

# Factors Affecting Attitudes Toward Juvenile Sex Offenders

Kimberly J. Sahlstrom  
Elizabeth L. Jeglic

**ABSTRACT.** This study investigated attitudes toward juvenile sex offenders and factors influencing those attitudes. Additionally, the influences of perpetrator characteristics such as age, gender, and ethnicity on societal attitudes towards intervention requirements were also investigated. Overall, attitudes toward juvenile sex offenders and their treatment amenability were negative. No differences in attitudes toward juvenile sex offenders were found between those who had been victims of sexual abuse and those that had not. Sex offenses committed by juvenile female sex offenders were viewed to be more serious and require more intervention than those committed by juvenile male sex offenders.

**KEYWORDS.** Juvenile sex offender, attitudes, treatment

Public reactions and media portrayals of sex offenses in recent years have helped shape policy on legal approaches to managing sexual offending behavior. These policies have included community notification, more

---

Kimberly J. Sahlstrom, MA, is Founder of Capstone Youth and Family Services in Vancouver, British Columbia. She has developed treatment programs for juvenile offenders and their guardians.

Elizabeth L. Jeglic, PhD, is Assistant Professor at the John Jay College of Criminal Justice in New York City. Her research interests include sex offender treatment and legislation.

Submitted for publication 9/9/06; revised 6/11/07; accepted 6/16/07.

Address correspondence to: Elizabeth L. Jeglic, Department of Psychology, 445 West 59th Street, New York, NY 10019, USA (E-mail: [ejeglic@jjay.cuny](mailto:ejeglic@jjay.cuny)).

Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, Vol. 17(2) 2008  
Available online at <http://jcsa.haworthpress.com>  
© 2008 by The Haworth Press. All rights reserved.  
doi:10.1080/10538710801916705

severe sentencing laws, civil commitment procedures, and residence restrictions for convicted sex offenders (Quinn, Forsyth, & Mullen-Quinn, 2004). While initially developed for adult sex offenders, many of these policies, such as sex offender registration and notification, have also been extended to juvenile sex offenders. As of 2003, 32 states required adjudicated juveniles to register as sex offenders, with some states registering adolescents as young as 11 years old (Szymanski, 2003). While certain states require juvenile sex offenders to register until they reach the age of majority, other states may require continued registration as an adult sex offender depending on the level of risk posed to society (Center for Sex Offender Management, 1999). Furthermore, since 2004, the identity of juvenile offenders in many states is no longer protected. Currently only two states, Alabama and Vermont, restrict the release of names and other identifying information to the public (Szymanski, 2004).

While the goal of these increased sanctions for juvenile sex offenders may be to protect the public, they are in direct opposition to the original goals of the juvenile justice system, which were to rehabilitate juveniles rather than punish them. In addition, there is little evidence to support the effectiveness of these legislations with adult sex offenders (Schram & Milloy, 1995), and thus the application of laws such as Megan's Law to juvenile sex offenders is questionable at best. Some even argue that these laws may actually be counterproductive by increasing the stress on the offenders (Levenson & Cotter, 2005; Zevitz, Crim, & Farkas, 2000), thus increasing the likelihood the sex offenders will reoffend (Cortoni & Marshall, 2001). Therefore, it may be premature to apply sex offender legislation to juveniles until it has further proven its utility.

Letourneau and Miner (2005) argue that current punitive legislation directed toward adolescent sex offenders has evolved from three faulty assumptions: (1) that there is an epidemic of juvenile sexual offending; (2) that juvenile sex offenders have more in common with adult sex offenders than with other juvenile delinquents; and (3) that juvenile sex offenders are at high risk for reoffending. While it has not reached epidemic proportions, juvenile sex offending is a growing concern. It is estimated that juveniles between the ages of 13 and 17 are responsible for up to one-fifth of all rapes and up to half of all cases of child molestation committed each year (Barbaree, Hudson, & Seto, 1993). Although there are some similarities between juvenile and adult sex offenders, research suggests that adult and juvenile sex offenders vary in: (1) the nature of the sexual acts; (2) the etiology of the behavior; (3) deviant sexual arousal patterns; (4) the choice of victim; and (5) the

duration of contact with victims (Letourneau & Miner, 2005; Miranda & Corcoran, 2000; Veneziano & Veneziano, 2002). Furthermore, in the longest follow-up study to date on juvenile sex offender recidivism, Waite, Keller, and McGarvey (2005) reported that at 10-year follow-up, juvenile sex offender recidivism was more likely for either property offenses (13–20%) or other nonsexual offenses perpetrated against another person (28–39%) than for sexual offenses (5%). This is considerably lower than the recidivism rates for adult sex offenders (13.7%; Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2005). In addition, treatments such as multi-systemic therapy have been recently developed and have shown great promise in the treatment of juvenile sex offenders (Borduin & Schaeffer, 2002).

