

ABSTRACT

PUBLIC ATTITUDE TOWARDS CALIFORNIA'S NEW LAW TO END LIFETIME SEX OFFENDER REGISTRATION

California is one of four states in the U.S. that still requires all sexual offenders to register for life. Governor Jerry Brown signed legislation that would change the present structure into a three-tiered system on January 1, 2021. The purpose of this study is to survey public attitude toward lifetime sexual offender registration and examine the effects of an educational video on attitude changes. The sample consisted of 407 student participants from California State University, Fresno. The predominant demographic characteristics of the sample were female (57.2%), Hispanic/Latino (65.1%), aged 18-24 (86%), and within the Democratic spectrum (56.5%). Data analysis consisted of descriptive statistics, one sample t-tests, and ANOVAs. Data results indicated that the experimental group showed significant attitude change in favor of modifying California's sexual offender registration system after viewing the educational video. Educational videos can be valuable tools for increasing public knowledge and acceptance of evidence-based policies on treating and managing sexual offenders.

Eric Gilberto Galeana
August 2018

PUBLIC ATTITUDE TOWARDS CALIFORNIA'S NEW LAW
TO END LIFETIME SEX OFFENDER REGISTRATION

by
Eric Gilberto Galeana

A thesis
submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science in Criminology
in the College of Social Sciences
California State University, Fresno
August 2018

APPROVED

For the Department of Criminology:

We, the undersigned, certify that the thesis of the following student meets the required standards of scholarship, format, and style of the university and the student's graduate degree program for the awarding of the master's degree.

Eric Gilberto Galeana
Thesis Author

Allen Azizian (Chair) Criminology

Peter English Criminology

Deirdre D'Orazio Department of State Hospitals

For the University Graduate Committee:

Dean, Division of Graduate Studies

AUTHORIZATION FOR REPRODUCTION
OF MASTER'S THESIS

 X I grant permission for the reproduction of this thesis in part or in its entirety without further authorization from me, on the condition that the person or agency requesting reproduction absorbs the cost and provides proper acknowledgment of authorship.

 Permission to reproduce this thesis in part or in its entirety must be obtained from me.

Signature of thesis author: _____

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to sincerely thank my committee members, Dr. Azizian, Dr. English, and Dr. D'Orazio, for guiding me through the thesis process. The time and patience that they dedicated to assisting me in my journey was phenomenal and priceless. I could not have asked for a better group of professionals to have helped me in this educational feat.

Thank you to Chris Greenwood, graduate statistics tutor, for assisting me with the analysis and interpretation of my survey data.

I would like to thank Kyra Hollingsworth, research assistant, for her aid and diligence in administering surveys and entering data with me.

I want to also express my gratitude to the faculty in the criminology department at California State University, Fresno. During my time as an undergraduate and graduate student I received many useful comments from faculty. I am grateful for every bit of information that was given to me.

There are not enough words to express how much I value and love my family. It was my mother, Martha, and father, Tito, words of encouragement, the patience of my sons, Corbin and Evan, and the helping hands of my sisters, Mayra and Krystal, that allowed me to dedicate my attention and time to my thesis. I could not have achieved this without their support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	7
Present Study.....	16
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY.....	17
Participants.....	17
Design	17
Survey Instrument and Variables.....	19
Independent Variables.....	19
Dependent Variables	20
Treatment Video.....	21
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS	23
Data Analysis	23
Descriptive Statistics.....	23
Non-Affecting Attitude Items	24
Items that May Affect Attitude from Video Treatment.....	24
CHAPTER 5: IMPLICATIONS	27
Main Findings	27
Limitations and Future Directions	28
Conclusion.....	30
Funding	31
REFERENCES	32
APPENDICES	37
APPENDIX A: PRE-BRIEFING	38

APPENDIX B: DEBRIEFING.....	40
APPENDIX C: QUESTIONNAIRE	41
APPENDIX D: QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS	47
APPENDIX E: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS (CHI-SQUARE).....	49
APPENDIX F: ITEMS NOT SIGNIFICANT TO ATTITUDE CHANGE AFTER TREATMENT VIDEO.....	51
APPENDIX G: PRE-TEST EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL COMPARISON (ANOVA).....	53
APPENDIX H: POST-TEST EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL COMPARISON (ANOVA).....	55
APPENDIX I: REPEAT MEASURES – TESTS OF WITHIN-SUBJECTS EFFECT.....	57
APPENDIX J: PAIRED T-TESTS (EXPERIMENTAL GROUP).....	59
APPENDIX K: ONE-SAMPLE T-TESTS (PRE-TEST) EXPERIMENTAL GROUP	61
APPENDIX L: ONE-SAMPLE T-TESTS (POST-TEST) EXPERIMENTAL GROUP	63

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

What makes a person who commits murder different than a person who commits sexual offenses? One involves the taking of someone's life through violence, and the other involves a sexual act performed against the victim's will or against those who cannot legally consent to sexual activity. Although both crimes consist of acts against a person, there is a consensus that the public has generally categorized these violent and sexual acts as being the most repugnant anyone can commit in our society. While these offenders may serve different sentences for their crimes, they both may be supervised in the community if they are released after serving their sentences in prison. A person who commits murder will likely be on parole and will have to follow the rules and restrictions placed on him as part of his conditional release back into the community. A person who commits a sexual offense will similarly be supervised by a parole or probation agency, but the constraints for both types of offenders begin to depart upon disclosure of their release. A person who commits murder will be released, and hardly a person will take notice of his return into the community; but when a person who commits a sexual offense is about to complete his sentence, the community to which he will return will be well-aware of his crime.

It is not that society has chosen to add these additional controls to sexual offenders solely on the belief that it is in the best interest of the community, but instead it is that notifications were put in place by legislators as a response to protecting the public from dangerous sexual offenders.

As most of the public loathe sexual offenders, it has seemed there has been a special allotment of hatred put aside for offenders who prey on children. Intuitively, legislators have used incidents that involve the sexually violent attacks

on children to bolster legislation in an attempt to amplify restrictions on sexual offenders, and to no surprise it has worked. As recently as the 1990s, sexual crimes against children have sadly aided the push to further sexual offender legislation, some for the better but most out of anger and without scientific research to support it. This is not to say that before the 1990s sexual crimes did not occur, because in reality there have always been laws against sexual crimes, but this current “wave” of sexual offender legislation has been assisted by the rapid switch of paper media to predominantly electronic methods.

The public’s reaction to any issue is critical to the government because it allows parties in authority to know what types of protections the majority of the population feel are important to them. Government officials then have a duty to address the concerns of the nation and respond with a variety of punishments available to them, such as retribution, rehabilitation, and deterrence. Dependent on the political parties’ ideological leanings, their methods of punishing criminals differ from one another. The liberal Democrat will tend to lean toward a progressive viewpoint that looks to rehabilitate an offender by offering education and psychosocial programs, whereas a conservative Republican’s inclination is to use retribution to punish criminals by making them pay their debt by physically separating them from the community.

Having gained strong support for punitive measures in the 1980s, state legislators received full backing in the 1990s after two highly publicized child murders. As described by Philip Jenkins (1998) in his chronicling of sexual crimes, Polly Klaas, a 12-year-old girl, was abducted from her slumber party at her home and murdered in 1993. Her death by a repeat violent offender was used to lobby for stricter legislation in California, an initiative that would become the “three strikes” law that was passed by overwhelming voter approval. Shortly after

in 1994, 7-year-old Megan Kanka was raped and murdered by a repeat sexual offender in her neighborhood (Jenkins, 1998). The New Jersey bill that was proposed and came to be known as “Megan’s Law” required community notifications of the presence of high-risk offenders.

Federal activism during this time was quickly onboard as well, in part, by President Clinton’s eagerness to deflect conservatives attacking him on what they perceived as a weak stance on morals and families (Jenkins, 1998). In 1994, the government passed the Jacob-Wetterling Act, which required all states to implement sexual offender registries, similar to New Jersey’s “Megan’s Law.” In 1996, it was proposed that the Wetterling Act have additional stricter provisions added, which co-sponsored by Senators Joe Biden and Phil Gramm, was successfully amended and changed into the federal “Megan’s Law” (Jenkins, 1998). It required all states to maintain a state internet site with sexual offender information, as well as handle community notifications passed with strong bipartisan support.

