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Preface

At the core of this exploratory research project, which sets out to examine community supervision of men convicted of sexual offences, is the introduction and development of a new model; the Sex Offender Risk Management Approach (SORMA). Essentially, SORMA describes a system of multi-agency risk management of sexual offenders in the community, and in so doing, utilizes the most convincing, comprehensive and influential research, models and theories that contribute to current thinking about control and treatment of sex offenders. In this concerted attempt to develop, through research, a model which harnesses the established value of credible and valid methods of intervention, the reader will recognise elements originating from key strands of celebrated work. SORMA is not, however, a simple re-arrangement of these existing contributing components. Vital as they are, they undergo critical analysis and are challenged, at times with considerable rigour to identify evidence to support existing claims of efficacy. SORMA does not add further conjecture to the existing and, some may say, complacent quasi-therapeutic treatment orthodoxy; rather, it disturbs it, to provide a reconsideration of the aims and purpose of the work, finding a broader context in which to examine these existing intervention strategies. The political and professional values that underpin this work are considered as are the ethical boundaries of probation supervision.

SORMA involves seven key components and each of these is explored in this work. The development of this model and the testing of it are detailed in the subsequent chapters. I will say no more about it at this point other than to invite the reader to consider these components together in their condensed form, for an oversight at this point will help to project the critical elements used to compose this research and fashion the outcomes. SORMA is:
1) Unambiguously concerned with Social Control
2) Clinical Treatment and Therapy
3) Situational Crime Prevention
4) Actuarial Risk Assessment and Management
5) Surveillance
6) Multi-Agency Collaboration
7) Maximisation of Legislative Authority.

These components are examined in Chapters 1 - 3 where they withstand analysis to provide the foundation for SORMA. This is presented as layered discussion guiding the reader through each separate area, whilst constructing the framework of the model itself. In the subsequent chapters, SORMA is fashioned, applied and discussed. Appearing as it does in the final chapter SORMA, as a processual model, becomes a practice utility ripe for implementation and further development.
CHAPTER 1

Professional Intervention With Sex Offenders:

Changing Structures and Ideologies Within Probation

Anyone unfamiliar with the current debate about methods of professional intervention with sex offenders may be rather concerned to realise that 'cure' is no longer considered a realistically achievable goal, at least not 'cure' in the medical sense. It would be a reassuring and welcome discovery if such a medical or psychiatric condition could be established and identified. Unfortunately, this is not so, except for a very few clearly recognisable cases where hypersexuality, head injury, psychosis or learning disability can be firmly linked to sexually abusive behaviour (Barker and Morgan 1993). The exact scale of sex offending can never be known, for reasons discussed later. New research and expertise are, however, emerging slowly to provide a more detailed landscape to our field of knowledge (see Saradjiian, 1995; National Children's Home, 1994; Kelly, 1992; Beckett, Beech, Fisher and Fordham, 1994).

Replacing the search for a cure is the exploration of strategies aimed at reducing the risk of further offending, and the issue of control is now the key concern of most intervention programmes for sex offenders (see for example West, 1987; Barker and Morgan, 1993).
This chapter begins by looking at the intervention strategies adopted by the English and Welsh probation service in supervising sex offenders. We examine what appears to be a rather narrow professional response concerned almost exclusively with provision of either individual casework or treatment programmes. This response has been developed at the cost of ignoring the wider application of preventative supervision and the potential which exists to prevent offending by means of external control. Expectations placed on the probation service by government are discussed, as are the traditional social work values that continue to influence probation practice generally, and, more specifically, its work with sex offenders. In conclusion it is suggested that the probation service could do much more to broaden its perspective in this work so bringing its practices more into line with the current research trends, to which reference has already been made. Despite an existing political agenda directing the probation service to use much greater initiative in its supervision of sex offenders, probation remains to a surprisingly large degree fixed on developing therapeutic strategies.

Sexual Offending and Professional Perceptions

Morrison (1994) in providing an historical account of the context in which professional intervention with sex offenders currently occurs, draws our attention to the 800% increase in the number of children at risk from sexual abuse on local authority child protection registers during the period 1983 to 1987. This increase can be accounted for by the development of registration practices, the introduction of child protection procedures and guidelines, an increasing professional appreciation of the risk presented to siblings of victims, and a greater public and professional awareness of sexual abuse, shaped in part by feminist consciousness-raising and political action (Herman, 1990). This period also witnessed the emergence of child sexual
abuse as a multi-agency concern, and an explosion of desire to protect and care for its victims. In contrast to this groundswell the criminal justice system appeared ineffective in identifying and controlling offenders, as, during the same period, prosecutions for sexual offences rose by only 17 per cent (Home Office, 1989). During this period the treatment services available to sex offenders were almost non-existent with few treatment services provided by the National Health Service.

This rapid increase of professional interest in dealing with sex offenders emerged not primarily from the criminal justice system but from the child protection agencies. This may with hindsight, have been a pivotal point in the development of current intervention strategies. Social work took hold of an emerging social problem and a solution was sought. Social work practitioners led the quest in this endeavour, leaving the policy makers and managers trailing along in their wake. Research into the effectiveness of treatment and other intervention methods, whilst obviously at a far more primitive stage than it is today, had little to offer those who fashioned the practice. It is not surprising then that commentators on this period should report that professionals working with sex offenders experienced a lack of support, supervision and leadership from their management (Cowburn and Wilson, 1992; Morrison, 1994).

The search for a solution gained momentum and was fuelled by the work of Ray Wyre and the Gracewell Clinic (Wyre, 1987). Cognitive behavioural treatment programmes had been discovered in the U.S.A. and were to have a major impact on the development of professional intervention strategies in the U.K. Social work had found a seemingly satisfactory solution to the problem. Practitioner led developments, however, run the risk of leaving behind an
organisational vacuum compounded by ill-informed and poorly equipped management, supervision and support. The enthusiasm for treatment initiatives was largely driven by ambitious pioneers whose work emerged in the field and was subsequently accepted as good practice.

The effectiveness of these treatment programmes is of obvious importance, not only to those in or alongside child protection work, but to a much wider audience. The government has shown great interest in research on treatment programmes and in 1990 the then Home Secretary announced plans to implement treatment programmes for sex offenders in prisons. Nevertheless, within this emerging orthodoxy of treatment, social work had little else to offer the criminal justice system in the struggle to control sex crime, and the probation service in particular largely failed to recognise, let alone utilise, its wide ranging powers of control not least because of its strong and continuing cultural, political and professional affiliation to social work.

Control of Sex Offending: Four Issues for Probation

Working with sex offenders is described by Cowburn and Wilson (1992) as presenting a fundamental challenge to the traditional social work position; namely to believe and respect the client's understanding of his/her experience. Traditional and libertarian workers within the probation service have formed an unexpected alliance in asserting that to challenge and undermine the client's world view is not the role of the probation officer. The desire to help rather than control has been the preferred practice option used by probation (see for example Fielding, 1984). It seems somehow inevitable that social work professionals would generally
favour this means of intervention. In particular, probation values have seldom extended to a concern for the victims of crime. The central focus has been the welfare of offenders and it is this that has maintained the probation service in a position which sets it apart from the other agencies involved in the criminal justice system.

Nevertheless, some probation officers who have pioneered work with sex offenders and continue under very difficult organisational constraints to deliver well structured and designed therapeutic programmes, would not see themselves as fitting (anything like) the mould of the "traditional probation officer". Ironically, they are promoting some of the most fundamental and traditional social work theories and values. Gocke (1995) provides a fascinating analysis of current values in this respect. Probation officers, although given the statutory authority to supervise sex offenders, have become embroiled in the 'Lombroso-istic' and socio-political endeavour to explain the cause rather than to deal with present behaviour. The 'why' preoccupation mirrors the positivist criminological stance of the 1960's and 1970's and is discussed further in Chapter 3. Feminist theory and behavioural psychology appear to have significant influence on probation work with sex offenders and shape the values that have come to be recognised as underpinning the practice but these too have frequently been presented within a methodologically eclectic but predominately positivist therapeutic paradigm.

Feminist theory maintains a stranglehold on the current understanding of sex offending but is challenged by increasing evidence that women commit sexual offences also, although not in significant numbers (see Saradijian, 1995; Kelly, 1991; National Children's Home, 1992). Feminist theory is fundamentally compromised by its failure to explain why most men do not
commit sexual offences. Those who do are seen as 'over-conforming' to societal pressures to exploit and dominate (see NAPO, 1990; Herman, 1990) but such an argument, whilst fitting neatly into feminist theory, to put it at its politest does not provide the further insight we seek.

Nonetheless, the contribution of feminist thought to our current understanding of sex offending must not be underestimated. The weight of evidence to support the feminist analysis of sex crime is considerable. Most known sex offenders are male and most known victims are female.

The research to reinforce this position is convincing (Ageton, 1983; Koss, Gidycz, and Wisniewski, 1987; Briere, Corne, Runtz and Malamuth, 1984; Rapaport and Burkhart, 1984; Finkelhor and Lewis, 1987; Brownmiller, 1975). As well as providing a potentially, and often actually fruitful explanation for the existence of sex crime, feminist writers such as Herman (1990) point to the use of preventative measures in an attempt to reduce offending.

"Vigorous enforcement of existing criminal laws prohibiting sexual assault might also be expected to have some preventative effect since both compulsive and opportunistic offenders are keenly sensitive to external controls".

(Herman, 1990 p.188)

Feminist thought supports the use of external methods of control in the supervision of sex offenders. However, this creates several personal and professional difficulties for those probation officers who, despite demonstrating an affiliation with feminist politics, resist changes in probation practice for fear of occupational loss (for example see NAPO, 1990).
Behavioural psychology offers probation an increasingly jargonistic and elaborate explanation of why sex offending occurs and what to do about it (see for example Houston and Adshead, 1993; Leonard, 1993; Beckett, Beech, Fisher and Fordham, 1994). Using an established addictions model of behaviour first developed in the 1970's, behavioural psychology can provide both practical and technical insight which may indicate useful treatment issues to the worker. Such an approach is attractive as it dictates a prescribed system for analysis and intervention. It also seems to make sense of a confusing aspect of human behaviour. However, it tends to invest almost all of its potential value in the offender, who it is hoped will become, in many respects, a self-controlling unit. The reliability of this control hinges on the offender's continued motivation to refrain. Behavioural psychology does, of course, provide a valuable glimpse of the internal control which a sex offender may potentially use to curb sexually abusive behaviours but, by regarding the offender as the centre of the therapeutic universe, cannot of itself address the social context within which he both lives and offends.

Having found what appears to it to be an acceptable and ethically sound approach to the problem of sex offending, the probation service may be reluctant to move from this position or even explore alternative propositions. After all the rehabilitative stance has seldom before been seen to warrant re-appraisal within the probation service (though for one such re-appraisal see Bottoms and McWilliams (1979)).

It is person centred, it is therapeutic and there is no evidence, as yet, to suggest that it does any particular harm; indeed, early small scale research projects promise that 'optimism' may be appropriate (see later). In the past this has been the criterion of acceptability for probation
initiatives with no greater certainty or potential being required. I suggest however, that such a stance is an underutilisation of expensive resourcing and a narrow-minded approach on the part of management, policy makers and practitioners. Too often, for example, probation supervision has been seen as synonymous with treatment and an example of this can be seen in Barker and Morgan (1993) where the intended aim of their work was to look at 'supervision' but they pursued only 'treatment'. Supervision and treatment are not the same, however, and there is a danger in regarding the two as such. Sex offender treatment takes place usually within the much broader statutory structure of probation supervision which yields other opportunities for control. Treatment programmes have become a specialist concern within probation and may hold effective long term value as a means of utilising internal control of sex offenders.

There may also be value in exploring other opportunities for control within the structure of probation supervision. External measures of control extend concern with sex offending further than the dimensions of individual pathology and place it in the context of the offender's involvement with the community. Some treatment programmes include work on relapse prevention strategies which, theoretically reach into the daily activities and community interactions of the offenders. Self control though remains the absolute strength in this (see Chapter 2).

To begin to look at whether or not external control has a place in probation supervision of sex offenders requires a re-evaluation of current treatment centred philosophy and a return to the origins of the theories and disciplines that impact on the work. This would include examining the theories and models currently used to explain sex offending. It would also involve a similar
analysis of the role and purpose of the probation service within the criminal justice system. Further to this it may help to contextualize sex offending within a solution focused orientation involving the imposition of external control by the use of 'safeguards'. (Safeguards are defined as reliable, although not necessarily absolute, intervention strategies which help to prevent and detect offending). A criminological analysis of sex crime would extend the range of possible intervention strategies beyond those currently conceived of, never mind implemented.

There can be little doubt that the overall aim of probation supervision of sex offenders, is to prevent them committing further offences. To achieve this, intervention strategies beyond those already discussed are worthy of consideration. Prevention and/or reduction in crime is the most fundamental purpose of criminal justice and is not the exclusive territory of any single agency within the criminal justice system. As the left realist criminologists have not been slow to acknowledge, crime prevention is as much the responsibility of the community as of the criminal justice system (see for example Young, 1994). In this respect the probation service is indeed a central authority, for it involves itself in the assessment of crime and the supervision of criminals in the community. As Harris (1992) points out, if the probation service is to be asked to extend its work more into the community, then its employees should be versed in some of the rapidly developing literature on crime prevention.

Crime prevention and child protection are no strangers. Agencies have been collaborating for almost 10 years to co-ordinate a system of crime prevention which includes joint training,
exchange of information, managing enquiries and developing inter-agency policies and procedures. Working with sex offenders is no doubt part of child protection work and therefore by definition is already an integral component of a crime prevention initiative. Not all sex offenders represent a risk to children but the principles of protection applied to the public generally do not require such an enormous shift of rationale.

Situational crime prevention is based on the theory that crime is related to opportunity; make it harder to commit and crime will reduce (see for example Clarke, 1980). Harris (1992) underscores this statement as being rather obvious but adds a caveat regarding the motivational influence of the offender. If the crime appears to be pathological, or, conversely, if it is systematic and planned then there may be reservations about such a model of crime prevention not least in respect of possible displacement effects. But whilst pathology would seem to have only limited or connective relevance for the vast majority of recorded offences, there is widespread agreement that most sex offending against adults as well as children is carefully planned. So, are sex offending and situational crime prevention incompatible? Chapter 3 discusses how situational crime prevention can lend its major principle of opportunity restriction to become offender specific.

Single and Multi-factor Theories and Models used to Explain Sexual Offending: Opportunities for External Control

To examine how to prevent and control sexual offending it is important to refer to existing explanations. These are referred to by West (1987) as being at a primitive level and are easier to
propound than to validate as they possess little or no empirical support. In contrast, Fisher (1994) refers to the same theories and models as 'helpful', 'comprehensive' and 'useful'. I do not propose simply to reproduce these theories and models but have reviewed their direct relevance to the particular opportunities for control that they reveal. We must therefore revisit these models and examine them to see what insight they can provide into the external dimensions of sex offending. We need to be able to look beyond the personal interaction of abuse to discover the territory for external control. If we can achieve this, then scope exists to develop this insight and facilitate interest towards broadening probation supervision to address it. The offence and not just the individual pathology may then become the central concern. If we discover that such opportunities exist then we might ask why they have remained so underutilized for so long.

Explanations of Sex Offending

Sexual offending covers a spectrum of diverse sexual behaviour from 'public nuisance' type offending such as obscene phone calling and indecent exposure to those more serious and disturbing offences which involve acts of torture and murder. It is not surprising that there exist a number of theoretical explanations as to why and how these offences are committed, - for example, psychodynamic (Freud, 1948), sociological (Herman, 1981), biological (Goodman, 1987) and behavioural (Laws and Marshall, 1990). These have come to be known as single factor theories and are regarded now as 'inadequate' (Fisher, 1994) to account for all types of sexual offending.
Beyond these single factor theories are several multi-factor models which offer a much broader perspective and explanation of causal factors that may reveal the external control opportunities we seek. The two models which have done the most to influence contemporary thinking about sexual offending in the U.K. are those of the American writers Finkelhor (1984) and Wolf (1984). These models provide the basis for an analysis of the development of both the criminal behaviour and of the process whereby the offence takes place. It is this latter element of the models which may reveal the potential for external control and prevention strategies. Wolf examines the social, developmental, situational and cultural factors which an individual may have experienced, and identifies a certain type of personality that can develop as a result of early childhood experiences of neglect, family dysfunction, emotional abuse, physical abuse, sexual abuse and victimisation that can pre-dispose an individual to commit sexual offences. Wolf proposes that it is the exposure to attitudes of abuse of any sort that provides the potential to offend, rather than personal experience of abuse. Wolf refers to these early experiences as 'potentiators', (Wolf, 1984) and explains that they can act to lessen inhibitions against deviant sexual behaviour such as social taboos, harm to victims and of greatest significance to this study the fear of being detected. This model has so far explained that a variety of early experiences may increase the likelihood of a person committing a sexual offence. The suggestion that fear of detection is an inhibitor against sexual offending will be explored in much greater depth later in this work; Wolf's point is that the lack of fear of detection is a disinhibitor for sexual offending. If this is so, it must follow that increasing the risk of detection will enforce the strength of the inhibition, and so reduce the likelihood of offending. Other inhibitors mentioned in this model rely to a greater extent on the willingness and motivation of the offender to receive help and exercise self control. The potential for deception, however, is much greater, and it may
be naive to rely solely on the offender's continued co-operation to prevent further offending. To Wolf the more potentiators present the greater the chance of the person becoming a sexual offender. The personality may develop certain facets including egocentricity, poor self image, defensiveness, distorted thinking and obsessive thoughts and behaviour, and the individual may become socially isolated and sexually preoccupied, to the extent of sexualising the behaviour of others. Other disinhibitors may include alcohol, drugs or pornography (see for example Diamond, 1980). These and similar factors can be monitored. In the U.S.A. for example, many sex offender programmes conduct urine analysis for traces of intoxicants and also have the statutory power to search for and seize pornography (Pithers, Martin and Cumming, 1989). There is no such measure of external control here in the U.K.. To demonstrate the relationship between these factors Wolf has developed the addiction cycle model which was first used to help explain sex offending by Lane and Zamora (1978) who applied it in their work with juveniles. Wolf refers to this as the 'sexual assault cycle' - see fig. 1.

This cycle is best explained by assuming that it commences at the 12 o'clock position. Having a poor self image and lack of ability to deal with stress and problems, the offender compensates by inappropriate coping strategies derived from distorted thinking. Failure and rejection are expected and in an attempt to defend against this the person withdraws to effect isolation. To accommodate this sense of self imposed isolation the person may attempt to make himself feel better through escapist sexual fantasies which create a feeling of control. These fantasies may involve deviant sexual activities and be reinforced by masturbation. Distorted thinking once again aids the maintenance of the position and direction in the cycle by displacing feelings of guilt which may be experienced from the deviant fantasies. The next phase in the 'cycle' is one
Figure 1 - Wolf's Sexual Assault Cycle
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that has the greatest bearing on the application of external control. The person, who until now has seemingly contained the deviant thoughts and feelings and who may have not yet attracted the attention of any other party, begins to plan an offence. This is referred to as ‘grooming’. At this stage potential victims and key people who may protect the victim are the focus of varying degrees of elaborate planning to ensure the least risk of detection. Once achieved, the outlet or offence becomes a reinforcement overwhelming any transitory feelings of guilt. Further distorted thinking helps the offender overcome the increasingly poor self image which started the cycle and may propel him on to commit further offences.

Despite being one of the most influential models currently used to explain sex offending Wolf's cycle has limited application. Many offenders may have characteristics which do not fit such an explanation. The model fails to provide an adequate explanation for why victims of physical abuse may perpetrate sexual instead of physical abuse, or why many people with a history of victimisation do not become sex offenders. Nevertheless, from our perspective Wolf's model introduces the idea of imposing controls at the grooming stage so as to increase the chances of detection and decrease the available opportunities for offending. It thus becomes a central underpinning of the method applied in the experimental phase.

Finkelhor (1984) also provides a framework which facilitates analysis of both offender and offending. His ‘4-factor framework’ can help explain why adults become sexually interested in children:

Factor I relates to the ‘emotional congruence’ that a sexual offender against children may demonstrate. For example, the offender might favour the company of children to adults as they
may be less assertive and threatening; factor 2 concerns the sexual arousal to children as a physiologically measured preference to adults. However, as yet the available research on offenders' sexual preferences lacks consistent findings to validate this aspect of the framework; factor 3 refers to blockage of appropriate sexual and emotional outlets. Blockage has two possible impacts on the offender. Developmental blockage describes how the offender may experience difficulty in relating to adults, particularly female adults, where the offender may demonstrate sexual anxieties and poor social skills; situational blockage refers to situations where an appropriate relationship exists but where there is restricted or no sexual contact with that person; factor 4 addresses the question of why offenders overcome those normal inhibitions which prevent sexual offending against children. Lack of impulse control and use of disinhibiting substances can be involved; and the offender has either not had the inhibiting mechanism in the first place or has adapted a circuitous route to overcoming it.

This 4-factor framework offers little insight into the possible application of external control. It describes in the main an individual profile of the offender and identifies certain 'fixed' variables about the offender's personality. Factor 3 may suggest that a controlling influence can be produced from an appropriate adult relationship, but, there is no explanation as to why a child should be targeted for abuse unless sexual arousal to children is present in the first place. The only other glimpse of opportunity arises in factor 4 where we can see that disinhibiting substances can increase the likelihood of the offender losing or overcoming their self-control. Nevertheless, while we fail to derive much preventative gain from this 4-factor framework we have to recognise its value to those concerned with the treatment and assessment of sex
offenders. It has undoubtedly been a major influence in the current professional intervention with sex offenders for all its lack of persuasiveness as a causal theory.

In contrast, the second of Finkelhor's propositions, the 4-pre-condition model, provides a useful explanation of the process associated with sexual offending against children, and one which provides the best opportunity to examine the potential benefits of using external control to help manage the risk presented by sex offenders. Whilst Finkelhor's model was developed with offenders against children in mind it has strong implications for work with other types of sex offenders also.

1. Motivation To Abuse Sexually:

This is a similar starting point to the one indicated earlier by Wolf (1984). To Finkelhor, motivation to offend is an accepted predisposing factor of the offender's character and personality. The original source of the motivation may be traced to earlier life experiences or the offender's current situation. Arousal to inappropriate stimuli exists and attempts to redress the offender's experiences can modify the motivation to abuse. This can influence the modelling of an external control strategy. The awareness that an offender is aroused by specific 'deviant' stimuli introduces an opportunity to examine the exact nature of victim preference. To identify who it is that most needs to be protected is the starting point for control and protection.

Information that may help to treat individual offending can also form the basis of a public protection strategy which supports the common aims of treatment. It may be possible to use the same assessment information to plan treatment for the individual offender and to implement an
external safeguard which does not have to rely on the continued co-operation and honesty of the offender. In this sense, an awareness of the offender's motivation is the foundation of risk management.

2. **Overcoming Internal Inhibitions:**

Internal inhibitors such as conscience doubtless prevent many sexual offences from being committed. Sex offenders, however, typically develop techniques to neutralise these internal inhibitors, for example by convincing themselves of factors which excuse or justify their behaviour, or by the use of disinhibitors such as drugs and alcohol. Most treatment initiatives attempt to convince the offender that they have allowed themselves to offend by relying on distorted thinking and then supplant the distortions with 'factual' interpretations of a kind which may hitherto have been evaded. This element of the 4 stage model relies heavily on the co-operation of the offender, and offenders who maintain a high level of motivation to participate in treatment may well benefit from such intervention. It would, however, be naive to rely too much on the estimated integrity of an offender and the value of treatment, and scope also exists to control an offender's use of drugs and alcohol and to restrict certain activities which may reinforce beliefs that women and children are sexual objects; such as membership of pornography groups or live sex clubs or the possession of normally legal child erotica.

3. **Overcoming External Inhibitions:**

This dimension of the model is similar to the planning and grooming phase of Wolf's sexual assault cycle. Having overcome internal inhibitors the offender must create a situation in which an offence can be committed. This involves overcoming obstacles to offending such as the presence of non offending adults, so planning to gain uninterrupted access to victims commonly occurs. Typical techniques are babysitting and organising children's activities. This stage of
Finkelhor's model provides the greatest scope for external control and the management of risk. Maintaining active surveillance and supervision while limiting opportunities and restricting access to potential victims can either contribute to a mode of supervision which also involves treatment, or can constitute a prevention programme in its own right. The approach adopted at this stage of the model involves relapse prevention - in other words helping the offender to avoid 'risky' situations. A risk management programme seeks both to convince the offender of the risk involved with specific behaviour and to prevent and police opportunities to offend.

4. Overcoming The Resistance Of The Victim:
This final stage describes how offenders may befriend a target, sometimes going to extraordinary lengths to bribe or threaten them, sometimes by physical violence. The offender may target a particular child or type of child and develop a sophisticated ability to identify particularly vulnerable victims. The treatment aim is to convince the offender of the abuse of trust and power used in such offending and to help develop a greater sense of empathy. Access to potential victims is controlled and monitored in a risk management programme.

These two multifactoral models, Wolf (1984) and Finkelhor (1984) give clear direction to treatment and help to establish a theoretical foundation for strategies of external control. We now consider why such intervention methods are so underutilized by the probation service.

Supervision: Treatment and Control

Probation supervision needs to broaden its concern with sex crime both by enhancing the professional recognition that more can be done to prevent crime and as a result of the current political necessity for each criminal justice agency to demonstrate greater efficiency and
effectiveness. As crime remains a major public concern and political issue, pressure in this latter direction can be expected to continue, raising, among other matters, the question of whether structural change to the service is required, or whether the existing mandate for probation supervision is adequate.

The legal mandate upon which the majority of the work with sex offenders in the community is based yields a few clues as to the purpose of supervision and the aims, in this respect, of the probation service. The statutory purpose of supervision under a probation order is defined in Section 2(1) of the Powers of Criminal Courts Act 1973 (as substituted by Section 8(1) of the 1991 Act) as:

- securing the rehabilitation of the offender
- protecting the public from harm from the offender, or
- preventing the offender from committing further offences

(Home Office, 1995)

Against this background, strategies for the work of the probation service with sex offenders have been developed. Two principal aims have been identified for the probation service;

- the protection of the public, particularly potential victims, through the effective supervision of offenders;
- the reduction of the risk of re-offending.

(Home Office, 1992a)
This mandate does little to clarify the precise requirement for action by the probation service. Its vagueness allows for enormous scope of interpretation and conflicting emphasis by individual officers, ranging from providing a social work service to effect rehabilitation to concentrating on community protection initiatives. Almost anything can, in short, be justified by the same statement of purpose. Despite this wide availability of valid intervention strategies, there is a certain artful consonance in the probation service's interpretation of this mandate "to protect the public by rehabilitating the offender". As a result 'community supervision' appears primarily to equal 'social work help', and few opportunities for applying external controls are exploited.

Rehabilitation is clearly a legitimate concern of the probation service. Rehabilitation has once again come to the forefront in discussions about the effectiveness of the probation service in view of recent interest in investing both financially and professionally in the 'What Works' approach to practice (see for example McGuire, 1995; Roberts, 1995), after a decade in which rehabilitation was rather overshadowed by diversion (see Raynor, 1996; Mair, 1996).

Rehabilitation refers to rather more than delivery of social work help to offenders.

"rehabilitation is a change in the offender's attitude, produced by the state intervention due to his criminal conviction and resulting in a willingness to refrain from criminal acts".

(Clear and O'Leary, 1983)
In an effort to expand this definition the authors explain that intervention may derive from a number of factors which motivate the offender to refrain, including fear of being caught and punished again, insight into emotional causes of criminal behaviour and access to socially legitimate opportunities whilst being punished. In short, the desired aim of rehabilitation is that the offender chooses to refrain from committing further offences.

Rehabilitation is not, however, a universally fashionable concept. May and Vass (1996) for example, claim that it is now a thing of the past; but their model of 'rehabilitation' is based largely on individual casework which attempted to correct the psychological maladjustment thought to be the primary cause of offending behaviour. This ignores the extent to which 'rehabilitation' is increasingly sought by other means, such as social skills training.

McWilliams (1986) documented the emergence of elements of control which have entered the professional arena. Political, economic and social pressures have impacted on successive governments to question and sometimes modify methods used to deal with crime and criminal behaviour. Fresh, cost effective methods of crime control were sought as law and order began to feature high on the political agenda. Control, whether of a custodial kind or not, has become the favoured response to the problems which arise from crime.

Control, however, is seen by some (Vass, 1982; Lacey, Pendleton and Read, 1983; May, 1991;) as undermining the professional - therapeutic movement in working with offenders and replacing it with what is described as a punishment - administrative phase, and by others, Harris (1992) as raising a number of contradictions for the probation service involving care and
control, liberation and constraint. But in truth the division of 'care' and 'control' is not so clear or precise as these writers imply. As well as creating access to socially legitimate sources through learning social skills and acquiring a heightened emotional awareness and self control, motivation to refrain depends also on factors such as fear of detection and restriction of opportunity, and there seems no reason in principle why acknowledgement of this within probation supervision, and accordingly the adoption of these elements of crime control, should present the service with insurmountable professional or ethical difficulties.

The statement of purpose and the aims of probation supervision as outlined earlier would certainly not draw any such distinction, and any decision not to pursue control has been largely professional. However, the probation service has a crucial role to play in this area of crime control.

The first step is to acknowledge that working with sex offenders is ultimately about rehabilitation. If reduction in recidivism can be achieved by persuading the offender to refrain from creating further victims then so much the better. If there are doubts about the offender's motivation to refrain from offending, and healthy scepticism is the bread and butter of those who work in criminal justice, further help can be provided for the offender through reducing opportunities for offending and raising awareness of the possibility of detection. To increase motivation to refrain from offending is a necessary aim for the probation service and remains, in essence, rehabilitative. As Young has noted, however:

"Traditionally ... a therapeutic approach to policy has contrasted with an emphasis on deterrence ... Such an opposition has no
logical basis, for if positivism is based on a motivational
structure generated by punishments and rewards in the process
of primary socialization, there is no reason why such punishments
and rewards (including deterrence) should not be effective in
later life".

(Young, 1994 p. 98)

Other professional agencies share the same concern, indeed the general public may have the
most significant concern of all. Appreciation of this and the will to work with other agencies to
prevent offending are the foundations of multi-agency crime prevention and child protection
work. The probation service finds itself in a central position in this respect, having
responsibility for statutory supervision with redress to the courts in the event of non-
compliance. No other agency has such power and control over the offender.

The probation officer may attract the co-operation of the other agencies and the public who have
an obvious interest in promoting crime control, as well as acquiring a wealth of intelligence and
predictive material concerning the nature and degree of risk. The value of this information to
other agencies is not to be underestimated; equally, neither is the contribution that other
agencies such as the police and social services can make to the task of probation supervision.

During July and August 1995 probation officers supervised 7109 sex offenders (Association of
Chief Officers of Probation, 1996), an average of 132 offenders per service. Approximately
half of these sex offenders were in prison, one fifth were receiving post release supervision, and
one third were serving community sentences. Accordingly the probation service had statutory responsibility for the supervision of 3,080 convicted sex offenders in the community. However, the same survey indicates that the service had the capacity to provide treatment programmes for less than 65% of these offenders; less than half of available treatment programmes involved relapse prevention instruction, and as such were considered by the government's STEP Research Team (Beckett, Beech, Fisher and Fordham, 1994) to be unlikely to be effective with serious sex offenders. It follows that in 1995 the majority of convicted sex offenders supervised in the community by the probation service, including many who presented the highest risk, were receiving no treatment, or treatment considered to be ineffective.

We now turn to a consideration of the respective merits of treatment facilities and enhanced supervision. 'Enhanced supervision' refers to the use of potential methods of external control intended to reduce the likelihood of an offence being committed by an identified offender. First, treatment is not effective in the case of all sex offenders and if it were then there would not be enough treatment programmes available. Enhanced supervision aimed at placing specific restrictions on sex offenders has, however, been shown to produce impressive results (see later) and can be applied through the existing statutory framework for supervision, and to all offenders.

Second, consent is required from the offender before statutory and therapeutic intervention can be considered. When this is not clearly defined, the scope for non-compliance and avoidance can become considerable. Enhanced supervision does not require consent from the offender additional to that statutorily required for existing community supervision, - though of course
additional requirements attached to probation orders do require consent and must be clearly defined (see Jarvis, 1995; Stone, 1994).

Third, treatment programmes are increasingly collaborative in nature, and with this comes a greater appreciation of the multi-agency approach to child protection (see Association of Chief Officers of Probation, 1996). However, the potential of enhanced supervision goes well beyond partnership with other agencies to protect children, to utilizing resources of a great number of organisations to transcend their own responsibilities by focusing collectively, rather than narrowly, on a shared objective - crime prevention and protection of the public.

Fourthly, the key figure in a treatment regime is the offender, whose behaviour determines the effectiveness of the treatment. It is not realistic to expect offenders in correctional treatment programmes to be completely honest about their level of motivation to comply with treatment goals. In contrast the key figures in enhanced supervision are the professionals involved and the strength of the interaction and communication between them. This is not to remove responsibility for offending from the offender - far from it - but to provide a more reliable source of information on which to manage the level of risk presented by the offender.

Fifth, treatment to a large extent remains an activity which takes place in the treatment room. Relapse prevention, although still absent from most treatment programmes, has to be discussed in the abstract, and is too seldom informed by the more complete, accurate and better informed portrayal of risk that can be provided by those agencies who work in the offender's own community. Enhanced supervision through multi-agency risk management can offer this by
involving other agencies in risk assessment and management. The offender remains central in such an initiative, and fully and actively aware of the involvement of these agencies and other key figures such as family members. This awareness has, we will see, been shown to have had a beneficial effect in the rehabilitation process.

It is not necessary, of course, to see enhanced supervision and treatment as separate initiatives which stem from opposite ends of probation officers' continuum of legitimate intervention strategies, and to do so is to over-simplify two converging models which share the common aim of prevention. The potential of enhanced supervision of sex offenders requires closer analysis and evaluation, however, so as to indicate its potential value. Hence in Chapter 2 we discuss the various forms of control available for supervising sex offenders, as well as the potential for tracking high risk offenders beyond the period of statutory supervision.

Enhanced supervision is not a new concept to the probation service. Intensive probation supervision has been the subject of debate and research for over 20 years, both in England & Wales, and the USA. Having reviewed this research Graham Smith the Chief Inspector of Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation identified 3 characteristics common to intensive probation supervision (Smith, 1994). First, contact between the probation officer and offender is greater with intensive probation supervision than with traditional supervision. This can be achieved either directly, or indirectly, and the probation officer is only one element in the range of available contact points. Increased contact ultimately results in
increased surveillance. The amount of contact may vary between programmes, but what seems to be the important factor is that it is prescribed and enforced.

Second, intensive supervision has to be time limited, and this has to be defined within the supervision contract between the probation officer and offender. It does not require the offender's consent, only his knowledge.

The third characteristic is a treatment imperative and integrity which has to be strictly observed by the worker and understood by the offender. Meeting expectations and delivering a prescribed programme of supervision, which should be clearly part of a contract established at the commencement of the order are fundamental to its character and purpose (Smith, 1994).

However, in the USA the nature of the supervision task has been identified and described very differently from the way in which it is practised in England & Wales. Social work is not the primary focus and although 'multi-goals' are often identified by programme developers in the USA these are more likely to be punishment, cost effectiveness, diversion and recidivism reduction.
Clear and Hardyman (1990) describe intensive probation supervision in the USA as "unapologetically strict" with home visits at night, twice weekly contact, community service and restitution, curfews, urine monitoring and electronic surveillance. They also report that staff who delivered these programmes experienced a high level of job satisfaction, welcoming what they regarded as a more worthwhile job. In addition, there are claims of effectiveness from intensive probation supervision research in the USA (see for example, Byrne and Kelly, 1989, Petersilia, 1990; Petersilia and Turner, 1990). They reported on the effectiveness of projects such as the Californian Experimental Special Intensive Patrol Unit which, quite typically, uses a combination of rehabilitation and deterrence.

In contrast, research conducted in England & Wales has failed, so far, to establish convincing evidence for the effectiveness of intensive probation supervision. Folkard, Smith and Smith (1976) report on the Intensive Matched Probation and Aftercare Treatment (IMPACT) which failed to improve re-conviction rates for offenders who participated. Increased social work did not seem to improve the effectiveness of probation supervision. There were however, methodological problems with this study, and subsequent re-analysis (encouraged by developments in meta-analytic techniques) has suggested that the overall 'broadly neutral' effect may have been an artefact of a conglomeration of positive and negative effects of supervision on different kinds of offender by different kinds of programme (Nuttall, 1998).
Rather similarly and most recently Mair, Lloyd, Nee and Sibbit (1994) report on the Home Office sponsored research into 8 intensive probation programmes. They found that whilst all of the programmes carried the same I.P. label they had very little in common and had not followed Home Office guidance on implementation. Re-conviction data have not as yet been published.
Assessment, Prediction and Management of Risk: Issues for Probation Practice

In order to supervise sex offenders effectively there is a need to determine how best to use available resources. As most such offenders will not be amenable to treatment, as we have seen, accurate selection of those expected to benefit needs to be undertaken. Supervision, however, must be co-ordinated for all sexual offenders who find themselves the subject of statutory control, not least in order to extract maximum value from available resources. To do this, sequential decisions are required in each case to determine how best to achieve the stated aims of supervision. Reducing the risk of re-offending and protecting the public require an estimate of the nature and level of risk presented by the offender and the potential consequences of this for the public.

The assessment and management of risk have become central probation tasks following legislative changes to early release arrangements, community supervision and the use of custody (Wasik and Taylor, 1991; Criminal Justice Act, 1991). Home Office National Standards (Home Office, 1995) provide clear guidance on the requirement for the assessment of both risk of re-offending and of harm to the public in pre-sentence reports, and management of community supervision cases. Probation practice in relation to the nature of risk, risk perception and assessment, and the differing methods for assessing and managing risk, have been identified as revealing various shortcomings and requiring further knowledge (Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation, 1995).
Is it the case then that predictive technology exists which, if applied to sexual offenders, will tell us the likelihood of that person re-offending and the nature of the re-offence? If we could identify and apply such a technique would it reduce the risk? In an examination of the issues relating to the definition, analysis and perception of risk, Kemshall (1996) argues that risk is best understood as an uncertain prediction about future behaviour, the outcome of which may be harmful or negative. Risk assessment is the calculation of probability that a harmful behaviour or event will occur, whom it will affect, and the frequency of occurrence. Danger describes the actual or potential exposure to harm, or the presentation of harm by certain individuals or circumstances. Risk analysis involves identifying the predisposing factors, situational triggers and hazards which may lead to harm. Risk perception describes the subjective response by assessors who will have organisationally specific influences which will affect assessment outcome. These are useful definitions and help to clarify the exact nature of the terms used.

Let us now look at what is known about risk assessment and the accuracy of its application. The science of managing offenders in the community is inexact (Harris, 1992; Hood and Sparks, 1970; Mair, 1989; Farrington and Farling, 1985; Creamer and Williams, 1996). Unfortunately, this extends to the prediction of risk in the supervision of sex offenders (see Fisher, 1994; Marshall, 1996; and Finkelhor, 1984). What is known, however, is that variables can be identified which increase the probability that a sexual offender may be reconvicted of a sexual offence. If we examine these variables it may be possible to draw conclusions as to the likelihood, in individual cases, of re-offending and so make an informed guess as to the level and nature of risk presented by the offender and in what circumstances.
However, before proceeding it is worth mentioning the very low rate of reporting of sexual crimes and the equally low rate of conviction. It is estimated that only around 5%-10% of sexual crime is reported to the police (Kelly, Regan and Burton, 1991; Hough and Mayhew, 1985) and of those the conviction rate is an estimated 1% (Russell, 1984). So we only know a little about a few sex offenders. Nonetheless, a significant percentage of the sexual offenders that we are aware of will be reconvicted, and although there is little the probation service can do to prevent the unknown majority of sexual abusers from offending, there are ways in which known offenders can be treated and supervised which will reduce the risk to which some potential victims are exposed.

In order to examine which sexual offenders present the highest level of risk to the public it is necessary to turn to research drawn mainly from reconviction, self report and victim studies. There are two established methods for assessing risk - clinical assessment and actuarial assessment. Clinical assessment is derived from case-based work and is carried out by a professional worker on an individual. Actuarial risk assessment is based on statistical analysis of information taken from sample groups of the population (Kemshall, 1996). These two methods have been compared for their accuracy over several years and overall actuarial risk prediction has the greater success rate (Mair, 1994), - though clinicians vary enormously in their individual success and some of these may consistently out-perform the actuarial method of statistical prediction.

The most useful role for actuarial assessment is to address the question of which group of offenders, within the limits of a minimum amount of common variables, is most likely to be
reconvicted. Success is currently measured at around 40% (Arthur, 1971; Gottfredson and Gottfredson, 1993), although other claims reach 80% accuracy (Hanson, Steffy and Gauthier, 1995). In contrast, the most useful application of clinical assessment is in assessing and understanding why risky behaviours occur and therefore how to address them. Used together the two methods reveal complementary relational dynamics, though caution is required, as each of these approaches has serious methodological problems that can lead to error and bias (Kemshall, 1996). An appreciation of these problems is essential, as all professionals have an ethical duty firstly to do no harm (primum non nocere) (Harris, 1992). Clinical assessment relies on the subjective views of the assessor whose opinion will have been influenced by sometimes limited interviewing and observational approaches; self report information is even more unreliable; statistical data are often ignored; causal inferences sometimes ascribed where none exists; and an actuarial statistical risk prediction relies on the assessment of the behaviour of purposely chosen and normally atypical groups (usually male prisoners). Predictive errors from both of these methods can therefore be considerable, and, in the case of both false positives and false negatives, lead to practical mistakes which are costly in human as well as financial terms.

A combination of clinical and actuarial risk assessment provides the best approach to policy and practice. For sex offenders clinical assessment is now almost invariably a multi-agency procedure (Cowburn and Wilson, 1992; Fisher, 1994; Beckett, 1994; Morrison, 1994; Barker, 1996). Probation officers have responsibility for the supervision of sexual offenders within the multi-agency forum, as do various other professionals in related but operationally separate contexts. The scope then for access to opinion and information is favourable, at least for cases
involving the sexual abuse of children. The actuarial assessment method of use with sexual
offenders has recently been fine tuned and in this respect is rather advanced when compared to
similar methods used for other offender categories (see Thornton and Travers, 1991; Fisher and
that we are working in the context of an inexact science and that actuarial risk assessment,
returning an estimated 80% success rate, out performs the clinicians' attempts to predict the
likelihood of further offending, caution is required when looking at how best to gauge the level
and nature of risk presented by sexual offenders. Both assessment methods need to be applied
together in individual cases. The actuarial data that can be most reliably used to inform a
clinical assessment are these:

Setting aside sex offending for a moment, the following variables have been identified as
having the greatest significance in terms of reconviction generally:

- Age
- Number of previous convictions
- Previous appearance rate
- Offence type
- Average number of previous convictions per appearance
- Number of Youth Custody sentences
- Sex

(Copas, Ditchfield and Marshall, 1994)
To be more specific for the purposes of this enquiry we can also look at the work of Beckett, Beech, Fisher and Fordham (1994) who applied a modified version of Thornton's algorithm (Thornton and Travers, 1991; Fisher and Thornton, 1993) in their sex offender treatment programme research for the Home Office. This algorithm was used to work out 'risk of re-offence' levels for the subjects in their sample (ie 67 male sex offenders, 90% of whom were child molesters). Subjects were categorised on the following basis, where one point is given for each of the following:

- Any sex preconvictions
- 4+ preconvictions of any kind
- Any current or previous conviction for non-sexual violence
- Has been convicted of sexual offences against 3 or more distinct victims.

Risk of reconviction is:

None of the above:- LOW RISK

1 of the above:- LOW-MEDIUM RISK

2 of the above:- MEDIUM-HIGH RISK

3 of the above:- HIGH RISK

All 4 of above:- HIGH (+) RISK

Separating the subjects in a survey sample into distinct sexual offence categories can provide further clarity to assess the risk of re-offending thus helping assessors and clinicians to be more precise. The following are taken from untreated sexual offender research projects and measures, or estimates, the risk of further repeat sexual offending for each group. A process of meta analysis has been applied here;
Incest
Extra Familial Abuse of Girls 10-29% (Furby, Weinrott and Blackshaw, 1989)
Extra Familial Abuse of Boys 13-40% (Furby, Weinrott and Blackshaw, 1989)
Rapist
Exhibitionists 4-10% (Gibbens, Soothill and Way, 1978, 1981)
7-35% (Furby, Weinrott and Blackshaw, 1989)
41-71% (Cox, 1980)

Finally, Marshall (1996) whose work involved the detailed analysis of 1832 convicted male sexual offenders who had received custodial sentences in England and Wales and were released in 1988, reveals further detailed insight. The survey was conducted after a 6 year follow-up period and as above is presented in offender-specific categories:

**Homosexual Paedophiles**
- Offenders with the most common *Modus Operandi* accounted for almost all of the re-convictions.
- History of psychiatric care revealed double the risk of re-conviction.
- History of being in care revealed higher risk of reconviction.
- Drug abuse seemed to aggravate risk.
- Alcohol abuse was not a risk factor.
- History of being sexually abused revealed decreased risk of reconviction.
- History of physical abuse revealed slightly increased risk of reconviction.
- Offenders living alone or with a parent were at higher risk of sexual reconviction.
Offenders living with spouses tended not to be reconvicted.

Single and divorced offenders seemed to be the highest risk group.

Younger offenders were at higher risk of reconviction.

