

About taking the perspective of an offender

**How self-reflection and group-membership influence people's perspective taking
of an offender**

Bachelor thesis 2014

Marie Steinbrecher

University Twente

Subject Psychology

Department Conflict, Risico, Veiligheid

First supervisor Dr. Sven Zebel

Second supervisor Dr. Elze G. Ufkes

Contents

Abstract	3
Introduction	4
Perspective taking	4
Group identity and evaluation of different offenders	5
Possible explanations	6
The threat to the self-esteem	6
The motivation to act without prejudice	7
The use of heuristics	8
This research	8
Method	10
Design	10
Participants	11
Material and procedures	11
Independent variables	11
Dependent variables	13
Results	16
Manipulation checks	16
The covariates	16
Degree of perspective taking	17
The three explanations	18
Discussion	19
References	24
Appendix	26

Abstract

In this study, there was at first tried to replicate an earlier study. With respect to this, it was expected that people who were primed on own good actions were more likely to take the perspective of an in-group offender and that people who were primed on own bad actions were more likely to take the perspective of an out-group offender. It was tested what possible explanations could be for these differences in perspective taking. The design was a 2 (good actions versus bad actions of the participants respectively) x 3 (in-group offender versus out-group offender versus neutral offender) between-groups design. The three possible explanations for these findings which were tested were the threat to the self-esteem (people's self-esteem would be threatened when they had to think about own bad actions and not threatened when they had to think about own good actions); the motivation to behave unprejudiced (people would show a higher motivation when confronted with an out-group offender compared to when confronted with an in-group offender) and the use of heuristics (the degree of seriousness of the crime and the estimation of its frequency). The hypotheses were that the findings regarding perspective taking would be replicated, that the threat to self-esteem would be influenced by the conditions and that this threat would explain the differences in perspective taking. Yet, the findings of the earlier study could not be replicated (i.e. the interaction effect concerning perspective taking did not occur). Results show that people remained more aloof when they were primed with own good actions and that they were more motivated to behave unprejudiced when they were confronted with an out-group offender. Therefore, the hypotheses cannot be confirmed and further research is necessary in order to assess the influence of the motivation to behave unprejudiced on the degree of perspective taking.

Introduction

In August 2012 in the US, Patrick Drum kills two sex offenders with a firearm. He pleads guilty and receives a life imprisonment without parole. Two groups of people exist who evaluate this crime and the offender in very contrasting ways. The families of the victims and the people working for the criminal justice system state (at least officially) that this crime is bad in nature and cannot be excused. They do not understand the perspective of Patrick Drum and have the opinion that what he did is wrong. The other group of people consists of US citizens who admire Patrick Drum's offence and honour him for what he did. They clearly understand why he killed those people and do not think that this is a wrong action (FoxNews, 9/19/2012).

There are two different groups of which one can take the perspective of the offender and one which cannot take his perspective and hence, evaluates the crime very differently. The group to which one belongs plays an important role when evaluating other people's actions and taking their perspective. This is for example explained by the Social identity theory where it is focused on the relationship between groups and individual members (Treppe, 2006). But there are other factors, too, which have to be considered. It has been shown that people who have to think about own "good" actions and then read about an offence, tend to take the perspective of an in-group member but not of an out-group member. The reverse is the case when they have to think about own "bad" actions. In this case, they take the perspective of an out-group member and not of an in-group member. Hence, they value the offence or the offender differently and this depends on the kind of self-relevant actions which they have to think about before (Zwicker, 2014).

Three possible explanations for these findings will be investigated. These are the threat to the self-esteem, the motivation to act without prejudice and the use of heuristics. The research question which will be investigated is therefore "To what extent explains the threat to self-esteem the effects of self-reflection on taking the perspective of in- and out-group offenders?"

Perspective taking

According to Todd, Bodenhausen, Richeson and Galinsky (p. 1; 2011), perspective taking means "the active contemplation of others' psychological experiences". To take the perspective of someone is important for people, because by doing this, they are able to understand and assess the behaviour of someone (Todd et al., 2011). This can for example be seen in the example mentioned above. Moreover, as a consequence, they feel empathy during

this process and this has an important effect on the way they perceive the other person and evaluate his or her actions (Batson, Chang, Orr en Rowland, 2002).

Therefore, if one takes the perspective of another person, he or she will evaluate the actions of the other more positively in comparison to when he or she does not take the perspective. Feeling empathy is also important when sharing an experience with another person, for example when one does the same that someone else has already done (Hodges, Kiel, Kramer, Veach, en Villanueva, 2010). This further enhances the process of taking one's perspective. When transferring these results on the current investigation, that would mean that people who are reminded of "bad" actions which they have done themselves are more likely to take the perspective of someone else who has done something bad in contrast to someone who is not reminded of own "bad" actions. People who are reminded of own "good" actions will consequently less likely take the perspective of someone who does something bad.

In the research of Zwicker (2014), it could be proven that people who are primed with own "bad" actions are more likely to take the perspective of a criminal offender than people who are primed with own "good" actions. They in turn are more likely to take the perspective of an in-group offender. It is intended to replicate these results in this study.

Group identity and evaluation of different offenders

Every human being is member of some groups but does not belong to others. Tajfel and Turner (1979) state that members of a group perceive themselves as sharing some characteristic together which distinguishes them from other people. Moreover, they are emotionally involved within this bond and they tend to evaluate their group and their group identity in the same way as the other members do. Groups create a social identity among the group members, because they identify themselves through their group membership. As people try to maintain a positive self-esteem, they do this by comparing their own group with other groups so that the own group is perceived in a much more positive way than the other group. Hence, when the own group is evaluated more positively than other groups, the own self-esteem is enhanced (Tajfel and Turner, 1979).

The group identity which one has affects the evaluation of acts of group members and non-group members. That means that people who belong to the own group are perceived differently than people who do not belong to the own group and therefore, their actions are evaluated differently, too (Tajfel and Turner, 1979; Zwicker, 2014). Two effects have been found which result from different group identities. Tajfel and Turner (1979) state that people of the in-group are favoured (in-group bias), because people can enhance their self-esteem by

evaluating members of their own group more positively than others. A related effect which is of even greater importance in this research is the in-group leniency effect which means that in-group offenders are punished more leniently than out-group offenders (Gollwitzer and Keller, 2010; Tajfel and Turner, 1979).

In contrast to that, the black-sheep effect postulates that people of the out-group are punished more leniently when they behave wrong (Gollwitzer and Keller, 2010). Yet, the reasons why this effect is also found in some studies lies within the same theoretical reasoning. People want to enhance their self-esteem by comparing their group to other groups but when one group member does something (such as committing a crime) which cannot be accepted by the other group members, this person is punished very harshly in order to establish a border between the offender and the rest of the group (van Prooijen, 2006). By doing this, any possible threat to the in-group identity which might be caused by the offence of an in-group member is prevented by the other group members (Okimoto and Wenzel, 2010).

Concluding, these two effects are very oppositional but yet they are both found in different studies. The results of Zwicker (2014) show that people tend to take the perspective of an in-group offender when they were primed with own “good” actions (in-group leniency effect) and that they tend to take the perspective of an out-group offender when they were primed with own “bad” actions (black sheep effect). In this study, it will be investigated what the reasons might be for these findings.

Possible explanations

In order to find feasible explanations for these findings, three possibilities will be tested. They include the use of heuristics, the possible threat to the own self-esteem and one's motivation to be perceived as someone who does not have any prejudices.

The threat to the self-esteem

The first possibility is that one feels threatened in his or her self-esteem by considering own offences or “bad” actions. When people's self-esteem is not threatened, they tend to evaluate their in-group more positively than their out-group. This helps them to enhance their own self-esteem by perceiving their in-group in a more positive light. They can defend their in-group identity and their own self-esteem and hence, feel better (Pinto, Marques, Levine and Abrams, 2010). As Braun and Gollwitzer (2012) state, one's self-esteem and the position of the own group are closely related. Therefore, by perceiving their in-group in a more positive light, they perceive themselves in a more positive light, too.

The reverse is the case when their self-esteem is threatened (when they have to think about own bad actions). They are not in a position to criticise others, as they themselves did something unacceptable. Therefore, they cannot define themselves as being “better” than an out-group offender. They are on the same level. This inclines that they more likely take the perspective of an out-group offender, but not of an in-group offender, because their own self-esteem and the position of their group is threatened.

This would mean that if a participant is reminded of own “bad” actions, he or she will more likely take the perspective of an out-group member and not an in-group member. In contrast to that, if one is reminded of own “good” actions, he or she will more likely take the perspective of an in-group member and not an out-group member. Hence, the in-group leniency effect respectively the black sheep effect would occur. These effects could help the person to enhance the own self-esteem. If an in-group member commits a crime, this is not acceptable to the person and he or she wants to demonstrate that this person is different from the rest of the group and that the offender is the worst member of the group.

A likely result which would support this hypothesis would be that people whose self-esteem is threatened the most, because they have to think about their own bad actions, would evaluate the offence of an in-group offender very negatively and the offence of an out-group offender much more positively. The reverse would be the case when their self-esteem is not threatened, because they had to think about own “good” actions (i.e. they would evaluate the offence of an in-group offender much more positively in comparison to the offence of an out-group offender).