While the public appears to support legislation designed to contain, identify, and confine adult sex offenders, two recent studies on attitudes toward adult sexual offenders found that both psychologists and undergraduate students believed that adult sex offenders could be amenable to treatment (Cohen, 2005; Wnuk, 2005). However, it is unclear how the public feels about juvenile sex offenders or their treatment. Furthermore, there is even less research examining what factors may affect those attitudes.

It has been suggested that attitudes toward perpetrators and victims can be influenced by factors such as perpetrator age, gender socialization, (Denov, 2003), and ethnic identity (Maxwell, Robinson, & Post, 2003). In addition, Barbaree and Marshall (2006) explain that in the past, juvenile sexual offending was often minimized using a “boys will be boys” attitude, with the implication that younger offenders were merely playing games with their victims and that the sexual offending was consensual. However, given the recent “get tough on crime” mentality and the push to sentence juveniles as adults, it is unclear how those attitudes translate to juvenile sex offenders. Understanding community attitudes toward intervention and treatment of juvenile offenders is important in educating the public regarding this population to help advocate for appropriate legal responses, in reducing community risk, as well as meeting the treatment needs for these youth.

As such, the goals of the present study were twofold. First, we investigated general attitudes toward juvenile sex offenders and their treatment and what factors influenced those attitudes. Second, we examined the influence of perpetrator characteristics on societal attitudes toward intervention requirements in an effort to better understand how the public responds to sex offenses perpetrated by both adolescents and preadolescents.

Specifically, we investigated whether it was believed that intervention should be by the perpetrator's parents, or whether more formal intervention was required by either the police or Child Protective Services (CPS). By varying perpetrator characteristics such as age, gender, and ethnicity, we also examined whether differences occurred for perceived negative impact for the victim as well as victim sympathy.

## METHOD

### *Participants*

A total of 208 undergraduate students from a large urban university completed the questionnaires. All students received research credit toward an introductory psychology course in exchange for their participation. There were a total of 106 female and 102 male students who completed the questionnaires. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 55 years, with a mean age of 20.41 years ( $SD = 4.28$ ). The sample was ethnically diverse, with 37% identifying as Hispanic, 25% African-American, 21% Caucasian, 8% Asian, and 7% "Other." Forty percent of the sample indicated they were Catholic, 7% Protestant, 17% reported no religious affiliation, and 37% identified as "Other."

### *Measures*

#### *Case Scenarios*

Participants were given three scenarios of a hypothetical case of sexual assault while the victim was being babysat or socially engaged with another youth. Scenarios were approximately 150 words in length. Names used in the scenarios were taken from Kasof (1993) and were matched on measures of perceived attractiveness and intellectual competence. Depictions involved fondling and exhibitionism (no penetration). Each scenario contained exactly the same wording except for the independent variables: perpetrator age, gender, and ethnicity. Age of the perpetrator was manipulated to be 8, 9, 11, and 13 years old, while the victim's age was held constant at 8 years. Gender of both perpetrator and victim were varied to include all possible combinations (male/female, male/male, female/male, female/female). Interracial scenarios included Caucasian, African-American, Hispanic, and East Indian perpetrators. Victims' ethnicity was constant as Caucasian. Scenario examples are provided in the Appendix.

### *Scenario Questionnaire*

The scenarios were followed by a short questionnaire. Participants were asked about their perceptions of the scenario. Specifically, participants were asked the extent to which they endorsed or refuted the following items: (1) police or CPS; CPS should be involved in this case; (2) the seriousness of the event; (3) the parents should be responsible for intervening—not the police or CPS; (4) the victim's life will be negatively affected by the event; and (5) sympathy for the victim. Answers were assessed on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (*completely disagree*) to 5 (*completely agree*).

### *Demographics*

Demographic information pertaining to the variables of interest was gathered, including participant gender, age, ethnicity, and religious background.

