law enforcement and front-line professionals keep pace. Recognising that production of IIOC may be an aspect of an individual’s sexually exploitative behaviour, even when there is initially no apparent evidence, is essential. It appears that it may be an overlooked or undetected area of offending and in turn, not dealt with in assessment, intervention and safeguarding. Future research is advisable to obtain a greater understanding of individuals who produce IIOC, in order to prevent, deter, and deal with the behaviour, as well as to help their victims.
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1 Introduction & Literature Review

1.1 Introduction

The sexual exploitation and abuse of children can come in many forms. It has been estimated that between April 2012 and March 2014, there have been 400,000 - 450,000 victims of child sexual abuse in the UK but with only 50,000 such children being known to statutory agencies in this timeframe (Children’s Commissioner, 2015). Survivor reports suggest that the majority of abuse occurs at age nine and that it can take years for children to disclose such abuse (Children’s Commissioner, 2015). In a recent study, sexual exploitation, at 61%, was found to have been the most common function of children trafficked into the UK (NCA, 2015). Capturing any such exploitation and abuse in an image or video, and producing indecent images of children (IIOC), brings another layer to the abuse process and provides an enduring record of the act. It is not a standalone offence but has been linked to child prostitution, sex tourism and the trafficking of children (Petit, 2005). Neither is the production of IIOC limited to the individual child whose image is captured. It can be used to further exploit that child or others (Gillespie, 2012; Yang and Donahue, 2012), bringing with it increased trauma and more severe abuse (Say et al., 2015; Weiler, 2015), particularly when it is disseminated via the internet. However, cybercrime brings with it evidence of the crime scene in electronic form (Chawki et al., 2015), and typically the uncovering of IIOC is really only the beginning of a multi-layered investigation into child sexual abuse (Sarkar, 2015).
In 2013, Tom Flanagan, the former advisor to the Canadian Prime Minister, stated of child abuse images, “I certainly have no sympathy for child molesters, but I do have some grave doubts about putting people in jail because of their taste in pictures” (Steel, 2014, p.2). While Flanagan later apologised unreservedly, his sentiment reflects the sometimes limited understanding of child sexual abuse and exploitation images and videos (ICMEC, 2016). The real extent and damage that can be caused by such abuse and concomitant material can be seen in the case of Amy, the girl behind what is known as the Misty series (NCMEC, 2013). Amy was sexually abused by her uncle from the age of four, and the Misty series contains still images of her being forced to engage in oral and anal penetration and masturbation. Between 2002 and 2011, NCMEC received from law enforcement approximately 52,000 such images of Amy that had been distributed, viewed, traded and collected worldwide. In her victim impact statement, Amy explained how she continues to feel victimised on a daily basis as the images still circulate (NCMEC, 2013).

The creation of images of sexual abuse and exploitation is not a new phenomenon, however, it is one that relatively little is known about (Quayle and Cooper, 2015). It has been postulated that the production of IIOC is rising, with an increase in convictions for production found between 2006 and 2009 in the Third National Juvenile Online Victimization Study (NJOV-3) (Wolak, Finkelhor and Mitchell, 2012). While the consumption of such material is prolific, information about those who create or produce it is limited (Bang et al., 2014). The central tenet of this thesis is to try to obtain a greater understanding of this group and, in turn, provide better protection for children.
1.1.1 Outline of the Work

The research began as a small pilot study, where, in interviews undertaken, the life experiences, perspectives and behaviours of four adult males who produced IIOC were examined\(^1\). Following this study, further interviews were carried out in an attempt to better understand this offence type, the function and parameters of the behaviour, and its aetiology. In total, the accounts of 22 adult males were qualitatively explored to test the following:

- Producers of child abuse images are sexually aroused to children;
- Producers of child abuse images do so to meet a sexual need;
- Producers of child abuse images are not motivated by financial gain;
- Producers of child abuse images share these images in a systematic manner.

This thesis sets out to further explore these objectives. This Chapter examines the law and relevant literature on individuals who have sexually exploited children. In particular, it explores work related to those who have produced IIOC. It concludes that, while there is much written on individuals who have sexually abused children, there is a dearth of research into those who have made the production of IIOC part of this sexual exploitation. This, in turn, raises questions as to how effectively intervention with such individuals can be carried out, when little is known about their modus operandi, motivation and thinking. It also shows a gap in understanding how victims of IIOC can be helped (Palmer and Stacey, 2004; Von Weiler, Haardt-Becker and Schulte, 2010; Quayle and Newman, 2016). Knowing more about those who abused them, and how this abuse unfolded from the perpetrator viewpoint, can

\(^1\) This was subsequently published - Sheehan, V., & Sullivan, J. (2010). A Qualitative Analysis of Child Sex Offenders involved in the Manufacture of Indecent Images of Children. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 16*(2), 143-167.
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bring an important insight to victim work. It has been highlighted that professionals are prepared for dealing with conventional sexual abuse experiences but that dealing with victims of production is an area that is under-researched and therapeutic intervention is likely to need modification in order to deal with this relatively new but growing phenomenon (Martin, 2015; Sinclair, Duval and Fox, 2015).

Chapter Two outlines the argument for the choice of qualitative analysis as the best option for examining the accounts of the cohort. The chosen approach is explained, and information on how the data was collected, the semi-structured interview, and the participants, is outlined. The key areas covered in the semi-structured interviews are; introduction, convictions, personal history, sexual exploitation of children general, and in the production of images. All of these areas have numerous sub-headings where the issues are explored in detail.

While a qualitative approach was chosen, Chapter Three, nonetheless, provides some quantitative information on the participants. Their age, ethnicity, marital and employment status are detailed, as well as conviction data. The findings of such demographics show that they are not a homogenous group in this respect. In addition, this chapter explores the participants’ early life experiences and what they consider may have been significant in respect of their subsequent sexual exploitation of children. Three key themes emerge from the data, namely; Family Milieu, Early Sexual Experiences, and Feelings of Isolation. These themes and further sub-themes are explored in this chapter and certain common issues are found pertinent across the cohort.
Chapter Four looks at the actual logistics and practicalities of producing IIOC. What emerges is that producers who are engaged in remote and/or adjacent production are both covert and overt in taking the images. In addition, the technical equipment, location and content relevant to production are examined. While, typically, images and videos are produced by individuals known to the victim, some change can be seen in this dynamic, as well as an impact noted, due to the advancement of technology and increasingly sophisticated recording equipment.

Professionals and parents alike strive to determine how best to protect their children from sexual exploitation. What are the reasons why certain children become the victims of perpetrators and can this process be interrupted and safeguarding improved? Chapter Five examines the process of victim selection for the production of IIOC. Four themes emerge from the data: Accessibility, Non-Disclosure/Non-Discovery Assurance, Malleability and Attractiveness.

Chapter Six explores the ways in which offenders justify engaging in the process of sexually exploiting and/or abusing a child and in the production of IIOC. Variously referred to in literature as cognitive distortions, justification, schema and implicit theories, three overarching themes emerge, namely; No Harm, Blame Dispersal and Self-Endorsement. Each of these produces a number of sub-themes which are discussed.

The concept of sexual grooming has become common parlance. Chapter Seven looks at how participants detail their grooming techniques and engage in both initial and production-specific grooming of victims. The complexity and individuality of a
grooming repertoire are explored, and common themes are identified. Three themes emerge in respect of initial contact with a victim; False Persona, Concerned/Likable Adult (attention/affection) and Introduction by Another Offender. When the issue of production per se is examined, four themes emerge; Normalisation of Sex, Enticement, Coercion and Force. This chapter shows how multi-layered and adaptive grooming can be and, in turn, highlights how difficult it can be for a child to discern, avoid and control such a process.

Chapter Eight explores the function of the production behaviour. The needs being met by taking these images and videos are examined, and it emerges that there can be more than one function and that the motivation is not always exclusively a sexual one. Some participants share the images they took with others, while others are adamant that they produce exclusively for their own use. A question is raised as to whether this latter contention is accurate, or whether individuals who have not shared are merely at an earlier stage in a process where distribution of their self-produced IIOC will eventually come?

Finally, Chapter Nine summaries the findings, and discusses the implications of the study for intervention with both victims and perpetrators. It addresses the limitations of the work, as well as suggesting areas for further research.

1.2 The Law and IIOC

While individuals may commit a variety of sexual offences against children using the internet and recording technology, the conviction data on this group is not always clear-cut, and the law is working a rear-guard action to try and cover emerging new
offence categories (Martellozzo, 2015). There are significant differences in how the law defines the various crimes that can be associated with IIOC (McManus and Almond, 2014). Worldwide, the laws dealing with IIOC are inconsistent and lax, or non-existent (ICMEC, 2016). A recent report notes that Directive 2011/92/EU\(^2\) of the European Parliament and of the Council on Combating the Sexual Abuse and Sexual Exploitation of Children and Child Pornography recommends that production of IIOC shall attract a maximum prison sentences of at least three years (Dos Santos Lemos Fernandes, 2015). However, the report also highlights the worldwide levels of differences, for example in the U.S., production of IIOC commands a mandatory minimum sentence of 25 years and a maximum of 50, and in Canada the sentence is one to 10 years. In the UK, production of IIOC can command a sentence ranging from a starting point of 18 months for category C images, a starting point of two years for category B images, and a starting point of six years for category A images (Sentencing Council, 2014). The categories, in effect since 2014, are defined as follows; A = Creating images involving penetrative sexual activity; Creating images involving sexual activity with an animal or sadism, B = Creating images involving non-penetrative sexual activity, and C = Creating other indecent images not falling within categories A or B (Sentencing Council, 2014).

In the UK, IIOC is covered by two sections of legislation.

Section 1 of the Protection of Children Act, 1978, states that:

“It is an offence for a person:

- to take or to permit to be taken, or to make any indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of a child;
- to distribute or show such indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs;
- to have in his possession such indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs with a view to their being distributed or shown by himself or others;
- to publish or cause to be published any advertisement likely to be understood as conveying that the advertiser distributes or shows such indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs or intends to do so.”

The offences are defined respectively as “taking/permit to take”, where IIOC are taken in person with a camera or remotely by webcam, “making”, where IIOC are downloaded from the internet or photocopied from another image, and “distribute”, where IIOC are sent via email or posted on a social network/newsgroup/website/in person (McManus and Almond, 2014, p.143).

The second piece of legislation is contained in Section 160 of the Criminal Justice Act, 1988, which details that it is an offence for an individual to have indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of a child in their possession.

Both offences were updated by the Sexual Offences Act (SOA), 2003, whereby the age of a child was increased to 18, and additional offences introduced included, namely; child abuse through prostitution and pornography. These include:
• buying sexual services of a child;
• causing, encouraging, arranging or facilitating child prostitution or pornography; and
• controlling any of the activities of a child involved in prostitution or pornography.

An additional offence, also covered under the SOA, 2003, is that of causing or inciting a child to engage in sexual activity.

McManus and Almond (2014) found that there has been a continual increase in the total number of IIOC offences sentenced in the UK from 2005/2006 (n=9,744) to 2012/13 (n=14,497). However, it is not possible to determine a specific breakdown of offences in relation to the sexual exploitation of children via the internet, due to the manner in which these offences are recorded by the Home Office (McManus and Almond, 2014). The law, in respect of charges relating to IIOC and internet sexual offences against children in other countries, has, as might be expected, its own categorisations, terminology and recording methods. Such lack of consistency and ambiguity when cross-referencing makes studying the trends in this population difficult.

Nonetheless, it would seem that a conviction of ‘producing’ indecent images of children is less frequent than other sexual offences against children. In a study by Henry et al. (2010) of sex offenders who had used the internet as a means to sexually exploit children, the vast majority of the sample (93.8%, n=594) were convicted of making (possessing) indecent images of children, 6% (n=38) were convicted of taking (producing) indecent images of children and 0.2% (n=1) were convicted of
inciting a child into sexual activity. This may be due to the fact that the offence of production was not applicable or because the offence was not detected or proceeded with. It has been suggested that producers of IIOC are seen by some judges as less risky than a child abuser and do not connect the two in an informed way (Edwards, 2000).

1.3 Review of Relevant Literature

There is evidence of a long history of writings and drawings relating to the sexual abuse and exploitation of children (Wortley and Smallbone, 2012), with sexual depictions of children not unusual in Ancient Greece and Rome (Bullough, 2004). However, it is considered that the invention of the camera (one that could make a permanent image) in 1826 was the true precursor to the images one is more familiar with today (Wortley and Smallbone, 2012). Louis Daguerre is credited with taking the first candid photograph in a Paris street scene in 1839. Henry Hayler is noted as one of the first-known producers of IIOC. The police raided his photography studio in Pimlico, London in 1874 and seized more than 130,000 photographs considered to be indecent (Ashbee, 2007). The collection contained images of children, including Hayler’s own children. Letters were also seized, indicating a trade in indecent material throughout Europe and America. A better-known photographer of naked and partially-clothed girls in the nineteenth century was Charles Lutwidge Dogson, more commonly known as Lewis Carroll (Tyler and Stone, 1985; Bullough, 2004; Wortley and Smallbone, 2012). While uncertainty exists around Carroll’s motivation, the Wonderland Club, a 1990s worldwide network of producers and possessors of IIOC, is believed to have derived its name from his book, Alice’s
Adventures in Wonderland (Sheldon and Howitt, 2007; Wortley and Smallbone, 2012).

The Polaroid camera, invented in 1948, removed a previous restriction, as it developed its own images. It was a significant advancement for those who were sexually abusing children. In a study by Bernard (1985) of 50 self-identified sex offenders, 74% acknowledged collecting indecent images of children, with 44% of this group detailing that they regularly produced such images themselves. 22% of this cohort admitted to collecting cinefilms of naked children, with 8% within this group stating that they also created their own cinefilms. It would seem that capitalising on advanced technology is not a new feature in the production of IIOC.

Despite technological advancements, production of IIOC during the 20th century was, in the main, limited, costly, locally-produced and sub-standard, being traded in hardcopy amongst small groups (Wortley and Smallbone, 2012). However, this situation changed in the late 1960s, when the law in countries such as Denmark and Sweden made production easier, and there was an increase in the smuggling of such material into Europe and America (Wortley and Smallbone, 2012). Amongst other measures, the law, in turn, was changed in America in the late 1970s to tackle the smuggling of IIOC, resulting in the U.S. Customs Service and the U.S. Postal Service announcing that they did not believe IIOC to be a high priority and that there was a reduction in the amount of material being seized (Ahart, 1982). Indeed, in certain states, it appears that they believed that, to an extent, the matter was under control. In California, in 1977, for example, a law was introduced that required retailers to keep an account of names and address of any individuals from whom they obtained material depicting pornographic images of children (Ahart, 1982). By
the following year, the Commanding-Officer of the Juvenile Division, Los Angeles Police Department, commented on the effectiveness of the new law, where in a letter to the State Senator he stated:

"The record keeping portion of the new Law is so effective that it has almost stopped distribution of child pornography locally... It will be a monumental task to ever stop child pornography and the sexual exploitation of children, but believe SB 817 [The new legislation] has taken child pornography out of adult bookstores, vending machines, and newsstands."

(Ahart, 1982).

However, this apparent reprieve was short-lived, and in approximately 1986, technology took a significant leap and individuals began to use the internet as a means of sexually exploiting children (Akdeniz, 2013).

1.3.1 Indecent Images of Children Online

The internet and other social media have brought with them immeasurable advances in the ability to communicate and share material and information with others throughout the world. The posting and accessing of material can be done with minimal risk of reprisal (Sloggett, 2015). From a law enforcement perspective, this has also resulted in new challenges in terms of policing the internet (Beech et al., 2008; Wolak, Finkelhor and Mitchell, 2009; Elliot, Findlater and Hughes, 2010; ICMEC, 2016). The use of the internet to commit sexual offences against children is growing rapidly (Seto, 2015). The volume and rapid increase with which IIOC are being distributed and uncovered by law enforcement since the advance of the internet has been highlighted (Leary, 2007; Bourke and Hernandez, 2009; Martellozzo, Nehring, and Taylor, 2010), and demand for such material is seen to be strong (Wortly, 2010). In 2011, The National Centre for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) in the USA recorded 17.3 million images and videos of
suspected indecent images of children; this was four times more than in 2007. Since its creation in 2002 up to December 2012, NCMEC has analysed more than 80 million images and videos depicting apparent child pornography through the Child Victim Identification Programme (NCMEC, 2013). By the end of 2015, Interpol’s International Child Sexual Exploitation Image (ICSE) database had identified more than 8,000 victims, with seven children a day being identified in 2015 (ICSE, 2015).

Between April 2011 and March 2012, referrals, in relation to possession of indecent images of children, to the Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre (CEOP) in the UK increased by 181% (CEOP, 2012.) In addition, between 2010/11 and 2011/12, CEOP observed an increase in the number of offenders identified in the production of indecent images of children involving multiple victims. In this timeframe, CEOP recognised an escalation in the number of females arrested in connection with possession of indecent images of children, with all but one acting in collaboration with male offenders (CEOP, 2012). Other research exploring the types of IIOC available (Beech et al., 2008; The Internet Organised Crime Threat Assessment (iOCTA), 2014) noted the emergence of increasingly more severe and explicit images containing ever younger children. The Internet Watch Foundation (IWF) found that 81% of all the sexual abuse content they analysed in 2012 was of children appearing to be aged ten years or under, an increase of 7% on the previous year (IWF, 2012). In 2014, they found an increase from 3% to 4% in the number of reports relating to children aged two years (IWF, 2014).

The Canada Centre for Child Protection (CCCP) was established in 2002 as a facility for the public to report concerns of online child sexual exploitation, and since that
time, 95% of the reports (N=175,000) made have been regarding IIOC (CCCP, 2016). Having completed a full analysis on 46,859 children since 2008, they found that 49.64% (21,640) were estimated to be younger than eight years of age, and 78.29% were considered to be less than 12 years. In terms of severity of abuse, they reported that 50% of the content depicted explicit and/or extreme sexual activity/assaults. They also found that, as the children became younger, the severity of the abuse increased, and where babies and toddlers were the subjects of the material, 59.72% of the acts were explicit sexual activity/assaults and extreme in nature.

In addition, the extent to which children are being solicited online is growing exponentially (Wolak et al., 2011). State and local law enforcement agencies involved in Internet Crimes Against Children Task Forces (ICAC) in the USA reported a 230% increase in the number of documented complaints of online enticement of children from 2004 to 2008. Law enforcement reports indicate that children are being incited to perform sexual activity via webcam by means of targeted coercion by offenders (CEOP 2012b; iOCTA, 2014). In interviews with victims of sexual abuse (N=93) where digital technology was a component, nearly half reported that the offender recorded an image, with 14% reporting that they were abused by an additional perpetrator who was aware of the produced material (Say et al., 2015). Another study found that 57% of the 100 12-17 year olds surveyed had been asked online to send a naked or semi-naked picture or video (Rood et al., 2015). In a recent study looking at reports from the public about online solicitations towards children, 155 of the 166 reports (93.37 %) detailed specific requests for pictures or dialogue previous relating to sexually explicit material that had been sent
by the child (Quayle and Newman, 2016). In one study, it has been found that those who solicit children online for sexual purposes have higher levels of social anxiety, loneliness, and problematic internet usage than other adults (Schulz et al., 2015). Individuals who want to engage sexually with children to meet exhibitionism and/or voyeurism needs have been found to use webcam to carry out their behaviours online (Seto, 2013; Webster, Davidson and Bifulco, 2014; Quayle and Newman, 2016).

While one study (Steel, 2009) reports that indecent images are the most prevalent material available, it also highlights that the vast majority of content-specific searches are for child abuse movies, at 99%. This is supported by more recent research which reports that video is the main production method for IIOC, with still shots being cut from the footage (Sarkar, 2015). CEOP (2012) highlights that, in some instances, networks of individuals are facilitating the sexual abuse of children in demand to specific requests. Reports indicate that virtual online brothels are operating in certain countries, with children sitting in cubicles awaiting instructions from overseas strangers to engage in sexual activity via webcam (ECPAT, 2010). Initially described as an emerging trend, live streaming of the sexual abuse of children is now seen as an established crime (iOCTA, 2015).

Evidence indicates that the resulting images/videos are initially shared within the community of individuals involved in a closed network but that over time this material moves onto peer-to-peer (P2P), image hosting and social networking sites on the open Internet (CEOP, 2012b). An analysis of peer-to-peer networks in December 2014 estimated that 840,000 peers shared IIOC, with a prevalence of toddlers and infants noted, however, the researchers suspect that other media, such
as social networks, darknets and apps, are also being used (Bissias et al., 2016). The Internet Watch Foundation (2014, p.7) has highlighted how IIOC is increasingly being distributed via ‘disguised’ websites, making detection and policing difficult. A significant decrease in the use of open search methods, such as search engines like Google, to access IIOC has been noted (NCA, 2016), with the efforts of Google and Microsoft to block such material deemed to have resulted in a 67% drop in web-based searches for IIOC in the last year (Steel, 2015). Cameron (2008), in a poll for CEOP, found that pay-per-view sites accounted for only 7.5% of indecent image sources. These findings suggest that individuals are prepared to trade and share indecent images without necessitating a financial transaction, thus possibly negating the need for commercial production (Sheehan and Sullivan, 2010). In support of this contention, the quantity of commercially-produced IIOC is considered to be small, with an approximation of as little as 8.5% of material being created in this way, while the use of Bitcoins has been noted as an emerging, albeit low-volume, trend (IWF, 2014; iOCTA, 2015). An increase has been noted however, with commercial web pages being put at 21% in more current analysis (IWF, 2016).

What is of particular concern is the fact that the images and videos of child sexual abuse and exploitation are not ‘old’ or the same images being redistributed repeatedly. CEOP (2012) refers to hidden internet sites and suggests that they are a source of new or first generation indecent images of children. CEOP’s analysis of such material highlights that many of the indecent images and videos are seen for the first time on such sites. In 2012, the IWF (2012) found 9,950 web pages that contained child abuse, and the hosting was traced to 38 countries. Watchdog organisations are also reporting the use of Darknet, i.e. sex offender communities
using hidden service platforms such as TOR and sophisticated technical expertise amongst offenders (iOCTA, 2014). Restricted areas of TOR have been linked to the creation of new IIOC containing more extreme and sadistic material (iOCTA, 2015). In addition, VIP or restricted sections are found to be commonplace, possibly fuelling the production of new images, with this being an entry level requirement (iOCTA, 2015; Johnson, 2014).

Production of IIOC in countries where children are particularly vulnerable is an increasing concern. An anti-human trafficking report, End Exploitation and Trafficking in Bangkok, suggests that approximately one quarter of missing children in Indonesia have met their abductors via Facebook (Sarkar, 2015). Over half of the foreign individuals arrested in Thailand in 2009 in connection with child sexual exploitation were found to be in possession of digital equipment and IIOC they had produced themselves (ECPAT, 2010). It has also been highlighted that mobile phones can act as a method of production, a grooming commodity, and a means of continuing communication with the victim when an offender returns to his own country (ECPAT, 2010). All of this activity is against the backdrop of a fact highlighted by The International Centre for Missing and Exploited Children (ICMEC), that 35 countries still have no laws addressing IIOC, and 50 countries do not consider possession of IIOC a crime, nor do they consider IIOC a crime (ICMEC, 2016).

1.3.2 Consumers of IIOC

It has become clear that the term ‘internet sex offender’ is proving to be an inadequate and limiting description that may, in fact, result in multi-agency
professionals underplaying and/or misunderstanding the behaviours and motivations of individuals who use the internet and social networking sites to sexually exploit children (Sheehan and Sullivan, 2010). Offenders who use online communications to perpetrate sexual offense against children are diverse and defy easy classification (Tener, Wolak and Finkelhor, 2015). In fact, the information available relating to internet-mediated crimes against children is limited, restricted by context, and sometimes appears contradictory (Quayle, 2009). There is no typical profile of the individuals who access indecent images of children (McCarthy, 2010), they have been categorised as a heterogeneous group (Henry et al., 2010) that defy simple categorisations, and there appears to be a lack of a coherent and agreed framework for defining their activity (Aslan, 2011).

The internet has been found to have particular appeal to those who consume IIOC (Davidson and Gottschalk, 2011). It seems that researchers, front-line professionals and safeguarding organisations are scrambling to keep up with new technology and the way in which individuals are seeking to sexually exploit children via such media (Buschman et al., 2010). Likewise legislation has been reactive, responding to public fear and media standpoint (Davidson, 2008). A primary area of research to date has been to explore the extent to which contact offenders and those found in possession of indecent images of children have similarities and/or differences (Wolak, Finkelhor and Mitchell, 2005; Middleton, et al., 2006; Webb, Craissati and Keen, 2007; Elliott and Beech, 2009; Babchishin, Hanson and VanZuylen, 2015; Tener, Wolak and Finkelhor, 2015; Bartels and Merdian, 2016). Research has also been carried out in order to assess whether those who have accessed indecent images of children are likely to continue on to commit a contact offence or have already
committed such an offence (Sullivan and Beech, 2003; Calder, 2004; Seto, Cantor and Blanchard, 2006; Bourke and Hernandez, 2009; Buschman et al., 2010; Eke, Seto and Williams, 2011; Seto, Hanson and Babchishin, 2011).

An offender’s collection has been described as an indicator of what they have done or would like to do (Johnson, 2015), however; there is no categorical evidence of such a link. However, a recent study urges caution in respect of those found in possession of IIOC, and suggests that they are more dangerous than their offence indicates and are likely to be contact offenders (DeLisi et al., 2016). Studies suggest that those who view IIOC are more likely to have both sexual fantasies about children and a desire for sexual contact with them (Dombert et al., 2015; Klein et al., 2015; Ray, Kimonis and Seto, 2014; Seto et al., 2015). An earlier study found that child pornography offenders were three times more likely to have pedophilic sexual arousal than contact sexual offenders and, as such, is a better diagnostic indicator of pedophilia than a contact offence (Seto, Cantor and Blanchard, 2006; Seto, 2010).

A review by CEOP (2012), of 97 case examples of individuals convicted of possession of indecent images, resulted in the identification of 246 victims of contact offences. Another study presented contrary findings, where of the 4,249 offenders who were convicted for possession of IIOC, only 10 of their cohort were subsequently reconvicted for the sexual abuse of a child (Goller et al., 2016). In a study comparing image offenders with dual offenders (McManus et al., 2015), it was found that dual offenders were more likely to have access to children, suggesting that this is a key factor in the assessment of an offender’s risk, a finding supported by other studies (Babchishin, Hanson and VanZuylen, 2015). Interest has also been
shown regarding the impact exposure to indecent images may have on the individual who is viewing them (Marshall, 2000; Quayle, 2004). It has been postulated by Carr (2012) that pro-social ties of individuals who access indecent images of children may serve to prevent them from committing contact sexual abuse offences.

The internet has created a new medium, whereby sexual thoughts are being disclosed and detailed in a public arena. This, in turn, raises serious implications in regard to the distinction between fantasy and the actual intention and/or likelihood of carrying out the behaviour (Seto, 2013). The findings of one study suggest that it may be normative to distort reality online (Zimbler and Feldman, 2011). This has caused particular challenges in terms of risk assessment and child safeguarding for law enforcement and other professionals. Research has also been undertaken into the type, size and relevance of collections of indecent images (McCarthy, 2010; Niveau, 2010; Long, Alison and McManus, 2012), an area that forensic law enforcement struggle to deal with, in terms of assessing the volume of indecent materials they are presented with, and overcoming the lengths offenders go to hide such material. In the past it was considered that a photograph was exactly like the object they represented (Miller, 2015). Reports are now emerging of cyber traffickers altering/enhancing images and, in turn, making identification more difficult (Aiken and Chan, 2015). However, despite internet and media advancements, it has been found that those who go online and sexually exploit children use a combination of old and new technology, and that while some are sophisticated in avoiding detection, others use few identity protection measures (Balfe et al., 2015). What is clear, however, is that when an image is shared, control and power over what happens to that image is transferred from the producer to the public (Kim and Joo, 2015).
1.3.3 Producers of IIOC

A producer of IIOC may be ‘a father, pimp, or trafficker’ (Bang et al., 2014, p.25), and is typically known to the child (Fortin and Corriveau, 2015). While they supply to a mass market, unanswered questions are left in respect of who this sub-group is. What are their motivations, what function(s) does their behaviour serve and how are they accessing children to sexually exploit in this way? The data from the National Juvenile Online Victimisation Studies (NJOV) (Wolak, Mitchell and Finkelhor, 2006; Wolak et al., 2011) confirm that crimes involving the production of indecent images of children are highly diverse, and that both the offenders and victims are not homogenous groups.

It has been noted that, while indecent images continue to emerge, producers are rare (Taylor and Quayle, 2003). Their status and value, as they post new IIOC within organised like-minded groups, have been observed, with them being referred to as power posters (Fortin and Corriveau, 2015). However, law enforcement observations (CEOP, 2012) and an increase in the skill of forensic analysis of computer hard drives, along with more insight into what to look for in investigations, may suggest that these individuals are more prevalent than previously considered, and/or are on the increase.

While they may be in the minority when compared with those found exclusively in possession of indecent images of children supplied by others, producers are a critical component in the supply and demand chain. It has been highlighted that the demand for new indecent material may encourage individuals to create such images (Oosterbann, 2009; Prichard, Watters and Spiranovic, 2011) and “turn collectors into
It has previously been detailed that those who view indecent images of children acknowledge the existence of the Fantasy Escalation Effect, whereby they experience a desensitisation to the images that they are viewing, and consequently seek more and more explicit images/video material (Sullivan and Sheehan, 2002). This suggestion has been supported by studies that found a progression to viewing more explicit/severe/new images for those accessing IIOC (Winder, Gough and Seymour-Smith, 2015; Houtepen, Sijtsema and Bogaerts, 2016). Research has suggested a possible progressive impact as a result of viewing indecent images, either in the form of desensitisation to the images and/or that exposure to the material may, in fact, trigger pre-existing sexual fantasies and urges (Bourke and Hernandez, 2009; Sheehan and Sullivan, 2010).

Self-generated/self-produced indecent material is a more recent phenomenon, and one engaged in increasingly by young people (Leary, 2010; CEOP, 2012). Popular culture advocates regular updating of social media posts with pictures, and in many countries, the number of children online when ‘out and about’ has doubled (Vincent, 2015, p.4). As the technology is becoming more mainstream, it is considered that young people’s inhibitions are being lowered, in terms of posting images/videos of themselves of their own volition to people they may have met only online (Quayle, Lööf and Palmer, 2008). This activity is sometimes referred to as sexting, and includes sending and/or posting sexually explicit texts or images of oneself via mobile phones or the internet (Levick and Moon, 2010), where coercion, grooming or adult participation is not involved (Leary, 2010). Posting the material to a social networking site is not an unusual aspect of this behaviour (McBeth, 2010). Between September and November 2014, the Internet Watch Foundation (IWF) tried to
provide an overview of this type of material. They found 3,803 self-generated, sexually explicit images and videos of young people, 89.9% of which had been taken from their original location and uploaded onto other websites, typically termed parasite websites (IWF, 2015). It is worth noting that some young people may have more problematic behaviour than others with respect to self-generated indecent images, and may coerce peers into production and/or distribute indecent images (Leary, 2010).

For the purpose of this work, it is important to distinguish between specifically adolescent, self-generated, indecent material originally created for personal use in a relationship context, and material that is solicited by individuals who are seeking out and exploiting vulnerable children to self-generate indecent images and videos. This activity is distinct in that it is undertaken by individuals online who solicit children, and prompt and encourage them to take and post illegal images and/or engage in online web production with those who create images using covert cameras (Wolak, Finkelhor and Mitchell, 2005). In such instances, the child may self-produce the image, and the individual who has requested and/or prompted the behaviour may never have come into direct contact with the child. Reports to Cybertip.ca found that in 18.67% of cases, young people had sent images they created following a request or threat from an adult (Quayle and Newman, 2016). It has been noted that individuals use various techniques to influence a child to self-produce indecent images which, once created, can in turn be used as leverage to coerce the child to continue production (CEOP, 2012; iOCTA, 2014; Quayle and Newman, 2016). Between 2011 and 2013, law enforcement dealt with 84 cases in which victims in the UK were coerced by offenders into making further images and videos of themselves
with threats of sharing the victim’s images/videos with friends, family and their online social network (CEOP, 2012). While determining the circumstances of the creation of sexually explicit images produced by children and young people was beyond the scope of the recent IWF report, it did raise concerns as to an emerging trend of younger children creating the material via laptop web cams (7.5%) and swift sharing with unknown individuals, suggestive of grooming (IWF, 2015).

Previously, it was anticipated that the commercial production of indecent images of children by organised criminal gangs in Eastern Europe would become the primary source of new images (Taylor and Quayle, 2003). Sullivan (2005) argued that there would be an increase in supply of indecent images of children resulting from systematic criminal activity which would seek to capitalise on a profitable market demand. CEOP’s Annual Review (2008-9) noted that the majority of commercially-produced child exploitation images were coming from Russia. Michel and Schulman (2009) noted that Russian officials acknowledged that their country was the commercial centre for the production of indecent images of children, and that organised criminals were behind some of the operations. It may be that production of IIOC is a by-product of larger child sexual exploitation, where pimps take IIOC in order to advertise a child to a potential customer (Rafferty, 2016). However, on-going monitoring and analysis of indecent images suggests that the extent to which a commercial explosion in such an industry was anticipated has not materialised, and the majority of production remains amongst individual who are not motivated by profit (Collins, 2007). Additionally, it has been noted that some individuals on TOR maintain that paying for IIOC is not in keeping with their world, as it compromises security (iOCTA, 2014). For some, the issue of charging for IIOC does not seem to
be relevant, possibly because the material is a currency in itself (The European Commission, 2015). Wolak et al. (2011) found that a consistent figure of 23% of those arrested for the production of indecent images had distributed the material. They suggest that most indecent images are not distributed but created for private use.

Interfamilial offenders are better positioned to gain easy access to children (Seto et al., 2015) and it seems that this is reflected in the IIOC settings. Sher (2007) indicated that an examination of case files undertaken demonstrated that producers of indecent images are, in the main, from the victim’s immediate family, social or educational world, with legitimate access to the child. This appears to be confirmed by the findings of Estes and Weiner (2007), who detailed that approximately 75% of the child victims in indecent images were living at home when the sexual exploitation occurred. This seems to be further supported by CEOP’s (2012) study, where it is detailed that empirical evidence shows that approximately 80% of sexual offences against children are committed within the family or by persons known to the child or children, often in positions of trust. An assessment of interfamilial child sexual abuse has highlighted ‘informal’ indecent image production and distribution emanating from the home, with families and carers complicit in live streaming of sexual abuse online (Horvath et al., 2014, p.10). Since 2013, Cybertip.ca\(^3\) has been analysing the locations of where the IIOC, which has been reported to them, seem to have taken place (N=22,656) (CCCP, 2016). It appears that 68.68% of the settings were in the home. However, since early 2016, they have found the need to track

\(^3\) Cybertip.ca is an online reporting mechanism for child sexual exploitation operated by the Canada Centre for Child Protection.
locations such as swimming pools and changing rooms, the results of which are yet to be determined.

NCMEC makes the distinction between the categories of homemade and commercial production of IIOC, however, they highlight that the distinction between these two categories is becomingly increasingly unclear as a result of online production and distribution (NCMEC, 2013). The internet and new photograph technology have enabled the production of indecent images which are cheap, easy, and relatively risk-free (iOCTA, 2014; IOCTA, 2015). While production of IIOC to date has been largely offline, it seems likely that, with the advent and advancement of the internet, this may change (Quayle, Lööf and Palmer, 2008; Aiken, Moran and Berry, 2011; Whittle, Hamilton-Giachritsis and Beech, 2014). While some IIOC may be professionally produced (Mitchell et al., 2012), it has more typically been amateurs who record their own sexual exploitation of children, an occurrence that may increase with the advancement of technology, in particular as digital cameras and web cameras allow individuals to create high-quality, homemade images (Krone, 2004; Quayle, Lööf and Palmer, 2008). Digital technology and web cameras afford individuals the opportunity to carry out the production, transmission and exchange of IIOC around the world in seconds (Hiber, 2009; Wolak, et al., 2010). What has been referred to as webcam sex tourism (Puffer et al., 2014), allows an individual in another country to become a co-producer and direct the sexual exploitation of a child via live streaming.

A high-profile case in the UK illustrates how modern technology readily facilities the production and distribution of indecent images. Vanessa George, a child-care
worker, was jailed in December 2009 for sexually abusing two children at the nursery where she worked, and distributing images of the abuse that she took with her mobile telephone (Plymouth Safeguarding Children Board, 2010). George initially made contact with one of her co-defendants via Facebook, and they ultimately communicated and shared child abuse images they produced using computers, webcams and mobile phones (Bunyan and Savill, 2009). CEOP also suggests an increase in the number of reported accounts of individuals taking illegal covert or candid images of numerous child victims, in both public and private settings (CEOP, 2012). Studies have suggested that such a technique allows the offender to ignore and minimise the impact of their behaviour on victims (Sheehan and Sullivan, 2010; Winder and Gough, 2010).

Baron and Kimmel (2000) suggested from their research that, where a group has established itself, the socially-reinforcing nature of its members may compel individuals to produce new material. Quayle, Lööf and Palmer (2008) explained how the images themselves may act as a form of currency, giving status to individuals within an online community. It has been suggested that, rather than indecent images of children being a by-product of child sexual offending, in some instances, contact offending may be more about the desire to produce indecent material to increase their social status and recognition within an established network (Carr, 2009; Carr, 2012). Carr (2009) found that, when compared with those exclusively in possession of IIOC, producers were more socially involved in terms of their online activities, and that they were in possession of larger and more structured collections of images. However, Carr (2009) also noted that producers’ collections of indecent images were confined to less severe or sadistic images of children. The pilot study that prompted
this research did not support this, finding instead that all four of the participants were in possession of level 1-5 images\(^4\) (Sheehan and Sullivan, 2010).

Hanson (2009) was less certain about the role of online communities in influencing individuals. While acknowledging the relationship that can exist between sex offenders and social interaction online, Hanson noted that an individual’s connection with online deviant communities may vary in potency and extent. Wolak et al. (2011) highlighted the importance of understanding more about those individuals who manufacture indecent images, and speculated that they may be motivated to photograph victims so they can participate in online trading, however, they also emphasised that many do not engage in distribution but produce exclusively for their own use, at least one quarter of their cohort. Sheehan and Sullivan (2010) found that sharing producers had greater access to their victims, that the nature of the abuse was more serious, and that their manipulation style focused on persuading the victims to engage and collaborate with the abuse. However, Sheehan and Sullivan (2010) also highlighted that non-sharing producers may have been detected prior to progressing to engaging in distribution, and that the behaviour could possibly be viewed on a continuum.

---

\(^4\) Prior to April 2014, to assist with determining the severity of the abuse depicted and to aid with sentencing, indecent images were graded on a five point scale outlined by the UK Sentencing Advisory Panel (SAP) and based upon an earlier scale devised by Combating Paedophile Information Networks in Europe (COPINE), a project emerging from the Department of Applied Psychology UCC, Cork, Ireland. Subsequent to April 2014 these were condensed into three levels, called A, B and C.
1.4 Conclusion

While it is known there is an overwhelming appetite for access to indecent images of children, the source of these images and videos is an important area that needs to be explored. The individuals who produce or manufacture indecent images of children are supplying the ever-increasing market. It is unclear whether the individuals who create the new or first generation material are acting of their own volition, or if they are responding to the demands of others, or perhaps elements of both processes are in operation.

This chapter has looked at development of the production of IIOC and highlighted that it is not a new phenomenon. An examining of the legal issues surrounding IIOC has also been explored and the literature and research pertaining to production and supporting behaviour examined.

A fundamental baseline for all problematic behaviours is that the better they are understood, the better they can be managed, policed, and intervened. However, as the range of ways in which offenders can capitalise on advancing technology continues to grow, the task facing social workers, intervention providers and law enforcement is a difficult one (Leman-Langlois, 2013). Their role has become broader and more ambiguous, and they need to adapt and develop alongside fast-progressing technology and evolving criminal behaviour (Rashid, 2012). The research proposal detailed by this paper aims to provide a greater understand into the thoughts, behaviours and modus operandi of producers of indecent images of children. As the demand for such material is so large, it makes sense to learn more
about those who supply this market, and target their criminal activity and behavioural subtleties as a priority.
2 Methodology

2.1 Introduction

Considering the first-hand account of the sexual exploitation of a child is not an easy task. Contemplating the thoughts, rationalisation and planning that accompany such behaviour is challenging. Exploring and analysing the subtle manipulations of children and their protective adults needs an understanding of nuances and individuality. Choosing any research method should be done against the backdrop of the specific topic under exploration and the aim of the piece of work being undertaken (Silverman, 2010), and examining the narratives of those who have sexually exploited children needs to be carefully considered.

The cohort in this study, 22 males who have produced IIOC, are a little-studied group. The work intends to look at the demographics of the cohort but perhaps even more importantly, it wants to gain a better understanding of the personal experience of individuals who produced IIOC. While the quantitative paradigm has much to offer, it was considered that a qualitative methodology was best suited to the specifics of this research, namely the lived experiences of individuals who produce indecent images of children. Qualitative research has been described as determining the sense individuals attribute to their behaviour (Ezzy, 2013) and, as such, lends itself to the task in hand. Quantitative research can fail to establish the human variable factor; motivations, feelings and thoughts are neglected, and a more accurate picture of the individual experience may be missed. A qualitative approach has been chosen in this piece of research because of its unique contributions, its
depth of understanding, and how it lends itself to an increased knowledge of the individual (Creswell, 1994; Radley and Chamberlain, 2001; Tewksbury, 2009; Frost, 2011; Ragin, 2011; Biggerstaff, 2012). Qualitative research has widely been applied in situational studies of crime, and has included exploration of such complex social topics as offender choices, pathways to offending, community networks, and the societal influences that determine crime (Giordano, Cherkovick and Rudolph, 2002; Sampson and Laub, 2003; Miller, 2005). In addition, it has been used in studying individuals who have been convicted of sexual crimes against children (Winder and Gough, 2010; Pflugradt and Allen, 2012; Mannix, Dawson, and Beckley, 2013; Winder, Gough and Seymour-Smith, 2015). A qualitative analysis of convicted sex offenders by Tidefors and Kordon (2009) concluded that the information about what the offenders themselves tell about their offences could be of importance in prevention work and treatment planning. Research, such as this, is important in demonstrating that core issues, such as prevention, intervention and, indeed, directions for future research, can be influenced upon by utilising a qualitative method.

In terms of the opportunities that qualitative research offers, it has been described respectively as an adventure and a revolution (Gergen, 2001; Willig, 2008), with an explosion of interest emerging (Smith, 2008). Qualitative research methodologies are intended to give the researcher the facility to learn about the perspective of a targeted subject group and entails direct involvement with the individual(s). In this way, the research is steered by the subject and not theory (Higgins, 2009). The voice of the subject is utilised to provide understanding as to how the individual arrives at a position and what meaning they attribute to their actions and the actions of others. In
particular, qualitative approaches have the ability to be diverse, complex and explore subtle distinctions (Holloway and Todres, 2003). Such attributes lent themselves directly to the proposed research and direct contact via interview with participants.