Proposition 83, also known as the Sexual Predator and Control Act and thereafter known as Jessica’s Law, was passed on November 7th, 2006 in the California general election (Institute of Governmental Studies, n.d.). The authors of the proposition were Republican husband and wife, State Senator George Runner and Assemblywoman Sharon Runner. The bill was co-sponsored by Republican Governor Schwarzenegger and favored by Democratic gubernatorial candidate Phil Angelides. Among the additional restrictions that were proposed in the proposition, one stood out among its opponents: a restriction that would require all sexual offenders from residing 2,000 feet from any public or private school, or park where children gathered (Institute of Governmental Studies, n.d.). The restriction was not outlandish, but it was the caveats that were attached to it

that worried legislators and sexual offenders. Jessica's Law stipulated that all registered sexual offenders old and new had to abide by the residency restrictions. It would be retroactively applied to offenders who had a sexual offense in their previous history, no matter if it was with a man, woman, or child, violent or consensual. With 70.5% of voters passing Proposition 83, trouble started brewing right away (Institute of Governmental Studies, n.d.).

In *William Taylor v. San Diego County* (2015) four sexual offenders immediately filed cases to the San Diego County Superior Court, stating that they were having their rights violated. Their main objections were that they lived in a highly populated area, San Diego, California, the restrictions would not allow them to find an area that would be suitable for them to live outside of the restriction zone and within a reasonable rent cost. Most of the appellants were registered sexual offenders who had a significant period between their conviction and passage of Proposition 83 (*William Taylor v. San Diego County*, 2015). It was because of these cases that big cities like San Diego, San Francisco, and Los Angeles decided not to enforce the new law and waited for decisions from the courts. Ultimately, the case reached the Supreme Court of California where it was decided that it was unconstitutional to have such strict laws placed on sexual offenders as it infringes on their liberties to find housing and services (O'Connor, 2015).

Wanting more uniformity among the states, the federal government passed the Adam Walsh Act (AWA) in 2006. Among the legislation was the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (SORNA). This act requires new federal sexual offender registration to be categorized not by a risk of recidivism but by a conviction of a sexual offense (Phenix & Hoberman, 2015). It also

requires juveniles to register under certain specific sexual offense convictions and calls for sexual offender information to be available in state and national registries.

If a state, tribe, or territory does not implement SORNA's standards, it risks losing 10% of its fiscal year's Edward R. Byrne Justice Assistance Grant (Byrne JAG) funds (Prison Legal News, 2014). The JAG funds are commonly used to fund local courts, prisons, jails, and other law enforcement programs. California currently does not conform to SORNA requirements due to the cost of implementing SORNA versus the amount of JAG funds it would receive, which is \$3.2 million a year in contrast to over \$30 million to implement guidelines (Prison Legal News, 2014). However, this does not mean that California is not taking the necessary steps to work towards meeting federal standards.

On October 6, 2017, Governor Jerry Brown passed Senate Bill 384 (formerly Senate Bill 421), which changes the manner that sexual offenders are supervised after their conviction. The bill recommends that lifetime registration for every convicted sexual offender change by first assessing the individual and then placing them in one of three levels (California Legislative Information, 2017).

Effective January 1, 2021, Senate Bill 384 will recast the California sexual offender registry scheme into a three-tiered registration system for periods of 10 years (tier 1), 20 years (tier 2) or life (tier 3), for a conviction in an adult court of specified sexual offenses. A juvenile sexual offender would also be assessed and be placed under one of three registry tiers if convicted in the juvenile court system of a specified sexual offense: 5 years for tier 1, 10 years for tier 2, and possibly life for tier 3 (California Legislative Information, 2017). The bill specifies that first, an adult required to register under the Sex Offender Registration Act for a misdemeanor or a non-violent, non-serious sexual offense be subject to

registration under tier 1. If convicted of the registerable offense in adult court, the person must register for a minimum of 10 years. Second, it provides that a person required to register under the Act for a serious or violent or other specified felony sexual offense is subject to registration under tier 2. If convicted of the registerable offense in adult court, the person must register for a minimum of 20 years. Third, the Act sets forth a procedure for a registrant who is either in tier 1 or tier 2 to petition to be removed from the sexual offender registry following the expiration of his or her registration period. Finally, it provides that an adult person be subject to tier 3 registration (lifetime registration) if convicted of specified sexual crimes (California Legislative Information, 2017).

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Academic research on sexual offenders is sizeable. Several studies have explored specific aspects of sexual offender research, such as recidivism (Hanson, Bussière, & Kendall, 1998; Quinsey, Rice, & Harris, 1995; Sothill, 2010); residency restrictions (Chajewski & Mercado, 2009; Mustaine, 2014; Tewksbury, 2007); and treatment (Harkins & Beech, 2007; Harkins, Flak, Beech, & Woodhams, 2012; Polizzi, MacKenzie, & Hickman, 1999). The research on attitudes towards sexual offenders and sexual offender registration laws, on the other hand, has been sparse. Research conducted will frequently look at one specific aspect of sexual offending. For example, some studies will include the college students' views towards sexual offenders on campus, but not include information of non-students as a comparison (Falco & Martin, 2012; Shelley, Waid, & Dobbs, 2011; Valliant, Furac, & Antonowicz, 1994).

The literature reviewed for this study included quantitative and qualitative studies that researched the public's attitude toward sexual offender registration and legislation.

Understanding the actions that people take to prevent sexual assault from a sexual offender is an important aspect that most people do not take into consideration. Most people know that law enforcement supervises sexual offenders and that sole information does make the public feel safer. Other tools are available to people but how often do they use them? Anderson and Sample (2008) wanted to know that as well and aimed to keep their research questions simple; they asked for the frequency people accessed sexual offender information, if they felt safer with notification information, and if they took precautionary steps upon learning about sexual offenders. Researchers achieved a large sample size and

high response rate by performing phone surveys. Surveys were conducted in Nebraska, with 9,674 telephone numbers used for the sample, and of those, 5,558 belonged to households (Anderson & Sample, 2008). Surveyors excluded phone numbers that had to be called back over 15 times with no answer. It was also required that the individuals completing a survey had to be at least 19 years or older; this resulted in a final tally of 1,821 completed surveys (Anderson & Sample, 2008). Data showed that respondents had accessed a sexual offender registry, at least once (78.7%), two to five times (49.8%), or five or more times (29%) (Anderson & Sample, 2008). Upon learning that a sexual offender was living in the community, 87.6% of those surveyed felt that the registry would keep them safe (Anderson & Sample, 2008). Although the question was somewhat vague, it was interpreted by the authors that the sexual offender registry and notifications laws helped those who were interviewed become more aware of their presence, which translated into safety. Finally, 62% of the respondents said that they did not take any preventative measures upon learning information on sexual offenders in their community (Anderson & Sample, 2008). The arrangement of answers for this survey shows that although the participants were aware of the registries and the notifications, they do not play an active part in continuously being aware of sexual offenders in their community. Similarly, knowing that tools are being used by law enforcement may create a false sense of security, as the people surveyed did not take any preventative measures to maintain an active part in their families' safety.

In a qualitative study done by Sample and Kadleck (2008), 25 legislators were interviewed for their opinion on sexual offenders. Twenty-one of the 25 interviewees were state representatives, and 4 were state senators. Fourteen were Republicans, and 11 were Democrats; 7 were women, and 18 were men. Three of

the 7 women were African American, as were 5 of the 18 men (Sample & Kadleck, 2008).

Most of the interviewees stated various reasons as to what they thought about the current legislation on sexual offenders. Their usual responses were aligned with that of the public in that some people were born mentally ill, that it was the fault of pornography, and that it would be best to lock away sexual offenders because they fear that it is a safety issue for the community.