### *Attitudes Toward Sex Offenders (ATSO; Melvin, Gramling, & Gardner, 1985)*

This five-point Likert scale was used with responses ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Each of the 36 items receives a score from 1 to 5, with 1 representing the choice of the alternative reflecting the most negative attitude and 5 the most positive attitude toward sex offenders. The scores on the ATSO range from 0 to 144, with a midscore of 72. Scores falling above the midscore suggest that offenders are viewed as normal persons capable of positive change, whereas scores below 72 reflect the view that offenders are basically deviant individuals. Melvin et al. (1985) found a split-half reliability between .84 and .92 in five different samples and high test-retest reliability ( $r = .82$ ).

### *Attitudes Toward Sex Offender Treatment (ATTSO; Wnuk, Chapman, & Jeglic, 2006)*

The ATTSO is a 20-item, self-report questionnaire that was developed to identify attitudes toward treatment for sexual offenders (Wnuk et al., 2006). Preliminary analyses indicated that the ATTSO is a reliable measure of attitudes toward sex offenders in a sample of undergraduate students (Wnuk et al., 2006). The ATTSO has a possible score range of 20 to 100 and a midscore of 60. Scores above 60 reflect positive views of sex offender treatment, with scores below 60 indicating a negative view. Scores of 60 on the ATTSO reflect "undecided."

### *Life Experiences Questionnaire (LEQ)*

This survey was created for this study to assess prior victimization or involvement with the criminal justice system, either by respondents themselves or someone in their social network. Eleven questions were used with a forced choice answer format (yes/no).

### *Procedure*

In order to participate in this IRB-approved project, all participants provided informed consent. Participants then read three different mock scenarios involving deviant sexual behavior that varied in regards to the independent variables (gender, age, and ethnicity of the perpetrators). Conditions were randomly distributed across respondents (Scenario 1,  $n = 52$ ; Scenario 2,  $n = 53$ ; Scenario 3,  $n = 51$ ; Scenario 4,  $n = 52$ ). Participants first completed the demographics form and then read one of the four possible scenarios in each condition. Each participant was instructed to read the scenario carefully before completing the scenario questionnaire. Participants were then asked to complete the ATSO and the ATTSO.

## **RESULTS**

This study employed a factorial 3 (perpetrator age, gender, ethnicity)  $\times$  4 (scenario condition) between-subjects design. Results are presented in two parts: (1) attitudes toward sex offenders and their treatment; and (2) perpetrator characteristics influencing perception of scenarios (age, ethnicity, and gender). Differences between respondent gender as well as differences between conditions were analyzed.

### *Attitudes Toward Juvenile Sex Offenders and their Treatment*

The mean score for the ATSO was 64.0 ( $SD = 17.4$ ) and the mean score for the ATTSO was 58.9 ( $SD = 6.0$ ). Overall, respondents viewed both offenders and their treatment amenability negatively; however, scores for all groups on the ATTSO (treatment) were only slightly below the midscore, suggesting that most respondents were undecided in regard to treatment amenability.

Group differences were analyzed using independent sample *t*-tests. No significant differences were found for either respondent gender or between respondents who have experienced sexual victimization versus those who have not. Respondents viewed offenders slightly more

favorably (but not treatment) if they either knew a sex offender ( $M = 67.7$ ,  $SD = 18.8$ ) or had been a victim of a sexual assault ( $M = 67.5$ ,  $SD = 18.8$ ) than those without prior contact ( $M = 63.7$ ,  $SD = 17.4$ ;  $M = 63.6$ ,  $SD = 16.9$ , respectively); however, these differences were not significant.

### *Perpetrator Characteristics*

Five items of the Scenario Questionnaire were analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance to test for significant differences between the four conditions for all three independent variables: age, ethnicity, and gender.

#### *Age*

Measures of central tendency and dispersion for the each age condition are shown in Table 1. Overall, respondents viewed each scenario as a serious event requiring either parental or formal (i.e., police or CPS) involvement (see Table 1). Respondents also indicated that the event had potential for a negative impact on the victim, and in all conditions respondents indicated they were very sympathetic toward the victim. No significant differences were found between conditions or for respondent gender.

#### *Ethnicity*

Mean scores for seriousness of event as well as negative victim impact were all above the mean in each condition, indicating that respondents viewed each scenario as a serious event with high likelihood of having a negative impact on the victim (see Table 2). Respondents in each condition also indicated feeling very sympathetic toward the victim. In determining whether

TABLE 1. Perpetrator age

	<i>Mean (SD)</i>			
	8 Years ( $n = 52$ )	9 Years ( $n = 53$ )	11 Years ( $n = 51$ )	13 Years ( $n = 52$ )
CPS/police involvement only	3.4 (1.3)	3.7 (1.3)	3.5 (1.3)	3.6 (1.1)
Seriousness of event	3.6 (1.1)	3.7 (1.2)	3.5 (1.3)	3.6 (1.1)
Parental involvement only	3.8 (1.3)	3.6 (1.3)	3.6 (1.2)	3.9 (1.2)
Negative victim impact	3.7 (1.0)	3.7 (1.1)	3.9 (0.8)	3.6 (1.0)
Victim sympathy	4.0 (1.2)	4.6 (0.9)	4.4 (0.8)	4.2 (1.1)

Note: Judgements were made on a 5-point scale (1 = completely agree, 5 = completely disagree).  
\* $p < .05$ .

