Fellow Traveller versus Moral Stranger: How overall views of offenders impact on
punishment and rehabilitation decisions

by

Stephanie Louise Fisher

A thesis
submitted to Victoria University of Wellington
in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in Psychology

Victoria University of Wellington
2013

Abstract

Theoretical discussions have proposed that opinions relating to offenders can be viewed along a continuum, with the moral stranger at one end and the fellow traveller at the other (Connolly & Ward, 2008). At the very basic level the moral stranger is the offender who *is* a bad person, while the fellow traveller is the offender who has *done* a bad thing. It is proposed that where an individual's view of offenders sits on the continuum will help determine punishment and rehabilitation decisions that they make about offenders. It is further proposed that these views are influenced by outside factors such as the way that the media portrays offenders. The media is an important source of information on crime and offenders (Gilliam & Iyengar, 2000; Klite, Bardwell, & Salzman, 1997), and so the way that the media write about offenders can influence the public's opinions about offenders. The moral stranger and the fellow traveller are theoretical concepts at present, so the aim of the current research was to investigate these concepts in an empirical context. Firstly, Studies 1 and 2 presented crime vignettes written from either the moral stranger perspective or the fellow traveller perspective and then investigated what punishment and rehabilitation differences there were. Study 3 then developed a measure to evaluate individuals' opinions about offenders, to create an empirical basis for the existing theory. The Opinions about Criminal Offenders (OCO) Scale was developed in Study 3. Study 4 then tested the psychometric properties of this Scale, and through further factor analysis the scale was pared down to 12-items made up of four subscales. Study 5 then brought together the empirical work from Studies 1 and 2 and the developed measure from Studies 3 and 4. Participants were presented with two vignettes, one written from a subjective view and the other from an objective view. They were also given the 12-item OCO Scale. Structural Equation Modelling was then used to extend the work of Studies 1 and 2, and to further develop the decision making process individuals go through. Results indicated that each subscale of the OCO predicted different judgements made about the offender, in terms of his characteristics and likelihood of reoffending, and that these judgements then predicted different judgements about the outcome of the offence, including punishment motive. These studies, together, show that the moral stranger and fellow traveller concepts do exist, as a continuum, and the development of the OCO Scale showed that there is utility in the scale in terms of the type of judgements made about an offender and an offence. The current study was conducted with a sex offence in the vignettes and so further research needs to extend this by using different offence types and different offender characteristics, to investigate how generalisable these findings are.

Acknowledgements

Firstly I would like to thank my primary supervisor, Dr Matt Crawford, for all the encouragement, support and movie recommendations over the last 3 and half years. I know that it was a bureaucratic decision that resulted in you becoming my supervisor and I wasn't sure how I felt about that decision at first but I think that it was the best thing that could have happened for me and my research. I honestly don't think I would have been able to complete this research without your knowledge and guidance, so I am immensely grateful to the Committee, or whoever it was, that made the executive decision that you would be my primary supervisor. Thank you for everything, and also a big thank you to your wife, Carmen, for the data entry work that she did for me. It was much appreciated!

To my secondary supervisor, Prof. Tony Ward: you inspire me and I am so thankful that I was able to take some of your theoretical work and turn it into an empirical body of research. I hope that you can be proud of what I have done with your ideas, and I appreciate all of the input, advice and encouragement you have given me over the years. I would also like to thank Dr Paul Jose for his excellent Structural Equation Modelling lecture and the extra help that he gave me when trying to learn how to do this work myself.

My parents, my rock; thank you so much for everything you have ever done for me. You have both been a constant support to me, and have always appreciated my 'stress' baking – perhaps now that the thesis is complete there might be less stress and therefore less baking? Mum and Dad, I feel so lucky to have you both in my life and you really are two of my best friends, as well as being my parents. And Henry, I know you don't really know what I have been doing at uni all these years but you have always been there to chat to or hang out with, and I think that we are both very lucky that we have such a good relationship...I don't think all siblings get on quite as well as we do!

My Clin Kids – both past and present classmates, thank you all for being so awesome. It's a tough road completing the clinical program and a thesis and I thank you all for the support you have given me and I wish you all the best with your own academic achievements.

To my amazing friends, thank you all for being there for me and supporting me over the years. I know that it hasn't always been easy and there have been many times when I've been stressed or too busy to really be much fun but I appreciate that you have all stuck with me and given me the support and encouragement that I needed, whether from close or afar. I especially want to thank my Darshi, Brylee, Geraldine, Cecilia, Katie, and Jason – you all

mean so much to me and I feel very privileged to have you as my closest friends. My U.S.A. crew: I know that we don't see each other very often, and I wish that I could change that, but I still love you all and appreciate that no matter how much time we have spent apart we can just pick up right where we left off. My gym crew, especially our great trainer, Dan: I think all the Overloading over the last year plus has really helped me stay sane while trying to finish this thing! Thanks guys!

Finally, to my Cougar! You are the most amazing cat (you play fetch!!) and I love you so much. Thank you for being so darn gorgeous and always knowing when I need an extra cuddle or two.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Preface	xiv
Chapter 1	1
Crime and the Media	1
Newsworthiness and the Media	2
Crime Representation in the Media	5
Violent Crime	6
Stereotypes of Offenders and Victims	8
Effects on the Viewing Public	10
Fear of Crime	10
Opinions and Punishment Decisions	14
Concluding Remarks	22
Chapter 2	23
Human Rights in Corrections	23
The Dangerous Offender	25
Belief Systems	27
Moral Stranger versus Fellow Traveller	28
The Current Research	37
Studies One and Two	38
Studies Three and Four	39
Study Five	39
Counterfactual Generation	40
Concluding Remarks	40
Chapter 3	44
Study One	44
Hypotheses	46
Method	46
Design and Participants	46
Materials	47
Dependent Variables	51
Procedure	54
Results	56
Reliability Analysis	56
Multivariate Analysis of Variance	63

Mediation Analysis	66
Structural Equation Modelling.....	67
Discussion	70
Mediation Analysis	72
Structural Equation Model.....	73
Concluding Remarks.....	73
Chapter 4	75
Study Two	75
Hypotheses	77
Method	79
Participants and Design.....	79
Materials	80
Dependent Measures	80
Procedure	81
Results.....	82
Principal Components Analysis	82
Multivariate Analysis of Variance	89
Structural Equation Modelling.....	93
Discussion	96
Replication of Study One Results	97
Extension of the Structural Equation Model.....	98
Concluding Remarks.....	102
Chapter 5	104
Study 3	104
Character and Society	104
Change and Rehabilitation.....	105
Culpability and Intent	105
Subject versus Object.....	106
Initial Item Generation.....	106
Hypotheses.....	107
Method	107
Participants.....	107
Demographic information.....	108
Materials	109
Procedure	110
Results.....	112
Factor Analysis	112

MANOVA Analysis.....	117
Discussion	130
Scale development	130
Exposure to crime	131
Demographics	132
Concluding remarks	132
Chapter 6	134
Study 4a	134
Method	134
Participants.....	134
Procedure	134
Results.....	135
Confirmatory Factor Analysis.....	135
CFA Conclusions	138
Discussion	138
Concluding remarks	139
Study 4b	139
Method	140
Participants.....	140
Materials	140
Convergent and Discriminant Validity Scales	140
Punitiveness Orientation Scale	140
Need to Evaluate Scale	141
Need for Closure Scale	142
Attributional Complexity Scale	143
Rational and Experiential Inventory	145
Dweck Scale.....	146
Procedure	147
Results.....	147
Test-Retest Reliability	147
Convergent and Discriminant Validity	148
Discussion	152
Test-Retest Reliability	152
Convergent and Discriminant Validity	153
Chapter 7	154
Study Five	154
Story Hypothesis	155

Structural Equation Model Hypotheses	156
Method	157
Design	157
Participants.....	157
Procedure and Materials	157
Results.....	161
Data Reduction.....	161
MANOVA Analysis.....	162
Structural Equation Modelling.....	162
Opinions about Criminal Offenders Scale	165
Judgements about the Offence	170
Study 2 Model.....	171
Model Fit.....	171
Discussion	173
MANOVA Analysis.....	173
Structural Equation Modelling Analysis.....	175
Concluding Remarks.....	177
Chapter 8	179
Counterfactual Generation	179
Study One Hypotheses.....	181
Study One Method	181
Design	181
Participants.....	182
Materials	182
Procedure	183
Results.....	184
Discussion	185
Study Five	188
Study Five Hypotheses	188
Study Five Method.....	189
Design	189
Participants.....	189
Materials	190
Procedure	190
Results.....	191
Discussion	194
Study One and Study Five Discussion.....	197

Chapter 9	201
General Discussion	201
Studies One and Two	201
Studies Three and Four	206
Study 5	209
Counterfactual Generation	212
Future Directions	215
Conclusions.....	219
References.....	221
Appendix A.....	239
Appendix B	253
Appendix C	261
Appendix D.....	265
Appendix E	269
Appendix F.....	281
Appendix G.....	284
Appendix H.....	301
Appendix I	316

List of Figures

<i>Figure 3.1</i>	Mediation effect of reoffending on the relationship between condition and severity	68
<i>Figure 3.2</i>	Measurement and structural model of relationships between condition, reoffending rating, internal attribution of cause and severity rating	69
<i>Figure 4.1</i>	Final structural equation model study 2	94
<i>Figure 6.1</i>	Structural Equation Model of OCO Scale.....	138
<i>Figure 7.1</i>	Structural Equation Model Studies 5	166

List of Tables

<i>Table 2.1</i>	Defining factors of the Moral Stranger/Fellow Traveller	30
<i>Table 3.1</i>	Reaction Scale PCA Study 1	58
<i>Table 3.2</i>	Correlations between factors	59
<i>Table 3.3</i>	Crime Opinion Scale Factor Analysis Study 1	61
<i>Table 3.4</i>	Correlations between factors	62
<i>Table 3.5</i>	Means and Standard Deviations on the Dependent Variables as a Function of Presentation Condition	64
<i>Table 3.6</i>	Model Fit Indices for Study 1 Structural Equation Model	70
<i>Table 4.1</i>	Trait Judgements PCA Study 2	84
<i>Table 4.2</i>	Correlations between factors	85
<i>Table 4.3</i>	Reaction Scale PCA Study 2	87
<i>Table 4.4</i>	Correlations between factors	88
<i>Table 4.5</i>	Means and Standard Deviations on the Dependent Variables as a Function of Presentation Condition Study 2	91
<i>Table 4.6</i>	Model Fit Indices for Study 2 Structural Equation Model	96
<i>Table 5.1</i>	EML Table for Study 3a and 3b Combined Final Version	115
<i>Table 5.2</i>	Correlation matrix between factors of the OCO Scale	116
<i>Table 5.3</i>	Means and Standard Deviations on the Dependent Variables as a Function of Committed Crime Study 3 Combined	120
<i>Table 5.4</i>	Means and Standard Deviations on the Dependent Variables as a Function of Victim of Crime Study 3 Combined	124
<i>Table 5.5</i>	Means and Standard Deviations on the Dependent Variables	

	as a Function of Know Victim of Crime Study 3 Combined	125
<i>Table 5.6</i>	Means and Standard Deviations on the Dependent Variables as a Function of Gender Study 3 Combined	128
<i>Table 5.7</i>	Means and Standard Deviations on the Dependent Variables as a Function of Age Study 3 Combined	129
<i>Table 6.1</i>	Model Fit Indices for Study 4a Confirmatory Factor Analysis	138
<i>Table 6.2</i>	Test-Retest Reliability	148
<i>Table 6.3</i>	Convergent and Discriminant Validity Study 4b	150
<i>Table 7.1</i>	Model Fit Indices for Study 5 Structural Equation Model	172
<i>Table 8.1</i>	Counterfactual Statements by Story Type	184
<i>Table 8.2</i>	Counterfactual Statements by Story Type and Belief System	191
<i>Table 8.3</i>	Counterfactual Statements by Story Version	192
<i>Table 8.4</i>	Counterfactual Statements by Belief System	193

List of Appendices

Appendix A	Demographic Tables	239
Appendix B	Study One Materials	253
Appendix C	Study Two Materials	261
Appendix D	Item Generation for the Fellow Traveller v	
	Moral Stranger Scale	275
Appendix E	Study 3a and 3b Materials	269
Appendix F	Study 4a Materials	281
Appendix G	Study 4b Materials	284
Appendix H	Study 5 Materials	301
Appendix I	Counterfactual Generation Examples	316

Preface

This thesis presents a new look at how opinions about criminal offenders can influence one's punishment and rehabilitation decisions, in relation to offenders. Chapter 1 covers information about how the media presents information to the public about offenders, and then what effects this type of presenting has on the public. It is discussed that the way with which the media presents stories about offenders influences fear of crime, punitive attitudes, punishment decisions, and public policy. Chapter 2 then discusses the area of human rights in corrections and then the concept of the moral stranger, a bad person who has offended, and the fellow traveller, a normal person who has done a bad thing, are then introduced. These concepts are discussed in the context of current correctional legislation and what they each mean in terms of the treatment and outcomes for offenders. From here, chapter 3 then presents a study looking at the influence of these two concepts on punishment and rehabilitation decisions. Participants were presented with a 'newspaper' story from either view and then had to make decisions based on the story. The findings of this study are then discussed in relation to the media and the model of punishment decisions. Chapter 4 extends the study of chapter 3 and expands on the dependent variables that were measured, in order to expand on the model that was developed in the first study. The work in chapters 3 and 4 was based on the theoretical concepts of the moral stranger and the fellow traveller. The next step was to create a measure of these concepts to determine if there was empirical support for their existence in the real world; this was the aim of the studies included in chapters 5 and 6. A measure of people's opinions about criminal offenders was developed and psychometrically validated in these studies. Chapter 7 then brought together the work of the preceding four chapters, presenting a story about an offender and also the measure of people's opinions about offenders. From this, a complex model of how pre-existing opinions about offenders predicts decisions made about the offender and the offence was created. Chapter 8 took a tangential step from the preceding chapters and presents the counterfactual generation task that was a part of studies 1 and 5. Finally, chapter 9 discusses the full body of research and what value it adds to current thinking, and what future implications there are from this work.

Chapter 1

Crime and the Media

The criminal justice system is influenced by government policy, policy that is developed by politicians, and politicians who are in office to represent the people of their electorate; these people make up the public opinion that government decisions are developed to be representative of. Public opinion is an important area to investigate because there are certain areas of the criminal justice system that would not function without the public. While in New Zealand sentencing of offenders is conducted by judges, juries still have a big role to play. The jury balances the evidence for and against the guilt of an offender, and each person brings to the jury a different set of pre-existing beliefs, values, and opinions. The criminal justice system could not function without juries and therefore understanding how the public think and feel about offenders is an important area to consider.

It is generally accepted in the Western world that, when compared with official statistics and empirical research, the public has an inaccurate view of crime and the criminal justice system (Levenson, Brannon, Fortney, & Baker, 2007; Maxwell, 2008; McGregor, 1993; Paulin, Searle, & Knaggs, 2003; Roberts & Hough, 2005). The consumption of news is a daily occurrence for most people and it has been found that crime makes up a significant proportion (between 18-30%) of news stories in television news broadcasts (Klite, Bardwell, & Salzman, 1997; McGregor, 1993; Prison Reform Trust, 2006). Other research has found that in New Zealand crime makes up 20% of television news, and that New Zealand ranked third in an international examination of the amount of crime reporting in newspapers (Maxwell, 2008).

Further, a significant proportion of the items presented in the news are negative, especially those that involve some aspect of crime, whether that be a single offence, an investigation by the police, or a report on a particular type of crime that has become prevalent in recent time. The idea that "Crime news is prime news" (McGregor, 1993) means that headlines such as "*Body Found in Burning Car*", "*Teen Dies on Trip to Grave*" and "*Home Detention Follows Child Porn Sting*" (NZPA, 2008) are commonplace in the news media. Specifically, research comparing official crime statistics and media coverage found a significant level of over-reporting of violent and sexual crimes (Mason, 2006; McGregor, 1993; Reiner, 1997). There are a number of explanations for the vast gap between public opinion and reality, often involving the media and a lack of accurate information freely and proactively available to the public (Levenson, Brannon, et al., 2007).

Both news and entertainment media have the tendency to draw the attention of the public to the most extreme and sensational forms of crime (Eschholz, 1997), such as violent murder or gang rape, when in reality the most prevalent form of crime in New Zealand, as measured by official statistics, is property/dishonesty crime (New Zealand Police, 2007; 2008; 2009). Klite et al. (1997) found that, through an investigation of local news channels in the United States, the most common crime reported in the media was murder, but this was actually the least common crime to occur.

A point to be wary of here is that official statistics do not necessarily present an entirely accurate view of the reality of crime (Mayhew & Reilly, 2007), however they are the most consistent and reliable source of crime information available. The “dark figure” of crime is often talked about in criminal justice circles and this represents the element of unreported crime in the community, which is difficult to quantify (Walklate, 2005). Victim surveys can begin to examine this unknown figure by asking community members for their experience of crime as compared with crime that they have reported to the police. Using a comparison between official statistics and a victim survey, sexual offences were reported as making up 0.8% of crime in the police statistics of 2006, whereas a victim survey found the figure to be 7% (Mayhew & Reilly, 2007; NZ Police, 2007). This is obviously considerably different, indicating that there is a significant amount of crime that is not reported to the police. However, regardless of which source of information is used, it can be seen that sexual offences represent a small proportion of overall crime when compared with property and victimless offences, which made up 56% in the same year (NZ Police, 2007).

Newsworthiness and the Media

Local television news is the primary source of information for the community about public affairs, including crime (Dowler, 2003; Gilliam & Iyengar, 2000; Klite et al., 1997; Roberts & Doob, 1990). The type of stories that the media choose to present to the public can influence the opinions that the public hold about crime and can also provide the public with incorrect or inflated estimates of certain types of crime. This indicates that the manner in which the media portrays crime will be significant for the way that the public perceives this area of public concern.

The media are commercial entities and, as such, need to produce the product that is going to sell the most and therefore turn the most profit. The different media bodies are competing with each other to sell their product and so the stories that they run need to catch the attention and interest of the reader/viewer. An interesting issue to consider are the factors

that make a journalist or editor decide to report one crime over another, this is termed *newsworthiness*. There is a body of research (Boulahanis & Heltsley, 2004; Chermak, 1994; Chermak, 1998; Chermak & Chapman, 2007; Humphries, 1981; Jewkes, 2004; Lundman, 2003; McGregor, 1993; Pritchard & Hughes, 1997; Taylor & Sorenson, 2002) that has examined the qualities of a story that make it more or less likely to be reported in the news that is, more or less *newsworthy*.

For example, Pritchard and Hughes (1997) examined how murders in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, were covered by two different newspapers through content analysis and interviews with journalists. It was found that a murder involving a Caucasian suspect and/or victim, a male suspect and a victim that was a female, a child or an elderly person was deemed the most newsworthy, when compared to other iterations of suspect and victim demographics. This indicates that status and cultural factors may play a large role in why a particular offence is reported, rather than the unusualness of the offence itself (Pritchard & Hughes, 1997). However, this is research for one area of the United States and an area that might have a very specific demographic make-up which could have influenced these findings.

Through an examination of two main newspapers in Chicago, Illinois, Boulahanis and Heltsley (2004) found that crimes involving African Americans were less newsworthy, because they were seen as occurring more frequently. This fits in with the assertion that unusualness is one criterion that influences newsworthiness. Further, it was found that homicide was the most commonly reported crime even though, statistically, it is relatively unusual. Within homicides, those that were perpetrated by an offender who was atypical in some respect, were more likely to receive attention in the media, and further still, offences committed by females were more newsworthy than those committed by males, again this is unusual. Boulahanis and Heltsley's findings indicate that unusualness is related to newsworthiness. This research was specifically related to juvenile offenders, who are a specific group related to the overall offender population, and so the findings here may have been influenced by the very specific nature of the group of offenders being examined.

Jewkes (2004) discussed the key factors that influenced which stories were presented in the media. One key factor was predictability; an event that was rare, out of the ordinary or unexpected was considered newsworthy. Norm theory states that the ease of mentally undoing an event is related to how normative the event is (Kahneman & Miller, 1986), indicating that more complex crimes are more difficult to understand and are therefore less normative and, as described above (Jewkes, 2004) are then reported in the media. This also indicates that, if these crimes are more difficult to mentally unpack (i.e. are more complex),

then the reader may not actually fully understand the information being presented about the crime and may misinterpret what information the media does present. Norm theory indicates that the public may develop skewed opinions about certain crimes if they are more complex, and so the reader has difficulty ‘unpacking’ the information they are presented with.

Another key area to consider is the characteristics of the victim and/or suspect involved, and how this relates to newsworthiness. Lundman (2003) found that victim and offender combinations that were stereotypical were more likely to be reported in the media than those that were not stereotypical. For example, an offence involving a black offender and a white victim was more likely to be reported, and also those involving a male offender and a female victim were more likely to be reported. This research found that race and gender factors were the best predictors of newsworthiness, and it was stereotypical combinations that received the most attention, rather than the unusual combinations.

Sorenson, Manz and Berk (1998) found that victim and offender characteristics influenced which homicides were considered more or less newsworthy. Those offences that involved a female, child or elderly victim and where the suspect was not known to the victim were considered more newsworthy. Conversely, those offences that involved a Black or Hispanic victim, where there was no firearm involved and where the suspect was an intimate of the victim were considered less newsworthy. These findings indicate that racial prejudice does play a role in what offences are reported through the media, in the United States, and that a combination of unusualness, a firearm offence, and stereotype congruency, a stranger offence, determine the newsworthiness of an offence. This research indicates that the area of newsworthiness is not black and white. There are certain circumstances whereby unusualness is the most influential criteria and then other circumstances when status and cultural factors are more influential. It might be that these different criteria are actually working toward the same end result, increasing viewership, just through slightly different ways. The other factor to consider is that each geographical area that this type of research is being conducted in may have different demographic factors that may influence the newsworthiness of an offence more so than in other areas.

Similar to the research about general crime is that the media often present stories that fit with the stereotypes that are held about sex offenders. That is, the media will present stories about stranger-rape more than they will present stories about sexual assault of a child by a parent or other relative (Cheit, 2003; Levenson, Brannon, et al., 2007), which is a stereotype-congruency factor. This research indicates that the newsworthiness of sex offender stories is based on a combination of unusualness and stereotype-congruency, and

this is likely because stereotype-congruency offences are actually less common and so they fit both that criterion and the unusualness criterion.

From the above research, it seems that newsworthiness is a combination of unusualness and stereotype-congruency. There is a balancing act between reporting crimes that are the most unusual, and so require a lot of mental unpacking, and reporting those crimes that actually fit in with one's stereotyped expectations; but also these can be the same thing. The other part of this is that often stereotypes are inaccurate and so what may be a stereotypical offence, such as stranger-rape, is actually unusual in terms of the statistics for that crime. Newsworthiness is therefore a combination of two factors, unusualness and stereotype-congruency, which are often times the same thing.

Crime Representation in the Media

As the research on newsworthiness above has shown, certain crimes and certain types of offenders and victims are more or less likely to receive attention from the media. This then shapes the information that the public have about crime, and may provide the viewing public with a biased view of crime and offenders.

Most community members are not directly involved in the criminal justice process on a regular basis and so they receive their information about this area from reading newspapers and internet bulletins, listening to the radio and/or watching the news on television. The manner with which the media presents news stories is likely to impact on the views of the consumers. This could lead to the reader or viewer to develop an inaccurate view about a particular type of crime and this may also generalise to their entire view of crime and offenders.

The psychological processes by which media exposure (in particular television) influences social reality judgements and thus attitudes towards crime and punishment has been extensively explored by, among others, Shrum and colleagues. Effects of media influence are affected by the method of cognitive processing that one utilises. A heuristic 'off the top of your head' processing will result in the impact of television being apparent, while a systematic method of process will result in the impact of television viewing being lessened (Shrum, 2001). The way that questions are asked is important. If people are asked to make a quick judgement then their pre-existing views, based on their knowledge including what they know from watching television, then they are not likely to make a well thought through response. Conversely, if people are asked to take a systematic approach to answer questions,

then they are more likely to weigh up all the information they are aware of and not just go with what comes to mind first (Shrum, 2001).

In a further study, Shrum and O'Guinn (1993) found that people who were heavier viewers of television would overestimate the frequency or probability of an offence and would also be more likely to give a faster response to the question. This fits in with the findings above, whereby heavier television viewers have more information from the television to base their answers on, and also that this background information may influence a fast responding time. This research shows that the relevant information, supposedly 'cultivated' from the television, is more accessible in memory for heavier television users, and this more accessible information can then increase frequency and probability judgements of criminal offences.

In different research, O'Connell (1999) examined how Irish newspapers presented crime and how this then influenced the public's perceptions of crime. This research found that there were four ways that the newspapers biased crime. Extreme and atypical offences were over reported, extreme offences were given more space in the newspaper, offences involving vulnerable victims and non-vulnerable offenders were over reported, and there was also a bias toward pessimistic accounts of the criminal justice system in Ireland. All of these factors increased the public's awareness of extreme and more atypical offences and made it seem that they were occurring more frequently than they actually were. Fear of crime research (e.g. Williams & Dickinson, 1993) suggests that this type of reporting is likely to increase one's fear of being the victim of such crimes. This is because the manner that the media presents crime can influence judgements made about crime, and these judgements may be unfounded, such as thinking a crime occurs more frequently than it actually does, and this can therefore cause individuals to believe that they are more likely to be the victim of that offence.

Violent Crime

There is a significant body of research that has found that violent crimes are featured in the media disproportionately when compared to their incidence in official statistics (Chermak, 1994; Klite et al., 1997; Mason, 2006; McGregor, 1993; O'Connell, 1999; Reiner, 1997). Reiner (1997) found that violent and novel crimes were presented in the media at a much higher rate than their official occurrence, while property/dishonesty crimes were reported at a much lower rate than their official occurrence. Sheley and Ashkins (1981) found that 80% of crime stories reported on local television news, and 45% reported in newspapers

involved murder or robbery, whereas official statistics indicated that 12.4% of crime in New Orleans involved murder or robbery.

Similarly, in an analysis of crime coverage in Los Angeles between 1996 and 1997, Gilliam, and Iyengar (2000) found that even though murder accounted for less than 1% of crime in the region, it was presented in 17% of the media stories. This makes it seem that murder is a very prevalent crime when, in fact, it is one of the least common crimes (Klite et al., 1997). Finally, in one study (Humphries, 1981) crime stories presented in the *New York Post* were analysed. Serious crime stories made up approx 67% of the crime stories presented in the *Post*, whereas serious crimes made up only about 20% of all crime. It is likely that the newspaper had an over-representation of serious crime stories because a newspaper is a profit-making enterprise and the stories included needed to be one's that would sell; a murder is generally more interesting and attention-grabbing than a burglary.

The above pieces of research indicate that violent crimes, particularly murder, are presented in the media at a disproportionate rate than the official occurrence of these crimes. The 'cultivation effects' research (Shrum & Bischak, 2001; Shrum & O'Guinn, 1993) would argue that people would use and access this information about violent crimes, and then would use this information to make judgements rather than thinking in a more systematic and broad way, and using their other knowledge about crime. Ease of access of the information is important in this area.

Research in both the United Kingdom (Mason, 2006; Mason, 2007; Prison Reform Trust, 2006) and New Zealand (McGregor, 1993) has found that the overrepresentation of crime, and in particular, violent crime, is not limited to American soil. McGregor (1993) conducted a content analysis of the five main newspapers in New Zealand, and found similar results to overseas studies. In her paper 'Crime News as Prime News' McGregor (1993) found that the main newspapers in NZ all presented a disproportionate number of news stories about crime, in general, and that these crime stories tended to involve violent or sex crimes, disproportionate to the official prevalence of these crimes. Official police statistics consistently report that dishonesty and property crimes are by far the most prevalent (52-56%), while sex crimes represent less than 1% of all crimes, and violent crimes represent less than 14% (NZ Police, 2007; 2008; 2009), however McGregor found that the news coverage for these crimes was far higher than these figures would indicate is representative. It seems that serious crimes with threat or physical harm to a person are more likely to be reported in the media, than supposedly "victimless" crimes involving harm to property (Chermak, 1994; Einsiedel, Salomone, & Schneider, 1984). This is tied in with the idea that

the media are a profit making commercial entity and the news stories included in newspapers and on television need to be those that will attract the most attention and therefore the most viewership. This increases the likelihood that more extreme crimes, and crimes with a definite victim, will be reported over less extreme and victimless crimes.

Stereotypes of Offenders and Victims

As well as violent crime being over reported in the media there are also certain victim and offender characteristics that influence whether or not an offence is reported. For example, crimes involving a white female victim and a minority male offender are more likely to be reported by the media, than other combinations of victim and offender demographics (Boulahanis & Heltsley, 2004; Lundman, 2003). One key finding in Gilliam and Iyengar's (2000) research was that people are more likely to pay attention to information that is congruent with their prior beliefs. For example, participants showed a much higher accuracy in recalling the race of an offender when the offender was black (and thus, consistent with their beliefs regarding race and criminality) rather than white. When information about an offender and victim matches with one's prior beliefs it is easier to remember. This indicates that one's knowledge about this area is likely to be filled with information about belief congruent, or stereotypical, offender and victim combinations, and those combinations that do not match with prior beliefs are likely to be forgotten, perpetuating one's stereotype. It is then this knowledge, based on the cultivation effects research (Shrum & O'Guinn, 1993), that will be used to make quick, heuristic, judgements about offenders and crime.

An example of victim race differences in reporting crime can be found with the Kent State and Jackson State University shootings. On May 4, 1970, students were protesting against the Vietnam War on the Kent State University campus. During the protest the Ohio National Guard opened fire on the students and killed four and wounded nine others. This made international news headlines and is a significant event in U.S. history. Ten days later, on May 14, a similar incident occurred at Jackson State University. State police opened fire on a student-led anti-Vietnam War protest and two students were killed and fourteen others were injured. There was very little media attention paid to the incident at Jackson State, while the Kent State event has become ingrained in people's memories. The primary difference between the incidents involves the students. That is, the students killed or injured at Kent State were predominantly White, middle-class students whereas Jackson State University is a traditionally African-American university (Gregory & Lewis, 1988; Lewis & Hensley, 1998; Verkuil, 1971). The Kent State situation involved stereotype-congruency and

a level of unusualness, whereas the Jackson State situation was not stereotype-congruent, and while shooting students is an unusual event, the race factor may have played a bigger role in this particular situation.

Eberhardt, Goff, Purdie and Davies (2004) found that race stereotypes could influence associations made about crime. It was found that there was a strong and automatic association made between Black and crime, and this association was actually bi-directional: Black led to crime, and crime led to Black. It was found that when participants were presented with degraded images of crime relevant stimuli the pairing of Black faces increased recognition time. Also, the pairing of abstract concepts such as crime and basketball created an attentional bias toward Black faces (Eberhardt et al., 2004). This lends further support to the notion that stereotypes are very involved in the development of crime stories and therefore the information that the public base their opinions and views on.

This is similar to the work by Payne and colleagues related to race-weapon effects (Payne, 2001). The race-weapon effect is that people are quicker at identifying a weapon when it is associated with a racial minority that is associated with crime, such as Black people, than when it is associated with the racial majority, i.e. White people. This is just a further example of how race can influence judgements that the public make about crime, and that stereotype-congruency is an influential factor.

Further, Dumas and Teste (2006) found that participants' judgements about crime severity and punishment were influenced by the level of face/offence congruency. Participants held a stereotype about what they thought an offender of a certain crime should look like, and when this was congruent then the punishment given was higher than when it was incongruent. Some of the stereotypes held were related to race of the offender, such as participants having a stereotype about Black people being more involved in crime than White people, and so giving a higher sentence when a Black person was charged with an offence compared with a White person. This is a similar finding to the work by Bodenhausen and Wyer (1985) who found that people use stereotypes that they hold about a racial group to make judgements about the reasons for a transgression and whether or not this transgression would be likely to occur again or not.

The media can be selective about what stories they choose to present to the public, and the stories that are more likely to sell or gain viewership are going to be those that are most likely presented. The above research has found that violent offences are presented in the media at a much higher rate than actual prevalence and that there are certain race and gender stereotypes that are held, and perpetuated, about offenders and victims that are also

not necessarily accurate (which is called an ‘illusory correlation’; Hamilton & Gifford, 1976). An ‘illusory correlation’ is when an erroneous inference is made between two categories of events, such as between media representation of the frequency of certain offences and stereotypes held about certain offenders. These factors can then influence the views that the public have about offences and may lead the public to hold increased punitive attitudes and increased fear of certain types of crime, and certain groups of offenders, which may in turn be inaccurate. Again, this is related to the cultivation effects research (Shrum & O’Guinn, 1993) and the influence that information from the television can have on frequency and probability judgements that one might make.

There is a large body of research that has found that the media has a significant influence on many different areas of knowledge and opinion, from smoking attitudes (Wakefield, Play, Nitchter & Giovino, 2003), to eating and body image (Thompson & Heinberg, 2002) to exercise (Cavill & Bauman, 1993). The media is a huge area of influence and it plays an important role in shaping attitudes and beliefs about many areas, not just criminal offenders. It is not surprising then, that the media does have a significant influence on this one particular area.

Effects on the Viewing Public

The above explains the different ways that the media choose which crimes to present to the public, and what sort of crimes are generally chosen to be the focus of media stories. If the above is true, then what is the effect of these biases of crime reporting on the public? Does the way that the media reports crime increase the fear that the public has about certain crimes? And if so, is this a valid and reasonable fear? Is there an effect on one’s level of punitiveness and one’s belief in the effectiveness of rehabilitation based on the way the media presents crime to its readers? And, does all this therefore have an effect on public policy by way of politicians designing policy that is in line with the distorted views that the public have, as a result of media representations?

Fear of Crime

An area often considered in the relationship between the media and crime is how much of an influence exposure to crime in the media has on one’s fear of crime. In a recent online poll the Sensible Sentencing Trust asked respondents if they believed that violent crime was getting worse in New Zealand. The results of this poll showed that 65% of those who responded to it believed that violent crime was getting worse (‘Sensible’, 2011), whereas

the actual statistics show that there has been a decrease in violent crime in NZ over recent years (Maxwell, 2008). This inaccurate belief in violent crime rising is likely the result of media exposure to inaccurate information, and this sort of an inaccurate belief can lead to an increased fear of violent crime. This finding also shows how, in the fear of crime area, research is often conducted with one item or question being used to measure a large area of opinion. In this case a single question has been used to show violent crime is increasing, but there is no room for differing opinions about how much this increase might be or how one is making the judgement. This single question approach is often used in fear of crime research, and it is a definite flaw in the conclusions that can be drawn from this body of research.

A Philadelphia based study (Romer, Jamieson, & Aday, 2003) found that, across a large sample, viewing local television news was positively related to fear of crime even though the people who had an increase in fear of crime had not had any more or less exposure to actual crime than those people who exhibited a lower fear of crime. This can be related back to the cultivation effect hypothesis, and that increased exposure to crime stories increases one's predictions of crime frequency and probability, measured as fear in the current study. It was also found that exposure to television news was strongly associated with the idea that crime was an important local issue.

Additionally, Williams and Dickinson (1993) found that there was a positive relationship between reading the newspaper and fear of crime. However, the correlational nature of this research indicates that fear of crime could result in increased searching for information about crime, and this might be through increased reading of the newspaper. This is further supported by Boulahanis and Heltsley (2004) who showed that increased exposure to the media is positively correlated with increased levels of fear of crime. Based on these findings it could be concluded that increased exposure to crime stories through the television news predicts elevated levels of fear and concern about crime in everyday life, regardless of one's actual exposure to or experience of crime. But, because of the correlational nature of this research the same could be said for increased fear of crime leads to increased information searching, through the use of the media.

Liska and Baccaglini (1990), however, found that the relationship between fear of crime and media exposure was more complex than the simple relationship presented above. Through an examination of newspaper coverage of crime, and fear of crime across 26 different cities in the United States it was found that there were some newspaper stories that appeared to increase fear, and there were others that appeared to decrease fear. The main predictor of this difference was the self-relevance of the story based on the location of the

offense. This relates to the elaboration likelihood model (Cacioppo & Petty, 1986) where self-relevance creates greater thinking about the event, and greater thinking about an event can make the likelihood of that event seem higher. There are two routes that one can take when thinking about an event: the peripheral or the central route. When one takes the peripheral route then pre-existing ideas are used to come to a conclusion, much like the heuristic processing level in cultivation theory. Conversely, when one takes the central route the information is considered logically and carefully, like in the systematic approach to cultivation theory (Shrum, 1995). When a story is local, this is more relevant to the individual and therefore they may be more likely to make quick judgements and take the peripheral route of processing, whereas when a story is further away, there is less self-relevance, and so the individual can take their time with thinking about this event and use the central route of processing.

In the above research, local stories of murder increased fear of this crime and non-local stories of murder decreased fear of this crime. When reading about crime, it seems that if the crime occurs in one's own city then this increases fear of this crime, but if it occurs in a different city then this makes one feel safer about one's own city and so decreases fear. This can be understood through construal level theory (Liberman, Sagristano, & Trope, 2002; Liberman & Trope, 1998) where events are considered in a more concrete way when they occur closely and are considered in a more abstract way when they occur further away. That is peripheral features are used in a judgement considered in a concrete manner, and this may increase fear of that event because the whole picture is not being examined, while the central features are used in a judgment considered in an abstract manner. Abstraction can result in thinking about things in more detail and weighing up the information, and therefore making a better, and more systematic judgement (Liberman & Trope, 1998)

In April of 2006, a press release was made by the Prison Reform's Trust (PRT) in the United Kingdom indicating that increased rehabilitation programs and reduced custodial sentences were required to help the problem of overcrowding in UK prisons (Prison Reform Trust, 2006). The main point of this press release was that custodial prison sentences were largely ineffective; however, a significant number of reporting bodies misrepresented the press release or ignored its main points and presented the reader with the problem of dangerous prisoners being released early and the immediate need for more prisons to be built in order to fix this problem (Prison Reform Trust, 2006). In this example the media used a reliable source to make their story seem valid, but then twisted the information to represent a particular stance that they likely believed would sell the most. From this misrepresentation

there was a public backlash toward the prison system based on the information the media presented, with the public demanding more prisons be built and prisoners should not to be released early from prison.

Mason (2006; 2007) conducted two content analyses of the U.K. media. In one he examined one month's worth of U.K. media and found that there was a discourse of dangerousness used about offender's and prison, and that this had the ability to increase the fear of the public about offenders, this fear possibly being about increased judgements of frequency and probability of crime occurring. Further, he examined some key stories about prison in the UK and found that these stories presented offenders as high risk and dangerous to the public, when in fact most offenders who are released from prison do not pose a high level of risk to the community. This had the effect of increasing fear about released offenders and also increasing support for imprisonment.

One group of offenders that is often discussed in the media are sex offenders (Dowler, 2006). As discussed earlier, the public gets a lot of information about crime and offenders from the media, and this includes information about sex offences and sex offenders. An important consideration is, therefore, how sex offenders are portrayed in the media. Sex offenders are one group of offenders who elicit a lot of fear, and this public fear then results in lawmakers passing legislation aimed at protecting the public from this group of 'dangerous' offenders. The public is generally supportive of sex offender policy, even without empirical evidence to support its effectiveness (Levenson Brannon, et al., 2007). The public generally believe that sex offenders are at high risk of reoffending, with a sexual offence (Harris, Rice & Quinsey, 1998; Letourneau & Armstrong, 2008; Levenson, Brannon, et al., 2007; Waite et al., 2005), which causes a great deal of fear about sex offenders, particularly when they are known to be living in one's community.

Research into sex offender recidivism rates shows that this belief is inaccurate. Sex offenders have low reoffending rates for sex specific crimes, but they do have higher rates of reoffending in a non-sexual way (Hanson & Bussiere, 1998; Harris et al., 1998; Nadesu, n.d., Waite et al., 2005). The research shows that sex offenders are not likely to reoffend with a sexual offence, and the one group that is most likely to reoffend with a sexual offence are child sex offenders, who generally offend against family members and/or known children, not strangers. Sex offender rates of general recidivism are comparable to non-sex offenders, and this seems to indicate that this particular group of offenders are being legislated against in a very specific way but their actual reoffending pattern is very similar to many other offenders, who this legislation is not designed for.

Opinions and Punishment Decisions

Sentencing opinions.

Given the marked impact that the media have on perceptions of prevalence of crime and the likelihood of being the victim of a crime, it should not be surprising that the media also exerts influence on people's views about the sentencing of offenders. A key finding of Gilliam and Iyengar's (2000) research was that there was a difference in punitive attitudes between participants who hardly ever watched the news and those who reported that they watched the news every day. Those participants who regularly watched the news were 16% more likely to endorse punitive measures than those who did not watch the news (Gilliam & Iyengar, 2000). This finding is important because it starts to show that watching news stories on a regular basis can have an effect on shaping one's opinions about the area of crime and offenders. This is also important because if watching the news can shape one's opinions and views then it is important that the information presented in the news is accurate and unbiased, which is not necessarily the case. Caution needs to be taken here, though, because it is possible that those people who watch more television news are the people who already have increased fear of crime or increased punitive views about crime, and this might be the reason for their increased news consumption. This overall area of research is not one that can easily be separated and explained. Further there are limitations to public opinion research because of the nature of questioning and the types of circumstances and populations that this research is conducted with.

In three studies, Roberts and Doob (1990) examined the influence of the media on public opinion about sentencing. In the first study participants read real newspaper stories about offenders in Canada and the sentence that these offenders received. Participants were asked if they thought this sentence was appropriate, too lenient or too harsh, and how confident they were of this judgement. Across all of the stories used, 51% were rated as the sentence given being too lenient, and only 16% were rated as the sentence given being too harsh. Almost 60% of the sample was confident of this judgement, even though many of the stories read were very brief and did not involve a lot of background or additional information, showing that people are willing to make confident judgements with limited information, the heuristic-type processing (Shrum, 1995). In another study, Sprott and Doob (1997) found that those who feared crime more rated sentences given in Canadian courts as too lenient, as compared with those who had a lesser fear of crime.

Another interesting finding was that when participants were given two different versions of the same story (one a broadsheet – more reliable - version and the other a tabloid – less reliable - version) there were significant differences in their responses (Roberts & Doob, 1990). When reading the tabloid version participants were more likely to regard the sentence as lenient, then when reading the broadsheet version, indicating that the source of the information, in particular, the expected respectability of the source, influences judgments about the appropriateness of a given sentence. Additionally, participants were more likely to agree with the sentence given after reading court documents (i.e., a more reliable source) than when they had read a newspaper version of the crime (Roberts & Doob, 1990). This indicates that both the narrative of a report as well as the generally limited amount of information presented in a media representation can influence the reader to make a decision that, in other circumstances, he or she may not make. This also shows that people want more reliable information to make judgements from, but the problem with the media is that reliable information is not always readily available.

Public opinion.

People have different opinions about many different things, and one area is the opinions that people hold about other people, particularly about personality traits. People typically hold ‘implicit’ theories about personality and while these are generally unconscious and unarticulated, they contain some key assumptions that can underlie the way that people process different social information. The different theories that people hold about personality can lead to different mental models about how humans function, and can therefore lead to different beliefs about one’s understanding of other people, such as offenders (Dweck, Chiu, & Hong, 1995a; Dweck, Chiu, & Hong, 1995b; Dweck, Hong, & Chiu, 1993; Levy, Plaks, & Dweck, 1999; Plaks, Grant & Dweck, 2005). Dweck and colleagues have examined this area in some detail and developed a theory whereby people can either view other people from the perspective of being an incremental theorist or an entity theorist. The entity theorist does not believe that people can change and that once people have developed certain traits they are not malleable, whereas the incremental theorist sees people as changeable, and that they can learn from their past experiences and make changes based on these (Dweck et al., 1995a).

The above implicit theories are important for the area of public opinion because they show how people think and make judgments about others, and in this area of research, about offenders. The implicit theory that one holds will determine what sort of outside information is going to be taken into consideration and what information is going to be disregarded.

Another important theory to consider when examining public opinion is attribution theory (Weiner, 1972; 1985). Attribution theory tries to explain and interpret the causes for individuals' behaviour. The attribution of the cause of the behaviour is then usually examined in terms of the control of the event, was it internal or external, the stability of the event, does it change or not, and the controllability of the event, is it something that can be directly controlled or something that is more to do with luck or the actions of others (Weiner, 1972). These are all factors that are involved in one's opinion about an offender, for example, whether there were external causes for the offender's behaviour, such as having no job and a family to feed. If an offender's behaviour is considered to be external, not stable and out of their control then this is likely to lead to a better opinion about that offender than if the opposite were true, and this enhanced opinion may be likely to lead to a decrease in punitiveness.

The area of public opinion about crime and offenders is further confused by the misunderstanding of public opinion by those in public office. Eschholz (1997, p 38) stated that "politicians have found a 'get tough' on crime stance helps to win elections". Further research has found that politicians tend to cite public opinion as the catalyst for punitive policies, but when public opinion is examined in detail, and with specific rather than global opinions tapped, it seems that the public is not nearly as punitive as those in power would have one believe (Applegate, Cullen, & Fisher, 2002; Applegate, Cullen, Turner, & Sundt, 1996; Carlsmith, 2008; Gromet & Darley, 2009). So, when people are asked to make judgements about a specific offender and his or her crime then punitiveness is often less than if people are asked about crime at the general level. The format of questions in public opinion research, therefore, has an impact on the types of results found.

The disparity between policy and public opinion can be illustrated with the so called 'three-strikes' laws in the United States. At the most basic level the 'three-strikes' laws (which are officially called habitual offender laws) in the U.S. mandate a sentence of life imprisonment for any offender who is convicted of a third felony offence, having been convicted of two previous violent or serious felonies (Stolzenberg & D'Alessio, 1997; Turner & Sundt, 1995).

The 'three strikes law' has been voted into legislation by the public in each state that currently has it in place (26 of 50 states as of 2004). However it has been claimed, as stated above, that when thinking about this law voters were envisioning the worst offenders (e.g., violent or sexual offenders) and neglected to reason that lesser offenders (e.g., property or other non-violent offenders) would be caught up in this process. As an example, Gary Ewing

was given a sentence of 25 years to life for shoplifting golf clubs, which was his third felony charge, and Santos Reyes was given 25 years to life for cheating on a driver's test, and there had been a 10 year gap between that offence and his last offence. These examples show that the law can hand down very severe sentences for relatively minor offences, when they have been preceded with two other felony offences. This type of sentencing is not proportionate, and actually goes against retributive punishment motives, as this is about handing out punishment that is commensurate with the crime committed (Carlsmith, Darley & Robinson, 2002). Research on this topic has found that when the public are asked global questions on this topic their answers are increasingly punitive but when specific questions are asked the public seems to use the increased information to make a more well rounded and significantly less punitive determination (Sherman, Beike & Ryalls, 1999).

When opinion polls are conducted they tend to be at a global level, asking respondents overall questions about their views on the specified area and research has found that agreement with these global statements tends to be significantly stronger than when respondents are asked to answer based on specific items (Applegate, et al., 1996). The government and representing bodies often cite public support for certain policies as being their reasoning for following through with policy that is not empirically supported (Sprott, 1999; Sundt, Cullen, Applegate & Turner, 1998), but it might be that this 'public support' is merely an artefact of the questioning method (Applegate et al., 1996). Most public poll type research focuses on broad questions and so information garnered from this sort of research may be flawed and unrepresentative of actual public beliefs. Thus, if decisions are made based on this information, those decisions are likely to be flawed as well.

Importantly, these more punitive laws have a negligible impact on recidivism rates. The United Kingdom has similar laws in place to the United States (Jones & Newburn, 2006). There is a two strikes law for serious violent offending, such that a second offence results in a doubling of the prescribed sentence for that offence. There is also a three strikes law for drug trafficking. Even though these laws have shown negligible impact on recidivism rates, this does not mean that the public is not supportive of them. Research into sex offender legislation has shown that even when extreme and harsh laws do not have an effect on recidivism they are still supported (Schram & Milloy, 1995). Levenson, Brannon, et al., (2007) asked participants to state what prison sentence they thought a sex offender should receive. On average, participants recommended 39 years in prison and 42 years on probation, and the modal response was 99 years. These participants also indicated that they would continue to

support sex offender policy even if there was no empirical research to support its effectiveness.

Another consideration to make is in regards to the information that an individual has about a certain topic. In some cases, when an individual is presented with a question they may not know much about the topic and so they give an answer, but one that is based on a stereotype or other societally-held associations (what has been referred to as “extra-personal” associations – Olson, & Fazio, 2004; Han, Olson, & Fazio, 2006). Roberts and Hough (2005) reviewed public opinion research related to imprisonment. This review concluded that most members of the public have little to no familiarity with the prison system and there is a commonly held belief that prison life is easy, which draws people to conclude that prison is ineffective. Despite these views, the review found that, generally, people do not want to make prison harsher in order for it to be more punitive, they believe that making prison harsher for the offender will make it more effective. This research shows that the understanding that the public has about what makes prison effective is flawed and inaccurate, and can result in the public indicating they want to be more punitive when in fact they do not. They simply want prison to be more effective, they just do not know how to get this result. This review is interesting in terms of public policy and the information that policy makers choose to use when making certain decisions.

Based on Roberts and Hough’s (2005) review it is clear that the public view prison to be easy and therefore ineffective and so policymakers could draw on this as a reason to increase prison penalties and change prison conditions. However, this change would be implemented without regard for the other evidence that the review found which was that people may believe prison to be easy and ineffective but they do not wish that prison should become harsher and more punitive. There is a mismatch between the views that the public hold and the reasons for these views. The public do not have a good understanding of what makes prison more or less effective, resulting in the public wanting prison to be harsher but for different reasons than might be expected; they wish prison to be harsher in order for it to be more effective. It is important to consider that this review presents two contrasting views, actually held by the same people because of a lack of understanding of how parts of the criminal justice system actually work, and that policy makers can use this information in whatever way they see fit.

Another important aspect of the review conducted by Roberts and Hough (2005) was the reasons that people gave for the ‘purpose of prison’. As has been found in other research (Brown, 1999; McCorkle, 1993; Payne, Gainey, Triplett, & Danner, 2004; Roberts, 2003),

when members of the public were asked for a single purpose of prison they gave an answer of punishment or incapacitation, however when they were asked to give multiple answers they provided these options plus rehabilitation. In a telephone survey of 397 adults McCorkle (1993) explored punitive and rehabilitative views about six common crimes. Across all six crimes participants gave strong punishment views, but when given the option to give more than one view about the crime, rehabilitation was also given a significant amount of support, especially among young, poor and minority respondents. This research found that the public were generally punitive, but alongside this, they did see value in rehabilitation. When research asks a simple question, a simple response is provided and when the research does not allow for multiple responses then this simple response can skew the general views held by the public.

Again, this shows that the way that information is used can influence the way that policy makers react to it. If research only asked for a single purpose of prison then it could be claimed that the public do not think that rehabilitation is important, however, give them the ability to give more than one answer and they *do* consider rehabilitation to be important. This also shows that the way that public opinion research is conducted can have a significant effect on the findings; if only one response is required then the results may be quite different than if multiple responses are required.

Punishment decisions.

Carlsmith (2008) investigated motives for punishment, comparing what one stated to be their motive for punishment and what was shown to be one's actual motive for punishment. This research found that, while participants explicitly stated that they punished to deter the offender (specific) and other offenders (general), when they actually had to attribute punishment to a case study they did so in a way that represented a retributive motive for punishment. This is a significant finding because if participants do not understand their own motivations to punish then this could lead them to support law changes and policies that actually go against their beliefs. This may be to do with construal level theory (Liberman & Trope, 1998) again. Deterrence is about a future outcome and retribution is about a present outcome; deterrence is from abstract reasoning and retribution is from concrete reasoning. Therefore, one may have an abstract understanding of the application of deterrence and believe this is their way of punishing but when actually asked about it, it may be easier to think in a concrete manner and this would then be likely to activate retributive punishment.

This is best illustrated by the case studies reported by Carlsmith (2008). There were four different case studies given, two that represented a deterrent method of punishment (zero-tolerance) and two that represented a retributive method of punishment (proportional punishment). When the case was of high severity then the participants all agreed with the punishment given, no matter which method of punishment was being used. However, when the case was of low severity participants began to see that the zero-tolerance method of punishment was unfair and they did not agree with this.

This is important to consider because it relates directly to some policy changes that have been proposed, both overseas and in New Zealand. One of these is the zero-tolerance 'three-strikes' law described above. What this research illustrates is that people are supportive of proportional punishment, which is actually a retributive punishment method (Darley, Carlsmith & Robinson, 2000; Darley & Pittman, 2003; Weiner, Graham, & Reyna, 1997), even though many people state that they punish for deterrent reasons.

When an injustice is experienced either directly, indirectly or merely observed, people have a strong desire to punish the individual at fault (Darley, 2009). Darley (2009) found that, in reaction to a transgression, people respond with an emotionally charged reaction of moral outrage, and it is this outrage that leads them to a punishment decision, based on retributive rather than deterrent ideals.

The death penalty is supposed to act as the ultimate deterrent and people believe that they support the death penalty because of this deterrent factor (O'Neil, Patry & Penrod, 2004). However, research has shown that people, in fact, support the death penalty more from a retributive stance than a deterrent one (Vidmar, 1974). These findings indicate that while people, in the abstract, generally say that they punish for deterrent reasons – a future outcome – (Warr & Stafford, 1984), in a concrete setting, where there are emotions involved, a retributive model of punishment – a current outcome – is actually what is implemented. This is a further area of support for construal level theory (Liberman & Trope, 1998).

Public policy.

Policy directly affects how the Department of Corrections works in New Zealand. If the public have a skewed view of the area of crime and offenders, then they are likely to demand action from policy makers that is in line with their skewed views. If these skewed views are negative then this action may actually be detrimental to the system and to the individuals involved in it; the offenders, corrections workers, and even the public.

Public opinion is often quoted as one of the main reasons behind policy decisions (Roberts, 2003) and yet this opinion can be misinterpreted and it can be the result of media influence, where opinion is moulded with incomplete or skewed information. Crime is often a “hot topic” when it comes to election time in democratic countries such as the United Kingdom, the United States and New Zealand (Eschholz, 1997). Politicians often campaign on this topic because it is salient and tends to be an emotive topic for the majority of the population. A campaign based on immigration laws or education spending is likely to be less emotionally charged than a campaign based on toughening up on crime. The former issues may actually be far more relevant to the country but at election time politicians need to get votes.

There are, though, times when public opinion is directly represented in public policy, but this may actually be the result of the minority speaking up the loudest. In fact, Brown (1999) found that while there was a split in respondents about whether they would or would not be supportive of sex offender rehabilitation programs in the community, it was those who were against it who stated that they would actively campaign against such programs. Those who supported the treatment programs stated that they would not actively do anything to support it.

There are a number of specific examples of the above, within the United Kingdom and the United States, where specific crimes have brought about the enactment of new laws, many holding the names of those who were the victims (e.g., “Megan’s Law”). These laws were enacted after a particularly horrific crime had befallen a young person, and the parents and community of that young person were outraged that this had happened. It is almost a natural reaction, but that does not move away from the fact that these cases are often the exception not the norm.

To look at a more recent, and New Zealand-based, example there is the rape case of Schollum, Shipton and Rickards, where two of the accused (Schollum and Shipton) were in prison for a previous rape conviction at the time of the trial. However the jury was not informed of this as part of the case (NZPA, 2008). This information was not permissible by law to be entered in as evidence, as it did not directly pertain to the case at hand. When this information was finally made public, after the acquittal of the three men, there was an outcry for legislation to be changed so that previous convictions, especially those that are for the same or related crime, be made available to jurors to make their deliberation. This then became an issues paper within the Law Commission (Law Commission New Zealand, 2008), asking for submissions from concerned parties to decide whether there needs to be a law

change made in this area. Public opinion was used as one of the reasons why this needed to be examined.

