

Senior Honors Thesis

The Effect of College Majors on Students' Perceptions of Sexual Offenders

Madison Santore

Florida Southern College

Introduction

“Punishment is not for revenge, but to lessen crime and reform the criminal.” This quote by English prison reformer and philanthropist Elizabeth Fry is still as valid today as it was in the 19th century. Punishment is needed to deter crime and hold criminals accountable for their actions, but it does not help society unless it also reforms and rehabilitates. Oftentimes, it seems that society wants to punish for purposes of revenge, especially in regards to the most serious and violent crimes. Determining an adequate punishment for a minor drug charge can be easily debatable with opinions on both sides of the spectrum. But where do opinions lie when it comes to punishment for a crime like sexual offending?

The purpose of my honors thesis is to determine whether or not students' opinions and assumptions about sex offenders differ according to their college major. This project also examines whether students' academic disciplines shape their perspectives on sanctions and policies for a type of crime that is known to be so egregious. In the United States, public opinion helps shape policies against sex crimes (Redlich, 2002). More research is needed to determine where and how the general public obtains information and forms opinions related to sex crimes. However, factors such as age, gender, income, and level of education are thought to be some of the main characteristics that help shape public perception (Budd, 2017). In addition to the level of education, the specific types of education that students are receiving can affect where they stand on societal issues, including sex crimes and criminal sanctions (Budd, 2017). My hypothesis was that students who are pursuing a degree in criminology will be more in favor of stricter sanctions and will show signs of lower empathy levels towards sexual offenders than students of other academic majors.

Literature Review

One journal article that was especially helpful before testing the data that I collected was *Empathy among College Students and Criminal Justice Majors: Identifying Predispositional Traits and the Role of Education* (Courtright et al., 2007). This article focused on a study of 633 college students in the northeastern United States, and had the same basic purpose that I had in mind when I first chose this research topic. The authors studied levels of empathy among students with various college majors and compared research results across gender, school size/type, grade level, and age, among other variables. These are some of the same variables that I later looked at using my own data. The relationship between empathy and attitudes towards punitiveness was also studied. Results showed that male criminal justice majors have the lowest levels of empathy, followed by males of other majors, female criminal justice majors, and females of other majors (Courtright et al., 2007). Among the important factors that were found to influence empathy levels were gender, academic discipline, and grade/class level. Criminal justice majors were also found to be more in favor of punitiveness than non-criminal justice majors, which matched my previously stated hypothesis. Lastly, criminal justice and non-criminal justice majors had differing opinions on what is considered fair and equitable punishment for criminals (Courtright et al., 2007). Unfortunately, this study is relatively unique and has not been replicated on the same scale. However, this proves that there is a need for more studies in this area involving how college major affects students' empathy levels and opinions.

Another helpful article I used was *Empathy Deficits of Sexual Offenders: A Conceptual Model* (Hanson, 2003). This article explains the history of empathy and how there is both a cognitive and an emotional component. Cognitively, empathy is the ability to recognize someone's emotions and experiences. Emotional empathy can lead to a variety of responses, including sadness, concern, anger, and anxiety (Hanson, 2003).

Sexual offenders are often thought to lack empathy for their victims. As a result of this assumption, programs for sex offender treatment commonly focus on victim empathy. This is an example of how assumptions of criminals directly impact regulation and treatment of crime. There is no significant relationship among victim empathy and recidivism risk, but there is reason to believe that different types of sexual offenders have different levels of empathy. Hanson argues that different treatments are needed depending on how much empathy a criminal is lacking (Hanson, 2003). The exact definition of empathy is still up for debate, as well as the best way to measure empathy among sexual offenders.

The article titled *Empathy-focused Learning: Teaching Criminal Justice Students to Care* focuses on a study conducted on students in a community-based corrections course. Students took a survey before completing two experiential learning projects. The first project was a 48 hour home confinement exercise that required students to confine themselves at home for 48 hours while complying with a list of restrictions that was given to them. In following these restrictions, students were not allowed to watch television or use a computer. Phone calls were allowed up to three times a day, and meals could only be eaten at certain times and for no longer than 20 minutes. For the second project, students were asked to visit any location where they could observe community-based corrections, such as correctional facilities, probation and parole agencies, and sexual offender group meeting sessions. Posttest surveys and interviews were conducted after these activities were completed. The results revealed an increase in students' capacity to feel pity for offenders treated unfairly and being disturbed by offenders' misfortunes. Some even admitted they felt "connected" or "shared the same emotions" with offenders during group meetings that they observed. One student shared, "The thing that affected me most was the sex offenders...I really started to empathize with those charged with statutory rape. I think we

