

PERCEPTIONS OF SEX OFFENDERS ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES

by

DAYANNE MEGAN HARVEY

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Honors in the Major Program in Sociology
in the College of Sciences
and in The Burnett Honors College
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Summer Term 2013

Thesis Chair: Dr. Amy Donley

ABSTRACT

As previous research has indicated, it is not a common societal norm that sex offenders generally have a negative connotation associated with them. These types of perceptions are held without considering the varying types of sexual offenders and sexual offenses. The legislation concerning sex offenders is broad, and therefore encompasses a lot of different offenses and people. Notification of these types of offenders varies by state, but all states require sex offenders to register. A number of colleges also require sex offenders to register before attending classes. This research focuses on student's perception of sex offenders on college campuses. That is, it questions how a student's awareness of sex offender legislation and presence affect their attitudes and perceptions about sex offenders.

This thesis was intended to research the UCF student's awareness of sex offenders (legislation and presence) in relation how it effects their perception of sex offenders. Students were surveyed and asked questions based on their knowledge, awareness, and opinion of sex offenders in general and at the college level. Results collected suggested that informing students does make them more aware of sex offenders. However, the heightened awareness does not improve the negative perception student's held about sex offenders. After conducting the study, it is my hope that it will aid in better understanding student perceptions of sex offenders in terms of how effective notification and awareness are.

DEDICATION

For my mother, Debbie, who has always been my strongest support system. Thank you for always being the person I could come to with good news and bad. I appreciate your patience and understanding because I know it was not always easy doing it on your own. It has not been without hard work, but you have helped me in more ways than words can describe; from lending your ear to giving me motivation to continue. I owe my success to you, and for that I am eternally grateful. You always say you are so proud to call me your daughter, but it is me who is truly proud to have the blessing of calling you my mom. Love you, Mom.

To my best friend and soul mate, Bryen, for all of your support, care, and sweetness you always show. I understand dealing with a stressed out, exhausted, and overworked version of me is not what you envisioned, but your kindness and understanding is more appreciated than you know. Thank you for being strong and tolerant for me when I needed it. I cannot believe that almost ten years ago we were a couple of best friends in high school, and now here we are graduating college after being together for almost 5 years. I am lucky to have met you so young, and I cannot wait to grow even more together.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank my thesis chair, Dr. Amy Donley, for all of her support and guidance.

Dr Donley, you have a real gift for teaching and motivating students to do their best. I cannot express how much I thank you for suggesting I participate in Honors in the Major, and for all of your help throughout the process.

I also want to thank Professor Jobe of Seminole State College for igniting my passion for Sociology. I remember taking my first Sociology course, Social Problems, and falling in love with the subject. I am forever indebted to you for teaching with so much passion and rigor, and for always seeing my potential.

Lastly, I would like to thank my other two committee members; Dr. David Gay and Professor Gail Humiston. Thank you for being thorough and available to help throughout this entire process. Your guidance and suggestions were priceless. Thank you again.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
LITERATURE REVIEW	3
What is a Sex Offender?	3
History and Legislation.....	4
Community Perceptions of Sex Offenders	7
Effectiveness of Legislation, Notification, and Awareness.....	9
Current Study	12
RESEARCH QUESTION.....	13
HYPOTHESES	14
METHOD/SAMPLE.....	15
MEASUREMENTS	16
Demographics	16
Dependent Variables	16
Independent Variables.....	17
Data Analysis Strategy	18
RESULTS.....	19
Univariate Analysis.....	19
Bivariate Analysis	24
DISCUSSION.....	29
Limitations and Suggestions for Future.....	31
Implications	33

APPENDIX: SURVEY	35
REFERENCES	40

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Demographics (n=275)	19
Table 2 Relation to Sex Offenders (n=275)	20
Table 3 General Student Perceptions of Sex Offenders	21
Table 4 Believe that Sex Offenders Can Change (n=275)	21
Table 5 General Student Knowledge of Sex Offenders on Campus (n=275)	22
Table 6 Student Opinions of Sex Offender Punishment and Legislation (n=275).....	23
Table 7 Negative Perception Index (n=275)	24
Table 8 Level of Awareness and a Student's Negative Perception (Correlation)	25
Table 9 Male vs. Female Perceptions of Sex Offenders (T-test).....	26
Table 10 Lower Classmen vs. Upperclassmen Awareness of Sex Offenders (T-test).....	26
Table 11 Perceptions based on relationship with sex offender (T-test).....	27

INTRODUCTION

Sex offenders often have a negative connotation associated with them (Edwards and Hensley 2001). Historically legislation pertaining to sex offenders has gotten progressively harsher, restrictive and aimed at protecting children from strangers. This is not to say that these types of laws are not necessary, but sex offenders are categorized in very broad terms that can harm those with less severe convictions. Criminals can be deemed sex offenders for a range of crimes. Some of these crimes are more heinous like crimes against children or rape, but others are less severe in nature like a statutory rape incident between a 17 year old and a young adult. That is to say, people's perceptions may be negatively affected by accurate, but sometimes over-encompassing labels given by broad legislation (Levenson and Cotter 2005b).

In general, people believe that it is the government's job to inform citizens of sex offenders because these citizens could be potential victims (Levenson et. at. 2007). All 50 states require sex offenders to be on a registry that is available and accessible to everyone. Dameron, Detardo-bora and Bora (2009) found that 72% of schools provided campus safety sites with statistics and contact information, but lacked crime alerts or procedural information in the event of criminal activity. Also, Levenson and Cotter (2005a) found that, specifically in Florida, registries often posted outdated or even outright false information. Notification and awareness of sex offenders can affect how a person interprets who qualifies as a sex offender. It is known that the community views it a part of the government's job to notify citizens of sex offenders by publicly registering offenders as a means of societal protection (Levenson et al. 2007). Information may be available, but it does not mean that people are accurately informed or even

aware of sex offender laws and presence (Beck and Travis III 2004). In fact, research has shown that generally not even sex offenders were aware of registration at the university-level (Tewksbury and Lees 2006). This leads to the purpose of the study.

More research is needed on students' perceptions of sex offenders and their awareness of sex offender presence and legislation. This in turn should lead to resulting research in preventative and protective measures taken by students due to attitudes about sex offenders. A positive aspect of proper awareness, like direct notification, is that people were more likely to take preventive measures to protect themselves (Beck and Travis III 2004). Another positive aspect of proper awareness, specifically on college campuses, is a number of people who were victimized actually reported it to the college police, but the fact still remains that most victimizations are never reported at all (Slain III, et al. 1997). Again, this why studies are needed to research student awareness in order to help them to be more comfortable with educating themselves so they can protect themselves. Re-defining who a sex offender is, or at least educating citizens accurately about what differing severity of sex crimes is a start. How does a student's awareness of sex offender presence and legislation affect his or her perceptions of sex offenders? These types of studies and research questions can possibly help sex offenders re-integrate into the community with options that can offer success like attending college rather than isolation, and also help create preventative measures for victims. The current study will be looking at how University students' awareness of sex offenders' presence and laws affect their perceptions and attitudes about sex offenders. The results can help determine what type of notification, laws, and reporting are most successful at the college level.

