



LJMU Research Online

Palasinski, M and Shortland, N

Individual determinants of punitive attitudes towards sexual and domestic abuse offenders

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/8748/>

Article

Citation (please note it is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from this work)

Palasinski, M and Shortland, N (2016) Individual determinants of punitive attitudes towards sexual and domestic abuse offenders. Safer Communities, 15 (3). pp. 125-133. ISSN 1757-8043

LJMU has developed [LJMU Research Online](#) for users to access the research output of the University more effectively. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LJMU Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of the record. Please see the repository URL above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information please contact researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/>

PUNITIVE ATTITUDES TOWARDS ABUSE OFFENDERS

Individual determinants of punitive attitudes towards sexual and domestic abuse offenders

Abstract

Purpose –individual factors predicting punitive attitudes toward sexual and domestic offences and offenders have received little attention, which this paper aims to address.

Design/methodology/approach - in *Study 1*, 137 participants completed a 25-item online questionnaire exploring individual factors hypothesised to predict punitive attitudes towards four sexual crimes: rape, paedophilia, incest and bestiality. In *Study 2*, 100 participants completed a similar questionnaire exploring individual factors hypothesized to predict punitive attitudes towards male and female emotional, physical and sexual abusers.

Findings - the standard multiple regression models of *Study 1* found that *Age* (i.e., being older), *Belief in a Just World* and *Gender* (i.e., being female) were predictors of harsher punitive attitudes. The models of *Study 2* found that the low score on the *Social Dominance* scale was the most common predictor.

Research limitations - this survey-based project presents a nuanced picture that could be complemented by the inclusion of a wider range of more complex factors and follow-on qualitative studies.

Practical implications – the key message from this study is to inform the public on the role of personality factors in developing punitive attitudes.

Social implications – it is vital to increase the legislators' and the people' awareness of the factors shaping the public impressions of criminal justice processes and evidence-based treatment effectiveness.

Originality/value - this relatively modest article offers insight of personality factors into people's punitive attitudes shaping actual legislation.

Keywords: attitudes; domestic abuse; perception of crime; sexual abuse

Individual determinants of punitive attitudes towards sexual and domestic abuse offenders

Punitive attitudes held by members of the British public have played a significant role in creating and guiding penal policies and practices in the legal system (Chung, O'Leary & Hand 2006; Shackley, Weiner, Day, & Willis, 2014). These punitive attitudes are also reflected in governmental spending and have given rise to the so-called 'penal populism' (Pratt, 2006), leading to the country's worst prison overcrowding crisis since 2008 (Leftly, 2014). In other words, the public attitudes concerning offenders shape and tone crime prevention policies, and it seems that the desire for retribution is the main stimulus reinforcing punitive attitudes towards sentencing, leading to a criticism of the justice system (Gerber & Jackson, 2013). This punitive, rather than rehabilitative, method of dealing with offenders lies behind attitudes held by the public which are often shaped by the lack of readily available information on effective long-term treatment of offenders and the exposure to the tabloid mass media advocating a punitive stance. This emphasis on punitiveness has also given rise to concerns about potentially facilitating re-offending (Hough & Kirby, 2013; Matthews, 2005).

Although there is some literature on what factors might lie behind punitive attitudes in general showing, for example, that individuals in support of dispositional attribution tend to be more punitive in their response to crime over individuals who support situational attribution (Cochran, Boots & Heide, 2003), related personality factors have received little attention with regard to specific sexual and domestic offences (Harper & Hogue, 2015). Taking this into account, and given that sex offender groups tend to be higher in neuroticism and lower in extraversion and conscientiousness (Dennison, Stough, & Birgden, 2001), for example, this paper, then, addresses this gap. Also, negative public attitudes toward sex offenders greatly hinder their treatment and integration with the society, potentially facilitating re-offending (Liu, 2014). The exploration of factors behind them, therefore, might

facilitate their better understanding and potentially inform the measures aimed at adjusting existing policies to the recommendations made by professionals interested in long-term effective treatment programs rather than by sensationalist media that overwhelmingly tend to demonise offenders (Malinen, Willis, & Johnston, 2014).

