Denial in Sex Offender Treatment

WORKING WITH, RATHER THAN AGAINST, DENIAL IN SEX OFFENDER TREATMENT AND MANAGEMENT

BRENT BORG, MSW SEX OFFENDER TREATMENT SUPERVISOR AIRWAY HEIGHTS CORRECTIONS CENTER WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS <u>BRBORG@DOC1.WA.GOV</u>

Working With, Rather Than Against, Denial

Session Outline

- Overview of Treatment
- Discussion of Denial
- Presentation of a Model for Treatment of Deniers

Sex offenders often deny various elements of their official case, and frequently minimize responsibility.

Some categorically deny the offense took place.

DOC SOTAP Policy (570.000)

► Eligibility Criteria

- To be considered for SOTAP, offenders must meet eligibility criteria as follows:
 - Convicted of a sex offense for the current or previous term of confinement.
 - Eligible for release frim Prison at some point in the future.
 - Acknowledge or recall having committed a sex offense.
 - Agree to attend SOTAP and follow treatment rules and expectations.

RNR Model

► Risk

Match service to identified risk to reoffend. Target treatment towards those assessed as highest risk.

Needs

- Assess criminogenic needs and target them in treatment.
 - ► Target dynamic risk factors linked to criminal behavior and future risk.
 - Clients may have many needs that deserve treatment, but not all are associated with criminal behavior or risk to reoffend.
- Responsivity
 - Effective interventions match the learning style, motivations, abilities, and strengths of clients served.

Treatment Resistance

System

- Lack of trust in professionals
- ► Bad experiences in treatment
- The system may undermine treatment

Psychological

- React to pressure for required programming
- Lack of insight into problems
- ► Lack of insight into risk

- Social Influences
 - ► Family believes in innocence
 - Social supports believe in innocence
- Client's Understanding
 - ► Is treatment effective?
 - Is treatment difficult?
 - ▶ Will I be safe?
 - ► Will I be released?

Making Excuses

► People lie:

- ► To protect themselves
 - Avoid anxiety and shame
- ► To protect others
 - Avoid hurting feelings
- Out of habit

- Can we know the truth regarding an event we did not experience, when only two people were there, and they have different stories?
- Excuse making may help avoid a loss of self-esteem and shame, both blocks for treatment.
- If a client minimizes his crimes, is this an indication he knows that what he did was wrong?

Functions of Denial

Denial can be seen as an approach that is used in certain settings and when reacting to specific conditions. We can see it as a state or as a trait, as situational or pathological.

- Save self esteem
- Fear of loss of family
- Fear of loss of support
- Case under appeal
- ► Shame
- Fear of physical harm
- Avoid label
- ▶ <u>That</u> isn't me

- Lack of understanding
- Don't see it as a sex offense
- Protect image
- Mental Illness
- ► STG affiliation
- May be innocent
- They may want to continue old behaviors
- Don't want to be around <u>those</u> guys

Forms of Denial

Denial of Harm

- Denial of Responsibility
- Denial of Planning or Grooming
- Denial of Number of Occurrences
- Denial of Need for Treatment
- Minimization
- Denial of Risk
- Treatment ambivalence normal, especially in a correctional environment
- Categorical Denial

Examples of Categorical Denial

I was falsely accused

- My lawyer told me to take the plea
- I pled guilty to spare the victim
- I am the victim, she/he was sexually aggressive
- It was consensual
- I was drunk, or we were both drunk
- She/they were out to get me, to get my stuff
- I don't remember

Consequences of Denial

- Release may be jeopardized
- SOTAP eligibility
- Community treatment eligibility
- Camp eligibility
- Work release eligibility
- Can't lower risk

How unusual is denial?

- In other types of treatment
- In psychotherapy
- ► In everyday life
- Pre adjudication
- Post adjudication
- Post treatment
- In sex offender treatment
 - ▶ 25% 35%

How is Denial Often Viewed Clinically or Managed

- Seen as an unmotivated client
- Seen as a significant problem
- Often excluded from treatment, or from treatment completion
- Seen as something that needs to be overcome
- May be seen as the highest risk, as one who wants to continue to offend
- May have time added to his sentence

Why Treat Deniers?

- To mitigate risk for recidivism for those who categorically deny their offending behavior and have refused & been found non-amenable for standard treatment. Mission Focused.
- Risks and Needs may be the same as those who admit
- ▶ Risk for recidivism can be addressed without direct discussion of offending behavior.
- It does not appear to be necessary to overcome denial, require admission
- Deniers program engages men who would not enter treatment and reduce risk
- Comfort discussing themes may facilitate greater willingness to engage in standard treatment.
- Address criminogenic risks by three core processes:
 - 1. Foster sense of necessity to address risks
 - 2. Awareness of protective and risk factors
 - 3. Development of skills to strengthen protective factors and mitigate propensity for risks as they pertain to sexual recidivism.

Addressing Denial in Sexual Offenders

Three Approaches

Overcoming denial in a regular treatment program

- Overcoming denial in a pretreatment program
 - Address barriers, understanding, motivation
- Accepting denial and working with it, rather than against it.

