

RATING GUIDE FOR
Comprehensive Inventory of Denial
Sex Offender Version (CID-SO)©

Sandy Jung

University of Victoria
Victoria, B.C.

Not to be copied under any circumstances without
the expressed written consent of the author.

Rationale and Assumptions

- Many treatment programmes for sex offenders are aimed at decreasing denial and encouraging the offender to accept responsibility for his behaviour.
- By measuring denial in a systematic way, it could be determined whether patterns do in fact change with treatment, and most importantly, whether this change is of prognostic importance.
- The Comprehensive Inventory of Denial - Sex Offender Version (CID-SO) is based both on my experience working with sex offenders, both individually and in groups, at Adult Forensic Psychiatric Services under the direction of D. Richard Laws, and on the existing research on sex offender denial (see References).
- The CID-SO is comprised of 18 items. It is an inventory that is to be completed by a mental health worker after he/she has interviewed the sex offender. Each item is scored on a 3-point scale ranging from 0 through to 2. Each point is given a more thorough description on the inventory such that the interviewer is to evaluate whether the client is representative of a score of 0, 1 or 2 (e.g., score of 0 for 'difficulty of change' would encompass a person who 'acknowledges offending is within his control and he is able to change with help). The interview is the basis for the CID-SO ratings.
- I am most interested in the pattern of the CID-SO items rather than the summation of the scores from each item, as this is most relevant to assessment and treatment of the sexual offender.
- These 18 items have been clustered into four conceptual forms of denial - described elsewhere. The use of clusters is purposely used to avoid treating denial as a binary concept or a series of levels ranging from weak to severe. Rather, denial has a variety of facets that can be identified and addressed through sex offender treatment (e.g., relapse prevention).

- My intentions behind the development of this instrument are not concerned with legal guilt or innocence - one must assume that the adjudicated offender is guilty of the crime for which he has been convicted or pled guilty. Rather, the issue explored here is denial as (1) a psychological defense mechanism used to protect oneself against anxiety-producing knowledge, or (2) conscious deception, and how such denial relates to supervision of sexual offenders.
- Please note that the instrument is currently being researched and is continually updated through this research and development. Hence, it is the user's responsibility to contact the author periodically and update their version of the CID-SO (or the previous version, CISOD). The author would appreciate receiving copies of completed CID-SO protocols and demographic and offense information. The data would solely be used for inclusion in a normative sample.

Conceptualization of CID-SO Denial Clusters

CLUSTER A:

Denying Sexually Deviant Behaviours and Arousal

This cluster represents an offender who does not acknowledge having committed a sexual offense nor having a sexual offending history (when file records indicate otherwise). They may minimize the sexual aspect of their offending and that they have no deviant sexual interests.

Items:

- 1: Deny Current Specific Offense
- 2: Deny Sex Offending History
- 4: Tends to Focus on Acceptable or Nonsexual Behaviours
- 12: Deny Deviant Arousal and Fantasies
- 13: Deny Sexual Arousal During Current Offense

CLUSTER B:

Denying Need for Treatment/Management of Sexual Offending

This cluster describes an offender who seems incapable of recognizing the need for treatment or management of a sexual offending problem. For those who completely deny committing the sexual offense or having a sexual offense history, they simply do not acknowledge having a problem that needs any psychological attention. For those who do not completely deny commission of offending, they may become defensive or hostile to mental health professionals or they may feel that this was a "one time deal" which does not require lifetime management. Some offenders may also feel that a change in his behaviour is "difficult" and that focus should be on secondary and tertiary changes, such as reunification of the family or getting a job.

Items:

- 10: Deny Possibility of Future Behaviour
- 14: Defensive/Excessive Hostility
- 15: Difficulty of Change
- 16: No Desire or No Expressed Need for Help

**CLUSTER C:
Denying Responsibility**

This cluster represents an offender who partly accepts responsibility, but qualifies offending with some stipulations or justifications. The offender may be accusatory and blame the victim for making up the accusations or exaggerating the sexual details of the offense or he may simply state that "it just happened". Many offenders may justify their offending with internal reasons, such as their mental status or some cognitive deficits. Often, the offender portrays himself as the real victim and may even say that he is a different person now. Others may justify their offending with external reasons, such as alcohol abuse, own sexual abuse as a child or wife's lack of interest in sex. When alcohol abuse is described as a proximate factor in their sexual offending, the offender may tend to claim that he does not remember the offending and therefore deny any responsibility for offending.

Items:

- 7: Blaming the Victim
- 8: Qualification/Justification - Internal Attribution
- 9: Qualification/Justification - External Attribution
- 11: Deny Any Intent/Planning/Premeditation
- 17: False Dissociation

**CLUSTER D:
Minimizing Harm**

This cluster represents an offender who shows little remorse for the commission of the offense and a lack of empathy for the victim. They have great difficulty acknowledging the seriousness of the offense and recognizing that they have done harm to their victim(s). They may also feel that they have been treated unjustly for their offense or that the offense should not be considered against the law.

Items:

- 3: Lacks Feelings of Guilt and Embarrassment
- 5: Minimization of the Seriousness of the Offense
- 6: Minimization of Harm to Victim
- 18: Social Sanction

Instructions for Scoring CID-SO Items

Overview of Scoring and Scorer

The Comprehensive Inventory of Denial - Sex Offender Version (CID-SO) is intended to be interview-based; professionals should conduct a thorough intake assessment interview with the offender, use collateral sources (e.g., file information, interviews with collateral sources, victim impact statements, police reports), and then subsequently complete the CID-SO rating form. Although it is possible for the CID-SO to be scored based on file information and corroborative information from relevant sources, it is best to conduct an interview with the offender.

Completing the items on the CID-SO requires that the practitioner has had some experience in the provision of psychological services within a forensic or correctional setting to sexual offenders.

Completing Items

Each item is described in great detail on the following pages. When scoring each sex offender practitioners should compare him to a prototypical sex offender represented by description detailed for that particular item. Hence, the characteristics or the items are described to represent an individual who represents a score of '2', unless otherwise indicated.

Some Considerations

It is important to note that offenders rarely volunteer information about other types of sexual deviance unless asked directly. Even when asked they may be less than honest, even when interviewed by experienced clinicians.

The rating of the CID-SO may change with the gathering of information, as each piece of information adds to the collective knowledge about the offender. The intention of the development of the CID-SO is to assess the change in a sex offender's cognitive distortions and his acceptance of responsibility for his own actions, particularly when he has engaged in a sex offender management/treatment program.

If the offender is in total denial of his current index offense, then score each item as '2' with the exception of Items 2: 'Sex Offending History' and 14: 'Defensive/Excessive Hostility'.

DESCRIPTION OF CID-SO ITEMS

Item 1: Denies Current Specific Offense

For a score of '2':

The offender denies committing the current sexual offense as charged and convicted. The offender denies the overall charge of sexual abuse and may or may not focus exclusively on the concrete details of a particular day, situation, or event. For example, he might say "I couldn't have done it because I wasn't there at the time," "I'm not the sort of person who would do that sort of thing. I am not a child molester; therefore, I did not molest this particular child." or "I didn't do anything wrong."

Some offenders focus concretely on the details of the alleged abuse and respond, not with an overall denial of the charges, but with an alibi for that particular day. Of these, some will have backup from family or friends for their alibi. While their families may support them and also deny the charge, family denial is less pathological than when the family produces a false alibi, since it does not involve outright lying to protect the offender (although family alibis are not infrequent).

They may tend to be preoccupied and focused on the child's memory, and have difficulty grasping the main point. For example, they cannot understand that whether it occurred on June 6th or 7th is not the main point.