label many of them as 'bad people' when they had consensual sex with someone underage. I don't think they should be on the sex offenders list" (Keena & Krieger-Sample, 2018, p. 402). One participant in the study compared what it was like for parolees to try and get back on their feet after prison to "always running into a brick wall" because "people don't want them around," and it makes it extremely difficult to find good employment (Keena & Krieger-Sample, 2018, p. 400). Regarding sex offenders specifically, one person said, "I had never thought about how difficult it is to survive in society once you are registered as a sex offender. For example, this one guy had to move because his neighbors kept defacing his apartment. I mean, the dude was working, going to counseling, and doing what he was supposed to do but he would come home and find his front door had been spray painted, egged, or other nasty things thrown at the door" (Keena & Krieger-Sample, 2018, p. 401). The confinement exercise reinforced some students' opinions that the prison system does not give offenders an opportunity or motivation to be rehabilitated. Others, however, still felt that the punitive environment of the prison system was what criminals deserved for their actions.

Contrary to common beliefs, most sexual offenders do not reoffend sexually over time (Harris & Hanson, 2004). In fact, after 15 years, 27% of sexual offenders were convicted again for a similar offense while the other 73% were not. These results were gathered from a study of 4,724 adult male offenders from across the U.S. and Canada. However, it should be noted that different types of offenders have different likelihoods of recidivism, and the statistics mentioned are in reference to the overall general demographic of sexual offenders.

Methods

During the fall semester of 2019, I began research on this topic by creating surveys to be distributed to students from various disciplines across campus at Florida Southern College

(Appendix B). Some survey questions were open-ended, and others required the student to choose one of the possible given answers depending on the question. In addition to personal demographic questions, students answered questions in which they choose which percentage they think best fit the statistic. For example, one of the questions reads, "What percentage of sex offenders commit another sexual offense?" Students would then pick the answer they assume to be the most correct. Survey participants also used a Likert scale to rate how much they either agreed or disagreed with common assumptions or misconceptions about sex offenders in society. An example of one of these misconceptions from my survey is, "Most sex offenders re-offend." In another set of questions, students indicated whether or not they believed certain treatments and management policies would be effective in reducing the rate of reoffending among sex offenders. These management policies and treatments include GPS/electronic monitoring, probation/parole supervision, residency restrictions, incarceration, and others. Students' responses were then compared to data from academic journals either confirming or denying the effectiveness of these treatments. The survey contained four independent variable questions, or questions regarding the respondent's sex, race, and age. The other 37 survey questions were dependent variables, which were focused on different themes. One theme focused on percentages of different types of sex offenders, and how often students perceive them to reoffend. For example, to assess beliefs regarding recidivism, students were asked, "What percentage of child molesters sexually reoffend?" Another theme focused on common generalizations or misconceptions of sex offenders, and how much students agree or disagree with the statements. An example statement is, "Treatment is not effective for sex offenders." The third theme includes the most commonly used sex offender-specific laws and management policies, and whether or not students believe the strategies are effective in reducing reoffending among sex offenders. An

example policy is "GPS/ electronic monitoring". In total, 148 students participated in the survey. Of this total, 70% of respondents were female and 30% of respondents were male. Criminology was the major for 32% of my sample, and psychology accounted for 13.5% of the sample. 16% of students were science majors, which included biology, chemistry, and marine biology, among others. 12% were business majors, which included accounting, marketing, sports management, and any other business program field. The remaining 26.5% was a mix of other majors ranging from theater and art to education and English. The average age of my survey participants was 19.8, with ages ranging mostly from 18 to 22 and a few outliers in the mid- to late-twenties.

Once the surveys were finished, the data was entered into SPSS statistical analysis software. Variables such as gender and academic major were coded numerically. For example, data was entered using the number 0 for "male," 1 for "female," and 2 for "other." After data entry was complete, three scales were created in order to group similar questions together. One scale was called "offender," and it included data from five questions that involved assumptions about sex offenders such as, "Treatment is not effective for sex offenders." Another scale was "law scale," which included seven social policies, restrictions, and laws that are meant to reduce sex offenses such as residency restrictions. The "consequence" scale involved data from two questions about whether or not sex offenders should be prepared to face backlash from society. Lastly, the "restrictions" scale included three questions regarding the effectiveness of sex offender restrictions such as employment limitations.

In order to show the relationships between students of various majors and their opinions and knowledge of sexual offenders, a t-test was used. The purpose of t-tests is to determine if there is a significant difference between the means of two groups. The purpose of this test in my research was to determine whether or not the difference in viewpoints from criminology students

as opposed to non-criminology students is significant. It also showed the direction and strength of the variables' relationship.