Qualitative analysis allows for hypotheses to be generated and developed as the data are collected and analysed, and in effect, the subject(s) are core to the creation of theory and the humanistic and holistic understanding of a topic. Qualitative interviews are particularly adept at describing the rationale behind why, and in what way, change occurs (Rubin and Rubin, 2004), and, in turn, theory is developed. Participants in this study were being asked about their early life experiences and to consider retrospectively seminal influences in their lives. Accordingly, a methodology that allowed for a possible understanding of change and developmental adjustments was deemed appropriate.

2.2 Data Collection

Data can be generated in a variety of ways in qualitative research but the most common method is the interview (Byrne, 2012). Generally, a semi-structured interview is used to help collect data during the interview and hypotheses are generated at this stage and during data analysis. Often the interview is recorded, with the permission of the interviewee, and subsequently transcribed. The interview was chosen as the main means of accessing data for this research. The interviews were recorded to ensure accuracy.
2.2.1 The Role of the Researcher

The researcher is central to the collection and analysis of data when qualitative analysis is being used. Various collection methods (focus groups, interviews, observation, oral histories, case notes) allow for exploration of a range of variables and an immediacy of interaction with the subjects. The qualitative researcher has been described as working in the real world, dealing with first-hand experiences in a non-formal setting (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). The result is a more textured and insightful understanding of the subject and topic than a quantitative approach might allow. The essence of qualitative research centres on the meanings, individuality and unique characteristics of issues, people, and understanding and motivations in particular settings and cultures (Tewksbury, 2009).

The long-term and extensive professional experience and employment of the researcher in the assessment and treatment of sex offenders was a fundamental part of this study. This provided a distinctive insight and first-hand knowledge over many years with such individuals. The researcher also has a long-established involvement in training practitioners and ancillary professionals in how best to work with this group. This, in turn, has resulted in a current overview and regular feedback on the pertinent issues for front-line staff dealing with such individuals in a variety of settings. To begin with, it was the researcher’s high level of involvement in working with convicted and non-convicted sex offenders and individuals suspected of various sexual crimes that prompted the realisation that producers of IIOC were an under-researched, possibly under-detected and almost unknown topic. Through the course of her work, the researcher realised that, while she was working with individuals who produced IIOC, this was often seen as a secondary aspect of their behaviour by
other professionals. She recognised that emphasis was being placed upon what was considered the most ‘serious’ aspects of their offending behaviour, and that an essential part of their offending narrative, production, was being sidelined. The researcher recognised that this had implications for therapeutic intervention with those individuals but also for law enforcement and perhaps above all, the victims of IIOC.

The researcher brings to the study first-hand experience of over twenty-five years of working with both victims and perpetrators of sexual abuse, as well as those who have had both experiences. Devising the semi-structured interview was informed by such experiences, as well as the concomitant understanding and influence of current research. The interface of theory and personal experience of the cohort being studied is an interesting and informative one. Long-term and intensive involvement with individuals suspected or confirmed of having a sexual interest in children which they have acted upon in a variety of ways means that the researcher was alert to layers of meaning, the likelihood of minimisation and deflection, as well as the necessity of ‘asking unaskable, unthinkable and uncomfortable questions’ (Prins, 2010, p.316). This also applies to the analysis in terms of speculation, hypothesising and suggestions on follow-up research. The experiences of this researcher mean that, from the inception of the study idea to the design of the interview and analysis of the data, an open mind to difficult and counterintuitive questions and thinking was in place.

While studying sex offenders, it is obvious that personal experience of the area being studied, namely insider status, is not the way forward (Dwyer and Buckle, 2009).
However, the researcher can have an insider status and brings insight via a ‘proximity’ to the subject matter and the individuals being studied, that does not necessitate having experienced the study topic first hand (Hodkinson, 2005, p.134). The researcher in this instance brings an insight and understanding of individuals who have a sexual arousal to children and the associated processes that accompany such behaviour. This, in turn, allowed for ‘pick up’ on nuances, identification of cognitive distortions and abuse supportive thinking that a less experienced researcher might not have spotted. However, it is also important to note that close proximity to the subject matter and knowledge of it can result in a predetermination or personal bias of which the researcher needs to be aware (Al-Natour, 2011). The value of ongoing supervision and how to use it effectively is essential when working with this cohort. The researcher used her supervision as a mean of self-protection and evaluation, and to ensure that the work and immersion in it remained at a remove that was healthy, whilst still allowing detailed exploration of difficult matters.

The researcher has worked for many years with young people displaying problematic and abusive sexual behaviour. This group is distinct from adult offenders and there are many differences between their processes and behaviour. However, it was nonetheless helpful in terms of analysis of accounts of participants’ early life experiences to have had regular involvement and insight into the formative years of young people with problematic sexual behaviour.

Rather than removing context or unnecessarily diminishing people’s experiences to numbers, responsive interviewing and analysis facilitates exploration in the context of its own environment, allows for related and contradictory themes and concepts,
and considers what is absent and ambiguous, as well as the unequivocal and the specific (Rubin and Rubin, 2004). As is well documented, sex offenders are considered to hold cognitive distortions, antithetical thinking and to engage in contradictory behaviours (Ward, 2000; Beech, Bartels and Dixon, 2013; Ó Ciardha and Ward, 2013; Grossman, Martis, and Fichtner, 1999). It was considered that the accommodating aspect of qualitative research would allow for such features, while not diminishing the quality of the research. Implementing the sexual exploitation of a child is a highly personal and atypical behaviour, where the variables of personal motivation, environment and influences need to be captured as relevant to each individual, in order to ensure maximum learning.

The researcher is required to have the skill to build rapport with interviewees and the ability to respond insightfully within the context of an interview, with a view to encouraging and maximising data collection. With this in mind, it is best if the researcher has a solid knowledge of the subject matter being explored, and experience of working with the cohort can be valuable (Robson, 2011). The interviews for this research were collected by the researcher (12) and an additional assistant interviewer (10). Using assistant interviewers at doctoral level, particularly in the area of sexual offending, is an effective means of providing a larger sample where access to subjects can be difficult (Nisbet, 2009). In this instance both interviewers have considerable experience in the field, regularly interview individuals who have sexually exploited children, and are up-to-date with current relevant research. Accordingly, the subject matter was familiar to them and they were able to bring a range of interviewing skills and understanding to the process. Discussion was held with the assistant interviewer as to what the researcher wanted
to focus on, what was important in advance of each interview and the necessity of following the semi-structured interview devised by the researcher. Both the researcher and assistant interviewer have recently co-authored a paper which looks at the aetiology of sexual offending and this lent itself to a close familiarity with the current literature, theories of sexual offending and the nuances of interviewing (Sullivan and Sheehan, 2016). Accordingly, there was a clear understanding as to what information was being sought. It is recognised that individuals will have a variety of responses on the same topic and that validity necessitates that each perception is acknowledged and valued while understanding the limitation of any single viewpoint (Porter, 2007). The interviewers took time at the commencement of each interview building rapport and bringing clarity to the process, they were adept at enhancing the participants’ engagement, and were able to be fluid and responsive to questions, while also keeping the interview on topic.

As interviews progress using qualitative analysis, what will begin to emerge are themes that in turn can be coded. Along with a choice of methods of collecting data, there are a range of qualitative analyses that include a wide range of options. These include; Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis, Discourse Analysis, Grounded Theory, Narrative Analysis, Thematic Analysis and Content Analysis (Howitt, 2010). This research has ultimately chosen Thematic Analysis as the most appropriate in terms of analysing the data gleaned from a series of interviews with individuals who produced images that were sexually exploitative of children, and in exploring their aetiology and the development of their offending patterns.
2.2.2 Thematic Analysis

An advantage of Thematic Analysis (TA) for such research is that it allows the researcher to delve more deeply into the world of participants. In addition, it differs from other analytic methods that seek to describe patterns across qualitative data, in that they are bound by theory, whereas thematic analysis is less restrained (Braun and Clarke, 2006). As thematic analysis is about understanding people’s everyday experiences in great detail (McLeod, 2011), it is particularly well-suited to gaining insight into the motivations and developmental processes involved when an individual sexually exploits a child.

Thematic analysis offers two internal approaches to deriving themes from the data, namely an inductive/bottom-up analysis (Frith and Gleeson, 2004) and a theoretical/top-down examination (Hayes, 2013; Boyatzis, 1998). The former is a process of coding without the need for it to conform to the researcher’s pre-determined assumptions or a pre-existing coding framework (Braun and Clark, 2006). Nonetheless, researchers are not devoid of a framework but must consider their theoretical and epistemological commitments (Braun and Clark, 2006). In addition, thematic analysis is suitable when there is a dearth of literature and/or previous research on a topic (Strauss and Corbin, 1998) - as the world of the internet and its usage as a medium for sexually abusing children is a relatively new and unexplored one, this approach is applicable. Theoretical analysis is constrained by a more rigid framework and data that is influenced by pre-determined concepts (Braun and Clark, 2006), and was deemed too limited when a rich understanding of individual experience is required to begin to understand how sex offenders and producers of indecent images function. In addition, inductive thematic analysis is
pertinent when there is no explicit research hypothesis or fundamental question to be answered but rather allows themes to emerge from the data. This research was exploratory and wanted to focus on the individual experience and aetiology of sex offenders, rather than impose any form of pre-determined constraints on the data.

In terms of inductive thematic analysis, Braun and Clarke (2006) recommend a six-phase approach which is outlined in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Key Phases of Thematic Analysis - Braun and Clarke (2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Familiarising yourself with your data:</td>
<td>Transcribing data (if necessary), reading and re-reading the data, noting down initial ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Generating initial codes:</td>
<td>Coding interesting features of the data in a systematic fashion across the entire data set, collating data relevant to each code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Searching for themes:</td>
<td>Collating codes into potential themes, gathering all data relevant to each potential theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reviewing themes:</td>
<td>Checking if the themes work in relation to the coded extracts (Level 1) and the entire data set (Level 2), generating a thematic ‘map’ of the analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Defining and naming themes:</td>
<td>Ongoing analysis to refine the specifics of each theme, and the overall story the analysis tells, generating clear definitions and names for each theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Producing the report:</td>
<td>The final opportunity for analysis. Selection of vivid, compelling extract examples, final analysis of selected extracts relating back to the analysis of the research question and literature, producing a scholarly report of the analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.3 Pilot Study

Thematic analysis was ultimately chosen as the considered best option for this research. However, the pilot study (Sheehan and Sullivan, 2010) that was the starting point used Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA). The pilot study consisted of a small cohort of four participants. This was seen as an important part of the research process and a guide to subsequent refinement of interview structure and content, as well as a means of reviewing and analysing emerging themes as the cohort grew.

There is support within the qualitative methodology that allows for, and indeed encourages, the use of an initial phase of research as a guide for directing the main body of work, seeing it as exploratory and a useful basis (Turner et al., 2008).

Maxwell (2005) highlights the importance of how continually assessing the extent to which the design is working as the research proceeds, to factor in how it affects and is being affected by its context, and to make alterations and adaptations, is necessary. In qualitative analysis, maintaining your original data design can be seen as sacrificing thorough data analysis for consistency (Silverman, 2010).

IPA is an analytical tool developed by Smith (1996), with origins in health psychology. IPA views the participants as the experts in the field and the researcher’s task is to elicit their perspectives and make sense of their experiences, their worlds, their behaviour and the meanings they attribute to them (Smith, Jarman, and Osborn, 1999; Smith and Osborn, 2015). IPA is seen as particularly suitable for smaller samples and case studies, and so lent itself particularly to the pilot study.
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(Smith, Jarman and Osborn, 1999; Smith, 2004). However, this, in itself, was seen as a limitation when the cohort for this piece of research grew. IPA can influence and, in turn, limit analysis as it is considered restricted by an epistemological framework (Braun and Clarke, 2006). A less-rigid approach was considered more useful moving forward with the research cohort.

2.3 Design

2.3.1 Semi-Structured Interview

The semi-structured interview for this research was devised to facilitate the investigation of factors that might have contributed to the development and progression of this form of child sexual exploitation. The areas covered by the semi-structured interview are; life history; blocks to offending; role of fantasy; planning and preparation for offending; the abuse; and function of image/movie production. The design of the semi-structured interview was based on the conceptual framework *The Spiral of Sexual Abuse*\(^5\) (Sullivan, 2002; Sullivan and Beech, 2004; Sheehan and Sullivan, 2010; Sullivan and Sheehan, 2016) and was further informed by other seminal works in respect of the etiology of sexual offending against children (Finkelhor, 1984; Marshall and Barbaree, 1990; Hall and Hirschman, 1992; Ward and Siegert, 2002).

A study of learning-disabled sexual offenders in the community noted that thematic analysis as a methodology and, more specifically, open-ended questions within semi-

\(^5\) The Spiral of Sexual Abuse is a framework that illustrates the development of sexual abuse that includes exploration of early life experiences, as well as the developmental stages in perpetrating sexual exploitation of a child. It allows for the individual story to unfold during interview whilst also exploring key identified areas in the aetiology of sexual offending.
structured interviews, allowed the greatest participant expression and yielded the best data (Hutchinson, Lovell and Mason, 2012). The interview questions for this study placed emphasis on open-ended questions, with the aim of trying to gain an understanding of the participants’ view of their process, as well as their attitudes and beliefs towards children and their own offending behaviour. Emphasis was placed upon questions that would lead the researcher into the data but not so broad as to lead to unlimited possibilities (Corbin and Strauss, 2008). Questions began with the general and moved to the specific (Stewart and Shamdasani, 1990).

While questions were prepared in advance against the broad backdrop of relevant literature, the interview content was also influenced by thoughts and hunches of the interviewee and, as such, was subject to change throughout the research process (Seale et al., 2007). However, it was recognised that while individuals will have a variety of responses on the same topic and that validity necessitates that each perception is acknowledged and valued, the limitation of any single viewpoint was also seen as an important factor (Porter, 2007). In addition, it was noted that interviewees may get different versions of the “probing” questions which, in turn, may produce different information (Higgins, 2009). Cognisance was also taken of the fact that excessive intervention from the interviewer can be counterproductive in the field of qualitative research (Guest, MacQueen and Namey, 2012). While researcher bias is inevitable in qualitative work and should be recognised and minimised, some bias will always exist (Yardley, 2008). The critical aspect is to acknowledge this fact (Hanson, 2009).
While all academic study is steered by research questions, these can be refined as the work progresses (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Following the pilot study, some changes were made to the semi-structured interview - in particular, with the inclusion of questions in relation to whether an individual had shared the images/videos they had taken or not. The pilot study identified that “sharing” and “non-sharing” producers had some differences in aspects of their offending behaviour, victim access and manipulation style. While the pilot was too small to be significant, it was nonetheless considered important to explore this issue more extensively with the full cohort. In addition, having been identified as themes during the pilot study, it was also decided to add questions in regard to the impact of the internet on offending behaviour and the relationship between viewing and the production of indecent images.

The semi-structured interview questions were as follows (see Table 2):

**Table 2: Semi-structured Interview Questions**

| Introductions | 1. Details of research project.  
|               | 2. Confirm they have read and understand confidentiality/data protection.  
|               | 3. Emphasis that all information is ‘on the record’ and will be available to referring organisation.  
|               | 4. Highlight the importance of not disclosing third party and/or incriminating information (reiterated throughout the interview). |
| Convictions   | 5. Summarise the offences for which you have been convicted. |
| Personal history | 6. Tell me about your childhood and life growing up.  
|               | 7. Do you have a sexual interest in children? At what age did you become aware of this?  
<p>|               | 8. Were there any factors in your childhood which might have contributed to journey to producing IIOC? |
| Sexual exploitation of children-general | 9. Have you engaged in other forms of child exploitation? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Production of images</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. How did you target/access children for this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Describe how you groomed children and others to this end?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Describe how you made it okay to engage in this behaviour-cognitive distortions /justifications used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Have you downloaded IIOC/used the internet to sexually exploit children?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Describe this process and your level of involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How did the process of production begin?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Tell me about the images you took?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stills/video/both.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Describe your production methodology-how you took the images.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Describe how you targeted/gained access to children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Was your process covert or overt, or both? Describe how you did this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Describe the grooming techniques/process you used with the child (children) and others that was directly linked to production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Were the images used as a threat to the child (children)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Did you involve the child in decisions about which images to take?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Describe how you made it okay to engage in the production of IIOC-cognitive distortions/justification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Why were the images important to you? Their function(s)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Did you share them with anyone?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Why did you / did you not share?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Describe you interactions with those whom you shared with/interacted with in relation to IIOC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.4 Participants

Participants were chosen from a range of individuals who were known to have produced child sexual exploitation images and, as such, met the criteria of appropriate (Yardley, 2008). Participants were initially contacted by a third party, either Law Enforcement, Probation, Prison Services or Local Authority personnel.
who are involved in a professional capacity with these individuals. The researcher works regularly with such organisations and contacted them to explain the research and the wish to interview individuals who had produced IIOC. The organisation the researcher works for is noted in the field of research for its involvement in studying individuals who have committed sexual crimes relating to children. As such, any approach was not atypical. As noted already, there is a dearth of information about producers and it is possibly an underdetected crime. Accordingly, production was the crucial element in identifying individuals willing to be interviewed. In the main, the participants were incarcerated at the time of interview or were involved with law enforcement in the community. As a consequence, individuals who engage in this behaviour but have not been caught were therefore not included; neither were those who had been apprehended but refused to talk. All participants were male. The selection of only convicted offenders, apart from one, will have created some anomalies within the data.

The interviews relied upon self-report; however, case files were made available and allowed for independent verification of certain aspects of the accounts given. The aims and objectives of the study were explained, and written consent, in accordance with the British Psychological Society’s code of conduct for professional practice ‘Ethical Principles for Conducting Research with Human Participants’ (1993; 1994), was obtained from all participants. All participants were told that the interviews were being conducted for the purpose of research. A description of the project was provided to participants and only those who were content to sign a consent form were included in the study. The names of participants have been changed and any details of their offending or account that might identify either the participants or their
victims were removed. Strong emphasis was placed upon the fact that, if any participant disclosed an offence and/or incriminating information, this would be passed to the relevant authorities. However, it was also emphasised that participants were not to disclose any such information and/or third party details that would identify any victims.

Originally, the study group comprised 23 participants, however, one participant withdrew his consent for the interview to be used prior to the analysis of the content.

2.4.1 Inclusion Criteria

The cohort was defined by the requirement that they had created ‘produced’ images that were sexually exploitative of children. As can be the case with qualitative methods, there can be challenges in the area of sampling (Berg, 2007); however, there was diversity within the sample in terms of IQ, culture and professional backgrounds, as well as in respect of the specifics of their offending behaviour. In all cases, the following selection criteria were applied:

- Volunteers nominated by professionals working in the field;
- Willing to give a recorded interview;
- IQ greater than 80;
- Acknowledged responsibility for the production of indecent images of children;
- Willing to take part in the research study/recorded interview;
- Willing to discuss their offence (therefore acknowledging some aspect of abusive behaviour).
2.5 Interviews

The interviews were carried out on a one-to-one basis over a minimum period of three hours. Some individuals were interviewed more than once - however, this was not always possible. All the interviews were video recorded onto a memory card using a Sony Digital camcorder. At the end of each interview, the file was transferred directly onto the encrypted hard-drive of a Sony Vaio laptop computer and the memory card was wiped using PGP wiping software. A back-up of the files was retained on a fully-encrypted, removable hard drive. The records of this study were anonymised and retained in password-protected Word Excel, SPSS and NVivo files on the encrypted laptop. No paper files were retained containing any personal details of the participants.

2.6 Analysis

As it has been suggested, that moving from the oral to the written text is a reconstruction as opposed to a direct copy (Steinar, 1996), the interviews were transcribed verbatim, retaining all grammar, pauses and unfinished sentences. As discussed above, thematic analysis, following Braun and Clarke’s (2006) six-phase approach, was then used to analyse the data.

Increasingly, researchers are utilising computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software to assist with the coding and cross-referencing of transcripts (Bringer, Johnston and Brackenridge, 2006). In this case, the QSR NVIVO (NVIVO) software package was used to store, manage and assist in the analysis of the transcripts. The benefit of the NVIVO software package is that it allows the researcher to code
passages in one document, while facilitating quick reference to similarly-coded passages from other transcripts. As themes, referred to as ‘nodes’, emerge from the data, they are stored in a manner that allows the creation, browsing and exploration of new themes and sub-themes as the ongoing analysis of the transcripts continues.

The first interview to be transcribed was read and re-read to familiarise the researcher with the data. The second stage involved the generation of initial codes, whereby interesting aspects were coded across the data. In stage three, following a broad grouping of codes, a preliminary list of themes was compiled. All subsequent transcripts of interviews were also reviewed and a revised list of themes was generated. Each revision required a review of the previously-coded data, in an attempt to ensure the reliability of the analysis and contribute to comprehensive data treatment (Silverman, 2000). In stage four, further refinements of themes were carried out, and dominant themes and sub-themes identified. Stage five involved defining themes and sub-themes. Stage six included the selection of extracts, final analysis and linking to literature.

2.6.1 Semantic vs. Latent Themes

As discussed above, themes can have a categorisation that includes both dominant and sub-themes. The analysis of research can benefit from exploring these themes at different levels, namely the semantic or explicit level, and the latent or interpretive level (Boyatzis, 1998). With a semantic approach, the researcher does not go beyond the explicit or surface meanings of the data. A thematic analysis at the latent level delves into the semantic content of the data and begins to identify and explore the underlying ideas, theories, and ideologies underpinning an individual’s surface
meaning. Such an approach can maximise detail, as both latent and semantic themes can be looked for simultaneously and, in turn, add to the meanings derived from the research interviews (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Such a dual approach was adopted in this analysis, as it lends itself to dealing with cognitive distortions and an under-developed sense of self, features often found within those who sexually exploit children, as well as recognising the validity of the participants’ perspectives.

### 2.6.2 Validity

Confidence in the validity of qualitative research can be improved by ensuring sound procedures are utilised (Porter, 2007), and by clearly identifying the method and measures used (Yardley, 2008). Pawson et al. (2003) recommend that the qualitative research can be improved by including transparency, accuracy, purposivity, utility, propriety, accessibility and specificity. Such validity is attained from the analysis procedures of the researcher and by utilising an external reviewer (Clark and Creswell, 2011).

Themes are found in a phrase or sentence that carries meaning in respect of what that data is about (Saldaña, 2009) and are not restricted by size or shape (Ryan and Bernard, 2003). The aim was to disprove the analytical conclusions in the manner described by Silverman’s (2000, p.289) ‘refutability principle’. A matrix was used to assist with the illustration of the themes relating to each participant, and to assist in following the complexity and volume of detail emerging from the accounts. Tabulations were used to display data and analysis, as it can enhance validity (Miles and Huberman, 1984).
2.6.3 Inter-Rater Reliability

Assessing inter-rater reliability, whereby data are independently coded and the codings compared for agreements, is a recognised component in quantitative research (Armstrong et al., 1997). While there is no golden key to validity, qualitative researchers must ensure critical analysis (Silverman, 2010). In the pilot study, the first interview transcription was read and coded separately by both interviewers. This list was regularly reviewed by both interviews, as all other transcripts were also examined separately, and the themes revised accordingly to ensure ‘comprehensive data treatment’ (Silverman, 2000). In respect of the larger cohort, in order to verify the reliability and validity of the codes and themes, the second interviewer preformed the inter-rater reliability function.

2.7 Conclusion

The use of qualitative analysis, and specifically thematic analysis, lend themselves to allow the interviewee to drive the research agenda and inform theories in a real and felt way. Berg (2007) contends that qualitative research establishes meaning for the essence and ambience of a topic and enlightens us as to the meanings of concepts, metaphors, symbols and description. This research seeks to explore the experiences of sex offenders who have produced indecent images of children and examine their behaviour. To this end, it is important that the individuals being interviewed are able to detail their experiences, thoughts, feelings and behaviours, and that these are then analysed for emerging themes and sub-themes. Thematic analysis is deemed most appropriate and conducive to such an analysis, in the hope that it may inform the field.
The emergence and development of the internet, and its concurrent use as a means of sexually exploiting children, is a relatively new phenomenon. Accordingly, it is an area that research needs to seek to gain a better understanding. As the variety of methods available to individuals who sexually exploit the internet is considerable and varied, a bottom-up approach, not fettered by existing theory, was considered advisable. Such an approach allows for individual experiences to be recognised, and for the process of change and why it occurs within the problematic behaviour, namely producing indecent images of children, to be examined.

The pilot study was a valuable means of underlining anomalies, inefficiencies and gaps in the semi-structured interview, and allowed for changes and additions to be made. It also highlighted initial themes and sub-themes which are further explored in this study. The process was aided by the fact that the researcher is experienced in working with and interviewing the cohort type. This allowed for a backdrop of theory and understanding, while nonetheless maintaining flexibility, and not allowing the theme generation be controlled or influenced by pre-existing research.

Reliability and validity are paramount in research, and the use of an independent individual to rate reliability was a means of assisting methodological rigour. To avoid anecdotalism (Silverman, 2010), the refutability principle is used along with regular reviews of the data. Tabulations are used to allow the reader to get a sense of the data as a whole and detail issues generated by analysis of the cohort’s themes and sub-themes.
The interviews, analysis and write-up are all underpinned by a rigorous and transparent methodology. It is hoped that this will increase an understanding of the aetiology and experiences of individuals who engage in producing indecent images of children.
3 Demographics & Formative Early Life Experiences

“I’m not like other sex offenders, I’m different.”

(Frank)

3.1 Introduction

Recent research has suggested that better understanding of the trauma antecedents in the lives of sex offenders will improve interventions and risk management (Levenson and Socia, 2015). Participants in this study were asked about early life experiences that they considered might have been significant in respect of their subsequent sexual behaviour towards children. The aforementioned pilot study (Sheehan and Sullivan, 2010) elicited themes, such as early sexualisation and social isolation in childhood as relevant, and this chapter further explores such issues. Demographics of the cohort are also examined, illustrating that they are not a homogenous group, a finding well-supported in other work (Perrot et al., 2014; Heffernan and Ward, 2015; Seto, 2015).

3.2 Study Group

All 22 participants were male and white, with the exception of one who described his ethnic origin as Jewish. As can be seen from Table 3, participants were predominately from the UK (N=15), with six from the USA and one from Ireland. The most common age range was between 35-44, with eight participants in this category. The majority (N=12) were single, and nine were either divorced or separated at the time of interview. This brought to 21 the number of participants who
were not in a relationship at the time of interview. Only one participant was in a relationship with a life partner. All of the participants had attended school and 10 of the cohort attained third-level education. Just under half of the cohort (N=10) had their own children. Twelve of the participants had been employed or worked at some point in a voluntary capacity with children.

The typical profile for an individual found in possession of indecent images of children (IIOC) is a single, white male over 26 years of age, who has never been married (McLaughlin, 2000; Wolak, Finkelhor and Mitchell, 2005; Bates and Metcalf, 2007; Sheldon and Howitt, 2007; Webb, Craissati and Keen, 2007; Middleton, Mandeville-Norden and Hayes, 2009; Aslan and Edelmann, 2014). Sex offenders convicted only of internet-related offences are also found to be better educated, more likely to have stable employment, and are also less likely to have had previous convictions, as opposed to contact sex offenders (Wolak, Finkelhor and Mitchell, 2005; Bates and Metcalf, 2007; Laulik, Allam and Sheridan, 2007; Sheldon and Howitt, 2007; Webb, Craissati and Keen, 2007; Middleton, Mandeville-Norden and Hayes, 2009; Aslan and Edelmann, 2014). Internet-only offenders have also been found to hold distinct core beliefs about themselves, the world and their online offending (Bartels and Merdian, 2016). However, research has also questioned the concept of differences between contact and non-contact offenders to the extent suggested by some studies (Bazinet, 2015). Wolak, Finkelhor and Mitchell (2011) examined what they termed ‘dual offenders’, namely those with both internet and contact sexual offences against children, and found that the latter were more likely to live with or have employment that gave them access to children; 37% of dual offenders versus 20% of child pornography-only offenders. However, there is not a
direct correlation in respect of the cohort in this study, as they do not fit any specific group categorisation beyond that of producers. Four of them did not use the internet in any way to sexually exploit children, and four of them deny any contact offences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Own children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tim</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>3rd Level</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sam</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>3rd Level</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leo</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Frank</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Post Grad</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hector</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Callum</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>3rd Level</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Shelton</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Finn</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>3rd Level</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Stan</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>3rd Level</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mitch</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Blair</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>3rd Level</td>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Trent</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Liam</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Tony</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>3rd Level</td>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Brian</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Foster</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>3rd Level</td>
<td>Married/ Life</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>partner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Mike</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Elias</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>3rd Level</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Hugh</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>3rd Level</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. David</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.1 Conviction Data

Of the 22 participants, 18 of them reported using the internet as part of their general sexual offending against children, three reported offending via the internet only, and one had no internet usage. While the 22 participants acknowledged producing IIOC, under half of them (N=9) have actually been convicted for this offence. One explanation for this is that, in some instances, the law for such an offence did not exist at the time of arrest. In some cases, self-produced IIOC were not found or not recognised as such when investigations were carried out. In some jurisdictions, law enforcement agencies do not have the resources and/or the technical sophistication to undertake a detailed forensic analysis of offenders’ computers, and victim identification can in turn be undermined. It also emerged that, in certain instances, the prosecution appeared to have presented sample charges and/or more specific serious offences, and the issue of production was side-lined. An overview of offence and conviction is detailed in Table 4 below.

Mitch spoke of how an image he had self-produced was not raised in court:

“and uh uh so they, the authorities never asked me about that picture, it was my lawyer, um, so I guess the authorities had, you know, told her about it but that particular picture was never brought up in Court or nothing you know.”

(Mitch)

A larger number (N=19) were also in possession of indecent images other than those they took themselves. Marshall (2000) maintains that pornography exposure may influence the development of contact sexual offending in some men. Others suggest that a conviction for possession of IIOC is a strong indicator the individual will have already committed contact offences against children (Bourke and Hernandez, 2009;
DeLisi et al., 2016). It has also been suggested that individuals are most likely to possess the pornography that corresponds to their sexual interests and that, accordingly, men who possess IIOC have a sexual interest in that type of behaviour (Seto, Cantor and Blanchard, 2006) and use the material as an arousal and a rehearsal of offending (Heffernan and Ward, 2015).

In respect of admissions of contact offences against a child, the majority of the cohort (N=18) acknowledged they had engaged in this behaviour, while 13 were convicted for such an offence. It is possible that more of the cohort have committed contact sexual offences against children but that they have not been caught and/or have not disclosed this information. All of the participants (N=22) reported that they were aware of their sexual arousal to children before they began to produce IIOC. Sixteen participants said that they were aware of their sexual arousal to children when they were teenagers. Four reported that they became aware of a sexual interest in children while in their 20s and 30s. One participant said his sexual arousal and offending behaviour began when he was aged 45 but also detailed atypical sexual experiences with peers as a child; another said it started when he was 52.
### Table 4: Offence and Conviction Data of Study Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Admitted of producing IIROC</th>
<th>Convicted of producing IIROC</th>
<th>Possessed other IIROC</th>
<th>Other Internet convictions</th>
<th>Admission of contact sexual offence(s)</th>
<th>Convicted of contact sexual offence(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tim</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sam</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leo</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Frank</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hector</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Simon</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Callum</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Shelton</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Finn</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Stan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mitch</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Blair</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Brady</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Trent</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Liam</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Tony</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Brian</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Foster</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Mike</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Elias</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Hugh</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. David</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Formative Early Life Experiences

Sexual offending is long considered heterogeneous in nature and associated with varied and unsubstantiated causal factors (Ward, 2014; Heffernan and Ward, 2015). Nonetheless, childhood emotional, physical and sexual abuse, behavioural problems, and family dysfunction have been found to be developmental risk factors for sexual arousal to children (Lee et al., 2002; Grady, Levenson and Bolder, 2016; Sullivan and Sheehan, 2016).

Despite this, minimal attention has been focused on the offender’s personal developmental history, with emphases instead being on cognitive and behavioural change (Levenson, 2014). What is increasingly emerging is that adverse childhood experiences can impact on neurodevelopment, hamper positive attachment relationships, interfere with relational attachment, and promote the development of maladaptive interpersonal skills (Finkelhor and Kendall-Tackett, 1997; Felitti et al., 1998; Weiss and Wagner, 1998; Anda et al., 2006; Creeden, 2009). Consequently, it is relevant to explore the impact of childhood narratives of sex offenders and, in particular, experiences of adversity in the emergence of their offending behaviour (Levenson, 2014).

It has been suggested that sexual abuse during childhood can increase the possibility of sexual contacts with children and subsequent reinforcement of sexual arousal to children due to fantasy and masturbation (Marshall, Laws and Barbaree, 1990). This theme is echoed in the findings of Lee et al., (2002), who determined that sexual abuse during childhood was a specific developmental risk factor resulting in a sexual arousal to children. Their study also identified childhood emotional abuse and family
dysfunction as formative risk factors for arousal to children. In a meta-analysis, Jespersen, Lalumière and Seto (2009) concluded that sex offenders are more likely to have been sexually abused than non-sex offenders, and that there was a significantly lower prevalence of sexual abuse history amongst those who offended against adults, as opposed to those who had child victims.

Poor quality attachments between parents and child, leading to low confidence, limited social skills and emotional loneliness, have been highlighted as childhood experiences of those who have been sexual with children (Marshall and Barberee, 1984; Smallbone and McCabe, 2003; Marsa et al., 2004; Marshall, 2010; Levenson and Socia, 2015). In addition, general trauma has been identified as components in the early years of those who go on to sexually harm children (Grattagliano et al., 2015).

Studies into the early lives of individuals who have used the internet to sexually exploit children are few, inconsistent, and only emerging (Houtepen, Sijtsema, and Bogaerts, 2014). However, in terms of childhood experiences of those who have sexually exploited children, Sheldon and Howitt (2007) found little difference in the upbringing of their contact, internet-only and mixed offenders. All categories reported experiences of parental non-supervision, violence and institutional care. The occurrence of physical violence was found to be extremely high across all groups, contact offenders (72%), mixed offenders (60%) and internet (44%), with sexual abuse also being reported as the lowest (20%) in the internet group, as opposed to contact-only (56%) and mixed (50%). The prevalence of physical and sexual abuse in childhood amongst offenders is echoed in another study where both contact and
non-contact offenders reported greater rates of physical and sexual abuse in childhood than the general population (Babchishin, Hanson and Hermann, 2011).

Early onset of sexual activity is reported from a study of both contact and internet-only offenders (Sheldon and Howitt, 2007), and almost a quarter of the study group of internet sex offenders in another study (Burgess, Carretta and Burgess, 2012) reported being victims of sexual abuse as children. However, lower figures have also been reported, as McCarthy (2010) found that, of individuals who used the internet to sexually exploit children, less than 20% had experienced child sexual abuse, and fewer than 15% reported experiencing physical abuse in their childhood.

### 3.3.1 Implications for Study Group

Qualitative analysis is highlighted as a particularly useful vehicle for exploring the lived experiences of individuals (Creswell, 2013). This was particularly apparent when examining the early life experiences of participants and the subsequent themes that emerged. It was not the case that every participant had a sense of early life experiences that were linked to their subsequent offending against children. Simon explained that he was still searching for answers:

> “I’m digging in my life to realise you know what turned me into a paedophile; there’s no other word for it. You know, I’m, I don’t like the word but um I just can’t figure out was it something in my life or was I just born [that way]?”

(Simon)
Simon was not the only one who speculated as to an innate disposition. Trent also raised this point but did not see it as the totality of the matter. He questioned his own sexual abuse experience as perhaps relevant, as he stated:

“Perhaps it’s just in the genes, so, but I can’t really say that that [my abuse] didn’t influence it. Might have, might explain a few things but it, I don’t think it, like totally explains it fully.”

(Trent)

The possible influence of genetic predisposition to sexual offending against children has been raised by some research (Harden, 2014; Långström et al., 2015). Mike also spoke of how he believes that the sexual abuse he experienced as a child did not influence his subsequent arousal but that it was innate:

“I got pleasure from it even when I was 11 years old and never wanted to run into and tell on him or say anything about it. I just let it keep going. And it never destroyed me I don't think. It was in my nature. I don't, whether he ever touched me or anybody else ever said anything to me, I would still be doing the same thing. Nobody, you know turned me this way, it's in my nature; it's what God gave me”.

(Mike)

3.3.2 Emerging Themes

However, despite varying levels of uncertainty amongst participants, three themes emerged when exploring formative life experiences, namely;

- Family milieu
- Early sexual experiences
- Feelings of isolation.

Examination of the data found a number of sub-themes, with considerable overlap also noted (See Figure 1).
Figure 1: Formative Life Experiences

3.3.3 Family Milieu

- Transitory living environment
- Exposure to and experience of violence
- Poor quality attachment with parents/main care givers (absent emotionally, protectively, literally).

3.3.3.1 Transitory living environment

The concept of a transitory living environment appeared to feature as an indicator of a childhood where disruption and lack of security existed (N=11). Negative associations, such as increased risk of academic, emotional and behavioural problems, as well as poor adjustment, have been linked to frequent moves in childhood (Wood et al., 1993; Adam, 2004; Jelleyman and Spencer, 2008; Oishi and Schimmack, 2010). It must be noted that, for some participants, the transitory nature
of their upbringing was due to the culture of the time, for example boarding school. For others, it seemed to be more about an unstable lifestyle, sometimes it was a combination of both. However, regardless of the cause, the impact of the experience was identified by participants as significant.

3.3.3.1 Boarding school

David described his childhood moves to different houses and two boarding schools as a confusing experience:

“We moved all over, all over the shop, different parishes ... then I was sent to boarding school, I was eight ... then I went to another boarding school, em, private school and I was there for about a year and a half ... I didn’t really understand, all I know is that I was dragged out and later on I was let back in to another school, that’s all I know really, they didn’t tell me anything.”

(David)

For Hugh the early move from home and away from his parents was not a positive experience:

“I would say perhaps being bundled up to boarding school when I was seven, it didn’t have a good effect on me at the time so, although it wasn’t intentional, my parents felt they were doing the right thing, so there’s no recriminations there but I would say it was not a positive thing for me at that time.”

(Hugh)

Of the three participants who attended boarding school, two of them were sexually abused while there. Stan highlighted that it was not just the move to boarding school per se but what happened to him there that was problematic. He illustrates how themes overlap and, while early sexual experiences are further discussed below, his account demonstrates a merging of issues:
“I was at boarding school, an all-boys boarding school and I reckon that was probably con... a contributory factor ...erm homosexuality was to a great extent part of school life erm it was you know an all-boys school there were no girls there and err it was something which you know you got on with erm, erm pretty open but it was almost entirely a matter of with someone of your own age if I can use the expression of wanking off and mutual masturbation but it was fairly common.”

(Stan)

### 3.3.3.1.2 Run away from home/Foster care

Family instability, neglect, physical and sexual victimisation have been identified as associated with young people who run away from home (Yoder, Whitbeck and Hoyt, 2001; Tyler and Cauce, 2002; Tyler and Bersani, 2008; Tyler, Hagewen and Melander, 2011). A number of the participants (N=4) in this study ran away from home. Mitch explained that, even when he was located, he chose not to return home:

“When my parents finally figured out where I was, and they called the police, the police came and picked me up and a social worker came to talk to me this time and she said 'well there’s really no use to send you back home is there’ and I said ‘no, there’s not’ and so she put me in temporary foster care and I stayed in temporary foster care for almost two years... I was in 15 different foster houses, because every time I would get in trouble, I guess I was in the mentality that you know I’m afraid I’m gonna get hit, so I would run away.”

(Mitch)

The combined experience of low parental monitoring and early age physical abuse have been found to contribute to diminished cognitive self-control (Kort-Butler, Tyler and Melander, 2011). Lack of parental monitoring and homelessness has also been identified as a risk factor for juvenile sexual offending (Salter et al., 2003; Felizzi, 2015).
3.3.3.1.3 Frequency of moves

For some participants, moving house regularly was an intrinsic part of their childhoods, again echoing the frequency of moves /out-of-home theme identified as relevant to juvenile sex offenders (Felizzi, 2015). Frank appeared non-plussed by the process:

“I seemed to move around quite a lot”.

(Frank)

Sam, however, was more inclined to recognise that it was unusual but, while viewing it as anomalous; he did not attribute any negative outcomes to the experience.

“I suppose the most remarkable thing of my life is the relative frequency of moves. When I was nine months old up until seventh grade, I had been to a different school every year except for second and third grade.”

(Sam)

Blair illustrated how a move had a knock-on effect that impacted upon him at a number of levels:

“All it was, was basically my Mum and Dad, we moved house when I was, um, 12 and at that same time, obviously a year earlier I started the, um, comprehensive, so changed schools as well. And most of my friends went to a different school so I lost my network of friends and at the same time in that year we moved home as well.”

(Blair)

3.3.3.2 Exposure to and experience of violence

Eight participants spoke of experiencing violence as children, and eight of them also spoke of witnessing violence against a third party, with cross-over in most instances. In total, 19 participants (86%) were exposed to violence as children. Research has shown that children and young people who have been exposed to violence in the home are at an increased risk of experiencing emotional and behavioural problems,
as well emotional, physical and sexual abuse (Hester, 2007; Holt, Buckley and Whelan, 2008; Margolin et al., 2010; Blair et al., 2015; Forsman et al., 2015). Studies have also found that children who experience domestic violence are more likely to have greater difficulty in forming peer relationships and have lower social abilities than non-abused children (Margolin and Gordis, 2000; Howe and Parke, 2001; Anthonysamy and Zimmer-Gembeck, 2007; Clarke and Wydall, 2015), as well as increased levels of antisocial behaviour and aggression in relationships (Herrera and McCloskey, 2001; Anthonysamy and Zimmer-Gembeck, 2007; Ireland and Smith, 2009). Specifically, some links have been found between witnessing violence in the family home and juvenile sex offending (Caputo, Frick and Brodsky, 1999; Salter et al., 2003; Ricks and DiClemente, 2015), however, contrary findings also exist (Benoit and Kennedy, 1992). The attitudes of the participants varied, with some appearing to have distortions in respect of their own abuse experiences and/or the perpetrators. It is widely supported that adult sex offenders hold cognitive distortions in relation to their own offending (Grossman, Martis and Fichtner, 1999; Marshall et al., 2009; Beech, Bartels and Dixon, 2013; Ó Ciardha and Ward, 2013; Hempel et al., 2015; Sigre-Leirós, Carvalho and Nobre, 2015). It has been further suggested that such distortions and maladaptive schema have their origins in adverse childhood experiences with primary care givers (Chakhssi, Ruiter and Bernstein, 2013; Carvalho and Nobre, 2014; Sigre-Leirós, Carvalho and Nobre, 2014). Tim viewed his physical abuse as a method of discipline and did not seem to attribute the concept of harm to the experience:

“He was never abusive but he used the belt and it was not a beating but proper disciplinary action.”

(Tim)
Mike appeared to view the experience of physical abuse at the hands of his father as not impacting on their relationship significantly:

“Even my Dad, you know he used to whip me and beat me and stuff when I was really young but I still love him to death you know.”

(Mike)

It has been suggested that young people who have been victims distinguish between hurt and harm, and can fail to recognise the lasting impact of the latter when the pain of the former dissipates (Williams, 2010). In addition, the concept of idealisation of abuser as a coping strategy is a recognised strategy employed by children (Milton, 1994; Blizard, 2001).