Another New Zealand situation where the media perpetuated the outrage of the NZ public was with three high profile murder acquittals that were made in the New Zealand courts in the month of May, 2008. These cases were Chris Kahui, George Gwayze and Murray Foreman; all men who were found not guilty of the charges of murder brought against them (NZPA, 2008). There was a public outcry about the ineffectiveness of the justice system after these verdicts were given; even though members of the public were not privy to the information presented to the jury they still felt that an injustice had been made and the media helped frame this idea, and with continued media coverage, helped perpetuate it.

Concluding Remarks

The media select which crimes to present to the viewing public based on a combination of unusualness and stereotypes, and these criteria can be termed *newsworthiness*. Research has shown that violent crimes are represented in the media disproportionately to the actual occurrence rates, and that stereotypical victim/offender combinations can influence which crimes are more likely to be reported. The way with which the media presents crime to the public then influences public perceptions of offenders and crime, opinions that can be formed through one's implicit theory of personality (Dweck, Hong, & Chiu, 1993) and one's attribution judgements (Weiner, 1972), and can influence one's fear of crime, punitive attitudes and sentencing opinions, and this can all influence the area of public policy. The influence of the media on public perceptions of offenders has far reaching and important consequences.

Chapter 2

Human Rights in Corrections

The current body of research has been developed based on the differing views that the public hold about offenders. These differing views being related to ‘how’ the public views an offender and what that then means for the punishment and rehabilitation of that offender. One view of offenders might see them as sub-human and not worthy of having their human rights in place, while a second view of offenders might see them as equals in society, who deserve to have their human rights respected. The concept of human rights is integral to how the public may or may not view offenders and so this chapter will examine this area in more detail, relating human rights to the area of opinions about criminal offenders.

Human Rights

Human rights are a basic expectation in society. The scope of human rights is such that by virtue of being human each and every person is deserved of their human rights. Basic human rights include the right to dignity, free will, and fulfilment of one’s basic needs for sustenance, shelter and community (Ward & Maruna, 2007). When an offender commits a crime they are breaching some aspect of another’s human rights. For example, if an offender assaults another person they are breaching the victim’s right to safety and security. So, when an offender has breached another’s human rights does that mean that they have their human rights stripped from them? Human rights in corrections literature (Connolly & Ward, 2008; Ward & Maruna, 2007; Ward & Birgden, 2007; Ward, Gannon & Birgden, 2007) would say that the answer to this should be ‘No’; an offender is still a human being and, while they have committed a transgression against someone else or the community, they should still be treated as a human being and, as such, they should be treated with their human rights intact.

The offender needs to be punished for the transgression that was committed, and as part of this punishment some of their human rights may need to be curtailed, such as their right to freedom if they are to serve a custodial sentence. Other than these few curtailments, though, the offender should be treated with their other human rights intact. This also means that once the offender has completed the punishment they should return to the position that they once held in the community, that is, they should be considered a human being with dignity, above being considered an offender (Connolly & Ward, 2008). However, there are an abundance of laws that do not provide this for each and every offender, and this particularly impacts on sex offenders (e.g. Levenson et al., 2007). Of course legislation may provide for circumstances that could influence how an offender is treated but legislation itself

cannot fully influence how each member of the public views offenders, and therefore what each member of the public thinks about the intactness of the human rights of offenders. Legislation has to be backed up by appropriately available information and education for the public to be able to make the most informed and accurate decisions.

Neglecting the rights of an offender can lead to the decrease in their motivation to improve, attend treatment/rehabilitation sessions and/or actively participate in treatment/rehabilitation (McMurran & Ward, 2004; Ward, 2007; Sellen, McMurran, Cox, Theodosi, & Klinger, 2006). This can then lead to an increased risk of reoffending after release from prison. It is in the best interest of both the offender and the community that an offender is given all the opportunities to better him or herself when serving the sentence and to do this the offender needs to be afforded as many of his or her human rights as is possible within the bounds of the prison sentence. An offender who has taken opportunities to better him or herself in prison and has also been treated with respect in the prison environment, and with his or her human rights intact, is an individual who is much safer to release back into the community, than an offender who has not had these things (McMurran & Ward, 2004).

Once the offender has been released, though, this need to be treated with respect and dignity does not end. An offender who is released but is then treated negatively because of their status as an offender is someone who will struggle to reintegrate into society and will struggle to live a pro-social life, where they do not reoffend. Human rights in corrections discussions would argue that laws such as “Megan’s Law” violate the offender’s privacy rights and their right to dignity (Ward et al., 1997).

Further, there is little research that has shown these laws to be effective in reducing sexual recidivism. Letourneau and Armstrong (2008) looked at differences between registered and non-registered sex offenders in terms of their reoffending rates. There was no difference found for sexual reoffending, which was low for both groups, but there was increased non-person recidivism for the registered group. This can be explained by the fact that these offenders are more supervised, and so if they do commit a burglary or petty theft then they are more likely to be caught. Caution does need to be taken with this finding because a number of sexual offences go unreported, so there may indeed be more sexual recidivism occurring than the statistics appear to show.

A further study found that sex offender recidivism was more likely to be for non-sexual offences and least likely to be for sexual offences (Waite et al., 2005). While Harris and Hanson (2004) found over a follow-up period of 15 years that the large majority (76%) of sex offender were not arrested for a sexual offence. All of this evidence points to the fact that sex

offenders are not at high risk of sexually offending after their initial offence, however they are placed under preventative legislation and this may actually be detrimental to their reintegration into society.

The Dangerous Offender

Research into the area of offenders and public opinion of offenders has found that in general there are two views that a person can take, one is that an offender is a person who has done something bad but they are still redeemable and need to be helped by the community to lead pro-social lives once they have completed the punishment for their crime. The other is that an offender is someone who is innately bad and does not deserve to be treated with respect or in fact with any of their human rights intact, this person is an outsider to the community and should not be given the opportunity at a second chance (Connolly & Ward, 2008). This second view is of the *dangerous offender*.

Legislating against the dangerous offender is a regular occurrence in Western societies, such as Canada, England, the United States, Australia and New Zealand. The offender is seen as someone that the community needs to be protected from, in terms of any future harm that they may cause. A prediction must be made as to whether each individual offender, on release from prison, is going to be a threat to society and whether they will be likely to reoffend or not. This is a prediction, and not a guarantee, so some offenders will be predicted to reoffend and may never reoffend (false positive), while other offenders will be predicted not to reoffend and they do reoffend (false negative). There are methods to the way that risk is assessed but it is a prediction based on the information at hand and the prediction is not infallible. The individuals who are predicted to reoffend but who do not (the false positives) have to spend their lives constantly under the shadow of that prediction, with people watching their every move, potentially, to prevent reoffending (Nash, 2006).

Sex offenders are a group of offenders who elicit a lot of fear, and by extension a lot of focus from legislators. In 1994 a law was passed by Congress in the U.S. mandating all 50 states to require sex offenders to register with local law enforcement agencies, once they have been released from prison, so that their current whereabouts is known (Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children and Sexually Violent Offender Registration Act, 1994), this law was proposed and passed in reaction to the abduction of an 11-year old boy by a convicted sex offender. Then, in 1996, Megan's Law was added to the Wetterling Act. This law mandates that states must have procedures in place to inform the public about sex offenders who live in close proximity. Like the Wetterling Act, Megan's Law was a reaction to the

murder of Megan Kanka by a convicted child molester (Jones, 1999; Levenson & Cotter, 2005; Proctor, Badzinski, & Johnson, 2002).

Megan's Law and most of the related legislation has been adopted by all 50 of the U.S. states, however there is still variation in the way that each state, and even each county within those states, chooses to implement the legislation and what information about the offender is made available (Beck & Travis, 2006; Elbogen, Patry, & Scalora, 2003; Trivitis & Reppucci, 2002). Some areas choose to have fairly passive notification processes, while others enforce very active and intrusive, for the offender, processes. In one example, a county in Ohio provides the community with every piece of information legally available about the sex offender and does so in a manner that all members of the community are aware of the offender. In contrast, a county in Kentucky has all of this same information available but it is only actively released to a select number of people and all other members of the community have to seek the information out for themselves from the local police (Beck & Travis, 2006). There is no consistency of how the notification and registration laws are implemented, and so the effects that they have on offenders, and on communities, varies from county to county, and state to state.

Protective legislation is an important area to consider when trying to protect the public from an offender. Protective legislation refers to legislation that is put in place to put boundaries and protections around an offender (such as the sex offender legislation described above), once they have been released back into society, in order to try and prevent them from reoffending (Nash, 2006). Preventive legislation punishes offenders not for what they *have* done but for what they *might* do (Nash, 2006). Sentencing is meant to be proportional; therefore a sentence should match with the severity of an offence (Darley, 2009). However, when an offender is given a sentence based on the offence that they committed, *and* they are subjected to some form of preventive legislation, this idea of proportionality can be lost. This legislation is put in place assuming that this offender will reoffend and that the legislation is merely acting as a protective 'coat' to prevent this from happening. If the offender never reoffends then the legislation can be seen to be effective, and if the offender does reoffend then the legislation can be seen as necessary; at no stage is there an outcome that will suggest that the legislation is either unnecessary or even a violation of the offender's human rights.

In New Zealand the sentence of preventive detention is an example of preventive legislation. Preventive detention is an indeterminate sentence of imprisonment that can be imposed on offenders who have been convicted of certain serious sexual or violent offences (Hurd, 2008). This sentence is aimed at protecting the community from high-risk offenders,

and the idea is that it is protective rather than punitive. However, an offender who has been sentenced to preventive detention may disagree with this comment, as being under an indeterminate sentence, being able to be recalled to prison, and being under the watch of a probation officer for a long period of time might seem like an extension of the actual punishment.

Belief Systems

In New Zealand there are two very different organisations that aim to create debate and change in the area of law and order, one is *Rethinking Crime and Punishment* and the other is the *Sensible Sentencing Trust*. These two organisations both work towards legislative change in how offenders are dealt with by the Courts, however they approach this from two very different stances or belief systems.

Both organisations have a statement of intent. Firstly, “Rethinking Crime and Punishment is a strategic initiative to increase public debate about the use of prison and alternative forms of punishment in New Zealand” (Rethinking, 2011) and then there is “Sensible Sentencing Trust for a safe, crime free New Zealand” (Sensible, 2011), both of which sound reasonable and useful. This is where any similarity between the two organisations ends, though.

Rethinking Crime and Punishment presents information and debate from a liberal standpoint, and they are open to creating and disseminating accurate and largely unbiased information about the areas of crime and punishment, and tend to present information that could be construed as pro-offender but more accurately views the offender as a fellow human being who deserves to have their rights heard and considered. The Sensible Sentencing Trust presents information from a more conservative standpoint and they appear to create and disseminate information from a viewpoint where offenders are considered bad people and the community needs to be protected from them, and this stance could be considered anti-offender.

These two organisations could be considered to mirror the two extreme ends of a possible continuum of beliefs about offenders. Connolly and Ward (2008) discussed that offenders can be viewed as either good people who have done a bad thing (similar to how Rethinking Crime and Punishment view offenders), or as bad people who have done a bad thing (similar to how Sensible Sentencing Trust view offenders). Further, these two views make up the extreme ends of a continuum of beliefs about offenders that may help describe

how people make punishment and rehabilitation decisions, and what sort of law and order policies people may support.

Moral Stranger versus Fellow Traveller

The following is a discussion of the proposed theory of opinions about criminal offenders, based on the work of Connelly and Ward (2008). The offender who is a generally a good person, but has done a bad thing is called the *fellow traveller*. This individual is a member of society and has redeemable qualities, and also has the desire for forgiveness and understands that he or she has caused harm through his or her offending behaviour. Most other members of society can generally understand this person, and can relate to this person, seeing them as similar to themselves. This person is believed to be able to rehabilitate and this person is also thought of as unlikely or less likely to reoffend. The roles of mitigating factors, such as a bad background or alcohol consumption, are considered to be important with the fellow traveller, and these factors can be used to help explain why the offender committed the offence (see Table 2.1 for all the differentiating factors).

The offender who is a bad person and who has done a bad thing is called the *moral stranger*. This individual is considered to be an outsider to society and does not have many redeemable qualities. This individual does not have the desire to gain forgiveness and does not have an understanding of the harm that he or she caused. Other members of society generally cannot understand this person, and cannot relate to this person, thinking of them as being quite different from one's self. It is thought that the moral stranger cannot rehabilitate and that they are likely to reoffend. The role of mitigating factors, with the moral stranger, are not considered relevant, as it is the nature of the person that led to the offending behaviour not the influence of outside factors.

These are the two very extreme ends of a proposed continuum of opinion about criminal offenders. It is thought that most people will hold a certain opinion about offenders and that this will fit somewhere along the continuum, between the fellow traveller and the moral stranger. It is also thought that this opinion will have been and will continue to be influenced by the information that the media present about crime, and the way that this information is presented. The differentiating factors of the moral stranger and the fellow traveller can be thought of in terms of attribution theory (Weiner, 1972; 1985) and implicit theory of personality (Dweck et al., 1993). The attribution of behaviour is about locus of control, stability and controllability which all relate to the discussion of offenders and their offending behaviour. The moral stranger is thought to have internal control for their

behaviour; they are a bad person not just someone who has done a bad thing. The offending behaviour is considered to be a stable trait, and so the moral stranger is likely to reoffend and the moral stranger has control over their behaviour but because they are innately bad they choose not to control it (Weiner, 1972). The opposite is true for the fellow traveller.

Implicit theory of personality either views people as being able to change (incremental theory) or as being unable to change (entity theory) (Dweck et al., 1993; 1995a) and this also applies to the moral stranger and fellow traveller. The moral stranger is thought to be innately bad and so, while they are in control of their behaviour, they are not able to change their ways because their personality is not malleable (entity theory). The fellow traveller is thought to be a generally good person who has done a bad thing, and they are thought able to change their behaviour because their personality is malleable (incremental theory).

The key defining factors of the moral stranger versus fellow traveller theory were developed based on the key areas of interest related to offenders and reoffending and also the main concepts of the above two theories: attribution theory and implicit theory of personality.

Table 2.1: *Defining Factors of the Moral Stranger/Fellow Traveller*

Moral Stranger	Fellow Traveller
Bad Person	Bad circumstances
Not part of society	Part of society
Cannot understand individual's motivations to commit the crime	Can understand individuals motivations to commit the crime
Cannot understand the person (i.e. their needs/interests)	Can understand the person (i.e. their needs/interests)
Intentional harm caused	Unintentional harm caused
Unimpaired mental state	Impaired mental state
Indifferent to gaining redemption	Seeking redemption
Unexceptional (background) circumstances	Exceptional (background) circumstances
Alien beliefs and values held by the individual	Same or similar beliefs and values held by the individual
Cannot be rehabilitated	Has potential to be rehabilitated
Unmotivated to change	Motivated to change
Object	Subject
Does not deem own actions to be bad, wrong, harmful	Can see that own actions were bad, wrong, harmful
Likely to reoffend	Unlikely to reoffend

Fellow traveller in practice.

Forensic psychology research, in recent years, has developed the concept of human rights within corrections, the necessity of motivation of offenders to improve, the benefits of the therapeutic alliance between the offender and treatment provider and various treatment models such as the Good Lives Model (GLM) (e.g. Fernandez, Marshall, & Mann, 2003; Hiller, Knight, Leukefeld, & Simpson, 2002; Johnson-Listwan, Cullen & Latessa, 2006; Marshall et al., 2005; Prendergast, Farabee, Cartier, & Henkin, 2002; Rigg, 2002; Rosen, Hiller, Webster, Staton, & Leukefeld, 2004; Whitehead, Ward, & Collie, 2007; Ward & Birgden, 2007; Ward & Brown, 2004; Ward, Day, Howells, & Birgden, 2004; Ward & Gannon, 2006; Ward & Moreton, 2008; Ward & Stewart, 2003). The preceding ideas all centre on the concept of the offender as a fellow traveller, and as such provide empirical evidence for the benefits of the fellow traveller view.

These concepts are also related to successful treatment outcomes, which makes sense in the context of the fellow traveller versus moral stranger perspectives. The fellow traveller is considered to be a fellow human being and someone who has the ability to change, therefore they are likely to succeed in treatment, while the moral stranger is considered to be an outsider and someone who does not have the ability to change, and therefore they are not likely to succeed in treatment. It is thought that the fellow traveller offender is more likely to succeed in treatment than the moral stranger, because of the key concepts of ability and desire to change; aspects of treatment readiness.

Research has found that for a lot of therapy/treatment to be successful the offender needs to be motivated towards being involved and to achieving their goals or, if they lack motivation, extra work by the treatment provider is required to achieve the desired results (Hiller et al., 2002). This requires that the offender be treated with their human rights intact and given agency to make, some, of their own decisions, within the bounds of what is appropriate in the prison setting. The fellow traveller is thought of as a fellow human being, and this indicates that they should have their human rights intact (except those that must be temporarily curtailed for the length of their prison sentence).

Prendergast et al. (2002) found that external pressure to be in treatment reduced attrition rates from treatment. However, it was also found that the pressure to

be in the treatment program was not the variable that effected change, rather it was the desire and motivation of the individual to change that best predicted a successful outcome. This finding shows that while it may be beneficial to mandate some offenders to a treatment group, especially those with alcohol and drug issues, it is still up to the individual to be motivated towards changing. This motivation comes from the offender being given agency, which is a component of the fellow traveller belief.

Rigg (2002) also found that perceived coercion could be a negative experience for offenders, and that the best outcomes were those where the offender was given agency to make his or her own decisions about treatment. This research, however did find that some coercion could be useful to get the offender into the program in the first place and then this could lead to better outcomes once the offender decided to commit to the program. This, again, describes the need for the offender to be given agency over their own decisions for the better outcomes of treatment to occur, but that some help toward making this decision can be useful as well.

It is also important that the offender be promoted toward achieving forgiveness (Day, Gerace, Wilson, & Howells, 2008) as this more positive approach has better outcomes for both the offender and the community. The offender must be able to identify that they have caused harm and done something wrong, and with this understanding he or she must then desire to seek forgiveness from the victim or victims for the harm caused. This is a key factor of the fellow traveller belief.

Successful treatment also requires a therapeutic alliance between the offender and the treatment provider (Rosen et al., 2004). A therapeutic alliance requires a level of trust between the two parties and also a level of respect and a functioning rapport, these are all concepts that are involved in the fellow traveller concept. The fellow traveller is respected as a member of society and is thought to have the ability to rehabilitate. There is also weight given to mitigating factors for the fellow traveller, including alcohol and/or drug consumption, and negative background experiences, such as abuse or neglect as a child. The consideration of such mitigating factors shows that all the blame about the offending behaviour is not placed on the individual themselves, but that this is spread across other factors as well, creating less blame and more understanding.

Important to mention here is the Good Lives Model (GLM), this is a treatment model that has been proposed by Ward and colleagues (Ward & Brown, 2004; Ward & Stewart, 2003). In this model the offender, through treatment, is provided with the

skills to lead a 'good life' once he or she leaves prison. The offender is given the skills to leave prison and reintegrate into the community successfully and in a pro-social manner (Ward & Brown, 2004). Rather than a focus on the offender not reoffending, so not being anti-social, the Good Lives Model focuses on the offender doing pro-social activities, and on the values and goods that the offender wants to gain in life. Through carrying out these pro-social activities the offender learns to not act in an anti-social way, and so not to reoffend. Also, through the development of his or her desired values a clearer understanding of how to achieve these desired goods in a pro-social way can be gained.

The GLM requires that offenders are treated with their human rights intact, because they are expected to reintegrate into society as pro-social, functional and useful members of society. Without one's human rights it can be hard to do this, because one feels like an outsider and this can lead to frustration, which in turn can lead to aggression and then negative affect (Berkowitz, 1989), and this can all lead to negative outcomes, such as reoffending. This frustration can also lead to aggressive actions even when it is the result of arbitrary or non-personal actions (Berkowitz, 1989), so even when there is a general law in place or a general belief about offenders this can still lead to similar outcomes as compared with when the belief or law is specifically relevant to the offender. What the frustration-aggression hypothesis shows is that the way that offenders are treated by society can negatively influence the likelihood of reoffending behaviour occurring. More explicitly, frustration caused by the actions and opinions of the public can lead to aggression, an undesired outcome and one that perpetuates the moral stranger perspective of offenders not being able to rehabilitate.

One important point to consider here is that the research in this area does not expect that offenders can be released from prison without any form of supervision or follow up treatment/assistance. Johnson-Listwan, Cullen and Latessa (2006) discussed that it is important for offenders to be given support and assistance setting up a life outside of the prison setting, and this assistance may be in the form of supervision for a period of time. The discussion also points out, though, that this supervision is not such that it treats the offender as a second-class citizen but rather the supervision is put in place as a means to work with the offender to help him or her best re-integrate into society. This is almost a combination of the fellow traveller and moral stranger views of offenders, with there being supervision of the offender (a more moral

stranger view) but also the offender having agency to have a say in the way this occurs (a fellow traveller view). This shows that there is some use in both parts of this belief system; it is a continuum where the mid-point is possibly the best place for both the offender and the community. The following discussion will highlight the difficulties apparent with only the moral stranger view.

Moral stranger in practice.

The moral stranger concept can be best illustrated by the sex offender legislation in the United States. Such laws treat the offender as a moral stranger that the community needs to be protected from, and who is not deserving of their basic human rights (Levenson, et al., 2007). These types of laws can also be found in the United Kingdom (Sarah's Law is a reaction to the murder of 8-year-old Sarah Payne by a convicted sex offender), Australia (Dangerous Prisoners [Sex Offenders] Act, 2003), and New Zealand (where high-risk sex offenders, upon release, can be placed under extended supervision for up to 10 years) (Evans, 2003; Mercado & Ogloff, 2007; Vess, 2009).

Legislation like Megan's Law and Sarah's Law are based on the theory that external factors (such as supervision through community notification) will reduce recidivism in sex offenders and will increase the safety of the community (Jones, 1999). The offender is thought of as a moral stranger in the community, someone who is innately bad and is not able to successfully rehabilitate and who the community needs protection from. This, however, is a theory that has not been empirically tested. It is largely thought that sex offenders have high rates of reoffending with a sexual offence; however the research shows that this is an inaccurate belief (Berliner, Schram, Miller & Milloy, 1995; Caldwell, Ziemke, & Vitacco, 2008; Hanson & Bussiere, 1998; Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2005; Harris & Hanson, 2004; Harris, Rice & Quinsey, 1998; Letourneau & Armstrong, 2008; Levenson & Cotter, 2005; Levenson Brannon, et al., 2007; Waite et al., 2005) and sex offenders are not actually more likely to reoffend with a sexual related offence, but rather another type of offence. This may be due to the supervision placed on them and the lack of freedoms that they have.

Sandler, Freeman and Socia (2008) utilised time-series analysis to examine the differences in sex offence arrest rates before and after the Sex Offender Registration Act (SORA) was put into place in New York state. Results of this analysis provided

no evidence for the effectiveness of these laws for all types of sex offenders, and it was also found that over 95% of all sex offences were committed by first-time offenders.

In one study (Levenson Brannon, et al., 2007) it was found that participants believed that sex offenders had around a 75% recidivism rate, whereas evidence from a broad range of studies conducted in the U.S. indicated that this rate was between 1 and 22%. This same research also showed that sex offenders were more likely to reoffend with a non-sexual offence, than a sexual offence, again supporting the idea that close supervision and removal of some human rights can possibly result in offending behaviour in general. These offenders may not actually be innately bad, but they are instead put into a challenging situation where their options are limited.

This is further supported by Harris et al.'s (1998) research which found that sex offenders did have high rates of reoffending, however this was for non-sexual offences. The rates of sexual reoffending were, comparatively, very low. This relatively high level of general offending could be partly related to the fact that sex offenders are often treated as second class citizens when they are released from prison, and so they are not necessarily afforded the same opportunities as other people, leading them to struggle with having a pro-social role in society. Offenders, sex offenders inclusive, need to be given the opportunity to lead a 'good life' (Ward et al., 2007) and preventative legislation, such as sex offender notification laws, may make this difficult to achieve. Further, this legislation may actually perpetuate views of offenders being unable to change because the restrictive legislation may be part of what is causing the offending behaviour; the offender has limited options.

Another issue with these types of laws is that they are all encompassing. The convicted sex offender who committed numerous sexual crimes on children under the age of 12 can be classified the same as the convicted 17-year-old who had sex with his consenting 15-year-old girlfriend and the exhibitionist who flashed his neighbours. The notification laws do not mandate levels of risk to be included so, at times, do not differentiate between different types of convicted sex offenders, and they also do not mandate for review of one's status as a risk to society (Levenson Brannon, et al., 2007). These laws see the sex offender as an outsider to the community, and they see sex offenders as a homogenous group, with little attention paid to the individual characteristics of each individual – key factors of the moral stranger belief.

The homogeneity of the sex offender registration and notification laws is reflected in the general public opinion of sex offenders. Research has found that the community generally holds very similar views of all types of sex offenders, from rapists to paedophiles to statutory rapists (Willis, Levenson, & Ward, 2010). The sex offender is thought to be similar to all other sex offenders, and all sex offenders are thought of as outsiders to the community – moral strangers.

Effects of ‘moral stranger’ type legislation on the offenders.

A number of studies have been conducted to examine the actual effects of sex offender legislation on sex offenders, and whether these laws provide positive or negative experiences for the offenders that they are implemented on. Mercado, Alvarez, & Levenson (2008) found that a high percentage of sex offenders perceived that residence restriction and community notification laws had negatively affected their employment and housing opportunities.

Levenson, D’Amora, & Hern (2007) also investigated Megan’s Law and the impacts that this law had on community re-entry for offenders. There was a mixed response from sex offenders about the law and how it had affected them. Some did express a positive experience from the law being in place, because they felt that the watchful eye of the community made them more motivated not to re-offend. Others, though, found similar negative experiences to Mercado et al.’s research, where there were negative effects on housing, job and social opportunities.

Female sex offenders are a relatively rare group, however they do exist and they fall under the sex offender legislation. Tewksbury (2004) investigated the experience of female sex offenders who were under the community registration laws. These offenders expressed that they had experienced a lot of negative outcomes from the registration laws, in terms of their occupational and social functioning, and they found that the law made it more difficult for them to reintegrate into society.

The research that has described negative experiences of sex offenders under these laws illustrates that these laws may be having a detrimental effect on these people, and this may then be having an influence on how well they are able to reintegrate into society. In order for offenders to lower their likelihood of reoffending they need to learn to act pro-socially and to feel that they are a member of society (Ward et al., 2007; Willis, Levenson, & Ward, 2010), the sex offender legislation makes this difficult to achieve.

The Current Research

At present offenders can be looked at from two polar-opposite view-points (Connolly & Ward, 2008). These two view-points are as follows. On the one hand there is the moral stranger view, which is based on risk-managing, with a prescriptive treatment program that is generalised and not tailored to the individual, with an emphasis on community protection, above the needs of the offender. This is where the offender is seen as having forfeited his or her human rights because of the offence(s) that he or she committed, and so his or her needs come secondary to the community and the system in place is not one that is individually tailored to each offender but is instead more generalised. On the other hand there is the fellow traveller view is a strengths-based, individually tailored treatment view, with an emphasis on the therapeutic alliance and on promoting the needs of the offender, alongside managing the risk to the community. The offender is entitled to be treated as a fellow community member and his or her needs are as important as those of the community as a whole. This second view-point deems that the offender has not forfeited his or her human rights by way of their offending. Instead the offender has some of his or her human rights curtailed as a means of punishment for their offence/s but, other than those few liberty rights, he or she is in fact entitled to be treated with all of his or her other human rights intact.

Ward (2007) has argued that these two polar opposite views need to be considered dimensionally as a continuum, rather than as two dichotomous, opposing ends of the spectrum. Successful and ethical treatment will incorporate the main concepts at each end of the spectrum. So, the rights of the offender need to be taken into consideration along with the needs of the community, and each offender needs to be treated as a unique and individual case, and as such will have his or her own special requirements, while there is an overall system in place that provides the framework for treatment. If the media representations of crime, offenders and rehabilitation are skewed in a particular direction then it may be difficult for the incorporation of these two differing views to occur.

The aim of the current research was to examine the effect of the two different presentation styles of crime stories and relate this back to the impact that the media may have on public opinion of crime, offenders, and rehabilitation. The two presentations were developed from Connolly and Ward's (2008) concepts of the

moral stranger and the fellow traveller, with the addition of attribution theory (Weiner, 1972) and implicit theory of personality (Dweck et al., 1993) as a theoretical base. These concepts have been presented as the two extreme ends of a continuum of beliefs about offenders. The research involved in the development of these two concepts has primarily focused on sex crimes and so, for the current body of research, a sexual offence was used in the presented 'newspaper stories'.

The current research has been developed from the theoretical concepts of the moral stranger and the fellow traveller (Connolly & Ward, 2008). The work in this area is only theoretical at this stage, so the current research has been designed to further investigate this theory in an experimental setting and to develop an empirical base for the existence of these theoretical concepts. While there is a large body of research available about the different ways that offenders are treated by correctional systems and the public there is nothing that ties this together with the opinions that are held by the public. The current research, therefore, aims to fill this gap and provide information about the different opinions that the public do hold about offenders and how these different opinions then influence punishment and rehabilitation decisions.

Studies One and Two

Studies 1 and 2 presented participants with two vignettes about a sex offender ostensibly taken from a newspaper. One version was written from the extreme moral stranger end of the continuum and the other was written from the extreme fellow traveller end of the continuum. Having read a version of the story, participants were then required to answer a number of questions about their reaction to the crime, including how severe they believed the crime to be and how morally outraged they were by the crime. Participants also answered questions about the causal attributions of blame for the crime committed and were asked to complete a counterfactual generation task, thinking about how the events of the newspaper story could have turned out differently.

In Study 2 the story was the same as in Study 1 and many of the same dependent variables were utilised. Study 2 extended Study 1 by including items about the personality characteristics of the offender, and about the culpability of the offender for the offence committed. Study 2 did not request participants to complete a counterfactual generation task, but other than this, both Studies 1 and 2 were very similar.

Structural equation modelling was used in both Studies 1 and 2 to develop a model of the decision making process that individuals go through when trying to decide on the severity of the crime and the level of punishment that should be given for the offence. Study 2 aimed to expand on the model that was developed in Study 1, and this was part of the reason for the inclusion of the extra dependent variables.

Studies Three and Four

The first two studies took the theoretical concept of the moral stranger and fellow traveller belief systems and manipulated them in an empirical setting. Any differences that Studies 1 and 2 found would be interesting and would show that manipulating the belief system has an effect on punishment and rehabilitation decisions; however what this would not show was whether or not these beliefs actually exist in the real world. The aim of Studies 3 and 4 was then to develop a measure of people's opinions about criminal offenders to establish if there was empirical support for the theory of the moral stranger and the fellow traveller.

To achieve this, Study 3 generated a large list of items that were meant to measure one's opinions about offenders. This list of items were then implemented on a broad sample of participants in order to conduct exploratory factor analysis and determine which of the items best described people's opinions about criminal offenders.

With the development of a measure of people's opinions about criminal offenders, Study 4 then aimed to complete a psychometric analysis of this measure to provide information about the reliability and validity of the developed measure. Study 4a planned to test a large group of participants in order to conduct confirmatory factor analysis and then Study 4b would use a subsample of the Study 4a sample to conduct test-retest reliability and convergent and discriminant validity analysis.

Study Five

Study 5 then aimed to bring together the experimental work of Studies 1 and 2, with the scale that was to be developed in Studies 3 and 4. In Study 5, participants were presented with one of two versions of the same story from the first studies; however the changes made to the story were different and more subtle than originally used. These differences were made to represent a subjective, media-like, version of

the story and an objective, less media-like, version of the story. Participants were also given the OCO scale to complete.

The aim of Study 5 was to investigate how the individual difference of opinions about criminal offenders, as measured by the scale that Study 3 aimed to develop, would influence punishment and rehabilitation decisions made about an offender presented in a 'newspaper' story. The structural equation model that was developed through Studies 1 and 2 was also a focus of Study 5; a further aim of study 5 was to utilise the OCO measure as part of a model of people's opinions about offenders and how this measure then influenced one's judgements about the offender and about the offence.

Counterfactual Generation

Within Studies 1 and 5 participants were asked to think back to the 'newspaper story' that they read and to conduct a counterfactual generation task. The statements written would be separated out into one of five different categories in terms of the main focus of the statement. These categories were: victim, offender, others, alcohol, and the situation.

The aim of this part of the research was to examine if there were different attributions of blame, as represented by the counterfactual statements made, between the two different versions of the story (in Study 1 and Study 5) and between the two different views of offenders (in Study 5). Further, differences between the number and type of counterfactual statements generated in Studies 1 and 5 were to be examined to determine if the way the story was written or the pre-existing beliefs one held had a differential influence on counterfactual statements generated.

Concluding Remarks

This body of research has brought together the theoretical concepts of the moral stranger and the fellow traveller and tested them in an experimental setting. It has also aimed to develop a measure of people's opinions about offenders, to show that these two concepts do exist in an empirical as well as a theoretical setting. Structural equation model was also implemented in order to develop a model of people's thought processes when making decisions about an offender and the offence committed. It was hoped that this research would show that there is utility in having a measure of people's opinions about offenders that can predict the judgements that

people make about the offender, and therefore the judgements that they make of the crime and what sort of punishment motives they choose to implement.

The research in the area of human rights in corrections and the current legislation in place for offenders has shown that the moral stranger and the fellow traveller views of offenders have far-reaching consequences for offenders, and for the public. This is an important area to develop, because knowing what is best for offenders in order to allow them to reintegrate into society as pro-social members of the community and what is best for the community, in terms of providing the best framework for offenders to be able to reintegrate, will provide the best outcome for both groups; offenders and the community.

The current research aimed to provide empirical support for the existence of the moral stranger and fellow traveller views, and also aimed to illustrate the effects that these two views have on punishment and rehabilitation decisions. This also ties in with the media, and how the media presents information about offenders to the community. As discussed in chapter 1, the media is a major source of information for the public and so showing that the way that a story is written can influence punishment and rehabilitation decisions, and also that such influenced decisions can then be detrimental to both the offenders and to the community is an important step forward.

It is important to understand the views that the public hold about offenders and also how the public come to hold these views. As the media is a huge source of information about offenders this is a key area to investigate further. If it can be shown that the way that the media presents information to the public, in terms of the type of information they present and the way that it is written, influences punishment and rehabilitation decisions in a negative way then this can help inform the sorts of changes that may need to be enforced in order for the public to receive more accurate and less biased information. This would then result in the opinions held by the public being better informed.

The proposed scale to measure opinions held about criminal offenders will go beyond merely thinking of offenders as bad people who need to be punished for the wrongdoing that they committed. The scale will take a more holistic and less emotive approach, which is not something that has been covered before with previous measures of people's views of offenders, such as the Community Attitudes toward

Sex Offenders scale (Church, Wakeman, Miller, Clements, & Sun, 2008) and the Attitudes toward Prisoners scale (Melvin, Gramling & Gardner, 1985).

The Attitudes toward Prisoners (ATP) scale was developed in 1985 and is made up of 36 items. It takes a more feelings based and emotional approach to views about this group of people, and it only creates an overall measure of people's views of prisoners. It does not have subscales within the overall scale to inform on different parts of one's view of offenders. Further, its use of the word 'prisoners' is somewhat dated and may influence people's opinions about this group more negatively than if a different word was used (Melvin et al., 1985). *Prisoner* implies that the individual is in prison, whereas many offenders do not end up being convicted and/or they do not receive a custodial sentence in New Zealand, and so the term *prisoner* actually limits the group, whereas the term *offender* is broad enough to capture any manner of individual who breaks the law. Prisoner is defined as a person who is held in custody, captivity, or a condition of forcible restraint, especially while on trial or serving a prison sentence, while an offender is defined as one that offends, especially one that breaks public law. These definitions show that there are considerable differences in the use of these two words for the same group of people, and that the proposed scale's use of offender instead of prisoner seems to be aimed at a broader and simpler definition.

The Community Attitudes toward Sex Offenders (CATSO) scale was developed in 2008 and is made up of 18 items, with 4 subscales: social isolation, capacity to change, severity/dangerousness and deviancy. The items in this scale are very emotive and many are very specific to the group under question, sex offenders. This is not a measure of general opinions about offenders, but rather is a very specific measure of sex offenders (Church et al., 2008). While the current research does use a story about a sex offence the aim of the development of the measure was to create a measure of people's overall opinions about offenders, not just one specific group. This more general measure could then be more versatile and could be applied to specific offence groups such as violent offenders, drug offenders, or property offenders.

The aim of the measure to be developed in the current body of research was to provide a scale that was modern enough to be useful, that was not overly emotive, and could inform on different areas of one's opinion about offenders. Also, it was

important that this measure could be applied to offenders as a general group but also had the versatility to be applied to specific sub-groups of offenders.

The moral stranger and the fellow traveller have been differentiated along 14 different factors based on the main parts of theory behind these concepts and on attribution theory (Weiner, 1972) and implicit theory of personality (Dweck et al., 1993), and so it was important in the current body of research that the measure developed took into consideration as many of these different factors as possible. Unlike the ATP scale, the current research aimed to create a measure that had a number of useful and informative subscales that could help understand the make-up of one's opinion about offenders, with more information than merely a person being more or less punitive. One's opinion about offenders is complex and so the measure developed needed to be able to inform on as many aspects of this opinion as possible, because each part of this opinion might help to inform different judgements made about the offender and the offence.

The area of crime, offenders, punishment and rehabilitation is an important one, and a complex one. The development of a better understanding of the sorts of opinions that members of the public have about offenders will help better inform policy decisions that are made for this group of people. Further, it is important to consider that opinions held about offenders and crime are not necessarily made from a simple, blanket view but rather there are different elements of belief that all add up to the general overall opinion, and these different elements might actually inform different judgements made about the offender and the offence committed.

It is also important to understand how these different opinions about offenders' affect decisions made about offenders, and also how these opinions are influenced by outside factors, such as the media. If opinions about offenders are negatively influenced by the way that the media presents information about this group of people, as research would suggest is the case, then the current research will help inform how this negative influence can have a significant effect on punishment and rehabilitation decisions.

Chapter 3

Study One

The opinions that community members hold about criminal offenders have a tremendous influence on punishment and rehabilitation decisions. Following from this, such decisions affect the actions that are made towards offenders by the community. Due to this influence it is important to understand *how* different views of offenders impact these decisions. The current study aimed to investigate how presenting information about the same offender and offence from two different perspectives could influence one's punishment and rehabilitation decisions about that offender.

To reiterate, it is theorised that, there are two different perspectives that can be held about criminal offenders. The *moral stranger* is the offender who is considered a risk that needs to be managed and controlled for the sake of community protection, his or her needs considered to be peripheral to those of the community as a whole (Connolly & Ward, 2008). In contrast, the *fellow traveller* is considered a client in need of support and help, one who has the right to a good life and who is considered to hold similar value as other members of the community (Connolly & Ward, 2008). These, seemingly polar opposite, beliefs about criminal offenders have the tremendous potential to affect attitudes not only about criminal offenders, but also about crime more generally, and the likelihood of rehabilitation.

The beliefs that the public hold are important in terms of public policy decisions, as policy makers have the obligation to follow the wishes and opinions of the public to whom they are accountable. It is important, therefore, to understand the mechanisms through which a person can be induced to hold one belief over the other and how these differing beliefs may impact on punishment and rehabilitation decisions. As such, these two opposite beliefs, the moral stranger and the fellow traveller, were the basis of the current research.

The distinction between the moral stranger and the fellow traveller belief systems is a theoretical one at this stage. However, even though the distinction has not yet been supported empirically, the research into the area of offender rehabilitation and treatment gives support to the importance of the fellow traveller ideals (McMurran & Ward, 2004; Ward & Maruna, 2007; Ward et al., 2007). The research in this area also indicates that the fellow traveller ideals are necessary in order to gain the best end result for both the offender and the community overall. It is

also clear that there is other research and policy that has put into place legislation that is consistent with treating offenders as moral strangers, getting the best end result for the community and considering the outcome for the individual as irrelevant (Levenson D'Amora, et al., 2007; Mercado et al., 2008; Mercado & Ogloff, 2007; Vess, 2009).

Whether an offender is described from the moral stranger perspective or the fellow traveller perspective could influence the punishment and rehabilitation decisions that one makes in regards to that offender. To test this hypothesis study one presented the story of an offender from these two different perspectives. The information provided in each of the two versions was essentially the same, with some very subtle differences. In the story, the offender was described as having committed the offence of rape against a co-worker, and these facts were kept consistent in both versions.

An example of how the story differed between the two presentations follows. In the moral stranger version it was described that the offender was not well liked by his colleagues, consistent with the idea that the offender is someone outside of society, while in the fellow traveller version it was described that the offender was generally liked by his colleagues, consistent with the idea that the offender is an equal member of society. These key differences are explained in more detail in the method section of this chapter.

All studies carried out in this body of research were approved by the Human Ethics Committee of the School of Psychology, Victoria University. The key considerations in this body of research was confidentiality, especially in studies that asked for participants' own experience of crime, such as being the victim of a crime or having been convicted of a crime. Participants needed to be assured that the information that they provided would be confidential and in no way be able to be traced back to them. This was achieved through there being no identifying markers on any of the studies conducted in this body of work. This was the case for all but Study 4. This was because in Study 4b participants were matched to their time one data, in study 4a. To ensure confidentiality in this part of the research too, an independent researcher, who was in no way affiliated or involved in the current research, matched the time one and two data, and then provided the primary researcher with this data, which no longer included any identifying variables.

The other ethical consideration taken into account was the nature of the crime included in the vignettes. However, this was considered to be no more explicit than a typical news story and therefore there was no need to make any restrictions on who could complete the current study.

Hypotheses

It was predicted that when an individual read about the offender in the moral stranger presentation, as compared with when an individual read about the offender in the fellow traveller presentation, that:

- a. The crime would be rated as more severe, a more severe punishment rating would be given and the offender would be rated as more likely to reoffend.
- b. The offender would be rated as more internally responsible for the offence, more personally responsible for the offence, that less weight would be given to external influences in terms of attributions of cause, and that attributions of cause would be rated as more stable.

Method

Design and Participants

Study one employed a single factor (Presentation: Moral Stranger versus Fellow Traveller) between-subjects design. One hundred and sixty individuals participated in this study; however one participant had to be dropped from the analysis due to submitting a significantly incomplete questionnaire. These participants were recruited from a variety of places; Wellington International Airport, University of Otago Medical School at Wellington Hospital, Datacom Wellington, State Services Commission, Johnsonville Community Centre and Victoria University of Wellington. Each participant received an individually wrapped chocolate fish as a token of appreciation for their participation.

The sampling method of the current study garnered a broad sample, with an average age of 38.97 years (ranging from 19 – 81 years, $SD = 15.26$), and consisting of 80 males and 79 females. Education information taken indicated that 85% of the sample had achieved, at least, university entrance and up to 60% of the sample had achieved higher than this, indicating that this sample was more educated than the overall NZ population, which is around 40% (Ministry of Education, 2006). The

sample presented a variety of occupations, from managers (N=16), to professional workers (N=56), to students (N=27) and retirees (N=24). The sample was predominantly NZ European (65.2%), with small representation of Maori, Pacific Island and Asian ethnicities. Seventeen percent of the sample identified themselves as New Zealanders or 'Kiwis' and so these participants specific ethnicity could not be determined. The above ethnicity figure is very similar to the overall population percentage of NZ Europeans of 67% (Statistics New Zealand, 2006). Participants were also asked about their New Zealand status and from this question it was determined that 85% of the sample were New Zealand citizens and 12.5% were permanent residents (4 participants did not answer this question). See Appendix A for full reporting of the demographic information.

Materials

Study one involved the completion of a booklet questionnaire (8-pages in length, A5 size), of which there were two versions (N=80 Moral Stranger version, N=80 Fellow Traveller version). The specific aspects of the questionnaire are described in full below. There were eight dependent measures used in the final analysis. Other materials used were an information sheet/consent form and a debriefing sheet (see Appendix B for the complete questionnaire material).

Newspaper stories.

The presentation manipulation involved two versions of the same scenario (ostensibly taken from a newspaper report), and these presentation versions were based on the work by Ward and colleagues (Ward, 2007; Connelly & Ward, 2008). Based on the fellow traveller and the moral stranger views, two crime stories were written to act as a newspaper story. The stories described a male offender who had been convicted of raping a female co-worker, at the work Christmas party. The facts of the crime and the conviction were held constant across both versions; however the descriptions of the offender's personal characteristics were manipulated to represent either a moral stranger or a fellow traveller (see below or Appendix B for both versions). Both versions were kept, as much as possible, to the same length. The moral stranger version was 258 words long and split into four paragraphs and the fellow traveller version was 255 words long and also split into four paragraphs.

A number of key differences between the two different versions are now illustrated, with particular reference to the defining factors of the two perspectives (as set out in Table 2.1) that these differences were created to represent.

Differentiating factors.

The moral stranger is thought of as an outsider to the community and is also deemed to not be understandable by most people, so in the ‘story’ it was described that “...his friends feel that he went too far with his advances toward the woman” and “Peter’s co-workers describe him as ‘not one of the guys’, and feel that he does not share their interests and values”. Conversely, the offender in the fellow traveller version is understandable and can be thought of as a member of society, and so in this version of the story it was described that “Peter was making understandable advances toward the woman” and “Peter’s co-workers describe him as ‘one of the guys’, and feel that he shares their interests and values”.

Further to the idea of either being a part of the community (fellow traveller) or considered an outsider (moral stranger), in the fellow traveller version the story ended with “When convicting Peter the judge accepted that he was a previously good member of the community who had made a mistake and that he now needed the help of his community to get back on track”. While, in the moral stranger version the story ended with, “When convicting Peter the judge described him as an outsider to the community, who had made a number of inexcusable mistakes, and that he was disinclined to receive help to get his life back on track”.

Another key difference that was illustrated in the two versions of the ‘story’ was good versus bad person. In the fellow traveller version it is described that “His friends were shocked by this offence as they consider Peter to be a genuinely good person...”, while in the moral stranger it was described that “His acquaintances were not shocked by this offence, as he has done similar things before”. The Peter in the fellow traveller version is seen as a good person who has done a bad thing, while the Peter in the moral stranger version is viewed as more of a bad person, and the bad action that he has done is thought of as part of his character.

Also key to the differentiation between these two views is remorse and desire to seek forgiveness, and the ability to recognise one’s own wrongdoing. This was illustrated with “...he never intended to harm the female victim, and thought what he was doing was consensual. He now sees that he was wrong and that his actions were

indeed harmful”, in the fellow traveller version, versus “...appeared to be unconcerned by any harm experienced by the female victim, and thought what he was doing was consensual. He does not think that he was wrong or that his actions were harmful”, in the moral stranger version. Peter in the fellow traveller version did not think he was doing something wrong at the time of the offence but after the fact he has developed an understanding of the harm he did cause and he is remorseful for this. On the other hand, Peter in the moral stranger version also thought he was not doing anything wrong at the time but, the difference is, that this Peter still does not think he has done any harm and he is not remorseful for his actions.

A further differentiating factor is external influences/explanations for an offender’s actions/behaviour. In the fellow traveller version, weight is given to the influence of outside factors i.e. “...where both parties had been drinking heavily throughout the night” and “...believes that his parents are disappointed in him...leading Peter to feel inadequate and unwanted”. While in the moral stranger version external factors are disregarded as being influential, i.e. “...where both parties had been drinking throughout the night, although Peter had not been drinking particularly heavily” and “...believes that his parents are disappointed in him...he appears quite unconcerned about their lack of approval”.

A sex crime was deemed most appropriate for the newspaper story as the Moral Stranger/Fellow Traveller theory has been developed with particular reference to sex offenders (Ward, 2007). The newspaper story was presented on the front cover of the questionnaire booklet and participants were directed to read this first before continuing with the rest of the questionnaire. The two versions of the story are outlined below.

Moral stranger version (258 words).

Peter is a 27-year old factory worker who has been convicted of raping a 20-year old co-worker. His acquaintances were not shocked by this offence, as he has done similar things before. Peter has been in trouble with the law before, a number of times. Peter comes from a working class family and believes that his parents are disappointed in him for not becoming successful

like his two siblings, who are both lawyers. He appears quite unconcerned by their lack of approval.

The crime in question occurred during the staff Christmas party, where both parties had been drinking throughout the night, although Peter had not been drinking particularly heavily. Peter had made a number of sexual comments about this particular co-worker previously and his friends feel that he went too far with his advances toward the woman. Peter's co-workers describe him as 'not one of the guys', and feel that he does not share their interests and values. At trial Peter appeared to be unconcerned by any harm experienced by the female victim, and thought that what he was doing was consensual. He does not think that he was wrong or that his actions were harmful. The judge commented on Peter's unwillingness to acknowledge that he had made a mistake and his lack of commitment to enter a treatment program for sex offenders.

When convicting Peter the judge described him as an outsider to the community, who had made a number of inexcusable mistakes, and that he was disinclined to receive help to get life back on track.

Fellow traveller version (255 words).

Peter is a 27-year-old factory worker who has been convicted of raping a 20-year-old co-worker. His friends were shocked by this offence as they consider Peter to be a genuinely good person, and they feel that it must have been the influence of the situation that led to his offending. Peter has not been in trouble with the law before. Peter comes from a working class family and believes that his parents are disappointed in him for not becoming successful

like his two siblings, who are both lawyers, leading Peter to feel inadequate and unwanted.

The crime in question occurred during the staff Christmas party, where both parties had been drinking heavily throughout the night. Peter had expressed his interest in this particular co-worker previously and his friends feel that Peter was simply making understandable advances toward the woman.

Peter's co-workers describe him as 'one of the guys', and feel that he shares their interests and values.

At the trial Peter testified that he never intended to harm the female victim, and thought that what he was doing was consensual. He now sees that he was wrong and that his actions were indeed harmful. The judge commented on Peter's willingness to acknowledge that he has made a mistake and his commitment to enter a treatment program for sex offenders.

When convicting Peter the judge accepted that he was a previously good member of the community who had made a mistake and that he now needed the help of his community to get back on track.

Dependent Variables

After reading the 'newspaper story' participants responded to a number of questions in relation to the story and their overall views of the New Zealand Criminal Justice System.

Causal dimension scale II.

The Causal Dimension Scale II (McAuley, Duncan, & Russell, 1992) was used to measure participants' attribution of cause opinions. This scale is made up of 12 items that are split into four constructs that each measures a different element of the cause of the act (i.e. the offence). The four constructs are locus of causality, personal control, external control and stability. Locus of causality refers to the cause being attributed to an internal versus external agent (e.g. that reflects an aspect of

Peter versus that reflects an aspect of the situation). Personal control refers to whether or not the cause can be attributed to the personal control of the individual or not (e.g. manageable by Peter versus not manageable by Peter). External control refers to whether or not there are external reasons of cause (e.g. over which others have control versus over which others have no control). Finally, stability refers to whether or not the attributions of cause are thought of as stable or as changeable (e.g. stable over time versus variable over time) (McAuley et al., 1992).

This scale was adjusted for the current study to be used as a measure of a third party (i.e. the offender) as opposed to as a measure of first person cause. All the items were predicated with the statement “Is the cause something that:” and then participants had to answer each of the following 12 items in response to this overarching question. Each item was presented on a continuum from 9-1. At each end of the continuum was one extreme version of the statement e.g. ‘inside of Peter’ at one end and ‘outside of Peter’ at the other end. Participants therefore chose which side of the continuum they most agreed with and then indicated a numerical response that represented how much they believed this to be the case, a response of ‘5’ represented a neutral response that was equally rated between the two response options. An example item is “over which Peter has power...over which Peter has no power”; this is a personal control item. For the full list of the adjusted items see Appendix B.

For each construct participants’ answers were summed and then divided by the number of items to give their overall rating for that construct. This meant that each participant ended up with a single score for each of the four causal dimension constructs/subscales.

Reaction scale.

Participants next responded to ten questions about their reaction to the crime story that they had read. These were measured on a 1-7 Likert scale, anchored by 1 = *not at all* and 7 = *extremely or completely*. These questions asked participants about the severity of the crime (i.e. How serious is this crime?), the likelihood that the offender would reoffend (i.e. How likely do you believe it is that this offender will commit this specific crime again?) and their punishment decision (i.e. To what extent was your punishment decision based on the desire to make sure that this offender is

discouraged from committing this crime again?). See Appendix B for the full list of questions.

The only question that was not presented in this manner was the item that asked participants what they thought the most appropriate punishment was for the crime. For this question, participants were given a list of possible punishments and they had to circle the one they thought was best. The options were as follows: reparation, home detention, supervision, community work, imprisonment, preventive detention, life imprisonment, or combination of these (where participants were given space to write out what options they would choose).

Crime opinions scale.

Participants rated their agreement with ten items designed to gauge their overarching opinion of crime and the criminal justice system in New Zealand (see Appendix B for the full list of items). Each item was answered with a 5-point Likert scale, from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). This scale was generated by the primary researcher to try to gauge general opinions held about crime and the criminal justice system in New Zealand. Some example items are: Prison sentences in New Zealand are not tough enough, Crime in New Zealand is on the rise, The New Zealand Justice System is too lenient on criminals.

Counterfactual generation.

Participants were asked to complete a counterfactual generation in regards to the crime story they had read on the first page. Instructions were given to “*Please think about the events that you read about in the newspaper story and how you think this might have turned out differently. Please give us these thoughts in the space provided below*”. The rest of the page below the instructions was blank, to allow for participants to write their thoughts about the events in the story.

These thoughts were coded into one of six categories in relation to the main focus of the individual statement. The six categories were: victim, offender, others, alcohol, context, and miscellaneous. Each statement given by a participant could fall under only one of these categories or it could fall under a combination of the six, depending on the content of the statement. Each individual statement was coded as a discrete response to be included in at least one of the six categories. For further information about this process see chapter 7, where full analysis and discussion of the counterfactual generations is covered.

The counterfactual generation task was included in the current study as a means of gathering some data that could help to develop an explanation of causality. This is because the aspects of an event that are mutated in a counterfactual task in order to create change can be seen as causal factors (Crawford & McCrea, 2004; Roese & Olson, 1996). The counterfactual research suggests that the task in the current study might provide some information about which actor or aspect of the story participants are attributing blame and causality to.

Demographic information.

The final page of the questionnaire asked for participants to disclose demographic information in regards to their gender, age, education level, current occupation and their status as a New Zealander (i.e. whether the participant was a New Zealand citizen or a permanent resident).

Procedure

Depending on where recruitment was taking place, the procedure was slightly different. However, in all cases, participants who expressed an interest in completing the questionnaire were given the information sheet/consent form to read and sign. If they did sign it, agreeing to participate, they were then randomly assigned to one of the two versions of the newspaper story. On completion of the questionnaire participants were given a debriefing sheet by the researcher and encouraged to ask any further questions, if they had any. Participants were then thanked for their participation and given an individually wrapped chocolate fish as a thank you token. Presented below are the more specific recruitment processes for the different locations.

At both Datacom and State Services Commission prior arrangement with the necessary manager provided either a meeting room or lounge area for the researcher to base herself in and for participants to come to her when they had the time to complete the questionnaire. These recruitment times were organised approximately a week in advance of the recruitment day and an email was sent out to all relevant employees to inform them of what the study was about and what was being asked of them. During these two recruitments participants came to see the researcher when they had time and received the relevant materials to complete the study. On completion and return of the questionnaire participants were thanked and given their chocolate fish. Participants would either complete the study in the allotted meeting/lounge room or they would take it back to their desk, to return once they had

completed it. There was no time constraint placed on the completion of the study so it was reasonable for participants to take their time with their answers and return the completed questionnaire to the researcher when it suited them.

Recruitment was slightly different at the Otago Medical School at Wellington Hospital. Again this was organised by prior arrangement and an email detailing the study and what was being requested of participants was sent out the week prior to the recruitment day. On the recruitment day the researcher entered the lecture hall at the completion of the class and asked those who wished to fill in the questionnaire to remain in their seats and then the information sheets were passed out, and signed, and the questionnaire was then handed out. The researcher utilised the help of a colleague to be able to carry this process out in a timely fashion. When the students had completed the questionnaire they brought it to the researcher who collected it in, thanked them and handed them their chocolate fish and debriefing sheet. This recruitment process took approximately 20-25 minutes.

