

ANALYZING THE ATTITUDES OF LAW STUDENTS
TOWARDS SEX OFFENDERS

by

VALERIE ELISABETH TRULL

LESLEY REID, COMMITTEE CHAIR
ARIANE PROHASKA
JENNIFER COX

A THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science
in the Department of Criminal Justice
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2017

Copyright Valerie Elisabeth Trull 2017
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

A significant amount of research has aimed to determine attitudes towards sex offenders and treatment for sex offenders, especially for those involved in the criminal justice system. Researchers have utilized the Community Attitudes Towards Sex Offenders (CATSO) and Attitudes Towards the Treatment of Sex Offenders (ATTSO) scales to measure attitudes of many populations, including law enforcement, corrections officers, parole boards, as well as general communities. To this point, the attitudes of those most directly involved in the courtroom—lawyers and judges—have not been addressed. As future jurists, law students can provide some insight into these attitudes. This study will attempt to determine the attitudes of a group of law students from The University of Alabama, and see if those attitudes can be changed through education.

DEDICATION

This thesis is first dedicated to my husband, Josh Trull, for his ongoing support of my continuing education and patience for the many hours spent away from home while working to complete this manuscript.

Second, I dedicate this work to those who are fighting an unjust system: to the people living the horror stories I tell when explaining the problems with many of our laws, as well as to those who have seen the error of their ways but struggle to find the resources to survive on their own. We all deserve to live in a world where past mistakes can be corrected and both the victims and those responsible can move on to live productive, happy lives.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
APA	American Psychological Association
ATTSO	Attitudes Towards the Treatment of Sex Offenders
CATSO	Community Attitudes Towards Sex Offenders
df	Degrees of freedom
<i>F</i>	Indicates statistical significance
IRB	Institutional Review Board
n	Sample size
M	Mean
NCMEC	National Center for Missing & Exploited Children
NSOR	National Sex Offender Registry
OJP	Office of Justice Programs
<i>p</i>	Indicates probability
PROTECT	Prosecutorial Remedies & Other Tools to end the Exploitation of Children Today
SD	Standard Deviation
SMART	Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking
SORNA	Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act
SPSS	Statistical Package for the Social Science
η^2	Total sum of squares

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my thesis committee chair, Dr. Lesley Reid, for taking the time to work through this incredible process with me. I would not be here without your efforts and support. I would also like to thank my other committee members, Dr. Ariane Prohaska and Dr. Jennifer Cox, both of whom provided great insight at various stages of this project.

Outside of my committee, I received a great deal of help and support from two people. Dr. Kathryn Seigfried-Spellar was a large part of the reason I originally enrolled in graduate school, and encouraged me to pursue research in taboo areas that make many people uncomfortable. Kellin Treadway, my dear friend and now an instructor, helped me greatly in navigating SPSS and understanding the concepts behind the statistics I ran and analyzed. Without Dr. Kate I would never have gotten here. Without Kellin, I would never have finished.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW.....	6
LAW STUDENTS ATTITUDES AND FEDERAL SEX OFFENDER LAWS	6
LAW STUDENTS ATTITUDES AND ALABAMA SEX OFFENDER LAWS.....	9
THE IMPACT OF LAW SCHOOL ON ATTITUDES.....	11
COST ANALYSIS OF SORNA LAWS.....	12
RESEARCH ON SEX OFFENDER LAWS AND ATTITUDES	14
THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE	16
CHAPTER III CURRENT STUDY	18
BACKGROUND	18
METHODOLOGY.....	19
CHAPTER IV FINDINGS	27
CATSO ANALYSIS.....	27
ATTSO ANALYSIS.....	29
ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS.....	29
DISCUSSION	30
REFERENCES	34
APPENDICES	39

APPENDIX 1 – FEDERAL DEFINITION OF SEX OFFENDER: 42 US CODE § 16911 39

APPENDIX 2 – PRE-SORNA CRIME LAWS..... 41

APPENDIX 3 – SEX OFFENDER REGISTRATION LAWS 44

APPENDIX 4 – STATE OF ALABAMA DEFINITION OF SEX OFFENDER: ALABAMA
CODE § 15-20-21 46

APPENDIX 5 – SOLICITAION: EMAIL FROM VICE DEAN LEONARD AND
ATTACHED LETTER 48

APPENDIX 6 – CONSENT FORM 50

APPENDIX 7 – MYTHS AND FACTS: CONTROL GROUP 52

APPENDIX 8 – MYTHS AND FACTS: EXPERIMENTAL GROUP..... 54

APPENDIX 9 – CATSO INSTRUMENT 56

APPENDIX 10 – ATTSO INSTRUMENT 57

APPENDIX 11 – ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS 59

APPENDIX 12 – DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS 60

APPENDIX 13 – IRB APPROVAL LETTER 61

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Demographics	26
Table 2: Two-Way Mixed ANOVA: Pre vs. Post Test.....	28
Table 3: Means and Standard Deviations	28
Table 4: Independent Sampes t-test	31

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The criminal justice system applies the label “sex offender” to a broad range of convicted persons. The same label can be used to identify someone who committed public urination as is used to identify someone who sexually assaulted another person. The Federal Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (SORNA) under Title 42 of the U.S. Code provides the following federal definition of a sex offender: a person who has been convicted of a sex offense. In tier systems, a Tier III sex offender has been convicted of charges involving sexual abuse or kidnapping of a minor, and is considered the most dangerous and likely to re-offend. Tier II sex offenders include those convicted of sex trafficking, coercion, transportation, and other charges that are punishable by imprisonment for 1 year or more. Tier I offenders are those convicted of sex offenses not deemed Tier II or Tier III offenses. Tier I offenders are typically deemed the least dangerous and least likely to re-offend (Appendix 1).

This Act makes an attempt to differentiate between those who have committed minor offenses and those who have committed more dangerous or extreme types of offense by the use of tiers. However, the general public is not likely to know the difference in these tiers, whether the severity of the tiers is increasing or decreasing, or what tier a sex offender they may have interaction with is ranked (Zgoba et al., 2015). Additionally, the ranking mechanisms are inconsistent among state and federal laws, and have been found to inaccurately determine the

likelihood of re-offense for a given offender. For example, Tier 2 sex offenders in Florida were found to be more likely to reoffend than Tier 3 offenders, who are supposedly more dangerous (Zgoba et al., 2015).

A conviction for a sex-based offense requires the individual to register as a sex offender based on applicable federal and state guidelines. These guidelines must meet federal minimum standards, but can vary by state. For instance, Alabama deviates from both the tier system and how the laws apply to youthful offenders (U.S. Department of Education, Office of Justice Programs [OJP], 2011). Since there are no tier variations in Alabama, convicted sex offenders are subject to registration requirements for life, including quarterly in-person verification, regardless of the severity of the crime committed (OJP, 2011). Convicted offenders under the age of 21 may be deemed “youthful offenders” in Alabama, and may only be subject to registration requirements for ten years, depending upon severity of offense and whether the conviction is status-based, such as consensual sex between teens where one is less than age 16 (OJP, 2011).

Federal SORNA requirements set a minimum expectation for information that must be regularly updated for a convicted sex offender, including: Names, Aliases, and Remote Communication Identifiers and Addresses (names and aliases, internet identifiers and addresses, and telephone numbers), Social Security Number, Residence, Lodging, and Travel Information (residence address, other residence information, temporary lodging information, travel and immigration documents), Employment Information (employer name and address, other employment information, and professional licenses), School Information, Vehicle Information, Date of Birth, Physical Description, Text of Registration Offense, Criminal History and Other Criminal Justice Information, Current Photograph, Fingerprints and Palm Prints, DNA, and Driver’s License or Identification Card (SORNA, 2008). Registrants are required to appear in

person for verification at minimum annually and up to quarterly (every three months), depending on their tier status. Each jurisdiction has the ability to make registration requirements even more stringent if they wish to do so (SORNA, 2008).

Registration requirements are in addition to any other sentencing handed down in a criminal case. If a person serves ten years in prison for a sex crime and is subject to registration, the registration requirements do not begin to be met until he or she is released from prison. This has raised questions about the punitive nature of the laws—if a person has completed the sentence required of them, should they then be subject to continual monitoring and restrictions once released? Preble (2014) compares sex offender registration to wearing a scarlet letter—intended as a warning for others, but ultimately an additional punishment for the bearer.

According to the Office of Justice Programs' Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking (SMART), their mission is “to protect the public by supporting the national implementation of a comprehensive sex offender registration and notification system” (SMART, 2014). Research indicates that SMART may not be achieving this mission. Studies show that sex offender rates have not decreased since the passing of SORNA laws (Zgoba et al., 2008), and that recidivism rates are extremely low, and are actually much lower than the public expects them to be (Calkins et al., 2014; Sample & Bray, 2003).

The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) reported that there were 747,408 registered sex offenders in the United States as of 2011, of which 13,327 were registered in Alabama. While 70% of these offenders are expected to commit another crime following release from prison, only 2.7% are expected to commit another sex crime (NCMEC, 2014).

The aim of community notification requirements of SORNA laws is to inform residents of potential threats. The reality, though, is that the most likely threat comes from someone already known to the victims. 93% of boys and 80% of girls who are sexually molested are victimized by someone they know (NCMEC, 2014). The Bureau of Justice Statistics (2013) reported that from 2005-2010, 78% of sexual violence was committed by someone known to the victim.

The Bureau of Justice Statistics collects a National Crime Survey annually, including a section called the National Sample of Rape Victims. This report consistently shows that rape, as well as other sex crimes, are underreported. Factors that heavily influence likelihood to report include ancillary evidence (proof of what occurred) and greater levels of social support (Allen, 2007). While some support for victims is on a personal level, there is a great need for professional support as well. Many cities especially lack structured responses for male victims of sex crimes (Allen, 2007). Sex offender registration focuses all of the available resources on registering and tracking offenders, leaving victims to fend for themselves in locating and securing professional support. Greater funding for these areas could increase reporting rates, leading to a larger number of arrests and successful prosecutions of rapists and other sex offenders (Allen, 2007).

A great deal of research has considered the attitudes various participants of the criminal justice system hold towards sex offenders and their treatment. There have been a significant number of studies conducted on this topic involving corrections officers, law enforcement officers, parole boards, and others. At present, there is no published research regarding the attitudes lawyers and judges hold towards sex offenders, or those of law students, who are the future of lawyers and judges. Considering these parties are the ones responsible for prosecution,

defense, plea bargains, and sentencing, their opinions regarding sex offenders, treatment options, and registration requirements should be taken into consideration.