Hector was able to recall the pain he experienced, and highlighted later in interview how fear of his father stopped him from disclosing to him when he had been sexually abused:

“I was terrified of my stepfather at the time because he was beating the crap out of me...he hit me so hard I thought my legs must have been broken. Looking back on it that’s what the pain felt like.”

(Hector)

And later in respect of his perpetrator:

“I was begging him not to tell my Dad; cos I thought my Dad would kill me...it wasn’t as painful as my Dad beating me to death.”

(Hector)

Mitch’s examples illustrated how some participants were both on the receiving end of violence as well as witnessing it:
“My stepmother would leave bruises on me, the very first time she did it my Dad, he knocked her across the room uh but after that you know, he never said anything to us about spanking us or whatever.”

(Mitch)

He also highlighted how women were the purveyors of violence for some participants and the mixed messages he was receiving around physical abuse from his father.

Frank described how, despite the police being called, there was no significant action taken when his mother experienced violence.

“I just remember having a difficult time up there. And, um, but my mum, it was almost like it, nowadays it would be domestic abuse. She sort of looked after the house for him and were allowed to stay there. This is because we couldn’t find somewhere to live at the time. And I remember he picked up a plate and smashed it in her face. And it was things like that that were a bit ‘oohf’, you know, and police came round. But back then it was a sort of slap on the wrist. Now you’d come up here for that.”

(Frank)

There is an increasingly improved understanding of the interrelationship between violence towards women and towards children. Such research tells us that, in situations where domestic violence is perpetrated against a mother, there is a greater likelihood of child abuse, compromised parental capacity (Fantuzzo and Fusco, 2007; Hester, 2007; Danese et al., 2009), and significant damage to the mother-child relationship (McGee, 2000; Mullender, 2002). Parents who perpetrate violence have been found to have additional deficits in playing with their offspring and demonstrating affection (Boyle et al., 2010), as well as difficulty in demonstrating affection (Barnett, Miller-Perrin and Perrin, 2010).
3.3.3.3 Poor quality attachment

While violence in the family home is likely to impact negatively on the attachment relationship between children and parents, it is not the only mediator of such a process. Secure attachment is seen to have the components of safety and soothing, and a dependable and proximal, protective care giver who allows separation in a secure environment (Levy et al., 2011). Poor quality attachments are seen to lead to low self-confidence, poor social skills, lack of empathy for others and unsatisfactory relationships (Marshall, 2010a; Maniglio, 2012) and, while not seen as necessarily causal, have been associated with predisposition to sexual offending against children in adulthood (O’Reilly et al., 2004; Wood & Riggs, 2009; Marshall, 2010a; McKillop et al., 2012; Wurtele, Simons, and Moreno, 2013 Levenson and Socia, 2015). Similarly, associations have also been postulated between problematic attachment bonds and sexual offending during adolescence (Marshall, Hudson and Hodkinson, 1993; Smallbone, 2006; Miner et al., 2009; Rich, 2011; Miner et al., 2014). While not describing it as poor quality attachment per se, many participants detailed limited and deficient relationships with their primary care givers (N=18).

Robin spoke of the lacking relationship he had with both his parents:

“It was ok. We were never close. Sort of Victorian in that sense. I’m afraid to say I was brought up on the adage that little children should be seen and not heard and all that sort of thing, so if you have problems you couldn’t discuss them and even though, we don’t really talk issues through so.”

(Robin)
An absent father and consequent poor masculine role models was found to be significant in the histories of sexual offenders against adults in one study (Davids, Londt and Wilson, 2015), with abandonment being linked to intimacy deficits in sex offenders in another (Martin and Tardif, 2015). Frank had an absent father from his early years and inconsistent poor quality contact:

“"I wouldn’t say I had a relationship with him. Even when he’d left and went to abroad it was like, he’d ring occasionally. Which is why, me being in here I make every effort to try and be part of my children’s lives. At the moment direct contact isn’t happening, but I still send them things. And, because I know that if he’d have done that for me, I, I would have felt very different.””

(Frank)

Liam experienced abandonment by both parents at a young age and, while he still had contact with them, any chance of a positive attachment was compromised:

“"Well I didn't see my parents till I was about 6, they, they got tired of, I mean I don't know what they got tired of, they, cos they got tired of me, so they gave me, not gave me they pretty much palmed me off on somebody, I'm not gonna, I can't say who because he's still alive obviously but um they pretty much raised me you know, and um, from about two weeks after I moved in with them, yeah he started messing with me and stuff like that.””

(Liam)

Mike’s experience of severe physical abuse at the hands of his father has already been detailed. While he appeared more accepting of that behaviour and expressed his love for his father when recounting the beatings he received, he seems less forgiving at the apparent level of parental neglect and ambivalence when describing his own sexual abuse:
“You know my dad's standing there all, on the other door talking to us, you know not openin' the door because you know the lights were out of course and uh, does he not know what's going on or does he even care or does it matter uh, to people back in them days, uhhh I thought about that a lot.”

(Mike)

Stan provided an example of where themes overlapped, and it seems that it was not just the move to boarding school at the age of eight that impacted upon him, but the sense of emotional distance from his mother and the impression that, at times, he felt like an inconvenience.

“Good, definitely good, I always loved my parents. In the holidays I got on marvellously with them. They did everything they possibly could for me but, and again I think I said this to you last time, they were both very, very busy people and they would, particularly my mother, would do her best to make sure she didn’t make any appointments in the school holidays so that at least one person was around to for me when I was there, but it was very convenient for them that I was away at boarding school but that was the ethos in those days in any case err and she, God bless her, used to trek down 2 or 3 times a term by train in the days when you couldn’t afford petrol or there wasn’t any petrol to afford [laughs] to come to visit me and we went on marvellous holidays every year together erm. I had a tremendous respect for my father which is why I wanted to become ordained myself he was an erm parish priest and I hope I’ve based myself on him.”

(Stan)

David believed that his mother knew that he was being sexually abused but that she did not intervene:

“My mother obviously knew what was going on because sometimes I got injured, I’d have bruises or eh I had, I ripped my anus, the skin on my anus there. We knew a doctor who used to be in the, who knew each other, em he used to fix me up and he was in the guild scene, we had all these people involved.”

(David)
Women are rarely seen as capable of violence and/or sexually harmful behaviour (Brayford, 2012), with a possible over-reliance on gender stereotypes, and limited, and at times inaccurate, portrayals of them in popular media (Stathopoulos, 2014). However, many in this cohort appear to have experienced both male and female primary carers as neglectful and/or abusive.

### 3.3.4 Early Sexual Experiences

In a cohort where exposure to domestic violence was experienced by 86% of participants, it is not surprising that other negative childhood experiences also occurred. It has been highlighted how child sexual abuse often co-exists alongside a disruptive home environment, where children are not protected against a plethora of risks (Dong et al., 2003; Levensohn and Socia, 2015). Most victims of childhood sexual abuse do not go on to sexually abuse children (Salter et al., 2003). However, it has been highlighted that many sex offenders have reported experiences of child sexual abuse (Craissat, McClurg and Browne, 2002; Salter et al., 2003; Jespersen, Lalumière and Seto, 2009; Levenson, Willis and Prescott, 2014; Ramirez, Jeglic and Calkins, 2015). One study found 73% of their cohort reported experiencing sexual abuse as children, and referred to their developmental histories as having heightened sexuality as a result of having been sexualised maladaptively to meet the needs of others (Simons, Wurtele and Durham, 2008). They cited early exposure to pornography (65% before age 10), an earlier onset of masturbation (60% before age 11), and sexual activities with animals (38%) as childhood experiences of those who go on to sexually abuse children as adults. While some early meta-analyses (Hanson and Bussiere, 1998; Hanson and Morton-Bourgon, 2005) found that a history of abuse in childhood was not linked with sexual recidivism, more recent work has
highlighted a link between childhood sexual abuse and sexual recidivism in respect of high-risk sex offenders (Nunes et al., 2013; Abracen and Looman, 2016). Analysis of the data revealed that a significant number of participants in this study had sexual experiences as children (See Table 5).

Table 5: Data analysis highlighting the number of participants within the study who had sexual experiences as children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of sexual experience</th>
<th>No. of participants who had sexual experience as children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexually abused by adults as children</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual activity (beyond typical sexual experimentation) with other children before their teenage years, with eight of the 9 being aged 10 or under.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewed adult pornographic material prior to their teenage years.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposed as children to the sexual activity of others and/or were aware that it was occurring.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.4.1 Abuse by adults

Liam explained that his early abuse experiences, which began when he was six years of age, habituated him to such an extent that he had no block to offending:

“I don’t think the wall ever stopped me at all because I had been raised that way honestly, I mean that’s just my life man and that’s how I got brought up from six and you know, yea.”

(Liam)
Liam’s experiences of abuse included bestiality:

“I remember, getting, getting, Offender having a dog do me when I was about 8 or 9, so. He asked me and I was like ‘sure, I don’t care, whatever’ you know.”

(Liam)

Mike explained that he believes his sexual preference was impacted by his abuse experience and a subsequent lack of sexual arousal to adults:

“UH, the first time I had sex with an adult was probably when I was 11 - uncle. And uh that went on for probably a couple of years until I got too old for him uh.. and uh I just kept going. And you know I lost interest in adults, you know, shortly after, even now and I’d go to these different prisons and they would, you know because the problems I’d be having on the compound, guards would always ask me, "well why don’t you have sex with adults" and I did you know when I was 11/12 years old, I lost interest.”

(Mike)

David was one example of the six participants who reported being sexually abused by more than one perpetrator:

“I’ve a very poor memory when it comes to anything before the age of 6 years of age, but eh, I mean the abuse started maybe a bit earlier but I just don’t remember it but I vividly remember my 6th birthday, it was the first time I had anal intercourse and with my father and after that it was continuous over until I was 13 and a half, 14, em he started, I started meeting his friends lots of them, hundreds over the years, and he was selling me on to them or swapping me for boys that he wanted, em, em you’ve heard of the organisation PIE...”

(David)

The extent to which David’s early life experience impacted on his own offending behaviour as an adult is evidenced in the almost identical replication of his own abuse of children alongside other networking offenders.
3.3.4.2 Early sexual experiences with other children

As can be seen from Table 5, exposure to early sexual activity was common among the study group, with just over half (N=12) indicating they experienced sexual contact with an adult during childhood, and 13 indicating that they engaged in atypical sexual contact with other children. Mitch spoke of how he believes that his early sexual experiences with his sister influenced his subsequent sexual interest in children:

“You know I think it started back when I was a child. I really do. You know when I was having sexual relations with my own sister. Um, you know I like the smooth skin, I like..you know even the genital area..Um, you know even that night my girlfriend and I conceived, I was probably fantasizing about having sex with you know, with one of her children while I was having sex with her. Um, that was just the way I’ve always done it.”

(Mitch)

Hector was sexually abused by a network of adults, and this included other children being involved in the abuse experience. He identified how this influenced his perception in a confusing way:

“Mm, well I mean, at the deepest level of it, back when I was about 7/8 in Colchester I basically learned that sex with other children is actually enjoyable and fun, can be fun no matter what else is going on in your life. Um, I got hooked on the pleasure of that, but sex with adults hurts, mostly. Almost always. And it’s, quite often it's not fun. And you really don’t want to have any part of it if you’ve got a choice. Even the good stuff, that just confuses you...it was like these were my experiences of adults and almost none of them were pleasant, except maybe with the couple. And the rest of them with children, and they were almost uniformly great, when it was just us kids.”

(Hector)

Brian described a sexualised family environment, and this seemed to impact on his interaction with other children and on his thinking:
“Um in that same period of time, there were neighbours down the street and I think, James was about my age or maybe a couple of years older. No more than six but probably around four or five. And his sister was probably two or three. And we engaged in sexual play. That was frequently in my mind so I don’t know if that’s a natural … tendency that I had if that memory sticks out or something that develops, cos I remember having very, extremely sexual fantasies at the age of five and six years old.”

(Brian)

Hugh was sexually abused by another boy in the toilets at boarding school, where he reported sexualised behaviour was rife, highlighting an overlap in themes where he was both sexually abused as a child and aware of the sexual activity of others at a young age. He perceived it as formative:

“I was triggered by it [sexual abuse experience/exposure] straight away. If I saw a naked child, bang, I’m being aroused. Because of all that crap [sexual abuse experience/exposure]. And even now, if I think about what happened in that toilet cubicle, it still has that effect. I mean it doesn’t last long but it still triggers me, even now. But I don’t wanna act on it, I don’t want to take it any further like that. It stops dead, but it still triggers me.”

(Hugh)

While the sexual abuse of peers by young people is difficult to determine (Murphy, Page and Hoberman, 2016) with underreporting considered common (Warner and Bartels, 2015), between 2009 and 2010, over 200,000 sexual offences were committed by children in the UK (Cooper and Roe, 2012) Additionally, abuse by multiple perpetrators has been linked to increased likelihood of psychiatric disorders (Sowmya et al., 2016), and is perhaps a more common occurrence than realised, with 12.4% of females and 14.3% of males in one study reporting more than one abuser (Mwangi et al., 2015).
3.3.4.3 Viewing pornography

In terms of exposure or awareness that sexual activity was occurring, nine participants reported that they had such experiences in childhood. Half (N=11) of them also reported early exposure to pornographic material when they were under the age of 13, bringing to 20 the number of participants who were exposed in one way or another to sexualised experiences when they were young.

Witnessing violent behaviour and exposure to pornography has been noted as featuring in the developmental experiences of child sex offenders (Simons, Wurtele and Durham, 2008). Exposure to pornography in childhood has been also been a risk marker for sexually reactive children, predisposing them to aggressive behaviour (Alexy, Burgess and Prentky, 2009). Brian explained that his stepfather, who was sexually abusing him, left pornographic material in family areas:

“I remember he had pornography, and I remember at, as a very young child, looking at pornography. I don't know what it is. My, at four I don't know what it is, I know it's probably human beings and they're, and I know nudity at its base level and I remember my brother saying 'mom he's looking at that book' you know and my mother saying 'oh he doesn't know what he's looking at'. I remember this distinctly.”

(Brian)

From his account, it appears that he was not the only one in the house who was exposed to such material as a minor, and that his mother was ambivalent about the occurrence.

Two participants, Liam and Hector, reported seeing themselves in IIOC as they were victims of production as children.
3.3.4.4 Exposure to sexual activity

Links have been made between poor sexual boundaries within the family home and children who go on to display problematic sexual behaviour (Christopherson et al. 2014; Walton, 2015). Leo spoke of watching his brother masturbate, but what is of additional interest is that his was a regular occurrence in the family living room:

“I mean this is very embarrassing, but I will be honest. There were a few occasions where .. I would um watch my brother masturbate through the door of the living room. Um. There's no, there was no physical contact with him but I did do that when I was 12, 13 um, and I'm ashamed of it now, it's disgusting, but uh yeah.”

(Leo)

Such an experience has the implications of seeing sexual activity but it also raises the issue of poor boundaries within the family home and a possibly more extensive sexualised environment. An overview of formative early life sexual experiences is detailed in Table 6 below.
### Table 6: Formative Early Life Sexual Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>CSA by an adult</th>
<th>Early atypical sexual activity with a child</th>
<th>Exposure to/awareness of sexual activity</th>
<th>Viewing pornography before 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tim</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sam</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes (10) peer</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leo</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes (9) peer</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Frank</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes (11) peer</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Simon</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Callum</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Shelton</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Finn</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Stan</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes (8) peers</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mitch</td>
<td>yes MA</td>
<td>yes (10) sibling [12]</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Blair</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Trent</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Liam</td>
<td>yes MA</td>
<td>yes (10) [6] coerced</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Tony</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Brian</td>
<td>yes MA</td>
<td>yes (4) peers</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Foster</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes (13) sibling [9]</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Mike</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes (4) cousins [4+]</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Elias</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Hugh</td>
<td>yes MA</td>
<td>yes (5) peer</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MA= Multiple Adults

( ) = (Age of participant)

[ ] = [Age of other child]
3.3.5 Feelings of isolation

‘Loneliness has at least two faces: social and emotional’

(Weiss, 1973, as cited in Marshall, 2010).

Links have been found between loneliness in childhood and emotional problems (Qualter and Munn, 2002). Social isolation and loneliness have also been noted as features of adult sex offenders (Chakhssi, Ruiter and Bernstein, 2013; Beauregard and Leclerc, 2014; Miner et al., 2014; Perrot et al., 2014; Sigre-Leirós et al., 2014; Fisher, 2015; Heffernan and Ward, 2015; Jahnke et al., 2015). In this study, two sub-themes are identified that seem to distinguish between a literal social isolation and a more figurative one of emotional (Weiss, 1973) or personal isolation.

3.3.5.1 Social isolation

For some participants, while they had interpersonal skills and the apparent ability to mix with others, their circumstances in childhood left them feeling isolated. It was the knock-on impact of the move to boarding school that Hugh also found had an impact on his formative years:

“Oh my siblings were either at boarding school, they moved on. I saw them during the summer holidays, but the holidays for me were incredibly lonely periods, cos I didn’t know anybody of my age in the village. I didn’t mix with anybody my own age, you know I wasn’t developing those sort of relationships or whatever that you should normally do.”

(Hugh)

Sam spoke of how moving had a significant impact upon him in terms of losing friendships:
“So not only did I lose my school friends I also lost my out of school friends, you know, the neighbourhood friends. So all of a sudden I felt quite isolated. Um, and, you know, even to this day I feel that had quite an impact on me at that time, yeah.”

(Sam)

The ability to form satisfactory, appropriate and mutually-rewarding friendships is crucial for children in their developmental years. An interruption to this process appears to have a knock-on effect for some participants and one that left them struggling in adulthood.

3.3.5.2 Emotional isolation

For others, while they may have had peer contact and a more established social environment, they described feeling emotional loneliness, findings supported by other studies (Chakhssi, Ruiter and Bernstein, 2013; Sigre-Leirós, Carvalho and Nobre, 2015). Brian detailed how he perceived his relationship with his mother:

“Look, you [his mother] think you love me, but you don’t know me. I’m doing these bad things, I don’t feel worthy of your love.”

(Brian)

Foster also described an inner loneliness, where even a negative experience of attention seemed welcome:

“When I was in my last year at primary school, so I would have been probably 11 maybe 10, we had the police come because somebody, there was someone hanging around, had been abusing kids in public toilets at home, and bizarrely she asked if anyone, it had happened to anybody, and got some boy to stand up and relate his story which seemed a pretty shocking thing to do. Anyway, so he talked about how he’d gone to the toilets in the park and some older man there had touched him and got him to touch him. And I actually, I remember, kind of being slightly jealous in a way, and I remember after that, kind of wanting to have some man show me that interest. I’d no concept of violence, sex, rape and all that kind of stuff then, but it’s just I thought the idea of seeing a
grown man naked would be quite nice and I wouldn’t mind if he wanted to touch me.”

(Foster)

Elliot appeared to struggle to find an emotional connectedness both at home or at school, and sought to alleviate and make sense of this by finding his own emotional payoff in peeping:

“I wasn’t fully integrated into any sort of peer group; I was really a bit of an outsider... So I was always a bit of a loner in that sense, in the sense of the peer group. The other factor if you want me to go on to that, was a freak of history, which is that in 1966 through to about 1970, that was a period when miniskirts became very prevalent and very short and it was actually very easy, especially in a school environment, to get glimpses of girls’ underwear, which I found attractive and sexually interesting. And that combined with the other factors, there’s something down there, I’m getting into another emotional experience, and the fact that I was a bit of an outsider from peer groups anyway, I think those factors almost in parallels, propelled me along the route of saying “no I don’t really want to get into a relationship, I’m pretty independent, I’m interested in what I’m interested in”. I was always very much of a self-starter, I always worked very hard, I was encouraged to work very hard by my parents who were both school teachers as well, though I’m not laying blame on them, don’t lead me along there at all. They were doing what they thought was best and it was my decision to go the way I went. Um and I think those factors together propelled me into the idea of just gaining visual sexual pleasure.”

(Elliott)

Such insight raises questions about the improved integration of emotionally-isolated children and how schools, carers and professionals might better recognise and address such deficits.
3.4 Conclusion

While adult sex offenders are not a homogenous group, this study has found certain common experiences amongst a cohort where all have produced IIOC. In terms of their adult lives, many of them struggled to maintain intimate meaningful adult relationships, and 21 of them were without partners at the time of interview. While this can undoubtedly be linked in some instances to their offending history and prison incarceration, they nonetheless reported struggling throughout adult life to achieve and/or maintain a romantic relationship. A striking feature of the study is the extent to which participants had early sexual experience with other children and/or with adults. In addition, and perhaps not surprisingly, many of them had adverse childhood living environments. It has been highlighted that if the early years and the trauma of individuals who have a sexual interest in children are not investigated, a critical aspect of human functioning is being overlooked (Hudson, 2013; Levenson, Willis and Prescott, 2014; Ward, 2014), and, in turn, abusive behaviour prevention may not be adequately executed.
Chapter 4 – Methods of Producing Indecent Images of Children

4 Methods of Producing Indecent Images of Children

You’re More Powerful Than You Think.
You have the power to create, shape, and share your life.
It’s right there in your hand. Or bag. Or pocket. It’s your iPhone 5s.
(Plummer, 2015)

4.1 Introduction

This chapter explores the practical issues and ancillary decisions that are necessary in the production of IIOC. It examines the behaviour associated with taking the actual footage, the technology involved, as well as content and location. Research has shown that recording and communication technologies have been adopted by those with a sexual interest in children, who are perhaps even more skilled at using them than those policing or legislating such media (Taylor and Quayle, 2003; O’Donnell and Milner, 2007; Sheldon and Howitt, 2007; Gillespie, 2008; Yar, 2010; Bissias et al., 2016). Knowing the differences in how IIOC offences are committed is essential in understanding and combating the problem of child sexual exploitation (Krone, 2004), and this is particularly relevant in terms of the methodology and technology used to create these images. In addition, without fully understanding how technology affects and interacts with child sexual exploitation, developing effective treatment programmes is unlikely (Aiken, Moran and Berry, 2011; Fortune, Bourke and Ward, 2015). The use of the internet and other technologies has changed the ‘landscape of crime’ (Bichler and Malm, 2015, p.33) and has added a new dimension to the sexual exploitation of children. What is less apparent is the degree to which
we are seeing traditional crimes and adaptive offenders (Gillespie, 2008), or is a new form of criminal activity emerging (Wall, 2010)?

4.2 Production Methodology

Advanced recording technology has allowed for more spontaneous production of IIOC, and an increase in production in public, with offenders being able to move into close proximity with a child unobtrusively or record at a distance (McCartan and McAlister, 2012). In September 2015, a report for Cambridge University Hospital’s NHS Foundation Trust regarding convicted child abuser, Dr. Myles Bradbury, noted that police found two spy pens in his possession, which had been used to capture partially-clad images of his victims, often taken with their parents in close proximity (Stanton, 2015). What emerged from this study was that, while not referring to spy pens, participants did use covert techniques to photograph and film victims. The study showed that modern recording technology allows remote or movement activation of hidden cameras, and that some devices are so small that participants were able to produce IIOC without anyone suspecting that they were filming. In this respect, it was noted that advancements in technology are facilitating the production of IIOC.

Creating IIOC involves risk-taking, and this is a factor that participants appear to have dealt with in various ways. Analysis of the data reveals two themes related to the practical processes or methodology for producing IIOC. The geography and context are determined as falling into two distinct production methodologies, namely Adjacent and Remote:
• **Adjacent**
  This includes those who had physical contact and/or were in proximity to their victims. The individuals who took videos/photographs of children from a distance are included in this category, as they all came close to their victims while photographing and recording them.

• **Remote**
  This includes those who photographed and/or video recorded children, producing IIOC, via indirect contact over the internet. This category also includes instances where cameras were left hidden and unattended.

Two sub-themes emerge from both these themes, namely Overt and Covert:

• **Overt**
  The overt producers did not hide their intention to video and/or photograph children, however, they hid their underlying sexual motivation when other protective adults were present. For producers who were alone with children, some were clear about their sexual intention and the victims were aware of this but in other instances, the children were oblivious of the sexual element of the recording/photographing behaviour. For many producers, their sexual/production agenda was along a spectrum, and was gradually revealed and accompanied by a grooming repertoire.

• **Covert**
  The covert producers took the images/videos without either their victims or others knowing they were taking any footage.
4.2.1 Adjacent Producers

The majority of the cohort were adjacent producers (N=20). Of these 20 who were adjacent to their victims when creating the IIOC, 19 were overt about their behaviour, one was exclusively covert and six engaged in both overt and covert adjacent production.

4.2.1.1 Adjacent Overt Producers (AOP)

These participants (N=19) were in close proximity to their victims and were open about recording and/or photographing children. They adopted a ‘hiding in the open’ approach, giving the illusion of normality, recording and/or photographing children, but ensuring that their sexual motivation was not apparent when potentially protective adults were present. The forthcoming Chapter Seven on grooming for production examines the behaviour of those in this group who were overt about filming and photographing children when adults were not present.

Different organisations and venues have their own policies about photography where children are present and demands for new legislation in respect of photography in public space (Miles, 2015). While it is important that this does not become overly restrictive, understanding the behaviour of some producers possibly throws light on the necessity for regulations in respect of recording and photographing children. Mike detailed that he attended public places in order to produce IIOC and how he was open about his photography, whilst ensuring that his underlying motivation was unknown:

“I would go to this auditorium where they would have diving competitions and I’d take my camcorder and man, all from all these middle schools and high schools and stuff, from diving competitions and
stuff, I saw it on the news one day, saw this boy, you know about 13 standing on a diving board in a pair of speedos, standing there and that's when I first learnt, I would go there every year and why would I want to sit at home on the internet when I got all these boys in speedos running around me you know, their whole families would come and I would just, I would take a piece of blank tape and tape the... the recording light on the camcorder where nobody could see that it was on and I would just walk around with it, in fact I ruined a couple of camcorders from uh, uh doing the indicator light I couldn't get to go off, because it was so moist and damp in there from staying in there for so long.”

(Mike)

Elias also described how he attended tourist attractions and public events, such as a Majorette tournament, in order to capture images of children. Again, like Mike, he chose events where children were in scant and/or short clothing, and where he had an apparently bona fide reason for having a camera:

“You blend into the crowd and places where other people are taking photographs like I said, a majorettes’ exhibition, being the other demonstration where there are always people and cameras, presumably for legitimate purposes. It was that, it was the key thing was not to become obvious, not to become out of place, to blend in.”

(Elias)

Mitch spoke of how he normalised the fact that he carried a camera with him at all times and of how he availed of opportunities to photograph children when they arose unexpectedly:

“I always took my camera everywhere I went. Even when I was transporting bodies, I liked taking pictures of sunsets, and you know nature. I love nature and uh, so I would take my camera everywhere I went and I went to his house and his granddaughter was there, and she was in a night gown and her and her brother were playing around. They were wrestling on the floor and she kept flashing her panties you know and things of that nature, and I was taking photos and nobody thought nothing of it you know.”

(Mitch)
Grooming can normalise sexually inappropriate or harmful behaviour so that the victim does not perceive that they have been abused (McAlinden, 2012). However, it would appear that it also extends to adults in the child’s life who can be blindsided to the production of IIOC. While the Normalcy Illusion is important to allay the suspicions of potential protective others, it is also likely to have a dual effect. Children may be desensitised to having their photograph taken and, given the apparent approval of other adults who do not respond in any censorial fashion, an imprimatur has been given. While a more detailed exploration of grooming used by the participants in this study is in subsequent chapters, aspects of grooming to ‘create the opportunity’ (Sullivan and Quayle, 2012, p.96) and manipulate adults are relevant here.

A number of the participants spoke of how they gained an official or self-appointed pseudo-official role as photographer for their organisation. Callum bought a camera and this seemed to give him a designated status, both within the school he taught at and a sporting organisation he belonged to:

“I had the camera when others didn’t, so I put myself in charge of photographs and it never caused any issue, it got me what I wanted, where I wanted over and over again and I always had the official club photos whenever anyone wanted them.”

(Callum)

The participants who were in the Adjacent Overt category, who used this Normalcy Illusion, reported that people were unaware of their sexual motive, however, it is possible that this was not the case. The Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre (CEOP, 2013, p.13) attests to the ‘bystander effect’, whereby individuals may
be aware of possible misconduct or have concerns about the welfare of a child, yet do not report the matter or challenge the concerning behaviour.

### 4.2.1.2 Adjacent Covert Producers (ACP)

Seven participants, who described production methodologies which were categorised as ACP, invested time and effort in attempting to ensure victims and protective others were unaware they were being filmed/photographed. Only one of the cohort described himself as exclusively covert in his production methodology. Two distinct approaches were observed:

- Hidden Camera (N=5)
- Sleeping Child (N=2).

The following section explores the extent to which the participants duped victims and others, and carried out their production of IIOC, with the intention of no-one being aware they were filming or photographing. It highlights the extent of planning involved in the production methodology, and the lengths individuals went to avoid detection.

#### 4.2.1.2.1 Hidden Camera

In their study of 129 sexual offences against juveniles, Wolak, Finkelhor and Mitchell (2004) found that hidden cameras were used by offenders to secretly record their sexual abuse of children. In another study of 19 defendants, who were charged with taking indecent photographs/videos, four of them had been using hidden cameras on beaches, in school changing rooms, or at swimming pools where children were undressing (Edwards, 2000). Both public and private settings were
used by participants in this study, where they hid cameras and reported recording children that were both known and strangers to them.

Brady walked around shopping centres and supermarkets taking photographs of children, while keeping his camera hidden. He described how he was opportunistic and the level of precision he employed in choosing his targets:

“You just trying to keep as distant as possible but obviously you, you work out who you target if you like. And you just time it, you just wait for the opportunity, you know, and then when you see they’re about to go on the escalator or whatever you make a beeline for that escalator and try to get in behind them before anybody else does.”

(Brady)

Mitch chose a victim that regularly visited a neighbour of his, and detailed how he would note her arrival and then photograph her surreptitiously, having positioned himself so his camera was not visible:

“She would play in the back yard in a real tight bathing suit, and whenever I would see her out there, I would take my camera outside and I would sit to where you couldn’t tell I had a camera in my hands and I would take photos of her from underneath my leg, you know of her playing around in the back yard.”

(Mitch)

Mitch describes how easily it was for him to be surreptitious when producing IIOC. Contemporary recording and photography equipment can be discreet and easily hidden (Gillespie, 2008). Such technological developments have allowed those with a sexual interest in children to hide the equipment and create IIOC without the child knowing it is happening. Leo used a laptop with an integrated webcam to record his sexual abuse of a six-year-old boy, without the child realising that this was happening:
“The first time he sat on my lap and we played [video games], I think it was the second time we came up [stairs], because he was so comfortable sitting on my lap, that’s when I put my hand on him and touched him through his clothing...I got from there to him exposing his penis and me masturbating him...um...I exposed myself to him...I had the webcam on.”

(Leo)

By focusing a child’s attention on a video game, Leo was able to deflect from his offending behaviour and distract the child; in this way the technology served two functions.

4.2.1.2.2 Sleeping Child

The two participants who detailed producing IIOC while children were asleep did not use this method exclusively, but it appeared to be one component of the production methodology they employed.

Hugh revealed that he would give his victims alcohol and then film them when they were asleep;

“The worst of it, I used to do it when they were asleep.”

(Hugh)

Mitch also spoke of how he capitalised on being with a sleeping child as an opportunity to produce IIOC:

“When they arrested me, they also took my blackberry phone and they found an image of what they thought was a toddler male penis, and uh it was actually a six-year-old boy's penis, but he was very under-developed ... He was asleep, and I just, I found an opportunity to, you know, he was wearing some loose shorts and I pulled the shorts up and I just held my camera, my phone there and snapped a picture.”

(Mitch)
Mitch’s use of a camera-phone highlights how advancements in technology have facilitated, and perhaps even have had a normative effect on, the production of IIOCs. He also worked in a funeral home, where it is alleged that he photographed himself molesting the bodies of children he was preparing for burial. The evidence found on his phone implicated him in the offences, however, his plea agreement meant he was never convicted of these offences:

“They're saying there was 6 photographs and a video. Um they're saying that there's a photograph and video of somebody's index finger being inserted into the vagina of a dead child. And that's that's, in the PSI [pre-sentence inquiry report], it says that I did it, but how can they say that I did it when I wasn't convicted of it, you know.”

(Mitch)

The case file detailed that Mitch acknowledged in police interview that he had taken photographs of himself “having sex” with a number of children who were in repose at the funeral home. The matter was not pursued in interview for this study. Law enforcement in the United States has dealt with a high profile case, where children were allegedly drugged and photographed in a varied of ‘placed’ sexual positions by a teacher. The offences came to light when images were found on a 6-gigabyte memory drive (Bentley and Thompson, 2014). Digital cameras, and in particular camera-phones, allow impulsive, opportunistic image-making (Van Dam, 2014), and the idea of capturing all sorts of images and videos can instigate the development of a regular, and possibly habitual, occurrence.

4.2.2 Remote Producers

The use of the term ‘remote’ is important in indicating distinct physical distance which, by extension, means the non-contact element in the production of IIOC. In
total, five participants produced IIOC in this way, with two of them claiming that this was their exclusive methodology. The National Centre for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC), in the USA, undertook a study between October 2013 and June 2015, and looked at cases where children had been prevailed upon to send sexual images of themselves (n=801) (NCMEC, 2015). They found that in 41% of cases, multiple online platforms were used to communicate with the children. The 2011 UK Kids Online survey of 9-16-year-olds in 25 countries found that 30% of them had communicated online with someone they had not previously met face-to-face (Livingstone, et al., 2011). Such interaction opens the possibility of children being sexually exploited remotely. However, the internet is not the exclusive means of remote production. Current technology also allows for cameras and recording devices to be hidden and activated by movement and/or remotely. This cohort had three participants who detailed producing IIOC remotely using hidden cameras which were variously activated when they were not present. While low in number, they are nonetheless worth acknowledging, as the existence of such a category of sex offenders and production methodologies may be on the increase.

It has been proposed that, as internet technology has advanced and become more available, risk and harm are also increasing (Sabella, Patchin and Hinduja, 2013). Others claim that this is not the case (Madge and Barker, 2007; Maughan et al., 2008), with the view that media and popular unfounded anxieties have over-reported the possibility of online risks (Vandebosch et al., 2013). Indeed, online sexual solicitation was seen to have decreased over the three waves of the Youth Internet Safety Survey (Mitchell, Wolak and Finkelhor, 2010), with figures declining from 19% to 13% to 9% over the lifetime of the study. However, it has also been
highlighted that such behaviour may be underreported and thus difficult to quantify (Livingstone and Smith, 2014). As detailed in Chapter Three, fewer than half the participants in this study, (N=13), were never convicted for the production of IIOC. As with adjacent producers, the concept of covert and overt production methodologies also emerged in the analysis of remote producers.

4.2.2.1 Remote Covert Producers (RCP)

Three participants used covert means to remotely produce IIOC. The FBI website (2013) detailed how Eric Justin Toth, who was taken into custody on the 20th April 2013, spent almost five years as a fugitive, and had been on their ‘Ten Most Wanted Fugitives’ list. He is a producer of IIOC, and one method he utilised was the placing of a camera in the boys’ toilets of the school where he worked as a teacher. A member of the public, Arnie Oerslien, commented on an online blog about Toth (Oerslien, 2014):

“Is secretly taking indecent photos of children a crime... [Eric Justin] Toth committed a victimless crime; it seems the victims did not even know they were photographed”.

While some may consider taking indecent photographs/videos of children as a victimless crime, this is a minority perspective. Nonetheless, it has been suggested that the surreptitious photographing and filming of children should be removed from the USA constitutional definition of pornography, even if the children are engaging in sexual acts, arguing that an invasion of privacy is different from sexual abuse or exploitation (Hessick, 2014).
The use of hidden cameras has become increasingly common in the surveillance of staff in both public and private settings (Hayes, 2015). Online reporting forums regularly update the occurrence of sex offenders using hidden cameras as part of their modus operandi (Aussie Sex Offenders, 2014). In addition, it is technically possible, indeed easy, to remotely activate web cameras, and capture images and videos of unsuspecting victims.

Leo moved his laptop to a neighbour’s house and set it up in the hope of capturing video of two boys who visited the house:

“I used to leave the webcam on when I wasn’t there to see could I capture some good footage, I did get some nude stuff once or twice.”

(Leo)

Case file material detailed how a camcorder tape, seized as evidence, showed Hugh setting up a hidden camera in his living room and a boy subsequently being filmed masturbating. Hugh detailed how he activated the recording from another part of the house when he knew the boy was in the room. As modern recording equipment is increasingly blurring the boundary between public and private (Chalfen, 2009), it undoubtedly raises the question as to whether it is leaving children more vulnerable to sexual exploitation and, in particular, victims of IIOC producers.

David, who produced with other offenders, described expertise and copious creation of IIOC covertly:

“The cameras we used to use, you used to have to hide them, em in corners, behind, just behind the shower sheets and stuff like that you know. Two-way mirror another way of doing it, it used to always steam up and you know but today cameras are so small, the size of pens or whatever it is, pin cameras you know I’m sure there’s hundreds of people out there doing it constantly.”

(David)
While David may not be correct in his estimation, it nonetheless raises the issue of security and procedure in regard to possible hidden recording devices in sensitive areas.

4.2.2.2 Remote Overt Producers (ROP)

Two participants reported that they used the internet as their means of inciting children to engage in sexual activity which they recorded via webcam, and that they did not hide the filming aspect of their behaviour but used various grooming techniques to sexualise the agenda. While one was convicted of possession of IIOC apart from that which he produced himself, the other had one single conviction for production and no other known offences.

While being overt about a sexual agenda, Frank, who assumed the person of a teenage boy, nonetheless described his checking process before he asked the child to engage in sexual activity for the camera:

"Are you alone in the house...Are your parents there, what time are your parents back? ... if I saw something move I would say ‘Oh what was that’ you know, ’cause obviously I’m thinking that somebody is looking.”

(Frank)

While Frank is being alert, evidential chat logs of conversations Blair had with one of his victims show that, while he was cautious about not being detected, he was also not deterred by others being in the house at the same time as he was creating IIOC:

Meg “I’m not at my mum’s house .. I just have my lap top I’m at my dad’s.”
Blair “Ok..Oh God...don’t let him find out what we are talking about! Lol.”
While exploring more general online sexual exploitation, similar themes of checking on parents have been found in other studies (Williams, Elliott and Beech, 2013; Whittle et al., 2013; Whittle, Hamilton-Giachritsis and Beech, 2014). However, perhaps Blair could be described as a hyper-confident groomer (Webster, Davidson and Bifulco, 2014), as he is undeterred and sufficiently confident, despite the close proximity of another adult.

Production methodology for ROPs needs specific equipment, and Blair explained that he noted when a child had the necessary equipment, and then suggested that they turn on the video:

“*I'd said, 'Shall we, you know, video on the thing?' And, and, um, if I remember correctly her, you can tell I think, whether somebody's video is on, yeah. If I remember correctly there's a, there's an icon or something that tells you whether it's on. So you get to view on that and then, 'Look, if you're viewing then we'll switch the video on.' I, the first time I think I just viewed her, not the other way round, yeah. And that may have even been for the first two times. And then after that we, we, we videoed sort of together.”* (Blair)

As detailed, he did not initially show himself, thus letting the child take the initial step to facilitate the production of IIOC. He also explained practical matters, and that his production methodology worked around the timeframe of children:

“*Remember the time of the day as well because they're schoolgirls, they'd be back from school, 4.30-ish, 5 o'clock-ish. Yeah. Then the*
Both Blair and Frank utilised social networking sites to facilitate contact with their victims. Despite Blair suggesting it many times, neither of them met their victims offline, however, they were nonetheless able to achieve their goal and create everlasting evidence of sexual exploitation. The parents involved had no idea what was going on and believed that their children were safe in their own homes, highlighting how the production of IIOC transcends distance (Eneman, Gillespie and Bernd, 2010).

4.3 Production, Technology and Content

A range of technological equipment was used by producers in creating IIOC, and there was a multiplicity of venues, as well as variations in the nature of sexual abuse perpetrated. At times, there was a practical correlation between the technology and the location used. Three key areas are identified as being relevant to the cohort, namely:

- Technical Equipment
- Location
- Content.

4.3.1 Technical Equipment

For those who choose to use technology to sexually exploit children, there are a range of ever-increasing options (Bissias et al., 2016). A number of online means
have been identified, including internet relay chat; ICQ (instant messaging); the internet; email; newsgroups; online games; webcams; social networking; and dating sites for young people (Wolak et al., 2010; Webster et al., 2012; Carr, 2013; CEOP, 2013; Kirwan and Power, 2013; Bissias et al., 2016). Of the 1,145 public referrals to CEOP in 2012, 19% involved the use of webcams as part of online child sexual exploitation (OCSE), and it is considered that the actual figure for such webcam usage is likely to be much higher. Live streaming of child abuse for payment is highlighted as an emerging trend due to the increased use of TOR, also known as the hidden internet or ‘dark net’ (CEOP, 2013; UNODC, 2014, p.17). 3G and 4G mobile phone technology that facilitates quick and simple sharing with others has been seen as an increasingly popular option (Farley et al., 2003; ECPAT, 2010), and such technology has aided faster and easier grooming of children (Jung, Ennis and Malesky, 2012; Quayle et al., 2012; Hui, Xin and Khader, 2015).

As Table 7 below details, a number of the cohort spoke of using multiple media options to create IIOC. Some participants began their production of IIOC with more traditional equipment, for example the Polaroid camera and/or VCRs, but as technology progressed, they adapted and moved to more sophisticated devices.

Table 7: Equipment Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Digital Camera (with video facility)</th>
<th>VCR</th>
<th>Phone Camera</th>
<th>Webcam</th>
<th>Polaroid Camera</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development of photographs and video footage was not a significant issue for the cohort, as the arrival of digital technology and home printers appears to have eliminated some of the dilemmas faced during earlier production. Polaroid cameras, long associated with taking sexual images (Clark-Flory, 2009), were used by three of the participants in this study. VHS tapes were also used by participants and negated the need to have film produced. Two participants reported sending film away to be developed. Callum described how he took precautions:

“The photographs would have to be sent to London, we cut the tops off the photographs, the heads to make them feel okay.”

(Callum)

Whereas Elias seemed less concerned:

“Any film developer…I used Kodak films and they’d go to Kodak to be developed.”

(Elias)

Stan was involved with others who got film developed abroad but also made sure he could develop him own films:

“I had had a black and white…developing thing erm right back from as long as I can remember so if it was black and white photographs erm I could do them myself.”

(Stan)

While a number of participants were describing their initial exploits into the production of IIOC, David’s account encapsulates the progression through various techniques as technology advances:

“I had a guy who would actually dip them and all that kind of thing, em it was a bit of a pain in the bum to be honest it was eh the polaroid were quick, in colour, instant so eh I had loads of them I had whole boxes of them polaroids, em which when it came to computers and we could scan them, scan the images and put them in … well eh before I went into
prison mobile phones and memory cards eh were just coming out and they are so easy to use, you know you can go anywhere and take a photograph. I had a nokia, old nokia now, it was a newish one when I bought it and I took eh one of the lads on a train and we, and I took photographs of him in the toilets using this and then sending them directly to my anonymous account because it encrypts it and sends it so em I had images on the move so to speak and eh videos, you could have 36 minute clip of whatever it was, em so yeah eh, today’s technology is so easy, so easy.”