LITERATURE REVIEW

What is a Sex Offender?

In order to discuss sex offender legislation and perceptions it is essential to define what a sex offender is because many people have different definitions based on varying experiences and situations. A sex offender is anyone who is convicted of committing an offense in a sexual nature as outlined by the current law (Colbert 2012). As noted by Colbert (2012), this type of definition is very broad, and thus gives the government and police a lot of sex offenders to handle and keep track of regularly. Colbert (2012) explains that any type of sexual offense, penetration, sexual touching, and/or contact to body whether clothed or not is considered a sex offender crime. Also, any type of conspiracy to commit these types of acts as well as any type of child pornography or voyeurism is grounds for arrest under sex offender legislation. It is important to note that, federally, in instances of consensual sexual activity between a child of at least 13 years of age and the offender is no more than four years older the offender is exempt from being required to be registered as a sex offender (Colbert 2012). However, there are statutory rape instances that are consensual, but are still illegal on the state level because the state can make the federal stipulations more severe. These types of discrepancies influence how people perceive sex offenders, and how they interpret notifications and legislation. Notification laws are used to increase community awareness so that the community can better protect themselves from offenders; thus, the assumption is that recidivism rates will be reduced through prevention (Edwards and Hensley 2001).

History and Legislation

Federal Level. Legislation right now is more focused on punishing sex offenders which can cause people to naively forget the important emphasis on notification and prevention of recidivism (Edwards and Hensley 2001). A lot of laws have been passed because of horrendous sexual acts against children where the parents and community demand quick legislation to lower chances of recidivism (Petrunik 2002). For instance, Megan Kanka was abducted, sexually assaulted, and murdered by a previously convicted sex offender which ignited the determination to inform citizens of potential dangerous offenders, specifically reoffending (Sample and Bray 2003). The federal legislature amended the Wetterling Act of 1994 with Megan's Law in 1996 which required states to notify communities by having a list of sexual offenders' addresses available directly to the public (Levenson, D'Amora and Hern 2007, Office of Justice Programs, Sample and Bray 2003). Megan's Law also legally allowed for any information that was collected using the registration programs to be disclosed for any purpose considering the state's laws (Office of Justice Programs 2013). This includes all three tiers of sex offenders as laid out by federal law, specifically in the Adam Walsh Act of 2006 that replaced previous sex offender legislation (United States Government Accountability Office 2013, Office of Justice Programs 2013, Reinhart 2006).

The three tiers of sex offenders vary upon degree of severity of the crime. The third tier is reserved for the most serious of sex crimes like aggravated sexual abuse, sexual abuse, sex acts against a minor under 13 years of age, and kidnapping (Reinhart 2006). Two tier offenses are related to victims who are a minor. Reinhart (2006) also details that second tier sex offender

crimes include: “sex trafficking, coercion and enticement, transportation with intent to engage in criminal sexual activity, or abusive sexual contact”, as well as “using a minor in a sexual performance, soliciting a minor for prostitution, or producing or distributing child pornography”. Tier one sex offender crimes are not as concrete as the previous, more severe tiers. However, tier one offenders do receive less time on the sex offender registry. Tier one offenders are registered for 15 years, in comparison to tier two offenders who receive 25 years on the registry, and tier 3 offenders who are on the registry for life (United States Government Accountability Office 2013). Tier one sex offenders are described as “someone convicted of a sex offense not included in the other tiers. The act defines a sex offense as (1) a crime involving a sexual act or sexual contact with another, (2) specified crimes against minors, (3) specified federal crimes and military crimes, and (4) attempt or conspiracy to commit one of them” (Reinhart 2006). In other words, the definition of ‘sex act’ used in the law leaves room for interpretation, and can sometimes include crimes that are not overtly sexual or deviant. That is, public urination near a school after hours is grounds for becoming a registered sex offender depending on the discretion used

Furthermore, in 2000, the Campus Sex Crimes Prevention Act was passed which required any registered sex offender to also inform their college or university, which he/she works at or attends as a student, of his or her status as a sex offender (Office of Justice Programs, 2013). This act also included the requirement that campus crime statistics be available to the public, and that means to receive more information about registered sex offenders must be provided.

In an effort to nationalize sex offender classification, registration, and notification requirements, congress passed the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act, also known as SORNA, to repeal previous sex offender legislation in favor of “establishing in their place a comprehensive set of sex offender registration and notification standards... These standards encompass the results of prior legislative developments but also extend and supplement them” (United States Government Accountability Office 2013: 7). According to the Office of Justice Programs (2013) and the United States Government Accountability Office (2013), the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, a provision of SORNA, created the Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking (SMART) Office within the Department of Justice to administer comprehensive standards for sex offender notification and registration. The Adam Walsh Act also included expanding the number of sex offenses recorded by registrations to encompass state, territory, tribal, federal, and even some foreign registries and offenses. It is also important to note that these requirements are also retroactive as to include more sex offenders and sexual offenses.

State Level. As of now, all 50 states are required to put the registered sex offender list online and available to the public (Levenson, D'Amora and Hern 2007). In fact, “all 50 states have expanded their registry, notification, and DNA laws to include persons convicted of a violent or nonviolent sex crime against any person regardless of their age” (Sample and Bray 2003: 62). In addition to federal laws, sex offenders are also impacted by state laws that vary from state to state. For example, in Florida sex offenders are listed on the registry for life (Levenson and Cotter 2005a). Florida has stricter registry laws for sex offenders despite the

federal law only mandating that third tier sex offenders be on the registry for life (Reinhart 2006). According to the Adam Walsh Act only third tier sex offenders are required by federal law to be registered for life (Office of Justice Programs, 2013). Residence restrictions are mandated in 30 states, including Florida, in effort to help reduce the amount of contact an offender will have with children to theoretically help lower recidivism. Restrictions, like the “1,000 ft. law” implemented in Florida, are used to prohibit an offender from living within 1,000 feet of schools, daycares, and other places where children are highly present (Levenson and Cotter 2005b, Meloy, Miller and Curtis 2008, Sample and Bray 2003). Meloy et al. (2008) further explain residence restrictions to include restrictions on places for work, walking, or even just being present. However, sometimes exceptions are made to the 1,000 ft. rule because of offender home ownership or because the offender is living with family (Levenson and Cotter 2005b). Furthermore, researchers found that sometimes it is probation officers who are in charge of deciding whether or not to allow an offender to live in a place that is generally considered restricted or uninhabitable by a registered sex offender (Meloy, Miller and Curtis 2008).

