

Running Head: Judgments of non-offending and offending pedophiles

Using video stimuli to examine judgments of non-offending and offending pedophiles:

A brief communication

Katie A. Boardman

Mersey Care Whalley, UK

Ross M. Bartels*

University of Lincoln, UK

*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to: Dr Ross M. Bartels, School of Psychology, University of Lincoln, Brayford Pool, Lincoln, LN6 7TS

E-mail: rbartels@lincoln.ac.uk

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Dr Craig Harper for his helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper, as well as the reviewers for their insightful and beneficial feedback

This version of the paper was accepted by the *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*:

Boardman, K. A., & Bartels, R. M. (2017). Using video stimuli to examine judgments of non-offending and offending pedophiles: A brief communication. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*. doi: 10.1080/0092623X.2017.1405300.

Using video stimuli to examine judgments about non-offending and offending pedophiles:

A brief communication

Pedophilia refers to a persistent sexual interest in pre-pubescent children (Cantor & McPhail, 2016); *not* the act of having sexual contact with a child. Non-offending pedophiles (NOPs) - that is, pedophilic individuals who do not (and do not intend to) act upon their sexual interest – have recently become of interest to researchers and clinicians (Cantor & McPhail, 2016). For example, treatment and prevention programs have been developed to help NOPs, such as Germany's Project Prevention Dunkelfeld, StopSO in the UK, and "Help Wanted" (for pedophilic adolescents) in the USA. However, NOPs who wish to seek help are often faced with harsh and stigmatizing judgments from other people.

Stigma is an attribute (e.g., condition or status) that is subject to devaluation (Pescosolido & Martin, 2015). Stigma towards pedophiles is proposed to have two main ramifications (Jahnke & Hoyer, 2013). The first is that it can hinder the prevention of contact sexual offending by discouraging NOPs to seek help (Jahnke, Schmidt, Geradt, & Hoyer, 2015). Second, stigmatization can increase the likelihood of a NOP engaging in a sexual offense. That is, the effects of stigmatization on NOPs, such as decreased social and emotional functioning (Jahnke, Schmidt, et al., 2015), are associated with the etiology of contact sexual offending behavior (Ward & Beech, 2006). Thus, it is important for researchers to investigate the nature of this stigma more fully.

Some researchers have taken on this task. Imhoff (2015) found that stigmatizing and punitive attitudes towards pedophiles were greater if participants were presented with the term 'pedophile' versus a more descriptive phrase (i.e., 'people with a sexual interest in prepubescent children'). Jahnke, Imhoff, and Hoyer (2015) found that pedophiles were stigmatized to a greater degree than alcoholics and people with sexual sadism and antisocial tendencies. This stigma is likely influenced by the misconception that they all engage in

contact sexual offending. Indeed, “sexually abusing children” is typically deemed a characteristic of pedophiles (McCartan, 2010). Arguably, this misconception is largely driven by the manner in which sexual *offenders* against children are represented in the media. For example, in UK news outlets, people who commit contact sexual offenses against children are often referred to as ‘pedophiles’ (Feelgood & Hoyer, 2008), often in conjunction with dehumanizing terms such ‘monster’ and ‘beast’ (Harper & Hogue, 2015).

In a recent study, Harper, Bartels, and Hogue (2016) found that participants presented with video-based information about pedophilia from the perspective of a NOP showed reduced stigmatizing views about pedophiles, relative to those who were presented with information by an academic expert. This study highlights the benefits of using context-specified stimuli to examine people’s judgments of NOPs. Moreover, it indicates the video-based stimuli is an effective medium to use in this field of study. Indeed, Sled, Durrheim, Kriel, Solomon, and Baxter (2002) argued that video vignettes are more useful than written vignettes for evoking beliefs and perceptions as they provide richer contextual information. This formed the basis of the study reported in this brief communication.