(David)

Technical expertise is now not even necessary to utilise technology to create IIOC and transform it into a form that is easy to view (Gillespie, 2008). As discussed above, the sexual exploitation of children and the production of IIOC can be done ‘live time’, and viewed almost anywhere in the world with little difficulty and minimal technical expertise and/or equipment. Digital cameras removed the need for files, however; mobile phones are even more facilitative, allowing ubiquitous usage and nearly instantaneous worldwide distribution of IIOC (Dunphy, Prendergast and Scolaí, 2014). Whereas previously, production and sharing involved real risk-taking, digital equipment and internet access have exponentially changed production and distribution options (ECPAT, 2010).

4.3.2 Location

It has been noted that production of IIOC is primarily home-produced by someone known to the victim (Long, Alison and McManus, 2012). However, this study finds that the production of IIOC is not confined to a home location and that a variety of venues are used (See Table 8). It is tentatively postulated that there is a link between this finding in production environment and the advancement, portability and usage acceptability of recording and photographic equipment.
Table 8: Victim Location in IIOC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim Location</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offender’s Home</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender’s Work Place</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Home/Child-minders</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populated (6)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secluded (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of the cohort produced IIOC in more than one location category. At first glance, and in keeping with previously-observed trends (cybertip!ca, 2016), the majority of acknowledged victims (N=11) were in their own home when the IIOC were produced. However, in five of these instances, the victims were in their own homes, and the offender was elsewhere when the images were being captured. This phenomenon increases the categorisation of victims in their own home but it is important to make the distinction that the offender was not physically with them. Since 2016, Cybertipline.ca has created a distinct category ‘public facility’ for coding locations of IIOC (cybertip!ca, 2016, p.19).

Analysis of the location of IIOC by the Cybertipline.ca has found that 15.25% of the material was located outdoors, and 10.81% was in a studio or manufactured setting (cybertip!ca, 2016). None of the participants in this study reported production in a specifically designed location such as a studio. However, there were 11 instances of IIOC being produced in public places, including one example of the offender taking IIOC in his place of work, an open-plan office. The public nature of the location will have inevitably increased the possibility of detection, yet this was not cited as an inhibitor, which seems to support the suggestion that technology facilitates the ease...
of IIOC production. There are some overlaps with a study that looked at children who were sexually exploited and trafficked in their own country, where semi-public and public locations, particularly ones known to the offender and/or associated with routine activities of the victims, were common (Cockbain and Wortley, 2015). Additionally, it has been noted that, in some instances, offenders who meet children online initially meet them offline at considerable distance from their own homes, in order to avoid identification (Webster et al., 2012).

Brady described how he became specific in respect of the venues he chose, based upon the type of individuals that frequented the location and how they dressed:

“It was a case of I knew, um, for instance ASDA [low price supermarket], I say it sounds crazy to mention it now but I knew ASDA would have a good broad range of people shopping there, and I knew the, um, in where I lived that I'd get a good success rate there 'cause I knew that there would be women of 20s, 30s, you know, teenagers, whatever the case may be. And, you know chances are they're gonna be dressing trendier or whatever. Their, their dresses were different, the way they dressed was different in ASDA as it would be in, you know? And I kind of sussed that out over time. Um, so I'd make a beeline, a focal point, go that particular supermarket 'cause I knew that would be the one that I'd get the most success with.”

(Brady)

Brady was able to meet his specific needs around attire by selecting his locations. Mike, who also created IIOC in his own home, spoke of choosing a secluded public location based upon his love of the outdoors:

“On the river, did the lakes and stuff. I tell you why because, I like that outside light. And I like the woods and stuff, something about it you know the trees and the green and fresh air and all the animals and birds and stuff, I liked it, ever since I was a kid I liked it. I liked having, going taking other boys, even when I was a kid myself, there was something about it.”

(Mike)
In understanding sexual offending, there is often what is referred to as a unique factor. In Mike’s case, his early childhood memories and possibly his experiences appear to be impacting on his choice of venue for production.

Stan created IIOC when he was abroad and in a variety of secluded public locations:

“I went on holiday to Italy touring around in a car .. I don’t know I I got to know some kids in in where was I, Puglia or Sienna or somewhere and they seemed quite happy to be photographed and I took a number of photographs of them we would go off each day in the mini bus to some convenient place it might be a nice sort of secluded castle it might be a wood it might be a where have you and we would take photographs normally erm we would take one boy boy with each had a err camera but only a very err ordinary one [co-offender 1] had both a video and err [co-offender 1] and [co-offender 2] who was the err Polish chap the polish adult both had expensive videos and expensive cameras and you know the lot and they would take a boy each and I would take a boy and we would swap and change each morning and each afternoon or what have you and we would go off and take photographs, [co-offender 1] always insisted on having or almost always insisted on having the mini bus.”

(Stan)

The photographs being produced in this instance were for both personal and commercial use, and the location may have been influenced in part by the desire to have a setting deemed visually appealing to the end-user, as well as customising to personal preference.

4.3.3 Content

None of the IIOC produced by the cohort was viewed as part of this study, and instead relied upon case file material and self-report. In the UK, the Sentencing Council categorised IIOC into five levels, depending on the severity of the behaviour depicted. This has recently been changed to three levels, effective from April 1st.
2014 (Sentencing Council, 2014). For the purposes of this study, the IIOC in the possession of the cohort was recorded using the 1-5 levels, as defined by the Sentencing Advisory Panel (2004) (See Table 9).

Table 9: Sentencing Advisory Panel Levels of IIOC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Images depicting erotic posing with no sexual activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Non-penetrative sexual activity between children or solo masturbation by a child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Non-penetrative sexual activity between adults and children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Penetrative sexual activity involving a child or children, or both children with adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Sadism or penetration of or by an animal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In instances where there was no record, the participants were asked to categorise the images they had in their possession on this basis. For those from other jurisdictions, where different categorisations apply, the IIOC was classified as to how it would have applied under the UK Sentencing Advisory Panel system. The numbers of participants with IIOC in each category are identified in Table 10 below.
Table 10: Possession Levels of IIOC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level only</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Levels 2-3</th>
<th>Levels 1-3</th>
<th>Levels 1-4</th>
<th>Levels 1-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Liam created Level 5 IIOC with more than one child, and engineered a situation where a dog was also involved in the sexual behaviour with the children:

“It was just oral sex, you know, um, and jacking me off, you know, uh, unfortunately started playing with the dog, you know, which I'd never, never, I mean I'd done things like that in the past, with [child 1] and shit like that. I never really introduced [child 2] to that, I guess, the dog was just laying there and we were all naked, playing with each other, you just kind of did it, you know. And eh, you know, I didn't think about it until he reached out to do it and I'm like 'oh, ok, whatever', you know.”

(Liam)

Liam appears to be placing responsibility with the child for engaging sexually with the dog, while nonetheless acknowledging that he has instigated such a practice with another child previously. Two studies that looked at juvenile sex offenders found accounts of bestiality at 14% and 81% respectively (Seto and Lalumière, 2010; Schenk et al., 2014). While this is related to young offenders, it is nonetheless indicative of the occurrence of such behaviour, and highlights the possibility of such a taboo behaviour being part of some individuals’ sexual arousal and production content. A study into the chat logs of sex offenders also noted the attempts by one individual to get a child to engage sexually with her dog (Kloess et al., 2015). However, recording of such incidents is low, with Cybertipline.ca finding 0.41% occurrence in 12, 600 images they analysed (cybertip.ca, 2016).
Blair detailed how wanted to get one of his victims to bring the family dog into the sexualised behaviour. He instructed her to do this via webcam but he was arrested before he achieved this goal. However, he did prevail upon his victim to insert an aerosol can into her vagina. Sam, who also used a knife and a cage, detailed how he introduced ropes as props in the creation of IIOC:

“There’s pictures where she appears to be tied to the bed but in fact the ropes, the ropes are tied around her well not terribly tightly around her wrists and ankles but there not actually attached to anything they’re just dangling off the edge of the bed.”

(Sam)

Sam spoke of how he used a webcam to provide a third party with footage of his daughter being sexually abused by him. He detailed that he introduced a weapon, despite not having being asked to do so:

“He wanted me to prove that I was actually you know really taking emm so he said, you know take this picture and write this stuff on her and my artistic vision or something it just seemed like a knife went with that and I happened to have this cool looking knife that I’d got that I’d used for some of my adult play so he hadn’t, didn’t actually ask for the knife, he asked for the like, I forget, slut or hurt me, it said, so it’s not something I wouldn’t otherwise have done if he hadn’t asked.”

(Sam)

It has been suggested that, in some instances, offenders intensify the impression of violence when producing IIOC, a behaviour that Sam appears to have engaged in (Nyman, 2007). The experience of the child in this account is likely to have been traumatic in the extreme, however, Sam appears more focused on the production aspect of the behaviour than on understanding the victim’s issues, even with the benefit of hindsight.
Above all other crimes, multiple perpetrators are not characteristic in respect of sexual offending against children, with typically few accounts of co-offending (Cockbain and Wortley, 2015). In this study, four of the participants were involved with other adults when producing IIOC, and eight included more than one child in the images/videos they produced. Cybertipline.ca noted 19.83% (N=2,498) of the material they analysed as having more than one child (cybertipline.ca, 2016). They also found 14,812 adults appearing in 12,297 images and video, demonstrating that production is not necessarily a solitary process. Co-offending also changes the dynamic of the offence and the experience for the victim, with those who engage in it known to be more serious and more frequent offenders (Cockbain and Wortley, 2015). Additional customisation/components of the abuse/produced material emerged from this study, and this is detailed in Table 11.

**Table 11: Reported Additional Components of IIOC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bondage</th>
<th>Weapons</th>
<th>Sex Toys / Implements</th>
<th>Bestiality</th>
<th>Multiple Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In studies into child pornography production at two different timeframes, 2000–2001 and 2006, similarities were found, with focus on the genitals of children and explicit sexual activity, within the majority of content, and with approximately 40% of produced material depicting an adult perpetrating child sexual abuse and sexual violence (Wolak et al., 2011).
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The Cybertipline.ca analysis divided the content of images and video into sexual posing/extreme sexual posing and explicit sexual activity/assaults/extreme sexual assaults, and found that, where the material was considered to be in the home, 69.91% was in the latter category (cybertip.ca, 2016). It is possible that requests from others, as described by Sam above, is an aspect in escalating the sexual exploitation of children (Sheehan and Sullivan, 2010; Carr, 2013), and that advancements in technology are increasing the opportunities for such occurrences.

At times, participants described producing benign or ‘normal’ footage of their victims; Tim is representative of this selection of the cohort:

“I took in the neighbourhood of 900 photographs ..but many of these, she had her clothes on, some were at the park, some were, we'd go bicycle riding together and I'd take pictures of her.”

(Tim)

84.02% of the material analysed by Cybertipline.ca which was considered to be in an outdoor location, was in the sexual posing/extreme sexual posing category as opposed to more intrusive behaviour (cybertip.ca, 2016). Tim’s description raises an important facet of production, namely volume of material. The issue of quantity of IIOC pertaining to a particular child and the impact of this, even when calculated to include ‘normal’ images, adds another dimension to the victim experience, one that professionals working with such children are struggling to understand and accordingly work with in an optimal way (Martin, 2014).
4.4 Conclusion

The accounts given by the participants with regard to their production methodology demonstrate that advances in the sophistication and design of technology have broadened the opportunities for people, who so desire, to take images and videos of children. Simultaneously, technological advances have also increased the numbers of vulnerable children who might be available to the participants. It is a dangerous combination and does not necessitate the child even coming into direct contact with the offender. However, despite the usage of technology, the crime of sexual exploitation of children is not a new crime. This chapter demonstrates how offenders adapted to their surroundings and technological advances in order to be sexual with children and produce IIOC. Interviews with the participants have shown that the emergence of discreet, portable and concealable recording equipment has allowed both adjacent and remote IIOC production. In addition, the ‘snap happy’ and ‘selfie’ culture that has exploded as a norm appears to have worked to the advantage of sex offenders. While before they may have had to travel to events where photographs were being taken or create a foundation as to why they were taking photographs in certain situations, the pervasiveness and accepted invasiveness of taking videos and photographs as a matter of routine appears to have eliminated the need for some aspects of more traditional targeting and grooming. As well as it not being necessary for an offender to be in the presence of a child when producing IIOC, they now do not even need to be directing sexualised behaviour or controlling recording equipment, as remote activation devices and timers can allow production to transcend temporal restraints.
5 Victim Selection

5.1 Introduction

“It's almost.. like.. planning a strategy, it was crazy.”

(Brady)

This chapter looks at the nature of the initial relationship, the type of contact, and what was considered important for producers when selecting children as the victims in the production of IIOC. Relationships between the producers and victims are classified into own, known and stranger children, with a combined section for those who crossed between categories. In the case of the latter, an own/known group (o/k) and known/stranger (k/s) group emerge, see Table 12 below. The known category includes children who had an established relationship with the perpetrator, either in a personal or professional capacity. The stranger category relates to individuals who took IIOC of children whom they had no association with prior to the commencement of contact for the purpose of sexual exploitation and abuse. In some instances, it was difficult to quantify the number of victims as some of the cohort were prolific offenders and had multiple victims. In most of these instances the victims were strangers.

Studies have shown that law enforcement investigations, that began as concerns in respect of possession of IIOC, revealed a considerable number of individuals who were also contact offenders, in particular, amongst those who lived with children or had access to them via their employment (Quayle, Lööf and Palmer, 2008; Wolak,
Finkelhor and Mitchell, 2011; Bissias et al., 2016). It has been suggested that knowledge of a victim’s routine, characteristics and vulnerabilities help the perpetrator in commissioning a sexual offence (Cockbain and Wortley, 2015; Fortune, Bourke and Ward, 2015). In a study of 100 child sex offenders, over half the sample reported a family member as their first victim, and 80% of the sexual abuse occurred in a domestic environment (McKillop et al., 2015). While accessibility has been cited as an influence in victim selection (McAlinden, 2006; Sullivan and Beech, 2014), other factors may also be in play. In a study by Aslan and Edelmann (2014), 87% of their contact offenders were known to their victims, however, they also found that the internet-contact category of their cohort was more likely to target stranger victims than contact offenders.

Table 12: Cohort's Relationship with Acknowledged Victims in IIOC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Own</th>
<th>Known</th>
<th>Stranger</th>
<th>Combination K/S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 of whom also had known victims= o/k 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relatively high number of stranger victims is somewhat of a shift from the more home-produced known victim association between producer and victim previously found (Estes and Weiner, 2007). This study tentatively suggests that there is a correlation between the use of advanced technology (i.e. digital camera, camera-phones), along with the internet, in creating greater access to potential victims and an increase in stranger targets. It has been suggested that the predominant offline pattern of offenders abusing individuals known to them and in close proximity, may
be changing (Whittle et al., 2013). This research supports the contention that the availability of discreet digital cameras and recording devices, and the ease of online access to children, together with the culture of ‘snapping’ and ‘selfies’, has created an environment that facilitates and possibly encourages the production of IIOC.

5.2 Emerging Themes

Four themes emerge in terms of victim selection, namely:

- Accessibility
- Non-Disclosure/Non-Discovery Assurance
- Malleability
- Attractiveness.

It was not unusual for participants to cite usage of more than one sub-theme as playing a part in their victim selection, as demonstrated by Hugh:

“Certainly there was the availability, the accessibility, the vulnerability, they were there.”

(Hugh)

5.2.1 Accessibility

It has been suggested that offenders will opt for an available victim and rarely take inordinate measures to commit a crime, opting instead to capitalise on opportunities and individuals that present themselves (Felson, 2002). Many child sexual abusers offend in the context of their role as a care giver, where they have regular day-to-day contact with a child and can capitalise on a close relationship (Sullivan and Beech, 2002; Richards, 2011; Sullivan and Quayle, 2012). Children are less likely to disclose when the abuse occurs while living with their abuser (Leclerc and Wortley,
2015), and the proximity of another adult has not been seen to be a deterrent (McKillop et al., 2015). A number of participants (N=10) had their own children, however, only four acknowledged using them for the production of IIOC. While the issue of accessibility for a parent or someone in a parental role seems more straightforward, it did not emerge as significant in this study. Based upon their account in interview, participants found other accessible children to use for production. Like a number of the cohort, Leo was a regular visitor at a family home and he capitalised on this:

“Um I mean the only reason I really had a connection with him was because ... uh his mother just used to drop him off here all day, just leave him there.”

(Leo)

Brady was strategic in terms of accessing a large volume of children and chose the weekend as an optimum time to target larger numbers:

“So you’ve got more opportunities on a Saturday, you know, weekend, that sort of thing. So it was that kind of strategy was involved.”

(Brady)

Mitch was convicted for production and possession of IIOC of a dead child. He acknowledged taking these photographs but was circumspect during interview in regard to the practice to ensure that he did not incriminate himself. While arousal is likely to have been a factor in selection, Mitch places emphasis on availability and ease of access to children:

“I’ve had an opportunity on numerous times you know that I could have taken pictures or whatever, you know I had codes to get into the funeral home at any given hour of the day or night um, you know like I said I was on, I was a transporter so you know, I could be called at 3 o’clock in the morning to, you know to go get a body and bring it back to the funeral home. Um., uh you know I’ve had to go to the hospital and pick up a new born baby you know that died at birth you know and take it
back to the funeral home. So, there could have been plenty of opportunities to do anything I wanted to, you know, I was at the funeral home for at least two years.”

(Mitch)

The concept of accessibility has undoubtedly become more fluid with the advancement of the internet and social networking sites providing a vehicle for contacting children (Whittle, Hamilton-Giachristis and Beech, 2014). Intimacy is available at arm’s length, with minimal effort apparently being needed to make contact with a child (Carr, 2003). Those who used this medium seemed to work around their own schedule and/or that of the child. The optimum time for contact sexual abuse was found to be between 3.00pm and 9.00pm in one study, with 48% of one cohort (N=100) offending during this timeframe (McKillop et al., 2015).

Blair, who contacted children via the internet, spoke of his optimum time:

“So I began to be sort of left in the office, if you like, between sort of 4.30 and no point in going home between 4.30 and 7.30...children were online then.”

(Blair)

While attractiveness was a theme, and is discussed below, it seemed to rank below accessibility for most participants in terms of facilitating production. Elias saw accessibility as a primary factor in accessing victims but acknowledged that he excluded certain available children if they did not meet his criteria:

“Well the availability was a primary driver, but there were some girls that I wouldn’t have found attractive, so I wouldn’t have bothered.”

(Elias)
5.2.2 Non-Disclosure/Non-Discovery Assurance

Offenders have been described as engaging in an assessment phase, where they evaluate the extent to which potential victims are likely to disclose (O’Connell, 2003; Williams, Elliott and Beech, 2013; Kloess et al., 2015). Initial calculations were made by participants in this study as to whether the child was likely or not to disclose. A number of the cohort produced IIOC of children who were too young to clearly recognise a sexual motivation to their behaviour. Sam described how he offended against a six-month-old infant:

“He wouldn’t tell anybody because he was pre-verbal, um I mean it was pure safety, that is a younger age than anything I really have any strong interest, sexually.”

(Sam)

Creating IIOC of children of such a young age ensures against a disclosure. IIOC containing children of younger ages and with more extreme abuse has been noted and continues to emerge in studies (Beech et al., 2008; Wolak, Finkelhor and Mitchell, 2011; IWF, 2014; Bissias et al., 2016; cybertip!ca, 2016). While this may be a function of sexual preference, the non-discourse assurance may also be an influencing factor.

Mitch, who as discussed, worked in a mortuary, was found in possession of IIOC of a deceased child:

“When, when we first started going to Court for this case, you know that was brought up all the time, was the dead, you know the dead child photos.”

(Mitch)

In this instance, Mitch only needed to ensure he wasn’t caught by colleagues, and concerns about victim disclosure were extraneous in this instance. However, it is
worth noting that non-disclosure was unlikely to be the totality of the motivation in Mitch’s choice of victim. Necrophilia is infrequently referred to in research findings on sex offenders. In one study of 362 offenders, while only 5% of the cohort disclosed having additional paraphilia other than paedophilia, necrophilia was not reported amongst these (Smallbone and Wortley, 2004). The studies on necrophilia deal specifically with offences against adults, and findings suggest that individuals who seek jobs in mortuaries and cemeteries, are sexually aroused to a totally unresisting partner, and may also be aroused to murder (Stein, Schlesinger and Pinizzotto, 2010). Low reports of necrophilia in relation to children may be because it is a rare occurrence, however, it is also less likely an offence to be disclosed, and a question perhaps not asked in investigations, assessments and interventions.

Tony accessed his victims online but he made a judgement as to how discreet they were likely to be in advance of creating any IIOC:

“I suppose something either, some sort of reassurance... I suppose therefore some kind of a reassurance that this was a private matter.”

(Tony)

It has been noted in previous research that suggesting secrecy in either an online or offline situation increased the possibility of sexual contact with a child or adolescent (Bergen, et al., 2014). Brady described what may have seemed as a degree of recklessness in selecting children to photograph but he appears to have been reassured by the ability to remove himself quickly from the busy scene on a Saturday in a shopping centre or supermarket:

“So I would literally be bloody brazen enough just to go up behind them and look round, make sure nobody is looking and then off I go... make a sharp getaway.”

(Brady)
Choosing a venue where individuals are intent upon their business (i.e. shopping), and where a sexually invasive behaviour is likely to be inconceivable to the majority of attendees, was referenced by a number of participants. Elias, who took IIOC at public tourist attractions and outdoor events involving children, was mindful of choosing a venue where others would be engaging, apparently, in the same behaviour as he was:

“There were so many people taking photographs... there are always other people and cameras, presumably for legitimate purposes. It was that, it was the key thing was not to become obvious, not to become out of place, to blend in.”

(Elias)

Leo, who offended in a neighbouring house, described how he evaluated the household routine of the primary care giver and believed that he had sufficient grasp of her movements to militate against being caught:

“I knew every move she'd ever make, you know. So without ever thinking about it I knew... how to get the child on his own, and, and whether, you know if I'd be caught or not.”

(Leo)

Participants also spoke of avoiding certain situations where they were not assured that they would be able to achieve their goal safely. Brady, while content that shopping centres were an acceptable venue, dismissed playgrounds as too risky:

“Playgrounds obviously... so if you're in a playground with your kids and you, and you see a bloke standing around on his own you automatically become suspicious, "I wonder what he's up to?" ...if I was the bloke standing over there, I'd know that I'd be standing out like a sore thumb, you know, it would be a bit, well very risky.”

(Brady)
Participants were also mindful of risk as their relationship with their victims developed, a theme also identified in a study of online chat logs of offenders (Kloess et al., 2015). Blair showed a technical knowledge and checked that his victim was able to aid his detection avoidance:

Blair: “Whos puter you on?”
Anna: “Mine.”
Blair: “No [web] cam den.”
Anna: “Only on mum lappy.”
Blair: “Go on den.”
Anna: “K.”
Blair: “Check da convo is not being saved.”
Anna: “K.”

One study found that, in the initial stage of online conversation with children, the issue of parents and their schedule was significantly and more frequently raised by offenders (Black et al., 2015). However, checking parents’ movements was not found to feature in another study (Quayle and Newman, 2016).

More recently, the interpersonal relationship with a perpetrator has been noted as a key grooming technique towards girls over a more traditional enticement approach (Katz and Barnetz, 2015), with related themes such as boyfriend status and flattery found in other studies (Black et al., 2015; Whittle, Hamilton-Giachritsis and Beech, 2015).

As is supported by the chat logs, Blair maintained a positive rapport with his victims:

“It seemed clear from the conversations and from the way it went and there was never a cross word or any argument or whatever, that it was highly unlikely she would ever tell anybody that, that would, would take it any further.”

(Blair)
5.2.3 Malleability

A sub-theme in the initial selection process of victims is that of identifying some form of malleability in the child that could be capitalised upon in due course for the purpose of production of IIOC. Two sub-themes emerge in this category:

- Pre-existing Vulnerability
- Suggestibility.

5.2.3.1 Pre-existing Vulnerability

The range of pre-existing vulnerabilities in children is finite and depends upon a plethora of variables and circumstance at any given time. Each child is likely to have their own susceptibilities and it is impossible to categorically and comprehensively catalogue all of these in relation to the victims of this cohort. Targeting children who are vulnerable is not surprising or new for sex offenders (Quadara, Higgins and Siegel, 2015). The children targeted did seem to have some degree of commonality, in terms of certain pre-existing vulnerabilities and economic disadvantage, emotional isolation, abuse history and isolation, as these were recurring in the accounts of participants. Current studies seems to suggest that children who are vulnerable offline are also vulnerable online (Livingstone and Mason, 2015; Whittle, Hamilton-Giachritsis and Beech, 2015).

David targeted boys that were transported around the UK, as well as procured from other developing countries. The range of pre-existing vulnerabilities associated with these children is well-documented (Bourdillon and Myers, 2014), and their sexual exploitation is a known occurrence (Sullivan, 2000; Berelowitz, 2013; Rafferty, 2013). However, David highlights an additional component, which involves
networking with others who facilitated the procurement of children that was relevant to victim selection:

“The place was Goa, to be... em then one of the pseudo charities opened up a boys orphanage in Brazil...you could buy a child from a care home, for a very, for you know 100 euro or whatever currency it was back then, em and you could just walk out of the country with him, with the license from this orphanage.”

(David)

In terms of children he targeted in the UK, David was clear about a pre-existing vulnerability and exit strategy in his selection criteria:

“I found that young boys, who would come from poor families... needed somebody to talk to or have a laugh with or to start off with, em who, you know, just needed taken out for McDonalds... I’d target a young boy, his family, I’d get to know them for a few weeks then move on, yeah once I got what I needed from them, I found that if I hit and run, they were less likely to say anything. You know, just get on with their lives afterwards, eh callous I know but that’s how it worked, so every month or two I’d have a whole new set of images.”

(David)

Mike reported a similar technique where he targeted runaway boys who were either on the street or in shelters:

“I gave them places to stay, I fed them, I gave them clothes, shoes, uh I did a lot of stuff. I got one out of a homeless shelter.”

(Mike)

Revictimisation is a well-documented occurrence for those who have experienced sexual abuse (Fergusson, Horwood and Lynskey, 1997; Blom et al., 2014; DePrince et al., 2015). Children who had previously been sexually abused were selected by three of the participants for the production of IIOC. Stan travelled abroad to create IIOC and worked with others:
"The boys were very experienced models... he had been photographing Boy 1 and Boy 2 but certainly Boy 1 since he was eight and he was now 16 and he wasn’t only photographing him he was screwing him fairly regularly and most of the other boys as well so the boys were very experienced in that and they were perfectly happy because I mean because both Co offender 1 and I and C Offender 2 were pleasant enough people and you know and they were so well worn in can I say of the boys they were perfectly happy to be photographed."

(Stan)

Organised multiple perpetrators, or as they are colloquially know, sex rings, typically involve boys and male offenders (Lanning, 1989). Lanning also identified common traits of such operations, multiple young victims and multiple offenders, which are similar to the activities of the participants in this study. The production of IIOC has been seen as a common theme in sex rings (Lanning and Burgess, 1984).

David identified boys for sexual exploitation with other offenders, undertook the grooming for production and then made videos of their sexual abuse, however, he explained that, in some instances, he did not need to provide a child:

"Em some cases if they were, they wanted to I’d be in there with them but they may have a child of their own, we used to, they always wanted me to film it, em that’s what I’d do."

(David)

Bill produced IIOC of neighbouring children with whom he formed a relationship. While they were not previously sexually abused, he was clear about their vulnerabilities, as he said of one victim:

"She got so excited because she was not really appreciated, she was an intelligent girl, she was a very affectionate girl and where she lived, she wasn’t abused but she was, there was so much going on that she didn’t get much attention."

(Bill)
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The theme of targeting a child with a pre-existing vulnerability was also apparent in Hugh’s account:

“No father figure. I had ingratiated myself into the family home.... he was dysfunctional then. He had problems. Another sad irony that he went through a phase of school phobia.”

(Hugh)

Tony spoke of identifying children he could impress and easily manipulate:

“Someone who's not confident... vulnerability is fairly high up on that scale, ultimately.”

(Tony)

Tony’s selection criteria are echoed in a study on professional offenders, who used their employment to target and groom children. Many acknowledged how they would choose children whom they knew were not assertive or inclined to defend themselves (Leclerc and Cale, 2015). Vulnerability, in terms of parental naivety or perhaps lack of adequate supervision, was also implied and/or highlighted by some of the cohort, as described by Frank:

“What right-minded parent would give an eleven-year-old girl a laptop with a webcam and say ‘take this to your bedroom’...and if you think your child has only one email address think again, you know, ‘cause they’ve probably got three or four.”

(Frank)

In one study, unsupervised children were found to be more likely to be targeted online, where uploading personal information and pictures was significant in receiving unsolicited contacts from strangers (Sengupta and Chaudhuri, 2011). The majority of victims from another study (75%) were from separated or reconstituted families, with 38% reporting a parental relationship that was undermined prior to the incidence of victimisation (Whittle, Hamilton-Giachritsis and Beech, 2014). Feelings
of alienation within the family home have been highlighted as risk markers and an
opening for predators who fill the void (Choi et al., 2015; Hui, Xin and Khader,
2015), with experiencing and/or witnessing domestic violence as another risk factor
(Quadara, Higgins and Siegel, 2015). Taking a child to an isolated or secure
environment, such as the offenders own home, was noted amongst professional
perpetrators who abused children with whom they worked (Leclerc and Cale, 2015).

A number of participants viewed emotional and physical isolation as important
vulnerabilities upon which to capitalise when selecting a victim. Frank, who targeted
children online, acknowledged that this was a factor for him:

“You’d think, “Ah, right, okay, so this person will spend quite a lot of
time on her own at home,” you know, and perhaps gets a bit lonely. God,
it, it sounds awful when I say it... he basically slotted into the, you know,
needed a friend type, you know, like what I’ve talked about. The, sort of,
she was quite vulnerable. I don’t know anything about her in real life,
but I, I got the impression that she didn’t have loads of friends. Um, so I
suppose in a callous way she was an easy target.”

(Frank)

Research has highlighted an indiscriminate targeting process is used by some online
offenders who approach large numbers of children in the hope that some might
respond (Quayle et al., 2014; Black et al., 2015). Frank used such an approach and
found it more productive to target younger children who were only beginning to
build online contacts and appeared anxious for companionship:

“But I think it was this friendship thing, you know, the, ’cause, you know,
they want people to be their friend... and then I was able to use that.
“Oh, well I’ll go off and chat to so-and-so,” or, “Oh, I’ve got to go
now.” “Oh, don’t go.” Whereas a 14-year-old would go, “Yeah, I’ll see
you later.” They’re not bothered, you know, ’cause they’ve got 500 other
friends they can speak to. Whereas someone who’s slightly younger is
perhaps only building a list.”

(Frank)
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Focus of online safety has typically been with adolescents; however, a recent study highlights the equally high solicitation of children (Schulz et al., 2015). The authors caution about the importance of better understanding the initial non-sexual elements of online solicitation by adults, which become sexual, as an area that needs to be examined and incorporated into prevention work.

5.2.3.2 Suggestibility

Webster et al. (2012) reported that children, whom they described as risk-takers, adventurers and disinhibited, are more likely to be at risk of online solicitation from predators. Children who provided more online overtly sexual content were also seen as being at greater risk (Wolak, Mitchell and Finkelhor, 2006). In their study of 14 men convicted of online grooming but which also included offline meetings, Quayle et al., (2014) found that some of their participants chose victims whom they described as sexually curious/vulnerable. A study looking at professional perpetrators, who used their work to access children, reported that 93.7% of their cohort described selecting children whom they knew had previous sexual contact and whom they believed to have sexual knowledge (Leclerc and Cale, 2015). A similar theme emerged in this study also, however, a note of caution is urged, as it is difficult to determine categorically to what extent perpetrators may have been minimising their own actions, and/or have been distorted in their perceptions, and have erroneously attributed a sexual curiosity/experimentation to children where there was none. Nonetheless, victim selection for production did appear to be determined by how easily some participants believed they could get a sexualised response from children.
Blair described evaluating the profiles of children and making determinations:

“It was the ones that had a fuller profile, so there was more in it, um, so you could make a judgement… Um, and I suppose what gives it away sort of, was in a sort of more sexual sense is the list of friends and the sort of friends that the person had. If it was just sort of their own school friends and a close clique of friends, then it's, it's probably not likely ... If they just chatted to a whole range of people so it was more likely they were gonna chat to me than, than anybody else. Um, and comments other people had made about them, I guess. And those were the sort of things that appear on the social networking site that give you a, a reasonably clear idea. You know, sort of more open-minded maybe, a little bit more, er, mature and a bit less child, childish, if you like, yeah.”

(Blair)

This mirrors findings by Quayle et al., (2014) who also noted a judgement process that offenders made about profiles of children online. Frank also made an evaluation based upon how easily he believed it would be to persuade a child to engage in sexual behaviour on webcam, with what he perceived as minimal effort from him:

“Someone who is willing to sort of take their, well you know, lift their top or whatever and, and expose themselves. Without, you know, someone who is sort of quite, does it freely rather than needs persuading... she would, she would, she was more ready to do anything.”

(Frank)

And of another girl he stated:

“I was a little bit surprised, I think, from what I remember that , you know, she came on the webcam and er, immediately she was sort of, ‘Do you want to see anything, any type of thing.’”

(Frank)

Again, it must also be noted that those who describe the children they exploited as sexually easily open to suggestion, may have been distorted in this view and/or being deceptive as to the level of grooming and persuasion they may have used.
Callum described another type of suggestibility, whereby he convinced his victims that the promise of riches and an exotic lifestyle was achievable if they followed the instructions of a fictitious modelling magazine. He described the Caribbean islands and fast cars so well that, as he stated:

“Every single one of the boys, except one, I think, did what I wanted.”

(Callum)

5.2.4 Attractiveness

In terms of selection of victims for IIOC, the cohort did factor in attractiveness but it seems to have had different weighting for different individuals, with some happy to forgo it if a child was willing to engage in a sexual behaviour. Frank was one of those for whom attractiveness became subordinate if a sexual agenda was being achieved:

“So yeah, it did to a certain extent matter what she looked like, but I think that, that was an initial thought, but then as soon as she did something, I thought, ‘Oh, it doesn’t matter what she looks really I suppose,” ’cause she’s doing something, to put it bluntly.”

(Frank)

Participants were also clear about how age range was an aspect of their selection criteria. Callum appears quite broad in discussing targeting a preferred age range. His offending towards children began when they were approximately 12 years of age, and it, in some instances, continued if he remained in contact with them into their late teens:

“Between the ages of 12 and 18, I would spot a particular boy who was nice looking, I would feel some arousal to him, it would be a warmth or I just liked looking at him.”

(Callum)
Blair described the process as less of a conscious decision but he had a narrow age range nonetheless:

“I don’t remember at the time sort of putting a filter in and saying, you know, ‘I only want to talk to 12 to 14-year-olds’, but I think that’s how it worked out... I think it was the ones that looked fun.”

(Blair)

Brady detailed how he had an attraction to a certain look and type of clothing when he was out searching for victims to produce IIOC:

“Um, they had to fit a certain criteria like for some reason I found sexually stimulating. You know, the way they looked...you know, boots. They had to, if they had boots, short skirt, um, that was quite a major criteria.”

(Brady)

For others, it was not what their victims wore but their physical appearance that was important:

“It’s their soft skin.”

(Mitch)

Online communication with children has been observed to include requests about appearance in the early stages of communication (Quayle and Newman, 2016), however, the extent to which this was a conversation developer or attractiveness assessment is not clear.
5.3 Conclusion

Child protection organisations, researchers and practitioners try to educate the general population of parents and carers to the importance of recognising that those who target children for sexual harm are most likely to be known to the child. The myth of ‘stranger danger’ has possibly permeated amongst society just at a time when the parameters of any such advocacy may need to be revised. Whereas previously, perpetrators of sexual harm against children were considered to have to be in proximity to the child and perhaps even known to them, this may no longer be a prerequisite. In terms of victim selection, over half the participants in this study (N=12) offended against children who were strangers to them. However, it is a small study and it is not advisable to extrapolate too widely until further research is done. What does not seem to have changed in terms of targeting victims is the propensity to seek out children who were considered malleable and had pre-existing vulnerabilities. In addition, sex offenders are not unintelligent individuals, and participants used a variety of means to ensure they were going to avoid detection and/or to limit disclosure as part of their process of victim selection process. Availability appears to have been favoured over attractiveness in choosing a child to exploit sexually, but with the rise in options for accessing stranger children via the internet, it raises the question that this might not need to continue to be the case.
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6 Justifications for the Production of IIOC and Child Sexual Exploitation

6.1 Introduction

This chapter looks at how the participants rationalised the production of IIOC and justified their thinking to sexually exploit children in this way, despite an underlying awareness that their behaviour is wrong (Craissati, 2015). Commonly known as cognitive distortions\(^6\), such processes have also been referred to, and expanded upon, to include; thinking errors, abuse supportive beliefs and attitudes, justifications, schema, denial, minimisation, excuses and implicit theories (Ward and Keenan, 1999; Mann, Hanson and Thornton, 2010; Ó Ciardha and Ward, 2013). The concept of implicit theories (Ward and Keenan, 1999; Keenan and Ward, 2000) has been postulated as the strongest overall theory, when examined against other premises (Ó Ciardha and Gannon, 2011). Implicit theories suggest five categories as a means of categorising cognitive distortions/thinking errors. These include; Child as a sexual being (children are sexual beings and can consent to and initiate sexual contact), Nature of harm (the way I am sexual with a child does not cause harm), Entitlement (my needs are paramount, I deserve sex when I want it), Dangerous world (the world is untrustworthy, I may seek retribution, it’s safer being with children) and Uncontrollable (the offender perceives the world and circumstances are outside of his control, and cannot control sexual urges) (Ward and Keenan, 1999). These theories resonate with some of the themes that emerge from this study.

\(^6\) A term generally recognised as originating from the seminal work of Abel, Becker and Cunningham-Rathner (1984).
Sykes and Matza’s (1957) seminal work ‘Techniques of Neutralisation: A Theory of Delinquency” has also been highlighted as relevant to the minimisations and justifications used by adult offenders. The five neutralisation techniques defined by Sykes and Matza (1957), namely, denial of responsibility, denial of injury, denial of victim, condemnation of condemners, and appeal to higher loyalties, have indeed overlaps with sex offenders, distortion theories, and are still being used to examine sex offender cognitions (Coston, 2015; Spraitz and Bowen, 2015). It has also been suggested that cognitive distortions should be more aptly referred to as etiological cognition, where the focus is on the function of cognitions and their contributory role in offending (Ó Ciardha and Gannon, 2011), as opposed to a possibly never-ending list of distortions per se. As those with a sexual interest in children may develop ‘psychologically comfortable positions’ in order to engage in the offending process, understanding such cognition processes can help break down blocks to behaviour change (Brown et al., 2013, p.289).

Cognitive distortions are recognised as a predictive risk factor for recidivism (Hanson and Morton-Bourgon, 2005; Helmus et al., 2013), and are accordingly typical components of treatment programmes (Schneider and Wright, 2004; Marshall and Serran, 2006; Ó Ciardha and Gannon, 2011). The type of cognitive distortions an offender presents can be helpful in directing intervention and highlighting specific dynamic risks (Marshall et al., 2003; Maruna and Mann, 2006).

While not necessarily including contact offending, all but one of the participants in this study acknowledged being involved in the sexual exploitation of children in some way, before they began to produce IIOC. Accordingly, they had a thinking
process in place to allow this to happen. Extending this thinking to allow for the production of IIOC does not appear to have been a big step or to have required particularly elaborate or new thinking processes. In many cases, it seems that pre-existing cognitive distortions facilitated the production process. However, participants also appeared to be able to adjust their thinking as necessary to accommodate the production of IIOC, drawing on established distortions as well as developing some new ones. In addition, it was noted that a distortion was not used in isolation but that participants regularly cited multiple thinking errors to support their behaviour, as was demonstrated by David:

“Well I’d eh go over the mantra that I’d learned that, that, I’d learned that it was okay in Greece in you know 400AD, the Romans were at it, em with their boys, em, you know and the samurai had a whole thing going with boys, em in Africa there was certain tribes that had that and they called them, that were sexually interested in boys and it was all part of their culture. I used to say well you know if it’s alright for them and it goes back for 2000, 3000 years it must be ok, then I’d go well the boys like it, they are not actually saying no, em I’m doing them a favour, I’m buying them clothes, I’m doing, I’m actually looking after them, you know I’m like an adoptive parent, em and they are getting as much out of the sexual contact as I am because it’s a well-known fact that children enjoy sex, you know they enjoy that sexual contact and all these things are going through my head, I’m backing it up all the time.”

(David)

David cited a plethora of justification for his sexual abuse of children and highlighted how participants in this study seemed to layer their rationale with multiple and dynamic supports as the situation requires.

Brian also overlapped distorted cognitions to allow him to sexually exploit children:

“OK, I had the same rationalisations with I'm not hurting anybody. I never penetrated a child, I never broke a hymen, I never did things that would cause pain.’ So I said I'm justified, I'm not causing them pain, they're enjoying what they're doing and so there's nothing wrong with this. It’s the rest of the world.”

(Brian)
Brian gave this explanation, which included six thinking errors, in respect of his sexual exploitation of a five-year-old child when he was twenty-four years of age. During interview, he also detailed how he believed that she instigated sexualised contact with him.

This study focuses on the distortions and abuse supportive thinking specific to the production of IIOC. However, there is an overlap with distortions and abuse supportive thinking about child sexual abuse behaviour in general, as this is typically part of the process of production. Three themes emerge, each with a number of sub-themes, see Figure 2.

- No Harm
- Blame Dispersal
- Self-Endorsement.

**Figure 2: Distortions and Justifications Themes and Sub-themes**
6.2 No Harm

Beliefs that children are able and/or willing to consent to sexual contact with an adult are well documented (Ward, 2000; Mann and Marshall, 2009). In a qualitative study looking at desistence in individuals with a sexual arousal to children, Mitchell and Galupo (2016) found that not wanting to harm a child was the most endorsed factor by participants. However, they nonetheless noted that many participants minimised harm, particularly in respect of sexual abuse of a child but, in turn, emphasised harm from third parties such as court and professionals. This demonstrated that, despite maintaining they would not want to harm a child, participants with a sexual arousal to children presented as distorted in their cognitions on this issue. Denial and minimisation in sex offenders may be motivated by many factors and supported by cognitive distortions. One function may be to preserve a more respectable identity and minimise the existence of harm to a child (Hudson, 2013; Davids, Londt and Wilson, 2015; Katsuta and Hazama, 2016). Considerable effort is put into reinterpreting illegal behaviour to make it more acceptable to the offender and others (Winder, Gough and Seymour-Smith, 2015), as well as an exercise in self-preservation (Craissati, 2015). However, it has been suggested that such distortions may dissipate as intervention proceeds and trust builds with the therapist (Marshall, Marshall and Kingston, 2011). The concept of no harm has four sub-themes; namely Child instigates it, Child enjoys it, Child as sexual and Exclusion clause.
6.2.1 Child instigates it

If an offender allows himself to believe that the child is the one who instigated the behaviour, it eliminates certain barriers to committing the offence. Cognitions that view child victims as agreeing and inclined towards sexual behaviour with an adult have been found to reduce the level of internal constrain and facilitate the abusive behaviour (Hempel et al., 2015), with offenders in one study being found to play down individual choice and agency (Winder, Gough and Seymour-Smith, 2015). Individuals in this category seem to be able to ignore the fact that they may have pre-groomed a child to create the situation, whereby the child makes a suggestion or initiates a behaviour that the offender wants to happen. While Sam did acknowledge that he sexually abused three children in his care, he attributes the production of IIOC to a child, who was under ten years of age:

“Child 1 suggested that she eh take some pictures like that and it was her that got Child 2 to pose for the first few. However, having said that it was me that abused Child 2 and Child 3, Child 1 was nothing to do with the fact that I touched them, whereas the pictures were her idea.”

