



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

Research Commons

<http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/>

Research Commons at the University of Waikato

Copyright Statement:

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

The thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of the thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from the thesis.

**Perceptions of child pornography and its inherent harm:
Does personality play a role?**

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree
of
Masters of Social Sciences
at
The University of Waikato
by
ANN AITKEN WORTH



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

2016

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	i
List of Tables.....	iv
Abstract	v
Acknowledgements	vi
Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
Literature Review	3
Defining online child pornography	3
The role of the Internet in offending	5
Who are online child pornography offenders?.....	9
Child sexual offending aetiology and cognitive distortions.....	10
The COPINE scale	15
The notion of harm.....	18
Personality and the Five Factor Model	20
The Five Factor Model and online child pornography offending	24
Hypotheses	27
Chapter Two: Method	29
Participants.....	29
Sampling Procedure	30
Design	31
Materials.....	33
Procedure.....	34

Ethical and Cultural Concerns	37
Chapter Three: Results	40
Ranking of the COPINE Scale	40
Differences to COPINE Original Rankings	42
Perception of Harm	43
Explanations for Perception of Harm.....	44
Rating of Harm and Five Factor Model of Personality.....	48
Chapter Four: Discussion.....	49
COPINE Ranking Behaviour	50
Divergence from Original Scale.....	51
Levels Two to Five.....	51
Levels Seven and Eight.....	52
COPINE Typology and Harm.....	54
The Five Factor Model of Personality and Perception of Harm	57
Limitations and Direction for Future Research.....	59
Chapter Five: Conclusion.....	61
Typology Ranking.....	61
Harmfulness	62
Harm Not Linked to Five Factor Model Domains	62
References	63
Appendix A	71
Final Version of Full Survey.....	71

Appendix B	97
Invitation to Participate	97
Appendix C	98
Ethics Approval.....	98

List of Tables

Table 1.....	33
Table 2.....	34
Table 3.....	41
Table 4.....	42
Table 5.....	43

Abstract

This study examined perceptions of inappropriateness of child sexual abuse material, the degree of perceived harm in that material and any relationship the latter had to the Five Factor Model of Personality domains. It examined whether a non-expert audience of university students would use the typology of the 10-level COPINE scale to create a hierarchy of harm or seriousness of offending that aligns with the original. The study found that while the anchors of the scale were ranked in original position, other levels moved in their ranking, representing some disagreement as to whether the COPINE scale adequately represented ascending level of seriousness of offending with regards to the harm caused to the victims

Perception of harm represented to the children depicted in the images was tied to wrongdoing. Participants appeared to link harm to the context in which images were used rather than the content represented

No correlation was found between Five-Factor Model of Personality domains and perception of harm, which may have been due to limitations of the study rather than the lack of any such link.

Results were obtained in an anonymous online survey created using an open-source questionnaire based on Goldberg's (1990, 1992) five-factor construct and plain English textual description of each of the 10 levels of the COPINE scale.

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank my University of Waikato supervisors Dr Armon Tamatea and Jo Thakker as well as Mohi Rua, from the University of Waikato's School of Psychology's Maori and Psychology Research Unit and Leilani Clarke and Sosefo Bourke, the Department of Corrections' Pacific regional advisors.

Thanks also goes to my flatmates, particularly Lynda Flavell, and my friends Shayne and Susan Massey, for all their support and help.

Finally, Percy, without whom this would never have been finished.

Chapter One: Introduction

This study set out to examine the perceptions of inappropriateness of online child sexual abuse material, the degree of perceived harm in that material and what relationship may exist with respondent's personality styles (as measured by the Five Factor Model). It also compared how a non-expert group of university students typologised textual descriptions of child sexual abuse material against the existing typology of the COPINE scale.

American comedian Steven Wright has been credited with saying "It's like the Wild West, the Internet. There are no rules". In this lawless and dynamic environment, it is possible to find almost anything, including material catering to all kinds of deviant sexual interests. This includes what has been called child pornography but might be better described as material depicting the sexualisation and sexual exploitation of children - in short, material depicting child sexual abuse.

The ever changing nature of the Internet means it is hard to estimate how much child pornography is available online at any time, or who and how many users are accessing it, but the material is known to be prolific (Taylor & Quayle 2003). This proliferation of child sexual abuse material, which includes images, video and audio, has focused attention beyond the producers of the media to the users (Quayle 2009). The meteoric rise of the Internet and its associated utility as a means to access and disseminate deviant materials including child pornography had created a growing concern amongst child protection and law enforcement agencies.

In response, the Combating Paedophile Information Networks in Europe Project, known as the COPINE Project, was set up in 1997. It aimed to address

and fill the gaps in understanding around the creation and sharing of abusive images of children on the Internet (Quayle, 2008). As part of that process, the COPINE Project produced the scale of the same name.