Results

One significant finding came from an independent samples t-test using a 95% confidence interval comparing opinions on sanctions between criminology students versus non-criminology students (Appendix A, Tables 1-3). I included data from all seven types of sanctions that were in my survey, where respondents answered whether they believed the sanction was effective, not effective, or they were unsure. These seven sanctions were: GPS/ electronic monitoring, registration/ community notification laws, probation/ parole supervision, paying restitution to victims, residency restrictions, specialized sex offender treatment, and incarceration (prison). The results showed a significant difference in opinions on GPS monitoring, registration/ community notification laws, probation/ parole supervision, and specialized treatment (Appendix A, Table 2). Based on these significant results, criminology majors were more likely to think that these sanctions were beneficial, while non-criminology majors thought them to be ineffective or were unsure how effective they are.

Next, I used the same independent samples t-test with a 95% confidence interval and the same sanction variables to look for a contrast based on gender (Appendix A, Tables 4-6). I found two significant results: one for GPS/ electronic monitoring, and one for residency restrictions (Table 5). These results indicated that males were more likely to believe that these two methods were effective compared to females.

The last significant result that I found was from an independent samples t-test where I looked for differences in opinions on treatment between males and females (Tables 7-9). Compared to females, males were more likely to feel that GPS monitoring is a violation of the

right to privacy (Table 8). No significant results were found for differences in opinions on offender treatment based on college major. Results were also not significant when comparing opinions based on student's ages.

The goals of sanctions for sexual offenders are to protect the community, deter offenders from committing more crimes, and to monitor offender behavior. Types of offender sanctions have varying levels of effectiveness when it comes to reducing recidivism. Many current sanctions that are in place today stem from opinion polls, and public emotion plays a significant role in these polls (Comartin et al., 2009). Community notification laws require states to keep track of sexual offenders in registries so that officials can notify the community when an offender relocates there. Registration can last anywhere from 10 years to an offender's lifetime. These sanctions are meant to protect the public by raising awareness that there are people in the nearby community who have been convicted of such offenses. A report from the National Institute of Justice shows that community notification and registration do not have an impact on sexual offender re-offense rates, the number of sexual offense victims, the type of offenses committed, or the amount of time between offenses (Comartin et al., 2009). Public registration was created under the retributive model, which aims to punish offenders in order to deter future crimes with the belief that sanctions should be proportional to the severity of the crime that occurred (Comartin et al., 2009). Residency restrictions prevent sex offenders from living and working within a certain distance of congregations of children, such as schools or parks. When it comes to community notification, law students and mental health professionals are less likely to be supportive (Comartin et al., 2009). A possible explanation for this lack of support is that law students have better knowledge of the Constitution and the ways in which laws affect individuals' rights. When studying how gender relates to support for community notification, it is

more likely that women will be more in favor than men. In both adult and child sexual abuse cases, women are usually more pro-victim than men (Comartin et al., 2009).

GPS monitoring systems send intermittent reports to law enforcement that show the offender's location. This sanction can last for up to an offender's lifetime in some cases. In a court case involving lifetime GPS monitoring, Michael Belleau was a convicted sex offender who argued that the ankle monitor violated his Fourth Amendment right to privacy. Belleau was convicted of sexual assault in 1992 and was originally supposed to be released from prison in 2005. However, in 2004, he was civilly committed to a treatment center after a civil trial and was released in 2010 when a treatment center psychologist said Belleau was "no longer more likely than not to commit further sexual assaults" (Anacker & Pinals, 2016). By the time of his 2010 release, a Wisconsin law had been enacted in 2006 that required sex offenders who were released from civil commitment to wear a GPS monitoring device 24 hours a day for the rest of their lives. In court, the district judge held this Wisconsin monitoring statute unconstitutional, and this was appealed by the Department of Corrections. The Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals reversed the decision, deciding that the Wisconsin law did not violate the Fourth Amendment because the electronic monitoring of sex offenders is considered a search under the Fourth Amendment. In other words, the Fourth Amendment prohibits unreasonable searches, and monitoring a sexual offender is not unreasonable. While examining the totality of the circumstances, the Seventh Circuit recognized that Belleau victimized children, which made him a unique threat to public safety. Sexual offenses against children are also associated with higher recidivism rates. In the end, it was decided that the monitoring statute was in the best interests of public safety and that lifetime monitoring was a reasonable sanction in this case (Anacker & Pinals, 2016).

Sensationalism of sexual offenses in the media can lead to increasingly severe policies as the public is made more and more fearful. Politicians have been known to act on demands from the public for more severe punishments, even when crime rates are not necessarily indicative of a need to do so. As a result, many offender policies are made to make the public feel safe, but without offender rehabilitation in mind (Presser & Gunnison, 1999). Without proper rehabilitation, offenders can become isolated, which increases the risk of recidivism. Policies are often made in response to quantitative opinion polls (Comartin et al., 2009), and that is why it is important to understand where the general public stands on such issues.