(Sam)

Viewing the victim as having instigated the behaviour in sexual exploitation is noted in studies of offenders (Brown, 2013; Houtepen, Sijtsema and Bogaerts, 2016). Such an approach allows, in the mind of the offender, for the child to be in control and disregards the inherent adult-child power dynamic. Hugh was able to recognise how he had allowed himself to think of the children he sexually exploited as instigators and responsible for what was happening:

“There was also the point where they were instigating it. So, it’s their responsibility, not mine. So that’s the way I pitched it in my own head.”

(Hugh)
To this end, Hugh presented video recording of both sexual and non-sexual behaviour amongst these children as a fun activity, and encouraged them to use the camcorder of their own volition and independent from him.

Tony was convicted of raping and producing IIOC of a 12-year-old boy he met initially online. He detailed how he struggled to see how the child could have been harmed by the abuse, as he had agreed to meet on more than one occasion:

“I can’t see how right now he would have been feeling ‘I hated that, I hope I never see that man again’ because he arranged to see that man again.”

(Tony)

Interestingly, the concrete evidence of the more aggressive nature of Tony’s interactions with children was captured in chat logs. It would appear that, if they were not available, he may have been able to continue to take a more passive stance:

“The chat logs are, that I have seen, are at variance with what I remember which is a shame.”

(Tony)

Frank, who produced IIOC remotely via webcam, placed blame with his victims, describing them as initiating the production:

“And it was actually put to me first, a girl said, “Do you want me to go on webcam?” I was like, “Okay,”... she was quite forward... it was them, you know.”

(Frank)

While postulating that the victims were the ones creating the sexual agenda, Frank appears to be able to dismiss his extensive manipulation and the power and age differential in the dynamic.
6.2.2 Child enjoys it

The concept of individuals, who sexually abuse children, viewing them as enjoying sexual contact is also well-supported in previous research (Salter 1988; Ward and Keenan, 1999; Mihailides, Devilly and Ward, 2004). This emerged more frequently than child as instigator, and had similar components of viewing the child with control and the capacity to consent. Leo produced IIOC by recording via webcam him sexually abusing a child as he sat on his lap. He streamed the recording live to his laptop screen and the child was able to see himself. Leo considered that this was a positive for the child:

“He seemed to enjoy seeing himself on the screen.”

(Léo)

Sam described the apparent pleasure his victim got from being involved in the production of IIOC:

“The images that involved urinating were the very first ones I took because that’s what she was particularly interested in. So I took the picture of her urinating and me urinating so she could see what that looked like and then took various others and she thought that was fun and we did several others and she seemed to be delighted. She seemed to be delighted and enjoying herself.”

(Sam)

As having photographs taken is a typical component of most childhoods, it is not too difficult to understand how children may be responsive when a photo opportunity arises. However, the sinister element of grooming and escalation of sexual abuse from ‘fun’ photographs can be recognised in Sam’s additional information:

“I had the presence of mind to film her but she’s like ripping the pants off, and she’s delighted and I had this stuff [IIOC] and early on she was enjoying the hell out of it.”

(Sam)
Sam also described his infant victim as enjoying the abuse:

“I did pee on him which he loved of course, you know infant’s love water that’s exactly, you know body temperature, which of course pee conveniently is, so em he actually laughed and giggled at that.”

(Sam)

Even when Liam was told by his victim that he had hurt him, he described how he was able to disregard this and focus on the perceived enjoyment the child was getting:

“He was such a normally-adjusted, happy child and on these videos he's happy. He did say ouch once, and I said 'what's wrong baby' and he said 'it hurts me' and I'm like 'ok I'm sorry' and I'm not going to hurt him you know, but he's happy and he was more than willing to participate you know. He was laughing, he was having fun in his life, he was doing good at school you know, he wasn't the smartest kid unfortunately, but he was a well-adjusted seven-year-old boy. Honestly, very well-adjusted.”

(Liam)

Liam appears to be balancing evidence (Ward and Keenan, 1999) of apparent positives in the child’s life, as a means of negating possible detrimental aspects of his own abusive behaviour.

Hector seemed able to make an important differentiation between what he actually knew and what he desired to be the case:

“It had to seem to be enjoyable for the victims as well otherwise I couldn’t enjoy it.”

(Hector)

Hector has engaged in intensive intervention in respect of his offending and it is possible that this accounts for his insight.
Frank initially reported that his victims initiated the online sexual activity, however, he also ultimately acknowledged that coercion was involved. Nonetheless, he appeared to have minimised this aspect of his behaviour choosing instead to focus on agreement or perceived agreement from the victim:

“I did coerce the girls into doing things, but they, a lot of the times, well not a lot, but some of the times it was almost as if it wasn’t a problem for them... they were okay to do it.”

(Frank)

He managed to minimise any grooming on his part and placed responsibility and choice with the victims:

“I, um, didn’t really question what I was doing. I just thought, ‘Oh yeah, they’re, they’re doing it,’ so ... ‘cause if they didn’t want to do it they’d turn the webcam off.’

(Frank)

Stan described being content that, as his victims were used to being sexually abused from a young age, they were both habituated to the abuse and happy to engage in production:

“The boys were very experienced models... he had been photographing Child 1 and Child 2 but certainly Child 1 since he was eight and he was now 16 and he wasn’t only photographing him he was screwing him fairly regularly and most of the other boys as well so the boys were very experienced in that and they were perfectly happy because I mean because both Co-offender1 and I and Co-offender 2 were pleasant enough people and you know and they were so well worn in can I say of the boys they were perfectly happy to be photographed and to allow other activities as far as I was concerned.”

(Stan)
Stan continued to view other victims at a later stage in his offending as having the same enjoyment level:

“They posed themselves for some very indecent shots, erections I think, they were masturbating I think, they were even doing oral sex on me. I don’t remember but they, they, they seemed to, they seemed to look on it as, as to the err bit of fun but I, I can’t I can’t say I didn’t enjoy it.”

(Stan)

While he does acknowledge his own pleasure, emphasising apparent victim enjoyment and disregarding victim age allows Stan to distance himself from other behaviours, such as targeting, grooming and production of IIOC.

Tony, who previously detailed how children initiated sexual contact with him, seemed to have more insight and honesty into his process as the interview progressed. When discussing how he wanted to believe that his victims were happy with the abuse experience, he stated:

“I think I genuinely would have wanted those children to say "oh well that was alright actually". It clearly wasn’t alright, I know it wasn’t alright, but at the time I would have wanted them to have felt that, and not felt abused, I would have wanted that. That has got its own problems as well of course cause it’s kind of shifting responsibility from, trying to shift it from me to them when I know that’s not on, it is my responsibility. But that’s what I was probably trying to do, to share the responsibility for what happened with them.”

(Tony)

6.2.3 Child as Sexual

While some participants viewed the child as instigating and/or enjoying sexual contact with adults, others were even more emphatic in seeing children as sexual per se. Like a number of participants, Brian appeared to have drawn upon his own childhood experiences to justify being sexual with children:
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“I looked for children who were sexual, to interact with. Because it's like OK we have a common interest here... you can't tell me as a therapist, that children aren't sexual, you can't tell me as a therapist that children don't like it and seek after it, because I was a child doing it. To get past that rationalisation is so difficult, so extremely difficult.”

(Brian)

Hugh, who also engaged in sexual activity with other children as a child, described how he chose to believe there was sexual activity going on between two of his victims:

“Well I was convinced, with no evidence to back it up, that Child 1 and Child 2 were sexually active with each other. There’s no evidence to back that up whatsoever, but it’s what I wanted to believe, so I believed it.”

(Hugh)

Simon revealed thinking about the IIOC he produced; describing it as part of a consenting relationship, attributing a sexual interest in such images to the child:

“I thought it was at the time a relationship, and they [IIOC] were for our personal use.”

(Simon)

Shelton, who abused his own sons and daughter, described his abuse in a similar way:

“As far as I was concerned that was the sort of relationship we had, a loving relationship, a consensual loving relationship. I know it’s not now but that was at the time what I thought we had.”

(Shelton)

By attributing consent to children, it allows the perpetrator to dismiss dissenting thoughts, and it places them in a positive light as a ‘partner’ in mutual behaviour and pleasure:
“Everything about it was consensual, in fact it was me trying to go slow rather than him. In terms of was he happy with everything, yes he was completely happy with everything, including taking photographs.”

(Liam)

Sam reported that his daughter, who was four years old when he began to sexually abuse her, was herself sexually motivated:

“I never had any intention of doing anything with any children. The stuff with my daughter developed because, I mean I have gone over this in great detail, but because at least in my view she's, well even my wife had noticed, she was terribly interested in sex… My daughter came on to me, I mean she really, really did.”

(Sam)

It has been noted that it is not just sex offenders who view their victims in a limited way but that institutional and cultural stereotypes serve to support victim blaming, when the victim profile steps outside our desired image of victimhood (McAlinden, 2014). Frank held views about children, in general, that allowed him to proceed to sexually exploit children online:

“I’m sorry, a 14-year-old, and, you know, when they go out and sleep with a 19-year-old man and then they say, ‘He’s had sex with me, I’m under age’ They know exactly what they’re doing... They know exactly what they’re doing.”

(Frank)

Blair, who also offended via the internet, described how he chose to believe that his victims would be doing this with some other man, or already had:

“None of what I'm doing here is gonna have any effect on their lives whatsoever because they've done it all before and they're probably all doing it.. Particularly the first one I spoke to, I genuinely thought she, she was probably doing this on a regular basis with, with other men anyway...so what does one more make a difference....And I convinced myself of that.”

(Blair)
By misconstruing the developmental, emotional and intellectual inequality between themselves and their victims, participants like Blair and Frank were able to tell themselves that their victims were in control, consenting and sexual.

### 6.2.4 Exclusion Clause

A number of exclusion clauses emerged from individuals’ accounts, whereby the participants seemed to be able to find a means of convincing themselves that, because of a particular aspect of their sexual exploitation, they were having minimal/reduced/no impact on children and not causing harm. These sub-themes include: no memory, no touching, no awareness, no crime, no hurting.

#### 6.2.4.1 No memory

Sam took photographs while he sexually abused a six-month-old child. He reasoned that it would not harm the child as he would never have a memory of the abuse:

“He, he was young enough that I figure he would have no memory of it, and therefore there would be no harm in it. I mean that was really the reason, he couldn't, he was pre-verbal, I mean I know some people who claim that very early memory, but I don't know anyone who claims to have memories you know from six months, so, with no memories it wouldn't harm him.”

(Sam)

Sam presents no disclosure concerns and no harm thinking as his primary motivation for abusing this child. However, it is also possible that this is part of a distorted thinking process, and that a sexual arousal to infants was the primary motivator, but that he is not able/willing to acknowledge this aspect of behaviour at this point.
6.2.4.2 No touching

Interestingly, and somewhat unexpectedly, both remote and adjacent offenders alike appeared to be able to separate the taking of pictures/videos from sexual exploitation, and see their actions as benign, since no touching was involved. Tim described the production of IIOC in favourable terms, despite the fact that he also committed and recorded contact sexual offences against his victims:

“Well I didn't sexually abuse her myself. Unless taking a picture of her in her underwear is sexually abusing her, but I never considered that sexual abuse... I wasn't doing this to gratify my own sexual needs. I was trying to build the self-esteem of these girls.”

(Tim)

Believing that children can gain from sexual contact with adults is a noted problematic cognition and is seen as a dynamic risk factor for reoffending (Neutze et al., 2011). Tim is also minimising the content of the IIOC he produced by referring to non-touching footage, whereas the case file demonstrated that he also took photographs and recordings of penetrative contact abuse.

Again, apparently separating out the taking of photographs from the sexual motivation, Brian focused on how he was not touching a child when he produced IIOC:

“I'm just gonna take pictures, I stepped over one [boundary] and like 'oh ok, this wasn't so bad, I'm here now and specifically in the children's section, but I'm not gonna touch anybody' and so then I went and said 'ok now I'm in a specific area where I'm isolated and I know adults can't see me, but I'm not gonna touch anybody, I'm just gonna take pictures, I'm in a place where I get a little closer and take better pictures'.”

(Brian)
Frank appeared to acknowledge that he knew being sexual with a child was wrong but he used the distancing of the internet as a means of proceeding with his behaviour and producing IIOC:

“If you see someone face to face and you’re, you’re going to have sex with them, if they’re a child it’s blatantly obvious they’re a child, you know. Whereas if you’re online you’re not physically touching them and there is a big, in your mind there’s a huge difference. ... I’m not touching them so it’s not hurting them.”

(Frank)

Foster described a similar process, whereby he was online with his victim and he was a considerable distance away:

“That wasn’t real life, that was over the internet. On a skype chat, so that wasn’t – we weren’t together in the same place, we were like whatever it is, 9,000 miles apart.”

(Foster)

Arguments have been made for providing intervention for those convicted of internet sexual crimes against children, viewing them as a distinct group (Quayle and Taylor, 2003; Merdian et al., 2013). However, it is possible that too much focus is being placed on a new medium, at the expense of the underlying commonalities of those who sexually exploit and abuse children. As detailed above, offenders themselves typically prefer to attribute blame beyond themselves, and it is important that professionals do not unwittingly collude with this perspective.

6.2.4.3 No awareness

While similar to the concept of no harm being done, as taking photographs and videos did not involve touching, there also was a distinct theme in respect of victims being unaware that their image was being captured:
“Well, the way I saw it was, first of all I wasn’t taking photographs of them in any sexual situation. Um, it was, like, I say, literally people on the street so without their knowledge. I mean nine times out of ten, occasionally somebody might have spotted something, you know, "That’s a bit odd, did he have a camera," or whatever. You know, you kind of know if they given you, looked at you in a funny way or whatever. But generally because a) they didn’t know and b) it was on the street, I thought, "Well, at the end of the day there’s no harm to anybody...and at the same time I was getting a sort of satisfaction out of it. Yeah."

(Brady)

Brady, like many of the cohort appears to be layering his distortions and justifications. He is factually correct in saying that he was not taking photographs in a sexual situation, however, his motivation was sexual, and he typically got close enough to his victims to photograph under their skirts. He also suggests that some individuals may have been aware he was photographing them but he seems able to dismiss this, even though it was a part of his rationale justifying engaging in this behaviour.

Brian also emphasised the issue of distance and individuals not knowing they were being photographed:

“I’m gonna get a camera, I can't hurt anybody. Because if I'm standing from 50 feet away, taking pictures, they don't know what I'm doing.”

(Brian)

Participants, who used the rationale of victims not being aware that their photograph was being taken as a permission giver, may, of course, have been mistaken and not as discerning as they contend.

Elias, who covertly took adjacent photographs of children, was also clear that he was not harming anyone, even himself:
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“At the time I was taking these images, it was merely nobody will become aware of this, so nobody will be harmed by it. It was certainly always a part of my thinking that what I was doing would not only cause no harm to me, but would cause no harm to anybody else and because it should be nobody else will become aware of it.”

(Elias)

A number of participants also spoke of sexually exploiting children while they were apparently asleep, thus postulating that no harm was perpetrated as they would have no knowledge that it ever happened. Of course they may be mistaken in this assumption.

6.2.4.4 No Crime

Participants found various ways of convincing themselves that there was no crime being committed and/or that no crime would be detected. Anonymity appears to have played a part for those who used the internet, and indeed some research has demonstrated that anonymity or perceived anonymity and possible invisibility can have a disinhibiting effect (Cooper, 1998; Quayle and Taylor, 2003; Suler, 2004; Christopherson, 2007). However, the underlying motivation must not be disregarded in such situations, and the internet per se cannot be held responsible for sexual offending (Finkelhor, 2014).

Blair spoke of how he believed he would not be caught:

“You’ve got that anonymity on the internet which you can get away with to a certain extent you’ve got this feeling that you’re anonymous, sort of thing, nobody’s gonna find you...And again I like to think I’m a reasonably intelligent and rational person, I didn’t think of the illegality of it, which was, um, startling.”

(Blair)
Frank described a similar process:

“You think the internet is, is a protector.”

(Frank)

Others either refuted the veracity of the law or were simply ahead of legislation.

Hugh’s comments represented those who wanted to believe the law was wrong:

“You naturally think well that’s the law, they must be right, from my experiences, they’re not, they’re wrong. They’ve got it wrong. It’s very confusing.”

(Hugh)

Both Stan and Elias described working outside the law:

“One way that I helped to get round this problem right from those early days in the 1960s was collecting photographs which in those days were perfectly legitimate errm in this country readily available abroad and available I think if you knew where to some extent in this country.”

(Stan)

Elias described either finding a loop hole in the law or believing that he had found one:

“I had been frequenting [Popular Tourist Attraction] since my University days as being a place where you could often see girls’ underwear... and when I bought this camera, and would start to photograph them occasionally there. The following year the um I think it was the Protection of Children Act, 1978 was passed, because at that time I believed what I was doing was not illegal, um the Act was passed and, which funny enough didn’t prevent possession I believe at the time, it merely prevented the taking of indecent images of children and I thought, well hang on this looks like I could be doing something illegal so I’m going to stop this, and did stop it.”

(Elias)
Elias went on to maintain that he stopped the behaviour for approximately a quarter of a century, until he claimed to have been prompted to recommence when he believed such activity was not illegal:

“Bit of a leap here of 25/26 years, I read an article and then followed it up regarding judgement, which seemed to suggest that the sort of photographs I had been taking before in public places, unposed photographs in public places were actually not unlawful. So I bought a camcorder which at that stage were on the market, and readily available, and started the process again, in the belief that it was not unlawful, and after a year or so of that was apprehended and the rest, they say is history.”

(Elias)

Elias is an intelligent, well-educated and informed individual, and it seems unlikely that he was unable to recognise his behaviour as production of IIOC and/or that it was illegal. However, by telling himself there was no crime, he appears to have overcome a barrier to the behaviour.

Mike and Liam both reported simply not considering their actions as illegal:

“I didn't think I was committing any crimes… I didn't even consider it a crime. I didn't. I helped people, I thought that.”

(Mike)

and

“I did, I mean, and I never thought of myself as a producer though, so I got charged with that, I never really considered that. I mean, even when I made the videos… I never really thought 'hey, we're doing something really illegal here, we could go to prison for 30 years per video they catch me with' you know, I never... never even phased me. I didn't know it was that serious, honestly, you know unfortunately so. If I had I, I'd like to think I wouldn't have done it.”

(Liam)

Again, like Elias, it seems unlikely that Liam and Mike were unaware that they were engaging in illegal behaviour. They did take precautions to ensure that they didn’t
get caught, but Liam, like others in the cohort, detailed how he became increasingly blasé and reckless as time passed. It seems more likely that both Mike and Liam’s contentions are post hoc justifications to help them present themselves in a more agreeable light. Indeed, in material provided alongside his interview, in a letter to his father, Liam stated:

“Just like gays and Lesbians, I believe BLs [Boy lovers] who are also repressed in large numbers should be able to live their lives free from government oppression. Although it is not legal to have a relationship with a boy in the USA, it is an accepted and identified class in other countries.”

(Liam)

It appears that, as well as layering distortions and justifications, individuals may on occasion also vacillate in their cognitions, contradict themselves, and select justifications, perhaps based upon how they are feeling at a particular point, who they are communicating with, and/or relative to a particular victim over time.

6.2.4.5 No hurt

The majority of participants sought to distance themselves for the behaviour they were engaging in, by viewing it as not causing any pain to victims, or more nebulously, not wanting to cause any pain. DeYoung (1982) noted multiple references to the concept of denial of injury and denial of victim in an analysis of the publications of three organisations, the Rene Guyon Society, the Childhood Sensuality Circle, and the North American Man-Boy Love Association (NAMBLA), where members share a sexual interest in child. While Shelton was able to acknowledge that his victim did not like what was happening, by maintaining to
himself that he was not physically harming her, he appeared to have been able to put her dislike, aside:

“You know, she seemed, she didn’t like what she was doing, but my perception at the time was that, you know, oh, it was sort of, ‘well I’m not, I’m not physically hurting her’.”

(Shelton)

Sam described a similar process with his daughter:

“I didn't want to hurt her, so even though I'd have fantasised about me doing other things, further things, I wouldn't do it until she was ready because you know no matter how perverted I am, I don't want to hurt people, I don't.”

(Sam)

Mitch also presents himself in an altruistic light:

“Well, I mean I would rather them have been awake and experienced what I was doing, because I always wanted to pleasure the child, you know it wasn't all about me.”

(Mitch)

While offending against girls online, Blair told himself, at the start of the process, that he was not causing harm:

“I guess originally I thought it wasn’t hurting anybody.”

(Blair)

Many participants described how they believed they were not causing harm and pain by maintaining that they were giving the victims a choice, as Hugh illustrated:

“I had rules, even though I was doing something very wrong. That if they said no or stop, or showed any signs of distress I would have stopped. This was not about hurting them or making them unhappy. I thought that this was just what boys did. Um of course, that’s not the case, but I had rules in place and if they’d said no, then I’m not happy with this, then that would have been it you know.”

(Hugh)
The case file reports that Hugh’s victims state otherwise.

Despite raping and recording the abuse of numerous boys, Mitch presented himself as mindful of children and considerate:

“But I never uh I mean I'm not going to try to sugar coat anything, I never fucked boys I never had any interest in it. Because I knew it was painful to 'em... If I ever thought that I was hurting one, I would have left him alone.”

(Mitch)

While discussing the likelihood of him abducting and sexually abusing a child, Mitch still tried to present himself in a balanced fashion with due regard for the well-being of children:

“I think that down the line, I would probably gone as far as..kidnapping a child and you know, playing with them. I wouldn’t hurt ‘em, I would never, you know rape a child um..you know I would only go as far as I thought I could, you know without hurting them.”

(Mitch)

The ability to diminish the reality and impact of one’s behaviour is achieved by the displacement and diffusion of responsibility (Bandura, Underwood and Fromson, 1975; Zimbardo, 2004; Castano and Kofa, 2009) in turn, negating the need for any behavioural constraints and any self-sanctioning (Bandura et al., 2001). The manipulation of language and meaning typically support such problematic behaviour, and sanitising phrases, euphemisms and obfuscation are utilised to make problematic behaviour seem acceptable (Bolinger, 1982; Bolinger, 2014). Mitch demonstrates such a process with the interplay of kidnapping and playing, and highlights how the exploration of distortions is essential in helping to fully understand the victim experience and to inform intervention.
6.3 Blame Dispersal

This theme demonstrates an externalising process, whereby participants attribute blame to forces they described as beyond them. In this way, they often place themselves in somewhat of a victim stance, and appear to be eliciting sympathy as well as abdication of responsibility. This distortion is found even in individuals who say that they are not acting on a sexual arousal to children (Mitchell and Galupo, 2016).

6.3.1 Victim Blaming

As detailed above, some participants suggested that their victims experienced no harm on the contention that they instigated the sexual contact, enjoyed it and were inherently sexual. However, a further theme emerges which seems to place blame with the victims in a manner separate to no harm, and more focused on the apparent power and/or appeal of the victim to control the offender. Tim sexually abused three girls under the age of ten and produced copious amounts of IIOC detailing the abuse, however, he struggled to take responsibility and, in particular, seemed to focus on the children as censurable:

“She won my heart and wrapped me round her little finger.”

(Tim)

Similarly, Mitch described how he was smitten by a child and appeared to distance himself from a sexual agenda by describing sexual arousal as love:
“This one particular girl, she was 11 years old but she looked like she was about eight. She was real petite and small, and .. I was falling in love with that little girl.”

(Mitch)

Franks seemed to view himself as the victim, even to the extent of perceiving himself as having been groomed by the child:

“It wasn’t me, I mean there was no grooming or anything there, if anything it was the other way around.”

(Frank)

Such a process becomes part of the legacy of abuse, as frequently detailed by victims who describe how they feel/felt responsible for the abuse. Defensive externalisation for abusive behaviour, in the form of victim blaming or minimising of victim harm, is regularly observed in sexual offenders, and has been linked to a lack of empathy, most specifically related to their own victims (Marshall et al., 2009; Barnett and Mann, 2013). The layering of distortion cognitions in respect of victims amongst the cohort highlights how entrenched and impactful such a process seems to be.

### 6.3.2 Beyond my control

By presenting the driver behind the offending behaviour as more a psychological issue or an external force that the offender could not control rather than one of personal agency (Winder and Gough, 2010), the participants appear to have been able to distance themselves from responsibility.
In respect to claims of physical chastisement and intimidation from the victim accounts, Hugh seemed to attempt to exonerate himself, by citing lack of knowledge of his own behaviour:

“I don't seriously believe that I ever set out to physically intimidate them to keep them quiet. Either obviously or less obviously. But it’s possible that that’s what was happening; I just wasn’t aware of it.”

(Hugh)

Three participants focused on drugs and/or alcohol as a militating factor. Connections between substance abuse and general criminal behaviour have been recognised (Fazel, Bains and Doll, 2006). However, only 14 participants in one study of 514 child sex offenders were found to have a problem with substances (Mitchell et al., 2012), with only 8% of child abusers being under the influence of drugs at the time of offending in another study (Hamdi and Knight, 2012). It has been suggested that those who cite alcohol/substance abuse as a reason for their sexual offending may be using it as a means of denying and minimising their responsibility for their actions (Hudson, 2013). However, it has also been suggested, as a positive, that an offender who offers an excuse for his behaviour is acknowledging that his actions were wrong (Hanson and Morton-Bourgon, 2005).

Frank made a link between substance abuse and his offending and described being on various drugs:

“I was on all sorts of medication and stuff.”

(Frank)
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Mike described drug-taking as fuelling his behaviour and making him less careful:

“I started eating a lot of lower tabs every day after work and um I started getting real careless you know, not putting enough thought into what I was doing. And next thing I know it was just one after another, one after another, and uh, even though I never showed boys videos of other boys and stuff, you know until the last, and I knew that was a mistake, but it was no reason for doing it, I just got careless and uh, and it was because of drugs and that’s what really got me.”

(Mike)

Brian typically abused boys, however, he detailed an occasion where he sexually abused a pre-pubescent child, blaming his behaviour in part at least on alcohol:

“Drinking it was totally out of character but for some reason eh I had sexually abused her but I don’t know why, I was drunk, em I think I touched her bum, eh but that was all I think it was, eh I think she may have touched me. As I say I was drunk at the time so I don’t know.”

(Brian)

Others focused on being ruled by a drive or urge that they could not help or control. While Elias acknowledged the sexual enjoyment element of producing and then viewing IIOC, he nonetheless appeared to give the behaviour a physiological genesis that controlled and interrupted his life, until he acquiesced to this greater force:

“I get pleasure from it [producing pictures], I get satisfaction and I can then, you know masturbate. I can then go and concentrate on something else so you’ve got the release you needed from that, um and carry on with life.”

(Elias)

The pleasure described by Elias, and the ultimate pay-off of masturbating to IIOC, is undoubtedly a powerful feeling, and it is not unusual for offenders to describe being controlled by the arousal rather than having self-agency. If the cognition is that sexual thoughts about children are all powerful and pervasive, or the individual believes themselves to be handed over to their fantasies and has developed a learned
helplessness (Vanhoeck, Van Daele and Gykiere, 2011), it suggests that running such fantasies is more likely to happen, and intervention needs to begin with such supportive thoughts in any fantasy modification work.

Sam similarly described his sexual arousal being beyond his control and that he would have a reaction to any naked female regardless of age:

“My daughter comes up to me, she has a towel wrapped around her, she spreads her legs like this drops the towel and spreads her pussy lips and says, ... says "daddy it itches" ... you know, ... which is I don't know its .. I don't know about other people but any female does that, I going to respond.”

(Sam)

Sam’s account has an almost cinematography quality to it, with the child as the lead actress in a seductive temptress.

Twelve of the participants reported being sexually abused themselves as children by adults, and a number of them related this to justifying their subsequent child sexual exploitation behaviour. Indeed, such accounts have been proffered as an explanation by a number of high profile individuals caught in possession of IIOC (Winder and Gough, 2010). Trent described the abuse of children with a sense of inevitability:

“It happened to me so, it’s going to happen isn’t it?”

(Trent)

Such a “mood of fatalism” (Maruna and Copes, 2005, p. 231) allows the individual to believe that they are helpless in a situation and that personal agency is limited or absent. Such a neutralisation technique has been likened to viewing oneself as a billiard ball in motion, unable to stop their own trajectory (Sykes and Matza, 1957).
Trent appears to link his own early trauma to defining a destiny for him. It is likely that any trauma experience, especially in childhood, can have an impact upon and influence development and sexual behaviour in later life (Groth and Burgess, 1979; Strickland, 2008; Maniglio, 2011; Levenson, Willis and Prescott, 2014). However, individuals still possess executive functioning and it can be important to challenge any distortions which place blame on an extraneous force, while also acknowledging and dealing with trauma experiences.

6.3.3 Third Party

What can begin as an investigation into possession of IIOC, can ultimately result in producers and victims being identified. Between 2006 and 2009, approximately 40% of cases which started with the discovery of an image(s)/video resulted in a further crime being uncovered (Wolak, Finkelhor and Mitchell, 2012). This typically results in a child being saved from further sexual exploitation and/or affords the opportunity for trauma counselling. While the detections of any such crimes, and the safeguarding of children as a result, is a positive, not all participants saw this to be the case. A number of the cohort appear to have employed post hoc justifications, by attributing blame and responsibility for the distress and trauma of victims to law enforcement involvement, as opposed to a legacy of their sexually exploitative behaviour. Liam described how he believed that his victim was showing no sign of trauma prior to FBI involvement:

“As soon as the FBI gets involved though, and tells him that this is wrong and I'm messing up his mind, he's, he has PTS, he won't be alone in a room any more, at seven years old he sleeps with mom every night you know, uh, excuse me, uh what the hell. How did he, maybe you can answer this. He was great up until the night that those Feds came and raided my house and my life. Now he's screwed up.”

(Liam)
Sam had a similar conception of events, believing that trauma to his victim may occur because of a decision to inform parents of the abuse their child experienced:

“Well he might be traumatised now, ‘cause his parents were traumatised, cause the idiots in the FBI decided to tell the parents. The whole world would have been better off if they hadn’t because nobody knew about it. He wasn’t physically injured and he was so early on he would have had no recollection of it whatsoever.”

(Sam)

While convicted of sexual assault on a child in a shopping mall, having previously taken covert photographs of her, Elias apportioned blame for harm beyond himself:

“Unless the security officers who had seen it, had they not been there, again the harm would not have occurred. Now don’t get me wrong in saying that I’m blaming it all on them. The fault was mine, no qualms about that at all. But um, but the thinking again was no harm will be done because nobody will be aware.”

(Elias)

As discussed previously, those who used the internet to sexually exploit children described how it allowed them to use distorted thinking in terms of distance from the victims and no harm due to no contact. However, a further theme also emerges whereby it appears that some of the cohort used blame dispersal, and placed responsibility with social networking sites and web pages. Blair seemed to suggest that if he had never been introduced to social media, he would not have ended up sexually exploiting children:

“That’s when I discovered messaging boards and whatever which, again the social networking sites, um, er, chat rooms, um, video messaging. It was all something, um, I wasn’t really aware of and it's things like, I suppose if you look back on, you know, [names two social networking sites] and, and whatever, was something else which appeared in, in the office with, where ... It sounds like I'm blaming my children for this, but I just, I hadn't heard of these things before and they appear.”

(Blair)
Brady spoke of how viewing voyeuristic-themed websites allowed him to believe that such behaviour was acceptable and possibly even legitimate:

“Um, so obviously when I got a digital camera, the, the means became available, you know, to do it myself, kind of thing. And also it’s, you kind of almost justify it as well because a lot of these websites are, a lot are American based. And I don’t know what American law is on this stuff but you get the feeling that those websites are okay, you know. Um, and you know subscription based and all that, and they’re all set up, all appear to be legitimate and all that kind of. And it’s almost like saying, it's okay. So you, kind of, just think in your head like that, so that’s where the guilt side goes from, you think, "Well if they're doing it and they're making money out of it, and nobody has closed them down."

(Brady)

The purported influence of online websites advocating voyeurism has been supported by findings of the European Online Grooming Project (Webster, Davidson and Bifulco, 2014). While such attributional thinking may have a factual foundation, it does not mitigate self-efficacy or an underlying sexual arousal to children.

In a concerning finding, one study reported that 21.4 % of their cohort (N= 323) considered that their victims’ parent(s) knew about the abuse but did not inform law enforcement (Smallbone and Wortley, 2004). The extent to which this is an aid to justifying the behaviour and distorting the seriousness of it is unclear, however, it appears to have allowed David to combine two elements of blame dispersal:

“They [Social Services] had already done a police search on me and found that I’d abused a little girl, they gave her [the children’s mother] a warning and I explained that I was an Alcoholic, I was drunk at the time, you can ask them about that, she accepted that and let me continue to see the kids and then she invited me to move into [UK town] with her and then I lived with the family for five months before they got taken into care, and I knew they would get taken into care as soon as the found out I was living there but she didn’t care, she was happy the way things were.”

(David)
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Liam also described how his partner chastised him initially when her son disclosed to her but that her anger was short lived:

“You're a piece of shit, you know, excuse me, what are you, you molesting my kid, what, do you molest your son too...but she came up like two days, two mornings later and then said that uh things were ok and I could come back home, so…”

(Liam)

If such accounts are to be accepted, it also raises the issue of impact on the cognitions of offenders when professionals leave them to continue to have contact with child and/or rely upon less than capable/compromised individuals to uphold safeguarding. In addition, it highlights the importance of exploring the effect upon the thinking of an offender when someone close to them overlooks their behaviour and/or accepts their distorted explanation.

6.4 Self-Endorsement

Almost all of the participants found ways to describe themselves in a positive light, in an apparent desire to balance their sexual abuse of children against more altruistic characteristics and motivations. Much of what they described will have been true, moments when they helped a child, their parents, and/or used their skills to good effect. However, considering that acts of kindness are compensatory or can ameliorate trauma is clearly a limited position, and one that needs to be explored with offenders who hold such distortions.
6.4.1 Love children

Love for children in general, and certain children in particular, emerges as a theme in many accounts. Liam expressed such feelings for his adopted son:

“I really don't regret the time I adopted my son, he's my world you know, and I love him to death.”

(Liam)

He also generalised his love for male children, presenting himself as an educator and carer:

“I really I love being around boys, I always have, not always sexually you know. I feel warm and fuzzy in my heart when I'm around a cute boy or something, you know, I can show him how to do something or teach him, you know, learn him, learn or share time with him or cuddle with him or whatever, you know, and it makes me feel good, you know.”

(Liam)

Sam spoke of how his love for his daughter meant that he would never harm her:

“I mean I would never have locked her in the cage if I realised how she would react to it 'cause I mean I love her, I love her, ridiculous as that may sound to you.”

(Sam)

Nonetheless, Sam perpetrated extreme abuse upon his daughter and shared the video footage of this with others.

Blair showed insight in being able to recognise how, at the time of his offending, he had believed that he had feelings for his victims:

“And I really did think, again justifying it to myself at the time, I really did think I really liked some of them.”

(Blair)
Tony was also able to reflect how, when offending, he viewed his behaviour through the lens of love and allowed his feelings to be the measure of the relationship:

“[It] felt to me a totally different thing, cos I really loved this guy, really enjoyed being with him and it was great.”

(Tony)

Perhaps an important distinction needs to be made regarding beliefs around strong positive feelings/love for their victims and possible self-serving bias (Blaine and Crocker, 1993) influencing thinking, both during the offence period and subsequently, as a means of deflecting from more opprobrious thoughts and behaviour.

6.4.2 I’m Kind and Helpful

The majority of the cohort expressed the opinion that they were kind towards their victims. In many instances, it appears that there may have been truth to the contention and suggests that the cognitions in relation to this aspect of their offending process were accordingly abuse supportive as opposed to distorted.

Brian presented his motivation towards the girls he abused as totally altruistic:

“When those little girls were with me, they were so happy, and all I wanted to do was make them happy...The girls were curious and I was trying to give them guidance so that they would not injure themselves.”

(Brian)

As these girls came for impoverished homes where they were possibly neglected, it is unsurprising that they may have experienced some happiness when Brian lavished them with treats and trips out, as was the breadth of his grooming repertoire.
However, by focusing on this aspect of the dynamic and his apparent selflessness, he sidesteps the harm and enduring legacy in IIOC material.

Possibly demonstrating grooming techniques, as well as distorted thinking, Blair, who said he was ‘a sounding board for their problems’, described a feeling of merit, by allowing himself to believe that he was presenting as straightforward to his victims from the beginning:

"If I'm open right at the beginning then I can feel better about myself when I go through because, you know, I've been honest... the chats initially were a lot of fun."  

(Blair)

Sam implied thoughtfulness on his part by describing how he tried to arrange for his daughter to meet another victim of IIOC, who had similar photographs taken, so that she would not feel alone:

“I mean, there’s one, I think there’s just the one picture with the knife, that came about because I had someone else, I was trying to get her [his daughter] to meet someone who was doing this ‘cause she was starting to feel uncomfortable because I think she felt alone, you know, like no one else was doing this.” 

(Sam)

While Liam was able to acknowledge that he had sexually abused a number of boys, he seemed unable or unwilling to relinquish his perspective on having been a positive influence in their lives:

“I mean I think for the better, even with all the abuse, I guess as you call it you know, I think I still made their lives better you know.”  

(Liam)
Liam was also able to cite the symptoms of trauma, as detailed in court, regarding one of his victims but nonetheless seemed determined to press his own beliefs on the matter.

However, such reports of kindness need to be interpreted cautiously, as the participants may be biased in their accounts. Tony described himself as interested in his victims and kind towards them, however, when it was highlighted that his chat logs evidenced otherwise, and that his behaviour could be construed as aggressive, he reflected:

“It’s also the case that when I looked through chat logs and things having been arrested, it’s also the case that [I am] quite surprised how aggressive my interest was because I would have said it was well, I was wrong about my self-understanding about that.”

(Tony)

When presented with concrete evidence, Tony was able to acknowledge that his evaluation of his own behaviour and how he wished to present the situation was incorrect. This highlights the importance of ancillary material being available to professionals working with offenders and victims, as well as the likelihood of individuals not being best placed to provide an accurate account of what has unfolded, at least in the initial stages of intervention. For many participants, it seems that they remember and/or prefer to present a more benign, and indeed, benevolent persona.

6.4.3 Not like other offenders

Popular culture would attest to the concept of a hierarchy of criminals, with sex offenders being found at the lowest rank (Bourke et al., 2014). The notion of a
hierarchy within sex offender populations was proffered by a number of the participants. Recognised as a typical distancing and sanitising technique used by individuals found in possession of IIOC (Winder and Gough, 2010), in this study, it transcended online and offline barriers amongst the participants.

Shelton, who committed extreme abuse against his daughter and sons, was able to view himself as different from what he described as predatory offenders:

“*I don’t want to do things against their will, even its a distortion and you know, and that’s why, hand on heart say I wouldn’t be a predatory offender because I couldn’t do something against somebody’s will. If I was to offend it would have to be in the same sort of context where I’d be in a relationship and be able to groom a victim.*”

(Shelton)

Stan differentiated between himself and his co-defendants by castigating their approach and offence type, and by suggesting a level of distinction based upon his sexual exploitation being less intrusive:

“*Well, little Child 1 generally was happy with, erm, me. I got on well with him and, and I know damn well he was being screwed by the other two occasionally at least but I think he and I got on best because we were perfectly happy with just masturbation and touching and erm..cuddling running my hands over him or what have you.*”

(Stan)

Mike also discriminated between his sexually exploitative behaviour and the age range of his victims (post-pubescent) from that of other offenders:

“I don’t really understand uh the ones that mess with six and seven-year-olds and specially when it’s anal, and it’s all about. They call themselves boy lovers, uh, how would you consider yourself, there’s no way that a six, seven or eight-year-old boy is going to get any pleasure from a grown man screwing him in the butt. Uh I can’t see. It’s all about you. If it’s all about you, you can’t consider yourself a boy lover, if it’s about you. To me, it was all about the boy, I don’t care what nobody says. Uh, I guess it was about me too because I did, I liked it so much uh, I was
obsessed with it uh… it wasn't about, you know, out there raping boys or whatever, cos I never raped anybody.”

(Mike)

While Mike estimated he had 350 victims and was convicted of sodomy and second degree sodomy, he maintained that he never “really” engaged in anal penetration of a child.

Callum had a degree of insight into his own process, and described how he contorted his thinking to deal with unpleasant information:

“When I would read about abuse, they were different people than I was because I loved kids, I didn’t jump out of hedges, I wasn’t the big dark stranger, I was their friend.”

(Callum)

Tony was also insightful on how he dismissed his own sexually exploitative behaviour, when he described why he did not engage in online sexual discussion about children with other adults:

“This sounds bizarre but it’s because I have fairly strong objections to people exploiting children and in every other case except me I would see that’s what it was… it’s easier to see a problem in other people’s practice I mean like grabbing someone out of their bath and taking them sort of miles down the motorway and butchering them in woods, I mean you can see why that’s wrong… There is still something that I found quite objectionable about older men preying on younger people, I know that sounds bizarre in the context but I still find that disturbing.”

(Tony)

Tony was in his forties when he targeted children online, prevailed upon them to send him sexually explicit photographs, ultimately met up with a number of them, and was convicted, of amongst other things, rape of a 12–year-old child. Throughout interview, he described himself as being youthful in his thinking, appearance and
friendships. It seems that this process may have been part of his means of distorting his actual age and the difference between him and his victims.

6.5 Conclusion

What is striking about the cognitive distortions used by the cohort is the extent to which they layer various thinking errors. Such a process appears to have been an attempt to distance themselves from responsibility for the behaviour and/or for harm caused. The themes that emerge, namely, no harm, blame dispersal and self-endorsement are all found in some part in almost every account. Distortions are often externalised, placing the locus of control elsewhere. For some participants, the etiology of their cognitions is clearly linked to their formative years, for example their own abuse experiences. However, for others it appears that the distortions may have emerged and developed over time to meet a particular need or to address a particular context. Accordingly, it is not possible to be categorical about the type of distortions a producer of IIOC holds but rather to view them as heterogeneous, variable in origin and likely to be flexible as required, dependent on who they are dealing with, distinct situations and/or timeframe.
7 Initial and Production Grooming

“It would be hang out with him and try to buy him stuff, give him stuff, turn him into a friend, make him really like you, and then plan the whole time to when you finally get him where you want him or, or and then just uh, you know and any time to you know fantasise, I would go like this, ‘well what if he says this’ you know, then I’d have another plan. I’ll do this, you know but then if this don’t work I’ll move that, but it’s all kind of the same.”