For a score of '1':

Often, offenders withhold information on the extent of their sexual deviance because of a fear of additional legal charges. For example, the penalties for fondling are often less severe than for penetration; thus an offender may admit to one but not the other or may admit to intercourse but denies the period of time over which it occurred.

If the offender says that the act occurred (and this is mostly consistent with what is on record and what the victim has alleged) but denies that he committed an actual sexual offense, score him as a '1'. For example, he may see himself as having had consensual sex despite the allegations that he forced the victim or the allegation that he knew she was underage. Another example would be that he claims to not have known that the victim was underage. Hence, in both cases the offender may claim that no crime was committed since there was no intent or knowledge on his part.

Scoring:

0 *Not at all*

Fully admits current offense as charged

The item is absent or does not apply to the individual; does not exhibit the facet of denial in question, or exhibits characteristics that are the opposite of, or inconsistent with, the intent of the item.

1 *Maybe/in some respects*

Partially denies the current specific offense

The item applies to a limited extent but not to the degree required for a score of 2; a match in some respects but with too many exceptions or doubts to warrant a score of 2.

2 *Yes*

Denies the current offense completely

The item applies to the individual; a reasonably good match in most essential respects.

Item 2: Denies Sex Offending History

For a score of '2':

The offender denies committing any sexual offense at any other time even though collateral information indicates otherwise.

This is similar to Item 1 (Deny Current Specific Offense): The offender denies committing historical offenses as charged and convicted. The offender denies these past charge(s) of sexual abuse and may or may not focus exclusively on the concrete details of a particular day, situation, or event. For example, he might say that he "was only giving her a bath, but did not do that". The offender refuses to acknowledge responsibility for even remotely similar behaviours.

If the clinician has some suspicions about the offender's past offending behaviours (e.g., some indication through file records or probation officers that offenses were committed before the charged offense -- whether allegations were made or charges were made), this information is intended to be considered as unrecorded offenses. Hence, this item pertains to an offender's admission to these previous offenses as well as those that are well-documented.

For a score of '1':

If the offender says that these past act(s) occurred (and this is mostly consistent with what is on record and what the victim has alleged) but denies that he committed an actual **sexual offense**, score him as a '1'.

For a score of '0':

If there is no indication that the offender had any previous sex offending history, admission of history is not necessary and this item can be scored as '0'.

Scoring:

- 0 *Not at all*
Fully admits committing offenses at other times, both as recorded and unrecorded
The item is absent or does not apply to the individual; does not exhibit the facet of denial in question, or exhibits characteristics that are the opposite of, or inconsistent with, the intent of the item.
- 1 *Maybe/in some respects*
Partly admits offenses at other times; some not all recorded offenses
The item applies to a limited extent but not to the degree required for a score of 2; a match in some respects but with too many exceptions or doubts to warrant a score of 2.
- 2 *Yes*
Denies previous offenses completely
The item applies to the individual; a reasonably good match in most essential respects.

Item 3: Lacks Feelings of Guilt and Embarrassment

For a score of '2':

The offender does not feel guilt over being discovered, as they believe they are not behaving inappropriately, and they rarely feel shame. When they do feel shame, it is over what they have done to their own or their family's status in the community or over some secondary effect of the abuse such as incarceration. Note this item refers to feelings of guilt regarding his sexually deviant behaviour and *not to the discovery or disclosure of his offending*.

The offender has no or little guilt for hurting someone or for taking advantage of another, especially when he doesn't see his behaviour as deviant or offensive in nature. Hence, in order for this item to be rated a '0' or a '1', he **must not deny committing the offense**.

Offenders who deny committing the offense show little, or no, evidence of shame or guilt about offending, but merely to the disclosure of the offending. This warrants a score of '2'.

For a score of '1':

It is important to notice whether what he says is consistent with what is observable in his affect. Some offenders are aware of what they are supposed to say (i.e., expressing guilt over the offense), but their affect and expression may indicate a lack of true guilt feelings. If the offender shows minimal remorse for his offense, but instead primarily focuses on his embarrassment and shame for his behaviour and the discovery of the offending, this would warrant a '1'. However, this does not apply if his regret is due to his embarrassment and shame for the disclosure and discovery of his offending.

Scoring:

- 0 *Not at all*
Feels guilt and embarrassment for committing the offense(s)
The item is absent or does not apply to the individual; does not exhibit the facet of denial in question, or exhibits characteristics that are the opposite of, or inconsistent with, the intent of the item.
- 1 *Maybe/in some respects*
Feels embarrassed over the offending, but feels minimal guilt for the offense itself
The item applies to a limited extent but not to the degree required for a score of 2; a match in some respects but with too many exceptions or doubts to warrant a score of 2.
- 2 *Yes*
Lacks any guilty or embarrassment associated with the actual offense
The item applies to the individual; a reasonably good match in most essential respects.

Item 4: Focuses on Acceptable or Nonsexual Behaviours

For a score of '2':

Offenders will frequently admit part of their behaviour but deny the rest. Offenders with this characteristic do not admit committing the current sexual offense, but may admit to engaging in "less harmful" behaviours. They tend to focus on other nonsexual aspects of their behaviour, usually more "acceptable" or "nonsexual" aspects. For example, he might say "I hit the victim, but I didn't rape her." The offender could also focus on the "love" aspect. For example, he was only trying to show his love to her/him and hence, he minimizes the sexual nature of the abuse/offense.

For child molesters, they may emphasize a nonsexual possibility, such as saying "the behaviour was simply part of her hygiene."

Offenders who deny committing the offense altogether also deny any wrongdoing and focuses on other aspects of his behaviour which are all nonsexual in nature. This warrants a score of '2'.

For a score of '1':

If the offender is able to bring up the sexual nature of the offense but primarily emphasize the nonsexual aspects of his behaviour, this would warrant a '1'.

Note:

Although the scoring of item 1 and 4 are related, they are scored separately. An individual could be scored a '1' for item 1 and a '2' for item 4. However, it is unlikely that one can be scored '0' for item 1, but a '2' for item 4 (e.g., if an offender admits committing the sexual offense, it is unlikely that he focuses solely on the nonsexual behaviours; but it is likely that he may emphasize the nonsexual behaviours more than the sexual ones).

Scoring:

- 0 *Not at all*
Fully focuses on sexual nature of the offense
The item is absent or does not apply to the individual; does not exhibit the facet of denial in question, or exhibits characteristics that are the opposite of, or inconsistent with, the intent of the item.
- 1 *Maybe/in some respects*
Able to focus on sexual nature of offense, but emphasizes other nonsexual behaviours
The item applies to a limited extent but not to the degree required for a score of 2; a match in some respects but with too many exceptions or doubts to warrant a score of 2.
- 2 *Yes*
Focuses on other aspects of behaviour; usually more "acceptable" or "nonsexual" aspects
The item applies to the individual; a reasonably good match in most essential respects.

Item 5: Minimizes the Seriousness of the Offense

For a score of '2':

The offender does not appreciate the seriousness of the consequences of the behaviour. He belittles or denies the offense was "a big deal". He does not acknowledge the seriousness of the offense, the deviant nature of the offending, or the harm done to the victim (see Item 6 for further explanation).

He may tend to compare his offense to other types of offenses or other types of offenders. For example, "my offense wasn't that bad - at least I didn't have sex with her, I just had her suck my cock." He might compare it to what he thinks is the worst kinds of sexual offending, such as rape or sodomy. Another comparison approach is to emphasize that the frequency of offending wasn't that bad. For example, "I only touched her once - I knew not to penetrate her as that would harm her permanently."

He might also emphasize "loving them" or wanting to just give them pleasure, hence implying that his intentions were not bad. The offender may say that it wasn't rape or molestation as it was "consensual" in nature - regardless of the victim being an adult or a child.

