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The Implicit Association Test was used to measure cognitive associations between children and sex in men convicted of child-sex offences. It was hypothesized that these cognitions would be different in pedophilic-type offenders (defined by having a victim aged less than 12 years) and hebephilic-type offenders (only victims aged 12 to 15 years) such that only the pedophilic-type offenders would have an implicit association between children and sex. This was confirmed. It was also hypothesized that this association between children and sex in the pedophilic-type offenders would be present irrespective of their denial of offence history. This was also confirmed. These results demonstrate differences in the cognitive associations between children and sex held by subgroups of child-sex abusers, and they help establish the Implicit Association Test as an indirect means to assess cognitive factors related to sexual offences.
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Introduction

Dissimulation in Sex Offenders

Sexual offending against children may be motivated by a set of distorted cognitions related to sex and children (Beech, 1998; Marziano, Ward, Beech, & Pattison, 2006; Ward, Hudson, Johnston, & Marshall, 1997). However, measurement of these cognitive distortions is not trivial. First, it has been suggested that many of these
distortions are held at an implicit level and are not available to measures that rely on explicit self-report (e.g., Ward & Keenan, 1999). Second, even if an individual offender is aware of these cognitions he (and we focus here solely on male offenders) may not be willing to admit to them and will often hide, deny, or minimize such cognitions. Thus, research into sexual offending has been hampered by difficulties in being able to access accurately the cognitions of sex offenders (Craisatti, 1998; Gannon, Keown, & Polaschek, 2007; Marshall, Anderson, & Fernandez, 1999).

In addition to this failure to report on offence-related cognitions, offenders may also deliberately misreport their offending histories (Cooper, 2005). For example, Wilcox and Sosnowski (2005) administered polygraphs to 25 men who had completed at least 50 hours of a community sex-offender treatment program, asking them questions about their sexual history. Reporting of victim numbers increased, with 4.7 more victims reported for noncontact sexual offences, and 3.5 more victims for contact offences, compared with that reported prior to polygraph. Hence, it seems that techniques that can supplement simple self-report may be of great value to clinicians in understanding the behaviours, cognitions, and motivations of sexual offenders.

The Implicit Association Test

There has been a recent explosion of interest in the possible use of implicit measurement techniques in the field of psychology (e.g., Gawronski, LeBel, & Peters, 2007). Prominent among measures of implicit cognition is the Implicit Association Test (IAT; Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998), which now has a long track record of exploring cognitions in many diverse settings such as racial bias (e.g. Richeson et al., 2003), eating behaviors (e.g., Vartanian, Polivy, & Herman, 2004), health-related behaviours (e.g., Wiers, Van Woerden, Smulders, & De Jong, 2002), clinical presentation (e.g., Teachman, Gregg, & Woody, 2001), and forensic settings (e.g., Gray, MacCulloch, Smith, Morris, & Snowden, 2003), including those related to sexual offences (e.g., Nunes, Firestone, & Baldwin, 2007). The technique is based on a response interference paradigm. To illustrate, Snowden, Wichter, and Gray (2008) had participants rapidly sort pictures of people according to whether they were male or female, and to sort words as to whether they were sexually attractive or sexually unattractive. In Condition A, the sexually attractive words and female pictures shared a response key (with sexually unattractive and male sharing the other key), whereas in Condition B the sexually unattractive words and female pictures shared a response key (with sexually attractive and male sharing the other key). They found that heterosexual males were faster and more accurate in Condition A than in Condition B, whereas homosexual males were faster and more accurate in Condition B. Snowden et al. interpreted these results as consistent with the idea that a picture of a female might produce an automatic association with the concept of sexually attractive for the heterosexual males. In Condition A, the activation of the concept
of female by the stimulus should also produce an activation of “sexually attractive” due to these cognitive associations. As both of these activations produce an impulse to respond toward the same key there is no interference and performance is fast and accurate. However, under Condition B the two activations now produce impulses to respond to different keys, and therefore there is response conflict and performance is slower and less accurate. The association between “female” and “sex” can be measured by the difference in performance between Conditions A and B. Snowden et al. (2008) showed that this technique produced almost perfect classification of a person’s reported sexual orientation (area under the curve = 0.97) suggesting that the IAT may be a most valuable tool to explore sexual associations.