In this study, I address the shortcomings in the literature by conducting an analysis of law students' attitudes towards sex offenders, and determine if those attitudes can be changed with education regarding myths and facts about sex offenders.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The following sections consider the history of SORNA laws at the federal and state level, how these laws have impacted the attitudes of today's law students, the cost and effectiveness of SORNA laws, and research on community attitudes towards sex offenders and treatment. A variety of methods have been used to determine what effect SORNA laws have had on attitudes towards sex offenders and their treatment, including the development of surveys specifically designed to measure such attitudes. Finally, labeling theory is considered in relation to the effectiveness of sex offender registration for reducing recidivism rates.

LAW STUDENTS ATTITUDES AND FEDERAL SEX OFFENDER LAWS

Attitudes towards any particular topic are not held in a vacuum. A person who is particular far-left or far-right leaning developed those beliefs sometime in their life, and has had those beliefs reaffirmed through their observations, experiences, and outside influences. Hess and Tourney (2017) found that children begin developing such attitudes as early as elementary school. These beliefs are formed based on the common narratives children are exposed to through family life, education, and news exposure. All of these influences combine to create social learning.

Law students today are typically in their 20s, meaning most of them were born in the 1990s. This should be noted when considering the attitudes they hold as individuals and as a

group. The social narratives, media, and major news stories of their lifetimes impact the attitudes they began forming in their elementary school days.

Prior to the birth of today's average law student, sex crimes gained the attention of the national media and began impacting state and federal laws. While there were a few federal laws passed in the 1970s and 80s regarding sexual offenses, registration requirements did not yet exist (see Appendix 2). Sex offender registration laws began with the 1991 Minnesota Sex Offender Registration Act. While this was a state law, not federal, it was the precursor to the federal laws that are in place today (see Appendix 3). This law required sex offenders within the state of Minnesota to register within 14 days of release or within 10 days of any relocation, including providing fingerprints and a photograph.

In 1994, the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act was passed, which was the first federal law regarding sex offender registration. This Act included the Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children and the Sexually Violent Offender Registration Act. The law required states to begin sex offender registries. The minimum standard at the time was annual registration for ten years, or quarterly registration for those convicted of violent offenses.

Also in 1994, the state of New Jersey passed Megan's Law, which was the first instance of community notification of sex offenders. In 1996, President Clinton signed Megan's Law as an amendment to the Jacob Wetterling Act in the 1994 law, making it a federal mandate for all states to follow. States were left to decide for themselves what information to include in community notifications. It should be noted that Megan's Law came from a highly publicized criminal case, stretching far outside of New Jersey and across national news.

The first National Sex Offender Registry (NSOR) was established via the 1996 Pam Lyncher Sex Offender Tracking and Identification Act. The national registry specifically focused

on offenders who were convicted of crimes against children, considered sexually violent offenders, and/or had a mental abnormality related to their crime. Offenders living outside of state-based registration areas, such as in US territories or on reservations, were also required to submit to NSOR. The FBI was also given the ability to share information with states for community notification, background checks, or relocation of sex offenders between states.

In 1998, the Jacob Wetterling Improvements Act and the Protection of Children from Child Predators Act enhanced sex offender registration requirements to include registration if relocating to a new state. Law enforcement and victims' advocates were included in the decision making process for deeming someone a sex offender. Internet access in prisons was required to be monitored.

The Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 included the Campus Sex Crimes Prevention Act, which required registered sex offenders to notify higher education institutions they attend or work for, as well as law enforcement in the area. Schools were required to include information about how to access sex offender registration in their annual campus security reports. In 2003, the Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to end the Exploitation of Children Today (PROTECT) Act required the Department of Justice to provide a complete list of states' websites for sex offender registration.

The Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 created a three-tier system for sex offenders. Tier I offenders requires annual registration updates for 15 years. This category is for offenders deemed the least violent and least likely to re-offend. Tier II requires bi-annual registration updates for 25 years. Tier III offenders are required to update their registration quarterly for life, and are considered the most violent and most likely to re-offend. These requirements were made retroactive, meaning convicted sex offenders who had never previously

been required to register, or those who had completed their original registration requirements but did not meet the current requirements were made to register. Much like the case leading to Megan's Law, the Adam Walsh case was highly publicized nationally.

The impact of these laws has not been strictly positive. During this 15 year period, the term Sex Offender became a label that the general public associated with something close to a monster (Sampson, 1994). Given the nature of SORNA laws, today's law students have grown up in an era of greater publicity and specific sanctioning of harsh sentences, public vilification, and more negative treatment since the early 1990s. The influence of the term sex offender has likely had opportunity to impact the social learning of these students' attitudes.

LAW STUDENTS ATTITUDES AND ALABAMA SEX OFFENDER LAWS

According to the records office at the University of Alabama Law School, more than half of law school graduates take the bar exam for the state of Alabama after graduating each year. In 2016, 75 of the 132 law school graduates stayed in-state to begin their careers following graduation (C. Barge, personal communication, October 11, 2017). These newly minted bar members will carry the attitudes they have formed over the course of their lives into their new roles.

Sex offender registration laws in Alabama are more severe than in many other states due to a lack of a tier system. All sex offenders are treated as Tier 3 offenders (<http://www.smart.gov/pdfs/sorna/Alabama.pdf>). Regardless of what severity of offense a person commits to become a registered sex offender, they must maintain sex offender registration quarterly for the remainder of their lives, or as long as they live in the state of Alabama.

Alabama Criminal Code Section 15-20-21 defines an Adult Criminal Sex Offender as "a person convicted of a criminal sex offense, including a person who has pleaded nolo contendere

to a criminal sex offense, regardless of whether adjudication was withheld.” A full list of the violations deemed sexual offenses by the state of Alabama are listed in Appendix 4. Charges such as rape, sodomy, child pornography, solicitation of a minor, and incest are all included (Alabama Code § 15-20-21). The legal age of consent in Alabama is 16, with a minimum two year age difference between victim and offender. Children under the age of 12 cannot consent to sexual activity under any circumstances (US HHS, 2004).

All persons who are deemed adult criminal sex offenders must register as a sex offender with the Alabama Department of Corrections, Sheriff’s office, or municipality from which they were released from custody. Community notification will be made via flyer for residents within given bounds of the sex offender’s registered home address. Those bounds vary from 1000 feet to 2000 feet, depending on the population of the area (Alabama Code § 15-20-25). Notification details include:

Name; actual living address; sex; date of birth; complete physical description, including distinguishing features such as scars, birth marks, or any identifying physical characteristics; and a current photograph. This notification shall also include a statement of the criminal sex offense for which he or she has been convicted, including the age and gender of the victim, the geographic area where the offense occurred, and the date upon which the criminal sex offender will be released. This notification shall also include a statement that the same information is on file at the sheriff’s office and police headquarters, if a police department has jurisdiction over the criminal sex offender’s residence, and that the information will be available to the general public for inspection and identification purposes during regular business hours (Alabama Code § 15-20-21).

THE IMPACT OF LAW SCHOOL ON ATTITUDES

A study of students at Yale University compared the cynicism and humanitarianism levels of first and last year students in the law, medical, and nursing schools (Eron & Redmount, 1956). Law students showed a particularly high level of cynicism during their last year of law school, but also a greater sense of humanitarianism than their counterparts in the medical and nursing schools. Eron and Redmount concluded that the subject matter studied in law school led students to both see the world more negatively (cynicism) and to want to do more to help through their work (humanitarianism).

A 1976 study of law students was conducted to determine what factors contributed to students' attitudes towards Supreme Court decisions in major cases (Rathjen, 1976). Multiple regression analysis showed students' opinions on the decisions and the appropriateness of social welfare related cases such as *Roe v. Wade*, *Brown v. Board of Education*, and *Miranda v. Arizona* were most heavily influenced by the year in law school and political affiliation of the students. These factors outweighed several others tested, including religious preference, social or economic motivation for becoming a lawyer, and region of birth. In general, upperclassmen law students were more likely to believe the role of lawyers was to be advocates not only for their individual clients, but for the impact a court decision would have on a group or society as a whole. This would indicate that law school itself influences the attitudes of law students towards issues affecting society and particular groups of society.

These factors—cynicism, humanitarianism, and group and societal advocacy—all play a role in the attitudes of law students. The influence law school has on these attitudes will contribute to how they approach cases throughout their law careers.

COST ANALYSIS OF SORNA LAWS

The U.S. Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs and the Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking (SMART) produced the “Sex Offender Registration and Notification in the United States: Current Case Law and Issues: September 2014” report. This report is issued approximately every four years to document the current status of sex offender registration requirements at the federal level, with some inclusion of how state laws operate under the federal requirements. This provides law enforcement and judicial entities with an up-to-date summary of the often confusing and constantly changing requirements for sex offender registration. While this report helps in keeping up with the current requirements, the fact it is required and has to be regularly updated highlights just how difficult these laws are to follow and enforce.

The effectiveness of sex offender registration laws has long been questioned. Boyle et. al (2013) found that even in New Jersey, where major public outcry for notification of sex offenders began, only half of survey respondents were aware the New Jersey Sex Offender Internet Registry existed, and only 17% had actually accessed the registry. One-third of those who claimed to have accessed the registry to prevent sexual assault did not take any preventative measures after accessing the registry (Boyle et. al, 2013). Further, research shows that compulsive crimes, such as those committed by child predators, are not deterred by the threat of registration as a sex offender (Metchnik, 2013).

Pre- and post-Megan’s Law analysis shows no effect on sex crime rates or recidivism (Zgoba et. al, 2008). In an eight-year pre- and post-SORNA comparison study, the best predictor for recidivism was found to be risk ranking—those rated as “high risk” for re-offense were more likely to reoffend than those at “low risk” (Tewksbury et. al, 2012). However, a study of

recidivism rates among registered sex offenders in Florida found recidivism risk did not match assigned tier rankings, and that those ranked as Tier 2 offenders in Florida were actually more likely to reoffend than those labeled Tier 3 offenders (Zgoba et. al, 2015), raising questions about the validity of risk assessments.

Analysis of recidivism rates have consistently shown that sex offenders have a very low re-offense rate, and when rearrested, are typically not charged with another sex-based offense (Sample & Bray, 2003). A review of eight years worth of arrest data showed that those arrested for robbery were most likely to re-offend within five years, at 74.9%, while sex offenders would only face another arrest 45.1% of the time, and only 6.5% of the time for another sex-based offense (Sample & Bray, 2003). Another study showed that recidivism rates for drug offenses actually increased following the enactment of SORNA requirements, while no significant change in sex offense rates occurred (Jennings et. al, 2014).