TABLE 2. Perpetrator ethnicity

	Mean (SD)			
	Caucasian (n = 52)	African-American (n = 53)	Hispanic (n = 51)	East Indian (n = 52)
CPS/police involvement only	4.2 (1.1)	4.3 (0.9)	4.0 (1.1)	3.9 (1.2)
Seriousness of event	4.1 (1.0)	4.2 (1.0)	4.0 (1.1)	3.8 (1.1)
Parental involvement only	3.3 (1.3)*	3.2 (1.4)*	3.4 (1.2)	4.0 (1.2)*
Negative victim impact	4.4 (0.8)	4.3 (0.8)	4.3 (0.7)	4.0 (1.1)
Victim sympathy	4.3 (1.1)	4.4 (0.9)	4.3 (1.0)	4.2 (1.2)

Note: Judgements were made on a 5-point scale (1 = completely agree, 5 = completely disagree).  
\* $p < .05$ .

formal or informal interventions were needed, significant differences were found between conditions. For East Indian perpetrators, respondents were significantly more likely to opt for parental involvement only versus scenarios with either Caucasian and African-American perpetrators,  $F(3, 204) = 3.84$ ,  $p = .011$ . There was also a trend for respondents to opt for parental involvement more frequently for Hispanic perpetrators than Caucasian or African-American perpetrators; however, the differences were not significant.

### Gender

For all items, there was a trend for respondents to endorse formal versus informal intervention in scenarios with mixed genders versus same-sex scenarios (see Table 3). In addition, mixed gender scenarios also produced

TABLE 3. Perpetrator/victim gender

	Mean (SD)			
	Male/Female (n = 52)	Male/Male (n = 53)	Female/Male (n = 51)	Female/Female (n = 52)
CPS/police involvement only	4.5 (0.9)	4.3 (1.1)	4.8 (0.5)*	4.1 (1.1)*
Seriousness of event	4.4 (0.9)	4.3 (1.0)	4.7 (0.5)*	4.2 (0.9)*
Parental involvement only	3.1 (1.5)	3.2 (1.5)	2.8 (1.4)	3.4 (1.5)
Negative victim impact	4.5 (0.7)	3.8 (1.5)	4.6 (0.7)*	4.0 (1.0)*
Victim sympathy	4.6 (0.7)	4.1 (1.2)	4.6 (0.9)	4.3 (1.1)

Note: Judgements were made on a 5-point scale (1 = completely agree, 5 = completely disagree).  
\* $p < .05$ .

higher mean ratings for seriousness of event, victim sympathy, and negative victim impact. However, there was a significant effect for victim gender when the perpetrator was female,  $F(3, 204) = 4.24, p = .006$ , indicating that when the victim was also female, respondents endorsed informal intervention more frequently. Likewise for seriousness of the event, respondents also significantly differed between conditions indicating that female/female scenarios were less serious than female/male scenarios,  $F(3, 204) = 3.42, p = .018$ , and that the impact to the victim would be greater in female/male scenarios versus female/female scenarios,  $F(3, 204) = 9.285, p < .001$ .

## DISCUSSION

Similar to past research findings on attitudes toward sex offenders (Brown, 1999; Fuselier, Durham, & Wurtele, 2002; Valiant, Furac, & Antonowicz, 1994), attitudes toward juvenile sex offenders were negative. Additionally, respondents reported generally negative views regarding treatment of juvenile sex offenders with most respondents indicating that they were unsure whether treatment would benefit juvenile sex offenders.

The findings of the study suggest that these perceptions of juvenile sex offenders are stable across both respondent genders as well as between those with and without a victimization history. Surprisingly, there was a trend for those who either knew a sex offender or had been victimized as a child to rate sex offenders in a slightly more positive light. Perhaps because the offender is known to them (as is the case with many child victims of sexual abuse), these respondents were less likely to think of a sex offender as a "scary monster" since they are often a member of the family or a family friend.