Recruitment of participants at the Johnsonville Community Centre required two trips out to Johnsonville, each of which garnered approximately 12 participants and took approximately two hours. The questionnaire was increased to an A4 size booklet for recruitment at the Community Centre because the participants at the Centre were older and so the small font on the A5 size questionnaire might have been hard for these participants to read. Potential participants had been forewarned, about the researcher coming out to the Centre, on the Community Centre notice board and those who were happy to participate made themselves known to the researcher, who then presented them with the information sheet to sign and if they agreed to participate then gave them the questionnaire to complete. Participants then returned the completed questionnaire to the researcher, who thanked them and gave them a chocolate fish and debriefing sheet.

Participants who were recruited from either Wellington International Airport or Victoria University were done so by the researcher approaching them individually, explaining who she was and asking if they would be interested in completing the questionnaire. If those approached expressed an interest in completing the questionnaire they were then given the information sheet to read and sign, if they agreed to participate then they would be given the questionnaire and were asked to return the questionnaire to the researcher when they had completed it. The researcher stayed within eyesight of the participant but also made sure that she was far enough

away so as to not influence the participants' answers. When the participant returned the completed questionnaire they were given the debriefing sheet, thanked by the researcher and also given a chocolate fish.

Results

Reliability Analysis

Causal dimension scale II.

Cronbach's alpha was used to determine the internal consistency of the four constructs within the current study. The current study found comparable internal consistency for the four constructs when compared with McAuley et al.'s (1992) findings; locus of causality ($\alpha=.66$ compared with $\alpha=.67$ in McAuley et al, 1992), personal control ($\alpha=.81$ versus $\alpha=.79$), external control ($\alpha=.61$ versus $\alpha=.82$), and stability ($\alpha=.67$ versus $\alpha=.53$). These reliabilities indicate that the items on each scale were consistently measuring a similar concept, even though the scale had been altered to ask about third person cause. This provided support for the scales use in this manner.

Reaction scale.

These ten items were subjected to principal components analysis (PCA) in order to uncover any over-arching constructs that the questions were measuring. From this analysis two composite indices were created. Two of the ten reaction items were excluded from the composites. Question four asked participants to make a decision as to what type of punishment would be most suitable; which was asked on a very different type of scale to the other items and so was not able to be translated into a similar format as the rest of the items used in the composite items. Question seven was also excluded as it was redundant, the question "How likely do you believe it is that this offence will occur again in the community?" can only be answered in one way and so inclusion of this item would not demonstrate differentiation between participants.

After the exclusion of the above two items, the remaining eight questions were analysed using principal component analysis with Direct Oblimin (oblique) rotation (see Table 3.1). The analysis yielded two components explaining a total of 62.26% of the variance for the entire set of variables. Component one was labelled *reaction severity* due to the high loadings by the following items: how serious is this crime; how severe should the punishment for this crime be; how morally outraged are you by

this crime ($\alpha=.77$). The first component explained 40.79% of the variance. The second component derived was labelled *reaction reoffending* as the three items that loaded on to this component all related to the likelihood of the offender reoffending or not, and all three items had high loadings ($\alpha=.80$). The variance explained by this component was 21.47%.

Table 3.1: *Reaction Scale PCA Study One*

Items	Loadings	
	Component 1 Reaction Severity	Component 2 Reaction Reoffending
How serious is this crime?	.804	
How severe should the punishment for this crime be?	.704	.536
How morally outraged are you by this crime?	.788	
To what extent was your punishment decisions based on a desire to make sure that the offender is discouraged from committing this crime again?	.692	
To what extent was your punishment decision based on the desire to make this offender pay for what he has done?	.639	
How likely do you believe that this specific will commit this specific crime again?	.339	.901
How likely d you believe it is that this offender will re-offend (in general)?	.379	.852
How likely do you believe it is that this offender will be helped by rehabilitation programs?		.672
Eigenvalue	3.263	1.718
% of Total Variance	40.789	21.470
Total Variance		62.259%

Table 3.2: *Correlations between Factors*

		Reaction Reoffending
Reaction Severity	r	.350
	p	<.001
	N	157

The communalities of the variables included are reasonable but two of the items (deterrence and pay for) exhibited a somewhat smaller amount (48.9% and 42.3% respectively) of variance in common with the other variables in the analysis. This could indicate that these particular items are not strongly related to the other items in the analysis; however the KMO (.762) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ($p < .001$) both indicate that the set of variables are adequately related for factor analysis.

This analysis found that within the reaction items that participants' responded to there were two patterns of responding, one relating to the participants reaction to the severity of the crime and one relating to the participants judgement of the likelihood of the offender reoffending.

Crime opinions scale.

These ten items were subjected to principal components analysis (PCA) which revealed a two-factor structure. Two composites were identified within this analysis and two of the ten items ('Prison is an effective deterrent' $\beta = .93$ and 'The main purpose of prison is punishment' $\beta = .36$) did not load significantly on either of these, or together, and so were removed from further analysis.

The analysis was conducted using principal component analysis with Direct Oblimin (oblique) rotation (see Table 3.3). The analysis yielded two components explaining a total of 51.67% of the variance for the entire set of variables. There was a third variable also identified but this had only one item loading strongly on to it, and so the two items (as mentioned above) that were identified under this third, residual factor, were removed from the analysis of participants' answers.

Component one was labelled *crime scale punishment* due to the high loadings by the following items: Prison sentences in New Zealand are not tough enough; The New Zealand Justice System is too lenient on criminals; Offenders receive adequate punishment for their crime in New Zealand (reverse scored) ($\alpha = .81$). The first factor explained 35.93% of the variance. The second component derived was labelled *crime scale rehabilitation* because the three items that loaded onto this factor all related to the availability or use of rehabilitation within the criminal justice system: Rehabilitation should be an important focus of the prison system (reverse-scored), Treatment programs should be readily available to offenders within prison (reverse-

Table 3.3: *Crime Opinion Scale PCA Study One*

Items	Loadings		
	Component 1 Punishment	Component 2 Rehabilitation	Component 3 Residual
Prison sentence in New Zealand are not tough enough	.858		
Crime in New Zealand is on the rise	.660		
The New Zealand Justice System is too lenient on criminals	.840		
Offenders receive adequate punishment for their crimes in New Zealand	.773		
Offenders are paroled too early in New Zealand	.623		.538
Rehabilitation should be an important focus of the prison system		.785	
Treatment programs should be readily available to offenders within prison		.816	
Rehabilitation is ineffective and a waste of taxpayers' money	.429	.656	
Prison is an effective deterrent to potential offenders			.928
The main purpose of sentencing should be punishment	.464	.426	.356
Eigenvalue	3.594	1.572	1.006
% of Total Variance	35.938	15.724	10.064
Total Variance		51.662%	61.726%

Table 3.4: *Correlations between Factors*

CS Rehabilitation		
CS Punishment	r	-.277
	p	<.001
	N	158

scored), and Rehabilitation is ineffective and a waste of taxpayers' money ($\alpha=.65$). The variance explained by this factor was 15.72%.

The KMO (.818) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ($p<.001$) both indicated that the set of variables were at least adequately related for factor analysis. This analysis found that within the crime opinion items that participants responded to there were two patterns of responding, one relating to the participants' opinion of punishment in New Zealand and one relating to the participants' opinion of rehabilitation in the prison system, in New Zealand.

Multivariate Analysis of Variance

A one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine the effect of presentation condition on the eight dependent variables; reaction severity, reaction rehabilitation, crime scale punishment, crime scale rehabilitation, locus of causality, external control, stability and personal control. The multivariate main effect for presentation condition was significant: Wilks' $\Lambda = .42$, $F(8,150) = 25.62$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .58$. Table 3.4 shows all the means and standard deviations on the dependent variables by presentation condition. Also shown for each dependent variable are the F values for univariate ANOVAs and their accompanying effect sizes, calculated as partial eta squared (η^2).

As can be seen by the means in Table 3.4, participants exposed to the moral stranger version rated the crime as more severe than did participants exposed to the fellow traveller version ($M=5.62$, $SD=0.85$ versus $M=5.17$, $SD=1.01$). In addition, perceptions of reoffending likelihood were higher for those who read the moral stranger version ($M=5.03$, $SD=0.89$), than when reading the fellow traveller version ($M=2.98$, $SD=0.96$). There was little difference between participants' ratings of both subscales of the crime scale.

In terms of the Causal Dimension Scale II, simply from examining the means, participants who read the moral stranger version rated the cause of the act as being more a part of the offender, there being less external control, the cause as being more

Table 3.5: Means and Standard Deviations on the Dependent Variables as a Function of Presentation Condition

Variable	Presentation Condition				$F(1,157)$	p	η_p^2
	<u>Moral Stranger</u>		<u>Fellow Traveller</u>				
	M	SD	M	SD			
Severity	5.62	0.85	5.17	1.01	9.38	.003	.056
Reoffending	5.03	0.89	2.98	0.96	194.99	<.01	.554
Punishment	3.64	0.66	3.56	0.80	0.29	<i>ns</i>	.002
Rehabilitation	4.19	0.59	4.16	0.78	0.08	<i>ns</i>	.001
Locus of Causality*	7.19	0.99	6.28	1.31	21.69	<.01	.136
External Control*	4.49	1.50	4.75	1.51	1.23	<i>ns</i>	.008
Stability*	4.73	1.56	4.51	1.64	0.81	<i>ns</i>	.005
Personal Control*	6.58	1.72	7.35	1.38	9.82	.002	.059

Note. All variables range from 1 to 7, except those with * which range from 1 to 9.

stable, and there being less personal control, than when reading the fellow traveller condition.

Table 3.4 shows that there were a number of significant main effects of presentation condition. For both reaction subscales there were significant main effects. As predicted, participants who read the moral stranger presentation rated the offence as more severe ($F(1,157)=9.38, p=.003$, partial $\eta^2=.06$) and the likelihood of the offender reoffending as higher ($F(1,157)=194.99, p<.001$, partial $\eta^2=.55$) than those that read the fellow traveller presentation. Also, those participants who read the moral stranger presentation rated the locus of causality of the act (i.e. the offence) as being more a part of Peter than outside of Peter than those that read the fellow traveller presentation ($F(1,157)=24.69, p<.001$, partial $\eta^2=.14$).

These three main effects were all in the predicted direction, with participants who read the moral stranger presentation rating the offence as more severe, the offender as more likely to reoffend and the cause of the offence as being more a part of Peter than outside of Peter, than those who read the fellow traveller version.

The final main effect was for the causal dimension subscale, personal control ($F(1,157)=9.82, p=.002$, partial $\eta^2=.06$). Participants who read the moral stranger presentation rated the cause of the act (i.e. the offence) as being less within Peter's personal control than those that read the fellow traveller presentation. This final main effect was not in the predicted direction, however when examining the means for this variable for both the moral stranger and fellow traveller presentations it can be seen that the ratings were at the high end of the scale for both, indicating that personal control was highly attributed in both conditions, just to differing levels.

As can be seen in Table 3.4, there were no significant main effects for the two Crime Scale subscales, punishment and rehabilitation, or for the other two subscales of the causal dimension scale, external control and stability. Regardless of which presentation version participants read they did not differ significantly in their ratings of crime in New Zealand, as based on the Crime Scale items, which was as expected. Further, participants did not differ in their ratings of the impact of external control on the cause of the offence or their ratings of the stability of the cause. It was expected that external control would differ between the two presentation versions, such that in the fellow traveller presentation it was expected that external factors would be considered more relevant to the causal attributions than in the moral stranger presentation. This is because the fellow traveller perspective takes into consideration

mitigating, external factors, while the moral stranger perspective does not. It was also expected that there would be a difference for the stability factor, as the fellow traveller perspective views the offender as changeable over time, while the moral stranger perspective does not holds the opposite view. However, neither of these hypotheses was supported.

Mediation Analysis

As a result of the MANOVA analysis it was hypothesised that the relationship between presentation condition and severity rating may actually be better explained by a mediating third variable. The hypothesised mediator was perceived likelihood of reoffending; that is when participants made a judgment of the severity of the crime they were doing so via their judgement of the likelihood that the offender would reoffend. The reoffending variable was selected as the mediator because likelihood to reoffend indicates how much the reader thinks that the offender is a bad person, because offending is more innate if it is expected to occur often rather than as a one off. How serious one then believes the offence to be will be related to reoffending, because if an offending is considered to be likely to reoffend then the offence committed the first time is representative of their nature and so is considered to be more serious.

To test this hypothesis, linear regressions were run, in line with the mediation procedures outlined by Baron and Kenny (1986). The first step involved the IV-DV regression with story condition as a predictor of severity. This analysis was significant ($\beta = -.237$, $p < .01$) indicating that there was, in fact, an effect that may be mediated. The second step involved examining the relationship between the IV (story condition) and the potential mediator (likelihood of reoffending). This analysis was also significant ($\beta = -.744$, $p < .01$). The third step involved examining the relationship between the mediator (likelihood of reoffending) and the DV (severity). This analysis revealed a significant predictive relationship between likelihood of reoffending and perceptions of crime severity ($\beta = .344$, $p < .01$). The final regression examined the initial effect of the IV (story condition) on the DV (severity), controlling for likelihood of reoffending. The mediated path from story condition to severity was reduced when controlling for likelihood of reoffending ($\beta = .042$, ns) (see Figure 3.1).

Using Sobel's test it was found that this was a statistically significant full mediation ($Sobel = -3.23$, $p < .01$). That is, participants' judgements of the severity of

the offence when reading either of the presentation conditions was explained by their judgement of the offender's likelihood of reoffending.

Note: Sobel = -3.23, $p < .01$

Figure 3.1: Mediation effect of reoffending on the relationship between condition and severity.

Structural Equation Modelling

Based on both the above mediation analysis and the MANOVA analysis, and the assumption that the dependent variables are interrelated, it was further hypothesised that the mediation occurring was driven by more than just reoffending ratings. Because this hypothesis was based on the meditational analysis already conducted the proposed SEM model had the same general structure, but additional mediators were included, to examine if this was a more complex process, as was hypothesised. This hypothesised meditational effect was tested using structural equation modelling (SEM) (AMOS 6.0). All of the attribution subscales and reoffending rating were added to this model to try to explain the relationship between

condition and severity, this was because it was thought that attribution of behaviour, based on attribution theory (Weiner, 1972), would be related to how serious the offence was seen to be. The SEM analysis was run with the saturated model first and then, one-by-one, those dependent variables that were not significant in the model were removed, until the point where a statistically significant model was left. The significant tested model is shown in Figure 3.2.

The hypothesised mediators were represented by an observed variable each. The observed variables 'reoffending' and 'internal' represented the variables used in the MANOVA analysis, reaction reoffending and locus of causality, respectively. The structural model in Figure 3.2 shows the standardized regression coefficients for the hypothesised paths between latent variables. All of the paths were significant (all $ps < .01$). Condition predicted reoffending ratings ($\beta = -.66$) and internal attribution ratings ($\beta = -.37$). Internal attribution ratings predicted reoffending ratings ($\beta = .23$) and severity ratings ($\beta = .24$), while reoffending ratings predicted severity ratings ($\beta = .24$). The path from condition to severity rating of the offence was mediated by internal attribution judgements and reoffending judgements.

Figure 3.2. Measurement and structural model of relationships between condition, reoffending rating, internal attribution of cause and severity rating.

To understand these pathways better the scoring for each of the variables in the model needs to be explained. A high number represented the fellow traveller condition and a low number represented the moral stranger condition. For each of the other variables a higher number represented a higher opinion of that variable, i.e. a higher number represented higher likelihood of rehabilitation, a higher rating of internal attribution and a higher rating of severity.

The first pathway found was that from condition to reoffending to severity. This pathway indicated that rating of reoffending likelihood mediated the path between the presentation condition read and the severity of the crime rating given. When a participant read the fellow traveller version of the story this predicted a lower rating of likelihood of reoffending, which in turn predicted a lower rating of the severity of the crime. For the moral stranger version of the story, there was a higher rating predicted for likelihood of reoffending and, therefore, a higher predicted for severity of the crime.

The second pathway found was from condition to internal attribution to severity. This pathway indicated that the rating of internal attribution of cause for the offence mediated the path between the presentation condition read and the severity of the crime rating given, much like reoffending rating did above. When the fellow traveller version of the story was read this predicted a lower rating of internal attribution of cause and this then predicted a lower rating of severity of the crime. Conversely, when the moral stranger version of the story was read this predicted a higher rating of internal attribution and therefore to a higher predicted rating of severity.

The third, and final, pathway found was from condition to internal attribution to reoffending to severity. This pathway indicated that the rating of internal attribution and reoffending together mediated the path from story condition to severity of the crime. When the fellow traveller version of the story was read a lower rating of internal attribution of cause was predicted, this then led to a predicted lower rating of likelihood of reoffending and then to a predicted lower rating of severity of the crime. For the moral stranger version, a higher rating of internal attribution was predicted to

lead to a higher rating of likelihood of reoffending and then to a higher rating of severity of the crime.

The fit of the model shown in Figure 3.2 was tested using several criteria: the chi-square test, the Comparative Fit Index (CFI; Bentler, 1990), and the root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA; Steiger, 1990). A non-significant chi-square indicates good model fit, as does a ratio of chi-square to degrees of freedom that is less than three. A CFI at or above .95 and an RMSEA at or below .07 also indicate good fit. Using the above criteria, the model fit the data well: $\chi^2 = .211$, $p = .646$; $\chi^2/df = .211$; CFI = 1.00; RMSEA = .00. For full model fit indices see Table 3.5.

Table 3.6: *Model Fit Indices for Study 1 Structural Equation Model*

Index	Attained	Desired	Achieved or Not
Chi Square	0.21		
Chi Square Sig.	0.65	Non-sig.	Achieved
Chi Square/df	0.21	< 3.0	Achieved
GFI	1.00	> 0.95	Achieved
AGFI	0.99	> 0.90	Achieved
PGFI	0.10	> 0.50	Not achieved
CFI	1.00	> 0.95	Achieved
PCFI	0.17	> 0.5 – 0.6	Not achieved
RMSEA	0.00	< 0.05	Achieved
Hoelter (0.05)	2877	> 200	Achieved
Hoelter (0.01)	4969	> 200	Achieved

Discussion

As stated earlier, it was predicted that when an individual read about the offender from the moral stranger perspective, as compared with when an individual read about the offender from the fellow traveller perspective, that the crime would be rated as

more severe and the punishment rating given would be higher, and both of these hypotheses were supported. Further, it was predicted that the offender would be rated as more likely to reoffend in the moral stranger presentation than the fellow traveller presentation, and this was also supported. In regards to the Causal Dimension Scale II items, it was predicted that the offender would be rated more internally responsible in the moral stranger presentation, which was supported, and would be rated as more personally responsible, but this was not supported. In fact, the opposite effect was found, when reading the fellow traveller presentation participants rated the offender as more personally responsible for the crime than when reading the moral stranger presentation. Further, it was predicted that less weight would be given to external influences in relation to attributions of cause, and that the attributions of cause would be rated as more stable in the moral stranger presentation, but neither of these hypotheses were supported. There was no difference found between the moral stranger and the fellow traveller presentations for the external attributions of cause variable or the stability of attributions of cause variable. This may be due to the nature of the differences in the two versions of the vignette. There were some aspects that were very overt in their differences and other aspects that were more subtle. The offender having previous offences was one overt difference that may have played a huge role in there being differences and then the differences about the influence of outside factors may not have been so overt.

The differences found in the current study may have been confounded by the fact that previous incidents of ‘trouble with the law’ were included in the moral stranger version and not in the fellow traveller version. However, this did not state that the offender had been convicted of any crime, just that he had had contact with the law for some of his behaviours. This would be something, though, that should be considered to remove from the vignettes in future research to help make the differences between the versions ‘fair’.

Overall, the current study found that when an individual read a story about an offender, the way in which that story was presented could influence the punishment and rehabilitation decisions that that individual made. When the story was presented from a moral stranger perspective, then the reader was likely to be more punitive and to believe that the offender was more likely to reoffend. In contrast, when the story was presented from the fellow traveller perspective, the reader was likely to be less punitive and to believe that the offender was less likely to reoffend.

When reading the moral stranger version, the reader also rated the offender as being more internally responsible for their actions and less personally in control of their actions, then when reading the fellow traveller condition. This final effect was not in the predicted direction, when examining the means for both the moral stranger and the fellow traveller responses for this item it can be seen that personal control was rated at the high end of the scale in both versions, just in the fellow traveller version it was rated somewhat higher again. It is possible that the fellow traveller is considered to be most similar to the respondent and so they are expected to be able to exert more personal control over their own actions, because this is what the respondent expects from themselves. This could relate to attribution theory, and that motivation is considered to be related to one's behaviour (Weiner, 1972). When a person is motivated to behave in a certain way then they can be seen to be personally in control of this, this might help to explain that the fellow traveller offender was seen to be motivated to change their behaviour and therefore would be more personally in control. This also relates to the implicit theory of personality (Dweck et al., 1993) as the fellow traveller is viewed as being malleable, able to change, and so can have some personal control because they can influence their own behaviour.

Mediation Analysis

The current study hypothesised that there was an additional variable that might be influencing severity decisions, and mediational analysis was conducted to investigate this. This analysis found that reoffending rating fully mediated the pathway between condition and severity rating, indicating that participants' judgements of the severity of the offence when reading either of the presentation conditions was explained by their judgement of the offender's likelihood of reoffending. The judgement of how severe a crime was rated to be was related to how likely the reader considered it to be that the offender would actually commit crime again. This is a key factor in deciding on the severity of a crime, and severity of a crime can lead to different punishment ratings (Carlsmith et al, 2009), so this is an important relationship to be aware of and to investigate further.

Structural Equation Model

Further to this, the current study used structural equation modelling to examine if there was more complexity to the pathways that were involved in how individuals made the severity judgement. It was found that participants' rating of the severity of the offence, having read either the moral stranger or the fellow traveller version of the story, was made via one of three different predictive pathways. The SEM analysis predicted that participants were either thinking about the internal responsibility of the offender and using this to make the severity judgement, or they were thinking about the likelihood of the offender reoffending, and making the severity judgement based on this, or, finally, they were thinking about the internal responsibility of the offender, and then the likelihood of reoffending, and using *both* of these to make the final severity judgement. Interpretation of this finding needs to be done with caution, though, because this type of analysis is about predictions and the data in the current study is all measured at one point in time. However, a number of different models were considered in this study but the model of condition to severity was the strongest and the one that made the most theoretical sense. Models tested in this manner need to have a theoretical base and for there to be a valid hypothesis for why they would exist (Iacobucci, 2009), this is why this was the model tested in the current study.

This model helps to understand the way in which people may think about the offender and how this may influence their final decision about the severity of the crime committed and the level of punishment needed. Increased severity ratings indicated an increase in punishment decision also (because this was a composite variable that included punishment rating), so understanding the cognitive processes that individual's go through is important to understand how punishment decisions are made.

Concluding Remarks

However, this model was only a starting point and through other research (Graham & Lowry, 2004; Hogue & Peebles, 1997), it was hypothesised that there may be other variables involved in the decision making process and this is what study two aimed to investigate. At the outset of study one, the aim was not to create a model of people's thought processes and so there were only limited variables that

were tested and that could be used in the model. The aim of study two, therefore, was to extend the findings of study one, and particularly to investigate the model further and potentially develop a more complex model of the process that individual's go through to make a decision about the offender. To this end, additional variables were added in study two and these are discussed further in the following chapter.

Chapter 4

Study Two

The model developed in study one developed predictive pathways that participants would use their judgements of perceived likelihood of reoffending and of internal (i.e. offender) responsibility to make their final judgement about the severity of the crime, which included their judgement of severity of the punishment that the offender should be given. This second study, therefore, attempted to expand on this cognitive model and determine if there were other factors that were involved in this decision making process, this was based on work by Graham and Lowery (2004) and Hogue and Peebles (1997) that had found different factors to be involved in punishment decision making, such as judgements of the character of the offender.

Hogue and Peebles (1997) manipulated a 'story' about a sex offender in terms of the intent of the offender and the level of remorse felt by the offender after the fact. It was found that higher ratings of punishment and blame were attributed to offenders that had intent and that were less remorseful for their actions. These findings indicated that the intent and culpability of the offender was one area that predicted punishment given and severity of the crime, which gave support to a measure of culpability being included in the current study. As Hogue and Peebles (1997) did not use a direct measure of culpability, it was necessary to look at further research to find such a measure.

Graham and Lowery (2004) investigated how priming unconscious racial stereotypes about adolescent offenders could influence judgements made about the offenders in terms of negative personality traits, culpability, likelihood to reoffend and punishment severity. Participants were first primed with either words relating to race or to neutral words and then they read about a hypothetical offender who had committed a crime. Having read the story, participants then had to make judgements about the offender, in terms of personality characteristics of the offender, perceived culpability, expected recidivism and punishment severity.

Graham and Lowery (2004) found that participants who were primed for race responded to the story with greater negative trait judgements, greater culpability, and more perceived likelihood of reoffending and harsher punishment judgements than those who were primed with neutral, non-race related words. It was also found that

this unconscious racial priming was not influenced by consciously held attitudes about race.

Graham and Lowery (2004) primed participants for race; in the current study participants are primed for belief system about offenders, via the version of the story read. The priming of belief system in the current study can be thought of as, similar to, a stereotype that could be held by an individual, similar to stereotypes about race. Based on these similarities, the additional dependent measures used in the current study were taken from Graham and Lowery's work. They showed that trait judgements made about the offender and ratings of culpability (similar to what Hogue & Peebles (1997) found) were also related to punishment and rehabilitation decisions made about an offender, indicating that these variables would be relevant to the current research.

Also relevant to the current study is that Graham and Lowery (2004) developed a model of punishment endorsed for the offender. It was found that racial priming predicted an increase in negative trait judgements of the offender, which then predicted either an increased rating of culpability or an increased rating of expected recidivism. Further, ratings of culpability significantly predicted higher ratings of punishment endorsed. In this model the path from primed unconscious racial stereotype to harsher punishment was indirect, and this was mediated by trait judgements, and judgements of culpability. And, as in the current research, the model is one of prediction because all of the variables involved were measured at the same point in time.

Part of the key differences between the moral stranger and the fellow traveller involve the personality characteristics and traits of the offender and also how culpable the offender is for the harm that they have caused. The moral stranger is thought of as a bad person, who has negative personality traits, while the fellow traveller is thought of as a good person, who has done a bad thing, and therefore has more positive personality traits. In the moral stranger view the offender is considered to be completely to blame for the offence they have committed, and little consideration is given to any mitigating factors that may be involved; that is, the moral stranger is thought of as fully culpable for the offence or offences they have committed. On the other hand, in the fellow traveller view the offender is considered to be at fault for the wrongdoing that they have committed but, mitigating factors are investigated and considered to help explain why the offender committed the crime; that is, the fellow

traveller is thought to be less culpable for the offence or offences committed, when compared with the moral stranger.

Based on the above, trait judgements and culpability were added to the current study as an extension of the first study. These items were added to extend the judgements that participants made about the offender and therefore provide more information about the cognitive process that participants were going through when making decisions about the offender and the scenario presented in the ‘newspaper story’.

The addition of the trait judgments and the culpability items was designed to extend the model of how people make a decision about the severity of a crime, and therefore the punishment they would give for that crime, based on the two different story versions. It was hoped that these items would boost the model developed in study one and provide a broader picture of the cognitive process that people go through to make this decision.

Study 2 was also designed to add further support to the results found in Study 1, in regards to the differences between presentation conditions. It was expected that the current study would replicate the findings of Study 1, providing further support for the differences found in the first study.

Hypotheses

MANOVA hypotheses.

It was predicted that when an individual read about the offender in the moral stranger presentation, as compared with when an individual read about the offender in the fellow traveller presentation, that:

1. The crime would be rated as more severe and the punishment rating given would be more severe and the offender would be rated as more likely to reoffend (a replication of what was found in Study 1)
2. The offender would be rated as more internally responsible and more culpable for the offence committed
3. The offender would be rated as more aggressive and less likeable

Structural equation model hypotheses.

As an extension of Study 1, it was predicted that the addition of the trait judgements and culpability items would provide a more complex model of the decision process that people were going through when deciding how severe the crime was, and as a part of this, how severe the punishment given to the offender should be.

Based on Graham and Lowery's (2004) research, in which their own model of the decision making process was developed, it was expected that the model would include judgements of culpability and judgements of the offender's personality traits. Graham and Lowery (2004) found that negative trait judgements led to ratings of recidivism, and they also found that negative traits judgements led to higher ratings of culpability and this also led to higher ratings of punishment. Based on these findings:

1. It was expected that negative trait judgements made in the current study would predict judgements about reoffending and then judgements about crime severity, such that high ratings of negative traits would predict high expectation of reoffending and this would predict high ratings of crime severity.
2. It was also expected that negative trait judgements would predict ratings of culpability, and this would then predict judgements about crime severity, such that high ratings of negative traits would predict high ratings of culpability and this would predict high ratings of crime severity.

Internal responsibility of cause was not included in Graham and Lowery's model or research but this was carried over from Study 1 and was included in the current research.

3. It was expected that internal responsibility of cause would still be related to judgements made about crime severity, and that internal responsibility might be related to trait judgements, because when someone is thought of to be internally responsible for a wrongdoing this may lead to an increase in negative judgements made about the personality of that person. Therefore, it was expected that high ratings of internal responsibility would predict high ratings of negative traits and this would predict high ratings of crime severity.

Graham and Lowery's (2004) model is similar to that developed in the first study of the current research, in that the ratings of severity/punishment were made

through judgements about likelihood of reoffending. Graham and Lowery's additional measures, that have been included in Study 2, were predicted to develop the Study 1 model further. This would be tested by employing structural equation modelling again.

As a summary, based on the above it was predicted that there would be three pathways that mediated the effect from story condition to crime severity rating. One pathway was predicted to be through negative trait judgements to reoffending ratings to crime severity ratings. The second pathway was predicted to be through negative trait judgements to culpability to crime severity ratings. The final predicted pathway was through negative trait judgements to internal responsibility to crime severity ratings. There may be some sort of link between internal responsibility and culpability, as these are both related to the responsibility of the individual for the act, so pathway two and three might actually be one, more complex, pathway.

Method

Participants and Design

Participants were 144 Victoria University of Wellington students from both Psychology and Criminology classes, ranging from introductory through to post-graduate level. No effects of age, gender or education were found in Study 1 so it was deemed acceptable to take a less broad sample for Study 2. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two story conditions: moral stranger ($N=74$) or fellow traveller ($N=70$) using the same scenarios as from Study 1.

Participants ranged in age from 18 to 46 years old, with a mean age of 22.02 years ($SD = 4.73$). The sample was made up of 112 females (77%) and 32 males (23%), with education ranging from final year of high school through to holding a Bachelor or Bachelor with Honours degree. The sample was predominantly NZ European (67.4%), with small representation of Maori, Pacific Island and Asian ethnicities. Nine percent of the sample identified themselves as New Zealanders or 'Kiwis'. Participants were asked about their status as a New Zealander and it was found that 89.6% of participants were New Zealand citizens and 9% were permanent residents (2 participants did not answer this question). See Appendix A for full details.

This study was a single factor (presentation condition: moral stranger versus fellow traveller) between-subjects design. However, counterbalancing was used for

the order of the dependent measures and so this created a 2 (moral stranger versus fellow traveller) x 2 (non-counterbalanced versus counterbalanced) design, with the second independent variable being the two orders of the dependent variables.

Materials

For Study 2 a similar questionnaire to the one used in Study 1 was employed (A5 size; six pages in length). The same two “newspaper articles” were used as those from Study 1; no changes were made to either of the presentation conditions (i.e. Moral Stranger or Fellow Traveller). See Appendix C for the full questionnaire materials.

Dependent Measures

Reaction items.

Just as in Study 1, participants responded to items about their reaction to the crime, both in term of severity and perceived likelihood of reoffending. Two additional items were added to the second study. The first asked, “Would you be accepting of this offender reintegrating into your community once he had completed his punishment (whatever that is)?” The second new item asked about availability of rehabilitation programs, “Do you think that this offender should have treatment and rehabilitation programs made readily available to him?” These items were all scored on 7-point Likert scales (1 = *not at all*, 7 = *extremely*).

Causal dimension scale II.

Participants were also asked two of the four Causal Dimension Scale II (McAuley et al., 1992) subscales, locus of causality (internal attribution) and personal control, each consisting of three items. The other two subscales of the Causal Dimension Scale II, stability and external control, were not included in Study 2 because there were no effects for these two variables in any of the analyses conducted in study one. Study 2 employed the same story versions as in Study 1 and so there was not expected to be any difference in the effects found from Study 1 for causal attributions, and so the six items relating to these two subscales were not included in the current study.

Culpability.

Additional to Study 1, participants were presented with three items in relation to the culpability of the offender, these items were, a) “Was Peter aware that his actions were a criminal act for which he could be prosecuted?”, b) “Did Peter intend to commit a crime?”, and c) “How responsible is Peter for this crime?” and were taken from the research conducted by Graham and Lowery (2004). The items were altered from Graham and Lowery’s work to be in particular reference to the offender, ‘Peter’, in the current story versions. All three items were answered on a 7-point Likert scale anchored with 1 (*not at all*) and 7 (*completely/definitely*).

Trait judgements.

Participants rated the offender on twelve bipolar adjective pairs, ranging from one (the negative adjective) through to seven (the positive adjective): a) Dishonest – Honest, b) Bad – Good, c) Unfriendly – Friendly, d) Unlikeable – Likeable, e) Unempathic – Empathic, f) Unremorseful – Remorseful, g) Self-focused – Other-focused, h) Malevolent – Misguided, i) Violent – Non-violent, j) Dangerous – Harmless, k) Aggressive – Passive, l) Hostile – Non-hostile. All twelve items were loaded in the same direction, i.e. no reverse scored items. On all items, a higher number indicated a more favourable rating of the offender, a lower number a non-favourable rating of the offender. For the list of all trait judgement pairs and how they were formatted on the questionnaire page, see Appendix C.

Procedure

Participants were mostly recruited within or just following their lab or tutorial time, in the Psychology and Criminology departments of Victoria University of Wellington, over the course of two weeks.

The researcher made prior arrangements with the tutors to be at certain lab times. Participants were informed that they were being asked to complete a piece of research for a post-graduate student in the School of Psychology and that participation was voluntary. Those who were interested were given the information sheet/consent form. If they agreed to take part then they handed back one copy of the signed consent form and were then given a questionnaire to complete. Participants were randomly assigned to either the moral stranger or the fellow traveller condition, and to either the standard or counterbalanced form of this. As before, the newspaper story

was presented on the front cover of the questionnaire booklet and participants were directed to read this first before continuing with the rest of the questionnaire.

Counterbalancing of the dependent variables was used in Study 2 to identify any effects that the order in which participants answered the dependent variables had. Within each story condition approximately half of the participants answered the reaction items, then the attribution items and then the trait judgement items (moral stranger $N = 39$; fellow traveller $N=35$), while the other half answered the trait judgement items, then the attribution items and then the reaction items (moral stranger $N=35$; fellow traveller $N=35$). As in Study 1, participants were asked to provide demographic information at the end of the questionnaire.

It took participants approximately 8 minutes to complete the questionnaire and once they were finished they handed the completed booklet back to the researcher who then presented them with the debriefing sheet and a chocolate fish, as a thank you token. Once all participants in the room had completed the study and had been given their chocolate fish the researcher again thanked them all and informed them that they could leave.

Results

Principal Components Analysis

Trait judgements.

Twelve questions relating to the perceived qualities of the offender (presented in the newspaper article) were factor analysed using principal components analysis with Direct Oblimin (oblique) rotation (see Table 4.1). The analysis yielded two components explaining a total of 69.93% of the variance for the entire set of variables. Component one was labelled *Likeability* due to the high loadings by the following items: remorseful, empathic, likeable and friendly. This component also incorporated two other items: focus and honesty. This first component explained 62.41% of the variance. The second component derived was labelled *Aggressiveness* due to the high loadings by the following items: violent, aggressive and dangerous. This component also incorporated the items: hostile, character and intent. The variance explained by this factor was 7.52%.

The KMO (.938) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ($p<.001$) both indicated that the set of variables were adequately related for factor analysis.

Support for the inclusion of both intent and focus is the internal reliability found for both factors. Cronbach's alpha was run for both likeability and aggressiveness with all six items for each and the alphas found were $\alpha = 0.91$ and $\alpha = 0.90$, respectively. These show that both factors have high internal reliability and lend support to the inclusion of all six items in each factor. This analysis found that within the trait judgement items there were two patterns of responding, one related to the likeability of the offender and one related to the aggressiveness of the offender. This created two factors rather than one negative trait judgement item that was used in Graham and Lowery's (2004) work.

Table 4.1: *Trait Judgements Principal Components Analysis Study Two*

Items	Loadings	
	Component 1 Trait Likeable	Component 2 Trait Aggressiveness
Remorseful	.882	
Empathic	.837	
Likeable	.824	
Friendly	.815	
Focus	.752	.331
Honesty	.659	
Violent	.471	.909
Aggressive	.369	.888
Dangerous		.771
Hostile	.366	.550
Character		.581
Intent		.578
Cronbach's α	0.914	0.904
Eigenvalue	7.489	0.902
% of Total Variance	62.410	7.516
Total Variance		69.926%

Table 4.2: *Correlations between Factors*

		Trait Likeable
Trait Aggressiveness	r	.568
	p	<.001
	N	138

Reaction scale.

Ten questions relating to participants reactions to the crime story that they read were analysed using principal components analysis with Varimax (orthogonal) rotation (see Table 4.2). It was necessary to complete this analysis in Study 2 again because of the additional reaction items that were included here. The analysis yielded two factors explaining a total of 60.43% of the variance for the entire set of variables. The first component was labelled *reaction severity* due to the high loadings by the following items: how serious is this crime?, how severe should the punishment be for this crime?, and how morally outraged are you by this crime? The other two items that loaded on this factor were: how much is your punishment decision based on deterrence? and how much is your punishment decision based on retribution? This factor explained 43.84% of the variance.

Component two was labelled *reaction reoffending* as the four items that loaded on this factor were all related to the perceived likelihood of the offender reoffending, and all four items had high loadings. These items were: the likelihood of the offender reoffending in general, the likelihood of the offender committing the same crime again, the likelihood of the offender being helped by rehabilitation (reverse-scored) and would you be accepting of the offender in your community (reverse-scored, and this was one of the new items)? The variance explained by this factor was 16.60%.

The second new item included in the current study, do you think that this offender should have treatment and rehabilitation programs made readily available to him, did not load significantly on either of the two factors above ($\alpha=0.41$ on reaction reoffending and $\alpha=-0.72$ on the residual factor) and so this item was excluded from further analysis.

The communalities of the variables included were reasonable except for the two items referring to punishment decision; deterrence (37.5%) and retribution (30.0%) indicating that they may not be strongly related to the other items in the analysis. However, the KMO (.774) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ($p<.001$) both indicated that the set of variables were adequately related for factor analysis.

Table 4.3: *Reaction Scale Principal Components Analysis Study Two*

Items	Loadings		Communality
	Component 1 Reaction Severity	Component 2 Reaction Reoffending	
How serious is this crime?	.769	-.430	.618
How severe should the punishment for this crime be?	.782		.733
How morally outraged are you by this crime?	.779	-.327	.678
To what extent was your punishment decisions based on a desire to make sure that the offender is discouraged from committing this crime again?	.585		.375
To what extent was your punishment decision based on the desire to make this offender pay for what he has done?	.482		.300
How likely do you believe that this specific will commit this specific crime again?		.796	.769
How likely do you believe it is that this offender will re-offend (in general)?		.823	.804
How likely do you believe it is that this offender will be helped by rehabilitation programs?	.395	.767	.622
Would you be accepting of this offender in your community?	.397	.700	.541
Should this offender have treatment and rehabilitation programs made readily available to him?	-.724	.414	.575
Cronbach's α	0.717	0.826	
Eigenvalue	3.946	1.493	
% of Total Variance	43.840	16.594	
Total Variance		60.434%	

Table 4.4: *Correlations between Factors*

		Reaction Reoffending
Reaction Severity	r	.278
	p	<.001
	N	140

Further support for the inclusion of both deterrence and retribution was found with the internal reliability of the factors. Cronbach's alpha was run for both factors, finding $\alpha=0.72$ for reaction severity and $\alpha=0.83$ for reaction reoffending. The alpha for reaction severity improves slightly when the deterrence item was removed ($\alpha=0.76$) however it was kept in this factor as it was then most comparable to that used in Study 1, which included deterrence in the reaction severity factor.

This analysis found that within the reaction items asked of participants there were two patterns of responding (matching what was found in Study 1 and including a new item), one relating to participants reaction to the severity of the crime and one relating to the participants belief of reoffending after the crime has occurred.

Multivariate Analysis of Variance

A two-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine the effect of presentation condition (moral stranger v fellow traveller) and counterbalancing (non-counterbalanced v counterbalanced) on the seven dependent variables: reaction severity, reaction reoffending, internal attribution, personal attribution, likeability, aggressiveness and culpability.

The multivariate main effect for presentation condition was significant: Wilks' $\lambda = .19$, $F(7, 132)=80.04$, $p<.01$, $\eta^2=.81$. Table 4.4 shows the means and standard deviations on the dependent variables by presentation condition. Also shown for each dependent variable are the F values for the univariate ANOVAs and their accompanying effect sizes, calculated as partial eta squared (η^2).

Table 4.4 shows that there were a number of significant main effects of presentation condition. For both reaction subscales there were significant main effects. As predicted, participants who read the moral stranger presentation rated the offence as more severe ($F(1,138)=30.64$, $p<.001$, partial $\eta^2=.18$) and the likelihood of the offender reoffending as higher ($F(1,138)=322.59$, $p<.001$, partial $\eta^2=.70$) than those that read the fellow traveller presentation.

Based on the individual items that each of these subscale consist of, these findings indicate that when reading the moral stranger presentation participants rate the crime as more serious, the punishment for the crime as needing to be more severe, and that they are more morally outraged by the crime, than when participants read the fellow traveller version. Within this subscale, participants also rated that their

punishment decision was based on deterrence and retribution goals more when reading the moral stranger version than when reading the fellow traveller version. For the reoffending subscale, these results indicated that participants believed the offender to be more likely to reoffend with this specific crime (rape), more likely to reoffend in general and as less likely to be helped by rehabilitation (reverse scored item) when reading the moral stranger version than when reading the fellow traveller version.

Table 4.5: Means and Standard Deviations on the Dependent Variables as a Function of Presentation Condition Study Two

Variable	Presentation Condition				$F(3,138)$	p	η_p^2
	<u>Moral Stranger</u>		<u>Fellow Traveller</u>				
	M	SD	M	SD			
Severity	5.73	0.74	4.96	0.94	30.64	<.001	.182
Reoffending	5.35	0.87	2.75	0.89	322.59	<.001	.700
Internal	5.08	1.10	3.92	1.34	32.01	<.001	.188
Personal	4.86	1.22	5.29	1.13	4.95	.028	.035
Likeable	2.37	0.74	4.99	0.76	425.94	<.001	.755
Aggressiveness	2.92	0.81	4.43	0.88	112.75	<.001	.450
Culpability	4.70	1.13	4.06	1.09	11.85	.001	.079

Note. All variables range from 1 to 7, except Internal and Personal which range from 1 to 9.

Also, those participants who read the moral stranger presentation rated the locus of causality of the act (i.e. the offence) as being more a part of Peter (internal) than outside of Peter than those that read the fellow traveller presentation ($F(1,138)=32.01, p<.001$, partial $\eta^2=.19$). That is, participants considered the offender to have internal control for his actions more in the moral stranger version than in the fellow traveller version. This indicates that external factors are considered more relevant in the fellow traveller version than in the moral stranger version, possibly because participants can empathise more with the fellow traveller offender than the moral stranger offender. This increased empathy could be because the fellow traveller offender is thought of as more like other members of society, while the moral stranger is thought of as an outsider to the community.

For the causal dimension subscale, personal control, it was found that participants who read the fellow traveller version rated the offender as more personally responsible than when reading the moral stranger version ($F(1,138)=4.95, p=.028$, partial $\eta^2=.04$). This final result may be because participants reading the moral stranger version of the story do not think that the offender is a normal human being (i.e. he is thought of as an outsider) and so may not hold him to the same standards as themselves, whereas when participants read the fellow traveller version they may think of that offender as more similar to themselves and so think that they should have personal control over the situation. The above result replicated what was found in study one.

The additional main effects in study two were for trait aggressiveness ($F(1,138)=112.75, p<.001$, partial $\eta^2=.45$), trait likeability ($F(1,138)=425.94, p<.001$, partial $\eta^2=.76$) and culpability ($F(1,138)=11.85, p=.001$, partial $\eta^2=.08$). These were all found to be significant. Peter was rated as more aggressive, less likeable and more culpable for the offence in the moral stranger version than in the fellow traveller version. That is, Peter was seen as more violent, more dangerous, more hostile and more unsociable in the moral stranger presentation than the fellow traveller presentation. Further, Peter was seen as friendlier, more honest, more empathetic, and more respectful in the fellow traveller presentation than the moral stranger presentation. From these trait judgements, it could be said that the Peter in the fellow traveller presentation condition was seen as a generally nicer and less violent person than the Peter in the moral stranger presentation condition.

Additionally, Peter was rated as less culpable for the offence in the fellow traveller version than in the moral stranger version. This may be because, in the fellow traveller version weight is given to mitigating factors, and so some of the blame and culpability for the offence might be mediated by these factors, such as alcohol consumption or family background issues. While, in the moral stranger version, there is little to no consideration of any mitigating factors, the fact that the offender was drinking alcohol is not considered to mitigate the culpability of the offender.¹

Structural Equation Modelling

To further investigate the model that described the predictive pathways that people went through after reading the ‘newspaper story’, structural equation modelling was again employed. A saturated model was run first, to include all of the relevant variables, including the new dependent measures: likeability, aggressiveness and culpability, this was based on the work by Graham and Lowery (2004) and the model that was developed in their research. The model aimed to develop a more informative explanation of any mediating factors between presentation condition and severity.

As stated above, the SEM analysis was run with the saturated model first and then, one-by-one, those dependent variables that were not significantly adding to the model were removed, until the point where a statistically significant model remained, and one that made theoretical sense and was based on the hypotheses developed beforehand (Iacobucci, 2009). The significant, tested, model is shown in Figure 4.1. The hypothesised mediators were represented by an observed variable each. The observed variables were labelled in the SEM analysis in the same way that they were labelled in the MANOVA.

The structural model in Figure 4.1 shows the standardized regression coefficients for the hypothesised paths between variables. All of the paths were significant (all $ps < .01$). There were three pathways in the SEM model from condition (or presentation version) to reaction severity ratings. Condition predicted reoffending ratings ($\beta = -.83$), reoffending ratings then predicted trait aggression

¹ The main effect for order was non-significant and the interaction effect for order by presentation condition was also non-significant. This analysis found that the order of the dependent variables did not have an effect on respondents’ answers.

ratings ($\beta=-.41$), and then trait aggression ratings predicted severity ratings ($\beta=-.56$). A shorter pathway was that condition predicted trait aggression ratings ($\beta=.32$), which in turn predicted severity ratings ($\beta=-.56$). The final pathway was that condition predicted trait likeable ratings ($\beta=.87$), trait likeable ratings predicted internal attribution of cause ratings ($\beta=-.51$), and internal attribution ratings predicted severity ratings ($\beta=.21$). The path from condition to severity rating of the offence was mediated by trait aggression, trait likeable, reoffending and internal attribution ratings.

Figure 4.1. Final structural equation model study two.

As in Study 1, a high number (2) represented the fellow traveller belief and a low number (1) represented the moral stranger belief. For the dependent measures included in the final model the following scoring was used: a high number

represented a high severity rating of the crime (including the punishment given and the seriousness of the actual crime) a high number represented a high perceived likelihood of reoffending, a high number represented a high rating of internal attribution of cause, a high number represented that the offender was considered likeable, and a low number represented that the offender was considered aggressive.

The first pathway was from condition to reoffending to aggressiveness to severity. This pathway indicates that the rating of perceived likelihood of reoffending and the rating of aggressiveness of the offender mediated the path between the presentation condition read and the crime severity rating given. When a participant read the fellow traveller version of the story this model predicts a lower rating of likelihood of reoffending, and then a lower rating of aggressiveness of the offender (represented as a higher number in that scale). This then led to a predicted lower rating of severity of the crime. For the moral stranger version of the story the predicted pathway is: a higher rating of likelihood of reoffending was given, then a higher rating of aggressiveness of the offender (represented by a low number) and then a higher rating of crime severity.

The second pathway found was from condition to aggressiveness to severity. This pathway indicates that the rating of aggressiveness of the offender mediates the path between presentation condition and the severity of the crime rating given, and this pathway does not have to pass through reoffending ratings. When the fellow traveller version of the story was read this model predicts a lower rating of aggressiveness of the offender (represented as a high number) and this then led to a predicted lower rating of crime severity. Conversely, when the moral stranger version was read the predicted pathway is: a higher rating of aggressiveness of the offender (represented as a low number) and this then led to a higher rating of crime severity.

The third, and final, pathway was from condition to likeability to internal attribution of cause to severity. This pathway indicates that the rating of likeability of the offender and internal attribution of cause mediates the path from presentation condition to severity of the crime rating. For the fellow traveller version this means the predicted pathway is that a higher rating of offender likeability is given (represented by a high number) and this then leads to a lower rating of internal attribution of cause, which then leads to a lower crime severity rating. For the moral stranger version the predicted pathway is that a lower rating of offender likeability is

given (represented by a low number) and this then leads to a higher rating of internal attribution of cause, which then leads to a higher crime severity rating.

The fit of the model shown in Figure 4.1 was tested using several criteria: the chi-square test, the Comparative Fit Index (CFI; Bentler, 1990), and the root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA; Steiger, 1990). A non-significant chi-square indicates good model fit, as does a ratio of chi-square to degrees of freedom that is less than three. A CFI at or above .95 indicates good fit and an RMSEA at or below .05 indicates a good fit and at or below .08 indicates a reasonable fit. Using the above criteria, the model fit the data well: $\chi^2 = 8.51$, $p = .13$; $\chi^2/df = 1.70$; CFI = .995; RMSEA = .07. For full model fit indices see Table 4.5.

Table 4.6: *Model Fit Indices for Study 2 Structural Equation Model*

Index	Attained	Desired	Achieved or Not
Chi Square	8.51		
Chi Square Sig.	0.13	Non-sig.	Achieved
Chi Square/df	1.70	< 3.0	Achieved
RMR	.04	< 0.05	Achieved
GFI	0.98	> 0.95	Achieved
AGFI	0.92	> 0.90	Achieved
PGFI	0.23	> 0.50	Not achieved
CFI	1.00	> 0.95	Achieved
PCFI	0.33	> 0.5 – 0.6	Not achieved
RMSEA	0.07	< 0.05	Not achieved (close)
Hoelter (0.05)	187	> 200	Not achieved (close)
Hoelter (0.01)	254	> 200	Achieved

Discussion

The purpose of study two was twofold. First, it aimed to replicate the main findings of Study 1, in terms of the differences in reaction to the crime based on the version of the story read. Second, it aimed to extend the model developed in Study 1,

by the addition of further variables that might be adding to the cognitive process that participants were using to decide on the severity rating of the crime at hand.

Replication of Study One Results

The results from this study add further support to what was found in Study 1; when participants read about the same offender, committing the same offence, from either the moral stranger perspective or the fellow traveller perspective there were significant differences in the severity and reoffending judgements made. When reading the moral stranger version, in both Studies 1 and 2, participants rated the offence as more severe and the perceived likelihood of reoffending as greater than when reading the fellow traveller version.

Further replicating what was found in Study 1, the offender was judged to be more internally responsible for the offence when reading the moral stranger version. Also the main effect for personal control was significant in Study 2, and this was in the same direction as that found in Study 1: when reading the fellow traveller version of the story the offender was rated as more personally responsible for his actions than when reading the moral stranger version of the story. Again, this was not in the predicted direction; however it did add support to what was found in Study 1. It could be that, because the moral stranger offender is viewed as an outsider and not similar to normal people that they are considered less personally responsible because they are not like most people, while the fellow traveller offender is considered to be similar to most people and so may be held to similar standards to what one would expect of oneself, and so personal responsibility is rated higher. However, this is merely a hypothesis.

Additional to replicating what was found in Study 1, Study 2 also examined trait judgements made about the offender and also how culpable the offender was judged to be for the offence. It was found that the offender was rated as less likeable and more aggressive in the moral stranger version than in the fellow traveller version, supporting the hypotheses.

It was also expected that the offender would be rated as more culpable in the moral stranger version than in the fellow traveller version, and this was supported by the current study. The offender in the moral stranger version was rated more culpable than the offender in the fellow traveller version.

Extension of the Structural Equation Model

Study 2 developed a more complex explanatory model of the cognitive process that perceivers go through when making judgements about the crime they read about in the 'newspaper story'. This was an extension of the model developed in Study 1 and this second model found that four different dependent measures were involved in the decision making process from condition to crime severity rating and that there were three different pathways that this decision making process was predicted to go through.

The first pathway went through one's judgement of how likeable an offender was and how internally responsible the offender was for his actions. The second pathway went through one's judgement of likelihood of reoffending and how aggressive the offender was considered to be. The final pathway was simpler than the previous two and went through the judgement of how aggressive the offender was considered to be. These pathways predict the manner by which judgements about severity of the crime were made by participants. The pathways indicate that thinking about the personality characteristics of the offender, the likelihood that the offender would reoffend and how internally responsible the offender was for his actions were all involved in severity of the crime judgements. These findings are supported by attribution theory (Weiner, 1972) and implicit theory of personality (Dweck et al., 1993). That is, internal versus external control of behaviour is an important aspect when considering the attribution of responsibility for one's actions (Weiner, 1972), a variable that was found to be involved in the current model. Also, implicit theory of personality posits that people can be thought of as able to change their behaviours (incremental theory) or not (entity theory) and this relates to likelihood of reoffending judgements, another aspect of the current model. Further, personality was found to be an important predictor of crime severity in Graham and Lowery's (2004) similar work.

While the models developed in both studies 1 and 2 are predictive in nature and are not able to show any level of causality, they do still provide some useful information and also indicate some areas of potential future research. As was found in Graham and Lowery's (2004) work, there are certain aspects of an offender that can help predict how severe the crime committed is rated to be and how harsh the punishment for that crime should be. The current study adds to this area of research, examining it from the perspective of two different presentation styles: the moral

stranger and the fellow traveller. Future research could try to examine this model in more of a causal way, to examine if certain beliefs about an offender, like reoffending likelihood and internal responsibility, actually cause the crime to be rated more severe and the punishment given to be more severe also.

It was hypothesised that the model would be extended in Study 2, by adding the additional measures from Graham and Lowery's (2004) work. Specifically, three pathways were hypothesised based on this research: 1) Presentation condition to negative trait ratings to reoffending ratings to crime severity, 2) Presentation condition to negative trait ratings to crime severity, and, 3) Presentation condition to negative trait ratings to either internal responsibility or culpability (or perhaps both) to crime severity.

For the trait judgements made in the current study, principal components analysis was employed and it was found that there were two patterns of responding to these items and so two factors of trait judgements were created: likeability and aggressiveness. This was different to Graham and Lowery (2004) where there was a single measure of negative trait judgements. This meant that the predictions made based on their work were only relating to negative trait judgements, not to the different outcomes that could occur for either likeability or aggressiveness. This needs to be taken into consideration when discussing the results of Study 2 in relation to the above structural equation model hypotheses.

If negative trait ratings and aggressiveness are considered to be the same, then the first two predicted pathways were supported by the current study. It was found that aggressiveness (negative trait ratings) and rating of likelihood of reoffending mediated the path from presentation condition to crime severity rating.