The cost of sex offender registration programs is four times that of programs aimed at non-sexually based offenders (Calkins et. al, 2014), and continues to rise. From 2006 to 2007 alone there was a 155% cost increase associated with Megan's Law (Zgoba et. al, 2008). As the number of offenders required to register continues to rise the cost of these programs will only increase. Given life-long registration requirements for many offenders, it is unlikely that the number of registered sex offenders will ever decrease under the current laws, creating an exponential cost increase for these programs.

While the dollar values in question are high, there are personal cost to the offender as well. The limitations placed on registered sex offenders have a punitive impact on the lives of both the offenders and their families (Tewksbury & Lee 2006). Tewksbury & Lee (2006) found through a qualitative study that registered sex offenders experience stigmatization more in

relation to being a sex offender than even that of being a felon, leading to a variety of issues: lack of employment opportunities, loss of familial relationships, inability to have romantic relationships, and harassment. Such consequences add another layer of punishment for committing a sex-based offense.

RESEARCH ON SEX OFFENDER LAWS AND ATTITUDES

Community attitudes towards sex offenders are challenging to measure. In most cases, researchers consider one group at a time, based on their relationship to sex offenders (i.e. professional, personal, location-based). Much like sex offender registration laws, community attitudes studies tend to have a distinct lack of definition for the term “sex offender.”

Common themes characterize studies of general populations. Research subjects are commonly in favor of treatment for sex offenders, (Levenson, Brannon, Fortney, & Baker, 2007; Olver & Barlow, 2010; Rogers, Hirst, & Davies, 2011), while at the same time, the same research subjects believe treatment to be ineffective in rehabilitating sex offenders (Levenson et al, 2007; Olver et al, 2010). Many community responses are at odds with the current research, such as the belief that sex offenders have high recidivism rates (Levenson et al., 2007). Willis, Malinen, and Johnston (2012) found that respondents with higher levels of education were more likely to be open to community involvement from sex offenders, including the possibility of living nearby, but still showed no higher level of affect towards sex offenders.

Attitudes towards sex offenders from law enforcement, corrections, and parole board members are of significant interest, as these are the people who are the most directly involved in the rehabilitation and registration process. Conley, Hill, Church, Stoeckel, and Allen (2011) found that corrections personnel believe sex offenders can be rehabilitated, but should be monitored closely, up to the point of tracking devices. Corrections and parole board members

surveyed in a national study moderately support sex offender registration, including 51% that believe offenders should wear tracking devices and 24% who believe sex offenders cannot be rehabilitated (Tewksbury, Mustaine, and Payne, 2012). Another study of parole board members found little faith in the effectiveness of registration at reducing recidivism rates (Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2012). Education level of respondents was also significant in this study, showing that the higher the educational attainment of the respondent, the less faith they had in the effectiveness of sex offender registration laws (Tewksbury et al., 2012).

Research related to law enforcement officers provides interesting insights from those most directly involved in monitoring sex offender registration. When polled, officers were in favor of sex offender notifications primarily through lists posted online and at agencies, to include name, photograph, home address, and description of offense (Tewksbury & Ernharst-Mustaine, 2013). This list is far less detailed than the reporting requirements of many states, and allows somewhat more freedom for registered offenders, such as not including employment details or vehicle information. Interviews conducted with law enforcement officers who work directly with sex offender registration programs determined officers find face-to-face interviews with offenders to be the most effective in proper monitoring, rather than the check-list based surveys most officers are required to complete (Powel, Day, Benson, Vess, and Graffam, 2014). Officers reported a lack of proper training for dealing with the propensity for grooming, “a variety of techniques used by sex offenders to access and control potential and actual child victims” (Lanning, 2010, p. 10), which as a psychological technique can be used against adults as well. In other research, officers reported offenders they interacted with regularly wound up having extreme cases of dependency on the officers (Powel et al., 2014). Treating sex offenders as human beings was a recurring theme in successfully establishing a rapport with the offenders.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

Labeling theory suggests that the individual is constantly evolving, and that the individual adapts in response to how he or she is perceived by others. Lemert (1951) expounded on this concept by introducing the terms primary and secondary deviance. According to Lemert, primary deviance is an action taken by a person that is rationalized by the person and/or society so as not to be deemed “criminal.” For example, society generally agrees that everyone speeds while driving so minor speeding violations, while illegal, are not considered criminal in the eye of the public. Secondary deviance occurs when such actions are repeated, creating societal recognition of the individual as criminal (Lemert, 1951). Someone who is cited repeatedly for speeding would eventually face suspension of license, increase in car insurance rates, or other sanctions that would impact the way he or she is perceived by society.

The problem that labeling theory recognizes is that once a person has accepted that society sees them through the lens of any given label—reckless driver, convict, parolee, sex offender—that person is then more likely to adapt themselves to match that label. This status perpetuates a cycle of deviance that would only serve to increase crime, rather than reduce it (Lemert, 1951). Therefore, requiring convicted sex offenders to publicly register as a sex offender and have their communities notified of their presence in such a capacity would only serve to increase the likelihood of such persons committing additional offenses. Labeling theory suggests that the goals of SORNA requirements are strictly opposed to the actual implications of such laws.

Further, Braithwaite (1989) discussed two types of labeling: reintegrative, when a society works together to bring a labeled person back into the community, and disintegrative, when a labeled person is stigmatized and essentially ostracized from the community. The sex offender

registry laws in the United States would be considered disintegrative—there is no attempt to bring an offender back into society as a whole, while efforts do exist to keep the offender separated through requirements such as distance from certain locations and secondary impacts such as lack of employment opportunities. Bratina (2013) suggests sex offender policies be reconsidered to limit the negative effects of disintegrative labeling.

This study focuses on law students—the future jurists who will argue and hear sex offense cases. As the actors in the courtroom, their beliefs about sex offenders could impact how they approach these cases, whether they serve as defense lawyers, prosecutors, or judges. Biases based on labels can negatively impact the treatment received by the defendant. For example, a prosecutor who believes sex offenders cannot be rehabilitated may be less likely to offer a plea deal including treatment for a lesser sentence.

The purpose of this study is to determine the attitudes towards sex offenders held by law students, and determine if those attitudes can be changed through education. Numerous groups within the criminal justice system have been surveyed regarding their attitudes towards sex offenders, however, lawyers and judges have not been included to date. For this study, future lawyers and judges—law students of today—were surveyed. The attitudes lawyers and judges hold towards sex offenders and their treatment is important because it can affect how such persons are treated in the judicial process and how the individual responds to such labeling. According to labeling theory, the attitudes held towards sex offenders can greatly increase such person's chances of recidivism or committing other criminal acts because once the label is applied the person conforms to the expectation of that label. Recent years have seen an increase in research into issues surrounding sex offender registration laws and attitudes towards sex offenders and their treatment from various populations within the criminal justice system.

CHAPTER III

CURRENT STUDY

BACKGROUND

There is ongoing debate about the effectiveness of sex offender registration policies at both the federal and state level (Boyle et. al, 2013), and significant resources are spent on these programs (Calkins et. al, 2014, Zgoba et. al, 2008). The common misconception that treatment is not an option for sex offenders creates a cultural taboo for those wishing to provide or seek treatment (Levenson et al, 2007; Olver et al, 2010).

The criminal justice system is composed of many parts operating together. Law enforcement officers, corrections, parole boards and others have been surveyed regarding their attitudes towards sex offenders and their treatment. However, a major component has been missed in the course of prior research—those parties actively participating in a courtroom: the lawyers prosecuting and defending, and the judges hearing the cases. For this study, law students at The University of Alabama were surveyed. While they are not the current participants in the courtroom, they soon will be, so their attitudes towards sex offenders are just as significant. The goal of this study is to determine what attitudes students hold towards sex offenders and their treatment. The original intent was to survey registered members of the Alabama State Bar Association, however, too few responses were received and the scope of the research had to be changed.

University of Alabama law students were surveyed to determine their attitudes towards sex offenders, and if those attitudes could be changed through education regarding myths and facts about sex offenders. Participants were divided equally into two groups. Both groups completed an identical pre-test, and then received an educational intervention. The experimental group read myths and facts about sex offenders, while the control group read myths and facts about drug offenders. Both groups then completed a post-test, which was identical to the pre-test. This methodology allowed for comparison between pre- and post-tests results, as well as between the experimental and control groups, to determine if any changes in attitudes occurred due to the education received.

METHODOLOGY

In the fall of 2016, University of Alabama law students received an email from James Leonard, Vice Dean of the Law School, inviting them to participate in a research study (Appendix 5). A formal solicitation was attached, explaining the purpose of the research and their role in it. The UA Law School population was 410 (N = 410) at the time of the study.

Participants followed a link provided in the invitation email to a Qualtrics-based survey. Qualtrics is a secure online survey system that uses secure socket layers (SSL) techniques to protect the data. Per Institutional Review Board (IRB) protocol, contact information to reach the researcher was provided to all participants; however, no direct contact was necessary or expected between participants and researcher. No personally identifiable information was collected at any time during the survey. All survey data has been encrypted and stored electronically and is only accessible by the author. This data will be destroyed per APA guidelines once no longer needed.

The survey began with a Participant Consent Form explaining the purpose, risks, benefits, and voluntary nature of the research study (Appendix 6). Participants were not

compensated for this study. Screening questions verified participants consent, age of at least 18 years, ability to read and understand English, and current enrollment as a University of Alabama law student. Two-hundred participants were sought to ensure external validity of the study results, however, participation levels did not reach that milestone. Participants were then asked to answer a series of questions, read a document containing myth and fact information (Appendix 7 and 8), then answer the questions a second time. Demographic information was collected at the end of the survey. Once all sections were completed, participants were thanked for their participation and asked to close their browsers. Of the 410 students eligible, 39 successfully completed the survey (n=39).

Participants were able to leave the study at any time they chose. The survey was made available for one month to reach the largest possible audience. Participants used their own computer or other internet-enabled device to complete the survey. The survey was hosted on Qualtrics through The University of Alabama's license for the software.

The intent of this study is to determine if the attitudes of law students towards sex offenders can be affected through education about myths and facts related to sex offenders. To that end, the hypotheses for this study were:

H₁: All respondents will initially have extremely negative attitudes towards sex offenders and treatment for sex offenders.

H₂: The experimental group will have a less negative view of sex offenders after receiving the educational treatment.

As a pre- and post-test survey with control and experimental groups, there were multiple variables in consideration. The independent variables were the education received, whether as part of the control or experimental group. Participants were randomly assigned by the Qualtrics

software, and provide internal validity to the study. Control group participants read a series of myths and facts about drug offenders, while experimental group participants read myths and facts about sex offenders. The dependent variables were the scores.