Overall, this study found that despite differences in age, gender, or ethnicity of the perpetrator relative to the victim, respondents had high levels of sympathy for victims, believing that juvenile sexual offending was a serious event that can have negative repercussions for the victims. In addition, in most conditions, respondents endorsed formal intervention for the juvenile perpetrators (i.e., either police or CPS involvement). These results suggest that participants are more inclined to endorse the "get tough on crime" approach versus the attitude that the behavior is merely childhood experimentation.

There were no differences in respondents' perceptions of who should intervene, how serious the event was, or with perceived negative impact to the victim, regardless of the age of the perpetrator. Even when the offender and perpetrator were of the same age, respondents still believed that the event should be taken very seriously and required intervention

through formal means. This is contrary to previous attitudes that "boys will be boys" or that sexual acts are only a form of play (Barbaree & Marshall, 2006). It appears that there is a growing awareness that juvenile sexual offending does occur and that the impact to victims can be severe even when there is a minimal age gap between perpetrator and victim.

Ethnicity of the offender was found to impact attitudes toward whether formal or informal intervention was needed, with a trend to endorse parental versus police involvement for Hispanic perpetrators. This finding may be due to the sample demographics, as nearly 40% of the sample indicated they were of Hispanic background; this may have resulted in respondents identifying more with Hispanic perpetrators and therefore advocating for more lenient intervention. There was a tendency to endorse informal versus formal intervention for victims who were of another race than the respondent; however, these findings do not support the assertion from Maxwell et al. (2003) that victims belonging to minority ethnic groups may be more devalued than Caucasian victims and that minority offenders are not judged as harshly.

The most striking results occurred in scenarios varying victim and perpetrator gender in situations where an 8-year-old child is being babysat by an older youth. Overall, respondents were more likely to view mixed gender scenarios more punitively versus scenarios depicting same-sex abuse. Mixed gender scenarios were deemed to have a greater negative victim impact, with respondents indicating they had more sympathy for victims in these scenarios than when the perpetrator and victim were the same gender, especially when both were female. Compared to mixed gender combinations, respondents indicated that same-sex scenarios more often required only the parents to intervene and that the event should not be taken as seriously as when the perpetrator and victim were of different genders. Female offenders with male victims were judged more harshly than all other gender scenarios, with respondents believing that formal intervention was required and that the event was more serious with the greatest likelihood of a negative impact to the victim. These results are in contrast to previous research findings that female perpetrators are considered less responsible and less guilty than male perpetrators (Rogers & Davies, 2007). While it has been suggested that traditional sexual scripts coupled with stereotypes of males as perpetrators and females as victims by society has contributed to the lack of recognition of females as sexual offenders (Denov, 2003), it appears that once a female is identified as a sex offender, attributions toward the female perpetrator are more negative perhaps because she is violating these traditional norms of the passive and nurturing caregiver.

There were several limitations to the present study. Previous research using these same attitudinal measures (Cohen, 2005; Wnuk, 2005) has found that students and professionals rated sex offenders and their treatment more positively, indicating that they believed sex offenders are capable of change and that they can benefit from treatment. In the present study, participants read the scenarios prior to filling out questionnaires regarding their attitudes toward juvenile sex offenders and their treatment. Therefore, responses to the attitudinal questionnaires may have been more negative as participants were primed to think of specific sexual assault scenarios. Future studies should randomize the presentation of the scenarios and attitudinal measures. In addition, the participants in the current study were undergraduate students and thus may not be representative of the opinions of the general population. It would be important to replicate these findings with a community sample in order to render the findings more generalizable. The present sample was composed primarily of Hispanic and African-American individuals, making meaningful distinctions between judgments of the scenarios for various ethnic respondent groups difficult. In the future, larger ethnic group samplings to compare differences between these groups would be useful to understand whether respondent ethnicity impacts attitudes toward either victims or perpetrators of sexual offending who are of different ethnicities. Subsequent research should also expand on the role of victim characteristics on attributions of responsibility as they relate to perceptions of sex offenders, particularly with minority and female offenders.

This was one of the first studies to examine societal attitudes toward juvenile sex offenders and intervention, especially with Hispanic and African-American respondents. As the public has had an immense impact on sex offender laws, it is imperative to continue to gain an understanding of community attitudes toward sex offenders and what factors influence those attitudes and beliefs. Fuselier et al. (2002) advocate for educational efforts to address problems in faulty assumptions of sex offenders to promote understanding that sex offenders are often known to the victim, that sexual offending can begin in adolescence, and that the methods used to offend may not necessarily include force; rather, they may be more coercive in nature. Continuing educational efforts, especially with populations that can help identify offending, such as parents, may increase overall reporting rates. The present study indicates that educational efforts aimed at informing the public on the potential for juveniles to engage in sexual offending behavior may be working; however, issues such as gender and ethnicity in the role of sexual offending still need to be explored.