Sample and Kadleck (2008) found that all public officials agreed that current sexual offender legislation is effective in addressing the public's demands for action. Also, all 25 respondents mentioned that some of the information they received was based on news media accounts. Legislators were also found to base their information on sexual crimes from the public and their constituents (Sample & Kadleck, 2008).

Sample and Kadleck (2008) also found that the people in authority who had the power to create criminal justice policies were influenced by public perception, media coverage, and their own personal biases. Sample and Kadleck determined (2008) that public officials' introduction of criminal justice reforms is often nothing more than political posturing, pandering to their constituents' views, and worry over their election success. Finally, it seems evident that policymakers' ideologies, beliefs, and assumptions play a role in introducing, passing, and enacting legislation (Sample & Kadleck, 2008).

Attitudes and knowledge that the public holds towards criminal justice policies, such as Megan's Law, were examined by Proctor, Badzinski, and Johnson (2002). Their study randomly sampled participants who lived in Massachusetts from listed phone numbers. Interviewers were able to contact 990 households and of those called, 345 were able to complete the survey. A high

percentage of the respondents were female and elderly; therefore, the sample was weighted to reflect the population characteristics of Massachusetts (Proctor et al., 2002).

The survey consisted of four sections (Proctor et al., 2002). The first section asked respondents about their media consumption. The second section assessed the respondent's knowledge of Megan's Law. The third section asked the participants about their level of support for Megan's Law, as well as its efficacy. The last section asked demographic information about the respondents (Proctor et al., 2002).

Mean scores for media consumption data showed that newspaper and television were used at similar rates, although radio did average slightly higher (2.93) than the other two. Respondent use of media averaged at about 2.68 times per week. Participants' data showed that more attention was given to crime when they watched it on television (6.75), instead of newspapers (6.37) or radio (5.72) (Proctor et al., 2002).

Two items questioned the respondents about their general knowledge of Megan's Law. Of the total sample, 12.6% were able to answer the questions correctly, while 42.7% were not able to answer any correct (Proctor et al., 2002). Participants were, on the other hand, able to answer specific community notification laws at higher rates (31.1%), whereas only 11.4% were able to answer either question correctly (Proctor et al., 2002). The authors' analysis did show that attention to crime in newspapers was significantly associated with general knowledge of Megan's Law. Radio use/attention and television attention were significantly associated with specific knowledge of Megan's Law. Overall, the more a participant used media, the higher their favorable attitude was towards Megan's Law community notifications.

Wiersma and Siedschlaw's (2016) study surveyed the attitudes of undergraduate students toward sexual offender policies and laws. They sampled 101 students at the University of Nebraska at Kearney. Students who participated in the survey and were selected from two Criminal Justice courses. Fifty-eight students (57.43%) were male, and 43 students (42.57%) were female. The overall mean age of the students was 20.43 years. Participants were 30.68% freshmen, 31.68% sophomore, 28.71% junior, and 7.92% senior students (Wiersma & Siedschlaw, 2016). Of those surveyed, 31.68% said that they had access to the Nebraska Sex Offender Registry.

Overall student attitudes leaned towards harsher punishments for sexual offenders. Participants indicated with an overwhelming 93% agreement that sexual offenders should be required to register with local law enforcement (Wiersma & Siedschlaw, 2016). Eighty percent of the participants believed that sexual offenders should always or frequently have some form of policy placed on them, such as registration, limitations on public places, residency restriction, harsher punishment, or required treatment. Nearly 85% believed that sexual offenders should always (35.64%) or frequently (48.51%) receive the maximum allowed punishment (Wiersma & Siedschlaw, 2016).

Regarding sentences and punishments, 89.10% believed that the death penalty should be used for repeat sexual offenders (Wiersma & Siedschlaw, 2016). When asked about chemical castration, 65.34% of the students expressed lenient attitudes towards the usage as a punishment for sexual offenders. Almost 48% of the participants believed that sexual offenders should be civilly committed if they refused treatment. It should be noted, however, that 33% of the students indicated they did not know what chemical castration was (Wiersma & Siedschlaw, 2016).

The results of this study are interesting in that the students favored tougher laws placed on sexual offenders when their behaviors and beliefs contradicted their inclination towards those favored punishments. For example, almost all students (93%) favored the requirement to have sexual offenders register with law enforcement, but nearly one-third of the participants had ever accessed their state's sexual offender registry. Students vastly favored the death-penalty (89.10%) for repeat sexual offenders, but almost half of them (47.52%) believed that civil commitment would be an appropriate punishment for refusing treatment (Wiersma & Siedschlaw, 2016). It would seem that these undergraduate students were centering their inclinations to harsher punishments on popular belief rather than their own experiences and habits.

Levenson, Brannon, Fortney, and Baker (2007) studied public perceptions about sexual offenders and community protection policies. The authors hypothesized that the public held inaccurate perceptions of sexual offenders and strongly supported community protection policies. Surveys were collected from 193 participants in Melbourne, Florida. Female respondents were over-represented at 57% of the sample. The mean age was 37 years old, and the median income was between \$30,000 and \$40,000. The ethnicity of the sample was 69% Caucasian, 14% Hispanic, 11%, African American, and 2.7% Asian (Levenson et al., 2007).

A questionnaire was created that gathered information on perceptions of sexual offenders, familiarity with notification laws, and the public's opinion whether community protection policies can reduce or prevent child sexual abuse (Levenson et al., 2007). The researchers' questionnaire first asked the participants about different methods that could have been used to notify them that a sexual offender was in their neighborhood. Almost all of the notification procedures that participants were questioned on were reported not to be common events.

Respondents did answer favorably to a separate question that the effectiveness of the community notification policies was successful in reducing sexual abuse (Levenson et al., 2007). When questioned about what information should be disclosed on a sexual offender registry, data showed that they were in favor of basic information on the offender. Participants primarily answered the questions in a manner that showed that they support a substantial amount of privacy for the sexual offenders, as they believed that employment information, home telephone number, fingerprints, and victim name should not be shown on a registry (Levenson et al., 2007).

Participant perceptions of sexual offenders indicate that they held misinformed views as data showed that they believed that sexual offender recidivism rates were high, that sexual offenders primarily assaulted strangers, and that more than half of all sexual crimes are reported to law enforcement by the victims. Respondents' attitudes towards punishment favored long sentencing laws, long periods of community supervision, but still believed that treatment should be administered throughout these phases (Levenson et al., 2007). More than half of the participants also appeared to believe that residency restrictions and chemical castration were effective strategies that could help reduce recidivism. At close to three-quarters of the sample (73%), participants revealed that they would approve of policies they believed would be useful in reducing sexual offender recidivism, even if there was a lack of scientific data to prove its effectiveness (Levenson et al., 2007).

Kernsmith, Craun, and Foster's (2009) study investigated the types of sexual offenders that elicited the most amount of fear in public. They predicted that sexual offenders who preyed on children would cause the most concern. Using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI), 773 individuals were

surveyed across the state of Michigan. The study required that residents be over 18 years old and readily available to participate. The age of the participants involved ranged from 18 to 95 years old, with an average age of 50.5 years. Most of the respondents were White (82.5%), female (67.3%), and had received a high school diploma (45%). Over a third (36%) of the participants had minor children (Kernsmith et al., 2009).

Kernsmith et al. (2009) used two scales to gather data on attitudes towards seven types of sexual offenders: pedophile, incest, juvenile offender, date rape, old offenses, spousal rape, and statutory rape. The first scale asked respondents to rate their level of fear towards the various types of sexual offenders using a 4-point Likert type scale. The second section of the survey asked for the participants to rate each type of sexual offender by using a 5-point Likert type scale to rate their level of agreement on the need for registration.

Data showed that pedophiles were feared the most (80%) among the seven categories of sexual offenders; incest offenders ranked second at 78.4% (Kernsmith et al., 2009). Pedophiles ranked highest (97%) on the need to register among both sexes. Statutory rapists received the lowest agreement to register at 65.1%. Females, when compared to males, were found to be more likely to favor registration across all types of sexual offenders (Kernsmith et al., 2009).