The Implicit Association Test in Child-Sex Offenders

Gray, Brown, MacCulloch, Smith, and Snowden (2005) produced a child/sex-IAT that examined associations between child versus adult and sex versus not sex. They found that offenders with a conviction for sex offences against a child produced faster performance under the conditions where child and sex were paired, whereas control offenders (those without a conviction for child-sex offences) were faster under the condition where adult and sex were paired. Similar findings of greater associations between children and sex in child-sex offenders have been reported by other groups (Banse & Clarbour, 2007; Nunes et al., 2007; van Leeuwen, van Baaren, Chakhssi, Loonen, Lippman, & Dijksterhuis, 2009). Mihailides, Devilly, and Ward (2004), using a slightly different IAT, also found a greater association between children and sex in those convicted of child-sex offences compared with controls. The results suggest that a child/sex-IAT can indeed measure distorted implicit associations in such offenders (e.g., that the concept of children is associated with the concept of sex), and may prove to be a valuable tool to investigate sexual associations in sexual offenders.

Pedophilic and Hebephilic Offenders

It has been hypothesized that child-sex offenders are heterogeneous (Beech, 1998; Marziano et al., 2006; Ward et al., 1997). For example, distinctions have been made between pedophilia (an erotic preference for prepubescent children), and hebephilia (an erotic preference for pubescent children), and may have serious implications for the treatment of sex offenders (Freund, 1980). This erotic preference has often been revealed in studies of sexual arousal via penile plethysmography (PPG; Freund & Blanchard, 1989; Studer, Aylwin, Cellland, Reddon, & Frenzel, 2002), where sexual arousal to prepubescent children is only found in the pedophilic offenders. Thus, the motivation for sexual offending between pedophilic and hebephilic offenders may be quite different, which in turn may suggest quite different
treatment and management regimes of these two subgroups of offenders. Given that we have previously shown a child-sex association in a mixed group of child-sex offenders (Gray et al., 2005), we hypothesized that pedophilic and hebephilic offenders might show quite distinct patterns of implicit associations between children and sex. We hypothesized that the pedophilic offenders would show an association between children and sex as demonstrated in previous studies (Gray et al., 2005; Nunes et al., 2007; van Leeuwen et al., 2009); however, we predicted that this association would be absent in hebephilic offenders despite their convictions for child-sex offences, as they are not sexually attracted to prepubescent children.

Faking and the Implicit Association Test

As discussed earlier, dissimulation of both reported offence history and child-sex related cognitions by child sex offenders is common. Thus, any technique that is at least partially resistant to deliberate attempts at dissimulation would be a valuable addition to methods/tools used by clinicians and researchers in this field. In our previous study (Gray et al., 2005), we did not take any measurement of whether the offender admitted to the offences for which they were convicted. Hence, in this study we wanted to compare the efficacy of the child/sex-IAT between offenders who admitted their offences and those that did not.

Previous research has shown that the IAT is somewhat resistant, though not impervious, to attempts to hide or fake these cognitions (Banse, Seise, & Zerbes, 2001; Cvencek, Greenwald, Brown, Gray, & Snowden, 2009; Steffens, 2004). Therefore, we hypothesized that the association between children and sex in the pedophilic offenders would be present in both those that deny and those that admit their child-sex related offence history.

Method

Participants

Participants were drawn from inmates resident at two local prisons in South Wales. The experimental group consisted of 75 men convicted of child-sex offences. The control group consisted of 49 inmates from the same prisons who volunteered to participate. They were mainly convicted of drug-related offences (supply, possession with intent to supply, etc.) or multiple theft/burglary. Two were convicted murderers and one was convicted of armed robbery. None of the controls had a past conviction for any sex offence.