## REFERENCES

- Barbaree, H. E., & Marshall, W. L. (2006). An introduction to the juvenile sex offender: Terms, concepts and definitions. In H. E. Barbaree & W. L. Marshall (Eds.), *The juvenile sex offender* (pp. 1–18). New York: Guilford.
- Barbaree, H., Hudson, S., & Seto, M. (1993). Sexual assault in society: The role of the juvenile offender. In H. E. Barbaree, W. L. Marshall, & S. Hudson (Eds.), *The juvenile sex offender* (pp. 1–24). New York: Guilford.
- Borduin, C. M., & Schaeffer, C. M. (2002). Multisystemic treatment of juvenile sexual offenders: A progress report. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality, 13*, 25–42.
- Brown, S. (1999). Public attitudes toward the treatment of sex offenders. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 4*, 239–252.
- Center for Sex Offender Management. (1999). *Sex offender registration: Policy overview and comprehensive practices*. Silver Spring, MD. Retrieved June 1, 2005, from <http://www.csom.org/pubs/sexreg.html>.
- Cohen, M. (2005). *Psychologists' attitudes towards sex offenders*. Unpublished master's thesis, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, New York, NY.
- Cortoni, F., & Marshall, W. L. (2001). Sex as a coping strategy and its relationship to juvenile sexual history and intimacy in sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 13*(1), 27–43.
- Denov, M. S. (2003). The myth of innocence: Sexual scripts and the recognition of child sexual abuse by female perpetrators. *Journal of Sex Research, 40*(3), 303–314.
- Fuselier, D. A., Durham, R. L., & Wurtele, S. K. (2002). The child sexual abuser: Perceptions of college students and professionals. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 14*(3), 271–280.
- 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, 73*, 1154–1163.
- Kasof, J. (1993). Sex bias in the naming of the stimulus persons. *Psychological Bulletin, 113*, 140–163.
- Letourneau, E. J., & Miner, M. H. (2005). Juvenile sex offenders. A case against the legal and clinical status quo. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment, 17*(3), 293–312.
- Levenson, J. S., & Cotter, L. P. (2005). The effect of Megan's Law on sex offender reintegration. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 21*(1), 49–66.
- Maxwell, C. D., Robinson, A. L., & Post, L. A. (2003). The impact of race on the adjudication of sexual assault and other violent crimes. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 31*(6), 523–538.
- Melvin, K. B., Gramling, L. K., & Gardner, W. M. (1985). A scale to measure attitudes toward prisoners. *Criminal Justice & Behavior, 12*, 241–253.
- Miranda, A. O., & Corcoran, C. L. (2000). Comparison of perpetration characteristics between male juvenile and adult sexual offenders: Preliminary results. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment, 12*(3), 179–188.
- Quinn, J. F., Forsyth, C. J., & Mullen-Quinn, C. (2004). Societal reaction to sex offenders: A review of the origins and results of the myths surrounding their crimes and treatment amenability. *Deviant Behavior, 25*(3), 215–232.

- Rogers, P., & Davies, M. (2007). Perceptions of victims and perpetrators in a depicted child sexual abuse case. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22*(5), 566–584.
- Schram, D., & Milloy, C. D. (1995). *Community notification: A study of offender characteristics and recidivism*. Olympia, WA: Washington Institute for Public Policy.
- Szymanski, L. (2003). Megan's law: Juvenile sex offender registration age limits. *National Center for Juvenile Justice Snapshot, 8*(5). Retrieved June 1, 2005, from <http://ncjj.servehttp.com/NCJJWebsite/publications/serial/freesnapshots.htm>.
- Szymanski, L. A. (2004). Releasing names of juvenile offenders to the media/public. *National Center for Juvenile Justice Snapshot, 9*(4). Retrieved June 1, 2005, from <http://ncjj.servehttp.com/NCJJWebsite/publications/serial/snapshot2004.htm>.
- Valiant, P. M., Furac, C. J., & Antonowicz, D. H. (1994). Attitudes towards sex offenders by female undergraduate university students enrolled in a psychology program. *Social Behavior and Personality, 22*(2), 105–110.
- Veneziano, C., & Veneziano L. (2002). Adolescent sex offenders: A review of the literature. *Trauma, Violence and Abuse, 3*(4), 247–260.
- Waite, D., Keller, A., & McGarvey, E. L. (2005). Juvenile sex offender re-arrest rates for sexual, violent nonsexual and property crimes: A 10-year follow-up. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment, 17*(3), 313–331.
- Wnuk, D. (2005). *Attitudes towards sex offenders*. Unpublished master's thesis, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, New York, NY.
- Wnuk, D., Chapman, J. E., & Jeglic, E. L. (2006). Development and refinement of a scale to measure attitudes toward sex offender treatment. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 43*(3), 35–47.
- Zevitz, R. G., Crim, D., & Farkas, M. A. (2000). Sex offender community notification: Managing high risk criminals or exacting further vengeance? *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 18*, 375–391.