(Mitch)

7.1 Introduction

As described by Mitch, beginning with one grooming approach and abandoning it for others that might be more successful is not unusual amongst offenders (Bennett and O’Donohue, 2016). This chapter examines the grooming techniques employed by the cohort in pursuing the sexual abuse of children and the creation of IIOC. The complexity associated with the word grooming is mirrored somewhat by the many terms used by those examining the topic. It has variously been described, for example, as masking (Bourke, Ward and Rose, 2012), modus operandi (Kaufman, Hilliker and Daleiden, 1996; McKillop et al., 2015), seduction stage (Bennett and O’Donohue, 2014), manipulation styles (Sullivan and Quayle, 2012), emotional seduction (Salter, 1995), enticement (Kierkegaard, 2008), entrapment (Howitt, 1995; Gallagher, 1998; Olson et al., 2007) and insider status (Van Dam, 2001). In essence, it is the behaviours that are considered necessary by the perpetrator in advance of, during and subsequent to, the sexual abuse of a child, to ensure he/she achieves his/her goal and optimises detection avoidance.
Individuals have been found to overestimate the extent to which they consider that they would have spotted sexual grooming (Winters and Jeglic, 2016). Considering that aspects of grooming are often not illegal (Bennett and O’Donohue, 2014), and have even been described as invisible (Van Dam, 2014), greater understanding is essential for intervention and prevention. More recently, there has been much focus on online grooming as differing from offline grooming (O’Connell, 2003; Whittle et al., 2013; Kloess, Beech and Harkins, 2014; Quayle et al., 2014; Whittle, Hamilton-Giachristis and Beech, 2014; Whittle, Hamilton-Giachristis and Beech, 2015). In particular, the rapid speed at which online grooming and sexualised agendas have manifested has been highlighted (Hui, Xin and Khader, 2015; Kloess et al., 2015; Quayle and Newman, 2016). While research exploring the similarities and differences between online and offline grooming continue, the heterogeneity and intention of those who use the internet to sexually exploit children is not in dispute (Martellozzo, 2015; Tener, Wolak and Finkelhor, 2015). As is increasingly being noted in literature, grooming of children online has been linked to their vulnerability in the offline environment rather than to the medium per se (Wells and Mitchell, 2008; Livingstone et al., 2011; Webster et al., 2012; Whittle et al. 2013; Livingstone and Smith, 2014; Whittle, Hamilton-Giachritsis and Beech, 2015). However, there are few studies that have examined the victim experience of grooming at an individual or family level (Williams, 2015).

This study contends that the preparation, planning and executing of the sexual exploitation of a child for the production of IIOC involves similarities of behaviour, regardless of context. Individuals may use their own particular skills or expertise (Ward, 1999; Bourke, Ward and Rose, 2012) and will draw upon, what this thesis
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describes as, their grooming repertoire to respond optimally to planning and execution in any given situation. Employment of elements of a grooming repertoire can also differ based on the child/others involved and can have a different pace when adjustment is deemed necessary by the perpetrator, capitalising on situations, children’s routines and lifestyles (McKillop et al., 2015).

It has been noted that the grooming accounts of perpetrators can sound repetitive as their manipulation tactics are so similar (Van Dam, 2013), and that little difference has been found between the grooming manipulations of extra-familial and intra-familial offenders (Horvath et al., 2014). Grooming is not confined to interactions with the child and has been reported as a cyclical, varied and non-linear process (Webster et al., 2012; Whittle, Hamilton-Giachristis and Beech, 2014; Kloess et al., 2015). It was with good reason that exploring the sexual abuse of children has been referred to as grappling with smoke (Gallagher, 1998). The grooming repertoire of participants in this study has been found to be multi-layered, textured, and full of nuances, as well as a dynamic process that was adapted, refined and developed over time. Favoured techniques in a grooming repertoire may be used habitually and instinctively, merging naturally and imperceptibly with other behaviour of the individual, giving the impression that there is little planning, targeting or indeed even grooming. Research has found that individuals can switch from one grooming technique to another depending upon the context (Leclerc, Proulx and Beauregard, 2009; Sullivan, 2009), the offender's age (Kaufman, Hilliker and Daleiden, 1996), and the age of the victim (Leclerc, Proulx and Beauregard, 2009). Preparing the environment to optimise success and minimise victim resistance have also been noted as core components of planning for child sexual exploitation (Sullivan, 2009;
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Balemba and Beauregard, 2012). The honing of skills required to sexually exploit a child can occur as a by-product of an offence (Hewitt and Beauregard, 2014), as expertise in a range of areas is developed, while maintaining an outward normal life presentation (Ward, 1999; Quayle et al., 2014; Fortune, Bourke and Ward, 2015). Such skill development allows for the individual to implement strategies for offending instinctively, with their early life experiences consciously or unconsciously influencing their grooming and offending behaviours (Bourke, Ward and Rose, 2012).

During analysis of the data it became apparent that participants, in the main, had engaged in an initial phase of grooming, as well as specific grooming for production of IIOC. In many cases, both were interwoven. In this chapter, both these aspects of grooming are explored, and the themes and sub-themes that emerge are presented and discussed.

7.2 Initial Grooming

The issue of initial contact with the children is viewed as part of the grooming process, described variously as creating the opportunity to offend (Sullivan and Beech, 2002, Ward and Siegert, 2002; Sullivan and Sheehan, 2016), the preparatory stage, (McAlinden, 2006) or creating private space (Quayle et al., 2014) which may take days, months or even years (Craven, Brown and Gilchrist, 2007). Grooming behaviour has been highlighted as an ongoing one, where risk assessment for detection and trust building are continuous and related tasks (Williams and Hudson, 2013). As highlighted in a study of manipulation styles of offenders, overlap of functions in grooming is not unusual (Sullivan, 2009).
In two instances, participants created IIOC using their own children, and in one case, nephews of the perpetrator were the victims. In such situations, a long-term, pre-existing relationship existed and the degree for grooming for production was part of a much more entrenched process of abuse. Nonetheless, these participants still engaged in and modified the grooming of their victims and others.

A review of the data finds three themes relating to the initial contact by participants with victims:

- False persona
- Concerned/likable adult (attention/affection)
- Introduction by another offender.

In addition, these themes have a number of sub-themes, as illustrated in Figure 3 below.

**Figure 3: Grooming for Initial Contact**
7.2.1 False persona

A recent study found that employing deception around identity online increased the likelihood of receiving a sexually explicit picture from a child or adolescent (Bergen et al., 2014). Two of the participants in this study spoke of using a false persona as their initial contact with a child. They were remote producers, however, one adjacent participant did create a false person/organisation when it came to grooming specifically for production, and this is detailed in the relevant section below.

The concept of assuming or creating a false person is not an unusual one and, in fact, individuals have long adopted such a method (Wall, 2013; Stroup, n.d.). It is a grooming repertoire that has gained prominence in literature with the advent and advancement of the internet (Bergen et al., 2014; Balfe et al., 2014). This cohort highlights that, while it may be an approach that is associated with the internet, it is not a new phenomenon.

Internet-facilitated sexual exploitation of children has provided the ability to hide one’s true identity (Cooper, 1998; UNODC, 2014), with half the offenders in one study reporting that they masked who they were while online (Dowdell, Burgess and Flores, 2011), whereas another study found that the majority of perpetrators did not hide the fact they were adult and interested in a sexual contact (Wolak, Finkelhor and Mitchell, 2004). It was noted as a low occurrence in an examination of online chat logs of sex offenders, with 6.63% of adults posing as either teenagers or a different gender (Quayle and Newman, 2016). Offenders have been known to take on children’s online idiolect in order to present themselves as a peer, often of the opposite sex, with similar interests and hobbies (Williams and Hudson, 2013). In
turn, these offenders have been found to use their false persons to dupe children into sending self-generated indecent imagery (SGII) (CEOP, 2012). Identity deception and the suggestion of secrecy have been found to increase the occurrence of cybersex with a child (Bergen et al., 2014).

7.2.1.1 Potential boyfriend

Frank described how he was duplicitous in his approach, and that he used social media to create the false person of a teenage boy as a means of engaging in contact with potential victims:

“So you sort of create a presence for yourself and almost an image or reputation or persona of yourself which may be accurate or may not be…there was a photo, yea…I probably though let’s see what happens.”

(Frank)

The photograph was one of a good-looking teenage boy that Frank had copied from the internet and presented as himself. Frank reported that he capitalised on his knowledge of children and the language they use as he worked with them to authenticate his false online profile and interactions. The adaptability of sex offenders to the presentation of each individual child was noted in one study that looked at the grooming techniques of online offenders (Webster et al., 2012).

7.2.1.2 Multiple personalities

Despite stating in interview,

“I didn’t want to trick anybody…I never lied about my age for one thing”,

(Tony)
Tony’s case file evidence reported that he posed as a school boy and a gay single man in gay chatrooms, in an attempt to initiate sexual conversations and pursue offline sexual exploitation of children. It is not unusual for those who sexually exploit children to have cognitive distortions and to minimise aspects of their behaviour (Mihailides, Devilly and Ward, 2004; Winder and Gough, 2010; Nunes and Jung, 2013). As the chat log demonstrates, it appears that this may have been the case with Tony.

Hector, who was interested in pre-pubescent children, described how he presented as a likable adult but by doing so to an extent that he adopted a childlike personality:

“So I had all these masks but the real me is still a 10-year-old emotionally. And if I didn't have to put this act on practically all of the time, I would still be a 10-year-old, I'd behave like a 10-year-old, talk like a 10-year-old, be interested in what a 10-year-old's interested in. Maybe, with a few more, older more mature.. sub interests, um particularly in sex, I mean that otherwise it's just, and that makes it a great deal easier for you to go on and offend if you're not an adult yourself.”

(Hector)

While it has been found that online offenders are more invested in deception (Wolak and Finkelhor, 2013), Hector’s account highlights the similarities with those who adopted false persona online to groom children and how this grooming technique has not originated with the internet, despite how it so readily enables that behaviour.

### 7.2.2 Concerned/likable adult

Giving the child attention and praise, sharing personal information and affording them adult status has been noted as techniques employed by professionals who access victim via their job (Leclerc, Proulx, and McKibben 2005; Sullivan and
Quayle, 2012; Kloess et al., 2015; Whittle, Hamilton-Giachritsis and Beech, 2015). Giving gifts, love and attention was also typical amongst a range of care giving individuals intent on being sexual with a child (Smallbone, Marshall and Wortley, 2008), with violence being seen as a minimal technique when compared with emotional exploitation (Smallbone and Milne, 2000). Stranger perpetrators have been noted in one study to show no emotional warmth towards their victims, and to be more likely to use force as a grooming technique (Smallbone, Marshall and Wortley, 2008), with emotional rapport and family manipulation found by Katz and Barnetz, (2015) as the most frequent offender tactic. The concerned, likable adult was an approach style with adjacent and remote producers alike, and two sub-themes are identified, namely:

- Want to be friends
- Befriend the family.

### 7.2.2.1 Want to be friends

While we might assume that, given the educative and awareness campaigns, children would be wary of an overt approach from an adult online, the interviews show that this is not necessarily the case. In many instances, this information was backed up by the case records and online chat logs. Blair adopted the ‘hiding in the open’ approach. He did not considerably alter his personal details when beginning the process of grooming a child online but presented as a friendly individual, with a manipulation style used by offenders that has been described as ‘liberal’ (Sullivan and Quayle, 2012, p.93), and challenging the image of the aggressive predator (Hui, Xin and Khader, 2015).
“I had a sort of standard message which I sent, which was something along the lines of, 'Hi, I'm Blair', and I would give them an age, around about my age 40, 50 years old, whatever it was. Say, 'I'm 40 or 50 would you', you know, 'I'm fun' and whatever, 'would you like to chat. If not, not a problem, but if you do, let's chat’.”

(Blair)

There is an implied sense of control being offered to the child by Blair that suggests the age differential does not denote a power imbalance.

Mitch, an adjacent producer, described how he initiated contact with children:

“...seeing somebody and trying to be friends with him for as long as you can, and don't wanna have sex with him to start off, because if you do, it's gonna change you know. He's gonna go and you won't get time to be around him for a while, uh and it would be hang out with him and try to buy him stuff, give him stuff, turn him into a friend, make him really like you, and then plan the whole time to when you finally get him where you want him.”

(Mitch)

Sam described how he normalised certain activities in front of the camera with his daughter, in advance of sexualising his behaviour with her and recording it, presenting it as fun and accommodating Dad:

“Well we played these things out as fantasies, I'd be the bad guy and I'd capture her and she'd manage to struggle and get free so I mean it, she was, before we even started doing any of the sexual stuff, she was, when we got the VCR she was always wanting to do plays and she'd be the princess or the bad guys would get her and I mean she was into that kind of story line, so when we did things like that, you know, we'd do it as a story line and we were filming it so, she didn't have.. I mean she didn't have a problem with it, it fit in with the story.”

(Sam)

Sam described capitalising on age-old themes that children use in play. Callum explained how he played the long game and took time with the rapport-build stage:

“Gradually over the weeks I would build a rapport with that particular boy. There might be another boy in the class but I wouldn't just single
out one - I’d also have that rapport if he had friends in the class I would have the same rapport with them, or similar rapport with them. I would allow them a bit of leeway, praising them when they did work well, giving out less to them if work was not done.”

(Callum)

David described how he targeted vulnerable children and showed them kindness:

“You don’t need violence, you don’t need aggression, you just be nice, pick on the lonely and the vulnerable.”

(David)

David has thought through his victim selection process as an adjunct to subsequent grooming, knowing that success is more likely with some children than others.

7.2.2.2 Befriend the family

Grooming of ‘gatekeepers of access’ (McAlinden, 2006, p.339), both to allay suspicion and to groom the child by a third-party, are recognised aspects of grooming (Van Dam, 2001; Knoll, 2010; Jaffe et al., 2013; Bennett and O’Donohue, 2014; Leclerc et al., 2014; Quadara, Higgins and Siegel, 2015). Tim spoke of how he developed a relationship with a foster carer of three children, who was single and grateful for the attention he showed to her and the children:

“[The little girl] who was six was learning how to swim and she saw me talking to her foster mom and she asked me, her foster mom was extremely obese, and did not get into the swimming pool often. I had no contact with her other than at the YMCA for a number of months, perhaps even half a year and then, as I got to know the family better, I asked them if they wanted me, if they would like me to take them to supper ... the foster mum was very thankful, very appreciative and not willing to take advantage of me and my generosity to do that, and the kids were just very excited because there was no father in their life.”

(Tim)
It is possible that Tim has targeted a vulnerable adult, as well as vulnerable children.

Brian used a relationship with an older sibling to initiate contact with a child, who ultimately became one of his victims:

“So I meet this girl and we start having sex and uh she’s got a sister who’s five... on the inside I’m like 'Man I want to be with your sister'.”

(Brian)

Teachers giving special attention and/or rewards to students have been noted as a way of initiating contact for sexual exploitation with children (Knoll, 2010). Callum chose boys who were from poor economic backgrounds, and where there was an absent or disinterested father:

“I’d normally have to call on many of the students’ parents, anyway that was part of my job, but I would particularly go up to this boy’s parents and praise him, usually the mother because the father might be an alcoholic or a tough man. Always praising the child that he was doing well at school, offering to help to get him past his exams and offering to do extra work with him so in a sense the mother felt I was really helping. Maybe a sad situation where the dad wasn’t interested at all or the mother would tell me problems and I would go out of my way to help in every way I could. But I had an ulterior motive and that was to try to get to abuse her son at the end of the day. I would do the very best for the family but not for the reasons she thought, it would be for other reason. I would come up for cups of tea.”

(Callum)

Callum’s approach is echoed in the findings of capitalisation of the power dynamic in a teacher/coach/leader role to implement grooming (Leclerc and Cale, 2015). David also described how he ingratiated himself with the child’s family as part of his grooming repertoire:

“I made myself invaluable to the family.”

(David)
The extent to which participants enmeshed themselves in the lives of families is a layering of the grooming process that serves multiple purposes, including ease of access to victim, suspicion deflection, and extension of trust conveyed by parental approval. Indeed unwittingly, other adults can prop up denial and distortion in offenders (Craissati, 2015).

### 7.2.3 Introduction by another offender

While it is known that co-operation and co-offending occurs amongst sex offenders (La Fontaine, 1993), its rate and prevalence are difficult to determine (Harkins and Dixon, 2010; Jimenez, Jackson and Deye, 2015). While not specifically looking at the production of IIOC, one study that examined the trafficking of children for sexual abuse, found that a third party ‘exploiter’ was responsible in the majority (57%) of cases, with 28% including more than one exploiter (Mitchell, Finkelhor and Wolak 2013, p.2). It has been highlighted that there can be different dynamics at play when offenders act alongside one another (Finkelhor and Lewis 1988; Zimbardo, 2007; Budd, Bierie and Williams, 2015) but that it is nonetheless a heterogeneous crime (Harkins and Dixon, 2010).

Four of the cohort in this study spoke of procuring children from others for the production of IIOC. Stan went with a co-offender to Eastern Europe to meet with a commercial producer of IIOC who had offered to provide them with boys to abuse and photograph. He said of the boys:

“The boys were very experienced models. [The provider of the boys] had been photographing the boys since they were eight ... and he wasn’t only photographing [them] he was screwing them fairly regularly and most of the other boys as well so the boys were very experienced in that and they were perfectly happy ... they were so well worn in.”

(Stan)
Stan has capitalised on grooming carried out by others and focuses on the boys’ perceived experiences and happiness as permission giver.

David, one of six of the cohort who was abused by multiple adults as a child, was the victim of a paedophile ring from the age of six. He continued to have contact with offenders when he reached adulthood, and went on to abuse children himself. He spoke of different instances when children were procured for him. One of these was when he was in a relationship with an individual who worked with children in a faith community:

“He gave me access to, because he was, he gave me access to Scouts cubs, I got the access towards children who were going to the church.”

(David)

Unsurprisingly, the self-esteem of children who have been abused by multiple perpetrators is significantly impacted and results in shame and the belief that others abhor them (Turner et al. 2015).

David also spoke of children being procured for him when travelling abroad:

I was with a friend of mine... and he spoke Thai, not really well but enough to get us around, I mean he knew somebody in Cambodia who was there, em and I spent about a week there just meeting the locals and meeting his boys... I preferred street children, they were cheaper and easier to control, em so it was, it was, when in Thailand in Phuket they used to go out to the countryside and come back, and bring new boys in.”

(David)

The pre-existing vulnerabilities of such children are evident, and the growing problem of sex tourism is well-documented (Thomas, 2012; Bang et al., 2014; Curley, 2014). However, as David’s case exemplifies, the procurement of children
for sexual exploitation is not confined to far-flung destinations. As well as being victims of exploitation in their countries of origin, it is estimated that 79% of the female children are trafficked for the purpose of sexual abuse (Hartjen and Priyadarsini, 2012). Research into trafficking examined by this study found little reference to the production of IIOC, however, the contributions of participants suggest that perhaps it is a question that needs to be asked.

7.3 Grooming children for production

Consideration of data indicates that there are four distinct themes to grooming children for production, which include:

- Normalisation of sex
- Enticement
- Coercion
- Physical violence.

Certain studies, that have approached grooming from the perspective of the victim, have found similar themes (Whittle, Hamilton-Giachritsis and Beech, 2014; Katz and Barnetz, 2015).

These themes produce sub-themes, as detailed in Figure 4.
Normalisation of sex as a topic of discussion has been highlighted as a common feature of sexual grooming of children and not a new one (Elliott, Brown and Kilcoyne, 1995; Knoll, 2010; Wolak and Finkelhor, 2013; Kloess, Beech and Harkins, 2014; Quayle and Newman, 2016). From this theme, three sub-themes are identified, namely:

- Sexual conversation
- Encouragement by others
- Show pornography.
7.3.1.1 Sexual conversation

Simon described how he sexualised conversations with his victims as a means of grooming them for sexual abuse and the production of IIOC:

“[I used] to start a conversation about um, you know, would you fuck on the first date basically, or then perhaps I think it may have gone down the lines to um, you know, about his girlfriends and things like that.”

(Simon)

Hugh adopted a similar approach:

“Well, what we call boys talk. So I would talk about adult issues with them.”

(Hugh)

Those who used the internet to sexually exploit children to produce IIOC were particularly explicit in their sexualised conversations:

“I wish you could see the effect you’ve had on me, I can’t get up from the desk...lol...I’m so horny I would fuck anything at the moment...better keep that dog of yours in tonight! Lol.”

(Blair)

The chat logs in relation to Blair and his victims are even more obscene but are presented, as seen from the extracts above, in a humorous and light-hearted fashion, even when he details wanting to drug his victims, use extreme bondage, torture and bestiality. Blair seemed to have a certain level of awareness of this tactic:

“Well you can make a joke about sex, I mean, you know, sex is funny anyway, isn’t it? And, um, er, taking her lead to make a, to make a joke out of it and then turn a phrase round or whatever it might be, not, not sort of long sexual jokes but, you know, to, um, just take, take the situation and try and make it amusing, if you like. I guess that was another strategy to keep people interested on line, I suppose, thinking back on it.”

(Blair)
The swift, explicit and persistent nature of sexualised conversations is one found in other studies of online groomers (Kloess et al., 2015; Quayle and Newman, 2016). Sexual conversations were a commonplace technique used by the cohort. It appears that once children began such a process it was difficult for them to extricate themselves and that they were without sufficient skills and developmental experiences to offset offender proficiency. It has been noted that the normalising of sexual abuse is a key factor in non-disclosure, creating a situation in some instances where the child does not even realise that they have been exploited (Bennett and O’Donohue, 2016; Wagner, 2015). It has been advocated that educative work with children and adolescents should be candid on the physiological response that can naturally accompany sexual talk and that, while this is normal, children need to be informed as to how offenders seek to capitalise upon this occurrence (Wolak and Finkelhor, 2013).

7.3.1.2 Encouragement by others

The concept of third party grooming has been noted by law enforcement and academics, whereby one child is groomed in order to facilitate access/sexual abuse of another child (Fasting and Brackenridge, 2005; CEOP, 2012; Mooney, 2014; Whittle, Hamilton-Giachritsis and Beech, 2014). Frank, who created a teenage boy persona, became the third party by hacking into online accounts of friends of his victims. Posing as their friends, he encouraged them to comply with the sexual requests they were receiving from his teenage boy persona. In this way, victims believed that they were receiving advice from peers about complying with his wishes and sexual requests, and encouraging them to expose for the camera. He also suggested, via the peers’ accounts he was operating, that additional sexual
behaviours be performed online, without it seeming that his teenage boy persona was making all the requests.

Mitch described how he groomed children he has abused to the extent that, when they were beyond his target range, they procured other children for him:

“When they're getting to the age that you're not really that interested anymore, but they wouldn't want to give up so now, you know they would try and bring other boys for you because they know it would be worth money to them.”

(Mitch)

Mitch gained access to children in this way and got his previous victims to normalise this behaviour and encourage vulnerable children to comply with his abuse and production of IIOC.

7.3.1.3 Showing pornography

Showing pornography to children was a feature of adjacent as well as remote producers in this cohort. It has been questioned whether showing pornography to a child actually constitutes grooming, as in effect, it is the abuse of a child (Bennett and O’Donohue, 2014). A number of participants in this study (N=13) showed their victims pornography (with one using an audio recording with adult sexual content) as a means of sexualising the agenda, while also normalising the behaviour. Sending IIOC and pornography to children has been a noted trend (CEOP, 2012). The findings of one study of online grooming found that 68.6% of the cohort sent nude photographs of themselves to children (Briggs, Simon and Simonsen, 2010), with this figure being 35.54% in the Quayle and Newman study (2016). 55% of
participants in another study on contact offending used pornography in the commission of their offence (Langevin and Curnoe, 2004).

It has been suggested that it has multiple purposes, namely to lower a child’s inhibition, show children enjoying sexual behaviour, and/or present sex between a child and an adult as normal activity (Yang and Donahue, 2012). While sharing pornography was described as more typical by those who used the internet to target and grooming children for production, it was also employed by those adjacent to their victims.

Shelton described how he used pornography as part of his grooming repertoire with his daughter:

“I’d showed her, she used to look through my pictures on my computer, me, for ideas for poses. Em and she’d say ‘Oh I want to do one like that, I like that one can we do that one?’”

(Shelton)

Mike had pornography available in his house and made it seem a natural occurrence for young people to sit around and watch such material:

“Watching the kind of porn they wanted to watch.”

(Mike)

Hugh spoke of how he did the same thing with his nephews:

“Well again its normalising it, is breaking down defences that he might have had, making him think well it’s there on video, this is normal. This happens. There’s nothing wrong with it.”

(Hugh)
The video recordings shown by Hugh to his nephews also included his sexual contact with one of the boys.

Blair sent adult pornography, IIOC, images of his erect penis, and links to websites depicting extreme sexual content, such as bestiality, to his victims:

“And I sent her images which I thought would sort of encourage, if you like. ‘You're not alone, here's images of other children’ you know, I think that's what was going through my mind. ‘Here's some images of other children who have done it. It's not just you, other children do it’.”

(Blair)

Blair appears to depict his sending of such material as a benevolent gesture to reassure the child as well as a grooming strategy.

### 7.3.2 Enticement

Children can be enticed in a myriad of ways, and what will work with one child may not with another. Results for this study found that the enticement was child- and context-specific, and determined by the offenders accordingly. Three sub-themes emerge from the analysis relating to how participants enticed children for the purposes of producing IIOC, which include:

- Offering gifts/money
- Offering attention/affection
- Child as pseudo producer/recruiter.

Each of these are discussed below and illustrated with accounts from the participants.
7.3.2.1 Offering gifts/money

The concept of a sex offender bribing children with gifts is a recognised feature of sexual grooming (Craven, Brown and Gilchrist, 2006; McAlinden 2006; McAlinden 2012; Kloess et al., 2015; Quadara, Higgins and Siegel, 2015). Low-value goods have been noted as being appreciated by many children, with 91% \((n=39)\) of the victims in one study receiving items that were not particularly expensive (Cockbain and Wortley, 2015). Drugs and alcohol were identified as particularly prevalent grooming techniques at the initial stages of an offender’s process (Cockbain and Wortley, 2015).

Stan, however, gave an example of a high value gift, and he explained in interview that he is still in contact with one of his victims, who is now an adult and married with his own family:

“\textit{I was always the one who paid for everything you know I don’t think I ever gave them money for the photographs or for sex or anything like that. I do give money now I mean I look on him as my son and my grandson and I bought this house as a wedding present and so on ... it is a bigger house than he can afford on an [job description] pay so I do a, you know, certain amount to, to help him keep up the running costs and that sort of thing.}”

(Stan)

Stan’s account may be true but he may also be trying to impress the interviewer and perhaps discredit the victim.

Callum, an adjacent contact offender, created a false third party persona/organisation as part of his grooming repertoire, as a means of initiating children into the production of IIOC. He used it to entice children to do as he wanted for production. Using the promise of a modelling or TV career is not unusual for sex offenders
(Keogh, 2013; FBI, 2014), with 10.81% of images reviewed by Cybertipline.ca considered to have happened in a studio or manufactured environment (cybertip!ca, 2016). Callum told children that a modelling agency was looking for models, and he typed out advertising letters and communication from the agency which offered money and the possibility of foreign travel. His requests became more and more explicit and sexual:

“Then I typed out an application form which was in his instructions saying that if you wanted to earn big money we are looking for sex models, ‘You might not be interested in that but if you are there are Caribbean islands, lovely girls, the whole shebang... I wrote instructions so I offered to take photographs because they would have known from the club and the school that I had a camera anyway and I had always portrayed myself as your friend... Each stage progressed and progressed until there was horrific sex all in the instructions.”

(Callum)

Callum’s technique seems to have been effective, as he stated in interview:

“Every single one of the boys, except one I think, did what I wanted.”

(Callum)

The long-term impact of childhood sexual abuse is well-documented (Salter, 1995; Arias and Johnson, 2013; Elklit et al., 2014). When the subtle and insidious nature of grooming techniques are detailed by offenders, perhaps especially those where the child may have been made feel complicit, for example by having accepted gifts, that level of potential damage can be considered fully.

7.3.2.2 Offering attention/affection

Giving attention and flattery (both sexual and non-sexual) has been noted as a grooming technique in one study which analysed the accounts of eight victims,
where all but one of them were the subjects of IIOC (Whittle, Hamilton-Giachritsis, and Beech, 2014; Kloess et al., 2015; Quayle and Newman, 2016). Tim detailed how he used flattery and the apparent allure of being on the computer as a means of persuading a six-year-old girl into allowing him to take her photograph:

“I said 'Child I'd like to take a picture of you and put it on the computer'. .. I said 'you look real cute today, can I take a picture of you and put it on my computer?' of you in your cute little dress and she says 'sure'.”

(Tim)

Tim’s account also demonstrates a grooming technique found amongst the cohort, where the child’s permission is sought to take the picture, thus making them complicit in their own abuse:

Blair described himself as a sounding board for their problems:

“I liked to portray myself as sort of, 'I'm a bit older, a bit more experienced, you've got some problem and maybe I can give you, give you a hand with those. And quite a lot of that went on.”

(Blair)

David described how he normalised touch in the guise of affection and attention in advance of providing a child for sexual exploitation and the production of IIOC for a third party:

“I’d sit in the back cuddling them or whatever it may be, em getting them used to being touched up.”

(David)

The dynamic between a victim and their abuser can often be complex, with the influence of grooming being considerable, as perpetrators are known to capitalise on
pre-existing vulnerabilities and provide a false sense of safety and love where it has been previously lacking (Rafferty, 2016).

7.3.2.3 Child as pseudo IIOC producer/recruiter

Hugh described how, initially, it was the children who unwittingly produced IIOC and, while he was not present for the creation of the material, he acknowledged that he engineered the situation:

“I had a video camera and they borrowed it to make a film of something ... Um they’d borrowed it to make some little horror film or something you know. As boys do – fair enough. And then um as I recall, then child 1 said ‘I want to make a film and I want child 2 to film it’ so ok, so he went and did this and he brought it back down and played it and it was child 1, doing a strip tease act...Um so then he wanted to do another film, but this time he wanted me to film him. So I did. Knowing what would happen and that’s when I indecently assaulted him... [He was] probably about seven or eight. Um, now the reality is of course that I had led them into this stage. This didn’t just come out the ether you know, there wasn’t a time they thought ‘Oh I’m gonna make him a video of me stripping off, and getting an erection’ sort of thing. That wouldn’t occur to him. I had been steering them in this direction by my behaviour.”

(Hugh)

Hugh then went on to capitalise on the filming and sexualised behaviour of the child by carrying out sexual abuse and producing IIOC. Once this dynamic is in place, it is less likely that a child will disclose, and the producers in this study appear to have exploited this situation.

A number of the adjacent producers included themselves in the images/video (N=13), and others involved more than one child in the production process (N=8). Tim described how he did both, and included the children as a pseudo co-producer:

“So, child one said OK, and she got in front of me and child two got the camera and I kissed her between her legs and child two took a picture of
that. And then I kissed her several more times and child two took pictures of that... Uh, what happened was, after I think about four pictures, child one says 'OK child two, you go, I need to take pictures of you, it's my turn to take pictures'. And child two said 'ok', she gives child one the camera and then child one stands up um, child one stands up on the bed and I started to kiss child two between her legs.’”  

(Tim)

Tim has created the dynamic whereby the child is actively involved in filming, such is the extent of his grooming repertoire. Livingstone and Palmer (2012, p.29) highlights how feelings of being complicit in their own sexual abuse and being the subject of abuse images are ‘a recipe for non-disclosure’. The silencing potency of IIOC when the child appears to be co-producing adds another layer to the complexity of victim trauma and recovery.

Mitch described how he made the child a co-producer, describing the production to the child as a joint effort:

“I would talk em into a video and say stuff like uh ‘I’m going to blur out your face, or I just want to do it to look at, you know, we’ll clear it off once we’re finished, are you crazy, do you actually think I’m gonna trying to keep a video, do you know how dangerous that would be, you know I just like making it, we’re goanna clear it off.’”  

(Mitch)

A number of participants (N=5) got one child to procure another for the purpose of IIOC. Sam, who abused his step-children, described the process:

“I’m going to say this now knowing that the effect it will have on you, because it’s the truth, you might not believe this but it’s the truth, and [Female child] suggested that she eh take some pictures like that and it was her that got Child 2 to pose for the first few. However, having said that it was me that abused [male child 2] and [male child 3] first, [Female child] was nothing to do with the fact that I touched them, whereas the pictures were her idea. It was me that, that abused them.”  

(Sam)
It is likely that children would be more trusting of a peer who tried to engage them for sexual abuse than they might be of an adult (Montgomery-Devlin, 2008), and as such, is an effective grooming tactic. It has also been noted that where children are made to smile during the photographing/recording of their sexual abuse, a greater block to disclosure is created (Palmer, 2003).

### 7.3.3 Coercion

The use of violence and threats compounds the severity of child sexual abuse (Stander et al., 2016). It is clear from the analysis of the data that coercion is used by a number of participants in various forms to force their victims into compliance and/or silence in producing IIOC. It may be that more used this approach but did not admit so. Analysis of the data suggests that participants used threats and substances to overpower children. These include three sub-themes, namely:

- Persistent demands
- Threats/aggression
- Drugs/alcohol.

#### 7.3.3.1 Persistent demands

The intensity and persistence of offenders was a significant theme in exploring victim accounts (Whittle, Hamilton-Giachritis and Beech, 2014) in a study where the level and methods of contact were found to have increased commensurate with the victims’ dependency. In other studies that looked at chat logs of online sex, the use of persistence was also noted (Kloess et al., 2015; Quayle and Newman, 2016).
Mike, who initially denied using persistence to overcome victim resistance, ultimately conceded that he did use such an approach to meet his own needs:

“I did stuff to him uh like oral sex and uh, except I never pushed him into doing. He didn’t want to do any of it really and I kind of pushed it and pushed it and pushed it.”

(Mike)

Mike also spoke of persistence and promises in respect of creating IIOC:

“I would talk em into a video and say stuff like uh ‘I’m going to blur out your face, or ‘I just want to do it to look at, you know , we’ll clear it off once we’re finished, are you crazy, do you actually think I’m gonna trying to keep a video, do you know how dangerous that would be?’ You know, I just like making it, we’re gonna clear it off.”

(Mike)

The chat logs of online conversations Blair held with victims belie his claims of an exclusively friendly approach to children online. His persistence in seeking sexualised behaviour to record via webcam was a feature throughout his contact with children, as illustrated by examples below:

“[I want] a flash”... “can you get the cam on for me”... “Mmmm sounds sexy, love to see”... “I need to see...!!!!”... “So can you get on the cam for me...want to see you so badly”... “can’t trust until I see.”

(Blair)

Repeating demands and insistent questioning as used by Blair have strong similarities with text in other offender chat logs (Kloess et al., 2015).
7.3.3.2 Threats/Aggression

The threats and aggression identified by participants in the study comprise of three categories:

- Threatening to share images/video with others
- Threatening withdrawal of attention
- Threats of violence.

7.3.3.2.1 Threatening to share images/video with others

While a means of silencing children from disclosure, threats to show the images or video to others can also be used to blackmail children into allowing further IIOC to be created (Eneman, Gillespie and Bernd, 2010; Yang and Donahue, 2012; Cohen-Almagor, 2013; Whittle, Hamilton-Giachritsis and Beech, 2014; Bennett and O’Donohue, 2016). While emotional threats were noted in one study of online sex offender chat logs, the majority were related to warnings of dissemination of sexual images of the child already in the possession of the offender (Quayle and Newman, 2016).

Sam detailed implied threats of exposure:

"I said 'I will not show those pictures, a picture like that I'm not gonna show your mom.'"

(Sam)

If he felt he was experiencing resistance or reluctance, Mike warned his victims:

"I would start talking to them about money and videos and coming back and you can’t let your mom know where you got the money."

(Mike)
David threatened his victims by telling them that he would post their picture of sexual abuse on the internet if they ever disclosed. The children were unaware that he had already done this.

7.3.3.2  Threatening withdrawal of attention

The desire to appease their abuser and have them revert to kindness is a noted feature of the grooming of children for sexual exploitation (Brackenridge, 1997; McAlinden, 2012; Whittle, Hamilton-Giachritsis and Beech, 2014; Whittle, Hamilton-Giachritsis and Beech, 2015).

Frank reported that he threatened to withdraw friendship and, as he was a remote overt offender who was using a false persona pretending to be a potential boyfriend of the victim, this had a significant impact. He also described how he prevailed upon children to act as he wanted, so he could capture the IIOC:

“Ok then I’ll go...Oh well if you want me to stay then prove you want me to stay, you know that sort of stuff...I was coercing the girls. It'd be like if you said tomorrow, you know, 'Lift your top up,' they'd go, 'Oh, we're not going out with each other', 'Okay, we'll go out with each other', 'Oh, all right then'. I mean, it was a simple, and you're just thinking, 'This is ridiculous' you know. If you drop the age group a bit, um, you know, they're a bit more sort of pliable.”

(Frank)

Tim created an environment where his victim was rewarded, given gifts, treats and attention, and then suggested that all of this might stop:

“Well, when she first started posing for pictures, I told her I said 'do you know if you tell anybody about this, you'll not be allowed to come over any more. I said I don't think I would ever be allowed to see you again', and she said 'well, I'll never tell' and that was all I'd said.”

(Tim)
The implied threat of losing privileges for a child who has little to start with is likely to be powerful.

### 7.3.3.2.3 Threats of violence

Offenders often imply violence against the victim or their loved ones (Craven, Brown and Gilchrist, 2006). The threat of violence can be as effective as experiencing violence, and is one way Mitch used to gain compliance from his victims:

> “Sometimes, no really physical violence because you know I would never hurt nothing. Not really, I may pretend that I would, I would try to touch them and they'd try to hold my hand back … Um, ‘move your hand or I'll break it’, uh or something like that uh which I never would.”

(Mitch)

Mike also described a more serious implied threat of violence:

> “When I would bring boys there, I would warn em, especially at night time when they would come, I would tell them that 'do you know how dangerous it is for you to come, do you know anything about me, you don't know anything about me, you know you jumped in a vehicle with me, and neither your mom nor dad or nobody knows where you're at and I've even said it on those videos, and uh uh, nobody knows where you're at. Uh, and anything could happen, I mean, I'm not the serial killer who wants to kill you, or nothing like that, but what if I was. It happens to people every day, you get people, you know, they get lured off every day and killed and threw away and nobody every knows what happened to them.”

(Mike)

Finding differences between the victim and offender accounts is not unusual (Whittle, Hamilton-Giachritsis and Beech, 2015), and this study is primarily limited to offender accounts. However, case file paperwork did provide some insight into victim experiences. Hugh’s victims alleged that he was violent towards them,
however, he minimised this in interview, and seemed to suggest that he gave the impression of possible violence rather than actually carrying it out:

“I was getting very very out of control towards the end of all this...Um and I was getting a very quick temper.”

(Hugh)

Sam, who placed his daughter in a cage and locked her inside, described her terrified reaction:

“Well the picture in the cage...as soon as I clicked the door she was scared out of her mind and the single thing I did in regard to her that was worse was instead of me releasing it I did take the picture...I did put her through some real terror.”

(Sam)

Sam shows how his intention to produce the IIOC became the priority, and while he had previously used more subtle and playful grooming, his behaviour seems to have become more extreme over time.

7.3.3.3 Drugs/Alcohol

Two participants spoke of using substances to disarm their victims and allow for sexual exploitation and the production of IIOC.

David described ensuring that there would be no resistance from a child when he provided them for “clients”:

“What we used to do we used to offer tablets sedate them, eh you know it could be anything from an anti-depressant to a sleeper really, em mix it in with a drink give it to them so they, you know, relax and not going to cause a scene.”

(David)
Hugh used alcohol to ensure his victims were asleep or at least more compliant:

“I used to ply them with alcohol...they of course though it was great. So it was unfortunately only too easy.”

(Hugh)

Engaging children in illicit activities, such as smoking cigarettes or consuming alcohol or drugs, of course, further distances them from feeling able to disclose abuse, as they are likely to fear repercussions for their own prohibited behaviour.

7.3.4 Physical Violence

7.3.4.1 Indiscriminate

The use of violence (apart from the obvious sexual violence) is not typically noted as a grooming technique (Smallbone and Milne, 2000; Wolak et al., 2008). However, it has been suggested that the violence in IIOC is hidden, with children being told to smile (Nyman, 2007). Findings from the National Juvenile Online Victimisation study (NJOV) reported that 21% of the images they examined included sexual violence and torture (Wolak, Finkelhor and Mitchell, 2005). Worryingly, Cybertipline.ca reports that if a boy is present in the image, the instances of extreme sexual assault increase (cybertip!ca, 2016). Two participants in this study acknowledged using physical force against their victims. Liam described using violence as a regular occurrence in the house, and not specific to production:

“When he would get into trouble I would beat him with a stick. I probably shouldn’t have done that no honestly. I was always treating him bad unfortunately. But he was a really irritating kid... he was an awesome kid, but irritating, and that’s how I dealt with it and I guess that messed him up a little bit.”

(Liam)
7.3.4.2 During Production

As the case paperwork indicates, Hugh’s victims experienced violence when they would not comply with his sexual advances and production of IIOC. However, he appeared to minimise this:

“I might have smacked Child 1 once.”

(Hugh)

It may be that more participants engaged in violence as a means of gaining compliance over their victims but that they have minimised this aspect of their behaviour, and/or that they didn’t want to be seen in this light during interview.

7.4 Summary and Overview

There have been numerous attempts at defining and describing sexual grooming by various professionals. The ongoing efforts to sum up the concept and associated behaviours are testament to how nebulous and complex grooming for sexual abuse actually is. It is only when the accounts of the perpetrators are detailed; those who have evaluated, adapted and refined their multi-layered grooming techniques, that the sophisticated and dynamic nature of the process becomes truly apparent.

The themes that emerge from an exploration of grooming in this study are not new in many respects, and previous research has detailed similar techniques. However, the adaptability of behaviour to capitalise upon situations, and the range of methods and variation detailed by participants is striking. What is apparent is that the underlying motivation and purpose associated with a seemingly innocuous act are the real determinants of whether a behaviour constitutes sexual grooming or not. If the
grooming behaviours per se are continued to be named, as a means of defining the concept, the list would be infinite. What has emerged from the data is the relevance of the underlying motivation more than the actual behaviour itself. The many behaviours described, for example, giving compliments, being a problem solver, and a friendly listener, are not in any way exclusively associated with untoward intent. In respect of grooming specifically for production, however, it appears that this is more intense, invasive and/or threatening than in the initial stages of manipulation. From the accounts of participants, it appears that the victims were already enmeshed with the perpetrators and less able to resist the pressure of grooming for production. While some participants maintained that they were kind towards their victims throughout the process, their accounts suggest that they were more focused on their goal, namely the production of indecent images, and that the more insidious nature of their motivation became more commonplace and more apparent with threats, force and persistence.
Chapter 8 – Functions of the Behaviour

8 Functions of the Behaviour

‘The act of photographing is about recording and owning.’