To be able to compare between subtypes of child-sex offenders, we split the 75 child-sex offenders on the basis of their sexual offending history. Fifty-four of this
sample had a conviction for abusing at least one victim of less than 12 years of age and were therefore termed the “pedophilic-type” group. We acknowledge that the term “pedophile” actually refers to a sexual preference and not necessarily to victim choice. Hence, we use the term “pedophilic-type” to distinguish this pragmatic grouping from any clinical diagnosis. Twenty-one men had a sexual conviction against a minor that only involved victims aged 12 to 15 years—this group was termed the “hebephilic-type” group.

To explore differences between the child-sex offenders who admitted their child-sex offences (which we will term “admitters”) and those who did not (which we will term “deniers”), we again used a pragmatic approach, and used the classification scheme adopted by HM Prison Service sex offender treatment program. This assessment had already been performed by the prison service as part of the treatment and management of these offenders. This clinical judgment as to admitter versus denier status is made on the basis of clinical interview and the Sex Offence Attitudes Questionnaire (Hogue, 1994) and assesses the extent to which the offender denies sexual interest in children in general, and his own offences in particular. In all, 55 child-sex abusers were designated as deniers and 20 were designated as admitters according to these classifications.

Stimuli and Materials

*Implicit Association Tests.* The child/sex-IAT involves both the classification of pictures as either adult or child, and the classification of words as either sex or not-sex related. The pictures (see Appendix A) were taken from the International Affective Picture System (Lang, Bradley, & Cuthbert, 1997) and involved children less than the age of 12, or adults, in a variety of contexts. It should be noted that none of these pictures involved any erotic or pornographic features; a considerable advantage over methods such as penile plethysmography (see Freund & Blanchard, 1989), which require erotic material. The sex words (Appendix A) were selected from a list judged most representative of their categories by inmates of HMP Grendon, and the nonsex words were chosen to match these in length. Our streamlined IAT uses only the “test” stages of a standard IAT. In Stage 1, eight exemplars of each of the four categories (child, adult, sex, and not-sex) were presented. The practice stage involved 16 trials (randomly chosen) to familiarize participants with the procedures and stimuli, and was immediately followed by 96 presentations in the test block (each exemplar being shown three times). In this first stage, the left button was the correct response for the pictures of children and for “not-sex” words (and therefore the right button was correct for adult pictures and sex words). Stage 2 was identical save that the left button was now correct for adult and not-sex (and the right button correct for child and sex). Hence, this task differs from our previous report (Gray et al., 2005) in that it involves the use of pictures (rather than all words) and has only two stages (compared with five stages).
The control-IAT used the categories “flowers” and “insects” as a target concept dimension and “pleasant–unpleasant” as the attribute dimension (Greenwald et al., 1998; Snowden, MacCulloch, Smith, Morris, and Gray, 2004). The methods were identical to that of the child/sex-IAT with the concepts of flowers and insects being represented by pictures (again drawn from the International Affective Picture System), and the concepts of pleasant and unpleasant were represented by words as in our previous studies (see Appendix B).

The overall aim of our research efforts is to develop implicit techniques that might have clinical utility. To this end, any test has to be able to be meaningful at the level of an individual, rather than just at a group level. It is well documented that the IAT is subject to both practice and order effects (e.g., Greenwald et al., 1998). Therefore, counterbalancing the order of the blocks of trials would create differences between individuals in these different conditions (though this would cancel out at a group level), which we wished to avoid. Therefore we decided not to counterbalance blocks and ran each individual on exactly the same order of blocks of trials (see Banse et al., 2001). We note that the “expected” order effect given the order we used (adult–sex combination in Stage 1 and child-sex combination in Stage 2) should produce results more suggestive of adult-sex associations, thus reducing the chance of detecting child-sex associations. We believe this choice of order is conservative to our hypothesis.