Kernsmith et al. (2009) hypothesized that sexual offenders who victimized children ranked highest in creating public fear. It is not surprising, but good to see, that additional research into the type of sexual offenders the public fears most are those who legislation targets most often. The names of most bills are named after children as a reminder to the public that legislation could help the community reduce the number of sexual offenses towards children.

Schiavone and Jeglic (2009) assessed and determined the public's knowledge of sexual offender registration and notification laws by sampling 115 community members from 15 states. The majority of their sample was White (81%), female (85%), between the ages of 25 and 64 (79%), and reported no religious affiliation (39%) (Schiavone & Jeglic, 2009). Schiavone and Jeglic (2009) created two surveys to assess respondents' knowledge and perceptions of sexual offender and sexual offender registration policies. A third assessment, Megan's Law Survey – Community Based Revision by Levenson and Cutter, was modified and used to reflect the respondents' perception of Megan's Law, residency restriction, recidivism, and vigilantism, to name a few items (Schiavone & Jeglic, 2009).

Most respondents (58%) indicated that they understood and were knowledgeable on registration and notification statutes, although (32%) responded that they had little to no familiarity with Megan's Law. When asked where participants had learned information on Megan's Law, 42% stated television, 38% indicated the Internet, and 29% newspaper (Schiavone & Jeglic, 2009).

Those surveyed indicated that they believe that high-risk sexual offenders (89%), moderate-risk offenders (82%), and low-risk sexual offenders (51%) should be subjected to Megan's Law. Nearly half of the sampled participants (43%) agreed with the statement, "Communities are safer when they know where the sexual offenders live" (Schiavone & Jeglic, 2009). Similarly, 44% agreed that registration and community notifications help prevent offending, whereas 57% believed that Megan's Law does not change the rate at which sexual offenders recidivate (Schiavone & Jeglic, 2009).

When asked what sexual offender information was fair to be displayed on the Megan's Law website, 76% indicated sexual offender's name, home address

(58%), physical description (83%), photographs (73%), and description of crime (78%) (Schiavone & Jeglic, 2009). Information that they believed was unfair be displayed was work address (61%), home telephone (76%), employer (59%), and fingerprints (53%). Sixty percent of those surveyed strongly agreed that “if sex offenders really wanted to re-offend, they would be able to do so despite residence restrictions” (Schiavone & Jeglic, 2009, p. 688).

Present Study

The present study examined the attitudes the public holds towards sexual offenders and sexual offender registration laws. This study incorporated a Likert-scale questionnaire and the presentation of an educational video. Analysis of responses to pre-test and post-test attitudes were examined and reported. The research questions were as follows:

Research question 1: What is the public attitude of sexual offender registration laws?

Research question 2: Can an educational video on sexual offenders influence public opinion on California’s new law to end lifetime registration for low-risk offenders?

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Participants

Surveys were administered to undergraduate students attending California State University, Fresno, a university of over 25,000 students in California's Central Valley. The researcher e-mailed full-time Criminology professors asking for permission to conduct surveys during the Spring 2018 school semester. Approval was given to survey 14 classes, which resulted in a total of 407 surveys being completed. Survey respondents were informed by the researcher of the study's intent to gather information on the public's attitude towards sexual offenders and sexual offender registration laws. Participations were notified that their involvement in the study was voluntary, as they were allowed to stop taking the survey at any time without penalty. They were also advised prior to starting the survey that their questionnaire responses would be anonymous, and thus their answers would not connect them to their signed consent forms. The questionnaire and procedures used to collect data were approved by the university's Institutional Review Board (IRB).

Design

The study used an experimental quantitative research design to measure public attitudes towards sexual offenders and sexual offender legislation through scaled measurements. Additionally, research was conducted to measure the possibility of attitude influence by using an educational video as a teaching tool for current and proposed legislation. A self-reporting questionnaire and video were utilized.

Based on total projected participation from professors' class sizes, two groups were administered the study questionnaire: the experimental group and the

control group. A two-paragraph pre-briefing handout was given to all respondents before they began any of the surveys in the control or experimental group (see Appendix A). The first paragraph reiterated to the respondent that they were allowed to stop and not finish the questionnaire for any reason without penalty. The second paragraph gave a summary of “SB-384: Registration: Criminal Offender Record Information System,” California’s bill to switch from a lifetime sexual offender registration system to a three-tier registration system. The intent of the pre-briefing was to remind the respondent that the survey was voluntary, as well as for them to gain a quick introduction about SB-384. Two items in the questionnaire referenced SB-384.

Experimental Group ($n = 202$)

This group received a pre-test after all consent forms were collected. Upon pre-test completion, participants were shown an educational video. When the video concluded, a post-test was administered to the group. The pre-test and the post-test was the same questionnaire dispensed on both occasions.

Control Group ($n = 205$)

Once consent forms were collected, the control group watched the educational video. When the video was finished they completed the questionnaire.

Both groups received a debriefing statement about the purpose of the experiment after the post-test had been completed (see Appendix B). Several respondents did not complete all the sections of the questionnaire, such as the portion of personal demographics. Participant responses in other sections were still used in the study.

Survey Instrument and Variables

The instrument for this study was four pages in length (front and back) and composed of two sections (see Appendix C). The first section consisted of the survey tool, which was composed of 20 items that helped researchers discover respondents' attitudes towards sexual offenders and California's sexual offender registration laws. Eighteen of the items were researcher-created, and two items were used from an established psychometric assessment instrument. The two items not created by researchers, questions #13 and #15 (modified) in the questionnaire, stem from the Community Attitude Toward Sex Offender Scale (CATSO) (Church, Wakeman, Miller, Clements, & Sun, 2008). Church et al. (2008) created the CATSO scale based on the need for an instrument that would examine attitudes towards sexual offenders across specific and relevant domains. The researcher of the current study believed that the two chosen items fit in well with the current study, as it is believed that these questions would assist in answering the study's research questions.

The second section of the questionnaire was a four-item personal demographic section. The items gathered information about the participant's sex, age, race, and political affiliation. Please see Appendix D for a description of questionnaire items.

Independent Variables

To ascertain the attitudes participants held on the topics of sexual offenders, sexual offender registration systems, proposed California sexual offender legislation, and general information gathering habits, Likert scaled questions were predominantly used. The questionnaire consisted of 20 items: 19 were 5-point Likert-type scaled questions, and 1 item was a "check all that apply" question.

Within the questionnaire's 20 items, 14 were identified as possibly creating a change in the attitude of the participant after watching the educational video. The remaining six items that would not cause a change gathered information on participants' views on media consumption and knowledge on sexual offenders and sexual offender legislation.

The 5-point Likert-type scale response items assessed participant attitudes with questions that used level of probability, level of agreement, frequency, the frequency of use, likelihood, level of satisfaction, and quantity. Responses were ordered (e.g., level of agreement) 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither agree or disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree.

Dependent Variables

The independent variables examined in the study included respondents' sex, age, race, and political affiliation. Sex was coded as (0 = male, 1 = female). Age, in years, was coded as 1 = 18 to 24, 2 = 25 to 34, 3 = 35 to 44, 4 = 45 to 54, and 5 = 55 and above. Race was entered as 1 = American Indian/Alaska Native, 2 = Asian, 3 = Black or African American, 4 = Hispanic/Latino of any race, 5 = Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, 6 = White, and 7 = Two or more races.

During the beginning of the surveying process, several participants informed survey administrators that they did not fall within any of the choices for a race. Researchers adjusted the option of "Two or more races" to "Other." "Other" thus meant that the participant either identified as being of two or more races or of a race or ethnicity not acknowledged on the item. Political Affiliation was recorded as 1 = Democrat, 2 = Independent, 3 = Republican, 4 = Independent, but feel closer to Republicans, 5 = Independent, but feel closer to Democrats, and 6 = Other.