The motivation to act without prejudice

The second possibility which is considered is the motivation to act without prejudice. When people have (for example) to answer a questionnaire they want to give socially desirable answers so that they would not be perceived as one who (amongst others) holds prejudices or behaves prejudiced (Banse and Gawronski, 2003). That means that people try to hide their true attitude and instead give false answers in order to be perceived as unprejudiced if they are motivated to do so (Dunton and Fazio, 1997).

This could explain why people sometimes tend to take the perspective of an out-group offender instead of an in-group offender. It can help them to prove that they behave unprejudiced and therefore, they are perceived in a more positive way by their social environment.

It would therefore be likely that people whose results indicate that they have prejudices

but want to hide them (as the scale to measure the motivation to behave unprejudiced would indicate) would tend to take the perspective of an out-group offender and people by whom this is not the case would take the perspective of an in-group offender. By doing this they can pretend to behave unprejudiced. This result would therefore confirm this hypothesis. Yet, it is unclear whether an effect of the priming (“good” versus “bad” actions) will occur as there is no research available concerning this aspect. It is expected that the differences between the two conditions will not be significant.

The use of heuristics

The term heuristics means that people make decisions based on simple rules which help them to decide quickly but which can lead to judgemental errors. Concerning the evaluation of in-group members and out-group members, the availability heuristic will be applied as it is most useful in this context. This means that if potential scenarios can be easily considered by a person, he or she perceives them to be also more likely to occur. Thus, if one can easily remember days when it was first warm and then cold, he or she would perceive that those days are more likely to occur than other days – though this is just a subjective perception (Tversky and Kahneman, 1974). Availability-by-recall means that a person is asked to recall events of type A (for example “good” actions”) or events of type B (for example “bad” actions) respectively. The person will evaluate the type of event which he or she had to recall as being more likely to occur than the other type of event which he or she did not recall (Pachur, Hertwig and Steinmann, 2012).

This could possibly be the same when considering offenders and their offences. If a person is reminded of own actions that were good in nature, “good” actions might be considered more likely and are thus more expected to be done by others, too. In contrast to that, if a person is reminded of own crimes or “bad” actions, these would be considered to be more likely and expected from others and therefore, a greater sympathy occurs for other offenders. This possibility is considered the least probable explanation for the in-group leniency effect and the black sheep effect, as no differences between the groups but only differences between the different priming conditions (“good” versus “bad” actions) are expected.

In order to assess the presence of an availability heuristic, two questions are asked which broach the issue of the seriousness of the crime presented and an estimation of how often this type of crime occurs. If the use of heuristics would be a logical explanation of the previous findings, people who were primed with own “good” actions would evaluate the

crime much harsher and would estimate its frequency much smaller. In contrast to that, people who were primed with own “bad” actions would evaluate the crime much more leniently but would estimate that it occurs more often.

This research

This research investigates possible reasons for the occurrence of the in-group leniency effect and the black sheep effect. It will be investigated if the threat to the self-esteem, the motivation to behave unprejudiced or the use of heuristics is most likely in explaining the varying results already found in different examinations.

Concerning the findings of Zwicker (2014), perspective taking occurred mostly in the condition where the participants were primed on own “bad” actions and confronted with an out-group offender. When they were confronted with an out-group offender and primed on own “good” actions, the degree of perspective taking was much smaller. In the condition where the participants were confronted with an in-group offender, perspective taking occurred in both priming conditions but the difference in the degree of perspective taking was here much smaller than when confronted with an out-group offender (i.e. the conditions with an in-group offender do not differ significantly concerning the degree of perspective taking and the conditions with an out-group offender do). The results will be the same for the neutral offender as for the in-group offender.

Concerning the three possible explanations, the threat to self-esteem is considered as being most likely to explain the differences in perspective taking. It is expected that people’s self-esteem is threatened when confronted with own “bad” actions and not threatened when confronted with own “good actions. Therefore, the in-group leniency effect would occur in the condition with “good” actions and an in-group offender and the black sheep effect would occur in the condition with “bad” actions and an out-group offender. The motivation to behave unprejudiced will be great in people who are confronted with their own “bad” actions and small when confronted with own “good” actions. The use of heuristics will be demonstrated when people who are primed on own “good” actions rate the crime as being more serious but less likely to occur and people who are primed on own “bad” actions will rate the crime as being less serious but more likely to occur. Again, the results of the neutral offender will be the same as for the in-group offender.

The research question which will be tested in this design is “To what extent explains the threat to self-esteem the effects of self-reflection on taking the perspective of in- and out-group offenders?” The first hypothesis states that people who have to think about own “good”

actions will be more inclined to take the perspective of an in-group offender than of an out-group offender. People who have to think about own “bad” actions will be more inclined to take the perspective of an out-group offender than of an in-group offender (i.e. an interaction effect between group membership of the offender and the self-reflection of own “bad” or own “good” actions; replication of Zwickler, 2014). The second hypothesis states that the threat to self-esteem will be higher among people who are primed with own “bad” actions compared to those primed with own “good” actions (i.e. a main effect of priming on self-esteem). Finally, the third hypothesis states that self-esteem explains the differential effects of own “good” versus own “bad” actions on the perspective taking of in-group versus out-group offenders.

To obtain the necessary data, a questionnaire will be developed which embraces the awareness of the own nationality, the priming on own “good” or own “bad” actions respectively, the manipulation with an in-group, an out-group or a neutral offender, the degree of perspective taking, questions which assess the threat to self-esteem, the motivation to behave unprejudiced and the use of heuristics, the evaluation of the offender and the social bond with the offender.

In order to obtain the results which are used in this study and for which reasons are to be found, a 2 (“good” actions versus “bad” actions) x 2 (in-group offender versus out-group offender) was used. This design will be used again but a third type of offender will be added. This offender has no clear group-membership and is therefore used as a control group. The reason for this is that it is not yet clear if the more positive evaluation of offences which are done by out-group offenders are due to the black-sheep effect of in-group members or due to a leniency effect of out-group members. By including such a group in the research design, the assumption that out-group offenders benefit from a leniency effect instead of the black-sheep effect can be eliminated (Braun and Gollwitzer, 2012).

Method

Participants

The total sum of participants amounts to 238. 97 participants had to be removed, because they stopped at the point when they had to take the perspective of the offender. As they did not fill in any questions after the manipulation text, their answers cannot be processed in order to test the hypotheses and therefore, their answers are not useful. Furthermore, 22 people had to be removed, because it was not possible to manipulate them with their own good or own bad

actions (i.e. they were not aware of the fact that they committed good or bad actions and answered the control question with “no”).

A striking aspect is that four conditions show the normal distribution of people who were or were not aware of this aspect but in two conditions, the distribution is not typical and very different from the others conditions as many more participants were not aware of the type of actions in comparison to the other conditions. The conditions are good actions and a neutral or an out-group offender, though the participants were not aware of the group membership of the offender when they were manipulated with the specific type of action (view Appendix N: tables 1, 2 and 3). Moreover, the distribution is very different concerning the questions whether the participants knows someone who was once a victim or committed a crime or whether the participant himself or herself was once a victim or committed a crime. This distribution is explained more in detail later.

The total sum of participants whose answers are analysed amounts hence to 122 which consist of 69 males and 50 females. The age ranges between 13 years and 63 years ($M=29.18$; $SD=11.45$). All participants have the German nationality. Concerning the educational level, 2% finished “Hauptschule”, 15% finished “Realschule”, 11% participants finished “Fachoberschule”, 42% finished “Gymnasium”, 5% participants finished “Berufsschule”, 7% finished “Fachhochschule” and 18% finished “Universität”. The participants were all unaware of the conditions in this study.

Design

The design used in this study is therefore a 2 (“good” actions versus “bad” actions) x3 (in-group offender versus out-group offender versus neutral offender) between-groups design. Every participant is asked the same questions concerning the three possible explanations (but different offender names are used in order to stress the group membership) and concerning their own group membership but different questions concerning the type of action on which they are primed (“good” actions or “bad” actions). The results are obtained through a questionnaire which is designed with *thesistools* and this questionnaire sent to participants via the Internet (i.e. e-mail or Facebook).

Materials and procedure

In the following paragraphs, it will be explained which scales are used in the questionnaire in general and in the specific conditions respectively.

Independent variables

The identification with the own nationality. The participants are asked in how far they can identify with their German nationality. It is important to ask these questions in order to stress their nationality and therefore, to which group they belong. The questions are used from Leach, Van Zomeren, Zebel, Vliek, Pennekamp, Doosje, Ouwerkerk and Spears (2008) and the translation of these questions is used from Zwicker (2014). There are 14 questions in total, for example: „I'm glad to be German“, „I feel solidarity for Germans“ (alphas for the scales range from .81 to .88; view Appendix B: Questionnaire to measure the identification with the own nationality).