Discussion

Although there were no significant findings for whether or not college major affects students' views on sex offender treatment, there were results that indicated a relationship between major and opinion on sex offender sanctions. Criminology students are more likely than non-criminology students to approve of current sanctions. I also found that males were more likely to find current sanctions to be effective than women, specifically residency restrictions and GPS tracking. However, results also showed that males were more likely to believe that GPS tracking violated offenders' Fourth Amendment right to privacy. Further research could possibly determine if male respondents believe that a "violation of rights" may be necessary in order for sanctions to be effective. If that is the case, this could lead to the conclusion that men have lower empathy levels than women, which would support the study by Courtright previously mentioned. However, there is not currently enough evidence in my research to support this conclusion.

A limitation of my research was limited access to in-person surveys due to Covid. When I first began surveying students in 2019, I distributed hardcopy surveys to classrooms. Due to the pandemic, I transferred my survey onto an online survey website, which made it more difficult to

get student participation. Additionally, most of my survey participants were volunteers, making my sample a voluntary response sample. Voluntary response samples can be more biased than a true random sample because those who volunteered to take my survey may have done so because they have strong feelings about some aspect of the survey topic. Lastly, all respondents were Florida Southern College students, which could have restricted the amount of diversity in my sample.

Crime is something that will always be relevant in society, and it is always important to know how to protect ourselves and our communities. The results of this study could possibly provide insight into what young adults understand about this type of crime and prevention methods and what they may not fully understand. If done on a much larger scale, this research could influence new laws and ordinances regarding sexual offenders, whether it be making stricter punishments or focusing on less punitive consequences. On a smaller scale, this research could support the idea that criminology courses shape students' perceptions of these criminals and the sanctions and treatments that they receive. This data could be helpful at both local and state levels because more information about crime prevention and safety is useful at both levels. It is important to ensure that those who enter the criminal justice field are there for ethical reasons. A future application that would be beneficial is the addition of learning techniques in college courses that challenge dominant or traditional views of crime. Also, empathy training would be beneficial for students entering professions in the criminology and criminal justice fields. Research has shown that empathy training would be most effective during college years when morals and abstract thought are developed (Courtright et al., 2007).

Conclusion

In conclusion, the results of my research have indicated that males and females tend to have a difference in opinion regarding sex offender treatment and sanctions. Based on my results, males are likely to be more in favor of sanctions placed on offenders while also considering GPS tracking to be a violation of the Constitutional right to privacy. Criminology majors are more likely to believe in the effectiveness of sanctions when compared to non-criminology majors. Public opinions on crimes such as sexual offenses matter because they can influence the decisions of political leaders and policymakers. Policies that are made can either have a positive or negative impact on offender rehabilitation. While sexual offenders certainly deserve to face consequences for their crimes, it is important that the consequences lead to long-term rehabilitation so that they will not commit the same offenses in the future.

References

- Anacker, Lisa and Pinals, Debra A. (2016). GPS monitoring for life. *The Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 44(4), 497-499.
<http://jaapl.org/content/44/4/497>
- Budd, Kristen M. and Mancini, Christina. (2017). Public perceptions of GPS monitoring for convicted sex offenders. *SAGE: International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 61(12), 1335-1353.
- Comartin, Erin B., Kernsmith, Poco D., and Kernsmith, Roger M. (2009). Sanctions for sex offenders: Fear and public policy. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 48(7).
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10509670903196066?needAccess=true>
- Courtright, Keivn E., Mackey, David A., and Packard, Susan H. (2007). Empathy among college students and criminal justice majors. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 16(1), 125-144. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1051125042000333514>
- Hanson, R Karl. (2003). Empathy deficits of sexual offenders: A conceptual model. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 9(1): 13–23.
- Harris, Andrew J.R. and Hanson, R. Karl. (2004). Sex offender recidivism: A simple question. *Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada*.
<https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/sx-ffndr-rcdvsm/index-en.aspx?wbdisable=true>
- Keena, Linda and Krieger-Sample, Laura. (2018). Empathy-focused learning: Teaching criminal justice students to care. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 43(1), 389-410.
- Presser, Lois and Gunnison, Elaine. (1999). Strange bedfellows: Is sex offender notification a form of community justice? *Crime & Delinquency*, 45(3), 299-315.