Treatment Video

In 2016, one of the goals that the California Sex Offender Management Board (CASOMB) sought to accomplish was to educate the public regarding sexual offender registration in California (L. Pauli, personal communication, March 9, 2018). A video titled “CASOMB - Educational Video” was produced by the California Coalition Against Sexual Assault (CALCASA) and CASOMB, as part of a platform that included printed pamphlets. The video, with a run-time of 5:59 minutes, presents information on California’s current lifetime registration system for sexual offenders with reasons why it would be favorable to change the current structure towards a system that assesses a sexual offender’s risk on an individual level instead of a one-size-fits-all system (CASOMB/SARATSO, 2016).

In the video, a female narrator begins by highlighting some of the shortcomings of the present sexual offender registry system in California: its requirement to register for life, its over 100,000 registrants, and its high costs to manage sexual offenders every year (CASOMB/SARATSO, 2016). The narrator continues by asking general questions about sexual offenders, such as who the people are who commit sexual offenses, what their likelihood of reoffending is, why is risk assessment important, and if lifetime registration is what survivors want. Questions posed by the narrator are answered by scholars, criminal justice professionals, and victim advocates in an on-video interview style. The experts then answer the narrator’s questions, and their main ideas appear as large white font following their statements to summarize their view on the topic. The video ends with a summary by the narrator on how to improve the three weaknesses of lifetime registration that were mentioned at the beginning of the video. To fix the current faults of the registration system, the narrator states that we need to make

policies that include sexual offender risk assessments, use resources effectively, and increase public safety.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences program, version 25 (SPSS, 2017). Analytical techniques primarily used were descriptive statistics frequencies, t-tests, and analysis of variances (ANOVAs).

Descriptive Statistics

Demographic characteristics of the study sample are presented in Appendix E. Survey results show that participants were primarily Female (57.2%) and were 18-24 years-old (86%). The greater part of the sample was Hispanic/Latino (65.1%), and politically associated more within the Democratic spectrum (56.5%). Chi-squares for the four demographic groups were also run to determine significant values in the distribution. It was found through the Chi-square that females in the “Sex” group were significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 401) = 10.54, p < .01$. Participants aged 18-24 were statistically significant, $\chi^2(4, N = 401) = 1162.75, p < .01$. In the “Race” group Hispanic/Latinos had a significant effect in the study, $\chi^2(6, N = 401) = 914.98, p < .01$. Finally, Democrats were found to be a significant variable in the studies “Political Affiliation” group, $\chi^2(5, N = 396) = 150.03, p < .01$.

It is of note that the survey sample’s demographic ratio is not similar to the beginning of the year’s student population. California State University, Fresno’s Fall 2017 student population was measured as being 60.4% Female, 54% Hispanic/Latino, and aged 18-24 (83.9%) (California State University, Fresno, n.d.).

Non-Affecting Attitude Items

The study identified six items from the questionnaire that would not cause a change in attitude after completing the questionnaire. Mean, median, and standard deviation scores are presented in Appendix F. Respondents were asked if they had any previous knowledge of Senate Bill 384 before participating in the survey. Overall, the sample responded that they had “very little” knowledge of the proposed sexual offender legislation. However, participants did answer that they “occasionally/sometimes” research legislation before they vote on new ballot propositions. Of worthy note are the results that show that the average sample participant “almost never” uses the Megan’s Law website. Yet, almost all of the sample “strongly agree” that awareness of sexual offenders in their neighborhood is important.

Participants were asked if they read or watch the news on a daily basis, of which a neutral “sometimes” was the average response given. Concerning the type of media used to inform themselves on new or current legislation, three methods were commonly used. The most common types of media used were Internet Websites (81%), followed by Television (60%), and Facebook (42%).

Items that May Affect Attitude from Video Treatment

A comparison of pre-test and control composite scores was performed using a one-way ANOVA to verify if there were any significant variations in the data between both groups. Data analysis showed that there was a significant effect between both group scores: $F(1, 405) = .36.196, p = .469$ (see Appendix G). A comparison of the experimental and control group post-tests was conducted using a one-way ANOVA to determine if there were significant variations. Data showed that there was no significant effect between experimental post-test and control scores: $F(1, 405) = .524, p = .469$. Data results are displayed in Appendix H.

Repeat measures comparing experimental pre-test and post-test scores yielded statistical significance: $F(1, 201) = 53.627, p = .000$ (see Appendix I).

A paired sample t-test was run on the 14 independent items that could have produced a change in attitude in the experimental group after viewing the treatment video (see Appendix J). Several variables showed significant response change; the variable “Amend” displayed a shift in attitude when both pre and post-test variables were compared, $t(201) = -6.510, p < .001$. There was a significance between pre-test “Amend” scores, where the Mean (M) was measured at 3.14, and the Standard Deviation (SD) was 1.248. Post-test “Amend” scores were ($M = 3.69, SD = 1.087$). After viewing the treatment video, the experimental group was half a point more likely to amend sexual offender legislation if presented on a ballot.

Additional variables that were of distinct importance were the “RegLife,” “CrimeAfter,” and “Reoccur” variables: pre-test “RegLife” and post-test “RegLife” comparison, $t(201) = 11.539, p < .001$; significance between pre-test “RegLife” scores ($M = 3.86, SD = 1.332$) and post-test “RegLife” ($M = 2.91, SD = 1.224$). The sample’s attitude that sexual offenders should register for life changed almost a full point towards being less inclined to favor lifetime website registration for all sexual offenders: pre-test “CrimeAfter” and post-test “CrimeAfter,” $t(201) = 15.502, p < .001$. There was a significance between pre-test “CrimeAfter” scores ($M = 4.41, SD = 1.034$) and post-test “CrimeAfter” scores ($M = 2.77, SD = 1.367$) that showed more than one-and-a-half-point change from probable to less probable that sexual offenders will commit another crime after release: pre-test “Reoccur” and post-test “Reoccur,” $t(201) = -3.062, p < .001$. There was a significance between pre-test “Reoccur” scores ($M = 3.18, SD = 1.202$) and post-test “Reoccur” scores ($M = 3.47, SD = 1.089$). Close to half a

point change was seen favoring the question that asked if SB-384 could help prevent the re-occurrence of sexual violence.

Individual items show that “Resources,” “MolestPedo,” and “CrimeAfter” had the highest mean scores in experimental pre-test questionnaires (see Appendix K). “Resources” had a mean of 4.13, “MolestPredo” had a mean of 4.07, and “CrimeAfter’s” mean was 4.41. In the post-test questionnaires “Resources” and “MolestPedo” maintained their high mean scores in the questionnaires, with ($M = 4.19$) and ($M = 3.76$), respectively (see Appendix L). The “CrimeAfter” item did not retain its high mean score.

CHAPTER 5: IMPLICATIONS

Main Findings

The purpose of this study was two-fold. The first was to find the public's attitude towards sexual offenders. The second objective was to determine if an educational video on sexual offenders could influence public opinion on California's new law to end lifetime registration for low-risk offenders.

The study found that respondents' initial reactions towards sexual offenders favored a more punitive stance and aligned to more commonly held stereotypical attitudes about sexual offenders. The sample was found to generally rate higher on their beliefs of necessary punishment towards sexual offenders; for example, it was revealed that above-average scores were measured in the belief that treatment of sexual offenders was ineffective. They also held that sexual offenders should register for life and lose their civil rights permanently. Additionally, the average participant thought that sexual offenders were predominantly pedophiles and had a higher probability of reoffending after release.

Preliminary reaction to amending the sexual offender registration system or switching to a tier-level system was on average favorable. Pre-test scores also showed that the sample preferred any new sexual offender legislation make criminal justice resource use a priority.

It was not until after the treatment video was shown that the impact it made on the sample was observed. In the analysis of the post-test scores, it was found that almost all 14 items that had beforehand been noted as possibly producing an attitude change did show a significant effect on the sample. The respondents' scores changed from punitive to being less punitive, as well as an increase in their

openness to sexual offender legislation change. On average a half point to a full point change was found after watching the educational video.