Manipulation to prime on own “good” or “bad” actions. For both conditions, there are respectively seven questions designed in order to check whether the priming on own “good” or “bad” actions influences the dependent variables. These questions are developed by Zwicker (2014) and deal with the participant’s actions he or she already did which were good or bad in nature. By doing this, the participants are manipulated and primed on the particular kind of action so that it is possible to influence their following answers with this. When primed with own “good” actions, questions are asked such as “Did you ever help the police by notifying someone who did something illegal?“, „Did you ever donate something to a person or an institution (e.g. money, clothes, food etc.)?“. When primed with own “bad” actions, the participants were asked questions such as “Did you ever steal something (e.g. shop lifting, property of other people as e.g. bike, money, bag, mobile phone, computer, clothes, food or something similar)?“, „Did you ever download material protected by copyright without paying for it (e.g. films, music, books, computer programmes or something similar)?“. The participants can answer with yes or no (view Appendix C: Questionnaire to prime on own “good” or “bad” actions).

Testing the manipulation of own “good” or “bad” actions. Per condition, there is one question asked in order to check the manipulation of own “good” or “bad” actions. In the condition “bad actions”, the question is “If you think about the questions which were just asked, does it occur to you that these are a question of illegal actions which you committed?“. In the condition „good actions“, the question is “If you think about the questions which were just asked, does it occur to you that these are a question of morally valuable actions which you committed?“. The answer options are yes and no (view Appendix C: Questionnaire to prime on own „good“ or „bad“ actions).

Manipulation with the group membership of the offender. The whole group of participants has the German nationality. Hence, the in-group is being German and the out-group is not being German. After answering the questions regarding the own nationality and the “good” or “bad” actions, the participants read a text which was written by Zwicker (2014). The offence presented in the text is therefore fictional and the fact that the source of this text is a popular German news agency is pretended in order to make the text believable. The text differs only in one aspect per condition: in the condition “in-group offender”, the offender is German; in the condition “out-group offender”, the offender is Portuguese and in the condition “neutral offender”, the offender has no identifiable nationality (view Appendix E: Manipulation text).

Instruction for the manipulation text. The instruction (view Appendix D: instruction for the manipulation text), which is presented directly before the manipulation text itself, asks the participants to put themselves in the position of the offender who is described in the text. They are further told that after reading the text, they are asked several questions. The examples mentioned are that they have to write down two thoughts and emotions which they had when reading the text over the offender and the crime committed. The aim is to strengthen the degree of perspective taking of the offender.

Dependent variables

Perspective taking. Whether the participant takes the perspective of the offender or not is measured with 13 items that ask for example whether one had problems with putting himself or herself in the position of the offender or if one did not want to put himself or herself in this position. The questions which are used in this questionnaire are developed by Figueiredo, Doosje, Valentim and Zebel (2010). The answers are presented in the form of a Likert scale from 0 (not at all) to 7 (totally). In order to assess the degree to which the participant takes the perspective of the offender, three different scales are used (view Appendix F: Questionnaire to measure the perspective taking). The scale “Remaining aloof” measures the degree to which the participant is not able to take the perspective of the offender (view Appendix F: items 32, 33, 34, 35 and 36; Cronbach’s alpha = .82). An example question of this scale is “I did not want to put myself in the position of Andreas/ Horacio/ the offender, because I did not want to feel any sympathy for him at all“. The scale “Trying to take the perspective” measures the degree to which the participants tries to take the perspective of the offender (view Appendix

F: items 25, 26 and 28; Cronbach's alpha = .79). An example question is "How much did you try to imagine what Andreas/ Horacio/ the offender thinks, feels and experiences?" Finally, the scale "Success" is used in order to measure the degree of success participants have when they take the perspective of the offender (view Appendix F: items 29 and 30; correlation = .91). An example question is "In how far were you able to take the perspective of Andreas/ Horacio/ the offender?"

The motivation to act without prejudice. The scale to measure the motivation to act without prejudice was first developed by Dunton and Fazio (1997). Here, the scale contained of two scales: „Concern with acting prejudiced“ (13 items) and „Restraint to avoid dispute“ (4 items). Yet, the scale was reviewed and altered by Banse and Gawronski (2003) and as the statistical analysis of the revised scale showed that the quality of the questionnaire increases when only one scale is used, this one-scale questionnaire is used here (view Appendix G: The scale to measure the motivation to act without prejudice; Cronbach's alpha = .77). The questionnaire consists of 16 items and the response options are presented on a Likert scale from 0 (not at all) to 7 (totally). Example questions are: "It is unpleasant for me to hurt someone so I always try to take care of the feelings of others", "When I have thoughts or feelings that discriminate against other people, I do not tell them". One important modification was made: in order to adapt the scale as good as possible to the topic crimes and criminals, the questions which refer to foreigners are changed into questions about criminals (view Appendix G: items 39, 40, 45, 47, 48 and 49). An example question is "When one talks about offenders, insulting descriptions ought to be avoided".

Self-esteem. How the participant perceives his or her self-esteem to be threatened is measured with a scale which assesses the current self-esteem of a person. It consists of one scale with eight items (view Appendix H: The scale to measure the threat to the self-esteem; Cronbach's alpha = .80). The answer options are presented on a Likert scale from 0 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). There are two types of questions. The first type of questions deals with positive aspects which the participants might perceive about themselves (view Appendix I: items 53, 54, 57, 59 and 60). An example question is "I feel proud". The second type of questions deals with negative aspects which the participants might perceive about themselves (view Appendix I: items 55, 56 and 58). An example question is "I feel embarrassed".

The use of heuristics. In order to check whether the use of heuristics influences the degree of

perspective taking of the participants, two questions are asked which are developed by the researcher (view Appendix I: Questionnaire to measure the use of heuristics; correlation = .44). The first question deals with the perceived frequency of the crime: “How often do you think does this type of crime occur in Germany?” (view Appendix I: item 61). The answer options are presented on a Likert scale from 0 (almost never) to 7 (almost always). The second question deals with the perceived seriousness of the presented crime: “How serious do you think this crime is?” (view Appendix I: item 62). The answer options are also presented on a Likert scale from 0 (not at all) to 7 (totally).

The evaluation of the offender. With evaluation of the offender, the opinion about the offender is asked. Six pairs of contrasting adjectives are presented and the participants have to decide whether they choose a more positive or a more negative evaluation (Appendix J: Questionnaire to measure the evaluation of the offender; Cronbach’s alpha = .92). The answer options range from -2 until +2. One example is the contrast of “suspicious” (-2) and “reliable” (+2).

The social bond with the offender. In order to assess to what extent the participants and the offender experience social proximity, the scale from Schrimpf (2012) is used. The scale consists of four items and the answer options are also presented in the form of a Likert scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 7 (totally). One example question is „I would find it a big problem when an offender such as Andreas/ Horacio/ this offender would live in my direct neighbourhood“ (view Appendix K: Questionnaire to measure the social bond with the offender; Cronbach’s alpha = .74).

Control variables. At the end of the questionnaire, demographic questions are asked concerning the gender, age, nationality and level of education of the participant (view Appendix L: Questionnaire to assess the demographic variables). Furthermore, the participants are asked to what extent they answered the questionnaire in a serious manner (view Appendix L: item 73). After that, the participants are asked whether they know someone who was once victim of a crime or whether they themselves were once victim of a crime and whether they know someone who committed once a crime even when the person was not punished for doing this or whether they themselves committed once a crime even when they were not punished for doing this. Answer options are yes and no and when they answer a question with yes, they are asked to briefly describe the incident (view Appendix L:

items 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84 and 85). Finally, a debriefing text is presented where the topic and the aim of the questionnaire are explained and where the participant gets to know that the text over the offence is fictional (view Appendix M: debriefing).

Results

Manipulation checks

Manipulation with own “good” or “bad” actions. In order to create the two conditions concerning self-reflection (different types of actions), the participants were asked to either report own good or own bad actions which they committed in the past. At the end of this scale, they were asked whether it was obvious to them that they committed either good or bad actions. 22 participants answered the question with “no” (the distribution among the conditions is outlined in Method). That means that it was not obvious to them which type of actions they were reporting and it can be concluded that the manipulation was not successful in their cases. As this is a crucial factor for the later analyses, these participants are not included in the analyses¹. A noticeable fact is that most of the participants who were not aware of the type of actions which they had to report, were in the condition with good actions.

Group membership. All participants stated that they have the German nationality. Therefore, this is the in-group in this study and the group membership of the offender is either in-group, out-group or neutral. In the analyses, it is intended to find out whether the priming on own good or bad actions and the group membership of the offender influence the degree of perspective taking of the participants.

The covariates

Knowing someone who was once a victim. In order to check whether there are differences between the six conditions concerning the questions which deal with knowing someone who was once a victim, having been a victim once in person, knowing someone who committed once a crime or having committed a crime once in person, percentages are calculated in order to analyse the distribution of the answers among the conditions. Concerning the question of knowing some who was once a victim, the percentage of people who answered yes is much higher in the condition with an in-group offender and own bad actions compared to the other conditions. 36.5% reported to know such a person. In the other conditions, these percentages

¹ If these participants were included in the analyses, no effects at all would be found. Therefore, it is crucial to delete their answers before starting the analyses of the scales.

range from 9.5% to 15.9% (view Appendix N: table 4).