Study 1

In *Study 1*, we explore what factors predict punitive attitudes towards some of the most controversial and underreported crimes – sexual offences: rape, paedophilia, incest and bestiality. In previous studies, female adults reported significantly more negative attitudes towards rape than males (Holcomb, Holcomb, Sondag, & Williams, 1991), which is probably down to the majority of rape victims being predominantly female. Figures suggest that around 3% of males between the age of 16 and 59 fall victim to sexual assault in comparison to one in every five females (Burn-Murdoch, 2013). It is also argued that due to the emotionally charged nature of such an offence, women tend to be more emotive in their feeling towards punishment than men (Edwards, 2001; Gault & Sabini, 2000).

Not surprisingly, perhaps, existing research has also long concluded that individuals who molest children receive longer sentences in contrast to rapists and other violent offenders (Mancini & Mears, 2010). Arguably, victimisation from family members accounts for the majority of sexual victimisation against children, which is further exacerbated by the culture of ‘shameful silence’ and under-reporting (Roberts, 2003). The data on incest, however, is quite scarce, with intra-family abuse being ignored (Roger & Levesque, 2000). It has already been suggested, for example, that incest tends to stem from family dysfunction rather than from males abusing their power (Jackson & Sandberg, 1985; Heath, Donnan & Halpin, 1990). With reference to incest being regarded as somewhat less severe than other sexual offences, public support for rehabilitation appears to be more popular (Brown, 1999). However, challenging this view is the idea that regardless of the crime, the public tend to favour lengthy

prison sentences over any other method of 'treatment' (Zimmerman, Alostyne & Dunn, 1988), suggesting that the public are generally punitive, rather than rehabilitative. Although data on public attitudes towards incestual and zoophilic offenders is largely missing, some campaigners claim that the legislation surrounding this taboo subject is not harsh enough (Peakman, 2013). Interestingly, despite bestiality contradicting the conventionally accepted standards of sexual behaviour and violating animal rights, there is some data suggesting that bestiality can be viewed similarly to masturbation, and less harshly if the zoophilic is single.

Predictor factors

To date, studies have not systematically explored the relationship between the age of the individual and their perspectives on punitive punishments for sexual offenders (Brannon, Levenson, Fortney & Baker, 2007), focusing instead on demographic characteristics.

Although Payne, Gainey, Triplett and Danner (2004) found strong correlations between punitive attitudes in relation to older participants and men, they argue that demographic characteristics are unreliable predictors of correctional attitudes. Whilst some researchers argue that older age is associated with an increase in punitiveness (Gerber & Engelhardt-Greer, 1996; Indermaur & Roberts, 2005), others suggest that the relationship is inconclusive (Kury & Ferdinand, 1999). Given the more recent findings (Indermaur & Roberts, 2005), however, it is hypothesised that *Age* is a good predictor of punitive attitudes towards sexual offenders, with the elder population being more punitive than the younger.

Gender

It seems that women demonstrate more negative attitudes to sexual offenders on both affective and behavioral measures compared with men (Willis, Malinen, & Johnston, 2013). However, men appear to be more supportive of punishment over treatment than women (Whitehead & Blankenship, 2000; Kury & Ferdinand, 1999). Relatedly, Gelb (2011) found higher levels of general punitiveness in male (and older) participants.

Right Wing Authoritarianism

Early research suggested that right wing authoritarianism was a generally reliable predictor of the public's punitive attitudes (Altemeyer, 1988). Later studies found that right-wing authoritarian men were less punitive towards physical or sexual assault of women (Benjamin, 2006) and less punitive in their general attitudes, possibly due to their 'traditional' view on gender roles (Whitley, 1999). However, more recent studies did not confirm that (McKee & Feather, 2008). Given this ambiguity, it was hypothesised that with the exception of rape, right wing authoritarian men would be more punitive in their attitudes towards sexual offenders than women.