No practice effect was observed as the various group analyses indicated. A one-way ANOVA of post-test and control show that there was no significant effect between the two groups. Another one-way ANOVA analysis of the pre-test experimental and control showed a significant effect among the groups. It was also a repeated measures ANOVA of pre-test experimental and post-test experimental scores that showed a significant effect. When all three analyses were compared it became evident that the positive attitude changes were the results of the effectiveness of the educational video used in the study.

Limitations and Future Directions

There are several limitations in this present exploratory study. Some of the limitations were that the sample size was small, participants were surveyed from only one university, and participants were primarily from one major.

Several studies that have looked at the public's attitudes towards sexual offenders have sampled thousands of participants in single studies. It would have been of most benefit to the researcher to have gathered more surveys for the study as selectiveness in the use of surveys was not stringent, however, had more requirements been used the reduction in questionnaires and resulting data could have skewed the figures. The lack of a significant sample in this study was not accomplishable due to the short amount of time available to conduct the survey; also, per IRB approval, surveying was restricted to classes in the Department of Criminology at the CSU, Fresno.

Sampling in one university also limits the results of the study, in that California State University, Fresno is in a county that predominantly votes

conservative. The initial punitiveness of the sample could have been the result of conservative beliefs, but an openness to a new sexual offender registration system could have been the result of the state's political climate. Had the study been conducted in a county with a population that was more liberal-leaning could have affected the results. Considering the study was conducted in California, a progressive state, exploration into research similar to the present study but conducted in a traditionally conservative state could also have yielded different results.

When researchers began sampling participants composed of predominantly Criminology students, it was not with the intention to gather the attitudes of criminal justice students, but instead, the researchers intended to gather the attitudes of voting-age adults. One could say that results of the study could have been the result of previous or current knowledge by the participants as a result of their knowledge of criminal justice. Observation of the data shows that most of the participants kept up-to-date on the news and did not proactively seek information on sexual offenders or legislation to a level that would indicate above average knowledge of sexual offenders.

Preliminary data analysis displayed differences in male and female participants. ANOVAs were performed in the study with the intention of later using these variables in conjunction with analysis of study data. Due to time restrictions, research on males and females with study data was abandoned. Future research could continue with this demographic variable, as well as look further into political affiliation.

Voluntary response bias can also be considered in this study, as extra credit points were given in several classes to students who participated in the survey.

Whether participants acted entirely voluntary would not be able to be determined due to the fact that an incentive was offered.

Continuation of a study similar to the one conducted on a longitudinal level can only add to the academic research on attitudes towards sexual offenders and use of educational video on criminal justice topics. This study does not reveal how long attitude changes would be retained after the completion of the surveys. In performing an additional study where this could be found, the results would be helpful to criminal justice organizations in understanding how often they should be presenting their educational videos.

Conclusion

The current study presents data on a group of participants who were surveyed on their attitudes on sexual offenders and sexual offender legislation while being presented an educational video on the same topic. This study found that the educational video used was effective in creating a significant attitude change by reducing the sample's punitiveness while increasing their openness to new sexual offender legislation. The literature gives insight on how constant bombardment of negative messages throughout the years from media outlets has led to the distorted image of sexual offenders that most of the public holds today. It may be that that is how it has been for over a century, but that does not mean that educational videos at this present time cannot continue to present factual and neutral toned messages to combat these false beliefs as observed. It is then that academic research can successfully engage legislators that prey on the heavy hearts of the public with educational messages that allow people to make informed decisions on criminal justice issues.

Funding

This study was supported by a California State University, Fresno Graduate Student Net Initiative Grant.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Anderson, A. L., & Sample, L. L. (2008). Public awareness and action resulting from sex offender community notification laws. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 19(4), 371-396.
- California Legislative Information (2017). *SB-384 sex offenders: Registration: Criminal offender record information systems*. Retrieved from http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=2017201805B384
- California State University, Fresno (n.d.). *New undergraduate cohort demographics*. Retrieved from <https://tableau.fresnostate.edu/views/Enrollment/RaceEthnicityDetail?%3AisGuestRedirectFromVizportal=y&%3Aembed=y>
- CASOMB/SARATSO. (2016, December 6). *CASOMB - educational video* [Video file]. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GBoy2FB27yg>
- Chajewski, M., & Mercado, C. C. (2009). An evaluation of sex offender residency restriction functioning in town, county, and city-wide jurisdictions. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 20(1), 44-61.
- Church, W. T., II, Wakeman, E. E., Miller, S. L., Clements, C. B., & Sun, F. (2008). The community attitudes toward sex offenders scale: The development of a psychometric assessment instrument. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 18(3), 251-259.
- Falco, D., & Martin, J. (2012). Examining punitiveness: Assessing views toward the punishment of offenders among criminology and non-criminology students. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 23(2), 205-232.
- Hanson, R., Bussière, M., & Kendall, P.C. (1998). Predicting relapse: A meta-analysis of sexual offender recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 66(2), 348-362.
- Harkins, L., & Beech, A. (2007). Measurement of the effectiveness of sex offender treatment. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 12(1), 36-44.
- Harkins, L., Flak, V. E., Beech, A. R., & Woodhams, J. (2012). Evaluation of a community-based sex offender treatment program using a good lives model approach. *Sexual Abuse*, 24(6), 519-543.

- Institute of Governmental Studies (n.d.). *Proposition 83*. Retrieved from <https://igs.berkeley.edu/library/elections/proposition-83>
- Jenkins, P. (1998). *Moral panic: Changing concepts of the child molester in modern America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Kernsmith, P. D., Craun, S. W., & Foster, J. (2009). Public attitudes toward sexual offenders and sex offender registration. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 18*(3), 290-301.
- Levenson, J., Brannon, Y., Fortney, T., & Baker, J. (2007). Public perceptions about sex offenders and community protection policies. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy, 7*(1), 137-161.
- Mustaine, E. E. (2014). Sex offender residency restrictions. *Criminology & Public Policy, 13*(1), 169-177.
- O'Connor, L. (2015). Housing restrictions for sex offenders unconstitutional, California court rules. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/03/02/sex-offenders-unconstitutional-california_n_6788268.html
- Phenix, A., & Hoberman, H. M. (Eds.). (2015). *Sexual offending: Predisposing antecedents, assessments and management*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Polizzi, D. M., MacKenzie, D. L., & Hickman, L. J. (1999). What works in adult sex offender treatment? A review of prison-and non-prison-based treatment programs. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 43*(3), 357-374.
- Prison Legal News (2014). *Some states refuse to implement SORNA, Lose federal grants*. Retrieved from <https://www.prisonlegalnews.org/news/2014/sep/19/some-states-refuse-implement-sorna-lose-federal-grants/>
- Proctor, J., Badzinski, D., & Johnson, M. (2002). The impact of media on knowledge and perceptions of Megan's Law. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 13*(4), 356-379.
- Quinsey, V. L., Rice, M. E., & Harris, G. T. (1995). Actuarial prediction of sexual recidivism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 10*(1), 85-105.
- Sample, L., & Kadleck, C. (2008). Sex offender laws: Legislators' accounts of the need for policy. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 19*(1), 40-62.

- Schiavone, S., & Jeglic, E. (2009). Public perception of sex offender social policies and the impact on sex offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 53(6), 679-695.
- Shelley, T., Waid, C., & Dobbs, R. (2011). The influence of criminal justice major on punitive attitudes. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 22(4), 526-545.
- Soothill, K. (2010). Sex offender recidivism. *Crime and Justice*, 39(1), 145-211.
- SPSS (Version 25) [computer software]. Chicago, IL: IBM.
- Tewksbury, R. (2007). Exile at home: The unintended collateral consequences of sex offender residency restrictions. *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review*, 42(2), 531-540.
- Valliant, P., Furac, C., & Antonowicz, D. (1994). Attitude toward sex offenders by female undergraduate university students enrolled in a psychology program. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 22(2), 105-110.
- Wiersma, B. A., & Siedschlaw, K. D. (2016). Student attitudes toward sex offender policies and laws. *College Student Journal*, 50(2), 143-152.
- William Taylor v. San Diego County* (2015). Retrieved from <http://www.courts.ca.gov/opinions/archive/S206143.PDF>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: PRE-BRIEFING

Pre-Briefing

We appreciate you volunteering to complete this survey and would like to remind you that your decision whether or not to participate will not prejudice your future relations with CSU, Fresno. **You are free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue participation at any time without penalty.** If you do decide to stop filling out any forms, they will be collected at the end and be destroyed. The Human Research Committee of the CSU Fresno Department of Criminology has reviewed and approved the procedures for the present research.

