ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

The Application of Network Analysis to Dynamic Risk Factors in Adult Male Sex Offenders

Jan Willem van den Berg^{1,2}, Wineke Smid³, Jolanda J. Kossakowski⁴, Daan van Beek⁵, Denny
Borsboom⁴, Erick Janssen², Luk Gijs²

¹Forensic Care Specialists, Utrecht, the Netherlands; Currently at Stichting Transfore/De
Tender, Deventer, The Netherlands

²Institute for Family and Sexuality Studies, Department of Neurosciences, KU Leuven, Belgium

³Forensic Care Specialists, Utrecht, the Netherlands

⁴Department of Psychology, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

⁵Private practice, Utrecht, The Netherlands

Contact information:

Jan Willem van den Berg

Stichting Transfore/De Tender

Building #5 - Schroeder van der Kolk

Nico Bolkesteinlaan 1

7416 SB Deventer

The Netherlands

e-mail: j.vandenberg@transfore.nl

Abstract

Although dynamic risk factors are considered important in the assessment and treatment of adult male sex offenders, little is known about their interrelationships. We apply network analysis to assess their associations and to provide an analysis of their shortest pathways to sexual and violent (including sexual contact) recidivism. Analyses revealed a central position for *General Rejection/Loneliness* (in all networks), *Poor Cognitive Problem Solving* (in networks containing sexual or violent [including sexual contact] recidivism), and *Impulsive Acts* (only in the network including sexual recidivism). These variables represented links between clusters of dynamic risk factors composed of factors relating to sexual self-regulation, emotionally intimate relationships, anti-social traits, and self-management. *Impulsive Acts* showed the strongest independent association with sexual and violent (including sexual contact) recidivism.

Keywords: dynamic risk factors, sex offenders, network analysis

The Application of Network Analysis to Dynamic Risk Factors in Adult Male Sex Offenders

The primary goal in the treatment of sex offenders is to help them desist from committing new offenses. To reach this goal, professionals in the forensic field mostly rely on Andrews and Bonta's Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) model (2010; Bonta & Andrews, 2017). This model involves three core principles. First, the *Risk Principle* proposes that instead of methods of risk assessment based on professional judgement, actuarial risk assessment instruments, which provide a probabilistic estimate of the risk of recidivism, should be used to determine treatment setting, intensity, and duration. More precisely, high-risk offenders need more intensive and extensive services while low-risk offenders need minimal or no intervention to reduce recidivism risk. Second, the *Need Principle* implies that forensic treatment effectiveness increases if treatment is focused on dynamic risk factors, which are factors that are amenable to change and correlate with the risk of reoffending. Finally, the *Responsivity Principle* maintains that the effect of treatment increases if it is matched to the ability and learning style of the offender. Findings of two meta-analyses (Hanson, Bourgon, Helmus, & Hodgson, 2009; Schmucker & Lösel, 2015) have shown that the application of RNR principles in sex offender treatment indeed is associated with a reduction in recidivism risk, although, overall, effects tend to be modest.

The current study starts from the premise that to further improve the effectiveness of sex offender treatment programs, we need a better understanding of the role of dynamic risk factors in recidivism risk (cf. the *Need Principle*). In particular, the current study aims to improve our understanding of the role of dynamic risk factors by exploring the nature and strength of their interrelationships and their (direct and indirect) associations with recidivism.

Dynamic risk factors

Dynamic risk factors can be divided into stable dynamic and acute dynamic factors. Stable dynamic risk factors can be changed or altered over time through effortful processing, for example with the use of therapy, and include personality characteristics, skill deficits, personal predilections, and learned behaviors (e.g., impulsivity, problem solving skills, offense supportive attitudes, deviant sexual interests). Acute dynamic risk factors can change instantaneously, often as the result of situational or interpersonal factors (e.g., victim access, substance abuse, emotional collapse, sexual preoccupation), and represent a high risk of committing an offense in the near future. Acute dynamic risk factors are often considered part of risk management, instead of treatment targets (Beech, Fisher, & Thornton, 2003).

Based on the findings of several meta-analyses (Hanson, Bourgon, Helmus, & Hodgson, 2009; Hanson & Bussiere, 1998; Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2004, 2005; Helmus, Hanson, Babchishin, & Mann, 2013) and of two large-scale recidivism prediction studies (Hanson, Harris, Scott, & Helmus, 2007; Knight & Thornton, 2007), Thornton (2002, 2013) formulated the Structured Risk Assessment (SRA) Need Framework. The SRA Need Framework distinguishes between four domains of dynamic risk factors of adult male sex offenders: sexual interests, distorted attitudes, relational style, and self-management, which each can be further divided into a number of subdomains (e.g., sexual interest can be subdivided into sexual preoccupation and offense-related sexual interests). The most widely used dynamic risk assessment instruments for adult male sex offenders all contain one or more dynamic risk factors from at least three of the four domains of the SRA Need Framework (e.g., ARMIDILO: Boer, Haaven, Lambrick, Lindsay, McVilly, Sakdalan, & Frize, 2012; SOTIPS; McGrath, Cumming, & Lasher, 2012; STABLE-2007; Fernandez, Harris, Hanson, & Sparks, 2014; VRS:SO: Wong, Olver, Nicholaichuk, & Gordon, 2003). In the first meta-

analysis on the predictive properties of dynamic risk assessment instruments, we found that dynamic risk assessment instruments have small-to-moderate predictive properties for sexual and other types of recidivism in adult male sex offenders (van den Berg, Smid, Schepers, Wever, van Beek, Janssen, & Gijs, 2018). Incremental predictive validity of dynamic over static risk assessment instruments was modest but significant. Above and beyond absolute scores, we found that change scores, reflecting changes in dynamic factors over time, significantly contributed to the prediction of sexual and other forms of recidivism (van den Berg et al., 2018).

Although there is growing interest in and support for the predictive properties of dynamic risk assessment instruments, attempts to explain how dynamic risk factors cause (re)offending have been largely unsuccessful, in part due to a limited understanding of the interrelationships among these factors (Heffernan & Ward, 2017; Ward & Fortune, 2016). A promising window into the structure and nature of the interrelationships among dynamic risk factors is offered by the network analytic approach (Borsboom, 2017; Borsboom & Cramer, 2013; van den Berg et al., 2018). Network analysis has been applied to a range of topics, including depression, anxiety, post-traumatic stress, bereavement, autism, psychosis, substance abuse, personality, the general structure of psychiatric symptomatology and more generally to quality of life (for a review, see Fried, van Borkulo, Cramer, Boschloo, Schoevers, & Borsboom, 2017). The general goal of such applications is to assess the way constituent components of disorders (i.e. “symptoms”) relate to one another in a complex network, with the hope of elucidating the causal pathways that connect these symptoms. The current study is the first to apply this approach to the construct ‘recidivism risk’ in sex offenders. We aim to determine the network structure of stable dynamic risk factors, to increase our understanding of how these factors are interrelated and associated to recidivism. We

believe that insights gained from network analyses may, ultimately, improve treatment effectiveness in adult male sex offenders.

Network analysis

Within the network analytic approach of psychopathology, constructs like mental disorders are not considered to arise from a latent syndromal structure but from the direct interaction among symptoms (Borsboom, 2017; Borsboom, Cramer, & Kalis, 2018). When causal connections – which can involve a myriad of biological, social, and psychological mechanisms – are sufficiently strong between symptoms, a self-sustaining equilibrium will occur within the network. External factors (e.g., life events such as losing a partner) can influence symptoms and thus the activity within the network, resulting in a new equilibrium and – when sufficient symptoms become active – cause a mental disorder.