Present Study

Using video-based stimuli, the present study examined how people respond to pedophiles that differ in terms of whether they have offended or not. It can be hypothesized that people would judge an offending pedophile (OP) more harshly, as they match the stereotypical, media-perpetuated view of a pedophile (King & Roberts, 2015). We also aimed to investigate the potential stigma of adolescent NOPS, given the importance of helping adolescent NOPs who are in the throes of discovering their sexual preferences (Letourneau, 2016). It can be argued that an adolescent NOP would be judged less negatively than an older NOP because of the stereotype that pedophiles are “dirty old men” (Murray, 2000). Furthermore, in an unpublished qualitative study examining public commentary about an

adolescent pedophile, one comment read “more research needs to be done to find a way to help pedophiles. I would really like to see more help for the sexually confused from a young age, it could prevent a lot of pain” (Theaker, 2015; p.34). Arguably, these perceptions of adolescent NOPs would likely lead to less negative judgments.

Based on the above propositions, the present study comprised three specific aims. The first was to test whether a short video-clip would elicit more stigmatizing judgments about an OP compared to a NOP (Hypothesis 1). A control condition involving a male who had failed a job interview was also included. The second aim was to determine whether an older pedophile would be judged more harshly than an adolescent pedophile (Hypothesis 2). Finally, given that people tend to hold negative and general stigmatizing attitudes towards NOPs (Imhoff, 2015) and sexual offenders (Harper, Hogue, & Bartels, 2017), we investigated whether these attitudes were greater following the offending clip, compared to the NOP and control clips (Hypothesis 3 and 4).

Method

Participants

Eighty-nine participants (males = 29; females = 60) were recruited from the general community and student population in the UK ($M_{age} = 27.76$, $SD = 12.58$, range = 18-62). Participants were recruited via a university participation scheme and by directly approaching prospective participants. Participants were not made aware of the experimental manipulation or hypotheses until after taking part.

Design

A 3 (Condition; Non-offender vs. Offender vs. Control) by 2 (Age; Older vs. Younger Male) mixed experimental design was adopted, with condition as the between-subjects factor and Age as the within-subjects factor. The dependent variables were self-reported judgments

about the male in the video clip; attitudes towards pedophiles; and attitudes towards sexual offenders.

Materials

Video clips. The experimental manipulation used was the video clip presented in each condition. The clips were modeled on the 30 second television advert used by Project Prevention Dunkelfeld. This advert depicts various men representing NOPs, who each describe the stigma they face. They also dispel some of the myths associated with pedophilia (e.g., stating that it is a non-chosen preference, but that behavior is a choice). The advert can be found at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ck3uOCyWB50>.

Three video-clips were created using a male actor in his forties. The clips presented a 47 year old male who was either: (1) a pedophile who had never offended and wanted help to manage his attraction children; (2) a pedophile who had offended but did not want to offend anymore and wanted help; and (3) a man asking for help following a failed job interview (control condition). The actor's script for each video was identical except for the contextual information pertinent to the condition (see Appendix). Another three videos were created to represent a 15 year old male, using a male actor in his early twenties. These videos were identical to the three described above, except for the name, age, and familial information. All six videos were filmed by the first author in a quiet room on a plain white background. Once recorded, the face of the actor in each video was pixilated. This kept the actor anonymous and ensured that their faces did not bias the participants' perception. The videos lasted between 25 and 30 seconds.

Stigma and Punitiveness Scale (SPS; Imhoff, 2015). The 30-item SPS assesses stigmatizing views about pedophiles. It contains four subscales: 'Dangerousness' ($\alpha = .62$); 'Intentionality' ($\alpha = .81$), and 'Deviance' ($\alpha = .37$), and Punitiveness ($\alpha = .85$). Items are rated using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree).

Higher scores indicate greater stigmatized and punitive views about pedophiles. Due to a poor alpha level in this study (see above), the 'Deviance' subscale was excluded.

Attitudes Towards Sex Offenders scale: 21-item version (ATS-21; Hogue & Harper, 2015). The ATS-21 measures existing attitude towards sexual offenders. It includes 21 statements about sexual offenders, which are rated on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 0 (Strongly disagree) to 4 (Strongly agree). Higher scores reflect more positive (or less negative) attitudes towards sexual offenders. In the present study, the ATS-21 demonstrated excellent internal consistency ($\alpha = .92$).