This study is supervised by Dr. Azizian. If you should have any questions or concerns regarding the study and your role in it, please do not hesitate to contact him at <http://aazizian@csufresno.edu>.

“SB-384 Sex Offenders: Registration: Criminal Offender Record Information System” Summary:

The California criminal justice system requires that convicted sex offenders of specified sex crimes or individuals designated as sexually violent predators (SVP) must register for life. Currently, Senate Bill 384 is proposing to change the manner that sex offenders are supervised after their conviction. The bill recommends that lifetime registration for every convicted sex offender change by first assessing the individual and then placing them in one of three levels.

Senate Bill 384, effective January 1, 2021, recasts the California sex offender registry scheme into a three-tiered registration system for periods of 10 years (tier one), 20 years (tier two) or life (tier three) for a conviction in an adult court of specified sex offenses. Juveniles would receive periods of five years (tier one), 10 years (tier two), and possibly life (tier three) for a conviction in the juvenile court system of specified sex offenses.

Source: California Legislative Information website, SB 384 Bill Analysis.

APPENDIX B: DEBRIEFING

Debriefing Statement

Thank you for participating in the study. This study is looking at the attitudes that college students hold towards current California sex offender legislation. Further, we are examining how educational videos on sex offender assessment and management practices can influence a person's opinion towards new legislation. Little is known about the relationship between these factors. This research will help better understand the relationship between these variables.

If you should have any questions or concerns regarding the study and your role in it, please do not hesitate to contact, Dr. Azizian at [http://aazizian@csufresno.edu](mailto:aazizian@csufresno.edu).

Thank you again for your time and participation.

APPENDIX C: QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire

Instructions: Please answer the following questions/statements as truthfully as you can by placing a checkmark in the appropriate box.

1. Prior to participating in this study, what was your knowledge on “SB-384 Sex Offenders: Registration: Criminal Offender Record Information System”?

- Very much
- Quite a bit
- Some
- Very little
- None

2. If presented on ballot how likely would you vote in favor of amending the sex offender registration system?

- Very Likely
- Likely
- Neutral
- Not likely
- Very Unlikely

3. When new propositions are on a ballot how often do you conduct research before you vote, e.g., voters’ guide, newspapers, and online websites?

- Every time
- Almost every time
- Occasionally/Sometimes
- Almost never
- Never

4. How frequently do you use the Megan’s Law sex offender website (www.meganslaw.ca.gov)?

- Every time
- Almost every time
- Occasionally/Sometimes
- Almost never
- Never use

5. What types of media do you use to inform yourself on new or current legislation news? (Check all that apply).

- Internet websites
- Newspapers/magazines
- Facebook
- Television
- Radio

6. Do you read or watch the news on a daily basis?

- Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

7. Awareness of sex offenders in my neighborhood is important.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

8. Most sexual assaults are committed by strangers.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

9. Efficient use of criminal justice resources is a priority when considering new sex offender legislation.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

10. Treatment for sex offenders is ineffective.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree or disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

11. Switching to a tier-system would advance California's sex offender registration system.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

12. All sex offenders should receive the same punishment, no matter the crime.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

13. Trying to rehabilitate a sex offender is a waste of time.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree or disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

14. Sex offenders should register for life.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree or disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

15. People who commit sex offenses should be punished with a lifetime loss of their civil rights.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree or disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

16. Child molesters are predominantly pedophiles.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree or disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

17. Sex offenders are punished more severely than other criminals.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree or disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

18. SB 384 can help prevent the re-occurrence of sexual violence.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree or disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

19. How satisfied are you with the present sex offender registry system's effectiveness?

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- Unsure
- Dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

20. What is the probability that a sex offender will commit another sex crime after release?

- Very probable
- Somewhat probable
- Neutral
- Somewhat improbable
- Not probable

Personal Demographics

Sex:

- Male
- Female

Age:

- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55+

Race:

- American Indian/Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Hispanic/Latino of any race
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
- White
- Two or more races

Political Affiliation:

- Democratic
- Independent
- Republican
- Independent, but feel closer to Republicans
- Independent, but feel closer to Democrats
- Other

APPENDIX D: QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

Questionnaire Items (Variable Name, Description, Source, and Expected Value)

Variable Name	Variable Description	Source	Expected
			Value
Know	Prior to participating in this study, what was your knowledge on “SB-384 Sex Offenders: Registration: Criminal Offender Record Information System”?	Researcher	5
Amend	If presented on ballot how likely would you vote in favor of amending the sex offender registration system?	Researcher	5
Research	When new propositions are on a ballot how often do you conduct research before you vote, e.g., voters’ guide, newspapers, and online websites?	Researcher	5
MegWeb	How frequently do you use the Megan’s Law sex offender website (www.meganslaw.ca.gov)?	Researcher	5
Internet, NewsMag, Facebook, Television, Radio.	What types of media do you use to inform yourself on new or current legislation news? (Check all that apply).	Researcher	5
ReadWatch	Do you read or watch the news on a daily basis?	Researcher	5
Aware	Awareness of sex offenders in my neighborhood is important.	Researcher	5
Stranger	Most sexual assaults are committed by strangers.	Researcher	1
Resources	Efficient use of criminal justice resources is a priority when considering new sex offender legislation.	Researcher	5
Ineffect	Treatment for sex offenders is ineffective.	Researcher	1
Switch	Switching to a tier-system would advance California’s sex offender registration system.	Researcher	1
SamePun	All sex offenders should receive the same punishment, no matter the crime.	Researcher	1
Rehab	Trying to rehabilitate a sex offender is a waste of time.	CATSO	1
Reglife	Sex offenders should register for life.	Researcher	1
CivilRight	People who commit sex offenses should be punished with a lifetime loss of their civil rights.	Researcher	1
MolestPedo	Child molesters are predominantly pedophiles.	CATSO	1
PunSev	Sex offenders are punished more severely than other criminals.	Researcher	5
Reoccur	SB 384 can help prevent the re-occurrence of sexual violence.	Researcher	5
SatisEffec	How satisfied are you with the present sex offender registry system’s effectiveness?	Researcher	5
CrimeAfter	What is the probability that a sex offender will commit another sex crime after release?	Researcher	5

APPENDIX E: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS (CHI-SQUARE)

Demographic Characteristics (Chi-Square)

	Observed <i>N</i>	Expected <i>N</i>	Residual	%	Chi-Square	<i>df</i>	Asymp. Sig.
Sex							
Female	233	200.5	-32.5	57.2			
Male	168	200.5	32.5	41.3			
Total	401				10.536	1	.001
Age							
18-24	351	80.2	270.8	86.2			
25-34	47	80.2	-33.2	11.5			
35-44	1	80.2	-79.2	0.2			
45-54	1	80.2	-79.2	0.2			
55+	1	80.2	-79.2	0.2			
Total	401				1162.753	4	.000
Race							
American Indian/Alaska Native	3	57.3	-54.3	0.7			
Asian	28	57.3	-29.3	6.9			
Black or African American	10	57.3	-47.3	2.5			
Hispanic/Latino of any race	265	57.3	207.7	65.1			
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	4	57.3	-53.3	1.0			
White	53	57.3	-4.3	13.0			
Other	38	57.3	-19.3	9.3			
Total	401				914.983	6	.000
Political Affiliation							
Democratic	149	66.0	83.0	36.6			
Independent	45	66.0	-21.0	11.1			
Republican	51	66.0	-15.0	12.5			
Independent, but feel closer to Republicans	25	66.0	-41.0	6.1			
Independent, but feel closer to Democrats	81	66.0	15.0	19.9			
Other	45	66.0	-21.0	11.1			
Total	396				150.030	5	.000

Note. Asymp. Sig. = Asymptotic Significance.