Offenders who deny committing the offense do not accept that their behaviour was harmful to themselves and to others. This warrants a score of '2'.

For a score of '1':

If the offender is able to recognize that his behaviour was deviant and harmful but primarily focuses on the comparative approach with other types of offenders, this would warrant at least '1'.

Scoring:

- 0 *Not at all*
Accepts seriousness of his behaviours
The item is absent or does not apply to the individual; does not exhibit the facet of denial in question, or exhibits characteristics that are the opposite of, or inconsistent with, the intent of the item.
- 1 *Maybe/in some respects*
Accepts, in part, seriousness of offense
The item applies to a limited extent but not to the degree required for a score of 2; a match in some respects but with too many exceptions or doubts to warrant a score of 2.
- 2 *Yes*
Denies the offense was serious in nature; belittles the sex offense
The item applies to the individual; a reasonably good match in most essential respects.

Item 6: Minimizes Harm to Victim

For a score of '2':

Offenders have great difficulty acknowledging the harm done to their victim(s). They may even go as far to say that they helped the victim by educating them, showing them love, or not going any further (e.g., penetration). The latter is common - emphasizing that he didn't go too far and "saved" the victim from furthering the pain (e.g., "I was gentle and kind - I didn't penetrate her because I knew that would harm her").

Child molesters who tell themselves they are educating the child, comforting the child, being close to the child, loving the child, or satisfying the child's curiosity do not allow themselves to appreciate the destructiveness of their behaviour to the child (see Item 5 for further explanation of minimizing seriousness). Hence, child molesters maintain, for example, that they were educating the children and/or offering them affection and friendship. So rather than harming the victim, they feel that they were to some extent helping the victim. Such offenders do not necessarily blame the children for the acts (see Item 7 for further explanation). They may also minimize the harm by expressing that the child misses the offender; hence, harm to the victim is only because of the disclosure and the subsequently separation as forced by the courts. For example, "she loved me so much" or "she misses me." An excellent example shows typical minimization of harm that an offender attributes to his offending: "In my own mind back then, I thought I was doing her a favor. I made myself feel that I was not doing anything wrong, that I was actually sexually educating her. We never did have complete intercourse. I thought . . . just touching and playing and fondling and all that, that wasn't harmful" (Salter, 1988; p. 99).

For rapists, most often they claim that there was no harm to their victim and the sexual assault was actually consensual by making statements such as "she showed no signs of abuse - we just had a drink the other day". They are unable or not willing to acknowledge that the victim has experienced negative consequences as a result of the offender's actions. They may even rationalize the victim's behaviour, such as seeking counselling or attempts at suicide to the victim's personality or their possibly mental disturbances which preceded the offense, rather than to the offense itself.

Some offender may also have great difficulty connecting the victim's behaviour (i.e., attempts at suicide, having children early, seeking counselling) as a result of his offending against the victim.

For offenders with severe cognitive distortions, they may claim that the victim enjoyed the offending and found it pleasurable. For example, "she loved the sex as much as me."

Some offenders may portray themselves as the real victim. These offenders tend to not see any harm done to their victim(s).

Offenders who deny committing the offense obviously do not admit that their behaviour has harmed the victim. This warrants a score of '2'.

For a score of '1':

If the offender has difficulty acknowledging harm to the victim, but speculates that there could be possible future harm to his victim, although examples are generic and non-specific to the victim, this would warrant at least a '1'. This especially applies when the offender appears to have been "educated on the effect on kids" and it is not apparent that he truly feels his victims were harmed, especially when his affect and what he is saying is inconsistent.

Scoring:

- 0 *Not at all*
Acknowledges harm to victim; not applicable
The item is absent or does not apply to the individual; does not exhibit the facet of denial in question, or exhibits characteristics that are the opposite of, or inconsistent with, the intent of the item.
- 1 *Maybe/in some respects*
Minimizes the harm to victim; difficulty acknowledging harm to victim
The item applies to a limited extent but not to the degree required for a score of 2; a match in some respects but with too many exceptions or doubts to warrant a score of 2.
- 2 *Yes*
Denies any harm was done to the victim; or claims to have helped the victim
The item applies to the individual; a reasonably good match in most essential respects.

Item 7: Blames the Victim

For a score of '2':

Offenders blame the victim for the initiation of the sexual behaviour, the extent of the offending, or the resulting charges of sexual assault. The result of this facet of denial is that the offender becomes the victim in the offending and the target of ill-will.

Offenders may blame the victim for initiating sexual activity by saying they were dressing provocatively or discussing topics *that the offender perceived as sexually related topics*. The latter is emphasized as the offender may paraphrase what the child had said but it is not clear and confirmed that the child had made such a statement, nor did the child even imply anything that was sexual in nature. Some offenders blame the child for wearing "sexy" or revealing clothes. They might maintain that the child's wearing a nightgown, sitting in the offender's lap, putting her arms around the offender, or running around the house nude after a bath were provocative and responsible for the abuse. This is an equivalent mental process to that of the adult exhibitionist, rapist, or potential rapist, who declares that exposure or rape is justified because women "think they are so high and mighty on a pedestal that nobody can touch them." They may express that many women, for example, who are walking in secluded areas in skimpy clothes such as shorts and a tank top were simply "asking for it." **Hence, the offender distorts the idea that the victims initiated the sexual encounter and promoted it by their actions.**

Offenders may focus on their perception of the offending by saying that the victim seemed to enjoy it and never said anything to indicate she wasn't enjoying it. Rapists may blame victims for not disclosing their age up front, assuming this would hinder their decision to have sex. The last form is blaming the victim for the resulting charges or the consequences of the charges. For example, "she was plotting against me from the very beginning" or "this was revenge."

Offenders who deny committing the offense may insist that the victim and/or the system is "out to get" them, and that they are the real victims. This warrants a score of '2'.

For a score of '1':

If the offender acknowledges that the offending is a result of his own behaviour but also emphasizes the victim's role in the offending or resulting charges (e.g., "she came to my bed", "she made it seem worse than it really was", "she didn't really like me, so she led me to do this", "she started it by sitting on my knee and touching my penis), this would warrant at least a '1'.

Scoring:

- 0 *Not at all*
Acknowledges offending is a result of his own behaviour
The item is absent or does not apply to the individual; does not exhibit the facet of denial in question, or exhibits characteristics that are the opposite of, or inconsistent with, the intent of the item.
- 1 *Maybe/in some respects*
Partly acknowledges offending is a result of his behaviour, but also to the victim's ill-will or exaggeration
The item applies to a limited extent but not to the degree required for a score of 2; a match in some respects but with too many exceptions or doubts to warrant a score of 2.
- 2 *Yes*
Blames the victim for the offending and/or the consequences of the charges
The item applies to the individual; a reasonably good match in most essential respects.

Item 8: Qualifies or Justifies with Internal Attribution

For a score of '2':

Internalizers tend to admit both the offense and harm to the victim but couple it with a dissociative style of explanation in which their actions were attributed to a temporary aberration of behaviour or mental state which was out of keeping with their normal character. Blame is placed on their mental status, their difficulty coping with pressures at work, and on their own emotional neediness. For example, "I would not have committed the offense if I had not been drunk (stoned, depressed, etc.)." But he may insist that he needs no treatment at all (as he does not plan to drink again) or, at the most, needs treatment for alcoholism as *that* is the real problem.

Inevitably, the offender portrays himself as the real victim. The affect is frequently a mixture of self-pity and anger at the world for denying him what should have been freely given, usually emotional support and sex. The offender tends to not admit that he committed the offenses because he found them pleasurable sexually, nor does he admit the extent of fantasy and planning that preceded them (see Item 11 for further explanation of intent/ planning/premeditation).