Judgments Questionnaire (JQ). An 11-item questionnaire was created to measure participants' perception of the male in the video clips. This outcome measure was administered twice (i.e., after each video clip). Each item represented a statement, which was rated using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree; 5 = Strongly Agree). Each item referred to "*the male in the video*" to ensure the questionnaire remained identical across all conditions, and referred to the person in the video clip rather than pedophiles (or offenders/men) in general. Like the SPS, the JQ embodied various dimensions of stigmatization (i.e., deviance, dangerousness, intentionality), as well as punitiveness (see Tables 1 and 2). For the older male and younger male JQ, internal reliabilities were acceptable to good for the 'dangerousness' (α 's = .81 and .75, respectively) and 'punitiveness' subscale (α 's = .72 and .79, respectively). However, the internal reliability of the 'intentionality' and 'deviance' dimensions were extremely low for both the older male and younger male JQs (α 's < .40). Thus, only 'dangerousness' and 'punitiveness' were analyzed.

Procedure

Each participant was allocated to one of the three experimental conditions. After reading the brief and consenting to take part, the participants provided demographic information (e.g., age, gender). Next, each participant watched their assigned video clips on a

laptop. The order of the two clips (i.e., older male first versus younger male first) was counterbalanced between participants. Immediately after watching each clip, participants completed the JQ via the survey software Qualtrics. Finally, the SPS and ATS-21 were completed, the order of which was randomized between participants. After the study, each participant was fully debriefed and thanked for their time.

Results

The descriptive statistics for each item of the JQ are displayed in Table 1 for the older male and Table 2 for the younger male. As Table 1 shows, 6.9% of participants ($n = 2$) in the control condition stated that the older male should be chemically castrated. This may indicate that these participants were not legitimately engaged in the task. Thus, to increase the validity of the findings, these two participants were removed from further analyses. Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics for the dangerousness and punitiveness JQ data, ATS-21, and SPS subscales ($N = 87$).

Insert Table 1 here

Insert Table 2 here

Insert Table 3 here

Correlations

The punitiveness JQ score for the young males and older males were strongly interrelated ($r = .75, p < .001$), as were the dangerousness JQ scores ($r = .86, < .001$). The punitiveness and dangerousness JQ scores for the young males were also strongly correlated ($r = .64, p < .001$), as well as the older males ($r = .71, p < .001$). The ATS-21 was found to

have a negative correlation with the punitiveness JQ score for the young males ($r = -.49, p < .001$) and older males ($r = -.42, p < .001$). A similar relationship was found between the ATS-21 and dangerousness JQ scores for the young males ($r = -.45, p < .001$) and older males ($r = -.40, p < .001$). This indicates that negative attitudes towards sex offenders was related to negative judgments about the males.

The punitiveness JQ score for the younger males was positively correlated with the Dangerousness ($r = .30, p = .005$) and Punitiveness ($r = .52, p < .001$) subscales of the SPS, but not Intentionality ($p > .05$). The punitiveness JQ score for the older males was also related to the Dangerousness and Punitiveness SPS subscales (r 's = .28 and .54, p 's = .009 and $< .001$, respectively), with the addition of Intentionality ($r = .22, p = .045$). The dangerousness JQ scores for the younger males was positively correlated with the Intentionality ($r = .25, p = .02$), Dangerousness ($r = .43, p < .001$), and Punitiveness ($r = .40, p < .001$) SPS subscales. Similarly, the dangerousness JQ score for the older males was positively related to the SPS subscales; Intentionality ($r = .25, p = .019$), Dangerousness ($r = .33, p = .002$), and Punitiveness ($r = .41, p < .001$). Finally, the ATS-21 was found to have a strong, negative relationship with the Intentionality ($r = -.49, p < .001$), Dangerousness ($r = -.59, p < .001$), and Punitiveness ($r = -.74, p < .001$) SPS subscales.

Arguably, these correlations could be expected due to the within-subjects component of the design. That is, the JQ scores for the younger and older male are derived from identical questionnaires completed within a short amount of time of each other, in response to two very similar videos. Since video order was noted during data collection, we explored whether the correlations still hold for each JQ score for the first video only. We split the data file by those who watched the older male first and younger male first, and re-ran the correlation analyses. As shown in Table 4, the same stronger correlations remained. Thus, these ancillary analyses helped substantiate the correlations found with the full sample.