Cognitive ability. To test for any possible confound of IAT score with IQ we also measured IQ using the two subtest version of the Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (The Psychological Corporation, 1999).

Procedure

Participants were approached individually and recruited on a voluntary basis. They read an information sheet on the experiment, had the opportunity to ask questions, and then signed a consent form. Wing officers kept participating inmates back from work, which allowed them to be called singly by the researcher to a side room on the wing where the study was administered.

The IQ test was administered first, after which the implicit measures were introduced. Participants completed the control-IAT first and then the child/sex-IAT. The IAT tests were repeated approximately 1 hour later. Finally, participants were given the opportunity to ask further questions and were given a debriefing sheet explaining the purpose of the experiment. This debriefing sheet did not explain the methodology behind the IAT. Inmates were asked not to discuss the experiment with their peers, thanked, and escorted back to the main wing.

Data Analysis

Reaction times (RTs) and errors were calculated for each trial. We used the scoring algorithm developed by Greenwald, Nosek, and Banaji (2003). $D$-scores were
calculated by replacing errors with a punitive RT (600 milliseconds + the mean RT score for that block), and then expressing the difference in mean RTs between Stage 1 (adult and sex paired) and Stage 2 (child and sex paired) in terms of the standard deviation. $D$-scores greater than zero indicated greater associations between sex and adult, whereas $D$-scores less than zero indicated greater associations between sex and child.

Results

Comparison of the Subtypes of Offender

Previous offending. Of the child-sex offenders, 85% had a female victim (pedophile-type = 85%; hebephile-type = 85%), 57% of the victims were known to the offender (pedophile-type = 57%; hebephile-type = 57%), whereas 28% were incest offenders (pedophile-type = 30%; hebephile-type = 24%), or 45% where the definition of incest was extended to include stepchildren (pedophile-type = 43%; hebephile-type = 48%). None of these between-group comparisons were statistically significant (chi square). The mean number of victims per offender was 1.69 ($SD = 1.13$; range 1-6), with pedophile-type having a mean of 1.87 ($SD = 1.28$; range 1-6) and hebephile-type offenders a mean of 1.33 ($SD = 0.58$; range 1-3). This difference was not statistically significant, $t(66) = 1.84$.

Child/sex-IAT. $D$-scores for the pedophilic-type participants were negative ($M = -0.185; SE = 0.046$), whereas those for the hebephilic-type participants ($M = 0.125; SE = 0.10$) and for controls ($M = 0.137; SE = 0.055$) were positive. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with offender type (pedophilic-type/hebephilic-type/control) as the between-subjects factor showed a significant main effect of offender type, $F(2, 123) = 10.92; p < .001; f = 0.42$. Simple effects analysis showed that the $D$-scores of pedophilic-type offenders were lower than the hebephilic-type offenders ($p < .01; d = 0.77$), and were lower than the controls ($p < .001; d = 0.92$). According to the standard recommended by Cohen (1992), these effect sizes are large. The control groups’ and hebephile-type offenders’ scores did not differ ($p = .91$).

Control-IAT. On the control task, $D$-scores for pedophilic-type offenders ($M = 0.422; SE = 0.042$), hebephilic-type offenders ($M = 0.389; SE = 0.060$) and controls ($M = 0.367; SE = 0.057$) were equivalent statistically, $F(2, 123) = 0.34; p = .71; f = 0.10$.

Cognitive Ability and IQ

The mean IQ of the control group was lower ($M = 95.3; SD = 15.5$) than hebephilic-type offenders ($M = 105.8; SD = 12.5$), whose IQ was lower than pedophilic-type offenders ($M = 106.3; SD = 15.8$). A one-way ANVOA showed a significant
effect of group, $F(2, 119) = 7.4; p < .01$. Therefore, to test for any effect of intellectual ability on the child/sex-IAT an analysis of covariance was conducted on the $D$-scores with IQ scores as a covariate. As before, results showed that the child/sex-IAT scores differed significantly across groups, $F(2, 114) = 7.97, p < .001$, with the pedophile-type offenders differing from both controls ($p < .001$) and hebephile-type offenders ($p < .001$), whereas the controls and hebephile-type offenders did not differ ($p = .97$).