He may make statements referring to himself as though he was a completely different person, such as "that was like a different person back then - I'm not like that now" or "I've never done it before, so how could it be me" - despite having never engaged in any formal treatment or formal changes to address sexual offending. Or he may stress that his offending was a result of his lifestyle which was taught by others, but he incorporated into his living (e.g., "this was considered normal where I lived [regarding the time period, or the community he lived in]").

Offenders who deny committing the offense will likely insist that they are not "that type of person" to commit such an offense. This warrants a score of '2'.

For a score of '1':

Although the offender attributes some of his offending to some mitigating factors, he also accepts responsibility for his commission of the offense. The offender may be less overt about not assuming responsibility. For example, he may say he is ultimately responsible for the offense; however, careful listening to their descriptions of the abuse will detect constant internalization (e.g., alcohol/substance abuse, emotional state).

Scoring:

- 0 *Not at all*
Accepts internal/personal responsibility; no mitigating internal factors
The item is absent or does not apply to the individual; does not exhibit the facet of denial in question, or exhibits characteristics that are the opposite of, or inconsistent with, the intent of the item.
- 1 *Maybe/in some respects*
Claims there were mitigating internal/personal factors, but accepts responsibility for committing the offense
The item applies to a limited extent but not to the degree required for a score of 2; a match in some respects but with too many exceptions or doubts to warrant a score of 2.
- 2 *Yes*
Denies internal/personal responsibility; claims offense was out of character
The item applies to the individual; a reasonably good match in most essential respects.

Item 9: Qualifies or Justifies with External Attribution

For a score of '2':

This item is similar to Item 8, but instead of simply not accepting that he is at fault and should accept responsibility, an individual scoring a '2' tends to externalize responsibility to outside factors. Blame is often placed on proximate factors, such as their wives' nagging, their wives' lack of interest in sex, their own problems at work, provocation by the child, lack of attention and care from the world in general (including lack of a romantic partner/lover), and excessive care and attention from the child ("she was the only one I could be close to"). Also, blame can often be placed on remote factors, such as their own sexual abuse as a child, poor upbringing, and lack of privileges during childhood.

The offender may admit the actual behaviours and may even accept their seriousness, but deny responsibility for them by attributing it to these proximate or remote factors. This is sometimes blatant, as when an offender attributes the abusive behaviour to his poor childhood and sexual victimization by a family member.

Inevitably, the offender portrays himself as the real victim. The affect is frequently a mixture of self-pity and anger at the world for denying him what should have been freely given, usually emotional support and sex. The offender may tend to not admit that he committed the offenses because he found them pleasurable sexually, nor does he admit the extent of fantasy and planning that preceded them (see Item 11 for further explanation of intent/ planning/ premeditation).

Offenders who deny committing the offense may blame external agencies (or persons) for conspiring against them (hence, the charges/convictions are not true because of these people). This warrants a score of '2'.

For a score of '1':

Although the offender attributes some of his offending to some mitigating factors, he also accepts responsibility for his commission of the offense. The offender may be less overt about not assuming responsibility. For example, he may say he is ultimately responsible for the offense; however, careful listening to their descriptions of the abuse will detect constant externalization (e.g., own sexual abuse, dissatisfaction with marriage, lack of a partner).

Note:

If an offender scores a '2' on item 7 (Blaming the Victim), then they would not score a '0' on this item (External Attribution).

Scoring:

- 0 *Not at all*
No blame of third parties
The item is absent or does not apply to the individual; does not exhibit the facet of denial in question, or exhibits characteristics that are the opposite of, or inconsistent with, the intent of the item.
- 1 *Maybe/in some respects*
Claims there were mitigating external factors, but accepts responsibility for committing the offense
The item applies to a limited extent but not to the degree required for a score of 2; a match in some respects but with too many exceptions or doubts to warrant a score of 2.
- 2 *Yes*
Blames remote and proximate factors
The item applies to the individual; a reasonably good match in most essential respects.

Item 10: Denies Possibility of Future Behaviour

For a score of '2':

The offender denies the possibility that he will commit a similar offense in the future. For example, "I know it'll never happen again." He may even go as far to say that he is at risk of being a victim of false allegations. However, there is no indication of *how* they will make sure it will never happen again. When asked, he may contend that he just knows that it will not happen, that he will use his willpower to overcome any temptations, that he will simply remind himself of the consequences (e.g., "I won't do it again, because I lost too much" - not really a reason to explain why he will not offend again), or that he will avoid potential victims (e.g., avoid children or blind dates with adult females). These "approaches" to reducing his potential for committing another offense are usually not realistic and, in many cases, not possible (e.g., avoiding women when he is heterosexual and is likely to pursue a relationship with a woman in the future). Even in those cases where the offender says he has not had sexual relations and states he will continue to abstain from sex (in order to make sure he does not give himself another a chance again), the offender does not acknowledge the possibility remains that he could offend again and abstinence is unlikely in the long-term.

Offenders who deny committing the offense do not see themselves as ever committing "another" offense in the future as they claim to have never done so in the past or in the charged offense. This warrants a score of '2'.

For a score of '1':

For those who have received sex offender treatment and do not deny committing the offense, if they acknowledge that there was planning in their offending, but they are ambiguous about it or not sure how, then the offender would appear to be "educated on the offending cycle" and actually lack insight into his own offending. Depending on the degree of lack of insight, this would warrant at least a '1'.

For a score of '0':

For offenders who have engaged in sex offender treatment, if they maintain that they will not commit further offenses as long as they continue to use the strategies learned from formal programming directed at sex offending, this may warrant a '0'.

Note this does not include offenders who have **not satisfactorily engaged in any sex offender treatment**, but only to those who have participated and completed a sex offender program. Also, offender may receive a '0' if they claim that they acknowledge that future offending is likely and that they cannot predict the future. For example, "I don't trust myself" and hence, he won't put himself in a risky situation.

Scoring:

- 0 *Not at all*
Acknowledges cannot predict future and identifies that future offending is likely; contends will not commit further offenses, if he or she uses strategies learned (Tx only)
The item is absent or does not apply to the individual; does not exhibit the facet of denial in question, or exhibits characteristics that are the opposite of, or inconsistent with, the intent of the item.
- 1 *Maybe/in some respects*
Partly denies possibility of committing similar offenses in the future
The item applies to a limited extent but not to the degree required for a score of 2; a match in some respects but with too many exceptions or doubts to warrant a score of 2.
- 2 *Yes*
Denies possibility of committing similar offenses in the future
The item applies to the individual; a reasonably good match in most essential respects.

Item 11: Denies Any Intent, Planning, or Premeditation

For a score of '2':

The offender denies that any decisions, intentions, or planning went into committing the sexual offense. Offenders who minimize the extent of their activities almost inevitably refuse to admit that either sexual fantasies or planning were present, even when the circumstances of the offenses were such that planning was clearly evidenced in the precautions against discovery. For example, many offenders say "it just happened" or "nothing led up to it".

They may acknowledge that different decisions could have been made but gives greater attribution to elements out of his control. For example, "I should have not been so nice to her - she took advantage of the situation". Also, the focus is on his lack of knowledge that he committed an offense (e.g., "I didn't even know her age" or "she lied to me about her age") and on how he could have prevented the **charges/conviction** rather than the actual sexual offense (e.g., "If I didn't pick her up hitchhiking, she would have never charged me"). Note these focus on no responsibility on the part of the offender in planning any offending - the rationale here is that because there was no intention, there was no responsibility.

Offenders who deny committing the offense obviously do not admit that they fantasized and planned prior to the offense. This warrants a score of '2'.