**Heterosexual Paedophiles**

- Incest offenders are slightly less likely to be reconvicted.
- Offenders with disciplinary offences in prison were more likely to be reconvicted sexually.
- Psychiatric history has no apparent relationship with re-conviction.
- Being in care and absconding from care are high and higher risk factors respectively.
- Alcohol was a substantial risk factor for sexual and violent offences.
- Living with their parent(s) or with another family member or a friend presented a high reconviction rate for sexual offences.
- Those released to a spouse or partner or to a hostel were less likely to be reconvicted.
- Those living alone are clearly at a high risk of being convicted of a violent offence.

**Rapists**

- Living in a hostel seemed particularly related to being reconvicted of a sexual or violent offence.
- There seems to be no relationship between psychiatric history and reconviction.
- Drug or alcohol abuse seem to be related with higher risk of reconviction.
- Sexual or physical abuse as a child seemed to have no relation to reconviction.
To be aware of this actuarial data is one thing, to put it to good use is another, entailing the collaboration of different agencies to exchange information and, normally, for a single person to collate that which is relevant to a clinical or professional assessment of risk. The factors to be considered here are too numerous to list and are not required to further the argument at this point. It is enough to be aware that assessment of sexual offenders is of growing concern to practitioners and a pivotal point of decision making in many of the agencies whose work brings professional people into contact with sexual offenders, and where a degree of responsibility for that risk is clearly identifiable, for example, criminal justice, psychiatry, psychology, social work, and probation.

We can reasonably comfortably rely on the actuarial data. It requires no opinion to be formulated and where opinion is absent, responsibility is less easily ascribed to a particular person should it prove to be faulty. If the 80% success rate is accurate and clinical assessments are informed by this as a starting point, it would be reasonable to assume that the overall prediction of re-offence and the understanding of any risk will benefit from such a precise analysis. Identifying high risk offenders with an 80% rate of reconviction and a low risk group with less than 20% reconviction (Hanson, Steffy and Gauthier, 1992) is a good position from which to develop clinical skills.

Perhaps the most important requirement is to be aware that the men who present the greatest risk of being reconvicted of a sexual offence will be identified by the actuarial predictors, and clinical approaches can either increase or lessen that concern. Where clinical assessment
indicates high risk, the detail of the factors involved may help provide indicators as to how to reduce the risk. For the moment it can be said that the scope for reasonably accurate identification of who may re-offend, and in what way, does exist and is being further developed by researchers. Prediction as the basis for risk management intervention is accurate enough for it to justify (or even demand) the appropriate targeting of resources. To pursue this point further would be a valuable project. How many 'high risk' offenders who have been identified and are currently without any form of supervision are now actively involved in regular undetected offending? Pro-active targeting and investigation of high risk sex offenders might reveal interesting results.

**Conclusion and Summary**

Professional intervention with sex offenders is a relatively new aspect of social control. Probation officers have adopted a response to the challenge of dealing with this problem by leading the probation service into developing policy and practice initiatives which invest heavily in treatment programmes. These in turn invest any value they may have firmly with the offender. The safeguard of future prevention is left almost entirely to the individual offender.

Social work values are comfortable with such a response, as it seems ethically correct. Feminism and behavioural psychology are the major influences in this area of practice but are open to challenge. Child protection and crime prevention work demand more from probation than traditionally it expects to provide. The theoretical explanations used to describe and understand sexual offending, and which provide such a valuable insight into treatment perspectives, can also reveal opportunities to consider the use of external measures of control.
Rehabilitation of offenders remains a central task of probation and does not rely solely on the need for social work intervention to the exclusion of more overt methods of social control. Indeed a combination of enhanced supervision and treatment for sexual offenders may combine to form the most effective solution when dealing with this problem. Predictive technology exists which can inform risk assessment practices and help to target resourcing. High risk offenders are perhaps the most easily identifiable group using predictive techniques. It appears wholly appropriate that this group should attract the attention and interest of those agencies with a legitimate concern. Professional intervention with sex offenders is a relatively new and rapidly developing area of concern. Probation is ideally placed to take the lead in developing comprehensive risk management initiatives. At the moment probation has a rather narrow focus, and fails to appreciate the value of its possible contribution to child protection and crime prevention strategies. Subsequent chapters explore some of that potential and define a key role for probation.
CHAPTER 2

Controlling Sex Offenders

In this chapter we examine control and concentrate our particular focus on the methods of control used in the experiment which forms the empirical core of this thesis. However, we must not assume that the experiment has availed itself of all of the control methods discussed here, or indeed regard them as being the most effective, rather, we need to appreciate that the limits of this endeavour have been established by the methods of control available at the time.

The chapter is in two main parts. First we review what the probation service and other therapeutic or quasi-therapeutic agencies see as the predominant method of intervention with sex offenders. This, as we will see, is cognitive behaviourism. This approach has attracted considerable support and our concern here is to disturb any sense of complacency which may exist as to the efficacy which has been reported. We must acknowledge that success has been associated with this approach, which has also proved to be lucrative in the therapeutic management of sex offending. However, we draw attention here to the pre-condition for acceptance on a cognitive behavioural programme as being the motivation to succeed. This not only rules out the most refractory cases but leads to exaggerated claims of success based upon selected sampling. Cognitive behaviourism is to be encouraged as a good way to help those who want to be helped, and who are not so entrenched in their criminal behaviour to be beyond
help of this kind. Unfortunately, it offers less to those offenders who cause the greatest public concern.

Secondly, we give due attention to three modes of non-therapeutic social control of which one, relapse prevention through surveillance, forms the theoretical core of this research. This is explored in greater depth later. We also touch on other methods of control, variably contentious and not available for the experiment, so as to put them on the political agenda and (doubtless more ambitiously) to invite welfarists and civil libertarians, whose combined, or sometimes separate, grip on the probation discourse is close to hegemonic, to think again. The methods of control to which we give most attention are castration (chemical rather than surgical) and electronic monitoring. Although these two approaches are, to some degree understandably, caught up in the never ending probation debate between punishment and welfare, neither of them should be defined as punishment. Both are methods of control, technologically available to be deployed under whatever moral or political conditions the government of the day sees fit to impose. It has to be remembered that by imposing control on the offender we create conditions of enhanced freedom for the victim. We then give very brief consideration to DNA testing, CCTV surveillance technology and community surveillance.

It is to control, then, and the control which could be constructively delivered by probation officers, that we now turn. Clearly a range of controls is available to protect the public from sex offenders from treatment to imprisonment. These approaches to control can be seen as a continuum along which a landscape of moral panic, punishment, retribution and political endeavour has evolved. This continuum of control is not static, its nature and composition are
forever changing as new features come to the foreground displacing others to positions of relative obscurity.

Controlling sex offenders in the community is a responsibility of a number of organisations who share the common aim of prevention. Control can be applied using a variety of sources and methods. Internal and external methods of control can be combined to make better, more comprehensive use of the control resources available. Probation officers are well placed to harness and co-ordinate community supervision in a manner which utilizes the full range of control measures. Moral persuasion is the basic ingredient of sex offender treatment programmes but this does not in itself constitute a comprehensive attempt to prevent offending. There is evidence, albeit rather limited, to invite a more positive acceptance that treatment has a potential value for some sex offenders (Beckett, Beech, Fisher and Fordham, 1994). Other methods of control, which do not require quite the same level of internal compliance, can demonstrate significant value in the control of sex offending. External control through surveillance and medical intervention can constitute additional supervision to those receiving therapy, or can enable a community supervision programme to be formulated for those offenders who are considered not suitable, or available, for treatment. The approach taken in this chapter is to explore the range of controlling influences which can be shown to have some potential benefit to the reduction of sex crime, whether by prevention or detection. What controls are available and what do we know about their effectiveness?
Cognitive Behavioural Therapy and Other Treatment Attempts:

Controlling Sex Offenders With Treatment

Considerable optimism exists surrounding the contention that certain methods of therapeutic intervention with sex offenders are effective. However, as research and evaluation in this field are unconvincing and this 'optimism' is all too often based on relatively small and statistically insignificant numbers (see for example Beckett, Beech, Fisher and Fordham, 1994), it is wise to view the value of such contributions with caution.

As we have seen already in Chapter 1 social workers' professional perceptions of the problem of sex offending are heavily influenced by psychological and sociological theories which currently find favour with the political will of the profession. Cognitive behavioural therapy is becoming an increasingly popular model for probation work generally, (see for example McGuire and Priestley, 1995, and more specifically for sex offenders, Beckett, Beech, Fisher and Fordham, 1994), despite the fact that these programmes have only recently begun to be tested. If a solution to the widespread problem of sex offending is to be found in cognitive-behavioural or other therapies then rigorous evaluation on a large scale needs to be developed. The probation service, desperate to demonstrate its effectiveness, would be wise to moderate its understandable enthusiasm for, and investment in, cognitive-behavioural sex offender treatment programmes with an active exploration of other methods of control.

Cognitive behavioural therapy for sex offenders involves the use of a variety of methods designed to equip the sex offender with enough self control to resist offending again. Little is
known about the effectiveness of each of these methods, however, so the safest way forward may be to continue to use them all in one programme (Barker, 1996), an eclectic approach termed 'mix and match' by Barker and Morgan (1993). The models used to understand sex offending and mentioned in Chapter 1, those of Wolf (1984), and Finkelhor (1984) provide the foundation upon which cognitive behavioural intervention is currently justified. Cognitive behavioural work with sex offenders offers a variety of approaches each to the areas of concern indicated by Finkelhor and Wolf in their multi factorial theories.

There is widespread agreement (Barker, 1996; Barker and Morgan, 1993; West, 1987) that sex offenders must demonstrate a motivation to control their offending behaviour before benefiting from cognitive behavioural therapy. This may then result in only motivated offenders being accepted for treatment. It may also be reasonable then to accept that the success rate is artificially inflated by a disproportionate quota of spontaneous remissions -offenders who would not have offended again without treatment. With an annual convicted sex offender population of some 7,000 per year, research based on a small scale sample of those who have undergone treatment in the community is far from significant. Any 'treatment effect' noticed may not be due only to the cognitive behavioural programme, and it is as likely that the improvement was in part also a function the selective sampling of those motivated to change. A more rigorous methodology would involve the use of a control group as motivated to stop offending as those who received treatment, but ethical considerations currently rule such an approach unacceptable.
Marshall and Barbaree (1990) have reviewed comprehensive cognitive-behavioural programmes for sex offenders in the United States. They conclude that intervention of this type offers 'encouragement' (p.382) for the continued use and development of cognitive-behavioural treatment. However, they add a rather powerful and far reaching caveat to accompany their findings. They found some inconsistencies amongst their observations. For instance, some programmes appeared effective in dealing with exhibitionists (eg Maletzky, 1987), whilst others (Marshall and Barbaree, 1988; Wolf, 1984), did not. Other programmes were found to have a more positive effective with men who offended against boys than men who offended against girls (Marshall and Barbaree, 1988; Wolf, 1984), whilst in other programmes the reverse appeared the case (Maletzky, 1990). Certainly, something seems to be working, and with so much optimism around it would be unreasonable to suggest that the measured treatment effect is nothing more than a statistical variation between men motivated enough to be included on treatment programmes and men with lesser motivation, who were not. Barker (1996); Barker and Morgan (1993); Fisher (1994) and Beckett, Beech, Fisher and Fordham (1994) lend similar support to cognitive behavioural treatment programmes in the U.K. and share the concern of Marshall and Barbaree (1990) that co-ordinated evaluation of programme effectiveness is required within the limits of acceptable statistical significance and methodological validity. On a less optimistic note it is also agreed that rapists are the least responsive to cognitive behavioural therapy (Davidson, 1979, 1984; Maletzky, 1987; Marshall and Barbaree, 1990; Barker, 1996).

In her review of American and the rather limited British cognitive-behavioural programmes Barker (1996) has identified six features of therapeutic programmes for sex offenders which
have been associated with success. In order to draw together the possible benefits of cognitive-behavioural therapy these six features are discussed below.

1. Types of Offender

Careful selection of offenders is required to maximise the full potential of these programmes. As we have already seen, rapists are less likely to benefit than child molesters and exhibitionists. The reasons for this are unknown.

Amongst the child molesters receiving treatment, those men who combined more entrenched patterns of sex offending against children with seriously inadequate personalities required longer treatment before change could be observed than men with less entrenched patterns of behaviour. Careful selection of programme candidates is accordingly advised, not least to target resources more accurately.

2. Length of Programme

Longer periods of therapy have been found to be more useful than shorter periods (Ryan, Davis, Miyoshi, Lane and Wilson, 1987). Their research with juvenile sex offenders indicated that 9 to 12 months should be the minimum duration of treatment. Unfortunately, no information was given about the delivery of this treatment or how many hours in total it should include. Barker (1996) cites Fordham (1992) who in the U.K. found that 'offenders gains' increased over a six month period. This work however does not provide any evidence of its own and is rather speculative about the benefits of longer cognitive behavioural programmes for sex offenders. The STEP study (Beckett, Beech, Fisher and Fordham, 1994) which we will examine a little
more closely later, found that cognitive behavioural programmes for sex offenders which lasted approximately 60 hours had some success in affecting offenders' attitudes, but the clinicians were unable to implement any relapse prevention safeguards. In addition to this, short term programmes were found to have had little or no impact on entrenched child molesters, who were said to be best dealt with in a residential therapeutic environment, to allow for more hours of therapy, despite a lack of evidence to support such a view. The study also recommends that the entrenched child molesters could be 'monitored' whilst not being worked with. The suggestion here is of a surveillance function that would presumably involve aspects of external control. In summary, the length of cognitive-behavioural programmes is felt to be a feature associated with success. Other than that of Ryan, Davis, Miyoshi, Lane and Wilson (1987), which appears to have had significant influence on programme development, the evidence for why this is considered to be so is very vague indeed. Overall the principle seems to be no more sophisticated than that more of a good thing is better than less.

3. Therapeutic Tasks

Ryan and Miyoshi (1990) from the U.S.A. reached 'tentative' conclusions about the association of reduced re-offending and therapeutic tasks. They found that, of the offenders who were not re-arrested or questioned about further offending by the police, (90.8 per cent of the sample), two such therapeutic gains had been achieved: the ability to identify and interrupt their offence cycle, and to recognise 'triggers' which might act as potentiators to offend. These two therapeutic tasks are fundamental to cognitive behavioural therapy for sex offenders. The recognition of this feature associated with the success of cognitive-behavioural programmes is arguably quite significant. It indicates, albeit in a very small sample (69) of American juvenile
sex offenders, a common element associated with those who have seemingly conformed and managed to use self control.

4. Impressions of Success in Therapy

Effectiveness is of fundamental importance to workers, but Ryan and Miyoshi (1990) discovered that clinicians could not accurately predict which of the sex offenders receiving therapy would re-offend. This has obvious implications for the value of expert opinion in risk assessments, and indicates that because professional opinion is not a reliable source of offence prediction there exists a need for the development of an objective risk assessment instrument to aid professional judgement such as those referred to earlier in Chapter 1. This however does not tell us anything about the success of cognitive-behavioural therapies, informing us only of the limitations of those whose job it is to deliver them.

5. Relapse Prevention

Relapse prevention is universally regarded as being an essential part of any cognitive-behavioural programme (Marques, Day, Nelson, Miner and West, 1991; Pithers, 1990; Beckett, Beech, Fisher and Fordham, 1994) which consolidates and maintains therapeutic changes. The American Sex Offender Treatment Evaluation Project (SOTEP) cited by Barker (1996) revealed that the strongest predictor of re-offending was the offender's ability to apply the relapse prevention skills learnt in the programme; imparting a sense of responsibility for offending behaviour was not enough on its own to lower the risk of recidivism. Relapse prevention is that part of a cognitive behavioural programme which provides concrete as opposed to abstract thinking about offending. Avoidance of risky, offence specific situations is encouraged to
enable sex offenders to benefit from personal, professional and community surveillance. In relapse prevention work the opportunities for offending are reduced and the chances of detection are increased. The opportunities to develop this feature even further are discussed later.

It is worthy of note that the research used as evidence for the value of relapse prevention by Barker is that of Pithers (1990) who demonstrated a 4 per cent reconviction rate from a four year follow up study of 167 child molesters and rapists. These most impressive results so far relate to situationally specific offending that uses surveillance as external control.

6. Programme Implementation and Management

It seems, as one would expect, that better organised and task centred programmes which pursue group and individual supervision plans and tend to demonstrate good group cohesion are most effective (Stephenson, 1991 and Beckett, Barker, Beech, Fisher and Fordham, 1994). Cognitive-behavioural treatment programmes for sex offenders are held in surprisingly high regard by managers and practitioners in the probation service. Optimism as to their potential value exists despite a general lack of research to measure their impact on re-offending. It does appear, however, that some, less entrenched child molesters, respond better than more entrenched child molesters and rapists; that longer term programmes are more effective than shorter ones; that offence cycle specific components and relapse prevention initiatives are beneficial; and that good management and task centred delivery are important. Relapse prevention and its association with opportunity reduction and improved detection rates are issues to be pursued further. In this summary of the perceived benefits of cognitive-behavioural
programmes for sex offenders it is worthy of note that support exists for the role of monitoring and surveillance. In fact the most impressive results emerge from programmes which use external control methods (see for example Pithers, 1990).

Castration and Chemical Control

The use of surgical castration and chemical suppressants to cure sex offending has long been regarded by many practitioners as 'old fashioned' and obscure. 'Cure', of course, belongs with a disease model and was essentially addressed in the first paragraph of Chapter 1. Our concern though, with control, demands a review of medical treatment to establish the scope for its effective use. Can it work to reduce offending and from where have these myths and ethical dilemmas arisen?

The use of sexual suppressants such as surgical or chemical castration is referred to by West (1987 p.258) as "destructive of the physical apparatus that produces sexual desire". He compares such action with treating a broken leg by amputation. Such a method of control is extreme, and despite occasional moral panics calling for the mandatory castration of sex offenders that may appear following instances of serious sexually motivated offending, such a method of control has become unpopular as it seems excessively punitive, and any attempt by an European Union member to introduce it would almost certainly be successfully challenged in the European Court and Human Rights. Castration, it appears, is more commonly viewed as punishment than as medical treatment. Such interpretation restricts exploration of castration as a means of control, though Bowden (1991) suggests an alternative explanation - That the near universal refusal to castrate sex offenders hormonally is linked with a covert desire to punish
rather than treat them, thereby reflecting condemnation of their behaviour. If castration, by surgical or chemical means, is to be examined for its utility in the control of sex offenders, it has to be seen as a means of treatment requiring consent, not as punishment. At one extreme castration can represent barbarism amongst seemingly civilised humanity, at the other it can justify the early release of hospitalised or imprisoned sex offenders who request medical attention for what they regard as a serious problem for society and themselves. If castration can lessen risk to the public and lead to safer early release from institutions then it is overdue for discussion and review, particularly as pharmaceutical knowledge progresses and criminological concern expands in the pursuit of crime control.

Several important issues have to be addressed before castration and chemical control can be thoroughly reviewed. These are consent, effectiveness, side effects, availability and feasibility. First, we shall look briefly at the history of castration provided by West (1987). Castration means the removal of the testes and was first used on the male guardians of harems. In more recent times it has been used to facilitate the early release of prisoners and patients in Europe, who would otherwise be regarded as being too dangerous. This legally approved treatment, in an historical perspective, was not punitive. However, castration was used as punishment in Nazi Germany for dangerous sex criminals (Law of 24 November 1933) (STURUP, 1972 and West, 1987) and in Kansas U.S.A. where the law demanded the castration of a negro or mulatto male who had raped, attempted to rape, or tried to force marriage upon a white woman (STURUP, 1972 p.363). Castration is not now permitted as a punitive measure of judicial process anywhere. However, in the U.S.A. castration of serious sex offenders is available on a voluntary basis to avoid long imprisonment. Voluntary castration was once used extensively in
Denmark for sex offenders. In England it is not available as a treatment other than in life-saving operations to remove malignancies, (West, 1987). Castration has a clearly recognisable history as treatment rather than punishment. If castration by surgical or chemical means is to be reviewed as a method of control for sex offenders then we must clearly define its purpose. It is not advocated here as legitimate punishment, but it may yet have a valid role as a method of treatment.

If castration as a treatment can be shown to have a beneficial effect upon the offender by reducing his desire or ability to commit sexual offences, then such treatment becomes beneficial to the community by reducing the risk of further offending. Castration as treatment protects and controls, providing of course, that it works. Sturup (1968) reports that a European surgical castration survey of 3120 subjects returned a recidivism rate of 2.2 per cent. Sturup (1972) later reported on a sample of 900 Danish men who had been castrated between 1929 and 1959, and Sturup discovered that 90 per cent of the subjects and doctors were satisfied with the procedure whilst 1.2 per cent were dissatisfied. This sample which may indeed be a sub sample of the earlier larger European survey mentioned above, returned a recidivism rate of only 1.1 per cent.

The author claims that no rapist raped again. However, Hiem and Hursh (1979), argue that castration has no ethical or scientific justification and likens surgical castration to amputation of the hand as a cure for stealing. They are critical of the validity and integrity of castratee follow up surveys.

Hiem (1981) argues that desire and impotency can remain in conflict and that some capacity to re-offend will remain. Bremer (1959) emphasises that one paranoid paedophile, who claimed
he had been falsely accused, murdered two children after castration to teach them not to tell lies.

West (1987) whilst acknowledging that a degree of criticism of the statistical and methodological inadequacies of castration research may be valid, argues that these inadequacies are insufficient to explain away the massive reduction in sex offending which has been reported. It is not claimed that castration can prevent murder, yet Bremer's single case appears to have convinced many practitioners that castration has little to offer prevention programmes.

If the suggested purpose of castration is other than punishment, and treatment for problematic sexual behaviour is the legitimate concern, then the means by which this is achieved is to reduce the sexual drive or libido. Castration can be effected by surgery or chemical intervention. Chemical intervention does not raise the same moral or ethical questions as surgical castration, as it does not rely on the removal of sexual organs from an otherwise healthy body, is not as absolute as surgery, and can be administered in varying degrees to reduce sexual drive. Surgical castration and the barrage of dilemmas that arise from it is unnecessary (West, 1987). Chemical castration, or hormonal therapy, is found to act more swiftly than surgical castration and is potentially more reliable as it interferes with the action of androgens upon which arousability depends. Surgical castration prevents secretion of androgens from the testes, whilst chemical intervention reaches other parts of the body where androgens are secreted, such as the adrenal glands. Use of libido suppressants has another advantage, the effect can be reversed when medication ceases, although this has less likelihood of occurring the longer the treatment is administered (Berlin and Meinecke, 1981).
There is widespread agreement that cyproterone acetate (C.P.A.) is the most appropriate drug for the use with sex offenders. This is an anti-androgen which works by blocking the secretion of androgens and suppressing sexual drive (Clarke, 1989; Day, 1994; Bowden, 1991; Torpy and Tomison, 1986 and West, 1987) C.P.A. is also known by its product name, Androcur and is considered capable of not only neutralising the impact of androgens but also of reducing their production to a level that would render a patient more susceptible to behavioural or psychological therapies. This drug can be swallowed or injected and monitoring of the patient's compliance is possible through analysis of serum testosterone and by the prescription not being self administered. Ortmann (1980) and Baron and Unger (1977) have produced research to reveal that C.P.A. is effective. Freund (1980), West (1987), Clarke (1989), Baron and Unger (1977) and Bowden (1991) all indicate that using C.P.A. to reduce the likelihood of repeat sex offending has an important contribution to make towards the overall management of risk.

Bowden (1991) provides a fascinating discussion of the issues relating to consent. He points out that C.P.A. cannot be given to the young or to those with liver disease. Side effects from treatment include breast enlargement in about one-fifth of cases which is not always reversible when medication is withdrawn. One in ten patients become depressed, with increased weight and osteoporosis. C.P.A. however, is the drug with the least side-effects. The author asserts that we should be treating prisoners, parolees, probationers and those accused of criminal acts despite concern of the voluntariness of any consent being compromised by their position within the criminal justice system.
Compliance may indeed be motivated by the offender's desire to pursue the least restrictive route from his precarious situation.

"this wholesale failure to treat patients is caused mainly by our reluctance to tackle the consent issues involved".

(Bowden, 1991 p.134)

Bowden suggests that we should accept the coerciveness of this situation and deal with the matter as we would any other medical problem. Consent in medicine is often coerced. This view is echoed by Blom-Cooper (1991 p.137) who argues that we must address this issue directly and see it for what it is, a straightforward treatment.

"Obviously there is no situation where pure, true consent can be forthcoming. Every response to treatment proposals takes place within the context of pressure of some kind or another".

(Bingley, 1991 p.140)

There is evidence that castration by surgery or libido suppressant drugs is an effective method of control. It is generally believed that removal of the testes is barbaric and unnecessary, as chemical treatments are now more pervasive. Castration as a punishment is not acceptable and does not feature in judicial process in this country or abroad, but castration as treatment may have something to offer in the multi-agency approach to the risk management of sex offenders. Libido suppressant drugs are effective, available, and, to put it at its lowest, are no more harmful to a person's potential for a normal life than the prospect of a very long prison sentence.
Surveillance: Relapse Prevention with Sex Offenders

Relapse prevention involves treatment with varying degrees of external surveillance. In many respects it represents an ethically unproblematic method of surveillance because it is predominantly treatment focused and could not work without taking a therapeutic lead. We have already seen that relapse prevention is considered essential to programme integrity but remains grossly underdeveloped. So what does relapse prevention have to offer? And can we identify the elements that set it apart from treatment only initiatives? If we can, then we get closer to a more comprehensive understanding of control. Having done this we must then see if there is evidence that it works.

Probation supervision of sex offenders offers very little in the way of surveillance or monitoring to control offending. Many probation officers do not recognise this as a task which should involve them and have resisted moves to introduce more intrusive methods of supervision. For simplification of this issue, it may be helpful for us to view supervision, in a general sense, as consisting of internal and external dimensions. While to separate these two for the purpose of analysis might be thought to create an opportunity for comparison, such comparison would not provide the answers we seek at this point. External and internal dimensions to probation supervision are more productively seen as complementary halves which reveal the potential to combine and produce a whole greater than the sum of the parts. This potential is not always realised by supervising officers, who may concentrate on the internal dimension of supervision by means such as counselling, treatment, advice giving and social work support. The external dimension which involves the active surveillance of the offender's involvement with his environment is becoming increasingly important in sex offender supervision in particular. The
overlap of these two dimensions is, as we have seen, often referred to as relapse prevention (R.P.) and is identified as an essential aspect to current treatment strategies (Beckett, Beech, Fisher and Fordham, 1994). The development of R.P. initiatives is discussed later; for the moment it is the external dimension of supervision, which rests comfortably in the sex offending models of Finkelhor and Wolf, on which we focus.

Probation supervision is part of a system in the process of transition. The function of probation is being broadened to include restriction of liberty. The probation service in England and Wales is not alone in this respect. A comparative study of other probation systems observed similar changes occurring in other parts of the world (Hamai, Ville, Harris, Hough and Zvekic, 1995). Surveillance and control do not emerge as punitive or correctional functions in many probation systems (Hough, 1995 p.165). In England and Wales the probation service remains to an unusual extent grounded in a welfare orientated approach to supervision. May and Vass (1996 p.1) argue that more overt elements of control have been prescribed for probation arising from political, economic, and social pressures. The efficacy of therapy in the reduction of crime has become a critical issue for probation. The internal dimension in probation supervision may not remain isolated from its association with the external dimension for very much longer. As the two elements become more closely associated, increased opportunities for effective supervision will emerge. Those who cling to the welfare principle in probation work should review their position in light of effective crime prevention initiatives that can enhance therapeutic work with appropriate measures of surveillance and control.
Carey and McGrath (1989) provide an insightful starting position for us to begin to look at some of the possibilities for surveillance. In their article, which adopts a very clear treatment perspective, they argue that manipulation of a sex offender's environment to limit his access to "external stimulus cues", and to find alternative uses for his time, will impact to reduce the urge to offend and also enhance the efficacy of other control methods. Using the term 'environmental interventions' they argue that offenders will experience considerable difficulty in responding to treatment if their environment remains unchanged. Maintaining any treatment changes would prove equally difficult if not reinforced with environmental change.

Taking a strong lead from earlier work with alcoholics, environmental intervention broadens the scope for traditional, individual centred work and includes changes in social contingencies. Family, employment and social interaction which encourage or discourage the problem behaviour is the focus of attention. Increasing family and community awareness of supervision aims can create a method of surveillance. If this method of supervision has anything to offer sex offender treatment then it may include, for example, meeting with close family and friends to discuss the aims of treatment and inform them of the assessed degree of risk, restricting employment opportunities to reduce the likelihood of the offender obtaining access to potential victims, and monitoring social and leisure pursuits to facilitate constructive and appropriate use of time that does not present opportunities for offending. It is not enough to limit the arena for change to therapy sessions. Stimulus, opportunity and victims are rarely found in the treatment room. The offender's interaction with his environment requires our consideration also.
Marques and Nelson (1989 p.37) argue the importance of locating environmental high-risk elements. They define these as situational or behavioural events that increase the chances of a sexual offence by providing the cues and contingencies for illicit sexual behaviour. The authors cite Mischel (1973), a proponent of social learning theory, who defines important external or situational variables as those which provide information influencing an individual's expectations, constructions, motivations, evaluations of stimuli, or ability to generate responses.

Environmental high risk elements for sex offending are those that can be shown to influence relapse. The most obvious environmental high risk element is the presence of a potential victim. The chances of re-offending if a necrophiliac starts work as an undertaker's assistant, or a boy target rapist frequents swimming baths during school sessions, would be considerably increased. Contact with potential victims needs to be considered and manipulated by external control.

It is not reasonable to suggest that all contact with all potential victims could be avoided. Striving to argue for such a goal attracts criticism from civil libertarians who regard such a position as too oppressive and restrictive, though this need not deter us from exploring the full potential of environmental interventions with a view to managing identified risk. To review the full extent of environmental risk factors is too exhaustive for our present discussion. It is enough to acknowledge that a wide range of possible situational variables must be considered and their relevance for a given offender determined by analysis of the conditions surrounding his particular crimes. To achieve this the relationship between internal and external dimensions of supervision has to be based on thorough appreciation of their combined value.
Relapse prevention as mentioned earlier is the process of maintaining change to prevent offending. It was devised as a method to help substance misusers refrain from problem behaviour. Chaney, O'Leary and Marlatt (1978) and Marlatt and Gordon (1980 and 1985) describe how R.P. was designed to strengthen self-control by facilitating the identification of problematic situations, analysing decisions that contribute to the problem and developing strategies to avoid, or cope more effectively with, these situations. Relapse prevention is therefore a functional hybrid of external and internal supervision that emerged from the development of self-management skills. The emphasis remained on internal strengths but placed them, with common-sense practicality, into the person's everyday life situations. A shift from internal to external, from individual to environmental, had emerged. Pithers, Marques, Gibat, and Marlatt (1983) modified the self-management model of relapse prevention for application to sex offenders.

Pithers (1990 p.357) argues that attention must be paid to the capacity for sex offenders to fail in attempts to self-manage their behaviour. They may neglect to employ the safeguards suggested and a lapse may occur that would not be reported to the therapist. In his work at the Vermont Treatment Programme for Sex Offenders, Pithers has found that despite the granting of immunity from punitive consequences for a lapse reported to the therapist, the tendency has been for secrecy to remain, and so the internal self-management dimension of relapse prevention was sometimes inadequate. In view of this he developed a new dimension of relapse prevention for sex offenders.
Having identified this problem Pithers and his colleagues in Vermont set out to develop a more comprehensive programme. To compensate for the shortcomings of the internal dimension they focused on external methods to enhance community safety. Gaining access to accurate information about the sex offender was considered essential, any possible lapses or problematic behaviour needing to be known by therapist and supervising officer. This led to the development of the external supervisory dimension of relapse prevention (Pithers, Buell, Kashima, Camming and Beal, 1987; Pithers, Camming, Beal, Young, and Turner, 1989).

Surveillance is a feature of this development. Pithers (1990) identifies 3 functions of the external supervisory dimension:

1) enhancing efficacy of supervision by monitoring specific offence precursors;
2) increasing the efficacy of supervision by creating an informed network of collateral contacts which assists the probation officer in monitoring the offender's behaviour;
3) creating a collaborative relationship with mental health professionals conducting therapy with the offender.

The first of these three functions is to establish offence precursors or elements of behaviour that are clearly related to the individual's risk of repeat offending. We could also refer to these as offence indicators or dynamic risk variables. It is not possible, or necessary, to monitor all the offender's behaviour, and so certain aspects, the offence precursors, are concentrated on. When detected, the offence precursor informs the supervising officer of the imminence of relapse and appropriate action may be taken to intervene. A risk assessment and ongoing therapy are the best source of information to determine these precursors.
The second of these functions is the use of collateral contacts. These are identified people known to the offender who act to support the maintenance of self-management. They are informed of the risk variables, or offence precursors, and help to point these out to the offender. These collateral contacts include people such as friends, family, neighbours, and employers. They are also encouraged to report lapses to the probation officer. Regular meetings and communication help reinforce the network of community support. The third function involves liaison between the probation officer and mental health staff who provide treatment for the offender. Progress and problems can be discussed and alternative interventions arranged. The work of Pithers and his various collaborators in the 1980's has parallels with the much earlier work of Shaw (1973) in Southend, who, though he did not report on his work in great detail, is a forerunner of these more detailed developments in the United States.

Pithers and Cumming (1989) have reported that relapse prevention is effective in reducing recidivism amongst their sample of 167 sex offenders. Over a period of 6 years only 6 offenders had re-offended, representing just 4% of the total, a lower figure than would have been expected for similar time periods (Furby, Weinrott and Blackshaw, 1989). Relapse prevention appears to work. It is of interest to note that a much higher proportion of the rapists from this sample re-offended than the paedophiles, whose re-offending tended to occur soon after they left the programme.

Surveillance of sex offenders is not of course the sole responsibility of the probation service. Many other organisations pursue this activity and we will examine this later. Probation supervision does, however, provide opportunities for surveillance that can enhance therapeutic
work. Relapse prevention has extended this capacity, first by aiming to improve offenders' self-management skills and then by involving external agents to monitor behaviour. Relapse prevention is a method of working with sex offenders that requires probation supervision to make use of certain aspects of community and professional surveillance. It has been demonstrated to be effective in reducing recidivism. There is scope, however, to develop relapse prevention further, and to do so represents a natural progression of development from this current position. However, it is debatable whether the term relapse prevention would remain appropriate. Linking together the shared principles of situational crime prevention and relapse prevention produces an opportunity to benefit from the separate advantages of each. A more correct name for such a method may be 'Risk Management'. This does not assume that we are working with an offender who has stopped offending, as the word relapse suggests, and it does not carry the connotation of solely a therapeutic activity. Risk management as a generic term invites and encourages the equal participation of agencies with shared interests but one common goal, preventing offending.

The Use of Surveillance Technology in the Supervision of Sex Offenders

Discovery and Invention have made it possible for
the government, by means far more effective than stretching
upon the rack, to obtain disclosure in court of what is
whispered in the closet.

(Justice Louis Dembitz Brandeis, 1928)
Cited in Marx (1988)
Every breath you take  (breath analyser)
Every move you make  (motion detector)
Every bond you break  (polygraph)
Every step you take  (electronic anklet)
Every single day  (continuous monitoring)
Every word you say  (bugs, wiretaps, mikes)
Every night you stay  (light amplifier)
Every vow you break  (voice stress analysis)
Every smile you fake  (brain wave analysis)
Every claim you stake  (computer matching)

I'll be watching you (video surveillance)

Adapted from a song by the 'Police' and cited in Marx (1988).

Surveillance technology that could be used in the supervision of sex offenders is readily available. As a form of social control and particularly as an aid to criminal justice it is highly contentious. I do not intend to reproduce the arguments in this debate in any great detail here, other than to comment, albeit briefly, that as powerful new surveillance tactics are developed the scope for legitimate and illegitimate use is likely to spread. In this sense it is the regulation of the use and misuse of this technology that requires attention rather than the technology itself.

The probation service, having a history of welfarism and a vested interest in issues related to civil liberties, seems an appropriate organisation to be involved in the regulation and proper application of surveillance technology. Many of the methods of surveillance to be discussed
here already exist and are used by allied agencies to monitor, track and police sex offenders. Active participation in these practices may not be required from probation officers, but an awareness of their potential application to prevent and detect new offences must not be ignored on ideological grounds alone. In the criminal justice system effectiveness sometimes comes into conflict with humaneness, decency or fairness, and members of a democratic society have to weigh these often conflicting principles. The ethical acceptability of new technology can only be defined by calculating under what conditions an end justifies the means. In such an analysis, and with increasing awareness of the long term effects of sexual victimisation, the balance of these conflicting principles seems tipped, at this point at least, in favour of the lawful and firmly regulated application of surveillance technology to prevent sexual offending. The means to such a valuable end consists of a great many methods of covert and overt surveillance.

The ones dealt with here are those that have been applied to sex offenders and shown to have been of some benefit.

At this point, however, it is important to indicate that whilst protection of potential victims is the aim of supervision, surveillance is often a means to detection and where this occurs it should be regarded not only as a measure of failure, but in a rather different sense, as a measure of success. For the offence may not have been revealed by any other source. Prevention must remain the most important function, but where this has failed detection is of obvious value.

Electronic monitoring, DNA testing and closed circuit television are the main areas of surveillance technology that have been shown to have useful application in the supervision of
sex offenders. This technology is available now in the U.K., and, legislation permitting, we will witness the scaled introduction of it in the U.K. criminal justice system at an increasing rate.

Crime prevention technology includes various methods of offender incapacitation. Clear and O'Leary (1983) argue that incapacitation approaches vary in focus from a desire to stop all criminal offending to targeting only those individuals who present a risk of harm to others. Risk prediction is a basic component of any incapacitation system that involves monitoring technology. What is required is identification of those who need incapacitating and for how long. Appropriate and resource sensitive decision making would determine these. However, incapacitation can be applied without such privilege. Wilson (1975) relies, in part, on the failure of both treatment and prediction to support and justify an incapacitation model.

"The purpose of isolating - or, more accurately, closely supervising offenders is obvious: whatever they may do when they are released, they cannot harm society while confined or closely supervised".

(Wilson, 1975 p.173)

All forms of incapacitation pose a fine moral problem: punishment is administered not only for what the offender has done, but also for what he or she is believed likely to do in the future. Modern predictive technology though is becoming increasingly advanced. Hanson, Steffy and Gauthier (1992) claim that it is possible to identify a high risk group of sex offenders with a probability of sexual or violent re-offending greater than 80 per cent. Such a high rate of success in prediction suggests incapacitation as a means of preventing crime has a central role in the supervision of sex offenders.
In the community supervision of sex offenders a surveillance and incapacitative function has not been associated to any large degree with the role of probation officers. Criminal justice requires a much broader application of preventative measures, and treatment by moral persuasion, which seems to be the only truly acceptable method of intervention in social work orthodoxy, is just one of them.

Community supervision can impose a variety of incapacitative conditions. Judges and magistrates can impose numerous conditions as additional requirements of a probation order providing of course they are reasonable and conducive to the overall aims of supervision (Stone 1994). Probation officers have considerable latitude also in their function as supervising officers, and this is embodied in legislation (Powers of the Criminal Courts Act 1973 S20 (6) para 2). The capacity exists to instruct any supervisee to do, or not to do, with the Court's authority, anything which helps to fulfil the requirement of supervision. Traditionally such authority is not assumed and is unpopular with many probation officers. If we view probation as an agency that is somewhat isolated within the criminal justice arena, then crime prevention work and incapacitation will remain an alien concept best left to law enforcement agencies. However, if probation is to explore the capacity of its role in the multi-agency forum of criminal justice generally, and more specifically the long established child protection collaboration strategies, then a critical role emerges for probation officers in all aspects of incapacitation.
Electronic Monitoring

The history of electronic surveillance of offenders in England is a fascinating, if not slightly amusing story. Russel and Lilly (1989) provide us with a documented account of how Tom Stacey a novelist, journalist and film maker had the misfortune to be imprisoned abroad whilst he was working as a foreign correspondent for the *Sunday Times*. He proposed the idea of tagging by electronics as an alternative to prison in 1981 after returning from his experience of incarceration. He reasoned that an electronic device fixed to an offender as they moved about in the community could be monitored. This would deter the offender, save the contamination and destructiveness of prison, and satisfy the need to punish the offender whilst protecting the public. The Home Office was not interested and refused to finance research. Stacey continued to campaign and in 1983 formed the Offenders Tag Association.

In the U.S.A. electronic tagging was being developed and trials were under way by the mid 1980's. American marketing of their technology in Britain was almost evangelical. It was suggested for example that offenders would 'return to God', complete household chores and D.I.Y. tasks whilst saving more money for the household budget. The British response was one of condemnation from NAPO, The National Council for Civil Liberties, NACRO and the Howard League, who rejected the idea as it was inconsistent with the development of 'trust' between the probation officer and offender. Such a response of course, as pointed out by Russel and Kelly (1989), is not inconsistent with self-interest and fear of occupational loss.

The tagging of sex offenders has been reported by Grinter (1989) who used three such subjects, he claims that all were successful completions, and believes generally that this population as a
whole will prove to have a high rate of compliance. Thomas (1989) also reported impressive results from early electronic tagging trials. She describes how in 1987 a decision was made in Jefferson County, Texas to use electronic tagging as a second chance before incarceration. It was hoped that electronic monitoring would act to rehabilitate through behavioural modification and protect the public through increased levels of supervision. This was a 90 day programme with 24 offenders, 31 per cent of whom volunteered.

An anklet was attached to the offender and monitored by receivers on the home telephone and electricity supply. A movement schedule was agreed and monitored for violations. In this sample almost one third were sex offenders. All were male. The trial revealed the following:

58% of total were successful completions.
50% reported watching more T.V.
31% family relationships worsened.
44% spent more time on household chores.
50% reported having less money.
38% reported having better money management skills.
56% reported an increase in D.I.Y. tasks.
100% said they could not cheat it.

The supervising probation officer felt that electronic monitoring had an impact on behavioural modification, responsibility and encouraging offenders to seek permission, victims felt better protected and this was especially so for sex offences because they felt a closer eye was being
kept on the offender. The general public felt that the programme was too short. Finally, the police were able to use the electronic monitoring record as corroborating evidence in prosecutions.

In 1989-90 electronic monitoring as a condition of bail was experimented with in the U.K. with inconclusive results (Mair and Nee, 1990). The 1991 Criminal Justice Act made provision for the introduction of the curfew order with electronic monitoring as a community sentence in its own right, but this was not used until after being amended by the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994. Trials have now been conducted and the findings published. Mair and Mortimer (1996 p.2) describe how sentencers from the trial areas viewed this new disposal as primarily a punishment that could appropriately be combined with probation supervision. Interestingly, it was also suggested that electronic monitoring could be used as a means to restrict opportunities for offending, or, as described earlier, as a form of incapacitation. Unfortunately the authors found that the response of probation to electronic monitoring was seen by other professions as

"at best equivocal and at worst obstructive".

(Mair and Mortimer, 1996 p.29)

Senior probation service staff had welcomed the trials, but NAPO was opposed, claiming them to be a waste of money, and launched a media campaign to obstruct the introduction of the trials. Individual probation officers, when interviewed objected to electronic monitoring on ideological grounds as an infringement of civil liberties and an unacceptable punishment. Fear of occupational loss may have been an additional disincentive for these probation officers. Of most significant relevance here is the finding that many probation staff felt that electronic
monitoring had nothing to contribute towards helping reduce the risk of further offending. There was misunderstanding about what electronic monitoring could offer the criminal justice system and the potential application of the order was found to have been played down or ignored by pre-sentence report writers.

There were no sex offenders included in these trials and some confusion existed about which offenders would benefit from such a sentence. In conclusion Mair and Mortimer (1996) argue that electronic monitoring works. The technology and the staff have proved to have been capable of working to a high standard.

The application of electronic monitoring of sex offenders although not used in this research, because it was not available, has a great deal to offer. To restrict the movement of an offender who is known to use specific places, such as parks, playgrounds, nightclubs and supermarket car parks to plan and commit offences at specific times, for example, when young children are not in school, or when public houses and nightclubs are closing, holds great promise to reinforce or even police a detailed and agreed movement chart as part of a risk management prevention programme. It does not of course prevent sex offences being committed in the home, where of course other measures of restriction would be required. For known sex offenders where an identifiable pattern of offending can be established, electronic monitoring would be an effective method of crime control for inclusion along with other methods of supervision.
D.N.A. Testing

We increasingly hear in the media of sex crimes that have been solved by D.N.A. sampling or, as it is sometimes referred to, genetic finger printing. This can link an individual to the scene of a crime by matching samples of D.N.A. found at the scene with that of an individual, who may not indeed even have been identified as a suspect.

England has the world's first database holding in excess of 19,000 D.N.A. profiles. Sex crime, murder and burglary are the offences expected to benefit the most out of this adaptation of technology. It is predicted that the database could eventually hold the profiles of all convicted criminals (Crime Prevention News, May 1996). With an accuracy level estimated to be capable of revealing the unique identity of a suspect to a scale of one in 160 million, this method of surveillance has truly formidable investigatory potential. Since 1995, sex offenders have routinely provided D.N.A. sampling as part of their arrest and documentation process as a suspect. Whilst this now applies to all new suspects it is possible for sex offenders, convicted previously, to submit samples to the database for future reference. This may act as a form of deterrence as well as allowing the offender to participate voluntarily in a crime prevention initiative that demonstrates compliance and motivation to refrain from further offending.