The first hypothesis (H₁) examines the overall pre-test analysis of all participants. After the scales were converted to z-scores to normalize the results between scales, the higher the score, the more negative the attitude the respondent would have towards sex offenders. Scores at zero would indicate a neutral attitude, and negative scores indicate more positive attitudes towards sex offenders or treatment for sex offenders.

Since the experimental group read myths and facts that provide evidence to the contrary of popular assumptions regarding sex offenders, the experimental group was expected to show positive change in attitude (H₂). For example, a common myth is that sex offenders are strangers to their victims, when in fact most sexual offenses are perpetrated by someone known to the victim. The control group did not receive the same education. Instead, they read myths and facts about drug offenders, such as the belief that drug users are able to choose to stop using at any time, when drug use is actually an addiction. This educational intervention was not expected to have an impact on their attitudes towards sex offenders; rather, their scores were expected to remain consistent between the pre- and post-tests.

A set of three measures were used for this study—the Community Attitudes Towards Sex Offenders (CATSO) (Church et al., 2008), Attitudes Towards the Treatment of Sex Offenders (ATTSO) (Wnuk et al., 2006), and a series of questions written by this author (Appendix 9, 10, and 11). The order of the surveys is very important. In order to properly test the hypotheses previously stated, the researcher must ensure one survey's questions do not influence the responses to a later survey. For this reason, the CATSO was presented first. This survey

measures overall attitudes towards sex offenders, and of significant note, does not define “sex offender” for the participant. The second scale is the ATTSO. The ATTSO asks questions regarding treatment of sex offenders, which if taken first could potentially influence overall attitudes towards sex offenders. Again, this survey does not define “sex offender”. The third group of questions was aimed at determining how “black and white” participants believe sex offenses should be considered. For instance, whether a judge or jury should have any discretion in determining whether a conviction should result in sex offender registration. These questions might cause the participant to consider the breadth of sex-based offenses more so than they did initially. Finally, the demographics were collected (Appendix 12). The primary reason for asking these at the end of the survey was to limit the influence providing political affiliations would have on participant’s survey responses.

The Community Attitudes Towards Sex Offenders (CATSO) is an 18-item scale ($\alpha = .74$) designed by Church et al. (2008) to measure four factors regarding attitudes towards sex offenders: Social Isolation ($\alpha = .80$), Capacity to Change ($\alpha = .80$), Severity/Dangerousness ($\alpha = .70$), and Deviancy ($\alpha = .43$). Questions from the CATSO scale are measured on a six-point Likert scale ranging from “not true” to “very true,” including questions such as “most sex offenders do not have close friends,” “trying to rehabilitate a sex offender is a waste of time,” “only a few sex offenders are dangerous,” and “sex offenders have high rates of sexual activity.” For this study, the Likert scale was reduced to four points for consistency between the scales.

The Attitudes Towards the Treatment of Sex Offenders (ATTSO) is a 35-item scale ($\alpha = .86$) designed by Wnuk et al. (2006), measuring three factors regarding the treatment of sex offenders: Incapacitation ($\alpha = .88$), Treatment Ineffectiveness ($\alpha = .81$), and Mandated Treatment ($\alpha = .78$). The ATTSO scale uses a 5-point Likert scale of “disagree strongly ” to “agree

strongly” including questions such as “I believe that sex offenders can be treated,” “treating sex offenders is a futile endeavor,” “right now, there are no treatments that work for sex offenders,” and “sex offenders should never be released.” The ambiguous “neutral” response was removed from this survey to force participants to state a belief positively or negatively, and to provide consistency between the scales. Both of these scales have been used previously in repetitious and expanding research.

The third set of questions maintains the four-point Likert scale and focuses on whether or not there might be extenuating circumstances that should be considered in some cases related to sexual offenses or if any sentencing discretion should be available. Local researchers reviewed this series of questions for reasonability and effectiveness. Questions include items such as “Judges should have discretion in sentencing and registration requirements” and “sex offenses are black and white cases; there is no grey area.”

Following these scales, a series of demographics questions were answered. These were requested after the surveys were completed so that answering questions regarding political affiliation did not influence survey results. Demographic questions included sex, age, marital status, race, current year in law school, political party affiliation, and political views (Likert scale from strongly Democrat to strongly Republican).

The data were analyzed using SPSS software licensed to The University of Alabama, with assistance from Dr. Lesley Reid. Data were cleaned, reducing the overall response from 94 to 39. Many participants chose to leave the survey prior to completing the post-test, resulting in this large reduction. Due to the comparative nature of a pre- and post-test design, it was impossible to include any of the incomplete surveys in the analysis.

Reverse-scored questions in the survey were adjusted. These included questions 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15 from the Community Attitudes Towards Sex Offenders (CATSO); questions 1, 2, 3, 10, 14, 15, 16, 31, and 35 from the Attitudes Towards the Treatment of Sex Offenders (ATTSO), and questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 from the additional questions. Responses to these questions were recoded for both pre- and post-tests to match the scale direction of all other questions in the survey.

Cumulative scores for each scale were calculated on an additive basis. The following score ranges were possible for each set of questions:

- CATSO (18 questions) 18-72
- ATTSO (35 questions) 35-140
- Other (9 questions) 9-36

These scores were then converted to z-scores to normalize the data between the three scales, allowing for comparative analysis between the scales.

A two-way mixed ANOVA was run to determine if there was any change between the pre- and post- tests for the control and experimental group. This test allows for consideration of two variables at the same time.

Finally, demographics were analyzed. Due to the small number of respondents, no demographics were controlled for in statistical analysis. Participants in this study were mostly age 18-29 and white, non-Hispanic. There was a near equal distribution of male (18) and female (20) respondents, as well as first (14), second (13), and third year (11) law students.

Approximately one-third of respondents reported being affiliated with the Republican party (11), but their political views were more Independent, Nearer Republic (10) than Strongly Republican (6). Another one-third of students claimed affiliation with the Democratic party (12), and were

more likely to have Strongly Democrat (9) political views. Due to the size of the sample, regressions were not considered, as there were not enough cases to determine influence of any demographics, such as political affiliation, on the amount of change between pre- and post-test.

Table 1

Demographics		
Variable		Total (<i>n</i> = 39)
Sex	Male	18
	Female	20
	Prefer not to answer	1
Age Groups (years)	18-29	34
	30-39	5
Marital Status	Now Married	4
	Divorced	1
	Never Married	32
	Prefer not to answer	2
Race	White (non-Hispanic)	35
	Black	1
	Other than listed	3
Current Year in Law School	First Year	14
	Second Year	13
	Third Year	11
	Prefer not to answer	1
Type of Law	Civil	10
	Criminal Defense	4
	Criminal Prosecution	10
	Corporate	6
	Other	7
	Prefer not to answer	2
Political Party Affiliation	Republican	11
	Democrat	12
	Independent	13
	Other	2
	Prefer not to answer	1
Political Views	Strongly Democrat	9
	Not Strongly Democrat	3
	Independent, Nearer Democrat	3
	Independent	3
	Independent, Nearer Republican	10
	Not Strongly Republican	4
	Strongly Republican	6
	Prefer not to answer	1

Note. Age range options were available for 18-60; however, all respondents fell into two categories.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

CATSO ANALYSIS

There were outliers in the data, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot for values greater than 1.5 box-lengths from the edge of the box. These outliers were reviewed individually and determined to be genuinely unusual values. Due to the small sample size, the outliers were not removed from the analysis.

CATSO Experimental Group scores were not normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test ($p < .05$), while the CATSO Control Group scores were normally distributed ($p > .05$). Due to the robust nature of ANOVAs, this is likely to have little impact on the analysis so no changes were made. There was homogeneity of covariance, as assessed by Box's test of equality of covariance matrices ($p = .108$).

There was no statistically significant interaction between the intervention and time (pre- and post-test scores) for CATSO scores $F(1,37) = .386, p = .538, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .010$. However, the main effect of time showed a statistically significant difference in CATSO scores at the different time points, $F(1,37) = 11.491, p = .002, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .237$.

The CATSO scores indicate that time can influence attitudes, but the myth vs. fact intervention did not significantly change attitudes towards sex offenders. The difference between

the pre- and post-test scores did show less negative attitudes towards sex offenders, but the change was not significantly different between the control and experimental groups.

Table 2

Two-Way Mixed ANOVA: Pre vs. Post Test

	Measures	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2	df
CATSO Score	Time	25.471	.002**	.237	1
	Time * Group	.856	.538	.010	1
ATTSO Score	Time	44.550	.027*	.125	1
	Time * Group	.242	.866	.001	1

** Significant at the .01 level

* Significant at the .05 level

n = 39

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations

	Group	M	SD	<i>n</i>
CATSO Pre- Score	Experimental	44.82	5.95	17
	Control	44.91	7.83	22
CATSO Post- Score	Experimental	43.88	5.72	17
	Control	43.55	5.55	22
ATTSO Pre- Score	Experimental	70.00	14.31	17
	Control	66.09	7.64	22
ATTSO Post- Score	Experimental	68.59	13.59	17
	Control	64.45	10.24	22

ATTSO ANALYSIS

There were outliers in the data, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot for values greater than 1.5 box-lengths from the edge of the box. These outliers were reviewed individually and determined to be genuinely unusual values. Due to the small sample size, the outliers were not removed from the analysis.

ATTSO scores were not normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test ($p < .05$), with the exception of the Pre-score for the Control Group. Due to the robust nature of ANOVAs, this is likely to have little impact on the analysis so no changes were made. There was homogeneity of variances for the ATTSO post-scores, as assessed by Levene's test of homogeneity of variance ($p > .05$), but not for the ATTSO pre-scores. There was homogeneity of covariance, as assessed by Box's test of equality of covariance matrices ($p = .006$).

There was no statistically significant interaction between the intervention and time (pre- and post-test scores) for ATTSO scores $F(1,37) = .029$, $p = .866$, partial $\eta^2 = .001$, however, the main effect of time showed a statistically significant difference in ATTSO scores at the different time points, $F(1,37) = 5.290$, $p = .027$, partial $\eta^2 = .125$ (see Table 2).

As with the CATSO scores, the ATTSO shows overall less negative attitudes between pre- and post-test scores regardless of if participants received the experimental or control group intervention.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

Analysis of the additional questions showed no reliability and no significant results. Further review of these questions showed the first six to be of a more legal nature, so an attempt was made to analyze those six alone, but no significant results were found there, either. The

decision was made to strike formal analysis of these questions from the overall results of the study.

DISCUSSION

The first hypothesis (H_1) of this study was that all respondents would initially have extremely negative attitudes towards sex offenders. For the CATSO and ATTSO, a lower score indicates a less-negative attitude. A CATSO score of 45 and an ATTSO score of 87.5 would be considered “average”. Based on the mean additive scores (seen previously in Table 3), scores fell between the first and second quartile, meaning they were not extremely negative.