Belief in a Just World

The established connection between the support for government institutions and belief in a just world (Rubin & Peplau, 1975) is not new. It also appears that in English speaking countries the punitive responses of the criminal justice system are increasing (Allen, Komy, Lovbakke & Roy, 2005), and the idea of just is closely linked up with punitiveness (Tyler & Boeckmann, 1997), giving rise to the hypothesis that individuals scoring highly on the *Belief in a Just World* scale will be more punitive in their attitudes towards sexual offenders.

Mortality Salience

Previous research has found that making individuals aware of their mortality creates the need for them to maintain and defend their subjective cultural worldviews (Lieberman, Arndt, Personius, & Cook, 2001). As a result, mortality salient participants typically strive to uphold legal sanctions and also tend to react negatively to those who promote alternative worldview beliefs (Arndt, Lieberman, Cook and Solomon, 2005). An individual's awareness of their own mortality was also found to activate their political attitudes (Burke, Kosloff & Landau, 2013) and to make them regard crime as a threat to their worldview beliefs (Koski &

Clinkinbeard, 2008), giving rise to the hypothesis that mortality salient individuals will be more punitive towards sexual offences than individuals who are not.

Religiosity

Despite the move towards modernity and secularism, religion is still seen to be a salient feature shaping punitive attitudes (Baumer & Martin, 2013). Christianity has been understood to play a substantial role in predicting individual support for corporal punishment and punitive criminal justice policies (Grasmick, Bursik & Kimpel, 1991; Grasmick, Morgan & Kennedy, 1992; Grasmick & McGill, 1994). It also appears that Christians have more correctional attitudes than individuals who are less associated with religion (Applegate, Cullen, & Fisher, 2000; Unnever, Cullen & Applegate, 2005). This is in line with the finding that individuals who are active church-goers tend to be more punitive. Drawing on the link between fundamentalism and dispositional attribution (Grasmick & McGill, 1994), it was hypothesized, then, that participants scoring higher on the religiosity scale would be more punitive in their attitudes towards sexual offenders.

Methodology

A standard multiple regression correlational design was adopted. The outcome variable, Punitive Attitudes, was split into four different types of sexual offence - *Rape*, *Incest*, *Paedophilia* and *Bestiality* (All measured on a scale of 1-7, where the higher scores indicated more punitive attitudes), which were hypothesised to be predicted by six independent variables. An opportunity sample was employed where 137 participants (71 Females; 66 Males) of various backgrounds aged 18+ ($M=30.5$; $SD=13.6$) completed an online questionnaire. Data was collected through the Internet using various social media platforms, such as Facebook and Twitter and also via email.

Questionnaires covered predictor factors using the 1-7 Likert-type scales: *Belief in a Just World* ($\alpha=.796$), *Mortality Salience* ($\alpha=.755$), and *Right Wing Authoritarianism* ($\alpha=.853$).

PUNITIVE ATTITUDES TOWARDS ABUSE OFFENDERS

Whereas *Belief in a Just World* and *Right Wing Authoritarianism* were pre-validated scales, *Mortality Salience* was formulated and tailored specifically to this study. The other predictor variables included; *Gender*, (Measured on 3 levels; 1=Male, 2=Female and 3=Transgender), *Age* (Numeric Value) and *Religiosity* (our pilot study found that including an additional item-based religiosity scale resulted in low survey completions, possibly due to the length – that a simple item was used - *how religious are you 1 -7*).

Results

Rape

The total variance explained by the model as a whole was 9%; $F(6,137)=2.203$, $p=.047$, $R^2=.092$. Only one predictor variable, (older) *Age*, was a statistically significant ($\beta=.221$, $p=.025$) predictor of *Punitive Attitudes towards Rape*.

Pedophilia

The total variance explained by the model as a whole was 7%, $F(6,137)=1.702$, $p=.125$, $R^2=.073$. Only one control measure, *Gender*, was a statistically significant ($\beta=.193$, $p=.027$) predictor of *Punitive Attitudes towards Pedophilia*, with men being more punitive than women.