As already discussed, many sex offenders have committed several offences of this kind before being detected. It is possible that volunteering to provide a sample of D.N.A. may link the offender to a previously unsolved offence where samples of D.N.A. were recovered from the scene. Where this occurs, serious crimes could be solved and dangerous offenders identified. Asking a convicted sex offender to participate in such an exercise may appear to be
unreasonable, oppressive and for some probation officers, unethical. However, for those charged with supervision designed to protect potential victims it is difficult to oppose. Once again, welfarism, trust and social work values have to be balanced against protecting the public. The opportunity to request a sample exists and the technology is available to match offenders to previous crimes. Probation supervision in the broadest sense really does lend itself to become much more of a criminal justice service than a social work service.

Closed Circuit Television

This represents another highly contentious method of surveillance. Debate on implementation, development and application of C.C.T.V. is comprehensively provided by Squires and Measor (1996) in a thorough examination of its crime prevention and detection value. Millions of pounds have already been spent on planning, installing and operating such systems in hundreds of urban areas throughout the U.K. Community supervision of sex offenders can benefit from these systems by using direct surveillance. To monitor the specific movements of known sex offenders by either visual or electronic identification would alert C.C.T.V. operators of the presence of a known sex offender in camera range. This could help to inform the supervising officer of any behavioural indicators such as befriending potential victims, or networking with other sex offenders, that could lead to re-offending. The scope for developing the surveillance role of the supervising officer through collaboration with C.C.T.V. operators is yet another method with potential to enhance community supervision.
Community Surveillance: Control by the Community

Probation supervision can be further developed to include a level of control from community surveillance. Shaw (1973) made good use of his supervisory responsibilities by including the partner, or a significant other, in supervision sessions. Shaw identified the limitations of probation supervision and utilized the natural surveillance of those people who lived with and cared for the offenders. Far greater levels of contact and knowledge about behavioural potentiators can be harnessed by establishing and maintaining their interest in the offender's supervision. A concerned relative or friend will, most probably, have a vested interest in helping the offender. Using this natural source of supervision and surveillance is so refreshingly simple and tangible, above all, it is virtually free.

Using the wider community presents a more complicated picture. Professional or employee surveillance would involve active recruitment of suitable candidates such as delivery round staff, caretakers, shop workers, etc. The issue of confidentiality here is a very delicate one. Potential collaborators have to be very sensitively selected and possess a shared concern about the importance of the task. Further to this they have to be trustworthy. Any such decision to impart confidential information to members of unrelated organisations and the public in general needs to be conducted with an awareness and understanding of relevant civil law restrictions. Here in the U.K., probation officers have to tread delicately amongst various pieces of legislation and policy before discussing confidential information. This does not however prevent or even obstruct the probation officer from making good use of the full range of community and professional surveillance resources available. This issue will be fully explored and tested in subsequent chapters.
In the U.S.A. community surveillance and community protection have been developed to make maximum use of preventative measures with sex offenders. Known as Notification Laws, the general public now have access to detailed information about convicted sex offenders. Kelly (1995) documents the history and development of this legislation that began with the torture and murder of a 7 year old boy in Washington State. This resulted in a campaign that became known as the "Tennis Shoe Brigade" as thousands of pairs of shoes symbolising the right to walk the streets in safety were dumped at the State Governor's office. The campaign support increased. Seven years after the campaign began notification laws were introduced. During the research of this subject I have obtained notification information on various registered sex offenders in the U.S.A. This information, which includes photograph, name, date of birth, offence type and location is public access information available through the Internet (Appendix 1).

Conclusion and Summary

We have examined the claims of efficacy and success in therapeutic interventions as a means of control for sex offenders, and acknowledge, with due optimism, that cognitive behaviourism has earned a stake in the claim for supervisory effectiveness. For those men motivated enough to be offered treatment, the chances of reconviction are reduced. The most effective treatment programmes, however, are those that make use of relapse prevention initiatives. This introduces an element of surveillance and suggests that external methods of control can be combined with those used in treatment (referred to earlier as internal controls) to positive overall effect.
It is surveillance on which we now concentrate. Our concern is to explore methods of surveillance which are currently available and that can be shown to have had some valid application in community supervision and crime prevention. We have seen how technology can offer the surveillance task an increased effectiveness that has not yet been made available to probation officers, let alone accepted by them. As with castration, which promises, without a doubt the most effective form of control we have examined so far, surveillance and electronic monitoring are cautiously resisted by welfarists and civil libertarians who choose to regard such modes of control as punitive, thereby ignoring any valuable contribution they hold for legitimate public protection. Surveillance through relapse prevention is currently an acceptable method of control, analysis and intervention in probation, and this becomes our primary focus of attention in subsequent chapters. However, before moving on we must first address some of the issues raised from our examination of technology, as these methods of control seem poised, for the moment at least, awaiting political and moral approval.

Technology is available to the probation service and others who might offer an alternative community supervision function. It takes many forms, as we have seen, and exists designed as an aid to increase surveillance and control. The probation service in England and Wales appears not to have welcomed the emergence of this technology and has resisted attempts to implement it. It has been suggested, however, that it is not the technology but the misuse of it that causes the greatest concern for probation officers. If an opportunity exists here for the probation service to help regulate its use, then it would seem to have been lost during recent skirmishing over electronic monitoring. There seems little doubt that technology can be made to work in the supervision, surveillance, detection and prosecution of sex offenders. The evidence
documented here is rather impressive. In short, it offers to improve the standard of community supervision, but by doing this is changing its very nature.

Instead of harnessing this technology the probation service has retreated to its ideological bunker. The frustration here is that community supervision of sex offenders is not maximising the full potential of preventative and protectionist measures or resources. Methods of control exist which could enhance the supervision task, yet a certain suspicious hesitancy tightens probation's grip on traditional ideologies as it clings, in resistance to the tide of change, to an identity that is seemingly void of political or professional evolution.
CHAPTER 3

Developing Theories of Crime

Administrative Criminology: Sex Offending and Crime Prevention

Much modern 'official' criminology is described by Young (1986) as 'administrative' criminology. Its origins can be traced back to the mid-nineteenth century; particularly to classical thinking, with its emphasis on individual rational calculation and free will. Crime was seen as a voluntary action undertaken by an individual after the costs and benefits had been considered. In its present form administrative criminology appears to have evolved as a post positivist development which modifies earlier classical theories. Control theories and classical thinking have combined to provide a significant development in mainstream criminology. Current criminological investigation has the potential to establish itself as a major contributor to the mechanism of social control, not least because, central to administrative criminology, is crime prevention.

As an element of human behaviour requiring control, sex offending is a criminal activity that may benefit from criminological examination. To control such a difficult social problem requires an analysis of research, policing, legislation, criminal justice, political will, current knowledge about theories and our understanding of how sex offences are committed. Administrative criminology as described above adopts the stance held earlier by classical theorists that crime is the product of individual rational choice. The criminal justice system is
seen to benefit from criminological research and new theories can provide significant insight into how best to reduce opportunities for individuals to commit crime and increase the risk of detection.

"Social democratic criminology with its search for the aetiology of crime within the realms of social justice has been replaced by an administrative criminology interested in technology and control".  

(Young, 1986 p.12)

New administrative criminology and its concern with evaluating the efficacy of the criminal justice system, emanating from an unequivocal aim to prevent offending and protect the public is our favoured theoretical stance from which to approach this research. Indeed to a large degree a fairly conservative approach to the study was predetermined by the professional role of the researcher and the socio-politics of the researcher-practitioner's relation to the subjects. Sex crime, in contrast to, say, white collar crime or drug abuse, offers less of an opportunity for radical or unconventional analysis, and it would have been unthinkable to have pursued this research, which, after all, set out to examine the boundaries of supervision, in any manner other than that which would, by necessity, have been expected from such activity within the criminal justice system. The study was not just of the 6 men but of the social agencies which they encountered. Further, its purpose was not to survey dispassionately but to act and to enhance the controls to which they were subject.
This is not to say, of course, that other approaches do not have some relevance, albeit some rather limited, to our field of enquiry. Let us now turn to examine these other approaches; for only with such insight will we know for sure we have chosen the most appropriate approach to inform our work.

First, critical criminology which emerged in the 1970s from what has been identified as the radical tradition (Taylor, Walton and Young, 1973, 1975), argues for a reformulation of the central issues of criminology. It identifies social structure, historical development, economic and class relations as its key features. Such a perspective does not yield many opportunities from which we might begin to examine supervision of sex offenders. To review the way in which sexual crime is contextualised, and the relative value of recognising sexual exploitation as a criminal act are certain possibilities for other research initiatives, but do not have general relevance to our current research activity, any more than do such approaches as the sexual liberationist perspective developed by the Paedophile Information Exchange (O'Carroll, 1980) - which would by definition be antithetical to the predominant control agenda which drives the present study - or the children's rights perspective, one form of which is not inconsistent with that of O'Carroll (see for example Ives, 1986; though for a different and more thoughtful approach see Freeman, 1983).

Second, left realism developed from the same original source as critical criminology (Lea and Young, 1984; Young, 1986), albeit that this is not always obviously the case, and shares with new administrative criminology a concern for victims. It draws attention to social divisions
and their relationship with crime and the criminal justice system. Women as victims of crime is one such concern relevant to our current activity, so too is the desire to uncover the extent of crimes such as rape, and a willingness to engage in matters of policy. However, left realism as a theory reveals a preference for large scale surveys as a research method and is best suited to a macro analysis of crime. While left realism would provide a useful source from which to inform our research activity, not least in relation to the 'power perspective' which it offers - one which almost invariably informs and deepens our understanding of sexual offending - it would have had limited relevance to the micro field experiment.

Finally, feminist sociology has, as we have already seen in Chapter 1, clearly made a useful contribution towards providing, in part, an explanation for the cause of sexual crime and a sensitisation of a (still) predominantly male-driven criminal justice system to the experiences of victims, children as well as women (see for example Stanko, 1985, 1988; Anna T., 1988). However, at this point at least, it offers little tangible suggestion as to how we might begin to control sex crime or manage sex offenders: the crucial contribution of feminist thought has been to lend support to examining ways of enforcing legislation to protect victims of sexual violence and prevent further victimisation (see for example, Herman, 1990 p.188).

Criminology, in short, is an inclusive rather than exclusive discipline, largely because of the multi-faceted and near boundary-less nature of the activity which is the object of its study. The contribution of a wide range of social, behavioural and medical sciences (sociological, anthropology, politics, economics, history, cultural studies, philosophy, law, psychology,
psychiatry, biochemistry, neurology and no doubt many more) sustains criminology as a fertile adjunct to contemporary social theorising, be it post-structuralist, post-modernist or existentialist. This combined perspective on human behaviours yields a discipline within which our current study is so neatly placed.

The vast array of competing or complementary 'explanations' of crime, from which the specific approach entailed in SORMA was chosen, had to be narrowed to facilitate the eclectic and multi-disciplinary character of our study. Aimed as it was at reducing incidence by prevention, detection or both, it has a strongly normative purpose, and this limited our options.

Our choice of criminological theory with which to pursue our research was, almost exclusively new administrative criminology. The centre for administrative criminology is the Home Office. The last Government was perhaps more active in its influence over the probation service in its work with sex offenders than with any other offender group dealt with by the service. During the last 6 years the Home Office has been seen to take the initiative in determining the role of the probation service in its involvement with sex offenders. It has steered legislation to create greater statutory powers and funded research projects aimed specifically at the provision of effective treatment for sex offenders. The Government also encouraged a multi-disciplinary approach to this work. The probation service has, however, often been less than innovative in its interpretation and acceptance of the expectations placed
upon it. The full realisation of existing statutory powers has not been achieved, for example, under utilization of Section 44 C.J.A. 1991 extended supervision (see Home Office, 1996); longer treatment and supervision programmes for the entire length of community supervision through attendance at probation day centres (see National Standards for Probation, 1994); and maximum length probation orders with 'negative' conditions restricting an offender's behaviour.

To look firstly at crime prevention initiatives generally and then more specifically at prevention of sex crime provides a useful historical context in which to open this discussion.

In May 1990 a joint circular was issued by 10 government departments known as Government Circular 44/90. The contributors were the Home Office, the Departments of Education and Science, Employment, Energy, Environment, Health, Social Security, Trade and Industry, Transport and The Welsh Office. The stated objective of this circular was to develop, following on from a previous 5 department initiative in 1984, an inter agency crime prevention policy. To promote ideas and stimulate local initiatives it was sent to the chief officers of all local area public service agencies, police, probation, fire service, councils, social service departments and education departments. The circular was accompanied by the booklet "Partnership in Crime Prevention" which contained examples of local initiatives around the country considered to be good crime prevention practice. It was expected to 'consolidate existing gains and introduce fresh initiatives', (Home Office, 1990 p.2). Recipients were invited to reconsider, with others, the contribution their agency was making towards crime prevention.

"In particular, there may be ways of improving the organisational support for crime prevention, of making
greater use of information about crime; and of
channelling more resources into crime prevention work".

(Home Office, 1990)

It further invited recipients to respond by preparing local joint reports to be considered by the
Home Office Standing Conference on Crime Prevention. It is of interest to note that of the 27
initiatives documented in the accompanying booklet the probation service was mentioned in just
9, police and local authorities having adopted the lead roles in most projects. In fact the
probation service featured as joint lead agency in only one initiative, example 27, Knowsley
Inter Agency Crime Prevention Project (p.32).

As an example of probation's relative isolation in local crime prevention initiatives we can
examine how Humberside Probation Service in 1990 engaged in this initiative. In response to
Circular 44/90 a joint report from Humberside County Council, Humberside Police and
Humberside Police Authority was produced and sent to the Home Office. Humberside
Probation Service was mentioned only twice in this report, firstly on page 17 as a potential
contributor to crime prevention and then again on the very last page (23) under the heading of
"Other Conflicts". Without undertaking a wider exploration of similar local response in other
areas of the country, it must be acknowledged that Humberside may be atypical, but it is
unlikely that a significantly different picture would emerge elsewhere, since there remains today
little appreciation of the critical role that the probation service, with its statutory access to, and
indeed control of, the majority of recidivist criminals in any particular area, can play in crime
prevention and control.
Crime prevention initiatives were being actively promoted by Government and although the probation service was clearly required, with other key agencies, to adopt a clearer focus in this respect, they did not emerge as a fore-runner in terms of innovative local developments. Circular 44/90 set an open agenda with a clear theme of crime prevention, but specific initiatives with a more focused purpose were expected to follow. Of those that did, the most relevant for our purposes came some 12 months later. The Home Office convened the Tripartite Seminar in 1991 with the theme "The Effective Management of Sex Offenders".

A report of this event has been compiled, see Home Office (1991). John Halliday, the then Deputy Under Secretary of State for the Home Office had convened the seminar for the purpose of achieving a greater understanding between agencies in the criminal justice system towards the effective management of sex offenders. The message was very clear:

"Time and again one notices how successful problem-solving in public services requires joint effort. A great deal of what services do is self contained. But - especially in criminal justice - each service is part of a wider "system". A "system" in the sense that the actions of one part affects another, in the sense that many problems require joint effort and joint action".

John Halliday (Home Office, 1991 p.2)

In 1992 the Home Office produced the booklet 'Supervision of Sex Offenders: A Probation Service Strategy Document" (also referred to as CPO 52/1992), the first probation service
document published to address the issue of sex offenders. It was introduced to coincide with the implementation of the 1991 Criminal Justice Act which contains specific provisions for the probation service in its development of work with sex offenders. Two principal aims were identified for the probation service:

1) The protection of the public, particularly potential victims, through effective supervision of offenders.
2) The reduction of the risk of re-offending.

Concern for victims was newly identified as a distinctive feature of the work. The document warned the service of the possibility of an increased number of community sentences due to more demanding conditions being made available and an extended range of options available to the courts, and of the need for supervision plans to consider control as well as treatment. Finally, the document emphasised the value and importance of multi-agency collaboration in 2 main respects:

a) To facilitate the exchange of information between criminal justice agencies
b) The development of partnerships between probation service and child protection agencies as the most effective means of protecting children.

Collaboration, it stated, must be effected at all levels in the participating agencies whose patterns of work shared common aims and objectives. This document provided a clear and reasonable directive to the probation service. Increased powers and responsibility in its work with sex offenders were obviously going to demand greater attention and resourcing at a time when central budget allocations looked set to become frozen. Would the high public profile of sex offending and pressure from other allied agencies be enough to convince the service that
increased resourcing was justified? With sex offenders amounting to just over 5% of those supervised by the service nationally (Her Majestys' Inspectorate of Probation, 1991) the decision to allocate increased resourcing, in an agency that had not yet demonstrated a significant understanding of, or commitment to, joint agency public protection, seemed remote.

Control and information exchange remain largely an uncharted field in probation work. The changing expectations placed upon the service by central government are emerging as policy directives,

"Government policy on crime reduction is geared to promoting a locally based co-ordinated approach, where possible through inter-agency crime prevention groups involving statutory agencies and others, and in appropriate cases through the Safer Cities programme".

(Home Office, 1992)

The directive towards inter-agency co-operation had now been expressed in operational goals but had still to infuse probation practice generally. Nevertheless one would expect child protection work under the co-ordination of the now maturing local Area Child Protection Committees to be one area of probation work that could easily be transposed to a shared multi-agency arena. After all, working with sex offenders is, as we have seen, recognised as an integral part of local child protection policies and procedures, and sex offender supervision and child protection work are clearly identifiable areas of overlapping concern. However, what had not yet evolved was a prevention practice which extended beyond the provision of treatment for
sex offenders. Child protection's practice and its parallels with multi-agency crime prevention generally had not yet been fully explored.

Treating sex offenders is not, then, the only element of probation supervision, and what is still required is a consolidation of far broader multi-agency crime prevention and sex offender supervision. The next government initiative in this area brought together the issues of supervision of sex offenders and multi-agency crime prevention in a structured way. The Inter-Departmental Group on Sex Offending was established in 1992 and involved the joint work and negotiations of the Home Office (C6), the Department of Health, the Lord Chancellor's Department, Magistrates' Association, Association of Chief Officers of Probation, Association of Chief Officers of Police, Association of Directors of Social Services, H.M. Inspectorate of Probation, Crown Prosecution Service, Prison Service, Attorney General's Office, Justices' Clerks' Society, Scottish Office and Northern Ireland Office. The agreed terms of reference for the group were these:

1) To promote co-ordination of policy and practice in the criminal justice system for the effective prevention of sex offending.

2) To ensure the prompt exchange of validated information about sex offenders and their management, within the criminal justice system for the effective prevention of sex offending.

3) To encourage agencies in the criminal justice system to co-operate with other child protection agencies in order to reduce the risk of further re-offending by sex offenders on their release and to minimise the impact of sex offending on their victims.
In personal communication, Gill Mackenzie, the Chief Probation Officer of Gloucestershire and Chair of the Work with Sex Offenders Group for the Association of Chief Officers of Probation, who, as previously mentioned, are a member organisation of this multi-agency initiative, informed me that the Home Office had not offered any explanation for the delay in publishing this paper, although it is hoped that it might be released during 1997.

The importance accorded this draft paper by the member organisations demonstrates an acceptance of shared goals. Collaboration on such a wide scale is rare outside of the realms of civil defence and disaster planning. Despite the loss of momentum created by the delay in publishing this paper, the inter-departmental group has to be acknowledged as a major achievement in the effort to control offenders and prevent crime of this nature, as, despite the absence of its written material, these agencies have demonstrated a shared commitment to developing multi-agency work with sex offenders.

We have shown that multi-agency work in child protection issues is well established and that the co-ordinated efforts of all professionals in this arena can be viewed as crime prevention work. Sex offending against children attracts priority in resource allocation among the agencies involved, so it is reasonable to assume that multi-agency crime prevention work with sex offenders who target children is already practised. The focus of activity is largely dictated by the area child protection committee, however, with the result that the child not the offender becomes the central focus. Where this occurs we can see very specific assessment of risk and often a child protection plan (see Department of Health, 1991) which is similar in structure and
purpose to crime prevention initiatives. Such a system of joint protection is regarded widely as being effective and relatively safe (see for example National Children's Home, 1992; Morisson, 1994). Sex offending against adults attracts less multi-agency concern mainly as a result of the smaller amount of agencies involved. Circulation of warning notices and informal communication between police, prisons and the probation service are, however, now regular practice in many areas and in some are prescribed in risk management policy (see for example Wilson, 1994). The history of multi-agency crime prevention is well documented by authors such as Gilling, 1996; Harris, 1992; Stern, 1987; Lea and Young, 1984). Whilst the concept of multi-agency crime prevention is not a new one, there has been an increasing focus over the last decade on the importance of involving the police with other agencies, to address particular crime problems. Liddle and Gelsthorpe (1994) have concluded that crime prevention is not solely a matter for the police and that it is now rare to find references to crime prevention, either in official policy statements or criminological literature, which do not highlight the importance of multi-agency collaboration.

Support for such collaboration is to be found among academics, politicians and professionals (see Elton, 1983; Newman, 1983). It was predicted, however, that problems might emerge, and attention was drawn to this by Kinsey, Lea and Young (1986) who noted that crime prevention strategies involving a multi-agency approach have traditionally been viewed as restrictive to the wider community and not just the potential offender. Deterrence they say is effected by potential criminals having the knowledge that they will be detected by the police. They also alert us to the possibility of 'colonisation': as agencies merge together in shared tasks their independent roles may be weakened. In response to this, and with the benefit of a further 8
years of multi-agency crime prevention development and practice, Liddle and Gelsthorpe (1994) claim that the extent to which blurring of agency boundaries or roles is acceptable will depend on what the inter-agency liaison is intended to achieve. It could be argued that a balance between the need for inter-agency co-operation and for adherence to individual professional and jurisdictional constraints which are in some cases wholly appropriate, is less easily maintained in informal inter-agency liaisons. The need for formal structure is indicated by the authors who researched various projects with a view to determining possible success or failure. They identified the following key elements which had been indicated earlier by the previously mentioned Circular 44/90 (H.O. 1990) as needing to be addressed in any effective crime prevention strategy involving a multi-agency response:

Structure
Leadership
Information
Identity
Durability
Resources.

In order for us to begin thinking about a multi-agency crime prevention approach to reducing the risk of further offending by sex offenders it may be worth examining these key elements with specific relation to sexual offending.

Situational Crime Prevention and Sex Offending:

'A crime will not occur, as 'Sherlock Holmes' points out, unless
there is someone who has not only a motive but also an opportunity
to commit it".

(Sir Arthur Conan Doyle: *Sherlock Holmes*)

Motives and opportunity may seem obvious pre-requisites for criminal behaviour, and common
sense may inform us that these two elements are more often than not essential, but that such a
comment is emphasised in a criminological context emphasises the extent to which positivist
ideas of causation have been repudiated by scholars of recent years. As a result, and with a
number of sociological and psychological qualifications, rational choice theory has a currently
established and credible position in criminological thought, and is a critical dimension of the
theoretical underpinning of current crime prevention thinking and development.

Crime prevention was for many years peripheral to the dominant interests of most agencies
concerned with criminal justice. Gilling (1996), for example, claims that there have been far
more important 'articles of faith' than crime prevention, such as 'welfarism'. Despite being
sidelined by other more immediate and critical responsibilities, however, crime prevention has
attracted considerable attention from academics and politicians, the latter hoping to gain merit
from publicising the nature of various crime policies promoted (see for example Home Office,
1996), and the former producing seemingly endless postulation, interpretation and occasionally
illuminating new themes (see for example Roshier, 1989; Gilling, 1996; Harris, 1992; Mair and
Mortimer, 1996). Crime prevention is undoubtedly a fascinating area of criminology whose
appeal stems from its basic and rather simple approach - to reduce crime by employing methods
that are tangible, practical, comprehensible, visible, measurable, and sometimes even effective.
The history of crime prevention is documented very well in other texts (see for example Gilling, 1996), whereas our own purpose is more limited. While the principles of crime prevention are by nature very broad, in that they apply to crime in general and usually only acquisitive crime, our concern is to test whether these general principles can be applied to sexually motivated offenders.

According to the Home Office Research Unit (Home Office, 1980) there are 3 basic approaches to crime prevention; opportunity reduction, which attempts to reduce opportunities for offending; social prevention, which attempts to counteract criminal motivation; and legislative prevention, which aims to reduce crime by reinforcing legal prohibitions. Clarke and Mayhew (1980) argue that criminal opportunity has several meanings. It can refer, for example, to situations where offenders chose opportunistic moments to commit impulsive offences where temptation is a major influence or to material conditions that a potential offender requires to facilitate offending. Situational crime prevention identifies specific opportunities for crime and determines a preventative solution. It is possible of course for the two meanings of criminal opportunity mentioned above to be conjoint. This would involve choosing opportunistic situations for offending in a crime supportive environment.

An example of how this might be applied in the case of sex crime may at this point be helpful. Nick is a convicted paedophile who is known to have a strong sexual attraction to male targets aged around 9 years. He harbours a recurring fantasy, revealed during therapy, of raping a boy whilst sunbathing with him in an isolated part of a local wood. The fantasy has been realised by
Nick at least once, resulting in a conviction. The aim of a situational crime prevention approach would be to examine what could be done to prevent Nick from once again actualising this fantasy. Opportunity and environment would be the focus of this analysis. A further perception of this scenario would be to see it as a task of risk management. If Nick were to consider that his chances of being detected were remote, this would increase the likelihood of his offending. In rational choice theory a calculation of the risk involved in sex offending is made by the offender, and here lies further territory for the manipulation and control of sex offenders.

To explore this example further may help to provide us with a more comprehensive review of what might be achieved if Nick were to be supervised in such a manner. Firstly, we have to establish certain factors to produce a context in which our analysis must rest. Nick lives in the community and is subject to 18 months licence supervision. He served 4 years in custody where he received sex offender treatment. He is required, as a condition of his licence, to receive further relapse prevention training as directed by the supervising probation officer and to reside where directed. The local probation service runs a group work programme and Nick has been offered a place, to start in 3 months time. This will involve him in weekly sessions lasting 2 hours. The police and social services department will have received notification of Nick's release from prison and this will include his destination address. Once released there is no expectation that the supervising officer will notify these agencies of any further details regarding Nick, unless of course the officer becomes concerned that Nick presents a significant risk to an identified child. Even then the officer has considerable professional discretion in the matter and may choose not to pass on information, unaware of its potential value to other
agencies. Supervision would, in that event, exist in isolation from other crime prevention activities.

We now focus on the potential of enhanced supervision, mindful of our concern with opportunity and environment. Our starting position for such an approach would be to acknowledge firstly the risk of further offending, and secondly to appreciate the contribution which probation supervision could make to a crime prevention initiative. As Nick revealed he has a recurring fantasy of raping a child, and accepts that he presents a high risk of re-offending, it can be assumed that his level of risk is significant and should, quite properly, be of interest to the police and social services department.

As Nick lives very close to the wood where he committed his last known offence, he has immediate access to a potential crime environment. He is an angler and fishes at a pond situated in this wood. The opportunities for offending which he creates for himself at the wood are plenty. He befriends boys and gains their trust. In treatment, a relapse prevention approach would concentrate on persuading Nick not to visit the wood and promote methods of self control to deal with 'risky situations'. This approach however tends to rely on Nick's compliance and honesty for its benefit. Nick may have already realised that he can quite easily get away with lying to his probation officer, and the chance of the officer finding out that he is regularly visiting the wood and meeting boys is very remote indeed. To address the issues of opportunities and environment with a more reliable and comprehensive approach would be to aim to reduce the opportunities to offend and increase the risk of detection. If this is done in a visible way then Nick might be less likely to offend. This could be achieved by:
including the police, social services department and other concerned agencies in a discussion about the risk; imposing an appropriate degree of restriction on Nick's access to the wood;

- allowing Nick to meet those professionals concerned about his risk, so promoting a sense of accountability;

- formulating a multi-agency plan to involve all agencies in a surveillance role (for example local police officer giving due attention to Nick during patrols, leisure officers who supervise youngsters in the wood being vigilant and school staff keeping Nick in mind when dealing with pupils who truant or manifest emotional problems that are unexplained);

- making Nick aware that he is 'visible' to everyone;

- considering whether Nick should be re-located from this crime environment;

- involving a relative or close friend as a collaborator in the supervision plan.

The benefits from such a method of supervision might extend beyond the 18 months of probation supervision. Nick would have adapted his 'risky behaviour' to accommodate a safer regime and the multi-agency supervision would not end when Nick's licence expired. In proceeding thus, the probation service would have facilitated an ongoing process of community crime prevention. We return to this example later.

To concentrate supervision on opportunity and environment leads us to consideration of situational crime prevention. Clarke and Mayhew (1980) indicate that situational measures can
be categorised under eight headings. The first three areas are measures which reduce opportunity by making offences physically harder to commit. The remaining five involve the manipulation of costs and benefits, environmental and material conditions, and offending in ways that are invariably complex. Given that these measures contribute to establishing a theoretically based rationale for intervention we explore each of these following eight measures for its possible implications for controlling sexual offending.

In this study we not only examine these eight categories of situational measures, discussed here as components of a theoretical model, but we test them through analysis of a hypothetical case, and then, in Chapter 6, using a modified, but not fundamentally separate application of the model, we overlay it with the findings of our work.

1) **Target Hardening** involves obstructing the target of the offence. This has proved a highly successful method in motor crime (see for example Mayhew, Clarke and Hough, 1980) and theft from phone boxes (Mayhew, Clarke, Hough and Winchester, 1980). To make the target in a sex offence harder to get at may prove very difficult indeed especially when so many, perhaps even the majority, of sexual offences occur in the home. However, it is possible to identify a target group of potential victims at risk from an individual offender, equipping oneself with the knowledge of how, when and where the offender is considered most likely to offend. A preventative strategy can then be planned. If, for example, it is known that a repeat child rapist who has twice abducted children from school playgrounds and raped them in his car at multi-storey car parks has just been
released from prison, one would alert local schools to the risk and advise them on informing the children with any of the preventative packages available, and on heightening the awareness of school staff to the anticipated danger. The circulation of the offender's vehicle details to car park authorities would also increase the risk of detection. A supervising probation officer is well placed to do both of these tasks and many more.

To conduct supervision in this way would make the victim harder to get at. What would be gained is some insight into the identification of a broad target range which would help to select potential victims so that other protection methods, some of which appear in this work and are discussed later, could be implemented. Target hardening in sex crime is therefore limited, and is best undertaken through public education programmes such as those used in schools.

Once the school staff are informed of the risk presented by the offender, and if they have met him or seen a photograph of him, they are likely to be more vigilant in their supervision of the children, alert to the increased level of responsibility and better equipped to protect their charges. Through surveillance, these target hardening methods would be effective. If the offender is successful in abducting a child then car park staff, who had previously been made aware of the offender's crime environment, would exercise their surveillance role to reduce opportunities further. Of course the dimensions of displacement and promotion of public fear of crime are important considerations
and need to be balanced against the distinct advantages of target hardening methods. The need for a reliable system of risk assessment would be of crucial importance in predicting the likelihood of a repeat offence.

2) **Target Removal.** This is effected by removing the target completely from risk.

Having wages paid by direct bank transfer has reduced robberies (Chaiken, Lawless and Stephenson, 1974). Other examples include snatch-plate car stereos that can be removed whilst the car is parked and coin slot energy meters being replaced by quarterly billing (Clarke and Mayhew, 1980). Target removal can be applied to some crimes against the person, such as young people hitchhiking by themselves or walking alone at night. It is possible to discourage people from placing themselves in such risky situations. Public safety campaigns and crime prevention initiatives already provide this to some degree. In our society though, where so much value is placed on individual freedom, removal of targets is often very difficult, and a trade-off will unavoidably be made between freedom and safety. Incapacitation of identified offenders is perhaps, in the case of very high risk, the only way to achieve this. It would separate potential victims from risk by removing or restricting the offender, thus achieving the aim. Methods of incapacitation such as electronic monitoring (discussed in Chapter 2) and compulsory residency at a probation hostel would effect target removal to some degree through incapacitation. For example the supervision of an offender with a long history of indecently exposing himself to girls in uniform on their way to a local infant school, and who appears unmotivated to accept treatment could be arranged to include methods of target
removal. This could be achieved by asking the courts, when he is next sentenced, to impose a probation order of 3 years and to include a condition in that order requiring him to remain at home during specified periods, say, 8 am to 9.30 am and 3 pm to 4.30 pm. If such a method was not practical due to employment or domestic circumstances then he could be directed to reside at a hostel approved by the probation officer and to observe specified curfews. Residency at a hostel may prove expensive but the level of supervision offered may justify this, especially as his offending is expected to escalate unless controlled, and in view of the vulnerability of the potential victims. If this offender is not within sight of uniformed school children his opportunity to offend is significantly reduced and his crime environment disturbed. As with target hardening, supervision would need to be sensitive to a displacement effect occurring, although this of course is not inevitable, particularly in the case of an offender with such a specific fetish.

The use of electronic monitoring, whilst not explored in the field experiment reported later, as it was not available at the time, holds considerable promise in the supervision of sex offenders as we have seen in Chapter 2. Imposed curfew with electronic monitoring or hostel provision may present the only effective alternative to long periods of imprisonment for high risk offenders. The courts and the probation service have at their disposal a range of incapacititive methods some of which are mentioned above and others which are discussed in the next chapter. Target removal through incapacitation is one aspect of situational crime
prevention with sex offenders which does have clear applications. Legally imposed restriction on contact with potential victims is discussed later.

3) **Removing the Means of Crime.** Some sorts of crimes have been dramatically reduced by removing the means to commit them. For example, skyjacking was reduced from 70 per year to 15 per year by screening passengers and baggage for bombs and weapons (Wilkinson, 1977). Violent offences in pubs have been addressed to some degree by using plastic glasses so as to reduce injury from being "glassed" (Scottish Council on Crime, 1975). In the case of sex crime this is not perhaps as sinister or drastic as one might first assume. Restriction on inappropriate employment or living arrangements, where close contact with potential victims is likely may prove beneficial, as would discouragement of membership in offender networks, such as restricted pornography and paedophile rings. As with the examples given above, removing the means to commit a sex offence would not include the removal of any such implement or object. However, if we adopt a view that such items are a form of 'accessory', in that they facilitate the commission of an offence, which would not otherwise have been committed, then such an interpretation may allow us to apply this crime prevention concept to sex offending. Whereas the high-jackers' motivation and the spontaneous nature of pub violence would remain, the opportunity to offend, in a way that presents considerable risk to many potential victims, is reduced considerably.
For sex offenders, removing the means of crime might include concentrating on their pro-offending activities and interests. For example, membership of paedophile news groups or Internet forums promoting illegal sexual behaviour (not only pornography of a sadistic nature but also child pornography and erotica). Whilst such activity does not cause sexual offending, it can promote and facilitate it by establishing networks and normalising the behaviour. To have an awareness of such activity, which might only be achieved through 'intrusive' home visiting or information received from a close relative or friend of the offender (both of which are explored later), would help in the assessment of risk and subsequent risk management plan. Enforcement of any prohibition in this respect would place these concerns firmly into the legal framework of supervision. For some officers, liberal mindedness might lead such activity to be discouraged as counter productive to the therapeutic nature of the treatment approach. For others, seizure of the equipment by the police and a thorough search of the data banks and the offender's property would provide a rigorous enough starting position from which to view future supervision approaches. Collaboration with the police and courts over such concerns and an examination of the powers available to probation officers are examined further in this thesis. Removing the means to commit sex offences requires that we broaden our interpretation of 'means' beyond the 'tools of the trade' and re-focus on pro-criminal activities which might maintain the offender at a higher risk of re-offending.
4) Reducing the Pay-Offs. Some preventative measures are designed to reduce the incentives to crime by reducing the financial gain to successful offenders. It is clear to see how post-coding valuable electrical items such as videos or televisions would reduce the resale value, but more difficult to draw benefits from sexual offences. If we could assume, and evidence to support this is available (see for example Wolf, 1984), that the motive for sexual offending is not financial but indeed a desire for emotional and sexual gratification, then to apply such a measure of pay-off reduction would require a reduction in that reward. Cognitive behavioural therapy here may have legitimate application if victim empathy work can be effective. Other interventions such as libido suppressants have been shown to be effective. If the need for gratification is reduced by chemicals then the 'pay-off' will not perhaps be required, or may be considerably reduced in value to the offender. If treatment with libido suppressant drugs can withstand the ethical, moral and professional scrutiny as discussed in Chapter 2, then, whilst it remains a matter for the patient and relevant doctor to consider, probation officers could do more to encourage its use. If sexual arousal can be reduced then not only might we achieve success in reducing the motivation to offend, but we might also reduce the incentive to seek opportunities to offend. If offending does persist, we might lessen the reinforcing effect of ejaculation in the maintenance of the offence cycle. The sexual assault cycle would lose a degree of momentum as the 'pay-off' is reduced in value. To interrupt the sexual assault cycle by reducing the
motivation, opportunity and reward, holds promise in the uncertain nature of treatment and supervision.

Probation officers are unable to prescribe libido suppressant drugs and the responsibility for treatment of this kind lies quite properly in the domain of the medical profession, for libido suppression is not, as we have seen, an exclusive utility of criminal justice. However, to support and encourage its use amongst those offenders who would seem to benefit is a perfectly reasonable use of supervisory authority, as the reduction of offending is probation's legitimate territory. As the consenting offender might benefit from his decision to be treated with libido suppressant drugs, so too might the general public who would otherwise be potential victims. This issue is pursued later in the thesis.

5) **Formal Surveillance.** This method of prevention refers to the offender's perception of the continued threat of apprehension, sufficient, it is hoped, to deter potential offenders. Under certain circumstances it may be worthwhile for public authorities or private organisations to provide formal surveillance in high risk areas, and certainly we have seen huge spending on close circuit television in city centres and other key target areas. The police service does of course provide such a system of formal surveillance by deploying constables on the beat and involving itself in local community policing. In calculating the risk of detection a potential offender would be unlikely to commit an offence if he considered he would be caught. This, one would assume, would apply equally to sex offenders as well as other criminals. Formal surveillance of high risk
offenders, rather than locations, is a practice which is resource intensive but highly successful (see Marx, 1988). Probation surveillance, whilst being currently much less intrusive than policing or other methods, is again very well placed to monitor sex offenders, and whilst we currently have no research evidence to support the contention that formal surveillance of sex offenders is effective it is our intention to test out such a hypothesis in this work by using various forms of formal surveillance, including that offered directly through probation supervision.

6) **Natural Surveillance.** This refers to a method of surveillance which is afforded by people going about their everyday business. Social cohesiveness and a concern for others is included also. It can refer to the physical design of neighbourhoods by promoting the use of better lighting etc, (see for example Tien, O'Donnell, Barnett and Mirchandani, 1979), but in the case of sex crime it is possible to use a system of notification. This is now legislated for in the U.S.A. and is being increasingly introduced in Britain. It involves the police informing the public of the presence of a sex offender in their neighbourhood so as to enhance natural surveillance. Potential also exists, although equally controversial, for the use of community collaborators. These are key people who are in some way close to the offender, either geographically or as a family member, and who agree to act, whether to rehabilitate or to incriminate, as an informer or behaviour monitor. There is little or no academic research available into the use of such a system of surveillance, though Shaw (1970) used similar methods of enlisting 'significant others' in his work with offenders. This issue is
explored in the next chapter and is a core component of this experimental research documented later.

7) **Surveillance by Employees.** Natural surveillance is of limited effectiveness and formal surveillance is expensive. Clarke and Mayhew (1980) suggest that more promise exists in exploiting the surveillance role of certain sorts of employee. Caretakers, bus conductors and doormen have all been shown to be able to reduce vandalism (see for example Waller and Okihiro, 1978). In child protection work, employee surveillance has proved to have been of considerable value (Department of Health, 1991). The role of probation here would be to harness existing motivation and create a new surveillance culture in many public, and occasionally private, organisations. Staff at schools, leisure centres, libraries, parks, playgrounds, amusement arcades, children’s discos and nightclubs could constitute crucial members of sex crime prevention initiatives. To recruit the help of staff in such a way may help to prevent and detect such offences, although promoting fear of crime and unjustifiable scapegoating or bullying would have to be checked in any such initiative. An offender focused approach to this task may prove more useful than a more general concern about sex crime. Supervising officers would be able to compile important information about those offenders regarded as presenting a substantial risk and this information could be made available, with current photograph, to the staff at public amenities including all leisure and recreation facilities. Schools would also benefit from a staff briefing about the risk which a local sex offender presents. The door supervisors at local nightclubs are in ideal positions to
regulate entry, and would prove useful in closely supervising or refusing entry to men convicted of date rape where the initial contact had been made at nightclubs in previous offences. Again, staff briefings could be arranged, and as door supervisors and admission staff are experienced at refusing entry to troublemakers, extending the net a little further to eliminate known rapists who target victims in clubs would not present such an enormous change of activity or principle. Indeed, local police training and accreditation schemes for door supervisors could include such an element. Club owners would benefit from providing better controlled, and safer, leisure outlets.

8) Environmental Management. This final situational crime control measure looks to control the community environment to avoid the occurrence of trouble 'hot spots'. In football crowd control the routing of fans, as well as closing pubs along the way, have been shown to be useful. Truancy sweeps and provision of youth services in local communities have also served as examples of environmental management. For sex crime, though, the potential for the application of such environmental management appears limited. Sensitive housing allocation policy informed by the probation service and other agencies such as police and social services, might create better surveillance and supervision of sex offenders. For example, in the case of a paedophile who is known to target vulnerable families, and offend against children in his own home, it may be prudent for him to live in a location that is easily observed either by closed circuit television, or through a warden or caretaker. The local housing department could be approached and involved in negotiations to plan to
manage the risk presented by him. Other examples would include directing the offender to move from an area, such as close proximity to a park or playground, to reduce the opportunity for offending. Probation officers have considerable discretionary powers which could be applied to effect greater use of environmental crime prevention measures and this too is tested in the research which follows.

Situational crime prevention is not without its critics and it seems crucial to consider the implications of displacement whenever discussing it. Displacement has been found to occur where opportunity reducing methods have been deployed in certain situations. This can work by causing offenders to choose a different time, location, target or method of offending or to commit a different form of crime (see for example Cornish and Clarke, 1986). If displacement occurs, situational measures have been effective only in protecting individual targets, with overall crime levels unaffected.

Harris (1992), in a review of crime prevention and its implications for probation, argues there is little fundamental disagreement about displacement: sometimes it happens and sometimes not. Clarke (1983) argues there are reasons to believe displacement has been unfairly viewed as problematic. He goes on to explain that people find it hard to accept that offenders who commit often very serious criminal acts may have done so on the situationally specific opportunity that presented itself. As an example of how opportunities can affect behaviour he discusses how suicide, which is popularly seen as the result of deep-rooted motivation, reduced in considerable number after the installation of less toxic North Sea gas in the home. Similar considerations
apply to several forms of crime, although due regard must be paid to differences in motivation underlying different categories of crime.

An example of situational crime prevention through formal surveillance in sexually motivated crime can be seen in recent research into obscene phone calling. As technology now exists to trace calls almost immediately, the chances of detection are considerable. Buck, Chatterton and Pease (1995) have documented the relative success of a crime prevention initiative in Hull. Kingston Communications and Humberside Police combined efforts to implement a highly publicised campaign claiming to be able to trace obscene callers and enforce existing laws. An evaluation by the authors has shown the scheme to be successful. Two features of obscene phone calls suggest that measures which enable calls to be traced are a powerful way forward. Repeat victimisation and the likelihood that many offenders know their victims should deter potential obscene and malicious callers. The fear of detection is expected to reduce this area of sexually motivated crime still further. As yet no displacement effect has been observed.

Although the evidence available, and accordingly relied upon here, lends itself to wide application, it does at least provide a prima facie case that applying offender specific crime prevention initiatives to sex offenders may be successful there too. To measure success, however, is problematic, as in the case of sex offending in particular many of the measures that could be used may indeed lead to detection and conviction of new offences. If a traditional crime rate analysis approach to evaluation were to be applied as a measure of success such a scheme might ultimately create its own apparent failure. Hence it is important to consider the wider purpose of crime prevention, which is to prevent offending and ultimately protect the
public. If an offence is detected by such measures and the offender apprehended as a result of, say, target hardening. (such as a victim successfully resisting abduction) or employee surveillance (for example, a school crossing patrol noticing that a known paedophile is bringing a certain child to school each morning) then this should be regarded as success.

To provide us with further illumination of this point it may be worth discussing a case example where a crime prevention approach has been applied to supervision and resulted in the discovery of evidence that led to prosecution. Whilst it appears that supervision has failed, as indeed it has when seen from a traditional rehabilitative stance, there is certain success in discovering that an offence has been committed, as it might otherwise have remained undetected. For this example let us return to the case of Nick, discussed earlier. If Nick was being supervised in such a way as to take full account of the risk he presented, and a plan had been agreed by several agencies to reduce the risk of re-offence, then how might this look in practice? Nick would be aware of the supervision plan but might not fully appreciate the far reaching effectiveness of surveillance. This example is an amalgam of case material and does not relate to any specific individual in its entirety.

Nick, although unfit, and never before ever demonstrating any interest in athletic sport, began to purchase sports clothing. This was noticed by the area police officer, who had attended a Risk Management Meeting to discuss Nick and was surprised to see it hanging on Nick's washing line. The police officer mentioned this to the probation officer who had seen Nick wearing expensive training shoes during visits to the probation office. Nick was asked about his new interest but was economical with the truth, saying he wore them as fashion shoes. During the
same week a school teacher, who had been briefed about Nick, overheard two pupils talking about 'training with Nick' and how each morning they would go jogging with him. The teacher reported the matter to the probation officer who contacted the police officer to request assistance. The following morning Nick was observed, by the area police officer, leaving his home dressed in running gear and heading for the woods where he previously offended. On the outskirts of the wood Nick met two boys, also dressed in running gear, and all three entered the woods. The police officer followed and caught up with Nick and the two boys, in a clearing near to the pathway. Nick was seen to be massaging one of the boys' buttocks as if to be providing some form of physiotherapy.