APPENDIX F: ITEMS NOT SIGNIFICANT TO ATTITUDE
CHANGE AFTER TREATMENT VIDEO

Items Not Significant to Attitude Change After Treatment Video

Items	Mean	Std. Dev.	Median
Prior to participating in this study, what was your knowledge on “SB-384 Sex Offender Registration: Criminal Offender Record Information System”?	2.34	1.105	2.00
When new propositions are on a ballot how often do you conduct research before you vote, e.g. voter’s guide newspapers, and online websites?	3.01	1.127	3.00
How frequently do you use the Megan’s Law sex offender website?	1.87	.974	2.00
What types of media do you use to inform yourself on new or current legislation news?			
• Internet Websites	.81	.392	1.00
• Newspapers/magazines	.32	.469	0.00
• Facebook	.42	.494	0.00
• Television	.60	.490	1.00
• Radio	.29	.455	0.00
Do you read or watch the news on a daily basis?	3.16	1.055	3.00
Awareness of sex offenders in my neighborhood is important.	4.44	.756	5.00

Note. ($n = 407$), All items were answered on a 1-5 scale, except for the item on media. Media was a 0-1 scale.

APPENDIX G: PRE-TEST EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL
COMPARISON (ANOVA)

*Pre-test Experimental (n = 202) and Control (n = 205) Comparison
(ANOVA)*

	Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
Between Groups	1579.084	1	1579.084	36.196	.000
Within Groups	17668.454	405	43.626		
Total	19247.538	406			

Note. Sig. = Significance, *df* = degrees of freedom.

APPENDIX H: POST-TEST EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL
COMPARISON (ANOVA)

*Post-test Experimental (n = 202) and Control (n = 205) Comparison
(ANOVA)*

	Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
Between Groups	20.103	1	20.103	.524	.469
Within Groups	15523.543	405	38.330		
Total	15543.646	406			

Note. Sig. = Significance.

APPENDIX I: REPEAT MEASURES – TESTS OF WITHIN-
SUBJECTS EFFECT

Repeat Measures - Tests of Within-Subjects Effect
Measure: Experimental Pre-test and Post-tests

	Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power
Pre-Test/Post Tests								
Sphericity Assumed	1233.752	1	1233.752	53.627	.000	.211	53.627	1.000
Greenhouse-Geisser	1233.752	1.000	1233.752	53.627	.000	.211	53.627	1.000
Hyunhn-Feldt	1233.752	1.000	1233.752	53.627	.000	.211	53.627	1.000
Lower-bound	1233.752	1.000	1233.752	53.627	.000	.211	53.627	1.000
Error (Pre-Test/Post Tests)								
Sphericity Assumed	4624.752	201	.707					
Greenhouse-Geisser	4624.752	201.000	.707					
Hyunhn-Feldt	4624.752	201.000	.707					
Lower-bound	4624.752	201.000	.707					

Note. Noncent. Parameter = Noncentrality Parameter, Sig. = Significance.

APPENDIX J: PAIRED T-TESTS (EXPERIMENTAL GROUP)

Paired T-tests (Experimental Group)

	(Pre) Mean	(Post) Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig. (2- tailed)
			Lower	Upper			
Pair 1							
Amend	3.14 ± 1.248	3.69 ± 1.087	.084	-.380	-6.510	201	.000
Pair 2							
Stranger	2.05 ± .896	2.21 ± 1.167	.073	-.019	-2.232	201	.027
Pair 3							
Resources	4.13 ± .862	4.19 ± .933	-.168	.059	-.946	201	.345
Pair 4							
Ineffective	3.16 ± 1.110	2.72 ± 1.165	.287	.605	5.526	201	.000
Pair 5							
Switch	3.19 ± 1.053	3.66 ± 1.195	-.642	-.308	-5.620	201	.000
Pair 6							
SamePun	2.97 ± 1.391	2.30 ± 1.206	.504	.833	8.008	201	.000
Pair 7							
Rehab	2.77 ± 1.297	2.45 ± 1.097	.154	.490	3.781	201	.000
Pair 8							
RegLife	3.86 ± 1.332	2.91 ± 1.224	.788	1.113	11.539	201	.000
Pair 9							
CivilRight	3.06 ± 1.429	2.50 ± 1.116	.394	.734	6.547	201	.000
Pair 10							
MolestPedo	4.07 ± 1.193	3.76 ± 1.220	.178	.456	4.495	201	.000
Pair 11							
PunSev	2.97 ± 1.253	3.11 ± 1.125	-.316	.029	-1.641	201	.102
Pair 12							
Reoccur	3.18 ± 1.202	3.47 ± 1.089	-.464	-.100	-3.062	201	.003
Pair 13							
SatisEffect	3.24 ± 1.094	2.98 ± 1.055	.093	.422	3.086	201	.002
Pair 14							
CrimeAfter	4.41 ± 1.034	2.77 ± 1.367	1.426	1.841	15.502	201	.000

Note. ($n = 202$); df = degrees of freedom; Sig. (2-tailed) = significance of a two-tailed test.

APPENDIX K: ONE-SAMPLE T-TESTS (PRE-TEST)
EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

One-Sample T-Tests (Pre-test) Experimental Group

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	<i>t</i>	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper
Amend	3.14	1.248	.088	35.813	3.144	2.97	3.32
Stranger	2.05	.896	.063	32.496	2.050	1.93	2.17
Resources	4.13	.862	.061	68.147	4.134	4.01	4.25
Ineffect	3.16	1.110	.078	40.508	3.163	3.01	3.32
Switch	3.19	1.053	.074	43.033	3.188	3.04	3.33
SamePun	2.97	1.391	.098	30.305	2.965	2.77	3.16
Rehab	2.77	1.297	.091	30.327	2.767	2.59	2.95
RegLife	3.86	1.332	.094	41.136	3.856	3.67	4.04
CivilRight	3.06	1.429	.101	30.488	3.064	2.87	3.26
MolestPedo	4.07	1.193	.084	48.554	4.074	3.91	4.24
PunSev	2.97	1.253	.088	33.678	2.970	2.80	3.14
Reoccur	3.18	1.202	.085	37.650	3.183	3.02	3.35
SatisEffec	3.24	1.094	.077	42.059	3.238	3.09	3.39
CrimeAfter	4.41	1.034	.073	60.588	4.406	4.26	4.55

Note ($n = 202$), $df = 201$, Significance = $p < .001$.

APPENDIX L: ONE-SAMPLE T-TESTS (POST-TEST)
EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

One-Sample T-Tests (Post-test) Experimental Group

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	<i>t</i>	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper
Amend	3.69	1.087	.076	48.237	3.688	3.54	3.84
Stranger	2.21	1.167	.082	26.945	2.213	2.05	2.37
Resources	4.19	.933	.066	63.820	4.188	4.06	4.32
Ineffect	2.72	1.165	.082	33.150	2.718	2.56	2.88
Switch	3.66	1.195	.084	43.564	3.663	3.50	3.83
SamePun	2.30	1.206	.085	27.078	2.297	2.13	2.46
Rehab	2.45	1.097	.077	31.683	2.446	2.29	2.60
RegLife	2.91	1.224	.086	33.738	2.906	2.74	3.08
CivilRight	2.50	1.116	.079	31.828	2.500	2.35	2.65
MolestPedo	3.76	1.220	.086	43.777	3.757	3.59	3.93
PunSev	3.11	1.125	.079	39.340	3.114	2.96	3.27
Reoccur	3.47	1.089	.077	45.237	3.465	3.31	3.62
SatisEffec	2.98	1.055	.074	40.130	2.980	2.83	3.13
CrimeAfter	2.77	1.367	.096	28.826	2.772	2.58	2.96

Note. $n=202$, $df = 201$, Significance = $p < .001$.