## APPENDIX

### PERPETRATOR AGE

#### Condition A1

Robert is an 8-year-old boy about to start the third grade. He lives with his parents and has an older brother. In his spare time he likes to play sports and enjoys socializing with friends. One day, Robert and his friend John, also 8 years old, are playing video games by themselves in the living room at Robert's house. During Robert's turn, John becomes bored and starts to complain that he wants to do something else. Robert states that he wants to finish his turn. John sits down next to Robert and began touching Robert's genitals. Robert tried to push John away and asked him

to stop. John became angry and told Robert if he told anyone about what had happened, that Robert would get into trouble. John then went home.

### ***Condition A2***

Robert is an 8-year-old boy about to start the third grade. He lives with his parents and has an older brother. In his spare time he likes to play sports and enjoys socializing with friends. One day, Robert and his friend John, who is 9 years old, are playing video games by themselves in the living room at Robert's house. During Robert's turn, John becomes bored and starts to complain that he wants to do something else. Robert states that he wants to finish his turn. John sits down next to Robert and began touching Robert's genitals. Robert tried to push John away and asked him to stop. John became angry and told Robert if he told anyone about what had happened, that Robert would get into trouble. John then went home.

### ***Condition A3***

Robert is an 8-year-old boy about to start the third grade. He lives with his parents and has an older brother. In his spare time he likes to play sports and enjoys socializing with friends. One day, Robert and his friend John, who is 11 years old, are playing video games by themselves in the living room at Robert's house. During Robert's turn, John becomes bored and starts to complain that he wants to do something else. Robert states that he wants to finish his turn. John sits down next to Robert and began touching Robert's genitals. Robert tried to push John away and asked him to stop. John became angry and told Robert if he told anyone about what had happened, that Robert would get into trouble. John then went home.

### ***Condition A4***

Robert is an 8-year-old boy about to start the third grade. He lives with his parents and has an older brother. In his spare time he likes to play sports and enjoys socializing with friends. One day, Robert and his friend John, who is 13 years old, are playing video games by themselves in the living room at Robert's house. During Robert's turn, John becomes bored and starts to complain that he wants to do something else. Robert states that he wants to finish his turn. John sits down next to Robert and began touching Robert's genitals. Robert tried to push John away and asked him to stop. John became angry and told Robert if he told anyone about what had happened, that Robert would get into trouble. John then went home.

**PERPETRATOR ETHNICITY****Condition B1**

Jake is a 13-year-old Caucasian youth. His best friend Joseph is also Caucasian and 13 years old. One afternoon both Jake and Joseph are hanging out at Jake's house. Jake's younger brother Richard wants to play with them but Jake doesn't want him to as he is only 8 years old and starts yelling at him to leave them alone. Joseph interrupts and tells Jake that it's okay and that Richard could help them. Jake reluctantly agrees. That night, Jake invites Joseph to sleep over. After Jake falls asleep and the house is quiet, Joseph goes into Richard's room. Richard wakes up when Joseph gets into bed with him. Joseph tells Richard that he was really nice to him that day even though he didn't have to be. Joseph begins touching Richard's genitals and tells him to be quiet.

**Condition B2**

Jake is a 13-year-old Caucasian youth. His best friend Darryl is African-American and is also 13 years old. One afternoon both Jake and Darryl are hanging out at Jake's house. Jake's younger brother Richard wants to play with them but Jake doesn't want him to as he is only 8 years old and starts yelling at him to leave them alone. Darryl interrupts and tells Jake that it's okay and that Richard could help them. Jake reluctantly agrees. That night, Jake invites Darryl to sleep over. After Jake falls asleep and the house is quiet, Darryl goes into Richard's room. Richard wakes up when Darryl gets into bed with him. Darryl tells Richard that he was really nice to him that day even though he didn't have to be. Darryl begins touching Richard's genitals and tells him to be quiet.