Community Perceptions of Sex Offenders

Perceptions of sex offenders in the community are influenced by a number of things, such as inaccurate information on treatment, recidivism rates of offenders, and negative stereotypes. This type of community effort obviously impacts the community members’ perceptions of the accused and convicted sex offenders. Levenson and Cotter (2005b) point out that the current, broad, over-encompassing legislation has validity, but it lacks major concern for individual risk

factors that often cause ineffectiveness and promotion of further recidivism. As a result, the community tends to categorize sex offenders under one label instead of looking at the offenders individually. In turn, the broad, negative labels create an overall negative perception of sex offenders in the community. For example, recent studies show that in contrast to previous research efforts, the overall community perception of sex offenders is that they will most likely re-offend (Levenson, D'Amora and Hern 2007). Research has shown that because information about the effectiveness of sex offender treatment is not clearly or easily provided to the community people have formed pessimistic attitudes about whether or not recidivism will occur with treatment (Levenson and Cotter 2005b). As a result, the majority of citizens support the idea that the government is responsible to notify the citizens, who are potential victims, because it is an issue of public safety (Levenson et al. 2007). According to Petrunik (2002) sex offenders are perceived to be, "persons for whom neither punishment nor treatment are considered to be effective controls and whose perceived enduring danger means they must be under the watchful eye of the state and community for the rest of their lives" (p. 485). For example, Edwards and Hensley (2001) described how the majority of people emotionally respond negatively to sex offenders and have a one-dimensional image of them. Community perceptions of sex offenders are heavily influenced by not believing that sex offenders can change. However, sex offenders are capable of change. In fact, one study conducted in a correctional facility found that "fewer than 7 percent of the sex offenders completing the Department of Correction's Sexual Offender Treatment Program...return to prison" (Department of Corrections Washington State 2012). Not to mention, the recidivism rates of sex offenders are considerably lower than offenders convicted

of other crimes. For example, “released sex offenders accounted for 13% and released non-sex offenders accounted for 87% of the...sex crimes committed by all prisoners released in 1994”, and furthermore only 5.3% of released sex offenders in the study were rearrested for a new sex crime (Langan, Schmitt, and Durose 2003: 24). Making people more aware of the effectiveness of treatment and rehabilitation of sex offenders would help the community form more positive perceptions about sex offenders.

Misperceptions and negative stereotypes are common among community perceptions of sex offenders. This includes the misperception that sex offenders are always strangers when statistics show the majority of people are victimized by family members (Levenson and Cotter 2005b). The information a person receives on sex offenders can alter how a person feels about sex offenders, but false or misleading information can cause irrational beliefs and misconceptions. Further perpetuating the misconceptions of sex offenders are the statistics from the Campus Security Act being exaggerated, and therefore, negatively affecting a person's perceptions of sex offenders (Sloan III, Fisher and Cullen 1997). An example of how negative perceptions actually are is the extreme view the government has on repeat offenders. In a handful of states, Florida included, judges must sentence repeat offenders to chemical castration as a part of their parole if the sex crimes are repeatedly with children (Petrunik 2002). This type of awareness does not encourage offender rehabilitation or therapy success.

Effectiveness of Legislation, Notification, and Awareness

The effectiveness of legislation and notification is an important aspect of how people and communities perceive sex offenders. For instance, research has shown that legislation may not

be effective because stigmatization of offenders and inaccurate information in community registries. A study conducted by Levenson and Cotter (2005b) showed that there are negative effects of the current legislation. Legislation is heavily centered on protecting children from strangers despite most victims being victimized by family members or people they knew (Levenson and Cotter 2005b; Levenson, D'Amora and Hern 2007). A study conducted on Florida sex offenders noted that sex offenders mentioned that a lot of the information provided on the registries was incorrect (Levenson and Cotter 2005a). False and misleading information is not good for the community or for the offenders because it is ineffective and provides a false sense of security. This supports the idea that although information may be readily available, it does not mean that people are properly notified, accurately informed, or acutely aware of current sex offender legislation and protective procedures (Beck and Travis III 2004). Also, according to the United States Government Accountability Office (2013) since SORNA replaced the previous sex offender legislation it has been mandated that all 50 states begin to implement it by a 2009 deadline. However, it is also noted that most states have not been able to meet all requirements as of yet. In fact, only 19 of the 56 jurisdictions, Florida being one of them, have substantially implemented the requirements of SORNA (United States Government Accountability Office 2013). This attests that there are laws that have been supposed to have been implemented for some time and are now outdated and not current. This supports that more research is needed in the effectiveness of legislation concerning sex offenders.

In addition to questionable effectiveness of sex offender legislation, research has shown that people, specifically college students, are not aware of sex offender legislation and policies.

For example, a survey modeled after the National Crime Victimization Survey was conducted by interviewing students from universities, and found that people who were victimized on campus, like the general public, do not report it. The fact is most victimizations were not reported at all, often times because people think nothing can be done (Sloan III, et al. 1997). Another alarming aspect of research revealed that, in general, neither registered sex offenders nor students were aware of the registration on the university-level (Tewksbury and Lees 2006). Tewksbury and Lees (2006) found that the majority of offenders were aware of the state-level, but not the university-level registration. It stands to reason that if the offenders are not even aware there is a state-level registration that students would not either. This is further supported by sex offenders reporting that they do not feel as if many other students know they are sex offenders, and also because only a few were ever confronted on a regular basis (Tewksbury and Lees 2006). It is as if most students are unaware that there are sex offenders attending campus classes because they did not receive direct notification or find the information easily accessible.

A positive aspect of proper awareness, like direct notification, is that people were more likely to take preventative measures to protect themselves (Beck and Travis III 2004). In one study, approximately 72 percent of schools provided campus safety websites, but the sites generally only gave information on crime statistics and contact information not on crime alerts or procedures (Dameron, Detardo-bora and Bora 2009). Students' perceptions of sex offenders can be negatively altered depending on whether or not they believe they are being completely informed or if they have any awareness at all.

Current Study

In the past, there has not been a lot of research on the actual perceptions of the community in regards to sex offenders, and their amount of awareness in relation to the type of notification approach used, if any. In the 2000's there has been more research conducted relating to sex offenders and people's perceptions of them, but more must be done in order to transform ineffective legislation into efficient law that protects both people, students and sex offenders. The current study is aimed at answering how aware students at a large university are of sex offenders. It is also looking at the perceptions and attitudes caused by current laws because it affects how people protect themselves and treat others.

RESEARCH QUESTION

- How does UCF students' awareness of sex offender legislation, presence, and treatment affect their attitudes and perceptions about sex offenders?