Insert Table 4 here

Judgments about the Male in the Video

To test Hypotheses 1 and 2, we ran a 3 (Condition; between-subjects factor) by 2 (Age; within-subjects factor) mixed ANOVA on the punitiveness and dangerousness JQ scores. For punitiveness, a significant main effect of Condition was found, $F(1,84) = 14.34, p < .001$, but not Age, $F(1,84) = 1.96, p = .17$, or the interaction, $F(2,84) = 2.28, p = .12$. Pairwise comparisons (with Bonferroni corrections) revealed that punitiveness judgments were higher towards the OPs ($M = 7.45, SE = .36$) than the NOPs ($M = 5.07, SE = .37; p < .001, d = 1.10$) and controls ($M = 5.02, SE = .39; p < .001, d = 1.21$).

For dangerousness, there was a significant main effect of Condition, $F(1,84) = 16.36, p < .001$, but not Age, $F(1,84) = 2.10, p = .16$. However, the interaction between Condition and Age was significant, $F(2,84) = 3.34, p = .04$. Simple main effects (with Bonferroni corrections) indicated that: (a) the older OP was judged as more dangerous ($M = 11.16, SE = .41$) than the older NOP ($M = 8.93, SE = .42; p = .001, d = 1.15$) and older control ($M = 7.93, SE = .44; p < .001, d = 1.33$); and (b) the younger OP was judged as more dangerous ($M = 10.65, SE = .39$) than the younger NOP ($M = 9.24, SE = .41; p = .044, d = 0.71$) and younger control ($M = 7.52, SE = .42; p < .001, d = 1.38$), and the younger NOP was judged to be more dangerous than the younger control ($p = .01, d = 0.73$); and (c) within the OP condition, the older male was rated as more dangerous than the younger male ($p = .03, d = 0.27$). This latter result provides partial support for Hypothesis 2 (in relation to dangerousness), but the effect size is small (Cohen, 1988).

Testing demand effects

In hindsight, it can be argued that the participants' judgments towards the second male may have been influenced by the knowledge gained from the content of the first video and JQ measure. Therefore, using responses from the first videos only, we split the sample into those who watched the video of the older male ($n = 39$) and those who watched the video of the younger male ($n = 48$). A 2 (Age) by 3 (Condition) independent samples ANOVA was then ran on the punitiveness and dangerousness JQ scores.

For punitiveness, a main effect of Condition was again found, $F(1,81) = 8.83, p < .001$, with OPs judged more punitively ($M = 7.25, SE = .41$) than the NOPs ($M = 5.21, SE = .43; p = .003$) and controls ($M = 4.99, SE = .45; p = .001$). As before, there was no main effect of Age, $F(1,81) = 3.27, p = .07$, and no interaction effect, $F(2,81) = 1.04, p = .36$. For dangerousness, we found a main effect of Condition, $F(1,81) = 13.81, p < .001$, and Age, $F(1,81) = 7.56, p = .007$, as well as a significant interaction, $F(2,81) = 3.85, p = .025$. Simple main effects (with Bonferroni corrections) revealed that: (a) the older OP was judged as more dangerous ($M = 11.19, SE = .51$) than the older NOP ($M = 9.08, SE = .59; p = .025$) and older control ($M = 9.18, SE = .62; p = .04$); and (b) the younger OP was judged as more dangerous ($M = 10.07, SE = .53$) than the younger control ($M = 6.38, SE = .51; p < .001$), and the younger NOP was judged more dangerous than the younger control ($p < .001$). These results are in accordance with the findings using the full sample, except for the difference between the young OP and NOP, and the difference between the older and younger OP (both now non-significant).

Attitudes towards Sex Offenders and Pedophiles

Differences on the ATS-21 between conditions were examined using a one-way ANOVA. The result was not significant, $F(2,84) = 0.23, p = .78$. Thus, Hypothesis 3 was not supported. Similarly, one-way ANOVAs were run on the SPS subscales to test whether

Condition affected participants' stigmatizing attitudes about pedophiles. The results indicated no differences for Intentionality ($F(2,84) = 1.23, p = .29$); Dangerousness ($F(2,84) = 0.83, p = .44$), or Punitiveness ($F(2,84) = 1.12, p = .33$). Thus, Hypothesis 4 was not supported.