For a score of '1':

If the offender partly acknowledges that he should have made different decisions as some decisions specifically led to the offending, in other words, he made some bad decisions but still maintains that certain things were out of his hands (e.g., "she kept calling me - how else could I have responded to it" or "she kept wearing see-through nightgowns to tempt me"), this would warrant a '1'.

For those who have received sex offender treatment, if they acknowledge that there was planning in their offending, but they are ambiguous about it or not sure how, then the offender would appear to be "educated on the offending cycle" and actually lack insight into his own offending. This would warrant at least a '1'.

For a score of '0':

A score of '0' should only be given if they fully acknowledge that there was intent in offending or that he made decisions and engaged in behaviours that led to the offense.

Scoring:

- 0 *Not at all*
Fully acknowledges offense was planned
The item is absent or does not apply to the individual; does not exhibit the facet of denial in question, or exhibits characteristics that are the opposite of, or inconsistent with, the intent of the item.
- 1 *Maybe/in some respects*
Partially admits there were elements that were planned
The item applies to a limited extent but not to the degree required for a score of 2; a match in some respects but with too many exceptions or doubts to warrant a score of 2.
- 2 *Yes*
Completely denies offense was planned
The item applies to the individual; a reasonably good match in most essential respects.

Item 12: Denies Deviant Arousal and Fantasies

For a score of '2':

The offender denies any deviant arousal and deviant fantasies associated with his offending. For example "I'm not into kids - I like adult women." The offender may also emphasize only the known victims. For example, "I'm only into kids I'm close to."

It is common for an offender to be arrested for one type of offense, child molestation for example, to engage in but not to admit in other types of sexually deviant behavior, for example, rape or exhibitionism.

Offenders may even give examples of times that he had opportunities but not acted/offended, hence concluding that he is not interested in deviant sexual behaviours. For example, "I babysat through my teens and nothing happened then."

Offenders who deny committing the offense obviously do not admit that they fantasized and planned prior to the offense. This warrants a score of '2'.

For a score of '1':

If the offender partly admits having fantasies and deviant interests but downplays this to overly emphasize his "normal" interests, this may warrant a '1'.

Note:

If there is no or little (minimal) indication that he has deviant sexual interests (e.g., no recorded nor unrecorded sexual offenses other than the current index offense), then give a '0'. Note this especially if clinicians, plethysmography or other arousal indicating measures reveal no indication of paraphilias.

For rapists, particularly those who have committed violent offenses against their victim(s), there must be some acknowledgment that there has been some deviant thoughts about women or some patterns in his relationships with women that lead to the current offense.

Scoring:

- 0 *Not at all*
Fully acknowledges he has, or has had, deviant sexual interests and fantasies
The item is absent or does not apply to the individual; does not exhibit the facet of denial in question, or exhibits characteristics that are the opposite of, or inconsistent with, the intent of the item.
- 1 *Maybe/in some respects*
Partly admits having fantasies and deviant interest; qualifies by emphasizing 'normal' interests
The item applies to a limited extent but not to the degree required for a score of 2; a match in some respects but with too many exceptions or doubts to warrant a score of 2.
- 2 *Yes*
Claims sexual offending occurred only this once; there is no deviant sexual interest or fantasies
The item applies to the individual; a reasonably good match in most essential respects.

Item 13: Denies Sexual Arousal During Current Offense

For a score of '2':

The offender may admit to committing the current offense but denies that he was sexually aroused during the offense. For example, he may report that he was engaging in the sexual assault but does not remember feeling "aroused" during the offense, or that although he exposed himself, he didn't find it "stimulating" that his stepdaughter was watching. Usually the offender tends to focus on the mental component of sexual arousal, but makes statements which deny any experience of sexual excitement for the offending.

Some child molesters and date rapists may emphasize that they did not feel any sexual arousal because they were simply "showing (or expressing) love" to the victim by engaging in sexual activities. Child molesters, in particular, may also emphasize that they were simply teaching the child about sex; hence, the assault was simply for instruction only and they felt no sexual arousal during the offense.

Offenders who commit crimes in which they access child pornography or they expose themselves to others may not acknowledge a sexual component to their offense, but rather they stress that they were only "curious" or that they "felt free and unfettered when they were not wearing clothes."

Offenders who deny committing the offense or claims not to remember at all obviously do not admit they were sexually aroused while offending. This warrants a score of '2'.

For a score of '1':

Some offenders admit sexual arousal but downplay it by focusing on guilt afterwards, in which case would warrant a score of '1' instead of a '0'.

Scoring:

- 0 *Not at all*
Admits being sexually aroused during offense
The item is absent or does not apply to the individual; does not exhibit the facet of denial in question, or exhibits characteristics that are the opposite of, or inconsistent with, the intent of the item.
- 1 *Maybe/in some respects*
Partially admits he was sexually aroused
The item applies to a limited extent but not to the degree required for a score of 2; a match in some respects but with too many exceptions or doubts to warrant a score of 2.
- 2 *Yes*
Fully denies any sexual arousal
The item applies to the individual; a reasonably good match in most essential respects.

Item 14: Shows Defensive or Excessive Hostility

For a score of '2':

The offender is excessively hostile or defensive. He may make directive and stand-offish statements such as "you people all are the same - you don't care what *actually* happened" or "what's the point in telling you, you already made up your mind about me." The hostile offender tends to have summed up what your role is and what he is forced to do regardless of what he says or does. Often the hostile client may swear or use a threatening and intimidating stance with the interviewer. On the other hand, some clients may not necessarily use such an aggressive stance, but rather a passive-aggressive approach whereby he may often roll his eyes and brush off what the interviewer has asked, particularly if the offender resents the interviewer for questioning the offender's version of the events.

For a score of '1':

If the offender maintains a defensive stance throughout the interview, but is not outwardly hostile, this warrants at least '1'.

Note:

Note this item can be scored 0, 1 or 2, regardless of whether the offender denies committing any offenses.

This is the only item which could be a '0' or a '1' even if the offender is in total and complete denial of the sexual offense.

Scoring:

- 0 *Not at all*
Fully compliant; may initially be defensive, but fades partway through the interview
The item is absent or does not apply to the individual; does not exhibit the facet of denial in question, or exhibits characteristics that are the opposite of, or inconsistent with, the intent of the item.
- 1 *Maybe/in some respects*
Maintains a defensive stance throughout the interview but is not outwardly hostile
The item applies to a limited extent but not to the degree required for a score of 2; a match in some respects but with too many exceptions or doubts to warrant a score of 2.
- 2 *Yes*
Defensive and shows excessive hostility and resentment for being questioned about the offense
The item applies to the individual; a reasonably good match in most essential respects.

Item 15: Acknowledges Possibility of Change through Treatment

For a score of '2':

The offender feels that a change in his behaviour is "difficult" (e.g., treatment is a waste of time) or not necessary as he knows he will never commit such an act again. This is particularly evident in those offenders who feel the offense was out of character for him and change is not necessary. Offenders who have a lengthy history of offending tend to see change as difficult and nearly impossible to change. They view their deviant sexual interests as pervasive and unyielding.

The offender may underestimate the difficulty of change, and feel that simply deciding not to abuse again will be sufficient to prevent relapse.

The offender may tend to focus on secondary changes, such as the reunification of the family, or reconciliation with his partner/victim, without changes to his offending behaviour. This item focuses on primary changes to the offending behaviour, **not secondary changes**.

Some offenders may see treatment as a way of learning to avoid risky situations. It is not their offending that is the problem, it is all the "traps" that people set for them. Although they endorse treatment for these purposes, they would still receive a score of '2', since they do not believe they, themselves, can be helped in terms of their own offending.