Incest

The total variance explained by the model as a whole was 5%, $F(6,137)=1.244$, $p=.288$, $R^2=.064$. However, the model itself was not statistically significant.

Bestiality

The total variance explained by the model as a whole was 9%, $F(6,137)=2.107$, $p=.057$, $R^2=.089$. Only one control measure, *Belief in a Just World* ($\beta=.292$, $p=.002$) was a positive predictor of *Punitive Attitudes towards Bestiality*.

Study 2

Taking the findings of *Study 1* into account, *Study 2* is focused on exploring the factors shaping people's perception about laws around a related, very common but much less outcry-evoking type of offending – domestic abuse. Across the world, domestic abuse is on the rise (Engel, 2014; Reddy et al, 1997) and in general communities agree that it is an offence. Pavlou and Knowles (2001), for example, asked participants to report the level of punishment suitable for a number of male to female domestic abuse scenarios, showing that most respondents agreed that the offender should receive a punishment of some sort, with 27% saying he should go to jail and 34% suggesting community service or a fine. That said, there was no overall consensus on the deserved punishment. Most related research has focused on perception of male perpetrators of domestic abuse (Smith, 2011), predictors of recidivism among them (2004) or the role of alcohol (McMurran & Gilchrist, 2008), and responses (Part, 2006), largely ignoring individual factors that may shape attitudes to domestic abuse, which *Study 2* aims to address.

Methodology

Like in *Study 1*, a standard multiple regression correlational design was adopted, but this time it was used to assess the predictability of each factor towards punitive attitudes towards emotional and physical domestic abuse by men and women. As the roles of *Age* and *Mortality Salience* were not very clear in *Study 1*, it was decided that including a measure that appears to be more related to hierarchy-based gender roles, *Social Dominance* (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) would be more appropriate. As *Social Dominance* was found to reduce concern for human victims (McFarland, 2005), it was hypothesised that its high scorers would be less punitive than low scorers. The other predictor factors (i.e., *Gender*, *Religiosity*, *Right-wing Authoritarianism*, and *Belief in a Just World*) were kept. Four models were run, the four outcome variables being *Support for Harsher Punishments for Men/Women*

Emotionally/Physically Abusing (their partner) Women/Men (1- none; 7 complete). Similarly to *Study 1*, an online questionnaire was used by 100 participants (72 Females; 27 Males) of various backgrounds aged 18+ ($M=28.2$; $SD=11.06$).

Results

Male emotionally abusing female

The total variance explained by the model as whole was 14%, $F(6,93)=2.52$, $p=.05$, $R^2=.14$ and the factor making the strongest unique contribution to explaining the dependent variable was *Social Dominance* ($\beta= -.226$, $p=.05$).

Male physically abusing female

The total variance explained by the model as a whole was 14.3%, $F(6,93)= 2.59$, $p=.05$, $R^2=.143$ and the factor making the strongest unique contribution to explaining the dependent variable was *Gender* (i.e., being male; $\beta= -.250$, $p=.05$). The factor making the second strongest unique contribution was *Social Dominance* ($\beta= -.235$, $p=.05$).

Female emotionally abusing male

The total variance explained by the model was 6%, $F(6,93)= 2.87$, $p=.013$, $R^2=.060$ and the factor making the strongest unique contribution to explaining the dependent variable was *Social Dominance* ($\beta= -.228$, $p=.027$).

Female physically abusing male

The prediction model was not statistically significant, $F(6,93)= 0.98$, $p=.06$.

Discussion

The emergent data picture from *Study 1* was not as clear and conclusive as first anticipated, implying the need for a follow-up study, taking into account more variables and a more diverse population sample. Although significant relationships were found between; *Gender* and *Punitive Attitudes* towards *Paedophilia*, *Age* and *Punitive Attitudes* towards *Rape*, and *Belief in a Just World* and *Punitive Attitudes* towards *Rape and Bestiality*, results found

that *Right Wing Authoritarianism*, *Mortality Salience* and *Religiosity* were not significant predictors.