1. Overcoming denial in regular treatment

- Expectation or requirement of admission in:
 - ► Screening
 - Intake
 - Treatment

2. Overcoming denial in pretreatment

- Increase motivation
 - Empathy
 - Collaboration
 - Values
 - Release
 - Civil Commitment

- Increase understanding of treatment
 - Normalize treatment and offense experience
 - Expectations
 - Disclosures
 - Assignments

3. Accepting Denial and Setting it Aside – Moving Forward

- Moving Forward A model of treatment for categorical deniers
- Began in 2015, by Dr. Tim Whetstine-Richel
- 2nd cohort in 2015, 3rd cohort completed group last week
- Amenability based on risk and denial
 - ► No requirement that client desire treatment. Mandated program.
- Previously screened for standard treatment and found to not be amenable due to denial of offense

Moving Forward Clients

- Adult males, incarcerated at Medium Security Facility (AHCC)
- Convicted of Sex Offense or Crime with Sexual Component
- Categorically deny guilt in conviction
- Actuarially assessed Mod-High to High risk for re-offense using Static-99R
 - (occasional use of other DOC risk assessments)
 - Average age= 34.9
 - Average Static 99R= 5.54, High 9
 - ~50% of group have significant MH needs S2-S3
- Less emphasis on time structure than standard treatment

Moving Forward Structure

- Approximately 10 clients per cohort
- 14 week, closed group
 - 2 X 2 hour groups per week
- Individual sessions
 - Pretreatment
 - Informed consent, address anxiety and anger, enhance motivation (empathy, validation, highlight values), Stable 2007 guided and treatment oriented interviews
 - Monthly sessions
 - Discharge session

Moving Forward Foundations

Risk, Needs, Responsivity

Mod-High – High Risk

Dynamic risk factors (DRFs) as conceptualized in the Stable 2007

Responsivity similar to standard program

Acceptance and Commitment Therapy

Focus on function of behavior in context

Focus on workability and stuckness

Prescribes manner of assessing that utilizes here-now experience, and treatmentoriented assessment

Focus on values

Core skills

Adverse Childhood Experiences and Developmental Perspective

Using lifetime adversity to validate and contextualize unworkable behavior.

Viewing adversity as stimulus

Moving Forward Approach

- Avoid challenging the client's version of his offense story
- Address criminogenic, dynamic risks
- Encourage development of positive, value-focused lifestyle
- Focus: some things in your life allowed others to believe that you were capable of committing this offense. We work to avoid being in the place in which you can be "falsely accused" again.
- False allegations are not beyond your control
- We do not focus on offense specific details
 - Demonstrate little interest in either side's version of the case
 - This is <u>specifically</u> not the place to retry a case

Behavioral markers of Change

Moving Forward

- ► Change is evidenced by:
 - Understanding/Acknowledgement of DRFs.
 - Expressed desire to reduce impacts of DRFs
 - Increased awareness of core values
 - Increased ability & willingness to defuse from problematic cognitive content.
 - Increased ability & willingness to navigate difficult emotional states.
 - Increased ability to achieve valued behavior in a consistent, committed way.
- ► Key Change Ingredients:
 - Motivation, Approach Goals, Valued Directions.
 - Awareness: Fusion with Cognitive Content & Avoidance of Unpleasant Emotional States; Focused on Process & Function
 - Behavior: Defusion, Commitment,

Standard/Traditional Accountability Model

- Change is evidenced by:
 - Correspondence of self-reported offending behavior with official account of offending behavior.
 - Acknowledgement of responsibility
 - Acknowledgement of harm/ Victim empathy
 - Expressed remorse
 - Commitment to non-offending future
 - Restructuring of offense facilitating cognitive distortions
 - Behavioral management skills
- Key change ingredients:
 - Motivation: Avoidance: Remorse, prevention of future harm.
 - Awareness: Permission giving cognitive distortions: Focused on content
 - Behavior: Skills to stop criminogenic behavior, mostly avoidance oriented.

First Group



Examples of Activities

Module 1:

Motivational Enhancement

<u>& Fostering Awareness</u>

- Values Identification/Clarification
 - Turn up the pain
 - Reframe pain as indication
 of values
- Condensed Autobiography leading up to disclosure of false accusation
- Opening Door to Risk

Module 2: <u>Self-Regulation Skills</u>

- Managing Urges
 - Reframing Skills
 - Shifting the Script
 - Mindfulness
- Behavioral Chain Analysis
- Asking for help
- Communicating Consent & Boundaries
- Self-Talk

Module 3:

Committing to Success

- Disclosure of High Risks
- Success Plan
- Recommendations

Functional contextual Auto



Challenges with treating Deniers

- How do we measure change if we can't rely on accepting responsibility, admission of guilt?
- How do we address risks without addressing offense associated beliefs and attitudes?
- How do we fix something that doesn't exist, that was never there?

Challenges cont.

- Victim Expectations
- Community Expectations
- System expectations
 - Legal
 - ► DOC
- Our individual expectations
 - Managing our reactions

- Denial of any/all problems
- Significant suspicion
- Fear of judgement
- Lack of faith in the system
- Contagion

Observations, so far

- High degree of mistrust of authorities
- Sincere belief in innocence for some
- For many, denial seems to be image management or other motivation
- Majority have history of addiction
- High level of complex trauma from childhood
- Normalization of violence and other problem behaviors
- More distrust of women compared to standard treatment group
- Family tends to rank very high in values clarification
- High degree of hopelessness regarding registration and community expectations

Feedback from Clients

"This should be longer, but for the next group"

"We were just getting started and it ended"

"We developed an ability to listen more clearly to other people, even in presence of negativity"

"I didn't want to be here, but I am glad I stayed."



Questions?

Thank you!!!!