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0011128799045003001>

Redlich, Allison D. (2002). Community notification: Perceptions of its effectiveness in preventing child sexual abuse. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 10*(3), 91-116.

https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1300/J070v10n03_06

Appendix A

Table 1

Group Statistics					
	majoring or minoring in crim	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
GPS/ electronic monitoring	yes	48	.4583	.77070	.11124
	no	100	.8000	.88763	.08876
registration/ community notification laws	yes	48	.2708	.57388	.08283
	no	100	.5000	.73168	.07317
probation/ parole supervision	yes	48	.2500	.56493	.08154
	no	100	.6000	.80403	.08040
paying restitution to victims	yes	48	.8125	.73387	.10592
	no	100	.8700	.73382	.07338
residency restrictions	yes	48	.2917	.61742	.08912
	no	100	.4100	.68306	.06831
specialized sex offender treatment	yes	48	.4583	.77070	.11124
	no	100	.7900	.91337	.09134
incarceration (prison)	yes	48	.3125	.62420	.09010
	no	100	.2700	.60059	.06006

Table 2

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
GPS/ electronic monitoring	Equal variances assumed	4.960	.027	-2.284	146	.024	-.34167	.14956	-.63725	-.04608
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.401	105.583	.018	-.34167	.14231	-.62383	-.05950
registration/ community notification laws	Equal variances assumed	11.297	.001	-1.906	146	.059	-.22917	.12026	-.46684	.00850
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.074	115.558	.040	-.22917	.11052	-.44808	-.01026
probation/ parole supervision	Equal variances assumed	24.229	.000	-2.710	146	.008	-.35000	.12917	-.60528	-.09472
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.056	126.191	.003	-.35000	.11451	-.57662	-.12338
paying restitution to victims	Equal variances assumed	.058	.810	-.446	146	.656	-.05750	.12886	-.31217	.19717
	Equal variances not assumed			-.446	92.792	.656	-.05750	.12886	-.31340	.19840
residency restrictions	Equal variances assumed	2.849	.094	-1.017	146	.311	-.11833	.11636	-.34829	.11162
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.054	101.770	.294	-.11833	.11228	-.34105	.10439
specialized sex offender treatment	Equal variances assumed	8.316	.005	-2.171	146	.032	-.33167	.15277	-.63359	-.02975
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.304	108.354	.023	-.33167	.14393	-.61696	-.04638
incarceration (prison)	Equal variances assumed	.393	.532	.398	146	.691	.04250	.10681	-.16860	.25360
	Equal variances not assumed			.393	89.648	.696	.04250	.10828	-.17263	.25763

Table 3

		Independent Samples Effect Sizes			
		Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
GPS/ electronic monitoring	Cohen's d	.85174	-.401	-.748	-.053
	Hedges' correction	.85614	-.399	-.744	-.053
	Glass's delta	.88763	-.385	-.732	-.036
registration/ community notification laws	Cohen's d	.68486	-.335	-.680	.012
	Hedges' correction	.68840	-.333	-.677	.012
	Glass's delta	.73168	-.313	-.659	.034
probation/ parole supervision	Cohen's d	.73559	-.476	-.823	-.127
	Hedges' correction	.73940	-.473	-.819	-.126
	Glass's delta	.80403	-.435	-.784	-.085
paying restitution to victims	Cohen's d	.73383	-.078	-.422	.266
	Hedges' correction	.73763	-.078	-.420	.265
	Glass's delta	.73382	-.078	-.422	.266
residency restrictions	Cohen's d	.66264	-.179	-.523	.166
	Hedges' correction	.66606	-.178	-.520	.166
	Glass's delta	.68306	-.173	-.518	.172
specialized sex offender treatment	Cohen's d	.87000	-.381	-.728	-.034
	Hedges' correction	.87450	-.379	-.724	-.033
	Glass's delta	.91337	-.363	-.710	-.014
incarceration (prison)	Cohen's d	.60829	.070	-.275	.414
	Hedges' correction	.61144	.070	-.273	.412
	Glass's delta	.60059	.071	-.274	.415

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.
 Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.
 Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.
 Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

Table 4

		Group Statistics			
What is your sex		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
GPS/ electronic monitoring	Male	43	.3953	.72832	.11107
	female	104	.8077	.89309	.08757
registration/ community notification laws	Male	43	.3023	.59900	.09135
	female	104	.4712	.72349	.07094
probation/ parole supervision	Male	43	.3953	.65971	.10060
	female	104	.5192	.78803	.07727
paying restitution to victims	Male	43	.6744	.64442	.09827
	female	104	.9231	.75931	.07446
residency restrictions	Male	43	.2093	.51446	.07846
	female	104	.4327	.70730	.06936
incarceration (prison)	Male	43	.2326	.61090	.09316
	female	104	.2981	.60547	.05937
specialized sex offender treatment	Male	43	.6512	.89665	.13674
	female	104	.6923	.88215	.08650