(Kim and Joo, 2015, p.3)

8.1 Introduction

Almost all behaviour occurs to serve a purpose, satisfy a need and achieve a desired outcome. The genesis of certain behaviours can start early in life, and become more entrenched and develop as time passes. The function of a behaviour is intrinsically linked to the maintenance of that behaviour (Kazdin, 2012). The motivations and functions of behaviours are closely related. There can be more than one motivation for a behaviour and, similarly, behaviours are often likely to serve more than one function. Motivation may drive someone to act in a particular way, and the ultimate purpose or function of a behaviour for an individual may be expected, unexpected or varied. While a sexual motivation is implicit in sexual offending (Abracen and Looman, 2016), most sexual behaviour also has non-sexual motivations (Finkelhor, 1994; Hoberman, 2016). For example, the sexual abuse of a child may provide a sexual reward but, in addition, mastery over the manipulation of that child may provide additional pleasure (Heffernan and Ward, 2015). By identifying a behaviour, and establishing its antecedents and functions, a healthier replacement can be found. The aim in intervention with sex offenders is that, rather than exclusively focusing on how a behaviour manifests, it is important to also focus on the function of the behaviour, and this can result in finding an equally-satisfying, non-harmful behaviour
with the same functional value (Craig, Browne and Beech, 2008; Quayle and Newman, 2015). Such a function-based approach allows for a shift from generic intervention to a more tailored response (Quayle, Vaughan and Taylor, 2006).

### 8.2 Function of production of IIOC

Four themes emerge from the data in respect of the function of the IIOC behaviour, namely:

- **Sexual**
- **Power and Control**
- **To Share**
- **Avoidance**.

Each of these in turn has various sub-themes, as detailed in Figure 5.

---

**Figure 5: Functions of Production**
The functions of the behaviour do not emerge as contained singular entity but rather a complex set of often inter-related, multi-layered transactions, as exemplified by David, who alluded to sexual, commercial, and social functions being met:

“I started taking photographs when I was in my 20s... em and as I got more known, people wanted me to film them with their boys so I’d travel all over the place, em just filming them and you know sometimes partaking in what was on offer there, em so in the end basically it was getting more of a business and I was getting my jollies thrown in with it. Yeah I turned into a right cold man.”

(David)

Each theme and associated sub-themes are discussed below.

### 8.3 Sexual

A sexual function for producing IIOC is, unsurprisingly, a prominent theme in a cohort who all acknowledged sexual arousal to children. IIOC has been noted as an aid to sexual arousal and to augment sexual fantasy for sex offenders (Klain, Davies and Hicks, 2001; Lanning, 2001; Taylor, Quayle and Holland, 2001; Quayle and Newman, 2015). While sexual function is an overarching theme, three sub-themes emerge, namely:

- Immediate gratification
- Delayed masturbation
- Customising.
8.3.1 Immediate gratification

In the main, the participants described being sexually aroused while taking the photographs/videos. Stan described the contemporaneous pleasure he felt while taking photographs of a group of boys:

“They posed themselves for some very indecent shots erections I think they were masturbating I think they were even doing oral sex on I, I don’t remember but they, they, they seemed to, they seemed to look on it as, as to the err bit of fun but I, I can’t, I can’t say I didn’t enjoy it.”

(Stan)

However, being in the presence of the victim(s) was not essential for the process to be arousing. Blair acknowledged masturbating while he recorded his victims on webcam as they engaged in sexual behaviour online. He detailed how the behaviour was sexually motivated, and progressed from viewing IIOC he accessed online, to creating his own:

“I like, obviously I find schoolchildren sexually stimulating....I guess I saw that as a natural progression... I've seen the images, now I can see that it's possible to chat, text or talk or video with the, with, with the actual children.”

(Blair)

Brady described how the process of taking the photographs was in itself stimulating:

“I thought ‘I fancy her’ kind of thing, took a covert photo, if you like. Obviously got a thrill out of doing that, um, and then I suppose it went from there, really.”

(Brady)

The issue of voyeurism is an under-researched area. The behaviours of peeping and/or secretly photographing individuals to gain pleasure need to be better understood per se, so specific intervention that addresses the motivating factor in that aspect of the behaviour itself can be provided.
8.3.2 Delayed masturbation

Many of the cohort spoke of gaining sexual pleasure from subsequently masturbating to images and videos they produced, a theme also found in an earlier study which included producers of IIOC (Langevin and Curnoe, 2004). Elias was clear that taking the photographs wasn’t arousing per se but simply a means to an end, i.e. material for masturbation at a later date:

“Again, not from taking them as such, but from having them...The taking of photographs as an act in itself is purely an instrumental part of the later pleasure of viewing them... Um the, I would get pleasure at the time from seeing the girls, but I didn’t actually get pleasure at the time from taking the photographs, the purpose of doing that was simply to be able to recall the pleasure and to be able to fantasise at a later stage.”

(Elias)

Elias was also caught in possession of IIOC he downloaded from the internet, so access to such material was not a problem for him. Considering that he acknowledged in interview that he had previously stalked a woman with whom he worked, it is possible that there is more to Elias’ following and filming of girls than he is admitting to at this point.

Tim detailed how he speculated about taking photographs of his future victim and how he would then be able to use them for masturbation:

“When she willingly showed me her underwear, uh it, that's when I got the idea well maybe someday she would let me take a picture of her like that. And then I could look at them at a later time, when she wasn't over there...I did masturbate looking at pictures of Child X in her underwear.”

(Tim)
Callum described a process whereby he anonymised the photographs by removing boys’ faces before sending them to be processed. He then detailed how he used them for masturbatory purposes:

“We cut the tops off the photographs, the heads, to make them feel OK, then unfortunately to my shame I used those for masturbation at night time.”

(Callum)

Hector highlighted how convenient it was to have images of his victim:

“If I had an urge to masturbate or for sexual gratification, I could just look at the pictures... And then that was it, it was there. I didn't have to wait around for an opportunity, I didn't have to groom, I didn't have to turn up to find out her parents were there and they were gonna be staying there and we are not going to be alone, and go home frustrated.”

(Hector)

Mike described a similar convenience aspect to producing his own IIOC:

“I really like making the videos because then you know, you didn't have to spend that much time going out finding different people, you had the same person, you know, the video of them so you see you just watch it later on or something, or tomorrow or next week or whenever.”

(Mike)

It has been suggested that ease of access to online IIOC may result in the emergence of a new group of offenders who give in to a desire and online behaviour that they may otherwise have controlled (Babchishin, Hanson and VanZuylen, 2015). However, the degree to which the production of IIOC may be expedient and desirable, due to customisation options, for sex offenders, raises the possibility that such behaviour may increase as various technologies make it a more achievable process. In addition, the use of IIOC for masturbatory purposes, as described above, is of course a re-victimisation of the children whose images have been captured.
8.3.3 Customising

A number of participants described how creating their own IIOC allowed them to customise the content to their specific taste or indeed the taste of co-offenders. A similar practice has been reported in respect of individuals who downloaded IIOC and digitally manipulated the images to their taste (Quayle and Taylor, 2002). However, this aspect of producing IIOC has not been researched and it raises a potentially important area for greater understanding of individual preference that may lie behind certain images and video. Stan described his artistic consideration when taking IIOC:

“He was lying there posing on the lying on the ground with his pants off and I can remember saying to him do you mind if I move your willy to a slightly more photogenic angle or you know it was casting a shadow.”

(Stan)

Stan also described more elaborate customising of the images he was producing with his co-offenders, by getting his victims to wear certain clothes:

“And err so [I] would very often do this with the lads and erm either dress them up in something we had there or, or tie a scarf round his neck or or, or, or you know belt put his belt on and tuck his shirt or t-shirt or vest hanging down or what have you that those were that was my fantasy, visual fantasy of boys dressing up.”

(Stan)

David spoke of how he too customised IIOC for individuals, whom he supplied:

“[If they] wanted any particular we’d have uniforms like cub scouts or eh navy, you know white shorts navy top that kind of thing, whatever they wanted we could supply.”

(David)

Mitch castigated the option of accessing IIOC online, in favour of his own production and the specific personalisation of material:
“Why would I want to waste my time when it would be more about the sound of your voice you know, your smell uh, your personality, everything about you uh that you couldn’t get from the internet.”

(Mitch)

Mitch also described how he was more extreme in the abuse he perpetrated if he was recording it:

“But if it was the video, it would be almost like uh, I wouldn’t normally do this, but since I’m recording it, you would try to make it as graphic or as nasty or whatever that you could possibly do, and if you just, I guess, because you’re making the video and it’s different now, you know what you would normally do, you know, wouldn’t be as bad as what you had on the video.”

(Mitch)

Mitch may be distorted in his account of being more severe when filming the abuse. It may be that he is using it to excuse the graphic nature of seized material but that, in truth, his behaviour was always as acute. However, it may also be that the act of production did spur him on to become more excessive in his abusive behaviour. If the latter is the case, as Mitch contends, it raises the possibility of a catalyst effect in respect of production and concerning issues about the risks associated with those who produce IIOC.

Sam described how he followed instructions from another offender, in terms of the abuse he perpetrated upon his daughter, but that he added a knife to the scene of his own volition:

“It just seemed like a knife went with that and I happened to have this cool looking knife that I’d got that I’d used for some of my adult play so he hadn’t, didn’t actually ask for the knife, he asked for the like, I forget, slut or hurt me, it said, so it’s not something I wouldn’t otherwise have done if he hadn’t asked for the, for the picture, emm.”

(Sam)
Blair’s chat logs detail a number of instances where he was encouraging one of his online victims to engage in sexual activity on webcam with her dog. He repeatedly sent her images of bestiality and a link to a web page dedicated to such a theme. While she did follow the link and discuss the content with him, the investigation did not discover anything to suggest that she had engaged in such behaviour herself.

Liam, however, did produce IIOC with animal content. He described it as his victim being the one to initiate sexual behaviour with a dog:

“It was just oral sex, you know, um, and jacking me off, you know, uh, unfortunately [he] started playing with the dog, you know, which I'd never, never, I mean I'd done things like that in the past, with Adult X and shit like that. I never really introduced Child Y to that, I guess, the dog was just laying there and we were all naked, playing with each other, you just kind of did it, you know. And eh, you know, I didn't think about it until he reached out to do it and I'm like 'oh, ok, whatever', you know.”

(Liam)

An understanding of sexual arousal to animals is an under-researched area (Wilcox, Foss and Donathy, 2014). Even for professionals, it can cause abhorrence and extreme responses (Wilcox, Foss and Donathy, 2005). Typically, it is associated with indiscriminate offenders with deviant sexual arousal (Wilcox, Foss and Donathy, 2005). Online sites dedicated to sexual arousal to animals do exist. One study examined a sample of the postings on one site which contained approximately 550,000 postings, and noted that cognitive distortions supporting the behaviour were common as well as social cohesion (Maratea, 2011).
8.4 Power and Control

Power and control has long been recognised as an underlying motivation in sexually harmful behaviour towards both adults and children (Barlow and Birch, 2004; Marshall, Laws and Barbaree, 2013; Van Dam, 2013).

In this study, it emerges as an overarching theme, as typified by Brady:

“Um, I suppose it's, it's, it's a controlling sort of, um, I use an example, I mean this might be a bit profound but, you know, this, this tribe in Africa, they don’t like their photographs being taken because they figure if you take their photograph you capture their soul. In other words you take part of them away. And with hindsight I feel that almost the sense I was doing, once I photographed the person I almost felt like I had a part of them. Um, so it was almost, I, I, I owned that person, if you like, within that photograph, yeah. Um, so I could then fantasise over that image, yeah.”

(Brady)

David described the feelings of power and control he got when he began to capture footage of children engaging in sexual behaviour, which he directed:

“I wanted to feel powerful, when I wanted to feel in control …once I started I enjoyed it, I enjoyed the power, I enjoyed the control.”

(David)

There are three further sub-themes within the overarching theme of power and control, namely:

- Grooming
- Deception
- Sadism.
8.4.1 Grooming

Showing IIoC to children is a recognised grooming technique that has been used to sexualise children, normalise sexual abuse (Itzin, 1997; Aftab, 2000; Lanning, 2001; Merdian et al., 2013) and, as has emerged in this study, direct the production process. Actual grooming techniques have been discussed in Chapter Seven. However, it is worth noting the additional issue, whereby grooming emerges as a function of the behaviour beyond the practicalities of perpetrating the abuse. While grooming for production is a practical necessity to avoid detection and disclosure, it also gives participants a more nebulous, but nonetheless potent, payoff. Feelings of power and control emerge as ancillary benefits of the grooming process. As the perpetrator holds sway over the child and his/her world, he may also gain a sense of omnipotence. The theme of blackmail emerges, in particular, as providing this dual function. Blackmail as a coercive and grooming technique is not a new phenomenon in child sexual abuse (Tate, 1990; Langevin & Curnoe, 2004; Wolak and Finkelhor, 2013; Kloess, Beech and Harkins, 2014; Quayle and Newman, 2016). With the advent of the internet, such a modus operandi, while perhaps not necessarily more prevalent, it has been more apparent (CEOP, 2008; Whittle et al., 2013). In January 2012, Europol was involved in an investigation and arrest of an individual who had approximately 80 social networking profiles and was engaging in the sexual coercion of children via online video link. The individual, in turn, used recorded footage of the children to blackmail them to perform even more sexually explicit behaviour. In addition, he also used this material to prevail upon one child to recruit other children into the online sexualised behaviour (O’Keeffe, 2015).
Callum, who offended against children before the internet became mainstream, detailed how he used the photographs of children for more than just masturbatory purposes:

“I was able to control children and bribe them, lie to them and threaten them for my own sexual gratification and I could do that...I blackmailed them with the photographs, it’s awful but they had to do what I wanted then.”

(Callum)

The insidious nature of such a process highlights Callum’s sense of power. It also demonstrates the dilemma children can find themselves in where they are led to believe that they are complicit in the behaviour (Smith, Thompson and Davidson, 2014), and shows how IIOC serves a multitude of functions.

Tim’s blackmail was more implied but nonetheless demonstrated his control over the child, as he duped her into believing she was the one in charge:

“I said ‘[Child 1] your mom would like to see pictures of you in your swimsuit’, and Child 1 got kind of panicky, and she said, ‘well I don't want you to show her all the pictures.’ And I said, ‘well I won't show her the ones with your butt up in the air or your legs spread apart.’ I said, ‘I'll let you pick out which pictures that you want me to show her.’”

(Tim)

The worried response of the child was evident, as was the way in which Tim subtly but effectively placed all emphasis of inappropriate behaviour on the child, and positioned himself as being accommodating and considerately collusive. If the child then picked photographs, which in turn were shown to her mother, she was likely to be further enmeshed in deception, the belief of self-determination, and a feeling of culpability.
8.4.2 Deception

“On the Internet, nobody knows you’re a dog”

(Steiner, 1993)

The concept deceiving someone as being enjoyable and exciting is not a new one, ‘duping delight’ (Ekman, Friesen and O’Sullivan, 1988, p.418) is a well-noted phenomena and one relevant to this cohort. The internet and online communications lend themselves to deception. Studies have found that, while online, people misrepresent themselves in varying degrees and about a range of personal matters, such as appearance, age, employment, gender (Cornwell and Lundgren, 2001; Whitty and Gavin, 2001), however, perhaps not as much as popular opinion would have us believe (Whitty, 2000; Caspi and Gorsky, 2006). Online deception has been found to be a more enjoyable experience than face-to-face subterfuge which seems to evoke shame and guilt more readily, aspects which do not seem to be as significant online (DePaulo et al., 2003; Caspi and Gorsky, 2006). While all participants in this study engaged in deception at various levels, for some, the deception itself appears to have been a function of the production behaviour, leading to enhanced enjoyment. Callum described not only the power and control but also the pleasure he felt as he typed out instructions for photo shoots, which he told his victims had arrived by post from a fictitious pornography magazine company:

“An awful lot of that is what gave me the buzz that I had control, manipulation over that particular person even days before I knew exactly every move that boy was going to make...He thought I was helping him but I knew everything that was going to happen in that session.”

(Callum)

One study of online behaviour, although not related to sex offenders per se, describes the deception process as a safe playground for experimenting with different aspects
of one’s identity, as well as providing for experimentation with less familiar parts of one’s identity (Turkle, 1995; Caspi and Gorsky, 2006). For Frank, both of these features seem to have been an element in his offending behaviour:

“But I don’t know how much of that interest was created by the fact that I was this alter persona. It was like a, a thrill through that rather than ... You know, if she’d have been in the same room it wouldn’t have been the same at all.”

(Frank)

Brady described how the covert element of his behaviour allowed him to derive non-sexual, positive feelings about himself:

“I suppose I kind of had this feeling of, like, almost superiority. In other words, I was doing it privately, I was doing it covertly. Um, as far as I was concerned nobody knew about it. Um, I was clever enough to keep it secret.”

(Brady)

This theme emphasises the homology of deception as a function of IIOC production but the individuality of specific behaviour and ploys is nonetheless apparent.

8.4.3 Sadism

Defining and identifying sexual sadism is difficult, ambiguous and disputed (Reed, 2014). Components of sexual sadism have been identified as sexual arousal to extreme coercion (Mokros et al., 2014), injury, cruelty, and indifference to the pain and humiliation of the victim (Frances and Wollert, 2012; Seto et al., 2012). An individual’s collection of IIOC can be an indicator of what they want to do or have done already (Johnson, 2015). Aspects of Sam’s account suggested that he may be sexually aroused to the distress of his victim and the capturing of this on film:
“Well the picture in the cage she definitely, I didn't really realise she was claustrophobic, apparently she was and she agreed to the picture in the dog cage but as soon as I clicked the door she was scared out of her mind and the single thing I did in regard to her that was worse was instead of me releasing it I did take the picture, I mean she was only in there for about eight seconds but it was eight seconds of definite terror, I definitely put her through some real terror.”

(Sam)

**Q:** Did you get a bit of a buzz out of that?

“I did get a kick out of it yea.”

(Sam)

Other participants also described arousal to the pain and distress of their victims. Mitch spoke about scaring his victims as part of his arousal process and Liam described arousal to hurting children. The level to which individuals may be aroused to the pain of their victims is undoubtedly a difficult one for them to discuss, and sometimes only becomes apparent to professionals when video evidence of IIOC containing distressed children, which they have produced, is seized in evidence. What is also not clear is whether sadism can develop over time or is it an innate disposition that emerges under certain circumstances. It may be that the reports of IIOC becoming increasingly extreme and including younger children (Internet Watch Foundation, 2014; Johnson, 2014) are linked in some way to a desensitising element of the internet for those who are immersing themselves in it, combined with the encouragement given by others, as detailed below.

### 8.5 To Share

Those that shared their images and video footage all did so via the internet, with two participants additionally meeting with other offenders offline, and providing
hardcopy material in person. It has been suggested that sex offenders gravitate towards like-minded individuals as a support to their beliefs, and in a desire to occupy a compatible environment (Ward and Hudson, 2000). Being part of a multiple perpetrator group changes the dynamic of offending and the impact to the victim (Finkelhor et al., 1988). The ‘harm of circulation’ is notably an addition trauma to victims, and arguably may cause even more long-term psychological impact, whereby the damage suffered by a child is extended over time and distance (Hessick, 2014, pp 8). Fewer than half (N=8) of the cohort shared the material they produced. Wolak, Finkelhor and Mitchell (2005) examined producers from the National Juvenile Online Victimisation study, and found that only three out of 10 offenders distributed the images. However, as such groups are the providers to the larger market, it was considered important to look more closely at the process of those who shared in this cohort. For those who did not share, a significant theme was the concern about being caught. It is unclear whether they would have ultimately shared, or indeed, whether they were being honest in denying distribution. Hugh said he never shared the videos he took of his victims but acknowledged that this might have changed:

“And if somebody had come to me and said ‘Well I’ve got this video, you know, its...there’s a lot of sexual activity on it but you’ve got to give me something in return.’”

(Hugh)

Q: And would you have been willing to?
“I might have been yeah. I’m not going to sit here and say definitely not because at that time, I might have done it yea.”

(Hugh)
For the eight who shared the IIOC they produced, it appears to have a number of functions beyond the abuse and production per se. Four sub-themes emerge as to the function of the sharing process, namely:

- Social engagement
- Status
- Proof of abuse
- Currency.

### 8.5.1 Social Engagement

“Cause obviously I made friends.”

(Trent)

Being sexually aroused to children can undoubtedly bring with it feelings of isolation and divergence. Participants described gaining a sense of belonging and community from meeting like-minded individuals with whom they could share both downloaded and produced IIOC. The internet can be a source of support, advice and companionship, where individuals can gain affirmation and bolstering for deviant behaviours (Gossett and Byrne, 2002; Quayle and Taylor, 2002; Durkin, Forsyth and Quinn, 2006). Analysis of the chat logs and postings of the organisations, where those with a sexual interest in children can communicate, demonstrates the normalising and reinforcing aspect of such forums (Harkins and Dixon, 2010). There are benefits to be gained from connecting with other sex offenders online as individuals’ core beliefs and offences supportive thinking is not challenged but supported by like-minded others, even to the point of facilitating additional offending (Heffernan and Ward, 2015). Trent captured this isolated feeling and
described how important it was to find like-minded individuals to share not just IIOC with:

“Well, to me, I thought I was, when I was younger, I thought I was the only one, you know like out of the whole of the North East or the whole of England that has this attraction, to me I was the only one, so obviously I used the internet to talk to other people. And you, you have certain problems, you, you don’t, one day you, I, I could control my lust and another day I could feel I couldn’t, so I never used to go out, you know, ‘cause that’s what, that’s all it all is, it’s whether you can control it or not. And it is difficult to control. It made me feel a part of a community.”

(Trent)

Sam spoke of the normalising and encouraging effect his online discussions with others had upon how he was feeling and on his behaviour:

“Uh well you know it was mostly people, especially this one guy I am talking about, um who er .. you know, keep telling, all of the people I chatted with, you know it's like you lucky dog, and you do this and wow if I had the chance I'd do this and that definitely encourages you a lot.”

(Sam)

Research on mainstream social networking sites highlights how they offer social capital and the benefits of being part of a group (McMahon, 2015), with minor information, news and advice being the primary rewards (Ellison et al., 2014). For Hector, the importance of that sense of community seemed to ultimately outweigh even the sexual function:

“Towards the end my erm preoccupation was community-based rather than sexually-based. I dropped everything for the fact I was on an online community of people I could talk to, that understood me, that I could talk openly and honestly to.”

(Hector)
For some individuals, it has been suggested that they may feel more competent in an online environment without the restraints of the conventional world (Quayle and Taylor, 2002). Shelton, who spoke of his group giving each other ‘nicknames’, described how he gained not just friendships but nurturing and information from interacting with others who were also producing IIOC:

“He took me under his wing and gave me advice...they had given sort of useful advice about websites and that.”

(Shelton)

It has been suggested that sharing other interests apart from a sexual one in children, can have an additional normalising effect on offenders (Malesky and Ennis, 2004). If it was not known that Shelton was referring to a co-offender, his account would be benign, normal, and possibly even encouraging, as to the benefit of online communication and comradery. His presentation of the relationship highlights the normalising impact, when individuals with collective cognitive distortions communicate and, it would seem, reinforce acceptability about an abusive behaviour.

### 8.5.2 Status

For those participants who shared their produced material, being connected with others not just alleviated feelings of isolation and provided companionship and advice, but seemed to open other possibilities, such as hierarchy within the group. It has been demonstrated that even anonymous websites have complex structures upon which online communities operate (McMahon, 2015). Low self-esteem has been identified as a typical feature of those with a sexual interest in children (Marshall and Mazzucco, 1995; Marshall et al., 2009; Jeglic, Mercado and Levenson, 2012). It
has also been postulated that online communication allows individuals to deliberately manipulate their social status (Mabry, 2001). In addition, studies have reported that, with sexual activity as a common denominator, male peer groups can become competitive with individuals vying for status (Brownmiller, 2013). Social networking sites were also found to allow individuals to alter negative mood states by using downward social comparisons against those who seem less successful (Johnson and Knoblock-Westerwick, 2014). If any of this cohort was experiencing low self-esteem and needed external validation, it seems that the role of producer afforded this opportunity. The participants spoke about the feelings of superiority and enhanced status that came with the nomenclature of producer.

Shelton described how his status as a producer gained him access to an inner sanctum and made him popular:

“I don’t doubt that I would never ever have been asked to join the Network had I not been a producer. Because I wasn’t a big collector, you know, I was new on the internet, I was still a newbie really, I was only months on IRC. And it was only because I was a producer really that I was accelerated into joining... it’s all over that I’m the producer of these images. And all of a sudden I’m very popular and everyone’s mad keen to say hello... And everyone was excited to see me because by this time it’s known that I’m a producer.”

(Shelton)

Sam described the enjoyment he got from knowing others were viewing the IIOC he produced:

“I really enjoyed sharing the pictures with other people cause you know it made me kinda like, you know, ’Wow you guys are talking about it but look I’m doing it’, you know, kinda thing which was which was a big ego trip.”

(Sam)
Shelton also detailed a sense of superiority over his co-offenders:

“Because I’d already given these people their own copies if you like of the things that’d we’d done there was nothing to hide, there was nothing that they didn’t already know. But it was like, ‘She’s mine and you can’t touch it.’”

(Shelton)

Likewise, Liam, when asked about the function of sharing the video he produced, described how he used the footage of the sexual abuse of his victim to boast to others:

“Probably just to say, 'Hey, look what I did' you know, honestly, so, you know. Yeah, I don't know why, but, I was online bragging about what I was doing, it was really stupid you know, I mean.”

(Liam)

Recording sexual criminal activity as a means of boasting retrospectively (Elian, 2015), and the concept of ‘trophy videos’ (Powell, 2015, p.574) of sexual assaults are not unusual. Such material becoming an internet meme highlights how the practice is becoming more commonplace. The sexual assault of a drugged 16-year-old girl at a party in Texas in 2014 went viral online (Culp-Ressler, 2014). More recently, a sexual assault by four adult women on another woman was posted by the perpetrators themselves (Yogaretnam and Seymour, 2015). While not sharing in an open forum, David detailed a process whereby images were shared in a closed network, for mutual enjoyment, and explained that boasting was also a function of this distribution:

“Em at the time it was you know sharing images for our own enjoyment between us, em but also yeah to brag about your latest, em victim and you know it’s, eh seeing this one, how gorgeous he is, and how cute this one is, em and you know we used to pass them around.”

(David)
Society has been found to convey stigmatisation to sex offenders, resulting in internalising feelings of shame and despair, as well as their labelling as unfair, and in turn can lead to isolating behaviour (Mingus and Burchfield, 2012; Tewksbury, 2012). Using self-produced IIOC as a trophy (Meridian et al., 2013; Powell, 2015) can generate internal feelings of enhanced esteem or, if shared, provide an external source to boost the ego. Producing and sharing new images in password-protected networking sites to boost popularity has been noted as an emerging trend amongst sex offenders (Johnson, 2014). Given the status recognition, as described by some of the participants in this study, it appears that it may have helped alleviate or counteract a sense of isolation and stigma.

8.5.3 Proof of abuse

Research and law enforcement intelligence suggests that certain networking groups also demand the production of IIOC as membership eligibility criteria (Johnson, 2014). Sam described how he was persuaded by another offender to prove that he was sexually abusing his daughter by sending images of the abuse:

“He wanted me to prove that I was really taking the pictures... I was trying to prove my bona fides to him and uh.. you know, so he gave me specific directions.”

(Sam)

Interestingly, Shelton used the same terminology to describe how the images and videos he produced had a confirmation function:

“I'd actually given some to him on the condition that he never spread them. Emm and that was my naivety, giving two people some pictures, if you like to prove my bona fides and to say these don't go anywhere, there are personal they never get traded. One of them betrayed my trust and they went public.”

(Shelton)
Perceived integrity in any online forum is an area that is increasingly being researched (Zahara and Harris, 2015). The concept of the ‘transitivity of trust’ (Jiang, Wang, and Wu, 2012, p.3) may be in operation in Shelton’s case, where individuals are more likely to trust someone if people known to them trust them already. However, Shelton appears to have been caught by the propagation process (Jøsang, Hayward and Pope, 2006) whereby, as the group receiving his daughter’s images became larger, his security was diminished and ultimately destroyed. Shelton appears to have taken a number of risks in order to prove to others that he was actually sexually abusing children. He engaged in a contradiction initially but then confirmed that he wanted to have video evidence of his abuse of his daughter to demonstrate to others that what he was claiming online was correct:

“And I wasn’t willing to share it with anyone, as far as people watching or you know, in any way. I mean I had a very basic set up of video conferencing at one point, but through a 28k modem [but] it wasn’t viable and it was so people could actually see Child Y for real. Because it was like another, just proof; that yes I am who I say I am. And here’s Child Y’s face to prove it.”

(Shelton)

Shelton was also one of the cohort who cited gaining status as a function of being a producer. It seems likely that proving himself as a genuine producer was one component of the process, and once this was achieved, other benefits, such as enhanced status, followed. These interconnected functions demonstrate how production is not a singularly motivated behaviour but rather a more multi-faceted process, with diverse but inter-related purposes and rewards.
8.5.4 Currency

In 2014, 3,741 (12%) of the 31,266 uniform resource locators (URLs) found to have child sexual abuse images were commercial sites, and represented an increase of 17% from 2013 of such profit-based webpages (IWF, 2014). In a new capitalisation on advanced commerce, The Internet Watch Foundation reported that they first came across bitcoins as a form of payment on commercial child sexual abuse websites on the open web in January 2014 (IWF, 2014). Commercial production was found as a function of production with one participant in this study. However, aside from monetary gain, the theme of production of IIOC as a currency, in terms of a gratuity and/or a commodity with value, is more apparent.

David was the participant who saw production as a commercial opportunity. His account provides confirmation of the extent to which material can be lucrative. He detailed how he did not begin photographing children as a commercial venture initially but that it was later when he started to sell what he had produced:

“I always dealt with cash, em yeah so yeah the set up was, a bit further on we started making money from it, big money, that’s when I started making movies, VHS movies, they were the big earners, £150 at the time, of course it was very rare back then to get good quality, high res movies so that’s what we did, em.”

(David)

He went on to explain how the monitory gain became considerable:

“But yes there was a lot, a lot of money, we [co-offenders] bought a house in Australia in Sydney for something like two hundred thousand eh dollars and that was at the back of a really good set of em pictures.”

(David)
Even in instances where money is not part of the transaction, it seems that IIOC has a value that can benefit its producer (Johnson, 2014). Shelton, who earlier described being helped technically by a co-offender, detailed how he showed his appreciation by forwarding on some IIOC he had created:

“I’d.. sent X a couple of my er Polaroid images that I’d scanned. As thanks for everything that he’d done.”

(Shelton)

The concept of IIOC being a thank-you gesture from one individual to another seems to further denigrate the victim. The dynamic in such a sharing broadens the function of IIOC and, in turn, it seems likely that the remit of any assessment and interventions needs to be equally as broad.

Images/videos produced by members of the cohort were also used in a way that can be likened to ‘taster campaigns’, where the produced material was shown to entice others to pay for sexual contact with children. David, the commercial producer, described such a process:

“We started chatting and he showed me a DVD, a film of his boys and I sent one back of X and Y, sent them back and then he wanted to come across and I introduced him to X and then Y and then filmed.”

(David)

While not possible to be completely accurate, CEOP (2013) estimates that 50,000 people were involved in the downloading and sharing of IIOC in the UK in 2012. The possibility of trading such material is a function of production and one that participants considered worthwhile. Sam detailed how he was mindful of the value of specific IIOC he created, and the interest in it for others, even when he was not as sexually interested in the subject of his abuse, a male infant:
"That is a younger age than anything I really have any strong interest, sexually, I mean I did it as much I suppose so I could show the pictures to somebody, although I mean I got something of a charge out of it, I mean don't get me wrong, but it was not, if I was picking someone I was interested in sexually, he would not have been it, he was too young."

(Sam)

It would appear that the production of IIOC, while sexually abusing an infant, was motivated by more than a sexual purpose and that a function of the behaviour was to use the images as a commodity that might appeal more to others than oneself. Such a process is indicative of the layers of purpose IIOC can serve for a producer.

### 8.6 Avoidance

It has been noted that, for sex offenders, the internet and the collecting of IIOC can provide a vehicle for avoiding dissatisfaction in their lives and reducing distress (Quayle, Vaughan and Taylor, 2006; Wilson and Jones, 2008; Wilson and Miner, 2016). A function of sexual fantasy may be to provide a means of coping with negative feelings that are alleviated by the deviant fantasy (Abracen and Looman, 2015). In this study, the concept of avoidance is not exclusive to participants who used the internet, though it is cited more regularly as a theory to account for their offending. Two sub-themes emerge, namely:

- ‘Real’ world avoidance
- Contact avoidance.
8.6.1 ‘Real’ world avoidance

A study of a game forum for children, MovieStarPlanet, found predatory behaviour that resulted in eleven users being permanently removed and two added to the watch list (Cheong et al., 2015). It may be that some sex offenders are seeking to avoid the ‘real’ world in a variety of ways. Elias spoke of having felt like an outsider all his life and of how he struggled to mix with peers. He described how on two or three occasions he was “dumped” by girlfriends without any explanation, and that this in turn caused him to decide to avoid such experiences again and focus on creating IIOC to meet his needs:

“That was a more, well it was a satisfying and less painful way of gaining the sort of sexual pleasure I needed as an adolescent boy.”

(Elias)

It may be that Elias is using a post-hoc justification, however, he appears to view the creation of IIOC as serving a function beyond the sexual, by providing a buffer between him and possible rejection and emotional pain. The individuals captured in his photographs and videos cannot reject him.

Those who used the internet as part of their offending pattern described how they considered their online behaviour as a different space, and where they were someone else. Brady explained that he would not behave in the real world in the same way that he did online:

“Because once you switch the computer off you're a different person. You're back to normality, in inverted commas and rationality. And no matter what, you'd say things and, um, agree things and do things online which you would never do in, in so-called real life. And that’s and that just seemed part of it, if you know what I mean.”

(Brady)
However, the chat logs between Blair and his victims detail many occasions when he spoke of meeting them offline, and he acknowledged in interview that he considered his behaviour to be escalating.

Foster, who produced IIOC both remotely via the internet and adjacently while sexually abusing a fifteen-year-old child, described viewing IIOC and online chat about the sexual abuse of children as a means of avoiding boredom. He also appeared to have considered the online environment as not real but seemed less categorical about the distinction. He described looking at children near where he lived and telling himself that he would never hurt them:

“*But somehow, that all went out the window at night time and online, because it kind of wasn’t real. And somehow it seemed okay to talk about it in something that wasn’t real.*”

(Foster)

However, Foster was caught in a law enforcement sting operation when he travelled from Canada to Florida to have sex with a seven-year-old boy.

For Frank, the concept of puer aeternus (Satinover, 1980), or the desire to be the eternal adolescent, was facilitated by the internet, as he adopted the persona of a teenage boy as part of his production process. The intensity of this desire is evident in his comments:

“I *think part of my problem is, I, you know, when you wish you could go back to a certain point in your life, I wish I could go back to being, sort of 16. If someone had said to me, ‘Right, you’re going to be 16 tomorrow, you’re going back in time’ oh I’d, I’d love it. Because they were, I quite enjoyed that time, you know... talking to children of, of that era as it were, that age group, you’re, you feel young.‘*”

(Frank)
Hugh, who did not use the internet as part of his production of IIOC, spoke of a similar concept of lost childhood and desire to recapture his youth in sexually abusing children and creating IIOC:

“It was about spending time with them, reliving my childhood. I have this absolute obsession about a lost childhood and that I missed out ... it’s all about grabbing something back.”

(Hugh)

It may be that both Frank and Foster are deluding themselves and that the notion of recapturing their youth is a justification for their abusive behaviour. However, it may also be as they say and that, along with being motivated by a desire to be sexual with children, they derive more than just the sexual element from the process. If sexually abusing children functions as a means of them feeling youthful again, the production of IIOC vicariously creates an enduring record of that moment in time.

8.6.2 Contact avoidance

Using IIOC as a means of avoiding contact offending is a distortion proffered by offenders in a previous study, where individuals downloaded such material from the internet (Quayle and Taylor, 2002). It may be that such a process does work for a portion of time or in some way, however, it is generally considered that viewing and masturbating to IIOC is more likely to fuel the behaviour (Leitenberg and Henning, 1995; Marshall, 2000; Beech and Ward, 2004; Beauregard, Proulx and Leclerc, 2014). Stan described how he believed that producing and masturbating to IIOC would stop him from touching children:

“They were my safety valve because I had them they I got my sexual kicks for want of a better expression from them and I didn’t need to erm have actual physical contact they, they they were my safety valve they kept me on the straight and narrow and I am absolutely convinced that
you know that was why I did [take photographs] in the first instance I believe they did they did keep me on the straight and narrow.”

(Stan)

Despite this purported function, Stan did, however, commit numerous contact offences. Mitch was less categorical as to the effectiveness of this control technique but nonetheless saw the images he produced as diminishing his behaviour:

“But uh, I think, I think that having the images did tone me down.”

(Mitch)

David also described how he initially thought that producing IIOC would keep him from committing contact offences and avoid another prison sentence, but that he recognised that this was not going to be effective:

“I had just gotten out of prison and uh I decided that I was no longer gonna be physically, I wasn't gonna offend physically. I said this is a problem for me and I need to not touch any more children and um I said I'm gonna get a camera and from now on I'll just take pictures, because if they don't know what I'm doing, then I can't be affecting them. But I realised that’s impossible. I can't control it like that. I can't micro control it. I have to be completely away from, I have to completely refrain from engaging in activity or thinking that I can control my behaviour. It's like sticking your toe in the water. I can't stick my toe in the water, I get wet. I can tell myself no completely or I'll be in trouble.”

(David)

David advocated absolute abstinence from any sexual involvement with children as the only way he might manage to desist. In response to a question about IIOC being a possible safety value, David was categorical:

“That’s rubbish, that just feeds the fantasy, and the fantasy just gets stronger and you want the real thing. It’s obvious it’s not; I mean I used to believe in that rubbish, em but it’s not true. The photographs, the images that I’ve seen just made me wanted the boy of my own in a sexual way, I didn’t care about boy love in general, I just wanted a boy to have sex with and the photographs, the images of that nature just fed it, you know and that’s the truth in the fact and it’s a fact.”

(David)
8.7 Conclusion

It was never considered that a sexual function was the totality of production of IIOC. In life, one typically engages in behaviours for a variety of payoffs and purposes. In some instances, one gains rewards for behaviours that one does not seek or even anticipate (Wang and Tchernev, 2012). The overarching themes of sexual power and control, to share, and avoidance emerge as functions of production that overlap and are inter-related in varying degrees for each individual. All participants acknowledged the sexual function of the material they produced, but even with this commonality, there are differences that emerge in the sub-themes. While some participants spoke of experiencing an emotional frisson from taking the images perse, for others the function was more about the long-term use and convenience for masturbatory purposes. The ability to customise IIOC for personal preferences, as discussed by participants, demonstrates the unique component in the sexual abuse of children and counsels one against generic explanations for the behaviour and its pathway. The emotional function and resulting payoff, aside from the sexual one, in the production of IIOC needs to be considered as particularly powerful and resilient.

What may ostensibly have begun with one or two functions motivated by a sexual arousal to children (i.e. for masturbation and as a trophy), is also likely to have developed, as individuals discovered the currency value for themselves and others of such material. Tracking the functions of IIOC production over time is likely to highlight the developmental aspect of such a process. Any assessment and intervention for those who have produced IIOC needs to look at the functions served by the material and the production process itself, in order to fully comprehend and address the heterogeneity of the behaviour and effect blocks to recurrence.
9 Summary and Conclusions

9.1 Introduction

‘I have a new baby about to be added to the game’, the caption accompanying a sonogram photograph of an unborn child on a sex offender website (Johnson, 2014).

The aim of this chapter is to provide a summary of the key findings from each section of the dissertation and to explore the implications in light of the original contentions that were to be tested. The chapter also looks at the conclusions which have emerged from the analysis of the accounts of the twenty-two individuals who produced IIOC. In addition, the limitations of the work are outlined.

9.2 Overview of the Findings

9.2.1 Introduction and Literature Review

The primary focus of Chapter One was to examine the literature relating and pertinent to those who produce IIOC. There has been very little research into such individuals to date (Quayle and Cooper, 2015) and, in the main, the material available was found in ancillary research, where aspects of production were discussed but subordinate to the main focus of the works. In addition, the law and conviction data on this group, both within and across jurisdictions, is not always clear-cut. This, in turn, can impede studying the cohort and clarity as to the
manifestation and prevalence of the behaviour. While an increase in arrests for production has been noted, whether this is as a result of increased production or enhanced detection operations remains unclear.

The historical nature of the production of IIOC emerged with the behaviour being long associated with the sexual abuse, grooming and exploitation of children. It clearly pre-dates the arrival of the internet but the propensity for sex offenders to capitalise upon new technology is apparent. Such advancements facilitate networking amongst sex offenders and producers, and add exponentially to the tasks for law enforcement. It was noted that producers supply an ever-increasing market, and that demand is high. The impact on the victims of IIOC highlights the enduring legacy of their abuse being captured, with often infinite parameters.

While studies relating to this cohort have been small, they nonetheless found producers to be a heterogeneous group. It was concluded that a greater understanding of this group, their motivations, the process of production, and how it develops, is necessary. This, in turn, may assist law enforcement, offender intervention, prevention strategies, and victim support.

### 9.2.2 Methodology

The aim of Chapter Two was to explain the rationale behind the choice of a qualitative methodology to explore participants’ accounts. Qualitative research allows the researcher to examine the data in a less restrictive fashion, and to consider personal nuances and experiences of each individual. As qualitative research allows for the voice of the subject to be heard above all else, it was considered that this
method would best provide understanding of the cohort. In particular, thematic analysis was chosen. It is a methodological approach well-suited to a topic where there is little existing literature or research. It is also suitable when the experience of the individual is to be paramount rather than imposing any constructs on another’s account.

Twenty-two individuals engaged in a semi-structured interview which focused on their early life experiences, and the developing account of how they came to sexually abuse children, and engage in the production of IIOC in particular. The study was underpinned by an earlier pilot piece of research where four producers were interviewed. This pilot study informed changes and highlighted gaps in the semi-structured interview that was then adapted in the larger piece of research, in an approach supported by qualitative analysis. It emerged that this methodological approach provided a wealth of rich data and lent itself to an increased understanding of the cohort.

### 9.2.3 Demographics and Formative Life Experiences

The participants were described in broad terms in Chapter Three, with demographic information about their age, education, employment and relationships provided. Twelve of the cohort had worked or been involved in voluntary employment with children, and almost half had children of their own. Ten participants had been married or in long-term relationships, however, all but one were single at the time of interview. In addition, conviction data and an offending overview were provided. While all participants had produced IIOC, only nine of them were convicted for this
offence. Nineteen of them were found in possession of IIOC, and 18 admitted contact sexual offences against children.