The third predicted pathway involved negative trait ratings and either culpability or internal responsibility rating, or both of these. This pathway was not quite so clearly supported by the current study. What was found was a pathway that involved likeability ratings and internal responsibility ratings mediating between presentation condition and crime severity. The likeability items were taken from the negative trait judgements in Graham and Lowery (2004), and internal responsibility does seem to be linked with how likeable the offender was considered to be, which was predicted. The main part of this pathway that was not supported by the current study was the involvement of culpability. Culpability was not involved with any of

the pathways in the SEM model in Study 2, while it was part of one of the significant predictive pathways in Graham and Lowery's model.

It is possible that culpability and internal responsibility of cause were asking very similar things of participants and so only one of them needed to be in the model in order for it to have predictive validity. However, if this were the case, then it would be expected that both of these variables would be present in the significant model, not that one of them would not load at all. Based on this, it is unclear why culpability did not load in this model, when it was part of the significant pathway in Graham and Lowery's model.

In the moral stranger version of the story participants thought of the offender as more aggressive and this predicted increased crime severity rating. Additionally, in the moral stranger version, the offender was thought to be more likely to reoffend and this predicted a higher rating of aggressiveness, which then led to increased crime severity ratings. Finally, for the moral stranger version, thinking of the offender as less likeable predicted a higher rating of internal responsibility for the offence, leading to increased crime severity ratings.

In the fellow traveller version of the story participants thought of the offender as less aggressive and this predicted a decreased crime severity rating. Further, the fellow traveller offender was thought to be less likely to reoffend and this predicted a decreased rating of aggressiveness and then a decreased rating of crime severity. Finally, for the fellow traveller version, the offender was thought of as more likeable and this predicted decreased ratings of internal responsibility for the offence, and this led to decreased ratings of crime severity.

These pathways indicate that, based on the condition that an individual reads, there are different elements possibly involved in how that person will come to a decision about how severe they believe the offence to be, and therefore what sort of punishment they think should be given, and that these different predictive pathways involve the trait judgements made about the offender and the level of internal responsibility rated for the offender.

Study 2 provides further evidence for the potential existence of the two view points about offenders: the moral stranger and the fellow traveller, by showing that a story written from these two different perspectives results in different punishment and rehabilitation decisions. This is an important finding because of the way in which the media presents information about offenders to the public. If, as has been done in the

current study, it can be shown that writing about an offender from a certain perspective can influence punishment and rehabilitation decisions that the public makes about that offender, this shows that the media could be thought to have a responsibility to be careful in the way that they write about offenders.

The media is the main source of information about crime for most members of the public (Gilliam & Iyengar, 2000; Romer et al., 2003), and so the way that the media presents this information will be likely to have an influence on the views and beliefs held by the public. The media has a tendency to over-represent violent and sexual crimes, this makes these crimes seem to be more prevalent (Mason, 2006; McGregor, 1993; Reiner, 1997) and it can also increase public concern about those crimes and about becoming a victim of that sort of crime (Einsiedel et al., 1984).

As stated above violent and interpersonal crimes are written about more in the media (Mason, 2006; Sheley & Ashkins, 1981) and so this can increase the fear of these types of crime, when in fact property crime is far more prevalent than violent crimes (NZ Police, 2007; 2008; 2009). Another example of this discrepancy is the research by Gilliam and Iyengar (2000) which found that murder accounted for only 1% of all crime in the Los Angeles area for 1996 and 1997, but that murder made up 17% of the media stories. This would make it seem to the typical consumer of the news that murder was more prevalent than the official statistics show.

All of the above research shows that what the media choose to report to the public can then influences the views held by the public about crime and offenders, and this can also influence fear of certain crime. The current study then relates to this by going further than just what is reported to the public but also looks at *how* this information is reported to the public.

From the results of Studies 1 and 2 there is some evidence that the way in which information is written and presented to readers, in terms of both word choice and specific content, can influence the punishment and rehabilitation decisions that the reader makes. This influence is such that when an offender is written about from the moral stranger perspective they are thought of as committing a more severe crime and needing to be punished more severely, and they are also thought of as more likely to reoffend, than when the offender is written about from the fellow traveller perspective, even when both offenders have committed the same offence. However, this last point needs to be qualified by the fact that in the vignettes used for Studies 1 and 2 the offender in the moral stranger presentation was stated to have ‘been in

trouble with the law before', indicating a pattern of behaviour that would inform reoffending judgements. This is one aspect of the current research that needs to be investigated further in future research. It would be beneficial for future research to present vignettes with no previous offence or 'trouble' information and to see if the same effect is found or not.

If the media present information from a predominantly moral stranger perspective then, the findings of the current study show that this is likely to increase the punishment that is given to the offender and is also likely to decrease perceived likelihood of rehabilitation success for that offender. This may be detrimental because it could lead to the public wanting increased punishment and a decrease in rehabilitation programs, which is not in line with the current research in the area of offender management and rehabilitation, which shows that higher prison sentences are not beneficial and that rehabilitation programs are, in fact, beneficial (Newbold, 2007).

One limitation of the research conducted in Study 2 was the counterbalancing. The order effects were tested based on two different orders, one the standard presentation and then the other being the counterbalanced order. However, there were three different sections of responses which indicates that there should have been three presentation orders, not just two. The analysis of the presentation orders found that there were no order effects, indicating that the order did not have much influence on responses and so the three orders would be hypothesised to not have a significant effect. This would need to be tested in further research conducted in this manner.

Concluding Remarks

Studies 1 and 2 have shown that manipulating the way in which a crime is written can influence the decisions that the reader will make about the offender involved. What Studies 1 and 2 have not shown is whether these two viewpoints, the moral stranger and the fellow traveller, actually exist, and if they do exist whether they are on a continuum or are two distinct categories. Empirical work needs to be conducted in order to investigate the existence, or not, of these theoretical beliefs about criminal offenders in the minds of the general public.

Therefore, Study 3 aimed to create a measure of people's opinions about criminal offenders to determine whether or not these two viewpoints do, in fact, exist. The items for this measure were generated based on the fundamental differences

between the moral stranger and fellow traveller, based on the 14 key points included in Table 2.1 and this is further explained in the following chapter.

Chapter 5

Study 3

While the results presented in the preceding chapters show that these two perspectives can influence one's punishment and rehabilitation decisions, the studies are based on the theoretical existence of the moral stranger and fellow traveller belief systems. That is, the current body of research is the first to utilise these concepts in an empirical setting as, up to this point, they have only been discussed as theoretical constructs (Connolly & Ward, 2008). Although the previous two studies showed that these do have an influence on the decisions that individuals make, it is important to take a step back and examine whether these differing belief systems exist as independent constructs. That is, do these belief systems actually represent an individual difference regarding how people think about crime, or are they more a narrative creation of the media?

Study 3, therefore, aimed at bridging the gap between what Studies 1 and 2 found and whether there is empirical support for the independent existence of the (currently theoretical) belief systems of the moral stranger and the fellow traveller. In order to do this, Study 3 aimed to develop a measure of people's opinions about criminal offenders based on the two perspectives. The key factors that differentiate the moral stranger and the fellow traveller were determined by the primary researcher and her secondary supervisor, who was the author that originally generated the terms: moral stranger and fellow traveller. These key factors were defined and based on these definitions, a pool of items were generated so that a measure could be compiled and tested. These items were generated by adhering to the 14 key factors that differentiate the moral stranger and the fellow traveller (refer to Table 2.1). These 14 key areas will now be discussed in detail.

Character and Society

One of the key differences between the moral stranger and the fellow traveller is the idea that the fellow traveller is a fellow human being who happens to have done something bad, but they are not necessarily a bad person, whereas the moral stranger is thought of as an outsider and different from others because they are a bad person. Based on this difference the first key factor is 1) *bad circumstances (FT) versus bad person (MS)*, followed by 2) *part of society (FT) versus not part of society (MS)*.

Along with this key difference is the idea that the fellow traveller is similar to most other people in society and, as such, shares similar beliefs, values and needs, whereas the moral stranger is an outsider who does not share similar beliefs, values or needs. This difference leads to the next two factors: 3) *can understand the person (i.e. their needs/interests; FT) versus cannot understand the person (i.e. their needs and interests; MS)* and 4) *same or similar beliefs and values held by the individual (FT) versus alien beliefs and values held by the individual (MS)*.

Change and Rehabilitation

Another key area that differentiates the fellow traveller and the moral stranger is that of change. The fellow traveller is seen as an individual who can change their ways, who wants to change and who wants to gain forgiveness, while the moral stranger is seen as an individual who cannot change, does not want to change and does not want to gain forgiveness for the crimes they have committed. This led to the following key factors: 5) *seeking redemption (FT) versus indifferent to gaining redemption*, 6) *has potential to be rehabilitated (FT) versus cannot be rehabilitated (MS)*, 7) *motivated to change (FT) versus unmotivated to change (MS)*, and 8) *unlikely to reoffend (FT) versus likely to reoffend (MS)*.

Culpability and Intent

The fellow traveller is seen as an individual who does not intend to harm others and can understand that their actions were wrong and harmful. This individual may also have a valid excuse for the harm that they have committed through an impaired mental state or adverse life circumstances, while the opposite can be said for the moral stranger. These differences led to the following factors: 9) *can understand the individual's motivations to commit the crime (FT) versus cannot understand the individual's motivations to commit the crime (MS)*, 10) *unintentional harm caused (FT) versus intentional harm caused (MS)*, 11) *can see that own actions were bad, wrong, harmful (FT) versus does not deem own actions to be bad, wrong, harmful (MS)*, 12) *impaired mental state (FT) versus unimpaired mental state (MS)*, and 13) *adverse or exceptional (background) circumstances (FT) versus unexceptional (background) circumstances (MS)*.

Subject versus Object

The final key difference between how the fellow traveller offender is viewed and how the moral stranger offender is viewed is the concept of 14) *subject (FT) versus object (MS)* (the final factor). What this means is that the fellow traveller is seen as *a person* who has unique needs and interests and who needs to be treated with their dignity intact and needs to be consulted with in regards to their treatment and future plans. The moral stranger, conversely, is seen as *an offender*, someone who the community needs to be protected from and someone who needs to do as they are instructed in terms of treatment and future plans once they have completed their sentence. The moral stranger is treated as an object, and is not considered to have a voice about what happens to them, while the fellow traveller is treated as a subject, and is considered to have a voice and an opinion about what happens to them.

Initial Item Generation

Several items were generated based on each of the 14 key factors. Each of these items was written as a statement with the intention that people would rate their level of agreement/disagreement with each. Statements were all made in reference to ‘offenders’ or ‘those who offend’, rather than the use of any other synonym such as ‘criminals’.

For each of the 14 factors the two ends of the continuum for that item were the main focus for the item generation. Items were generated in both the fellow traveller direction (i.e. Offenders can be rehabilitated, from factor 6) and the moral stranger direction (i.e. Offenders do not want to change, from factor 7). As many items as possible were generated for each of the 14 factors, and there were 4-6 items generated for each of the 14 factors (109 in total).

By removing items that were highly similar to other items (e.g., a change in 1-2 words) and compound statements that included different aspects within the same item. The original pool of 109 items was pared down to 71 items that were retained for use in Study 3, in the hopes of creating a shorter and more streamlined measure for future use. All 71 items generated can be found in Appendix D.

It was also important to consider some individual differences between the respondents and whether these may influence one’s response to the various items. The items generated for the scale were all related to one’s opinion and beliefs about criminal offenders and so participants were asked about their previous experience of

crime. This was in terms of whether they had been a) a victim of a crime, b) the offender of a crime (and if so, had they been convicted of this crime), and c) whether they knew of someone close to them who had been the victim of a crime. These questions were included in the current study because previous research has shown that exposure to crime information can influence one's opinions about crime and about the prevalence of crime (Gilliam & Iyengar, 2000; Romer, et al., 2003). Individuals were also asked if the crime experienced by themselves or by the person close to them was a violent crime. It may be that people answer the items on this scale very differently depending on their experience of crime.

Hypotheses

It was predicted that individuals who had been the victim of a crime, or knew someone close to them who had been the victim of a crime, would rate at the moral stranger end of most items, due to their negative experience of crime and offenders. Further, people who had been the offender of a crime would rate at the fellow traveller end of most items, because of their personal experience of being the offender. It was also predicted that when the crime in question was a violent crime, that these individuals would have more strongly rated responses, in the moral stranger direction.

Method

Participants

The full sample consisted of three hundred and forty-six respondents. One hundred and seventy-two of these completed a hard copy version of the questionnaire (Sample A) that was hand delivered to residential letterboxes. Those who completed the hard copy version of the questionnaire were from the Wellington region. A further one hundred and seventy-four participants (Sample B) completed an online version of the questionnaire. This was completed via a snowball sampling method, whereby the researcher and her supervisors sent out an email with the link to the online survey to all New Zealand email contacts they had and within this each person who received the email was asked to then forward it on to all of their New Zealand email contacts, and so on, creating a snowball effect.

Those who completed the online version were mostly from the Wellington area but also included participants from around the country, e.g. Invercargill, Dunedin

and Auckland. Demographic information for the two datasets is described below separately.

The two types of data collection were used in the current study to combat the typically low response rates for hard copy research (Yan, Levine, Yu & Rivas, 2009). It was deemed acceptable to incorporate two methods of data collection because current research into the area of online research has found that there is much similarity between hard copy and online responding, such that there are typically few significant differences between these two methods of data collection (Yan et al., 2009). The current study then compared the two sample (A and B) and it was found that they were not statistically significantly different from each other, so they were combined to form one larger data set to develop the measure from.

Demographic information

Study 3a.

The hard copy sample had an average age of 41.99 years (ranging from 17 to 85 years old, $SD = 17.53$), and the sample consisted of 58 males and 112 females (two participants did not disclose their sex). Education information indicated that 83.7% of the sample had achieved, at least, university entrance and 64% of the sample had achieved higher than this, while 4.1% of the sample had no formal education qualification. The sample presented a wide variety of occupations, from educators ($N=15$), to managers ($N=10$), to lawyers ($N=6$) to healthcare professionals ($N=9$). The sample was predominantly NZ European (74.4%), with small representation of Maori, Pacific Island and Asian ethnicities. A further 15.7% of the sample did not disclose their ethnicity. The final demographic question asked was whether participants were New Zealand citizens or permanent residents. In this sample, 83.7% were New Zealand citizens and 12.8% were permanent residents (2 participants did not answer this question) (see Appendix A for full details).

Study 3b.

The online survey had an average age of 26.27 years (ranging from 15 to 67 years old, $SD = 9.71$), and the sample consisted of 47 males and 124 females (three participants did not disclose their sex). No further demographic information was asked of the online survey sample (see Appendix A for full details).

Study 3a and 3b combined.

When these two datasets were combined, there was an average age of 34.11 (SD = 16.18), and the combined sample consisted of 105 males and 236 females. As there was limited demographic information asked in the online survey dataset, the combined dataset only has the demographic information for those questions asked in the online survey (see Appendix A for full details of the combined demographic information).

Materials

Study 3 involved the completion of a 7-page written (study 3a) or online (study 3b) questionnaire, the only difference between these two versions was that the online questionnaire included only two demographic questions (age and gender), in comparison to the six demographic questions included in the written questionnaire. Participants were also provided with an introduction letter (hard copy version) or screen (online version) indicating what was expected of them, an information sheet/consent form and a form to complete at the end to go in the draw to win a prize. The hard copy version also included an addressed Freepost envelope, so that participants could return their completed questionnaire to the researcher. See Appendix E for full questionnaire materials.

Moral Stranger v Fellow Traveller Items.

The first five pages of Study 3 involved the 71 items that had been generated to develop the measure of people's opinions about offenders. These items were developed to be worded in a number of different ways, e.g. "It is often understandable why someone commits a crime", "Most offenders are regular people", "Alcohol or drug abuse can never excuse offending", and "Bad circumstances can never excuse an offender's actions". Further, the items were written from either the fellow traveller end of the continuum (N=34) or the moral stranger end of the continuum (N=37; these were the reverse scored items).

The various characteristics that these items were designed to measure included the likelihood of the offender reoffending, the similarities between offenders and others in society, the excuses that can be used to explain offending, and the desire of the offender to seek redemption. Examples of items are: "An offender's motivations are similar to most other people", "Offenders usually want to be forgiven", and "Most

offenders are bad people”. These items were all answered on a 7-point Likert scale, anchored from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

General Crime Opinion and Experience.

After completion of the 71 belief system items, participants were then asked about some of their beliefs about offenders and their life experience of offenders. These items included questions about how similar the participant thought offenders’ beliefs are to the rest of society (anchored with 1 {*very different*} to 7 {*very similar*}), questions about the influence of extenuating factors on an offender’s behaviour (anchored 1 {*not at all*} to 7 {*a lot*}), and finally questions about the participant’s previous experience of crime, answered as yes/no questions, e.g. “Have you ever committed a crime?” and “Have you ever been the victim of a crime?”.

Demographics.

The final page of the questionnaire asked for demographic information, including age and gender for all formats, and education, occupation, ethnicity, and New Zealand status for the hard copy questionnaire only.

Procedure

The procedure for Study 3 was somewhat different for the hard copy questionnaire than for the online questionnaire, so these will be explained separately, starting with the hard copy questionnaire.

For the hard copy questionnaire, 600 copies of the questionnaire were printed out and put into A4 envelopes. Each envelope also included a letter to the resident explaining what the envelope contained, an information sheet/consent form, an addressed, postage-paid envelope, and a form to fill in to win a prize, for completing the survey. In total, each A4 envelope contained 5 separate items. The A4 envelope also had a sticker placed in the centre of the front of it explaining what the envelope was for (see Appendix E).

The A4 envelopes, after they had been stuffed with all of the relevant material, were then disseminated by the researcher. This was done by visiting randomly selected streets in a number of different suburb areas of Wellington, New Zealand. The suburb areas that were used in this study were: Kelburn, Newtown, Oriental Bay, Johnsonville, Khandallah, Lower Hutt, Kaiwharawhara, Karori, and Mt Victoria. The

researcher walked through the randomly selected streets and placed a single envelope into each house's letterbox. Houses that were excluded from this were those that had no obvious letterbox and those that had a sign on the letterbox requesting "Addressed mail only".

These envelopes were disseminated to the various areas of Wellington over a 2-3 week period, and then returns came in over a 6 week period from July, 2009. In total 174 of the hard copy questionnaires were returned, which is a return rate of 28.67% (this is within expectations for this type of research; Tayie, 2005).

To supplement the hard copy data, an online survey was also set up. This online survey was exactly the same as the hard copy one, except that it was in a digital format and there were four fewer demographic questions asked of participants. Each page of the hard copy questionnaire was represented as a separate page on the online version, so that there was as much similarity between the two versions as possible. The order of all items and questions was kept consistent between the hard copy and the online version of Study 3.

Participants for the online survey were recruited through two recruitment methods. Firstly the researcher attached the link for the survey to an email that she sent out to all New Zealand residents that she had email addresses for, this included friends, family, colleagues, and other students. This same email was also sent to the researcher's supervisors, for them to send on to persons that they had email addresses for.

There was also an online link set up which was accompanied by a short blurb indicating that the link was for a brief study being conducted by a PhD student at Victoria University of Wellington. When individuals followed the link from either the email or from the webpage it went, firstly, to an information sheet and consent form. This meant that all persons who followed the link were fully informed of what they were being asked to do before they went any further and they all had the option to pull out at any stage, including being able to choose not to go any further with the research when they got to the first page, simply by closing the browser.

Once the online data had been collected, the researcher then had two sets of data, the hard copy (N=172) and online (N=174) versions of study three, giving a total of sample size of 346 respondents.

The data from the different samples were initially analysed separately and compared. For the online data the KMO = .832 and the Bartlett's test of sphericity was

significant ($p < .01$). The initial solution gave 17 factors over the Eigenvalue of 1, and the scree plot indicated that a better number of factors was between 5 and 7. For the written data, the KMO = .806 and the Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($p < .01$). The initial solution gave 19 factors over the Eigenvalue of 1, and the scree plot indicated that a better number of factors was 5 or 6. Based on these two initial analyses showing that there was little difference between the two data sets, the written data and the online data were combined and the analyses reported below represent this combined set, including all 346 respondents.

Results

Factor Analysis

Exploratory factor analysis was conducted (in line with recommendations made by Costello and Osborne, 2005) on the 71 items that made up the main part of the questionnaire (the results section will refer to the overall data set, rather than the two separate parts). Seventy-one items relating to participants' opinions about criminal offenders were analysed using estimated maximum likelihood with Direct Oblimin (oblique) rotation. The reason behind this analysis was to create a clear factor solution for the development of the Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale (OCO).

In the initial exploratory factor analysis, the elbow of the scree plot looked to be around the 4 factor point, and so analysis was conducted forcing between 4-6 factors, and matching these factors up with the original key defining points about the moral stranger and fellow traveller (see Table 2.1), which all 71-items had been based on. The final four factor solution was decided upon because it best matched to the defining factors of the moral stranger and fellow traveller, and the individual factors were found to have good internal reliability (presented below).

In the final factor solution the KMO (.905) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ($p < .001$) both indicated that the set of variables were adequately related for factor analysis. The analysis yielded four factors explaining a total of 40.53% of the variance for the entire set of variables, and utilised 16 of the original 71-items (see Table 5.1). Factor one was labelled *Ability to Change*, and this factor explained 25.47% of the variance. The second factor derived was labelled *Excuses*, and this factor explained 6.03% of the variance. Factor three was labelled *Decision Impairment*, and explained 4.88% of the variance. The fourth and final factor was

labelled *Desire to Change*, and explained 4.15% of the variance. This analysis found that there were four different patterns of responding for the items relating to one's opinions about criminal offenders.

Ability to change.

The first pattern of responding related to the participant's view about offenders being able to change their ways (*Ability to Change*) and the following four items made up this subscale: a) Offenders are not able to change their ways (reversed); b) Offenders cannot be rehabilitated (reversed); c) Like regular people, offenders can change; d) Those who commit crime can stop offending. The Cronbach's alpha for this subscale showed good reliability ($\alpha = .79$). A high score on this subscale represents the view that offenders have got the ability to change, whereas a low score on this subscale represents that view that offenders do not have the ability to change.

Excuse making.

The second pattern of responding was in relation to ideas that the perceiver holds about possible or common excuses that are used to explain the behaviour of criminal offenders (*Excuses*) and this subscale was made up of the four following items: a) Offenders cannot use the excuse of a bad background for their actions; b) Alcohol or drug abuse can never excuse offending; c) Bad circumstances can never excuse an offender's actions; d) Offenders do not have a legitimate excuse for their criminal offending. This subscale showed good internal reliability ($\alpha = .80$). A high score on this subscale represents a view that there are mitigating factors, such as alcohol consumption and adverse background circumstances, that can help explain why someone commits crime, whereas a low score represents a view that any mitigating factors involved are irrelevant and do not excuse the actions of the offender.

Decision impairment.

The third pattern of responding was related to decision impairments that an offender may experience (*Decision Impairment*) and this subscale was made up of the following four items: a) Those who commit crime are often impaired in their decision-making ability; b) Offenders' judgement can be impaired when they commit crimes; c) Offenders have often not thought about the consequences of their actions; d) Criminal acts are often spontaneous. The Cronbach's alpha for this subscale showed

good internal reliability ($\alpha = .65$). A high score on this subscale represents the view that offenders can be impaired in their decision making ability at the time of offending and that this can act as a mitigating factor, whereas a low score on this subscale represents the view that the offender is not impaired in their decision making ability and so there is no mitigating factors related to their offending behaviour.

Desire to change.

The fourth pattern of responding related to the participant's view about the desire that an offender has to change or not (*Desire to Change*) and the subscale was made up of the following four items: a) Offenders usually want to be forgiven; b) Offenders want to change; c) Those who commit crime do not want to continue to do so; d) Those who commit crime want to redeem themselves. This subscale showed good internal reliability ($\alpha = .84$). A high score on this subscale represents the view that offenders have the desire to change, whereas a low score on this subscale represents the view that offenders do not have the desire to change.

Table 5.1: EML Table for Study 3a and 3b Combined Final Version

	Loadings			
	Factor 1 Ability	Factor 2 Excuses	Factor 3 Decision	Factor 4 Desire
Offenders are not able to change their ways	.743			.339
Offenders cannot be rehabilitated	.701			.318
Like regular people, offenders can change	.576			.410
Those who commit crime can stop offending	.618			
Offenders cannot use the excuse of a bad background for their actions	.324	.639		
Alcohol or drug abuse can never excuse offending		.618		
Bad circumstances can never excuse an offender's actions		.611		.324
Offenders do not have a legitimate excuse for their criminal offending		.522		.358
Those who commit crime are often impaired in their decision-making ability			.658	
Offenders' judgement can be impaired when they commit crimes	.366		.471	
Offenders have often not thought about the consequences of their actions			.484	
Criminal acts are often spontaneous			.408	
Offenders usually want to be forgiven				.713
Offenders want to change	.486			.559
Those who commit crime do not want to continue to do so	.374			.506
Those who commit crime want to redeem themselves				.640
Eigenvalue	48.08	4.28	3.47	2.94
% of Total Variance	25.47	6.03	4.88	4.15
Cronbach's α	.789	.795	.648	.835
Total Variance				40.528

Table 5.2: Correlation Matrix between Factors of the OCO Scale

		AC	DC	EX	DI
Ability to Change (AC)	r	1	.442*	.292*	.241*
	N	346	342	343	344
Desire to Change (DC)	r	.442*	1	.315*	.200*
	N	342	342	339	341
Excuses (EX)	r	.292*	.315*	1	.149*
	N	343	339	343	341
Decision Impairment (DI)	r	.241*	.200*	.149*	1
	N	344	341	341	344

* = Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

These four subscales combine to form a 16-item measure of people's opinions about criminal offenders ($\alpha = .81$), incorporating a number of the key factors involved in the theoretically based Moral Stranger/Fellow Traveller belief systems.

MANOVA Analysis

Experience of crime.

The data were also subjected to MANOVA analysis. In Study 3 participants were asked about their previous experience of crime and offenders, and they were also asked about some of their specific beliefs about offenders, such as whether they thought offenders had similar beliefs to most other's in society. It was determined that some of these items might provide important information about how people differ on their responses to the items being asked in the scale. Each item was a dichotomous response (1=Yes, 2=No), and this was used as the independent variable in the MANOVA analysis, with the 4 subscales of the crime opinions scale, from the factor solution outlined above, being the dependent variables. The overall Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale score was also used as a dependent variable in this analysis.

Committed a crime.

A one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted with the independent variable 'whether the participant had committed a crime' (referred to from now on as '*committed crime*'), coded as 1 = yes, 2 = no. In this sample, 109 participants self-identified as having committed a crime and 213 participants stated that they had not committed a crime. No definition was given to participants about what constituted a 'crime' when answering this question, it was up to the individual to interpret the question and how it applied to them. Participants were also asked if they had been convicted of a crime, but the affirmative responses to this item were so rare (N=13) that this variable was not used in any further analysis.

The dependent variables used in this analysis were the four subscales of the Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale: ability to change, desire to change, excuses, and decision impairment. A further one-way ANOVA was conducted with the same independent variable and the dependent variable of the overall scale score for the Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale. This was conducted separately because of the correlation that would be present between the overall scale score and each individual subscale, making inclusion of the overall scale score with the subscales

analysis redundant. The one-way MANOVA is presented first, and then the one-way ANOVA is presented.

The multivariate main effect for *committed crime* was significant: Wilks' $\Lambda = .895$, $F(4, 322) = 9.43$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .11$. This analysis found that whether a participant had committed a crime or not had a significant effect on responses given on the subscales of the OCO scale. Table 5.2 shows all the means and standard deviations of the dependent variables by the *committed crime* variable. Also shown for each dependent variable are the F values for the univariate ANOVAs and their accompanying effect sizes, calculated as partial eta squared (η^2).

Table 5.2 shows that there were three significant main effects for the independent variable of *committed crime*. For the subscale *ability to change* ($F(1,325)=16.44$, $p<.001$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$), participants who had committed a crime gave a higher rating ($M=5.71$, $SD=.90$) on this subscale than those who had not committed a crime ($M=5.30$, $SD=.85$), a higher rating indicating a more fellow traveller belief. The second significant main effect was for the subscale *excuses* ($F(1,325)=28.85$, $p<.001$, partial $\eta^2 = .08$), participants who had committed a crime rated the offender higher ($M=3.67$, $SD=1.29$) on this subscale than those who had not committed a crime ($M=2.94$, $SD=1.11$), again representing a more fellow traveller belief. The third significant main effect was for the subscale *desire to change* ($F(1,325)=6.24$, $p<.001$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$). Participants who had committed a crime rated the offender higher ($M=4.17$, $SD=0.83$) on this subscale than those who had not committed a crime ($M=3.91$, $SD=0.90$), representing a more fellow traveller view.

The above findings supported the hypothesis that participants, who self-identified as having committed a crime, would have a more sympathetic view of offenders, which could be characterised by the fellow traveller belief system. Based on this, it was expected that those who stated that they had committed a crime would provide responses to the Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale that were in the fellow traveller direction more than those who did not identify as having committed a crime, and this was supported by the current study. When interpreting these results, though, one has to be careful because there was no definition given for what constituted 'have committed a crime', and so there is likely a huge variety of possible offences that participants were referring to when they answered this question. It is likely that more of these self-identified 'offenders' have only committed a minor

offence, but as no further information about this offence was requested this cannot be investigated any further.

Table 5.3: Means and Standard Deviations on the Dependent Variables as Function of Committed Crime Study 3 Combined

Variable	Committed a Crime				<i>F</i> (1,325)	<i>p</i>	η ²
	Yes		No				
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Ability to Change	5.71	0.90	5.30	0.85	16.44	<.001	.048
Desire to Change	4.17	0.83	3.91	0.90	6.24	.013	.019
Excuses	3.67	1.29	2.94	1.11	28.85	<.001	.082
Decision Impairment	4.91	0.96	4.87	0.89	0.12	<i>ns</i>	.000
Overall OCO Score	4.61	0.62	4.26	0.61	26.32	<.001	.076

Note. All variables range from 1 to 7.

For the *decision impairment* subscale there were no significant main effects. Whether a person had committed a crime or not had no effect on the answers that participants gave to the scale items that related to offenders' potential decision impairment at the time that they committed the crime.

The one-way ANOVA for *committed crime* with the dependent variable of the overall Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale score found that there was a significant main effect of *committed crime*, $F(1, 325)=23.90$, $p<.001$, partial $\eta^2 = .076$. Those who committed a crime had a higher (more fellow traveller) overall score on the OCO scale ($M=4.61$, $SD=0.62$) than those who had not committed a crime ($M=4.26$, $SD=0.61$). These results, further, support the hypothesis that those who had committed a crime would identify with the fellow traveller belief more than those who had not committed a crime.

Victim of a crime.

A 2 x 3 multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted with the independent variables of victim of a crime (from now referred to as *victim of crime*) and know a person close who has been the victim of a crime (from now referred to as *know victim of crime*), the first with two levels and the second with three levels. For both of these independent variables, participants responded yes or no and they also responded yes or no as to whether the crime experienced was violent or not. However, for the *victim of crime* variable there were comparatively few respondents overall ($N=47$, 13.7% of the overall sample) who responded in the affirmative to having experienced a violent crime themselves. For this reason, and the fact that inclusion of this variable with three levels would have created some very small cells in the overall 3 x 3 analysis, the victim of crime variable was coded for yes ($N=203$) or no ($N=119$) only; there was no differentiation made for the crime being violent or non-violent. For the *know victim of crime* variable, however, the three options were used because there was relatively even distribution of responses across the options: 1 = yes violent ($N=120$), 2 = yes non-violent ($N=119$), and 3 = no ($N=83$). The dependent variables for this analysis were the four subscales of the Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale: ability to change, desire to change, excuses, and decision impairment.

Also conducted here was a 2 x 3 analysis of variance (ANOVA) with the same two independent variables as above, and the dependent variable of the overall scale score for the Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale.

The multivariate main effect for *victim of crime* was non-significant: Wilks' $\Lambda = .983$, $F(4,318) = 1.382$, $p = .299$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$. This analysis found that whether a participant had been the victim of a crime (violent or otherwise) had no significant effect on responses given for the OCO scale, refer to Table 5.3. Further to this, by examining the univariate ANOVA effects for the victim of crime variable it can be seen that there were no significant main effects at the univariate level.

The multivariate main effect for *know victim of crime* was also non-significant: Wilks' $\Lambda = .977$, $F(8,636) = .949$, $p = .476$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$ (see Table 5.4). This analysis found that whether a participant knew someone in their life who had been the victim of a crime (violent or otherwise) had no significant effect on responses given for the OCO scale, refer to Table 5.4. Further to this, by examining the univariate ANOVA effects for the know victim of crime variable it can be seen that there were no significant main effects at the univariate level.

These non-significant main effects, however, are subsumed by the significant multivariate interaction of *victim of crime* and *know victim of crime* was significant: Wilks' $\Lambda = .932$, $F(8,636) = 2.835$, $p = .004$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$. This indicates that participants' responses to the OCO scale were dependent on both their own experience of crime and their vicarious experience of crime, through someone close to them.

There were two significant univariate effects for the interaction of *victim of crime* and *know victim of crime*. The first significant interaction effect was for the *excuses* subscale, $F(2,321)=4.07$, $p=.018$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$. This interaction effect relates to the pattern of responses given by participants in each of the three levels of the *know victim of crime* variable by the two levels of the *victim of crime* variable. When participants have vicarious experience of crime, either violent or non-violent, then their responses to the *excuses* subscale are higher when they have not experienced crime (violent: $M=3.76$, $SD=1.24$; non-violent: $M=3.52$, $SD=1.033$) personally than when they have experienced crime personally (violent: $M=3.20$, $SD=1.25$; non-violent: $M=2.99$, $SD=1.16$). Whereas, when participants have no vicarious experience of crime they give higher responses to the *excuses* subscale when

they have experienced crime personally ($M=3.27$, $SD=1.33$) than when they have not ($M=2.92$, $SD=1.22$).

The second significant interaction effect was for the *desire to change* subscale, $F(2,321)=3.54$, $p=.030$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$. This interaction effect relates to the pattern of responses given by participants when they had known someone who had been the victim of a non-violent crime. When participants had been the victim of crime themselves then they rated higher when they had vicarious experience of crime ($M=4.17$, $SD=0.86$) or no vicarious experience of crime ($M=4.08$, $SD=1.01$), in comparison to vicarious experience of non-violent crime ($M=3.74$, $SD=0.92$). While when participants had not been the victim of a crime the opposite pattern was apparent; higher rating were given when the participant had vicarious experience of non-violent crime ($M=4.22$, $SD=0.68$), compared with vicarious violent crime experience ($M=4.07$, $SD=0.83$) or no vicarious experience ($M=3.96$, $SD=0.84$).

The 2 (*victim of crime*) x 3 (*know person victim of crime*) ANOVA with the dependent variable of the overall Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale score found that there were no significant differences on scores for the overall scale dependent on whether the participant was the victim of a crime, $F(1,321)=1.29$ $p=.257$, partial $\eta^2 = .004$, or whether the participant knew someone close to them who had been the victim of a crime, $F(2,321)=2.25$, $p=.107$, partial $\eta^2 = .014$, or a combination of these two factors, $F(2,321)=2.94$, $p=.054$, partial $\eta^2 = .018$.

Table 5.4: Means and Standard Deviations on the Dependent Variables as Function of Victim of Crime Study 3 Combined

Variable	Victim of Crime				<i>F</i> (1,321)	<i>p</i>	η ²
	Yes		No				
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Ability to Change	5.47	0.88	5.40	0.91	0.39	<i>ns</i>	.001
Desire to Change	3.80	0.91	3.95	0.73	0.61	<i>ns</i>	.002
Excuses	3.12	1.23	3.33	1.23	2.95	<i>ns</i>	.009
Decision Impairment	4.86	0.91	4.92	0.93	0.65	<i>ns</i>	.002
Overall OCO Score	4.39	0.66	4.41	0.64	1.29	<i>ns</i>	.004

Note. All variables range from 1 to 7.

Table 5.5: Means and Standard Deviations on the Dependent Variables as a Function of Know Victim of Crime Study 3 Combined

Variable	Know Victim of Crime						<i>F</i> (1,321)	<i>p</i>	η ²
	Yes-Violent		Yes-Nonviolent		No				
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Ability to Change	5.49	0.95	5.46	0.83	5.34	0.88	0.43	.648	.003
Desire to Change	3.90	0.81	3.74	0.88	3.95	0.85	0.69	.500	.004
Excuses	3.36	1.27	3.14	1.15	3.05	1.27	2.38	.094	.015
Decision Impairment	4.92	0.95	4.88	0.90	4.83	0.90	1.08	.340	.007
Overall OCO Score	4.53	0.64	4.35	0.63	4.26	0.67	2.45	.107	.014

Note. All variables range from 1 to 7.

Gender and age.

The multivariate main effect for gender was non-significant: Wilks' $\Lambda = .980$, $F(4,322) = 1.65$, $p = .161$, partial $\eta^2 = .020$ (see Table 5.5). This indicates that a participant's gender does not have a significant effect on responses given to the OCO scale items. However, by looking at the univariate effects in Table 5.5 it can be seen that there is one univariate effect that does reach significance: the *Excuses* subscale ($F(1,325)=4.83$, $p=0.029$, partial $\eta^2 = .015$). This effect was such that female participants gave a higher rating ($M=3.28$, $SD=1.21$) on this subscale than male participants ($M=2.96$, $SD=1.24$). There were no other significant univariate effects for any of the other subscales of the OCO scale. This was an unexpected finding as there is current research available that shows gender to be a differentiating factor when it comes to punitiveness and punishment decisions, with males generally being more punitive than females (Gault & Sabini, 2000; Peterson, 2010).

The multivariate effect of age was significant: Wilks' $\Lambda = .884$, $F(4,327) = 10.71$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .116$. Age group was divided into two groups, based on a median split at age 27. Those 27 years and under were the younger age group (coded 1; $N=177$) and those 28 years and older were the older age group (coded 2; $N=169$). This analysis indicated that age does have a significant influence on the way that participants responded to items on the OCO scale.

At the univariate level there were significant main effects for three of the OCO subscales. There was a significant effect for the ability to change subscale ($F(1,330)=6.60$, $p=.011$, partial $\eta^2 = .020$), such that younger participants rated higher ($M=5.57$, $SD=0.86$) than older participants ($M=5.32$, $SD=0.89$). Similarly, younger participants rated higher on the excuses subscale ($M=3.53$, $SD=1.21$) than older participants ($M=2.85$, $SD=1.14$), ($F(1,330)=27.24$, $p<.001$, partial $\eta^2 = .076$). Finally, there was a significant effect for the *desire to change* subscale, ($F(1,330)=23.14$, $p<.001$, partial $\eta^2 = .066$), such that younger participants rated higher ($M=4.23$, $SD=0.71$) than older participants ($M=3.78$, $SD=0.98$).

An overall effect of age was expected in the current study, this is due to the research that shows older people to be more conservative than younger people, and also to be more punitive than younger people (Ray, 1985; Truett, 1993). The interpretation of these results need to be taken with care, though, as a median split

was used on this sample and it was a relatively young overall sample, making the ‘older’ age group start from the age of 28, which to most people and in most other research would not necessarily be considered ‘old’ for an ‘older’ age group. This may be a reason for there not being a significant effect of age in the current study.

The multivariate interaction of *age* and *gender* was non-significant: Wilks' $\Lambda = .978$, $F(6,313) = 1.189$, $p = .312$, $\eta^2 = .022$. This indicates that participants' responses to the OCO scale were not dependent on their age and gender, or on a combination effect of these two variables. Examining the univariate effects for this it can be seen that there are no significant interaction effects at the univariate level.

Table 5.6: Means and Standard Deviations on the Dependent Variables as a Function of Gender Study 3 Combined

Variable	Gender				<i>F</i> (1,325)	<i>p</i>	η ²
	Male		Female				
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Ability to Change	5.47	0.98	5.43	0.84	0.17	.682	.001
Desire to Change	3.79	0.93	3.88	0.81	0.83	.363	.003
Excuses	2.96	1.24	3.30	1.21	7.16	.029	.015
Decision Impairment	4.86	0.95	4.90	0.91	0.17	.684	.000
Overall OCO Score	4.36	0.66	4.42	0.64	0.010	.920	.000

Note. All variables range from 1 to 7.

Table 5.7: Means and Standard Deviations on the Dependent Variables as Function of Age Study 3 Combined

Variable	Age				<i>F</i> (1,330)	<i>p</i>	η ²
	Younger		Older				
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Ability to Change	5.57	0.86	5.32	0.88	6.59	.011	.020
Desire to Change	4.23	0.71	3.78	0.98	23.14	<.001	.066
Excuses	3.53	1.21	2.85	1.14	27.24	<.001	.076
Decision Impairment	4.86	0.87	4.94	0.95	0.58	<i>ns</i>	.002
Overall OCO Score	4.59	0.56	4.20	0.68	31.65	<.001	.091

Note. All variables range from 1 to 7.

Discussion

Scale development

Study 3 was designed to begin the development of a measure of people's opinions about criminal offenders, in order to provide empirical support for the existence of the moral stranger and the fellow traveller perspectives, as used in Studies 1 and 2. Moving to the factor analysis, the current study has found that there is a distinct pattern to how individuals respond to items about criminal offenders and that these items do map onto the distinct factors that relate to the moral stranger and the fellow traveller. From a large pool of items, Study 3 was able to use factor analysis to come up with a manageable and meaningful scale that utilises 16 items that come under 4 subheadings.

The four subscales that were found in this analysis are meaningful and distinct, and match up with a number of the 14 key factors that all of the scale items were based on. The four subscales are: *ability to change*, *desire to change*, *excuses*, and *decision impairment*, and these reflect some of the key areas of difference between the moral stranger and the fellow traveller. Each of these subscales includes meaningful items, some of which are reverse scored, and each scale has a reasonable Cronbach's alpha, indicating good internal reliability.

Each of the four factors relates to two or more of the 14 factors that the items of the scale were all based on. The *ability to change* subscale relates to the following differentiating factors: potential to be rehabilitated versus cannot be rehabilitated, unlikely to reoffend versus likely to reoffend, and, can see that actions were bad/wrong/harmful versus do not deem own actions to be wrong/bad/harmful. The *desire to change* subscale relates to the following: seeking redemption versus indifferent to gaining redemption, and, motivated to change versus unmotivated to change.

The *excuses* subscale relates to: bad circumstances versus bad person, and adverse or exceptional (background) circumstances versus unexceptional (background) circumstances. The *decision impairment* subscale relates to: unintentional harm caused versus intentional harm caused, impaired mental state versus unimpaired mental state, and, can understand that own actions were bad/wrong/harmful versus does not deem own actions to be wrong/bad/harmful.

Exposure to crime

In addition to the creation of the Opinions about Criminal Offenders Scale, Study 3 also included the examination of the effect of exposure to offenders on these belief systems. Participants who had both been the victim of a crime and knew someone close to them who had been the victim of a crime were most influenced in their answers to the scale items, such that they answered some items in a moral stranger direction, as predicted. However, just being the victim of a crime did not have a significant effect on the responses to the scale items, while knowing someone who had been the victim of a crime did have a significant effect. Perhaps being the victim of a crime oneself is not enough but people react more strongly when someone that they are close to, and presumably they care about, is the victim of a crime. People can cope with their own victimisation better than seeing someone that they care about go through this, and then the accumulation of both experiences presents most strongly.

Having committed a crime or not was the other variable that was examined in the MANOVA analysis conducted in Study 3. It was predicted that those participants who had committed a crime would respond in the direction of the fellow traveller, because they would consider that they were answering items about a group of people that included themselves. This hypothesis was supported by the current study. Whether a participant had committed a crime or not had an influence on one's responses to the scale items, such that those who had committed a crime responded in a more fellow traveller way than those who had not committed a crime.

This is an interesting finding, even while being in the predicted direction. What was not considered in the current study was what sort of crime the participant had committed, or how many crimes the participant had committed. There is a lot of variation in how one can answer this question and what one person considers as an offence that they have committed, another person may not consider being serious enough to include. For example, a high percentage of people in New Zealand have, at some time in their life, smoked marijuana, which is a Class C illegal drug in NZ (Durrant, Adamson, Todd & Sellman, 2009). This is quite an accepted part of society in NZ, and while it is illegal to do this, a lot of people may not consider this action as a crime when answering the question about whether they had committed a crime or not.

The other problem is that this was a self-report study and so participants may not have been being truthful about their answer. There was no reason for a participant to not be truthful, given that the study was confidential, completely anonymous, and was guided by the Human Ethics Board at Victoria University. However, some people who had committed a crime may still have felt cautious about answering yes to that question, and equally, people who have never committed a crime might have thought it 'daring' to say yes. This is not something that can easily be overcome in research such as this.

Demographics

Participants' answers to the scale items were also assessed for gender and age differences. It was found that there was no difference based on gender, so the responses of male and female participants did not differ significantly. However, it is important to note here that the sample for Study 3 had a majority of female participants and this could be a reason for there being no gender difference, as previous literature would indicate that a gender difference is something to expect in the context of opinions about offenders and crime (Gault & Sabini, 2000; Peterson, 2010).

An age difference was found, and this age difference was in the predicted direction. Participants in the older age group gave responses that were in the moral stranger direction, when compared with the lower age group. This was expected when comparing the concepts of moral stranger and fellow traveller to liberal and conservative belief systems, with research showing that older people tend to hold more conservative (moral stranger) beliefs than younger people (Ray, 1985; Truett, 1993). A problem with this finding is that the sample in Study 3 was an overly young sample and so a median split had to be used to get even sized groups, which meant that people aged 28 and over were considered to be in the older group. So, while the expected influence of age was found this may not be an accurate finding based on the characteristics of the current sample and future research would need to examine age differences on a sample that had a more broad range of ages represented.

Concluding remarks

This study used exploratory factor analysis to determine what items would be included in the measure and from this point it was necessary to conduct confirmatory

factor analysis, on a further sample, and to also examine the psychometric properties of the measure through test-retest reliability, and convergent and discriminant validity. This was the aim for Study 4. Two samples were used in Study 4; the first was a large sample to conduct the confirmatory factor analysis with and the second was a smaller number of participants from the first sample pool, to be able to conduct the test-retest reliability, and other psychometric properties of the scale.

Chapter 6

Study 4a

The results of Study 3 provided the initial factor structure and internal reliability of the Opinions about Criminal Offenders (OCO) Scale. From this stage it was important to investigate the psychometric properties of the scale, to determine if it is a psychometrically valid and useful measure. Specifically, the goals of Studies 4a and 4b were: a) to test the validity of the previously obtained factor structure of the 16-item scale with a new population; b) to examine the stability of scores over time; and c) to examine the convergent validity of the scale by comparing it to theoretically or conceptually related measures.

To examine these issues, Study 4a used a large sample ($N = 647$) in order to conduct confirmatory factor analysis. This analysis was conducted to examine whether or not the factor structure that had been developed through Study 3 was valid and the best fit for the data. Study 4b included a subsample ($N = 217$) of the respondents from Study 4a to examine stability (i.e., test-retest reliability), and convergent validity by completing the scale along with several other extant measures.

Method

Participants

Participants were first year psychology students who completed the scale as part of a mass testing package that they were given in the first laboratory of the trimester (week two of classes). Six hundred and forty-seven participants completed the scale for course credit. Participants ranged in age from 16-59 years old, with a mean age of 19.44 ($SD=4.01$). The sample was made up of 434 females (67.1%) and 212 males (32.8%), one respondent did not disclose his or her sex. The sample was predominantly NZ European (82.8%) with small representation of Asian (6.6%), Polynesian (4.0%) and Maori (0.46%) ethnicities (see Appendix A). No further demographic information was collected. Students gained course credit for completing this research but they were all made aware that this research was not compulsory and that they did not have to complete it, and that they could withdraw at any stage.

Procedure

The study was conducted using the Survey Monkey online questionnaire package (Survey Monkey Corporation, 1999-2011) as part of the mass testing

program that the School of Psychology, Victoria University of Wellington implements at the beginning of each trimester for the introductory psychology students. The first page of the online study was an information/consent form and once participants had agreed to complete the study they were taken to the next page which had the 16-item OCO scale, scored on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) Likert scale. This scale was followed by demographic questions, asking for the respondents' age, gender, and ethnicity. See Appendix F for the full questionnaire materials.

Results

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on the 16 items that made up the main part of the questionnaire using AMOS 18.0 (analysis is reported in line with recommendations from DiStefano & Hess, 2005 and Jackson, Purc-Stephenson, & Gillaspay, 2009). To do Structural Equation Modelling was completed on the data. The exploratory factor analysis conducted in Study 3 found that there were 4 factors that best explained the responding patterns of participants; therefore, for the confirmatory factor analysis, it was expected that the same 4 factors would be found.

The SEM analysis was run with the saturated model first and then, one-by-one, those observed variables that did not add to the good model fit indices were removed. This process resulted in a final model that had good model fit but that had less items retained than the exploratory factor analysis in Study 3 had supported.

The initial saturated model had the four latent variables representing each of the four subscales of the OCO: Ability to Change, Excuses, Desire to Change and Decision Impairment. Each of these latent variables was informed by four observed variables (items from the OCO scale). The analysis was then conducted to determine if this saturated model, which was the structure found in Study 3, met the criteria for good model fit and was therefore confirmation of the structure found previously.

The analysis, however, found that the saturated model did not have acceptable model fit and so changes to the model had to be made. There were a number of items that were found to load on more than one latent variable and it was these variables that were initially removed from the analysis. This was completed one-by-one, with each item that would have the most impact on the model fit being the item that was removed first. This resulted in one item from each of the latent variables being

removed, leaving three items per subscale. This analysis still found that one of the items loaded on both the Excuses subscale (as it had in the original structure) and the Decision Impairment subscale (which was a new loading). The model achieved good model fit with the double loading of this item, and when it was removed to try and make the structure cleaner there was no longer model fit. Due to this, the double loading item was retained and the new model achieved good model fit.

This analysis indicated that there was a three-item per factor, and four factor structure to the OCO scale, measuring people's opinions about criminal offenders. The four subscales were supported indicating that people's opinions about offenders is made up of their judgement of the ability of the offender to change, the excuses that the offender could use to explain the behaviour, the desire of the offender to change and the decision impairment that the offender experienced.

The fit of the model shown in Figure 6 was tested using several criteria: the chi-square test, the Comparative Fit Index (CFI; Bentler, 1990) and the root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA; Steiger, 1990). A non-significant chi-square indicates good model fit, as does a ratio of chi-square to degrees of freedom that is less than three. A CFI at or above .95 and an RMSEA at or below .07 also indicate good fit. Using the above criteria, the model fit the data well: $\chi^2 = 46.60$, $p = 0.160$; $\chi^2/df = 1.23$; CFI = 0.99; RMSEA = .002. For full model fit indices see Table 6.1.

Figure 6.1

Structural Equation Model of OCO Scale

Table 6.1: *Model Fit Indices for Study 4a Confirmatory Factor Analysis*

Index	Attained	Desired	Achieved or Not
Chi Square	46.60		
Chi Square Sig.	0.16	Non-sig.	Achieved
Chi Square/df	1.23	< 3.0	Achieved
GFI	0.99	> 0.95	Achieved
AGFI	0.98	> 0.90	Achieved
PGFI	0.57	> 0.50	Achieved
CFI	0.99	> 0.95	Achieved
PCFI	0.69	> 0.5 – 0.6	Achieved
RMSEA	0.02	< 0.05	Achieved
Hoelter (0.05)	741	> 200	Achieved
Hoelter (0.01)	848	> 200	Achieved

CFA Conclusions

There was some support for the structure developed in Study 3, however the CFA conducted on the Study 4a data did not exactly match up with the originally developed structure. This indicates that the structure developed in Study 3 may not have been the best fit for the data and therefore the analysis conducted in Study 4a has acted as a further exploratory factor analysis. This second EFA has then found that the structure developed in Study 3 was slightly too broad, including too many items, for a clean factor solution. The analysis conducted in Study 4a, therefore, has found that the same four subscales of the OCO exist but they are best explained by 3 items each, not by 4. This limits the number of items in the OCO scale and makes it more streamlined. Because the CFA that was conducted in Study 4a has ended up as a further EFA because support was not found for the original structure this indicates that further CFA research needs to be conducted on the OCO scale. The OCO scale, in the shorter form found by Study 4a, needs to be utilised in further research that can use a large sample size and perform another CFA with AMOS.

Discussion

Study 4a conducted Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) on the Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale with a large sample size and utilising AMOS. This

analysis found some support for the factor structure that had been developed in Study 3, but there was not full support and so a new structure was developed.

This new structure indicates that Study 4a has resulted in an additional Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), lending some support to the overall structure, but also indicating that further validating research needs to be conducted. Due to the fact that Study 4a has not resulted in support for the factor structure developed in Study 3, additional research needs to be conducted in order to find support for this new factor structure.

The OCO scale needs to be given to an additional sample and CFA with AMOS then needs to be conducted on the results of this new sample. This additional research will ideally provide the statistical support needed in order for the OCO scale to have a solid rationale for its use in further research.

Concluding remarks

Study 4a found some support for the factor solution developed in Study 3, but also refined this factor solution to provide a better, more efficient final solution. This new final solution, though, requires that additional CFA be conducted with the shorter form of the OCO scale. One item was removed from each of the four subscales and this resulted in a 12-item, 4 factor, structure that had good model fit. This 12 item version of the scale still had very good internal reliability. This finding led to the 12 item version being the preferred solution for the Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale, and the version that would need to be validated in further research.

Study 4b

Study 4a was designed to confirm the factor structure that was found in Study 3, and this was achieved. Having done this the next step was to focus on additional psychometric properties of the scale and this was the aim for Study 4b. Specifically, Study 4b was designed to examine the test-retest reliability of the scale, as well as both the convergent and discriminant validity of the scale. To achieve this, a subsample (N = 217) of the respondents from Study 4a again completed the OCO scale along with several other measures (described below).

Method

Participants

Two-hundred and seventeen introductory psychology students completed this study in exchange for course credit. Participants ranged in age from 16 to 59 years old, with a mean age of 19.60 years ($SD = 5.01$). The sample was made up of 153 females and 63 males (one participant did not disclose his or her sex). The sample was predominantly NZ European (75.6%), with small representation of Maori, Pacific Island and Asian ethnicities (see Appendix A). Participants completed Study 4b approximately 2 months after they had completed Study 4a, giving an interval of 2 months between time 1 and time 2 for the test-retest reliability.

Materials

Study 4b involved the completion of a 12-page online questionnaire using the Survey Monkey online presentation package (Survey Monkey Corporation, 1999-2011). The first page was a 'Welcome Page' quickly explaining what the study entailed and then the second page was an information sheet and consent form. This second page provided participants with all the information they needed to know about what they were consenting to complete and this page asked them to agree or not agree to complete the questionnaire, and to include their student ID number (as a means of matching their time one and time two data for the test-retest reliability). See Appendix G for the full questionnaire materials.

After participants had consented to complete the questionnaire they were then presented with the first page of the study, which was the Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale. Following completion of the OCO scale, each additional measure included in Study 4b was started on a new page of the online questionnaire. After completion of the additional measures participants responded to questions about political opinions and reported basic demographic information.

Convergent and Discriminant Validity Scales

Punitiveness Orientation Scale

Punitiveness is when an individual chooses to assign a harsh punishment to an offender rather than a more lenient punishment. Capps (2002) developed a scale to measure individual differences in punitiveness and previous research has shown this

dimension to be associated with right-wing authoritarianism (RWA, Altemeyer, 1981; 1988; 2004) and social dominance orientation (SDO, Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, &, Malle, 1994; Whitley, 1999).

The Punitiveness Orientation Scale (PUN), as developed by Capps (2002), measures the distinct construct of punitiveness, and this scale measures this construct in relation to: the treatment of children, physical punishment, severe punishments, and in general, a tendency to go for more punitive actions over leniency. The scale is made up of 15 items answered on a -4 to +4 Likert scale, with 7 of the items being reverse scored (see Appendix G for the full list of items).

In Study 4b it was expected that the Punitiveness Orientation Scale would be significantly and negatively correlated with the Opinions about Criminal Offenders Scale (OCO). This was predicted because both the PUN and the OCO scales are measuring constructs that are related to an individual's punitiveness, although the OCO does go beyond this and examines opinions of offenders as well as one's general punitive attitude, and the correlation was expected to be negative because a high score on the PUN represents someone who is highly punitive, while a high score on the OCO represents someone who views offenders from the fellow traveller end of the spectrum, and therefore more lenient and not as punitive.