**Retest Stability and Internal Consistency**

We managed to obtain retest data on 76 of the participants (29 pedophile-type, 14 hebephile-type, 33 control offenders). The child/sex-IAT had a test–retest reliability of $r = .63 (p < .01)$. We note that this is excellent for a response-latency based measure and far exceeds some previous measurements of the stability of the IAT (for a review of these, see Nosek, Greenwald, & Banaji, 2005). Using the formula described by Cohen and Cohen (1982) for difference score measures and using each response latency as an item, the child/sex-IAT returned a value for Cronbach’s alpha of $.80$, which represents excellent internal reliability for a reaction time measure (Cunningham, Preacher, & Banaji, 2001).

**Denial**

For this analysis, we were interested in whether the association between child and sex demonstrated by the pedophile-type offenders would be moderated via denial. Hence, the next analysis is confined to those in the pedophile-type offender group.

*Previous offending.* Deniers did not differ from admitters in terms of number with a female victim (82% vs. 88%), whether the victims were known to the offender (66% vs. 39%) or whether they were incest offenders (34% vs. 22%; or 46% vs. 39% where this includes stepchildren). Admitters did have more victims per offender ($M = 2.73, SD = 1.75; \text{range 1-6}$) than deniers ($M = 1.47, SD = 0.72; \text{range 1-3}$), $t(45) = 3.53, p < .001$.

*Child/sex-IAT:* We addressed the degree to which the child/sex-IAT would differentiate between each of the two groups (deniers and admitters) and the control group. Child/sex-IAT $D$-scores for the admitters ($M = −0.134; SE = 0.079$) and deniers ($M = −0.210; SE = 0.056$) were both negative, whereas those for the controls were positive ($M = 0.137; SE = 0.055$). A one-way ANOVA with offender type (admitters, deniers, and controls) as a between-subjects factor showed a significant effect of offender type, $F(2, 103) = 11.1; p < .01; f = 0.47$. Simple effects tests confirmed that pedophilic men who admit their offences differed significantly to non-sexual offender controls ($p < .05; d = 0.75$) as expected. Analysis also showed that
the denier group differed significantly from the control group ($p < .01; d = 1.01$) but did not differ from the admmitter group ($p > 0.10; d = 0.27$). No significant effect of offender type was found on the control-IAT, $F(2, 101) = 0.7; p = .52; f = 0.1$.

**Discussion**

Our results are in accord with our previous report (Gray et al., 2005) in showing an implicit association between children and sex in certain sex offenders. Further, the present results used a shortened (two-stage) version of the task, a far larger sample than previous reports, and showed this basic result is not a result of any cognitive confound (e.g., an IQ effect). In tandem with independent replications of these results (Banse & Clarbour, 2007; van Leeuwen et al., 2009), and with conceptually similar data (Milhailides et al., 2004; Nunes et al., 2007), the results suggest that this is a robust finding, and that the IAT may be a valuable tool for research into the implicit associations related to sexual cognitions in sexual offenders.

Our main aim was to test two hypotheses with respect to associations between children and sex in child-sex offenders. First, previous experiments have classified child-sex offenders as either pedophilic (an erotic preference for prepubescent children) or hebephilic (an erotic preference for pubescent children). We hypothesized that these groups would show different associations relating to children and sex, with pedophiles showing an implicit association between these concepts, whereas the hebephiles would not. The hypothesis was confirmed.

Second, we hypothesized that the child-sex association revealed in the pedophile group would exist even if the pedophile-type offender denied his sexual offences. This hypothesis was confirmed in the sense that the pedophile-type offenders who were deniers had child/sex-IAT scores that differed from the control group, but did not differ from those who admitted their sexual offences. These results are consistent with work on other versions of the IAT showing that the IAT is resistant (though not impervious) to deliberate dissimulation (Banse et al., 2001; Cvencek et al., 2009; Egloff & Schmukle, 2002; Fiedler & Bluemke, 2005; Kim, 2003; Steffens, 2004).