Estimated (sexual) offending risk arises from the accumulation of its various (risk) factors. After all, risk assessment instruments are, fundamentally, prognostic tools, given that they serve to predict a continuous construct (i.e. the risk of recidivism; Helmus & Babchishin, 2017). From a network analytic point of view, recidivism risk increases if more (interrelated) dynamic risk factors become activated for a sufficiently long duration to engage in feedback loops that sustain network activation. Conversely, a reduction in recidivism risk may occur when dynamic risk factors become deactivated or if the connection between them weakens or dissolves (McNally, 2016). However, interrelated risk factors consisting of observed patterns of behavior, thought, and emotion, could also (in part) be manifestations of latent variables (Brouillette-Alarie, Babchishin, Hanson & Helmus, 2016; Epskamp, Rhemtulla, & Borsboom, 2017), in which case indicators that depend on the same latent variable would be expected to form fully connected networks. Importantly, the statistical models used in this manuscript identify networks of conditional dependencies

between variables but cannot by themselves distinguish between various explanations for why these dependencies arise; this requires additional experimental research or, if such research is unfeasible, the assessment of plausibility based on theoretical arguments.

Statistical network analysis has proven to be a useful tool to detect and visualize the interrelationships among (sub)factors of a construct (Jones, Mair, & McNally, 2018). These analyses also provide information on which factors in a network of factors may play a central role. If the pathways in the network structure indeed represent causal and directed interactions between the network components, then dynamic risk factors causing a relatively large number of other dynamic risk factors are considered more central and should have a greater influence on other dynamic risk factors, in turn contributing to changes in the risk of recidivism. This information can be visualized graphically using *nodes* and *edges*, where dynamic risk factors are represented as nodes and edges are a function of statistical associations among risk factors. Also, centrality metrics can be computed, which allow for the generation of hypotheses on the relative importance of nodes in the network.

Other analytical approaches (e.g., structural equation modeling or SEM) can also accommodate reciprocal effects and provide exploratory models, although they are not often applied in this way. Most commonly, SEM is considered, used, and interpreted as a confirmatory statistical technique. The advantages of using network analyses over alternative approaches such as SEM include its ability to produce a model in a purely exploratory fashion (i.e., in a bottom-up empirical approach), without prior assumptions regarding the interrelations of the included factors. In addition, in contrast to SEM and latent variable models, networks that represent conditional dependencies (i.e. pairwise Markov random fields; Epskamp & Fried, 2017) are statistically speaking determinate; that is, no statistically equivalent network models exist that have a different structure. In contrast, a

given SEM model typically has many equivalent or nearly equivalent alternative models (Epskamp, Rhemtulla, & Borsboom, 2017). These are important benefits of the network analytic approach, because (a) our current insight into the interplay among dynamic risk factors may be too limited to theoretically single out a particular model from a large class of nearly equivalent models, and (b) the occurrence of feedback loops is highly likely in the case of dynamic risk factors. For example, sex can be used to cope with feelings of loneliness, which may be effective in the short-term but may further increase loneliness, resulting in more sexual activity in an attempt to cope with this negative emotional state, in the long-term. Finally, network analyses allow for generating hypotheses regarding causal relationships between dynamic risk factors and the pathways to recidivism. Networks based on repeated measurements may also provide information on the direction of observed relationships and give more insight in nonstationary processes that result from changing dynamics (Bringmann, Hamaker, Vigo, Aubert, Borsboom, & Tuerlinckx, 2017).

Current study

The goal of the current study was to assess how and to what degree dynamic risk factors are interrelated, and which dynamic risk factors play a central role within dynamic risk factor networks in adult male sex offenders. For this purpose, we conducted three regularized network analyses (Borsboom & Cramer, 2013; van Borkulo, Borsboom, Epskamp, Blanken, Boschloo, Schoevers, & Waldorp, 2014; Epskamp, Borsboom & Fried, 2018). In regularized networks, edges represent the strength of the connection between two nodes that remains after controlling for all other nodes in the network (Epskamp & Fried, 2017). Our analyses focused on network construction, node centrality, and the shortest paths of dynamic risk factors to recidivism. First, we investigated the relationship among dynamic risk factors, as measured by the STABLE-2007 (Fernandez, Harris, Hanson, & Sparks, 2014).

Second, we determined which dynamic risk factors play a central role in networks of dynamic risk factors. Third, we examined the pathways between individual risk factors and sexual and violent (including sexual contact) recidivism.

Method

Participants

The data, collected between January 2001 and November 2005, were taken from the Dynamic Supervision Project (DSP; Hanson, Harris, Scott, & Helmus, 2007). This project aimed to improve the quality of community supervision of sex offenders by testing the STABLE-2000, a dynamic risk assessment instrument, and by developing a revision of this instrument, the STABLE-2007 (Hanson et al., 2007). Offenders participating in this project were adults (age 18 year or older) from any of the Canadian provinces and territories, and the USA states of Alaska and Iowa, who were starting a period of community supervision (probation or parole) for a sexual offense. The average age of the overall sample, which included a total of 805 sex offenders, was 40 years ($SD=13.5$) at the time of release from custody, after serving sentence for a non-contact offense (9%), extra-familial child molesting (27%), incest (24%), rape (35%), and a mix of these offense types (5%). Of this group, 71% was serving their first sentence for a sexual offense. Most of the sexual offenses (78%) involved physical contact. In 12% of the offenses, the victim was physical injured, and in 0.5% of the cases, the victim had experienced life-threatening injuries. Approximately 10% of the offenders had been hospitalized for a psychiatric condition, and 5% had previously been diagnosed as developmentally delayed. Data of 15 sex offenders were excluded from analysis because either the offender's gender was unknown ($n=8$), five or more of the thirteen risk factors had not been scored ($n=1$), or a score was missing for the dynamic risk factor *Capacity for Relationship Stability* ($n=6$). In addition, the data of female sex offenders

($n=2$) were excluded because different assessment procedures are recommended for women (Cortoni, Hanson, & Coache, 2010). Thus, the final sample consisted of 788 adult male sex offenders.

Recidivism data, with a median of 41 months of follow-up, was available from official criminal records for 611 (76% of the total sample) of the adult male sex offenders. The recidivism rate for sexual recidivism after five years was 10.8%, while for all violent (including sexual contact) offenses the recidivism rate was 20.4%. More detailed information about the sample can be found in the DSP research report (Hanson, Harris, Scott, & Helmus, 2007).

Assessment of dynamic risk factors

The STABLE-2007 was used to measure stable dynamic risk factors relevant to the prediction of sexual recidivism in adult male sex offenders (e.g., personality characteristics, skill deficits, and learned behaviors; Fernandez, Harris, Hanson, & Sparks, 2014; Hanson et al., 2007). The STABLE-2007 constitutes a revision of the STABLE-2000. Three attitude items of the STABLE-2000 were dropped from the STABLE-2007 because they were not significantly related to sexual recidivism (Hanson et al., 2007). Also, items about lovers/relationship stability and deviant sexual interests were revised to more clearly incorporate past behavior. Finally, the *Emotional Identification with Children* item was restricted to apply only to offenders with at least one victim less than 14 years old. The STABLE-2007 has 13 items organized into five subsections (significant social influences, intimacy deficits, sexual self-regulation, general self-regulation, and cooperation with supervision). The items of the STABLE-2007 are presented in Table 1 and were scored using three-point scales: a score of “0” reflects “no problem”, a score of “1” “some concern/slight problem”, a score of “2” “present” or “definite concern”. A score of “2” on any item suggests

sufficient concern to be worthy of consideration in the offender's treatment, supervision, and management plans. The information required to score the STABLE-2007 was obtained during a structured interview, conducted by an officer. When available, evaluators were encouraged to use collateral information, such as police reports, previous pre-sentencing reports, specialized testing, psychological testing, and information from family members, friends, employers, etc.