More specifically, it was predicted that there would be the strongest correlation with the PUN scale and the *Ability to Change* subscale. The reason for this is that one of the motivations behind punishment is about deterrence, which is about the offender not doing the same behaviours again, i.e. changing, which relates to the *Ability to Change* subscale.

Need to Evaluate Scale

Need to evaluate refers to the level with which an individual engages in evaluative responding, and this is seen as an individual difference, such that some people have a high need to evaluate, while others have a low need to evaluate. Through the development of the Need to Evaluate Scale (NES), Jarvis and Petty (1996) determined that high-need to evaluate individuals were more likely to report having attitudes towards important social and political issues than low-need to evaluate individuals, and that high-need to evaluate individuals write more evaluative thoughts in free thought writing tasks than low-need to evaluate individuals.

The NES is made up of 16 items answered on a 5-point Likert scale anchored 1 = *somewhat uncharacteristic* and 5 = *extremely characteristic*. Six of the items in the scale were reverse scored and there are no subscales within the NES. Examples of the items in the scale are: 'I form opinions about everything' and 'I prefer to avoid taking extreme positions' (reverse scored) (see Appendix G for the full list of items).

The task of evaluating relates most closely to the fellow traveller view of offenders, as the person who views an offender as a fellow traveller is likely to have examined the body of information around offenders and that particular offender to come to their decision about the offender, while the moral stranger view would suggest that the individual has a blanket view of offenders and is likely to make simpler and less evidence based evaluations and will only take information into account that supports their currently held view/s. This indicates that there should be a positive correlation between the OCO scale and the Need to Evaluate Scale, whereby high-need to evaluate individuals hold that fellow traveller belief about offenders. This would be particularly so for the *Excuses* subscale because of the relationship between high-need to evaluate individuals and attitudes towards social and political issues. This relationship indicates that high-need to evaluate individuals hold opinions about important issues and so look to extra information to make judgements, such as looking at mitigating factors to help understand an individual's offending behaviour (i.e. *Excuses*).

However, while direction of the relationship is expected it is not expected that these correlations will be significant. The need to evaluate and the opinions about criminal offenders scale are expected to differentiate from each other, and so provide discriminant validity for the OCO scale.

Need for Closure Scale

Need for closure is the desire to obtain a definite answer about a topic, and this can be any answer so long as confusion and ambiguity is avoided (Kruglanski, 1989; Kruglanski, Webster & Klem, 1993); need for closure represents the desire for a clear cut answer. Kruglanski and colleagues describe that need for closure can differ across individuals and across situations. Webster and Kruglanski (1994) describe that need for (cognitive) closure is generated through a number of areas: desire for predictability, preference for order and structure, discomfort with ambiguity, decisiveness and close-mindedness.

The Need for Closure scale consists of 42 items scored on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree) and is made up of 5 subscales. Sixteen of the items in the scale are reverse scored (see Appendix G for the full list of items). The first subscale relates to one's preference for order, an individual who has high-need-for-closure has a preference for order and structure in their life, while a person who has low-need-for-closure is not concerned with this. The second subscale is preference for predictability; the high-need-for-closure individual prefers predictability, meaning that they like to be able to look at a situation and based on previous experience be able to predict what will occur. Subscale three is decisiveness, and this represents that a high-need-for-closure individual wants to gain closure and so they are quick to make a decision when compared with the low-need-for-closure individual. The fourth subscale is discomfort with ambiguity; the high-need-for-closure individual does not feel comfortable with ambiguity and prefers to have a definite answer, than the low-need-for-closure individual. Finally, the fifth subscale is closed-mindedness, and this refers to the high-need-for-closure individual having such a strong desire to achieve cognitive closure that they may, in fact, be unwilling to have their view challenged by further information once they have come to their decision.

Based on the above subscales of the Need for Closure Scale, in particular the closed-mindedness and decisiveness subscales, it was predicted that high-need-for-closure would be negatively related to the OCO scale. That is, individuals who have high-need-for-closure will be quick to make a decision, because of their desire to avoid ambiguity, and they will be resistant to changing this decision based on any extra information, and so they will be likely to make a quick and definite decision about their thoughts of the offender and this will likely be made without evaluating all the information available. For this scale, because all of the subscales are relevant to the distinction between the moral stranger and the fellow traveller, it was expected that they would all be significantly and negatively correlated with the OCO scale, and it was not expected that any one subscale would have a stronger or weaker correlation.

Attributional Complexity Scale

This measure was included in Study 4b because of the work conducted by Sargent (2004) that found that attributional complexity mediates the relationship between need for cognition and punitiveness. Sargent found that individuals who

were high in need for cognition were less supportive of punitive responses than those who were low in need for cognition (2004), but that this was mediated by attributional complexity.

Attributional complexity refers to an individual difference in relation to the extent that a person prefers complex explanations for behaviour (Fletcher et al., 1986). The Attributional Complexity Scale (1986) is made up of 28 statements that are scored on a 7-point scale, indicating one's agreement or disagreement with the statement (see Appendix G for the full list of items). The scale is designed with statements that can be scored as either 'simple' or 'complex', representing the two different extremes of attributional complexity. At one end of the scale, individuals have a preference for complex explanations to behaviour; while at the other end of the scale individuals have a preference for simple explanations.

The AC scale is divided into 7 subscales made up of 4 statements each. The first subscale relates to an individual's desire to explain and understand human behaviour. Subscale two measures an individual's preference for complex rather than simple explanations. In the third subscale an individual's preference for thinking about (meta-cognition) the underlying processes in causal attribution is measured, and in subscale four an individual's awareness of the extent to which people's behaviour is the function of interaction with others is measured. The fifth subscale measures one's tendency to infer abstract or causally complex internal attributions, while the sixth subscale measures one's tendency to infer abstract external attributions that are occurring proximally in time. The final, and seventh, subscale measures one's tendency to infer external causes for behaviour that are the result of a causal chain from the past.

A high score on the AC scale represents high attributional complexity, that is, the individual prefers complex explanations for behaviour. This is expected to be convergent with the fellow traveller view of offenders, because the fellow traveller is seen as a person who, through any number of explanations, has come to commit a crime, whereas the moral stranger is seen as a bad person, and there is little thought put to explanations for why they have committed crime. A positive correlation is expected between the AC scale and the OCO scale; an individual who views offenders as moral strangers will have a preference for simple explanations of behaviour and an individual who views offenders as fellow travellers will have a preference for more complex explanations. Specifically, because the attributional

complexity scale is about explanations for behaviour it was expected that the strongest correlations would be with the *Excuses* subscale and the *Decision Impairment* subscale, of the OCO scale.

Rational and Experiential Inventory

The Rational and Experiential Inventory measures two distinct types of thinking styles: rational versus experiential (Pacini & Epstein, 1999). The rational thinking style is measured by use of items from the Need for Cognition scale (NFC; Cacioppo & Petty, 1982) and relates to an enjoyment in use of one's cognitive abilities. The experiential thinking style is measured by items from various sources to make up the Faith in Intuition subscale (Epstein, Pacini, Denes-Raj, & Heier, 1996; Swinkels & Giuliano, 1995) that examines a different style of thinking whereby the individual uses more of an intuitive pathway to come up with ideas and make decisions.

Along with the inventory being made up of two thinking styles, rational and experiential, each of these two parts have two subscales: ability and engagement. The ability subscales refer to the participant's view of how much skill they have in thinking using a rational style or an experiential style, while the engagement subscales refer to what the participant's view of their preferred mode of thinking is (regardless of their actual ability). The four parts of the inventory are: rational ability, rational engagement, experiential ability and experiential engagement (see Appendix G for the full list of items).

It was expected that there would be a positive correlation between rational thinking and the OCO scale. This is because someone who views offenders at the fellow traveller end of the spectrum would be expected to use rational thought processes to come up with these views, by weighing up all of the available information in relation to the topic. It was also expected that there would be a negative correlation between experiential thinking and the OCO scale. This is because someone who views offenders at the moral stranger end of the spectrum would be expected to be using their intuition about their opinions, rather than using relevant information to make this decision. However, it was not expected that these correlations would be significant. The Rational and Experiential Inventory and the Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale were not expected to be significantly related, providing discriminant validity for the OCO scale.

Dweck Scale

People's lay theories about personality play a pivotal role in their social understanding. Such 'implicit' theories, although generally unconscious and unarticulated, contain key assumptions that can underlie different patterns of social information processing. These different perspectives are likely to lead to different mental models about how humans function, and therefore very different beliefs about what information is needed in order to understand and predict their behaviour (Dweck, Chiu, & Hong, 1995a; Dweck, Chiu, & Hong, 1995b; Dweck, et al., 1993; Levy, Plaks, & Dweck, 1999; Plaks, Grant & Dweck, 2005). These different perspectives can be defined as either an entity theorist or an incremental theorist. The entity theorist does not believe that people can change that once people have developed certain traits they are not malleable, whereas the incremental theorist sees people as changeable, that they can learn from their past experiences and make changes based on these (Dweck et al., 1995a).

There are two subscales to the Dweck Scale, the Moral View subscale and the World View subscale (Dweck et al., 1995a; Dweck et al., 1995b). The moral view subscale relates to beliefs about a person's moral character and the malleability of this, while the world view subscale refers to beliefs about a person overall, and the malleability of their personality characteristics. There are 11 items in the overall scale, with 3 making up the moral view subscale and 8 making up the world view subscale. The items are scored on a 7-point Likert scale, from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) (see Appendix G for the full list of items). High scores on the Dweck scale represent the entity theorist, with low scores representing the incremental theorist. One of the key defining factors of the moral stranger versus fellow traveller view is ability of the offender to change, and based on this, it is predicted that there will be a negative correlation between the Dweck scale and the OCO scale. This is particularly relevant for the *ability to change* subscale, because it is about the ability of the offender to change his or her way, while the *excuses* subscale could also be relevant because of the permanency of the trait as seen by entity theorists, so excuses are not acceptable because it is about the character of the person, which to an entity theorist cannot be changed.

Procedure

The current study was run as an online questionnaire. The order of the scales presented in the online questionnaire was kept the same across all participants; no counterbalancing of the scales was used in this study. Participants completed the OCO scale first and then the other scales were presented in the following order: Attributional Complexity, Need for Closure, Rational-Experiential Inventory, Dweck Scale, Punitiveness Orientation scale, and the Need to Evaluate scale. After these, participants responded to items about political opinion and a number of demographic items.

The original, 16-item, version of the OCO scale was used in the current study because the results presented in Study 4a were being worked through at the time that Study 4b was run.

Results

Test-Retest Reliability

Pearson's product moment correlations were calculated between time 1 and time 2 data on the four subscales of the OCO and on the overall scale score for the OCO scale (with the 12-item version of the OCO scale). These data were compared to the accepted standards for reliability coefficients developed by Cicchetti and Sparrow (1981): 0-.4 Poor, 4-.59 Fair, 6-.74 Good, .75-1.0 Excellent.

As can be seen in Table 6.2, scores were stable over the interval of two months. Pearson product moment coefficients ranged from .60 to .74 for the individual subscales, all in the good range, and there was a coefficient of .82 for the overall scale, which is in the excellent range. These results indicate that the Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale is stable over time.

Table 6.2: *Test-Retest Reliability*

Scale Name	r
Ability to Change	.71
Desire to Change	.62
Excuses	.63
Decision Impairment	.59
OCO Overall	.82

Note. N = 233 for all.

Convergent and Discriminant Validity

For the convergent and discriminant validity of the Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale six different scales were implemented alongside it in an online questionnaire. It was expected that the Punitiveness Orientation scale, the Need for Cognitive Closure scale, and the Dweck scale would all be negatively, and significantly, correlated with the OCO scale, while it was expected that the Attributional Complexity scale would be positively, and significantly, correlated with the OCO scale. Further the Need to Evaluate scale and the Rational-Experiential Inventory were expected to not be significantly correlated with the OCO scale. If these predictions were supported by Study 4b this would help provide conceptual validation for the OCO scale. This analysis was conducted with the 12-item, 4 subscale version of the OCO scale.

Convergent validity.

As predicted there was a significant negative correlation between the Punitiveness Orientation Scale and the OCO scale, $r(217) = -.599$, $p < .01$. This indicates that those who are punitive (as represented by a high number on the PUN) view offenders at the moral stranger end of the scale (as represented by a low number on the OCO). As can be seen in Table 6.5, for each of the subscales of the OCO there were also significant, negative correlations with the PUN.

There was a significant negative correlation between the Need for Cognitive Closure scale and the OCO, $r(217) = -.143$, $p = .035$. This finding supports the

hypothesis that need-for-closure would be negatively related to the OCO scale because individuals scoring high on need for closure are quick to make a decision, because of their desire to avoid ambiguity. Further, they are resistant to change, so they are likely to make a quick and definite decision about the offender and will not be likely to change this based on any extra information that is brought to light. As can be seen in Table 6.5, for each of the subscales (except for *excuses*) there were also significant and negative correlations with the Need for Closure Scale.

As predicted, there was a significant positive correlation with the Attributional Complexity scale, $r(217) = .219, p < .001$. This indicates that a person who scores high on the AC scale thinks of an offender as a moral stranger, which makes sense because an individual who views offenders as fellow travellers will have a preference for more complex explanations of behaviour and so will take into account circumstances, both background and situational, whereas an individual who views offenders as moral strangers has a preference for simple explanations and so does not review their beliefs about an offender based on any mitigating information. As can be seen in Table 21, only two of the OCO subscales (*Ability to Change* [$r(217) = .295, p < .01$] and *Decision Impairment* [$r(217) = .220, p = .001$]) were significantly correlated with the Attributional Complexity scale, and the *Desire to Change* subscale was actually in a negative direction (but not significant).

The final scale that was expected to be convergent with the OCO scale was the Dweck scale. There was a significant negative correlation between the Dweck scale and the OCO scale, $r(217) = -.259, p < .01$. This indicates that an entity theorist (a high score on the Dweck scale) is also someone who thinks of offenders as moral strangers, while an incremental theorist (a low score on the Dweck scale) is also someone who thinks of offenders as fellow travellers. As can be seen in Table 6.5, each of the subscales of the OCO scale was negatively related to the Dweck scale, but only two of these subscales (*Ability to Change* [$r(217) = -.269, p < .01$] and *Excuses* [$r(217) = -.218, p = .001$]) were significant.

Table 6.3: Convergent and Discriminant Validity Study 4b

	AC <i>r</i>	DC <i>r</i>	EX <i>r</i>	DI <i>r</i>	OCO Overall <i>r</i>
Punitiveness Orientation Score #	-.326**	-.290**	-.165*	-.119*	-.367**
Need to Evaluate Score	-.076	-.023	-.034	.036	-.043
NC Subscale 1	-.048	-.135*	-.119	-.045	-.143*
NC Subscale 2	-.135*	-.102	-.068	-.048	-.144*
NC Subscale 3	.034	-.029	-.018	-.053	.024
NC Subscale 4	-.067	-.083	-.162*	.024	-.127*
NC Subscale 5	-.232**	-.097	-.059	-.161*	-.219**
NC Overall Score	-.135*	-.145*	-.135*	-.089	-.207**
AC Subscale 1	.274**	-.080	-.044	.181*	.128
AC Subscale 2	.165*	.000	.121	.147*	.179*
AC Subscale 3	.238*	-.073	.079	.158*	.165*
AC Subscale 4	.168*	.007	.022	.201**	.156*
AC Subscale 5	.254**	-.032	.040	.226**	.194**
AC Subscale 6	.284**	.042	.044	.144*	.207**
AC Subscale 7	.192*	-.093	.082	.117	.125
AC Overall Scale Score	.295**	-.039	.069	.220**	.219**

Notes. All N = 217 except for where indicated by # then N = 214 and * = <.05 and ** = <.01

AC = Ability to Change; DC = Desire to Change; EX = Excuses; DI = Decision Impairment

Table 6.3 (continued)

	AC <i>r</i>	DC <i>r</i>	EX <i>r</i>	DI <i>r</i>	OCO Overall <i>r</i>
RE: Experiential Ability	.081	.043	-.015	-.003	.042
RE: Experiential Engagement	.120	.052	-.011	.040	.079
RE: Rational Ability	.131	-.081	-.067	.113	.025
RE: Rational Engagement	.144*	.049	-.004	.124	.121
RE: Overall Scale Score	.176*	.023	-.037	.107	.103
Dweck Moral View	-.275**	-.054	-.229*	-.018	-.232*
Dweck World View	-.241**	-.112	-.193*	-.093	-.248**
Dweck Overall Scale Score	-.269**	-.100	-.218*	-.074	-.259**

Notes. All N = 217 except for where indicated by # then N = 214 and * = <.05 and ** = <.01

AC = Ability to Change; DC = Desire to Change; EX = Excuses;; DI = Decision Impairment

Discriminant validity.

It was predicted that the Need to Evaluate scale and the OCO scale would not be significantly related to each other, as they are measuring quite distinct constructs. It was found that there was a non significant negative correlation between the Need to Evaluate Scale and the OCO scale ($r(217) = -.043$, $p = .526$) supporting the hypothesis. By looking at Table 6.5, it can be seen that for all 4 of the subscales of the OCO scale the correlations were non-significant.

As expected, the Rational-Experiential Inventory was not significantly correlated with the OCO scale, $r(217) = .131$, $p = .131$. While there are some similarities between thinking in a rational or experiential manner when compared with thinking of offenders as either a fellow traveller or a moral stranger, these similarities are very basic and these two scales are really measuring two quite distinct constructs. As can be seen in Table 6.5, there was no significant correlation between 3 of the 4 subscales of the OCO and the Rational and Experiential Inventory, but for the *Ability to Change* subscale there was a significant positive correlation between the two scales ($r(217) = .176$, $p = .010$).

Discussion

Taken together, the findings of Study 4b provide support for the psychometric properties of the Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale.

Test-Retest Reliability

Test-retest reliability is important to the development of any scale as this gives an indication of the stability of the measure over time. A good measure will have high test-retest reliability, indicating that when a person completes the measure at two different time points there is a high similarity between answers to the items at both time 1 and time 2. In examining the stability of the test over time, it was found that the overall OCO scale achieves an excellent standard for test-retest reliability. In other words, scores on the measure as a whole were consistent over a period of time (i.e., at least two months in the current study).

While the overall OCO scale achieved an excellent level for test-retest reliability the various subscales of the scale achieved a good level. Study 4b was run with the 16-item OCO scale; however it was decided when completing the analysis

for the convergent and discriminant validity that the focus would be on the 4 subscales made up of only 3 items each, based on the analysis in Study 4a.

Convergent and Discriminant Validity

Convergent and discriminant validity are important in the development of a measure as they provide support for the construct validity of the measure. Convergent validity tests whether constructs that are meant to be related to each other are in fact related to each other, while discriminant validity tests whether constructs that are not meant to be related to each other are in fact not related to each other. The combination of both convergent and discriminant validity provide support for the validity of the measure being developed, such that the measure is distinct from other constructs (as in there is no perfect correlation between constructs) but that it is similar to constructs that it should be similar to and is different to constructs that it is supposed to be different to.

In the current study it was found that the measures which were expected to be convergent with the OCO scale were, in fact, and the measures that were expected to be discriminant with the OCO scale were. This provides support for the OCO scale being a psychometrically sound measure.

The current studies have provided statistical support for the OCO scale being a valid and distinct measure that has sound psychometric properties. From here, the next study incorporated the OCO scale, which has been developed in Studies 3 through 4, with the experimental work that was carried out in Studies 1 and 2. Study 5 used different versions of the same ‘news story’, much like was done in Studies 1 and 2, and included the Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale, tying the two parts of the current research together.

Chapter 7

Study Five

Study 5 was designed to combine the research conducted in the first two sections of this thesis; the experimental work carried out in Studies 1 and 2, and the Opinions about Criminal Offenders (OCO) Scale that was developed and validated through Studies 3 and 4. Two different versions of the 'newspaper story', similar to those used in studies one and two, were developed and used in the current study and similar dependent measures to those used already, were utilised here. Along with these different versions of the story the OCO scale was included, bringing together the two strains of research that had been carried out through the rest of this body of research.

In Studies 1 and 2, the two versions of the newspaper story were differentiated by being written from either the moral stranger perspective or the fellow traveller perspective. However, because of the inclusion of the OCO scale in Study 5, which would in effect determine which belief participants held, the stories needed to be differentiated in a different manner. For Study 5 the story was very similar in content to what was presented in Studies 1 and 2, the story used in all three studies was about the same offender and victim and had the same set of circumstances, resulting in the same offence occurring. However, for Study 5, instead of being presented from a moral stranger or fellow traveller perspective, the story was told from a purely objective point-of-view or from a point-of-view where there was some room for interpretation of the presented information.

These two different versions of the story were designed so that the full effect of belief system about offenders on punishment and rehabilitation decisions could be determined. That is, when being presented with very similar sets of facts about an offender and crime, what differences would be found based on the two belief systems. The objective version of the story was intended to emulate a purely factual presentation of the offence, with no ambiguity about the information presented, where there was little room for differential interpretation of the facts. With no room for interpretation, this version of the story was intended to allow for one's pre-existing beliefs to be the only influence on one's responses (without the interaction of the way that the story had been written influencing the responses), and the pre-existing beliefs of interest in this study were those of belief system about offenders. This version of

the story was also designed as an ideal; an ideal of how the media should be presenting factual information to the public about crime and offenders.

The other version of the story was subtly different from the objective version described above, and this version was designed to allow some room for interpretation by the reader. This version of the story was intended to allow participant's pre-existing beliefs about offenders to interact with their subjective interpretation of the facts, giving more scope for pre-existing beliefs to influence one's responses to the story. For example, if the story described the offender as having been drinking but gave no specific details about how much alcohol had been consumed then this left room for subjective interpretation of what 'drinking' meant. In this example, those who hold a fellow traveller belief would be expected to interpret 'drinking' as meaning the offender was somewhat impaired and this might be a mitigating factor to take into consideration when determining the blameworthiness and intent of the offender. On the other hand, those who hold a moral stranger belief would be expected to interpret 'drinking' as meaning that the offender had consumed an amount of alcohol, however this did not excuse his offending behaviour, and the alcohol consumption would not be considered as a mitigating factor when considering the blameworthiness and intent of the offender.

Study 5 used a one factor between-subjects design with the variable of story version (objective v subjective). Also, structural equation modelling was used to further investigate the model developed in Studies 1 and 2 with inclusion of the OCO scale.

Story Hypothesis

It was hypothesised that there would be a main effect of story type, those who read the objective version of the story would be less punitive and more likely to think that the offender will not reoffend than those who read the more subjective version of the story. This was hypothesised because in the objective version participants were responding based on the facts, while in the subjective version participants were responding based on those facts that were presented and, additionally, based on their interpretation of the slightly ambiguous pieces of information that were given in this version

Structural Equation Model Hypotheses

It was expected that the OCO measure would act as a starting point for explaining decisions that participants made about the qualities of the offender and qualities of the offence, much like the story presentation condition in Studies 1 and 2 did. Each subscale of the OCO scale relates to a different aspect of one's overall opinion about offenders and it was expected that each subscale would be differentially related to certain parts of the overall model. It was predicted that each subscale would predict judgements of only certain aspects of the offender, not all aspects, and then the judgements made about the offender would predict certain parts of the judgement made about the offence overall. These predictions are now discussed in more detail.

Predicting Offender Judgements.

It was expected that the *ability to change* subscale would be related to the likelihood of reoffending variable and the rehabilitation variable. This was expected because these variables are about the offender having the ability to change. It was expected that the *desire to change* subscale would be related to the rehabilitation variable and to the trait valence of the offender variable. This is because if the offender is thought of as wanting to change then this indicates that rehabilitation is likely to be successful and so should be offered, and also that the offender is a better person than someone who does not want to change.

The *excuses* subscale was expected to predict the likelihood of reoffending variable and the causal attributions variable. This was expected because if there are mitigating factors involved with the offender committing the offence then these lead to less blame being attributed to the offender, and so he is thought of as less likely to reoffend and less to blame for his actions.

It was expected that the *decision impairment* subscale would be related to the causal attribution variable and the likelihood of reoffending variable. This is because, if the offender had impaired decision making ability at the time of the offence then this indicates less direct blame to the offender and this is a mitigating factor that can help explain that reoffending is less likely.

Predicting Offence Judgements.

From the judgements made about the offender the model then moves onto judgments made more generally about the offence and the punishment for the offence.

It was expected that likelihood of reoffending would be related to severity of the crime rating and trait rating of the offender as these pathways were part of the model developed in study two. It was also expected that causal attributions would be related to ratings of culpability. This is because how blame is attributed is directly related to how culpable the offender is thought to be.

It was also expected that trait rating of the offender would be related to retribution and deterrent punishment motives. This is because if the offender is thought of as a good person then it is more likely that deterrent punishment motives would be more likely to be used, and retributive punishment motives would be less likely to be used. Finally, it was also predicted that rating of rehabilitation success would be related to deterrent and retribution punishment motives. If one thinks the offender is able to rehabilitate then it was expected that deterrent punishment motives would be used more, and that retribution punishment motives would be used less.

Method

Design

This study was a one-way (story type: objective v subjective) between-subjects factorial design. The story type was manipulated and participants were randomly assigned to one of the two versions (objective $N = 62$; subjective $N = 64$).

Participants

One hundred and twenty-six participants completed this study. The group was made up of 89 females and 36 males (one participant did not disclose his or her sex). The mean age was 24.20 years ($SD=6.78$). The group was predominantly New Zealand European ($N=96$), with small representation of Asian ($N=7$), Maori ($N=4$), Polynesian ($N=1$) ethnicities. There was a small group who disclosed their ethnicity as other ($N=21$) and this included answers such as Pakeha (i.e. white New Zealander), New Zealander, British and Dutch (see Appendix A for full details).

Procedure and Materials

Participants were recruited to complete the survey online via (Survey Monkey Corporation, 1999-2011). A recruitment process was used whereby the link for the online survey and an information blurb about the survey was sent out via email and also via the social networking site, Facebook.

Participants could then choose to click on the link if they were interested in the study, and they were then directed to the first page of the online survey. This first page included the full information sheet and the consent form, so participants were given all of the relevant information to make an informed decision about completing this study as soon as they were directed to it through the online link. See Appendix H for full questionnaire details.

This study was conducted as an online survey using (Survey Monkey Corporation, 1999-2011). Participants were presented with an information sheet and consent form first, this explained what was expected of them when completing the survey and at the end of the information sheet participants had to indicate if they agreed to participate or not, indicating their consent. If participants clicked on 'Agree' they were directed to the first page of the survey.

Newspaper story.

To randomly allocate participants to a story version each participant had to select a numbered box from 1-6. Once participants had selected one of the six boxes and had therefore been placed into one of the two versions of the survey they were then directed to the first page of the study, which was the only page of the survey to differ between the two versions. This page presented a story, ostensibly taken from a newspaper, about an offender by the name of Peter who had committed a sexual offence against a female co-worker at a work Christmas party. The two versions were almost identical except that in one version a few key facts were presented in a very objective way, while in the other version these same facts were presented in a somewhat more subjective way, so that there was a little bit of movement in terms of the attributions of cause that the participants could make about the offender in this version. The two versions of the newspaper story are presented in Appendix H, with the key differentiating sentences highlighted.

The first sentence, that differed, was either "Peter had previously been in trouble with the law *regarding a number of other offences*" or "Peter had previously been in trouble with the law *but not for violent or sexual offences*". In the first version there is room for the participant to think that these previous contacts with the law may have involved violent or sexual incidents, rather than dishonesty or petty crime, whereas in the second version the participant is clearly given information to the

effect that the offender has not previously been in contact with the law for these more serious offences.

The second sentence was either “Peter and the victim went out to Peter’s car late in the evening, *several hours after the beginning of the party*” or “Peter and the victim went out to Peter’s car late in the evening, *after they had spent several hours inside the party drinking*”. Again, in the first version the information provided is very general and allows the reader to make their own decision about what ‘several hours after the party started’ could mean in terms of what the two involved parties may have been doing, whereas in the second version the information clearly states that both parties had been drinking during that time, but not to what extent.

The third, and final sentence that differed between the two story versions, was either “Both Peter and the victim entered Peter’s car to talk, but once inside the car *talking turned into more intimate behaviour*” or “Both Peter and the victim entered Peter’s car to talk, but once inside the car *Peter and the co-worker became more intimate*”. In the first version, it is unclear whether the intimate behaviour was initiated by one or other of the two involved parties and whether or not both parties were consenting about this behaviour, there is room for the participant to make his or her own judgment here. In the second version it is made clear that both parties became intimate with each other and rules out the possibility that the intimate behaviour was consensual by only one of the two parties, at least to begin with.

The remainder of the two versions of the story was kept the same. What are described above were three very brief and subtle differences created between the two versions.

Dependent measures.

Having read the newspaper story participants were then directed to the first page of the dependent measures. Firstly, participants were asked to rate items of causality, taken from McAuley et al.’s (1992) work. Participants responded to six items on a 7 point Likert scale, anchored 1=*not at all* and 7=*extremely*. These six items represented two of the subscales of the original Causal Dimension Scale II (Locus of Causality and Personal Control) and were the same as those used in Studies 1 and 2, which were slightly altered versions of the original scale. These altered versions were validated in Study 1, which supported their further use, in this way. In

the structural equation modelling analysis the two cause subscales were combined to create one overall measure of causal attributions.

Following these items participants were asked a variety of questions about their reaction to the crime story that they had just read, such as “How serious is this crime?” and “How likely do you believe it is that this offender will be helped by rehabilitation?” All of these items were scored on 7 point Likert scales. All of these items can be viewed in Appendix H.

Participants were then asked to rate the offender, Peter, on 12 different bipolar personality dimensions. For example, they were asked whether they considered Peter to be: dishonest or honest, with dishonest at point 1 on the Likert scale and honest at point 7 on the Likert scale. These are the same trait judgements that were used in study two and the full list of the traits and how they were laid out on the page can be found in Appendix H. For the structural equation modelling analysis the 12 trait judgements were combined to create one overall measure of trait valence attributed to the offender, such that a high number represented a positive trait valence and a low number represented a negative trait valence.

Following the trait judgments participants were asked to engage in a counterfactual generation task. Participants were asked to “Please think about the events that you read about in the newspaper story and how you think it might have turned out differently. Please give us these thoughts in the space provided below”. There was then a blank box available for participants to type in their thoughts in response to this request. The counterfactual generation responses are analysed and discussed in chapter seven, and so are not discussed any further in this chapter.

After the counterfactual generation participants were given the Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale (that had been developed in the earlier studies). Each item was rated on a 7-point Likert scale, anchored 1 = *strongly disagree* and 7 = *strongly agree*. A number of the items were reverse scored.

Finally, participants were asked some basic demographic questions, including gender, age, level of education, current profession (if working), New Zealand status, and where they currently lived. The online survey concluded with a debriefing page that thanked participants for taking part in the study and explained what the purpose of the study was.

Results

Data Reduction

Dependent variables were aggregated based on the DV's used in the previous studies. The cause subscale 1 (Internal) was made up of the following three items: a) is the cause of this act something that is manageable by Peter, b) is the cause of this act something that Peter can regulate, and c) is the cause of this act something over which Peter has control ($\alpha=.90$). The cause subscale 2 (Personal) was made up of the remaining three items: a) is the cause of this act something that reflects an aspect of Peter, b) is the cause of this act something that is inside Peter, and c) is the cause of this act something about Peter ($\alpha=.79$). As stated above, for the SEM analysis this was combined into one variable: causal attributions.

The first of the trait subscales was the Trait Likeable subscale and was made up of the following trait dimensions: honest versus dishonest, good versus bad, unfriendly versus friendly, unlikeable versus likeable, unempathic versus empathic, unremorseful versus remorseful ($\alpha=.79$). The second of the trait subscales was the Trait Aggressiveness subscale and was made up of the remaining six trait items: self-focused versus other-focused, malevolent versus misguided, violent versus non-violent, dangerous versus harmless, aggressive versus passive, hostile versus non-hostile ($\alpha=.85$). As stated above, for the SEM analysis this was combined into one variable: trait valence.

The severity (response to crime) variable was made up of the following three items: a) how serious is this crime, b) how severe should the punishment for this crime be, and c) how morally outraged are you by this crime ($\alpha=.80$). The reoffend variable was made up of the items: a) how likely do you believe it is that this specific offender will commit this specific crime again, b) how likely do you believe it is that this specific offender will reoffend (in general), c) to what extent was your punishment decision based on a desire to make sure that the offender is discouraged from committing this crime again, and, d) to what extent was your punishment decision based on the desire to make this offender pay for what he has done ($\alpha=.71$).

The offender responsible variable was made up of the following three items: a) was Peter aware that his actions were a criminal act for which he could be prosecuted, b) did Peter intent to commit a crime, and, c) how responsible is Peter for this crime ($\alpha=.70$). The rehabilitation variable was made up of the following three items: a) how

likely do you believe it is that this offender will be helped by rehabilitation programs, b) do you think that this offender should have treatment and rehabilitation programs made readily available to him, and, c) would you be accepting of this offender reintegrating into your community once he had completed his punishment (whatever that is) ($\alpha=.63$).

MANOVA Analysis

A one-way (story: objective versus subjective) MANOVA was conducted with all of the dependent measures described above. The multivariate effect of story versions was non-significant: Wilks' $\Lambda=.90$, $F(9,116)=1.39$, $p=.20$, partial $\eta^2=.097$. This indicated that the version of the story read did not have an effect on participants' responses to the dependent variables. An examination of the univariate ANOVA effects also supported this conclusion; there were no significant difference for any of the dependent variables.

Structural Equation Modelling

There is a strong argument in research against dichotomizing continuous independent variables (Fitzsimmons, 2008; Irwin & McClelland, 2001; Irwin & McClelland, 2003; Maxwell & Delaney, 1993). Researchers often use a median split to create two distinct groups out of one continuous variable and this practice can lead to a reduction in the power of the tests conducted (Irwin & McClelland, 2003). Further this can also lead to spurious significant results (Maxwell & Delaney, 1993). Both of these are outcomes that are to be avoided.

The current research involves a continuous variable of people's opinions about criminal offenders. The two extreme ends of this continuous variable are the moral stranger belief and the fellow traveller belief. A median split could have been employed with this variable to create two distinct groups, one representing each end of the spectrum. However, this would be against the advice of the research that looks at the negative effects of dichotomizing continuous variables (Irwin & McClelland, 2001; Fitzsimmons, 2008). It would also be against the advice of the theorist who originally came up with the moral stranger and fellow traveller concepts (Ward, 2007), who described that these opinions were best thought of on a continuum rather than as two distinct groups.

Based on the above discussion against the use of dichotomization, structural equation modelling was employed with the subscales of the belief system variable as continuous variables, ranging from 1 to 7. It was hypothesised that each of the subscales of the OCO scale would be related to different outcomes, and that these would be mediated by different judgement processes. The hypothesised model started with the four subscales of the OCO scale and then moved onto judgements being made about the offender, such as judgements of the offender's likelihood of reoffending, the likelihood of rehabilitation success, the character of the offender, how responsible the offender is deemed to be and the attributions of cause of the offender. It was then expected that these judgements about the offender would lead to judgements that were more related to the crime itself, including one's response to the crime in terms of severity and moral outrage, and one's use of deterrence and/or retribution punishment reasons. These hypotheses were based on the work of Graham and Lowery (2004) which had developed a model similar to this and also to the areas of attribution theory (Weiner, 1972) and implicit theory of personality (Dweck et al., 1993), which showed that judgements about cause of behaviour and elements of personality were related to the types of judgements one might make about a person, such as an offender in a newspaper story.

The *ability to change* subscale was expected to relate to the likelihood of reoffending variable and the rehabilitation success variable. This was supported. The *excuses* variable was expected to relate to the likelihood of reoffending variable and the causal attributions variable. This hypothesis was partially supported. The *excuses* subscale did predict judgements of the likelihood of the offender reoffending, but it did not predict judgements about causal attributions.

The *desire to change* variable was expected to relate to the rehabilitation success variable and also to the character of the offender variable. This was also partially supported. The *desire to change* variable did predict judgments about the likely success of rehabilitation but it did not predict judgements about the character of the offender. The *decision impairment* subscale was expected to relate to judgements about the likelihood of reoffending and the causal attributions. This was partially supported. The *decision impairment* subscale did predict cause judgements but not likelihood of reoffending judgements.

In terms of the judgements about the offence, it was predicted that severity ratings would be predicted by likelihood of reoffending judgements and causal

attribution judgments. What was found was that severity was predicted by reoffending and by ratings of the trait valence of the offender, not causal attribution judgements.

It was predicted that culpability ratings would be predicted by the causal attribution judgements, and this was supported. It was also found, though, that trait valence judgements also predicted ratings of culpability. Likely success of rehabilitation and trait valence judgements were predicted to relate to use of deterrent punishment motives and this was supported, except that trait valence judgements went through rehabilitation judgements to deterrence. Further, likelihood of reoffending also predicted use of deterrent punishment motives.

Likely success of rehabilitation and trait valence judgements were also predicted to relate to the use of retribution punishment motives and this hypothesis was also supported. Further, likelihood of reoffending also predicted use of retribution punishment motives.

It was also thought that the model from Study 2 would in some way be represented within the overall model developed in the current study. This was supported, in that the pathway between trait valence, likelihood of reoffending and severity of the crime rating was found in the current model. This was one of the key predictive pathways in the model developed in Study 2 and its inclusion in the current model shows that the current model is an extension of the work carried out in Study 2.

The SEM analysis was run with the saturated model first and then, one-by-one, those dependent variables that were not significant in the model were removed, until the point where a statistically significant model was left. The significant tested model is shown in Figure 7.1.

The model in figure 7.1 shows that there are many of the predicted pathways between the OCO subscales, judgements about the offender, and judgements about the offence. It can also be seen that there are some differences to what was expected. The specific parts of the pathways leading to the four end-points: deterrence punishment reasons, retribution punishment reasons, severity of the crime, and culpability of the offender, are explained in detail below.

Opinions about Criminal Offenders Scale

This section is an explanation of how the various subscales of the Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale predict the different judgments made about the offender.

Excuses.

One's rating of excuses predicts rating of perceived likelihood of reoffending, such that a high rating on the *excuses* subscale (a fellow traveller view) leads to a low rating on the perceived likelihood of reoffending variable, indicating that the perceiver views the offender as less likely to reoffend (which is the fellow traveller view). The *excuses* subscale is not related to any of the other variables in the model.

Ability to Change.

One's rating of the ability of the offender to change predicts rating of perceived likelihood of reoffending and rating of the likely success of rehabilitation. A high rating on the *ability to change* subscale represents a fellow traveller view of the offender, and there is a negative relationship between this subscale and the reoffending variable, this indicates that when an offender is thought to have the ability

Figure 7.1. Structural Equation Model Study 5.

to change then they are not likely to reoffend.

The rehabilitation variable is scored in a positive direction, with a high rating representing that the perceiver believes that offender is likely to rehabilitate (i.e. has the ability to change) and should have rehabilitation programs made available to them. As expected, there is a positive relationship between ability to change and rehabilitation.

Desire to Change.

One's rating of the desire of the offender to change predicted rating of likely rehabilitation success. That is, a high rating of desire of the offender to change (a fellow traveller belief) predicts a high level of belief that the offender is likely to rehabilitate and should have rehabilitation programs made available to them.

Decision Impairment.

One's rating of the decision impairment of the offender predicts rating of the general trait valence of the offender and rating of causal attributions about the offence. There is a negative relationship between the decision impairment subscale and the trait valence variable, such that when the offender is rated as having some level of impairment in his or her decision making ability he or she is rated less favourably in terms of his or her character. There is a positive relationship between the decision impairment subscale and the cause variable. This indicates that when an offender is rated as having some level of decision impairment he or she is believed to be more causally to blame for the offence than when the offender is rated as not having decision impairment.

When the offender is thought to have impaired judgement at the time of committing the offence then they are viewed as less likeable by the perceiver than when the offender is not considered to be impaired at the time of the offence. The items in regards to judgement of the offender make no specific reference to why it is that the offender's judgment is impaired, so it could be that the offender is perceived as being lazy and not forward looking in order to see what the consequences of their actions would be and when the offender is viewed in this light then they are considered less likeable overall. It was expected that this relationship would be in the other direction, that the offender would be seen as more likeable when his or her

judgment is impaired, but this, most likely, comes down to the interpretation of impaired judgement by the respondents.

Judgements about the Offender.

This section is an explanation of how the various judgements made about the offender then relate to the judgements made about the offence, overall.

Likelihood of Reoffending.

One's rating of the perceived likelihood of reoffending predicts use of the deterrent punishment motive, use of the retribution punishment motive, and rating of the severity of the crime.

The likelihood of reoffending rating then leads to the deterrence motivation for punishment, and this is a positive relationship. A high rating of likelihood of reoffending (a moral stranger view) leads to a high rating of deterrence as a motivation for one's punishment decisions. This link between likelihood of reoffending and deterrence punishment motivation is understandable, because if one believes that an offender is likely to reoffend then one is likely to attribute punishment with the motivation to deter said offender from reoffending.

From likelihood of reoffending there is a large positive relationship to retributive punishment motivations. This indicates that if an offender is considered to be likely to reoffend that punishment is driven, a lot, by retributive punishment motivations.

Next, there is a positive relationship between likelihood of reoffending and severity rating. When an offender is considered to be more likely to reoffend then the offence that they have already committed is rated as more severe and, as part of this, the punishment as needing to be more severe. This particular pathway is a replication of what was found in the structural equation models of studies one and two.

Rehabilitation Success.

One's rating of likely rehabilitation success predicts use of the deterrent punishment motive and the retribution punishment motive. There is then a small positive relationship between rehabilitation and deterrence punishment motivations. This is understandable, because if an offender is thought to be able to rehabilitate then

punishment decisions made for that offender should be about deterring the offender from reoffending.

There is a small negative relationship between rehabilitation and retribution. This indicates that when an offender is considered able to rehabilitate there is a lower rating of retribution as the motivation for the perceiver's punishment decision made about said offender. This makes sense because if the offender is considered to be likely to rehabilitate then they are likely to be considered less deserved of harsh punishment, and it would be likely that other punishment motivations, such as deterrence, would be more involved.

Trait Valence.

One's rating of the overall trait valence of the offender predicts use of the retribution punishment motive, rating of the severity of the offence and rating of culpability of the offender. When the offender is seen as more likeable then there is a higher rating given for retributive motivations being involved in the decision to attribute what sort of and how much punishment. This relationship seems counterintuitive. It was expected that when an offender was rated as likeable or good then retributive motivations would be applied less than when the offender was rated as unlikeable or bad, but this is not the case. It seems that when the offender is thought of as a good person then retributive motives are applied more than when the offender is thought of as a worse person.

When the offender is considered to be a more likeable person then the offence that they have committed is viewed as less severe, and the punishment as needing to be less severe. Also, the offender who is thought of as more likeable is therefore thought of as less culpable for the offence committed.

Additionally, trait valence rating predicts perceived likelihood of reoffending, such that when the offender is rated as a good or better person than he or she is rated as being less likely to reoffend. This pathway is one of the key components of the model developed in Study 2. Trait valence also predicts perceived likelihood of rehabilitation success, such that when an offender is rated as a good person than he or she is rated as being more likely to succeed with rehabilitation.

Causal Attributions.

One's rating of the causal attributions of blame for the offence predicts rating of the culpability of the offender. When the offender is rated as having more internal and personal attributions of cause for the offence committed then they are rated as being more culpable for the offence committed.

Further, ratings of cause also predicts perceived likelihood of reoffending, such that when an offender is rated as being more internally responsible for his or her actions then he or she is perceived to be more likely to reoffend.

Judgements about the Offence

This section is an explanation of judgments made about the offence and what aspects of the judgements made about the offender predict these various outcomes.

Deterrence.

Deterrent punishment motives are predicted by likelihood of reoffending rating and likely success of rehabilitation rating, such that deterrent motives are used more when the offender is thought likely to reoffend, and when the offender is thought likely to be able to rehabilitate.

Retribution.

Retribution punishment motives are predicted by likelihood of reoffending rating, likely success of rehabilitation rating, and trait valence of the offender rating. This indicated that retributive punishment motives are used more when the offender is thought likely to reoffend, when the offender is thought to be less likely to succeed at rehabilitation, and when the offender is thought of as a better person.

Severity.

Severity of the crime was predicted by likelihood of reoffending rating and trait valence of the offender rating, such that the offence was rated as more severe when the offender was thought to be likely to reoffend and when the offender was thought of as a bad person.

Culpability.

Culpability of the offender was predicted by trait valence of the offender and ratings of the causal attributions of blame, such that the offender was rated as more culpable for the offence when he or she was thought of as a bad person and when the causal attributions were rated as being more internally within the control of the offender.

Study 2 Model

When looking at Figure 7.1 it can be seen that the general model from Study 2 has been subsumed within the larger model (this pathway has been highlighted in red). The pathway between trait valence and likelihood of reoffending and severity rating of the offence was one of the key pathways of the model as described in Study 2. This indicates that the current model is a replication, in part, and then an extension of what was found in Study 2.

Model Fit

The fit of the model shown in Figure 7.1 was tested using several criteria: the chi-square test, the Comparative Fit Index (CFI; Bentler, 1990), and the root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA; Steiger, 1990). A non-significant chi-square indicates good model fit, as does a ratio of chi-square to degrees of freedom that is less than three. A CFI at or above .95 and an RMSEA at or below .07 also indicate good fit. Using the above criteria, the model fit the data well: $\chi^2 = 39.44$, $p = .822$; $\chi^2/df = .822$; CFI = 1.00; RMSEA = .00. For full model fit indices see Table 7.1.

Table 7.1: *Model Fit Indices for Study 5 Structural Equation Model*

Index	Attained	Desired	Achieved or Not
Chi Square	39.44		
Chi Square Sig.	0.81	Non-sig.	Achieved
Chi Square/df	0.82	< 3.0	Achieved
RMR	0.07	<.05	Not achieved
GFI	0.96	> 0.95	Achieved
AGFI	0.92	> 0.90	Achieved
PGFI	0.50	> 0.50	Achieved
CFI	1.00	> 0.95	Achieved
PCFI	0.62	> 0.5 – 0.6	Achieved
RMSEA	0.00	< 0.05	Achieved
Hoelter (0.05)	207	> 200	Achieved
Hoelter (0.01)	234	> 200	Achieved

Discussion

The current study was designed to bring together the Opinions about Criminal Offenders (OCO) scale that had been developed in Studies 3 and 4 and the empirical work that had been conducted in Studies 1 and 2.

MANOVA Analysis

It was expected that there would be a significant difference between responses that participants gave based on whether they read the objective version of the story or the subjective version of the story. However, for all of the dependent measures used in this study, this was not the case.

This lack of effect for the version of story read may be because the changes made to the story were very subtle and perhaps not different enough to effect a change. The two versions of the story were exactly the same except for three short phrases that were altered. These short phrases that were altered were not the main focus of the story and so may not have been enough to bring about any sort of change based on the version of the story that was read.

The same ‘story’ that was presented in Studies 1 and 2 was not used in Study 5; instead a new version of the same story was used. In Study 5 it was decided to present a more subtle difference between the two versions, as the differences between the two versions in Studies 1 and 2 were quite explicit. The ‘extremeness’ of the differences in the story presented in Studies 1 and 2 were thought to not be representative of the actual way in which the media may present such a story in a biased manner. It was thought that the media does indeed present stories to the public with a slightly biased view; however this is not done in such an explicit manner. This led to the development of the story for Study 5 being very subtle in terms of the differences between the two versions.

The two different versions used in Study 5 did not need to be thought of as one version being moral stranger and the other being fellow traveller, rather that the two versions needed to be different in terms of the ability of the reader to ‘read in to’ the story more or less, depending on the way in which it was written. This was designed so that the pre-existing beliefs of the participants (i.e. their belief about whether offenders were fellow travellers or moral strangers) could interact with the

information that they were or were not presented with in the version of the story that they read.

The fact that there was little difference found between reading the objective version of the story and reading the subjective version of the story indicates that it may be necessary to go beyond this study and look at making the differences between the two versions of the story more salient and more influential. It may be necessary to change more than just the three short phrases that were changed in this study and it may also be better to make the changes between the two versions more definite and more salient.

One area of change that could possibly be utilised for future research is the semantic valence of the words being used. Research has found that different words can have a positive or negative valence and that this judgement can be consistent across the population (Abele, Uchrowski, Suitner, & Wojciszke, 2008). Valence has also been found to have an influence on the way that people interact with others and how comfortable one may feel disclosing information to another person through written communications, indicating that valence can have a significant impact through written information (Taylor & Belgrave, 1986). This is relevant to the current research, as the information presented to participants was in a written format.

For example, Abele et al. (2008) found that the words able, active and creative had positive valence, while the words shy, detached and vulnerable had negative valence. These words were in particular in relation to the concept of agency, however, what this research was able to show was that through a range of words related to a particular concept there can be words that carry either a positive or negative valence. The current research could have determined appropriate positive and negative valence words in relation to offenders, punishment and rehabilitation and utilised these words in the manipulation of the two story versions. Even further, in future research valence could be utilised to create three conditions: positive valence, negative valence and neutral valence. This would be able to show both the effect of positive and negative valence but would also be able to provide the contrast of the control condition.

The lack of significant findings based on the story manipulation and the possibility that this was due to a poor choice of manipulation in the current research, indicates that this is an area of future research. It would be important to carry out this further research to determine whether or not the finding of Study 5 is an actual effect or rather the result of a weak manipulation.

Structural Equation Modelling Analysis

Due to the thought that the OCO scale might be better represented as a continuum, rather than as two extreme, bi-polar points, structural equation modelling was used to develop a model of people's judgments about the offender and the offence, based on participants' responses to the various subscales of the OCO scale. The model developed in Study 5 showed that each part of the OCO scale, as represented by the four different subscales, was related to different parts of the judgements that people make about the offender, and by extension, about the offence committed. Each subscale was related to at least one part of the judgments being made about the offender, and then each judgment of the offender was a mediating factor for some part of the judgment made about the offence.

What this model shows is that the process, by which people make a judgment of the severity of the crime, or the level of culpability of the offender, or their punishment motivation, is related to judgements made about the offender. These judgments made about the offender are specifically related to previously held beliefs that one has about the ability of offenders to change, the desire of offenders to change, the validity of excuses and mitigating factors, and to the validity of decision impairment in determining the blameworthiness of the offender.

Most of the predicted pathways were supported by the model presented in Figure 7.1, although there were a few pathways that were not supported or that were not in the predicted direction. The *excuses* subscale only predicted judgements of the likelihood of reoffending, not judgements about causal attributions. The *excuses* subscale is about the factors that could be involved in understanding why the offender committed the offence and so it had been expected that this would relate to judgements of cause, as these judgements are about whether the offender is personally and internally responsible for their actions or not. However, the SEM model did not find this. It is possible that by aggregating the two causal attribution scales for the SEM analysis this gave the scale less power, and this was why the pathway between excuses and cause was not found.

It was predicted that the *desire to change* subscale would predict likely success of rehabilitation and trait valence judgments. The pathway between desire to change and rehabilitation was supported; however the pathway between desire to change and trait valence was not supported. This pathway had been predicted because

it was thought that is an offender was thought to desire change then they would be thought of as a better person, however perhaps this is too broad of a judgement to make and so even when an offender is thought to desire change the judgments about their character are seen as separate from this.

Finally, it was predicted that the *decision impairment* subscale would predict judgments about likelihood of reoffending and judgements about causal attributions. The second pathway was supported; however the predicted pathway to reoffending was not supported. The reasoning for this hypothesis was similar to that for the excuses subscale and both of these were not supported by the final model. It may be that the prediction that ratings of likelihood of reoffending would be connected to whether or not the offender was thought to be fully to blame for the offence or if there were mitigating factors involved was not an accurate one to make. Perhaps judgements about reoffending are just more related to the offender and his or her ability to change than anything else. Additionally, the decision impairment subscale predicted judgments about the trait valence of the offender, which had not been expected, and this was a negative relationship. When one thinks of offenders as being impaired in their decision making ability one thinks this offender is less likeable, and when one thinks of the offender as not being impaired then they are thought of as more likeable. This is possibly due to the lack of definition of what the decision impairment actually was. It might be that participants were thinking of this as being more in the direct control of the offender, than something that was an external factor to them, as had been intended.

The predicted pathways from the judgements made about the offender and the judgments made about the offence were supported for the most part. There were a few additional pathways also. It was found that judgements of likelihood of reoffending predicted not only severity rating but also use of retribution and deterrent punishment motives. This can be explained by the fact that if an offender is thought not likely to reoffend one still wants to make sure of this and so will use deterrence as a punishment motive, but research shows that people usually use more than one punishment motive (Carlsmith, 2008) and so retribution can be used at the same time.

Trait valence was found to predict severity rating and it was found to predict culpability. This last pathway was not originally predicted however it does make sense. If an offender is thought of as a better or nicer person then that offender being rated less culpable for the offence is understandable.

Based on the model developed in Study 2 it was predicted that severity ratings would be predicted by judgements of causal attributions, however this was not supported. Severity was predicted by trait valence judgments and judgements of the likelihood of reoffending, and causal attribution judgments predicted culpability. This can be explained by the addition of the culpability variable. Culpability is linked to attributions of the cause of the action, and so with the addition of culpability as an outcome variable this pathway is understandable. And, as had been found in earlier studies in the current research, it seemed that culpability and causal attributions were not needed to both be included as they are possibly tapping into similar beliefs or opinions.

Overall the pathways between the OCO subscales, the judgments about the offender and the judgments about the offence mostly supported the hypothesised model and there were only a couple of pathways that were unclear and may need further explanation to be able to explain.

Concluding Remarks

The model developed in Study 5 is a more complex version of what was developed in Studies 1 and 2, showing the predicted pathways that may be involved when people make judgements about an offender and the offence committed. This model subsumed one of the main predictive pathways from the model developed in Study 2, and then extended this pathway to a more complex and explanatorily valuable model.

This model brings in the empirically tested Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale to test respondent's belief system about offenders, while this belief system was manipulated by different versions of a 'newspaper story' in Studies 1 and 2. This model brings together the theoretical and the empirical parts of this entire body of research, and shows that there is an empirical basis for the OCO scale.

While showing that there is an empirical basis for the OCO scale, this model also shows that there is utility in the use of the scale. The scale provides information about the different elements of one's beliefs about offenders and how these different elements, as represented by the five subscales, relate to different aspects of judgements made about offenders and about the offence. It shows that there is not one blanket judgement that is made about offenders, but rather, that there are different elements of one's belief system about offenders and that each of these elements serves

a purpose in terms of the judgement made about the offender. And the judgements made about the offender can be considered in terms of the likelihood of reoffending, the anticipated rehabilitation success, the character judgements made about the offender, and the attributions of blame placed on the offender.

The effect of belief system within the SEM model further supports the work carried out in the previous studies of this research and also further validates the existence of different patterns of belief about offenders that are anchored at either end by two very extreme versions and can be modelled as a continuum. The majority of persons hold a belief about offenders that sits slightly on either side of the centre point of the continuum and it is the minority that holds a very strong moral stranger or fellow traveller view.

Opinions about lots of areas of life can be thought of as a continuum and the majority of persons will hold a belief that is not particularly extreme in either direction, however there will be a minority at either end who hold one of the two more extreme opinions, and this is what can be seen with the current research. Studies 1 and 2 influenced participants to think of the offender as one of these two more extreme versions of the offender, and this was found to have a significant influence on the decisions that they made about the offender. What Study 5 has then done is tried to incorporate each participant's individual belief about offenders with one of two versions of a story about an offender, trying to emulate the situation where a person who holds a pre-existing belief about a topic then reads a story about that area and the information that they are presented with in the story then interacts with their pre-existing beliefs.

This body of research has been conducted in order to determine whether or not the fellow traveller and moral stranger theory actually exists in the real world and, if it does in fact exist, then whether or not it has an important influence on the rehabilitation and punishment decisions that members of the public make in relation to offenders. The research presented in this study and in the preceding studies does lend support to the existence of these two belief systems and also expresses them as a continuum, with each of the two extreme views at one end of it.

The Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale provides information about different areas that are related to one's overall judgement of offenders. This information can then inform one's judgements about certain characteristics of the offender, and following on from this, judgements about certain aspects of the offence.

Chapter 8

Counterfactual Generation

In both Studies 1 and 5 participants were asked to complete a counterfactual generation task. In this task participants were asked to consider the scenario set out in the ‘newspaper’ story and to think about how these events might have turned out differently. Participants were then given a space to record these thoughts in.

In counterfactual generation, counterfactual refers to the act of expressing what has not actually happened but what could or might have happened under different circumstances (Crawford & McCrea, 2004; Roese & Hur, 1997; Roese & Olson, 1993a; Roese & Olson, 1993b; Roese & Olson, 1996). Counterfactual thoughts can be upward (i.e. how an event could have turned out better) or downward (i.e. how an event could have turned out worse), and generally downward are more common than upward counterfactual statements (Roese & Olson, 1993b). Further, counterfactual thoughts generally focus on the unusual rather than the normal aspects of a situation (Roese & Hur, 1997).

Important to counterfactual thoughts, and especially to the current research, is that the aspects of an event that are mutated in order to create change can be seen as causal factors (Crawford & McCrea, 2004; Roese & Olson, 1996)). This is particularly relevant to the current research, as causal factors and blame are important aspects of the difference between the two belief systems: the moral stranger and the fellow traveller. Once a counterfactual thought has been brought to mind this can then influence one’s judgements and one’s affective reactions, including causal attributions (Roese & Olson, 1993a). The research in the area of counterfactual thinking proposes that the underlying mechanism of the counterfactual statement is based on a causal attribution focus (Roese & Olson, 1996), which is one of the main areas of focus for the current research.

In the fellow traveller belief system the offender is considered to be at fault but situational factors may also be considered important to the outcome, such as alcohol consumption and/or background factors. This indicates that counterfactual statements given by fellow traveller believers might focus on a wider range of aspects of the situation that could change or be changed. On the other hand, in the moral stranger belief system the offender is considered to be at fault, without there being excuses to explain or justify the behaviour. Also, one of the fundamental defining

factors of the moral stranger belief is that the offender cannot change, and so counterfactual statements made by moral stranger believers will focus on actors other than the offender.

Crawford and McCrea (2004) discussed that the aspect of an event that is changed by the counterfactual thought(s) can have far-reaching consequences for attributions, blame, emotions, coping and future behaviour. For example, in the current research counterfactual thoughts about the victim doing things differently might indicate attributions of blame towards the victim. It is also clear that counterfactual thoughts are significantly impacted by pre-existing views, individuals prefer thoughts that support their own pre-existing beliefs than that refute them (Crawford & McCrea, 2004).

In Crawford and McCrea's research, pre-existing views of the death penalty were measured. Participants then had to give counterfactual statements about a death penalty related scenario. The counterfactual thoughts given by participants were found to be related to their pre-existing belief about the death penalty such that death penalty supporters were less likely to give counterfactual thoughts about the death penalty and the appeals process when compared with those who were not so supportive of the death penalty.

In the current research this idea of pre-existing views having an effect on what counterfactual thoughts are generated is one of the main aims of the task. It was expected that the counterfactual thoughts generated by fellow traveller believers and by moral stranger believers would be different, because of the different pre-existing beliefs that these individuals hold about offenders.

Counterfactuals provide an interesting insight into the cognitive process of participants, and counterfactuals give participants increased scope to express their individual beliefs, more so than just answering a number of Likert scale-type questions. The subject of participants' counterfactuals can indicate who the participant believes is most at fault in the situation, and the specific behaviour that the participant chooses to focus on can indicate what is believed to be the most concerning aspect of the behaviour that occurred in the situation. For example, an individual may generate a thought in relation to the story about Peter that states, "Others at the party should have been looking out for the girl and not allowed her to go off on her own with Peter". This particular counterfactual statement focuses on the influence of others above any other actor in the scenario and the focus is also on

preventing the female party from being alone with Peter, rather than on any other action. In this particular counterfactual statement, these seem to be the most important factors to change.

In the current research, the counterfactual statements generated by participants were examined to determine if there were any differences between what participants considered the most important aspects of the situation to change. In Study 1 the independent variable used was story condition; participants either read the newspaper story written from a moral stranger perspective or from a fellow traveller perspective. In Study 5 there were two independent variables; the version of the story that participants read (objective v subjective) and the individual difference of belief system (moral stranger v fellow traveller). The counterfactuals expressed in both studies were considered separately and were analysed in relation to the relevant independent variables. Also examined was whether there were differences between the types of counterfactual thoughts generated in Study 1 as compared with Study 5.

Study One Hypotheses

1. It was expected that more statements would be made about the offender when participants read the moral stranger version of the story than the fellow traveller version, because the offender is considered to be blameworthy for his behaviour.
2. It was expected that more statements would be made about situational factors and the influence of alcohol in the fellow traveller version than in the moral stranger version, because in the fellow traveller version less blame is attributed to the offender and so the reader will look to other factors.
3. Overall, it was expected that there would be fewer statements made about the victim than about the offender, because in both versions of the story the victim was presented in a passive way.

Study One Method

Design

This part of Study 1 required participants to complete a counterfactual generation task as part of the overall questionnaire. Participants were required to read one of two versions of the story (this was a one factor between-subjects design with

two levels: moral stranger version of the story, fellow traveller version of the story); participants were randomly assigned to a condition.

Participants

Participants did not have to complete the counterfactual generation task, and so of the overall sample that completed Study 1 not every participant completed the counterfactual generation task. In total, 94 participants generated some form of counterfactual statement in relation to the ‘newspaper’ story; this is out of the 160 participants who completed Study 1, which is 59% of the total sample. Of the 94 participants who produced counterfactual statements, 47 read the Moral Stranger version of the story and 47 read the Fellow Traveller version of the story. This sample had a very even gender split (48 male participants, 45 female participants, 1 participant did not disclose his or her sex) and had a mean age of 37.68 years ($SD=14.23$). Of the sample 40.2% identified as NZ European, 3.3% identified as NZ Maori, 8.5% identified as Asian, and 46.8% were categorised as ‘other’, this was largely due to participants writing ‘New Zealander’, ‘Kiwi’, or something similar as their ethnicity, which could not be categorised into one of the other groups.

When compared with the overall sample for Study 1, the participants who chose to write something for the counterfactual task were not different in age (37.68 years v 38.97 years) and there was an even gender split for both groups. There was somewhat more representation of NZ European identified participants in the overall sample, but the small representation of the other ethnicities was similar in both groups. Overall, those who chose to write a counterfactual statement were not different from those who chose not to.

Materials

Participants in Study 1 were completing a pen and paper questionnaire that was handed to them by the primary researcher in one of many public settings, as explained in the method for Study 1. There was a predominantly blank page in the questionnaire where participants were asked to record any counterfactual thoughts they had about the story that they read on the front page of the questionnaire.

Procedure

As part of the overall Study 1, on the fourth page of the questionnaire booklet participants were given instructions about the counterfactual generation task. At the top of the page was the following:

“Sometimes we think about how events could have turned out differently.

For example, you might think “If only I had left five minutes earlier, I would have caught my bus,” or perhaps you might think, “At least I was not late for the meeting.”

Please think about the events that you read about in the newspaper story and how you think it might have turned out differently. Please give us these thoughts in the space provided below.”

After these two paragraphs the rest of page was blank so that participants could record whatever counterfactual thoughts they had about the story they had just read. There were no instructions given about what the counterfactual statements should focus on, or how much participants were expected to write. There was also no obligation for participants to write anything in this section.

Questionnaires were collected from all 160 participants and then those that had completed some form of counterfactual statement were separated out from those that did not, and these left 94 questionnaires to be examined for this part of Study 1. There was a huge range in the number of counterfactual statements that each participant wrote down. Some participants merely wrote one or two short sentences, while others filled the whole page with a paragraph of information they thought was relevant. Some of the longer responses included some information that was not strictly counterfactual, but rather a discussion of the criminal justice system, and these non-counterfactual statements were not included in the final categorisation of the statements.

For analysis, the counterfactual statements were coded into one of six categories in relation to the main focus of the individual statement. This was conducted by the primary researcher without the use of a second rater, a potential problem in the current research that will be discussed further later in this chapter. The six categories were: victim, offender, others, alcohol, context, and miscellaneous. Participants could have one statement from only one category, or they may have written one statement

for three of the categories, and others wrote a number of statements that all focused on one of the categories. Each individual statement that was different and a complete sentence was coded as a discrete response to be included in one of the six categories of coding. There are examples of each of the six categories for both the moral stranger presentation of the story and for the fellow traveller presentation in Appendix I.

The story version was made into two variables for comparison by conducting a median split was used based on the guidelines used in Coutinho, Wiemer-Hastings, Skowronski & Britt (2001). This created a moral stranger and a fellow traveller group.

Results

When looking at the frequencies of the different types of counterfactual statements between the two different story conditions (as seen in Table 8.1), it can be seen that there were very similar numbers of statements made about the victim and the offender between the two conditions. On the other hand there were more statements made about others in the moral stranger condition, than the fellow traveller condition, and the opposite pattern is evident for statements made about alcohol.

In this study there were very few statements made about context and also few miscellaneous statements, and there was no discernible pattern of the miscellaneous statements to make them more meaningful. Based on this, for the analysis conducted for Study 1, only the counterfactual statements about victim, offender, others, and alcohol were used.

Table 8.1: *Counterfactual Statements by Story Type*

General Category	FT	MS	Total
Victim	15	16	31
Offender	30	31	61
Others	28	39	67
Alcohol	43	19	62
Context	2	1	3
Miscellaneous	2	13	15
Total	120	119	239

When examining the overall counterfactual statements made by participants (without taking into consideration the condition participants were in) it seemed that there were more statements made about the offender ($M=.65$, $SD=.76$) the involvement of others ($M=.71$, $SD=.83$) and alcohol ($M=.66$, $SD=.65$) than about the victim ($M=.33$, $SD=.63$).

A 4 (counterfactual statement: victim v offender v others v alcohol) x 2 (condition: FT v MS) mixed ANOVA was conducted for the Study 1 counterfactual statements. The counterfactual statement variable was the within-subjects factor, and condition was the between-subjects factors.

The multivariate main effect for type of counterfactual statement was significant: Wilks' $\Lambda = .83$, $F(3,90) = 6.38$, $p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .18$. A significant main effect was found for the type of counterfactual statement made, $F(3,276) = 5.58$, $p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .06$. Simple effects analysis showed that this main effect was due to the lower number of victim statements made, compared with the higher number of offender, others and alcohol statements made, and also due to these three categories not being significantly different from each other.

The multivariate interaction effect for type of counterfactual statement and story condition was significant: Wilks' $\Lambda = .81$, $F(3,90) = 6.99$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .19$. It was found that there was a significant interaction for the type of counterfactual statement and the condition, $F(3,276) = 4.64$, $p = .003$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$.

To investigate the above significant interaction, simple effects analysis was conducted. This analysis found that the interaction was driven by the significant difference in the number of alcohol related counterfactual statements made in the fellow traveller version and in the moral stranger version. When reading the fellow traveller version of the story there was a higher number of alcohol related statements made ($M=.93$, $SD=.66$) than when reading the moral stranger version ($M=.41$, $SD=.54$). There were no other significant differences for the other types of counterfactual statements.

Discussion

In Study 1; overall, more counterfactual statements were made about the actions of the offender, the influence of others, and the effects of alcohol, than about the victim. Also, there was a significant effect of the type of story read and the number of counterfactual statements that participants generated in relation to the

effect of alcohol. The story version had no significant effect on statements made about the victim, the offender, or the involvement of others.

These findings provide support for two of the four hypotheses; therefore two of the hypotheses were not supported. It was expected that there would be more statements made about the offender than the victim, overall, and this was supported. The other hypothesis that there was support for was that there would be more alcohol related statements made when reading the fellow traveller version of the story than the moral stranger version. It was expected that this same effect would be found for situational factors, however there were so few of these types of statements made that analysis was not conducted for this.

There was no support for the hypothesis that there would be more statements made about the offender when reading the moral stranger version than the fellow traveller version; instead this difference was found to apply across both story types and the influence of the story did not have a significant effect.

For alcohol related counterfactual statements, those who read the fellow traveller version of the story made more statements about the influence of alcohol on the outcome than those who read the moral stranger version. This may be because, in the fellow traveller version, the offender, Peter, was described as a fairly normal 27-year-old man, someone who could be easily understood by others and someone that was a member of society, so there was not much in this version to make Peter seem to be a bad person and so a very salient and easy explanation for his behaviour was his alcohol consumption. On the other hand, in the moral stranger version Peter was described as an outsider, someone who had done previous bad things, and someone who could not easily be understood, so the salience of alcohol as a contributing factor was not as strong as in the fellow traveller version. In the moral stranger version there was more information to lay blame on than just alcohol, as compared with the fellow traveller version.

It was expected that there would be a difference for counterfactual statements made about Peter (the offender) in the moral stranger version than the fellow traveller version but this was not the case. Based on the way Peter was described in the two versions it would have been expected that when reading the moral stranger version of the story there would have been more attributions of blame laid on Peter, because there was enough described in the story about Peter to make him seem like a bad person. It seemed that the statements made in the moral stranger version focused on

many of the external factors that were described in the story rather than on Peter, such as his family, his friends and his previous actions. Perhaps, in the moral stranger version, Peter comes across as such a bad person that the reader did not think that he could actually change himself (which is a key defining factor of the moral stranger belief system) and so when the reader was thinking of changes that could be made they had to look more to the people around Peter and his background and how these areas could be influenced so that he did not become the bad person that he currently is.

In the fellow traveller version Peter was described as a relatively good person, who has done a bad thing, and so it is understandable that there would be some comments made about him but this is also why there was such a focus on alcohol consumption. The fellow traveller reader can understand that Peter has the ability to change, but they also consider that a significant causal factor to the overall outcome was alcohol consumption.

The statements were coded by the primary researcher only, and this is a potential problem in the current study. This is because one rater is not enough to conduct any sort of reliability analysis with to determine if the coding of the statements is accurate. Further, because the coding was conducted by the primary researcher this may also be a confound to the current study. This is because the primary researcher may have coded statements in such a way as to support her hypotheses, even unintentionally. It would have been a more statistically sound way to code these statements to have two independent researchers complete the rating. These researchers would have been blind to the overall purpose of the research and to the hypotheses that the primary researcher had and this would have allowed for the most non-biased rating. Further, by having two raters, reliability analysis would have been able to be conducted in order to examine how reliably similar the coding between the researchers was.

The counterfactual generation analysis for both Study One and Study Five was conducted at the same time and so the above comments were not taken into consideration for Study Five because they had not been developed. This means that the same problems presented above apply to the coding in Study Five also.

Study Five

Study Five Hypotheses

1. Story type

- a. It was expected that participants would write more counterfactual statements overall when reading the subjective version of the story than the objective version, this is because there is room for interpretation in the subjective version and so this allows for more scope for thoughts to be generated.
- b. It was expected that there would be more victim and offender statements than any of the other categories, because these are the most salient actors in the story.

2. Belief system

- a. It was expected that there would be more offender statements made by fellow traveller believers than moral stranger believers, and this is because the moral stranger believer does not think offenders can change and so will not be able to make many statements about the offender in the story changing any of his behaviour.
- b. It was expected that there would be more victim statements made by the moral stranger believer than the fellow traveller believer, this is because the moral stranger believer cannot think of change to the offender and the victim is the next most salient actor in the story.
- c. It was expected that there would be more counterfactual statements given about situational factors and alcohol involvement by fellow traveller believers than moral stranger believers, because the fellow traveller believer looks for mitigating factors and believes that these are valid to consider, while the moral stranger believer does not.

3. Interactions

- a. It was expected that there would be the highest number of victim related statements written by moral stranger believers who read the subjective version of the story, and the highest number of offender related statements written by fellow traveller believers who read the subjective version of the story. The subjective version of the story was expected to enhance the effect of the belief system, while the objective

version of the story was expected to have no influence when combined with belief system.

Study Five Method

Design

This part of Study 5, like for Study 1, required participants to complete a counterfactual generation task as part of the overall questionnaire. Participants were required to read one of two versions of the story; participants were randomly assigned to a condition, and participants were also separated into groups based on their belief system about offenders, as measured by their scores on the Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale (OCO). This second factor was an individual difference measure. The overall design for analysis for the counterfactual statements for Study 5 was a mixed 4 x 2 x 2 design, with type of counterfactual statement as the 4 level within-subjects factor and story type, and belief system as the two 2 level between-subjects factors.

Participants

Participants did not have to complete the counterfactual generation task, as in Study 1, and so from the overall sample that completed Study 5 not everyone responded to the counterfactual generation task. In total, 111 participants generated some form of counterfactual statement in relation to the 'newspaper' story; this is out of the 126 participants who completed Study 5, which is 88% of the total sample. Of the 111 participants who produced counterfactual statements, 57 read the objective version of the story and 54 read the subjective version of the story. This sample was 72% female, compared with the overall sample, which was 70.5% female, so there was little difference in terms of the gender split. This sample had a mean age of 24.08 years ($SD=7.02$). Of the sample 74.8% identified as NZ European, 2.7% identified as NZ Maori, 2.7% identified as Asian, and a further 18% were categorised as 'other', this was largely due to participants writing 'New Zealander', 'Kiwi', or something similar as their ethnicity. This ethnicity make-up was largely the same as the overall sample.

When compared with the overall sample for study five, the participants who chose to write something for the counterfactual task were not different in age (24.08 years v 24.20 years) and the gender split for both groups was very similar. Overall,

those who chose to write a counterfactual statement were not different from those who chose not to.

Materials

Participants in Study 5 completed an online questionnaire. On one of the pages of the online questionnaire participants were asked to record any counterfactual thoughts they had about the story that they read first, and they were provided with a blank box to type these statements into.

Procedure

The procedure for Study 5 was largely similar to that of Study 1, the main difference being that participants had to type their responses into a blank box on the computer screen in Study 5, while they had to write down these statements by hand on a blank page in Study 1. Above the blank box on the fourth page of the online questionnaire the following instructions were given:

“Sometimes we think about how events could have turned out differently.

For example, you might think “If only I had left five minutes earlier, I would have caught my bus,” or perhaps you might think, “At least I was not late for the meeting.”

Please think about the events that you read about in the newspaper story and how you think it might have turned out differently. Please give us these thoughts in the space provided below.”

Following these two paragraphs there was a blank box on the page that participants could type their counterfactual thoughts into. As with Study 1, there were no instructions given about what the counterfactual statements should focus on and there was no obligation for participants to write anything in this section, however in Study 5 the vast majority of participants chose to do this, more so than in Study 1. This may have been because in Study 5 participants could type their counterfactual thoughts out, while in Study 1, participants had to write them out by hand.

The online responses from all 126 participants were collected and the counterfactual statements given by participants were downloaded into an excel document. This document recorded the statement or statements given by the participant, their subject number and the version of the story that they read. As with

Study 1, there was a huge range in the number of counterfactual statements that each participant wrote down

For analysis, the counterfactual statements were coded into the same six categories that were used in Study 1: victim, offender, others, alcohol, context, and miscellaneous. Each individual statement that was different and a complete sentence were coded as a discrete response to be included in one of the six categories of coding. There are examples of each of the six categories for both the moral stranger presentation of the story and for the fellow traveller presentation in Appendix I.

Results

As with Study 1, in this study there were very few statements made about context and also few miscellaneous statements, and there was no discernable pattern of the miscellaneous statements. Due to this, for the analysis conducted for Study 5, only the counterfactual statements about victim, offender, others, and alcohol were used.

When looking at the frequencies of the different types of counterfactual statements made (as seen in Table 8.2), it can be seen that there were more statements made about the victim than the offender, the involvement of others and the influence of alcohol. Similar levels of counterfactual statements were made about the offender, and the influence of alcohol and then the least amount of counterfactual statements were made about the involvement of others. These observations are across all conditions.

Table 8.2: *Counterfactual Statements by Story Type and Belief System*

	subjective/FT	subjective/MS	Objective/FT	Objective/MS	Total
Victim	12	34	26	36	108
Offender	23	10	14	9	56
Others	11	6	7	7	31
Alcohol	20	17	10	6	53
Context	4	8	3	3	18
Misc.	5	1	6	0	12
Total	75	76	66	61	278

Table 8.3: *Counterfactual Statements by Story Version*

Category	Subjective	Objective	Total
Victim	46	62	108
Offender	33	23	56
Others	17	14	31
Alcohol	37	16	53
Context	12	6	18
Miscellaneous	6	6	12
Total	151	127	278

A 4 x 2 x 2 mixed ANOVA was run with the within-subjects factor of the type of counterfactual statement (victim, offender, others, alcohol) and the between – subjects factors of story (objective, subjective), and belief system (MS, FT).

The multivariate effect of type of counterfactual statement was significant: Wilks' $\Lambda = .71$, $F(3,105) = 14.41$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .29$. A significant main effect was found for the within-subjects factor of type of counterfactual statement ($F(3, 321)=17.89$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2 = .14$). Simple effects analysis showed that this main effect was due to more statements being made about the victim than any of the other three categories, and there were more statements made about the offender than the influence of others, and about the effect of alcohol as compared with the influence of others.

There were no significant main effects found for the two between subjects factors: story condition ($F(1,107)=2.18$, $p=0.14$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$), and belief system ($F(1,107)=0.26$, $p=0.61$, $\eta^2 = .002$). There was also no significant interaction effect for counterfactual statement type by story version ($F(3, 105)=1.91$, $p=0.13$, $\eta^2 = 0.05$).

The multivariate interaction effect of counterfactual statement type and belief system was significant: Wilks' $\Lambda = .88$, $F(3,105) = 4.75$, $p = .004$, partial $\eta^2 = .12$. A significant interaction was found for type of counterfactual statement and belief

system ($F(3,321)=6.49, p<.001, \eta^2 = .06$). This interaction seemed to be driven by differences in the number of counterfactual statements made about victim involvement (more for the MS believer than the FT believer) and about offender involvement (more for the FT believer than that MS believer). To investigate this further, follow-up independent-sample t-tests were conducted on each of the types of counterfactual statements, with the grouping variable of belief system.

Table 8.4: *Counterfactual Statements by Belief System*

Category	FT	MS	Total
Victim	38	70	108
Offender	37	19	56
Others	18	13	31
Alcohol	30	23	53
Context	7	11	18
Miscellaneous	11	1	12
Total	141	137	278

When comparing the counterfactual statements across the two belief systems it was found that more statements were made about the victim in the moral stranger ($M=1.34, SD=1.27$) condition than in the fellow traveller ($M=.74, SD=.83$) condition ($t(109)=2.91, p=.005$). Further, more statements were made about the offender in the fellow traveller ($M=.72, SD=.88$) condition than in the moral stranger ($M=.42, SD=.75$) condition ($t(109)=-1.99, p=.049$).

This analysis found that there were no significant differences between the number of counterfactual statements made about others ($t(109)=-.69, p=.49$) in the two belief conditions nor between the number of counterfactual statements made about alcohol ($t(109)=-.39, p=.70$). This supports the conclusion above, that the interaction between type of counterfactual statement and belief system is driven by differences in the number of statements given about both the victim and the offender, with an opposing pattern for these two types of counterfactual thoughts.

The multivariate interaction effect for the three-way interaction between type of counterfactual statement, story version and belief system was non-significant: Wilks' $\Lambda = .99$, $F(3,105) = 0.48$, $p = 0.69$, partial $\eta^2 = .014$.

Discussion

Overall, what this analysis showed was that in Study 5 there were more counterfactual statements made about the victim than any of the other three categories, and that there were differences in the number of statements made about the victim and the offender based on belief system.

The first set of hypotheses related to the variable of story. It was expected that more counterfactual statements overall would be written when reading the subjective version of the story than the objective version, and across almost all types of counterfactual statements this was not supported. The only type of statement that this hypothesis did hold true for was alcohol-related statements, where those who read the subjective version wrote more of these statements than those who read the objective version, as were expected.

It was also expected that there would be more statements; overall, made about the victim and about the offender, than alcohol or others, this was partially supported. It was found that there were more statements about the victim than any other category, and it was also found that there were more statements about the offender than about others. Where the hypothesis was not supported was for the comparison of offender and alcohol-related statements. More statements were made about the effect of alcohol than about the offender, which was not expected. This may be because of the salience of alcohol as a causal factor.

The second set of hypotheses related to the belief system variable. Of the three hypotheses given for the belief system, two were supported and one was not. It was expected that someone who held a moral stranger belief would write more statements about the victim than someone who held a fellow traveller belief, and this was supported. It was also expected that someone who held a fellow traveller belief would write more statements about the offender than someone who held a moral stranger belief, and again this was supported. The other hypothesis was about the fellow traveller believer would generate more statements about situational factors and about the influence of alcohol, than the moral stranger believer. There were too few situational-type statements made by participants, so this was not able to be tested. For

alcohol related statements it was found that there was no difference between the two belief system types in terms of the number of statements generated about alcohol. This is likely due to the focus of the counterfactual statements being on the two main actors' in the story, which were the most salient components; the offender and the victim.

The final set of hypotheses was in relation to proposed interaction effects. A significant interaction effect was found for type of counterfactual statement and belief system. No other significant interaction effects were found. What can be seen from the findings of Study 5 is that there was a lot of blame attributed to the victim of this crime, more so when the participant read the subjective version of the story than when the participant read the objective version of the story.

Research into the 'belief in a just world' can help to explain the findings of Study 5. The just world hypothesis posits that people need to believe that the world is a predictable and fair place, where individuals get what they deserve (Lerner & Simmons, 1966; Lerner & Miller, 1978). The way that this works is that when something bad happens to another person then most people want to be able to explain why this happened and determine how they, themselves, could control things so that this bad thing does not happen to them. If the world is seen as an unpredictable and dangerous place then people will be scared to do anything, whereas if people can think of changes in behaviour that could be made and that are within their own control then this helps to make them feel that the world can be predictable, controllable and, therefore, safer (Lerner & Miller, 1978).

This just world hypothesis can be used to help understand why so many participants in the current research made counterfactual statements about the behaviour of the victim in the story that they were presented with. The victim can be viewed as most similar to the participant, either because the participant is themselves a female (particularly in the current study when 72% of the sample was female) or because the participant has someone close to them, a sister, girlfriend, mother, close friend who would fit those same criteria. As a result of this familiarity, participants then think about the situation in a way that will prevent someone they know, or themselves, from getting hurt, and the easiest and most salient way for them to do this is to think about the victim's behaviour changing. One cannot easily make decisions about changes to the offender because the offender is the unknown component of the equation. The offender is unpredictable, so to make the overall situation predictable

and within their own control participants need to make changes to the behaviour of the victim, which can come across as attributing blame to the victim, often at the expense of any blame being attributed to the offender.

The just world hypothesis can be related to the idea of rape myths, which are widely held beliefs about rape that are, false or misunderstood or misrepresented (Burt, 1980; Giacopassi & Dull, 1986; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994). Some prominent rape myths are that only 'bad women' get raped or that when women dress in certain ways they are 'asking for it', or that women actually enjoy being raped (Bohner, et al., 1998; Burt, 1980). There are many more of these myths and a lot of them are related to the idea of a just world, where a good person cannot be harmed, therefore something the rape victim did must be the reason for the rape. These myths can help explain why participants in Study 5 generated a lot of statements that involved the victim's actions changing, rather than changing the actions of any other actor in the story. The story is about a sexual assault and this sort of story triggers pre-existing thoughts about the topic, and this can include rape myths. Research has shown that there is a significant minority of people who hold rape myth related beliefs (Burt, 1980; Giacopassi & Dull, 1986; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994), and so this may have an influence on the results of the current study.

There were more counterfactual statements generated for victim blame when the participant held a moral stranger belief about offenders than a fellow traveller belief and there were more counterfactual statements generated for offender blame when the participant held a fellow traveller belief about offenders than a moral stranger belief. These findings initially seem counterintuitive; the moral stranger belief system is all about the offender being a bad person and the fellow traveller belief system is all about the offender being an average person who has done a bad thing, so why would someone who holds a moral stranger belief put more blame on the victim and someone who holds a fellow traveller belief would put more blame on the offender.

The key factor that can explain this finding is that of malleability. The moral stranger believer considers that offenders cannot change their ways or their behaviours, offenders are bad people, and cannot be helped or changed, while the fellow traveller believer considers that offenders are changeable, and that they can be rehabilitated. A counterfactual statement is where one is asked to review the information they have been presented about a certain situation and to think about how

this situation could have turned out differently (Crawford & McCrea, 2004; Roese & Olson, 1993a; Roese & Olson, 1993b); how it could have been changed.

In the ‘newspaper stories’ used in the current research the participant is asked to think about how the rape situation between Peter and his co-worker could have been different. This is effectively asking the participant what sort of change or changes could have been made. The results show that moral stranger believers come up with more statements about the victim making changes than the fellow traveller believers, and this is likely because moral stranger believers do not think that Peter, the offender, can change, one of the fundamental characteristics of the belief system. So, when the moral stranger believer is asked to come up with counterfactual statements about the story they come up with statements about the victim making changes much more so than the offender making changes, because the moral stranger believer can consider that the victim is able to change while the offender is not.

As stated earlier, there were the same problems in Study Five as were in Study One in terms of the coding of the statements. The primary researcher conducted the coding on her own and so there was no way to conduct reliability analysis and there was also a concern about biased coding. In the future, this type of research would need to use at least two independent researchers to avoid bias and so that reliability of the coding could be examined.

Study One and Study Five Discussion

It was found that in Study 1 there were more counterfactual statements generated about the about the offender, the influence of others, and the effects of alcohol, than about the victim. It was also found that for statements made about the influence of alcohol there was a significant effect of the type of story read. This effect was that those who read the fellow traveller version of the story made more statements about the influence of alcohol on the outcome than those who read the moral stranger version. These were the key findings from Study 1.

In the analysis of Study 5 it was found that there were more counterfactual statements made about the victim than any of the other three categories, and that there were differences of number in statements made about the victim and the offender based on belief system. The fellow traveller believer made more counterfactual statements about the offender than the moral stranger and, conversely, the moral stranger believer made more counterfactual statements about the victim than the

fellow traveller believer. These are the key findings from Study 5, and they appear to be quite different from what was found in Study 1.

The opposite pattern of counterfactual statements was found between Study 1 and Study 5. In Study 1 the focus of the statements was on anyone but the victim, whereas in Study 5 the focus was primarily on the victim. There are a number of reasons why this may have happened.

In Study 1 participants' individual beliefs about offenders were not taken into consideration, instead the only factor used was which version of the story the participant read, either the fellow traveller version or the moral stranger version. These two versions of the story may have a large influence on the type of counterfactual thoughts generated. In the fellow traveller version, the offender was portrayed as a fairly normal person who had done a bad thing and the influence of alcohol was a very salient factor, while in the moral stranger version the offender was portrayed as a bad person that had a lot of bad factors in his life that may have influenced his behaviour and so he is really the main focus of the whole story. Based on the way these two versions of the story were presented it can be seen that the victim is not a main focus of either story, and so the offender receives more attention and, especially in the fellow traveller version, alcohol receives a lot of attention.

It is also important to note that in Study 1 the two versions of the story differed in quite a few ways, in terms of the information presented to the reader. The basic story and events were the same between the two versions but when describing the offender and his relationships with friends and family there were a lot of differences, and this is compared with the versions of the story presented in Study 5, where there were few differences and they were very subtle. It would seem that the way the story was written in Studies 1 and 5 might be the most important factor for the differences found.

In Study 5, as already mentioned above, participants read one of two versions of a very similar story to that which was used in Study 1. In Study 5 the differences between these two versions were very subtle and there were only three sentences that changes were made in. This meant that the differences between the two versions of the story in Study 5 were much less salient when compared with those in Study 1. Also, in Study 5 there was a lot less background information presented about the offender, so less was known about him, and this may have contributed to the focus of the counterfactual statements not being on him.

A key difference between Studies 1 and 5 was that, in Study 5, participants were measured for their belief system about offenders and this individual difference was then used to group participants as either moral stranger believers or fellow traveller believers. This was not done in Study 1. This can help explain the differences in counterfactual thoughts generated, when combined with the way the story was written for Study 5, because the two belief systems have quite different ways of thinking about offenders and so will have different counterfactual thoughts about the story.

The moral stranger believer does not think that offenders can change, and therefore will not be likely to generate many counterfactual thoughts about Peter changing in any way, which is the fundamental process behind counterfactual generation. This means that, for moral stranger believer, the focus of their counterfactual thoughts will need to be on another aspect of the story and one of the most salient parts of the story is the victim, in both versions of the story.

The fellow traveller believer does think that offenders can change, and so they are likely to generate counterfactual thoughts about Peter changing, but they are also likely to think about all aspects of the story presented and come up with counterfactual thoughts that apply to all parts of the story. This means that, while the fellow traveller believer will make counterfactual statements about the offender, there is no reason to think that they would make more or less statements about the offender than any other actor or factor in the story.

The offender, others and alcohol were seen as key factors in Study 1, with the victim getting little attention, while in Study 5 the main focus of the counterfactual statements was on the victim. The combined effect of belief system and the way that the story was written in Study 5, compared with Study 1, can help explain why there were obvious differences between the types of counterfactual statements made in each study.

The coding of the statements in both counterfactual generation tasks was at a very basic level. To expand on this area the statements could have been looked at in more detail and the differences between the statements teased apart further. Some areas that could have been examined include looking at the number of people who provided more than one statement compared with those who only provided one statement, also gender differences could be an area to focus on as well. There could have been more analysis of the exact content of the statements and the type of

changes of behaviour that participants thought the victim, offender or others should have carried out. A statement about the victim not going out to the car on her own compared with a statement about the victim not wearing provocative clothing or not drinking so much alcohol, have quite different underlying messages and it is these types of differences that it would be useful to look at further.

Chapter 9

General Discussion

This body of research has been made up of three key sections of work. First there is the empirical work that was conducted in Studies 1 and 2 that examined the effect of the (theoretical) moral stranger and fellow traveller belief systems on punishment and rehabilitation decisions. Second, Studies 3 and 4 were designed to develop a measure of people's opinions about criminal offenders in order to provide empirical support for the theoretical belief systems. To tie these two pieces of research together, Study 5 then presented a 'story' about an offender, similar to what was done in Studies 1 and 2, alongside the Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale, as developed in Studies 3 and 4. The final section of this work was the counterfactual generation task that was included in Studies 1 and 5 and was examined to determine if there were differences in the number and type of statements generated based on the different story version (Study 1) or the different belief system and story version (Study 5).

Studies One and Two

Key Findings.

The first two studies provided insight into the way that people think about offenders by creating a predictive model of the process. The model showed that the predictive pathways were that people use their judgements about the perceived likelihood of reoffending, attributions of internal responsibility of the offender for the offence committed, and judgments about the offender's personality (i.e., aggressiveness and likeability) to make the decision about the severity of the crime. This decision also involved how severe the punishment given to the offender should be and how morally outraged the respondent was about the offence in question.

As shown by the findings from the first two studies, when people are influenced to think about offenders from a moral stranger perspective or a fellow traveller perspective there is a difference in the way that they decide to punish that offender and what rehabilitation judgements they make about that offender. The first two studies found that the two perspectives influenced important decisions differently, and this could be to the detriment of both the offenders and the general public. The different versions of the story were created to mimic the way that the media could

present such information to the general public. The findings of this research indicate that the way the media reports crime stories is an important area to consider conducting further research in due to the far reaching implications of such biased reporting.

The other key aspect of the research conducted in Studies 1 and 2 was the structural equation models that were developed. The model in Study 1 showed that ratings of perceived likelihood of reoffending and ratings of internal attributions of cause mediated the path from the story version read and the severity of the crime rating given. Study 2 then extended this model by including ratings of the offender's personality. It was found that the pathway from the version of the story and ratings of the severity of the crime was mediated not only by likelihood of reoffending and internal attributions of cause ratings, but also ratings of the aggressiveness and general likeability of the offender.

These models indicate that when reading one of the versions of the story, the reader was predicted to use a combination of judgements about the offender to make his or her final judgement about how severe they believed the crime to be and how severe they believed the punishment should be.

Interpretation of Findings.

The moral stranger version presented an offender who was a bad person, who had few redeemable qualities and was not considered a fellow member of society. These attributes make it understandable that the crime committed by this individual would be considered more severe, than when the individual was presented as a good person, with redeemable qualities (the fellow traveller). This was the case even though the actual facts of the offence committed were kept the same in both versions. While the facts of the case were the same, the emotional reactions based on the two descriptions of the offender were quite different and this then linked to the severity rating of the offender. In the current research this emotional reaction was measured by respondents' moral outrage to the crime.

This also links to the punishment rating given being higher. When the individual at fault was thought of as a bad person then it is understandable that he or she would be given a higher level of punishment for the offence committed, because judgements made about punishment are not just linked to facts but to emotions also (Darley, 2009). A common reaction to an offence committed is moral outrage, and this is an

emotionally charged reaction. Moral outrage can lead to punishment decisions that are based more on retributive punishment ideals than deterrent punishment ideals, which can result in an increased level of punishment (Darley, 2009).

An important point to consider here is that in the moral stranger version of the story previous contact and ‘trouble’ with the law was included, while in the fellow traveller version of the story it was made clear that the offender had not had previous contact with the law. This manipulation was made based on the idea that moral strangers are thought to be unable to stop offending, while fellow traveller are thought able to stop, but in translating this to the stories included in Studies One and Two a key difference was created that was not merely about the language being used but was about an actual fact. While the two stories presented the same facts of the crime, the fact about previous contact with the law was not kept constant. This may have influenced the punishment and rehabilitation decisions that respondents made and the differences found in these studies may have been due to this more than due to an actual difference due to the other aspects of the stories.

It was found in the current research that participants based punishment decisions on both retribution and deterrence punishment motives; there was no significant difference between the uses of these two motives. What research in this area would indicate is that people often believe that they punish for deterrent reasons but when this is actually placed in a concrete setting there is not as much support for deterrence and retribution motives becomes more relevant (Carlsmith, 2008). The fact that, in the current research, participants indicated that their punishment motives were both retributive and deterrent is in line with the research in this area.

The importance of Study 2 was the replication of what was found in Study 1 but also the extension of the structural equation model. The inclusion of personality ratings was based on the work of Graham and Lowry (2004) and also Hogue and Peebles (1997), whereby ratings of the personality of the offender and of the culpability of the offender were found to be related to severity of the crime ratings. Specifically, Graham and Lowery (2004) found that negative trait judgments influenced ratings of crime severity and both Graham and Lowery (2004) and Hogue and Peebles (1997) found that higher ratings of culpability led to increased ratings of crime severity. Although the current research found that personality ratings were important in severity decisions, ratings of offender culpability were not involved.

One explanation for why culpability was not found to be part of the structural equation model in the current research was because of the inclusion of the internal attributions of cause variable. Internal attributions of cause indicate that one thinks the cause of the act can be attributed to internal factors of the offender (rather than to external factors), which is very similar to ratings of culpability. Culpability means that the individual involved is 'deserving of blame' or is 'blameworthy' (Graham & Lowery, 2004), which indicates that the individual is considered to have internal control for their actions and so can be blamed for what they have done. This is very similar to internal attribution of cause for the actions conducted. The inclusion of both internal attributions of cause and ratings of culpability may have been redundant and so it was the stronger of these two that was found to load significantly in the model.

Alternative Explanations.

One aspect of the findings for Studies 1 and 2 that is hard to understand is that ratings of personal control were rated higher when participants read the fellow traveller version of the story as compared to when they read the moral stranger version of the story. This was not in the expected direction. In the fellow traveller view mitigating factors are considered relevant to help explain the actions of the offender and so it was expected that there would be less personal control expected of the fellow traveller offender than the moral stranger offender. What was found, though, was that more personal control was attributed to the fellow traveller offender, although for both story versions the ratings of personal control were at the very high end of the rating scale and so both represented a high attribution of cause to personal control, it was just that the fellow traveller version resulted in slightly (but significantly) higher ratings than the moral stranger version.

The fellow traveller offender is considered to be similar to others in society and the motivations of this offender are considered to be understandable, while the opposite is the case for the moral stranger offender. This may indicate that the ratings of personal control were higher for the fellow traveller offender because this offender is thought to be more similar to the respondent and so considered that they should be able to have control over their own actions, while the moral stranger offender is considered to be too different from the respondent and so it is harder to attribute cause to their personal control. This is an area that requires some further

exploration, to get a better understanding of why it is that the fellow traveller offender is rated as more personally in control of his or her actions than the moral stranger offender.

This finding could relate to attribution theory, particularly the part of the theory that considers motivation to be related to one's behaviour (Weiner, 1972). When a person is motivated to behave in a certain way then they can be seen to be personally in control of this. This part of attribution theory might help to explain that the fellow traveller offender was seen to be motivated to change their behaviour and therefore would be considered more personally in control. This could also relate to the implicit theory of personality (Dweck et al., 1993) as the fellow traveller is viewed as being malleable, able to change, and so can have some personal control because they can influence their own behaviour.

Additionally, it was expected that there would be significant differences for the external control and stability attributions of cause subscales between the two story versions, particularly based on attribution theory (Weiner, 1972), but these hypotheses were not supported. The fellow traveller view accepts that there are additional factors involved in a situation that might help explain the behaviour of an offender, while the moral stranger view considers the offender to be fully to blame for his or her actions and external factors are not considered relevant. Due to this difference between the two views it was expected that external control would be rated higher in the fellow traveller version than the moral stranger view, but no difference was found. This may be because the external factors in the current story versions were not as salient when compared with the personality characteristics of the offender, as supported by research showing the personal characteristics are focused on more than situational characteristics (Ross & Nesbit, 1991) and so the focus was on the offender more so.

The bad character of the moral stranger offender is considered to represent a fairly stable and long standing personality type, while the fellow traveller is considered to be an average person who has done a bad thing at one point in time. This difference indicated that there would be a difference for the stability subscale between the moral stranger and fellow traveller story versions, but this was not supported. This may have been because there was not a lot of information in the story versions about the offender's past, and if there had been more of this information then perhaps the expected difference would have been found. This, and the external control factor, could be investigated in further research.

Studies Three and Four

Key Findings.

Studies 1 and 2 provided an empirical examination at how members of the public judge offenders and how this then influences the way that they punish the offender and how likely they think that rehabilitation will help the offender. This research was based on the theory that an offender can be viewed as either a moral stranger, an outsider to society who will continue to reoffend, or as a fellow traveller, a person who is still a member of society and has the ability to change. However, the work to this point in the literature had been exclusively theoretical and had not been supported by any empirical investigations. Studies 3 and 4 were designed to investigate this theory by way of the development of a measure of people's opinions about criminal offenders.

Studies 3 and 4 involved the development of the Opinions about Criminal Offenders Scale (OCO), which is a 12 item scale measuring the way that people think about offenders. The scale is made up of 4 subscales relating to the following areas: the ability that offenders have to change (*Ability to Change*), the desire that offenders have to change (*Desire to Change*), excuses that perceivers implement to help explain the behaviour of the offender (*Excuses*), and the decision impairment that offenders may experience at the time that they offend (*Decision Impairment*). Each subscale is made up of **three** items and each item is scored on a 7-point Likert scale, anchored 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*. The scale provides a score for each subscale and also an overall scale score, which indicates the general view that an individual holds about offenders. A high rating on the scale represents the fellow traveller end of the continuum and a low rating represents the moral stranger end.

The structure of the scale was subjected to confirmatory factor analysis in order to validate it, this was conducted on a large sample of participants and it was then subjected to test-retest reliability and convergent and discriminant validity. It was found that the Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale has some good psychometric properties, and therefore the OCO scale has real potential for inclusion in future research as a valid measure of the way that people think about offenders. However, because the CFA conducted in Study 4a ended up as a further exploratory factor analysis, the OCO scale still needs further validation in the form of another CFA being conducted.

Interpretation of Findings.

The research conducted in Studies 3 and 4 provided some indication of a psychometrically valid measure of people's opinions about criminal offenders. The measure was subjected to confirmatory factor analysis in Study 4a and this provided reason to refine the measure from the 16-item version set out in Study 3, to the final 12-item version that was made up of 4 subscales – one item being removed from each of the four subscales. This indicates that a further CFA needs to be conducted in order to validate the new structure of the OCO scale.

The research conducted through Studies 4a and 4b showed that the OCO scale has good to excellent test-retest reliability over a 2 month period, that the scale has good convergent and discriminant validity, and that it has good internal reliability. The overall OCO scale score was found to have test-retest reliability in the excellent range, and the subscales were all found to be in the good range, with some coming very close to excellent (Cicchetti & Sparrow, 1981). It was found that the OCO scale was convergent with the Dweck scale, the Punitiveness Orientation Scale, the Need for Cognitive Closure Scale and the Attributional Complexity Scale, while it was discriminant with the Need to Evaluate Scale and the Rational and Experiential Inventory. These were all the expected findings, and the specific subscales of the OCO scale that were more or less related to the various scales used were also the predicted outcomes. Further, the internal reliability of the overall scale was over 0.80, which is in the excellent range, and each of the subscales was in the good range, nearing to excellent in some cases (i.e. the *Ability to Change* subscale).

Taken together, these findings indicate that the Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale has good psychometric properties and has the potential to be a valid measure to be used in further research. There is further work that can be done to investigate the utility of this scale further and to show its applicability in a range of settings, including conducting a further CFA.

Alternative Explanations.

For this scale, through the whole development and into the final version, offenders were not specified to be any certain group. Instead participants were merely directed to think of offenders in a general sense; however this will not necessarily have prevented participants from thinking about a certain group of offenders when

making their judgements of the items in this scale. Participants may have been thinking of violent offenders or drug offenders, or they could have been thinking about property offenders or other dishonesty offenders. Research would indicate, though, that it is most likely that participants were thinking about more severe offenders when answering items on the scale, such as violent offenders, rather than less severe offenders, such as burglary offenders, because this is the information that the media is more likely to present, and is thus, more accessible (Chermak, 1994; Klite et al., 1997; Mason, 2006; McGregor, 1993; O'Connell, 1999; Reiner, 1997).

This could be one potential shortcoming of the current scale and may indicate an area that needs to be investigated further. In future research participants could be directed to think about a particular group of offenders, such as violent offenders, drug offenders, or non-violent offenders and then answer the items in the scale. Such research will help to validate the scale, indicate the generalisability of the belief systems across offender types, and show its applicability in a variety of areas.

This scale has similarities to the Attitudes toward Prisoners scale (ATP; Melvin et al., 1985) and the Community Attitudes towards Sex Offenders Scale (CATSO; Church et al., 2008); however there are also a number of differences. The OCO scale is a broad measure of people's opinions about criminal offenders, unlike the CATSO which is specific to sex offenders, and the OCO also separates these opinions into meaningful subscales, unlike the ATP which has no subscales, that can help inform on different areas related to punishment and rehabilitation. Further, the use of the word offenders instead of prisoners further differentiates the OCO scale from the ATP scale, as this term is not as broad and could be considered somewhat dated.

It would be interesting and useful for future research to examine the convergent and discriminant validity of the OCO scale as compared with the ATP and the CATSO, as they are all examining the general area of views of offenders, however in different ways. The ATP is somewhat dated in terms of the language used and it does not differentiate different aspects of belief about offenders, while the CATSO is specifically related to the sex offenders, not any other offenders. The OCO uses a more general term to define the group of people (offenders) that are the focus of the scale and the OCO differentiates between 5 different parts of the belief about offenders and it is also at a general level, not focussing on one specific group of offenders, such as sex offenders. These differences indicate that there should be some

level of difference between these three measures. This further research would provide support for the OCO being a useful measure of people's opinions about offenders, and that the OCO scale provides different, and importantly, useful information that the ATP scale or the CATSO scales do not provide.

Study 5

Key Findings.

Study 5 brought together the empirical work of Studies 1 and 2, and the scale developed in Studies 3 and 4. This was important to do in order to tie together the two main components of the current research. In this final study participants were presented with the OCO scale and they were also presented with a 'newspaper' story similar to those used in Studies 1 and 2 and were asked to respond to the same dependent measures as in those earlier studies.

It was expected that there would be differences in responses to the dependent measures based on the opinion one held about offenders, as measured by the OCO scale. Because the OCO scale is a continuum and is measured as a continuous variable, ANOVA type analysis, as was conducted for the story type and in Studies 1 and 2 was considered to be inappropriate for these data. Instead the subscales of the OCO were used in a further structural equation model, to determine if the opinions one holds about offenders influences the judgements made about the offender and the offence in a certain way. The structural equation model found that each subscale of the OCO informed different parts of the judgement made about the offender, such as the *ability to change* subscale predicted judgements about the likelihood of reoffending while the *desire to change* subscale predicted likely success of rehabilitation. The judgements made about the offender were then found to inform on judgments made about the offence, such as severity and culpability ratings.

Interpretation of Findings.

There were no significant differences found on the dependent variables based on the story version read. The two story versions were differentiated in terms of being objective – fact based with little room for interpretation – or subjective – still fact based but with more room for interpretation of some of the facts. The two versions were only different in terms of three specific sentences and the rest of the story was kept consistent across the two versions. These three sentences may not have

provided enough of a difference between the two stories in order to effect a change. The story versions used in the first two studies of this research were differentiated across almost all of the sentences used and so were very different from each other.

The key finding for Study 5 was the structural equation model. This model was a replication and then extension of the models developed through Studies 1 and 2. The structural equation model developed in Study 5 shows previously held beliefs that one has about the offender in terms of the ability of offenders to change, the desire of offenders to change, the validity of excuses and mitigating factors, and the validity of decision impairment in determining the blameworthiness of the offender lead to judgements made about the offender. These judgements about the offender relate to the character of the offender, the perceived likelihood of the offender to reoffend, the causal attributions and the likely success of rehabilitation. The judgements made about the offender then lead to judgments of the severity of the crime, the level of culpability of the offender, and the punishment motivation used (retribution and/or deterrence).

As stated above the model developed in Study 5 is a more complex version of what was developed in Studies 1 and 2. This model subsumed one of the main predictive pathways from the model developed in Study 2, which was that of perceived likelihood of reoffending, and judgements of the character of the offender leading to ratings of severity of the offence. The model then extended this pathway to a more complex and explanatorily valuable model.

This model shows that there is an empirical basis for the OCO scale, and it also shows that there is utility in the use of this scale. The OCO scale provides information about the different elements of one's beliefs about offenders and how these different elements, as represented by the 4 subscales, relate to different judgements made about offenders and about the offence. It shows that it is not one overall belief about offenders that informs various judgements made about the offender and the offence, but rather different elements of one's belief system about offenders that informs different subsequent judgements. For example, judgements about the ability of the offender to change then inform judgements made about the perceived likelihood of the offender reoffending and also the likely success of rehabilitation of the offender. The judgements made about the offender in the current research were in terms of the perceived likelihood of reoffending, the anticipated rehabilitation success, the character of the offender, and the attributions of blame

placed on the offender. Further research may find that there are other judgements that are made about an offender at the time an offence is committed and these different judgements will likely be linked to different parts of the OCO scale.

This model found significant and theoretically meaningful pathways as expected, and while not all of the predicted pathways were supported by the current model, the majority were. The overall model provides a lot of information about the types of beliefs and the relevant information that people use to make judgements and decisions about offenders and this sort of information may be useful in terms of further understanding how people make punishment and rehabilitation decisions for offenders. This is an important area for consideration because, in New Zealand, we have a judicial system that implements a jury of the public to help make judgments about an offender's guilt or innocence.

Alternative Explanations.

The predictive validity of the OCO scale and its subscales in the current research may be limited by the various dependent variables that were included in the current research. It might be necessary in future research to look to further judgements that are made about the offender and about the offence, to determine how the OCO subscales predict these different judgements. These further judgements could be in terms of the social and occupational functioning of the offender either at the time of the offence or as an outcome after he or she has gone through the criminal justice system, or both. It might be useful to look at outcomes for the family of the offender specifically, as well as his or her general social functioning.

These additional areas might be useful to investigate in further research because of the existing research that shows that social and occupational functioning is necessary for a 'good life' (Ward & Brown, 2004; Ward et al., 2007) and that these areas can often become impaired by preventative legislation (Levenson, D'Amora, et al., 2007; Mercado et al., 2008), and so inhibit one's ability to better reintegrate into society after a custodial sentence. These may be areas, though, that general members of the public do not consider to be important when thinking about a criminal offender, particularly an offender that is thought of as a moral stranger. Even given this, the inclusion of judgements about factors that are important for successful reintegration may expand the utility of the current model further.

Counterfactual Generation

Key Findings.

It was found that in Study 1, across both story versions, there were more counterfactual statements generated about the offender, the influence of others, and the effects of alcohol, than about the victim. It was also found that there was a significant effect of the type of story read for statements made about the influence of alcohol. This effect was that those who read the fellow traveller version of the story made more statements about the influence of alcohol on the outcome than those who read the moral stranger version.

In the analysis of Study 5 it was found that there were more counterfactual statements made about the victim than any of the other three categories, and that there were differences in the number of statements made about the victim and the offender based on belief system. The fellow traveller believer made more counterfactual statements about the offender than the moral stranger and, conversely, the moral stranger believer made more counterfactual statements about the victim than the fellow traveller believer. These are the key findings from Study 5, and they appear to be quite different from what was found in Study 1.

Interpretation of Findings.

In Study 1 the main focus of the story was the offender. Most of the story involved describing aspects of the character of the offender and how the offender was viewed by others, and there was little emphasis placed on the victim. The story also introduced 'others at the party' and 'alcohol use' as important aspects of the situation. Based on this, it is clear that the victim was not a main focus of the story and so it is not necessarily surprising that there were the least number of counterfactual statements made about the victim, compared with the other 3 categories of statements. On the other hand, in Study 5 there was not such a clear focus on the offender in the story and the manipulation between the two versions was more subtle than that used in Study 1. This was done so that pre-existing attitudes in Study 5, as measured by the OCO scale, could be shown to influence one's judgements about the offender and offence, as opposed to in Study 1 where the manipulation was the two beliefs, as represented by the two story versions.

At first the finding of Study 5, that more statements were made about the offender by those who held a fellow traveller belief of offenders, and more statements were made about the victim by those who held a moral stranger belief, seems counterintuitive. Surely those who believe offenders are at the moral stranger end of the spectrum would place more blame on the offender and therefore make more statements about change than those who believe offenders are at the fellow traveller end of the spectrum? However, one of the key defining factors of the moral stranger belief system is that offenders are not able to change. A counterfactual statement is one made about what could be changed or could have been done differently in a situation to result in a different outcome. Based on the fact that moral offenders are believed to be unable to change, and that counterfactual statements are made about changes to a situation, it makes sense that there were less counterfactual statements made about the offender by those who held a moral stranger belief than those who held a fellow traveller belief.

Due to there being fewer statements made about the offender changing by those who hold a moral stranger belief, this makes it seem like there is more blame being placed on the victim and others than on the offender. This is not necessarily the case, but rather that active change can only be attributed to the victim and others in the situation due to the nature of the moral stranger belief system. The fellow traveller believer, on the other hand, does consider the offender able to change (as part of the key defining factors of this belief system) and therefore makes more statements about the offender than the moral stranger believer.

For those who believe that offenders are more at the moral stranger end of the spectrum more statements were made about the victim than the offender. This is because the offender is not considered able to change. Also, the belief in a just world hypothesis (Lerner & Simmons, 1966; Lerner & Miller, 1978) and rape myths can help explain the focus on the victim (Burt, 1980; Giacomassi & Dull, 1986; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994) through the idea that the world is meant to be a predictable and safe place.