Having been a victim once in person. Concerning the question about having been a victim once in person, it is again the condition with an in-group offender and own bad actions which has a much higher percentage in comparison to the other conditions. While the percentages in the other five conditions range from 9.5% to 16.7%, the percentage in this condition is 31% (view Appendix N: table 5).

Knowing someone who committed once a crime. Concerning the question about knowing someone who committed once a crime, the distribution occurs. The percentage in the condition with own bad actions and an in-group offender is 40% while the other percentages range from 8% to 16% (view Appendix N: table 6).

Having committed a crime once in person. Concerning the question about having committed a crime once in person, the percentage of the condition with own bad actions and an in-group offender is with 35.1% again the highest percentage but this time, the percentages of the two other conditions with own bad actions are higher, too and therefore, the percentages of the other conditions range from 5.4% to 24.3% (view Appendix N: table 7).

Degree of perspective taking

Remaining aloof. As it got clear from the percentages named above, there are clear differences between the conditions concerning experiences with victims and offenders. It is assumed that these differences have significant impact on the degree of perspective taking. This is the reason why the different questions are included as covariates in the analyses. Every scale will therefore be analysed with one of the four questions as covariate². In all cases, a one-way ANOVA analysis is conducted in which the two conditions (priming on own good or

² Here, the results are presented when these questions are not included as covariates: Concerning the scale “Remaining aloof”, there is no main effect of the awareness of the type of actions ($F(1, 113) = 6.36$; $p = .13$). There is no main effect of the group membership of the offender ($F(2, 113) = 0.79$; $p = .46$) and no interaction effect between the two either ($F(2, 113) = 0.72$; $p = .50$). Therefore, no significant effects can be found.

Concerning the scale “Trying to take the perspective”, there is no main effect of the awareness of the type of actions ($F(1, 113) = 0.34$; $p = .83$), no main effect of the group membership of the offender ($F(2, 113) = 1.59$; $p = .56$) and no interaction effect between the two ($F(2, 113) = 0.19$; $p = .83$). Hence, no significant effects can be found.

Concerning the scale “success”, there is no main effect of the awareness of the type of actions ($F(1, 113) = 0.04$; $p = .85$), no main effect of the group membership of the offender ($F(2, 113) = 2.18$; $p = .11$) and no interaction effect between the two ($F(2, 113) = 0.14$; $p = .87$). Concluding, no significant effects can be found when these questions are not included as covariates.

bad actions and in-group, out-group or neutral offender) are the fixed factors and the particular scale is the dependent factor. Concerning the scale “remaining aloof”, when “knowing someone who was once a victim” is included as covariate, no main effect of offender can be found ($F(2, 112) = 0.94$; $p = .39$) but a main effect of act ($F(1, 112) = 5.44$; $p = .02$). Furthermore, no interaction effect can be found ($F(2, 112) = 0.55$; $p = .58$). When looking at the average numbers, it becomes that the degree of remaining aloof is higher in the conditions with good actions ($M = 3.19$; $SD = 1.34$) compared to the conditions with bad actions ($M = 2.58$; $SD = 1.02$). The same pattern emerges for the other questions when included as covariates (view Appendix N: table 8). It can be concluded that the participants tend to remain more aloof when they were primed with own good actions in comparison to own bad actions. Therefore, hypothesis one cannot be confirmed, because there, an interaction effect was expected.

Trying to take the perspective. Concerning the scale “trying to take the perspective”, when “knowing someone who was once a victim” is included as covariate, no main effect of offender ($F(2, 112) = 1.65$; $p = .20$) and no main effect of act ($F(1, 112) = 0.27$; $p = .61$) can be found. Moreover, no interaction effect can be found ($F(2, 112) = 0.2$; $p = .82$). The same pattern appears for the other three questions when used as covariates (view Appendix N: table 9). Therefore, no significant differences exist between the different conditions regarding the amount of trying to take the perspective and this does not confirm hypothesis one either.

Success. Concerning the scale “success”, when “knowing someone who was once a victim” is included as covariate in the analyses, no main effect of offender ($F(2, 112) = 1.92$; $p = .15$) and no main effect of act ($F(1, 112) = 0.16$; $p = .69$) can be found. Moreover, no interaction effect can be found ($F(2, 112) = .15$; $p = .86$). The same pattern appears for the other three questions when used as covariates (view Appendix N: table 10). Therefore, no significant differences exist between the different conditions regarding the success taking the perspective of an offender and this is no confirmation for hypothesis one either.

The three explanations

The motivation to behave unprejudiced. Concerning the scale “motivation to behave unprejudiced”, when “knowing someone who was once a victim” is included as covariate, there is a main effect of the type of offender ($F(2, 112) = 3.39$; $p = .04$). There is no main effect of the type of actions ($F(1, 112) = 0.09$; $p = .76$) and no interaction effect between the

two ($F(2, 112) = 1.7; p = .19$)³. When looking at the means of the different conditions, it becomes clear that the motivation to behave unprejudiced is higher in the conditions with an out-group offender ($M = 4.55; SD = 0.70$) and the conditions with a neutral offender ($M = 4.60; SD = 0.53$) compared to the conditions with an in-group offender ($M = 4.18; SD = 0.73$). The findings are the same when the analysis is done with one of the other three questions (view Appendix N: table 11). It can be concluded that an out-group or a neutral offender evoked a higher motivation to behave unprejudiced than did an in-group offender but this is only the case in the conditions with bad actions.

Self-esteem. Concerning the scale “threat to self-esteem”, when “knowing someone who was once a victim” is used as covariate in the analysis, there is no main effect of type of offender found ($F(2, 112) = 0.11; p = .89$) as well as no main effect of type of actions ($F(1, 112) = 0.72; p = .4$) and no interaction effect between the two ($F(2, 112) = 0.31; p = .74$). The results are for the other questions used as covariates the same (view Appendix N: table 12). The self-esteem of the participants was therefore not influenced by the two conditions. Hypotheses 2 and 3 cannot be confirmed according to these results.

The use of heuristics. Concerning the scale “use of heuristics”, there is no main effect of type of offender ($F(2, 112) = 1.53; p = .22$) as well as no main effect of type of actions ($F(1, 112) = 0.87; p = .35$) and no interaction effect between the two ($F(2, 112) = 0.21; p = .81$). The results of the other questions used as covariates match these (view Appendix N: table 13). The use of heuristics was therefore not influenced by the two conditions.

Discussion

The research question which was investigated by this research design was “To what extent explains the threat to self-esteem the effects of self-reflection on taking the perspective of in- and out-group offenders?” Perspective taking is important in order to understand a person and the reasons for his or her actions (Todd et al., 2011). Research indicates that this process is enhanced when one tries to take the perspective of someone who does something which oneself has already done (Hodges et al., 2010). This was an important basis for the assumption that people who are primed on own bad actions would be more likely to take the perspective of an offender compared to people who are primed on own good actions.

Aside from the type of actions as an important influence on the degree of perspective

³ The findings for all other scales are the same when done without including any covariates.

taking, the group identity of a person is important here, too, because this influences the way someone is perceived. By using different types of offenders with respect to group membership, it was intended to elicit in-group leniency and black-sheep effects.

It was expected that the results of Zwicker (2014) would be replicated (i.e. people would take the perspective of an in-group offender when confronted with own good actions and would take the perspective of an out-group offender when confronted with own bad actions). Furthermore, three possible explanations for these findings were investigated. These were the threat to the self-esteem, the motivation to behave unprejudiced and the use of heuristics. As already indicated by the research question, the threat to the self-esteem was considered to be the most likely explanation. It was expected that people's self-esteem would be more threatened when confronted with own bad actions compared to when confronted with own good actions. Finally, the last expectation was that this effect would explain the differences in perspective taking among the participants.

Another expectation was that the in-group leniency effect would occur in the condition with “good” actions and an in-group offender and the black sheep effect would occur in the condition with “bad” actions and an out-group offender. Concerning the motivation to behave unprejudiced, it was expected that it would be bigger among participants in the conditions with an out-group offender when compared the conditions with an in-group offender. Finally, the use of heuristics was expected to be present in the conditions with good actions when participants rate the crime as being more serious but less likely to occur and present in the conditions with bad actions when participants rate the crime as being less serious but more likely to occur. An overall expectation was that the results of the neutral offender will be the same as for the in-group offender.

The results are that it is beneficial to include the four questions concerning knowing someone who was once a victim, having been a victim once in person, knowing someone who committed once a crime and having committed a crime once in person as covariates, because then, the results for remaining aloof were different (otherwise, no significant effect would have been found). Participants who were primed on own good actions remained more aloof than did participants who were primed on own bad actions. This does not support hypothesis one, because in order to replicate the findings of Zwicker (2014) fully, interaction effects for the three scales had to be found. Yet, this is not the case. Yet, this effect shows at least a pattern which fits with the expectations.