**Condition B3**

Jake is a 13-year-old Caucasian youth. His best friend Miguel is Hispanic and is also 13 years old. Jake's younger brother Richard wants to play with them but Jake doesn't want him to as he is only 8 years old and starts yelling at him to leave them alone. Miguel interrupts and tells Jake that it's okay and that Richard could help them. Jake reluctantly agrees. That night, Jake invites Miguel to sleep over. After Jake falls asleep and the house is quiet, Miguel goes into Richard's room. Richard wakes up when Miguel gets into bed with him. Miguel tells Richard that he was really nice to him that day even

though he didn't have to be. Miguel begins touching Richard's genitals and tells him to be quiet.

### ***Condition B4***

Jake is a 13-year-old Caucasian youth. His best friend Arash is East Indian and is also 13 years old. Jake's younger brother Richard wants to play with them but Jake doesn't want him to as he is only 8 years old and starts yelling at him to leave them alone. Arash interrupts and tells Jake that it's okay and that Richard could help them. Jake reluctantly agrees. That night, Jake invites Arash to sleep over. After Jake falls asleep and the house is quiet, Arash goes into Richard's room. Richard wakes up when Arash gets into bed with him. Arash tells Richard that he was really nice to him that day even though he didn't have to be. Arash begins touching Richard's genitals and tells him to be quiet.

## ***PERPETRATOR GENDER***

### ***Condition C1***

David's parents have recently celebrated their 20th wedding anniversary, and as part of the celebration, they arranged to go out for dinner. Because David, who is 8, is too young to be left alone, his parents arranged for Thomas to come and stay at the house for the night. Thomas, who is 13, lives next door and has babysat David a few times before. As it is a school night, David's parents have asked Thomas to make sure that he has a shower and is in bed by 8:30. David and Thomas have fun playing games on David's PlayStation 2, and listening to music. Before bed, Thomas reminds David to go have a bath. While David is having a bath, Thomas comes into the bathroom. He takes off his clothes and gets into the bath with David. He begins to masturbate and asks David to touch him. David refuses by shaking his head.

### ***Condition C2***

Brian's parents have recently celebrated their 20th wedding anniversary, and as part of the celebration, they arranged to go out for dinner. Because Brian, who is 8, is too young to be left alone, his parents arranged for Karen to come and stay at the house for the night. Karen, who is 13, lives next door and has babysat Brian a few times before. As it is a school night,

Brian's parents have asked Karen to make sure that he has a shower and is in bed by 8:30. Brian and Karen have fun playing games on Brian's PlayStation 2, and listening to music. Before bed, Karen reminds Brian to go have a bath. While Brian is having a bath, Karen comes into the bathroom. She takes off her clothes and gets into the bath with Richard. She begins to masturbate and asks Brian to touch her. Brian refuses by shaking his head.

### *Condition C3*

Karen's parents have recently celebrated their 20th wedding anniversary, and as part of the celebration, they arranged to go out for dinner. Because Karen, who is 8, is too young to be left alone, her parents arranged for Brian to come and stay at the house for the night. Brian lives next door and has babysat Karen a few times before. As it is a school night, Karen's parents have asked Brian to make sure that she has a shower and is in bed by 8:30. Karen and Brian have fun playing games on Karen's PlayStation 2, and listening to music. Before bed, Brian reminds Karen to go have a bath. While Karen is having a bath, Brian comes into the bathroom. He takes off his clothes and gets into the bath with Karen. He begins to masturbate and asks Karen to touch him. Karen refuses by shaking her head.

### *Condition C4*

Karen's parents have recently celebrated their 20th wedding anniversary, and as part of the celebration, they arranged to go out for dinner. Because Karen, who is 8, is too young to be left alone, her parents arranged for Lisa to come and stay at the house for the night. Lisa lives next door and has babysat Karen a few times before. As it is a school night, Karen's parents have asked Lisa to make sure that she has a shower and is in bed by 8:30. Karen and Lisa have fun playing games on Karen's PlayStation 2, and listening to music. Before bed, Lisa reminds Karen to go have a bath. While Karen is having a bath, Lisa comes into the bathroom. She takes off her clothes and gets into the bath with Karen. She begins to masturbate and asks Karen to touch her. Karen refuses by shaking her head.

Copyright of *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse* is the property of Haworth Press and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.