Offenders who deny committing the offense may acknowledge that people "of this sort" who actually committed these offenses can change their behaviour, but deny that they need any treatment and do not need change. Hence, it is difficult to change a behaviour that was never there to begin with. They feel no real need to change the abusive behaviour, and therefore do not quibble over whether their abusive patterns will be easy or difficult to change. This warrants a score of '2'.

For a score of '0':

A score of '0' is warranted only if it is evident that the offender has acknowledged that he is in control and believes that he can change.

If post-treatment and the offender acknowledges that change has been possible with the aid of sex offender treatment, then a '0' is warranted.

Scoring:

- 0 *Not at all*
Acknowledges offending is within his control and he is able to change with help
The item is absent or does not apply to the individual; does not exhibit the facet of denial in question, or exhibits characteristics that are the opposite of, or inconsistent with, the intent of the item.
- 1 *Maybe/in some respects*
Expresses that it is difficult to change, but is willing to be proven wrong
The item applies to a limited extent but not to the degree required for a score of 2; a match in some respects but with too many exceptions or doubts to warrant a score of 2.
- 2 *Yes*
Expresses that it is difficult to change abusive patterns; believes he cannot be helped
The item applies to the individual; a reasonably good match in most essential respects.

Item 16: Expresses No Desire or Need for Help

For a score of '2':

The offender has no desire or no expressed need for treatment or any sex offending related programming. In the offender's view, the sex offense was a one time mistake, not a serious condition that may require lifetime management.

The offender may express the wish that he would not reoffend, but nothing more. Offenders may feel that the best strategy was "just not to think about it" and treatment may make things worse, since he would have to dwell on it. Of course, when an offender who copes by "not thinking" about the offense is released and finds himself in situations that arouse sexual impulses towards children or adults, he has no coping mechanisms or strategies to rely on in order to resist them. Not thinking about it at that point is likely to be of little help.

Others may even say they are willing to accept some therapeutic input such as treatment for substance abuse or anger management, but not treatment aimed at their sexual deviance. This does **not** warrant a '0' as the desire or need for help must be sex offense related.

A variation of the refusal to accept sex offender treatment is the claim of an offender that he has no need for treatment because he has undergone a religious or a moral conversion. They insist that they will rely on God for guidance which only serves only to protect offenders from treatment and, of course, does not reduce the risk of reoffense.

Offenders who deny committing the offense see no reason to change an abusive pattern that they deny exists. They feel no real need to change the 'abusive' behaviour. This warrants a score of '2'.

For a score of '1':

The offender be willing to see what the program has to offer and feel that it might give them insight into why they committed the sexual offense. These offenders who seek understanding of their offending, but not necessarily acknowledge that the program is completely suitable for them, would warrant a score of a '1'.

If the offender is willing to see what sex offender treatment is like, but if not ordered to doing the programming would prefer not to do it, then this warrants at least a '1'.

For a score of '0':

If the offender has received treatment for sexual offending specific to the current offense (e.g., pled guilty to child molestation and received sex offender management treatment) and it is clear in the records that he has participated and done adequately in the program, a lack of desire or expressed need for further treatment is not to be construed as a '2', but rather should receive a '0'. On the other hand, if he has received treatment in the past for similar sex offenses, but has a new charge and conviction, the offender does not necessarily receive a '0'.

Scoring:

- 0 *Not at all*
Acknowledges he needs help and welcomes intervention
The item is absent or does not apply to the individual; does not exhibit the facet of denial in question, or exhibits characteristics that are the opposite of, or inconsistent with, the intent of the item.
- 1 *Maybe/in some respects*
Seems reluctant to receive any treatment
The item applies to a limited extent but not to the degree required for a score of 2; a match in some respects but with too many exceptions or doubts to warrant a score of 2.
- 2 *Yes*
Refuses to receive treatment; shows no desire for help
The item applies to the individual; a reasonably good match in most essential respects.

Item 17: Denies Memory of Offense

For a score of '2':

The offender simply says that he cannot recall the behaviour in question. The offender claims that he does not remember the offense and therefore cannot admit to committing it. For example, he might state that he was drunk at the time or "I guess it happened, if she said so, but I don't remember" (the latter example exemplifies a lack of responsibility for the offending).

It is important to differentiate between false dissociation and remembering the behaviours differently than the victim. False dissociation refers to claiming not to remember parts of the offending or the entire offense. The offender may propose such a dissociation as a result of substance use or a long period of time (e.g., historical offense that occurred over 20 years ago). For example, an offender may say "it was so long ago - I can't remember that far back."

Offenders who deny committing the offense do not recall or remember committing an offense as charged. This warrants a score of '2'.

For a score of '1':

If the offender admits to some parts of offending but claims that they cannot really recall the behaviour in question, then this may warrant a '1'.

If there is concrete evidence that substantiates the offender's claim that he could not possibly have remembered, for example, he was extremely intoxicated or had larger than normal dosages of illicit drugs, then this warrants a score of '1'.

Scoring:

- 0 *Not at all*
Remembers offense completely
The item is absent or does not apply to the individual; does not exhibit the facet of denial in question, or exhibits characteristics that are the opposite of, or inconsistent with, the intent of the item.
- 1 *Maybe/in some respects*
Partially remembers offense
The item applies to a limited extent but not to the degree required for a score of 2; a match in some respects but with too many exceptions or doubts to warrant a score of 2.
- 2 *Yes*
Claims not to remember; therefore, cannot admit to committing it
The item applies to the individual; a reasonably good match in most essential respects.

Item 18: Denies Deserving Sanction

For a score of '2':

The offender harbours a sense of injustice against the way people like himself are dealt within the legal system. In a more extreme scenario, he may see his offending as legitimate and he may even advocate that it should not be considered illegal.

He may have difficulty completely accepting that his sentence was fair or he feels that crown counsel was out to get him and made things worse than necessary (in light of the offenses for which he was charged).

Of course, offenders who deny committing the offense feel they have been dealt with unjustly and the consequences received were not warranted. This warrants a score of '2'.

For a score of '1':

The offender tends to acknowledge his sentence and his treatment by the criminal justice system as almost fair, although he may also make statements which support the idea that his sentence was somewhat harsh. For example, he may say that "I suppose things could have been worse" or "it worked out in the end, but I don't think I should have served time in jail (or such a long probationary sentence)."

Note:

This item refers to whether the offender sees the sentence as fair considering the offense only, not whether it was fair based on how he pled, how incompetent his lawyer was, etc.

Scoring:

- 0 *Not at all*
Regards offense as deserving sentence like that received
The item is absent or does not apply to the individual; does not exhibit the facet of denial in question, or exhibits characteristics that are the opposite of, or inconsistent with, the intent of the item.
- 1 *Maybe/in some respects*
Believes sentence generally too harsh for what they have done
The item applies to a limited extent but not to the degree required for a score of 2; a match in some respects but with too many exceptions or doubts to warrant a score of 2.
- 2 *Yes*
Believes type of offense should not be against law or they have been dealt unjustly
The item applies to the individual; a reasonably good match in most essential respects.