The belief in a just world hypothesis posits that people generally want to believe that the world is just and predictable, and they make judgements about situations based on this fundamental belief (Lerner & Simmons, 1966; Lerner & Miller, 1978). If the world is thought to be just and understandable then if something bad happens to a person there must be a reason for this, so the person must have done

something wrong. Also, it must be predictable, so there must be actions that the person made that could be changed to prevent the bad thing from happening. This belief can lead to people attributing blame to a victim in a scenario like the story presented in Study 5. This is because the victim is believed to be somehow at fault; because the outcome must be just, and there must be actions that the victim could have done to change the outcome, because the outcome must be predictable. The idea of rape myths also fits into this explanation, because rape myths are really judgements made about a specific crime, rape, that help support the just world hypothesis. Rape myths attribute blame to the victim and also create a situation where the victim could have changed her actions (in the case of rape myths the victim is stereotyped as a female) to prevent the outcome (Burt, 1980; Giacomassi & Dull, 1986; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994). This further helps to explain the focus on the victim in the current research, because the crime in questions was a sexual offence, which is an offence that can activate rape myth beliefs.

Alternative Explanations.

A further area of research that can help explain the outcomes of the counterfactual generation analysis is the work by Crawford and McCrea (2004). In this research it was found that pre-existing attitudes influence counterfactual thoughts. In Study 1 of their research, Crawford and McCrea found that pre-existing attitudes about gun waiting time laws influenced one's subsequent counterfactual judgements made about a scenario where an actor either bought a gun straight away, and so avoided being harmed, or had to wait the 5 day period, and was harmed in the interim period. The counterfactual statements that participants made were influenced by their pre-existing attitude, and as such this pre-existing attitude mutated the type of counterfactual statements made so that the statements reflected this pre-existing attitude. In Study 5 of the current research the pre-existing attitude measured was belief about offenders, as measured by the OCO scale. This pre-existing attitude may then have influenced the counterfactual statements made, so that those who held a more fellow traveller belief about offenders made statements about the offender changing his actions, and those who held a more moral stranger belief made statements about the victim changing her actions. These mutations made in order to reflect and support the respondents pre-existing attitude about offenders.

An issue with the analysis conducted for the counterfactual statements was the dichotomisation of a continuous variable, the OCO overall scale score. A median split was used based on the guidelines used in Coutinho, et al. (2001); however there is a significant body of research that has discussed the problems with dichotomising a continuous variable, in terms of getting spurious results or lowering the power of the tests conducted (Fitzsimmons, 2008; Irwin & McClelland, 2001; Irwin & McClelland, 2003; Maxwell & Delaney, 1993). For the counterfactual statements this was seen as the best way to approach the analysis; however it may be important for future research to examine the counterfactual statements with regression analysis instead, in order to keep the continuous variable intact and avoid the issues of dichotomisation. Use of regression analysis might also find that there are certain subscales of the OCO scale that are more strongly related to counterfactual generation, i.e. the *Ability to Change* subscale, than others, i.e. the *Decision Impairment* subscale.

A further potential problem with the current research was that the statements were coded by the primary researcher only. This is problematic because one rater is not enough to conduct any sort of reliability analysis with to determine if the coding of the statements is accurate. Further, because the coding was conducted by the primary researcher this may also be a confound to the current study. This is because the primary researcher may have coded statements in such a way as to support her hypotheses, even unintentionally.

It would have been a more statistically sound way to code these statements to have two independent researchers complete the rating. These researchers would have been blind to the overall purpose of the research and to the hypotheses that the primary researcher had and this would have allowed for the most non-biased rating. Further, by having two raters, reliability analysis would have been able to be conducted in order to examine how reliably similar the coding between the researchers was.

Future Directions

The current research has provided some important findings in terms of the effect of the moral stranger and fellow traveller beliefs on punishment and rehabilitation decisions when they are manipulated, and then in terms of validating a measure of these opinions in the creation of the Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale. And, as such, finding empirical support for the existence of the moral stranger

and fellow traveller beliefs, which up until this research had been conducted were only theoretical.

In the future there are a number of areas that this research could be expanded into including, using different types of stories, using different offender/victim combinations, applying the OCO scale to very specific groups of offenders, investigating the actual presentation of crime stories in the media and how closely these match up with the moral stranger or fellow traveller beliefs, extension of the structural equation model, and finally, further validation of the OCO scale with different population samples and also by conducting further convergent/discriminant validity with the CATSO (Church et al., 2008) and the ATP (Melvin et al., 1985). Some of these areas are outlined in more detail below.

Story Used.

One clear area for future investigation is to present vignettes similar to what were used in Studies One and Two but without the information about previous contact with the law. The moral stranger vignette in Studies One and Two presented this factual information, which made a distinct difference between the two versions and a difference that was based on a fact rather than a matter of the way the information was written and presented.

Further areas to consider include that the current study was conducted with vignettes that involved a sex offence, specifically an adult to adult rape offence. It would be interesting for future research to apply the current research to a broader range of offences, such as assault, assault with a weapon, homicide, and non-person offences such as fraud, burglary and wilful damage. It may even be useful to look at different sex offences, such as indecent exposure, sexual interference, and attempted sexual offence.

The current study involved a male offender and a female victim, both in their 20's, with the male being a few years older than the female. The offence was a sex crime and so this victim/offender combination is fairly stereotypical. It would be interesting to look at the effect of different age combinations of the offender and victim, and also to look at the effect of the victim being male and the offender being female, or the victim and offender both being male or both being female. In terms of age combinations it could be useful to look at very young and/or very old victims and offenders. Research has shown that more vulnerable victims are reported more often

in the media, and one criteria of vulnerability is age (i.e., the young and the old; O'Connell, 1999).

It may also be interesting to look at the effect of race on the belief system. That is, are minority race offenders more likely to be seen as moral strangers than majority race offenders, particularly those races that are already associated with criminality? This would be expected due to the work by Payne (2001) and Eberhardt et al. (2004), which indicated a race bias toward those in the racial minority being associated with criminality more than those in the racial majority. The work by Yzerbyt and colleagues (Yzerbyt, Corneille, & Estrada, 2001; Yzerbyt, Rogier & Fiske, 1998) would also support this hypothesis through the concepts of subjective essentialism and entitativity. These concepts purport that members of a group, such as black offenders, are seen as very similar to each other and when one thinks about a single member of such a group one elicits beliefs and thoughts about the group as a whole to make a judgement about that one member. Also, when one is thinking of a single member of the group one tries to bring together pieces of information that help link the individual to one's overall beliefs about the group that they belong to. So, if one hold a belief about Black people being related to crime then this research would indicate that a specific example of a Black person being involved in crime would activate one's views about the group as a whole, and attribute the group's characteristics to the individual.

In further research it may also be useful to try to apply the OCO scale to a specified group of offenders, rather than just offenders are an overall, homogenous group. When completing the OCO scale participants could be directed to think about a specific group of offenders. For example, participants could be directed to think about recidivist drug offenders or first-time burglary offenders or homicide offenders when completing the scale, and so participants' answers on the scale would therefore be representative of beliefs about only that particular group of offenders.

Media Representations.

It was hypothesised in the current study that the media presents crime stories from a more moral stranger view than fellow traveller view however this needs to be investigated further to determine what is actually happening. This would require a content analysis of print media or television news media (or both). The content analysis would require an examination of the language and content used by the media

to describe crime and offenders, and this language and content would need to be compared to the defining features of the moral stranger/fellow traveller belief system. This comparison would then provide information about whether the media do present a biased view of crime and offenders in terms of the moral stranger/fellow traveller belief system, and which direction this bias is in. Based on the research already conducted on media representations of crime (Chermak, 1994; Klite et al., 1997; Mason, 2006; McGregor, 1993; O'Connell, 1999; Reiner, 1997) it has been shown that sensationalism sells and sensationalism means that the most brutal attacks on the most vulnerable victims are going to be the focus of media coverage. These sorts of crimes are presented with a focus on the vulnerable victim, and therefore the less than vulnerable offender (the moral stranger), indicating that a content analysis of news coverage would find that crime and offenders are presented in a moral stranger way more so than a fellow traveller way.

Further, research has shown that the media present a biased view of crime and offenders (Levenson, Brannon, et al., 2007; Maxwell, 2008; McGregor, 1993; Paulin, et al., 2003; Roberts & Hough, 2005), and if this bias is in the moral stranger direction, then the current research has shown that this can negatively influence punishment and rehabilitation decisions made by members of the public. A content analysis such as this could help inform changes that might need to happen with the guidelines that the media adhere to, in order to ensure that the public get a more accurate picture of crime and offenders.

Extension of the Structural Equation Model.

It could be useful to extend the model of people's thought process about offenders further by adding in other variables that might be related to the current model and that have predictive value. It might be useful to include some items about the offender's job and social prospects beyond the offence, as these are good predictors of successful reintegration of an offender once released from prison. However, these factors may not be considered relevant from the public's perspective. These factors are also areas of life that sex offenders, who are under registration and notification laws, have expressed having difficulty with, once out of prison (Levenson, D'Amora, et al., 2007; Mercado, et al., 2008; Tewksbury 2004).

Another area of the model to look at further is a better way to incorporate punishment given. Currently, punishment given is measured through the severity

variable and only in terms of the severity of punishment that would be given not the actual specific form that this punishment would take. It would be important for future research to look at a better way to incorporate punishment given into the model, particularly with some sort of representation of the specific type of punishment given, such as a determinate prison sentence or community service. The type of punishment that one thinks is appropriate for a given crime could be linked to various elements of one's prior beliefs about offenders, and also judgements made about the offender, such as ratings of the character of the offender. This would, therefore, be an interesting area to investigate further.

Psychometrics and Sample Used.

Some of the samples used in the current study were very broad and representative; others less so (e.g., predominantly younger university students). It would be important in the future to try and gain participants from some more low socio-economic areas, i.e. a more overall representative sample. In the current body of research some lower social-economic areas were canvassed in Study 3, however participants still had to choose to complete the questionnaire and mail it back in, and from those who responded it appeared that not many from that group did complete the questionnaire. Also, use of an online method of recruitment did limit those who could respond to people who not only had easy access to a computer but also had internet access. While New Zealand does have a good rate of homes with computers and internet access this is still a limiting factor (1.4 million homes - roughly 32% of the population- in 2011 had broadband internet services) (Statistics NZ, 2011). Also, the current study had a high number of higher educated participants which is not representative of the overall New Zealand population (NZ Census, 2006), so trying to gain a broader sample in terms of education would also be key for future research.

Conclusions

The current body of research has taken theoretical work and tested it in an empirical setting and through this research support has been found for the existence of this belief system about offenders. The belief system has been found to be best represented as a continuum with four different elements that make up the overall belief one holds about offenders. These four elements of this belief are: ability to change, desire to change, excuses, and decision impairment. The measure developed

in the current body of research is a starting point, and further validation is required in order to confirm the statistical support for the final factor structure developed in Study 4a.

The media present information to the public and this information then influences the views held by the public about offenders and so this then affects outcomes for offenders such as punishment and rehabilitation decisions. This was the main finding of Studies 1 and 2. That is, the way that a story is written can influence punishment and rehabilitation decisions, and so it is important to understand the way that the media do write stories about crime and whether these stories are more of a moral stranger or fellow traveller representation.

This research also found that people's decision making judgements about the offender and the offence can be modelled and that the pre-existing beliefs one holds about offenders can inform on these particular judgements. This model also shows that different aspects of one's pre-existing beliefs about offenders predict judgements made about the offender, in terms of the personality of the offender and the perceived likelihood of the offender reoffending, for example, and these judgements then lead to judgements made about the offence, such as severity of the offence and use of retributive punishment motives. One's pre-existing beliefs about offenders inform judgements made about the offender and the offence and this can lead to differences in the punishment and rehabilitation decisions that are made for the offender.

References

- Applegate, B.K., Cullen, F.T., & Fisher, B.S. (2002). Public views toward crime and correctional policies: Is there a gender gap? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30, 89-100. doi: 10.1016/S0047-235(01)00127-1
- Applegate, B.K., Cullen, F.T., Turner, M.G., & Sundt, J.L. (1996). Assessing public support for three-strikes-and-you're-out laws: Global versus specific attitudes. *Crime & Delinquency*, 42, 517-534. doi: 10.1177/0011128796042004002
- Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right – wing authoritarianism*. Winnipeg, Ontario, Canada: University of Manitoba Press
- Altemeyer, B. (1988). *Enemies of freedom: Understanding right-wing authoritarianism*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Altemeyer, B. (2004). Highly dominating, highly authoritarian personalities. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 144, 421-447. doi: 10.3200/SOCP.144.4.421-448
- Baron, R.M. & Kenny, D.A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1173
- Beck, V.S., & Travis, L.F. (2006). Sex offender notification: An exploratory assessment of state variation in notification processes. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34, 51-55. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2005.11.005
- Bentler, P.M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 238-246. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.107.2.238
- Berkowitz, L. (1989). Frustration-Aggression Hypothesis: Examination and reformulation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 106, 59-73. doi: 0033-2909/89/\$00.75
- Berliner, L., Schram, D., Miller, L.L. & Milloy, C.D. (1995). A sentencing alternative for sex offenders: A study of decision making and recidivism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 10, 487-502. doi: 10.1177/088626095010004007
- Bodenhausen, G.V., & Wyer, Jr, R.S. (1985). Effects of stereotypes on decision making and information-processing strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48, 267-282. doi: 0022-3514/85/\$00.75
- Bohner, G., Jarvis, C.I., Eyssel, F., Siebler, F. (1998). The causal impact of rape myth acceptance on men's rape proclivity: Comparing sexually coercive and non-

- coercive men. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 819-828. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.284
- Boulahanis, J.G., & Heltsley, M.J. (2004). Perceived fears: The reporting patterns of juvenile homicide in Chicago newspapers. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 15, 132-160. doi: 10.1177/0887403404263624.
- Brown, S. (1999). Public attitudes toward the treatment of sex offenders. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 4, 239-252. doi: 10.1348/135532599167879
- Burt, M.R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports of rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 271-230. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.38.2.217
- Cacioppo, J.T. & Petty, R.E. (1982). The need for cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 116-131. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.42.1.116
- Caldwell, M.F., Ziemke, M.H., & Vitacco, M.J. (2008). An examination of the sex offender registration and notification act as applied to juveniles. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 14, 89-114. doi: 10.1037/a0013241
- Capps, J.S. (2002). Explaining Punitiveness: Right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 4, 263-278. Retrieved from <http://najp.8m.com/>
- Carlsmith, K.M. (2008). On justifying punishment: The discrepancy between words and actions. *Social Justice Research*, 2, 119-137. doi: 10.1007/s11211-008-0068-x
- Carlsmith, K.M., Darley, J.M., & Robinson, P.H. (2002). Why do we punish? Deterrence & just deserts as motives for punishment. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 83, 284-299. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.83.2.284
- Cheit, R.E. (2003). What hysteria? A systematic study of newspaper coverage of accused child molesters. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 27, 607-623. doi: 10.1016/S1045-2134(03)00108-X
- Chermak, S.M. (1994). Body count news: How crime is presented in the news media. *Justice Quarterly*, 11, 561-582. Retrieved from http://www.acjs.org/pubs/167_669_3514.cfm
- Chermak, S.M. (1998). Predicting crime story salience: The effects of crime, victim and defendant characteristics. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 26, 61-70. doi: 10.1016/S0047-2352(97)00055-X

- Chermak, S., & Chapman, N.M. (2007). Predicting crime story salience: A replication. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35, 351-363. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2007.05.001
- Church, W.T., Wakeman, E.E., Miller, S.L., Clements, C.B., & Sun, F. (2008). The Community Attitudes toward Sex Offenders Scale: The development of a psychometric assessment instrument. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 18, 251-259. doi: 10.1177/1049731507310193.
- Cicchetti, D.V. & Sparrow, S.A. (1981). Developing criteria for establishing interrater reliability of specific items: Applications to assessment of adaptive behaviour. *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, 86, 127-137. Retrieved from <http://www.aaidjournals.org/>
- Connolly & Ward (2008). *Morals, rights and practice in the human services: Effective and fair decision-making in health, social care and criminal justice*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Costello, A.B. & Osborne, J.W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 10, 1-9. Retrieved from <http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=10&n=7>
- Coutinho, S. Wiemer-Hastings, K., Skowronski, J.J., & Britt, M.A. (2001). Metacognition, need for cognition and use of explanations during ongoing learning and problem solving. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 15, 321-337. doi: 10.1016/j.lindif.2005.06.001
- Crawford, M.T., & McCrea, S.M. (2004). When mutations meet motivations: Attitude biases in counterfactual thought. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 64-74. doi: 10.1016/S0022-1031(03)00062-3
- Darley, J.M. (2009). Morality in the law: The psychological foundations of citizens' desires to punish transgressions. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 5, 1-23. doi: 10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.4.110707.172335
- Darley, J.M., Carlsmith, K.M., Robinson, P.H. (2000). Incapacitation and just deserts as motives for punishment. *Law and Human Behaviour*, 24, 659-683. doi: 10.1023/A:1005552203727
- Darley, J.M., & Pittman, T.S. (2003). The psychology of compensatory and retributive justice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7, 324-336. doi: 10.1207/S15327957PSPR0704_05

- Day, A., Gerace, A., Wilson, C., & Howells, K. (2008). Promoting forgiveness in violent offenders: A more positive approach to offender rehabilitation? *Aggression and Violent Behaviour, 13*, 195-200. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2008.03.004
- DiStefano, C., & Hess, B. (2005). Using confirmatory factor analysis for construct validation: An empirical review. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 23*, 225-241. doi: 10.1177/073428290502300303
- Dowler, K. (2003). Media consumption and public attitudes towards crime and justice: The relationship between fear of crime, punitive attitudes, and perceived police effectiveness. *Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture, 10*, 109-126. Retrieved from http://www.albany.edu/scj/jcipc/jcipc_home.html
- Dowler, K. (2006). Sex, lies, and videotape: The presentation of sex crime in local television news. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 34*, 383-392. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2006.05.004
- Dumas, R., & Teste, B. (2006). The influence of criminal facial stereotypes on juridic judgements. *Swiss Journal of Psychology, 65*, 237-244. doi: 10.1024/1421-0185.65.4.237
- Durrant, Adamson, Todd, & Sellman (2009). Drug use and addiction: Evolutionary perspective. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 43*, 1049-1056. doi: 10.3109/00048670903270449
- Dweck, C.S., Chiu C., & Hong, Y. (1995a). Implicit theories and their role in judgements and reactions: A world from two perspectives. *Psychological Inquiry, 6*, 267-285. doi: 10.1207/s15327965pli0604_1
- Dweck, C.S., Chiu, C., & Hong, Y. (1995b). Implicit theories: Elaboration and extension of the model. *Psychological Inquiry, 6*, 322-333. doi: 10.1207/s15327965pli0604_12
- Dweck, C.S., Hong, Y., & Chiu, C. (1993). Implicit theories individual differences in the likelihood and meaning of dispositional inference. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19*, 644-656. doi: 10.1177/0146167293195015
- Eberhardt, J.L. Goff, P.A., Purdie, V.J., & Davies, P.G. (2004). Seeing Black: Race, crime, and visual processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*, 876-893. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.87.6.876

- Einsiedel, E.F., Salomone, K.L. & Schneider, F.P. (1984). Crime: Effects of media exposure and personal experience on issue salience. *Journalism Quarterly*, 61, 131-136. Retrived from <http://journalismquarterly.wordpress.com/>
- Elbogen, E.B., Patry, M., & Scalora, M.J. (2003). The impact of community notification laws on sex offender treatment attitudes. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 26, 207-219. doi: 10.1016/S0160-2527(03)00016-5
- Epstein, S., Pacini, R., Denes-Raj, V., & Heier, H. (1996). Individual differences in intuitive-experiential and analytical-rational thinking styles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 390-405. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.71.2.390
- Eschholz, S. (1997). The media and fear of crime: A survey of the research. *University of Florida Journal of Law and Public Policy*, 9, 37-60. Retrieved from <http://sites.google.com/site/floridajlpp/>
- Evans, S. (2003). Vigilance and vigilantes: Thinking psychoanalytically about anti-paedophile action. *Theoretical Criminology*, 7, 163-189. doi: 10.1177/1362480603007002416
- Fitzsimmons, G.J. (2008). Death to dichotomizing. *Journal of Consumer Research Inc.*, 35, 5-8. doi: 10.1086/589561
- Fletcher, G.J.O., Danilovics, P., Fernandez, G., Peterson, D., & Reeder, G.D. (1986). Attributional complexity: An individual differences measure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 875-884. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.51.4.875
- Fernandez, G.S.Y., Marshall, W.L., & Mann, R.E. (2003). Process issues in treatment: Application to sexual offender programs. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 34, 368-374. doi: 10.1037/0735-7028.34.4.368
- Gault, B.A., & Sabini, J. (2000). The roles of empathy, anger, and gender in predicting attitudes toward punitive, reparative, and preventative public policies. *Cognition and Emotion*, 14, 495-520. doi: 10.1080/026999300402772
- Giacopassi, D.G. & Dull, R.T. (1986). Gender and racial differences in the acceptance of rape myths within a college population. *Sex Roles*, 15, 63-75. doi: 10.1007/BF00287532

- Gilliam, F.D., & Iyengar, S. (2000). Prime suspects: The influence of local television news on the viewing public. *American Journal of Political Science*, 44, 560-573. Retrieved from <http://www.wiley.com/bw/journal.asp?ref=0092-5853>
- Graham, S., & Lowery, B.S. (2004). Priming unconscious racial stereotypes about adolescent offenders. *Law and Human Behaviour*, 28, 483-504. doi: 10.1023/B:LAHU.0000046430.65485.1f
- Gregory, Jr, S.W., & Lewis, J.M. (1988). Symbols of collective memory: The social process of memorialising. *Symbolic Interaction*, 11, 213-233. doi: 10.1525/si.1988.11.2.213
- Gromet, D.M., & Darley, J.M. (2009). Punishment and beyond: Achieving justice through the satisfaction of multiple goals. *Law & Society Review*, 43, 1-38. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-5893.2009.00365.x
- Hamilton, D.L., & Gifford, R.K. (1976). Illusory correlation in interpersonal perception: A cognitive basis of stereotypic judgments. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 12, 392-407. doi: 10.1016/S0022-1031(76)80006-6
- Han, H.A., Olson, M.A., & Fazio, R.H. (2006). The influence of experimentally created extrapersonal associations on the Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Experimental and Social Psychology*, 42, 259-272. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2005.04.006
- Hanson, R.K. & Bussiere, M.T. (1998). Predicting relapse: A meta-analysis of sexual offender recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 66, 348-362. doi: 10.1037/002-006X.66.2.348.
- Hanson, R.K., & Morton-Bourgon, K.E. (2005). The characteristics of persistent sexual offenders: A meta-analysis of recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 6, 1154-1163. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.73.6.1154
- Harris, A.J. & Hanson, R.K. (2004). Sex offender recidivism: A simple question. *National Criminal Justice Reference Service*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/App/Publications/abstract.aspx?ID=206023>
- Harris, G.T., Rice, M.E., & Quinsey, V.L. (1998). Appraisal and management of risk in sexual aggressors: Implications for Criminal Justice Policy. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 4, 73-115. doi: 1076-8971/98/\$3.00
- Hiller, M.L., Knight, K., Leukefeld, C., & Simpson, D.S. (2002). Motivation as a predictor of therapeutic engagement in mandated residential substance abuse

- treatment. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 29, 56-75. doi: 10.1177/0093854802029001004
- Hogue, T.E., & Peebles, J. (1997). The influence of remorse, intent and attitudes toward sex offenders on judgments of a rapist. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 3, 249-259. doi: 10.1080/10683169708410821
- Humphries, D. (1981). Serious crime, news coverage, and ideology: A content analysis of crime coverage in a metropolitan paper. *Crime & Delinquency*, 27, 191-205. doi: 10.1177/001112878102700202
- Hurd, C. (2008). The changing face of preventive detention in New Zealand. *Ministry of Justice (NZ)*. Retrieved from <http://www.njca.org.au/Professional%20Development/programs%20by%20year/2008/Sentencing%20Conference%202008/papers/Hurd.pdf>
- Irwin, J.R., & McClelland, G.H. (2001). Misleading heuristics and moderated multiple regression model. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38, 100-109. Retrieved from <http://www.journals.marketingpower.com/loi/jmkr>
- Irwin, J.R., & McClelland, G.H. (2003). Negative consequences of dichotomizing continuous predictor variables. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 40, 366-371. Retrieved from <http://www.journals.marketingpower.com/loi/jmkr>
- Jackson, D.L., Purc-Stephenson, R., & Gillaspay Jr., J.A. (2009). Reporting practices in confirmatory factor analysis: An overview and some recommendations. *Psychological Methods*, 14, 6-23. doi: 10.1037/A0014694
- Jarvis, W.B., & Petty, R.E. (1996). The need to evaluate. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 172-194. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.70.1.172
- Jewkes, Y. (2004). *Media and Crime*. London: Sage Publishing.
- Johnson-Listwan, S., Cullen, F.T., & Latessa, E.J. (2006). How to prevent prisoner re-entry programs from failing: Insights from evidence-based corrections. *Federal Probation*, 70 (3), 19-25. Retrieved from <http://www.uscourts.gov/FederalCourts/ProbationPretrialServices/FederalProbationJournal.aspx>
- Jones, K. D. (1999). The media and Megan's Law: Is community notification the answer? *Journal of Humanistic Counselling, Education and Development*, 38, 80-88. Retrieved from <http://www.counseling.org/Publications/Journals.aspx>

- Jones, T., & Newburn, T. (2006). Three strikes and you're out: Exploring symbol and substance in American and British crime control politics. *British Journal of Criminology*, 46, 781-802, doi: 10.1093/bjc/az1007.
- Kahneman, D., & Miller, D.T. (1986). Norm Theory: Comparing reality to its alternatives. *Psychological Review*, 93, 136-153. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.93.2.136
- Klite, P., Bardwell, R.A., & Salzman, J. (1997). Local TV news: Getting away with murder. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 2, 102-112. doi: 10.1177/1081180X97002002009
- Kruglanski (1989). *Lay epistemics and human knowledge: Cognitive and motivational bases*. New York: Plenum.
- Kruglanski, A.W., Webster, D.M., & Klem, A. (1993). Motivated resistance and openness to persuasion in the presence or absence of prior information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 861-876. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.65.5.861
- Law Commission New Zealand (2008). *Disclosure to Court*. Retrieved from <http://www.lawcom.govt.nz/>
- Lerner, M.J. & Miller, D.T. (1978). Just world research and the attribution process: Looking back and ahead. *Psychological Bulletin*, 85, 1030-1051. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.85.5.1030
- Lerner, M.J., & Simmons, C.H. (1966). Observer's reaction to the "innocent victim": Compassion or rejection? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4, 203-210. doi: 10.1037/h0023562
- Letourneau, E.J. & Armstrong, K.S. (2008). Recidivism rates for registered and non-registered juvenile sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 20, 393-408. doi: 10.1177/1079063208324661.
- Lewis, J.M., & Hensley, T.R. (1998). The May 4 shootings at Kent State University: The search for historical accuracy. *The Ohio Council for the Social Studies*. Retrieved from <http://isite.lps.org/khubbell/web/documents/KentStateReading.pdf>
- Levenson, J.S., Brannon, Y.N., Fortney, T., & Baker, J. (2007). Public perceptions about sex offenders and community protection policies. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 7, 137-161. doi: 10.1111/j.1530-2415.2007.00119.x

- Levenson, J.S., & Cotter, L.P. (2005). The effect of Megan's Law on sex offender reintegration. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 21, 49-66. doi: 10.1177/1043986204271676
- Levenson, J.S., D'Amora, M.S., & Hern, A.L. (2007). Megan's Law and its impact on community re-entry for sex offenders. *Behavioural Sciences and the Law*, 25, 587-602. doi: 10.1002/bsl.770
- Levy, S.R., Plaks, J.E., & Dweck, C.S. (1999). Modes of social thought: Implicit theories and social understanding. In Chaiken, S., & Trope, Y. (Eds.), *Dual-Process Theories in Social Psychology* (pp. 179-202). New York: Guilford Publication.
- Liberman, N., & Trope, Y. (1998). The role of feasibility and desirability considerations in near and distant future decisions: A test of temporal construal theory. *Attitudes and Social Cognition*, 75, 5-18. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.75.1.5
- Liberman, N., Sagristano, M.D., & Trope, Y. (2002). The effect of temporal distance on level of mental construal. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 38, 523-534. doi: 10.1016/S0022-1031(02)005335-8
- Liska, A.E., & Baccaglini, W. (1990). Feeling safe by comparison: Crime in the newspapers. *Social Problems*, 37, 360-374. Retrieved from <http://www.ucpressjournals.com/journal.asp?j=sp>
- Lonsway, K.A., & Fitzgerald, L.F. (1994). Attitudinal antecedents of rape myth acceptance: A theoretical and empirical re-examination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 704-711. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.68.4.704
- Lundman, R.J. (2003). The newsworthiness and selection bias in news about murder: Comparative and relative effects of novelty and race and gender typifications on newspaper coverage of homicide. *Sociological Forum*, 18, 357-386. doi: 10.1084-8971/03/0900-0357/0
- Marshall, W.L., Ward, T., Mann, R.E., Moulden, H., Fernandez, Y.M., Serran, G., & Marshall, L.E. (2005). Working positively with sexual offenders: Maximising the effectiveness of treatment. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20, 1096-1114. doi: 10.1177/0886260505278514
- Mason, P. (ed.) (2006). *Captured by the Media: Prison Discourse in Popular Culture*. Devon: Willan Publishing.

- Mason, P. (2006). Lies, distortion, and what doesn't work: Monitoring prison stories in the British media. *Crime Media Culture*, 2, 251-267. doi: 10.1177/1741659006069558
- Mason, P. (2007). Misinformation, myth, and distortion: How the press construct imprisonment in Britain. *Journalism Studies*, 8, 481-496. doi: 10.1080/14616700701276240
- Mayhew, P. & Reilly, J. (2007). New Zealand Crime & Safety Survey: 2006. NZ Ministry of Justice.
- Maxwell, G. (2008) Is crime getting worse? Will getting tough help? What should be done? (Institute of Criminology, Victoria University of Wellington).
- Maxwell, S.E., & Delaney, H.D. (1993). Bivariate median splits and spurious statistical significance. *Quantitative Methods in Psychology*, 113, 181-190. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.113.1.181
- McAuley, E., Duncan, T.E., & Russell, D.W. (1998). Measuring causal attributions: The revised Causal Dimension Scale (CDSII). *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 566-573. doi: 10.1177/0146167292485006
- McCorkle, R. C. (1993). Research Note: Punish and rehabilitate? Public attitudes toward six common crimes. *Crime and Delinquency*, 39, 240-252. doi: 10.1177/0011128793039002008
- McMurran, M., & Ward, T. (2004). Motivating offenders to change in therapy: An organising framework. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 9, 1-17. doi: 10.1348/1355325041719365
- McGregor, J. (1993). Crime news as prime news in New Zealand's metropolitan press. *Legal Research Foundation*, 36, 1-36. Retrieved from <http://www.legalresearch.org.nz/>
- Melvin, K.B., Gramling, L.K., & Gardner, W.M. (1985). A scale to measure attitudes toward prisoners. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 12, 241-253. doi: 10.1177/0093854885012002066
- Mercado, C.C., Alvarez, S., & Levenson, J. (2008). The impact of specialised sex offender legislation on community re-entry. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 20, 188-205. doi: 10.1177/1079063208317540.
- Mercado, C.C., & Ogloff, J.R.P. (2007). Risk and preventive detention of sex offenders in Australia and the United States. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 30, 49-59. doi: 10.1016/j.ijlp.2006.02.001

- Nadesu, A. (n.d.). Reconviction rates of sex offenders: Five year follow-up study. Department of Corrections, New Zealand. Retrieved from http://www.corrections.govt.nz/research/reconviction_rates_of_sex_offenders.html
- Nash, M. (2006). *Public Protection and the Criminal Justice Process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Newbold, G. (2007). *The Problem of Prisons: Corrections Reform in New Zealand Since 1840*. New Zealand: Dunmore Publishing Ltd.
- New Zealand Census (2006). Education. Retrieved from <http://www.stats.govt.nz/Census/1996-census-data.aspx>
- New Zealand Police (2007). *New Zealand Crime Statistics: A summary of recorded and resolved offences*. Retrieved from <http://www.police.govt.nz/service/statistics/2006/calendar/variance-in-crime-rates-05-06.pdf>
- New Zealand Police (2008). *New Zealand Crime Statistics: A summary of recorded and resolved offences*. Retrieved from <http://www.police.govt.nz/service/statistics/2007/calendar/stats-national-20071231.pdf>
- New Zealand Police (2009). *New Zealand Crime Statistics: A summary of recorded and resolved offences*. Retrieved from http://www.police.govt.nz/service/statistics/2008/calendar/00_National_Official_Stats_2008_Final.pdf
- NZPA (1998). New Zealand Press Association.
- O'Connell, M. (1999). Is Irish public opinion towards crime distorted by media bias? *European Journal of Communication*, 14, 191-212. doi: 10.1177/0267323199014002003
- Olson, M.A., & Fazio, R.H. (2004). Reducing the influence of extrapersonal associations on the Implicit Association Test: Personalising the IAT. *Attitudes and Social Cognition*, 86, 653-667. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.86.5.653
- O'Neil, K.M., Patry, M.W., & Penrod, S.D. (2004). Exploring the effects of attitudes toward the death penalty on capital sentencing verdicts. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 10, 443-470. doi: 10.1037/1076-8971.10.4.443
- Pacini, R., & Epstein, S. (1999). The relation of rational and experiential information processing styles to personality, basic beliefs, and the ratio-bias phenomenon.

- Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 972-987. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.76.6.972
- Paulin, J., Searle, W., & Knaggs, T. (2003). *Attitudes to crime and punishment: A New Zealand study*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Justice.
- Payne, B.K. (2001). Prejudice and Perception: The role of automatic and controlled processes in misperceiving a weapon. *Attitudes and Social Cognition*, 81, 181-192. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.81.2.181
- Payne, B.K., Gainey, R.R., Triplett, R.A., & Danner, M.J.E. (2004). What drives punitive beliefs? Demographic characteristics and justifications for sentencing. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32, 195-206. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2004.02.007
- Peterson, M. B. (2010). Distinct emotions, distinct domains: Anger, anxiety and perceptions of intentionality. *The Journal of Politics*, 72, 357-365. doi: 10.1017/S002238160999079X
- Petty, R.E., & Cacioppo, J.T. (1986). The Elaboration Likelihood Model of Persuasion. In Berkowitz, L. (Ed.). *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 19 (pp. 123-205) Academic Press, New York.
- Plaks, J.E., Grant, H., & Dweck, C.S. (2005). Violations of implicit theories and the sense of prediction and control: Implications for motivated person perception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 245-262. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.88.2.245
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L.M., & Malle, B.F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 741-763. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741
- Prendergast, M.L., Farabee, D., Cartier, J., & Henkin, S. (2002). Involuntary treatment within a prison setting: Impact on psychosocial change during treatment. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 29, 5-26. Retrieved from <http://cjb.sagepub.com/>
- Prison Reform Trust (2006). *Bromley Briefings: Prison Factfile*. London Prison Reform Trust.
- Pritchard, D., & Hughes, K.D. (1997). Patterns of deviance in crime news. *Journal of Communication*, 47 (3), 49-67. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.1997.tb02716.x

- Proctor, J.L., Badzinski, D.M., & Johnson, M. (2002). The impact of media knowledge and perceptions on Megan's Law. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 13, 356-379. doi: 10.1177/088740302237804.
- Ray, J.J. (1985). What old people believe: Age, sex and conservatism. *Political Psychology*, 6, 525-528. Retrieved from <http://portal.idc.ac.il/en/schools/Government/politicalpsychology/Pages/journal.aspx>
- Reiner, R. (1997). Media-made criminality: The representation of crime in the mass media. In Maguire, M., Morgan, R. & Reiner, R. (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* (pp. 302-337). Oxford; Clarendon Press.
- Rethinking Crime and Punishment (2011). "About us". Retrieved from <http://www.rethinking.org.nz/Default.aspx?page=3291>
- Rigg, J. (2002). Measures of perceived coercion in prison treatment settings. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 25, 473-490. doi: 10.1016/S160-2527(01)00094-2
- Roberts, J.V. (2003). Public opinion and mandatory sentencing: A review of international findings. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 30, 483-508. doi: 10.1177/0093854803253133
- Roberts, J.V., & Doob, A.N. (1990). News media influences on public views of sentencing. *Law and Human Behaviour*, 14, 451-468. Doi: 10.1007/BF01044222
- Roberts, J.V., & Hough, M. (2005). The state of the prisons: Exploring public knowledge and opinion. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 44, 286-306. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2311.2005.00373.x
- Roese, N.J., & Hur, T. (1997). Affective determinants of counterfactual thinking. *Social Cognition*, 15, 274-290. Retrieved from <http://guilfordjournals.com/loi/soco>
- Roese, N.J. & Olson, J.M. (1993a). Self-esteem and counterfactual thinking. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 199-206. doi: 0022-3514/93/\$3.00
- Roese, N.J. & Olson, J.M. (1993b). The structure of counterfactual thought. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19, 312-319. doi: 10.1177/0146167293193008

- Roese, N.J., & Olson, J.M. (1996). Counterfactuals, casual attributions, and the hindsight bias: A conceptual integration. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 32, 197-227. doi: 10.1006/jesp.1996.0010
- Romer, D., Jamieson, K.H., & Aday, S. (2003). Television news and the cultivation of fear of crime. *Journal of Communication*, 53, 88-104. Doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2003.tb03007.x
- Rosen, P.J., Hiller, M.L., Webster, J.M., Staton, M., & Leukefeld, C. (2004). Treatment motivation and therapeutic engagement in prison-based substance use treatment. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, 36, 387-396. Retrieved from <http://www.journalofpsychoactivedrugs.com/index.html>
- Ross, L. & Nisbett, R.E. (1991). The person and the situation. In Nadelhoffer, T., Nahmias, E. & Nichols, S. (Eds.). *Moral Psychology: Historical and Contemporary Readings*. Philadelphia, PA: Wiley Publishers.
- Sandler, J.C., Freeman, N.J., & Socia, K.M. (2008). Does a watched pot boil? A time-series analysis of New York state's sex offender registration and notification law. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law*, 14, 284-302. doi: 10.1037/a0013881
- Sargent, M.J. (2004). Less thought, more punishment: Need for cognition predicts support for punitive responses to crime. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 1485-1493. doi: 10.1177/0146167204264481
- Schram, D.D. & Milloy, C.D. (1995). *Community notification: A study of offender characteristics and recidivism*. Washington: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
- Sellen, J.L., McMurran, M., Cox, W.M., Theodosi, E., & Klinger, E. (2006). The Personal Concerns Inventory (Offender Adaptation): Measuring and enhancing motivation to change. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 50, 294-305. doi: 10.1177/0306624X05281829
- Sensible Sentencing Trust (2011). "Goals, Vision Statement and Mission". Retrieved from <http://www.safe-nz.org.nz/goals.htm>
- Sheley, J.F., & Ashkins, C.D. (1981). Crime, crime news and crime views. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 45, 492-506. Retrieved from <http://poq.oxfordjournals.org/>
- Sherman, S.J., Beike, D.R., & Ryalls, K.R. (1999). Dual-processing accounts of inconsistencies in responses to general versus specific cases. In Chaiken, S., &

- Trope, Y. (Eds.), *Dual-Process Theories in Social Psychology* (pp. 203-227). New York: Guilford Publication.
- Sorenson, S.B., Manz, J.G.P., & Berk, R.A. (1998). News media coverage and the epidemiology of homicide. *American Journal of Public Health*, 88, 1510-1514. Retrieved from <http://ajph.aphapublications.org/>
- Sprott, J.B. (1999). Are members of the public tough on crime? The dimensions of public punitiveness. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27, 467-474. doi: 10.1016/S0047-2352(99)00017-3
- Sprott, J.B., & Doob, A.N. (1997). Fear, victimization, and attitudes to sentencing, the courts, and the police. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 39, 275-291. Retrieved from <http://www.ccja-acjp.ca/en/cjc.html>
- Statistics NZ (2011). Internet Service Provider Survey: 2011. Retrieved from http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/industry_sectors/information_technology_and_communications/ISPSurvey_HOTPJun11.aspx
- Steiger, J.H. (1990). Structural mode evaluation and modification: An interval estimation approach. *Multivariate Behavioural Research*, 25, 173-180. doi: 10.1207/s15327906mbr2502_4
- Stolzenberg, L., & D'Alessio, S.J. (1997). "Three Strikes and You're Out": The impact of California's new mandatory sentencing law on serious crime rates. *Crime and Delinquency*, 43, 457-469. doi: 10.1177/0011128797043004004.
- Sundt, J.L., Cullen, F.T., Applegate, B.K., & Turner, M.G. (1998). The tenacity of the rehabilitative ideal revisited: Have attitudes toward offender treatment changed? *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 25, 426-442. doi: 10.1177/0093854898025004002
- Survey Monkey Corporation (1999-2011) *Survey Monkey*. Retrieved from <http://www.surveymonkey.com/>
- Swinkels, A. & Giuliano, T.A. (1995). The measurement and conceptualization of mood awareness: Monitoring and labelling one's mood states. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 934-949. doi: 10.1177/0146167295219008
- Taylor, C.A., & Sorenson, S.B. (2002). The nature of newspaper coverage of homicide. *Injury Prevention*, 7, 121-141. doi: 10.1136/ip.8.2.121
- Tewksbury, R. (2004). Experiences and attitudes of registered female sex offenders. *Federal Probation*, 68, 30-33.

<http://www.uscourts.gov/FederalCourts/ProbationPretrialServices/FederalProbationJournal.aspx>

- Trivits, L.C., & Reppucci, N.D. (2002). Application of Megan's Law to juveniles. *American Psychologist*, 57, 690-704. doi: 10.1037/0003-006X.57.9.690
- Truett, K.R. (1993). Age differences in conservatism. *Personality Individual Differences*, 14, 405-411. doi: 10.106/0191-8869(93)90309-Q
- Turner, M.G., & Sundt, J.L.(1995) 'Three strikes and you're out' legislation: A national assessment. *Federal Probation*, 59, 16-73. Retrieved from <http://www.uscourts.gov/FederalCourts/ProbationPretrialServices/FederalProbationJournal.aspx>
- Verkuil, P.R. (1971). Immunity or responsibility for unconstitutional conduct: The aftermath of Jackson State and Kent State. *North Carolina Law Review*, 50, 548. Retrieved from <http://nclawreview.net/>
- Vess, J. (2009). Fear and loathing in public policy: Ethical issues in laws for sex offenders. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 14, 264-272. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2009.04.004
- Vidmar, N. (1974). Retributive and utilitarian motives and other correlates of Canadian attitudes toward the death penalty. *The Canadian Psychologist*, 15, 337-356. doi: 10.1037/h0081769
- Waite, D., Keller, A., McGarvey, E.L., Wieckowski, E., Pinkerton, R., & Brown, G.L. (2005). Juvenile sex offender re-arrest rates for sexual, violent non-sexual and property crimes: A 10 year follow-up. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 17, 313-331. doi: 10.1007/s11194-005-5061-4.
- Walklate, S. (2005). Counting Crime. In Walklate, S. (Ed.). *Criminology: The Basics* (pp. 29-48). London: Routledge.
- Ward, T. (2007). On a clear day you can see forever: Integrating values and skills in sex offender treatment. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 13, 1-15. doi: 10.1080/13552600701794036
- Ward, T., & Birgden, A. (2007). Human rights and correctional clinical practice. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 12, 628-643. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2007.05.001
- Ward, T. & Brown, M. (2004). The good lives model and conceptual issues in offender rehabilitation. *Psychology, Crime and Law*, 10, 243-257. doi: 10.1080/10683160410001662744

- Ward, T., Day, A., Howells, K., & Birgden, A. (2004). The multifactor offender readiness model. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 9, 645-673. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2003.08.001
- Ward, T., & Gannon, T. (2006). Rehabilitation, etiology, and self-regulation: The Good Lives Model of sexual offender treatment. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 11, 77-94. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2005.06.001
- Ward, T., Gannon, T., & Birgden, A. (2007). Human rights and the treatment of sex offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 19, 195-216. doi: 10.1007/s11194-007-9053-4
- Ward, T., & Maruna, S. (2007). *Rehabilitation: Beyond the risk paradigm*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Ward, T., & Moreton, G. (2008). Moral repair with offenders: Ethical issues arising from victimization experiences. *Sexual Abuse*, 20, 305-322. doi: 10.1177/1079063208322423
- Weiner, B., Graham, S., & Reyna, C. (1997). An attributional examination of retributive versus utilitarian philosophies of punishment. *Social Justice Research*, 10, 431-452. doi: 10.1007/BF02683293
- Warr, M., & Stafford, M. (1984). Public goals of punishment and support for the death penalty. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 21, 95-111. doi: 10.1177/0022427884021002002
- Webster, D.M., & Kruglanski, A.W. (1994). Individual differences in need for cognitive closure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 1049-1062. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.67.6.1049
- Whitehead, P.R., Ward, T., & Collie, R.M. (2007). Time for a change: Applying the Good Lives Model of rehabilitation to a high-risk violent offender. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 51, 578-598. doi: 10.1177/0306624X06296236
- Whitley, B.E. (1999). Right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 126-134. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.77.1.126
- Williams, P. & Dickinson, J. (1993). Fear of Crime: Read all about it? The relationship between newspaper crime reporting and fear of crime. *British Journal of Criminology*, 33, 33-56. Retrieved from <http://bjc.oxfordjournals.org/>

- Willis, G.M., Levenson, J.S., & Ward, T. (2010). Desistance and attitudes towards sex offenders: Facilitation or hindrance? *Journal of Family Violence*, 25, 545-556. doi: 10.1007/s10896-010-9314-8
- Willis, G.M., & Ward, T. (2011). Striving for a good life: The Good Lives Model applied to released child molesters. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 17, 290-303. doi: 10.1080/13552600.2010.505349
- Yzerbyt, V., Corneille, O., & Estrada, C. (2001). The interplay of subjective essentialism and entitativity in the formation of stereotypes. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5, 141-155. doi: 10.1207/S15327957PSPR0502_5
- Yzerbyt, V.Y., Rogier, A., & Fiske, S.T. (1998). Group entitativity and social attribution: On translating situational constraints into stereotypes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 1089-110. doi: 10.1177/01461672982410006

Appendix A

Demographic Tables

Table A1

Demographic Data for Study 1

% of group	≤ 5	≤ 10	≤ 20	≤ 30	≤ 40	≤ 50	≤ 60	≤ 70	≤ 80	≤ 90	≤ 100
Males						80					
Females						79					
Missing	1										
19-24 years old				39							
24-30 years old		17									
31-37 years old			19								
38-43 years old			24								
44-49 years old		14									
50-56 years old		15									
57-62 years old		11									
63-68 years old	6										
69-74 years old	3										
75-80 years old	3										
≥ 81 years old	1										
% of group	≤ 5	≤ 10	≤ 20	≤ 30	≤ 40	≤ 50	≤ 60	≤ 70	≤ 80	≤ 90	≤ 100
Missing	1										
NZ European								101			
NZ Maori	6										
Pacific Island	2										
Asian		13									
New Zealander/Kiwi			27								

Table A3*Demographic Data Study 3a only*

% of group	≤ 5	≤ 10	≤ 20	≤ 30	≤ 40	≤ 50	≤ 60	≤ 70	≤ 80	≤ 90	≤ 100
Males					58						
Females								112			
Missing	2										
18-24 years old				39							
25-32 years old			21								
33-40 years old			27								
41-48 years old			19								
49-56 years old			25								
57-64 years old		16									
65-72 years old		11									
73-80 years old	8										
80-88 years old	2										
Missing	1										
NZ European										128	
% of group	≤ 5	≤ 10	≤ 20	≤ 30	≤ 40	≤ 50	≤ 60	≤ 70	≤ 80	≤ 90	≤ 100
NZ Maori	1										
Pacific Island	2										
Asian		13									
Middle Eastern	1										
Missing			27								
No formal education	7										
5 th or 6 th form certificate	6										
University Entrance			19								

Table A4*Demographic Data – 3b only*

% of group	≤ 5	≤ 10	≤ 20	≤ 30	≤ 40	≤ 50	≤ 60	≤ 70	≤ 80	≤ 90	≤ 100
Males				47							
Females									124		
Missing	3										
15 years old	1										
17-22 years old						76					
23-28 years old					57						
29-34 years old		13									
35-40 years old	6										
41-46 years old	5										
47-52 years old	6										
53-58 years old	3										
59-64 years old	2										
≥ 65 years old	1										
Missing	4										

Table A5*Demographic Data Study 3a and 3b combined*

% of group	≤ 5	≤ 10	≤ 20	≤ 30	≤ 40	≤ 50	≤ 60	≤ 70	≤ 80	≤ 90	≤ 100
Males				105							
Females								236			
Missing	10										
15 years old	1										
17-22 years old				106							

Table A6*Demographic Data Study 4a*

% of group	≤ 5	≤ 10	≤ 20	≤ 30	≤ 40	≤ 50	≤ 60	≤ 70	≤ 80	≤ 90	≤ 100
Males					224						
Females								459			
Missing	1										
16-18 years old							399				
19-21 years old				201							
22-27 years old		47									
28-33 years old	15										
34-39 years old	5										
40-45 years old	3										
≥ 46 years old	7										
Missing	5										
NZ European									539		
NZ Maori	3										
Pacific Island	27										
% of group	≤ 5	≤ 10	≤ 20	≤ 30	≤ 40	≤ 50	≤ 60	≤ 70	≤ 80	≤ 90	≤ 100
Asian		44									
Middle Eastern	3										
European	29										
North American	5										
South African	5										
New Zealander	4										
Other	6										
Missing			19								

New Zealand Citizen			600
Permanent Resident		65	
Other	19		
<hr/>			

Other	4
Missing	1

Appendix B

Information Sheet

Stephanie Fisher
MSc Student
stephanie.fisher@vuw.ac.nz

Dr. Matt Crawford
Lecturer
matt.crawford@vuw.ac.nz
(04) 463 6702

What is the purpose of this research?

- This research examines the way in which the media presents information about crime offenders and how media coverage affects public views of criminals, crime, and rehabilitation.

Who is conducting the research?

- Stephanie Fisher is a Masters student in the School of Psychology, and this research is supervised by Dr. Crawford. This research has been approved by the University ethics committee.

What is involved if you agree to participate?

- If you agree to participate in this study, you will first read a story about a particular rape crime. After you have read the story, you will be asked questions about the story as well as your views on crime and rehabilitation in general.
- We anticipate that your total involvement will take approximately 10 minutes.
- During the research you are free to withdraw at any point before your data have been collected.
- As a token of our appreciation, we offer a candy bar for your time and effort, at the end of the study.

Privacy and Confidentiality

- We will keep your consent forms and data for at least five years after publication.
- You will never be identified in my research project or in any other presentation or publication. The information you provide will be coded by number only.
- In accordance with the requirements of some scientific journals and organisations, your coded data may be shared with other competent researchers.
- Your coded data may be used in other, related studies.
- A copy of the coded data will remain in the custody of Dr. Crawford and will be kept in a locked cabinet in his office.

What happens to the information that you provide?

- The data you provide may be used for one or more of the following purposes:
 - The overall findings may be submitted for publication in a scientific journal, or presented at scientific conferences.
 - The overall findings may form part of a PhD thesis, Masters thesis, or Honours research project that will be submitted for assessment.

Please Turn Over

Statement of consent

I have read the information about this research and any questions I wanted to ask have been answered to my satisfaction.

I agree to participate in this research. I understand that I can withdraw my consent at any time prior to the end of my participation.

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Copy to:

[a] participant,

[b] researcher (initial both copies below)

I would like a copy of the summary of the results of this study YES / NO

Please send the summary to the following address (please write address below)

Or email: _____

Please read the following newspaper article carefully and then answer the questions relating to it on the following pages.

{FELLOW TRAVELLER VERSION}

Peter is a 27-year-old factory worker who has been convicted of raping a 20-year-old co-worker. His friends were shocked by this offence as they consider Peter to be a genuinely good person, and they feel that it must have been the influence of the situation that led to his offending. Peter has not been in trouble with the law before. Peter comes from a working class family and believes that his parents are disappointed in him for not becoming successful like his two siblings, who are both lawyers, leading Peter to feel inadequate and unwanted.

The crime in question occurred during the staff Christmas party, where both parties had been drinking heavily throughout the night. Peter had expressed his interest in this particular co-worker previously and his friends feel that Peter was simply making understandable advances toward the woman. Peter's co-workers describe him as "one of the guys", and feel that he shares their interests and values.

At the trial Peter testified that he never intended to harm the female victim, and thought that what he was doing was consensual. He now sees that he was wrong and that his actions were indeed harmful. The judge commented on Peter's willingness to acknowledge that he had made a mistake and his commitment to enter a treatment program for sex offenders.

When convicting Peter the judge accepted that he was a previously good member of the community who had made a mistake and that he now needed the help of his community to get back on track.

Please read the following newspaper article carefully and then answer the questions relating to it on the following pages.

{MORAL STRANGER VERSION}

Peter is a 27-year-old factory worker who has been convicted of raping a 20-year-old co-worker. His acquaintances were not shocked by this offence, as he has done similar things before. Peter has been in trouble with the law before, a number of times. Peter comes from a working class family and believes that his parents are disappointed in him for not becoming successful like his two siblings, who are both lawyers. He appears quite unconcerned by their lack of approval.

The crime in question occurred during the staff Christmas party, where both parties had been drinking throughout the night, although Peter had not been drinking particularly heavily. Peter had made a number of sexual comments about this particular co-worker previously and his friends feel that he went too far with his advances toward the woman. Peter's co-workers describe him as "not one of the guys", and feel that he does not share their interests and values.

At the trial Peter appeared to be unconcerned by any harm experienced by the female victim, and thought that what he was doing was consensual. He does not think that he was wrong or that his actions were harmful. The judge commented on Peter's unwillingness to acknowledge that he had made a mistake and his lack of commitment to enter a treatment program for sex offenders.

When convicting Peter the judge described him as an outsider to the community, who had made a number of inexcusable mistakes, and that he was disinclined to receive help to get his life back on track.

Think about the news article that you have just read. The items below concern your impressions or opinions of the cause or causes of this act. Circle one number following each item.

Is the cause something that: reflects an aspect of Peter	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	reflects an aspect of the situation
manageable by Peter	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	not manageable by Peter
permanent	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	temporary
Peter can regulate	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Peter cannot regulate
over which others have control	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	over which others have no control
inside of Peter	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	outside of Peter
stable over time	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	variable over time
under the power of others	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	not under the power of others
Something about Peter	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	something about others
over which Peter has power	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	over which Peter has no power
unchangeable	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	changeable
other people can regulate	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	other people cannot regulate

1. How serious is this crime?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all Moderately Extremely

2. How severe should the punishment for this crime be?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all Moderately Extremely

3. What do you think is the appropriate punishment for this crime?
(circle the option that fits best)

- a. Reparation
 - b. Home detention
 - c. Supervision
 - d. Community Work
 - e. Imprisonment
 - f. Preventive Detention
 - g. Life Imprisonment
 - h. A combination of the above, please specify
(i.e. reparation and imprisonment):
-

5. How likely do you believe that this specific offender will commit this specific crime again?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all Moderately Extremely

6. How likely do you believe it is that the above offender will re-offend (in general)?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all Moderately Extremely

7. How likely do you believe it is that this offence will occur again in the community? (not necessarily by the same offender)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all Moderately Extremely

8. How likely do you believe it is that the above offender will be helped by rehabilitation programs?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all Moderately Extremely

9. How morally outraged are you by this crime?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all Moderately Extremely

10. To what extent was your punishment decision based on a desire to make sure that the above offender is discouraged from committing this crime again?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all Moderately Completely

11. To what extent was your punishment decision based on the desire to make the above offender pay for what he has done?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all Moderately Completely

12. Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

- 1 = strongly disagree
- 2 = disagree
- 3 = neither agree nor disagree
- 4 = agree
- 5 = strongly agree

- _____ Prison sentences in New Zealand are not tough enough
- _____ Crime in New Zealand is on the rise
- _____ Rehabilitation should be an important focus of the prison system
- _____ The New Zealand Justice System is too lenient on criminals
- _____ The main purpose of sentencing should be punishment
- _____ Treatment programs should be readily available to offenders within prison.
- _____ Offenders receive adequate punishment for their crimes in New Zealand
- _____ Offenders are paroled too early in New Zealand
- _____ Prison is an effective deterrent to potential offenders
- _____ Rehabilitation is ineffective and a waste of taxpayers money.