Table 5

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
GPS/ electronic monitoring	Equal variances assumed	14.153	.000	-2.680	145	.008	-.41234	.15387	-.71645	-.10823
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.915	95.417	.004	-.41234	.14144	-.69312	-.13156
registration/ community notification laws	Equal variances assumed	6.005	.015	-1.350	145	.179	-.16883	.12505	-.41599	.07833
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.460	94.001	.148	-.16883	.11566	-.39847	.06082
probation/ parole supervision	Equal variances assumed	4.204	.042	-.907	145	.366	-.12388	.13654	-.39375	.14599
	Equal variances not assumed			-.977	92.978	.331	-.12388	.12686	-.37579	.12803
paying restitution to victims	Equal variances assumed	.265	.608	-1.884	145	.062	-.24866	.13197	-.50949	.01218
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.017	91.732	.047	-.24866	.12329	-.49354	-.00378
residency restrictions	Equal variances assumed	13.613	.000	-1.875	145	.063	-.22339	.11917	-.45892	.01214
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.133	106.721	.035	-.22339	.10472	-.43098	-.01580
incarceration (prison)	Equal variances assumed	.751	.388	-.595	145	.553	-.06552	.11006	-.28305	.15201
	Equal variances not assumed			-.593	77.811	.555	-.06552	.11047	-.28546	.15442
specialized sex offender treatment	Equal variances assumed	.144	.705	-.256	145	.798	-.04114	.16070	-.35877	.27648
	Equal variances not assumed			-.254	77.295	.800	-.04114	.16180	-.36331	.28103

Table 6

Independent Samples Effect Sizes

		Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
GPS/ electronic monitoring	Cohen's d	.84866	-.486	-.845	-.125
	Hedges' correction	.85308	-.483	-.840	-.125
	Glass's delta	.89309	-.462	-.822	-.100
registration/ community notification laws	Cohen's d	.68974	-.245	-.601	.112
	Hedges' correction	.69334	-.244	-.598	.112
	Glass's delta	.72349	-.233	-.590	.124
probation/ parole supervision	Cohen's d	.75311	-.164	-.520	.192
	Hedges' correction	.75703	-.164	-.517	.191
	Glass's delta	.78803	-.157	-.513	.199
paying restitution to victims	Cohen's d	.72790	-.342	-.699	.016
	Hedges' correction	.73189	-.340	-.695	.016
	Glass's delta	.75931	-.327	-.685	.031
residency restrictions	Cohen's d	.65729	-.340	-.697	.018
	Hedges' correction	.66072	-.338	-.693	.018
	Glass's delta	.70730	-.316	-.673	.043
incarceration (prison)	Cohen's d	.60705	-.108	-.463	.248
	Hedges' correction	.61021	-.107	-.461	.247
	Glass's delta	.60547	-.108	-.464	.248
specialized sex offender treatment	Cohen's d	.88638	-.046	-.402	.309
	Hedges' correction	.89099	-.046	-.400	.307
	Glass's delta	.88215	-.047	-.402	.309

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.
 Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.
 Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.
 Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

Table 7

Group Statistics

	What is your sex	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Residency Restrictions should be imposed on reentering offenders	Male	43	3.9302	1.03269	.15748
	female	104	3.8269	.96986	.09510
Sex offenders should be prepared for threats from neighbors	Male	43	3.2093	1.22587	.18694
	female	104	4.6635	13.32973	1.30709
GPS tracking recode	Male	43	2.8837	1.46725	.22375
	female	103	3.4369	1.11733	.11009
Sex offenders should accept employment opportunities to be hard	Male	43	3.9302	.93593	.14273
	female	104	4.8077	9.36641	.91845
Child Sex offenders should be punished more severely	Male	43	4.0233	1.31816	.20102
	female	104	4.4327	9.41983	.92369
sex offender punishment should vary on severity of crime	Male	43	5.7209	14.62276	2.22995
	female	104	3.5288	1.14872	.11264
Should sex offenders keep civil rights	Male	43	2.0930	1.32403	.20191
	female	104	3.5769	9.52431	.93394

Table 8

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Residency Restrictions should be imposed on reentering offenders	Equal variances assumed	.145	.704	.576	145	.565	.10331	.17921	-2.5090	.45752
	Equal variances not assumed			.562	74.195	.576	.10331	.18397	-2.6325	.46986
Sex offenders should be prepared for threats from neighbors	Equal variances assumed	1.868	.174	-7.13	145	.477	-1.45416	2.04038	-5.48689	2.57857
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.101	107.147	.273	-1.45416	1.32039	-4.07163	1.16332
GPS tracking recode	Equal variances assumed	2.405	.123	-2.478	144	.014	-.55317	.22327	-.99448	-.11186
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.218	63.271	.030	-.55317	.24937	-1.05146	-.05488
Sex offenders should accept employment opportunities to be hard	Equal variances assumed	.794	.374	-.612	145	.542	-.87746	1.43416	-3.71202	1.95710
	Equal variances not assumed			-.944	107.881	.347	-.87746	.92948	-2.71987	.96495
Child Sex offenders should be punished more severely	Equal variances assumed	.579	.448	-.283	145	.777	-.40944	1.44615	-3.26572	2.44684
	Equal variances not assumed			-.433	112.369	.666	-.40944	.94531	-2.28238	1.46351
sex offender punishment should vary on severity of crime	Equal variances assumed	6.279	.013	1.525	145	.129	2.19208	1.43760	-.64928	5.03345
	Equal variances not assumed			.982	42.214	.332	2.19208	2.23279	-2.31320	6.69736
Should sex offenders keep civil rights	Equal variances assumed	.627	.430	-1.016	145	.312	-1.48390	1.46110	-4.37171	1.40391
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.553	112.252	.123	-1.48390	.95551	-3.37708	.40928