Comprehensive Inventory of Denial - Sex Offender Version (CID-SO): Rating Form

Name of Offender: _____ ID #: _____ Date Completed: _____

Offense Type (check one): Child Molestation Date of Birth: _____
 Incest
 Sexual Assault (Adult Victim) Age: _____
 Other Paraphilias (i.e., exhibitionism, voyeurism, zoophilia)

Victim Gender Preference: Male Female Sex Offender Treatment: Never engaged in sex offender treatment program
 Female Ongoing (currently engaged in sex offender treatment program)
 (check one) Completed sex offender treatment program

1. Denies Current Specific Offense
 - 0 Fully admits current offense as charged
 - 1 Partially denies the current specific offense
 - 2 Denies the current offense completely
2. Denies Sex Offending History
 - 0 Fully admits committing offenses at other times, both as recorded and unrecorded
 - 1 Partly admits offenses at other times; some not all recorded offenses
 - 2 Denies previous offenses completely
3. Lacks Feelings of Guilt and Embarrassment
 - 0 Feels guilt and embarrassment for committing the offense(s)
 - 1 Feels embarrassed over the offending, but feels minimal guilt for the offense itself
 - 2 Lacks any guilty or embarrassment associated with the actual offense
4. Focuses on Acceptable or Nonsexual Behaviours
 - 0 Fully focuses on sexual nature of the offense
 - 1 Able to focus on sexual nature of offense, but emphasizes other nonsexual behaviours
 - 2 Focuses on other aspects of his behaviour; usually more "acceptable" or "nonsexual" aspects
5. Minimizes the Seriousness of the Offense
 - 0 Accepts seriousness of his behaviours
 - 1 Accepts, in part, seriousness of offense
 - 2 Denies the offense was serious in nature; belittles the sex offense
6. Minimizes Harm to Victim
 - 0 Acknowledges harm to victim; not applicable
 - 1 Minimizes the harm to victim; difficulty acknowledging harm to victim
 - 2 Denies any harm was done to the victim; or claims to have helped the victim
7. Blames the Victim
 - 0 Acknowledges offending is a result of his own behaviour
 - 1 Partly acknowledges offending is a result of his behaviour, but also to the victim's ill-will or exaggeration
 - 2 Blames the victim for the offending and/or the consequences of the charges
8. Qualifies or Justifies with Internal Attribution
 - 0 Accepts internal responsibility; no mitigating internal factors
 - 1 Claims there were mitigating internal factors, but accepts responsibility for committing the offense
 - 2 Denies internal responsibility; claims offense was out of character
9. Qualifies or Justifies with External Attribution
 - 0 No blame of third parties
 - 1 Claims there were mitigating external factors, but accepts responsibility for committing the offense
 - 2 Blames remote and proximate factors
10. Denies Possibility of Future Behaviour
 - 0 Acknowledges cannot predict future and identifies that future offending is likely; contends will not commit further offenses, if he or she uses strategies learned (Tx only)
 - 1 Partly denies possibility of committing similar offenses in the future
 - 2 Denies possibility of committing similar offenses in the future
11. Denies Any Intent, Planning, or Premeditation
 - 0 Fully acknowledges offense was planned
 - 1 Partially admits there were elements that were planned
 - 2 Completely denies offense was planned
12. Denies Deviant Arousal and Fantasies
 - 0 Fully acknowledges he has, or has had, deviant sexual interests and fantasies
 - 1 Partly admits having fantasies and deviant interest; qualifies this by emphasizing 'normal' interests
 - 2 Claims sexual offending occurred only this once; there is no deviant sexual interest or fantasies
13. Denies Sexual Arousal During Current Offense
 - 0 Admits being sexually aroused during offense
 - 1 Partially admits he was sexually aroused
 - 2 Fully denies any sexual arousal
14. Shows Defensive or Excessive Hostility
 - 0 Fully compliant; may initially be defensive, but diminishes partway through the interview
 - 1 Maintains a defensive stance throughout interview but is not outwardly hostile
 - 2 Defensive and shows excessive hostility and resentment for being questioned about the offense
15. Acknowledges Possibility of Change through Treatment
 - 0 Acknowledges offending is within his control and he is able to change with help
 - 1 Expresses that it is difficult to change, but is willing to be proven wrong
 - 2 Expresses that it is difficult to change abusive patterns; believes he cannot be helped
16. Expresses No Desire or Need for Help
 - 0 Acknowledges he needs help and welcomes intervention
 - 1 Seems reluctant to receiving any treatment
 - 2 Refuses to receive treatment; shows no desire for help
17. Denies Memory of Offense
 - 0 Remembers offense completely
 - 1 Partially remembers offense
 - 2 Claims not to remember; therefore, can't admit to committing it
18. Denies Deserving Sanction
 - 0 Regards offense as deserving sentence like that received
 - 1 Believes sentences generally too harsh for what they have done
 - 2 Believes type of offense should not be against law or they have been dealt unjustly

**Comprehensive Inventory of Denial - Sex Offender Version (CID-SO)
WORKSHEET - #1**

Name of Offender/ID#: _____

Date Completed: _____

<u>Item</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Notes</u>
1. Denies Current Specific Offense		
2. Denies Sex Offending History		
3. Lacks Feelings of Guilt and Embarrassment		
4. Focuses on Acceptable or Nonsexual Behaviours		
5. Minimizes the Seriousness of the Offense		
6. Minimizes Harm to Victim		
7. Blames the Victim		
8. Qualifies or Justifies with Internal Attribution		
9. Qualifies or Justifies with External Attribution		
10. Denies Possibility of Future Behaviour		
11. Denies Any Intent, Planning, or Premeditation		
12. Denies Deviant Arousal and Fantasies		
13. Denies Sexual Arousal During Current Offense		
14. Shows Defensive or Excessive Hostility		
15. Acknowledges Possibility of Change through Treatment		
16. Expresses No Desire or Need for Help		
17. Denies Memory of Offense		
18. Denies Deserving Sanction		

**Comprehensive Inventory of Denial - Sex Offender Version (CID-SO)
WORKSHEET - #2**

Name of Offender/ID#: _____

Date Completed: _____

	Cluster A	Cluster B	Cluster C	Cluster D	Item
#1	<input type="checkbox"/>				Denies Current Specific Offense
#2	<input type="checkbox"/>				Denies Sex Offending History
#3				<input type="checkbox"/>	Lacks Feelings of Guilt and Embarrassment
#4	<input type="checkbox"/>				Focuses on Acceptable or Nonsexual Behaviours
#5				<input type="checkbox"/>	Minimizes the Seriousness of the Offense
#6				<input type="checkbox"/>	Minimizes Harm to Victim
#7			<input type="checkbox"/>		Blames the Victim
#8			<input type="checkbox"/>		Qualifies or Justifies with Internal Attribution
#9			<input type="checkbox"/>		Qualifies or Justifies with External Attribution
#10		<input type="checkbox"/>			Denies Possibility of Future Behaviour
#11			<input type="checkbox"/>		Denies Any Intent, Planning, or Premeditation
#12	<input type="checkbox"/>				Denies Deviant Arousal and Fantasies
#13	<input type="checkbox"/>				Denies Sexual Arousal During Current Offense
#14		<input type="checkbox"/>			Shows Defensive or Excessive Hostility
#15		<input type="checkbox"/>			Acknowledges Possibility of Change through Treatment
#16		<input type="checkbox"/>			Expresses No Desire or Need for Help
#17			<input type="checkbox"/>		Denies Memory of Offense
#18				<input type="checkbox"/>	Denies Deserving Sanction
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Totals per Cluster