Concerning hypothesis two, no effect for self-esteem was found. Hence, hypotheses two and three cannot be confirmed. For the use of heuristics, no effect was found either. Yet,

there was a main effect found of offender on the motivation to behave unprejudiced. It can be concluded that participants who were confronted with an out-group offender or a neutral offender had a higher motivation to behave unprejudiced compared to participants who were confronted with an in-group offender. The findings concerning the neutral offender match those of the out-group offender and this contrasts therefore to the expectation made above.

Summarising these findings, the hypotheses cannot be confirmed. Positive about these findings is the fact that the pattern goes in the right direction. There are signs that participants differ in their degree of perspective taking when confronted with different types of actions and there are signs that people differ with respect to their motivation to behave unprejudiced when confronted with different types of offenders. Still, the results are different from what was expected and there are several possible reasons for this.

The reason why the four different questions named above were used as covariates in the analyses is that the different conditions differ extremely with respect to these questions. It was found that especially the condition with an in-group offender and own bad actions differs extremely in the distribution from the other conditions (i.e. they know more former victims and offenders and were themselves more often victims and offenders). By using these questions covariates, more significant effects can be found. Therefore, these questions certainly have influence on the way offenders are perceived.

This aspect also belongs to the limitations of this research and as the limitations might also be the reasons why the results do not fully match the expectations, they are listed in this context. The reason why the participants may not be distributed in a qualitatively good way might lie in the way how participants were gained for this study. People were contacted via e-mail or Facebook and asked whether they would like to participate. Therefore, most of the participants are acquaintances of the student. But in one condition – the one with an in-group offender and own bad actions and therefore, the one with a wholly different distribution – a friend asked randomly around whether people would be willing to participate. It seems therefore as if the distribution of the participants was influenced by the “type” of people who answered the questions. A selection bias might have occurred.

Moreover, more than the half of the participants stopped when they had to take the perspective of the offender. Therefore, most of the answers could not be included in the analyses and this might have had an influence on the results as well. A related aspect is that due to the huge drop-out of participants, some conditions only contain 14 people. This is a very small number and it might influence the significance of the results. That means that it is more likely to obtain significant results with a greater number of participants and some effects

are missing due to the small number of participants.

Other limitations refer to the questionnaire itself. An example is the scale “motivation to behave unprejudiced”. In order to fit the manipulation with an out-group offender, some questions which originally referred to foreigners were changed so that they refer to offenders instead. This might be a reason why only one main effect was found instead of another main effect or an interaction effect.

Taking together these limitations and possible reasons for the results, it might be of great importance how participants are gained for such a research. The distribution of participants in this study differs from the distribution of earlier research on this topic and it might be crucial to accommodate this in order to replicate the findings. This implicates that the results obtained in earlier research in part depend on the distribution of participants and that the participants of this study differ to a great extent from the participants in earlier studies. This fact might also have implications for the found effects and theories build upon the effects (i.e. in-group leniency effect and black-sheep effect).

It can therefore be concluded that participants and especially the distribution of them is a crucial part of the research in order to reach significant results. The number of participants and possible external influences such as earlier experiences with offenders might have a great impact on the results. It could be interesting to assess to what extent these experiences might result in one or the other effect found in earlier research on this topic. Moreover, it is important to accommodate the research design and especially the scales of the study in a way that minimises possible influences such as the wording of single questions. Finally, as already in Zwicker's study (2014) a great number of participants stopped while or after reading the manipulation text, it would be interesting to analyse whether any demographic variables influence the decision to stop with the questionnaire. As in Zwicker's research and the present study the demographic variables were assessed at the end of the questionnaire, this analysis is not possible.

Some pieces of advice for future research can be to pay excessive attention to the procedure of gaining participants for the study. It might help to design one questionnaire with random assignment instead of individual questionnaire. Moreover, a shorter questionnaire would help in order to minimise the drop-out of participants and the demographic variables should be placed at the beginning in order to check for differences between participants who finish the questionnaire and those who do not.

As not everything around this research and the obtained results is negative – some positive aspects are to be mentioned, too. First, it gets clear that no study is perfect and that

earlier results cannot always be replicated. This is an important information for future researchers who want to work with perspective taking, in-group leniency effects and black-sheep effects. Some variables need to receive a more detailed regard when working with this theoretical approach. Moreover, there are indications that the motivation to behave unprejudiced can function as an explanation for the differences in perspective taking among different conditions. It would be an interesting goal to assess in what way the motivation to behave unprejudiced influences the degree of perspective taking and what processes play a role here.

As a conclusion, the most important aspect which can be learned from this study is the fact that the motivation to behave unprejudiced plays a crucial role in taking the perspective of offenders and that this fact needs a lot of empirical work in order to have a rounded theoretical basis.

References

- Banse & Gawronski (2003). Die Skala Motivation zu vorurteilsfreiem Verhalten: Psychometrische Eigenschaften und Validität. *Diagnostica* 49, 4-13.
- Batson, C.D.; Chang, J., Orr, R. & Rowland, J. (2002). Empathy, attitudes and action: Can feeling for a Member of a stigmatized group motivate one to help the group? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 1656-1666.
- Braun, J. & Gollwitzer, M. (2012). Leniency for out-group offenders. *European Journal of Social Psychology*.
- Dunton, B.C. & Fazio, R.H. (1997). An Individual Difference Measure of Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 316.
- Figueiredo, A.; Doosje, B.; Valentim, J.P. & Zebel, S. (2010). Dealing with Past Colonial Conflicts: How Perceived Characteristics of the Victimized Outgroup Can Influence the Experience of Group-Based Guilt. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, 4 (1), 89 – 105.
- FoxNews (2012, September 19). Washington man gets life without parole for killing sex offenders. Retrieved March 27, 2014 from <http://www.foxnews.com/us/2012/09/19/washington-man-gets-life-without-parole-for-killing-sex-offenders/>.
- Gollwitzer, M. & Keller, L. (2010). What You Did Only Matters if You Are One of Us - Offenders' Group Membership Moderates the Effect of Criminal History on Punishment Severity. *Social Psychology*, 41(1), 20–26.
- Hodges, S.D.; Kiel, K.J.; Kramer, A.D.I.; Veach, D. & Villanueva, B.R. (2010). Giving Birth to Empathy: The Effects of Similar Experience on Empathic Accuracy, Empathic Concern, and Perceived Empathy. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 3, 398-409.
- Leach, C.W.; Van Zomeren, M.; Zebel, S.; Vliek, M.L.W.; Pennekamp, S.F.; Doosje, B.; Ouwerkerk, J.W. & Spears, R. (2008). Group-Level Self-Definition and Self-Investment: A Hierarchical (Multicomponent) Model of In-Group Identification.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95 (1), 144-165.

- Okimoto, T.G. & Wenzel, M. (2010). The Other Side of Perspective Taking: Transgression Ambiguity and Victims' Revenge Against Their Offender. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 2, 373.
- Pachur, T.; Hertwig, R. & Steinmann, F. (2012). How Do People Judge Risks: Availability Heuristic, Affect Heuristic, or Both? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 18 (3), 314–330.
- Pinto, I.R.; Marques, J.M.; Levine, J.M. & Abrams, D. (2010), 'Membership status and subjective group dynamics: Who triggers the black sheep effect?'. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 99, 107–19.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J.C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W.G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations*, 33-48. Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.
- Todd, A. R.; Bodenhausen, G.V.; Richeson, J.A. & Galinsky, A.D. (2011). Perspective Taking Combats Automatic Expressions of Racial Bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100 (6), 1027-1042.
- Trepte S. (2006). Social identity theory. *Psychology of entertainment*. New York: Routledge, 255–271.
- Tversky, A. & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. *Science*, New Series, 185 (4157), 1124-1131.
- Van Prooijen, J.W. (2006). Probability Retributive Reactions to Suspected Offenders: The Importance of Social Categorizations and Guilt. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 715.
- Zwicker, K. (2014). Zelfreflectie beïnvloedt perspectief nemen van outgroup daders. Retrieved from www.essay.utwente.nl.