The creation of the COPINE scale represents an attempt to provide a typology of child pornography images available on the Internet (Quayle, 2008). It is a standardised assessment tool (Merdian, Thakker, Wilson, & Boer, 2013) made up of 10 levels of escalating victimisation, with the first level of indicative images (non-erotic or non-sexualised images) to the highest level of sadistic or bestiality material. The attention of the Project was always on the victims of such offending and the scale did not attempt to classify the dangerousness of the users of such material (Quayle, 2008), though it has arguably been used to do so.

However, not only has the scale been utilised in ways it was never intended to be, there is also limited work establishing if the levels of the COPINE scale represent ascending seriousness of offending. A study conducted by Merdian (2012) was said to be the first attempt to validate the COPINE typology “as a measure of the 'seriousness' of the depicted scenes” (Merdian, et al., 2013, p.25).

The current study was intended to build on Merdian’s (2012) work, continuing the examination of the COPINE typology, this time with a non-expert audience of university students. However, the current study goes further and examines the idea of harmfulness inherent in the child pornography described by the COPINE scale. Participants were asked if the images classified by each levels of the scale, as converted into plain English, were harmful to the children or adolescents depicted in them. This was paired with a personality questionnaire

based on Goldberg's (1992) markers for the Five Factor Model of Personality to probe any links between this rating of harmfulness and personality domains.

Literature Review

Defining online child pornography

Child pornography on the Internet is a huge and ever-growing problem that is very difficult to police. Despite engaging with the topic of online child pornography from different theoretical bases and outlining many different views, this is one point where the majority of literature on the topic is all but unanimous.

The first question to address is how child pornography is defined and the problem inherent in this description or classification. Media depicting the sexualisation and sexual exploitation of children is commonly known as child pornography, although this has been contested by advocacy groups, who prefer to term the material "abuse images" (Quayle & Jones, 2011). Child pornography is a problematic term, because it carries with it notions of consent, that the child is a willing participant, such as might be assumed to be present in the production of mass market adult pornography, though this is also somewhat contentious (Quayle, 2008). While it should be noted that the public at large can likely differentiate between adult and child pornography (Gillespie, 2011) the problem inherent in the label "child pornography" is that this classification of the abuse images of children may allow us to distance ourselves from the nature of the media (Quayle, 2008). It places a veneer over the reality of abuse and assault that are part of the production of such images. Therefore, child pornography as a term is shunned by many in the child protection arena (Gillespie, 2011). However, despite these problems child pornography is a widely used and accepted term, by law enforcement, in legislation and in academic and research literature.

Furthermore, the term “abuse images” does not reflect the non-sexual images of children that can be, and are, used for sexual gratification (Howitt & Sheldon, 2007) and are covered by the term “child pornography”.

While the common perception of child pornography is that of photographs or videos, it can come in the form of other media, such as audio representations, text, and other types of images, which may include drawings, manipulated photographs or cartoons (Merdian et al., 2013). The current study focused on textual description of images.

The dynamic and shifting nature of the Internet means it is hard to estimate how much child pornography is available at any given time or how many users are accessing it, especially given users and hosts often take measures to protect their anonymity (Taylor & Quayle 2003). However, there are vast amounts of such media available - as an example one United Kingdom-based Internet watchdog, the Internet Watch Foundation, found that in 2014 there were 31,266 URLs hosted on 1694 domains that contained child sexual abuse imagery worldwide. Eighty percent of those images depicted children under 10 years old. (Internet Watch Foundation, 2015). Analysis of material found by two different advocacy groups found between 79% and 83% of the images depicted female children (Elliot & Beech, 2009; Quayle & Jones, 2011). A 2004 New Zealand study found the majority of offenders accessing child pornography selected images of female children who could be described as White or Asian (Carr, 2004). A similar finding was made by Quayle and Jones (2011) who approached an analysis from a different angle by looking at the images available rather than offender preference. Quayle and Jones (2011) randomly selected 10% of the 247,950 images submitted to the Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre

between 2005 and 2009. These were categorised according to gender, age, and ethnic group. They also found the majority of the children depicted in child pornography were white and female (Quayle & Jones, 2011).

The proliferation of such images has focused attention beyond the producers of the media to the users, which has created the concept of an Internet child sex offender (Quayle 2009). Such offenders may also be contact offenders, who have also offended against children offline, or their offending can be limited to the online consumption, collecting and cataloguing of such child pornography media.