Nick was arrested for indecent assault and the boys later disclosed how he had further abused them. Whilst Nick had re-offended, the method of supervision had revealed this, and in so doing had prevented further offending and identified victims requiring therapy. As a crime prevention method, the supervision, whilst failing to protect the victims in the short-term, had no doubt protected them from further abuse. It had also prevented further victims from being created. During the course of this offending Nick was attending a treatment programme and was seen to be making good progress. The news of these offences however, provoked a re-evaluation of this.

Managing the risk presented by serious offenders in the community demands an appropriate escalation in the nature and intrusiveness of supervision. Clearly detection of sex offending may lead to the provision of desirable intervention for the victim. Beyond that, however, such an intervention invites public and political re-evaluation of the nature of freedom, and the
balance to be struck between the freedom of the potential victim and the civil liberties of the offender.

A comprehensive risk management initiative underpinned with the principles of situational or individual crime prevention theory would provide a system of enhanced supervision which would probably find favour with most agencies, the public and perhaps some sex offenders themselves. However, Gilling (1996), whilst lending support to the concept of individual crime prevention, warns that all too often probation officers become confused between social and criminal justice and become over involved in community issues that are best addressed by other agencies. He argues that because the probation service has frequently found itself in a disadvantaged position during collaborative encounters, its long term interests are unlikely to be realised in continuing with crime prevention work. In contrast, and with certainly more optimism, Harris (1992) identifies a major theme emerging from crime prevention strategies, the need for collaboration beyond inter-agency hostility and professional jealousy. Resources need to be committed and information shared. For this to be effective each agency has to be aware that the advantages they stand to gain far outweigh the discomfort of accommodating change. Sex offending is identified as a problem which adversely affects all relevant agencies to the extent that collaboration is welcomed, encouraged and promoted.

Conclusion and Summary

In its present form criminology can contribute to the creation of a more detailed picture of sex crime, concerned not only with the reason for its existence, but, more importantly, with providing the theoretical and political context in which to begin to examine how to control it.
Administrative criminology has developed as a post positivist enterprise which draws on classical strands to create a framework for analysis, but within an overall context of the creation and maintenance of social order. One of the major achievements of this political and professional concern with crime has been the formulation and academic application of situational crime prevention. Rational choice is currently held to be a major influence in the motivation to offend. This dictates that potential offenders will, if given the opportunity, commit offences. If the perceived chances of detection are minimal then the likelihood of an offence occurring is greater. Such behaviour is to a large degree predictable, and where human behaviour can be predicted the scope for modifying that person or the environment is possible. Offending is therefore in principle preventable.

Administrative criminology informs criminal justice and as such has the potential to become a means of social control. An administrative criminological approach to the control of sex crime may produce an insightful opportunity to re-evaluate the ways in which criminal justice and welfare agencies work with sex offenders. Administrative criminology merges in its interest with multi-agency crime prevention and child protection to provide new opportunities for academic interest and professional activity. Control of sex offenders through individual or situational crime prevention strategies seems, at this stage at least, a theoretical possibility. Successful research to add to that already documented by Buck, Chatterton and Pease (1995) may help to illuminate the scope for further implementation of control strategies in sex crime.
CHAPTER 4

**Sex Offender Risk Management Approach (SORMA):**

The Creation of a Model and its Application to this Research

**Research Design**

The method of criminological research used to explore SORMA and interpret the findings is best described as a field experiment (for a detailed description of this research method see Jupp, 1989). It was decided to follow this method because of the central role it has played in the evaluation of social policies such as crime control, prevention and treatment.

In their purist form experiments have developed a unique set of procedures, many of which are quite elaborate. The basic aim is to establish strict control over all variables, except those which are deliberately manipulated, with the intention of identifying the effects of such manipulation. In brief, because we wanted to see how a different supervision technique would affect offenders we needed to incorporate an experimental approach to our research.
Of course, it is not possible to conduct such an experiment as the one reported here in a controlled situation, and a field experiment is one which takes place in a natural or field setting, and, where this is undertaken to study the effects of a change in policy or practice it becomes an instance of "reforms as experiments" (Campbell, 1969) or "evaluation research" (Bulmer, 1986). Field experiments are not uncommon in criminological research, and contribute more to analyses of the functioning and efficacy of the criminal justice system, than to explanation of crime and criminal behaviour.

This point is fundamental to any defence of decisions taken over method, scope, theoretical underpinning and sample size. If the object of the study had been to claim quantitative reliability or validity, then the sample size (6 sex offenders) would be unacceptably low. However, given the exploratory nature of the study as originally conceived, and the time available for the researcher to undertake his own fieldwork, it was both appropriate and achievable.

This is only in part a pragmatic point - an indication that the researcher has identified a method of work the demands of which were consonant with the time available to undertake the study. More important is the fact that what was envisaged and achieved was a depth study of six men in day to day interaction with their formal and informal social systems - families, communities, welfare and criminal justice agencies. So in addition to our primary focus on six sex offenders there is a second, wider perspective. Beyond this, however, the research
activity extends into the dynamic relationships between the various agencies involved. As stated elsewhere (see in particular pp.82-85) this required the implementation of a research design flexible enough to facilitate, when appropriate, a shift in focus, and accommodate the analysis and interpretation of our findings.

In short, as a field experiment the study undertaken here is generative and exemplary, and makes no claims for statistical significance. This is not said defensively: it is simply a different kind of research. The study is addressed as much to practitioners as to academics, and its proper habitation is as much the criminal justice system as the study or classroom.

Certainly it would be unwise to consider the inter-relationship between available theories and methods as if they existed in a vacuum. Jupp (1989, p.19) uses the term "criminological enterprise" to describe how criminological research spans a number of institutional contexts. We recognise there are two aspects of concern, each raising significant political and ethical issues. First is the recognition that all subjects of this research were offenders bound by legal sanctions within the criminal justice system. As such they could be regarded as captives, a position which tests to the limits notions of voluntary participation. Second, the researcher's role as probation officer within the criminal justice institution where these subjects were "captive", with responsibility for their statutory supervision gives such scope for manipulation, misuse of power and lack of objectivity as to raise important political and ethical considerations in planning the methodology. While, as we explain elsewhere (see
pp.137-138) these factors were meticulously addressed, it does remain the case that, in Jupp's words, "In the main such experiments require "captive" populations from which to select subjects and it is not surprising, therefore, that the Home Office has been a prime initiator of such experiments". (Jupp, 1989 p.52).

Consideration of quantitative methods can also too easily beg the question of what, precisely, it is that is being measured. This is an area fraught with difficulty. While this is not the moment to consider in general the methodological and epistemological problems which functionalist social research methods raise, it is not difficult to show that an approach based on a before-after study (for example, reconviction) or control group methods (allowing of course for a large enough sample size to validate the task which, as we have already seen could not be achieved in our present study) would have raised insurmountable problems.

First we should have faced the familiar problem of the impact of the "dark figure" on baseline data, one to which researchers need to be especially sensitive in the area of sexual offending. Secrecy, dissimulation and gross under reporting of criminal acts committed by the subjects are reported in the story of this research in this thesis. In brief, our methodology embraces this problem in a way that a control group study could not, and in so doing aims to reduce the dark figure by means of improving prevention or by improving detection, so that a higher proportion of otherwise unknown criminal acts become processed as crimes. The researcher, therefore, was not akin to the scientist with a telescope, observing only and intervening not at
all; rather he was - indeed had to be given the role and function of the researcher-cum-probation-officer - engaging in action and intervention in their own right - but action and intervention related not to the criminal activity but to the enforcement of law. The very fact that these subjects were under the closer scrutiny which is fundamental to SORMA meant that they were more likely to be detected than had they not been. A control group approach would, therefore, have been inappropriate to the method chosen.

Secondly, and closely related to this, had a control group been set up it would have been impossible to ascribe meaning to our findings. This is because we lacked the analytic or empirical tools to separate prevention and detection in the course of our fieldwork. For example, in this study paradoxically "failure" and "success" became, if not interchangeable then inverted, and because it was conducted in the 'field' not a laboratory, prevention and detection were impossible to distinguish. How could we have usefully interpreted the fact that either more or less detected crime had been committed by the sample? If fewer crimes had been detected we might, conventionally, have used this as evidence of SORMA's prophylactic capacity - crudely that the fact that the offenders knew they were under scrutiny had affected their criminality. If on the other hand more crimes had been detected we could, with equal plausibility, have pointed to the probable size of the dark figure in paedophiliac sexual offending and to the likely incorrigibility of the sample, claiming that a 'failure to prevent' in fact signified a 'success in detection'.
This duality of purpose (between prevention and detection) is not an unusual problem in field experiments. While to the purist it represents a corruption of strict scientific method, to other researchers the problem is rather the opposite: over strict adherence to scientific method, by presupposing that the complexities of the social world are amenable to accurate investigation on the basis of methods appropriate to a clinical drugs trial, can get in the way of the systematic, applied, context-based testing of new ideas, new strategies, 'real world' policies.

Thirdly, and still on the issue of research methods, it would have been possible to have engaged more fully with the evaluation literature, and there are ways in which the design of the study could have been moulded to fit the methods available to evaluate it (see for example Herman, 1988; Rossi and Freeman, 1998); but the decision was taken to proceed on a basis which was generative and exemplary for three main reasons: first, the urgency, topicality and social usefulness of the work; secondly, the consequentially strong support for its implementation from key stakeholders in the process (and the challenge involved in securing this necessary co-operation should not be underestimated. More could be said about this, but field experiments which require the co-operation of professionals for whom the agenda is slightly different require detailed negotiation and cannot be irrelevant to the methods employed); and thirdly, as already mentioned, there is the capacity of the (part-time) researcher to combine the research with his own professional practice.
Overall, therefore, it should by now be clear why the more conventional approaches to 'measurement' would have been inappropriate for the present research, which necessarily drew its inspiration from qualitative and ethnographic methods, but overlaid with the political realities of the necessity of research negotiation with key agencies, and the role of the researcher himself.

Nor, however, should it be conceded that more conventional approaches do not have limitations too. As the field experiment was the only method of research to be used here, and because the subjects were not the only focus of our activity it was decided to proceed with our modified field experiment. For, as we shall see, what this part of the methodology lacked in purity was compensated for by the breadth and flexibility of the overall design. As Jupp wisely observes, "the reality is often that experiments carried out in criminology can only be rough approximations to the experimental ideal". (Jupp, 1989 p. 54)

For all the sanitisation of many positivist research reports, control groups are never perfect matches; things go wrong in the day to day business of research management; in much research into the efficacy of correctional or supportive social action professional and recipient are perceived as interchangeable variables - as though the same 'method of intervention' conducted by Professional A on Recipient X were identical in process to that conducted by Professional B on Recipient Y, irrespective of (say) style, personality, age, attractiveness, racial or gender mix. In short, no method of work is perfect, but the one employed here is
defensible and only demands, like all research, not to have more claimed for its findings than can be justified by the nature and scale of the method deployed.

It is time now to outline the Sex Offender Risk Management Approach (SORMA) which has been created for the purpose of this research study. Nothing that follows will surprise the careful reader, for in presenting the background issues we have carefully trailed the key components of the model itself.

Like almost any model in the social sciences SORMA draws on different theories, and exists in a political world far removed from that of the natural scientists' laboratory. This position, whilst diminishing the purity of the model, creates for us a flexibility of approach that accommodates the unpredictable nature of exploratory endeavour. However, although we accept that the theoretical purity is diminished, we benefit from the robustness of this model, situated, as it is, in an imprecise science.

SORMA comprises the following key elements and as we examine these we refer back to the relevant sections of Chapters 1-3. It is important to note that SORMA is not based on a pure model of rational choice and neither is it inconsistent with the positivist assumption that with sex offenders at least, biochemistry may well have a part to play. Causation however is not our concern except to the extent that SORMA essentially assumes a degree of choice to exist, and the case studies demonstrate clearly that the majority of the offences the subjects are committing are far from impulsive, but are carefully planned, in some cases over many weeks. The ethnography of the case studies forms the empirical core of the thesis. We will see how the
subjects appear to possess an instinct for spotting the right victim in the right place at the right
time.

SORMA is concerned not with aetiology but with management, and in this sense it is, as we
have seen in Chapter 3, located within what Young has called the emerging tradition of
administrative criminology (Young 1986; 1994). The model, however, is also situated in and
draws part of its functional value from, a therapeutic interaction with environment
manipulation, which forms the core of SORMA, though since the model also entails the
repudiation of the distinction between supervision and therapy, the main focus is on
management and creating conformity than on humanistic self expression. For in therapeutic
sessions with controlling but 'caring' professionals subjects can reveal much that they would
conceal in the course of police interrogation. Extending the circle of confidentiality in this way
transforms therapy into an instrument of power and control.

**Sex Offender Risk Management Approach (SORMA)**

1) **Unambiguously Concerned With Social Control:** There exists an unequivocal
   purpose to maintain, as the central focus, a concern with social control. We have seen in
   Chapter 2 how a range of controlling influences are available to prevent sex crime.
   SORMA attempts to utilise appropriate methods of social control for the benefit of the
   majority. Community supervision, seen as it is here, as a function of the state to reduce
   crime and protect victims, is the responsibility, for the greater part, of the probation
   service. Social control has been, is, and probably always will be, a product of the
   political climate within which professional organisations such as the probation service
operate. This will continue to influence the methods of social control used in such an activity. A continuum of control is referred to on page 44 and introduces for the purpose of analysis a broad range of control methods. Control through incapacitation, surveillance and treatment are available within this model for, as we have seen, SORMA is most accurately seen as a utility of social control.

2) **Clinical Therapy:** Treatment for those who are reasonably expected to benefit is encouraged within SORMA as it provides an opportunity for the offender to self-manage his problem behaviour. There is also considerable value in using therapeutic intervention as a means to gather important information that can be used to formulate risk assessment and manage supervision. SORMA therefore derives dual benefit from treatment, firstly, for those offenders with appropriate motivation to refrain from offending, and secondly, those with less motivation whose supervision requires a surveillance function (see Chapter 2).

3) **Situational Crime Prevention:** SORMA adopts this as a theoretical foundation in its attempt to manage risk. The locks and bolts approach to situational crime prevention has been replaced with an emergence of the importance of the offender as the source of concern, and not just the anticipated crime scene or victim. Offender specific situational crime prevention as discussed in Chapter 3, relies on a thorough risk assessment and multi-agency collaboration for effective application. SORMA's strength, in part, is derived from the ability to predict which known offenders are likely to offend, where this will be, in what circumstances and who the intended victim or target group will be. Once this has been established then a plan is implemented to lower the risk of offending by reducing opportunities and increasing the risk of detection.
4) **Actuarial Risk Analysis and Management:** Advances in sex offender risk assessment practices and risk management systems (the latter being currently more of an organisational and administrative nature rather than 'live' practitioner work - mezzo rather than micro) enables SORMA to access the predictive technology necessary to inform supervision initiatives. A level of accuracy has now been reached (see Chapter 2) that allows organisations to allocate resourcing to reduce anticipated crime with maximum effectiveness.

5) **Surveillance:** Probation supervision affords a degree of surveillance that can be enhanced by a broader understanding of risk management. SORMA advocates not only the full use of probation surveillance but harnesses, in its collaborative enterprise with other agencies, their surveillance methods, opportunities and skills also. This was examined in Chapter 3, and emerges as not only a means of detection but also as a method to reduce opportunity, as offenders who are aware they are the subject of surveillance are less likely to offend. SORMA also makes use of the surveillance opportunities available to non statutory bodies, whose involvement with relevant members of the community, be they intended targets or the offender, places them in a valuable role. Surveillance is essential to this model, its eyes and ears. This however introduces to probation supervision a further step away from traditional values and is therefore reflective of the discourse mentioned in Chapter 1.

6) **Multi-Agency Collaboration:** SORMA embraces the collaborative spirit of child protection work and harnesses the concern that many agencies have with the protection of victims, not only to inform them of potential risk but to engage them in a multi-agency enterprise to assess and manage it. Risk Management Meetings bring together
those practitioners with a legitimate interest and facilitate the negotiation of situational crime prevention plans, designed to reduce opportunities and increase the likelihood of detection. The probation service, with its statutory responsibility to supervise sex offenders, is ideally placed to co-ordinate and enforce these plans. Within SORMA is the recognition that probation supervision, whilst proving in some cases to be of some benefit to the individual offender, has little protective value to offer the wider community and professional network. This recognition, however, introduces the potential collaborative value of inter-agency working and places the probation service not in a diminished role by such a realisation. Quite the contrary, it elevates it to a powerful position, exercising greater statutory control and emerging as central to local crime prevention initiatives.

7) Maximisation of Legislative Authority: There exists a varied and surprisingly comprehensive range of legislative authority available, either directly to probation officers for use in community supervision activities or indirectly through collaborative working with other criminal justice and public service agencies. However, the availability of this legislative authority is little known amongst probation officers, and as a result, is rarely exercised to its maximum public protection effect in the supervision process. SORMA involves the identification, development and implementation of the statutory utilities that can enhance enforcement and public protection in sex offender supervision. It does not necessarily require that full use of power and control is exercised in all cases, but rather it encourages an awareness and appreciation of the effective use of available legal, professional and political mandates in appropriate cases.
These seven components of SORMA help to provide the reader with an introduction to the key elements of the model. This is complemented in Chapter 7 by a processual account of the model which describes its practical application through probation supervision, and then within the 'contingent flexibility' referred to earlier, its role in multi-agency prevention of sex crime.

To test such a model and record the findings requires, because of the multi-variate nature of social science research, a clear and detailed methodological approach to analyse the data. For this reason we now examine the context in which the research took place and then the procedure by which the findings were established.

First, I must explain that this research project has been conducted and recorded by myself. This raises one or two problems for the internal validity of the data, an issue discussed in some detail earlier and referred to again later. During the period of this research 1993-1997, which was undertaken on a part-time basis, I have worked as a probation officer in a field office in the north of England, referred to as Middletown. My duties were to co-ordinate a cognitive behavioural treatment programme for sex offenders and to supervise an otherwise generic caseload of adult offenders.

In this research I set out to discover what would happen if sex offenders were supervised to a plan that had been negotiated at a multi-disciplinary meeting. What would the supervision consist of? How would the other agencies and the offenders respond? Would the complications
be so great as to outweigh any potential benefits? The report, therefore, is ethnographic, of an exemplary project, but while it is exploratory in nature, and makes no claim to have produced valid or generalisable outcomes, the theoretical model developed from this piece of practice, SORMA, is offered for further detailed testing by researchers with greater resources at their disposal than were available to me. The processual dimensions of the work are, therefore, intended to offer examples in the effective handling of difficult and potentially dangerous men whose depredations would otherwise cause human suffering and political damage to the agency.

Essentially this research is a criminological enterprise, and the findings from this discovery based approach to interdisciplinary research are expressed mainly as qualitative data collected during a field experiment involving the functioning of certain aspects of the criminal justice and child protection systems.

Deciding this research project was a criminological enterprise was no simple process. Considerable attention was given to finding the appropriate discipline in which to pursue this project. Sex offenders and how they are dealt with by society attract legitimate interest from a variety of disciplines and professionals, for example social work, police, psychology, sociology, psychiatry and the law. But criminology encapsulates the full range of these disciplines and sets the context of the research in the arena of criminal justice. As the focus of this work is not to discover why sex offenders commit their crimes but what can be done to help stop them, the behavioural sciences seemed to have limited relevance. In view of the fact that sex offending is a moral and social construct, then law and law enforcement were equally as important as the
behavioural sciences but also limited. Criminology is flexible enough to provide a comprehensive insight into sex offending and what to do about it.

The methodology is explained here in the hope that it attracts more than just a cursory glance from any enquirer of this work. All too often we see methodologies attached as appendices to pieces of work, as if there only as a matter of courtesy or ritual, and of little significance. This piece of work acknowledges the importance of using clear and precise methodology as an aid to explaining how the findings have been arrived at. The methods used will undoubtedly have implications for the way in which problems are conceptualised and results formulated.

The amount of time and level of commitment devoted to this work have been considerable, for not only has the experiment been conducted as an additional practice initiative requiring planning and liaison, but also recorded and analysed using the methodology detailed here. In addition to this, the work, which has its roots firmly grounded at a micro level, has been contextualised not only to figure conceptually and theoretically both at mezzo and macro levels but, for the purpose of academic pursuit and validation, has undergone the rigours of analysis, discussion and interpretation. Each of the cases has required significant attention to detail and this is reflected in the proceeding chapter.

**The Research Objective:**

The objective is to describe the outcome of individual intensive supervision programmes for adult male sex offenders who are the subjects of probation supervision and who reside in the
Middletown area. The individual intensive supervision programme is referred to as the Sex Offender Risk Management Approach (SORMA). Specifically the research will:

1) Explore methods of multi-agency collaboration in the management of sex offenders in the community.

2) Describe the planning and implementation of individual supervision plans designed to protect the public from sexual crime.

3) Describe in each example the reasons for imposing specific conditions to restrict the liberty of individual offenders.

4) Describe the resource implications of such an initiative.

5) Describe any obstacles which have prevented the enforcement or implementation of such restrictions and, where appropriate, how they have been addressed.

6) Explore the use of community surveillance such as relatives of the offender, or others, in the implementation of the supervision.

7) Identify the relevance to this study of any situational crime prevention strategies.

**The Research Setting:**

Middletown is a medium sized industrial town in Northern England. Middletown County Probation Service provides resources for the Middletown area and this includes a cognitive behavioural sex offender programme of 2 years duration, offered to the local courts as a condition which they may choose to attach to probation orders.

The town has a history of innovative approaches to child protection. Joint police and social services investigations into allegations of abuse were first conducted there as early as 1985.
The subjects of this research have all been convicted of sexual offences against children. Two of the subjects have convictions against adults also. They are all the subject of probation supervision with a condition of attendance at the cognitive behavioural treatment programme. All of the subjects have given their informed consent to participate in the research.

The Research Methodology

The Research Subjects:

The 6 subjects for this research enquiry have been taken from existing probation case material. This figure has been established taking into account the limited amount of research time available. A separate interview was provided for each potential subject during which the full details of the research objectives were explained. The offenders were told that participation would be voluntary and declining to become a subject would not affect their supervision. A consent form was provided and those who participated signed it. Every effort was made to achieve fair, ethically sound and informed consent.

The following selection criteria were applied. It was anticipated that those who declined to participate would be asked to provide a reason for their refusal and this would be recorded. Neither the subjects nor the court were aware of the research prior to sentencing. This was intended to ensure the research did not influence any decision making at such a sensitive, and for the offender particularly, critical, time.
Selection Criteria for Research Subjects:

1) Must be aged 18 years or above and convicted of a sexual offence with a minimum of 12 months probation supervision to run as at 1 February 1995 for this offence.

2) Must have provided consent and signed a consent declaration.

Intensive Supervision Plans:

The subjects were supervised as existing clients of the probation service. In addition they became the focus of supervision that was planned by a multi-agency meeting. The offenders were invited to attend these meetings. These meetings became known as Risk Management Meetings (R.M.M.) and convened on the following basis:

- February 1995
- May 1995
- September 1995
- December 1995.

The Risk Management Meetings were chaired by the researcher and attended by any agency personnel with legitimate reason to be concerned with the risk presented to the public by the offender, and who chose to attend. This included:

- Police Service
- Social Services
- Health Professionals
- The Offender
- Relative/Friend/Collaborator.
The meetings shared information about the offender and established a shared understanding of the level of risk presented to the public. Details of the offences, associated behaviour and victim characteristics were discussed, and guidance provided, if required, on issues relating to recidivism, dangerousness and risk.

A supervision plan, known as the Risk Management Plan (R.M.P.) was then negotiated and included proposals to reduce the risk of re-offending. A Risk Management Form (R.M.F.) was then circulated. These forms were reviewed and updated at every subsequent Risk Management Meeting.

Community Surveillance:
Subjects were given the opportunity to include a community collaborator as part of their Risk Management Plan. This person could have been a relative or friend who volunteered to participate. The involvement of such a person is felt to be very important and all attempts were made to engage such an individual. Such a person was expected to have regular contact or oversight of the subject, and substantial influence on the implementation of a R.M.P.

Recording of Data:
1) The Risk Management Forms were examined and anonymised information provided for scrutiny by the enquirer.

2) A diary of communication was maintained referring to details of contact and issues arising during the 12 months period of research.

3) Case file material was used in the final accumulation of data used for publication.
Supervision Methods:

In addition to the level and nature of supervision expected by the probation service and the guidelines contained within the Home Office National Standards for the Probation Service (1994), additional methods of contact and supervision were required for certain subjects. These were identified by the R.M.M. and included:

1) Regular telephone contact
2) Regular reporting to monitor and restrict liberty
3) Targeting for surveillance
4) Issuing reasonable instructions in line with the aims of the risk management plan, for example:-
   a) prohibited places
   b) acceptable conduct
   c) special conditions
   d) regular home visits.

Compliance or otherwise with such supervision methods was recorded. Sanctions for non-compliance were discussed with the Risk Management Meeting and legal advice sought prior to any possible breach action in court. Any such instructions were encompassed into and mandated by the expectations of the existing probation order requirements. Put simply, the Risk Management Plan was enforced as an integral part of supervision practice, and on the basis
of options available in existing legislation. The following procedure was adopted by the Risk Management Meeting to deal with failure to comply.

1) Verbal warning
2) Written warning
3) Breach action.

Protection of the Public:

The subjects were made aware that details of any offences that they chose to reveal during this research would be reported to the police and social services department. If any suspicions arose as a result of the subject's conduct or behaviour that suggested an offence was being planned this too would be reported to the investigating agencies.

Ethical Considerations:

All attempts have been made to design this methodology in such a way as to respect the individual civil liberties of those participating. Consent was obtained and all of the supervision methods used were within the legal boundaries that applied to each agency involved.

Criminological research can, like other areas of research, particularly in the social sciences, fall victim to ambiguity. For example, outcomes can be attributable to a range of non-experimental factors as well as classic phenomena such as Hawthorne - with subject behaviour itself influenced by the fact that the experiment is underway. Wherever possible, design faults are discussed as possible variables that could have influenced the results. Once a subject had been interviewed and consent obtained he was not reminded by the researcher of the fact that he was
part of a research experiment. If he chose to raise the matter for discussion then this would have been recorded and reported. The nature of the supervision that emerged during this research was considered as an integral part of probation supervision. As the subjects had limited experience of probation supervision it was anticipated that they would not consider they were being dealt with in any different, research orientated way.

Subject captivity is an issue that was expected to influence consent. Men who are already subjects of probation supervision may feel obliged to participate in the research for fear of being seen as less than co-operative with their supervising probation officer. At the time of selecting eligible clients of the service to approach for consent there were 9 offenders who fitted the established criteria. As the target figure was 6 offenders there was no pressure to use coercive means to enlist subjects. Using an independent person to interview subjects and obtain consent was considered as a possibility but discounted due to the anticipated difficulties that could arise from misinforming the offenders. Public safety was also considered as an ethical and professional issue. Those involved with the research were aware that placing undue stress on a subject might increase the likelihood of further offences being committed. Game-playing was also acknowledged as a possibility, and a decision made to discontinue the research with a particular offender if it appeared that he was responding to the research, particularly the close supervision, with mischievous or even dangerous intent.

Outcomes:
The findings of this exploratory investigation will reveal what occurs when efforts are made for agencies to work together to manage the risk presented by convicted sex offenders. It has to be stated that such an initiative may indeed identify or detect further offences - a consequence
which considerably complicates the rather complacent definition of 'success' as entailing 'no further offences'. Success in SORMA can also entail the discovery and punishment of offences which would otherwise have gone undetected - a fact which emphasises clearly the policing as well as therapeutic dimensions of the model. At the time of preparation it was impossible to predict what would occur during the course of the study. The findings are not expected to provide any insight into why sex offences are committed, but rather, what can be done to prevent them.

Agency Involvement:

The agencies involved in the research project are all situated in Middletown and are linked, necessarily, by their membership of the Middletown County Child Protection Committee and more specifically the local area sub committee. During the preparation of the research project the local area sub committee was briefed about the research aims by the probation service representative (not the researcher). At this time the research design had not been finalised, but an outline of the experiment was presented in order to test the response of agencies collectively. It must also be noted that such a representation was considered essential for the smooth running of existing child protection procedures and any anticipated alteration to professional working practices. If there was to be any chance of adversely affecting existing liaison, and this could not be ruled out completely, then it was felt essential to provide an opportunity for the Area Child Protection Committee to comment. In addition to this the A.C.P.C. might well find the project of interest and it would have been discourteous and unprofessional not to involve them. The response was rather quiet and uneventful. The research project was acknowledged, no issues were raised.
As there exists no separate umbrella organisation for co-ordinating local response to sexual offences against adults it was decided that no preparatory work could be undertaken other than to approach any relevant agency directly, for discussion. Within each organisation involved with the A.C.P.C. separate responsibility exists for work with adult victims, though staff from some organisations deal with both adults and children. In this respect the right people had already been made aware of the research project's existence, aims and intended outcomes. At the time of conducting the research the A.C.P.C. was not experiencing any local agency problems and relations were politically healthy. There was, however, expected to be a reorganisation of local government that would most likely bring a devolution of local authority control. Whilst this would affect the structure of the social services and education departments it was not expected to affect the health, police and probation service.

The Probation Service:

Middletown County Probation Service has provided access for this research to be conducted, and has part funded the project in recognition of its potential value to probation locally and nationally. Limited support has been provided from senior officers other than the regular and procedural monitoring of cases, but the research has attracted little interest from fellow officers or senior officers, though the demands of the research on the researcher's contribution to agency duties have been tolerated by the staff team even at times of heightened pressure.
The six subjects for the research are all sex offender cases that I supervised as a main grade probation officer working for Middletown Probation Service. They are known to each other as they were all members of a cognitive behavioural treatment programme for sex offenders.

The Police:

The Middletown County Police Service has a Middletown division which includes a designated Child Protection Unit consisting of a Detective Inspector, Detective Sergeant, and 4 Detective Constables with increased resources as and when required. The service they provide includes the video interviewing of child victims of abuse as well as the arrest and investigation of alleged offenders. Their work also includes the investigation of sexual offences against adults. During the planning of this research the police remained enthusiastic and undoubtedly helped to shape the 12 months field experiment as it evolved. It was anticipated that community beat officers would become involved to some degree and this would be at the discretion of the Child Protection Unit.

The Social Services Department:

In the Social Services Department in Middletown area teams have operational responsibility for child protection and conduct joint investigations with the Police Child Protection Unit. The Department has principal practitioners in child protection who offer specialist advice to social workers on issues relating to child protection. During the planning of this research the principal practitioners became the point of reference for negotiation. As experienced specialists in their field their advice was of great benefit, as was their commitment to developing the research initiative. As with most social service departments the designated child protection workers find
themselves investigating, assessing and prohibiting sex offenders as part of their statutory responsibility to protect children. It was envisaged that adult services staff would also become involved with some of the subjects.

**Health Services:**

Staff from a variety of health departments, particularly mental health staff, were invited to become involved in the Risk Management Meetings. Local health service providers are devolved into separate trusts. At the time of planning this research it was not known if health staff would necessarily accept an invitation to become involved with the supervision of sex offenders.

**Education Service:**

The involvement of the Education Service consisted of an invitation to school staff, where appropriate, to participate in the risk management process. As professionals involved in the A.C.P.C. and in acknowledgement that education staff are in close contact with children and their families as well as having close community links and responsibility for the health, protection and welfare of pupils, their participation was vital.

**Risk Management Meetings:**

The idea of bringing together professionals from various disciplines to discuss issues of shared concern and responsibility is by no means a new one. The police have co-ordinated crime prevention forums and local panels for many years, and as we have seen in Chapter 3, multi-agency crime prevention work has now developed into effective public policy. The medical and
nursing professions have held inter-disciplinary meetings to discuss the various aspects of individual or indeed, community health. The social services department features, in most areas, as the co-ordinating body for area child protection committees and certainly the most identifiably connected with child protection conference protection plans. In the area of public service provision multi-agency discussions are commonplace and widely accepted as beneficial to overall aims.

The probation service is a member of several multi-agency initiatives. However, whilst being the guest at many, it is host to few. At the time of planning this research I could find no reference to any multi-agency scheme aimed at managing the risk presented by individual sex offenders. Some of the reasons why this might be so can be found elsewhere in this thesis. What appears to be an introspective over-emphasis on social justice has caused the probation service to maintain a neutral (if not isolated) position in multi-agency work. Community supervision of sex offenders would appear to be an insular activity.

In this context, to discuss such a development with other agencies was somewhat unusual and appeared out-of-step initially with existing practice. Reaction to early discussions with probation staff ranged from amusement to disbelief, suspicion and avoidance for fear of implication. Some regarded Risk Management ideas as too extreme and politically to the right of criminal justice policy, whereas others took the view that protecting children and adults was liberationist, as the intention was to make the environment an ultimately safer place by acknowledging with the offender the level of risk presented, and then aiming to reduce it.
It was decided that Risk Management Meetings would be so called because that is exactly what they were, meetings to discuss how to manage the risk presented by individual sex offenders. It would provide an opportunity for concerned professionals to meet together, with the offender present, to exchange information and ideas about the level of risk. The offender who had consented to participating in a sex offender programme ordered by the court was expected to participate in the risk management meeting as an integral element of probation supervision. This presented opportunities for the professionals in attendance to ask the offender questions pertaining to risk. Such an opportunity is usually denied to agencies such as the police and social services due to gross mistrust and suspicion. It was also hoped that a deterrent effect might be created by the offender realising that he was known to so many professionals and could easily be identified. Consistently with contemporary criminological ideas such as control theory (Hirschi, 1969) and shaming (Braithwaite, 1989) maintaining or developing an acute sense of responsibility to the community was also expected by making the offender feel part of a forum that was concerned with him. It was also possible that the offender might choose to ask questions of the professionals, thereby reinforcing links and perhaps improving relationships. Surveillance of the offender was expected to be increased through liaison of staff between Risk Management Meetings and by establishing a Risk Management Plan.

Using the Risk Management Meeting as a forum for practitioners it was not envisaged that managerial issues would be encountered. Indeed such matters were regarded as being best addressed by organisations independently of the Risk Management Meeting so as not to present an image of confusion or disagreement that could be damaging to the supervision of the
offender, or which might divert practitioners' time into unfruitful activities. Managerial issues were not a major feature of the research.

The Risk Management Meeting was scheduled to last between 45-60 minutes and to be chaired by the researcher. A Risk Management Form (R.M.F.) was to be circulated amongst the professionals prior to the offender being invited to join them. This created an opportunity to discuss any sensitive issues that the offender was not to be party to, such as new allegations, investigation of suspicions and also to decide which particular risk or supervision issues would be most productive to pursue, taking into account individual departmental involvement in the case. The R.M.F. was to contain information about the offender (see Appendix B) and form a point of reference during the meeting raising questions for those present. The R.M.F. was to be prepared by the researcher using case material. After reviewing the R.M.F. the meeting then proceeded to:

1) Discuss sensitive issues prior to the offender joining the meeting.

2) Address any immediate concerns of the offender after introductions have been completed.

3) Review the R.M.F. in the presence of the offender by reading it aloud and checking the content with the offender. This was to be done by the chair who then invited questions from any of the members pertaining to the case.

4) Ask the offender to provide an update of how he saw his treatment progressing and current levels of risks.

5) Hold a general discussion steered to explore issues of concern.

6) Invite the offender to ask questions.
7) Dismiss the offender from the meeting whilst a R.M.P. was negotiated. Certain aspects of the R.M.P. might remain confidential, such as surveillance methods, and the offender would not be informed of such plans.

8) Prepare an agreed R.M.P. The offender was to be informed of the plan unless agreed that it should remain confidential.

Anticipated Problems:
One of the most immediate concerns was whether or not professionals would attend, and how they would view the meeting. It might present as too intimidating for certain people to attend, especially as the content of discussion could accurately be predicted to contain issues of a sensitive and perhaps uncomfortable nature. Much thought was put into how to structure the meetings so as not to place any individual, including the offender, in an avoidably anxiety provoking position. Most of the professionals had received a personal approach from me to discuss the series of meetings and their purpose. During this planning stage no concerns were raised that required prolonged or separate attention. The idea of having the meetings was met with considerable enthusiasm.

The issue of securing the offender's co-operation and not just his consent raised further doubts. Would he be unresponsive or even rude to certain professionals? All that could be done to try and avoid such an occurrence would be to chair the meeting sensitively with frequent encouragement, especially for the offender during difficult periods. It was also decided that the offender would be made to feel that the R.M.M. was just a different method of doing the same work, as indeed it was, and that he had not been singled out. The connection between the
R.M.M. and the research project, to which of course they had consented, did not appear to have been of any consequence to the subjects. It had been explained as part of their probation supervision, it seemed reasonable to them, and so was accepted. All offenders were informed that they were permitted to leave the meeting if they chose to do so.

A further anticipated problem was that of agency conflict and the potential blurring of professional boundaries. The only action that was taken to avoid such situations occurring would be to acknowledge at the beginning of each meeting that the separate agencies each had their own role to play in the co-ordinated management of risk. This was intended to promote respect and understanding of each other's contribution. Finally, the concept of risk needs to be a shared understanding with an appreciation of credible assessment methods. It would be arrogant and misleading to provide a professional opinion of the level and nature of risk, expecting everyone to accept it. A negotiated understanding of risk would be attempted as this would demonstrate respect for each agency's point of view - an essential foundation of multi-disciplinary work. The task of how to address risk was thought best left to the creative talents of those present at the meeting, as such a scenario was unprecedented.

**Risk Management Plans:**

A Risk Management Plan (R.M.P.) is a written account of the methods to reduce the risk of re-offending agreed by the R.M.M. in the case of each subject. These would be negotiated at the R.M.M. then prepared and circulated to the participants and other organisations that might benefit from the information. It seemed likely that the R.M.P. would be circulated with a copy of the R.M.F. attached. Not all the offenders received a copy of the plan. This would be
discussed at the R.M.M. and a decision made there. It would be naive, for example, for the police to inform an offender of the intricacies of a surveillance operation when he was the target. The R.M.P. would hopefully become a form of intelligence for relevant agencies to circulate amongst colleagues and to use as a point of reference. There had been no outline prepared during this planning stage to formulate a structure for the R.M.P. It is anticipated that such a pro-forma would restrict the meeting to certain criteria thereby limiting creative thought and discussion.

Accountability for the R.M.P. was to rest with the R.M.M. and ultimately with the agency to whom each proposal was directed in the R.M.P. For example, if it was proposed that the Social Services Department should consider visiting the parents of a child who had recently been found to have had contact with one of the offenders, then clearly the Social Services Department would ultimately decide on their own course of action. The proposal, however, was to be pursued by the person co-ordinating the R.M.P., in this instance by the chair of the R.M.M., though in other examples it could be by the supervising officer of the offender. It was expected that each R.M.P. would be reviewed at each subsequent meeting in the context of a report on progress and to monitor the level of risk. The R.M.P. was not intended to shift any existing location of specific responsibility, but it did create an environment of shared knowledge that made agencies accountable to each other for specific tasks.

**Co-ordination:**

The co-ordination of the R.M.M. and the implementation of the R.M.P.s were clearly the tasks of the supervising probation officer. The research was ultimately an initiative to explore a
multi-agency approach to community supervision of sex offenders which is a core task of the probation service. Statutory responsibility for the supervision of the orders to which these men are subject exists in parallel to responsibility for the internal validity of the research project. Although this might sound an onerous task it was really quite straightforward. The study was designed to explore a new method of supervising sex offenders. Statutory supervision did indeed become, for the purposes of this research, the subject matter under investigation. There no doubt existed a feeling of vulnerability here. Other agencies became aware of probation working practice as it was exposed during the research. The mysterious practice of working with sex offenders was revealed to a multi-agency group in the presence of each of the subjects. Whilst such a prospect seemed a little unnerving the potential gains of adding information to the field of knowledge made the prospect seem worthwhile. After all the aim was to see what happened and not to make it a success.

The Research Subjects:

The research project required 6 subjects all of whom had to meet the eligibility criteria. At the time of recruiting the subjects there were 9 eligible sex offenders supervised by the probation service. The 6 chosen were initially selected as they represented a broad range of offender types based on their sexual preferences, convictions and lifestyles. All 6 initially selected gave their consent and signed a consent declaration. At the time of signing all of the offenders were members of a sex offender treatment programme run by the probation service and were aware that other members of the programme were subjects of the research too. There was no secret kept intentionally of who was a research subject and who was not. At the time of signing consent declarations some offenders were heard discussing the matter informally with other
offenders in the sex offender treatment group. Very little importance seemed to be placed on
the research initiative and after the consent signing there was no mention of the research project
again, either within the treatment group or during individual sessions. Every effort has been
made to anonymise the subjects of this research. No offender or victim is referred to by name
or addresses given and victim information generally is not a feature of this work. Dates of
convictions are also absent so as to aid the anonymity of offenders, and where facts appear
which could lead to sample identification they have been changed in ways not relevant to the
study. All subjects were white European and male.
CHAPTER 5

Sex Offender Risk Management Approach (SORMA)

The Field Experiment

This comprehensive chapter incorporates edited accounts of the six case studies, producing the chronology and ethnographic description of the application of SORMA in this experiment. It has, for the purposes of brevity, been necessary to exclude much of the interesting, but less important material from this text. What follows is felt to be the minimum amount of material required to provide the reader with a glimpse of SORMA in action. The case studies are presented separately and the elements relevant to our purpose, are brought to the surface for examination. We then deal with these in Chapter 6 where they undergo closer scrutiny and reasoned analysis.

Subject A

Background Information:

Subject A was a 37 year old man convicted of indecent assault against his daughter. He was the subject of a probation order and a suspended sentence supervision order. As a child, Subject A lived in Middletown with both parents and two younger sisters. He described his early life as happy, with no major difficulties or trauma. He left school with reasonable grades and moved
to Manchester in order to attend polytechnic. He studied subjects to qualify him for a career in finance. As a teenager he says that he was rather shy with both sexes. He started a sexual relationship with a female but discovered several months later that she had other male sexual partners, and so he ended the relationship. He described how he became disillusioned by this and did not search for other partners. In fact he did not experience a sexual relationship again until he met the woman he was to marry. His interests at that time centred mainly on work and motorcycles. He has described how he would spend most of his free time in his parents' garage, tinkering with his bike. His friends belonged, as he did, to a local motorcycle club. His time at polytechnic had been cut short by his general lack of interest in the subject matter, homesickness and the sudden death of his father. He returned home to pursue a career with an insurance company and attend a local college. He met the woman who was to become his wife through a mutual friend at the motorcycle club. Their relationship started when he was aged around 21 years and she was 18 years. She became pregnant to another man with the child that Subject A would eventually be convicted of indecently assaulting. The couple married and decided that Subject A would formally adopt the baby. Their second daughter was born 4 years after the first and the family lived together until Subject A's offending was discovered. Subject A continued with his career in insurance and earned an above average income. His wife had started work as a nursing assistant at the local hospital working part-time on regular night duty. The family had never been brought to the attention of the police, or social services department. There were no relevant health problems with any member of the family other than Subject A's wife who had had an overactive thyroid for around 3 years prior to the disclosure of these offences.
Criminal Offending

Subject A was convicted of one count of indecent assault against his adopted daughter. He was later charged with unlawful sexual intercourse but the degree of penetration could not be established other than on his own admission of 2 or 3 centimetres. The charge was therefore replaced with indecent assault. The sexually abusive behaviour towards this child had started at the age of 11 years according to him, but much younger, perhaps as young as 3 or 4 years, according to the child's therapist, a clinical psychologist who relied on professional interpretation of therapy sessions to establish this. This specimen offence involved him laying naked on top of her whilst she was in bed and placing his erect penis between her legs. The second conviction came a year later after it emerged that whilst he was on bail for the offence above, his daughter had entered her parents' bedroom after she had a bath and asked him to rub muscle relaxant cream over her limbs. He did this and rubbed her breast also. He was at the house by arrangement to carry out repairs. His wife was in the garden. This was disclosed some 2 months following his first conviction. When arrested and interviewed about this offence he readily admitted it. Whilst Subject A has only 2 convictions it must be remembered that this sexually abusive behaviour involved weekly incidents over a considerable period.

Victim Description

This child is described by school staff as quite bright. She is popular at school with both boys and girls and is a keen competitor at horse riding events. She is relatively tall and physically mature for her age. Her breasts were developed by the age of 11 years and she is described by her social worker as an attractive girl who appears older than her years.
Offence Environment

All of the offences against this child, including of course those that resulted in convictions, occurred in the family home whilst he was alone with her. He appears to have started intimate contact with her as a source of comfort for them both at bedtimes. This behaviour gradually became sexually abusive and it would seem that the victim's compliance was maintained by Subject A's expressed expectation of secrecy and his misuse of power and trust. There has been no suggestion of verbal threats being made by Subject A to secure the victim's compliance.

Detection

Subject A's first conviction resulted from the victim disclosing to school staff that her father had abused her. She was no more specific than that and had then fainted. Attention had been drawn to her frequent fainting episodes that only occurred at school and had no specified organic cause. The police and social services department attempted to interview her, but had great difficulty in establishing exact factual accounts of incidents as she was in trauma. Subject A was arrested and confessed to indecently assaulting her. He provided more detail on which to mount a prosecution than the victim had and was considered to have been generally co-operative with the police, although suspicion remained that he may have been responsible for offences against other children. It transpired that the sexually abusive behaviour had stopped 18 months prior to the girl's disclosure, the last incident being the most serious, in a legal sense, as it involved partial penetration. The reason for the abuse stopping would appear to have been due to Subject A making a firm decision himself that this must stop. He had become concerned by his daughter's unresponsiveness during the offence and says that he realised the seriousness of his actions. It is not clear why the victim disclosed when she did. It has been speculated that
she may have developed a sense of concern for her younger sister; had been waiting for the 'right moment' to disclose (though if this was the case it was not known why this was 'the right moment'); or that the abuse had not in fact ended at all and was continuing on a regular basis.