Overview Appendices

Appendix A: Instruction for the participants

Appendix B: Questionnaire to measure the identification with the own nationality

Appendix C: Questionnaire to prime on own “good” or “bad” actions

Appendix D: Instruction for the manipulation text

Appendix E: Manipulation text

Appendix F: Questionnaire to measure the perspective taking

Appendix G: The scale to measure the motivation to act without prejudice

Appendix H: The scale to measure the threat to the self-esteem

Appendix I: Questionnaire to measure the use of heuristics

Appendix J: Questionnaire to measure the evaluation of the offender

Appendix K: Questionnaire to measure the social bond with the offender

Appendix L: Questionnaire to assess the demographic variables

Appendix M: Debriefing

Appendix N: Tables of analysis

Appendix A: Instruction for the participants

Lieber Teilnehmer,

auf diesem Wege möchte ich Sie über die Umfrage informieren, an der Sie im Anschluss von dieser Einführung teilnehmen können. Bei dieser Umfrage geht es darum, wie sehr man sich in andere Menschen und deren Situationen einfühlen kann. Sorgen Sie dafür, dass Sie die Fragen in Ruhe beantworten können. Ebenso ist es wichtig, dass Sie die Fragen nüchtern ausfüllen (keine Drogen, kein Alkohol). Die Teilnahme an dieser Untersuchung bleibt zu jeder Zeit anonym. Es ist nicht möglich nachzuvollziehen, welcher Teilnehmer welche Antworten gegeben hat. Ihre Daten werden auch nicht an Dritte weitergegeben. Sie können zu jeder Zeit mit der Umfrage aufhören, ohne Angabe von Gründen. Die Umfrage dauert 20 Minuten. Bitte achten Sie darauf alle Fragen zu beantworten, bevor Sie fortfahren, denn eine Auswertung ist nur möglich, wenn der Fragebogen komplett ausgefüllt wurde. Im Anschluss der Befragung werde ich Ihnen ausführlichere Informationen zu dieser Untersuchung geben. Wenn Sie am Ende der Untersuchung über die Resultate informiert werden wollen oder andere Fragen haben, dann melden sie sich bei m.steinbrecher@student.utwente.nl. Wenn Sie auf "Weiter" klicken geben Sie an, die oben genannten Informationen gelesen zu haben und erklären sich bereit, an der Umfrage teilzunehmen.

Appendix B: Questionnaire to measure the identification with the own nationality

Zu Beginn einige Fragen, die darauf eingehen, wie Sie Deutschen gegenüber stehen. Lesen Sie die Aussagen gut durch und klicken sie diejenige an, mit der Sie am meisten übereinstimmen. Es gibt keine richtigen oder falschen Antworten. Es geht um Ihre persönliche Meinung! Sorgen Sie dafür, dass Sie alle Fragen beantworten, bevor Sie fortfahren. Inwieweit stimmen Sie zu?

1. Ich bin froh Deutsche(r) zu sein.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

2. Ich fühle mich solidarisch gegenüber Deutschen.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

3. Deutsche(r) zu sein macht einen großen Teil aus von dem, wie ich mich sehe.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

4. Ich denke oft an die Tatsache, dass ich Deutsche(r) bin.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

5. Es gibt mir ein gutes Gefühl, Deutsche(r) zu sein.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

6. Ich fühle mich mit Deutschen verbunden.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

7. Ein wichtiger Teil meiner Identität ist die Tatsache, dass ich Deutsche(r) bin.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

8. Ich denke, dass Deutsche viel haben worauf sie stolz sein können.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

9. Ich finde es angenehm, Deutsche(r) zu sein.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

10. Ich fühle mich zugehörig/betroffen mit Deutschen.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

11. Ich habe viel mit dem durchschnittlichen Deutschen gemein.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

12. Deutsche sind sich sehr ähnlich.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

13. Deutsche teilen sich viele Gemeinsamkeiten.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

14. Ich ähnele dem durchschnittlichen Deutschen sehr.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

Appendix C: Questionnaire to prime on own “good” or “bad” actions

Red: priming on own “bad” actions

Green: priming on own “good” actions

Bei den folgenden Fragen geht es darum, ob man schon mal falsch oder unmoralisch gehandelt hat in seinem Leben, auch wenn man dafür nicht bestraft oder verurteilt wurde! Bitte antworten Sie ehrlich und denken Sie auch daran, dass Ihre Antworten anonym sind. Es gibt keine richtigen oder falschen Antworten, es geht nur um Ihre Erfahrung.

Bei den folgenden Fragen geht es darum, ob man schon mal moralisch gut gehandelt hat in seinem Leben, auch wenn man dafür nicht belohnt wurde! Bitte antworten Sie ehrlich und denken Sie auch daran, dass Ihre Antworten anonym sind. Es gibt keine richtigen oder falschen Antworten, es geht nur um Ihre Erfahrung.

15. Haben Sie jemals vorsätzlich eine fremde Sache beschädigt (z.B. Straßenlaterne ausgetreten/ zerstört, Verkehrsschilder beschädigt, Automaten oder andere technische Geräte beschädigt, Gegenstände von anderen Personen beschädigt/ zerstört, oder ähnliches)?

Ja

Nein

15. Haben Sie schon einmal einem älteren oder körperlich eingeschränkten Menschen geholfen?

Ja

Nein

16. Haben Sie jemals etwas gestohlen oder entwendet (z. B. Ladendiebstahl, Eigentum von anderen, wie z.B. Fahrrad, Geld, Tasche, Handy, Computer, Kleidung, Lebensmittel oder ähnliches)?

Ja

Nein

16. Haben Sie schon einmal etwas gefunden (z.B. Geldbörse, Schmuck, Schlüssel, Kleidung, Handy oder ähnliches) und es an den Eigentümer zurück gegeben oder so gut

es geht dafür gesorgt, dass diese Person ihr Eigentum wieder zurückbekommen kann (Abgabe des Gegenstandes an einer offiziellen Stelle oder Fundbüro)?

Ja

Nein

17. Ist es schon mal vorgekommen, dass Sie sich eine Leistung erschlichen haben (z.B. Schwarzfahren in einem öffentlichen Verkehrsmittel wie Bus oder Bahn, sich in Veranstaltungen wie Kino, Diskotheken oder Konzerte reingeschlichen ohne zu bezahlen oder ähnliches)?

Ja

Nein

17. Haben Sie schon einmal der Polizei geholfen, indem Sie eine Person angezeigt haben, die sich gesetzeswidrig verhalten hat?

Ja

Nein

18. Haben Sie jemals vorsätzlich urheberrechtlich geschütztes Material heruntergeladen ohne zu bezahlen (z.B. Filme, Musik, Bücher, Computerprogramme oder ähnliches)?

Ja

Nein

18. Haben Sie schon einmal die Schuld für etwas auf sich genommen, um jemand anderen zu schützen/helfen, obwohl Sie nicht schuldig waren?

Ja

Nein

19. Haben Sie schon einmal betrunken oder unter Einfluss anderer Substanzen, wie z.B. Drogen oder spezielle Medikamente, im Straßenverkehr teilgenommen indem Sie Auto, Motorrad, Fahrrad oder ähnliches gefahren sind?

Ja

Nein

19. Haben Sie schon einmal einen Fehler begangen (z.B. etwas beschädigt, etwas

entwendet, etwas verheimlicht oder ähnliches) und diesen Fehler freiwillig im Nachhinein zugegeben/gestanden, obwohl Sie ihn nicht hätten zugeben/gestehen müssen?

Ja

Nein

20. Ist es schon mal vorgekommen, dass Sie jemanden mit Gewalt gedroht oder bei jemanden Gewalt angewendet haben?

Ja

Nein

20. Haben Sie schon einmal einer Person/Institution etwas gespendet (z.B. Geld, Kleidung, Möbel, Lebensmittel, etc.)?

Ja

Nein

21. Haben Sie jemals ein anderes Delikt begangen, welches nicht oben genannt wurde, auch wenn Sie dafür nicht bestraft oder verurteilt worden sind?

Ja

Nein

Wenn ja, können Sie eine kurze Beschreibung von diesem Delikt geben?

21. Haben sie schon mal etwas moralisch Gutes getan was oben nicht genannt wurde?

Ja

Nein

Wenn ja, können Sie hier eine kurze Beschreibung dieser guten Tat geben?

22. Wenn Sie zurückdenken an die eben gestellten Fragen, ist Ihnen dann bewusst, dass es sich um strafbare Dinge handelt, die Sie getan haben?

Ja

Nein

22. Wenn Sie zurückdenken an die eben gestellten Fragen, ist Ihnen dann bewusst, dass es sich um moralisch gute Taten handelt, die Sie getan haben?

Ja

Nein

Appendix D: Instruction for the manipulation text

Im folgenden Teil werden Sie gebeten, eine Berichterstattung der Nachrichtenagentur „dpa“ vom 24. Juni 2013 über ein Gewaltverbrechen zu lesen und sich in den Täter hineinzusetzen. Versuchen Sie sich vorzustellen, dass Sie dieser Täter sind. Versuchen Sie darauf zu achten, welche Gedanken und Gefühle Sie erfahren, während Sie den Bericht lesen. Nachdem Sie ihn gelesen haben, werden Sie gebeten mindestens zwei dieser Gedanken und Gefühle aufzuschreiben. Danach werden noch andere Fragen zu diesem Bericht gestellt. Auch hier gilt, es gibt keine richtigen oder falschen Antworten. Es geht allein um Ihre persönliche Einschätzung!