HYPOTHESES

- Hypothesis 1: Students who are less aware of sex offender legislation, presence, and/or treatment will have a more negative attitude about sex offenders than more aware students.
- Hypothesis 2: Female students will be more likely to have negative perceptions about sex offender than male students.
- Hypothesis 3: Upperclassman will be more likely to be aware of sex offender policies than underclassmen.
- Hypothesis 4: Students who do not have a relationship with a sex offender will have a more negative perception of sex offenders.

METHOD/SAMPLE

In order to obtain information for the present study, an online survey was administered to a convenience sample of students. Participants were acquired by professors e-mailing students with a link to the survey, about an opportunity to participate in a survey gathering information on perceptions of sex offenders among UCF students. The sample consisted of 275 UCF undergraduate students. The majority of students were enrolled in a sociology course, but students were from a variety of majors. The participants were asked to complete an anonymous, online survey that took approximately 5-7 minutes for them to complete. The survey was broken up into three sections: the general perceptions of sex offenders, punishment of the sex offender, and opinions of sex offenders in relation to college. The surveys were conducted through Qualtrics, and the data collected was statistically analyzed in SPSS. There was no incentive or direct benefit for participating in the survey, and no identifying information was collected.

MEASUREMENTS

Demographics

The demographics being measured in the study are class standing, sex, and racial/ethnic background (See Appendix: Survey). Age and criminal history were not included. Exact age was not included because class standing of students was used as a proxy for age given the little variation. The participants were not asked if they were a convicted or registered sex offender because according to the registry there are only two sex offenders attending UCF. To collect data for Hypothesis 2, a student's sex was measured by asking the participant to choose male or female. In relation to Hypothesis 3, the student's class standing was broken down into four categories for the student to choose from: Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior. For analysis, the class standings were further categorized into Upper and Lower class standing. The racial/ethnic background question was the only survey question that required participants to check all that apply. The choices were: White/Caucasian, African American, Latin/Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, Native American, Multiracial, and Other. If a participant chose the 'Other' category there was an area to write in the race/ethnicity. Also, if the participant chose multiple race/ethnicities the data was re-coded as multi-racial.

Dependent Variables

Questions regarding students' perceptions and attitudes were drawn from a survey similar to the Community Attitudes towards Sex Offenders (CATSO) survey (Balow and Conley 2008). Participants responded with an answer from a 6-point Likert Scale ranging from strongly

disagree (1) to strongly agree (6). The CATSO questionnaire was designed to focus on community perceptions and attitudes of sex offenders (Balow and Conley 2008, Church et al. 2008). The questions measured whether the participant felt like sex offenders could change, how sex offenders are with people, and whether knowledge of sex offenders can affect probability of victimization. The survey also collected data on how the respondents felt about sex offender punishment, even in instances of less severe sex crimes.

Independent Variables

Awareness was the main independent variable tested. The study examined how sex offender awareness through registration, notification, media, etc. affects students' perceptions of sex offenders. School awareness was specifically measured. Respondents were asked if UCF notifies students of sex offenders on campus, and if they knew if there are any sex offenders on campus. There are currently two sex offenders attending UCF so this question is measuring whether students were aware of the basic campus sex offender information available. The survey also provided questions pertaining to how aware the respondent thinks UCF students are, and if colleges are required to inform students of sex offenders attending classes on campus. Participants answered these questions on a 6-point Likert Scale, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Sex and class standing were also measured as independent variables in which awareness and/or perception were dependent upon.

In addition, another tested independent variable was asking whether or not the participant had a relationship with an offender by answering either yes or no. If the participant answered, yes, he/she was asked what type of relationship it was. The participant could choose: intimate,

family, friend, acquaintance, or stranger. Defining what type of relationship, if any, could help interpret the data without skewing it due to a couple of strong, personal relationships with offenders.

Data Analysis Strategy

After the 275 participants had finished completing the surveys, the data were collected and entered into SPSS. Once entered into SPSS, the data were analyzed statistically. An index was created to examine student negative perceptions. In order to measure the scale reliability, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used. In relation to the demographics chosen, frequency tables were used to acknowledge any patterns in samples that would project to the population. To test each hypothesis, a number of different tests were run, in addition to frequencies on the variables. For hypothesis 1, a correlation was run to examine if student awareness affects perception and attitudes in a positive or negative way. For hypothesis 2, a T-test was conducted to measure differences between men and women in terms of awareness. For hypothesis 3, another set of T-tests were run to measure the difference between upperclassmen and lowerclassmen in terms of awareness. Hypothesis 4 also required a T-test to be run to determine whether or not knowing someone who has been convicted of a sex offense effects a person's negative perception toward sex offenders. These types of tests will aid in interpreting how awareness from the varying categories (knowledge, sex, class standing, etc.) actually affects the attitudes conveyed in the survey from the different participants. The study researched the relationship between the dependent variable, perceptions, and independent variables such as awareness of sex offender legislation, presence, and treatment; while analyzing group differences as well.

RESULTS

Univariate Analysis

Frequencies were run on all the demographics to determine the characteristics of the sample that was collected. The demographics are displayed in Table 1. The sample was comprised of mostly females. In fact, over two thirds, almost 72 percent, were female students. The sample was 60 percent white students, almost 11 percent African American, and 12 percent Hispanic. The largest groups of class standing participants were Freshman (38%). The other class standings were relatively close in range; Sophomore 25%, Junior 20%, and Senior 15%. It is important to note the discrepancies in a convenience sample to see how it may affect or skew the interpretation of the data. In order to test the hypothesis, class standing was further categorized into Upper and Lower Classes. Therefore, 64 percent of the sample was Lower Classman students and the remaining almost 36 percent were Upper Classman students. In terms of race/ethnicity and sex the sample was representative of the UCF population. However, it is important to distinguish that unlike the sample collected, the majority of UCF students are Upperclass standing (University of Central Florida 2013).

Table 1 Demographics (n=275)

Characteristic	Percentage
Sex	
Male	28.3
Female	71.7
Race/Ethnicity	
White	60.4
Black/African American	10.9
Latin/Hispanic	12.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	5.7

Native American	.4
Multi-Racial	9.8
Other	.8
Class standing	
Freshman	38.8
Sophomore	25.4
Junior	20.5
Senior	15.3

Frequencies and descriptive statistics were run on all the questions in the survey to obtain an overall idea of the content that was collected. First, whether or not a student had a relationship with a sex offender was analyzed with the use of a frequency (Table 2). The majority of respondents did not know a sex offender, but those who did were generally only acquaintances with the offender. Over 80 percent of students did not have any type of relationship with a sex offender. Of those who did respond yes to having some type of relationship with a sex offender, over 60 percent answered acquaintance as the relationship type.