The present results concerning cognitive associations between sex and children appear to mirror those that have examined erotic preferences via sexual arousal as measured by PPG (Freund & Blanchard, 1989). Therefore, we should ask if the IAT has anything more to offer than PPG already provides. We believe that it does. First, we should note that there are pragmatic considerations. PPG requires sensors to be placed on the penis, specialized recording equipment, training on how to test the offender and interpret the results (which is not standardized), the presentation of sexually explicit material, and long testing sessions. On the other hand our child/sex-IAT can be administered on a standard PC with little or no training, does not require any sensors to be placed on the body, can be administered in less than 10 minutes, and does not use sexually explicit material. Therefore, even if all other
factors were equal, the use of the IAT might be preferable due to these pragmatic factors. However, it seems likely that these two methods do not measure the same thing. PPG detects changes in penile circumference and is therefore a measure of sexual arousal, whereas IAT measures cognitive associations between concepts (in this case child and sex) and these are not the same thing (Everaerd & Laan, 1994; Janssen & Everaerd, 1993; Wormith, 1986). For instance, studies of hypogonadal men have shown that sex drive is absent in these men, yet sexual arousal (as defined by penile response) is intact (Bancroft, 1995). Clearly, an examination of implicit sexual cognitive associations in such men would be of interest. Furthermore, the IAT has tremendous flexibility that the PPG does not have. The IAT can be easily modified to measure other cognitive distortions related to sex (see Milhailides et al., 2004; Nunes et al., 2007) and exactly the same techniques can be used for both men and women. Further studies, which combine such techniques as PPG, self-report, and viewing times (e.g., Abel, Huffman, Warberg, & Holland, 1998; Glasgow, Osborne, & Croxen, 2003) are needed for a clearer understanding of the conceptual issues relating to these measures, and to the pattern of abnormal cognitions and arousal in sexual offenders.

Limitations

There are clearly some limitations to our study that need to be addressed in future research.

**Definition of groups.** We note that our definition of pedophile versus hebephile is not ideal and that direct measurement using PPG, or a more sophisticated examination of offending history such as the Screening Scale for Pedophilic Interests (Seto & Lalunière, 2001) would have been desirable. However, any misclassification would make the groups more similar and therefore our present result of a difference in child/sex-IAT scores between pedophile-type and hebephile-type offenders occurs despite, not because of, this limitation.

**Biases.** Our sample all volunteered to take part in this research and therefore might not be representative of all offenders. We also note that because we debriefed each participant as to the nature of our study straight after completion, there may well have been discussions between inmates as to whether to volunteer, or indeed what to do when being tested. It is important to note, however, that offenders were not informed as to the methodology of the IAT and were only informed as to the overall aims of the study.

**Research versus clinical consequences.** We found no effect relating to whether the participants denied or admitted to sexual offending against children on the
child/sex-IAT. We note that this was under conditions where the results of the test would have no consequence for the inmate. One cannot assume that the result will transfer to situations where there might be a greater motivation for the offender to dissimulate, such as when the results of the IAT would be placed on their files or have influence over parole decisions, and so on. Studies are needed in such clinical settings to test the veracity of implicit techniques under these more testing circumstances (for a discussion of faking the IAT in other settings, see Steffens, 2004).

**Child-sex associations versus lack of adult-sex associations.** Although we have presented our results as indicative of an increased association between the concepts of children and sex in pedophiles, the results could also be indicative of a decreased association between adults and sex, or some combination of these two factors. Further work using implicit tasks that can separately index sexual attraction to children and adults will be of value (e.g., Nosek & Banaji, 2001).