The victim had chosen, as her channel of communication to the statutory agencies, a child psychologist who exercised considerable professional discretion in the case management and the child's treatment. Whilst this was considered to be valuable to the child it seemed to cloak aspects of multi-agency working especially relating to issues of risk. The case provoked considerable anxiety amongst professionals and in their contact with the family. The second offence came to light in a similar way as the first, although disclosure was made to the child psychologist. Subject A recognised he had re-offended and admitted the offence when interviewed by the police.

Identifiable Patterns

Subject A presents most of the typical characteristics to be found with 'incest type offenders' (Barker and Morgan, 1993). He has been assessed by an independent forensic psychologist who conducted various psychometric tests, the results of which support such a typology. He was not found to be seriously deviant nor a paedophile. Although the victim is not his biological daughter he has lived with her from a very early age and has brought her up as his own. She had not been aware that he was not her natural father.

Williams and Finkelhor (1990) have reviewed over 2 dozen recent studies of incestuous fathers and their findings include:-
1) Incestuous fathers are consistently and widely reported to have difficulties in empathy, nurturance and caretaking.

2) Social isolation and lack of social skills are also wide-spread.

3) Histories of being sexually abused themselves are given only by a fifth of offenders, fewer than the popular stereotype suggests.

4) A history of physical child abuse is more common than sexual abuse, and other parental maltreatment, particularly rejection by fathers, is quite common.

5) Between a fifth and a third of incestuous fathers show signs of general sexual arousal to children, while a more widespread response is a pattern of low sexual arousal to, or even disgust with, normal adult sexual partners.

6) Studies have failed to find that incestuous abusers are identified with traditional masculine sex roles, but rather, they seem to be more likely to have weak masculine identification.

Offender A revealed that he had developed an obsession with his daughter although denied ever having sexual fantasies about her.

**Subject A: The Implementation of SORMA**

Subject A had been receiving treatment for approximately 16 months prior to the commencement of this research period. He had been a regular attender and a willing participant, and presented no enforcement problems related to probation supervision. He readily consented to participate in the research programme showing little interest in the aims or methods.
First Risk Management Meeting - February 1995

This meeting was attended by:-

Detective Constable from the Middletown Child Protection Unit,

Principal Practitioner in Child Protection from the Social Services Department,

Probation Officer Co-worker,

Probation Officer, Researcher,

Subject A.

The police were checking on information that might implicate Subject A in a series of attempted abductions of teenage girls in areas that he is known to have visited. In view of this the police officer advised the R.M.M. of the need to regard Subject A as having wider and perhaps more serious offending potential than was at first thought. These enquiries were continuing, and it was important that Subject A was not made aware of the concern.

The social worker explained that Subject A's daughter had now begun to reveal more detailed information about her experience. The child's therapist was convinced, based on her professional interpretation of the girl's behaviour, that this assumption was right. However, the girl was not prepared to make a complaint to the police, who indicated their reluctance to proceed with any matter not supported by valid evidence. The social worker also advised the meeting that greater caution should be used as, like the police officer, she was concerned that the full offending potential of Subject A had not yet been clearly recognised. This information proved very useful for the discussion and subsequent assessment of risk. It was agreed that Subject A would not be informed of these concerns.
Once Subject A left the meeting the discussion was dominated by the concerns expressed about possible new offences. The focus of his supervision had been influenced heavily by the understanding that he was an 'incest type' offender with a medium to low risk to children other than his daughter. No concerns about the possible risk to younger children had been raised during treatment.

This new information raised the following issues:

1) Was the current approach to his supervision adequate given these new concerns? As he travelled around the country he had considerable freedom.

2) His sex offending might not be exclusively related to his daughter.

3) The probation assessment that had been based on established facts might be wrong, with Subject A deceiving everyone very effectively through 16 months of seemingly successful treatment.

In line with these possibilities it was agreed that additional controls were required. The following were negotiated and agreed as a Risk Management Plan.

**First Risk Management Plan**

1) That Subject A would be instructed, as part of his probation supervision, to make no approach to his victims unless the social services department were fully aware and supportive of such action.
2) There would be weekly telephone contact to monitor his whereabouts or weekly reporting to a probation office - whichever presents less of a restriction on his employment.

3) That Subject A must inform his supervising officer without delay of any direct contact with children or young people, through either social relationships, extended family or leisure time pursuits.

The social services department asked to be immediately informed of any failure to comply with the R.M.P. as this would have direct relevance to his continued suitability for contact with his youngest daughter. They were to prepare a written contract with him to this effect. This was an interesting source of control that had not previously been recognised. The idea for this came from the principal social worker.

It was further suggested that the supervising probation officer should contact Subject A's mother to cultivate a useful link. She might want to be included in the R.M.P. Contact with his wife already existed.

Co-ordination: February 1995 - June 1995

Subject A was informed that issues raised at the R.M.M. had caused considerable concern, and that in view of this additional controls were to be imposed in line with the R.M.M. suggestions. He was very curious to know exactly what had been alleged against him but accepted that I could not disclose this. Telephone contact proved difficult because he was frequently travelling and did not always carry a mobile phone. In view of the problems with this attempt at
monitoring by telephone I requested that the probation service, in the area he was lodging, arranged a contact officer to allow Subject A to report during the week he did not attend for treatment in Middletown. This placed a degree of added restriction but presented no serious employment problems for him. He proved to be as prompt as he was in Middletown.

During this same period a woman who had been an acquaintance of Subject A and his family reported that 10 years ago he attempted to rape her. She did not want the matter reporting to the police as she preferred to remain anonymous, so avoiding having to explain it all to her partner.

This obviously increased my concern and seemed to fit generally with the other concerns raised at the R.M.M. that Subject A could be a rather indiscriminate and potentially dangerous sex offender. Surveillance and crime prevention issues emerged as important factors during this period of supervision.

Liaison with the police and social services department was regular and proved to be a two way process. The police were unable to mount a detailed investigation of their concerns relating to child abduction, and the social services department received no further information from the child psychologist to suggest the victim was prepared to make a complaint. Both the police and social services department were informed about the alleged attempted rape but were unable to respond.

Second Risk Management Meeting - June 1995

This meeting was attended by:-

Child Psychologist,
A revised R.M.F. was circulated and important changes such as acquisition of a new vehicle and change of address were pointed out. There were no new concerns other than the previously mentioned allegation of attempted rape. All of the previous concerns remained, but none had been drawn to a satisfactory conclusion due to their very nature. Subject A joined the meeting and the revised R.M.F. was read aloud as the point of focus. He pointed out to the meeting at his earliest opportunity that he was concerned that various undisclosed matters had been raised that had increased everyone's concern about him. He was particularly challenging of the child psychologist whom he felt was not helping his daughter at all by exaggerating events. This was not said in a threatening manner but rather more as a reasoned discussion. He maintained his polite co-operation throughout the meeting despite revealing afterwards that he had felt quite angry at one point with the psychologist.

He left the meeting and a discussion followed about the various outstanding concerns. It was agreed that nothing could be done about them other than to use them as additional information to help assess the risk he presented. This remained at medium/high. The existing R.M.P. was reviewed and considered to remain valid.
Second Risk Management Plan - June 1995

1) The R.M.F. and R.M.P. should again be sent to the police, probation and social services department in his local area.

2) That the probation officer would conduct a home visit.

3) That the probation officer would attempt to explore the nature of Subject A's sexual fantasies regarding adult women as this might illuminate any capacity he had to rape.

4) That Subject A would write letters to his daughters explaining what he has done, how he felt and what he had done to control his offending and risk. These were to be handed to the child psychologist and social worker for them to use at their discretion with the girls.

5) That the previous R.M.P. remained applicable.

Co-ordination: June - September 1995

The plan was implemented by first visiting the area in which he was lodging. He was met at work in an insurance office by prior arrangement. The home address he had given was visited and inspected. There was no evidence that children lived at the house and I was generally satisfied that he lived there, although at times it seemed as though his actions had been staged to convince me that he lived there in case I had doubts. I was mildly suspicious of this. Probation surveillance in this context was facilitated through maximum use of legislative authority.

Subject A continued to report to his local probation office weekly and to the Middletown office for treatment. Enforcement did not present a difficulty. He refused to provide the letters requested by the R.M.M. on the grounds that he did not trust the child psychologist to put them
to good use, believing she believed she might misinterpret them, thus creating further difficulties.

Towards the end of this period an appeal was launched by police from the area where Subject A was living. This included a photofit picture that bore close resemblance to him. A newspaper article revealed the details of how a man was wanted in connection with the abduction and rape of two 6 year old girls in this area. The following made Subject A a possible suspect:-

1) Existing concern that Subject A had attempted to abduct teenagers.

2) Child psychologist believed he was capable of abusing very young children.

3) The photofit picture was a definite likeness.

4) The vehicle used was the same make and colour as his.

5) He had lived in that area during the period that both attacks occurred.

After speaking to the police in Middletown our concerns were passed on to the police making the appeal. It was agreed that this information would remain restricted to police and probation for the time being. Multi-agency collaboration in supervision was not felt to require the exchange of such information prior to police investigation.

Third Risk Management Meeting - September 1995

This meeting was attended by:-

Detective Constable, Child Protection Unit, Police,

Police Constable, Child Protection Unit, Police,

Principal Practitioner, Social Services Department,
Social Worker, victim, Social Services Department,

Student Probation Officer,

Probation Officer,

Subject A.

The R.M.F. was once again revised and circulated to those present before Subject A joined the meeting. There had been no contact from the police investigating the recent abductions, which came as rather a surprise to us all. There was no other information shared at this stage and so Subject A joined the meeting.

Subject A was co-operative and very chatty throughout the meeting. He again had the attitude that he was once more in some way accountable to this meeting, and exuded a sense of responsibility. He apologised for not writing the letters as previously requested and gave a detailed reason for this. He went on to describe how he had explored his sexual fantasies and certain outstanding concerns with his probation officer and hoped there was less suspicion now.

During this discussion he was asked specific questions about his relapse prevention plan that he had completed before finishing the treatment programme. He had remembered this very well but stated that he had not needed to use it.

This meeting was a little less formal than its predecessors, and little chairing was requiring as it took the form of a reasoned discussion. Subject A had no questions to ask of the professionals and so left the meeting. The discussion that followed concluded that it would still be wise to regard him as being of medium/high risk because of the many concerns.
Third Risk Management Plan - September 1995

1) That the existing R.M.P. remained.
2) That his new address was circulated.
3) That the R.M.F. and R.M.P. were circulated to the area in which he was working.
4) That he was asked once again to write the letters to his daughters.

Co-ordination: September - December 1995

Subject A was contacted by police from the area he had previously lived in and asked to provide a specimen of D.N.A. which he did. He did not seem concerned at this, saying that it was just to rule him out of the enquiry and that he was glad to help. He moved back to his mother's and never, as far as we knew, ever found lodgings in his new area. However, the police informed the meeting that his vehicle was only very rarely seen parked at his mother's home. It seemed that he was most likely staying elsewhere and not disclosing this. He kept in regular contact but home visits could not be undertaken as he always worked late. Liaison remained strong although only when an event prompted it.

Fourth Risk Management Meeting - December 1995

This meeting was attended by:-

Detective Inspector, Child Protection Unit, Police,
Principal Practitioner, Social Services Department,
Social Worker,
Probation Officer,
Subject A.
Subject A was asked by the police about his exact address, pointing out that his vehicle was never seen by the night patrol to be parked at the address given. He became visibly distressed at this point and explained that he parked round the corner from home sometimes as his car has been the target of vandalism. Subject A was then asked for the exact location of the place where he parked his vehicle, to which he replied "all over, to avoid damage". The police officer made the point of letting Subject A know that the night patrol was going to check for this in the coming months. Subject A was again asked for the letters to his daughters. He agreed to give this some thought, offering to send them to the social worker but no-one else.

Fourth Risk Management Plan - December 1995

1) That detailed information was to be sent to the police and S.S.D. in his new area of employment.

2) That Subject A should be encouraged to write the letters to his daughters as previously requested.

3) That the probation officer should write to the child psychologist to explain Subject A's delay or refusal to write the letters.

4) All agencies would endeavour to discover the exact location of where he was living and if it could be established that he had lied then he would be prosecuted by the probation officer for failing to notify a change of address. If he was found to have been living in a household with children then the police and social services department would be notified and consideration given to investigating possible abuse, which would seem to be the most likely reason for failing to notify his supervising officer.
Co-ordination: December 1995 to February 1996

During the following 6 weeks, which saw Subject A through to the end of this research period but not to the end of his supervision, several contacts were made to various organisations by the police, social services department and probation to try and establish if he was using another address. The suspicions were never established as fact but the combined effect of multi-agency collaboration, surveillance, control and ongoing therapy resulted in Subject A's vehicle being found parked at his given address on every occasion that it was checked.

Summary: Subject A

Subject A demonstrated a sense of instant accountability to the meeting that remained for the full twelve month period. It appeared that he accepted the rationale for the management of risk and could appreciate each participant's concern with him and their collective as well as individual responsibilities. This seemed to influence his own sense of responsibility towards the shared aims. The meetings became an accepted part of supervision.

So many concerns were expressed about Subject A that the probation service needed to re-evaluate its work with him and question the appropriateness of current supervision methods. This focused attention on the process of assessment and single-agency working.

Subject A was in no doubt, indeed the aims of supervision were explicit, that he was the subject of a collaborative effort to control him and prevent any offending. He did not share the agencies' view of the level of risk he presented but accepted that he was to be supervised in
accordance with the agenda set by SORMA. Sex offender treatment continued to provide very useful information for the co-ordination of supervision. Police and probation surveillance was conducted in accordance with the R.M.P. and aimed to reduce the opportunities for him to offend whilst increasing the risk of detection. The actuarial assessment of risk did not reflect the more pronounced concerns of the professional/clinical assessment, which became the basis of an agreed and therefore 'legitimate' risk status.

Subject B

Background Information

Subject B was 66 years old and was placed on a 2 year probation order with a condition to attend the probation sex offender programme. At the time of commencing this research he had been on probation for just 2 months following his conviction for abduction and taking indecent photographs. He was born and raised in Middletown and lived at home with both parents. He remembers his childhood, part of which included the period during the second world war, with fond memories. His health had been good throughout his life although he claims to have been unable to obtain an erection for the last 15 years. More recently he developed angina, for which he received medication, and suffered from poor blood circulation to his legs. However, he was quite ambulant and a familiar figure in the town walking his dog. Subject B lived alone on the bottom floor of a 4 storey complex of flats situated in gardens and set back a little from a busy junction close to the centre of Middletown. He had not married or fathered children. He reported that his first sexual experience was at the age of 14 years with a 14 year old girl, they fondled each other and had sexual intercourse on local playing fields. He first had homosexual intercourse at the age of 25 and since then has considered himself to be exclusively homosexual.
He has had several adult partners since that time, the most recent dying in a house fire in 1994. Subject B admitted to having a strong sexual attraction to teenage boys in preference to men. However, he disagreed with any suggestion that he is a paedophile preferring, at times, to assert that his history of sex offending has been because of his homosexuality. He is of average intelligence and has an interest in mechanics. He was a sailor in the Royal Navy for several years before taking up employment at a local industry where he remained until retirement. Subject B has disclosed that he was sexually abused himself, as a child.

Criminal Offences

1941 - Larceny - Bound over for one year in the sum of £1
1942 - Larceny - Fined
1942 - School breaking - Bound over for 2 years in the sum of £1
1943 - Larceny - Fined £1
1955 - Indecent Exposure - Imprisonment 1 month
   - Indecent Exposure - Imprisonment 1 month consecutive
1981 - Indecent Assault - Imprisonment 18 months
   - Gross Indecency - Imprisonment 18 months concurrent
1984 - Indecent Assault - Probation Order 6 months
1993 - Theft - shoplifting - Caution
1994 - Theft - shoplifting - Conditional Discharge
   - Taking a Child Without Lawful Authority - Probation Order 2 years with
   Condition
Subject B was first convicted at the age of 12 years and as a juvenile had 3 subsequent convictions for dishonesty offences. His first conviction for sexual offences was in 1955 when he was imprisoned for a total of 2 months for offences of indecent exposure. This is an unusually firm sentence for such offences and suggests they may have been regarded as especially serious by the sentencing court. He admits to having had a sexual attraction to boys for over 40 years and although his convictions have been for offences against teenage boys he has a wide target range to boys, some as young as 8 years. He has told me that he once offended against a girl aged about 5 years but only because she was with a group of slightly older boys. It is clear that his offending has been much greater than his criminal record reveals.

Subject B has many of the typical characteristics of a boy target paedophile. He prefers to refer to himself as a homosexual and often tries to talk professionals into seeing him as homosexual in preference to paedophilic. He is motivated not only by a lust for sexual gratification but places great value on developing what he sees as an emotional relationship with boys. He has spoken of 'love' when describing his offences.

The current offence of child abduction and taking indecent photographs involved Subject B befriending a 15 year old boy who has slight learning difficulties, and cultivating a friendship. He had been warned over many years by local police officers not to invite children into his flat and, in a piece of geographical displacement, spent his savings on purchasing a small touring caravan that he collected with the boy. He parked it in the car park of a public house and spent
the night there with him. The boy's parents were not aware of this and had not given their consent.

**Victim Description**

The victim of these 2 current offences is similar in age and characteristics to previous victims. He is 15 years old, has mild learning difficulties and isolated from his peers. He made no complaint about the conduct of Subject B to either the police or his parents. There was no social services department involvement in the boy's family as a result of the offences and he was not receiving any victim orientated therapy from any agency. It appears that the boy readily participated in the commission of these offences.

**Offence Environment**

The offences took place in Subject B's caravan and car. The local police were aware of his propensity to abduct children and take them into his home with the intention of committing offences against them. They had warned him not to do this again and it would seem that their warning had been heeded. What he had done instead was to create a similar home environment in a caravan, abducting the boy in his vehicle and detaining him, not against his will, in the caravan. The boy had informed his parents that he was staying at a school friend's house for a couple of nights. Subject B has committed this type of offence before, although he had not previously faced a charge of abduction, in the past victims having, however, given statements to implicate him in sexual offences. He had offered boys driving lessons and stayed in caravans with them on at least 2 other occasions that had resulted in convictions. He has also in the past
used bribery to obtain compliance, always working very hard to forge what he has described as a relationship.

**Detection**

Subject B was arrested along with the boy the following morning for shoplifting. They had gone to a local supermarket and attempted to steal a pan scourer valued at 13 pence, in an effort to equip the caravan. This arrest led to the discovery of the offence of abduction, and a search of the caravan revealed an indecent photograph. The boy made no complaint to the police. During the night, Subject B had fondled the boy's genitals and photographed his erect penis. He orally masturbated the boy although this was not reported, Subject B volunteering this information during treatment. Subject B readily admitted the charges put to him and was bailed out of the area for several months awaiting conviction.

**Identifiable Patterns**

Victim characteristics, the offence location, the type of offence and the nature of the offence all form a uniform pattern that has been repeated on at least 3 occasions in the last 10 years. This repetition reveals predictability and therefore scope to interrupt the pattern by prevention, if the appropriate controls can be found with detection, a secondary measure, should prevention prove to have failed. Geographical displacement was also a characteristic of this subject, as he had already relocated his offending to avoid detection.
Subject B: The Implementation of SORMA

First Risk Management Meeting - February 1995

This meeting was attended by:-

Detective Constable, Police, Child Protection Unit,
Principal Practitioner, Social Services Department,
Probation Officer, co-worker,
Probation Officer.

Following a discussion about the nature of his offending he was unanimously regarded as being of very high risk of repeat offending.

The discussion of risk began with a description of how the probation officer felt Subject B was progressing in the sex offender group. This introduced consideration of the nature of his offending and the ground gained in terms of securing from Subject B an acknowledgement that a problem existed. He did not disagree with the assessment of risk indicating that he was likely to re-offend. Before he left the meeting he was asked to provide an account of his typical daily activities. This revealed that he stood out in the grounds of the flats where he lived during the times when local schools were opening and closing so that he could chat to boys and other passers-by. His behaviour had been a source of concern for some time, and despite being told he should not speak to children as it constituted a 'risky' practice, he was still observed doing exactly that. The R.M.M. was faced with the task of trying to control this behaviour. There was a great deal of discussion about this once Subject B had left the meeting and a determination emerged to 'do something'. No obvious potential community collaborator emerged, but the
police agreed to speak to the caretaker of the flats in an effort to promote a sense of awareness and community surveillance.

An examination of how surveillance and crime prevention could be mandated by utilisation of statutory control revealed that scope existed to approach the local court to request the imposition of clearly defined restrictions on his behaviour.

**First Risk Management Plan - February 1995**

1) That the probation officer would make application to the local court for variation to the probation order. The following condition is proposed:

"Must not permit any person under the age of 16 years to enter his premises or to accompany him to any place where they could be alone".

(The wording was eventually changed).

2) That unannounced home visits would be made by the probation officer at a frequency of not less than once per fortnight between the hours of 8 am and 10 pm and to include weekends.

**Co-ordination: February - May 1995**

The police had established a strong link with the caretaker of the flats, who proved to be a vigilant and reliable informant. This person alerted them to the 3 occasions when Subject B was stopping boys and talking to them, and Subject B was made aware that the probation officer had received the information and was concerned about it. Eventually a written warning was issued, instructing him not to have contact with boys.
The application to vary the probation order met with notable surprise from the magistrates' clerk who made it quite clear that such an application was not welcome. I asked for clarification of why this should be so but was rebuffed. I did not heed the advice of the clerk to withdraw my application. Instead I insisted that the magistrates should decide on this matter after listening to the facts. Subject B was not represented by a solicitor in court. He consented to the variation being made, commenting that it would help him.

The magistrates granted the application after the wording of the condition had been amended on the legal advice and experience of the clerk, who became more helpful as the application proceeded. The condition granted was:

"not to engage in any employment or activity that places you in direct contact with children under the age of 16 years without giving prior notification to your supervising officer".

Home visiting had proved to be a difficult and very time consuming activity. I had been unable to visit fortnightly during this period due to the volume of work I had accumulated recently, some of which stemmed from this research. However, I did make 6 home visits during this period and found Subject B at home on 4 of them. These were all made in the evening, the latest being 8.30 pm. The visits did not reveal any concern at all during this period.

Second Risk Management Meeting - May 1995

This meeting was attended by:-

Detective Constable, Police Child Protection Unit,
Police Constable on attachment to Child Protection Unit,
Principal Practitioner, Social Services Department,
Probation Officer,
Subject B.

The discussion of risk was started whilst Subject B was in the meeting and continued once he had left. He said that he had been making attempts to alter his daily activities so that he did not attract the attention of children, especially boys. He discussed this without prompting and in a very casual way that was free from the jargon that was all too often used in the treatment room. Walking his dog in playgrounds and along cycle paths was an activity that he said he had altered as this caused him to meet boys. He now walked the dog along pavements and in the park. He also pointed out that he does not now stand outside department stores in the town centre smiling at boys, as he recognised this was risky behaviour too. This had been a good source of contact for him especially as word had got around amongst many groups of children that he had been known to lend money for sweets.

It was agreed that in view of the many sightings, reported by the caretaker and professionals, of him talking to boys, that the risk of offending had not been substantially reduced and therefore remained very high. It was acknowledged that his whole way of life seemed devoted to meeting boys in an effort to cultivate what he saw as a loving relationship. He understood that this was against the law but had difficulty in seeing it as abusive. He had convinced himself that he could identify boys that were homosexual and that his behaviour would not corrupt or abuse
them. He was rather stubborn on this point and very little ground was gained during treatment sessions.

His vehicle was a source of contact with children also, and the vehicle index number and description had been circulated. It was also speculated that he might indeed still have the caravan used previously to abduct his victim, or have purchased another and be using it in the same way.

Second Risk Management Plan - May 1995

It was agreed that home visiting would continue, and whilst these visits had not actually revealed any concerns, they had no doubt given a clear message that his supervising officer was likely to call frequently and at unscheduled times. This surveillance was thought to have a deterrent value.

The following additional recommendations were made:

1) The police were to maintain links with the caretaker and to record details of any contact with children. Such contact would be investigated as necessary, and any evidence of a breach of his probation order would be submitted to the probation service for possible prosecution.

2) That written instructions were sent to Subject B setting out exactly what he was prevented from doing and the likely consequences of failing to conform.
Co-ordination: May - September 1995

In June, Subject B was seen talking to a boy in the street outside his home. This was reported to me by a colleague who had seen him on her way home from work. He was spoken to about this and explained the boy was unknown to him and had stopped to ask him the time. A verbal warning was given and the police and social services department were informed. The boy's identity was obviously unknown.

Later in the month a report was received from the police that Subject B had been seen talking to a boy outside the civic buildings. The boy had been standing on the pavement and Subject B was in his vehicle. The informant had contacted the police who had attended the scene. When they arrived Subject B had left, and the police were unable to offer any evidence. I spoke to Subject B about this incident and he admitted to it, although seemed quite shocked that I should have got to know about it. He explained that the boy was 17 years old and he had been 'chatting him up' with a view to establishing a relationship, having met him about two weeks previously. Subject B provided the name, address and date of birth of the boy, which was verified using local agency record systems.

In July the police received information indicating that Subject B was towing a caravan. They had suspected this for some time and had visited local caravan dealers to ask for their assistance. Their vigilance had paid off, and as soon as Subject B had purchased a caravan the dealer contacted them with full details. The dealer explained that Subject B had visited their site previously that week and had a boy in his company. The police followed Subject B, who parked the caravan at a disused airfield on the outskirts of Middletown, the scene of previous
offending against boys. I arranged a meeting with the police to discuss the increasing concerns about Subject B. The concerns had to be prioritised so as to inform our joint action. It was agreed that the most likely scenario was that Subject B had targeted one or several boys and had already begun sexually abusing them. In view of this it was important to identify the victims so that we could be sure they were adequately protected. Subject B had concealed the fact that he had purchased a caravan. Caravan ownership is one of his features identified in his release prevention plan that places him at higher risk of re-offending. Subject B was obviously deceiving us.

It was agreed that Subject B would not be spoken to about these concerns, and the police would pursue their enquiries. The police had enlisted the help of a local gamekeeper who had agreed to keep the caravan under observation and report any sign of activity. The caravan was moved the same evening and unfortunately lost from surveillance. The police were understandably becoming frustrated by their enquiries. However, in early September the gamekeeper had spotted Subject B's vehicle on the airfield and stopped it. He obtained the name and address of the driver and a passenger, described as a young boy. The driver was Subject B and the boy's details proved to be false. The police checked them but were unable to make an accurate identification. SORMA became fully engaged at this point with all elements actively contributing to the supervision effort.
Third Risk Management Meeting - September 1995

This meeting was attended by: -

Head Teacher of local special school,
Detective Constable, Police, Child Protection Unit,
Police Constable attached to Child Protection Unit,
Social Worker, Social Services Department,
Student Probation Officer,
Probation Officer,
Subject B.

The head teacher had been invited because of concern regarding Subject B's continued risk and the suspicion that he may be offending. This particular school had pupils attending who might be particularly vulnerable, and it was felt important that the head teacher should be offered the chance to share in the information that had such direct relevance to them.

There was considerable discussion prior to Subject B joining the meeting. This centred on his caravanning activities and contact with boys. It was agreed that we would explore with Subject B his relapse prevention plan, which mentioned the issue of caravans.

Subject B joined the meeting, and provided an alarmingly dishonest account of how he was no longer a caravanner and had not had any contact with boys for many months. He went on to give a very accurate description of the work he had been doing in treatment, stressing the vital importance of this in his rehabilitation and the value he placed on the new changes he had made.
in his life. Had we not had the benefit of the police intelligence there was little doubt that we would have accepted his account of progress with a degree of congratulation. The level of risk was considered to be very high and it was felt that no change should be made to the existing Risk Management Plan. The value of sex offender treatment here seemed dubious, as a separate intervention. However, as an indication of his dishonesty it proved rather illuminating.

Third Risk Management Plan - September 1995

1) Home visits to continue.
2) Close liaison between agencies with a shared agreement not to discuss the new concerns with Subject B.
3) That any evidence of breaching the probation order would be passed to the probation service for consideration of prosecution.

Co-ordination: September - December 1995

Home visits continued during this period and produced no concerns whatsoever. The police were unable to find any evidence or, for that matter, any concern, that Subject B was having contact with boys. The caretaker reported that nothing was being observed. Subject B continued to attend the probation office for the treatment programme for sex offenders. This period was in sharp contrast to the previous period that witnessed so much activity. It was speculated that this could be a seasonal variation to his pattern of offending, or that he had realised he was under surveillance and had decided to curtail this behaviour. Displacement was another possibility.
Final Risk Management Meeting - December 1995

This meeting was attended by:-

Detective Constable, Police, Child Prosecution Unit,

Police Constable, Community Beat Officer,

Social Worker, Social Services Department,

Probation Officer,

Senior Probation Officer (observing),

Subject B.

There was very little to discuss as the period had been so quiet. No agency had received reports of Subject B behaving in a way that breached his order.

There were no direct questions asked of Subject B other than related to the risk he presented. His own view was that this was reducing, as he felt more in control. He left the meeting and the discussion of risk continued. It was decided that the existing R.M.P. should remain, although it was very re-assuring that his behaviour had appeared to alter significantly. Displacement was considered and all agencies were conscious of the potential of such a phenomenon.


This was not considered to be in need of adjustment and so remained as before. A copy was sent to Subject B.
Co-ordination: December 1995 - February 1996

Home visits continued as before. Subject B was at home for most of these visits and no concerns were raised about the possibility of re-offending. The police did not hear from the caretaker, as all had become seemingly quiet. The social services department had no involvement nor did the head teacher from the local school. The period ended very quietly for Subject B.

Summary: Subject B

A community collaborator could not be easily identified but a council caretaker was used as a form of community surveillance, and passed reliable information to the police on a regular basis. On two occasions the caretaker contacted the probation service, having been given the name of the probation officer by the police.

During this 12 month period there was no direct contact between the caretaker and the probation officer co-ordinating the Risk Management Plan, the police conducted all of the liaison work with her.

During the R.M.M.s Subject B was more relaxed than I had expected him to be, even when he was telling the meeting a series of lies about having changed his behaviour so dramatically, when in fact we all knew otherwise. Subject B seemed to accept SORMA as a functional aspect of his supervision.
The variation of his probation order to include what are sometimes referred to in probation literature as negative conditions presented quite a challenge. It was suggested as a possible additional measure of control that may help to enforce specific instructions. The professionals immediately liked the idea and never hesitated in recommending it should be applied for. Subject B was advised that this is what the meeting had recommended and he understood the reasons why. He declined my advice to discuss this with a solicitor and consented to the application being made. The magistrates' clerk was not so enthusiastic at first but warmed to the idea once the Bench were given the facts, and ended up giving legal advice about appropriate wording of the condition.

Home visiting produced a great deal of work but no observable results, though they may have had deterrent value. There is no doubt that the community collaborator provided the most useful method of surveillance. Widespread concern existed at one stage but no breakthrough was made to secure evidence. Flexibility had to be demonstrated in the balancing of public protection and policing strategy. Whilst evidence could have been obtained to secure a breach of the probation order it was agreed that we should not act too hastily and risk being unable to identify victims that we felt sure existed. The established priority was that of the long term protection needs of children. This was discussed at length and agreed at senior management level in each agency. Perhaps the most surprising feature of this whole period of supervision was the sudden change in Subject B's behaviour following the R.M.M. in September. There does not appear to be any obvious explanation for this. Seasonal variation, displacement, experience of the September 1995 R.M.M., a decision to refrain or indeed progress from therapy could be elements that brought about such a shift. It is also possible that Subject B
developed a method to avoid the surveillance activities of the police and caretaker so as to avoid detection.

Subject C

Background Information

Subject C was 29 years old and lived in a housing association hostel with minimum support in Middletown. He was subject to a 2 year probation order with a condition to, 'submit to psychiatric treatment', reside where directed; and attend the 'sex offenders' group' run by the probation service. This order was imposed for the indecent assault of a 14 year old girl and a 17 year old girl in separate incidents.

Subject C was born and brought up in Middletown by his parents, who were described by various professionals involved at the time, as strict disciplinarians. He had two older sisters and three older brothers. At the age of 21 years he suffered his first mental breakdown and was admitted to an acute psychiatric ward where he remained for 4 weeks. At the time of admission he was having visual and auditory hallucinations, mainly of the devil plotting against him and God. He was made the subject of a Mental Health Section and diagnosed as suffering from schizo-affected psychosis. There were subsequently 3 further admissions, the longest being 3 months, for the same presenting problem.

Subject C had never been involved in a long term relationship and had no dependant children, describing himself as a 'virgin', and blaming his mental ill health for preventing him from having the confidence to start a relationship. He had short periods of employment but none for
the previous 6 years due to ill health. At school he was quite bright and his psychiatrist described his cognitions as being "intact". Indeed, when discussing his family background, Subject C was able to remember the full names of 64 extended family members and the dates of birth of 31 of them. He disclosed no evidence of being the victim of sexual abuse.

Criminal Offences

Subject C had no previous convictions of any description. However, he received a police caution in 1992 for indecently assaulting his 7 year old nephew following an incident in which he undressed the boy and rubbed his erect penis against the boy's buttocks. A rather bizarre feature emerged from this offence in that he rolled the boy up in a carpet after he had sexually abused him. His motivation for doing this had not been explored.

The current offences began when he accosted two girls who were walking along a street together. He stood very close to one of them and began to sing a love song to her. He then began to make sexually suggestive remarks to her, shouted obscenities and stroked her face and breast with his hand. She was able to walk past him to summon help, and whilst she did so he continued to shout obscenities.

The second incident occurred on a bus 3 months later. He was on the top deck of the bus with several other passengers situated around him. He noticed two teenage girls (14 years and 16 years) who were sitting together talking. He stared at them for a while and then moved to take up the seat directly in front of them. He leant over the seat and started to make suggestive remarks. He invited the girls to become his sexual partners. He then focused his attention on
the youngest girl and started to tell her how he would like her to come back to his room and have sex with him. He became aggressive whilst saying this and had placed his face very close to the girls face. He was shouting at her and then pushed her backwards against the seat.

Victim Description
The victims of these offences were both slim teenage girls. They presented to him a fantasy image of sexual attractiveness. They had no relationship to Subject C, never having met him before.

Offence Environment
On both occasions the victims had been in a public place and it had been daylight. There is no evidence to suggest that Subject C had planned his encounter with these victims other than opportunistically to draw himself into closer proximity once he had seen them. Members of the public had witnessed the offences, but none had intervened.

Detection
Subject C was arrested for these two offences after being identified from the description given to the police by the victims and witnesses. He readily admitted the offences, describing them both as attempts to chat up the girls that had gone terribly wrong. Both of the incidents were immediately reported to the police.
Identifiable Patterns

It is quite difficult to find much of a pattern with Subject C's offending. In other cases it has been the subject’s planning of the offences that has revealed patterns. Subject C appears not to have planned the situational environment of his offences.

It is of course highly likely that he had contemplated accosting girls in similar public situations to those where the offences occurred and indeed that he had previously done so. It is known that he had behaved in this aggressive way for a considerable time and had often been verbally abusive to vulnerable people. His targets were usually the elderly, young women or girls, and his target areas anywhere that vulnerable people might frequent.

His behaviour was predictable once he had chosen to accost a person. In the case of a sexually motivated accosting he would make a confrontational approach to his victim and use wholly inappropriate language and actions to try and impress. On realising that his advances were unwelcomed, almost always soon after commencement of his actions, and detecting the victim was uncomfortable and affronted, he would interpret this as a form of either sexual or aggressive provocation and become aroused. In theoretical terms this behaviour could perhaps be seen as a courtship disorder (see for example, Freund, 1990).

This theory is less convincing when used to analyse his motivation to abuse his nephew, however, which is perhaps best explained as adding a pederastic dimension to his offending. During assessment procedures for the sex offender group, Subject C revealed a strong sexual attraction to children, particularly boys. A useful insight might be gained from regarding
Subject C as a paedophile with a preference for boys. He had been cautioned for the abuse of his nephew and might have managed to contain his behaviour towards children for some time.

When interviewed by the police for his offences against these 2 girls, one of the first things he said was;

"I've been talking to my C.P.N. about my illness, having to cope with stress and frustration as well as wanting to actually get somebody myself, make a relationship myself"

It is possible that Subject C was doing just that, and that his anger was fuelled by his sense of failure, clumsiness and, as a paedophile, lack of genuine sexual motivation towards his victim.

The probation officer writing the pre-sentence report for the magistrates' court warned them that all of the professionals involved with Subject C were concerned that his offending could escalate in seriousness. Indeed Subject C had expressed this concern himself. He confused attraction and lust with anger and intimidation, revealing that his sexual fantasies were of rape, and that he targeted these current victims because they looked similar to the girls in his fantasies. It is reasonable to assume that he might carry out other more serious offences, driven by the images from these fantasies. The author of the report predicted that the risk of re-offending was very high. A psychiatric report was obtained at the request of the defence solicitor, but this did not inform the court of any issues relating to risk.
Subject C: The Implementation of SORMA

First Risk Management Meeting - February 1995

This meeting was attended by:-

Consultant Psychiatrist,
Community Psychiatric Nurse,
Detective Constable Police, Child Protection Unit,
Principal Practitioner, Social Services Department,
Hostel Manager,
Hostel Keyworker,
Probation Officer (co-worker),
Probation Officer,
Subject C.

The meeting began with the psychiatrist outlining Subject C's case history. The psychiatric services did not provide any specific treatment, therapy or supervision for sexually abusive behaviour, but the Community Psychiatric Nurse monitored Subject C's behaviour and offered counselling in times of crisis. The psychiatrist was asked if libido suppressant drugs had been considered for Subject C. This was discussed and it was decided this ought to be pursued with Subject C. The Principal Practitioner was interested to learn of any contact that Subject C might have been having with children.
Subject C acknowledged the concern expressed about him, agreeing the risk of committing another similar offence was high. At this point the psychiatrist introduced the idea of prescribing a libido suppressant drug as a form of treatment, which might, along with the sex offender treatment programme and professional surveillance, reduce the likelihood of his re-offending. Subject C expressed a willingness for such treatment, and the psychiatrist agreed to arrange an appointment for him to discuss it further. The meeting lasted for approximately one hour, with Subject C present for half of that time.

The meeting was unable to identify a concerned relative who could act as a community collaborator. His mother was obviously concerned about him and had frequent contact, sometimes more than she felt comfortable with. However, she was suffering ill health and was rather frail. Her influence over Subject C was minimal and the constant worry over his behaviour was often so extreme that it aggravated her ill health. She appreciated the concern of the professionals and had proved to have been a reliable source of information about her son in recent years. However, it was decided not to involve her as a community collaborator.

It was felt important to establish a shared working understanding of how his psychiatric condition and offending were linked. It was agreed that the best approach would be to regard Subject C as an offender with the capacity to rape women and children. Indeed, he recognised this himself, and described rape fantasies. It appeared that aggression raised his sense of arousal, as did fear and intimidation in his victim, and that the schizo-affected psychosis aggravated this position to the point of increasing the risk of violent attack. His mental illness was controlled to a degree but was not considered likely to be cured or to remit.
assessment that everyone understood and agreed, a starting point for the risk management plan had been formulated. Subject C was aware of this assessment; indeed, he contributed to it. The challenge here for SORMA was to test how amenable the model would be to an offender whose needs required considerable intervention from health and social services. Would the statutory supervisory function provide too great a challenge for the care and welfare philosophy that often dominates these agencies, so detracting from the concern with risk, surveillance and crime prevention?

First Risk Management Plan - February 1995

1) That Subject C was made aware of the joint view taken by the professionals at the R.M.M. regarding the association between his mental health and his sex offending.

2) That the police would attend the hostel if called by the staff to warn Subject C about his behaviour. It was noted that he tended to respond well to authoritarian discipline and that this might avert a more serious situation. The Detective Constable was to brief the operations room.

3) That Subject C would be actively discouraged from accosting vulnerable people. When this was discovered to have occurred the police would deal with the matter accordingly. All such matters had therefore to be reported to the police immediately they came to light.

4) That the probation officer applied to the magistrates' court for a variation to Subject C's probation order restricting his contact with children. The wording of this to be agreed after seeking legal advice.
5) That Subject C was supported in his interest in the use of Cyproterone Acetate as a Libido suppressant drug.

6) That the keyworker from the hostel was to be regarded as Subject C's most significant member of the community as that person had most contact with him.

7) That Subject C received a copy of the R.M.P.

Co-ordination: February - May 1995

Several days after the R.M.M. Subject C was served an eviction notice from the hostel he was staying at. The staff consulted me about this and were clear about their reasons. His behaviour had deteriorated generally, although no specific incidents had occurred. He had continued to seek out a female member of staff, a middle aged woman, and harass her. The staff group were concerned that he presented a danger to her and so he would have to leave.

The psychiatrist was able to start Subject C on libido suppressant medication almost immediately. Androcur, or C.P.A., was prescribed but had to be discontinued when a liver function test revealed he had had an adverse reaction to it. This was rather a disappointment but it might be tried again in due course.

Very few home visits were conducted, as Subject C was living in a hostel with 24 hour staff supervision. He spent considerable time at his mother's house, a walk of about 40 minutes from the hostel. Liaison with the hostel staff was frequent during this period, as was contact with the community psychiatric nurse. Subject C was referred to the social services department for a community care assessment.
In April, a decision was made not to pursue the variation of his probation order, as he was not able to demonstrate a clear enough understanding of the condition for his consent to be valid. The professionals from the R.M.M. were informed of this decision. Finally, in May 1995 the hostel staff decided that his eviction notice would be enforced at the end of the month. He had only 3 weeks to find another address. Numerous attempts had been made to try and find suitable accommodation but to no avail. The community care assessment had been completed, but did not take into account his accommodation needs. It had been this that had prompted the hostel to enforce the eviction notice.

Second Risk Management Meeting - May 1995

This meeting was attended by:-

Detective Constable, Police, Child Protection Unit,

Police Constable attached to Police,

Principal Practitioner, Child Protection, Social Services Department,

Senior Practitioner, Mental Health,

Community Psychiatric Nurse, Hostel Manager, Hostel,

Key Worker, Hostel,

Probation Officer,

Subject C.

It was the general feeling that Subject C's mental illness had been the only thing to manifest itself during this period. There had been no concern about sexual offending. His accommodation needs looked set to become the most dominant problem as his date for eviction
approached. The issue of risk was discussed and felt to remain high. Subject C was present for most of this meeting and co-operated very well.

Second Risk Management Plan - May 1995

1) All attempts were to be made to provide accommodation for Subject C.
2) That the police would continue to offer to attend any incidents that occur at the hostel.
3) That Subject C continued to attend the sex offender treatment programme and observe his relapse prevention plan.
4) That Subject C received a copy of the R.M.P.

Co-ordination: May - September 1995

He was evicted from the hostel in early June 1995 and very quickly found himself a bedsit. He introduced the owner to me so that I might discuss with her his risk of offending. I met her and viewed the property, which seemed suitable. The full range of concerns were divulged to her with Subject C's agreement. Links between her and the professionals involved were encouraged, and everyone from the R.M.M. was notified of his change of circumstances in writing.

Within 4 weeks of moving into the bedsit the owner contacted me with concerns. She explained that Subject C had accosted a girl on a bus and the child had had to be escorted home. He had also knocked an elderly woman over by walking into her. It was not clear if this had been an accident, but Subject C had become verbally abusive to the woman and onlookers. This was only reported to me because of the surveillance function of the landlady.
These incidents represented a realisation of the concerns that had been expressed at the R.M.M. After having detailed discussions with the principal practitioner from the S.S.D., the police and the C.P.N., it was decided that Subject C should be seen by the consultant psychiatrist (a new figure, his predecessor having withdrawn from management of Subject C on promotion). I presented Subject C at the Accident and Emergency Unit of the local hospital and asked for the duty psychiatrist to be called. Given the nature of the risk that had been outlined in the R.M.P., which was handed to the psychiatrist when she arrived, it was decided that he ought to be admitted to the psychiatric unit for assessment. His admission was initially as a voluntary patient but following a psychiatric case conference attended by the majority of those concerned with the R.M.P. he was made subject to Section 3 of the 1983 Mental Health Act, and a forensic psychiatric assessment was requested.

At this point the powers of the probation order were subsumed by mental health legislation. However, no such mandatory demarcation was ever really experienced. The probation service and all other agencies remained involved and attended relevant meetings.

Third Risk Management Meeting - September 1995

This meeting was attended by:-

Staff Nurse, Psychiatric Unit,

Detective Constable, Police Child Protection Unit,

Police Constable, Community Psychiatric Nurse,

Assessment Officer, Social Services Department,

Principal Practitioner, Social Services Department,
Student Social Worker, Social Services Department,

Student Probation Officer,

Probation Officer.

The new consultant psychiatrist did not attend but had been invited. Subject C was not invited to this meeting on the advice of the psychiatric staff involved in his case. The meeting discussed Subject C's recent admission to hospital and the circumstances surrounding the incidents that precipitated this. The police explained that after making enquiries into these incidents no evidence could be found to arrest Subject C.

The level of risk was not felt to have significantly reduced, although, he was of course, under much closer surveillance at that time, and as such his opportunities for offending were obviously reduced. Risk to other patients had already been discussed and addressed by the ward staff. As Subject C was expected to be back in the community relatively soon it was agreed that the R.M.M.s would continue.

Third Risk Management Plan - September 1995

1) That all agencies would continue to support the ward staff in their work with Subject C.

2) The police and social services department would be informed by the psychiatrist of any plan for discharge or rehabilitation.