The results of *Study 1* compliment the findings of Applegate *et al* (2002) who found women to be far less punitive (but more rehabilitative) in their attitudes as opposed to men, which is likely due to men demonstrating punitive behaviour than women (Holbrook, White & Hutt, 1995). The results are also in line with existing research showing that older members of the public are more punitive in their responses to criminals, in particular sex offenders (Wood & Tendayi Viki, 2004). They also tie in with much earlier findings (Rubin & Peplau, 1975; Tyler & Boeckmann, 1997) suggesting a strong link between *Belief in a Just World* and support of harsher punitive policies. Attitudes of the public towards sex offenders have a number of potentially important consequences for sex offenders and the communities that they are re-enter (Church, Wakeman, Miller, Clements, & Sun 2007; Pickett, Mancini & Mears, 2013). Research suggests that punitiveness is linked to inaccurate perceptions of crime (Roberts & Indermaur, 2007), and as a result sex offender policies have been influenced more by public outcry based on misinformation than on empirical evidence (Griffin & West, 2006).

In *Study 2*, the variable *Social Dominance* produced a consistently negative regression coefficient for males emotionally abusing females, and females emotionally abusing males, meaning there was a negative relationship between *Social Dominance* and these variables. These findings contrast with the existing research such as that by Sidanius *et al* (2006) who found high levels of *Social Dominance* positively correlated with harsh criminal punishment. However, they are in line with research showing that those scoring high on Social Dominance have been found to display less empathy (Pratto *et al*, 1994), less concern (McFarland, 2005) and to show coldness towards others (Ekehammar *et al*, 2004). In other words, it is possible that the high Social Dominance scorers had little empathy towards the domestic victims, thus

giving low support of harsher punishments. Gender also proved to be a significant predictor of harsher punishments in response to males physically abusing females, challenging feminist theories of domestic abuse. By being more punitive to other men physically abusing females, it is possible that male participants could demonstrate their chivalry and sensitivity. As stated by Nicholls (2005), men may not view a female violence towards them as an equally serious crime, which might clarify the lower preference of punishment for females physically abusing males.

Despite the relatively narrow range of examined factors, this exploratory research represents a tentative, qualified and small-scale, but original extension of relevant research in the field, inviting other more focused studies. Recent news articles stress the importance placed behind changes in public opinion (Hobley, 2012). It is important to understand the factors that have an effect on punitive attitudes to understand the increasingly relevant punitive phenomenon and the public satisfaction with the justice system (Roberts & Indermaur, 2007). However, research focused on individual factors related to punitive attitudes to specific sexual and domestic offences has, to date, been quite limited (Gelb, 2011). As there is a gap between the public and judges in terms of appropriate sentences, the laws put in place do not seem to reflect public views on crime (Mirrlees-Black, 2001; McNaughton et al., 2012). In support of this claim, others (Gelb, 2009; Hough & Roberts, 1999) found that when the public is more fully informed about sentences that are actually given for different offences, its members tend to be less punitive.

In recent years, the public has become more punitive in their attitudes and many countries across the world have put stricter laws in place as it has become harder for legislators to introduce any other approaches to offenders, other than the increasingly punitive responses (Gelb, 2007). The findings from this research indicate the need for

PUNITIVE ATTITUDES TOWARDS ABUSE OFFENDERS

informing public on criminal justice processes and evidence-based treatment effectiveness, as well as ensuring that legislators are more aware of what factors shape public attitudes.

As crime and treatment are both sensitive topics, we argue that it is the role of public leaders to inform the public about the utility of certain sanctions and the disutility of others.

Due to public attitudes playing such an important part in the effectiveness of offender treatment (Shackley et al., 2014), there is a clear need for the exploration of other individual and socio-economic factors that might lie behind punitive attitudes to specific rather than general offences. Such further exploration might also address some of the limitations of this research, like the relatively narrow range of explored individual predictor factors and outcome variables, as well as the correlational rather than an experimental design that would link the punitive attitudes to actual behaviours.

Acknowledgement

We thank Alex for the help with data collection.