Due to the adjusted Likert scale for the CATSO from six points to four, and the ATTSO from five points to four, a direct comparison could not be made between the results of this study and results of similar studies conducted by other researchers. To make this determination, a two-tailed independent samples t-test was run.

The CATSO showed no significant difference between this study ($M = 44.82$, $SD = 9.5$) and the 2012 Willis, Malinen, and Johnston study ($M = 54.54$, $SD = 9.5$); $t(416) = -0.95$, $p = 1.96$. Day et. al (2014) conducted a two-part study involving Health Professionals and Law Enforcement which also showed no significant difference from the results of this study ($M = 37.6$, $SD = 8.2$); $t(18) = 1.67$, $p = 2.03$ and ($M = 45.7$, $SD = 5.8$) $t(17) = -.17$, $p = 2.037$.

There was significant difference found between this study ($M = 70$, $SD = 14.31$) and other research conducted using the ATTSO: Sahlstrom and Jeglic (2008) ($M = 58.9$, $SD = 6$); $t(52) = 2.74$, $p = 1.99$; Kleban & Jeglic (2012) ($M = 86.32$, $SD = 11.95$); $t(29) = -2.80$, $p = 2.02$).

Table 4

Independent Samples t-test

Scale	Study	Scale	M	SD	<i>n</i>	df	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
CATSO	Trull (2017)	4	70	14.31	17	16		
	Willis, Malinen, and Johnston (2012)	6	54.54	9.5	401	416	0.95	1.96
	Day (2014) Health Professionals	6	37.6	8.2	18	33	1.67	2.03
	Day (2014) Law Enforcement	6	45.7	5.8	17	32	0.17	2.04
ATTSO	Trull (2017)	4	44.82	5.95	17	16		
	Sahlstrom & Jeglic (2012)	5	58.9	6	52	67	2.74	1.99
	Kleban & Jeglic (2008)	5	86.32	11.95	29	44	-2.8	2.02

The second hypothesis (H₂) was that the experimental group would have a less negative attitude of sex offenders after receiving educational treatment. While this was true, the control group actually saw a greater change.

The results of this study were less compelling than desired. Prior research using the same educational intervention with other groups has yielded positive changes in attitudes among experimental group participants (Kleban & Jeglic, 2012). In their study, the ATTSO instrument was used, as well as a scale called Attitudes Towards Sex Offenders (ATSO), rather than the CATSO used in this study. The same myth and fact interventions used by Kleban and Jeglic were adopted for this study. They were able to conduct multiple types of interventions—written surveys, focus groups, and oral presentations—with a higher number of respondents, and compare the effectiveness of each type of intervention. Their findings showed that focus groups were the most effective form of education (Kleban & Jeglic, 2012).

The small number of participants in this study greatly limits the generalizability of these results. A more robust sample could potentially show significant differences in control and experimental group responses. This study could be repeated with additional, larger populations of law students, as well as with currently acting jurists who handle sex offense cases.

The change in attitudes seen in relation to time could indicate that exposure to the questions raised caused more critical thinking to take place. This would indicate there is potential to influence negative attitudes by way of questioning why those attitudes exist, and creating an opportunity for individuals to reconsider beliefs they have previously taken for granted. This may be more likely to be true in the cases in this study, where participants are law students, and therefore can be expected to regularly make use of a certain level of critical thinking processes that may not take place in the general public. The simple questioning of whether sex offenders should wear tracking devices, whether treatment is effective, and whether they should be allowed in the community could cause reconsideration for people trained in critical thinking the way law students have been trained. However, the same level of critical thinking could be expected of jurists actively working in courtrooms.

As future jurists, the capacity to reconsider and change attitudes towards sex offenders seen in these results provides hope that future cases tried and heard by these students can be handled fairly and justly for the defendants. The label of sex offender could be less damning given legal counsel and judges who believe in the possibility of effective treatment and rehabilitation. Greater understanding of the vast differences in types of offense that fall under the sex offender label could increase the likelihood of opportunities for plea bargains and sentencing that focuses on treatment and rehabilitation, an approach that has been shown effective (Stenson, Becker, and McVay, 2017).

Therefore, future research should consider current jurists actively working in criminal law as prosecutors, defense attorneys, and judges. Regression analysis of key demographic differences should be analyzed to potentially see where significant bias may exist. A focus group approach could be useful for the educational portion of the survey as well. This would allow more time to be spent emphasizing the differences in the myths and facts, and encourage critical thinking among participants to move past the knee-jerk reactions most people have towards sex offenders. Results of larger studies could be used to create training programs for jurists involved in sex offense cases to help alleviate the stigmatization of the sex offender label and nullify the impact of such labels in the courtroom.

REFERENCES

42 US Code § 16911

Adam Walsh Child Protection Safety Act of 2006, Pub. L. No. 109-248, 11 Stat. 2466 (2006).

Ala. Code (1975) § 15-20-21.

Ala. Code (1975) § 15-20-25.

Allen, W. D. (2007). The reporting and underreporting of rape. *Southern Economic Journal*, 73(3), 623-641.

Boyle, D., Ragusa-Salerno, L., Marcus, A., Passannante, M., & Furrer, S. (2014). Public knowledge and use of sexual offender Internet registries: Results from a random digit dialing telephone survey. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(10), 1914-1932.

Bratina, M. P. (2013). Sex offender residency requirements: an effective crime prevention strategy or a false sense of security? *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 15(3), 200-218.

Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame, and reintegration*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Calkins, C., Jeglic, E., Beattey, R. A., Zeidman, S., & Perillo, A. D. (2014). Sexual violence legislation: A review of case law and empirical research. *Psychology, Public Policy, And Law*, 20(4), 443-462.

Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment and Adoption Reform Act, Public Law 95-266 (1978).

Child Protection Act of 1984, Public Law 98-292 (1984).

Child Sexual Abuse and Pornography Act of 1986, Public Law 99-628 (1986).

Children's Justice and Assistance Act of 1986, Public Law 99-401 (1986).

Church, T., Wakeman, E., Miller, S., Clements, C., & Sun, F. (2008). The Community Attitudes Towards Sex Offenders scale: The development of a psychometric assessment. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 18(3), 251-259.

Conley, T., Hill, K., Church, W. T., Stoeckel, E., & Allen, H. (2011). Assessing probation and community corrections workers' attitudes toward sex offenders using the Community Attitudes Toward Sex Offenders (CATSO) scale in a rural state. *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity*, 18(2), 75-85.

- Crime Control Act of 1990, Public Law 101-647 (1990).
- Day, A., Boni, N., Hobbs, G., Carson, E., Whitting, L., & Powell, M. (2014). Professional Attitudes to Sex Offenders: Implications for Multiagency and Collaborative Working. *Sexual Abuse In Australia & New Zealand*, 6(1), 12-19.
- Eron, L. D.; Redmount, R. S. (1956). Effect of legal education on attitudes, the *Journal of Legal Education* 9(4), 431-443.
- Hess, R. D., & Torney-Purta, J. (2017). *The Development of Political Attitudes in Children*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Higher Education Amendments of 1992, Public Law 102-325 (1992).
- Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act, Public Law 101-630 (1990).
- Jennings, W. G., Zgoba, K. M., Donner, C. M., Henderson, B. B., & Tewksbury, R. (2014). Considering specialization/versatility as an unintended collateral consequence of SORNA. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 42, 184-192.
- Jacob Wetterling Improvements Act, Public Law 105-119 (1997).
- Kleban, H., & Jeglic, E. (2012). Dispelling the myths: Can psychoeducation change public attitudes towards sex offenders? *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 18(2), 179-193.
- Lanning, K. (2010). Child molesters: A behavioral analysis. *National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention*. 5, 26.
- Lemert, E. M. (1951). *Social pathology; a systematic approach to the theory of sociopathic behavior*. New York, NY. McGraw-Hill, 1951.
- Levenson, J. S., Brannon, Y. N., Fortney, T., & Baker, J. (2007). Public perceptions about sex offenders and community protection policies. *Analyses Of Social Issues & Public Policy*, 7(1), 137-161.
- Major Crimes Act Amendment of 1986, Public Law 99-303 (1986).
- Mancini, C., & Mears, D. P. (2013). U.S. Supreme Court decisions and sex offender legislation: Evidence of evidence-based policy? *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 103(4), 1115-1153.
- Mental Health Systems Act, Public Law 96-398 (1980).
- Metchik, E. (2013). Megan's Law. *Salem Press Encyclopedia of Science*. January 2013.
- National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC), Special Analysis Unit. (2014). *Registered sex offenders in the United States and its territories per 100,000 population*. Retrieved from http://www.missingkids.com/en_US/documents/Sex_Offenders_Map.pdf

- National Center for Missing & Exploited Children (2011). Number of registered sex offenders in the U.S. in 2011 by state. In Statista - The Statistics Portal. Retrieved from <http://www.statista.com/statistics/203854/number-of-registered-sex-offenders-in-the-us-by-state/>
- National Child Protection Act of 1993, Public Law 103-209 (1993).
- Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics (2013). Female victims of sexual violence, 1994-2010. Retrieved from: <http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=4594>.
- Olver, M. E., & Barlow, A. A. (2010). Public attitudes toward sex offenders and their relationship to personality traits and demographic characteristics. *Behavioral Sciences & The Law*, 28(6), 832-849.
- Pam Lychner Sex Offender Tracking and Identification Act, Public Law 104-236 (1996).
- Powell, M., Day, A., Benson, M., Vess, J., & Graffam, J. (2014). Police officers' perceptions of interviewing offenders on sex offender registries. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 16(4), 255-266.
- Preble, J. (2014). The shame game: Montana's right to privacy for Level 1 sex offenders. *Montana Law Review*, 75, 297.
- Privacy Protection for Rape Victims Act, Public Law 95-540 (1978).
- Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to end the Exploitation of Children Today Act (PROTECT Act), Public Law 108-21 (2003).
- Protection of Children Against Sexual Exploitation Act, Public Law 95-225 (1978).
- Protection of Children from Sexual Predators Act, Public Law 105-314 (1998).
- Rathjen, G. J. (1976). The impact of legal education on the beliefs, attitudes and values of law students. *Tennessee Law Review* 44(1), 85-118.
- Rogers, P., Hirst, L., & Davies, M. (2011). An investigation into the effect of respondent gender, victim age, and perpetrator treatment on public attitudes towards sex offenders, sex offender treatment, and sex offender rehabilitation. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 50(8), 511-530.
- Sahlstrom, K. J., & Jeglic, E. L. (2008). Factors affecting attitudes toward juvenile sex offenders. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 17(2), 180-196.
- Sample, L. L., & Bray, T. M. (2003). Are sex offenders dangerous? *Criminology & Public Policy*, 3(1), 59-82.