3) That the probation officer and police officer would provide full offence material for the Regional Secure Unit to aid the assessment process.
4) The Community Care Assessment Officer was asked to track the case as future services may be required when the assessment process was complete.

5) That the consultant psychiatrist would be sent a copy of this R.M.P.

Co-ordination: September - December 1995

Subject C remained at the local psychiatric unit until November 1995 when he was transferred to regional secure unit for assessment. Offence details were sent to the unit by the police and probation officer. Multi-agency collaboration remained strong.

Fourth Risk Management Meeting - December 1995

This meeting was attended by:-

Detective Constable, Police Child Protection Unit,
Police Constable, Community Beat,
Psychiatric Nurse, Regional Secure Unit,
Social Worker, Regional Secure Unit,
Staff Nurse, Psychiatric Unit,
Senior Probation Officer (observer),
Probation Officer.

The main focus of this particular meeting was to co-ordinate the safest method for the discharge of Subject C when the time arrived. There was a great deal of information exchanged and the staff from the regional secure unit were able to confirm an early diagnosis of his illness. This remained the same as the previous diagnosis, ie, schizo-affected psychosis.
Fourth Risk Management Plan - December 1995

1) That the probation officer was kept informed of any significant change in the treatment.

2) That the social services department was appraised of Subject C's progress through the assessment process.

3) That a copy of this R.M.F. and R.M.P. was sent to the psychiatric unit and placed on file for the replacement psychiatrist.

Co-ordination: December 1995 - February 1996

During this period I visited Subject C once at the Regional Secure Unit. There was no other liaison of any kind. He remained the subject of assessment, detained under the Mental Health Act.

Summary: Subject C

It was necessary to formulate a shared opinion of the nature of the risk that he presented. This inevitably involved speculation because of the nature of his mental health. It seemed inappropriate to regard him as being of high risk without some structured reasoning for doing so. What occurred was that each agency agreed, based on their individual experience, skills and approach to risk management, that the mental health concerns aggravated the level of risk by creating an unpredictability and level of aggression that were felt to be unmanageable in the community. If Subject C had been in good mental health then these offences would in themselves have caused enough concern to place him at high risk. Unfortunately, his illness compounded this. Professional liaison was particularly good in this case and the R.M.M. was able to remove professional focus from exclusively looking at the mental health problems to
examining the potential for offending. The police showed considerable flexibility here, organising to provide verbal warnings.

This demonstrated a commitment to SORMA that gave a very positive message to all other agencies. The Social Services Department was represented by various professionals in differing roles. Scope for conflict existed but only very occasionally did it surface. An example of this was when the psychiatrist appeared not to be listening to the concerns being expressed by the other agencies. In the end he was persuaded, by overwhelming concern and professional opposition, to reconsider his public protection responsibilities.

Once an agreed level of risk was understood it was agreed that libido suppressant medication would provide an additional method of control that Subject C could acquire for himself. Unfortunately, though, this had to be discontinued as it had adverse side effects. It was also acknowledged that no person had been identified as a community collaborator. However, residing in a staffed hostel was thought to have been an equivalent method of surveillance and indeed, whilst he remained at the hostel this additional control proved very useful.

SORMA had been implemented in the case of Subject C with dramatic results. The political presence of multi-agency collaboration had been an intervention which gave greater insight and direction to the psychiatric management of his case. Surveillance had produced concern that ultimately triggered the recognition of the need to use legislative authority to control the risk he presented.
Subject D

Background Information:

Subject D was a 42 year old divorced man with 3 children, all of whom are now of adult age. He was the subject of a 2 year probation order with a condition to attend the probation treatment programme for sex offenders in Middletown. This order was imposed following his conviction at Crown Court on 2 counts of indecency with a child. The victims were both girls aged 5 years and 7 years and were not related to him. He had been on probation for only 2 weeks prior to this research beginning and had spent 12 months on remand at a local prison. He was temporarily staying with his mother who lived in a small village close to Middletown and had plans to move into private rented accommodation in the very near future. He received his income from state benefit and was seeking employment.

His family of origin are from Wales where he was born and raised. He had one sister and described his childhood as happy, although he experienced a period of trauma whilst at school, the source and nature of which was never made explicit. Details of his relationship with his father are also vague.

He was a quietly spoken man with a good command of written and spoken English. It appears that he was quite bright and generally 'philosophical' about life. At the time he separated from his wife he assumed the role of sole carer for his 3 children. This prevented him from pursuing any specific vocation.
Subject D had interests in Christianity and art, often combining the two and illustrating biblical scenes. He had a history of drug abuse which centred around his use of L.S.D. He was adamant that this stopped rather dramatically after he witnessed the death of a friend from a drugs overdose. However, more recently police recovered drugs from his home during a search. There was no history of Subject D being a victim of sexual abuse, and no psychiatric or psychological assessment of his character or offending to inform supervision. Subject D reported that his first experience of sexual contact was at the age of 10 years with a girl of the same age. They fondled each other’s genitals on a school playing field. His first heterosexual intercourse was at the age of 16 years and he reported no sexual dysfunction during his adult life. He currently had no sexual partner and reported that he masturbated relatively infrequently, once per 8/10 weeks.

Criminal Offences

Subject D has several convictions starting at the age of 17 years.

1969  Taking Conveyance
1972  Indecent Exposure
1978  Theft of Cassette Player
1978  Theft of Purse and Cash
1980  Indecent Exposure
      Breach of Probation
1986  Fraudulent Use of Tax Disc
1988  Indecent Assault on Female Child × 9 +

5 T.I.C.’s (victims aged between 7 years and 11 years)
Imprisonment - 9 years

Fine £4
Fine £10
Fine £20
Probation Order - 24 months
Fine £20
To continue
Conditional Discharge
Imprisonment - 9 years
11 years)

Unlawful Sexual Intercourse with Girl Under 13 years x 3 (victims aged between 7 years and 11 years) Imprisonment - 9 years

1995 Indecency with Female Child x 2 (victims aged 5 years and 7 years). Probation Order and Condition

He explained that his sexual offending began when he was aged around 23 years and had continued unabated for many years. The convictions for indecent exposure drew the attention of the police to him during this period and on reflection he believed it to be incredible that he was never prosecuted for more serious offences until 1988. He commented that:

"it was as though no-one wanted to see what was going on".

In 1987 he was arrested for numerous sexual offences that led to his convictions in 1988. During this period he had befriended many families area with children, gaining the complete trust of the parents, who would frequently allow their daughters, and on occasion, sons, to stay overnight at his home. He abused a large number of girls during this period, often sleeping with them in his own bed. He kept detailed dairies of his activities which included introducing the girls to sex aids and condoms. He painted pictures of many of his victims and regarded his behaviour as being, with some, an expression of love. He was detected when one of the victims disclosed to a school teacher.
Subject D spent 6 years in prison during which he was offered the chance to participate in an experimental sex offender treatment programme. He attended this only occasionally and found it to be of no use to him. He was released without supervision and within 4 months had been re-arrested for these current offences which involved him enticing a group of children into his home, allowing them to look at pornographic materials, asking two of the girls to remove their knickers and then indecently exposing himself. He explained how he allowed the children to do whatever they wanted in his house. They played with his art materials and drew pictures. The children left his home after being there for around 45 minutes.

**Victim Description**

The two girls were aged 5 years and 7 years and were playmates amongst a group of around 4 other children. They were not related to Subject D and had only met him on 2 or 3 previous occasions whilst playing on the street. They lived in relatively close proximity to Subject D and had seen him painting. The girls lived with their parents who did not know Subject D or of his previous offending. Victims from previous offences had been known to him for a considerable period of time prior to disclosure. The youngest of these was 7 years. Subject D said that his preference was for girls aged between 10 years and 13 years. He realised the potential of encouraging the friendship of younger girls and boys as they often had contact with older children within his preferred target group.

**Offence Environment**

These current offences, like the majority of the previous ones, were committed in his own home. He had planned his home in such a way as to facilitate his offending. In 1987 when he
was arrested the police discovered that he had prepared a series of peep-holes through which he could watch children using his toilet or having a bath. He had sex aids situated around his home, and condoms were clearly visible and accessible for the children to experiment with. There were also explicit photographs and drawings of some of the children on the walls of his home, even in the downstairs rooms where quite often parents of the victims would sit during visits. It is astonishing to learn that some of these showed the girls in naked poses. In many respects his home was an instrument that he required to commit his offences, a significant fact which extended to his previous home where he committed his most recent offences, having lured the children in with his art work and made available to them a pornographic magazine.

Detection

Subject D was discovered due to the concern showed by a parent of one of the victims. She had sent her daughter with a group of friends to the nearby football field where her husband was playing football. She intended joining them soon after. She arrived at the field three quarters of an hour later and could not see her daughter. She cycled back home along the route that her daughter should have taken, calling her daughter's name. Her daughter heard this and ran out of the house to let her mother know where she was. The woman was not happy with the girl's account of her experience with this stranger, and the police were called. They arrived after two men had visited Subject D and carried out a punishment attack. He was not seriously injured.

He was arrested after the victims were formally interviewed, and denied indecently exposing himself or asking the girls to take off their knickers. He was remanded in custody for 12
months charged with abduction. At the time of sentence the charge was replaced with Indecency with a Child, to which Subject D pleaded guilty.

Identifiable Patterns

Subject D explained his offending as being due to his sexual attraction towards girls aged between 10 years and 13 years, though there is reason to believe that his true attraction is towards girls of a rather younger age. He presented as having many of the characteristics to be found with paedophiles. He developed a strong emotional and sexual attraction to young girls and the majority of his offences were against girls aged 8 and 9 years. In his diaries he revealed a deep obsession with sexual gratification and would often prevent himself from ejaculating whilst abusing the girls so as to create a stronger sense of arousal and heightened pleasure. For a period he devoted the whole of his life to the pursuit of sexually abusing girls. He was able to offer his victims much greater attention than their parents could, and despite the sexual abuse this made him a seemingly attractive and valuable friend to many of these girls. In fact when interviewed by the police in 1987 several of the victims would not make a complaint against him even though evidence existed detailing their sexual abuse. As mentioned above, Subject D had previously been a drug user and described receiving the same 'high' from abusing girls as he got from L.S.D. Indeed, he claimed that he started abusing when he stopped using drugs.

The identifiable patterns that emerge from Subject D's offending are these: firstly, he had a seeming fixation with young girls- an emotional as well as sexual attraction. His primary source of sexual arousal would appear to be girls aged between 7 and 10 years. As this was so strong it seems likely that it would remain a feature of his character whether or not he chose to
control it. This is not to say that he has always had this predilection or that he always will, indeed it is known that he has had age appropriate sexual contact in the past. For the current time though he accepted that sex with an adult was something that he found a less than exciting proposition.

Second, he has usually befriended whole families to obtain access to children. While this was not so in the case of his most recent offences it is likely that he would have befriended the children and then their families if he had been allowed to. His contact with these children was brief, but he seized this opportunity to offend. Whilst focusing on his earlier established pattern of 'grooming' it must be remembered that he demonstrated more recently the use of opportunism.

Third, he used his home as a means to commit offences. Displaying pornography, using peepholes and encouraging experimentation with sex aids helped create an environment in which children could quickly become trapped by their own natural curiosity, and so manipulated by Subject D in the confines of his own home. It can reasonably be predicted that such a method used to offend on so many occasions, with such ease and with such high yield, would be used again if he chooses to offend.

Fourth, his connection to the church was used to assist him in meeting families, some of whom, by their very trusting nature, fell prey to his manipulation in an atmosphere where forgiveness and tolerance were promoted. Elsewhere Subject D might not always experience the same level of spiritual motivation, and might well encounter less than Christian responses.
If we are to look at this case from the point of view of opportunity reduction then each of these identifiable features of his offending needs to be addressed. If they are predictable then arguably they are ultimately preventable.

**Subject D: The Implementation of SORMA**

**First Risk Management Meeting - February 1995**

This meeting was attended by:

Detective Constable, Police, Child Protection Unit,

Principal Practitioner, Social Services Department,

Probation Officer (co-worker),

Probation Officer (researcher),

Subject D.

The meeting began with an expression of surprise from all in attendance that Subject D had consented to being made the subject of probation supervision with a condition of attendance at the treatment programme. It is understood that for his particular offences he could only have received a maximum sentence of imprisonment of 2 years. As he had already spent almost 12 months remanded in custody the longest period he could expect to have served was just 2 weeks with a short period of supervision once released. The reason why Subject D should choose to consent to this order in full appreciation of the implications was the source of lengthy speculation. His own explanation was that he had decided to see if a treatment programme could really help him control his behaviour. He said he was determined to give this a try. His
offending had earned him a reputation locally that prompted acute mistrust and suspicion. It was suggested that he might be looking forward to playing games with the statutory agencies and deriving pleasure from deceiving them. If his motivation was indeed to receive treatment however, SORMA was able to provide for this.

Subject D joined the meeting and commented that whilst he was doing what he could not to offend, he would need all the help he could get from each agency. The meeting moved on to discuss risk. Subject D appeared to be very detailed in his understanding of risk. He explained that he was highly motivated to control his offending but realised that powerful urges had proved too difficult for him to control in the past. He therefore acknowledged that this would continue to present problems for him from time to time. Actuarial risk assessment procedures had proved a welcome, and, to Subject D, an obvious basis for calculation.

He stressed that he felt he was at high risk of re-offending and needed to develop strategies to prevent situations occurring where he could develop friendships with families with children. He offered his full co-operation with any agreed proposal for supervision offered by the meeting. His compliance with SORMA was striking. The police officer asked him for details of the vehicle he was using and the social worker asked for a list of all of the children with whom he was currently having contact. He was also asked about his current connections with the Church and his plans for the future. He provided these details and was thanked for attending the meeting.
Once Subject D had left the room there was considerable discussion about how best to provide an adequate level of external control that would complement any determination he had to refrain from offending. He had seemed determined to co-operate with our joint efforts, although he did not allay concerns about his power of manipulation. His main source of support in the community was his mother. She would provide a useful point of contact but it seemed doubtful if she would be objective enough to be party to the risk management plan. In the past she had protected Subject D to the point of collusion, by sheltering him from the police and providing a false alibi. At this stage no other community collaborator could be found. It was acknowledged by the professionals that Subject D was perhaps the most sophisticated offender of all of the subjects. He certainly presented as the brightest and as the one who had revealed the most sexual offences. He had many convictions and had recently spent 6 years in a maximum security prison with other paedophiles. The following risk factors were discussed:

1) He had the potential to deceive professionals.

2) He was an experienced paedophile with a preference for girls.

3) He had religious beliefs that might confuse his sense of responsibility and mask any deviant motivation he might have.

4) His use of drugs presented a further sense of concern. He stated he had not used drugs for some considerable time, yet police had recovered cannabis and amphetamine from his house in 1987. He has likened his sexual offending to a 'high' obtained from L.S.D. This association between drugs and sex offending is a confusing one.

Child witnesses from 1987 described sweets with powder in being given to them, so there is a chance that Subject D had used drugs to gain the compliance of victims.
5) His tendency to deflect direct questions with elaborate philosophical postulation cast a degree of concern over his mental health on occasion.

It was agreed that Subject D presented a very high risk of re-offending. The extent and nature of his sexual fantasies was unexplored as he had not started to engage in any of the therapeutic work facilitated by the sex offender treatment programme. However, this, when known, might not significantly alter this view of the level of risk he poses.

First Risk Management Plan - February 1995

1) Subject D was to be asked to sign a declaration/consent form enabling the probation officer to inform local schools and youth groups of his whereabouts and perceived level or risk. This was to include a photograph.

2) That weekly home visits would be made by the probation officer who might be accompanied by personnel from other agencies. These visits were to be conducted on any day of the week between 8 am and 10 pm.

3) That Subject D's general practitioner would be contacted with a view to referring him for a forensic psychiatric examination to inform current supervision plans.

4) That application was made to the local court asking for an additional condition to be attached to his order:

"must not communicate or associate with any persons under the age of 16 years save for his grandchildren".
Co-ordination: February - May 1995

Subject D found accommodation away from his mother but still in the same village. He sought approval from the probation service to move address and for advice on the suitability of it. The flat was visited with him and appeared to be suitable. Details of the proposed move were discussed with the police and S.S.D. who had no objections. Consent for the move was given although no legal mandate existed that required him to seek this.

Home visits were undertaken in line with the R.M.P. and I asked to be shown around the flat on several occasions. This did not seem to cause Subject D any feeling of resentment. The intrusion was welcomed. On some occasions he would ask if I would like to look around, and more often than not I would accept. I would visit every room in the company of Subject D and open the larger cupboards to see what was inside. I was looking for articles of children's clothing, toys, photographs, toiletries, sweets or food.

Subject D asked if I could assist him in obtaining his property back from the police. He mentioned that they had seized a large quantity, consisting of 8 black plastic bags and a suitcase of his property, when he was arrested 12 months ago. The majority of this was his personal writing, art work, diaries and letters. There were also dozens of photographs of children, collages and list of children's names with birthdays noted. I contacted the police over this matter and agreed to negotiate the return of it. The police were concerned that some of this property constituted paedophile paraphernalia, and were very reluctant for him to regain access to his victim's details.
It was agreed that Subject D would visit the police station with me and we would sift through his property with the co-operation of a police officer. Subject D would point out the items that were of value to him and he would have these returned if approved by the police and myself. This process took about an hour and resulted in him selecting only a small amount of the material, most of which was not objected to. He agreed that to keep such victim sensitive information in his possession was not conducive with the aims of his supervision and that it should be surrendered. The police did not destroy the material; instead they asked if I could use it to aid the treatment work with Subject D. I accepted. This collaboration and use of authority to implement control had proved a useful purpose, satisfying all parties.

Towards the end of February the Social Services Department contacted the probation service with news that Subject D's flat was in reasonably close proximity to one of their foster carers who often looks after quite vulnerable children. I was asked if I would visit the family and speak to them about Subject D. This I did, taking with me a photograph of Subject D to show them. I stressed the importance of maintaining confidentiality, as they would with sensitive information about a child in their care.

Attempts were made to cultivate a co-operative relationship with Subject D's mother. She had been visited at home and it was clear that she took a keen interest in her son. She was not, however, interested in discussing risk.

Subject D's General Practitioner was contacted regarding the forensic risk assessment. Subject D seemed willing to undergo this procedure. He said he knew he was not mad, although, he
would be interested in the outcome. There was an inevitable delay in finding the right person to examine him. Advice was given in this regard and it seemed likely that he would be examined in the coming months.

Subject D also reported that he was thinking of changing address. He had been offered a cheaper tenancy by a friend in a small village on the very outskirts of the area covered by the Middletown Probation Service. This news was not at all welcome. It would mean that all of the work undertaken to provide a degree of community surveillance and professional risk management would need to be repeated in this new area. This was not conveyed to Subject D although he must have realised the implications for his supervision.

Second Risk Management Meeting - May 1995

This meeting was attended by:-

Detective Constable, Child Protection Unit,

Police Constable, Police, Child Protection Unit,

Principal Practitioner, Social Services Department,

Probation Officer,

Subject D.

There had been no reports of concern relating to his behaviour during this period. His change of address was noted as was his regular attendance and full participation in the treatment programme for sex offenders. His drug use was discussed also, and concerns arose about the
likely increase in the risk of offending if he were to use drugs. He was adamant that he was a reformed drug user and would never be tempted to use L.S.D. again.

Second Risk Management Plan - May 1995

1) That the probation officer made enquiries about monitoring Subject D's use or non use of illegal drugs. Specialist advice would be required for this.

2) That home visits would continue as before.

3) That the probation officer would inform the local school of the presence of Subject D.

4) That the Detective Constable informed the area police officer of Subject D's whereabouts and assessed risk.

5) That the principal practitioner contacted the area manager of the local Social Services Department team to inform them of the presence of Subject D in their area.

6) That the probation officer pursued the matter of the forensic psychiatric examination as Subject D will now be registered with another G.P.

7) That Subject D was encouraged to continue with his positive efforts towards rehabilitation.

8) That the probation officer pursued resourcing as an issue with senior managers.

Co-ordination: May - September 1995

I visited the local school and spoke to the staff there about Subject D. The Head Teacher asked for advice about how to deal with confidentiality in a situation like this. She was concerned that information should be shared with parents and had been asked by the school governors, some of
whom are parents, to address this matter directly. The written advice given to the school was that the information about Subject D was confidential and should not be given to parents or the general public. To do so would be a breach of confidentiality and those responsible for the breach could be held accountable for any adverse reaction or loss he suffers as a result of their actions. This issue did not amount to a large problem.

Several weeks after visiting the school I was contacted by the Head Teacher who had been confronted by a deputation of parents concerned that they had not been informed of the presence of Subject D.

A useful contact developed with a branch of the Benefits Agency who agreed to put a trace on Subject D's address and name that would alert any of their staff to the need to contact the probation service if any alteration should be made, like for example if another claimant stayed with him or if he ever left the address for a short period and claimed benefits from elsewhere.

The Benefits Agency was keen, once given the serious nature of the concerns, to support the supervision effort.

Subject D's illegal use of drugs was to cause some interesting responses from the various agencies, in particular the probation service who would not permit random sampling of urine as an acceptable part of supervision. I arranged to meet with a drugs counsellor who had experience of dealing with L.S.D. users and the question posed for the drugs worker was this;

"If it is believed that use of L.S.D. could increase the likelihood of Subject D re-offending, is there a test available to monitor such usage?"
The specialist pointed out the obvious fact that L.S.D. does not cause people to abuse children as far as she was aware. However, in the case of Subject D she agreed that it might well increase the likelihood of a relapse. A test was available that would trace L.S.D. use in the previous 24 hour period. This was available for Subject D, if he consented.

Subject D accepted the logic of the proposal but did not welcome it as he had the rest of his supervision. However, he agreed to attend the drug clinic for a discussion about this and to give a sample of urine for analysis.

Testing by appointment was not a credible means of surveillance. If Subject D knew that L.S.D. was only traceable for up to 24 hours than all he had to do was not use it the day before his test. The best method would be random urine testing at home.

**Third Risk Management Meeting - September 1995**

This meeting was attended by:-

Detective Constable, Police, Child Protection Unit,

Police Constable, attached to the Police, Child Protection Unit,

Head Teacher, local primary school,

Principal Practitioner, Social Services Department,

Clinical Nurse Specialist, Drugs Project,

Student Probation Officer,

Probation Officer,

Subject D.
The forensic assessment had finally been requested by the G.P. and I explained to the meeting that the clerk to the magistrates had apologised for the delay in processing the application to vary the order. Urine analysis was discussed also, the drug specialist involved was in attendance at the meeting and restated the offer of urine-analysis tests.

**Third Risk Management Plan - September 1995**

1) That home visits would continue as before.

2) That Subject D was asked to reconsider his refusal to consent to urine analysis.

3) That the local school would continue to receive information about Subject D.

4) That the forensic psychiatric examination is pursued.

5) That Subject D was asked to provide a full list of all the contacts and members of the proposed religious group in an attempt to help police in the activities of those involved.

**Co-ordination: September - December 1995**

The Benefits Agency contacted the probation service with information that a family with a 15 year old son had moved next door to Subject D. This had been noticed due to their earlier undertaking to pass on relevant information.

The application to vary the probation order was finally heard at the magistrates' court. Subject D and the Bench were in agreement that the application was appropriate. However, the court clerk was not so sure and advised the Bench that the wording was ambiguous and the condition would be impossible to enforce because of this. The words "communicate" and "associate"
were the troublesome ones (N.B. This was somewhat ironic as it was this very clerk who had advised me to use them on the basis that they were used in the Bail Act and seem clear enough there). Their ambiguity became rather an issue, and finally I asked the Bench if they would be prepared for enforcement of any apparent breach of these conditions to be left to the discretion of the supervising officer who would rely on experience to interpret what was intended. Asking for permission to speak, Subject D stated that he knew what was intended and this seemed enough to satisfy the Bench. The variation was included in the order:

"not to communicate or associate with any person under 16 years of age save for his grandchildren".

This was circulated to all agencies involved in the R.M.M. for enforcement purposes.

His presence in the village was quite widely known by this time, and he described how he had sensed a change in the way that locals regarded him. He began to disengage from the village because of this, fearing attack which he had experienced in the past. He stated that he was determined to 'ride out the storm' but his actions revealed a motivation to do the opposite.

Fourth Risk Management Meeting - December 1995

This meeting was attended by:-

Detective Constable, Police, Child Protection Unit,

Social Worker, Social Services Department,

Principal Practitioner, Social Services Department,

Subject D,

Probation Officer.
Apologies were received from the local Head Teacher.

Subject D joined the meeting almost immediately and was introduced as before. The meeting discussed risk with him present. He thought that it remained 'considerable' - the rest of the meeting agreed.

**Fourth Risk Management Plan - December 1995**

1) That the probation officer pursued the forensic risk assessment.

2) That home visits would continue.

3) That the local school would continue to receive information.

4) That Subject D was asked again to provide his religious group membership list.

5) That Subject D's good progress was acknowledged.

**Co-ordination: December 1995 - February 1996**

The elusive psychiatric report was never undertaken and Subject D claimed no longer to have the membership list of his religious group. He also notified me of his intention to move house again, which he subsequently did. Throughout this period of research Subject D was not found to have breached any of the conditions imposed on him. He had seemingly co-operated with almost all that had been required of him.
Summary: Subject D

The professionals reached an early and absolute agreement of the level of risk presented by Subject D. He was regarded as a fixated paedophile with a clearly identifiable pattern emerging from his known offending. He claimed to welcome as much help as could be offered and he regarded control as help. He seemed to embrace SORMA with almost as much enthusiasm as the professionals.

Subject D signed a consent form allowing for the circulation of information about him to local agencies. This included a photograph that proved very useful. He also agreed to receive home visits from his probation officer, accompanied by 'other professionals'. In fact this never occurred, although single agency visits did, which included inspection of each room and large cupboards. The earliest visit was 8.30 am and the latest was 9.15 pm. It was of interest that he felt it important to seek permission to move house.

A situation arose where the police, probation and Subject D negotiated the return of property that had been seized in the course of an investigation. This proved rewarding for all parties.

The local drugs agency became involved and at one stage it seemed set that urine analysis for drug use would be undertaken. However, Subject D withdrew his consent and appropriate arrangements for the collection of random urine samples could not be established. Subject D asked for this to remain an option for him to use in the future if needed. The objection by the probation service would of course only preclude the probation officer from collecting the
sample, and as SORMA is a multi-agency supervision initiative there is no reason why this could not have been an agreed arrangement between the subject and the drugs agency.

The Benefits Agency proved a useful source of information, and the local school raised an interesting point of issue regarding public access to information. The public had learned of Subject D's whereabouts via the school and attempted to obtain information about him.

Once again the magistrates' clerk raised objections to the application to vary the probation order. The magistrates themselves however were willing to grant the variation requested and did so.

Subject E

Background Information

Subject E was a 27 year old local man who lived with his partner and 8 year old son in a rented house in Middletown. He was the subject of a 2 year probation order with a condition that he attended the sex offender treatment programme run by the probation service. This order was imposed for one offence of unlawful sexual intercourse with his 15 year old step-sister. He had always lived in the Middletown area and was brought up by his parents along with his 9 step-siblings. He left school at 16 years of age and trained as a decorator. He worked as a painter and decorator for a total of 6 years before spending 2 years unemployed.

Subject E has experienced considerable personal tragedy. The mother of his first son died at the age of 23 years in a road accident. The boy was aged 8 years and lived with him. He later
became the father of twin boys one of whom died at the age of 6 months, apparently causing a separation between Subject E and the twins' mother. The surviving twin remained with his mother. The next tragedy was the suicide of his brother. He had been injured in a road traffic accident and was subsequently disabled. Shortly after the accident he committed suicide by pouring petrol over himself and igniting it. He was found burnt to death in a field. In the same year his mother died after a long illness. Subject E became acutely depressed and received psychiatric help for this.

Despite this prolonged period of grief and depression Subject E had good health. It had been observed by the psychiatrist that he had a rather over-active libido and increased sexual attraction to females. Subject E reported some previous experimentation with cannabis, amphetamine and L.S.D. but no habitual usage. At times of depression he had drunk alcohol to excess.

Subject E reached puberty at 14 years of age and had his first sexual encounter at the age of 15 years. Since that time he reported having numerous heterosexual relationships. He had not disclosed any sexually abusive experiences as a child.

Criminal Convictions

Subject E was first convicted of a criminal offence at the age of 14 years. His criminal record was as follows.
1983 Criminal Damage Conditional Discharge
1983 Juvenile in need of Supervision Supervision Order
1989 Assault Occasioning Actual Bodily Harm Caution
1990 Unlawful Sexual Intercourse - 14 year old Caution

The first sexual offence in 1990 against a 14 year old girl involved Subject E meeting her at a night club and offering to take her home in his car. He claimed at the time not to have known her age although he made it clear that he did not believe she was 18 years old as she had told him. He did in fact suspect that she was aged about 14 years. He committed the offence against the girl in his car and then drove her home. As Subject E was under the age of 24 he was able to use, as his statutory defence, his belief that she was over the age of 16 years and had therefore not been aware that he was committing an offence. This defence can only be used once by a defendant and results in a Caution being given.

At the time of his last conviction Subject E revealed he was often sexually attracted towards teenage girls knowing them to be below the age of 16 years. He would achieve a greater sense of sexual arousal, emotional satisfaction and conquest from seducing them and having unlawful sexual intercourse with them. This was reinforced by several of his peers who dared him to try to seduce a particular child. This gave him the encouragement he needed to proceed. He would report back to them the 'progress' he believed he had made.
Also of concern is his admission of indecently exposing himself to women in a local wood. The police had received reports for a period of over 12 months of a man wearing a black balaclava and track-suit approaching women and masturbating in front of them. These incidents had become increasingly serious with one victim being pulled from the footpath by her arm. The police had suspected Subject E after he was followed home by a victim who noted his address. The police were confident that Subject E was the offender but he would not admit to it until he was arrested for the offence of Unlawful Sexual Intercourse in 1994. Unfortunately, the offences had been committed over 6 months prior to his arrest and as such his admission was of no value as the time period involved meant that any prosecution was statute barred. Whilst the police were certain that Subject E was the man who had been indecently exposing himself he never admitted to committing these offences again, explaining that he only made his confession as he thought this is what the police wanted to hear before releasing him from custody.

The current offence of unlawful sexual intercourse was committed against his 15 year old stepsister who lived in the same household. The victim described her experience to a school friend who reported the matter to a teacher. The police interviewed the victim who gave an account of how Subject E had seduced her with discussion of sexual aids, his own sexual exploits, condoms and her sexual inexperience. He arranged to have unlawful sexual intercourse with her whilst the rest of the family were out. Subject E gave a similar account of what had happened but placed emphasis on the victim's participation being more than passive. He also revealed that he did not ejaculate and lost his erection quite soon after penetrating her as he felt so guilty for what he was doing. These actions were reported by the victim also.
Victim Description

The victim of this current offence was 15 years of age and related to Subject E as his step-sister. She was described as being an average pupil by her teacher, who was popular with friends. She had known Subject E for almost 18 months, and was described by him as not a particularly attractive girl. The case material presents a picture of the victim being rather plain and ordinary. She looks her age and is rather plump. The girl was physically mature and what emerges is that it was her age and inexperience that held the attraction for Subject E.

Offence Environment

This one offence was committed in the family home. The other members of the family had been taken to a local community event by Subject E and left there, with no means of returning. He drove back home and by prior arrangement his step-sister had remained in bed. He got into her bed to commit the offence. Several weeks before the offence Subject E had complained to his father that the girl should not wear her night clothes whilst she sat in the company of him and his male friends. She was asked not to do this by her father and stopped.

Detection

Subject E was arrested as a result of his victim disclosing. She had informed a friend at school who in turn informed a teacher. She was interviewed by the police and gave a statement about the incident. Subject E admitted the offence and was prosecuted. This was a very traumatic time for him and he was eventually admitted to the local psychiatric ward for assessment. The presenting problem was depression and unresolved grief at the loss of so many relatives. The
consultant psychiatrist observed that Subject E was affected by hypersexuality with increased sexual appetite and libido.

**Identifiable Patterns**

Subject E does not fit any exclusive offender type with any degree of comfort. He does not appear to have any of the characteristics found with paedophiles. He is heterosexual with an attraction to biologically mature but sexually inexperienced females, and this obviously brings him into conflict with the law as many of these females would be aged between 13-16 years.

It has been argued by his psychiatrist that most heterosexual males are attracted to those more feminine and younger than themselves. In this respect Subject E is only different in one respect - that he chose to break the law whilst presumably most other heterosexual men choose to observe it. The presence of hypersexuality would create a stronger sexual urge with which to contend.

The suspicion that he had also been indecently exposing himself in a particularly threatening manner was also of concern. Although he had not been convicted of these offences it seems reasonable, given the strength of the evidence and his own admission to the police, to assume that he was responsible. This adds an element of dangerousness to the pattern of offending. To make physical contact with a victim in such a threatening way is a progression beyond that found with many indecent exposers and may reveal the potential for far more serious offending.
In order to establish patterns to this offending it seems reasonable to assume that the risk of repeat offending against females was high. The location of offences and victim type do not readily lend themselves to predictability. His macho self image and peer influence would continue to normalise illegal sexual acts and increase the probability of further offending. If the diagnosis of hypersexuality was correct, and there is no reason to believe otherwise, then whenever the legal boundaries of acceptable behaviour were reached we could expect the possibility of transgression unless enough internal and external controls were in place.

Subject E: The Implementation of SORMA

First Risk Management Meeting - February 1995

This meeting was attended by:-

Detective Constable, Police, Child Protection Unit,
Principal Practitioner, Social Services Department,
Community Psychiatric Nurse, Health Authority,
Probation Officer, co-worker,
Probation Officer,
Subject E.

The police officer gave details of their concerns about Subject E's offences of indecent exposure, and asked if they could be dealt with in the treatment programme as they presented a greater danger than the offence for which he had been convicted. The police wanted to discuss this with Subject E when he joined the meeting if the opportunity arose. However, it was agreed that this would need to be addressed very sensitively, as he had so far retracted his earlier
admissions and it would not be helpful to create a feeling of defensiveness over this issue. Subject E had so far been quite open and seemingly honest about his offending.

There was also discussion about Subject E being charged with a new offence of improperly using telecommunication equipment. Whilst participating in the treatment programme he had been telephoning a young woman anonymously and some of his calls had been obscene. He was working as a taxi driver and one of his regular fares was a young attractive woman whom he had first met several years previously. The two recognised each other and Subject E became obsessed with her. It was agreed that this new offence should be discussed with him when he joined the meeting as it had a direct bearing on the risk he presented and the way he was managed. He had lost his job as a result of the telephone calls but was once again driving taxis for another firm.

Subject E apologised to the meeting for making the obscene telephone calls, describing how he developed very strong fantasies about the victim but felt unable to ask her directly for a date, or to tell her how he felt about her, as he feared rejection. He blamed the taxi driving job for giving him the opportunity to think about his victim and to promote overwhelming sexual fantasies about her. He explained that he no longer worked nights because of this. He said that he would leave the job altogether if he could find something to replace it.

The community psychiatric nurse gave an account of his involvement with Subject E, who no longer received psychiatric treatment. There was no underlying psychiatric illness that required treatment and Subject E had been discharged. The issue of risk was discussed and Subject E
completely agreed that he presented a high risk of re-offending. He said that he had not realised
the power of his fantasies until finding himself obsessed with his recent victim. He stated that
he was now determined to do whatever it took to avoid risky situations. In view of the variety
of his offending and his ability to plan situations carefully, the risk of a further offence would
appear to be high. His hypersexuality did not improve this situation at all.

First Risk Management Plan - February 1995

1) That home visits would be conducted fortnightly between the hours of 8 am and 10 pm
   and on any day of the week including Saturday and Sunday.

2) That the probation officer made application to the local magistrates' court to vary the
   probation order to include the following:

   "must not engage in any employment or activity that places you in direct contact with
   children or vulnerable adults without giving prior notification to your supervising
   officer".

3) That Subject E considered approaching his General Practitioner or Psychiatrist with a
   view to discussing the use of libido suppressant drugs.

4) That the probation officer established contact with Subject E's partner with a view to
   including her in his supervision as a community collaborator.

5) That the probation officer contacted the head teacher of the school attended by
   Subject E's son to advise about the appropriateness of including Subject E as a parent
   helper on school trips.
Co-ordination: February - May 1995

A letter was sent to Subject E's psychiatrist explaining that the R.M.M. had suggested that a libido suppressant drug may help to reduce the risk of re-offending. The psychiatrist discussed this with Subject E, who agreed to give the matter some thought. Later, he decided he would not consent to taking this medication. He did, however, request that it should be given to him if he changed his mind in the future. This was agreed.

Subject E's partner was approached and initially seemed an ideal collaborator. She appeared to be an honest woman who took a serious view of his offending. However, it soon became apparent that he was not honest with her. She did not know that he was being prosecuted for making obscene phone calls or that he was about to be the father of a child to a 17 year old girl who lived nearby. As these two issues seemed rather crucial to future discussions and decisions about his sexual behaviour, trust and risk of offending, it seemed almost impossible to engage her as a community collaborator but withhold such information from her. It was decided instead that Subject E must inform her before matters could proceed. He was advised of this and reported within the week that he had done so. The next home visit confirmed this.

The application to vary the probation order was made immediately, and was listed for hearing 10 weeks hence. The justices' clerk advised the Bench in open court that this was an unusual application and that enforcement would be a very difficult issue. I addressed the Bench and informed them that such a condition would be enforced in the same manner as any other community sentence or bail condition. If it was believed that a breach of the condition had occurred, evidence would be presented to the court in the form of a prosecution. The use of discretion and reasonableness would be exercised by the probation officer so as not to waste
court time by prosecuting a trivial transgression. The court would ultimately be the final arbiter in what was reasonable. The application lasted 14 minutes and the Bench did not retire to consider the issues before granting the application. The following condition was placed on Subject E's existing probation order:

"Not to engage in any employment or activity that places you in direct contact with children or vulnerable adults without giving prior notification to your supervising officer of your intention to do so".

The social services began making enquiries into Subject E's suitability to live with his son. As Subject E was a Schedule 1 offender the local child protection guidelines and procedures advise that an assessment should be made to address issues relating to child protection. Subject E was rather obstructive to the Social Services Department and seemingly failed to recognise the importance of their responsibilities. I was asked to intervene in this assessment by both the social services department and Subject E to try and facilitate dialogue and contact. This was eventually achieved and resulted in no further action being taken by the social services department. They were satisfied that Subject E did not present a risk of significant harm to his son, and offered his partner the opportunity of contacting them in the future if she ever felt the need for help or support. SORMA demonstrated here that the strength of multi-agency collaboration can assist in separate, single agency tasks.

Second Risk Management Meeting - May 1995

This meeting was attended by:-

Detective Constable, Police, Child Protection Unit,
Police Constable, Police, Child Protection Unit,

Principal Practitioner, Social Services Department,

Probation Officer, researcher,

Subject E.

The meeting received apologies from the psychiatrist and community psychiatric nurse. Subject E did not join the meeting until after there had been some discussion about his compliance with the social services department and his domestic circumstances. The meeting heard that no new concerns had emerged from any of the agencies represented.

The Principal Practitioner asked Subject E about his fantasies and whether they were as strong and overwhelming as before. Subject E replied that he does still tend to focus his fantasies, which were heterosexual in nature, and of mature women, on individuals he meets. The more contact he has the stronger these fantasies become. Subject E explained that he is now better equipped to deal with these fantasies as he recognises how his behaviour can be dominated by them. When asked if he felt as though he presented a risk of re-offending against teenage girls and women he replied that he always would, and would never pretend otherwise.

Second Risk Management Plan - May 1995

The R.M.P. remained unchanged.
Co-ordination: May - September 1995

The social services department received an anonymous report that Subject E and his partner were physically abusing his son. This was investigated and unsubstantiated. During this period no concerns emerged relating to his sexual behaviour at all. Subject E was reminded of the possible availability of a libido suppressant drug if he felt he needed it. During this period he was completely discharged from psychiatric care.

Third Risk Management Meeting - September 1995

This meeting was attended by:-

Detective Constable, Police, Child Protection Unit,
Police Constable, attached to Child Protection Unit,
Principal Practitioner, Social Services Department,
Student Probation Officer, observer,
Student Social Worker, observer,
Probation Officer, researcher,
Subject E.

Subject E started working as a relief van driver delivering parcels to people's homes in the region. The risks involved in this new position were discussed with Subject E at the meeting. He had thought through his response to risky situations occurring from this work, in the treatment programme. His relapse prevention plan reflected this. Subject E had no questions for the professionals and subsequently left the meeting. SORMA's linking of treatment with surveillance and situational crime prevention was very much in evidence here.
His employment provoked considerable discussion amongst the professionals once he had left.
The question raised was whether or not this work should be encouraged or even permitted. It placed him in direct contact with householders - a large majority of whom could be expected to be female. The scope for him becoming fixated with a householder seemed substantial. On the other hand he was completely aware of the dangers of becoming too friendly with customers and for this reason had opted to remain a relief driver and not to establish himself on a regular round where he would become familiar. He had not concealed the nature of his work and seemed to be facing the issues head on, and was prepared to leave the job if instructed to do so.
After a long discussion it were agreed that the advantages of the work, ie, keeping him occupied for long hours on identifiable routes and providing a sense of self-worth and productive engagement in the community, were better than to deny him the same, which would be likely to create pressures of boredom and low self-esteem. The police officers were particularly keen that he should not have to leave his work. One of them commented that whilst he was at work a degree of surveillance was automatically imposed by the regime of the tasks involved. Subject E had tried hard to find work and now that he had it was felt to help reduce the chances of re-offending. All of the professionals agreed with this view.

Third Risk Management Plan - September 1997

1) That home visits would continue to be undertaken as before.

2) That the probation officer examined specifically the issues of fantasy and obsession and how these might be avoided by Subject E in the context of his work.

3) That Subject E was to be frequently reminded of the availability of libido suppressant drugs.
Co-ordination: September - December 1995

This period also turned out to be a relatively quiet and uneventful period. Home visits continued but revealed no concerns.

Fourth Risk Management Meeting - December 1995

This meeting was attended by:-

Detective Inspector, Police, Child Protection Unit,
Principal Practitioner, Social Services Department,
Probation Officer, researcher,
Subject E.

No new concerns had arisen since the meeting was last convened. Subject E had not asked for a prescription of libido suppressant drugs. The meeting lasted just 20 minutes, with the professionals feeling a sense of relief and satisfaction that no new concerns were arising. The level of risk was assessed as being reduced.

Fourth Risk Management Plan - December 1995

1) That Subject E was reminded of the conditions imposed on his probation order and asked to inform his probation officer of any change to his work arrangements.

2) Use of libido suppressants were to remain on the agenda.

3) That the S.S.D. approached the new school attended by Subject E's son to discuss risk and offending.

4) That all agencies continued to liaise and secure any evidence indicating that a breach
of his order has occurred.

5) Home visits to continue.

Co-ordination: December 1995 - February 1996

Home visits continued fortnightly and revealed that Subject E and his family were reasonably settled. The libido suppressant drug was not requested and no change in his work pattern was reported. There was no liaison during this time and enforcement was not an issue.

Summary: Subject E

Subject E was under a considerable amount of suspicion at the beginning of this 12 month period for sexually abusive behaviour unrelated to his convictions. He denied these other offences in treatment. In view of this, suspicion obviously remained and Subject E's 'denial' was tolerated. However, Subject E was regarded as though he had committed these additional offences. He did not, for the purposes of SORMA, have to admit it. This contrasts, of course, with the need in many forms of treatment for all aspects to be fully explored and acknowledged.

To assume the safest route to manage risk the R.M.M. naturally adopted the view that the suspicions were justified. In all reality nothing could have been lost by assuming this and it contributed to the comprehensiveness of SORMA.

The conviction for a new sexually motivated offence seemed to bring considerable pressure to bear on Subject E, who demonstrated a sense of responsibility to the professionals at the R.M.M. He apologised for making the obscene phone calls and voluntarily gave a detailed
account of why he believed he had done this. He also left his job as a taxi driver because of his concern over access to potential victims, a concern which was shared by the professionals.

Subject E agreed with the assessment of risk as being high and consented to the making of a specific condition at the magistrates' court to be attached to his probation order. He was aware that all agencies involved in SORMA would search for evidence that he was complying with this. Despite the level of concern this case required less time and attention than any of the others. He withheld his consent to be prescribed a libido suppressant drug as he did not want it to interfere with his 'legitimate' sexual activities. He did however ask for the option to remain open to him in case he changed his mind.

Subject E's community collaborator proved to be a reliable support for him, though her ability to report concerns about him was never tested.

Subject F

Background Information

Subject F was a 32 year old single man serving a 2 year probation order with a condition to attend the probation sex offender treatment programme and to reside where directed by his supervising officer. The order had been imposed for one offence of indecent assault against a 12 year old girl. He lived with his parents in a rented home and he was unemployed. His work record was one of almost complete employment since leaving school. For most of this period he had been employed in a factory making garden furniture.
Subject F is the second eldest child with 3 sisters and 3 brothers. One of his older brothers has a conviction for rape of a woman. As a child Subject F was ill-treated by his father who had a violent temper and would use physical violence against him. He attended a special school having been identified as having a mild learning disability and chronic speech impediment. For the last two years of his schooling he ate and slept in a brick outbuilding to the rear of the family home. This had been directed by his father who was the dominant parent. Subject F had not disclosed that he was the subject of sexual abuse as a child.

He had his first heterosexual relationship at the age of 18 years with a partner of similar age. This lasted for about a year and he then met a woman with whom he lived for 5 years; the couple had 3 children, 2 girls and one boy. After separating Subject F had regular contact with his children until it was discovered that he was sexually abusing his eldest daughter, aged 6 years.