Insert Table 1 about here

Data were collected by a total of 156 parole and probation officers who attended a 2-day training session primarily involving descriptions of the scoring criteria combined with exercises. Most of the training sessions were conducted by the principal investigators of the DSP (K. Hanson and A. Harris), although other trainers were used in some jurisdictions. Descriptive and demographic data on the supervision officers were not collected, but the officers would have included men and women with varying levels of expertise and sex crime specialization (Hanson et al., 2007).

As part of the DSP-project, the interrater reliability of the STABLE-2000 was calculated, based on file reviews of 87 randomly selected cases (Hanson et al., 2007). The intraclass correlation (ICC) for the total score was .89 (for the individual items, ranging from .66 to .92 with *Mdn*=.83). Reliability calculated using this approach would tend to overestimate the inter-rater agreement, while the second raters used case files prepared by the officer who originally scored the case. Second, the ICC of the total score of the STABLE-2000 was calculated based on a structured interview with the offender and the use of collateral information for an initial score at the start of the supervision and a follow-up score

after the first six months of the supervision period. The ICC for the initial score was .94 ($n=87$) and for the follow-up score .93 ($n=45$). The predictive properties of the STABLE-2007, as measured with the area under curve (AUC), were .67 (95% CI: .60-.74) for sexual recidivism and .67 (95% CI: .62-.72) for violent (including sexual contact) recidivism (Hanson et al., 2007).

Network analysis

Because the dataset included both count and categorical data, we used mixed graphical models (mgm; Haslbeck & Waldorp, 2016) to estimate network structures. Three networks were constructed, while using regularized network estimation as described by van Borkulo and colleagues (2014). Regularization is used to control the Type I error rate; this technique has been shown to result in networks with high specificity and adequate sensitivity (van Borkulo et al., 2014). This means that connections present in the sample network are likely present in the population as well, while connections that are absent may either be absent in the population network, or too weak to be picked up by the regularization technique. To control for spurious connections that may result from sampling error and to estimate sparser and more interpretable network models, we used Extended Bayesian Information Criteria (EBIC) for L_1 penalized regularization which has become the standard in the network literature (Costantini, Epskamp, Borsboom, Perugini, Mottus, Waldorp, & Cramer, 2015; Epskamp & Fried, 2017).

To compare the networks visually, we set the maximum value (1.00) and cut-off (0.08) for possible connections at the same level for all three networks. Furthermore, we used the layout of the network with sexual recidivism as a template for the network containing violent (including sexual contact) recidivism.

In the first network, each node represents a dynamic risk factor as measured by the STABLE-2007 (Fernandez, Harris, Hanson, & Sparks, 2014; $N=788$). The nodes in the second and third networks were complemented with data on sexual and violent (including sexual contact) recidivism ($n=611$). In all networks, green edges indicate positive statistical associations. The stronger an association, the more saturated and wider the edge.

Node centrality metrics. A node high in strength centrality has a relatively high number of edges, with high magnitudes in a weighted network (Opsahl, Agneessens, & Skvoretz, 2010). In this study, we focused on strength centrality because it reflects the likelihood that activation of a dynamic risk factor will be followed by activation of other dynamic risk factors (McNally, 2016), which may ultimately result in recidivism.

Identification clusters of dynamic risk factors. The spinglass algorithm, which is based on the principle that edges of nodes of the same community should connect while edges of nodes belonging to different communities should not, was used to identify clusters of items in the networks (Reichardt & Bornholdt, 2008; Yang, Algesheimer, & Tessone, 2016). With this procedure, each dynamic risk factor can only be part of one community. We simulated this process 1000 times and extracted the number of communities with the highest frequency. Also, following Briganti, Kempenaers, Braun, Fried and Linkowski (2018), we applied the walktrap algorithm (Golino & Epskamp, 2017; Demetriou et al., 2017), which is based on the principle that adjacent nodes tend to belong to the same community (Yang et al., 2016).

Shortest paths. To analyze patterns of connectivity for particular dynamic risk factors, we used graphical representations that indicate the shortest paths from all dynamic risk factors to sexual and violent (including sexual contact) recidivism (Isvoranu, Borkulo, Boyette, Wigman, Vinkers, Borsboom, & Group Investigators, 2017). In our study, based on

weighted networks, shortest paths are paths with the maximum product of weights. These representations can be seen as roadmaps that show the shortest route between nodes. The shortest path in a partial correlation network from node A to node C via node B may in addition suggest that node B mediates the predictive relation between node A and C (Langley, Wijn, Epskamp, & van Bork, 2015). However, it should be noted that mediation was not explicitly tested in our study. Furthermore, to avoid misconceptions, we note that the term shortest path – which is commonly used within the network analytic approach – should not be interpreted as different path, implying an incompatible route to sexual offending. By using the term shortest path, we do not refer to mutually exclusive routes to sexual offending, but to the sequence of nodes through which a particular dynamic risk factor is connected with recidivism via a series of regression equations.

Network stability. To check the robustness of the estimated networks (i.e., the degree to which they are affected by sampling variation) and to examine the reliability of our inferences regarding strength centrality, we conducted a bootstrap procedure using 1000 bootstraps for each network. To quantify stability of the estimated networks, we calculated the correlation stability coefficient (CS-coefficient). According to Epskamp, Borsboom, and Fried (2018), the CS-coefficient should be not below 0.25, and preferably above 0.5 to interpret centrality differences.

Networks were constructed and investigated using R-Packages qgraph (version 1.6.1.; Epskamp, Cramer, Waldorp, Schmittmann, & Borsboom, 2012), mgm (version 1.2-5; Haslbeck & Waldorp, 2016), igraph (version 1.2.2; Csardi & Nepusz, 2006), and bootnet (version 1.2; Epskamp, Borsboom, & Fried, 2018). Appendix C in the online supplemental materials contains the full R codes for the network construction, node centrality, clustering, shortest paths, and network stability.

Results

Network construction and centrality of dynamic risk factors

Figure 1 presents the network structure (left, Figure 1a) and the centrality plot (right, Figure 1b) for the dynamic risk factors ($N=788$). All associations among risk factors were positive, suggesting that our set of risk factors featured no inhibitory connections. This is an expected effect of the way the items are formulated and scored in the Stable-2007: higher scores on any of the items refer to higher risk. We visually identified a cluster of the dynamic risk factors *Sexual Preoccupation*, *Sex as Coping*, *Deviant Sexual Interests*, and *Emotional Identification with Children* (see bottom of Figure 1a) that was mainly connected with the other dynamic risk factors through *Impulsive Acts*, *General Social Rejection/Loneliness*, and *Capacity for Relationship Stability* (see middle part of Figure 1a). These findings were even more apparent in both the results of the spinglass and the walktrap algorithms (see Figures A1 and A4 and Tables A1 and A4, respectively, in the supplemental material). These results showed *Sexual Preoccupation*, *Sex as Coping*, *Deviant Sexual Interests*, and *Emotional Identification with Children* to form a distinct cluster that was connected with one other cluster via *Impulsive Acts*, *General Social Rejection/Loneliness*, and *Capacity for Relationship Stability* (spinglass algorithm). The walktrap algorithm presented these three dynamic risk factors as a separate cluster in between *Sexual Preoccupation*, *Sex as Coping*, *Deviant Sexual Interests*, and *Emotional Identification with Children* and a cluster of the remaining six dynamic risk factors. *General Social Rejection/Loneliness*, *Lack of Concern for Others*, and *Sex as Coping* had the highest estimated strength centralities in this network, while *Significant Social Influences* was relatively weakly connected with other factors in the network.