Table 9

		Independent Samples Effect Sizes			
		Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Residency Restrictions should be imposed on reentering offenders	Cohen's d	.98847	.105	-.251	.460
	Hedges' correction	.99362	.104	-.250	.458
	Glass's delta	.96986	.107	-.249	.462
Sex offenders should be prepared for threats from neighbors	Cohen's d	11.25392	-.129	-.485	.227
	Hedges' correction	11.31255	-.129	-.482	.225
	Glass's delta	13.32973	-.109	-.464	.247
GPS tracking recode	Cohen's d	1.22972	-.450	-.809	-.089
	Hedges' correction	1.23617	-.447	-.804	-.089
	Glass's delta	1.11733	-.495	-.856	-.132
Sex offenders should accept employment opportunities to be hard	Cohen's d	7.91025	-.111	-.466	.245
	Hedges' correction	7.95146	-.110	-.464	.244
	Glass's delta	9.36641	-.094	-.449	.262
Child Sex offenders should be punished more severely	Cohen's d	7.97085	-.051	-.407	.304
	Hedges' correction	8.01238	-.051	-.405	.303
	Glass's delta	9.41983	-.043	-.399	.312
sex offender punishment should vary on severity of crime	Cohen's d	7.92924	.276	-.081	.633
	Hedges' correction	7.97055	.275	-.080	.629
	Glass's delta	1.14872	1.908	1.465	2.346
Should sex offenders keep civil rights	Cohen's d	8.05884	-.184	-.540	.172
	Hedges' correction	8.10083	-.183	-.537	.171
	Glass's delta	9.52431	-.156	-.511	.201

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.
 Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.
 Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.
 Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

Appendix B

Informed Consent to Participate in Research Information to Consider Before Taking Part in this Research Study

Project Title: Student Perceptions of Sexual offenders

Principal Investigator(s): Madison Santore and Vanessa Lujan

Faculty Advisor(s): Chastity Blankenship

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY:

The purpose of our study is to explore the different perceptions of sexual offenders that are held by students with different academic interests. We are interested in uncovering if criminology students have a different understand than students of other majors. We will measure student perceptions through the use of self-reported student surveys.

STUDY PROCEDURES:

Participation will include completing a survey to measure your perceptions regarding sexual offenders and presence in society. You will participate in the completion of surveys on a voluntary basis and declining to participate will have no impact on your course grade.

RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS:

A risk can be triggering thoughts or emotions for the student as a result of past experiences with sexual offenses.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS:

No potential benefits.

CONSENT:

A signature of consent will be required to participate in study.

CONFIDENTIALITY:

All answers will be kept confident and data will not be shared with anyone except the professor.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION / WITHDRAWAL:

Subjects may withdraw from the study at any time if they wish to do so.

QUESTIONS, CONCERNS, OR COMPLAINTS: If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this study, please contact the Chair of the Institutional Review Board at (863) 680-6205, VP for Academic Affairs at (863) 680-4124.

Consent to Take Part in this Research Study

It is up to you to decide whether you want to take part in this study. If you want to take part, please sign the form, if the following statements are true.

I freely give my consent to take part in this study. I understand that by signing this form I am agreeing to take part in research.