He was now prevented from having contact by civil court action, initiated by himself, in the hope of obtaining parental responsibility. Since this separation he had no further sexual relationships. A forensic psychiatric report revealed that Subject F has a strong interest in incestual, paedophilic and heterosexual rape. There was also a finding of a sadistic element to his rape fantasies. Other than his sexual deviancy there were no noticeable concerns arising from the psychiatric examination, and no history of mental or physical illness.
Criminal Convictions

Subject F had the following rather extensive list of previous convictions starting at the age of 10 years.

1973 Theft
1974 Theft
1974 Taking Conveyance
Breach of Court Order
1976 Theft - shoes
Theft - chocolate
1979 Indecent Assault on Woman
A.O.A.B.H.
Taking Conveyance
1979 Theft £30 cash
Theft £20 cash
1981 Burglary
Burglary
Burglary
Burglary
Handling
Handling
Handling
1982 Theft of Cigarettes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Theft from Wallet</td>
<td>Fined £45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>False Representation (fraud)</td>
<td>Fined £50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Attempt Deception - T.V.</td>
<td>Probation Order - 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attempt Theft - T.V.</td>
<td>Probation Order - 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>A.O.A.B.H.</td>
<td>Community Service Order - 40 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indecent Assault on Girl</td>
<td>Community Service Order - 40 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breach of Probation Order</td>
<td>To continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breach of Probation Order</td>
<td>To continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Indecent Assault on Woman</td>
<td>Community Service Order - 80 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indecent Assault on Girl</td>
<td>Community Service Order - 80 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breach of Probation Order</td>
<td>To continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breach of Probation Order</td>
<td>To continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Indecent Assault on Girl</td>
<td>Probation Order - 18 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Indecent Assault on Girl</td>
<td>Probation Order with Conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject F's record therefore included 6 separate convictions for sexual offences against children and adults and 2 for sexually motivated physical assault. It was somewhat surprising that he had never received a custodial sentence. Previous sexual offences included incidents where Subject F followed his victim in the street, attacking her at a secluded spot. He described how his first offence was an attempt to rape a woman. He was 16 years old and was out delivering papers in the early morning. He had spotted his victim several days earlier leaving home and walking in the direction of work, which coincided with his delivery round. He had felt a sense
of sexual attraction to the woman, whom he says was aged about 20 years, and pulled her down to the ground in the driveway of a house. He punched her several times and attempted to undress her. He indecently assaulted her but failed in his attempt to rape her. The reason for this is unclear. In his own opinion this was the most serious of all his sexual offending.

His next conviction for a sexual offence came 9 years later, although he admitted to several offences occurring during this period that never resulted in prosecution. On this occasion he punched a 14 year old girl in the face and indecently assaulted her as she delivered newspapers in the early morning. He grabbed at her breasts and ran off. In the same year he was convicted for two similar attacks, the first against a 28 year old woman and the second against a 12 year old girl. He ran up behind them and indecently assaulted them as they walked in the street, escaping by running away.

The conviction in 1992 relates to an indecent assault on his 6 year old daughter with digital penetration and oral abuse of her vagina. He had separated from his partner but would arrange to babysit for her whilst she went out. He described how he first found his daughter to be sexually attractive when he attended her sixth birthday party. He developed strong sexual fantasies about molesting her and planned to obtain access to her in order to indecently assault her. This is why he volunteered to babysit. It took about 6 months between developing the idea and committing the offences. During this planning stage he said he masturbated twice a day, stimulated by thoughts of his daughter.
The offence for which he was currently on probation was committed against his 12 year old niece. He had been visiting his sister and her family, and whilst other family members were in adjoining rooms he walked up behind her and grabbed her breasts. She complained that he was hurting her and a struggle began. He attempted to move her into another room and says he became very sexually aroused by the struggle. He had wanted to hurt her more. She reported the incident to her mother who informed the police. Subject F initially denied the offence when interviewed, but was advised to return to the police station by a probation officer to admit what he had done.

Victim Description
Subject F had numerous victims all of whom appear to have been female. Their ages have ranged from 6 years to 28 years and it is known that he has committed many more offences that have never been reported, or if they had, never resulted in a prosecution. During therapy he revealed that he found female babies and pregnant women particularly attractive and had used a health education booklet on pregnancy and child birth as a stimulus for masturbation. With Subject F having committed so many sex offences against a wide victim range it is difficult to be more specific than to say that his victims were female and would probably have all been under 30 years of age. His last two victims were related to him and were described by their parents and social workers as quite ordinary girls.

Offence Environment
This has varied from the home to public places. He committed offences in a variety of situations, even assaulting younger nieces on a school playing field whilst he was taking them to
school. It would seem that wherever he was able to obtain access to females was potentially an
d offence environment. He would select convenient spots to attack his victims and there have
been no reports of him ever committing an offence in view of a third party.

Detection

Subject F had been detected by various means in the past. Victims' descriptions of him were
usually enough to provide the police with a lead to identify him. Early disclosure of his attacks
was a common feature which could be due to the sudden and violent nature of most of his
offending and his lack of sophistication in silencing his victims. After initial denials he usually
admitted his offences, but hiding, to a degree, behind his learning disability, which he would
exaggerate if he saw it to be of advantage. This would appear to have been used several times
as mitigation in court also and is perhaps one of the reasons why he had not yet received a
custodial sentence.

Identifiable Patterns

Having 6 convictions for sex offences is a pattern in itself. Subject F presented a variety of
characteristics found in several offender types. He had a strong paedophile orientation in that
young children appeared to be his preference. He also showed strong identification with child
and adult rapist types. He seemed not to seek the emotional gratification sometimes referred to
as emotional congruence from his contact with children as was often found in paedophiles. He
also showed a repeated tendency towards physical violence more strongly associated with
rapists than with paedophiles. His recurrent fantasy was to lure two 6 year old girls with pony
tails into a derelict building and to rape them. His description of this does not, however, include
more physical violence than was necessary for him to gain the compliance of his victims. There would appear, however, to have been an element of sadistic pleasure in several of his offences. He explained how he became more aroused by struggles and physical confrontation. The more he hurt his victim the better he felt. Given the nature of Subject F's offending it would seem reasonable to regard him as having the characteristics of a sadistic rapist with a preference for girls but not confined to the parameters usually associated with this offender type. His offending was variously planned and spontaneous.

Subject F: The Implementation of SORMA

First Risk Management Meeting - February 1996

This meeting was attended by:

Detective Constable, Police, Child Probation Unit

Principal Practitioner, Social Services Department

Social Worker (victim), Social Services Department

Probation Officer, co-worker

Probation Officer, researcher

Subject F.

To have an offender in the community who appeared to present such a high risk of re-offending was quite a shock to most of the professionals at the meeting. He was considered to represent a danger to the public. Subject F readily spoke of his offences and fantasies, explaining that he did not want to offend, but often did because he could not stop himself.
There was a frank and very interesting discussion that followed, with Subject F telling the agencies with statutory responsibility for the protection of children and the general public how he wanted to rape children. This presented them with an enormous opportunity to gather intelligence about him and to directly influence his supervision.

Once Subject F had left the meeting there were gasps of astonishment at the level of dangerousness he presented. This had not surfaced whilst he was present but there was clearly a deep sense of concern that could probably only have occurred from the direct interaction of the meeting. The professionals agreed that Subject F presented a very high risk of re-offending and was dangerous.

First Risk Management Plan - February 1995

1) That the Social Services Department considered convening a child protection case conference to consider the protection of Subject F's nephews and nieces with whom he had regular contact.

2) That Subject F's sister was approached by the probation officer with a view to including her as a community collaborator as it appeared she was the person in his family with most oversight and understanding of him. She had previously reported him to the police for indecently assaulting her daughter and so would appear to be non collusive yet concerned.

3) That the probation officer would seek to obtain a variation in the probation order to include an additional requirement as follows:

"shall not engage in any employment or activity that involves contact with any person
below the age of 16 years".

4) Home visits would be conducted by the probation officer at a frequency of not less than once per fortnight.

5) That Subject F was required to report weekly to the probation office.

6) That the probation officer would approach the local school to discuss Subject F with the Head Teacher.

7) That Subject F was asked to sign a declaration consenting to having his photograph and details circulated to other professional agencies.

**Co-ordination: February - March 1995**

During this period one of the first things to occur was that Subject F managed to find himself a job working in a factory.

He agreed to sign the consent declaration allowing his photograph and details to be passed to professional agencies with a legitimate concern.

The Social Services Department convened a strategy meeting to discuss the risk that Subject F posed to his nephews and nieces. By this time he had already been given direct instructions not to visit the home whilst the children were there.

Subject F decided he wanted to move from his parents' home and found himself a bedsitter in the town. This accommodation was visited and inspected, it seemed suitable and Subject F moved in. However, soon after this a pregnant teenager moved into the room above him,
having shared access to the bathroom, kitchen and lounge. The police and social services department were informed of his change of address and the arrival of this other resident.

The application was made to Middletown Magistrates' Court to vary the probation order as recommended at the R.M.M. Shortly after this a note was found attached to the case file from the Senior Probation Officer stating that she did not support the application to vary the order as she had not been consulted and believed that the suggested condition would require 24 hour surveillance to enforce. These views were acknowledged but did not persuade me to withdraw the application.

The application to vary the probation order presented several notable features. The justices' listing officer was asked by the clerk to contact me and to ask me to reconsider the wording of the condition I was asking to be made. The word "vulnerable" was causing some concern for the clerks whose responsibility it is to advise the justices on points of law such as this. When I had written to the court I had asked for the following wording which is not quite the same as that recommended by the R.M.M. The reason for changing this was to ensure more comprehensive control that might help to protect adults as well as children:

"Not to engage in any employment or activity that places you in direct contact with children under the age of 16 years or vulnerable adults without giving prior notification to your supervising officer".

When the application was eventually heard I was advised by the clerk of the court that she was not happy with the application as it gave too much discretion to the probation service and could
not easily be enforced. I acknowledged these concerns but argued that matters of risk and vulnerability were issues that experienced probation officers have considerable knowledge of and that vulnerability could be defined further if the justices were not happy to rely on the professional judgement of a probation officer. Enforcement may also be problematic but perhaps no more so than court bail conditions which, like suggested condition of probation, are designed to protect the public by reducing opportunities for offending. Finally, I stressed that the ultimate decision regarding a breach would rely on the presentation of evidence and a decision by the court. The magistrates heard the application and after briefly retiring to consider the matter they granted the application.

Home visits were conducted fortnightly, revealing the presence of the pregnant teenager that raised concern about risk. It was agreed to discuss this at the R.M.M.

Second Risk Management Meeting - May 1995

This meeting was attended by:-
Detective Constable, Police Child Protection Unit
Police Constable attached to the Police Child Protection Unit
Principal Practitioner, Social Services Department
Probation Officer, researcher

Subject F.

Subject F joined the meeting and the immediate concern was the risk he presented to the pregnant teenager who lived in the same household. She had moved in 10 days previous and
was unaware, as far as we could tell, that Subject F presented a danger to her. Subject F interjected at this point and explained that he did find the girl to be very attractive and he was having difficulty in controlling himself. He explained that he would now leave the bedsit and find somewhere else to live. This came as rather a relief to the meeting and Subject F was congratulated for making such a good decision. The value of SORMA’s intrusion here should not be underestimated as it may have prevented an offence being committed.

Second Risk Management Plan - May 1995

1) That Subject F was directed to move out of his bedsit because of the danger he presented to the female resident there.

2) Home visits continued.

3) Weekly reporting continued.

4) That local schools and agencies be made aware of his presence in the area he was to move to.

5) That Subject F's sister was included in the supervision plan as a community collaborator.

Co-ordination: May - September 1995

At the beginning of this period Subject F was directed to move out of his address. At the same time his father became very ill and was admitted to hospital. Subject F decided to move back home with his mother who was occasionally disorientated and slightly senile. There was no concern about Subject F living there. His father died fairly soon after this and Subject F sought permission to visit his extended family to grieve and to participate in funeral arrangements. He
produced a list of dates, times and activities that been prepared by the community collaborator. After telephoning to verify this the Social Services Department and police were consulted about his request and Subject F was advised that he could proceed to have contact with his extended family, including the children.

Following the death of Subject F's father came the news that his mother was to be re-housed. This happened very quickly and I was informed by Subject F that he had already moved with his mother to a 2 bedroomed flat. A home visit was conducted and it was noticed that the property was directly adjacent to a school playground. Many of the windows overlooked the playground and a small fence separated it from Subject F's garden. As he was only staying temporarily with his mother it was decided to encourage him to move on. The risk from being so close to the school was one that the social services department, police and probation agreed was acceptable only in the short term.

The school playground belonged to an infant school and next door to it was a junior school. I visited the head teacher of the infant school and showed her a photograph of Subject F and explained the concern. I left her a copy of the R.M.F. and she agreed to inform her colleagues in the neighbouring school. I was contacted by the area community police constable whose beat covered the area in which the schools were situated. He had spoken to the head teachers at the schools and was keen for Subject F to move on as soon as possible. He made a point of visiting him at the flat to let him know who he was and that he was aware of his presence there.
Towards the end of this period a telephone call was received from a member of the public informing that Subject F was regularly visiting children, one of whom he had previously sexually abused. The social services department and police were contacted and it was agreed that the caller should be visited by a social worker and probation officer. This visit was undertaken the following day and resulted in Subject F being given a verbal warning about his behaviour and the family he was visiting being the subject of a social services department assessment.

A further phone call, reporting Subject F for having contact with children, was received at the end of this period. The caller who identified herself explained that Subject F was visiting his brother's home whilst his brother was at work, and was therefore alone with his sister-in-law and her two children, a boy aged three years and a girl aged five years. The caller was thanked for her information.

Third Risk Management Meeting - September 1995

This meeting was attended by:-

Detective Constable, Police Child Protection Unit
Police Constable attached to Police Child Protection Unit
Principal Practitioner, Social Services Department
Social Worker (nieces), Social Services Department
Social Worker (own children), Social Services Department
Student Probation Officer
Probation Officer
Subject F.

Although quite a lot had happened during this period the R.M.M. did not produce or reveal any new concerns. Subject F was thanked for his contribution and before leaving explained that he felt as though the risk of offending had reduced - although he could not identify why he thought this. He added that he had decided to stay with his mother and now viewed his present accommodation as permanent. Once he had left it was agreed that a move-on address would have to be found soon, the issues of his presence on the edge of an infant school playground having perhaps been allowed to drift too long. It was also agreed that the risk of re-offending remained very high.

**Third Risk Management Plan - September 1995**

No change to previous R.M.P.

**Co-ordination: September - December 1995**

One of the first things to occur during this period was a further report, passed on by a social worker, that Subject F had had contact with his son and one of his daughters. The children had told their mother of this and she had informed the social worker. Subject F denied this. He explained he had "bumped into" his daughter in the street but had not stopped to talk to her and that he had not seen his son at all. Although this matter was investigated there seemed to be no grounds to bring a prosecution for breach of his order.
Several weeks later a local health visitor contacted the probation office to report that she had visited Subject F's brother at home and found Subject F there. He was with his sister-in-law, whom it was revealed was epileptic and had regular 'grand mal fits' leaving her unconscious for up to an hour. It was pointed out by the health visitor that this effectively meant that Subject F was alone with the children. It also occurred to me that his sister-in-law was a vulnerable person and would be at risk herself. This was reported to the social services department and police and it was planned to visit the home at the next available opportunity. The area community constable was also concerned and he contacted the probation service to ask if he could attend the next R.M.M. This was agreed.

The head teacher of the infants school contacted me also and expressed concern that Subject F was having a great deal of contact with his nephew and niece. The sister-in-law with epilepsy had also informed a teacher that Subject F had attacked her. The police and social services department were informed of this. A visit was made to the home of the brother with a social worker. He admitted that he allowed Subject F to be there whilst he himself was at work, to help his wife care for the children. His wife had very little to say and seemed to distance herself from the discussion. It seemed clear that she had not informed her husband that she had been attacked by Subject F, as she had told the teacher. The couple were advised that Subject F should not be allowed into the home unless his brother was there and the children were out.

The social services department convened a child protection case conference and the children's names were placed on the register. The social worker arranged for a more appropriate solution
to the family’s need for a baby sitter. Subject F admitted he had breached his order and he signed a statement to this effect. He was also made aware that he would be prosecuted.

The housing department were sensitive to the concerns relating to Subject F living so close to the school and agreed to offer them both more suitable accommodation that could first of all be approved by the probation officer.

Fourth Risk Management Meeting - December 1995

The meeting was attended by:-

Detective Constable, Police Child Protection Unit

Community Constable, Police

Head Teacher, local Infants School

Head Teacher, local Junior School

Principal Practitioner, Social Services Department

Social Worker (nephew and niece), Social Services Department

Social Worker (own children), Social Services Department

Probation Officer, researcher

Subject F.

There was considerable discussion about the recent breach of probation and the ongoing concerns that Subject F might have committed offences against either of these two children and his sister-in-law. If the risk management initiative had not been in operation then his contact with these children may not have been known. Subject F joined the meeting and volunteered
information that one of his brothers, a convicted rapist, was in the process of adopting a young girl.

The housing department had agreed to re-house Subject F and his mother as soon as a suitable property became available. The information was welcomed by the meeting. Most of the discussion at this meeting took place whilst Subject F was present. He was asked many questions by the police officer and one of the two head teachers. Despite many professionals having been caused so much concern, extra work and expense, the atmosphere was very reasonable indeed. There was a shared concern with the risk presented by Subject F and a developing sense of shared responsibility.

Fourth Risk Management Plan - December 1995

1) That the prosecution for breach of probation was fully supported by all agencies.

2) That the probation officer liaised with the housing department to approve the next property.

3) Weekly reporting continued.

4) Home visits continued.

5) R.M.F.'s were sent to both schools and neighbouring school.

6) That the Social Services Department pursued the claim that Subject F's brother is adopting a young child.

7) That all agencies continued to liaise.
Co-ordination: December 1995 - February 1996

In this relatively short period of 6 weeks no new concerns emerged.

Summary: Subject F

Subject F engaged well with SORMA and co-operated with the professionals at a level that was quite surprising to us all. It was noticeable that all of the professionals were sensitive to his learning disability and compensated for this by providing greater clarity in their communication with him. Subject F discussed fantasy, offending and risk with little inhibition and once he became familiar with the procedures and professionals he dismissed any feeling of intimidation and would answer any question put to him. Towards the end of this period he became very familiar to the concept of risk management and informed a R.M.M. of a potentially risky situation concerning his brother, a rapist.

The social services department became very active with the relatives of Subject F and three child protection case conferences and four joint home visits with the probation officer were conducted during this 12 month period. At one stage 12 children had their names on the child protection register due to the risk of sexual abuse from Subject F. The social services department and indeed the multi-agency child protection conference were obviously keen that a condition should be added to his probation order, to restrict access. This would reduce the enormous level of resources being used to protect children from him and would be much less intrusive to the children and might even serve to protect them better. The social services department fully supported the application to the magistrates' court for this reason.
The community collaborator was a close relative who was considered to have low collusive potential with Subject F and who had demonstrated her potential as a responsible person. She was enthusiastic about being involved and contacted the probation service at appropriate times. Three other relatives, two female and one male, contacted the probation service with information about Subject F allegedly breaching his probation order. This was pursued, and eventually, after considerable professional and community surveillance, Subject F was prosecuted for breaching this order.

The R.M.M. proposed that an added condition was attached to Subject F's probation order. The senior probation officer and clerk of the court were not happy with the application on the grounds of it being unenforceable. However, despite this and with the support of local child protection agencies, the magistrates granted the application. They were satisfied that the condition was enforceable on the understanding that a probation officer was professionally able to assess vulnerability and could adequately determine what was reasonable using experience and discretion.

Home visits were regular and proved useful as they revealed the presence of a potential target who became a resident in the same house. The level of risk was considered to be too great and Subject F was directed to find alternative accommodation, which he did. Home visits also alerted the R.M.M. to the proximity of local schools.

SORMA was fully tested in the case of Subject F as all of the elements in the model were shown to be relevant to his supervision needs.
Summary and Conclusion

The field experiment encountered few problems during the course of the twelve months trial period. All six subjects accepted the supervision practice as necessary and attended all of the meetings. Special conditions were imposed in the majority of these cases and these were adhered to, as far as we can establish, by the offenders and the professional organisations.

This selected overview is discussed in the next chapter, where the issues emerging here, are examined and discussed. SORMA was adopted by the professionals who demonstrated an overwhelming enthusiasm for multi-agency collaboration, accepting a shared responsibility for the management of risk. What is most surprising of all, is that the subjects showed an almost equal commitment to SORMA, never challenging the maximum use of authority adopted to achieve the stated aims of supervision.
CHAPTER 6

Results and Findings: A Discussion

Agency Participation

Probation

The probation service demonstrated an ability to be lead agency in this risk management initiative. It was not only concerned with the co-ordination of the individual risk management plans but also retained statutory control of the offenders who participated. The probation service hosted the risk management meetings and provided administration for the R.M.M.s and R.M.P.s. Over the course of the 12 months research period the extra amount of probation officer time spent on each case averaged 2 hours per week. This is accounted for through liaison, home visiting, recording, attending R.M.M.s and attendance at court. Probation supervision practice had to be tested to see if it could accommodate the suggested supervision methods agreed by the multi-agency group. The vagueness, ambiguity and flexibility of both legislation and policy facilitated the increased level of supervision and control. Where boundaries were reached the subject's informed consent was obtained to dispense with any notion of restriction or limitation. Instances of this included informing local agencies of personal information such as the nature of an offender's sexual fantasies, gaining access to inspect the rooms and cupboards of an offender's home and circulating an offender's profile and photograph to local professional agencies. Supervision methods such as these are not usual probation practice and within the existing framework of community supervision methods appear
at odds with traditional social work values. However, a question of professional legitimacy must be asked here. The offender and the multi-agency forum concerned with crime prevention and child protection believed, in this experiment, that such supervision methods were necessary and valid, and indeed they proved to be of considerable value. Why then are they considered to be too intrusive and oppressive by some probation officers? Social work values, particularly those that have underscored the foundation of child protection practice, allow for such methods of intervention and indeed encourage a more thorough and intrusive inspection and policing role to protect children. Probation does not seem to have adopted these values, and evidence can be found to indicate they have in fact been vigorously resisted by some (NAPO, 1990). Using legislative power and professional control over sex offenders is not pursued with the determination that the task requires despite an acceptance of the nature of the risk and need for thorough supervision. Is it a fear of professional erosion in probation that has stifled the exploration of wider community control strategies? The issue of status and occupational devaluation may be a consideration within probation ranks, but at what cost? Is it the case that probation principles are to become a monolith within multi-agency child protection and crime prevention initiatives?

Although little interest was shown in the research project by other probation officers and management there were two occasions where senior probation officers intervened to influence and advise on matters of probation practice that impacted on the research. The first was in the form of a written note stating that an application to the local court to vary a probation order was not supported as it had been done without consultation with the senior probation officer, and was not enforceable. There are no policy or guidance notes that would compel a probation
officer in Middletown Probation Service to obtain the approval of a senior probation officer. However, it would have been good practice and courteous to have done so.

The other occasion of managerial intervention came when the senior probation officer was directly approached and asked if he considered it appropriate for a probation officer to collect urine samples for drug analysis. The R.M.M. had raised the question. The senior probation officer had consulted with his superior and it was agreed that such a task was not the role of a probation officer as it involved various health and safety matters that could not adequately be addressed by the probation service. Such a task is a health service matter and as such would be more appropriately dealt with by a health agency.

The probation service appeared to gain the interest of the other agencies involved in the R.M.M. As the meetings were held at the probation office many professionals who had not previously visited the office were now doing so on a regular basis. Communication with the probation officer raised the profile of the agency and this increased the level of probation involvement in multi-agency collaboration on other non-related tasks. During this period the probation service was asked to participate in a consultative role with the social services department to formulate treatment initiatives for juvenile sex offenders. The same agency would often phone for advice on other offenders and frequently invited probation officers to attend child protection case conferences to offer advice on non-convicted men and women who were considered to present a risk of sexual harm to children. The police and social services department requested R.M.M.s on all known sex offenders in the community. The police also developed a closer link with
probation, and invited the service to participate in an advisory capacity in an international operation concerned with investigation into allegations of child abuse.

The impact of the extra work for the probation service as a whole was almost negligible. As the individual officer who conducted this experiment I had to find time myself and this was accommodated by prioritising tasks and dealing only with matters that were considered important enough to warrant attention. This in turn was achieved by reducing contact levels with some offenders, recording only relevant information and pursuing supervision issues that were directly related to crime and criminal justice. Potentially criminogenic issues were addressed, but other matters were either referred on to other agencies or not addressed. For example, welfare rights, accommodation problems and encouragement to pursue leisure activities were passed on to agencies better equipped to deal with them. This re-alignment of operational priorities did not create any problems or result in any complaints being made. However, such a change in practice style was regarded by some colleagues as unusual and suspicious. No-one asked to join me in this work other than students, whose interest in a variety of working methods is to be expected.

During the course of the research period a feeling of mystification and confusion developed amongst some colleagues who never, however, really asked what the research was about. This created a sense of isolation from the probation service and a stronger identity with the professionals from other agencies as it was acknowledged that we had shared tasks and goals in protecting the public. Probation remained insular and culturally separate in this respect. Conducting frequent home visits alone to sex offenders in the community is a risky practice.
However, during the course of this research no incidents occurred that amounted to being threatened or even a feeling of discomfort. This activity would have benefited from having a colleague co-working but resourcing was not available.

Health Services
Several of the local psychiatrists participated in SORMA, exchanging information relating to risk and offering specialist advice. In the case of Subject C who had a diagnosed psychiatric illness the role of the psychiatrist was crucial to the management of risk. Although the consultant psychiatrist was new to the area he was experienced in forensic psychiatry. Unfortunately he did not embrace the multi-disciplinary approach to the management of risk, preferring, so it seemed, to make decisions based on clinical experience. Working this way in a multi-agency forum exposes methods and practice to wider professional scrutiny. Advice and opinion from other disciplines undoubtedly have an accumulative effect, and at times the psychiatrist in this case appeared overwhelmed by other professionals, who did not share his opinion on the level of risk presented by Subject C. Mental health legislation was finally used to detain Subject C following a repeat of his abusive behaviour. There remains little doubt that the pressure from the professionals involved in SORMA had a major influence on the psychiatric treatment and use of legislation in Subject C's case. Referral for a forensic risk assessment was made, and Subject C was transferred to a regional secure unit for assessment.

Libido suppressant drugs were considered in the case of Subjects C and E. Subject E considered the use of these drugs but chose not to pursue treatment for fear of loss of
'legitimate' sexual appetite. Subject C asked to try the drugs after discussing them with his psychiatrist. Treatment was started but had to be terminated due to an adverse liver reaction.

The Middletown Drugs Project became involved in the risk management of Subject D. They were approached for specialist advice and then asked to participate. They agreed to undertake urine analysis of Subject D who initially had given his consent for this. A system was devised for random collection and testing to inform the R.M.M. of drug use and the chances of increased risk. Unfortunately, Subject D withdrew his consent after becoming frustrated over appointment arrangements and expressing concern that the testing was unnecessary. Although the testing was never done the procedure was negotiated and the R.M.M. believed such provision would help to prevent the level of risk increasing or indeed, remaining hidden.

The nursing profession was well represented in SORMA. Community psychiatric nurses and ward based staff proved to be good communicators with an excellent understanding of the nature of multi-disciplinary work. During the process of risk assessment these professionals seemed to be very well experienced and trained not only in estimating risk but in working to reduce it. The concept of control seemed to fit comfortably with their objective approach to managing risk. In the case of Subject F, a local health visitor, who had been shown his photograph at a child protection case conference, found him in the company of two young children. This was in breach of his court order and resulted in him being prosecuted. The health visitor was clear in her task to safeguard the children and asked Subject F to leave the house, which he did, and told him that he was to be reported to his probation officer.
The child psychologist involved in the case of Subject A proved at times unwilling to invest in the collaborative multi-agency approach to managing risk. Working with a fixed victim focus did not allow for a wider appreciation of other agencies' tasks or the risk management of Subject A. Such a working style proved to be at odds with multi-agency work and discouraged Subject A from participating in discussion about risk. Perhaps the most contentious factors were that the psychologist relied on individual interpretation of the victim's ordeal and proved to be unreliable in keeping information confidential. As with the consultant psychiatrist referred to above, the vital ingredient that appeared to be missing was the ability to appreciate the value of other contributors to the risk management initiative.

General practitioners were not invited to the risk management meetings but two were contacted on behalf of the R.M.M. and requested to consider referring Subject D for a forensic psychiatric assessment. This process seemed to drag on for months and was not helped by Subject D changing address and his doctor. The written requests to the G.P.s were from the R.M.M. and contained the implication that the request was fully supported by the agencies represented and were aimed at reducing the risk of re-offending. As a joint agency referral the G.P. was placed in a situation where a refusal would seem unreasonable.

Social Services Department

The social services department regarded SORMA as a functional method to reduce the likelihood of further offending. Having a statutory duty to protect children and promote their welfare SORMA created an ideal opportunity to obtain information and influence the way in which offenders were supervised. Having a value base similar to that of probation, the social
services department proved to be the agency which reflected many of the same ethical and professional considerations. The R.M.M.s were all attended by a principal practitioner in child protection and any social worker with an interest. Middletown has three principal practitioners who alternated their attendance at the R.M.M.s and circulated the R.M.P.s to concerned workers amongst the various teams and specialisms. Attendance at R.M.M.s was seen as good experience for staff and there was no reluctance to participate.

In the case of Subject F, three initial child protection case conferences were convened on separate families to discuss concerns raised during supervision. In addition to this four families received a joint probation/social services department home visit to discuss the risk presented by him. Subject E became hostile to the social workers during the initial stages of investigation into concern over physical abuse of his son. On this occasion the social services department requested support from the probation officer to mediate rather than rely on right of entry and enforce this with police assistance. The allegations were unsubstantiated but without the close co-operation of the two agencies it seemed that extreme and obtrusive measures would have been required.

The social services department provided some very creative thinking for the R.M.M.s. Subject A was unable to have specific legal requirements placed on his suspended sentence supervision order so the principal practitioner suggested the use of contracts. This was accepted by the R.M.M. and Subject A became party to a contract which required him to have no contact with any person under the age of 16 years without informing his supervising officer of his intention to do so. If he failed to observe this then the social services department would review his
contact arrangements with his youngest daughter, the implication being that his breach of this contract could result in restricted contact or no contact at all as he would have demonstrated that he remained deviant and was actively seeking out contact with children.

Police

The Police Service in Middletown adopted SORMA wholeheartedly and helped to develop many of the ideas and suggestions which emerged from the experiment. All of the ranks within the child protection unit participated in the initiative from Detective Inspector to probationary constables. Officers from other branches attended also. The presence of a police officer in uniform served as an additional deterrent on one occasion and although the officer questioned whether it was appropriate to have worn it, the rest of the professionals welcomed the image of authority as a symbol of control. The police did not want to send more officers than necessary and decided to rotate staff attendance. The R.M.P.s were circulated to other units and the intelligence officer included detail from the R.M.F. on to the police intelligence computer. The concept of multi-agency crime control came naturally to the police and their ability to think clearly about aspects relating to situational crime prevention was of great value to the other agencies.

The police provided surveillance to inform the R.M.M. and to look for indicators of offending or breach of order. Having equipped themselves with the best source of intelligence available about these offenders, and an assessment of not only the likelihood of an offence, but the nature of it also, they served an essential function in SORMA. They checked on Subject F's adherence to conditions on Christmas Day by making a home visit. The night patrol made regular checks
on the location of Subject A's car and reported the frequency with which it was absent from his home address. They also investigated Subject B and discovered he was continuing with his interest in caravanning, despite his assurances in treatment that he no longer did this as it was a 'risky' practice.

The police also discovered he had befriended a potential victim. They had cultivated a useful source of information in the caretaker, who demonstrated great vigilance in employee community surveillance. Sensitive policing methods were agreed in response to Subject C's mental illness and the need to support hostel staff. During the course of the R.M.M.s and in all liaison, the police showed great attention to detail of information, which introduced a greater sense of accuracy and validation of data to many of the other agencies. Liaison with the police was very regular, and during particularly busy periods of the research was daily. Full support was given to SORMA by the police and encouragement towards developing other areas of multi-agency crime prevention. Senior officers appeared pleased that the service had broadened the net of policing activities across other professional agencies.

It might have been expected that the police would have adopted a 'hard-nosed' approach to this work. In fact, the truth was quite the opposite. Officers demonstrated a healthy respect for therapeutic considerations, and in the case of Subject E chose not to discuss his previous admission of indecent exposure as this might have been an unproductive area of inquiry and could reinforce existing denial issues. Several months later the police supported Subject E in seeking suitable work and argued in the R.M.M. that a regular structure of employment would aid surveillance and might benefit his overall rehabilitation. The police also expressed an
interest in encouraging Subject A to discuss sexual fantasy issues with the probation officer in
the hope of determining the level of risk of offending against adults. Overall, the police
demonstrated enthusiasm towards SORMA, and their skills in surveillance and information
gathering were of great value. They cultivated useful sources of intelligence both from within
the community and from professional agencies.

Enforcement

The Subjects each had a clear plan of supervision and were aware of the instructions and
conditions that applied to them. Where these had been imposed as a result of a proposal by the
Risk Management Meeting they had a clear understanding of the reasons why such conditions
had been imposed, and indeed had helped in the negotiation process to formulate appropriate
measures. The relationship between these conditions and the treatment work was made
obvious, and in all but one of the cases the degree and nature of risk was accepted and
confirmed by the subject. Subject A did not agree with the level of risk and was not party to the
reasoning behind it. The nature of the concern prevented him from being informed as they
related to allegations that might at some later stage be investigated by the police. All of the
agencies represented were made aware of the conditions in each case to enable them to monitor
and best gauge the nature of risk presented.

Subject A signed a contract with the social services department agreeing not to have contact
with any child under the age of 16 years without giving prior notification to the supervising
officer. Any such contact that placed him in breach of this would be reported to the social
services department who would then review his suitability to have contact with his daughter.
Subject B consented to an application made at Middletown Magistrates' Court to vary the existing probation order to include the condition "Not to engage in any employment or activity that places you in direct contact with any child under the age of 16 years without giving prior notification to your supervising officer". This was enforced by the police, probation and social services department. Various concerns emerged that Subject B was not observing his condition and he was indeed eventually prosecuted. Subject C was considered unfit to provide his informed consent to such a condition and the application was subsequently withdrawn. Subject D consented to having a similar condition imposed to that of Subject B with an exception made allowing him to have contact with his grandchildren. Subject E similarly consented as did subject F who was found to have breached the condition, and he too was prosecuted.

Enforcement of these conditions relied on the participation of the other agencies whose professional activities placed them in the best situation to monitor behaviour in line with this. Having probation conditions enforced by other agencies proved no difficult task, as transgression of the established conditions placed potential victims at risk and became a legitimate concern of all agencies. It was hoped that a deterrent effect would be evident and indeed this may have been the case to some degree. However, two of the subjects were found to have breached these conditions. They were detected before offences were committed and both admitted, in interview, that this was part of their offence planning, and if not detected, that they would probably have gone on to commit offences against the children in whose company they were found. The conditions were a determined effort to increase the risk of detection and decrease opportunities to offend. The established breaches were taken as an indication of their success.
For the most part the Justices' Clerks at Middletown Magistrates' Court did not welcome the applications, and seemed reluctant to discuss the matter at first, but later offered constructive advice. On one occasion a meeting was arranged to discuss the appropriate wording of an application. An agreement was reached but resulted in the same clerk criticising the vagueness of the wording, presumably forgetting it was his own, in open court.

The main source of difficulty here appears to lie in the flexibility found within the legislation and establishing a working definition of what is reasonable. Enforcement of any condition has to be realistic and achievable (see Jarvis, 1994: Stone, 1994). The findings of this research indicate that enforcement of such conditions in SORMA is realistic. The question arises here as to whether or not specific conditions are required at all, or can 'instructions' be enough to enforce crime prevention measures? If a probation officer, under the terms of an order, instructs an offender not to participate in contact with children, is this enough to impose a legal requirement and are such conditions enforceable? (see Justice of the Peace, May 27 1995 p. 360). It appears that in the absence of any recent case law each case would have to be judged on its own merits and a decision regarding what is reasonable or otherwise would have to be made by the court in each case. In terms of making these areas of probation legislation effective, it is necessary to make the restriction as reasonable as possible, that is to say directly related to the risk of offending and intended to protect the public. It must also be explicit, and perhaps the best way to ensure this is to have the 'instruction' validated by the court, by making it a condition. The Court will, at the time of application, examine the reasonableness of the intention, and grant the application if it appears to be legitimate and appropriate. Future
evidence of alleged breaches will then rest on the quality of the evidence and individual merits of each case.

The Relationship Between SORMA and Treatment Programme

Not all of the subjects had received treatment at the time the research period commenced. Subject B had been in the treatment group for only 8 weeks and Subject D had not yet commenced treatment. What quickly became very apparent was that the two elements of supervision complemented each other considerably. A direct link existed between the two. The treatment programme had prepared the subjects to discuss in detail their offending and associated behaviour patterns. Sexual arousal and victim preference were established in treatment, as was the planning of the offending and maintaining secrecy. If this information had not been available the task of the R.M.M. would have been that much harder. In this respect the treatment programme provided useful assessment information with which to establish the degree and nature of risk. This was so in all cases and as the majority of the subjects had been receiving treatment for many months they came to understand that intrusive methods of control were to be expected. The issue of risk, a shared understanding amongst the professionals and the offender, was under constant scrutiny. The R.M.M.s usually began with a discussion of how the treatment programme was progressing, and the subjects were keen to discuss this. The police and social services department showed considerable interest in the treatment programme as this seemed to hold the key for so much information that was important to the overall assessment.
Subject B demonstrated that he was not being honest in treatment. This was identified by SORMA that revealed, by use of surveillance, that he was continuing to befriend boys and take them to his caravan. In treatment he showed every determination to convince the workers that he no longer did this. Not only was the caravanning contrary to his relapse prevention plan, but contact with boys was, by this time, a forbidden activity. Evidence was later obtained by the police and Subject B was prosecuted. Subject F did the same. He was behaving in a way that placed him in positions of trust with children as a babysitter. This too was contrary to his relapse prevention plan and court order. SORMA as well as drawing attention to some of the shortfalls in treatment, also served to provide evidence to support claims that treatment was working well. Subject D was under considerable surveillance but this did not reveal any concern relating to his behaviour. This confirmed the general picture obtained from treatment. The same was true for Subject E and to some degree Subject A, who attracted considerable suspicion but could not be found to have transgressed any of the instructions given to him.

During the field experiment all six subjects participated in a cognitive behavioural treatment programme for sex offenders. This was a statutory requirement imposed by the local courts (although subject A chose to continue as a participant in the treatment programme after the legal requirement ceased). This programme was exclusively a probation initiative, as no other agency participated in its delivery; although as we have seen, all agencies demonstrated an acute awareness of the value of any information it yielded about the subjects' offending.
Group work is one of the methods used to deliver the programme and, therefore, all of the research subjects were familiar to each other.

The relationship between SORMA and the cognitive behavioural treatment programme is clearly defined in both the theoretical model discussed earlier and the processual model presented in the next chapter. For, as we have already seen, SORMA incorporates clinical therapy as one of its key strands. It seeks to utilise every avenue for change, whether by enforcement of incapacitative measures, or, through treatment, convincing the offender to refrain from offending by applying self control. The cognitive behavioural treatment programme comprised five units of structured therapeutic activity over a 24 month period. During the field experiment (a period of 12 months) 2.5 units of the programme were received by the subjects. These were:

- ( victim awareness (1 unit)
- ( relapse prevention (1 unit)
- ( assessment (.5 unit)

Each of the subjects attended all of the treatment sessions, completing the units and, subsequently, the whole programme.

There was no evidence of tension in the relationship between the research and the treatment programme. Being the subject of an experimental research project generated little curiosity
or interest from the subjects, and the sum of their supervision, which included the cognitive
behavioural treatment programme as an essential element of SORMA, was received as a
comprehensive package with the explicit aim of preventing re-offending. Accordingly, the
subjects engaged, as they had all agreed to, in this combination of supervision and research.

In a further analysis we considered whether the research activity might have interfered with
the cognitive behavioural programme, by, for example, undermining trust or understanding in
the worker/client relationship. There is no evidence or suspicion that this occurred. The
process of examining relevant thoughts, decisions and behaviour proceeded unhindered, and,
although no formal control group had been identified, the six research subjects showed no
difference in response to the cognitive behavioural programme than the 'non research'
offenders.
Establishing Risk

The R.M.M. was presented with a list of actuarial factors relating to each subject. This had been compiled by the probation officer and offered to the other professionals as the baseline from which a clinical assessment could be formulated. Each professional and the subject could then affect the outcome of the assessment by either adding information that increased the level of perceived risk, or revealing detail or explanation to reduce it. As each agency contributed to the discussion, more information, some of which was previously undisclosed, was revealed, adding to the overall assessment. The challenge though was not only to obtain a reasonable understanding of risk but to explore ways of reducing and managing it. In 5 out of 6 cases the subjects agreed with the level of risk predicted by the R.M.M. The multi-agency process proved to be so naturally comprehensive and defensible because the understanding of risk had been set by the very people whose job it was to deal with it and who had a thorough appreciation of not only how the last offences were planned, committed and detected, but also of the local resources available to help prevent them from occurring again.

There exists a danger in meetings used to discuss issues such as risk, from what is sometimes referred to as the 'risky shift phenomenon' (Kogan and Wallach, 1967). The experience of this is to witness the professionals participating in an 'all or nothing' estimation of risk, usually following the line assumed by the most charismatic or assertive member of the meeting. This was not in evidence here to any noticeable degree. The presence of the offender often served to regulate any glimpse of professional hysteria, under or over reaction. Examples of this are available firstly with Subject F who was permitted to remain living on the edge of a school
playground for several months despite barely tolerable levels of risk, in order to obtain more suitable accommodation. In contrast, he was directed (even though he had voiced his intention to move) to leave his accommodation earlier in the year when it was discovered that a pregnant teenager had moved into the house with shared facilities. Secondly, Subject E was advised that he could continue with his employment as a delivery round driver despite the fact that it placed the public at a degree of risk. In both of these cases it was considered reasonable to attempt to manage the level or risk. Whether the level of risk in these examples had been over or under estimated will never be known. What is clear though is that each decision was based on accurate information that had been thoroughly discussed.

Establishing the relevance of issues such as displacement, patterns and prediction came easily to the police and to a lesser extent probation. However, the other agencies witnessed negotiation of crime prevention issues that brought a new approach to dealing with sex offenders. Individual situational crime prevention strategies benefited from the total support of all agencies and a plethora of creative ideas and innovative responses.

So how accurate was the predictive power of SORMA? Subject A was regarded as being high risk and of deceiving those responsible for his supervision. It emerged that this was broadly correct and it was likely that he was not living at the address he had provided. SORMA revealed that the prediction was true in some respects. After receiving a warning it appeared that he returned to the address he had given earlier. Subject A was probably deceiving his supervisors. Subject B was regarded as being high risk. He had an established pattern of offence planning, and in the light of that a degree of displacement was accurately predicted. He
was found to be following broadly the same pattern of behaviour as before, targeting boys and taking them to a caravan. Subject C was regarded as being of high risk and capable of rape of a child or adult. This prediction was upheld by the forensic risk assessment that added 'murder' to the likely outcomes of further offending. Subject C is now receiving maximum security psychiatric treatment and is likely to remain an inpatient for many years. SORMA not only predicted and forewarned of such a degree of risk but actively worked to bring its concerns to the attention of the psychiatrist, and then persuaded him to refer Subject C for specialised assessment. Subject D was seen to make good progress with treatment. The initial prediction of high risk was never realised and there was no established concern that Subject D was offending or deceiving the professionals, although a degree of suspicion about his ability to deceive will always remain, since the level of risk predicted by the actuarial assessment is so great. Although this level cannot ever reduce significantly, neither can his capacity to offend. Subject E also proved the prediction wrong. He was seen to make good progress in both treatment and SORMA. Towards the end of the research period it was considered that the level of risk had reduced. No concerns had arisen about him whatsoever. Subject F provided further evidence of accuracy in the prediction and assessment of nature and level of risk. He was found to have been in breach of his order conditions on several occasions and had been seeking out contact with children and vulnerable adults. In total, 4 out of the 6 cases had proved to have been accurately predicted. There were two false positives. These may be accounted for by the beneficial effects of the treatment and supervision methods or by their ability to avoid detection. There were no false negatives.
In summary in a majority of cases the R.M.M. accurately predicted not only who was likely to offend but also the planning process involved. This had identified predictability of behaviour and installed plans to reduce offending opportunities and increase detection. In two of the cases, Subjects B and F, surveillance detected and prevented offending; in a further 2 cases, Subjects A and C, surveillance alerted the R.M.M. to pre-offence behaviour that warranted intervention. Subjects E and F both commented that the high levels of supervision and surveillance had not just reduced offending opportunities but had helped to support their strong motivation to control their behaviour.

We return now to the eight components of the situational crime prevention model discussed in Chapter 3 and tested, with the aid of a hypothetical example, for durability as a utility in the examination of sex crime prevention. The model, which was developed to analyse property crime (see Clarke and Mayhew, 1980), has been modified here to include, among other things, greater attention to offender specific factors, whilst maintaining the necessary concern with geographic and environmental considerations. This provides us with a useful framework to examine further the findings of our research.

**Situational Crime Prevention: An Offender Focus**

The research subjects became the focus of individual risk management plans negotiated by a multi-disciplinary crime prevention meeting looking at situational characteristics. The task was to try and identify predictable patterns in their offending, and then impose external controls that would reduce the opportunities for offending and increase the risk of detection. If the risk assessment and predictive technology could help to inform professional judgement of risk, then
what could be done with the information? Would it be possible to use it to enable a situational crime prevention approach to risk management?