Insert Figure 1a and 1b about here

The networks of dynamic risk factors including sexual (Figure 2a) and violent (including sexual contact; Figure 2c) recidivism and their respective centrality plots (Figures 2b and 2d) show considerable similarities, as evidenced by a correlation between the connection weights for both networks (including recidivism) of .97. Similar to the network that did not include recidivism, both networks featured exclusively positive connections between nodes. Again, we visually identified a cluster of the dynamic risk factors; *Sexual Preoccupation, Sex as Coping, Deviant Sexual Interests, and Emotional Identification with Children* (at the top of Figure 2ac) mainly connected with the other dynamic risk factors through *General Social Rejection/Loneliness* (network with violent [including sexual contact] recidivism), *General Social Rejection/Loneliness*, and *Impulsive Acts* (network with sexual recidivism) (middle part of Figure 2ac). However, the spinglass algorithm identified four distinguishable clusters in the networks including recidivism. The walktrap algorithm showed respectively two and three clusters in the networks including sexual and violent (including contact sexual) recidivism (see Figures A2, A3, A5, A6 and Tables A2, A3, A5, A6 in the supplemental material). Again, both algorithms found a cluster containing *Sexual Preoccupation, Sex as Coping, Deviant Sexual Interests, and Emotional Identification with Children* in the networks containing recidivism. Community analysis conducted using the spinglass algorithm showed three other clusters: A cluster consisting of *Capacity of Relationship Stability, General Social Rejection/Loneliness, and Negative Emotionality/Hostility*; a cluster made up of *Cooperation with Supervision, Lack of Concern for Others and Hostility towards Women*; and a cluster including *Significant Social Influences, Impulsive Acts, Poor Cognitive Problem Solving, and recidivism*. The walktrap algorithm identified one second community containing all other dynamic risk factors in the network

with sexual recidivism. Using this algorithm, the network containing violent (including sexual contact) recidivism appeared to have two other clusters, one containing *Capacity of Relationship Stability* and *General Social Rejection/Loneliness*, the other containing the remaining seven dynamic risk factors and recidivism.

Impulsive acts had the strongest independent association with sexual recidivism and an even stronger independent association with violent (including contact sexual) recidivism. Based on strength centrality, we found the highest centralities in both networks including recidivism for *General Social Rejection/Loneliness* and *Poor Cognitive Problem Solving*. *Impulsive Acts* had a relatively high strength centrality within the network including sexual recidivism. In turn, *Significant Social Influences*, *Capacity for Relationship Stability* and recidivism had a relatively low strength centrality in both networks.

Insert Figure 2a,b,c,d here

Shortest paths

Figure 3 displays networks that depict the shortest paths from each dynamic risk factor to sexual (left) and violent (including sexual contact) recidivism (right).

Insert Figure 3a and 3b about here

For the shortest path analysis that included sexual recidivism, within the cluster of dynamic risk factors *Sexual Preoccupation*, *Sex as Coping*, *Deviant Sexual Interests*, and *Emotional Identification with Children*, only *Emotional Identification with Children* was found to be directly connected to sexual recidivism. The other dynamic risk factors within this

cluster were directly connected to *General Social Rejection/Loneliness (Sex as Coping, Deviant Sexual Interests)* or to *Impulsive Acts (Sexual Preoccupation)*. Second, the cluster of the dynamic risk factors *Capacity for Relationship Stability, Negative Emotionality/Hostility* and *General Social Rejection/Loneliness* was directly connected to *Poor cognitive problem solving*. *Poor Cognitive Problem Solving* in turn was connected to all three clustered dynamic risk factors: *Cooperation with supervision, Lack of concern for others* and *Hostility toward women*. Although the shortest path that includes violent (including sexual contact) recidivism has many similarities, no direct connection to recidivism for *Emotional Identification with Children* was found. Instead, this dynamic risk factor was directly connected to *Poor Cognitive Problem Solving*. As a result, only *Impulsive Acts* showed a direct link to violent (including sexual contact) recidivism. Also, *Sexual Preoccupation* and *Significant Social Influences* were directly connected to *General Social Rejection/Loneliness* in the shortest path to violent (including sexual contact) recidivism, instead of to *Impulsive Acts* which we found for the shortest path to sexual recidivism.

Network stability

To check the accuracy of the estimated networks (i.e., its sensitivity to sampling variation), and to test the stability of our inferences about the network structures (especially the centrality measures), we computed bootstrap samples for each network. Our centrality measure of interest, the CS-coefficient of strength, varied from .28 for the network including sexual recidivism to .44 for the networks without recidivism and with violent (including sexual contact) recidivism. Thus, differences between nodes with respect to strength centrality should be interpreted with caution.

Appendix B in the supplemental materials contains the subset bootstrap and the CS-coefficients of the strength centrality for all three networks.

Discussion

To our knowledge, this study is the first to provide an estimation of the network structure of dynamic risk factors as assessed by the STABLE-2007 (Fernandez, Harris, Hanson, & Sparks, 2014). Although we approached this task without specific hypotheses, using the spinglass and walktrap algorithm and visual inspection of the networks, we identified prominent clusters of dynamic risk factors. In particular, we identified clusters involving sexual self-regulation, emotionally intimate relationships, anti-social traits, and self-management skills. These clusters of dynamic risk factors, that most markedly emerged from the spinglass algorithm, mirror risk domains previously identified in the literature (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2005; Stinson & Becker, 2013; Stinson, Becker & McVay, 2016; Stinson, Becker, & Sales, 2008; Thornton, 2002; Thornton, 2013). Within the sexual-self-regulation cluster, the relatively strong connections between *Sexual Preoccupation* and *Sex as Coping* on the one hand, and *Deviant Sexual Interests* and *Emotional Identification with Children* on the other are of particular interest. These findings are in line with a recent factor analysis of the STABLE-2007, which found that *Emotional Identification with Children* loaded on the same factor as *Deviant Sexual Interests*, while *Sexual Preoccupation* and *Sex as Coping* formed a separate factor together (Etzler, Eher, & Rettenberger, 2018).

Based on the central position of *General Rejection/Loneliness* (in all networks), *Poor Cognitive Problem Solving* (in networks containing sexual or violent [including sexual contact] recidivism), and *Impulsive Acts* (only in the network including sexual recidivism), these dynamic risk factors may be considered to function as a bridge between the other (clusters) of dynamic risk factors.