Table 2 Relation to Sex Offenders (n=275)

Measure	Valid %	Median	Mean	Std. dev.
Known a sex offender?*		2.00	1.81	.391
Yes	18.8			
No	81.2			
Type of relationship**		4.00	3.54	.803
Family	15.4			
Friend	19.2			
Acquaintance	61.5			
Stranger	3.8			

*Yes=1, No=2

**Family=1, Friend=2, Acquaintance=3, Stranger=4

The participants were asked to rank on a Likert scale, from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6), about their perceptions, knowledge, and awareness of sex offenders in general

and on the college campus. Again, the survey was split into three parts: General student perceptions of sex offenders, knowledge of legislation/punishment of sex offenders, and opinions of sex offenders on college campuses. Table 3 shows the general perceptions of the respondents. Overall, students believed that being notified of sex offender presence lowers the likelihood of victimization. Also, the majority of students, almost 80 percent, answered that rehabilitating sex offenders is, in fact, not a waste of time. Although students generally agreed that rehabilitating sex offenders was not a waste of time, only slightly over half, 59.5 percent of respondents believed that sex offenders were capable of change (Table 4). That is, students varied on their consensus of whether or not sex offenders have the ability to change with therapy and/or support.

Table 3 General Student Perceptions of Sex Offenders

Opinion	Median	Mean	St. dev.	Range *
With support/therapy sex offender can change.	4.00	3.72	1.269	1-6
Sex offenders prefer to stay home than be around people.	3.00	3.18	1.318	1-6
Sex offenders do not have close friends.	3.00	2.91	1.353	1-6
Rehabilitating a sex offender is waste of time.	2.00	2.61	1.213	1-6
Only a few sex offenders are dangerous.	2.00	2.19	1.231	1-6
Sex offender notification lowers likelihood of victimization.	4.00	3.86	1.448	1-6

*1=Strongly Disagree; 2= Disagree; 3=Somewhat disagree; 4=Somewhat Agree; 5=Agree; 6=Strongly Agree.

Table 4 Believe that Sex Offenders Can Change (n=275)

Measure	Percent
Strongly Agree	7.2
Agree	19.3
Somewhat Agree	33
Total Agree	59.5
Strongly Disagree	5.9
Disagree	10.8
Somewhat Disagree	22.3
Total Disagree	39

The second set of statements in the survey pertained to the basic knowledge a student has of sex offenders in awareness of status of offenders on campus. Table 5 outlines the information and data collected on the students' knowledge of sex offenders using the same 6 point Likert scale. Most students were knowledgeable that the university notifies the students about crime on campus with a mean of 5.04, and that sex offender information is readily available to them with a mean of 4.48. However, the majority of students agreed that, generally speaking, students were not aware of the actual status of sex offenders on campus, with a mean response of 2.42. On average, students disagreed or somewhat disagreed that students were aware of sex offender status on campus. It is important to note that students were aware that sex offenders are allowed on campus, and that there may be sex offenders attending the school or in the area. Again, although students were aware that sex offenders were allowed and may be on campus; they were not aware of the actual status of sex offenders on the campus with a mean of 2.42.

Table 5 General Student Knowledge of Sex Offenders on Campus (n=275)

Statement	Median	Mean	St. dev.	Range *
Sex offenders should attend college with no restrictions.	2.00	2.46	1.226	1-6
University notifies students about crime.	5.00	5.04	1.057	1-6
Colleges are required to notify students of enrolled sex offenders.	4.00	3.98	1.417	1-6
Sex offender information is readily available.	5.00	4.48	1.219	1-6
There are no sex offenders on the UCF campus.	2.00	2.19	1.051	1-6
Students are aware of the status of sex offenders on campus.	2.00	2.42	1.114	1-6

*1=Strongly Disagree; 2= Disagree; 3=Somewhat disagree; 4=Somewhat Agree; 5=Agree; 6=Strongly Agree.

The third set of statements in the survey inquired the opinions students' held about punishment and legislation pertaining to sex offenders by using the previous 6 point Likert scale.

Depicted in Table 6 it can be seen that for the most part, students agreed that the punishment of sex offenders should be proportionate to the type of sex crime they committed with the mean being 4.58. That is, rape of a child should be punished more harshly than statutory rape between two consenting individuals. Also, students meandered between somewhat agree and somewhat disagree on whether or not sex offenders should lose their civil rights. Students agreed that sentencing for sex offenders, in comparison to other crimes, is not too long, but that child sex offenders should definitely be punished more severely than other sex offenders with the mean being 4.68.

Table 6 Student Opinions of Sex Offender Punishment and Legislation (n=275)

Statement	Median	Mean	St. dev.	Range *
Sex offenders should lose civil rights.	4.00	3.49	1.392	1-6
Punishment should vary accounting for crime severity.	5.00	4.58	1.310	1-6
Child sex offenders should be punished more severely.	5.00	4.68	1.380	1-6
Should have to wear tracking devices.	4.00	3.83	1.461	1-6
Sex offense when victim is known is less serious than stranger.	1.00	1.70	1.076	1-6
Incarceration reduces likelihood of reoffending.	4.00	3.39	1.298	1-6
Compared to other crimes, sentencing is much too long.	2.00	2.54	1.082	1-6

*1=Strongly Disagree; 2= Disagree; 3=Somewhat disagree; 4=Somewhat Agree; 5=Agree; 6=Strongly Agree.

In order to be able to measure a participant's negative perception toward sex offenders an index was created using six variables from the survey. The Negative Perception Index was created in order to measure the negative perceptions of students in order to test the hypotheses. These variables have a scale reliability of .647 which indicates a moderate to strong relationship between the variables. The scale reliability was found by analyzing the reliability analysis's alpha coefficient. Table 7 displays the six variables, and how respondents answered them. The

Negative Perception Index measured the six variables, and grouped the answers of participants who responded strongly agree, agree, or somewhat agree. The majority of the Negative Perception Index used variables from the general perceptions of sex offenders section of the survey.