Appendix E: Manipulation text (in-group offender/out-group offender/neutral offender)

Quelle: dpa

25-jähriger **Deutscher** gesteht Straftat/ 25-jähriger **Portugiese/ 25-jähriger** gesteht Straftat

Während ein Zeitungsausträger früh am Morgen durch eine Passage in einem Einkaufszentrum ging, ertappte er einen Einbrecher. Dieser Einbrecher, sein Name ist Andreas W./ **Horacio P.**, war nach eigenen Aussagen darüber so erschrocken gesehen worden zu sein, dass er mit seinem Einbruchswerkzeug, einer Art Stemmeisen, gleich zweimal zuschlug. Deshalb steht der 25-Jährige Andreas W./ **Horacio P./ der 25-jährige Täter** nun vor Gericht. Der Angeklagte gesteht den Angriff: Er habe in den Laden einbrechen wollen, an dessen Eingangstür er das Stemmeisen schon angesetzt hatte. Der (ebenfalls) deutsche Zeitungsausträger, sein Name ist Thomas J. schildert den Vorfall allerdings etwas anders: Ihm sei das Verhalten des Mannes sehr komisch vorgekommen, er habe geschaut, sei aber weitergegangen. Der Mann sei ihm nachgelaufen und habe ihn wortlos und kaltblütig mit der rund ein Meter langen Stange seitlich auf den Kopf geschlagen. Thomas J. erlitt Platzwunden und Prellungen, war fünf Tage krankgeschrieben und vier Wochen in ärztlicher Behandlung. Als Andreas W./ **Horacio P./ der Täter** an diesem Morgen nach seiner Tat nach Hause kam, habe er immer noch unter Schock gestanden und es mit der Angst zu tun bekommen, dass der Mann, den er geschlagen hatte, sterben könnte: "Mir sind dann die Emotionen durchgegangen und ich habe angefangen zu heulen." Die Frage, ob er einen Notarzt für den Mann gerufen habe, verneint der Angeklagte und fügt an: "Ich weiß, das war eine Scheißaktion." Nach der Vernehmung des Zeitungsausträgers entschuldigt sich der 25-Jährige Andreas/ **Horacio/ der 25-jährige** bei diesem: "Ich weiß, das ist keine Entschuldigung für das, was ich Ihnen angetan habe." Der Zeitungsausträger sieht ihn an und nickt mit dem Kopf.

Appendix F: Questionnaire to measure the perspective taking

23. Geben Sie nun zwei Gedanken an, die Sie hatten, während Sie sich in Andreas/
Horacio/ den Täter hineinversetzt haben.

24. Geben Sie nun zwei Gefühle an, die Sie hatten, während Sie sich in Andreas/
Horacio/ den Täter hineinversetzt haben.

25. Wie sehr haben Sie probiert sich vorzustellen, was Andreas/ Horacio/ der Täter denkt,
fühlt und erfährt?

Überhaupt nicht _ _ _ _ _ Sehr

26. Wie sehr haben Sie probiert sich vorzustellen, was Sie selber denken, fühlen und
erfahren würden, wenn Sie Andreas/ Horacio/ der Täter wären?

Überhaupt nicht _ _ _ _ _ Sehr

27. Wie sehr haben Sie probiert, objektiv zu bleiben und emotionalen Abstand zu halten
gegenüber Andreas/ Horacio/ dem Täter?

Überhaupt nicht _ _ _ _ _ Sehr

28. Inwieweit haben Sie versucht, Andreas'/ Horacios Perspektive/ die Perspektive vom Täter
einzunehmen?

Überhaupt nicht _ _ _ _ _ Sehr

29. Inwieweit ist es Ihnen gelungen, Andreas'/ Horacios Perspektive/ die Perspektive vom
Täter einzunehmen?

Überhaupt nicht _ _ _ _ _ Sehr

30. Inwieweit war es Ihnen möglich, seine Perspektive einzunehmen?

Überhaupt nicht _ _ _ _ _ Sehr

31. Inwieweit haben Sie einen Widerstand erfahren, als Sie sich in Andreas/ Horacio/ den Täter einfühlen wollten?

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

32. Ich fand, dass es Andreas/ Horacio/ der Täter nicht wert war, dass ich mich in ihn hineinversetzt habe.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

33. Ich fand es schwierig, die menschliche Seite von Andreas/ Horacio/ dem Täter zu sehen.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

34. Ich hatte Angst, dass wenn ich mich zu sehr in Andreas/ Horacio/ den Täter hineinversetze, zu viel Sympathie für ihn zu empfinden.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

35. Ich wollte mich in Andreas/ Horacio/ den Täter nicht hineinversetzen, weil ich auf keine Art und Weise Sympathie für ihn empfinden möchte.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

36. Ich wollte mich nicht in Andreas/ Horacio/ den Täter hineinversetzen, weil ich es vermeiden wollte, seine Tat gut zu reden.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

Appendix G: The scale to measure the motivation to act without prejudice

Im Folgenden geht es um Ihre Haltung, was Vorurteile betrifft. Antworten Sie auch hier vollkommen ehrlich, es gibt keine richtigen oder falschen Antworten.

37. Man sollte sich nie durch Vorurteile leiten lassen.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

38. Ich achte darauf, dass mein Verhalten nicht durch Vorurteile beeinflusst wird.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

39. Es ist mir egal, wenn jemand glaubt, dass ich Vorurteile gegenüber Straftätern hätte.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

40. Wenn man über Straftäter spricht, sollte man abwertende Bezeichnungen vermeiden.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

41. Es lohnt sich nicht, sich ständig Sorgen darüber zu machen, ob man sich gerade irgendwem gegenüber vorurteilsvoll verhält.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

42. Jeder Mensch hat Vorurteile. Es kommt darauf an, sich nicht davon leiten zu lassen.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

43. Man sollte sich seine eigenen Vorurteile bewusst machen.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

44. Man sollte sich besonders fair verhalten, wenn man mit jemandem zu tun hat, der wahrscheinlich häufiger unter Vorurteilen zu leiden hat.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

45. Man sollte in Gesellschaft nichts Negatives über Straftäter sagen.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

46. Ich ärgere mich über mich selbst, wenn ich etwas denke oder fühle, was für vorurteilsvoll gehalten werden könnte.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

47. Man sollte nicht über Verbrecherwitze lachen.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

48. Es wäre mir unangenehm, wenn jemand glauben würde, dass ich Vorurteile gegenüber Straftätern hätte.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

49. Es macht mich wütend, wenn jemand Vorurteile über Straftäter äußert.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

50. Ich finde es wichtiger zu sagen, was man denkt, als sich ständig Sorgen darüber zu machen, ob man damit jemandem zu nahe tritt.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

51. Es ist mir unangenehm, jemanden zu verletzen, daher versuche ich immer, Rücksicht auf die Gefühle anderer zu nehmen.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

52. Wenn ich Gedanken oder Gefühle habe, die andere diskriminieren, behalte ich sie für mich.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

Appendix H: The scale to measure the threat to the self-esteem

Bitte geben Sie an, wie Sie sich jetzt in diesem Moment fühlen.

53. Ich fühle mich stolz.

Überhaupt nicht _ _ _ _ _ Sehr

54. Ich denke positiv über mich selbst.

Überhaupt nicht _ _ _ _ _ Sehr

55. Ich fühle mich beschämt.

Überhaupt nicht _ _ _ _ _ Sehr

56. Ich fühle mich verlegen.

Überhaupt nicht _ _ _ _ _ Sehr

57. Ich fühle mich aufrichtig.

Überhaupt nicht _ _ _ _ _ Sehr

58. Ich denke negativ über mich selbst.

Überhaupt nicht _ _ _ _ _ Sehr

59. Ich fühle mich vertrauenswürdig.

Überhaupt nicht _ _ _ _ _ Sehr

60. Ich fühle mich ehrlich.

Überhaupt nicht _ _ _ _ _ Sehr

Appendix I: Questionnaire to measure the use of heuristics

Bei den folgenden Fragen geht es um Ihre persönliche Einschätzung zu der begangenen Straftat. Da es um Ihre Meinung geht, gibt es weder richtige noch falsche Antworten. Bitte achten Sie darauf, dass Sie jede Frage beantworten, bevor Sie fortfahren.

61. Wie oft denken Sie, kommt diese Art von Straftat in Deutschland vor?

Sehr selten _____ Sehr oft

62. Wie ernst finden Sie diese Straftat?

Überhaupt nicht ernst _____ Sehr ernst

Appendix J: Questionnaire to measure the evaluation of the offender

Es folgen Wortpaare, mit denen Sie Ihre Meinung zu Andreas/ Horacio/ dem Täter abgeben können:

63. Kalt _ _ _ _ _ Warm

64. Negativ _ _ _ _ _ Positiv

65. Feindselig _ _ _ _ _ Freundlich

66. Verdächtig _ _ _ _ _ Vertrauenswürdig

67. Verachtend _ _ _ _ _ Respektvoll

68. Ekel _ _ _ _ _ Bewunderung

Appendix K: Questionnaire to measure the social bond with the offender

Im Folgenden geht es darum, wie Sie zu Andreas/ Horacio/ dem Täter stehen können, wenn es um Ihr soziales Umfeld geht. Geben Sie bei jeder Aussage bitte an, inwieweit Sie zustimmen. Bitte vergewissern Sie sich auch hier, dass Sie jede Frage ausfüllen.