Discussion

Using short video stimuli, the present study investigated: (1) whether judgments about a male offending pedophile (OP) differ to those of a male non-offending pedophile (NOP), and control; (2) whether these judgments differ based on the age of the male; and (3) whether stigmatizing and punitive attitudes towards pedophiles and sexual offenders are affected by the video stimuli. In partial support of Hypothesis 1, OPs were judged as more deserving of punishment than NOPs. Punitiveness judgments did not differ between the NOPs and controls. One explanation for this is that the video-clips were successful in humanizing NOPs, in turn, reducing stigmatizing judgments to the point where they were not different from the control. Alternatively, knowing that the study was related to pedophiles may have primed participants, inflating their punitive judgments about the control male (despite not being presented as a pedophile).

An interaction between condition and age for dangerousness judgments was also observed. Based on both the main and ancillary analyses, this result was not in accordance with Hypothesis 2 (i.e., a difference between the older and younger pedophiles). Rather, the older OP was judged as more dangerous than the older NOP and control, with no difference between the latter two. However, the younger OP and NOP did not differ from each other, but were both judged as more dangerous than the younger control. Thus, while participants made less stigmatizing judgments about the older NOP (in terms of being less dangerous than the OP and no more dangerous than the control), this was not the case for the younger NOP. It can be argued that the video stimuli did not have a positive effect on judgments towards

younger pedophiles. This may be because younger pedophilic males are seen as more dangerous (regardless of whether have offended or not) due to a perception that they are less able to control their urges (e.g., due to a lack maturity or experience). Alternatively, participants may have thought that, because the adolescent males are closer in age to children, they may have a stronger desire to offend and/or have easier (and less suspicious) access to children. It is important for future research to address these questions and unpack the way in which NOP-related stigma manifests in relation adolescents, especially given that helping adolescent NOPs is a crucial route to preventing sexual offending (Letourneau, 2016).

Finally, no differences were found between conditions on participants' existing attitudes toward pedophiles and sexual offenders. This suggests that these attitudes may be more enduring and, thus, less likely to be affected by brief video-based stimuli. Note, however, that the pattern of responses were in the expected direction on the Dangerousness and Punitiveness SPS subscales (see Table 3), with non-negligible effect sizes (d 's = 0.35 and 0.31, respectively).

Limitations

Since this preliminary study offers useful implications for future researchers, it is important to note its limitations. First, the study suffers from being underpowered. Thus, replications and extensions of this work should use larger, more representative samples of the public (e.g., by using an online format). Second, baseline judgments were not assessed. Thus, it is not known whether the video stimuli actually *reduced* stigmatizing views towards NOPs. Future researchers should include an assessment of baseline judgments to allow for a comparison of pre- and post-manipulation judgments. Third, two participants were removed because they stated that the younger control male should be chemically castrated. This may indicate that not all participants were being sincere in their answers. Future research should include quality control questions presented at random points throughout the study to help

screen-out participants who do not pay attention or appear to respond spuriously. Finally, future studies should use a between-subjects design, rather than presenting younger and older videos as a within-subjects factor. This will avoid potential cross-over effects. Although our ancillary analyses (using just the first videos) helped to validate the results found from our mixed-model analyses, follow-up research is needed to corroborate these findings.

Concluding remarks

Research into pedophilia-related stigma is in its infancy but immensely important for sexual offending prevention. Thus, it is crucial that researchers continue to investigate and understand this phenomenon. The presents study suggests that context-specific video stimuli may be a useful approach to do this. That is, it invites participants to make judgments in response to a particular circumstance (or set of circumstances), rather than in an abstract manner as if they apply equally across all contexts (Finch, 1987). Thus, video-based stimuli may be a more sensitive strategy for examining context-specific factors related to stigmatizing judgments towards NOPs and OPs. We believe the current findings are a useful addition to the existing research base and hope future researchers will adopt the methodology in future studies.