The risk factor that showed the strongest independent relationship with recidivism was *Impulsive Acts* (for both sexual and violent [including sexual contact] recidivism). This

connection also surfaced in the shortest path analyses, in which *Impulsive Acts* was found to be the link to recidivism for all other factors except *Emotional Identification with Children*, which was directly related with sexual recidivism. We interpret this latter finding to mean that emotional identification with children is more directly associated with sexual recidivism than sexual interest in children *per se*. It should be mentioned that, at the group level, a shortest path indicates the sequence of conditional predictions from one variable to another that, in each step, minimizes the prediction error. Thus, it shows how any dynamic risk factor is probabilistically connected to recidivism via other factors. At the individual level, however, individual offenders may deviate from these shortest paths. For example, in sex offenders with strong psychopathic traits, who do not emotionally identify with children, recidivism (at a group level) apparently is more closely related to other factors, for example their propensity for *Impulsive Acts* or *Hostility toward Women*.

The clusters of dynamic risk factors found in our study seem consistent with the findings of factor analyses of static risk factors for sex offender recidivism (e.g., Brouillette-Alarie et al., 2016). Such analyses have revealed factors referred to as a sexual factor, an impulsive/anti-social factor, and sometimes a third factor, described as “detachment” or “immaturity”. Our findings are also compatible with theoretical models distinguishing between different pathways to sexual offending. For instance, Malamuth (1986/2003; see also: Malamuth & Hald, 2016; Malamuth, Linz, Heavey, Barnes & Acker, 1995) described two relatively independent pathways to sexual coercion against women, one relevant to sexual processes (*Impersonal Sexual Promiscuity*) and one relevant to callousness and hostility towards women (*Hostile Masculinity*).

Limitations

Several limitations of our study should be acknowledged. First, although the STABLE-2007 is empirically and theoretically driven and its predictive validity has been supported in studies in North America and several European countries (Brankley, Babchishin & Hanson, 2019; Eher, Matthes, Schilling, Haubner-MacLean, & Rettenberger, 2012; Eher, Rettenberger, Gaunersdorfer, Haubner-MacLean, Matthes, Schilling & Mokros, 2013; Smeth, 2013; Sowden, 2013), it captures a limited number of relevant dynamic risk factors. Network analysis can only calculate the interconnections of the factors measured and adding an additional dynamic risk factor to a network analysis could impact both the networks and centrality measures. Second, our analyses are based on data obtained from a group of mostly untreated sex offenders who differ with respect to their offenses. Risk factors that are predictive for one group of offenders (e.g., emotional identification for child molesters) may be less important in other groups of offenders (e.g., rapists). As network structures and metrics tend to differ across different samples (Borsboom, Fried, Epskamp, Waldorp, van Borkulo, van der Maas, & Cramer, 2017), replications with different risk assessment instruments and in separate samples of, for example, child molesters and rapists, or in treated versus untreated sex offenders, are indicated. Replication attempts should, preferably, also include the collection of additional demographic information, as the study from which the current data were derived lacked information on ethnicity, education, socioeconomic status, and income. A third limitation concerns the fact that, due to variations in prison sentences, the time between assessments and offenses differed among individuals. Although we were not able to control for this variable, other studies have found that STABLE-2007 scores were highly consistent for the first and six-month follow-up during community supervision (e.g., Hanson et al., 2007). Thus, we have little reason to expect meaningful change on stable dynamic risk factors during sentencing periods. Nevertheless,

future research could take sentence duration into account and describe the percentage of subjects who received sentences of long enough duration to impact the levels and number stable dynamic risk factors. A fourth limitation of this study is that it is based on cross-sectional data. This type of data allows for the generation of undirected networks regarding relationships between dynamic risk factors and the pathways to recidivism. Using a longitudinal design, future studies could provide information on the direction of observed relationships and offer more insight in processes that result from changes in dynamic risk factors. A fifth limitation concerns the fact that the measurement of each dynamic risk factor was limited to a single item. Although all individual items were related to recidivism, it would be valuable to examine the possible added value of measuring dynamic risk factors using multiple items/scale scores. Finally, although stability coefficients for strength centrality were all above the lower limit, none of the strength centrality coefficients exceeded the cutoff of 0.5 that is required for the metric to be considered stable (Epskamp, Borsboom, & Fried, 2018). As a result, the order of node strength within all three networks should be interpreted with caution. The stability coefficients for strength centrality suggest that it is unfeasible to analyze network structure, centrality, and shortest paths to recidivism separately for sex offenders with adult and child victims. We recommend further studies, preferably in larger samples, attempt to replicate our findings, while differentiating between those two offender groups in their analyses.

Implications and strengths

Despite the above limitations, we believe our findings – to the extent that the estimated network structure indeed describes a pattern of mutualistic causal interactions – have several theoretical, clinical, and social implications. As network analyses provide insight in the interrelations among risk factors and possible shortest pathways to (sexual) offending

behavior, without the need for *a priori* assumptions, they can be used to contribute to the further development of theories on sex offending (e.g., Malamuth, Linz, Heavey, Barnes, & Acker, 1995; Malamuth & Hald, 2016; Seto, 2019; Smid & Wever, 2019; Toates, Smid, & van den Berg, 2017; Ward, Polaschek, & Beech, 2016; Ward & Beech, 2016). For example, our network analyses provide support for the idea that different clusters of dynamic risk factors and pathways to recidivism exist, as has been found in earlier research in adult male sex offenders (Malamuth, 1986, 2003; Malamuth & Hald, 2016; Malamuth, Linz, Heavey, Barnes & Acker, 1995). Future longitudinal research may be able to produce “directed networks”, assessing not only the strength of interrelations but also their direction. Another important move forward would involve the identification of psychobiological and social mechanisms that underlie the connections among risk factors.

Our findings also have clinical implications for treatment. Accepting the possibility that conditional dependencies in our network structures indeed reflect mutualistic causal interactions between risk factors, treatment should be focused on highly central dynamic risk factors and dynamic risk factors directly related to recidivism after statistically controlling for the other dynamic risk factors. Based on our findings, treatment efforts may benefit from a focus on inhibition of impulsive acts, improving cognitive problem solving, reducing feelings of loneliness, and stimulating reintegration in society. However, again, we acknowledge that the network estimation techniques we used are primarily hypothesis generating, so these ideas should be tested and validated more systematically in future studies.

The central role of *Social Rejection/Loneliness* in all three networks suggests that this factor is important to address and monitor not only during treatment but also during reintegration efforts. Strengthening connectedness may be facilitated by the involvement of

initiatives like Circles of Support and Accountability (COSA), which involve groups of volunteers who support the reintegration of sex offenders under professional supervision. COSA have been found to be an effective tool in the prevention of recidivism (e.g., Höing, 2015; Wilson, Cortoni, & McWhinnie, 2009; Wilson, Picheca, & Prinzo, 2005) and the findings of our network analyses raise the question of whether their impact may, in part, be attributed to reductions in the experience of social rejection and loneliness.

Author's contribution

Jan Willem van den Berg developed the study concept. All authors contributed to the study design. Statistical analyses were conducted by Jan Willem van den Berg and Jolanda Kossakowski, under supervision of Denny Borsboom. Jan Willem van den Berg, Wineke Smid, Daan van Beek, Luk Gijs, and Erick Janssen were all involved in the interpretation of the network analyses. Jan Willem van den Berg drafted the paper and all authors provided feedback and contributed to the final manuscript.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Karl Hanson and Public Safety Canada for sharing the DSP-data and Maaïke Helmus for preparing the dataset for use in our network analyses.

Funding

Denny Borsboom and Jolanda Kossakowski are supported by European Research Council Consolidator Grant no. 647209 awarded to Denny Borsboom.