- Sampson, A. (1994). *Acts of abuse: Sex offenders and the criminal justice system*. London: Routledge.
- Sex Offender Registration Act, Minnesota Statute 285-371 (1991).
- Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act, 42 U.S.C. § 16911 (2006).
- Sexual Abuse Act of 1986, Public Law 99-654 (1986).
- Stinson, J. D., Becker, J. V., & Mcvay, L. A. (2017). Treatment progress and behavior following 2 years of inpatient sex offender treatment. *Sexual abuse: A Journal Of Research & Treatment (Sage)*, 29(1), 3-27.
- Tewksbury, R. (2014). Evidence of ineffectiveness: Advancing the argument against sex offender residence restrictions. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 13(1), 135-138.
- Tewksbury, R., & Ernharst Mustaine, E. (2013). Law-enforcement officials' views of sex offender registration and community notification. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 15(2), 95-113.
- Tewksbury, R., Jennings, W. G., & Zgoba, K. M. (2012). A longitudinal examination of sex offender recidivism prior to and following the implementation of SORN. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 30(3), 308-328.
- Tewksbury, R., & Lees, M. (2006). Perceptions of sex offender registration: Collateral consequences and community experiences. *Sociological Spectrum*, 26(3), 309-334.
- Tewksbury, R., & Mustaine, E. (2012). Parole board members' views of sex offender registration and community notification. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37(3), 413-431.
- Tewksbury, R., Mustaine, E. E., & Payne, B. K. (2012). Community corrections professionals' attitudes about sex offenders: is the CATSO applicable? *Criminal Justice Studies*, 25(2), 145-157.
- United States Department of Health and Human Services. (2004). *Statutory rape: A guide to state laws and reporting requirements*. Retrieved from <https://aspe.hhs.gov/report/statutory-rape-guide-state-laws-and-reporting-requirements>
- United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking (SMART). (2011). *SORNA Substantial implementation review: State of Alabama*. Retrieved from <http://www.smart.gov/pdfs/sorna/Alabama.pdf>
- United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking (SMART). (2014). *Sex offender registration and notification in the United States: Current case law and issues*. Retrieved from <http://floridaactioncommittee.org/us-doj-issues-september-2014->

sex-offender-registration-and-notification-in-the-united-states-current-case-law-and-issues/

Veterans Health Care Act of 1992, Public Law 102-585 (1992).

Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act, Public Law 106-386 (2000).

Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, U.S.C.A. 42 § 16901 (1994).

Willis, G., Malinen, S., & Johnston, L. (2012). Demographic differences in public attitudes towards sex offenders. *Psychiatry, Psychology, and Law*, 20(2), 1-18.

Wnuk, D., Chapman, J. E., & Jeglic, E. L. (2006). Development and refinement of a measure of attitudes toward sex offender treatment. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 43(3), 35-47.

Zgoba, K. M., Miner, M., Levenson, J., Knight, R., Letourneau, E., & Thornton, D. (2015). The Adam Walsh Act: An examination of sex offender risk classification systems. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research And Treatment*. Advance online publication. February 5, 2015.

Zgoba, K. (2008). *Megan's Law. [electronic resource] : assessing the practical and monetary efficacy*. [Washington, D.C. : U.S. Dept. of Justice ; Trenton, N.J.] : Research & Evaluation Unit, Office of Policy and Planning, New Jersey Dept. of Corrections, [2008].

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 – FEDERAL DEFINITION OF SEX OFFENDER: 42 US CODE § 16911

“(1) Sex offender

The term “sex offender” means an individual who was convicted of a sex offense.

(2) Tier I sex offender

The term “tier I sex offender” means a sex offender other than a tier II or tier III sex offender.

(3) Tier II sex offender

The term “tier II sex offender” means a sex offender other than a tier III sex offender whose offense is punishable by imprisonment for more than 1 year and—

(A) is comparable to or more severe than the following offenses, when committed against a minor, or an attempt or conspiracy to commit such an offense against a minor:

- (i) sex trafficking (as described in section 1591 of title 18);
- (ii) coercion and enticement (as described in section 2422 (b) of title 18);
- (iii) transportation with intent to engage in criminal sexual activity (as described in section 2423 (a)) ^[1] of title 18;
- (iv) abusive sexual contact (as described in section 2244 of title 18);

(B) involves—

- (i) use of a minor in a sexual performance;
- (ii) solicitation of a minor to practice prostitution; or
- (iii) production or distribution of child pornography; or

(C) occurs after the offender becomes a tier I sex offender.

(4) Tier III sex offender

The term “tier III sex offender” means a sex offender whose offense is punishable by imprisonment for more than 1 year and—

(A) is comparable to or more severe than the following offenses, or an attempt or conspiracy to commit such an offense:

(i) aggravated sexual abuse or sexual abuse (as described in sections 2241 and 2242 of title 18); or

(ii) abusive sexual contact (as described in section 2244 of title 18) against a minor who has not attained the age of 13 years;

(B) involves kidnapping of a minor (unless committed by a parent or guardian); or

(C) occurs after the offender becomes a tier II sex offender” (SORNA, 2006).

APPENDIX 2 – PRE-SORNA CRIME LAWS

Year	Title	Details
1978	Protection of Children Against Sexual Exploitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Made the participation in, production of, and distribution of child pornography illegal • Made the use of interstate commerce in transporting females under the age of 18 for the purpose of prostitution illegal
1978	Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment and Adoption Reform Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused on the sexual abuse of children • Funding was made available to create programs for prevention, identification, and treatment of sexually abused children
1978	Privacy Protection for Rape Victims Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibited the sexual history of a rape victim from being flaunted in court • Prior to this Act, a woman’s supposed sexual history was often used as a defense for the accused, intending to show that she consented to sex with the accused based on a history of past consent
1980	Mental Health Systems Act – Title VI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided grants for services for rape victims, including counseling and other social services, rape prevention programs, and additional victim assistance within Community Mental Health Centers
1984	Child Protection Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications via wire were allowed to be used as evidence in sexual exploitation of children cases • Penalties for such convictions were increased • Materials involving the sexual exploitation of children no longer had to be deemed “obscene” to be prohibited • Distribution of such materials was banned even if there was no intent to sale the items • The age of a minor for the purpose of sexual exploitation definitions was raised to age 18
1985	Major Crimes Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amended to include Indian country in federal jurisdiction for cases involving the sexual molestation of a minor
1986	Children’s Justice and Assistance Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required the FBI’s Uniform Crime Report to begin including the age of the victim and relationship between the victim and offender in child abuse cases, including sexual abuse
1986	Child Abuse and Pornography Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibited the advertisement of products, including undeveloped video or film, depicting sexual exploitation of children and the availability of children for use in acts of sexual exploitation • Further amended prior statutes to include male victims in bans on using interstate commerce for the purpose of prostitution • Increased penalties for such actions

1986	Sexual Abuse Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Created federal definitions for graded sexual offenses <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aggravated sexual abuse—includes use of force or threat of harm, death, or kidnapping; 2. Sexual abuse—includes threat of harm, death, or kidnapping of a third party, or involving a person incapable of consent; 3. Sexual abuse of a minor or ward—includes engaging in a sexual act with a minor between the ages of 1 and 16 who is at least four years younger than the accused, or is under the custodial or supervisory care of the accused; provided defense if the accused believed the minor to be age 16 at the time of the act. 4. Abusive sexual conduct
1989	Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directed the establishment of an Indian Child Abuse Treatment Grant Program, which was to include programs for Indian children who were sexually abused
1990*	Crime Control Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Included numerous acts all aimed at increasing crime control in the United States. Multiple titles follow (*).
1990	Title II: Victims of Child Abuse Act*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subtitle A: Improving Investigation and Prosecution of Child Abuse: Provided grant funding for the formation of programs to include counseling for children who were victims of sexual abuse, which was required to be provided within 24 hours • Subtitle D: Federal Victims Protection and Rights: Allowed any victim of childhood sexual abuse to file charges against their abuser up until the victim is age 25, regardless of any statute of limitation that may be in place, including both criminal and civil proceedings • Subtitle E: Child Care Worker Employee Background Checks: Allows denial of or dismissal from employment from childcare positions for any person convicted of a sex crime, or suspension from such position if charged with a sex crime
1990	Title III: Child Protection Restoration and Penalties Enhancement Act*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subtitle A: Restoration of Recordkeeping Requirement: Increased labeling and recordkeeping requirements for interstate commerce involving sexually explicit materials, and removed the requirement that such materials include genital or pubic-focused conduct in such images • Subtitle B: Sexual Abuse Penalties: Changed the maximum penalty for sexual abuse of a minor from five to 15 years, as well as increases penalties for intent to sell child pornography and eliminating limitations on fines for possession of child pornography
1990	Title IV: Offenses Involving Children*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased penalties for kidnapping a minor and mistreating, sexually abusing, or delivering the child into the custody of another non-legal guardian of the child who commits such abuses

1990	Title V: Protection of Crime Victims*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires the investigating agency in a sexual abuse case to provide the cost of physical examination, by directly paying for such services or reimbursing the victim for those costs
1990	Title XVIII: Correctional Options Incentives Amendments*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires funds be withheld from those states who do not provide testing for the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) of the defendant and the victim involved in a sexual assault, disclosure of test results to both parties, and counseling for HIV for the victim of a sexual assault
1992*	Higher Education Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided revision and reauthorization for various programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, some of which relate to sex crime laws. Multiple titles follow (*).
1992	Title IV: Student Assistance*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part G: General Provisions: Requires colleges and universities to create and distribute information about campus sexual assault programs designed to prevent sex offenses, and what procedures should be followed should a sexual offense occur
1992	Title XV: Related Programs and Amendments to Other Laws*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part D: Grants for Sexual Offenses Education: Provided grant funding for education and prevention programs for sexual assault, specifically connected with local rape crisis centers
1992	Veterans Health Care Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided one year of counseling for female veterans with psychological trauma associated with sexual assault, battery, or harassment incurred while on active duty, provided treatment is sought within two years of discharge from active duty
1993	National Child Protection Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Required states to collect and report child abuse information for inclusion in a background check system for child care providers

Note. Compiled from Congress.gov/legislation, 2015.

*Full title contains included indicated sub-titles under the same legislation.