Table 7 Negative Perception Index (n=275)

Measure*	%*
-People who commit sex offenses should lose their civil rights (e.g. voting, privileges, privacy, etc.)	52.0
-Trying to rehabilitate a sex offender is a waste of time	20.4
-Sex offenders should wear tracking devices so their location can be pinpointed at any time	63.1
-Child sex offenders should be punished more severely than other sex offenders	82.9
-Most sex offenders do not have close friends	30.6
-Sex offenders prefer to stay home rather than be around lots of people.	39.4

*Scale Reliability= .647

**Valid % includes answers for Strongly Agree, Agree, Somewhat Agree

Bivariate Analysis

After running univariate analyses, like frequencies and descriptive statistics, bivariate analyses were run to test the hypotheses. A correlation was run to test the significance between a student's awareness and its influence on a student's perception (Table 8). To study this relationship, a correlation was run between the Negative Perception Index (Table 7) and whether or not the student was aware that sex offenders are capable of change with support and therapy. The correlation was -.175. This negative correlation indicates that the less aware a student is the more negative a perception they will have. In other words, the more aware a student is of a sex offender's ability to change the more likely they are to hold a more positive perception of sex

offenders. However, another correlation was run that was also testing the Negative Perception Index in relation to awareness. This correlation was run using the Negative Perception Index and the students' knowledge of the University being required to inform students of sex offenders attending campus. This relationship had a weak positive correlation of .284. This correlation implies that the more aware student's are of legislation concerning sex offenders on campus the more negative perception they hold of sex offenders. Other variables were tested in relation the correlation between awareness and negative perception, but were not significant.

Table 8 Level of Awareness and a Student's Negative Perception (Correlation)

Measure	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	N
Negative Perception Index (N=267)			
Colleges are required to notify the students of a sex offender attending classes.	.284	0.00	268
With support and therapy, a sex offender can change.	-.175	.004	269

A T-test was used to determine the significance between a student's sex and perception of sex offenders. The T-test showed that there is no real significant difference between the negative perceptions held by male and female students. Again, the Negative Perception Index was used in running the T-test against that of the respondent's sex. Table 9 depicts the lack of significance between the two variables. However, it is important to note that there was significance in measuring the perceptions men and women held about the ability of sex offenders to change their behavior. Men were more likely to believe that sex offenders were capable of change, a mean of 4.01; while females were more skeptical about the offender's ability to do so, with a mean of 3.59.

Table 9 Male vs. Female Perceptions of Sex Offenders (T-test)

Measure	Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	N
Negative Perception Index		-.774	261	.106	
Male	20.36**				75
Female	20.8777**				188
Trying to rehabilitate a sex offender is a waste of time					
Male	2.55	-.638	263	.524	75
Female	2.65				190
With support/therapy sex offenders can change their behavior					
Male	4.01	2.474	263	.014	75
Female	3.59				190

Notes:***p<.05= Significant

**Mean was measured using Negative Perception Index Scale

*1=Strongly Disagree; 2= Disagree; 3=Somewhat disagree; 4=Somewhat Agree; 5=Agree; 6=Strongly Agree.

Another set of T-tests were run to determine if there was a significant relationship between class standing and a student's awareness of sex offenders (Table 10). After analyzing the results, there was a significance level of .044 with students generally agreeing that sex offender information is readily available to them, but Upper-class students being slightly more aware. The measured value of t was -2.027 which indicates that there was a difference in the upper and lower classmen means, but not a large amount. The other T-tests run in relation to Upper and Lower classmen awareness did not show any significance.

Table 10 Lower Classmen vs. Upperclassmen Awareness of Sex Offenders (T-test)

Measure	Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	N
Sex offender information is readily available to the public/students.					
Lower Classmen	4.36	-2.027	262	.044	170
Upper Classmen	4.68				94
University notifies students about crime					

Lower Classmen	5.03	-.131	265	.896	172
Upper Classmen	5.05				95
Students are aware of the status of sex offenders on campus					
Lower Classmen	2.38	-.895	265	.371	172
Upper Classmen	2.51				95

Notes: **p<.05= Significant

*1=Strongly Disagree; 2= Disagree; 3=Somewhat disagree; 4=Somewhat Agree; 5=Agree; 6=Strongly Agree.

Finally, the last sets of T-tests were run in order to test perceptions based on a student's relationship to an offender. The T-test measured whether knowing/having a relationship with a sex offender influences the student's perception. Table 11 shows that the results were insignificant. The insignificance of the T-test indicates that a prior/current relationship with a sex offender does not influence the person's negative perception toward sex offenders. T-tests were also run for the individual statements on perception, but they were insignificant as well. The compilation of these results continues to insinuate that there is not a significant relationship between knowing a sex offender, and it effecting one's perception of sex offenders in general. The perceptions of sex offenders that students held did not vary based on a student's relationship, or lack of, with a sex offender.

Table 11 Perceptions based on relationship with sex offender (T-test)

Measure	Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	N
Negative Perception Index					
Yes, known a sex offender	20.04*	-1.058	265	.822	50
No, no relationship	20.85*				217
With support and therapy, someone who committed a sexual offender can learn to change their behavior.					
Yes, known a sex offender	3.86	.834	267	.405	50
No, no relationship	3.69				219
People who commit sex offenses should lose civil rights					
Yes, known a sex offender	3.44	-.306	267	.760	50
No, no relationship	3.51				219

Notes: **p<.05= Significant

*Mean is measured using Negative Perception Index Scale

*1=Strongly Disagree; 2= Disagree; 3=Somewhat disagree; 4=Somewhat Agree; 5=Agree; 6=Strongly Agree.

This study depicts and analyzes the perceptions that students hold toward sex offenders based on a number of factors; such as awareness, sex, and class standing. Correlations were run to determine the relationship between a students' awareness and their degree of negative perception. T-tests were conducted to compare men and women's perceptions of sex offenders, lower and upper classmen's awareness level and resulting perceptions, and to compare perceptions of those who have had a relationship with a sex offender versus those who have not. The entire survey consisted of all Likert scale responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree except for the questions about demographics and question concerning the student's relationship to (or with) a sex offender. The Negative Perception Index was created in order to better categorize the negative perception statements in the survey. However, perception was also still measured using individual perception variables, not solely the Negative Perception Index.

DISCUSSION

After conducting analyses of the data collected, Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 3 are partially supported. Hypotheses 2 and 4 were not significantly supported. That is, not all variables tested were significant to the hypothesis, but aspects of each were.

For Hypothesis 1 it was hypothesized that the less aware students were of sex offender information, the more negative perception they will have. The correlation ran depicted that, yes, there was in fact a significant relationship between awareness and perception. It was partially supported because of the level of significance. Also, the moderate positive relationship depicted by the correlation between students' awareness and negative perception supports the idea that awareness does effect perception. The first test was testing the relationship between a student's knowledge that sex offenders are capable of change and their perception. The results indicated that the more aware a student is that sex offenders can change with treatment and rehabilitation the more likely they are to hold a more positive perception of sex offenders. However another variable tested indicated that the more aware students were that universities are required to inform students of sex offenders on campus led the students to have a more negative perception. This type of relationship may be explained by students becoming more fearful of sex offenders do to knowing that sex offenders are allowed on campus. Some students who were more aware that had a more negative perception may be caused by the information available being outdated. To reiterate, Florida has outdated information (Levenson and Cotter 2005a). Therefore, a student may be more aware, but may be informed with false or misleading information that influences one's perception to become more negative. Although, this may have negative effects on the sex

offender, it actually helps those who are more aware to be more preventative (Beck and Travis III 2004).