References

- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (5th ed.). New Providence, NJ: LexisNexis, Matthew Bender.
- Beech, A. R., Fisher, D. D., & Thornton, D. (2003). Risk assessment of sex offenders. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 34, 339-352. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.34.4.339
- Boer, D.J., Haaven, J., Lambrick, F., Lindsay, W.R., McVilly, K.R., Sakdalan, J.A., & Frize, M.C.J. (2012). *The Assessment of Risk and Manageability of Intellectually Disabled Individuals who Offend – Sexually (ARMIDILO-S)*. Retrieved from: www.armidilo.net
- Bonta, J., & Andrews, D. A. (2017). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Borsboom, D. A., (2017). A network theory of mental disorders. *World Psychiatry*, 16, 5-13. doi:10.1002/wps.20375
- Borsboom, D., & Cramer, A. O. (2013). Network analysis: An integrative approach to the structure of psychopathology. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 9, 91–121. doi:10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-050212-185608
- Borsboom, D., Fried, E. I., Epskamp, S., Waldorp, L. J., van Borkulo, C. D., van der Maas, H. L. J., & Cramer, A. O. J. (2017). False alarm? A comprehensive reanalysis of “Evidence that psychopathology symptom networks have limited replicability” by Forbes, Wright, Markon, and Krueger (2017). *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 126, 989-999. doi:10.1037/abn0000306
- Borsboom, D., Cramer, A., & Kalis, A. (2018). Brain disorders? Not really... Why network structures block reductionism in psychopathology research. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 1-54. doi:10.1017/S0140525X17002266

Brankley, A. E., Babchishin, K. M., & Hanson, R. K. (2019). STABLE-2007 demonstrates predictive and incremental validity in assessing risk-relevant propensities for sexual offending: A meta-analysis. *Sexual Abuse*, 1-29. doi:10.1177/1079063219871572

Briganti, G., Kempenaers, C., Braun, S., Fried, E. I., & Linkowski, P. (2018). Network analysis of empathy items from the interpersonal reactivity index in 1973 young adults. *Psychiatry Research*, 265, 87–92. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2018.03.082

Bringmann, L. F., Hamaker, E. L., Vigo, D. E., Aubert, A., Borsboom, D., & Tuerlinckx, F. (2017). Changing dynamics: Time-varying autoregressive models using generalized additive modeling. *Psychological Methods*, 22, 409-425. doi:10.1037/met0000085

Brouillette-Alarie, S., Babchishin, K. M., Hanson, R. K., & Helmus, L. M. (2016). Latent constructs of the Static-99R and Static-2002R: A three-factor solution. *Assessment*, 23, 96-111. doi:10.1177/1073191114568114

Cortoni, F., Hanson, R.K., & Coache, M-E., (2010). The recidivism rates of female sexual offenders are low: A meta-analysis. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 22, 387-401. doi:10.1177/1079063210372142

Costantini, G., Epskamp, S., Borsboom, D., Perugini, M., Mottus, R., Waldorp, L.J. & Cramer, A.O.J. (2015). State of the aRt personality research: A tutorial on network analysis of personality data in R. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 54, 13-29. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2014.07.003

Csardi, G., & Nepusz, T. (2006). The Igraph software package for complex network research. *InterJournal Complex Systems*, 1695. <http://igraph.org>

Demetriou, A., Spanoudis, G., Kazi, S., Mouyi, A., Žebec, M.S., Kazali, E., Golino, H., Bakracevic, K., & Shayer, M. (2017). Developmental differentiation and binding of mental

processes with g through the life-span. *Journal of Intelligence*, 5, 1-31.

doi:10.3390/jintelligence5020023

Eher, R., Matthes, A., Schilling, F., Haubner-MacLean, T., & Rettenberger, M. (2012). Dynamic risk assessment in sexual offenders using the Stable-2000 and the Stable-2007: An investigation of predictive and incremental validity. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 24, 5-28. doi:10.1177/1079063211403164

Eher, R., Rettenberger, M., Gaunersdorfer, K., Haubner-MacLean, T., Matthes, A., Schilling, F., & Mokros, A. (2013). Über die Treffsicherheit standardisierter Risikoeinschätzungsverfahren bei aus der maßregel entlassenen Sexualstraftätern [On the accuracy of the standardized risk assessment procedures Static-99 and Stable-2007 for sexual offenders released from detention.]. *Forensische Psychiatrie, Psychologie, Kriminologie*, 7, 264–272. doi:10.1007/s11757-013-0212-9

Epskamp, S., Borsboom, D., & Fried, E. I. (2018). Estimating psychological networks and their accuracy: a tutorial paper. *Behavioral Research Methods*, 50, 195-212. doi:10.3758/s13428-017-0862-1

Epskamp, S., Cramer, A.O., Waldorp, L.J., Schmittmann, V.D., & Borsboom, D. (2012). Qgraph: Network visualizations of relationships in psychometric data. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48, 1-18. doi:10.18637/jss.v048.i04

Epskamp, S., & Fried, E. I. (2017). *A tutorial on regularized partial correlation networks*. (Arxiv Preprint). Retrieved from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1607.01367.pdf>

Epskamp, S., Rhemtulla, M., & Borsboom, D. (2017). Generalized network psychometrics: Combining network and latent variable models. *Psychometrika*, 82, 904-927. doi:10.1007/s11336-017-9557-x

Etzler, S., Eher, R., & Rettenberger, M. (2018). Dynamic risk assessment of sexual offenders: Validity and dimensional structure of the Stable-2007. *Assessment*, 1-18. doi:1073191118754705.

Fernandez, Y., Harris, A. J. R., Hanson, R. K., & Sparks, J. (2014). *Stable-2007 Coding Manual: Revised 2014*. Ottawa: Public Safety Canada. Retrieved from: http://www.simcoe psychology.com/f/STABLE_2007_coding_manual_2014_10.pdf

Fried, E.I., van Borkulo, C.D., Cramer, A.O.J., Boschloo, L., Schoevers, R.A., & Borsboom, D. (2017). Mental disorders as networks of problems: A review of recent insights. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 52, 1-10. doi:10.1007/s00127-016-1319-z

Golino H. F. & Epskamp S. (2017) Exploratory graph analysis: A new approach for estimating the number of dimensions in psychological research. *PLoS ONE*, 12, e0174035. doi:10.1371/ journal.pone.0174035

Hanson, R. K., Bourgon, G., Helmus, L., & Hodgson, S. (2009). The principles of effective correctional treatment also apply to sexual offenders: A meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 9, 865–891. doi:/10.1177/0093854809338545

Hanson, R. K., & Bussière, M. T. (1998). Predicting relapse: A meta-analysis of sex offender recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 66, 348-362. doi:10.1037//0022-006x.66.2.348

Hanson, R. K., Harris, A.J.R., Scott, T., & Helmus, L. (2007). *Assessing the risk of sexual offenders on community supervision: The Dynamic Supervision Project* (Corrections Research User Report 2007-05). Ottawa, ON: Public Safety Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/ssssng-rsk-sxl-ffndrs/ssssng-rsk-sxl-ffndrs-eng.pdf>

Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2004). *Predictors of sexual recidivism: An updated meta-analysis* (Corrections User Report No. 2004-02). Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: Public Safety Canada. Retrieved from:
<https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/2004-02-prdctrs-sxl-rcdvsm-pdtd/2004-02-prdctrs-sxl-rcdvsm-pdtd-eng.pdf>

Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2005). The characteristics of persistent sexual offenders: A meta-analysis of recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 73*, 1154–1163. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.73.6.1154

Haslbeck, J., & Waldorp, L. J. (2016). Mgm: Structure estimation for time-varying mixed graphical models in high-dimensional data. arXiv preprint
<http://arxiv.org/abs/1510.06871v2>.