APPENDIX 3 – SEX OFFENDER REGISTRATION LAWS

Year	Title	Details
1991	Minnesota Sex Offender Registration Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State law that prompted beginning of federal sex offender registration laws • Required sex offender registration within 14 days of release from custody or 10 days of relocation • Fingerprint card and photograph collected • Documents could be collected from inmate processing if available
1994	Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Included: Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children; Sexually Violent Offender Registration Act • First federal requirement for states to begin sex offender registration programs • Required annual sex offender registration for ten years or quarterly registration for violent offenses
1994	Megan’s Law	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amended to Section 170101(d) of Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act • Allowed states to begin community notification of sex offenders in the area • States determined what information would be distributed publicly
1996	Pam Lyncher Sex Offender Tracking and Identification Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Established a National Sex Offender Registry (NSOR) for use by the FBI • Tracked sex offenders who were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ convicted of sex crimes against children ➢ deemed sexually violent predators ➢ have a mental abnormality related to their crime • Required registration for those living outside of state-based registration areas • Allowed FBI to share information with states for community notification, background checks, or relocation of sex offenders between states
1998	Jacob Wetterling Improvements Act (within the Appropriations Act of 1998)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expanded the consideration of sex offender status decisions to include law enforcement and victim advocacy input • Required sex offender to register in new state if they relocated, worked, or attended school in a new state • Required states to adjust their laws to accommodate these requirements
1998	Protection of Children from Child Predators Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided federal assistance from Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) to assist in complying with federal requirements through the Sex Offender Management Assistance (SOMA) program • Required federal prisons’ internet access to be monitored
2000	Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Included Campus Sex Crimes Prevention Act

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required registered sex offenders to notify the higher education institution they attended or worked at, and that notification to be sent to local law enforcement • Required higher education institutions to provide information regarding how to access sex offender registration information as part of the annual campus security report required by the Higher Education Act of 1965
2003	Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to end the Exploitation of Children Today (PROTECT) Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilized the internet as a resource for sex offender registration • Required the Department of Justice (DOJ) to maintain a website linking to each state's newly required website for sex offender registrations
2006	Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defined three tiers of sex offenders based on crimes committed • Established federal regulations for registration based on tier <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Tier 3 offenders required to update residency information quarterly for life ➤ Tier 2 offenders required to update residency information every six months for 25 years ➤ Tier 1 offenders required to update residency information annually for 15 years • Retroactive in nature, requiring unregistered prior offenders to meet current tier-based regulations regardless of any prior exemptions

Note. Compiled from Congress.gov/legislation, 2015.

APPENDIX 4 – STATE OF ALABAMA DEFINITION OF SEX OFFENDER: ALABAMA CODE § 15-20-21

- a. Rape in the first or second degree, as proscribed by Section 13A-6-61 or 13A-6-62; provided that a sentencing court may exempt from this article a juvenile or youthful offender criminal sex offender for a criminal sex offense as defined in Section 13A-6-62(a)(1).
- b. Sodomy in the first or second degree, as proscribed by Section 13A-6-63 or 13A-6-64.
- c. Sexual torture, as proscribed by Section 13A-6-65.1.
- d. Sexual abuse in the first or second degree as proscribed by Section 13A-6-66 or 13A-6-67.
- e. Enticing a child to enter a vehicle, room, house, office, or other place for immoral purposes, as proscribed by Section 13A-6-69.
- f. Promoting prostitution in the first or second degree, as proscribed by Section 13A-12-111 or 13A-12-112.
- g. Violation of the Alabama Child Pornography Act, as proscribed by Section 13A-12-191, 13A-12-192, 13A-12-196, or 13A-12-197.
- h. Kidnapping of a minor, except by a parent, in the first or second degree, as proscribed by Section 13A-6-43 or 13A-6-44.
- i. Incest, as proscribed by Section 13A-13-3, when the offender is an adult and the victim is a minor.
- j. Soliciting a child by computer for the purposes of committing a sexual act and transmitting obscene material to a child by computer, as proscribed by Sections 13A-6-110 and 13A-6-111.

- k. Any solicitation, attempt, or conspiracy to commit any of the offenses listed in paragraphs a. to j., inclusive.
- l. Any crime committed in any state or a federal, military, Indian, or a foreign country jurisdiction which, if it had been committed in this state under the current provisions of law, would constitute an offense listed in paragraphs a. to k., inclusive.
- m. The foregoing notwithstanding, any crime committed in any jurisdiction which, irrespective of the specific description or statutory elements thereof, is in any way characterized or known as rape, sodomy, sexual assault, sexual battery, sexual abuse, sexual torture, solicitation of a child, enticing or luring a child, child pornography, lewd and lascivious conduct, taking indecent liberties with a child, or molestation of a child (Alabama Code § 15-20-21).

APPENDIX 5 – SOLICITAION: EMAIL FROM VICE DEAN LEONARD AND ATTACHED LETTER

Dear Law Students,

Valerie Trull, a graduate student at The University of Alabama, is conducting a survey of law student attitudes toward sex offenders. One participates by taking an anonymous online survey that requires approximately 20 minutes. If you are interested in participating, please see the attached instructions from Ms. Trull. Please also note that participation is strictly voluntary and not required by the Law School.

Take care,

JBL

James Leonard

Vice Dean and James M. Kidd, Sr. Professor of Law

School of Law

[The University of Alabama](#)

Room 256 Law Center

Box 870382

Tuscaloosa, AL 35487

Phone [205-348-5927](tel:205-348-5927)

jleonard@law.ua.edu

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA®

Dear Law Student,

My name is Valerie Trull and I am a graduate student at The University of Alabama. With the help of Dr. Lesley Reid, I am analyzing the attitudes of future lawyers and judges towards sex offenders. Given your role as a law student, who will one day become a lawyer and maybe even a judge in our criminal justice system, I am inviting you to participate in this research study by completing the linked survey. Your responses are valuable regardless of what type of law you plan to practice.

The study involves a survey which may be completed online at your convenience. The survey takes about 20 minutes. The short survey is completely confidential. Please do not include your name, as we will not be collecting any identifiable information (e.g., your name, IP address). Instead, your responses to the survey will be coded with a random ID number so we will not have to ask you for any personal information. Your participation is voluntary and you can quit the survey at any time by exiting your Internet browser.

If you are over the age of 18 years, and are interested in participating in this confidential survey please click on the link below to continue on to the survey.

The data collected will provide useful information regarding attitudes towards sex offenders. This study will be published, and copies will be made available upon request.

In addition, you may contact Valerie Trull, the principal investigator, at The University of Alabama in the College of Arts & Sciences via email valerie.trull@ua.edu or phone (205) 348-4054, or Dr. Lesley Reid, faculty advisor, via email lwreid@ua.edu or phone (205) 348-1792 for more information or to request a copy of the results of the study.

To access the survey please click here, or copy/paste this URL into your browser:
[Link to Survey]

Thank you for participating in scientific research!

Sincerely,

Valerie Trull
Graduate Student
University of Alabama
Department of Criminal Justice

APPENDIX 6 – CONSENT FORM

RESEARCH PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Analyzing the Attitudes of Law Students Towards Sex Offenders

Valerie E. Trull

The University of Alabama

College of Arts & Sciences

Purpose of Research. The purpose of this research is to analyze the attitudes of law students towards sex offenders.

Specific Procedures. The anonymous, online survey will be administered using a secure website. Once you have read this consent form, and agree to voluntarily participate, you will be taken to a secure website to complete the online survey. You may withdraw from the survey at any time, and you may skip any questions you do not feel comfortable answering.

Duration of Participation. Most people take about twenty minutes to complete the survey. We understand that twenty minutes is a long time, but we hope that you decide to continue and be a part of scientific research.

Risks. The risks to you are minimal. They are not greater than those ordinarily encountered in daily life. Please know that this is an confidential survey that uses a secure link. The survey is confidential because we will not be able to link your responses back to you. While completing the survey, the only risk to you might be if someone were to see your responses to the survey. We recommend you take this survey when you have complete privacy with little interruption. Please access the survey in a private browser and make sure to close the browser once you have completed the survey. We want you to be as comfortable as possible, and we hope that you will consider being a part of this scientific research.

Benefits. There will be no personal benefit from your participation in the study, but the knowledge received may be of value to humanity. The information is expected to be informative and helpful in determining community attitudes towards sex offenders.

Confidentiality. We do not ask for your name or any other information that could be used to identify you during the time you take the online survey. The survey software will randomly assign an ID number to your responses. This means that the responses in the questionnaires cannot be linked or matched to you, which means your responses will remain completely confidential. Only researchers associated with this study will have access to the data, and it will be stored electronically in an encrypted format. The encrypted data will be kept indefinitely and will be used only for research purposes. The project's research records may be reviewed by departments at The University of Alabama responsible for regulatory research oversight.

Voluntary Nature of Participation. Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary and you may withdraw from the survey at any time or skip any questions that you feel uncomfortable answering.

Contact Information. If you have any questions about this survey either before or after completion, you may contact Valerie Trull, the Principal Investigator, at (205) 348-4054 or via email at valerie.trull@ua.edu or Dr. Lesley Reid, faculty advisor, at (205) 348-1792 or via email at lwreid@ua.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a person taking part in a research study, or if you would like to make suggestions or file complaints and concerns, you may call Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer of the University at (205) 348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3066. You may also ask questions, make suggestions, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach Website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html. You may email us at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu. You may print a copy of this consent form for your records.

Your consent to continue. If you are 18 years of age or older, freely agree to participate in this study, have had the opportunity to read this consent form, had the research explained, had the opportunity to ask questions about the project and have them answered, then please click on the “I Agree” button below. Otherwise, we thank you for your time and ask that you click on the “I Do Not Agree” button.

I Agree

I Do Not Agree

APPENDIX 7 – MYTHS AND FACTS: CONTROL GROUP

Myth #1: Drug addiction is voluntary behaviour

A person starts out as an occasional drug user, and that is a voluntary decision; but as times pass, something happens, and that person goes from being a voluntary drug user to being a compulsive drug user. Why? Because over time, continued use of addictive drugs changes your brain*at times in dramatic, toxic ways, at others in more subtle ways, but virtually always in ways that result in compulsive and even uncontrollable drug use.

Myth #2: More than anything else, drug addiction is a character flaw

Drug addiction is a brain disease. Every type of drug of abuse has its own individual mechanism for changing how the brain functions; but regardless of which drug a person is addicted to, many of the effects it has on the brain are similar: they range from changes in the molecules and cells that make up the brain, to mood changes, to changes in memory processes and in such motor skills as walking and talking. These changes have a huge influence on all aspects of a person's behaviour. The drug becomes the single most powerful motivator in a drug abuser's existence. He or she will do almost anything for the drug. This comes about because drug use has changed the individual's brain and its functioning in critical ways.