In addition to Hypothesis 1 being supported, Hypothesis 3 was supported by the data. After running T-tests to determine the relationship between class standing and the student's perception it was found that the relationship was significant. Students agreed that sex offender information was readily available, but upper classmen were slightly more aware. This relationship may be explained by the amount of time on campus the students have had to become more aware of sex offenders through campus notifications. The longer a student is attending campus the more opportunities they may have to receive notifications concerning sex offenders. Overall, most students felt that the majority of their peers were not aware of the status of sex offenders on campus, a mean of 2.24. This relates to previous literature that found sex offenders feeling that other students were not aware they were sex offenders (Tewksbury and Lees 2006).

The second hypothesis was not supported or significant. After running the T-test with the sex of the respondent and the Negative Perception Index it was concluded that the relationship was not significant. In other words, the sex of the respondent does not affect the perception a student has of sex offenders. In fact, male and female answers were quite similar. This could be caused by majority of the sample being female because males are not proportionately represented. Furthermore, the fourth hypothesis was not found to be significant either. The T-test showed that having a relationship with a sex offender or not, does not affect the perception a person may hold. Most students had not known a sex offender on any level, but for those who had, it did not influence their perception to be any different than those who had not known a sex

offender. This could be explained by looking at the type of relationship that most of the students who have known a sex offender had since the majority of the students who had a relationship with an offender considered them to be an acquaintance. Future studies should look at people who have more intimate relationships like friends, family, or a significant other to see if they influence the perception of sex offenders the person has.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future

There are some limitations to the current study. First, the characteristics of a convenience sample, like the fact that the majority of the survey was female or white, can hinder the results of the data collected. Second, in an effort to get the most honest answer from students the survey was vague in some areas of the statements as to not bias the student into answering a certain way. Future researchers would behoove themselves to ask more direct questions about perception and awareness. Third, the larger the sample size is the better. For instance, UCF has over 60,000 students, and the survey only measured 275 students which most of which were white, female underclassmen. Upcoming studies should focus on getting a more representatively accurate sample to survey. In addition, future studies should test more on the knowledge people have of sex offender legislation as a whole versus focusing on legislation affecting only the college campus. This may help in understanding when the negative perception was developed instead of assuming it was developed solely on the college campus. The last suggestion for future researchers would be to directly ask students how many sex offenders are attending classes on campus. This study asked them if there were any sex offenders on campus, but lacked having an option of a numerical value. In order to truly test a student's knowledge of sex offenders in

relation to the campus would be to ask them how many sex offenders are attending classes on campus. In doing so, the researcher could determine a more accurate assessment of the student's awareness.

Some studies have shown that face-to-face notifications like going door to door/handing out fliers is an ineffective manner of making people more aware. Studies have also shown that internet registration is flawed because of incorrect information being provided (Levenson and Cotter 2005a). Another study conducted by Levenson and Cotter (2005b) noted that offenders expressed the need for social support in order for policies to be effective. As of right now, the perceptions of sex offenders portrayed by the government causes social harm to offenders, and the community by causing that false sense of security mentioned earlier. An important result of research to remember is that people who were notified were more likely to use precautionary tactics instead of defensive behavior like those who had not been notified (Beck and Travis III 2004). That is to say that people's perceptions were at least altered enough by the information to take preventative measure to protect themselves which can lower recidivism rates, and in turn improve attitudes on all sides.

Another suggestion to consider is redefining who is considered a sex offender with varying levels of crime severity in the eyes of the law as a start to improving legislative effectiveness through redefining perceptions (Colbert 2012). This goes back to the idea that people have very different, and sometimes opposing, views of who a sex offender is, what is considered a sexual act, and what type of punishment is acceptable for which type of sex offender. In Colbert's 2012 study the United Kingdom was compared to the United States in

terms of sex offender legislation. The United Kingdom dispenses harsher legislation and punishments on those who have committed severe sexual crimes. As compared to the United States, the United Kingdom uses a less 'hands on approach' with less severe crimes which is considered more ideal because it allows a more reasonable number of offenders for the government to observe and, if need be, reprimand (Colbert 2012).

Implications

This type of research is helpful for not only sex offenders, but also for students and the public because everyone is affected by it for both preventative and recidivist reasons. Future research in this area may aid in reforming sex offender definitions and legislation. Furthermore, this will help improve the awareness and overall perceptions that effect sex offenders daily. Student perceptions of sex offenders are effected by their level of awareness. For example, Levenson and Cotter (2005b) discuss how since the effectiveness of sex offender treatments is not made apparent to people it has caused pessimistic perceptions about the sex offender's ability to not recidivate after treatment. This can be seen in the data collected as well. That is, student's meandered on the opinions of whether or not a sex offender can change, but most believed that treatment should be used. It is important that the University take proper steps in order to lower the effects of the stigma associated with sex offenders.

The University could make more efforts to inform the students, not only of sex offenders attending campus, but also inform them of accurate legislation and statistics on sex offender recidivism rates. The university notifies students, but doing so on a more regular basis like it does with other types of crimes would be beneficial because it would heighten students' level of

awareness. Informing students with accurate information on a regular basis will allow students to be more preventative and understanding with issues concerning their own safety and sex offenders. In terms of what UCF can do as a result of research, the University could differentiate between the tiers of sex offenders when notifying students. This type of discretion could not only alleviate student concern, but it may also help integrate the sex offender into a more successful college experience. Differentiating between the varying types of sex offenders may help lower the concern students have because not all sex offenders are tier three offenders who are violent or extremely dangerous. This type of information could not only help students form a reasonable perception of sex offenders, but also alleviate some of the misconceptions that negatively affect sex offenders, especially the ones who attend campus. This type of research is important to not only the University, but for future legislation concerning sex offenders limitations and rights overall and at the educational level.

APPENDIX: SURVEY

This survey is for participants who are **18 years of age or older**. Participation in the survey is **voluntary**, and it is completely **anonymous**. Please mark the box or fill in the blank that best describes your opinion for all questions; there is no right or wrong answer. There are statements concerning sex offenders and college prevalence.

Sex Offenders:

- 1 With support and therapy, someone who committed a sexual offense can learn to change their behavior.

Strongly Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------	--

- 2 Sex offenders prefer to stay home alone rather than be around lots of people.

Strongly Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------	--

- 3 Most sex offenders do not have close friends

Strongly Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------	--

- 4 Have you known someone who has been convicted of a sex offender crime?

Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------	-----------------------------

- 5 If yes, what type of relationship did you have with the person?