Heffernan, R., & Ward, T. (2017). A comprehensive theory of dynamic risk and protective factors. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 37*, 129-141.
doi:10.1016/j.avb.2017.10.003

Helmus, L.M., & Babchishin, K. M. (2017). Primer on risk assessment and the statistics used to evaluate its accuracy. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 44*, 8-25.
doi:10.1177/0093854816678898

Helmus, L., Hanson, R. K., Babchishin, K. M., & Mann, R. E. (2013). Attitudes supportive of sexual offending predict recidivism: A meta-analysis. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse, 14*, 34-53. doi:10.1177/1524838012462244

Höing, M. A. (2015). *Empowering circles: Circles of support and accountability*. Oosterhout: OCC De Hoog B.V.

Isvoranu, A-M., van Borkulo, C. D., Boyette, L-L., Wigman, J. T. W., Vinkers, C. H., Borsboom, D., & Group Investigators (2017). A network approach to psychosis: Pathways

between childhood trauma and psychotic symptoms. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 43, 187-196.

doi:10.1093/schbul/sbw055

Jones, P.J., Mair, P., & McNally, R.J. (2018). Visualizing psychological networks: A tutorial in R. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 1-12. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01742

Knight, R.A., & Thornton, D. (2007). *Evaluating and improving risk assessment schemes for sexual recidivism: A long-term follow-up of convicted sexual offenders* (Document No. 217618). Washington, DC: United States department of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/217618.pdf>

Langley, D. J., Wijn, R., Epskamp, S., & van Bork, R. (2015). Should I get that jab? Exploring influence to encourage vaccination via online social media. *ECIS 2015 research-in-progress papers*. Paper 64. ISBN 978-3-00-050284-2. Retrieved from: http://aisel.aisnet.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1063&context=ecis2015_rip

Malamuth, N. M. (1986). Predictors of naturalistic sexual aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 953-962. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.50.5.953

Malamuth, N. M. (2003). Criminal and non-criminal sexual aggressors: Integrating psychopathy in a hierarchical-mediational confluence sex roles model. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 989, 33–58. doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.2003.tb07292.x.

Malamuth, N.M. & Hald, G.M. (2016). The confluence mediational model of sexual aggression. In D. Boer, A.R. Beech & T. Ward (Eds.). *The Wiley Handbook on the Theories, Assessment and Treatment of Sexual Offending* (Vol. 1, pp. 53-71). London: Wiley-Blackwell.

Malamuth, N. M., Linz, D., Heavey, C. L., Barnes, G., & Acker, M. (1995). Using the confluence model of sexual aggression to predict men's conflict with women: a 10-year follow-up study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 353–369.

McGrath, R.J., Cumming, G.F., & Lasher, M.P. (2012). *Sex Offender Treatment Intervention and Progress Scale (SOTIPS)*. Middlebury, VT: Author. Retrieved from: <http://www.csom.org/pubs/SOTIPS%20MANUAL%202012.pdf>

McNally, R. J. (2016). Can network analysis transform psychopathology? *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 86, 95–104. doi:10.1016/j.brat.2016.06.006

Opsahl, T., Agneessens, F., & Skvoretz, J. (2010). Node centrality in weighted networks: Generalizing degree and shortest paths. *Social Networks*, 32, 245–251. doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2010.03.006

Reichardt, J., & Bornholdt, S. (2008). Statistical mechanics of community detection. *Physical Review E - Statistical, Nonlinear and Soft Matter Physics*, 74, 16110. doi:10.1103/PhysRevE74.016110

Schmucker, M., & Lösel, F. (2015). The effects of sexual offender treatment on recidivism: An international meta-analysis of sound quality evaluations. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 11, 597–630. doi:10.1007/s11292-015-9241-z

Seto, M.C. (2019). The motivation-facilitation model of sexual offending. *Sexual Abuse*, 31, 3-24. doi:10.1177/1079063217720919

Smeth, A. (2013). *Evaluating risk assessment among sex offenders: A comparative analysis of static and dynamic factors* (Doctoral dissertation). Unpublished thesis. Carleton University. Retrieved from https://curve.carleton.ca/system/files/theses/27517_1.pdf

Smid, W. J., & Wever, E. C. (2019). Mixed emotions: An incentive motivational model of sexual deviance. *Sexual Abuse*, 31, 731-764. doi:10.1177/1079063218775972

Sowden, J.N. (2013). *Examining the relationship of risk, treatment readiness, and therapeutic change to recidivism in a sample of treated sex offenders* (Doctoral dissertation). Unpublished thesis. University of Saskatchewan. Retrieved from

<http://ecommons.usask.ca/bitstream/handle/10388/ETD-2013-11-1305/SOWDEN-DISSERTATION.pdf?sequence=4>

Stinson, J.D., & Becker, J.V. (2013). *Treating Sex Offenders: An Evidence-based Manual*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Stinson, J.D., Becker, J.V., & McVay, L.A. (2016). Multimodal self-regulation theory of sexual offending, In D. Boer, A.R. Beech & T. Ward (Eds.). *The Wiley Handbook on the Theories, Assessment and Treatment of Sexual Offending* (Vol. 1, pp. 103-122). London: Wiley-Blackwell.

Stinson, J.D., Becker, J.V., & Sales, B.D. (2008). Self-regulation and the etiology of sexual deviance: Evaluating causal theory. *Violence and Victims*, 23, 35-51.

doi:10.1891/0886-6708.23.1.35

Thornton, D. (2002). Constructing and testing a framework for dynamic risk assessment. *Sexual Abuse*, 14, 139–153. doi:10.1023/A:1014620214905

Thornton, D. (2013). Implications of our developing understanding of risk and protective factors in the treatment of adult male sexual offenders. *International Journal of Behavioral and Consultation Therapy*, 8, 3–4. doi:10.1037/h0100985

Toates, F., Smid, W., & van den Berg, J.W. (2017). A framework for understanding sexual violence: Incentive-motivation and hierarchical control. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 34, 238-253. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2017.01.001

van Borkulo, C. D., Borsboom, D., Epskamp, S., Blanken, T. F., Boschloo, L., Schoevers, R. A., & Waldorp, L. J. (2014). A new method for constructing networks from binary data. *Scientific Reports*, 4, 1–10. doi:10.1038/srep05918

van den Berg, J. W., Smid, W., Schepers, K., Wever, E., van Beek, D., Janssen, E., & Gijs, L. (2018). The predictive properties of dynamic sex offender risk assessment

instruments: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Assessment*, 30, 179-191.

doi:10.1037/pas0000454

Ward, T., & Beech, A.R. (2016). The integrated theory of sexual offending – revised. A multifield perspective, In D. Boer, A.R. Beech & T. Ward (Eds.). *The Wiley Handbook on the Theories, Assessment and Treatment of Sexual Offending* (Vol. 1, pp. 123-138). London: Wiley-Blackwell.

Ward, T., & Fortune, C. (2016). From dynamic risk factors to causal processes: A methodological framework. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 22, 190-202.

doi:10.1080/1068316X.2015.1117080

Ward, T., Polaschek, D., & Beech, A. R. (2006). *Theories of sexual offending*. Chichester: John Wiley.