Myth #3: You have to want drug treatment for it to be effective

Virtually no one wants drug treatment. Two of the primary reasons people seek drug treatment are because the court ordered them to do so, or because loved ones urged them to seek treatment. Many scientific studies have shown convincingly that those who enter drug treatment programs in which they face "high pressure" to confront and attempt to surmount their addiction do comparatively better in treatment, regardless of the reason they sought treatment in the first place.

Myth #4: Treatment for drug addiction should be a one-shot deal

Like many other illnesses, drug addiction typically is a chronic disorder. To be sure, some people can quit drug use "cold turkey", or they can quit after receiving treatment just one time at a rehabilitation facility, but most of those who abuse drugs require longer-term treatment and, in many instances, repeated treatments.

Myth #5: We should strive to find a "magic bullet" to treat all forms of drug abuse

There is no "one-size-fits-all" form of drug treatment, much less a magic bullet that suddenly will cure addiction. Different people have different drug abuse-related problems, and they respond very differently to similar forms of treatment, even when they're abusing the same drug. As a result, drug addicts need an array of treatments and services tailored to address their unique needs.

Myth #6: People don't need treatment. They can stop using drugs if they really want to

It is extremely difficult for people addicted to drugs to achieve and maintain long-term abstinence. Research shows that long-term drug use actually changes a person's brain function, causing them to crave the drug even more, making it increasingly difficult for the person to quit. Especially for adolescents, intervening and stopping substance abuse early is important, as children become addicted to drugs much faster than adults and risk greater physical, mental and psychological harm from illicit drug use.

APPENDIX 8 – MYTHS AND FACTS: EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

All information contained herein was taken directly from the Centre for Sex Offender Management (CSOM) website at www.csom.org. CSOM is a project of the Office of Justice Programs, US Department of Justice.

Myth #1: “Most sexual assaults are committed by strangers”

Fact: Most sexual assaults are committed by someone known to the victim or the victim’s family, regardless of whether the victim is a child or an adult.

Myth #2: “The majority of sexual offenders are caught, convicted, and in prison”

Fact: Only a fraction of those who commit sexual assault are apprehended and convicted for their crimes. Most convicted sex offenders eventually are released to the community under probation or parole supervision.

Myth #3: “Most sex offenders re-offend”

Fact: Reconviction data suggest that this is not the case. Further, re-offence rates vary among different types of sex offenders and are related to specific characteristics of the offender and the offence. Child molesters had a 13% re-offence rate for sexual offences over a 5-year period. Rapists had a 19% re-offence rate for sexual offences over a 5-year period (Hanson & Bussiere, 1998). Sex offenders have a lower likelihood of re-offending than the general criminal population.

Myth #4: “Sexual offence rates are higher than ever and continue to climb”

Fact: Despite the increase in publicity about sexual crimes, the actual rate of reported sexual assault has decreased slightly in recent years.

Myth #5: “Children who are sexually assaulted will sexually assault others when they grow up”

Fact: Most sex offenders were not sexually assaulted as children and most children who are sexually assaulted do not sexually assault others.

Myth #6: “Treatment for sex offenders is ineffective”

Fact: Treatment programmes can contribute to community safety because those who attend and cooperate with programme conditions are less likely to re-offend than those who reject intervention. Research indicates that offenders who do not receive treatment are at an increased risk for general and sexual re-offence. Treatment has been shown to lower re-offence rates by as much as 8%.

Myth #7: “The cost of treating and managing sex offenders in the community is too high—they belong behind bars”

Fact: One year of intensive supervision and treatment in the community can range in cost between \$5000 and \$15,000 per offender, depending on treatment modality. The average cost for incarcerating an offender is significantly higher, approximately \$22,000 per year, excluding treatment costs.

APPENDIX 9 – CATSO INSTRUMENT

CATSO SCALE (Community Attitudes Towards Sex Offenders)

The statements listed below describe different attitudes towards sex offenders in the United States. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. You are asked to express your feelings about each statement by indicating whether you (1) Disagree strongly, (2) Disagree (3) Agree, or (4) Agree Strongly. Indicate your opinion by writing the number that best describes your personal attitude in the left-hand margin. Please answer every item.

Rating Scale

1	2	3	4
Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree
Strongly			Strongly

1. Sex offenders have difficulty making friends even if they try real hard.
2. Most sex offenders do not have close friends
3. Most sex offenders keep to themselves
4. Sex offenders prefer to stay home alone rather than be around lots of people.
5. Most sex offenders are unmarried men
6. Convicted sex offenders should never be released from prison.
7. Sex offenders should wear tracking devices so their location can be pinpointed at any time.
8. People who commit sex offenses should lose their civil rights (e.g., voting and privacy).
9. Trying to rehabilitate a sex offender is a waste of time.
10. With support and therapy, someone who committed a sexual offense can learn to change their behavior.
11. A sex offense committed against someone the perpetrator knows is less serious than a sex offense committed against a stranger.
12. Only a few sex offenders are dangerous.
13. Someone who uses emotional control when committing a sex offense is not as bad as someone who uses physical control when committing a sex offense.
14. The prison sentences sex offenders receive are much too long when compared to the sentence lengths for other crimes.
15. Male sex offenders should be punished more severely than female sex offenders.
16. Sexual fondling (inappropriate unwarranted touch) is not as bad as rape.
17. Sex offenders have high rates of sexual activity.
18. People who commit sex offenses want to have sex more often than the average person.

APPENDIX 10 – ATTSO INSTRUMENT

ATTSO SCALE (Attitudes Towards the Treatment of Sex Offenders)

The statements listed below describe different attitudes toward the treatment of sex offenders in the United States. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. You are asked to express your feelings about each statement by indicating whether you (1) Disagree strongly, (2) Disagree, (3) Agree, or (4) Agree strongly. Indicate your opinion by writing the number that best describes your personal attitude in the left-hand margin. Please answer every item.

Rating Scale

1	2	3	4
Disagree Strongly	Disagree	Agree	Agree Strongly

1. I believe that sex offenders can be treated.
2. Treatment programs for sex offenders are effective.
3. It is better to treat sex offenders because most of them will be released.
4. Most sex offenders will not respond to treatment.
5. People who want to work with sex offenders are crazy.
6. Psychotherapy will not work with sex offenders.
7. I believe that all sex offenders should be chemically castrated.
8. Regardless of treatment, all sex offenders will eventually reoffend.
9. Treating sex offenders is a futile endeavor.
10. Sex offenders can be helped using the proper techniques.
11. Treatment doesn't work, sex offenders should be incarcerated for life.
12. Only certain types of sex offenders will respond to treatment.
13. Right now, there are no treatments that work for sex offenders.
14. It is important that that all sex offenders being released receive treatment.
15. We need to urge our politicians to make sex offender treatment mandatory.
16. All sex offenders should go for treatment even if they don't want to.
17. Sex offenders who deny their crime will not benefit from treatment.
18. Treatment only works if the sex offender wants to be there.
19. Sex offenders don't deserve another chance.
20. Tax money should not be used to treat sex offenders.
21. Sex offenders don't need treatment since they chose to commit the crime(s).
22. A sex offender whose crime is rape offends because he is violent.
23. Treatment is only necessary for offenders whose victims are children.
24. Treatment funding should be focused on the victims, not on the offenders.
25. Sex offenders should be executed.
26. Sex offenders should never be released.
27. Most sex offenders serve over 10 years in prison for their crime.
28. The prison sentence sex offenders serve is enough, treatment is not necessary.
29. Treatment is not necessary because everyone in the community knows who the sex offenders are.

30. Civilly committing sex offenders to treatment facilities is a violation of their rights.
31. Treatment should be conducted during incarceration.
32. Sex offenders are the worst kind of offenders.
33. Sex offenders should not be released back into the community.
34. A sex offender is like any other offender, no special treatment is necessary.
35. Treatment of sex offenders should be completed within a year.

APPENDIX 11 – ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

Additional Survey Questions

Rating Scale

1	2	3	4
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

1. Age difference should be considered when charging young adults with sex crimes
2. Maturity should be considered when charging young adults with sex crimes
3. IQ should be considered when charging young adults with sex crimes
4. Intended consent (whether legal age of consent or not) should be considered when charging young adults with sex crimes
5. Judges should have discretion in sentencing and registration requirements
6. Jurors should have discretion in whether a conviction should require registration
7. All convicted sex offenders are equally bad for society
8. Sex offenses are black and white cases; there is no grey area
9. Sex offender registration should be equally applied to all convicted sex offenders

APPENDIX 12 – DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

Demographics

Sex:

- Male
- Female
- Other
- Prefer not to answer

Age:

- 18-29
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50-59
- 60+
- Prefer not to answer

Marital Status:

- Now married
- Widowed
- Divorced
- Separated
- Never Married
- Prefer not to answer

Race:

- Black or African American, not Hispanic
- Hispanic or Latino
- White, not Hispanic
- Other
- Prefer not to answer

Current Year in Law School:

- First Year
- Second Year
- Third Year
- Prefer not to answer

Type of Law You Wish to Practice (choose one):

- Civil
- Criminal Defense
- Criminal Prosecution
- Corporate
- Other
- Prefer not to answer

Political Party Affiliation:

- Republican
- Democrat
- Independent
- Other
- Prefer not to answer

Political Views:

- Strongly Democrat
- Not Strongly Democrat
- Independent, Nearer Democrat
- Independent
- Independent, Nearer Republican
- Not Strongly Republican
- Strongly Republican
- Other Party
- Don't know
- Prefer not to answer

APPENDIX 13 – IRB APPROVAL LETTER



August 25, 2016

Valerie Trull
Dept of Criminal Justice/Sociology
College of Arts and Sciences
Box 870289

Re: IRB # 16-OR-290, "Analyzing the Attitudes of Law Students Towards Sex Offenders"

Dear Ms. Trull:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for your proposed research.

Your application has been given expedited approval according to 45 CFR part 46. You have also been granted the requested waiver of written documentation of informed consent. Approval has been given under expedited review category 7 as outlined below:

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

Your application will expire on August 24, 2017. If your research will continue beyond this date, please complete the relevant portions of the IRB Renewal Application. If you wish to modify the application, please complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol form. Changes in this study cannot be initiated without IRB approval, except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants. When the study closes, please complete the Request for Study Closure form.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this proposal, please include the above application number.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,

Carpanato T. Myles, MSM, CIM, CIP
Director & Research Compliance Officer
Office for Research Compliance
The University of Alabama

358 Rose Administration Building | Box 870127 | Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0127
205-348-8461 | Fax 205-348-7189 | Toll Free 1-877-820-3066