Sometimes we think about how events could have turned out differently. For example, you might think “If only I had left five minutes earlier, I would have caught my bus,” or perhaps you might think, “At least I was not late for the meeting.”

Please think about the events that you read about in the newspaper story and how you think it might have turned out differently. Please give us these thoughts in the space provided below.

Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by writing the number that corresponds to your opinion next to each statement.

- 1 = strongly disagree
 2 = disagree
 3 = neither agree nor disagree
 4 = agree
 5 = strongly agree

- _____ The kind of person someone is, is something very basic about them and it can't be changed much
- _____ People can do things differently, but the important parts of who they are can't really be changed.
- _____ Everyone, no matter who they are, can significantly change their basic characteristics.
- _____ As much as I hate to admit it, you can't teach an old dog new tricks. People can't really change their deepest attributes.
- _____ People can always substantially change the kind of person they are.
- _____ Everyone is a certain kind of person, and there is not much that can be done to really change that.
- _____ No matter what kind of person someone is, they can always change very much.
- _____ All people change even their most basic qualities.
- _____ A person's moral character is something basic about them and can't be changed much.
- _____ Whether a person is responsible and sincere or not is deeply ingrained in their personality. It cannot be changed very much.
- _____ There is not much that can be done to change a person's moral traits (e.g. conscientiousness, uprightness, and honesty).

Demographic information

1. What is your gender? (circle one) Male Female
2. What is your age? _____(years)
3. Highest level of education achieved? _____
4. If currently working, what is your profession? _____
5. Ethnicity _____
6. Are you (circle one): New Zealand citizen
 Permanent resident

Thank you for your time and your participation, please give this questionnaire back to the researcher and she will give you an explanation sheet.

Debriefing Statement

Thank you for participating in this study.

This study focuses on how media coverage of crime affects how the public views crime, criminal offenders, and rehabilitation.

The media is a pervasive aspect of modern life. The consumption of news is a daily occurrence for most people; whether it is reading the newspaper, watching the 6 o'clock news or checking the latest bulletins on the internet. A significant proportion of the items presented in the news are negative and involve some aspect of crime, whether that be a single offence, an investigation by the police, or a report on a particular type of crime that had become prevalent in recent times. How crimes are presented affects how we think about crime.

At present there are two view-points on issues relating to corrections, crime, offenders, and rehabilitation. One view is that community protection is more important than the rights of the individual offender. In other words, the offender has given up his or her rights because of the crime committed and their needs are less important than the community. The other view is that the rights of the offender are as important as those of the community as a whole. That is, the offender has not forfeited his or her rights by offending, but should have some rights limited as punishment.

Successful and ethical treatment incorporates the rights of the offender along with the needs of the community, and each offender needs to be treated as a unique and individual case, and as such will have their own special requirements, while there is an overall system in place that provides the framework for treatment. If the media representations of crime, offenders and rehabilitation are skewed in a particular direction then it may be difficult for the incorporation of these two differing view-points to occur.

Policy directly affects the way that the Department of Corrections works in New Zealand. If the public have a skewed view of the area of crime, then they are likely to demand action from policy makers that is in line with these skewed views. If this skewed view is negative then this action may actually be detrimental to the system and to the individuals involved in it, being the offenders, and corrections workers.

Again, thank you for your participation. If you have further questions, please feel free to contact either Stephanie Fisher (Stephanie.Fisher@vuw.ac.nz) or Dr. Matt Crawford (Matt.Crawford@vuw.ac.nz) at the School of Psychology, Victoria University of Wellington.

Appendix C

Please read the following newspaper article carefully and then answer the questions relating to it on the following pages.

Peter is a 27-year-old factory worker who has been convicted of raping a 20-year-old co-worker. His acquaintances were not shocked by this offence, as he has done similar things before. Peter has been in trouble with the law before, a number of times. Peter comes from a working class family and believes that his parents are disappointed in him for not becoming successful like his two siblings, who are both lawyers. He appears quite unconcerned by their lack of approval.

The crime in question occurred during the staff Christmas party, where both parties had been drinking throughout the night, although Peter had not been drinking particularly heavily. Peter had made a number of sexual comments about this particular co-worker previously and his friends feel that he went too far with his advances toward the woman. Peter's co-workers describe him as "not one of the guys", and feel that he does not share their interests and values.

At the trial Peter appeared to be unconcerned by any harm experienced by the female victim, and thought that what he was doing was consensual. He does not think that he was wrong or that his actions were harmful. The judge commented on Peter's unwillingness to acknowledge that he had made a mistake and his lack of commitment to enter a treatment program for sex offenders.

When convicting Peter the judge described him as an outsider to the community, who had made a number of inexcusable mistakes, and that he was disinclined to receive help to get his life back on track.

Please answer the following questions in relation to the article that you read on the previous page. Using the scale below, please indicate your beliefs in relation to each item by writing the number that corresponds to your opinion next to each statement.

1 = not at all
 2 = slightly
 3 = somewhat
 4 = moderately
 5 = quite
 6 = very
 7 = extremely

- _____ 1. How serious is this crime?
- _____ 2. How severe should the punishment for this crime be?
- _____ 3. How likely do you believe it is that this specific offender will commit this specific crime again?
- _____ 4. How likely do you believe it is that this specific offender will re-offend (in general)?
- _____ 5. How likely do you believe it is that this offender will be helped by rehabilitation programs?
- _____ 6. Do you think that this offender should have treatment and rehabilitation programs made readily available to him?
- _____ 7. Would you be accepting of this offender reintegrating into your community once he had completed his punishment (whatever that is)?
- _____ 8. Is the cause of this act something that reflects an aspect of Peter?
- _____ 9. Is the cause of this act something that is manageable by Peter?
- _____ 10. Is the cause of this act something that Peter can regulate?
- _____ 11. Is the cause of this act something that is inside of Peter?
- _____ 12. Is the cause of this act something about Peter?
- _____ 13. Is the cause of this act something over which Peter has control?

14. How morally outraged are you by this crime?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 Not at all Moderately Extremely

15. To what extent was your punishment decision based on a desire to make sure that this offender is discouraged from committing this crime again?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 Not at all Moderately Completely

16. To what extent was your punishment decision based on the desire to make this offender pay for what he has done?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 Not at all Moderately Completely

17. Was Peter aware that his actions were a criminal act for which he could be prosecuted?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 Not at all Moderately Completely

18. Did Peter intend to commit a crime?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 Not at all Moderately Definitely

19. How responsible is Peter for the crime?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 Not at all Moderately Completely

Please rate Peter on the following traits (circle the number that represents where you think Peter would fall on the scale between the two traits)

20. Dishonest
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Honest

21. Bad
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Good

22. Unfriendly
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Friendly

23. Unlikeable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Likeable

24. Unempathic
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Empathic

25. Unremorseful
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Remorseful

26. Self-focused
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Other-focused

27. Malevolent
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Misguided

28. Violent
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Non-violent

29. Dangerous
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Harmless

30. Aggressive
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Passive

31. Hostile
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Non-hostile

Demographic information

1. What is your gender? (circle one) Male Female
2. What is your age? _____(years)
3. Highest level of education achieved? _____
4. If currently working, what is your profession? _____
5. Ethnicity _____
6. Are you (circle one): New Zealand citizen
 Permanent resident

Thank you

For your time and your participation, please give this questionnaire back to the researcher and she will give you an explanation sheet.

Appendix D

Item Generation for the Fellow Traveller v Moral Stranger Scale

Bad circumstances/bad person.

- Most offenders are bad people
- Most offenders are regular people
- Offenders often commit crime because their circumstances dictate that they have few other choices
- Crime occurs because offenders are bad people
- Bad circumstances are often involved in why a person commits crime

Part of society/not part of society.

- I would be accepting of an offender being released on parole into my community
- Offenders deserve a second chance
- Those who commit crime are no longer part of the community
- The community needs to be protected from offenders
- Those who commit crime are very different from the rest of society
- Most offenders still deserve to be a part of the community

Can understand the individual's motivations to commit the crime/cannot understand the individual's motivations to commit the crime.

- I can, at times, understand how a person comes to commit a crime
- It is never understandable what drives people to commit crime
- It is often understandable why someone commits a crime
- An offender's motivations are similar to most other people's

Can understand the person (i.e. their needs/interests)/cannot understand the person (i.e. their needs/interests)

- It is hard to understand the needs and interests of those who commit crime
- Offenders are just trying to provide for themselves and their family
- By choosing to commit crime offenders are demonstrating that they have different needs and interests to most people
- Even though they have done something bad, offenders still share similar needs and interests to the rest of society
- Most people can understand the needs and interests of offenders

Unintentional harm caused/intentional harm caused.

- Often offenders do not mean to cause the harm that they do
- Offenders know full well that their actions will cause others harm
- Criminal acts are often spontaneous
- Offenders have often not thought about the consequences of their actions
- Offenders don't usually intend to cause harm to others

Impaired mental state/unimpaired mental state.

- Alcohol or drug abuse can never excuse offending
- Offending often occurs when a person is under the influence of drugs or alcohol
- Those who commit crime are often impaired in their decision-making ability
- Offenders do not have an excuse for their criminal actions
- Even if an offender is under the influence of drugs or alcohol they know that their actions are wrong

Seeking redemption/indifferent to gaining redemption.

- Offenders usually want to be forgiven
- Offenders want to redeem themselves
- Offenders do not care about gaining forgiveness from their victims
- Offenders are indifferent to gaining redemption
- Offenders have no desire for their victims to forgive them

Adverse, exceptional (background) circumstances/unexceptional (background) circumstances.

- Regardless of what may have happened in their past offenders know the difference between right and wrong
- Bad circumstances can never excuse an offender's actions
- Offender's cannot use the excuse of a bad background for their actions
- Those who commit crime often come from adverse and exceptional backgrounds
- An offenders background shapes who they are and what they do

Same or similar beliefs and values held by the individual/alien beliefs and values held by the individual.

- Offenders are like most people
- Offenders hold similar values and beliefs to most others in society

- It is hard to understand offenders because they hold vastly different beliefs and values from most of society
- Those who commit crime hold very different beliefs and values to most people
- Offenders do not hold vastly different beliefs and values to most others in society

Has potential to be rehabilitated/cannot be rehabilitated.

- Everyone can change who they are, and offenders are no exception to this
- Offenders cannot be rehabilitated
- Offenders are not able to change their ways
- Like regular people, offenders can change
- If given the resources, offenders will be able to change their ways

Motivated to change/unmotivated to change.

- Offenders want to change
- Those who commit crime have no desire to change who they are
- Offenders are not interested in changing their ways
- Offenders just want to serve their sentence and get out
- Offenders are motivated to change
- Those who commit crime do not want to continue to do so

Subject/object.

- Treatment and rehabilitation decisions should be made in consultation with the offender
- Treatment and rehabilitation decisions should be made for the offender by the authorities
- Offenders should not be consulted about their treatment plan
- Offenders should not get a say in their prison-based treatment
- Offenders should just do as they are told within the treatment setting

Can see that own actions were bad, wrong, harmful/does not deem own actions to be bad, wrong, harmful.

- Offenders don't understand that what they have done is wrong or bad
- Offenders don't believe that what they have done is wrong or bad
- Like regular people, offenders know that their actions are wrong and harmful
- After the fact, offenders can often identify that their actions were wrong and harmful
- An offender's judgement can be clouded at the time that they commit a crime

Unlikely to reoffend/likely to reoffend

- Once someone has committed a crime they will continue to do so
- No matter what punishment an offender receives they will continue to offend
- Once offenders are out of prison they will continue to commit crime
- Those who commit crime will not always continue to do so
- Offenders can stop offending

Appendix E

Sticker on front of envelopes

Fill out a questionnaire and be in to win one of give \$50 vouchers.

The questionnaire will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. To return the completed questionnaire, we have included a pre-addressed FreePost envelope.

This research is being conduct by Stephanie Fisher, a PhD student at Victoria University of Wellington (under the supervision of Drs. Matt Crawford and Tony Ward).

Thank you for your consideration.

Dear Resident,

My name is Stephanie Fisher and I am a PhD student within the School of Psychology at Victoria University of Wellington. As part of my research I am asking people to complete a questionnaire about opinions of criminal offenders. This questionnaire is enclosed within this envelope. If you are interested in participating in this research then all you need to do is read the enclosed information sheet, and if you agree to this, then sign and date the back of the form. Then you can go ahead and complete the questionnaire.

Once you have completed the questionnaire please put this and the signed information sheet in the return envelope. Also complete your details on the enclosed form to go into the draw to win one of five \$50 gift vouchers, and include this in the return envelope. Once you have all of the materials in the return envelope then please seal this and post it at your earliest convenience.

Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter and I really appreciate it if you are able to complete the questionnaire and return it to Victoria University.

Kind Regards

Stephanie Fisher

Information Sheet

Stephanie Fisher

PhD Student

stephanie.fisher@vuw.ac.nz

Dr. Matt Crawford

Senior Lecturer

matt.crawford@vuw.ac.nz
(04) 463 6702

Prof. Tony Ward

Professor

tony.ward@vuw.ac.nz
(04) 463 6789

What is the purpose of this research?

- This research aims to develop an understanding of what opinions people hold about criminal offenders.

Who is conducting the research?

- Stephanie Fisher is a PhD student in the School of Psychology, and this research is supervised by Dr. Crawford and Prof. Tony Ward. This research has been approved by the Victoria University ethics committee.

What is involved if you agree to participate?

- If you agree to participate in this study, you be asked to complete a 3-page questionnaire. This will involve indicating your level of agreement or disagreement with a number of items relating to criminal offenders. You will also be asked a few other questions relating to your experience of crime and offenders, and you will be asked for some basic demographic information.
- We anticipate that your total involvement will take approximately 15-20 minutes.
- During the research you are free to withdraw at any point before your data have been collected.
- As a token of our appreciation, we offer you the chance to win one of five \$50 gift vouchers (from a number of options).

Privacy and Confidentiality

- We will keep your consent forms and data for at least five years after publication.
- You will never be identified in this research project or in any other presentation or publication. The information you provide will be coded by number only.
- In accordance with the requirements of some scientific journals and organisations, your coded data may be shared with other competent researchers.
- Your coded data may be used in other, related studies.
- A copy of the coded data will remain in the custody of Dr. Crawford and will be kept in a locked cabinet in his office.

What happens to the information that you provide?

- The data you provide may be used for one or more of the following purposes:
 - The overall findings may be submitted for publication in a scientific journal, or presented at scientific conferences.
 - The overall findings may form part of a PhD thesis, Masters thesis, or Honours research project that will be submitted for assessment.

Please Turn Over

Statement of consent

I have read the information about this research and any questions I wanted to ask have been answered to my satisfaction.

I agree to participate in this research. I understand that I can withdraw my consent at any time prior to the end of my participation.

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Copy to:

[a] participant,

[b] researcher (initial both copies below)

I would like a copy of the summary of the results of this study YES / NO

Please send the summary to the following address (please write address below)

Or e-mail: _____

BE IN TO WIN ONE OF FIVE \$50 VOUCHERS!

Complete the enclosed survey and fill in your details below, and we will enter you in a draw to win one of five \$50 vouchers for either: groceries (New World or PAK 'n SAVE), Reading cinema, the CD/DVD store, or Whitcoull's – your choice!

Please print clearly:

Name _____

Contact phone or email -

PART 1:

Using the scale below please circle the number next to each item that best represents your level of agreement/disagreement with that item. Circle one number per item.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Somewhat Disagree	4 Unsure / Neutral	5 Somewhat Agree	6 Agree	7 Strongly Agree				
The community needs to be protected from offenders				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most offenders are bad people				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
An offender's motivations are similar to most other people's				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Anybody has the potential to commit a crime				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
An offender's background shapes who they are and what they do				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Those who commit crime want to redeem themselves				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Bad circumstances can never excuse an offender's actions				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders are like most people				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Often offenders do not mean to cause the harm that they do				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
By choosing to commit crime offenders are demonstrating that they have different needs and interests to most people				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Alcohol or drug abuse can never excuse offending				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders usually want to be forgiven				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
It is hard to understand the needs and interests of those who commit crime				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders cannot be rehabilitated				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders should have a say in their treatment				1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Using the scale below please circle the number next to each item that best represents your level of

agreement/disagreement with that item. Circle one number per item.										
1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Somewhat Disagree	4 Unsure / Neutral	5 Somewhat Agree	6 Agree	7 Strongly Agree				
Those who commit crime hold very different beliefs and values to most people				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders want to change				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
After committing a crime offenders often feel remorse				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most offenders will continue to offend once they are released from prison				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders don't understand that what they have done is wrong or bad				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most offenders are regular people				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Those who commit crime are no longer part of the community				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
It is not possible to understand why people commit crime				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders are just trying to provide for themselves and their family				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Criminal acts are often spontaneous				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders do not have a legitimate excuse for their criminal actions				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Those who commit crime are indifferent to gaining redemption				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Regardless of their past experiences offenders know the difference between right and wrong				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders do not hold vastly different beliefs and values to ordinary citizens				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Like regular people, offenders can change				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders just want to serve their sentence and get out				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders should not get a say in their prison-based treatment				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Using the scale below please circle the number next to each item that best represents your level of agreement/disagreement with that item. Circle one number per item.										

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Somewhat Disagree	4 Unsure / Neutral	5 Somewhat Agree	6 Agree	7 Strongly Agree
--	-----------------------------	--	---	---	--------------------------	---

Offenders' judgement can be impaired when they commit crimes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Once someone has committed a crime they will continue to do so	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

People who commit crimes have made poor decisions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Offenders often commit crime because their circumstances dictate that they have few other choices	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Crime often occurs because offenders are bad people	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Most offenders still deserve to be a part of the community	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I would be accepting of an offender being released on parole into my community	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

It is often understandable why someone commits a crime	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Offenders have similar needs and interests to the rest of society	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Offenders don't usually intend to cause harm to others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Even if under the influence of drugs and alcohol offenders know that their actions are wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Offenders do not care about gaining forgiveness from their victims	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

An offender's background circumstances, no matter how bad, do not excuse their offending	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Offenders hold similar values and beliefs to most others in society	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Everyone can change who they are, and offenders are no exception to this	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Bad circumstances often contribute to people committing crimes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Using the scale below please circle the number next to each item that best represents your level of agreement/disagreement with that item. Circle one number per item.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Somewhat Disagree	4 Unsure / Neutral	5 Somewhat Agree	6 Agree	7 Strongly Agree
--	-----------------------------	--	---	---	--------------------------	---

It is hard to understand offenders because they hold vastly different beliefs and values from the rest of us

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Offenders should not be consulted about their treatment plan

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

No matter what punishment an offender receives they will continue to offend

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Offenders don't believe that what they have done is wrong or bad

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Those who commit crime can stop offending

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Those who commit crime have no desire to change who they are

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Offenders deserve a second chance

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I can sometimes understand how a person comes to commit a crime

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Most people can understand the needs and interests of offenders

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Offenders have often not thought about the consequences of their actions

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Those who commit crime are often impaired in their decision-making ability

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Offender's cannot use the excuse of a bad background for their actions

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Offenders know full well that their actions will cause others harm

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

If given the opportunity offenders will be able to change their ways

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Those who commit crime do not want to continue to do so

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Offenders should just do as they are told within the treatment setting

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Using the scale below please circle the number next to each item that best represents your level of agreement/disagreement with that item. Circle one number per item.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Somewhat Disagree	4 Unsure / Neutral	5 Somewhat Agree	6 Agree	7 Strongly Agree
--	-----------------------------	--	---	---	--------------------------	---

Even if offenders experience adverse life events they still know that their actions are wrong

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Those who commit crime are very different from the rest of society

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Offenders are not able to change their ways

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Offenders are not interested in changing their ways

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Treatment and rehabilitation decisions should be made for the offender by the authorities

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Those who commit crime will not always continue to do so

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Offenders know that their actions are wrong and harmful

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Offenders are motivated to change

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Please continue to the next page.

PART 2:

Please indicate your answer for the following questions using the scale below.
Circle one number per question.

1 Very Different	2 Different	3 Somewhat Different	4 Unsure / Neutral	5 Somewhat Similar	6 Similar	7 Very Similar
---	------------------------------	---	---	---	----------------------------	---

How similar are offenders' beliefs to the rest of society? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

How similar are offenders' values to the rest of society? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Please indicate your answer for the following questions using the scale below.

1 Not at all	2 Minimally	3 A little	4 Unsure / Neutral	5 Somewhat	6 Quite a bit	7 A lot
-------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	---	-----------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------

How much of an influence does negative background circumstances have on an offender's behaviour? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

How much does drug and alcohol use explain the behaviour of offenders? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

How much contact have you had with offenders in your life? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

How much experience have you had with crime in your life? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Circle one option to answer the following questions:

Have you ever committed a crime? Yes No

Have you ever been convicted of a crime? Yes No

Have you been the victim of a crime? Yes No

If yes, have you been the victim of a violent crime? Yes No

Has anyone close to you been the victim of a crime? Yes No

If yes, were they the victim of a violent crime? Yes No

PART 3: Demographic Information

1. What is your gender? (check one) ☐ Male ☐ Female

2. What is your age? _____ (years)

3. Highest level of education achieved (check one):
 - ☐ No formal qualification
 - ☐ Year 10 or 11/Fifth or Sixth Form Certificate
 - ☐ University Entrance
 - ☐ Post-School Certificate
 - ☐ Post-School Diploma
 - ☐ Tertiary
 - ☐ Post-Graduate
 - ☐ Other (please specify) _____

4. If currently working, what is your profession? _____

5. Ethnicity (check one):
 - ☐ NZ European
 - ☐ Maori
 - ☐ Pacific Island
 - ☐ Asian
 - ☐ Middle Eastern
 - ☐ Other (please specify) _____

6. Are you a (check one):
 - ☐ New Zealand Citizen
 - ☐ Permanent Resident

Thank you for your participation in this study

Please fold and place the completed survey into the pre-addressed freepost envelope that was included in your information packet and post from any post box. Also, please include your signed information/consent form and the filled out ticket to be entered into the \$50 voucher drawings.

If you would like to make any comments about the survey, please feel free to write on the back of this page.

Appendix F

Information Sheet

Stephanie Fisher
PhD Student
stephanie.fisher@vuw.ac.nz

Dr. Matt Crawford
Senior Lecturer
matt.crawford@vuw.ac.nz
(04) 463 6702

Prof. Tony Ward
Professor
tony.ward@vuw.ac.nz
(04) 463 6789

What is the purpose of this research?

- This research aims to develop an understanding of what opinions people hold about criminal offenders.

Who is conducting the research?

- Stephanie Fisher is a PhD student in the School of Psychology, and this research is supervised by Dr. Crawford and Prof. Tony Ward. This research has been approved by the Victoria University ethics committee.

What is involved if you agree to participate?

- If you agree to participate in this study, you be asked to complete a short questionnaire. This will involve indicating your level of agreement or disagreement with a number of items relating to criminal offenders. You will also be asked a few other questions relating to your experience of crime and offenders, and you will be asked for some basic demographic information.
- We anticipate that your total involvement will take approximately 3-4 minutes.
- During the research you are free to withdraw at any point before your data have been collected.

Privacy and Confidentiality

- We will keep your consent forms and data for at least five years after publication.
- You will never be identified in this research project or in any other presentation or publication. The information you provide will be coded by number only.
- In accordance with the requirements of some scientific journals and organisations, your coded data may be shared with other competent researchers.
- Your coded data may be used in other, related studies.
- A copy of the coded data will remain in the custody of Dr. Crawford and will be kept in a locked cabinet in his office.

What happens to the information that you provide?

- The data you provide may be used for one or more of the following purposes:
 - The overall findings may be submitted for publication in a scientific journal, or presented at scientific conferences.
 - The overall findings may form part of a PhD thesis, Masters thesis, or Honours research project that will be submitted for assessment.

Using the scale below please circle the number next to each item that best represents your level of agreement/disagreement with that item. Circle one number per item.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Somewhat Disagree	4 Unsure / Neutral	5 Somewhat Agree	6 Agree	7 Strongly Agree				
Like regular people, offenders can change				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders cannot use the excuse of a bad background for their actions				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Those who commit crime do not want to continue to do so				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most offenders are regular people				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders do not hold vastly different beliefs and values to ordinary citizens				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
It is not possible to understand why people commit crime				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders usually want to be forgiven				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders have similar needs and interests to the rest of society				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Bad circumstances can never excuse an offender’s actions				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Those who commit crime want to redeem themselves				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Criminal acts are often spontaneous				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders do not have a legitimate excuse for their criminal offending				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Those who commit crime can stop offending				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Those who commit crime are often impaired in their decision-making ability				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders cannot be rehabilitated				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Those who commit crime hold vastly different beliefs and values to				1	2	3	4	5	6	7

most people

Using the scale below please circle the number next to each item that best represents your level of agreement/disagreement with that item. Circle one number per item.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Somewhat Disagree	4 Unsure / Neutral	5 Somewhat Agree	6 Agree	7 Strongly Agree				
Offenders' judgement can be impaired when they commit crimes				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders want to change				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Alcohol or drug abuse can never excuse offending				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
It is hard to understand the needs and interests of those who commit crime				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders have often not thought about the consequences of their actions				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
It is hard to understand offenders because they hold vastly different beliefs and values from the rest of us				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders are not able to change their ways				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders hold similar values and beliefs to most others in society				1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1. What is your gender? (check one) ☐ Male ☐ Female

2. What is your age? _____ (years)

3. Ethnicity (check one):

- ☐ NZ European
- ☐ Maori
- ☐ Pacific Island
- ☐ Asian
- ☐ Middle Eastern
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

4. Are you a (check one):

- ☐ New Zealand Citizen
- ☐ Permanent Resident
- ☐ Other

Thank you for your participation in this study

Appendix G

Information Sheet

Stephanie Fisher

PhD Student

stephanie.fisher@vuw.ac.nz

Dr. Matt Crawford

Senior Lecturer

matt.crawford@vuw.ac.nz
(04) 463 6702

Prof. Tony Ward

Professor

tony.ward@vuw.ac.nz
(04) 463 6789

What is the purpose of this research?

- This research aims to develop an understanding of what opinions people hold about criminal offenders.

Who is conducting the research?

- Stephanie Fisher is a PhD student in the School of Psychology, and this research is supervised by Dr. Crawford and Prof. Tony Ward. This research has been approved by the Victoria University ethics committee.

What is involved if you agree to participate?

- If you agree to participate in this study, you be asked to complete a short questionnaire. This will involve indicating your level of agreement or disagreement with a number of items relating to criminal offenders. You will also be asked a few other questions relating to your experience of crime and offenders, and you will be asked for some basic demographic information.
- We anticipate that your total involvement will take approximately 3-4 minutes.
- During the research you are free to withdraw at any point before your data have been collected.

Privacy and Confidentiality

- We will keep your consent forms and data for at least five years after publication.
- You will never be identified in this research project or in any other presentation or publication. The information you provide will be coded by number only.
- In accordance with the requirements of some scientific journals and organisations, your coded data may be shared with other competent researchers.
- Your coded data may be used in other, related studies.
- A copy of the coded data will remain in the custody of Dr. Crawford and will be kept in a locked cabinet in his office.

What happens to the information that you provide?

- The data you provide may be used for one or more of the following purposes:
 - The overall findings may be submitted for publication in a scientific journal, or presented at scientific conferences.
 - The overall findings may form part of a PhD thesis, Masters thesis, or Honours research project that will be submitted for assessment.

Using the scale below please circle the number next to each item that best represents your level of agreement/disagreement with that item. Circle one number per item.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Somewhat Disagree	4 Unsure / Neutral	5 Somewhat Agree	6 Agree	7 Strongly Agree	
Like regular people, offenders can change	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders cannot use the excuse of a bad background for their actions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Those who commit crime do not want to continue to do so	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most offenders are regular people	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders do not hold vastly different beliefs and values to ordinary citizens	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
It is not possible to understand why people commit crime	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders usually want to be forgiven	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders have similar needs and interests to the rest of society	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Bad circumstances can never excuse an offender’s actions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Those who commit crime want to redeem themselves	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Criminal acts are often spontaneous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders do not have a legitimate excuse for their criminal offending	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Those who commit crime can stop offending	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Those who commit crime are often impaired in their decision-making ability	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Offenders cannot be rehabilitated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Those who commit crime hold vastly different beliefs and
values to most people

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Please continue to the next page.

Using the scale below please circle the number next to each item that best represents your level of agreement/disagreement with that item. Circle one number per item.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Somewhat Disagree	4 Unsure / Neutral	5 Somewhat Agree	6 Agree	7 Strongly Agree
--	-----------------------------	--	---	---	--------------------------	---

Offenders' judgement can be impaired when they commit crimes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Offenders want to change	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Alcohol or drug abuse can never excuse offending	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

It is hard to understand the needs and interests of those who commit crime	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Offenders have often not thought about the consequences of their actions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

It is hard to understand offenders because they hold vastly different beliefs and values from the rest of us	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Offenders are not able to change their ways	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Offenders hold similar values and beliefs to most others in society	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Punitiveness Orientation Scale

It's unreasonable to give people stiff prison sentences simply for possessing small quantities of drugs for personal use	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

In most cases probation is simply an unjustified way of putting criminals back on the street	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

The death penalty is never an appropriate punishment, even for murder	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Three-time losers deserve to be sentenced to life without the possibility of parole	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Spanking is often the most effective way to teach children not to hit others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Punishment simply for the purpose of getting revenge is unacceptable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

The courts should do everything they can to prevent law enforcement officers from physically harming or intimidating crimes suspects 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Physically punishing misbehaving children may hurt them in the short run, but will help them in the long run 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Teachers should be forbidden to physically punish children who misbehave 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I would never personally throw the switch to execute a condemned prisoner, no matter what his crime might have been 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I think private citizens should take matters into their own hands if the courts are unwilling to punish criminals properly 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

People should never kick or hit their pets 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

If children refuse to eat what their parents serve them, they should be required to stay at the table until they change their minds 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

If your teenagers use drugs, you should turn them into the police 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

If I were a juror I wouldn't hesitate to cast the decisive vote to send a murderer to death row 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Dweck Scale

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Unsure / Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

The kind of person someone is, is something very basic about them and it can't be changed 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

People can do things differently, but the important parts of who they are can't really be changed 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Everyone, no matter who they are, can significantly change their basic characteristics	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

As much as I hate to admit it, you can't teach an old dog new tricks. People can't really change their deepest attributes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

People can always substantially change the kind of person they are	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Everyone is a certain kind of person, and there is not much that can be done to change that	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

No matter what kind of person someone is, they can always change very much	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

All people change even their most basic qualities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

A person's moral character is something basic about them and can't be changed much	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Whether a person is responsible and sincere or not is deeply ingrained in their personality. It cannot be changed very much	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

There is not much that can be done to change a person's moral traits (e.g. conscientiousness, uprightness, and honesty)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

The Need to Evaluate

1 Extremely Uncharacteristic	2 Uncharacteristic	3 Somewhat Uncharacteristic	4 Unsure / Neutral	5 Somewhat Characteristic	6 Characteristic	7 Extremely Characteristic
---	------------------------------	--	---------------------------------	--	----------------------------	---

I form opinions about everything	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
----------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I prefer to avoid taking extreme positions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

It is very important to me to hold strong opinions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I want to know exactly what is good and bad about everything	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I often prefer to remain neutral about complex issues	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
If something does not affect me, I do not usually determine if it is good or bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I enjoy strongly liking and disliking new things	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
There are many things for which I do not have a preference	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
It bothers me to remain neutral	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I like to have strong opinions even when I am not personally involved	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I have many more opinions than the average person	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I would rather have a strong opinion than no opinion at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I pay a lot of attention to whether things are good or bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I only form strong opinions when I have to	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I like to decide that new things are really good or really bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I am pretty much indifferent to many important issues	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Attributional Complexity Scale

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Somewhat Disagree	4 Unsure / Neutral	5 Somewhat Agree	6 Agree	7 Strongly Agree
----------------------------------	----------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------

I don't usually bother to analyse and explain people's behaviour	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Once I have figured out a single cause for a person's behaviour I don't usually go any further	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I believe it is important to analyse and understand our own thinking processes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I think a lot about the influence that I have on people's behaviour	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

I have found that relationships between a person's attitudes, beliefs, and character traits are usually simple and straightforward	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

If I see people behaving in a really strange or unusual manner, I usually put it down to the fact that they are strange or unusual people and don't bother to explain it any further	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I have thought a lot about the family background and personal history of people who are close to me, in order to understand why they are the sort of people they are	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I don't enjoy getting into discussions where the causes for people's behaviour are being talked about	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I have found that the causes for people's behaviour are usually complex rather than simple	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I have thought a lot about the family background and personal history of people who are close to me, in order to understand why they are the sort of people they are	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I don't enjoy getting into discussions where the causes for people's behaviour are being talked about	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I have found that the causes for people's behaviour are usually complex rather than simple	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I am very interested in understanding how my own thinking works when I make judgements about people or attach causes to their behaviour	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I think very little about the different ways that people influence each other	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

To understand a person's personality/behaviour I have found it is important to know how that person's attitudes, beliefs, and character traits fit together	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

When I try to explain other people's behaviour I concentrate on the other person and don't worry too much about all the existing external factors that might be affecting them	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I have often found that the basic cause for a person's behaviour is located far back in time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I really enjoy analysing the reasons or causes for people's behaviour	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I usually find that complicated explanations for people's behaviour are confusing rather than helpful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I give little thought to how my thinking works in the process of understanding or explaining people's behaviour	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I think very little about the influence that other people have on my behaviour	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I have thought a lot about the way that different parts of my personality influence other parts (e.g. beliefs affecting attitudes or attitudes affecting character traits)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I think a lot about the influence that society has on other people	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
When I analyse a person's behaviour I often find the causes form a chain that goes back in time, sometimes for years	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I am not really curious about human behaviour	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I prefer simple rather than complex explanations for people's behaviour	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
When the reasons I give for my own behaviour are different from someone else's, this often makes me think about the thinking processes that lead to my explanations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I believe that to understand a person you need to understand the people whom that person has close contact with	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I tend to take people's behaviour at face value and not worry about the inner causes for their behaviour (e.g. attitudes, beliefs etc)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I think a lot about the influence that society has on my behaviour and personality	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

I have thought very little about my own family background and personal history in order to understand why I am the sort of person I am	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Need for Closure

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Somewhat Disagree	4 Unsure / Neutral	5 Somewhat Agree	6 Agree	7 Strongly Agree
---------------------------	---------------	---------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	------------	------------------------

I think that having clear rules and order at work is essential for success	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Even after I've made up my mind about something, I am always eager to consider a different opinion	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I don't like situations that are uncertain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I dislike questions which could be answered in many different ways	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I like to have friends who are unpredictable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I find that a well ordered life with regular hours suits my temperament	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

When dining out, I like to go to places where I have been before so that I know what to expect	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I feel uncomfortable when I don't understand the reason why an event occurred in my life	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I feel irritated when one person disagrees with what everyone else in a group believes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I hate to change my plans at the last minute	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I don't like to go into a situation without knowing what I can expect from it	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

When I go shopping, I have difficulty deciding exactly what it is that I want	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

When faced with a problem I usually see the one best solution very quickly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
When I am confused about an important issue, I feel very upset	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I tend to put off making important decisions until the last possible moment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I usually make important decisions quickly and confidently	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I would describe myself as indecisive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I think it is fun to change my plans at the last moment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I enjoy the uncertainty of going into a new situation without knowing what might happen	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My personal space is usually messy and disorganised	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
In most social conflicts, I can easily see which side is right and which is wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I tend to struggle with most decisions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I believe that orderliness and organisation are among the most important characteristics of a good student	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
When considering most conflict situations, I can usually see how both sides could be right	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I don't like to be with people who are capable of unexpected actions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I prefer to socialise with familiar friends because I know what to expect from them	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I think that I would learn best in a class that lacks clearly stated objectives and requirements	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
When thinking about a problem, I consider as many different options on the issue as possible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

I like to know what people are thinking all the time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I dislike it when a person's statement could mean many different things	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
It's annoying to listen to someone who cannot seem to make up his or her mind	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I find that establishing a consistent routine enables me to enjoy life more	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I enjoy having a clear and structured mode of life	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I prefer interacting with people whose opinions are very different to my own	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I like to have a place for everything and everything in its place	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I feel uncomfortable when someone's meaning or intention is unclear to me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
When trying to solve a problem I often see so many possible options that it's confusing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I always see many possible solutions to problems I face	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I'd rather know bad news than stay in a state of uncertainty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I do not usually consult many different opinions before forming my own view	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I dislike unpredictable situations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I dislike the routine aspects of my work (studies)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Rational-Experiential Inventory

1 Definitely not true of myself	2 Not true of myself	3 Somewhat not true of myself	4 Unsure / Neutral	5 Somewhat true of myself	6 True of myself	7 Definitely true of myself
---	-----------------------------------	---	---------------------------------	---	-------------------------------	---

I try to avoid situations that require thinking in depth about something	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I'm not that good at figuring out complicated problems	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I enjoy intellectual challenges	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I am not very good at solving problems that require careful logical analysis	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I don't like to have to do a lot of thinking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I enjoy solving problems that require hard thinking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Thinking is not my idea of an enjoyable activity	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I am not a very analytical thinker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Reasoning things out carefully is not one of my strong points	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I prefer complex problems to simple problems	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Thinking hard and for a long time about something gives me little satisfaction	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I don't reason well under pressure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I am much better at figuring things out logically than most people	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I have a logical mind	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I enjoy thinking in abstract terms	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I have no problem thinking things through carefully	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Using logic usually works well for me in figuring out problems in my life	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Knowing the answer without having to understand the reasoning behind it is good enough for me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I usually have clear, explainable reasons for my decisions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Learning new ways to think would be very appealing to me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I like to rely on my intuitive impressions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I don't have a very good sense of intuition	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Using my gut feelings usually works well for me in figuring out problems in my life	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I believe in trusting my hunches	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Intuition can be a very useful way to solve problems	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I often go by my instincts when deciding on a course of action	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I trust my initial feelings about people	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
When it comes to trusting people, I can usually rely on my gut feelings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
If I were to rely on my gut feelings, I would often make mistakes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I don't like situations in which I have to rely on intuition	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I think there are times when one should rely on one's intuition	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I think it is foolish to make important decisions based on feelings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I don't think it is a good idea to rely on one's intuition for important decisions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I generally don't depend on my feelings to help me make	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

decisions

I hardly ever go wrong when I listen to my deepest gut feelings to find an answer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I would not want to depend on anyone who described himself or herself as intuitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

My snap judgements are probably not as good as most people's	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I tend to use my heart as a guide for my actions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I can usually feel when a person is right or wrong, even if I can't explain how I know	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I suspect my hunches are inaccurate as often as they are accurate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Politics in New Zealand

How do you feel about the **political parties in New Zealand**? The scale below runs from 1 to 7, where “1” means you feel very unfavourable toward a party, “4” means you feel neutral toward a party, and “7” means you feel very favourable toward a party.

	Very Unfavourable			Neutral	Very Favourable				Very Unfavourable			Neutral	Very Favourable		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
National								Maori							
Labour								Party							
NZ First								Green							
Alliance								Party							
Act								Destiny							
								Progressive							
								United							
								Future NZ							

Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a National voter, a Labour voter, a voter for another party or what? _____

If an election were to be held now - what party would you give your party vote to? _____

Often, people use the terms “liberal” or “conservative” to describe their political beliefs. How would you rate yourself in these terms? (circle a number from 1 to 7)

Liberal 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Conservative**

Alternatively, people use the terms “left-wing” or “right-wing” to describe their political beliefs. How would you rate yourself in these terms? (circle a number from 1 to 7)

Left-wing 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Right-wing**

1. What is your gender? (check one) ☐ Male ☐ Female

2. What is your age? _____ (years)

3. Ethnicity (check one):

- ☐ NZ European
- ☐ Maori
- ☐ Pacific Island
- ☐ Asian
- ☐ Middle Eastern
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

4. Are you a (check one):

- ☐ New Zealand Citizen
- ☐ Permanent Resident
- ☐ Other

Thank you for your participation in this study

Debriefing Statement

Thank you for participating in this study.

This study focuses on the development of a scale measuring people's opinions about criminal offenders.

The scale under development focuses on the ideas of there being two view-points on issues relating to corrections, crime, offenders, and rehabilitation. One view is that community protection is more important than the rights of the individual offender. In other words, the offender has given up his or her rights because of the crime committed and their needs are less important than the community. The other view is that the rights of the offender are as important as those of the community as a whole. That is, the offender has not forfeited his or her rights by offending, but should have some rights limited as punishment.

The research that you have just completed incorporates the Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale that is under development, and you may have noticed that you answered this same scale in the mass testing that you completed in the second week of the trimester. The reason that you have done this twice is to determine the test-retest validity of the scale; that is do respondents consistently respond to the scale items over time.

Within this research you also completed a number of other scales in relation to characteristics of yourself and of what you think about people overall. These scales were included because they share some similarities or key differences with the Opinions about Criminal Offenders (OCO) scale. The purpose of their inclusion is to test convergent and discriminant validity of the OCO scale. Convergent validity means that the OPO is correlated with scale items that are similar to it, and discriminant validity means that there are distinct differences between the OCO and scale items that are measuring different things.

All of the testing in this piece of research is aimed at developing the psychometric properties of the OCO scale, and determining if it is a psychometrically sound measure of people's opinions about criminal offenders.

Again, thank you for your participation.

If you have further questions, please feel free to contact either Stephanie Fisher (Stephanie.Fisher@vuw.ac.nz) or Dr. Matt Crawford (Matt.Crawford@vuw.ac.nz) at the School of Psychology, Victoria University of Wellington.

Appendix H

Welcome!

This is an online survey investigating opinions about offenders and related areas. This research is being conducted by a PhD student at Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, and it has been approved by the Human Ethics Committee.

This survey takes approximately 15-20 minutes to fill out. Please read through the consent form on the following page and click on "I agree" to proceed.

Thank you for your interest!!

Stephanie Fisher & Dr Matt Crawford

Victoria University

Consent Form

Please read this consent agreement carefully before you decide to participate in the study

Purpose of the research study: This research aims to develop an understanding of what opinions people hold about criminal offenders

Who is conducting the research?: Stephanie Fisher is a PhD student in the School of Psychology, and this research is supervised by Dr. Matt Crawford and Prof. Tony Ward. This research has been approved by the Victoria University ethics committee. What is involved if you agree to participate?: If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete the online questionnaire. This will involve indicating your level of agreement or disagreement with a number of items relating to criminal offenders and also about some related areas. You will also be asked for some basic demographic information. We anticipate that your total involvement will take approximately 15 minutes.

Confidentiality: The questionnaire is totally **anonymous** so no individual's responses can or will be identified. Participants should be aware; however, that the experiment is not being run from a "secure" https server of the kind typically used to handle credit card transactions, so there is a small possibility that responses could be viewed by unauthorized third parties (e.g., computer hackers). We will keep the data collected here for at least five years after publication. You will never be identified in this research project or in any other presentation or publication. The information you provide will be coded by number only. In accordance with the requirements of some scientific journals and organisations, your coded data may be shared with other competent researchers. Your coded data may be used in other, related studies. A copy of the coded data will remain in the custody of Dr Matt Crawford and will be kept in a locked cabinet in his office.

Voluntary participation: Your participation in the study is **completely voluntary**

What happens to the information that you provide?: The data you provide may be used for one or more of the following purposes: The overall findings may be submitted for publication in a scientific journal, or presented at scientific conferences; The overall findings may form part of a PhD thesis, Masters thesis, or Honours research project that will be submitted for assessment.

Who to contact if you have questions:

Stephanie Fisher

School of Psychology

Victoria University of Wellington
Wellington, New Zealand
E-mail: stephanie.fisher@vuw.ac.nz
Dr Matt Crawford
School of Psychology
Victoria University of Wellington
Wellington, New Zealand
Tel.: +64 (4) 463-6702
E-mail: matt.crawford@vuw.ac.nz

PLEASE FEEL FREE TO PRINT A COPY OF THIS PAGE FOR YOUR RECORDS

{OBJECTIVE VERSION}

Please read the following newspaper article carefully and then answer the questions relating to it on the following pages.

Peter is a 27-year-old factory worker who has been convicted of raping a 20-year-old co-worker. Peter had previously been in trouble with the law [regarding a number of other offences](#).

The offence in question occurred during a staff Christmas party, in 2008. Peter and the victim went out to Peter's car late in the evening, [several hours after the beginning of the party](#). Peter had expressed his interest in this particular co-worker previously, although they had little contact at work.

Both Peter and the victim entered Peter's car to talk, but once inside the car [talking turned into more intimate behaviour](#). This intimacy soon turned into something that the victim did not want to participate in; however, Peter continued with it and subsequently, he forced the victim to have sex with him.

While this was going on, the rest of their work colleagues were inside the party, unaware of what was going on in the car not far from them

After the incident the victim went home, where she called a friend, who then contacted the Police and charges were laid within a week.

When sentencing Peter, the judge recommended that Peter be enrolled in a treatment program for sex offenders and then he sentenced Peter to 6 years in jail, with a 3-year non-parole period.

{SUBJECTIVE VERSION}

Please read the following newspaper article carefully and then answer the questions relating to it on the following pages.

Peter is a 27-year-old factory worker who has been convicted of raping a 20-year-old co-worker. Peter had previously been in trouble with the law **but not for violent or sexual offences**.

The offence in question occurred during a staff Christmas party, in 2008. Peter and the victim went out to Peter's car late in the evening, **after they had spent a number of hours inside the party drinking**. Peter had expressed his interest in this particular co-worker previously, although they had little contact at work.

Both Peter and the victim entered Peter's car to talk, but once inside the car **Peter and the co-worker became more intimate**. This intimacy soon turned into something that the victim did not want to participate in; however, Peter continued with it and subsequently, he forced the victim to have sex with him.

While this was going on, the rest of their work colleagues were inside the party, unaware of what was going on in the car not far from them

After the incident the victim went home, where she called a friend, who then contacted the Police and charges were laid within a week.

When sentencing Peter, the judge recommended that Peter be enrolled in a treatment program for sex offenders and then he sentenced Peter to 6 years in jail, with a 3-year non-parole period.

Please answer the following questions in relation to the article that you read on the first page.

Using the scale below, please indicate your beliefs in relation to each item by writing the number that corresponds to your opinion next to each statement.

- 1 = not at all
- 2 = slightly
- 3 = somewhat
- 4 = moderately
- 5 = quite
- 6 = very
- 7 = extremely

- _____ 13. Is the cause of this act something that reflects an aspect of Peter?
- _____ 14. Is the cause of this act something that is manageable by Peter?
- _____ 15. Is the cause of this act something that Peter can regulate?
- _____ 16. Is the cause of this act something that is inside of Peter?
- _____ 17. Is the cause of this act something about Peter?
- _____ 18. Is the cause of this act something over which Peter has control?
- _____ 19. How serious is this crime?
- _____ 20. How severe should the punishment for this crime be?
- _____ 21. How likely do you believe it is that this specific offender will commit this specific crime again?
- _____ 22. How likely do you believe it is that this specific offender will re-offend (in general)?
- _____ 23. How likely do you believe it is that this offender will be helped by rehabilitation programs?
- _____ 24. Do you think that this offender should have treatment and rehabilitation programs made readily available to him?
- _____ 25. Would you be accepting of this offender reintegrating into your community once he had completed his punishment (whatever that is)?
- 26. How morally outraged are you by this crime?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all				Moderately			Extremely

27. To what extent was your punishment decision based on a desire to make sure that this offender is discouraged from committing this crime again?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all				Moderately			Completely

28. To what extent was your punishment decision based on the desire to make this offender pay for what he has done?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all				Moderately			Completely

29. Was Peter aware that his actions were a criminal act for which he could be prosecuted?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all				Moderately			Completely

30. Did Peter intend to commit a crime?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all				Moderately			Definitely

31. How responsible is Peter for the crime?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all				Moderately			Completely\

Please rate Peter on the following traits (circle the number that represents where you think Peter would fall on the scale between the two traits).

1. Dishonest							Honest
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
2. Bad							Good
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3. Unfriendly							Friendly
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
4. Unlikeable							Likeable
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
5. Unempathic							Empathic
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
6. Unremorseful							Remorseful
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
7. Self-focused							Other-focused
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
8. Malevolent							Misguided
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

9. Violent

Non-violent

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

10. Dangerous

Harmless

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

11. Aggressive

Passive

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

12. Hostile

Non-hostile

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Sometimes we think about how events could have turned out differently. For example, you might think “If only I had left five minutes earlier, I would have caught my bus,” or perhaps you might think, “At least I was not late for the meeting.”

Please think about the events that you read about in the newspaper story and how you think it might have turned out differently. Please give us these thoughts in the space provided below.

Using the scale below please circle the number next to each item that best represents your level of agreement/disagreement with that item. Circle one number per item.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Somewhat Disagree	4 Unsure / Neutral	5 Somewhat Agree	6 Agree	7 Strongly Agree
--	-----------------------------	--	---	---	--------------------------	---

Like regular people, offenders can change	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Offenders cannot use the excuse of a bad background for their actions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Those who commit crime do not want to continue to do so	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Most offenders are regular people	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-----------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Offenders do not hold vastly different beliefs and values to ordinary citizens	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Offenders usually want to be forgiven	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Offenders have similar needs and interests to the rest of society	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Bad circumstances can never excuse an offender's actions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Those who commit crime want to redeem themselves	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Criminal acts are often spontaneous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Offenders do not have a legitimate excuse for their criminal offending	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Those who commit crime can stop offending	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Those who commit crime are often impaired in their decision-making ability	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Offenders cannot be rehabilitated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-----------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Offenders' judgement can be impaired when they commit crimes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Offenders want to change	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Alcohol or drug abuse can never excuse offending	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Offenders have often not thought about the consequences of their actions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Offenders are not able to change their ways	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Offenders hold similar values and beliefs to most others in society	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

How do you feel about the **political parties in New Zealand**? The scale below runs from 1 to 7, where “**1**” means you feel very unfavourable toward a party, “**4**” means you feel neutral toward a party, and “**7**” means you feel very favourable toward a party.

	Very		Neutral		Very		
	Unfavourable				Favourable		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
National	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Labour	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
NZ First	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Act	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Maori Party	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Green Party	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Progressive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
United Future NZ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a National voter, a Labour voter, a voter for another party or what? _____

If an election were to be held now - what party would you give your party vote to? _____

Often, people use the terms “liberal” or “conservative” to describe their political beliefs. How would you rate yourself in these terms? (circle a number from 1 to 7)

Liberal 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Conservative**

Alternatively, people use the terms “left-wing” or “right-wing” to describe their political beliefs. How would you rate yourself in these terms? (circle a number from 1 to 7)

Left-wing 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 **Right-wing**

1. What is your gender? (check one) ☐ Male ☐ Female

2. What is your age? _____ (years)

3. Ethnicity (check one):

- ☐ NZ European
- ☐ Maori
- ☐ Pacific Island
- ☐ Asian
- ☐ Middle Eastern
- ☐ Other (please specify)

4. Are you a (check one):

- ☐ New Zealand Citizen
- ☐ Permanent Resident
- ☐ Other

Debriefing

Thank you for participating in this study

This study focuses on the development of a scale measuring people's opinions about criminal offenders.

The scale under development focuses on the idea of there being two view-points on issues relating to corrections, crime, offenders, and rehabilitation. One view is that community protection is more important than the rights of the individual offender. In other words, the offender has given up his or her rights because of the crime committed and their needs are less important than the community. The other view is that the rights of the offender are as important as those of the community as a whole. That is, the offender has not forfeited his or her rights by offending, but should have some rights limited as punishment

The research that you have just completed incorporates the **Opinions about Criminal Offenders scale** that is under development.

Again, thank you for your participation

If you have further questions, please feel free to contact either **Stephanie Fisher** (Stephanie.Fisher@vuw.ac.nz) or **Dr. Matt Crawford** (Matt.Crawford@vuw.ac.nz) at the School of Psychology, Victoria University of Wellington.

Appendix I

Counterfactual Generation Examples

CFG Examples for Fellow Traveller.

“If the company had reduced the amount of booze the situation may never have happened” (s70) 1.

“What is frustrating about this is that we will never know what actually happened and are only taking the word of Peter’s co-worker. She could have consented at the time but they had both been drinking heavily...so who will remember” (s133) 6, 7, 8.

“More responsible drinking” (s71) 8.

“Co-workers being more active in the situation and what was happening to prevent” (s71) 1.

“Peter may not have gone to the Xmas party” (s75) 9.

“If Peter and the woman had both not drunk so much it may not have happened” (s76) 8.

“If Peter had greater self-confidence he may not drink as much” (s76) 3.

“If they hadn’t been as intoxicated, Peter’s feelings might have been clearer and thus the colleague may have been more prepared for his advances and could have avoided them. Also, Peter might have better understood her saying ‘no’ or protesting and not gone ahead with the rape he thought was consensual. If Peter had felt more wanted and accepted he might have thought more carefully about his actions and the impact they might have in advance of committing them” (s81) 8, 3, 4.

“If only he did not feel inadequate, he might not have committed the crime” (s87) 4.

“If Peter had listened and openly communicated with his co-worker about his desires for their relationship and listened and responded appropriately to her responses/wishes” (s89) 3.

“Others at the Xmas party could have been watching for ‘trouble’ and keeping everyone safe” (s92) 1.

“There might be a drinking culture at Peter’s work that needs to be addressed” (s94) 8.

“Intervention by others when excessive drinking was noted” (s98) 1, 8.

“Direct response by female to Peter that not interested” (s99) 7.

“Different friend choices would have helped Peter think about women in a different way, and helped his sense of value/worth etc” (s103).

“Many people drink to lose inhibitions but do not go on to rape. Peter seemed to be missing judgement, even impaired by alcohol that might have led another person in the same situation to stop and back off” (s132) 3.

“Management should have been ‘responsible hosts’ and perhaps have a time limit on the party, say 6-7.30pm” (s156), 1, 8.

CFG Examples for Moral Stranger.

“Co-workers could have intervened with either Peter or his victim to slow down drinking and keep an eye on them” (s22) 1, 8.

“It is unclear whether the young woman complained to her manager about the ‘sexual comments’ or whether she told Peter they were unwelcome. If nothing had been said or if they were laughed off this may contribute to Peter’s attitude. Did the ‘friends’ say anything or did they report his behaviour? Were there any clear company policies in place about unacceptable behaviour?” (s25) 6, 7, 8, 1.

“If co-workers have said something then Peter may have stopped with the comments, and the girl should have asked for help” (s20) 1, 7.

“Perhaps if Peter felt better about his childhood this could have been avoided” (s12) 4.

“If Peter had been more inclined to be social with his workmates he may have developed some of their values and not committed the crime” (s9) 3, 4.

“Peter clearly misunderstands the line between right and wrong and did not believe he was committing a crime” (s34) 3.

“Peter had more respect for others. Peter was more involved in the community. Peter had a better understanding of the potentially devastating consequences of his actions on his victim. Peter was part of an appropriately stronger peer group” (s38) 3, 4.

“Accusations would have been more legit if not under the influence” (s40) 6.

“Peter’s family is dysfunctional in its relationship with him and is part of the root cause of his behaviour. He appears to have a skewed perception of acceptable behaviour” (s67) 4, 3.

“People who drink too much put themselves at risk” (s63) 8, 7, 6.

“Peter had low self-esteem – if he had a higher opinion of himself he may not have committed the crime” (s159) 4.

“He was a loner and I don’t think he valued his life or others” (s147) 4.

“If the girl had not drunk, she would have had more control over her own circumstances and prevented being in a situation she could not have got herself out of” (s149) 8, 7.

“If there had been adequate rehabilitation/reparation in Peter’s earlier brushes with the law, he might not have committed the rape. If Peter felt valued, useful, motivated, liked and purposeful, I think he would not have raped” (s140) 4.