References

- Ahlers, C. J., Schaefer, G. A., Mundt, I. A., Roll, S., Englert, H., Willich, S. N., & Beier, K. M. (2011). How unusual are the contents of paraphilias? Paraphilia-associated sexual arousal patterns in a community-based sample of men. *Journal of Sexual Medicine, 8*, 1362-1370. doi:10.1111/j.1743-6109.2009.01597.x
- Cantor, J. M., & McPhail, I. V. (2016). Non-offending pedophiles. *Current Sexual Health Reports, 8*, 121–128. doi:10.1007/s11930-016-0076-z
- Dombert, B., Schmidt, A. F., Banse, R., Briken, P., Hoyer, J., Neutze, J., & Osterheider, M. (2016). How common is men's self-reported sexual interest in prepubescent children? *The Journal of Sex Research, 53*, 214-223.
- Feelgood, S., & Hoyer, J. (2008). Child molester or paedophile? Sociolegal versus psychopathological classification of sexual offenders against children. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 14*, 33–43. doi: 10.1080/13552600802133860.
- Harper, C., & Hogue, T. (2015). The emotional representation of sexual crime in the National British Press. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 34*, 3-24. doi:10.1177/0261927X14544474.
- Harper, C. A., Hogue, T. E., & Bartels, R. M. (2017). Attitudes towards sexual offenders: What do we know, and why are they important? *Aggression and Violent Behavior*. Advanced online version. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2017.01.011
- Harper, C. A., Bartels, R. M., & Hogue, T. A. (2016). Reducing stigma and punitive attitudes towards pedophiles through narrative humanization. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*. Advanced Online Version. doi: 10.1177/1079063216681561.
- Hogue, T. E., & Harper, C. A. (2015). *The 21-item short version of the Attitudes to Sex Offenders (ATS) scale*. Unpublished data.

- Imhoff, R. (2015). Punitive attitudes against pedophiles or persons with sexual interest in children: does the label matter? *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *44*, 35-44.
doi:10.1007/s10508-014-0439-3.
- Jahnke, S., & Hoyer, J. (2013). Stigmatization of people with pedophilia: A blind spot in stigma research. *International Journal of Sexual Health*, *25*, 169-184.
doi: 10.1080/19317611.2013.795921.
- Jahnke, S., Imhoff, R., & Hoyer, J. (2015). Stigmatization of People with Pedophilia: Two Comparative Surveys. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *44*, 21-34.
doi:10.1007/s10508-014-0312-4.
- Jahnke, S., Schmidt, A. F., Geradt, M., & Hoyer, J. (2015). Stigma-related stress and its correlates among men with pedophilic sexual interests. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *44*, 2173-2187. doi:10.1007/s10508-015-0503-7.
- King, L. L., & Roberts, J. J. (2015). The complexity of public attitudes toward sex crimes. *Victims & Offenders*. Advance online version. doi: 10.1080/15564886.2015.1005266.
- Letourneau, E. (2016). "Can Programs Like "Help Wanted" Prevent Child Sexual Abuse? How do we help all children lead happier, healthier lives?" Retrieved from:
<https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/prevention-now/201612/can-programs-help-wanted-prevent-child-sexual-abuse>.
- McCartan, K. (2010). Student/trainee-professional implicit theories of pedophilia. *Psychology, Crime, & Law*, *16*, 265-288. doi:10.1080/10683160802614144.
- Murray, J. B. (2000). Psychological profile of pedophiles and child molesters. *The Journal of Psychology*, *134*, 211-224. doi:10.1080/00223980009600863.
- Pescosolido, B. A., & Martin, J. K. (2015). The stigma complex. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *41*, 87-116. doi:10.1146/annurev-soc-071312-145702.

Sleed, M., Durrheim, K., Kriel, A., Solomon, V., & Baxter, V. (2002). The effectiveness of the vignette methodology: A comparison of written and video vignettes in eliciting responses about date rape. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 32, 21-28.

Theaker, E. A. (2015) *Reframing the non-offending pedophile to combat child sexual abuse: A content analysis of public response to Luke Malone's "Help Wanted"*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Bothell, WA: University of Washington Bothell.

Ward, T., & Beech, A. (2006). An integrated theory of sexual offending. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 11, 44-63. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2005.05.002.

Pre-proof version

Appendix

The script for the experimental video clip stimuli

Hi, I'm Peter/Daniel and I am a 47 year old [OR 15 year old; *young condition*] British male. For a while now I have known I was a bit different, I have a sexual interest in children. I have not acted on these fantasies but they are a part of me and my life. I worry I will never be able to change these feelings, but I have no intention of ever hurting anyone [OR and I wish I hadn't hurt anyone; *offender condition*]. I know it is wrong to feel this way about children but I don't know who to turn to. I dare not tell my wife and two young children [OR parents or brother; *young male condition*]. I suppose I will be like this forever...unless I can find help.