References

- Allen, J., Komy, M.E., Lovbakke, J., & Roy, H. (2005). Policing and the criminal justice system – public confidence and perceptions: Findings from the 2003/04 British Crime Survey. *Home Office Online Report 31/05*. London: Home Office
- Altemeyer, B. (1998). The other “authoritarian personality.” In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. Academic Press, 47–92
- Applegate, B. K., Cullen, F. T., & Fisher, B. S. (2002). Public views toward crime and correctional policies: Is there a gender gap? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30(2), 89-100.
- Baumer, E. P., & Martin, K. H. (2013). Social organization, collective sentiment, and legal sanctions in murder cases. *American Journal of Sociology*, 119(1), 131 – 182.
- Benjamin, A. J. (2006). The relationship between right-wing authoritarianism and attitudes toward violence: Further validation of the Attitudes toward Violence Scale. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 34(8), 923-926.
- Brannon, Y. N., Levenson, J. S., Fortney, T., & Baker, J. N. (2007). Attitudes about community notification: A comparison of sexual offenders and the non-offending public. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 19(4), 369–379.
- Brown, S. (1999). Public attitudes toward the treatment of sex offenders. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 4(2), 239–252.
- Burke, B. L., Kosloff, S., & Landau, M. J. (2013). Death goes to the polls: A meta-analysis of mortality salience effects on political attitudes. *Political Psychology*, 34(2), 183–200.
- Burn-Murdoch, J. (2013). 69,000 female, 9,000 male rape victims per year visualised: get the full data. *The Guardian*. Retrieved 15th March from

<http://www.theguardian.com/news/datablog/2013/jan/11/male-female-rape-statistics-graphic>.

Chung, D., O'Leary, P., & Hand, T. (2006). *Sexual violence offenders: prevention and intervention approaches*. Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies.

Church, W. T., Wakeman, E. E., Miller, S. L., Clements, C. B., & Sun, F. (2007). The community attitudes toward sex offenders scale: The development of a psychometric assessment instrument. *Research on Social Work Practice, 18*(3), 251–259.

Cochran, J. K., Boots, D. P., & Heide, K. M. (2003). Attribution styles and attitudes toward capital punishment for juveniles, the mentally incompetent, and the mentally retarded. *Justice Quarterly, 20*(1), 65–93.

Dennison, S.M., Stough, C., & Birgden, A. (2001). The big 5 dimensional personality approach to understanding sex offenders. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 7*(1-4), 243-261.

Edwards, W. (2001). Contextualizing sex offender management legislation and policy: Evaluating the problem of latent consequences in community notification laws. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 45*(1), 83–101.

Ekehammar, B., Akrami, N., Gylje, M., & Zakrisson, I. (2004). What matters most to prejudice: Big five personality, social dominance orientation, or right-wing authoritarianism? *European Journal of Personality, 18*(6), 463-482.

Engel, S. (2014, December 15). 'He beat me to a pulp': B.C. faces 'epidemic' of domestic violence. *Global News*. Retrieved December 14th from: <http://globalnews.ca/news/1728385/he-beat-me-to-a-pulp-b-c-faces-epidemic-of-domestic-violence/>.