Wilson, R. J., Cortoni, F., & McWhinnie, A. W. (2009). Circles of support & accountability: A Canadian national replication of outcome findings. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 21, 412-430. doi:10.1177/1079063209347724

Wilson, R. J., Picheca, J. E., & Prinzo, M. (2005). *Research report—Circles of support & accountability: An evaluation of the pilot project in South-Central Ontario*. Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Services of Canada. Retrieved from: http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/research/092/r168_e.pdf

Wong, S. C. P., Olver, M. E., Nicholaichuk, T. P., & Gordon, A. E. (2003). *The Violence Risk Scale-Sexual Offender Version (VRS:SO)*. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada: Regional Psychiatric Centre and University of Saskatchewan.

Yang, Z., Algesheimer, R., & Tessone, C.J. (2016). A comparative analysis of community detection algorithms on artificial networks. *Scientific Reports*, 6, 1-18.

doi:10.1038/srep30750

Table 1. Description of the STABLE-2007

STABLE-2007 Dynamic Risk Factors		
Item	Dynamic risk factor	Description
1	Significant Social Influences	This item is based on the subtraction of the number of people likely to influence a sex offender's decisions and behavior in positive versus negative ways. Differences: >2 = score 0, 0 or 1 = score 1, <0 = score 2.
2	Capacity for Relationship	The combination of no history of intimate adult relationship(s) and not being in such a relationship now, results in the highest score on this item.
3	Emotional Identification with Children Only scored for sex offenders with at least one victim who was 13 years or younger at the time of the offense.	A high score on this item indicates that the offender prefers the company of and activities with children over those of and with adults. The offender's demeanor is and he engages in child-oriented leisure and possibly work-related activities. The offender considers children to be his friends and may perceive them to have adult or adult-like qualities.
4	Hostility Toward Women	This item evaluates the sex offender's attitudes and behavior toward women, including sexist attitudes, stereotypically traditional beliefs about women and their roles, or hatred of women, based on, for example, the perception of past wrongs and the belief that women are unfairly advantaged. The more hostile the attitudes and behaviors, the higher the score on this item.
5	General Social Rejection and/or Loneliness	This item evaluates how close the offender feels to others and his general capacity to make friends and secure adult attachments. More intense feelings of rejection and/or loneliness lead to higher scores on this item.
6	Lack of Concern for Others	This item involves the quality of interactions with others. The more selfish, ruthless, callous, and indifferent to the rights and wellbeing of others, the higher the sex offender's score on this item will be.

7	Impulsive Acts	This item identifies sex offenders who exhibit impulsive behavior across a number of settings (e.g., financial, vocational, leisure, accommodation, personal relationships). Sex offenders who display frequent impulsive behaviors in more than one setting or context receive higher scores.
8	Poor Cognitive Problem Solving	This item assesses the sex offender's ability of identifying and solving everyday problems. The highest scores are given to offenders who frequently make poor decisions and fail to identify life problems in multiple domains.
9	Negative Emotionality/Hostility	This item refers to the tendency to feel victimized and mistreated by others, and to respond with anger and hostility to life's challenges. More frequent expressions and experiences of such tendencies result in higher scores on this item.
10	Sexual Preoccupation	This item focuses on both the frequency of sexual thoughts and behaviors and the degree to which an offender's sexual thoughts and behaviors interfere with interpersonal and/or prosocial functioning (i.e., work, school, relationships). The higher the frequency and/or impact, the higher the score.
11	Sex as Coping	This item measures to what degree a sex offender uses sex to cope with negative emotions/feelings (e.g., tension, anger, hostility, anxiety, boredom or loneliness). The highest score is given when sex appears the only way to cope with such feelings.
12	Deviant Sexual Interests	This item assesses whether the offender is sexually interested in or is sexually aroused by activities, situations, people, or objects that are illegal, inappropriate, or highly unusual. The more frequent, intensive and/or unusual the interest of behavior, the higher the score.
13	Cooperation with Supervision	This item is based on whether the offender is working with or against the supervising officer, correctional authorities, therapist in the assessment and management of their sexual offending behavior. The highest scores are given when professionals experience no cooperation from the sex offender.

Fig. 1. (a) Estimated network structure of 13 adult male dynamic risk factors as measured by the STABLE-2007 ($n = 788$; Fernandez et al., 2014). The network structure is a mixed graphical model (mgm) in which a connection between nodes represents the strength of the statistical association that remains after statistically controlling for the other nodes. (b) Strength centrality of the estimated network structure of 13 adult male dynamic risk factors as measured by the STABLE-2007 ($n = 788$). Strength centrality is shown as standardized z scores. The nodes are defined as follows: Significant social influences: A1 = significant social influences; intimacy deficits: B1 = capacity for relationship stability, B2 = emotional identification with children, B3 = hostility toward women, B4 = general social rejection/loneliness, B5 = lack of concern for others; general self-regulation: C1 = impulsive acts, C2 = poor cognitive problem solving, C3 = negative emotionality/hostility; sexual self-regulation: D1 = sexual preoccupation, D2 = sex as coping, D3 = deviant sexual interests; and cooperation with supervision: E1 = cooperation with supervision.

Fig. 2. Estimated network structure of 13 adult male dynamic risk factors as measured by the STABLE-2007 ($n = 611$; Fernandez et al., 2014) including (a) sexual recidivism and (c) violent (including sexual contact) recidivism. The network structure is a mixed graphical model (mgm) in which the connection between nodes represents the strength of the statistical association that remains after statistically controlling for the other nodes. Strength centrality of the estimated network structure of 13 adult male dynamic risk factors as measured by the STABLE-2007 ($n = 611$) including (b) sexual recidivism and (d) violent (including sexual contact) recidivism. Strength centrality is shown as standardized z scores. The nodes are defined as follows: Significant social influences: A1 = significant social influences; intimacy deficits: B1 = capacity for relationship stability, B2 = emotional identification with children, B3 = hostility toward women, B4 = general social rejection/loneliness, B5 = lack of concern for others; general self-regulation: C1 = impulsive acts, C2 = poor cognitive problem solving, C3 = negative emotionality/hostility; sexual self-regulation: D1 = sexual preoccupation, D2 = sex as coping, D3 = deviant sexual interests; cooperation with supervision: E1 = cooperation with supervision; sexual recidivism: sxr = sexual recidivism; and violent recidivism: vir = violent recidivism.

Fig. 3. Network depicting shortest paths between each adult male dynamic risk factor and (a) sexual recidivism ($n = 611$) and (b) violent (including sexual contact) recidivism ($n = 611$). The generated graph in (a) may give the appearance of a mediated effect of *significant social influences*. However, the connection between *emotional identification with children* and *sexual recidivism* is direct, not mediated. Dashed lines represent background connections within the network. Solid lines represent shortest paths. The nodes are defined as follows: Significant social influences: A1 = *significant social influences*; intimacy deficits: B1 = *capacity for relationship stability*, B2 = *emotional identification with children*, B3 = *hostility toward women*, B4 = *general social rejection/loneliness*, B5 = *lack of concern for others*; general self-regulation: C1 = *impulsive acts*, C2 = *poor cognitive problem solving*, C3 = *negative emotionality/hostility*; sexual self-regulation: D1 = *sexual preoccupation*, D2 = *sex as coping*, D3 = *deviant sexual interests*; cooperation with supervision: E1 = *cooperation with supervision*; sexual recidivism: sxr = *sexual recidivism*; and violent recidivism: vir = *violent recidivism*.