69. Ich kann mir vorstellen, dass ich einen Straftäter wie Andreas/ Horacio/ diesen Täter heiraten würde und dass er zu einem Teil meiner Familie würde.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

70. Straftäter wie Andreas/ Horacio/ dieser Täter können genauso gute Freunde von mir sein, wie Menschen ohne kriminelle Vergangenheit.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

71. Ich empfinde es als großes Problem, wenn ein Straftäter wie Andreas/ Horacio/ dieser Täter in meiner direkten Umgebung wohnen würde.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

72. Ich kann mir vorstellen, dass ich mit einem Straftäter wie Andreas/ Horacio/ diesem Täter auf der Arbeit zusammenarbeiten würde.

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

Appendix L: Questionnaire to assess the demographic variables

73. Inwieweit haben Sie an dieser Umfrage gewissenhaft teilgenommen?

Überhaupt nicht _____ Sehr

74. Was ist Ihr Geschlecht?

- Männlich
- Weiblich

75. Was ist Ihr Alter?

76. Was ist Ihre Nationalität?

- Deutsch
- Andere, nämlich: _____

77. Was ist Ihre höchste abgeschlossene schulische Ausbildung:

- Sonderschule
- Hauptschule
- Realschule
- Fachoberschule
- Gymnasium
- Gesamtschule
- Berufsschule
- Fachhochschule
- Universität
- Andere, nämlich _____

78. Kennen Sie jemanden, der Opfer einer Straftat war?

Ja

Nein

79. Wenn ja, können Sie eine kurze Beschreibung dieser Straftat geben?

80. Waren Sie jemals Opfer einer Straftat?

Ja

Nein

81. Wenn ja, können Sie eine kurze Beschreibung dieser Straftat geben?

82. Kennen Sie jemanden, der eine Straftat begangen hat, auch wenn derjenige nicht dafür bestraft oder verurteilt worden ist?

Ja

Nein

83. Wenn ja, können Sie eine kurze Beschreibung dieser Straftat geben?

84. Haben Sie jemals selbst eine Straftat begangen, auch wenn Sie nicht dafür bestraft oder verurteilt worden sind?

Ja

Nein

85. Wenn ja, können Sie eine kurze Beschreibung dieser Straftat geben?

Appendix M: Debriefing

Das Thema dieser Untersuchung lautet: “In den Schuhen von Tätern: Einen Schritt zu weit?“ Nachdem Sie nun an dieser Umfrage teilgenommen haben, möchte ich Sie noch darüber aufklären, dass es sich bei dem beschriebenen Täter um eine fiktive Person handelt. Somit ist die erwähnte Berichterstattung erfunden. Die Untersuchung basiert auf verschiedenen Fragebögen und jede Version bezieht sich auf eine andere fiktive Täterbeschreibung, um verschiedene Reaktionen auf verschiedene Täterprofile feststellen zu können. Sie haben dabei geholfen Einblicke darüber zu bekommen, inwieweit Menschen bereit sind die Perspektive eines Täters einzunehmen. Falls Sie Fragen oder Anmerkungen zu dieser Untersuchung haben, können Sie mich gerne per E-Mail kontaktieren unter m.steinbrecher@student.utwente.nl

Herzlichen Dank für Ihre Teilnahme!

Appendix N: Tables of analysis

Table 1: Distribution of the participants among the six conditions

	Good actions	Bad actions	Total
In-group offender	21	31	52
Out-group offender	14	19	33
Neutral offender	14	20	34
Total	40	70	119

Table 2: Distribution of the participants who were extinguished due to failed manipulation

	Good actions	Bad actions
In-group offender	2.86%	1.27%
Out-group offender	30.3%	6.9%
Neutral offender	18.75%	6.67%

Table 3: Distribution of the participants who were extinguished due to missing answers

	Good actions	Bad actions
In-group offender	37.14%	59.49%
Out-group offender	27.27%	27.59%
Neutral offender	37.5%	26.67%

Table 4: Distribution of the participants knowing someone who was once a victim

	Good actions	Bad actions
In-group offender	14.3%	36.5%
Out-group offender	9.5%	14.3%
Neutral offender	9.5%	15.9%

Table 5: Distribution of the participants who were once a victim

	Good actions	Bad actions
In-group offender	14.3%	31%
Out-group offender	9.5%	16.7%
Neutral offender	11.9%	16.7%

Table 6: Distribution of the participants knowing someone who committed once a crime

	Good actions	Bad actions
In-group offender	16%	40%
Out-group offender	8%	14%
Neutral offender	12%	10%

Table 7: Distribution of the participants who committed once a crime

	Good actions	Bad actions
In-group offender	5.4%	35.1%
Out-group offender	8.1%	18.9%
Neutral offender	8.1%	24.3%

Table 8: Results of the variance analyses concerning the scale “remaining aloof”

Covariates	Effect	df	F	p
Knowing someone who was once a victim	Type of offender	2, 112	0.94	.39
	Type of actions	1, 112	5.44	.02
	Interaction	2, 112	0.55	.58
Having been a victim once in person	Type of offender	2, 112	0.85	.43
	Type of actions	1, 112	6.05	.01
	Interaction	2, 112	0.71	.50
Knowing someone who committed once a crime	Type of offender	2, 112	0.77	.46
	Type of actions	1, 112	6.27	.01
	Interaction	2, 112	0.7	.50
Having committed a crime once in person	Type of offender	2, 112	0.76	.47
	Type of actions	1, 112	4.45	.04
	Interaction	2, 112	0.59	.55

Table 9: Results of the variance analyses concerning the scale “try to take the perspective”

Covariates	Effect	df	F	p
Knowing someone who was once a victim	Type of offender	2, 112	1.65	.20
	Type of actions	1, 112	0.27	.61

	Interaction	2, 112	0.2	.82
Having been a victim once in person	Type of offender	2, 112	1.7	.19
	Type of actions	1, 112	0.26	.61
	Interaction	2, 112	0.23	.80
Knowing someone who committed once a crime	Type of offender	2, 112	1.83	.17
	Type of actions	1, 112	0.29	.60
	Interaction	2, 112	0.28	.76
Having committed a crime once in person	Type of offender	2, 112	1.48	.23
	Type of actions	1, 112	0.1	.75
	Interaction	2, 112	0.19	.83

Table 10: Results of the variance analyses concerning the scale “success”

Covariates	Effect	df	F	p
Knowing someone who was once a victim	Type of offender	2, 112	1.92	.15
	Type of actions	1, 112	0.16	.69
	Interaction	2, 112	0.15	.86
Having been a victim once in person	Type of offender	2, 112	2.16	.12
	Type of actions	1, 112	0.04	.85
	Interaction	2, 112	0.14	.87

Knowing someone who committed once a crime	Type of offender	2, 112	1.91	.15
	Type of actions	1, 112	0.06	.81
	Interaction	2, 112	0.09	.91
Having committed a crime once in person	Type of offender	2, 112	2.24	.11
	Type of actions	1, 112	0.11	.75
	Interaction	2, 112	0.5	.86

Table 11: Results of the variance analyses concerning the scale “motivation to behave unprejudiced”

Covariates	Effect	df	F	p
Knowing someone who was once a victim	Type of offender	2, 112	3.39	.04
	Type of actions	1, 112	0.09	.76
	Interaction	2, 112	1.7	.19
Having been a victim once in person	Type of offender	2, 112	3.99	.02
	Type of actions	1, 112	0.004	.95
	Interaction	2, 112	2.2	.12
Knowing someone who committed once a crime	Type of offender	2, 112	2.94	.05
	Type of actions	1, 112	0.02	.90
	Interaction	2, 112	1.76	.18

Having committed a crime once in person	Type of offender	2, 112	4.31	.02
	Type of actions	1, 112	0.07	.79
	Interaction	2, 112	2.02	.14

Table 12: Results of the variance analyses concerning the scale “threat to self-esteem”

Covariates	Effect	df	F	p
Knowing someone who was once a victim	Type of offender	2, 112	0.11	.89
	Type of actions	1, 112	0.72	.40
	Interaction	2, 112	0.31	.74
Having been a victim once in person	Type of offender	2, 112	0.13	.88
	Type of actions	1, 112	0.72	.40
	Interaction	2, 112	0.34	.72
Knowing someone who committed once a crime	Type of offender	2, 112	0.1	.90
	Type of actions	1, 112	0.78	.38
	Interaction	2, 112	0.27	.76
Having committed a crime once in person	Type of offender	2, 112	0.07	.93
	Type of actions	1, 112	2.05	.16
	Interaction	2, 112	0.51	.60

Table 13: Results of the variance analyses concerning the scale “heuristics”

Covariates	Effect	df	F	p
Knowing someone who was once a victim	Type of offender	2, 112	1.53	.22
	Type of actions	1, 112	0.87	.35
	Interaction	2, 112	0.21	.81
Having been a victim once in person	Type of offender	2, 112	1.51	.23
	Type of actions	1, 112	0.65	.42
	Interaction	2, 112	0.13	.88
Knowing someone who committed once a crime	Type of offender	2, 112	1.54	.22
	Type of actions	1, 112	0.56	.46
	Interaction	2, 112	0.09	.92
Having committed a crime once in person	Type of offender	2, 112	1.52	.22
	Type of actions	1, 112	0.54	.47
	Interaction	2, 112	0.12	.89