**Target Hardening and Removal**

Application of controls intended to obstruct access to potential victims was a feature in each case. These were made explicit so as to exploit the full potential of any deterrent effect they might yield. This was achieved by using legislative controls and in the case of Subject A a written contract. Negotiating a shared assessment of risk and then imposing, with consent, a method to reduce opportunities, reinforced by legal or civil sanction, emerged as a primary external control. To achieve this did not require any change of existing legislation at all. It was facilitated by the creative use of existing powers and professional influence. It served to validate the offender's own ideas and thoughts on prevention by developing relapse prevention strategies to create an external dimension of control. The internal relapse prevention and the external situational crime prevention dimensions combined to create a comprehensive method of supervision.

**Removing the Means**

In all of the cases there was an analysis of the scope to remove the means of offending. This was interpreted to mean the existing opportunities for offending facilitated by the subjects' interaction with materials or activities. Subject E was encouraged to leave his job as a taxi driver as it often led to situations where he was alone with a female and gave him a degree of control and access to personal information such as home address, social activities, lifestyle and employment. By leaving this job he was cutting links with potential victims, offence
environments, and leads or sources of information that facilitated these. In the case of Subject D, close links with the police led to an arrangement being formulated to filter the return of property considered to be inappropriate. The items were quite obviously the legal property of Subject D and he had every right to claim back what he owned. However, the nature of it was considered to constitute child erotica, which might encourage and normalise his thoughts about re-offending, through disinhibition and fantasy promotion. The bulk of his property was never returned to him and he consented to it being disposed of by the police.

Reducing the Pay-Offs

Finding ways to reduce the reward from offending was not a straightforward task. It was acknowledged that the treatment programme might impact to reduce this, and as such was regarded as having considerable value. Every effort was made to allow the treatment initiative to remain, but obviously in an enhanced form. In its most crude interpretation this was of benefit through using treatment methods that would convince the offender that what he was doing was wrong, the reward subsequently being less gratifying.

The use of libido suppressant drugs would also prove to be a method of reducing the pay-offs from sexual offences. If the offender's sexual appetite could be reduced then perhaps the chances of a sexual offence being committed could be reduced. Of the 6 subjects, 2 of them appeared to be suitable for the use of drug therapy. Subject E would not give his consent and Subject C, after giving his consent and receiving the drug, had it discontinued due to the side effects. In the follow up period to the research, Subject F consented to the same drug being
administered, and following 12 months of treatment appears to have made good progress, with no reported concerns about offending.

Formal Surveillance

Formal surveillance emerged in many forms during the research period. There is no doubt the R.M.M.s intended the subjects to be completely aware they were under a degree of surveillance in the belief this would act as a deterrent. If they perceived the risk of detection to be high then it was expected to reduce offending. However, this was not intended to be an empty promise, a bluff with no means of actual surveillance. The purpose behind the applications to vary the probation orders and impose conditions was to provide some validation to the need for surveillance. The conditions helped to set a surveillance agenda for the professionals. For the police this appeared particularly important as law enforcement as well as crime prevention and detection is their key functional role. Home visits conducted by the probation officer to the subjects were another form of professional surveillance. These were resource intensive to the probation service, and as they were random unannounced visits, it is difficult to estimate quite what they prevented from happening. What is clear though is that several of the visits revealed facts and suspicions that contributed to the overall assessment of risk. Subject A may have been misleading the R.M.M. about his exact address, and suspicion raised from a single home visit to his lodgings 100 miles away was later increased by concern raised by police surveillance of his home. The implication was that he could have been concealing his true address, where children could be living who might have been at risk from him. Informing him of the concern had the effect of altering his behaviour, and his vehicle was then found on a more regular basis parked where it was expected to be. Home visits to Subject B revealed nothing. However, police
surveillance discovered a great deal of activity that was of enormous concern. A decision was agreed not to alert Subject B to our new found knowledge, as it would be more useful to identify the boy who had been discovered in his company. Police surveillance eventually led to evidence being obtained of a breach of probation, and subsequently to prosecution. The police actively pursued surveillance in the case of Subject B and a potential victim was identified.

Home visits to Subject C did not reveal any concern, and he was not at any stage under surveillance from the police. However, there was considerable surveillance afforded by the hostel staff whilst he was there, and the psychiatric services also offered a form of direct surveillance whilst he remained in the community. Subject D experienced considerable surveillance including having his accommodation inspected and frequent searches during home visits. The police in Middletown and surrounding areas were active in circulating intelligence on him and the local beat officer paid attention to his presence also. Neither of these produced any concern during the 12 months research period.

Surveillance through drug testing was arranged but not pursued, and the Department of Social Security proved a reliable early warning system on the presence of newcomers in the immediate vicinity of Subject D's address. Surveillance through home visits produced no concerns in respect of Subject E, whilst Subject F became a regular target of formal surveillance. Home visiting revealed that a potential target had become a fellow resident, and later, that he was living in very close proximity to two schools. Police surveillance by the area beat officer produced further concern, as did that of a health visitor and school staff revealing he was having
contact with children, so breaching his probation order. This led to a prosecution for breach of order.

The circulation of information to professional agencies such as schools and youth organisations produced another form of surveillance. This was done with the consent of the offender who had supplied, when asked, a photograph of himself that was circulated to child protection conferences, where a direct link with a subject existed. The photograph was obviously the most accurate form of identification to most professional staff and had certainly been of use in the case of Subject F. This was attached to the R.M.F. which contained a full outline of the offender's personal details and a risk assessment.

A method of telephone monitoring of the whereabouts of Subject A was suggested but was unable to be implemented at the time of the research period, due to the lack of appropriate technology. This would have provided a further form of surveillance.

Natural Surveillance and Surveillance by Employees

Constructive use of community resources in crime prevention is not only an important factor but essential to a thorough crime prevention initiative. The use of dependable family members or those employed in settings that bring them into regular contact with, or oversight of, the subjects, was attempted in this research. In three of the cases the offender's mother was approached, but after discussion and closer examination of their position it was decided that they would not make reliable sources of information, and did not warrant the valuable and scarce resources available to the research initiative. Instead, an alternative source of
collaboration was established where possible. In one of the cases this involved enlisting the
support of the landlady. In all, 4 of the 6 cases benefited from the active participation of a
community collaborator and in the case of Subject F, 3 separate relatives became reliable
communicators over issues related to risk, and Subject F became one himself by reporting
concern that a convicted rapist was applying to adopt a child. Having regular employment
produced opportunities for surveillance in the case of two of the subjects but became an
obstruction in the case of Subject A that served to complicate surveillance.

Environmental Management

Middletown Housing Department became involved in the re-location of one of the subjects and
proved to engage well in the planning of a safer living environment. Sensitive allocation to an
area that was considered to present less of a risk was felt essential to the overall management of
one of the cases. Other evidence of this was found in the hostel placement for Subject C.
Living with regular supervision seemed to create a better contribution to the risk management
initiative, and it is of significance that he soon encountered difficulties once evicted.

Displacement

No evidence emerged to suggest that crime was displaced to another geographical area or other
type of offence but in fairness it must be said that the study was not fully equipped to test this.
There was suspicion that Subject A might be living with children out of the immediate vicinity
and it was apparent that Subject E had recently been convicted for making obscene phone calls.
Subject B had also taken to luring his victims to a caravan rather than to his flat. However,
there was no noticeable effect that could be identified as displacement from the imposition of
the situational crime prevention approach to the management of risk.

Summary

There is evidence to be found in this research suggesting that the probation service is able to co-
ordinate a multi-agency response to the task of supervising sex offenders in the community.
Joint concern with prevention enabled a programme to be developed and implemented
alongside an existing treatment programme, introducing a system of external validation to both
treatment and supervision. Each of the agencies represented demonstrated a commitment to
SORMA both in terms of creative thinking and functional participation. Separate roles in
public protection were harnessed to facilitate a comprehensive crime prevention initiative.
Situational crime prevention methods were applied to individual offenders who were assessed
as presenting risk. The methods used to co-ordinate this research project might lend principles
to wider application and interpretation. The accumulation of lessons learned from this research
has been developed to produce a processual model to stimulate greater interest in, and possibly
application of, SORMA. This is provided in the next chapter.

The views and attitudes of the representatives of other agencies towards SORMA suggest it is
perceived to be a valuable method of collaboration. Managers and practitioners from each of
the agencies represented made various comments suggesting that the wider systematic
application of SORMA would be of benefit to both joint and single agency activities with
offenders. Some of these comments, none of which was solicited, are summarised here:
"Multi-agency risk management meetings make such perfect sense to us. Dealing with our child protection duties we are often left unaware of the presence of high risk sex offenders in our area. What is more, even when we do know where they are we often have very little information about what it is they have done and the nature of risk they present. By involving ourselves in SORMA we get all the information available and can help to plan how we might reduce the chances of another child falling victim". (Principal practitioner in child protection, social services department)

"Coming to these risk meetings was rather a shock at first, we were very concerned when we heard that a sex offender lived very close to our school and we wanted to know as much as we could about him. We didn't even know what he looked like, let alone understand how he might abuse again. All of us were disturbed at first, but once we knew what we were dealing with we felt more in control". (Head teacher of junior & infant school.)

"Sex offenders take risks when they offend. If they really knew the very low report, detection and prosecution rates for their type of offences they might be surprised and feel encouraged to continue offending. The odds are stacked in their favour at the moment, I think many of them are already aware of this... SORMA lets them know that we remain concerned about them. In the meetings some of the offenders tell us how they have thought about offending and what they have done in the past to avoid being caught. This experience has been the best lesson in intelligence gathering I have ever had." (Community police officer)
"Attending these risk management meetings helped me to provide some of the answers for the child I have in treatment. I was able to ask the abuser many questions about what he did to her. This has been of great benefit and a good use of my time." (Child therapist)

"I was worried about confidentiality when I first heard of SORMA... The risk management plan is a very clear and well focused document for our files... I had never really thought how many different professionals would have an interest in sex offenders." (Student probation officer)

"I really couldn't believe the way my patient co-operated with this supervision project. He would discuss with me the progress he was making, and developed respect and trust for the police and social workers. He felt part of something and worked hard to avoid breaking the law." (Consultant psychiatrist)

"The probation service should do more of this. I'd never really thought of them as an agency which could prevent crime... In theory, this should work with other types of offender also." (Police officer)

"For me SORMA is about sharing. Sharing information, sharing responsibility and sharing ideas about what to do to prevent offending." (Social worker)

"There's a lot of talk about risk management at the moment but most of it seems to be nothing more than a recognition that we should be doing it. SORMA provides us with a method of doing risk management." (Senior probation officer)
"SORMA offers the police a unique opportunity to develop many areas of their work. Prevention, liaison and crime management are essential ingredients of public protection...this should be part of inter-agency crime management policy." (Detective inspector)

Some comments received about SORMA were not quite so enthusiastic. The examples given below were made by colleagues not involved in the initiative and who were largely unaware of the exact nature of the work.

"All these meetings must mean you lose sight of the offender as a real person, who wants to put his offences behind him and make a fresh start." (Probation officer)

"brief therapy is the key to the future for probation... criminology and crime prevention should remain separate concerns for universities and police." (Probation officer)

"SORMA is just an informal initiative between practitioners." (Assistant chief probation officer)

Quantitative Data

The following information has been collated to provide readers with a simple guide to some of the research activity.

Number of subjects - 6
Number of meetings - 24
Average length of meetings - 1 hour
Number of meetings attended by subjects - 22
Number of meetings missed due to mental health section - 2

Number of meetings attended by police - 24

Number of meetings attended by principal practitioner, S.S.D. - 24

Number of meetings attended by psychiatrist - 1

Number of meetings attended by hostel staff - 2

Number of meetings attended by head teachers - 3

Number of meetings attended by psychiatric nurses - 5

Number of meetings attended by student social workers - 1

Number of meetings attended by probation officers other than researcher - 5 (the same officer every time)

Number of meetings attended by student probation officers - 3

Number of convictions for sex offences during period - 0

Number of arrests in follow up period (June 1997) - 0

Number of convictions for offences total - 1 (Subject E) - Improper Use of Telecommunications committed prior to research period

Number of home visits - 97

Number of applications to local court - 4

Number of applications granted - 3

Number of applications withdrawn - 1

Number of breaches period - 1 (Subject F)

Number of breaches (June 1997) - 2 (Subject F and B)

Case conferences called as a result of information from SORMA - 3

Total number of professionals attending R.M.M.'s - 92 (+ observers)
CHAPTER 7

Sex Offender Risk Management Approach (SORMA):
A Processual Model

Developing Probation Supervision

Probation supervision of sex offenders remains largely concerned with the provision of treatment programmes aimed at providing offenders with enough self control to refrain from offending. Individual case work and treatment find favour with traditional social work values that underpin current probation practice. However, these values are becoming increasingly isolated from work with sex offenders where their application appears naive and possibly collusive (see Gocke, 1995). Legitimate use of power, manipulation and control are being recognised as increasingly important methods of intervention. Such a shift in values arguably sets this area of work apart from other probation activities and equips it to adopt a far greater allegiance with child protection and criminal justice agencies. Probation is well placed to seize the initiative and develop methods of practice that make full use of collaborative enterprise.

The major theoretical approaches that inform our understanding of sex offending reveal opportunities for intervention that are not confined only to the treatment room. Feminist thought advocates the vigorous enforcement of legislation as one method to deal with this problem, yet probation does not use its statutory powers to the full. Behavioural psychology provides us with addiction models to explain offending and these reveal how external controls can be imposed prior to or during the "grooming" process to prevent offending - see Fig 2. In
Figure 2 - Sexual Assault Cycle Revealing Opportunities for External Control
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addition, Finkelhor's multi factor analysis of sex offending demonstrates how external inhibitors can have a major influence on an offender's decision making process when planning offences - see Fig 3. Criminology has a contribution here also with situational crime prevention theory providing a model to analyse crime so as to reduce the risk of it occurring.

Probation supervision of sex offenders should consist of both treatment and control. It has been argued here that the evidence to support the use of external control with sex offenders is impressive and certainly no less effective than treatment initiatives. The subjects in this study were provided with intensive treatment and supervision for 12 months, aimed at promoting internal control and enforcing external control. The findings support such a joint programme. In recognition of the multi-agency concern with sex offenders probation can utilize wider professional interest towards achieving a joint goal, crime prevention, protecting the public from sex crime by reducing the opportunities to offend, and increasing the risk of detection. What is more, the offender must participate in the process so as to inform his own assessment. Risk management of sex offenders is given foundation in the multi-factorial theories and models of Finkelhor (1984) and Wolf (1984). Administrative criminology provides the framework and situational crime prevention the main method. This process is enriched by the vital collaboration of multi-agency participation.

Public protection and crime prevention demand more from probation than it has traditionally expected to provide. Rehabilitation of offenders remains a central task but does not have to rely solely on the need for social work intervention to the exclusion of other methods of social control. Predictive technology is now available to give greater guidance and a degree of
Figure 3 - Finkelhor (1984) Four Pre-Conditions Model: Opportunities for External Control
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accuracy to assessing which offenders pose the most significant risk and in what circumstances. As probation finds itself supervising high risk offenders for longer periods it needs to devise community supervision methods that make full use of legislation, research and resources.

If community supervision methods can do more to demonstrate effectiveness by reducing offending opportunities, then far greater credibility will be attributed to probation intervention by the Home Office, the criminal justice agencies, the public and the offenders. The probation service will strengthen its role as the rehabilitative arm of the criminal justice process.

There is mounting concern emerging with offender risk, and the probation service is becoming distanced from its humanitarian and welfare orientated beginnings. It is seen by some (Raine and Wilson 1993), as taking its place as one of the 5 agencies of an increasingly centralised and managed justice system (along with the police, courts, crown prosecution service, and prisons). However, the gulf between what has been prescribed for the probation service and what is considered acceptable probation practice is widening. Kemshall (1995 p.139) argues that two questions need to be urgently addressed. The first is how can probation be more accurate at predicting risk? The second, what do we do about risk once we are more certain? There has been growing interest in prediction work with various models being devised to best guess the level of risk and inform probation officers of anticipated dangers. However, despite the recognition of the need to do something with risk assessment once it has been formulated, there have so far been few developments to attempt to provide an answer. It could be argued that officers who are better informed are better equipped but this does not even begin to address the problem. What can probation officers do to make the best use of assessment information in an
effort to protect the public? A.C.O.P. (1994) warns that the probation service has a ‘limited ability to protect the public’. Obviously the probation service should not promise what it cannot deliver, but perhaps a greater link should be established with other agencies such as those from within the criminal justice system, health and local authority in a joint approach to crime prevention. The probation service is well placed to develop and co-ordinate a multi-agency risk management initiative.

Probation supervision of sex offenders is, as we have seen, very much treatment centred. Where programmes are not available then case work is provided. However, this is the one area of probation work that brings the service into most contact with other agencies, through, for example, case conferences, core groups and assessment procedures. Multi-agency working has indeed been experienced in this work for many years now. The probation service has gained considerable expertise in assessment and treatment methods and are now well placed to put this experience to greater use, not only to further develop treatment techniques but to co-ordinate multi-agency risk management programmes.

The Aims of Multi-Agency Risk Management

Crime is the concern of a great many organisations both within and outside the criminal justice system. What is becoming increasingly clear is that whilst each of these separate organisations has an individual function, they share a common purpose, and what is more, the public is equally as concerned with crime. Protection and prevention are the most fundamental aims emerging from this concern. The Home Office has been trying to encourage the co-ordination of agencies in crime prevention initiatives for a number of years with geographically patchy
results. The probation service was moved 'centre stage' to promote greater participation but this casting invoked stage fright as they appear lost for words. Multi-agency risk management provides a script that is written in universal language and recognises the joint roles that exist in community supervision. Bringing together these agencies to discuss individual offenders and indeed recognising that the offender and family members may have a contribution appears such an obvious solution. Each agency stands to gain from such an initiative and is not required to apply any greater attention or resources than is necessary. Indeed joint assessments may produce considerable savings as resources can be more accurately targeted when assessment, prediction and protection have been considered. In brief, the aims of multi-agency risk management are:

- Enabling a joint approach to crime prevention benefiting from the sharing of information.
- Promoting shared responsibility and accountability.
- Promoting public confidence and reducing fear of crime.
- Respecting and maintaining each agency's individual contribution.
- Reducing the opportunities for offending and increasing the risk of detection.
- Accessing the full range of legislation to implement offender risk management plans.
We can gain useful alternative perspectives of risk and risk management if we compare SORMA to current developments in mental health practice. Davis, in a brief but insightful overview of risk management work in mental health, describes risk as having a high profile, which actively shapes relevant policy, law and service response (Davis, 1996).

Risk in mental health, like risk in criminal justice, is vulnerable to definition and re-definition by conflicting political, professional and organisational interests. The care and control debate is not unique to probation, as, in the mental health field there are two main approaches to working with risk: the risk minimisation approach and the risk taking approach (Davis, 1996 p.110).

Closer analysis of these approaches reveals further similarity to probation. The risk minimisation approach is evolving in the context of government directives, both legislative and procedural mandates (for one such example see the care programme approach (CPA) Department of Health, 1990). More recently the care programme approach has been extended to incorporate risk work. An assessment of risk is now required as part of this process. Individuals whose behaviour has been characterised by violence and or self harm in the community and who have been detained under the Mental Health Act (1983) require a thorough, multi-disciplinary risk assessment followed by the establishment of a clear agreed risk management plan subject to regular review (Department of Health, 1994).
The risk minimisation approach identifies those individuals who require additional attention because of the perceived level of risk they present. Once identified they are registered and managed by medication and surveillance.

In contrast to the structurally mandated risk minimisation approach described above is the practitioner developed risk taking approach. The definition of risk used in this approach is normalising and positive in an attempt to empower individuals by taking chances. Risk, including situations which may have dangerous consequences for the public are accepted as facts of life (see for example, Mosher and Burti, 1994).

The conflict between government and practitioner led risk management initiatives in mental health mirrors, to some degree the probation service response. In both cases risk is easier to discuss in the abstract, or as applied to research cohorts, than to individuals. As one scholar has put it:

"... prediction is about individuals, yet studies on dangerousness are mainly concerned with definition and prediction of groups... It is with groups that predictive power is most accurate... Yet professionals cannot escape responsibility for prediction, not least because consideration for prison parole or hospital release and court reports necessarily requires estimation of the risk element to the community at large and to the individual himself." (Craft 1984: 211-212)
In both probation and mental health work individual practitioners have to bear a tension between the political and professional imperative to protect the public while at the same time acting in a decent and responsible way to the offender, and the fact that human behaviour is unpredictable and, ultimately, beyond most forms of control short of coercion. In such a situation, while it is impossible to guarantee success, it should be possible to work in an agreed professional manner, and for the character of that work to be open to public debate.

When things go wrong, whether they are in mental health or some other form of community protection, the problems are broadly predictable and have been identified in enquiry report after enquiry report (Blom-Cooper, Grounds, Guinan, Parker and Taylor, 1996 offers a good enough recent example): they include a lack of harmonisation between disciplines, a lack of inter-agency co-ordination, the lack of flexible localised resources of different gradations of security between institutions and the community, the absence of an effective method of community control involving members of the public as well as professionals, and an effective and responsive review system designed to react quickly and flexibly to problems as they occur, and to propose reforms at local, regional and national level.

This being so, one possible test of SORMA's likely robustness is the extent to which its procedures address factors of this kind, all of which are generic to managing community risk, albeit that they have specific application to the more developed field of the management of the mentally disordered. In fact these are all issues which SORMA has sought to address.
Interdisciplinarity and inter-agency co-ordination are fundamental to SORMA's philosophy as well as method; the involvement of members of the public is similarly a feature of its approach, and it is clear from the case studies reported in the thesis that where the production of a community collaborator was impossible community safety was threatened (though see also Grant 1999 forthcoming). Flexibility, tactical awareness and immediacy of response are similarly fundamental to SORMA which, as a system response to a community problem, also involved as much effort being put into ensuring system support and maintenance (by daily iteration with the other professionals and with the Area Child Protection Committee) as it did into the management of the offenders themselves. It therefore had immediate input into, and received immediate output from, the local and regional body responsible; though naturally it lacks any national dimension.

SORMA is provided as a processual model at fig. 4, and without being over prescriptive it formulates a proposed process from the research evidence found in this thesis. As a processual model it is flexible enough to be adapted for implementation elsewhere and would most probably benefit from creative professional interpretation. If the model is to be used as a public protection navigation tool then account must be taken of the contour and feature of local terrain.

Risk Source - The Offender

The model starts with the offender being recognised as the source of risk and coming to the attention of the probation service as the subject of statutory supervision. The need for statutory control has been found to have been of considerable value in the treatment of sex offenders and vital in this risk management research. This does not exclude the application of the model to a
Figure 4 - SORMA: Multi-Agency Risk Management of Sex Offenders

A Processual Model (Grant, 1997)

PROBATION SUPERVISION → RISK SOURCE: THE OFFENDER → TREATMENT

RECOGNITION OF RISK NATURE AND DEGREE

REFERRAL TO RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME

RISK MANAGEMENT MEETING: ASSESSMENT, PREDICTION AND EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION

FORMULATION OF RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN

CO-ORDINATION OF RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN

PROBATION SUPERVISION → POLICE → PRISON → LOCAL AUTHORITY → SSD → HEALTH → TREATMENT

REVIEW OF RISK AND RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN

PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC REHABILITATION OF THE OFFENDER
risk source who is not the subject of supervision. It does of course mean that there is less scope to impose instructions or enforce conditions designed to reduce risk, as we will see. There may be scope to include at the beginning of supervision a legal requirement or at least acknowledgement, and hopefully acceptance, that participation in SORMA is expected. This establishes a necessary contract with the courts or prison authorities and creates an informed and consensual working relationship with the offender. If the offender is to be invited to participate in this programme, which is desirable but not essential, then it seems reasonable to have kept him/her fully informed of the aims, objectives and methods of supervision to be expected. In the Middletown project all of the subjects had consented to participating in the research, several of whom explained during the course of the research that they had expected community supervision to have involved risk management methods such as those included in this model when they were first placed on probation supervision. In this respect they did not object to the process but expected it.

Recognition of Risk

The offender will already have been the subject to some method of assessment either from the sentencing or prison release process.

It may be that a preliminary assessment of risk has been established, for example through the preparation of a pre-sentence report or through the detailed procedure of parole or licence application procedure from prison. In either case the offender will have already been assessed and a degree of risk identified. Where this is considered high, or where subsequent and more recent events or information suggest that the preliminary assessment no longer accurately
reflects a clear enough picture of the nature or degree of risk, a decision may be taken to refer
the offender to the risk management programme.

Referral to the Risk Management Programme: SORMA

The process of referral would most likely involve recognition by the probation officer and
manager of the need for risk management. It may also be derived from a risk assessment
screening process that can be adapted from any of the existing assessment models and applied
as standard procedure to all probation cases. What matters is that accurate prediction materials
are used so as to target resources efficiently.

The risk management programme can either be co-ordinated by the probation officer with
statutory supervision responsibility of the offender or by a specialist member of staff with
responsibility for a number of similar cases and who does not assume overall responsibility of
the order or licence. In this sense a dedicated specialist role will emerge. If it appears that the
risk source can be appropriately managed by the risk management programme then detailed
information is collated to inform the process.

The offender is then interviewed to ascertain his or her own view regarding the level of risk he
presents. This includes an instruction to attend a multi-agency risk management meeting to be
convened locally. At this point it is hoped the offender recognises the need for the R.M.
Meeting and is fully co-operative with the explicit aims and objectives. Where attendance is
refused then consideration of how to compel through instruction, to persuade or to dispense
with attendance has to be given. The meeting could continue without the offender, but the
potential benefits from attendance at the meeting for both the offender and the professional agencies would seem enough to convince the offender that it is in his/her interests to attend. If this fails then compulsion and enforcement seem the most reasonable way to proceed. If the offender is made aware at the beginning of supervision and provides informed consent then the chances of non co-operation are reduced. If all attempts fail and the offender does not attend then there remains considerable value in continuing with the risk management initiative.

A R.M. Form detailing the offender's name, address, date of birth and other personal information can be prepared by the probation officer with statutory order or licence responsibility. An option exists here to ask or require the offender to submit a recent photograph of himself to be attached to the R.M. Form. It has also proved useful in the Middletown research project to obtain signed consent from the offender enabling the probation officer to provide the information to appropriate sources who may not have attended the risk management meeting.

Such a waiver would help protect the probation service in the unlikely event of a complaint or civil action over breach of confidentiality, although the chances of any such complaint being upheld is now regarded as unlikely (Hebenton and Thomas, 1996), probably more so than the opposite possibility of a victim taking action against the probation service over professional negligence when it fails to do what it can to protect that member of the public from harm. If the intention to use R.M. methods is made explicit at the commencement of supervision then such rare but troublesome occurrences will be less of a professional hindrance. Currently probation officers are expected to issue offenders with reasonable instructions that fulfil the intended
nature of supervision. With protection of the public ranking as the highest of these it would seem very unreasonable for any civil action against the service to be successful if the complaint is against a public safety and crime prevention plan negotiated and agreed by the local police, health authority, social services department and perhaps even the offender himself. When examined in detail the issue of breach of confidentiality does not withstand the need to protect the public.

**SORMA: Risk Management Meetings. Assessment, Prediction and Exchange of Information**

SORMA facilitates a forum for the exchange of information, collation of assessment material and negotiation of Risk Management strategies. Its purpose is to produce a shared assessment of risk and a plan to reduce the opportunities to offend and increase the risk of detection. These two are inextricably linked by the understanding that most offenders will not offend if they regard the chances of detection to be significant. The agencies who participate are those with a legitimate concern with crime prevention, public protection, child protection, the offender and potential victims.

Once patterns of predictability have been established, as was the case with all of the subjects in the Middletown research, then strategies for the reduction of opportunity and increased detection are formulated. The means to reduce opportunities are numerous and rely partly on the creative thinking of those professionals in attendance at the R.M. Meeting, and are informed by the experience of the police. Individual case examples are given later.
The exchange of information during a R.M. Meeting will reflect the levels of trust between participating agencies. Occasionally the need for restriction arises when information is given to the offender, and in view of this the offender is excluded from part of the meeting. It is enough for each agency to share what they feel able to, and as experience of multi-agency risk management is gained acceptable boundaries for exchange will be reached. There proved to be only one incident in the Middletown research where confidential information was misused. The professional that chose to do this had not embraced the spirit or aim of the meeting and had adopted a narrow professional focus.

In facilitating such an information exchange the probation service is providing a wealth of factual details and comprehensive assessment material to all of the agencies represented. In recognition that it can do little by itself to protect the public it is co-ordinating a programme of supervision that involves a myriad of experience, resources, legitimate professional interest and shared goals. This does not subsume, devalue or undermine any single agency but establishes a network of responsibility and concern that is visible to the offender, and that he or she has contributed to and feels a part of. The R.M. Meeting does not replace the need for any participant agency to carry out its individual functional role it simply better equips it to do so.

Once the R.M.P. has been agreed and a decision made about how much of it should be disclosed to the offender, then a co-ordinating role emerges and this is undertaken by the probation officer. This could either be the officer with case responsibility or the co-ordinator of the risk management initiative. What is required is for an overall view of the case to be maintained and to monitor the implementation of SORMA and any group or individual therapy
that might be offered. There could be some rather startling comparisons as in the case of Subject B, whose participation in therapy bore no resemblance to his actual behaviour detected through surveillance.

Although the task of co-ordination could be undertaken by a professional other than a probation officer it seems that community supervision responsibility is best held within the agency holding statutory authority for it.

There is no suggestion of implementing a separate recording or administrative system for this co-ordination role, as existing probation records systems are already developed to a degree that can accommodate it. During the Middletown research the nature of co-ordination became passive as agencies and members of the public reported transgressions and concerns. The inflow of co-ordination information was enormous as the probation role served to manage and co-ordinate what became supervision in the community, by the community.

SORMA: New Directions in Probation Practice

There has been widespread support among those with an interest in development of the probation service for the view that wider community involvement and crime prevention can and should be one of the directions in which the future of the service rests (see for example, Haxby, 1978; Laycock and Pease, 1985; Henderson, 1987; Harris, 1992). However, despite creative local developments or partnerships, there have not yet emerged any large scale or strategic local arrangements for crime prevention involving the probation service in anything
other than a cameo role. The police, and to a lesser degree local authorities, command the co-
ordination and development roles in localised crime prevention initiatives.

The 'locks and bolts' approach to crime prevention holds little appeal for many probation
officers, and few criticisms could reasonably be levelled at them for remaining less than
enthusiastic. Clinging, at times rather desperately, to its welfare ethos, rank and file officers
prefer to reserve their specialist skills for a more elaborate role in social amelioration,
believing that dealing with poverty and other inequalities comprises their unique contribution
to criminal and social justice. Why then, given that welfare and social issues are now
emerging as matters under consideration by community crime prevention initiatives, has the
probation service not emerged as a key agency either at a policy or practice level?. It is not
surprising that some commentators have questioned the absence of any larger scale and
strategic local partnerships in relation to work with offenders and crime prevention, claiming
this already represents a lost opportunity for greater things (Broad, 1996 p.204).

Probation has skirted around greater involvement with the community, and witnessed as a
relative bystander the emergence of community crime prevention initiatives; while police and
local authorities have seized the initiative, developing local crime policies. The reason for
this is unclear. Is it that there still does not appear to be an appropriate social work role in
crime prevention, despite seemingly criminogenic issues such as unemployment, alcohol and
substance misuse and accommodation entering the agenda of localised crime prevention
developments? Could it be that as a relatively small organisation within criminal justice probation is just not resourced to mount a change in direction of such proportions? Is it because of an over investment in the 'what works' philosophy, despite less than wholly convincing, but often imaginative interpretation of the effectiveness research upon which it is based? Or is it that probation has lost too much credibility in the recent past to recover public and government confidence? Accordingly, is probation being designed out of the criminal justice system?

Resting quite comfortably in the care and control debate in probation there is some common ground: social work will continue to play a part in its activities. If supervision programmes such as SORMA are to be implemented more widely, beyond the established fabric of multi-agency child protection work, then the challenge to probation is to identify the balance of care and control resting within it. For SORMA encapsulates the diversity of probation, bringing together concern for treating the offender with the necessary enforcement of statutory power: it entails helping the offender to have every opportunity for rehabilitation yet without compromising public safety.

The challenge of engaging in active risk management supervision would almost certainly require managers and practitioners to take stock of the role, purpose, function, values and principles of probation work. To review these in the light of an integrated supervision package such as SORMA would reveal such a package to be no fundamental threat to the
treasured ethics at the heart of the profession. A further missed opportunity and continued
decline of the part it plays in the criminal justice system would be far more damaging. If
indeed a rationalisation of these considerations could be achieved, and this would not require
such an enormous leap of faith, then the all important ingredients which set the probation
service apart from the other criminal justice agencies would be preserved intact, to continue
to influence both criminal and social justice.

Social work has had, and will continue to have, a legitimate function in the probation service.
SORMA and any other similar approach would strengthen not weaken this position through
offering a timely convergence of care and control. The important features of social work; its
values, ethics and principles emerge as constituent parts to most of the separate areas of
probation work which formulate risk management programmes:

- Multi-agency work; nothing contentious here. Working together towards a common
  aim yet pursuing an individual function has not only become an acceptable element of social
  work but is one that is promoted as good practice in the probation service.

- Community involvement; a shift in focus from the individual to the greater good of
  the community is one that has remained a sensitive issue in social work for many years.
  What are usually described as the civil liberties of offenders often have to be restricted
  (though the fact that this restriction is, or should be, always in line with a specific legal
  mandate does raise definitional questions about the appropriateness of the use of the term) for
  the perceived benefit of the majority. Social work has grappled with this issue in a variety of
settings, including mental health, provision for the elderly, health promotion, child protection, child care and community care. To achieve an acceptable balance of restriction and risk is a delicate task, and one which undoubtedly benefits from the assessment skills found in social work. Probation work has refined these skills to meet the specific needs of criminal justice.

- Clinical treatment and therapy; searching for a therapeutic path to follow which could offer offenders alternative responses to offending is one of social work's most fundamental values. Instead of making offenders comply with changed routines in their behaviour SORMA actively encourages self determination. A decision to refrain must remain an ultimate goal in supervision.

However, other aspects of SORMA, or indeed any approach to supervision which comprises a surveillance function, will be controversial in the challenge it is perceived as posing to social work's ethical consideration of trust. Whilst child protection social work practice has brought about a re-consideration of some of the traditional values and principles associated with trust, befriending and self determination, probation practice has not, and a certain 'lag' exists.

It is difficult for the probation service, as a state funded criminal justice agency, to remain aloof from changing popular and political perceptions of crime and its management. Granted there is resistance to change among many rank and file officers, and this of itself is not surprising; but organisationally the probation service, including ACOP and CPC, is likely to
be interested in seizing such new initiatives as present themselves, and proceeding in a manner which, whilst ethical so far as offenders are concerned, enables it to discharge its mandate to protect the public against crime. SORMA offers the probation service a means of doing this.

Of course a culture of openness, of partnership with victims, communities and between criminal justice agencies brings with it new problems. The main ones are vigilantism and other related forms of exclusionary response from members of the public. These need to be set alongside the advantage of openness, and managing the dangers itself becomes a proper part of probation and policing activities.

So while implementing SORMA or other similar risk management programmes on a wider scale, for example as pilot projects, would involve practitioners and policy makers reconsidering the role and responsibilities of the probation service within a multi-agency and community centred arena, such a reconsideration is probably overdue if the service is indeed to show itself willing to grapple with the unavoidable complexities of managing unacceptable behaviour in the contemporary world.

The findings from this research indicate that probation supervision of sex offenders can be improved by the co-ordination of a multi-agency response to risk management supervision. Risk measurement instruments are becoming increasingly sophisticated and probation
intervention is being drawn towards a risk needs culture. Risk assessment has become common practice, but once this process has been initiated there is little done to manage it other than the emergence of cognitive behavioural treatment initiatives that are little more than embryonic as intervention strategies. Early small scale surveys have encouraged a sense of optimism for treatment and a considerable wealth of enterprise has emerged to promote it.

Probation supervision of sex offenders has been a practitioner led specialism adopting theoretical and ethical insights that have found favour with the political and professional climate of the late 1980's and 1990's. Internal measures of control, whilst promising the most comprehensive approach to preventing sex crime, fail to provide reliable safeguards to protect the public, instead relying on an assumption of trust. External control can reinforce positive change from treatment and create a greater sense of professional confidence in preventative interventions. What emerges is a dimension to supervision that can begin to manage risk and offer accurate and reliable information about the offenders observed behaviour.

SORMA offers the probation service a method of supervision that can improve existing intervention strategies by reducing opportunities to offend and increasing the chances of detection. Adopting such a response to the statutory task of supervision does not require a fundamental leap of professional ethics. The probation service finds itself within a transitional criminal justice process that demands far greater professional and public unity in response to crime management.
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We are finally beginning construction of this unprecedented database!

Currently, over 5,000 sex offenders have been mandated to register with the State of Minnesota’s Bureau of Criminal Apprehension since 1991. Unfortunately, the state didn’t begin mandating registration until 1991. Which actually means that there are literally hundreds of thousands of sex offenders who aren’t registered, aren’t being caught, aren’t being convicted, aren’t being reported. And until these records are released to the public, we will not rest!

Fortunately, there are several officials who are beginning to understand what victims have been telling them for decades in that the criminal justice system is a failure. Some are even beginning to do everything in their power to side with the public in the issue of properly punishing and exposing sex offenders. One such state is the State of Indiana which has made all of their information on sex offenders public and has provided an Internet site to search through the information. Another, is the State of California who recently released a Yearbook of sex offenders.

Because our state officials here in Minnesota are just getting to Community Notification [which we believe falls far short of a true effort] we will continue to undertake the task of informing the public ourselves. You can help too!

The Exposed section of Preventive Measures magazine features the names, mug-shots and offense information for all sex offenders being released from prisons each month including those who change names or gender, beginning with Minnesota.

In addition, we have begun uploading case information and mug-shots to a database that you will be able to access via your computer through a dial-up service to get data and printout actual mug-shots on all the sex offenders known to authorities across the entire country. We expect initial public access by December, 1996. To get an idea of how this will work, click on one of the offenders below but PLEASE READ ON after scanning the mug-shots.
Over 325 sex offenders were released from prison in Minnesota in 1995. By October, 1996, you will see all their mug-shots here. However, again, BCA has the registration records of over 5,000 mandated to register since 1991. The Director of this registration program has expressed to us that he doesn't intend for the records to ever be made available to the public.

Keep in mind that only 40% of sex offenses are ever reported. Within that, only 25% ever make it through the plea-bargain travesty as a sex offense, and an even lower percentage ever receive jail time which serves as a deterrent rather than as an incentive to reoffend. The average time served for the most serious criminal sexual conduct offense is 18 months. The average time is takes a victim to recover from the attack...is life.

Our intention is to create more awareness, and possibly help prevent sexual violence from occurring by letting everyone know who is committing the crimes. We're even planning to do television news.

We often hear that one of the most common reasons rape is not reported is, "They're just going to blame me," or "Nothing's going to be done about it."

NOW, something is being done about it.

A MESSAGE TO ALL VICTIMS: We are here to help. There are many, many other organizations with similar focus. Some may be in your area. We are driven by the lack of concern for victims. Don't give the offender(s) the opportunity to do to someone else what they have already done to you! STOP THEM NOW! REPORT THEM NOW!

• Why the mug-shots?
There are people in our society who create havoc amongst our families by choosing to invade and permanently brand our lives. Often, when these individuals are arrested and charged, the process they go through never lands them in jail. Slap-on-the-wrist-sentencing is a problem throughout the country and often, offenders have more rights than the people they victimize. Therefore, the photos are a way to stay informed of who is being convicted of committing the crimes. Without the mug-shots, the names would mean nothing more than John or Jane Doe.

In our offices, we receive hundreds of phone calls monthly from people who have been victimized by sex offenders and are simply looking for someone to validate their feelings of anger, depression, guilt, etc., and may simply be reaching out for the one thing that most of us victims never find, justice.

Sex offenders, especially first-time offenders, often get no punishment at all.

Multiple offenders, even admitted ones, are often given lighter sentences for cooperating with the system [i.e. a chance to harm someone else]. Their victims are often never considered and are often never contacted when there is a plea-bargain hearing [which should be outlawed], or when the offender has any type of appearance before a judge, even though the law clearly states that the victims are supposed to be contacted.
Criminal Justice Institute
Offender Registry Search

Results for search on:
Last Name: smith
First Name: joseph

Registry database search results: 1 found
Thu, Jan 16 '97 - 06:06 AM EST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IC Code</th>
<th>Offense Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IC 35-42-4-1</td>
<td>Rape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 35-42-4-2</td>
<td>Criminal Deviate Conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 35-42-4-3</td>
<td>Child Molesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 35-42-4-4(b)</td>
<td>Child Exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 35-42-4-5</td>
<td>Vicarious Sexual Gratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 35-42-4-6</td>
<td>Child Solicitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 35-42-4-7</td>
<td>Child Seduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 35-42-4-9</td>
<td>Sexual Misconduct with a Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 35-46-4-3</td>
<td>Incest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Offenders in the Registry Database
Back to top of page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Physical Description</th>
<th>Offenses (first 3 lines)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH SMITH</td>
<td>WHITE MALE BROWN EYES</td>
<td>IC35-42-4-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and State</td>
<td>5 Feet 9 Inches 210 Pounds</td>
<td>4 YEARS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>312-68-1823 7/9/61</td>
<td>2/17/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>License #</td>
<td>Sentence Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORT WAYNE, IN</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 YEARS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please send email to webmaster@ai.org if you did not find what you were looking for from this agency or page, or have other comments about our site.

Return to Government Offices Index
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### Criminal Justice Institute

**Offender Registry Search**

Results for search on:
- **Last Name:** Jones
- **First Name:** Paul

Dept of Correction database search results: 1 found

Thu, Jan 16 '97 - 06:09 AM EST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sentence/Release Date</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IC 35-42-4-1</td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>IC35-42-4-3</td>
<td>4/20/87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 35-42-4-2</td>
<td>Criminal Deviate Conduct</td>
<td>2/27/91</td>
<td>2 Yrs, 0 Mnths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 35-42-4-3</td>
<td>Child Molesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 35-42-4-4(b)</td>
<td>Child Exploitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 35-42-4-5</td>
<td>Vicarious Sexual Gratification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 35-42-4-6</td>
<td>Child Solicitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 35-42-4-7</td>
<td>Child Seduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 35-42-4-9</td>
<td>Sexual Misconduct with a Minor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 35-46-4-3</td>
<td>Incest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Offenders in the Dept of Correction Database

**Back to top of page**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Alias</th>
<th>City/County</th>
<th>Physical Description</th>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Sentence/Release Date</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAUL JONES</td>
<td>PAUL JONES</td>
<td>MARION, GRANT CNTY</td>
<td>Black Male</td>
<td>IC 35-42-4-3</td>
<td>4/20/87</td>
<td>2 Yrs, 0 Mnths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black Hair, Brown Eyes</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/27/91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Feet 10 Inches 220 Pounds</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Yrs, 0 Mnths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>311-52-2230 Born: 4/24/51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please send email to webmaster@ai.org if you did not find what you were looking for from this agency or page, or have other comments about our site.
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## Criminal Justice Institute

### Offender Registry Search

Results for search on:
Last Name: green

Police database search results: 11 found
Thu, Jan 16 '97 - 06:16 AM EST

| IC 35-42-4-1 | Rape |
| IC 35-42-4-2 | Criminal Deviate Conduct |
| IC 35-42-4-3 | Child Molesting |
| IC 35-42-4-4(b) | Child Exploitation |
| IC 35-42-4-5 | Vicarious Sexual Gratification |
| IC 35-42-4-6 | Child Solicitation |
| IC 35-42-4-7 | Child Seduction |
| IC 35-42-4-9 | Sexual Misconduct with a Minor |
| IC 35-46-4-3 | Incest |

## Offenders in the Police Database

### Back to top of page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>DOB</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>SSN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL W GREEN</td>
<td>04/26/54</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTT J GREENE</td>
<td>08/27/60</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>306-76-4939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT G GREEN</td>
<td>02/21/73</td>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>311-72-9838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITCHELL D GREEN</td>
<td>07/16/70</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEWIS A GREEN</td>
<td>02/20/65</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK A GREEN</td>
<td>03/28/57</td>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>316-66-2154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES R GREENLEE</td>
<td>12/15/61</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSELL E GREENE</td>
<td>09/30/57</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>313-68-5721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILLY R GREENE</td>
<td>08/07/68</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE P GREEN</td>
<td>04/24/66</td>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVORY J GREEN</td>
<td>07/14/49</td>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>322-44-8827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please send email to webmaster@ai.org if you did not find what you were looking for from this agency or page, or have other comments about our site.
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APPENDIX 2
RISK MANAGEMENT MEETING

NAME: ......................................................... D.O.B. ........................................

ADDRESS ......................................................

..............................................................

..............................................................

TYPE OF SUPERVISION

..............................................................

..............................................................

..............................................................

RISK ASSESSMENT

STATIC/ACTUARIAL .............................................................

..............................................................

DYNAMIC/CLINICAL

..............................................................

..............................................................

RISK TO THE PUBLIC OF RE-OFFENDING

..............................................................

..............................................................

..............................................................

CONTACT INFORMATION

PROBATION OFFICER  HOSTEL

POLICE  G.P.

SOCIAL SERVICES DEPT  EDUCATION

HEALTH  OTHER