Intimate <input type="checkbox"/>	Family <input type="checkbox"/>	Friend <input type="checkbox"/>	Acquaintance <input type="checkbox"/>	Stranger <input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

- 6 Trying to rehabilitate a sex offender is a waste of time.

Strongly Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------	--

- 7 Only a few sex offenders are dangerous.

Strongly Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------	--

- 8 Being notified of sex offenders lowers likelihood of being victimized.

Strongly Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------	--

Punishment:

9 People who commit sex offenses should lose their civil rights (e.g. voting, privileges, privacy, etc.)

Strongly Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------	--

10 Sex offender punishment should vary depending on individual crime severity.

Strongly Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------	--

11 Child sex offenders should be punished more severely than other sex offenders.

Strongly Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------	--

12 Sex offenders should wear tracking devices so their location can be pinpointed as any time.

Strongly Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------	--

13 A sex offense committed against someone the perpetrator knows is less serious than a sex offense committed against a stranger.

Strongly Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------	--

14 Incarceration of sex offenders reduces likelihood of reoffending.

Strongly Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------	--

15 The prison sentences sex offenders receive are much too long compared to sentence lengths for other crimes.

Strongly Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------	--

College:

16 Sex offenders should be able to attend college campuses as students with no restrictions.

Strongly Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------	--

17 This University notifies students about crime (mail, e-mail, flyers, etc.)

Strongly Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------	--

18 Colleges are required to notify the students of a sex offender attending classes.

Strongly Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------	--

19 Sex offender information is readily available to the public and students.

Strongly Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------	--

20 There are no sex offenders on the college campus.

Strongly Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------	--

21 Students are aware of the status of sex offenders on the college campus.

Strongly Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Disagree <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Agree <input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Agree <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------	--

22 What is your class standing?

Freshman <input type="checkbox"/>	Sophomore <input type="checkbox"/>	Junior <input type="checkbox"/>	Senior <input type="checkbox"/>	5th + year <input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------------

23 What is your major and minor (if applicable)?

Major:	Minor:
--------	--------

24 What is your sex?

Male <input type="checkbox"/>	Female <input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------	---------------------------------

25 What is your racial/ ethnic background? (Check all that apply)

White/ Caucasian	African American <input type="checkbox"/>	Latino/ Hispanic <input type="checkbox"/>	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Native American <input type="checkbox"/>	Multi-racial <input type="checkbox"/>	Other <input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------	---	---	-------------------------------	--	--	-----------------------------------

If you have ever been a victim of a crime please call the UCF Victim Services 24 hour hotline (407) 823- 1200 for help.

REFERENCES

- Balow, Kirsten and Timothy B. Conley. 2008. "A Report to the Montana Department of Corrections on Community Corrections Professionals' Attitudes Towards Sex Offenders". *University of Montana School of Social Work*. 1-14.
- Beck, Victoria S. and Lawrence F. Travis, III. 2004. "Sex Offender Notification and Protective Behavior". *Violence and Victims*. 19: 289-302.
- Church, Wesley T., Emily E. Wakeman, Sarah L. Miller, Carl B. Clements and Fei Sun. 2008. "The Community Attitudes Toward Sex Offenders Scale: The Development of a Psychometric Assessment Instrument". *Research on Social Work Practice*. 18: 251-9.
- Colbert, Ryanne. 2012. "Discrimination Needed: the Over-Inclusive Definition of Who is a Sex Offender". *Journal of Criminal Psychology*. 1: 43-50.
- Dameron, Samuel L., Kimberly A. Detardo- bora, and Dhruva J. Bora. 2009. "An Assessment of Campus Security and Police Information on College/University Websites". *Security Journal*. 22: 251-268.
- Department of Corrections Washington State. 2012. *Community and Safety: Sex Offenders*. Sex Offender Treatment in Prison. Accessed July 2013 from:
<http://www.doc.wa.gov/community/sexoffenders/prisontreatment.asp>
- Edwards, William and Christopher Hensley. 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: 83-101.

- Langan, Patrick A., Erica L. Schmitt, and Matthew R. Durose. 2003. "Recidivism of Sex Offenders Released from Prison in 1994". *United States Department of Justice: Bureau of Justice Statistics*. 1-40.
- Levenson, Jill S., Yolanda N. Brannon, Timothy Fortney, and Juanita Baker. 2007. "Public Perceptions About Sex Offenders and Community Protection Policies". *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*. 7: 1-25.
- Levenson, Jill S. and Leo P. Cotter. 2005. "The Effect of Megan's Law on Sex Offender Reintegration". *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*. 21: 49-66.
- Levenson, Jill S. and Leo P. Cotter. 2005. "The Impact of Sex Offender Residence Restrictions: 1,000 Feet From Danger or One Step From Absurd?". *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. 49: 168-178.
- Levenson, Jill S., David A. D'Amora, and Andrea L. Hern. 2007. "Megan's Law and Its Impact on Community Re-entry for Sex Offenders". *Behavioral Sciences & The Law*. 25: 587-602.
- Meloy, Michelle L., Susan L. Miller, and Kristin M. Curtis 2008. "Making Sense out of Nonsense: The Deconstruction of State-Level Sex Offender Residence Restrictions". *American Journal of Criminal Justice*. 33: 209-222, 309-10.
- Office of Justice Programs. 2013. *Legislative History*. Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking. Accessed May 2013 from: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/smart/index.htm>
- Petrunik, Michael G. 2002. "Managing unacceptable risk: Sex Offenders, Community Response,

- and Social Policy in the United States and Canada”. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. 46: 483-511.
- Reinhart, Christopher. 2006. “Federal Law on Classifying Sex Offenders”. *OLR Research Report*. Accessed May 2013 from <http://www.cga.ct.gov/2006/rpt/2006-r-0765.htm>
- Sample, Lisa L. and Timothy M. Bray. 2003. “Are Sex Offenders Dangerous?”. *Criminology and Public Policy*. 3: 59-82.
- Sloan III, John J., Bonnie S. Fisher, Francis T. Cullen. 1997. “Assessing the Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act of 1990: An Analysis of the Victim Reporting Practices of College and University Students”. *Crime & Delinquency*. 43: 148-168.
- Tewksbury, Richard and Matthew B. Lees. 2006. “Sex Offenders on Campus: University-based Sex Offender Registries and the Collateral Consequences of Registration”. *Federal Probation*. 70: 50-65.
- United States Government Accountability Office. 2013. Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act: Jurisdictions Face Challenges to Implementing the Act, and Stakeholders Report Positive and Negative Effects. *Report to the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives*. 1-17
- University of Central Florida. 2013. Preliminary Spring 2013 Headcount by Classification, Time, Gender, and Ethnicity: Total University. *Enrollment 2012-2013*.
http://www.iroffice.ucf.edu/enrollment/2012-13/Spring13_Univ_Hdct_Eth_Gender.pdf