**Causal versus correlation.** Our results indicate an association between children and sex in pedophile-type offenders. The etiology of this association is unclear. It is possible that it arises as a by-product of offending and its aftermath. The offender would have been “labeled” a pedophile and may have to discuss their beliefs about children being sexual beings as part of their treatment program. However, two points seem to argue against this etiology. First, similar labels would have been attached to our hebephile-type group, yet they did not show child-sex associations. Second, our “denier” group was excluded from treatment programs by HM Prison Service, and still exhibited the same child-sex associations as the admitter group. We are not yet in a position to claim that these distorted cognitions were causal to the offending behavior or may be an indicator of future risk of sexual offences, though clearly this is a question that could be addressed.

**Risk assessment.** Although we have hinted that implicit cognitions may one day form part of the assessment of sexual offenders, it is also possible that level of risk may account for some of our results. Nunes et al. (2007) noted that the extent of the child-sex association on the IAT was correlated to a measure of future risk of sexual offending (Static-99; Hanson & Thornton, 2000). Thus, it is possible that the present results are not the consequence of a pedophile versus hebephile distinction but may reflect differences in risk status. Unfortunately, we did not take any such risk measure and cannot therefore dismiss this possibility. However, we note that our comparison of the previous offending characteristics of the pedophiles and hebephiles did not produce any marked differences.
Future Directions

We are not yet at the stage where implicit measures can be used in a clinical setting, but we would like to offer some suggestions with regard to the eventual aim of this research. Child molesters make efforts to avoid detection, attempt to prevent their victims reporting the offences, and develop intricate strategies to gain access to victims (Marshall et al., 1999; Marshall & Serran, 2000). Their success in this is evidenced by the imbalance between estimates of the prevalence of sexual victimization and the numbers of convictions for such offences (Grubin, Madsen, Parsons, Sosnowski, & Warberg, 2004; Wilcox & Sosnowski, 2005). Professionals working with sexual abusers are often hampered by offenders’ apparent poor insight into their own and their victims’ behavior before, during, and after abuse occurs (Craisatti, 1998; Marshall et al., 1999). Work with child sexual abusers aims to break down denial to allow behavior change and the assumption of responsibility (Craisatti, 1998; Lord & Willmot, 2004).

We suggest that the adoption of not only implicit measures such as the IAT, but also other implicit techniques such as viewing times (e.g., Glasgow et al., 2003) for assessment and therapeutic work with child-sex abusers may have beneficial effects. Results of implicit tests might be useful in therapy by demonstrating distorted cognitions (Marziano et al., 2006; Ward et al., 1997), or abnormal sexual attraction, in offenders that can then be addressed within therapeutic programs.

Appendix A
Appendix B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flower items</th>
<th>Insect items</th>
<th>pleasant</th>
<th>unpleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td>cancer</td>
<td>accident</td>
<td>ugly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>disaster</td>
<td>pollution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health</td>
<td>poverty</td>
<td>sickness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honest</td>
<td>sickness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accident</td>
<td>cancer</td>
<td>pollution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disaster</td>
<td>poverty</td>
<td>sickness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accident</td>
<td>cancer</td>
<td>pollution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disaster</td>
<td>poverty</td>
<td>sickness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td>cancer</td>
<td>pollution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>disaster</td>
<td>sickness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accident</td>
<td>cancer</td>
<td>pollution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disaster</td>
<td>poverty</td>
<td>sickness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td>cancer</td>
<td>pollution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>disaster</td>
<td>sickness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accident</td>
<td>cancer</td>
<td>pollution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disaster</td>
<td>poverty</td>
<td>sickness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td>cancer</td>
<td>pollution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>disaster</td>
<td>sickness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accident</td>
<td>cancer</td>
<td>pollution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disaster</td>
<td>poverty</td>
<td>sickness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td>cancer</td>
<td>pollution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>disaster</td>
<td>sickness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note

The child/sex-IAT once again produced significant differences between the groups, $F(2, 73) = 5.55; p < .01.$
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