While varied causal factors are noted in the history of sex offenders (Ward, 2014), the importance of identifying, exploring and including such factors in intervention with this group is increasingly recognised (Levenson, 2014). Sex offenders’ reports of maltreatment and trauma in their formative years have been shown to impact on how they cope with psychosocial stressors and related emotions (Abbiati et al., 2014). Accordingly, exploring the impact of such experiences on their behaviour in adulthood might improve intervention (Abbiati et al., 2014; Levenson, 2014), and have a positive bearing on those presenting with anxiety and insecure attachment styles (Grady, Swett and Shields, 2014).

In terms of formative life experiences with this group, three themes emerged, namely, family milieu, early sexualisation and social isolation in childhood. Each theme had further sub-themes, and issues such as atypical childhoods, exposure to violence and poor quality attachment were commonplace. Twelve participants reported having been sexually abused as children, with six of them describing having been abused by multiple adults. Examining the participants’ accounts of childhood gave an important insight into abuse, neglect and trauma. It was noted that such early life experiences need to be addressed in any intervention, so that the totality of their childhood struggles, and the legacy of them into adulthood, is understood as a likely significant aspect of their offending behaviour.
9.2.4 Methods of Producing IIOC

Chapter Four looked at the practical issues facing those who produced IIOC. It examined the technology used, the realities of processing of film and the issues of location and content.

Twenty of the cohort were adjacent producers, meaning they were in close proximity to their victims. Only one participant claimed to have kept his filming hidden at all times. Six acknowledged engaging in both methodologies. The 19 that openly took photographs appear to have created a Normalcy Illusion to allow their production to seem innocuous or unchallengeable. It seems that a normative culture around posting on social media sites, including taking copious photographs and videos, has facilitated this production, and it was speculated that, as this seems to be an increasing phenomenon, producers are likely to continue or escalate in capitalising upon this. It was mooted that the normative photography/video practice may be eroding more traditional grooming techniques. The seven participants who were adjacent to their victims and covert about their production behaviour did this by capturing footage of children while they were asleep and/or hiding the technology they were using.

Five participants were remote producers, meaning they were not in the same physical space as their victims when they produced IIOC. While three of them used hidden cameras to record their victims, two participants did not hide their sexual intention, but were overt about their wishes and recorded their victims remotely using webcams.
Digital cameras with a recording facility were the most used device for the production of IIOC. However, three participants used their mobile phones, and web cameras were used by five participants. Participants also used multiple devices, and with the advent of the internet, the ease of storage, processing and dissemination became apparent.

In keeping with known trends, the majority of victims (11) were in their own home when the IIOC were produced. However, in five of these cases, while the child was in his/her own home, the offender was elsewhere when the images were being captured. While the number is small, this is nonetheless an important finding, and may suggest a change in the relationship between offenders and their victims from that with which we have been more familiar.

9.2.5 Victim Selection

Chapter Five examined the process whereby participants selected victims for the production of IIOC. In 12 cases, participants produced IIOC of stranger victims. It was speculated that this relatively high number of stranger victims was, in part at least, due to the more advanced, discreet recording devices, and the ability to access children remotely over the internet. It supports previous research, which suggests that the nature of offending behaviour may be changing in accordance with advancing technology and all that it facilitates (Whittle et al., 2013). Four themes emerged in terms of victim selection, namely, Accessibility, Non-Disclosure/Non-Discovery Assurance, Malleability and Attractiveness. However, there was an overlap between the themes, with participants often citing more than one selection criteria.
While 10 participants had children of their own, only four of them reported having used them to produce IIOC. Questions were raised as to the honesty of this account. However, it was also speculated that the greater availability of potential victims online, and in locations where recording equipment is deemed acceptable or can be hidden, possibly increases the pool of children that can be exploited in this way.

Despite apparent risk-taking by filming and photographing in public places, participants were nonetheless cautious, and assessed situations and victims to ensure non-disclosure or discovery. However, exploring this theme also highlighted how one participant engaged in necrophilia, which only came to light initially, because images were found when he was arrested. Such behaviour may never have been known about had the photographic evidence not been found. This raises the importance of assessment and intervention going beyond initial self-report and perfunctory forensic analysis that time constraints can necessitate. It was speculated that those who produce IIOC may have a broader range of sexual interests than they acknowledged and, as such, a better understanding of the nature and progression of the material they produce is significant. This raises the benefits of sharing of information between professionals who are performing different roles with the offender. While forensic analysis of an offenders recording equipment is used by law enforcement to obtain a conviction and/or track children, the insight such information could also give to those undertaking assessment and delivering intervention is perhaps under-acknowledged and under utilised.

Participants displayed technical, forensic and considered insight into both victims and others in pursuit of their goals. Capitalising on pre-existing vulnerability was an
important sub-theme and one well-noted amongst sex offenders, with participants not confining themselves to one country but readily recognising the defencelessness of children in developing countries. Additionally, the participants appeared to have exploited situations where vulnerabilities were combined with suggestibility and children who believed that they were in control, mature and ‘on-trend’ with their behaviours were targets.

9.2.6 Cognitive Distortions

Cognitive distortions are variously and equivocally described in research (Ó Ciardha, 2015). However, they are also considered essential areas for exploration when trying to understand the etiology and maintenance of sexual offending. In Chapter Six, distortions, abuse supportive thinking, and justifications were looked at, and three themes emerged, namely, No Harm, Blame Dispersal and Self-Endorsement. Each of these elicited further sub-themes. The desire to preserve a benign or altruistic sense of self emerged as important to the participants. A number of the participants appeared to view the victims as willing participants in the production process, and were unable or unwilling to recognise their role in creating opportunity to offend.

Even in instances where participants acknowledged their sexually abusive behaviour, they sought to minimise and/or employ distortions as to their degree of culpability in other areas of the process. This included cognitions that allowed participants to distance themselves from not just the sexual abuse but from elements of targeting, grooming, planning and impact upon victims. It has been suggested that popular views on perceptions of victims may influence how people respond to children of different ages and presentations who have been sexually abused (McAlinden, 2014).
It appeared that some participants also held this view, attributing responsibility to children, and viewing them as sexual and thus culpable, failing to acknowledge the power differential and more informed choice they held as the adults in the situation. This was apparent with both those who offended online and those who did not use the internet as part of their offending. However, the former did use the internet per se as a vehicle for distancing themselves from their abusive behaviour and as a rationale for offending. McMahon states that one needs to move beyond ‘digital dualism’, and advises that what occurs in cyber space is real (McMahon, 2015, p.728). While some participants stated that their behaviour was confined to the ‘unreal’ world of the internet, their chat log conversations could be considered to call this into question as they sought off-line contact, and/or were more blunt and aggressive in their dealings with children than they preferred to acknowledge. What also emerged is that participants layered their distortions, and used more than one, in respect of their engagement with their victims and their ecology. In addition, over time, participants appeared to have developed and fine-tuned their distortions and abuse supportive thinking. Often, this was based upon victim responses, which they neglected to consider were engineered by them in the first instance.

It was evident that, at times, cognitions around offending and production behaviour were based upon truisms, actual kindnesses and altruistic actions. The cognitive distortions and justifications arising from self-endorsement, underpinned with genuine, tangible behaviours, appear likely to be more difficult to challenge, as they are inextricably linked to self-identity and long-held beliefs.
9.2.7 Initial and Production Grooming

Chapter Seven explored the grooming repertoire of participants, looking at both their initial and production grooming. In many instances, the merging of the two was imperceptible, analogous and invariably complex, particularly where relationships were long-term. Three themes emerged in respect of initial grooming, namely, False persona, Concerned/likable adult and Introduction by another offender. Unsurprisingly, duplicity was evident across all themes, and the contention of English et al. (2000), that most convicted sex offenders have lived their lives based upon organised deception, was highlighted. While false person did emerge as a trend amongst those who used the internet to groom children, it was not exclusive to this group, and was also a feature for participants who were adjacent to their victims.

Participants engaged in both opportunistic and long-term grooming, and appeared able to adapt to given situations fluidly. Four participants acquired children from other offenders, and there was less grooming required in these instances, as the victim had already been subjected to abuse.

In respect of specific grooming for production, participants capitalised upon apparently benign photography practices they had established, or exploited already-existing situations where the taking of photographs and videos was not sufficiently monitored or challenged. The themes that emerged for grooming for production included namely, Normalisation of sex, Enticement, Coercion and Force. Many of the themes and sub-themes that were explored are not new or unusual in respect of existing literature. The occurrence of sexualised talk with children, and the showing of sexual material to them, has been the experience of research and clinical practice.
However, the ease of sharing sexual material via the internet was evident, and suggests that it is a more undemanding grooming technique than heretofore.

More current trends in grooming also emerged, with one participant creating false peer personalities to encourage children to engage in production. Using one child as a recruiter and/or pseudo-producer was a noted grooming technique that further enmeshed victims in the process, leaving them susceptible to agreeing to more extreme abuse and images, as well as increasingly less inclined to disclose. This grooming by proxy is noted in others areas of child sexual exploitation, where women and family members are found to be part of the process but often victims themselves of some level of abuse (Broad, 2015; Reid, Huard and Haskell, 2015; Shen, 2016).

As discussed above, participants liked to present a less coercive, aggressive and, indeed, sexual sense of self but that was undermined, in many instances, by victims’ reports, produced material and chat logs. Additionally, their grooming repertoires were more forceful and overtly intimidatory than literature on the topic typically suggests. Threats, relentless insistence, violence and coercion were aspects of grooming for production.

9.2.8 Function of Production

For all participants, there was a sexual function to the production of IIOC. They described using the material they produced for arousal and masturbatory purposes, both during and subsequent to the production. In addition, they detailed being able to customise IIOC to their own sexual predilections. However, three other functions
also emerged, namely Power and Control, To Share and Avoidance. Participants explained how they felt powerful and better able to control their victims by producing IIOC. However, the collateral benefits went beyond the immediacy of sexual arousal and victim control. Participants, who shared the images and videos they produced, described how it gave them a status and notoriety amongst their co-offenders. They were also able to describe how there was a social element in sharing produced and general IIOC, and that personal and technical information was a useful ancillary to the production process. In addition, for one participant there was financial gain.

Some participants described their production process as a means of controlling their sexual arousal, and avoiding or limiting contact offences. They were not categorical as to the effectiveness of this technique, however. For others, they saw the entire ecology that surrounded the sexual abuse and exploitation of children as a means of avoiding the real world. However, this abdication process did not appear to fit with the more concrete and thought-through aspects of their offending, for example, steps to avoid detection, which seemed to demonstrate self-determination over disassociation.

The multifunction of IIOC production was apparent. The development of these functions emerged as the process became more sophisticated and entrenched, and participants discovered new benefits and services the images and videos could provide.
9.3 Implications of Results for Original Assumptions

This thesis sought to test four hypotheses and each one is addressed below.

- Producers of child abuse images are sexually aroused to children

This entire cohort acknowledged a sexual arousal to children. This does not mean that all those who produce IIOC have the same interest. Some producers may be motivated exclusively by financial gain, and others may have a different non-sexual motivation. However, it may also be that those who make such claims are not being honest.

- Producers of child abuse images do so to meet a sexual need

While meeting a sexual need was one function of the production behaviour, many others also emerged. Production of IIOC serves a number of functions, including ones that are not exclusively sexual. While, in many instances, the process began to meet a sexual need, it emerged, for participants, that ancillary functions developed, and the images and videos served as purveyors of status, enhanced self-esteem, provided access to other IIOC, and were grooming tools.

- Producers of child abuse images are not motivated by financial gain

As far as was acknowledged, only one of this cohort gained commercially from the production of IIOC. He acknowledged a pre-existing sexual arousal to children, and described the financial gain and motivation as secondary to this. For the rest of the
cohort, financial gain was not a motivator. However, it may be that if they had not been detected, they may have progressed to use the material they produced for financial gain.

- Producers of child abuse images share these images in a systematic manner

The sharing of produced IIOC was an individual process, with variations and vagaries within the practice. Many of those who shared did ask for discretion and spoke of exclusivity but this was not heeded by their co-offenders, and their images and video were disseminated to a larger audience. Those who did not share were inhibited, in the main, by fear of detection. It was not possible to determine whether they may have ultimately sought to share, and that those who did share were simply further along a spectrum in the whole production process. Participants may not have been honest about sharing due to possible self-incrimination, with distribution being a distinct offence in all jurisdictions.

9.4 Recommendations for Practice

When working with individuals confirmed or suspected of committing sexual crimes against children, one needs to consider that what is presented initially is not likely to be the totality of the problematic behavior. This is already an accepted position for most working with sex offenders, however, this study suggests that practitioners may need to go even further, and that exploring the possibility of production of IIOC may be of benefit. Assessment and intervention with offenders explores concepts of minimisation, distancing, and cognitive distortions, because such programmes recognise that offenders are likely to present a sanitised and/or distorted account of
their offending behaviour. However, to what extent are such programmes able to fully examine offending behaviour? One participant in this study described it as “a shame” that his chat logs with a victim were more aggressive than he recalled and at odds with his recollection. It highlights how easily a self-promoting narrative can become a truism, unless it can be counteracted by concrete evidence to the contrary. Like evidential chat logs (Quayle and Newman, 2016), self-produced IIOC provides important guidance on how an individual has actually offended, the supportive accompanying behaviours and thinking, and how his victims have been treated. The distortions and abuse supportive thinking themes that emerged from this study highlight how, by dispersing blame and minimising or indeed denying harm, individuals allowed themselves to proceed and progress with the sexual exploitation of children. Such distortions are not likely to be exclusive to producers. However, the data does suggest that aspects of production methodology, namely remote and covert, can endorse such thinking in those who wish to capitalise on modern technology and trends in prolific photograph/selfie taking.

Intervention with sex offenders needs to be individualised and person-centred, exploring the unique aspects of behaviour (Akerman, Craig and Beech, 2014; Wilcox, Garrett and Harkins, 2014) and avoiding a one-size-fits-all approach (Rich, 2011). A greater understanding of the IIOC produced by this cohort gives a tangible insight into their behaviour, predilections and risk factors. This study has highlighted that much about offending history, the function of the behaviour, and arousal patterns has been revealed, only because produced material acted as evidence. Exhibitionism, necrophilia, voyeurism, bestiality, use of mannequins, urination and sadism are areas that might not have been discovered as part of an offending pattern,
unless the produced IIOC had prompted the discussion. Collected IIOC provide insight into many aspects of offenders’ behaviour and process (Quayle and Newman, 2015). Self-produced IIOC provide an even more valuable opportunity to learn about the sexual crimes committed against children, motivation, grooming, the functions of the behaviour, and the specific sexual fantasies and customising predilections of offenders. Such material needs to be seen as more than an exhibit to confirm the crime but as a tool to gain a greater understanding about those who perpetrate such behaviour.

This work supports the notion that those who produce IIOC are not a unique group of sex offenders. Rather they are heterogeneous, as has been found with others who have a sexual interest in children. However, the production of IIOC does add an additional layer that needs to be addressed in any assessment and requires intervention with those for whom it has been part of their offending pattern. The multiplicity of functions supported by the data, the concept of playing with one’s identity, and the catalytic effect of production upon offending needs to be explored with those found to have produced IIOC.

The misnomer of the somewhat benign and limited term ‘grooming’, in describing the behaviours experienced by victims of child sexual abuse and production, became apparent in this study. It emerged that threats, aggression and violence were commonplace. The manipulation of children and protective adults appeared as a much more insidious process than the media- and academic-popular term of grooming implies. A study into therapy with 245 children, who were the subject of production of IIOC, found that professionals reported that there was a lack of
knowledge in how to identify, approach, and help such victims (Von Weiler, Haardt-Becker and Schulte, 2010). When individuals, who have produced IIOC, are not recognised as such or when this behaviour is diminished by focus on a perceived hierarchy of offences, pursuit of information that might inform victim services is also lost. This study highlights that it is advisable that perpetrator accounts are not taken at face value but that exploration and examination of ancillary material is essential to gain a full picture. Such a practice, while helpful to any victim work, is also essential in supporting a perpetrator by understanding the full range of his behaviour and, in turn, effecting change. The use of force and blackmail emerged as techniques used by this cohort and suggests that practitioners need to explore such possibilities perhaps as a matter of course.

Determining risk or dangerousness is a complex matter when working with sex offenders. Individuals who have produced IIOC may not necessarily be deemed more dangerous than those who have not. However, the ancillary benefits, beyond sexual, that emerged from this study do suggest that production may act as a driving force and that those who produce IIOC may be on a journey whereby detection simply reveals a stage in the process. This study suggests that producers may be motivated to increase production, try more extreme exploitation of children, and take more risks when they connect with others who, either deliberately or inadvertently, encourage them. Production of IIOC needs to be seen as an evolving process both from a psychological and methodological perspective. If, as this study suggests, producers of IIOC are on the increase, frontline practitioners need to become more familiar with the process of production, the subtleties of grooming for this purpose.
and the multilayers and developing functions of the behaviour to work optimally with this cohort.

This study has highlighted how the cultural acceptance and normalisation of regular and copious recording and photography has created a practice that sex offenders can capitalise upon. Further exploration and education regarding the normalcy illusion as a grooming technique is necessary. Education of the public to view the taking of photographs and video footage with a more critical eye is perhaps necessary. While there is awareness of the bystander effect, there is perhaps less understanding of how to move beyond it and challenge concerning behaviour. It has been suggested that, following scandals such as the Jimmy Savile case, public attention is receptive to education and wants increased understanding (McCartan, Kemshall and Tabachnick, 2015). A project recently introduced into the UK by Durham Police, known as ‘Intervent to Protect a Child’ (ICP), is one such initiative. Pioneered by the Texas Ranger, IPC brings together frontline police officers and professionals, whose work brings them into contact with children, to educate them to potential markers of child sexual exploitation. It has been highlighted that identifying victims of sexual exploitation, even by professionals, often falls short (Rafferty, 2016). To improve such a situation, increasing vigilance and understanding within a whole community, and placing responsibility with a broader range of individuals, is likely to increase the safeguarding of children. Encouragingly, intervention from industry is having an impact, with a reduction in peer-to-peer networks sharing IIOC noted (Bissias et al., 2016). However, these are not the only means of accessing IIOC, and ongoing work is required to dissuade individuals from posting, sharing and selling such material.
9.5 Limitations of this Thesis

Case file material and information on seized, self-produced IIOC provided important corroboration and additional information on participants. However, as already highlighted, self-report means that participants may not have given honest accounts of their offending behaviour. In addition, they may have sought to dramatise aspects of their story. The majority of participants in this study had not received any intervention, and as a result, may have been less insightful and more invested in distortion and denial than individuals who had been challenged and educated via an intervention programme.

New technological advancements are emerging at a rapid rate. This study has been unable to address the most recent tools now available to offenders; those which emerged and/or become more mainstream and available while the research was underway.

9.6 Future Directions

This study highlights the need for further study into individuals who produce IIOC, both as a means of better informing prevention, assessment and intervention with those who create such material, and to assist in support and therapy for the victims. More research needs to be undertaken into exploring the spectrum along which producers range, in terms of sharing their material with others, and if this is a fluid and/or evolving process. The ease with which IIOC can be taken, as a result of advancements in technology, calls for additional scrutiny of existing child safeguarding policies for organisations and possible amendments to same, but
certainly more vigilance. A means of passing more information about self-produced IIOC beyond law enforcement, confirming its existence to assessment and intervention practitioners, needs to be considered. Such material possesses valuable information, and a structure for dissemination of same is likely to assist in assessment, intervention and safeguarding.
9.7 Conclusions

“Photography promises an enchanting mastery of nature, but photography also threatens conflagration and anarchy, an incendiary levelling of the existing cultural order” (Sekula, 1986, p.343).

Demonising those who sexually exploit and abuse children is not a helpful approach to safeguarding (Finkelhor, 2014) and it is important not to conflate the danger (Quayle and Cooper, 2015). However, it may be time to enhance safeguarding practices in light of production methodologies used by those who photograph and/or film children for sexual purposes. Technology, and video recording equipment specifically, has become so sophisticated that it can be remotely- or sensor-activated, and IIOC can be created while the offender is in another location. Equally, such devices are so small that an offender can be in close proximity to protective adults as well as children, and go undetected as they produce IIOC. Venues where children congregate, in particular, for example, where they undress, change and shower, may need to consider periodically introducing specialist equipment to ensure recording devices have not been surreptitiously concealed.

The findings of this study suggest that investigations of, and intervention with, individuals who have produced IIOC may need to expand their remit. As previously highlighted by Wolak et al. (2011), law enforcement needs to assume that those found in possession of IIOC may also be producers. They may also have committed contact sexual abuse. Standard practice should involve considering the children within the suspects’ world, and approaching the forensic analyses of their IIOC collections accordingly. The time and financial implications for such a practice are undoubtedly considerable. However, when contrasted with the benefits of victim
identification, improved risk assessment and preventative outcomes, it is an approach to consider.

Seen as possibly the “tip of the offending iceberg”, (Bourke et al., 2015, p.356), early intervention self-report is only likely to provide what is deemed by offenders as the most palatable information. The extent to which professionals can struggle to believe the unimaginable, abhorrent and counter intuitive, for example being sexually aroused to a child or having sex with an animal and recording it, is understandable. In some instances, it may be more palatable to limit enquiry or excuse away IIOC by accepting offenders’ accounts and associated distortions. Therapists have been known to support offenders in refusing additional polygraph testing because they did not believe them capable of perpetrating more serious offences (Buschman et al., 2010). This was despite acknowledgements of such offending undertaken during the study. Law enforcement, and those undertaking risk assessment and intervention with individuals found in possession of IIOC, need to be cautious about relying exclusively on self-report. Consideration needs to be given to a possible collective collusion within research and clinical work, where academics and practitioners may accept accounts and rationale for behaviour that is a limited but more agreeable account.

This study has referred throughout to indecent images of children (IIOC) and to video recording of sexual abuse. The term child pornography is used more typically in America and Canada, when referring to such material. However, what has emerged is that the video recording of the sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children is the most prevalent behaviour. Referring generically to images or
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pornography may create a limited impression for practitioners, researchers, and the public. It conjures a child posing and the sound of a digital mechanism whirring briefly with every depression of the index finger. The reality is, more typically, the video recording of the protracted sexual abuse/exploitation of a child, from which individual images are extracted. Consideration of the duration and content of a recording allows for the victim experience to be more fully understood and the perpetrator behaviour to be considered in its totality. In addition, awareness of the production methodologies may help safeguarding strategies and prevention approaches.

Arrest data suggests that producers of IIOC are currently relatively rare (Wolak et al., 2011). However, this study tentatively contends that the number of individuals engaging in this behaviour may increase, that it has been under-recognised and under-detected, and that modern technology has opened another avenue upon which child sex offenders are capitalising. The cautionary words of Arago, a leading patron of the inventor of the camera, perhaps take on an almost prophetic meaning,

‘When experimenters use a new tool in the study of nature, their initial expectations always fall short of the series of discoveries that eventually issue from it. With this invention, one must particularly emphasis the unforeseen possibilities’ (Freund, 1980, p. 27).
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<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please attach a brief summary of the research project including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Background/rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aims/objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Research methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review of the key literature in this field &amp; conceptual framework for study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• References</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B2**

**BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE**

**AIMS/OBJECTIVE**

**METHODOLOGY**

**REVIEW OF KEY LITERATURE**

**REFERENCES**
Please outline any ethical issues that might arise from this study and how they are to be addressed.

**NB all research projects have ethical considerations. Please complete this section as fully as possible using the following pointers for guidance.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Ethics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project involve potentially deceiving participants?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will you be requiring the disclosure of confidential or private information?</td>
<td>The participants are asked about their own thoughts and behaviours but are asked not to disclose any information pertaining to a third party where that individual could be identified. At the beginning of each interview the participants are advised to reflect on their answers as their responses will be available to their referring organisation. They are also advised that the interview is about understanding their process as opposed to any incriminating detail. Approximately eight weeks in advance of the interviews, participants, who have voluntarily agreed to take part in the research, are sent an outline of the research and question areas, advised that they can withdraw from the process at any stage, and assured that all participants will be anonymised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project likely to lead to the disclosure of illegal activity or incriminating information about participants?</td>
<td>As discussed above, the research is about gaining a better understanding of the internal process of individuals who have created IIOC. This activity is illegal however, the research is concerned exclusively with the understanding their internal processes and behaviour rather than identifying/incriminating information and this is made clear to all participants. The importance of not disclosing any incriminating information is emphasised before the interview begins. A check is done by asking the participant to explain back what they have understood to ensure they have grasped that incriminating information is not being solicited and is not wanted. Participants are also informed that if they do make a disclosure, this will be passed at the end of the interview to their referring organisation. A transcript of the section of the interview where the disclosure is made can be made available to the organisation as well as access to the video interview. However, no copies will be made of the video.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project require a Criminal Records Bureau check for the researcher?</td>
<td>No, but the researcher by the nature of their work has this in place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| B5 | • Is the project likely to expose participants to distress of any nature? The research questions focus on the thoughts, feelings and behaviours of the participants in respect of producing IIOC and their early life experiences. It is possible that any such questions may trigger an emotional response in an individual. However, they are not designed to cause upset or offence in any way, and the interviewers are experienced in working with this cohort in an empowering and sensitive manner. Participants can stop the interview at any stage and an identifying support person is available to them should they want this.

  • Will participants be rewarded for their involvement? NO
  • Are there any potential conflicts of interest in this project? NO
  • Any other potential concerns? NO

If you answered yes to any of the points above, please explain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the proposed research project involve:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The analysis of existing data, artefacts or performances that are not already in the public domain (i.e. that are published, freely available or available by subscription)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The production and/or analysis of physical data (including computer code, physical entities and/or chemical materials) that might involve potential risks to humans, the researcher(s) or the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The direct or indirect collection of new data from humans or animals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you answered yes to any of the points above, please explain. ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE AND INTERVIEW MIGHT LEAD TO NEW DATA/INFORMATION.

RESPONSE: The interviews are not in the public domain and the analysis of the data may illicit new information in respect of understanding the cohort. However, this is focusing on the generalities of their behaviour patterns and associated thinking, as well as their own opinions. All participants are anonymised and any identifying information excluded from the thesis. All the interviews are stored in accordance with data protection legislation.
In addition, all participants are asked to anonymise anyone else they make reference to during interviews. This is highlighted to them in advance of the interview in the information and consent form. They will also be reminded of this point throughout the interview. In the event that personal references or third party details are accidentally referred to in the interview, this will be replaced in the process of transcription by the researcher who will transcribe all of the interviews personally.

**B4**

Will the proposed research be conducted in any country outside the UK?

*Yes, USA and Ireland*

If so, are there independent research ethics regulations and procedures that either:

- **Do not** recognise research ethics review approval from UK-based research ethics services? and/or
- Require more detailed applications for research ethics review than would ordinarily be conducted by the University’s Research Ethics Review Panels and/or other UK-based research ethics services?

No, only referrals from referring organisations that have compatible regulations, and recognise and are happy to facilitate research that has the UK-based research ethics approval will be used.

**If you answered yes to any of the points above, please explain.**

**B5** Does the proposed research involve:

- The collection and/or analysis of body tissues or fluids from humans or animals?
- The administration of any drug, food substance, placebo or invasive procedure to humans or animals?
- Any participants lacking capacity (as defined by the UK Mental Capacity Act 2005)?
- Relationships with any external statutory-, voluntary-, or commercial-sector organisation(s) that require(s) research ethics approval to be obtained from an external research ethics committee or the UK National Research Ethics Service (this includes research involving staff, clients, premises, facilities and data from the UK National Health Service, Social Care organisations and some other statutory public bodies within the UK)? NO

**If you answered yes to any of the points above, please contact your faculty’s RERP chair for further guidance.**
### C1 Risk Assessment

Please outline

- the risks posed by this project to both researcher and research participants
- the ways in which you intend to mitigate these risks
- the benefits of this project to the applicant, participants and any others

RESPONSE: Interviews are only undertaken with individuals who are known to have no history of physical violence or aggression. All interviews are conducted in a professional setting with other individuals in close proximity. Before the interview begins it is explained that the interviewee will be treated with respect and that the same would be expected of them towards the interviewer. It is agreed that the interview will be terminated if this is not the case. Throughout the research process the researcher is undertaking monthly personal supervision with a clinical psychologist and has the option of increasing this if deemed necessary. The supervision is considered necessary in order to discuss any aspect of personal impact of the interview material and/or process.

The interviewee can terminate the interview at any stage if they wish. The interviewers are skilled and experienced interviewers and make it clear to the interviewees that if they are finding the interview upsetting, they can pause and or terminate at any stage. Participants can access their support person at any stage during the interview process.

Participants engage in the project voluntarily with a view to helping professionals and themselves to better understand their offending behaviour and in turn possibly assist with intervention with this cohort. Participants are made aware that all information may be passed to their referring organisation with a view to broadening the understanding of their behaviour. This is clearly explained and a checking process is carried out,
asking the participant to confirm that they understand and explain back what has been put to them.

All interviews for this study will be video recorded onto a memory card using a Sony Digital camcorder. At the end of each interview the file is transferred directly onto the encrypted hard-drive of a Sony Vaio laptop computer and the memory card is wiped using PGP wiping software. A back up of the files is retained on a fully-encrypted, removable hard drive. The records of this study are anonymised and retained in password-protected Word Excel, SPSS and NVivo files on the encrypted laptop. No paper files are retained containing any personal details of the participants.

Checklist to be completed by applicant prior to submission of the form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section A</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section B</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section C</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Proposal attached</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please ensure that you have completed Sections A, B, and C and attached a Research Proposal before submitting to your Faculty Research Ethics Review Panel (RERP)

Please sign this form and submit it as an email attachment to the Chair of your faculty’s Research Ethics Review Panel (RERP) and cc all of the staff and students who will be involved in the proposed research.

http://www.londonmet.ac.uk/research/current-students/research-ethics/

Research ethics approval can be granted for a maximum of 4 years or for the duration of the proposed research, whichever is shorter, on the condition that:

- The researcher must inform their faculty’s Research Ethics Review Panel (RERP) of any changes to the proposed research that may alter the answers given to the questions in this form or any related research ethics applications.
The researcher must apply for an extension to their ethics approval if the research project continues beyond 4 years.

Declaration

I confirm that I have read London Met’s Research Ethics Policy and Procedures and Code of Good Research Practice and have consulted relevant guidance on ethics in research.

Researcher    Valerie Sheehan

Signature:    [Signature]

Date:        01.02.2015
### Feedback from Ethics Panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Feedback where further work required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section A</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section B</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section C</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Concerns below addressed on this resubmission**

B4, B5: please answer all the questions; please explain how consent is achieved and supply draft information sheets/consent forms.

Please explain how data is stored.

Interesting project that has the potential to make a significant contribution to knowledge.

---

**Date of approval**

NB: Researcher to be notified of decision within two weeks of the submission of the application

Condition:

Adjust consent form:

(a) consider queries to wordings and adjust if necessary

(b) add supervisor’s contact details

(c) use LondonMet email for you or supervisor

(d) make clear what participants are consenting to: use of anonymised transcript of video or anonymised video.

02/02/15

Chair of FSSH RERP

---
SECTION B: THE PROJECT

B1. Brief summary of the research project including:

- Background/rationale

The proposed area of research is an analysis of interviews with individuals who have manufactured (‘taken’) indecent images of children (IIOC). The study aims to qualitatively explore the lived experiences of approximately twenty-two males who committed offences related to indecent images of children to determine whether there are similarities or differences in their experiences, perspectives and behaviours which, in turn, might provide a greater understanding of the offence of manufacturing IIOC.

Various studies are ongoing with regard to those who use the internet to sexually exploit children. Those that collect and/or distribute child sex abuse images are by far the largest group amongst all those who use the internet for this purpose. However, one significant sub-group, about which little is known, are those who manufacture (also known as ‘produce’ and ‘take’) IIOC. These individuals supply the market that consumes IIOC and, as such, much more needs to be known about them. This thesis proposes to explore the aetiology and process development of individuals who ‘take’ the images/video of the sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children.

In 2010, I was the lead author in an article entitled ‘A qualitative analysis of child sex offenders involved in the manufacture of indecent images of children’ that was published in the peer-reviewed Journal of Sexual Aggression, 16 (2), 143-167. This article used qualitative research and undertook interviews with four individuals who were convicted of IIOC offences, all of whom had also manufactured IIOC. This work was carried out in accordance with the British Psychological Society’s code of conduct for professional practice ‘Ethical Principles for Conducting Research with Human Participants’ (1993; 1994). It is this earlier piece of research that the thesis intends to build upon.
• **Aims/objectives**

The aim is to explore any similarities and differences in the experiences, perspectives and behaviours of the cohort, with the objective of gaining a greater understanding of this type of offence. Research has shown that those who view indecent images of children increasingly seek more explicit images and younger children. While IIOC may provide clues and information regarding the victims, the images rarely provide information relating to the producer. Those who view indecent images of children testify to the concept of Fantasy Escalation Effect\(^7\) whereby they seem to become desensitised to the images that they are viewing and accordingly seek more and more explicit images/ video material. Is it the producer escalating in terms of his abuse of children of his own volition, or is he responding to the demand of others? In addition, it appears that while some individuals share the images they produce, others never do so. The extent to which social interaction plays a role in the choices of the former group is one that needs to be further explored.

The aim of this study is to look more closely at those who have been convicted for the production of IIOC and to try and gain a greater understanding of aspects of their behaviour and motivation.

The research intends to test the following:

- Producers of child abuse images have distinct characteristics from others who use the internet as a means of exploiting children.
- Producers of child abuse images are sexually aroused to children.
- Producers of child abuse images share these images in a systematic manner.
- Producers of child abuse images are not motivated by financial gain.

• **Research methodology**

Qualitative analysis and specifically thematic analysis is the chosen research methodology. It was seen as the appropriate choice as it involves the searching across a data set - be that a number of interviews or focus groups, or a range of texts

- to find repeated patterns of meaning (Braun and Clark, 2006). The participants are viewed as the experts in the field. Since so little is known about the proposed cohort, it is considered that such an approach could illicit much information. The researcher subjectively reflects upon the ‘lived experience’ of the participants and generates interpretations which might offer richer, more complex understandings than those provided by qualitative methods.

Data is collected using semi-structured interviews. The semi-structured interview for this research was devised to facilitate the investigation of factors that might have contributed to the development and progression of this form of child sexual exploitation and abuse. The areas covered by the semi-structured interview are:

- Life history
- Blocks to engaging in the behaviour
- The role of fantasy
- Planning and preparation for producing IIOC
- The technology associated with producing IIOC
- The function of image/movie production (including any social aspect)
- The sharing process of material produced (if applicable).

The design of the semi-structured interview is based on the conceptual framework *The Spiral of Sexual Abuse* (Sullivan, 2002) and further informed by other seminal works in respect of the etiology of sexual offending against children (Marshall and Barbaree, 1990; Hall and Hirschman, 1992; Finkelhor, 1994; Sullivan, 2002; Ward and Siegert, 2002). Interviews rely on self-report; however, case files are available and allow for independent verification of aspects of the accounts given. Participants are initially contacted by a third party, either Law enforcement, Probation, Prison services or Local Authority personnel who are involved in a professional capacity with these individuals.

The aims and objectives of the study are explained to each participant and their written consent is obtained in accordance with the British Psychological Society’s code of conduct for professional practice ‘Ethical Principles for Conducting
Research with Human Participants’ (1993; 1994). All participants are informed that the interviews are conducted for the purpose of research. A description of the project is provided to participants and only those who are content to sign a consent form are included in the study. The names of participants are changed and any details of their offending or account that might identify either the participants or their victims are removed.

Two researchers conduct the interviews and follow the semi-structured interview plan. All interviews for this study are video recorded onto a memory card using a Sony Digital camcorder. At the end of each interview, the file is transferred directly onto the encrypted hard-drive of a Sony Vaio laptop computer and the memory card is wiped using PGP wiping software. A back-up of the files is retained on a fully-encrypted, removable hard drive. The records of this study are anonymised and retained in password-protected Word Excel, SPSS and NVivo files on the encrypted laptop. No paper files are retained containing any personal details of the participants.

- **Review of the key literature in this field & conceptual framework for study**

The volume and rapid increase with which IIOC are being uncovered by law enforcement is immense. In 2011, The National Centre for Missing & Exploited Children (NCMEC) in the USA recorded **17.3 million** images and videos of suspected IIOC; this was four times more than in 2007. Since its creation in 2002, up to December 2012, NCMEC has analysed more than 80 million images and videos depicting apparent child pornography through the Child Victim Identification Programme (NCMEC, 2013).

Between April 2011 and March 2012, referrals, in relation to possession of IIOC, to the Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre in the UK (CEOP) increased by 181% (CEOP, 2012.) In addition, between 2010/11 and 2011/12, CEOP has observed an increase in the number of offenders identified for producing indecent images of children involving multiple victims. In this timeframe, CEOP has recognised an escalation in the number of females arrested in connection with
possession of indecent images of children, with all but one, acting in collaboration with male offenders (CEOP, 2012).

In addition, the extent to which children are being solicited online is growing exponentially. CEOP (2012) highlight that, in some instances, networks of individuals are facilitating the sexual abuse of children in demand to specific requests.

‘Internet sex offender’ is proving to be an inadequate and limiting description that may in fact result in multi-agency professionals underplaying and/or misunderstanding the behaviours and motivations of individuals who use the internet and social networking sites to sexually exploit children (Sheehan and Sullivan, 2010). Quayle (2009) maintained that the information available relating to internet-mediated crimes against children is limited, restricted by context and sometimes appears contradictory. There is no typical profile of the individuals who access indecent images of children (McCarthy, 2010) and internet sex offenders have been categorised as a heterogeneous group (Henry et al., 2010) that defy simple categorisations, and there appears to be a lack of a coherent and agreed framework for defining their activity (Aslan, 2011).

It seems that researchers, front-line professionals, and safeguarding organisations are scrambling to keep up with new technology and the way in which individuals are seeking to sexually exploit children via such media (Buschman et al., 2010). A primary area of research to date has been to explore the extent to which contact offenders and those found in possession of indecent images of children have similarities and/or differences (Wolak, Finkelhor and Mitchell, 2005; Middleton et al., 2006; Webb, Craissati and Keen, 2007). Knowing the differences in how IIOC offences are committed is essential in understanding and combatting the problem of child sexual exploitation and abuse (Krone, 2004), and this is particularly relevant in terms of the technology used by individuals in order to create these images. In addition, without fully understanding how technology effects and interacts with child sexual exploitation and abuse, developing effective treatment programmes is unlikely (Aiken, Moran and Berry, 2011).
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Appendix 2: Information and Consent Form for Participants

Consent to Participate in a Research Study

PART REQUIREMENT FOR Postgraduate doctorate, in Policing Security and Community Safety, London Metropolitan University, London, UK

Title of Study: Producers of indecent images of children (IIOC): A qualitative analysis of the aetiology and development of their offending patterns

Researcher: Valerie Sheehan

Dept: Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities

Introduction
You are being asked to be in a research study of individuals who have created, produced or taken indecent images of children (IIOC). The study aims to explore the lived experiences of approximately 22 individuals who have produced IIOC in order to determine whether there are similarities or differences in their experiences, perspectives, motivation and behaviours. Various organisations, e.g. Law Enforcement, Probation, were approached and asked if they would be prepared to ask their service users if they were willing to engage in the research. The study has UK-based research ethics approval which is recognised by your referring organisation.

- As you have produced IIOC you were identified as a possible participant.
- In order to learn more please read the following and ask any questions you would like before making a decision to participate or not.

Purpose of Study
The purpose of the study is to hopefully provide a better understanding of the offence of manufacturing IIOC.
Appendices

The research intends to test the following:

- Producers of child abuse images have distinct characteristics from others who use the internet as a means of exploiting children
- Producers of child abuse images are sexually aroused to children
- Producers of child abuse images share these images in a systematic manner
- Producers of child abuse images are not motivated by financial gain.

- It is considered that answers to these questions may assist professionals in the future in helping individuals struggling with the desire to create such images and/or add to the existing knowledge in how to help victims of such crimes.
- This research is to be published in thesis form as part requirement for Postgraduate doctorate, in Policing Security and Community Safety. However, the information gleaned from it may also at some stage be published as part of a book/journal article and/or presented as a research paper, shared with other professionals in a training capacity.

Description of the Study Procedures

If you agree to be in this study, you will be interviewed and asked a series of question that will cover topics such:

- Life history
- Blocks to engaging in the behaviour
- The role of fantasy
- Planning and preparation for producing IIOC
- The technology associated with producing IIOC
- The function of image/movie production (including any social aspect)
- The sharing process of material produced (if applicable).

Risks/Discomforts of Being in this Study

A consideration before engaging in this study is that all information arising from it will be available to your referring organisation. Accordingly they will be aware of any incriminating information you might disclose.

- This study is not concerned with such information and does not want to discuss this area with you.
- In addition, you are asked not to disclose any information pertaining to a third party where that individual could be identified.
As the research is designed to look at your life history and the process of producing IIOC it may trigger an emotional response in you. However, the questions are not designed to cause upset or offence in any way and the interviewers are experienced in working within this area in an empowering and sensitive manner.

An identified support person from your referring organisation will be available to you should you wish to receive support/counselling at any stage in the interview process.

Benefits of Being in the Study
The benefits of participation are that you may gain a better insight into your own process. The questions are drawn from research already carried out in this area and as such examine issues that may be underlying motivators/triggers/desistance (blocks to offending) mechanisms that you may not have known about and/or considered before. The more you learn about your own process the better able you are likely to be to seek appropriate help and support in the future.

Confidentiality
This study is anonymous. No identifying information relating to you will be included in the study and the video will not be used in the thesis, only the anonymised transcriptions. The video is used to facilitate the transcriptions and to ensure safety for all during the interviews.

The interview is video recorded onto a memory card using a Sony Digital camcorder.

At the end of each interview the file is transferred directly onto the encrypted hard-drive of a Sony Vaio laptop computer and the memory card is wiped using PGP wiping software.

A back up of the files is retained on a fully-encrypted, removable hard drive.

The records of this study are anonymised and retained in password-protected Word Excel, SPSS and NVivo files on the encrypted laptop.

No paper files are retained containing any of your personal details.

Payments
You will not receive any payment/reimbursement as a result of partaking in this research.
Right to Refuse or Withdraw

- The decision to participate in this study is entirely your choice. You may refuse to take part in the study at any time without affecting your relationship with your referring organisation and/or the researcher. Your decision will not result in any loss or benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You have the right not to answer any single question, as well as to withdraw completely from the interview at any point during the process; additionally, you have the right to request, within a six-month timeframe following the interview, that the interviewer does not use any of your interview material.

Right to Ask Questions

- You have the right to ask questions about this research study and to have those questions answered by me before, during or after the research. If you have any further questions about the study, at any time feel free to contact me, Valerie Sheehan at [email] or at [address]. If you like, a summary of the results of the study will be sent to you. You can also use these contact details to notify of your decision to withdraw. The supervisor for this study is Dr Dan Silverstone, D.Silverstone@londonmet.ac.uk.

Consent

- Your signature below indicates that you have decided to volunteer as a research participant for this study, and that you have read and understood the information provided above. You will be given a signed and dated copy of this form to keep.

Subject's Name (print): ____________________________

Subject's Signature: ____________________________ Date: __________________

Researcher’s Signature: ____________________________ Date: __________________