PUNITIVE ATTITUDES TOWARDS ABUSE OFFENDERS

- Gault, B. A., & Sabini, J. (2000). The roles of empathy, anger, and gender in predicting attitudes toward punitive, reparative, and preventative public policies. *Cognition and Emotion, 14*(4), 495-520.
- Gelb, K. (2007). Recidivism of Sex Offenders Research Paper. Sentencing Advisory Council
- Gelb, K. (2009). Myths and Misconceptions: Public Opinion versus Public Judgment about Sentencing. *Federal Sentencing Reporter, 21*(4), 288–290.
- Gerber, J., & Engelhardt-Greer, S. (1996). Just and Painful: Attitudes Toward Sentencing Criminals. *Americans View Crime and Justice: A National Public Opinion Survey*, 62–74.
- Gerber, M., & Jackson, J. (2013). Retribution as revenge and retribution as just deserts. *Social Justice Research, 26*(1), 61-80.
- Grasmick, H. G., & McGill, A. L. (1994). Religion, Attribution Style And Punitiveness Toward Juvenile Offenders. *Criminology, 32*(1), 23–46.
- Grasmick, H., Bursik, J. R., & Kimpel, M. L. (1991). Protestant fundamentalism and attitudes toward corporal punishment of children. *Violence and Victims, 6*(1), 283- 297.
- Grasmick, H. G., Morgan, C., & Kennedy, M. (1992). Support for corporal punishment in the school: A comparison of the effects of socio-economic status and religion. *Social Science Quarterly, 73*(1), 177 – 187.
- Griffin, M., & West, D. (2006). The lowest of the low? Addressing the disparity between community view, public policy, and treatment effectiveness for sex offenders. *Law & Psychology Review, 30*(1), 143 – 169.

PUNITIVE ATTITUDES TOWARDS ABUSE OFFENDERS

- Harper, A., & Hogue, E. (2015). Measuring public perceptions of sex offenders: reimagining the Community Attitudes Toward Sex Offenders (CATSO) scale. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 21*(5), 452 - 470.
- Heath, K. C., Donnan, H., & Halpin, G. W. (1990). Attributions for blame and responsibility among female incest victims. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal, 18*(1), 157–167.
- Hobley, M. (2012). *Public opinion can play a positive role in policy making. The Guardian*. Retrieved 14th January from: <http://www.theguardian.com/public-leaders-network/2012/sep/03/public-opinion-influence-policy>.
- Holcomb, J., Holcomb, L., Sondag, K., & Williams, N. (1991). Attitudes about date rape: Gender differences among college students. *College Student Journal, 25*(1), 434-439.
- Hough, M., & Kirby, A. (2013). The role of public opinion in formulating sentencing guidelines. *Exploring the English Model, 20*(4), 140–156.
- Indermaur, D., & Roberts, L. (2005). Perceptions of crime and justice. *Australian social attitudes: The first report*, 141-160.
- Jackson, T. L., & Sandberg, G. (1985). Attribution of incest blame among rural attorneys and Judges. *Women & Therapy, 4*(3), 39–56.
- Koski, C., & Clinkinbeard, S. (2008). Deadly impact: The effects of mortality salience on Arab-American hate crimes. Paper presented at the 2008 American Society of Criminology Annual Meeting, St. Louis, MO.
- Kury, H., & Ferdinand, T. (1999). Public opinion and punitivity. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 22* (3–4), 373–392.

PUNITIVE ATTITUDES TOWARDS ABUSE OFFENDERS

- Leftly, M. (2014). Britain's prison overcrowding crisis surges 'close to the brink'. *The Independent*, 16th March. Retrieved December 10th from:
<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/crime/britains-prison-overcrowding-crisis-surges-close-to-the-brink-9194843.html>.
- Lieberman, J., Arndt, J., Personius, J., & Cook, A. (2001). Vicarious annihilation: the effect of mortality salience on perceptions of hate crimes. *Law and Human Behavior*, 25(6), 547-566.
- Liu, S. (2014). University students' knowledge of and attitudes toward sex offenders and treatment of sex offenders in New Zealand and China. Unpublished Masters Thesis, *The University of Waikato*, New Zealand.
- Malinen, S., Willis, G.M., & Johnston, L. (2014). Might informative media reporting of sexual offending influence community members' attitudes towards sex offenders? *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 20(6), 535-552.
- Mancini, C., & Mears, D. P. (2010). To execute or not to execute? Examining public support for capital punishment of sex offenders. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(5), 959–968.
- Matthews R (2005), The myth of punitiveness. *Theoretical Criminology*, 9(2), 175–201.
- McFarland, S.G. (2005). On the eve of war: authoritarianism, social dominance, and American students' attitudes toward attacking Iraq. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(3), 360-367.
- McKee, I. R., & Feather, N. T. (2008). Revenge, retribution, and values: social attitudes and punitive sentencing. *Social Justice Research*, 21(2), 138–163.