Signature of Person Taking Part in Study

Date

Printed Name of Person Taking Part in Study

Section 1

1. What is your gender?

- a. Male
- b. Female
- c. other

2. Which best describes your race?

- a. White
- b. Black
- c. Hispanic
- d. Asian
- e. Other (please specify): _____

3. What is your age? _____

4. Which category best describes you?

- a. Liberal
- b. Democrat
- c. Independent
- d. Conservative
- e. Republican
- f. Other

5. Are you currently majoring or minoring in criminology?

- a. Yes
- b. No

If no, what is your major? _____

If yes, how many criminology courses have you taken? _____

6. Have you known someone who has been convicted of a sex offender crime?

- a. No
- b. Yes (please indicate if this individual was a family member, friend, etc. _____)

Section 2

1. What percentages of sex offenders commit another sexual offense?

- 1-10% 11-20% 21-30% 31-40% 41-50%
51-60% 61-70% 71-80% 81-90% 91-100%

2. What percentages of rapists sexually reoffend?

- 1-10% 11-20% 21-30% 31-40% 41-50%
51-60% 61-70% 71-80% 81-90% 91-100%

3. What percentages of child molesters sexually reoffend?

- 1-10% 11-20% 21-30% 31-40% 41-50%
51-60% 61-70% 71-80% 81-90% 91-100%

4. What percentages of adult sex offenders were sexually abused as children?

- 1-10% 11-20% 21-30% 31-40% 41-50%

51-60% 61-70% 71-80% 81-90% 91-100%

5. What percentages of sex offenders are severely mentally ill?

1-10% 11-20% 21-30% 31-40% 41-50%
51-60% 61-70% 71-80% 81-90% 91-100%

6. What percentages of sex offenses are brought to the attention of authorities?

1-10% 11-20% 21-30% 31-40% 41-50%
51-60% 61-70% 71-80% 81-90% 91-100%

7. What percentages of sex crimes are committed by strangers?

1-10% 11-20% 21-30% 31-40% 41-50%
51-60% 61-70% 71-80% 81-90% 91-100%

8. What percentages of sex crimes are committed by individuals familiar to the victim?

1-10% 11-20% 21-30% 31-40% 41-50%
51-60% 61-70% 71-80% 81-90% 91-100%

Section 3

1. Most sex offenders re-offend.

Strongly disagree	disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

2. Treatment is not effective for sex offenders.

Strongly disagree	disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

3. Sexual offense rates continue to increase.

Strongly disagree	disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

4. The majority of sex offenders are caught by the authorities, convicted, then placed in prison.

Strongly disagree	disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

5. Most sexual assaults are not committed by strangers.

Strongly disagree	disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

6. Sex offenders reoffend at higher rates compared to other criminal offenders.

Strongly disagree	disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

7. When sex offenders do re-offend, they are more likely to commit a crime that is more violent and serious than their prior offense.

Strongly disagree	disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

Section 4

Listed below are the most commonly used sex offender-specific laws and management policies. Please indicate by choosing "yes" or "no" whether or not you believe the following strategies are effective in reducing reoffending among sex offenders.

GPS/ electronic monitoring	yes	no	unsure
----------------------------	-----	----	--------

registration/ community notification laws	yes	no	unsure
probation/ parole supervision	yes	no	unsure
Paying restitution to victims	yes	no	unsure
Residency restrictions	yes	no	unsure
Incarceration (prison)	yes	no	unsure
Specialized sex offender treatment	yes	no	unsure

Section 5

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about sex offender management and policies by circling the number that best represents your opinion.

1. Residency restrictions should be imposed on all reentering sex offenders, even if that means they are unable to return home due to close proximity of a school, playground, or park.

Strongly disagree	disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

2. Sex offenders should be prepared to endure threats and harassment from their neighbors once they have been found out due to the sex offender registry.

Strongly disagree	disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

3. GPS tracking devices violate sex offenders' individual rights protected by the Constitution .

Strongly disagree	disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

4. Because of registration laws, sex offenders should accept the fact that employment opportunities may be difficult to find.

Strongly disagree	disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

5. Experiencing shame and embarrassment due to the sex offender registry is a consequence sex offenders should learn to accept.

Strongly disagree	disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

Section 6

1. Sexual offenders should be able to keep their civil rights (voting, privacy, etc.).

Strongly disagree	disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

2. Child sex offenders should be punished more severely than other sex offenders.

Strongly disagree	disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

3. Sex offenders should wear tracking devices so their location can be known at all times.

Strongly disagree	disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

4. Sex offender punishment should vary depending on the severity of the individual crime.

Strongly disagree	disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

5. Being notified of sex offenders lowers likelihood of being victimized.

Strongly disagree	disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

6. Incarceration of sex offenders reduces likelihood of reoffending.

Strongly disagree	disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

7. Sex offenders should be able to attend college campuses as students with no restrictions.

Strongly disagree	disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

8. A sex offense committed against someone the perpetrator knows is less serious than a sex offense committed against a stranger.

Strongly disagree	disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

9. Most sex offenders do not have close friends.

Strongly disagree	disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

10. Only a few sex offenders are dangerous.

Strongly disagree	disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	agree	Strongly agree
-------------------	----------	-------------------	----------------	-------	----------------

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

Thank you for taking this survey. If you need to talk to someone about victimization, please contact the Counseling Center at 863-680-6236.