The scripts for the control video clip stimuli

Hi I'm Peter/Daniel and I am a 47 year old [OR 15 year old; *young condition*] British male. I have a wife and two children [OR I currently attend a school. I live with my parents and elder brother; *young condition*]. I have just been for a job interview for a promotion, which went terribly. I know that it's a big part of me and my life. I feel like such a disappointment and I worry I will never be able to change these feelings, but I had no intention of ever hurting anyone. I dare not tell my wife or children. I suppose I will be a failure forever...unless I can find help.

Table 1: Means, SDs, and frequency of agreements (%) with each item of JQ in relation to the older male, across conditions

Items	Non-offending Pedophile			Offending Pedophile			Control Condition		
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Agree ^a	Uncertain ^b	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Agree ^a	Uncertain ^b	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Agree ^a	Uncertain ^b
1. The individual in the video should receive confidential help* (De)	1.24 (.44)	100.00	0.00	1.39 (.67)	96.80	0.00	1.93 (.80)	86.20	6.90
2. The individual in the video should go to prison (Pu)	1.93 (.70)	3.40	10.30	3.74 (.93)	70.90	19.40	2.41 (1.15)	24.10	20.70
3. The individual in the video is a nasty person (Da)	2.21 (.62)	0.00	31.00	2.74 (.86)	12.90	51.60	2.41 (.91)	13.80	27.60
4. The individual in the video is a risk to children (Da)	3.59 (1.02)	62.00	17.20	4.61 (.50)	100.00	0.00	2.86 (1.25)	34.40	20.70
5. The individual in the video is mentally ill* (De)	2.62 (.94)	51.70	31.00	2.61 (1.23)	48.40	25.80	3.14 (.95)	17.20	51.70
6. The individual in the video cannot be helped (De)	2.00 (.80)	3.40	20.70	2.10 (.75)	6.50	12.90	1.97 (.68)	0.00	20.70
7. The individual in the video should be chemically castrated (Pu)	1.66 (.77)	3.40	6.90	2.26 (1.03)	16.10	9.70	1.69 (.97)	6.90	13.80
8. The individual in the video cannot help the way he feels* (In)	2.48 (1.09)	62.10	20.70	2.77 (1.02)	38.70	32.30	2.72 (1.03)	51.70	20.70
9. The individual in the video is responsible for his own actions (In)	4.52 (.57)	96.60	3.40	4.42 (.62)	93.60	6.50	4.10 (.67)	82.80	17.20
10. The individual in the video cannot be trusted (Da)	3.14 (.83)	34.4	41.40	3.81 (.95)	64.50	25.80	2.86 (1.06)	24.10	41.40
11. The individual in the video should get the death sentence (Pu)	1.34 (.67)	0.00	10.30	1.77 (.90)	3.20	9.70	1.38 (.56)	0.00	3.40

JQ = Judgment Questionnaire. Items with an asterisk are reverse scored. De = Deviance, Da = Dangerousness, Pu = Punitive, In = Intentionality

^a Based on a score of 4 or 5 (on a 5-point Likert scale)

^b Based on a score of 3 (on a 5-point Likert scale)

Table 2: Means, SDs, and frequency of agreements (%) with each item of JQ in relation to the younger male, across conditions

Items	Non-offending Pedophile			Offending Pedophile			Control Condition		
	<i>M(SD)</i>	Agree ^a	Uncertain ^b	<i>M(SD)</i>	Agree ^a	Uncertain ^b	<i>M(SD)</i>	Agree ^a	Uncertain ^b
1. The individual in the video should receive confidential help* (De)	1.38 (.81)	96.6	0.00	1.31 (.65)	96.8	0.00	1.90 (.98)	82.80	10.3
2. The individual in the video should go to prison (Pu)	1.97 (.87)	3.40	13.80	3.32 (1.11)	48.40	29.00	2.10 (.94)	6.90	27.60
3. The individual in the video is a nasty person (Da)	2.31 (.60)	0.00	37.90	2.58 (.89)	16.10	35.50	2.28 (.84)	6.90	31.00
4. The individual in the video is a risk to children (Da)	3.79 (.94)	72.40	13.30	4.45 (.62)	93.50	6.50	2.76 (1.22)	31.00	24.10
5. The individual in the video is mentally ill* (De)	2.69 (1.12)	48.30	24.10	2.61 (1.12)	51.60	22.60	3.28 (.96)	20.70	44.80
6. The individual in the video cannot be helped (De)	1.93 (.84)	3.40	20.70	1.97 (.66)	3.20	9.70	2.07 (.88)	3.40	20.70
7. The individual in the video should be chemically castrated (Pu)	1.79 (.94)	3.40	13.80	2.13 (1.18)	13.00	16.10	1.55 (.83)	3.40	10.30
8. The individual in the video cannot help the way he feels* (In)	2.21 (.82)	75.90	13.80	2.55 (1.03)	48.40	35.50	2.62 (1.12)	58.60	17.20
9. The individual in the video is responsible for his own actions (In)	4.38 (.62)	93.10	6.90	4.32 (.60)	93.50	6.50	3.90 (1.05)	79.30	6.90
10. The individual in the video cannot be trusted (Da)	3.14 (1.03)	31.00	48.30	3.61 (1.02)	48.40	38.70	2.72 (.96)	17.20	44.80
11. The individual in the video should get the death sentence (Pu)	1.45 (.91)	3.40	6.90	1.68 (.91)	3.20	9.70	1.34 (.55)	0.00	3.40