PUNITIVE ATTITUDES TOWARDS ABUSE OFFENDERS

- McMurrin, M., & Gilchrist, E. (2008). Anger control and alcohol use: Appropriate interventions for perpetrators of domestic violence. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 14(2), 107-116.
- McNaughton Nicholls, C., Mitchell, M., & Simpson, I. (2012). Attitudes to sentencing sexual offences. *Centre for Gender and Violence Research*. Retrieved 27th December from: <http://www.natcen.ac.uk/media/24273/attitudes-sentencing-sexual-offences.pdf>.
- Mirrlees-Black, C. (2001). Confidence in the Criminal Justice System: Findings from the 2000 British Crime Survey. *Home Office Research Findings*, 137.
- Part, D. (2006). A flexible response to domestic abuse: Findings from an evaluation. *Practice*, 18(1), 47-58.
- Pavlou, M., & Knowles, A. (2001). Domestic violence: Attributions, recommended punishments and reporting behaviour related to provocation by the victim. *Psychiatry, Psychology & Law*, 8, 76 – 85.
- Payne, B. K., Gainey, R. R., Triplett, R. A., & Danner, M. J. (2004). What drives punitive beliefs? Demographic characteristics and justifications for sentencing. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32(3), 195-206.
- Peakman, J. (2013). *The pleasure's all mine: a history of perverse sex*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Pickett, J. T., Mancini, C., & Mears, D. P. (2013). Vulnerable victims, monstrous offenders, and unmanageable risk: explaining public opinion on the social control of sex crimes. *Criminology*, 51(3), 729–759.
- Pratt, J. (2006). *Penal Populism: Key Ideas in Criminology*. London: Taylor & Francis.

PUNITIVE ATTITUDES TOWARDS ABUSE OFFENDERS

- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 67(4), 741-763.
- Reddy, P., Knowles, A., Mulvany, J., McMahon, M., & Freckelton, I. (1997). Attributions about domestic violence: A study of community attitudes. *Psychiatry, psychology and law*, 4(2), 125-145.
- Roberts, L., & Indermaur, D. (2007), 'Predicting Punitive Attitudes in Australia', *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, 14(1), 56-65.
- Rubin, Z., & Peplau, L.A (1975) Who Believes in a Just World? *Journal of Social Issues*, 31(3), 65-89.
- Shackley, M., Weiner, C., Day, A., & Willis, G.M. (2014). Assessment of public attitudes towards sex offenders in an Australian population. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 20(6), 553-572.
- Sidanius,, J., & Pratto, F.(1999). *Social Dominance: An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression*. Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, M.E. (2011). A qualitative review of perception of change for male perpetrators of domestic abuse following abuser schema therapy (AST). *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, 11(2), 156-164.
- Tyler, T. R., & Boeckmann, R. J. (1997). Three strikes and you are out, but why? The psychology of public support for punishing rule breakers. *Law & Society Review*, 31(2), 237 – 265.

PUNITIVE ATTITUDES TOWARDS ABUSE OFFENDERS

- Unnever, J. D., Cullen, F. T., & Applegate, B. K. (2005). Turning the other cheek: Reassessing the impact of religion on punitive ideology. *Justice Quarterly*, 22(3), 304-339.
- Whitley Jr., B. E. (1999). Right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(1), 126 – 134.
- Whitehead, J. T., & Blankenship, M. B. (2000). The gender gap in capital punishment attitudes: An analysis of support and opposition. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 25(1), 1–13
- Willis, G.M., Malinen, S., & Johnston, L. (2013). Demographic differences in public attitudes towards sex offenders. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, 20(2), 230-247.
- Wood, J., & Tendayi V. G. (2004). Public perceptions of crime and punishment. *Forensic Psychology: Concepts, Debates and Practice*. Cullompton: Willan Publishing.
- Zimmerman, S. E., Alostyne, D. J., & Dunn, C. S. (1988). The national punishment survey and public consequences. *Criminology & Penology*, 25(2), 120 -149.