References

- Abel, G. G., Gore, D. K., Holland, C. L., Camp, N., Becker, J. V., & Rathner, J. (1989). The measurement of cognitive distortions of child molesters. Annals of Sex Research, *2*, 135-152.
- Baldwin, K., & Roys, D. T. (1998). Factors associated with denial in a sample of alleged adult sexual offenders. Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, *10*, 211-226.
- Barbaree, H. E. (1991). Denial and minimization among sex offenders: Assessment and treatment outcome. Forum on Corrections Research, *3*, 30-33.
- Baumeister, R. F. (1991). Escaping the self. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Birgisson, G. H. (1996). Differences of personality, defensiveness, and compliance between admitting and denying male sex offenders. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, *11*, 118-125.
- Brake, S. C., & Shannon, D. (1997). Using pretreatment to increase admission in sex offenders. In D. R. Laws, & W. O'Donohue (Eds.), Sexual deviance: Theory, assessment, and treatment (pp. 5-1 - 5-16). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Bumby, K. M. (1996). Assessing the cognitive distortions of child molesters and rapists: Development and validation of the MOLEST and RAPE scales. Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research Treatment, *8*, 37-54.
- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *38*, 217-230.
- DeBono, K. G. (1987). Investigating the social-adjustive and value-expressive functions of attitudes: Implications for persuasion processes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *52*, 279-287.
- DeBono, K. G., & Edmonds, A. E. (1989). Cognitive dissonance and self-monitoring: A matter of context? Motivation and Emotion, *13*, 259-269.
- Festinger, L. (1957). A theory of cognitive dissonance. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- Fiske, S. T. (1989). Examining the role of intent: Toward understanding its role in stereotyping and prejudice. In J. S. Uleman, & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), Unintended thought: The limits of awareness, intention and control (pp. 153-283). New York: Guilford Press.
- Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). Social cognition (2nd Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Garland, R. J., & Dougher, M. J. (1991). Motivational intervention in the treatment of sex offenders. In W. R. Miller & S. Rollnick (Eds.), Motivational interviewing: Preparing people to change addictive behavior (pp. 303-319). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Gocke, B. (1991). Tackling denial in sex offenders: A therapeutic dilemma exacerbated by the criminal justice system. Social Work Monographs, Norwich.

Grossman, L. S., & Cavanaugh, J. L., Jr. (1990). Psychopathology and denial in alleged sex offenders. The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, *178*, 739-744.

Hall, R. L. (1989). Self-efficacy ratings. In D. R. Laws (Ed.), Relapse prevention with sex offenders (pp. 137-146). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Happel, R. M., & Auffrey, J. J. (1995). Sex offender assessment: Interrupting the dance of denial. American Journal of Forensic Psychology, *13*, 5-22.

Haywood, T. W., & Grossman, L. S. (1994). Denial of deviant sexual arousal and psychopathology in child molesters. Behavior Therapy, *25*, 327-340.

Haywood, T. W., Grossman, L. S., & Hardy, D. W. (1993). Denial and social desirability in clinical evaluations of alleged sex offenders. The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, *181*, 183-188.

Haywood, T. W., Grossman, L. S., Kravitz, H. M., & Wasyliv, O. E. (1994). Profiling psychological distortion in alleged child molesters. Psychological Reports, *75*, 915-927.

Hoke, S. L. (1989). Systemic/Strategic interventions targeting denial in the incestuous family. Journal of Strategic and Systemic Therapies, *8*, 44-51.

Jackson, C., & Thomas-Peter, B. A. (1994). Denial in sex offenders: workers' perceptions. Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health, *4*, 21-32.

Johnston, L., & Ward, T. (1996). Social cognition and sexual offending: A theoretical framework. Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, *8*, 55-80.

Kennedy, H. G., & Grubin, D. H. (1992). Patterns of denial in sex offenders. Psychological Medicine, *22*, 191-196.

Kroner, D. G., & Weekes, J. R. (1996). Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding: Factor structure, reliability, and validity with an offender sample. Personality and Individual Differences, *21*, 323-333.

Lafien, B., & Sturm, W. R. (1994). Understanding and working with denial in sexual offenders. Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, *3*, 19-37.

Lanyon, R. I., Dannenbaum, S. E., & Brown, A. R. (1991). Detection of deliberate denial in child abusers. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, *6*, 301-309.

Lanyon, R. I., & Lutz, R. W. (1984). MMPI discrimination of defensive and nondefensive felony sex offenders. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, *52*, 841-843.

Laws, D. R., & Marshall, W. L. (1989). Revised Cognition Scale. Unpublished manuscript.

Maletzky, B. M. (1993). Factors associated with success and failure in the behavioral and cognitive treatment of sexual offenders. Annals of Sex Research, *6*, 241-258.

Marshall, W. L. (1989). Sex with Children Scale. Kingston, ON: Kingston Sexual Behaviour Clinic.

Marshall, W. L. (1994). Treatment effects on denial and minimization in incarcerated sex offenders. Behavioral Research and Therapy, *32*, 559-564.

Marshall, W. L. (1997). Pedophilia: Psychopathology and theory. In D. R. Laws, & W. O'Donohue (Eds.), Sexual deviance: Theory, assessment, and treatment (pp. 152-174). New York: The Guilford Press.

Nelson, C., & Jackson, P. (1989). High-risk recognition: The cognitive-behavioral chain. In D. R. Laws (Eds.), Relapse prevention with sex offenders (pp. 167-177). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Nugent, P. M., & Kroner, D. G. (1996). Denial, response styles, and admittance of offenses among child molesters and rapists. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, *11*, 475-486.

O'Donohue, W., & Letourneau, E. (1993). A brief group treatment for the modification of denial in child sexual abusers: Outcome and follow-up. Child Abuse & Neglect, *17*, 299-304.

O'Donohue, W., Letourneau, E. J., & Dowling, H. (1997). Development and preliminary validation of a paraphilic sexual fantasy questionnaire. Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, *9*, 167-178.

Paulhus, D. L. (1984). Two-component models of socially desirable responding. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *46*, 598-609.

Potter, J., & Wetherall, M. (1987). Discourse and Social Psychology. London: Sage Publications.

Rogers, R., & Dickey, R. (1991). Denial and minimization among sex offenders: A review of competing models of deception. Annals of Sex Research, *4*, 49-63.

Rosenberg, M. J. (1965). Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Salter, A. (1988). Treating child sex offenders and victims: A practical guide. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Schlink, A. M., & Shaw, T. (1996). Treating sexual offenders who deny their guilt: A pilot study. Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, *8*, 17-23.

Schlink, A. M., & Shaw, T. (1997). Treating sexual offenders who deny -- a review. In B. K. Schwartz, & H. R. Cellini (Eds.), The sex offender: New insights, treatment innovations and legal developments (pp. 6-1 - 6-7). Kingston, NJ: Civic Research Institute.

Scully, D., & Marolla, J. (1984). Convicted rapists' vocabulary of motive: Excuses and justifications. Social Problems, *31*, 530-544.

Snyder, M. (1974). The self-monitoring of expressive behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *30*, 526-537.

Snyder, M. (1987). Public appearances/Private realities. New York: W. H. Freeman.

Snyder, M., & Gangestad, S. (1986). On the nature of self-monitoring: Matters of assessment, matters of validity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *51*, 125-159.

Stevenson, H. C., Castillo, E., & Sefarbi, R. (1990). Treatment of denial in adolescent sex offenders and their families. Journal of Offender Counseling, Services & Rehabilitation, 14, 37-50.

Strate, D. C., Jones, L., Pullen, S., & English, K. (1996). Criminal justice policies and sex offender denial. In K. English, S. Pullen, & L. Jones (Eds.), Managing adult sex offenders on probation and parole: a containment approach (pp 4-3 - 4-18). Lexington, NY: American Probation and Parole Association.

Ward, T., Hudson, S. M., & Keenan, T. (1998). A self-regulation model of the sexual offense process. Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 10, 141-157.

Ward, T., Hudson, S. M., & Marshall, W. L. (1995). Cognitive distortions and affective deficits in sex offenders: A cognitive deconstructionist interpretation. Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 7, 67-83.

Wilson, G. (1978). The secrets of sexual fantasy. London, England: J.M. Dent & Sons.

Winn, M. E. (1996). The strategic and systemic management of denial in the cognitive/behavioral treatment of sexual offenders. Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 8, 25-36.

Zachary, R. A. (1991). Shipley Institute of Living Scale - Revised Manual. Los Angeles, CA: Western Psychological Services.