JQ = Judgment Questionnaire. Items with an asterisk are reverse scored. . De = Deviance, Da = Dangerousness, Pu = Punitive, In = Intentionality

^a Based on a score of 4 or 5 (on a 5-point Likert scale)

^b Based on a score of 3 (on a 5-point Likert scale)

Table 3: Demographic data and means (standard deviation) for the JQ_{dangerousness}, JQ_{punitiveness}, ATS-21, and SPS across conditions and full sample

		Non-offending Pedophile (<i>n</i> = 29)	Offending Pedophile (<i>n</i> = 31)	Control Condition (<i>n</i> = 27)	Full sample (<i>N</i> = 87)
Gender (<i>n</i>):	Male	7 (24.1%)	11 (35.5%)	11 (37.9%)	29 (33.3%)
	Female	22 (75.9%)	20 (64.5%)	16 (59.7%)	58 (66.7%)
Age:	Mean (<i>SD</i>)	27.8 (12.70)	26.55 (12.09)	29.30 (13.50)	27.80 (12.65)
	Range	19-62 years	18-59 years	19-56 years	18-62 years
JQ for younger male					
Dangerousness		9.24 (2.05)	10.65 (1.91)	7.52 (2.58)	9.21 (2.51)
Punitive		5.21 (2.48)	7.13 (2.68)	4.82 (1.76)	5.77 (2.55)
JQ for older male					
Dangerousness		8.93 (2.03)	11.16 (1.83)	7.93 (2.91)	9.41 (2.64)
Punitive		4.93 (1.91)	7.77 (2.26)	5.22 (1.74)	6.04 (2.37)
Attitudinal Measures					
ATS-21		41.83 (13.37)	43.19 (12.82)	40.78 (12.59)	41.99 (12.83)
Dangerousness (SPS)		22.00 (4.19)	23.39 (3.81)	23.07 (4.97)	22.83 (4.31)
Intentionality (SPS)		22.10 (6.43)	22.65 (7.49)	24.85 (6.75)	23.15 (6.94)
Punitive attitudes (SPS)		47.76 (11.74)	51.39 (11.52)	52.22 (12.77)	50.44 (12.01)

Note: JQ = Judgment Questionnaire. ATS-21 = Attitudes Towards Sex Offenders scale – 21 item version.

SPS = Stigma and Punitiveness Scale. Lower scores on the ATS-21 reflect more negative attitudes.

Table 4: Correlations between JQ scores for the first videos and other attitudinal measures

	Old Punitive JQ	Old Dangerous JQ	Young Punitive JQ	Young Dangerous JQ
Old Punitive JQ (<i>N</i> = 48)	-			
Old Dangerous JQ (<i>N</i> = 48)	.76***	-		
Young Punitive JQ (<i>N</i> = 39)	n/a	n/a	-	
Young Dangerous JQ (<i>N</i> = 39)	n/a	n/a	.60***	-
ATS-21	-.42**	-.40*	-.46***	-.41**
SPS Punitive	.58***	.50***	.48***	.37*
SPS Dangerousness	.28	.43**	.32*	.41**
SPS Intentionality	.15	.34*	.13	.17

*** = $p < .001$, ** = $p < .01$, * = $p < .05$