The role of the Internet in offending

The Internet has revolutionised how we access information and material of all kinds. This includes pornography. Pornography catering to all forms of sexuality are easily and readily available online (Niveau, 2010). This includes material catering to what is termed deviant sexuality, a form of which is a sexual interest in children. While child pornography is not a new problem or a new crime, the use of technology has changed its incidence (Gillespie, 2011). Paedophilic fantasies are not rare in the general population Niveau (2010) states, drawing on work by Briere and Runtz (1989), Green (2002) and Smiljanich and Briere (1996). Green (2002) notes that sexual arousal patterns to children can be found in a “substantial minority of ‘normal people’” (p.470). Briere and Runtz' (1989) study of 193 male university undergraduate students found 21% had felt sexual attraction to some children. In addition, 9% had experienced sexual fantasies involving children, 5% had masturbated to such fantasies and 7% said there was some likelihood of having sex with a child if it was possible to do so while avoiding detection and punishment. The authors state these results support

the idea that sexual response to children is relatively common in a non-clinical, non-incarcerated males.

Smiljanich and Briere's (1996) study of adult sexual interest in children involving 99 male and 180 female undergraduate university students found that of the males, 22% had experienced sexual attraction to children.

A variety of pornography catering to those that experience sexual arousal to or fantasies of children is available online, such as images and videos. The Internet created an opportunity for what Niveau (2010) calls cyber-pedocriminality. This consists of the online display, exchange, sale and purchase of child pornography (Webb, Craissati, & Keen, 2007) which can also be called pedopornography (Niveau, 2010).

There are a number of ways children can be sexually victimised online. These include by the download of child pornography, by the trading of child pornography, by the production of child pornography and through Internet solicitation of children for contact offences, which is also called grooming (Quayle, 2008). In addition, an offender may threaten to distribute nude images of a child in order to blackmail or coerce them into situations that result in sexual assault (Quayle & Taylor, 2002). Elliot and Beech (2009) link four types of child pornography offenders to this victimisation of children: (a) the "periodically prurient" (p.181), or individuals who access the material impulsively and sporadically, as part of an interest in pornography, including the more extreme material; (b) fantasy-only offenders, who do not have a known history of contact sexual offences against children; (c) direct victimization offenders, who use online opportunities to facilitate later offline contact offences; and, (d)

commercial exploitation offenders, who may have no sexual interest in children but make money from producing or trading images (Elliot & Beech, 2009).

This means that online child sex offending is not limited to the consumption of child pornography alone, nor is this offending limited to those with a fixed sexual preference for children but instead can be part of extreme sexual exploration.

The role of the Internet in online child pornography offending is more than as a medium to access or disseminate offensive material. The Internet sets up a pleasurable stimulus-response situation (Elliot & Beech, 2009.). For offenders accessing child pornography, the primary function is as an aid to sexual arousal for masturbatory purposes. This makes accessing such images highly reinforcing and via conditioning, the act of simply accessing the Internet can also become reinforcing (Quayle, 2008) perpetuating the use of such material.

The term “Internet addiction” (Quayle, Vaughan, & Taylor, 2006, p.2) has been used to reflect problematic use of the Internet such as that exhibited by some child pornography offenders (Niveau, 2010; Quayle et al., 2006). Compulsive or pathological Internet use maintains the online child pornography offending (Elliot & Beech, 2009). While there is some debate whether Internet addiction fits within the parameters of the addiction framework the behavioural symptoms are said to be similar to other impulse control disorders (McCarthy, 2010). As well as a way of relieving sexual tension, accessing the material can also become a means of escape from a more unpleasant reality and a way to indulge fantasies for offenders (McCarthy, 2010). It is also likely that this type of offender is using the Internet to avoid or change negative emotional states, as sexual arousal and orgasm is intrinsically rewarding and a better alternative than unpleasant feelings (Quayle,

Vaughan, & Taylor, 2006). Sex becomes a coping mechanism and a method for solving all manner of problems for these offenders, who likely find dealing with negative emotional states more problematic than other people (Quayle, Vaughan, & Taylor, 2006) as they have less tools or skills at their disposal to do so.

In a study, Caplan (2002) found a number of factors associated with problematic Internet use, or Internet addiction. They were alteration of mood; perceived social benefits and control online; Internet use associated with negative outcomes; compulsive Internet use; excessive time spent online and withdrawal symptoms when away from the Internet. This corresponds closely with what Quayle and Taylor (2002) found to be the psychological functions of accessing child pornography. This makes it difficult to separate out the effects of the problematic material accessed and the Internet use itself. The escalating Internet use of child pornography offenders is not just a function of accessing material that meets sexual needs but because the Internet is meeting other emotional needs (Quayle, Vaughan, & Taylor, 2006). It is likely that these offenders have deficits in interpersonal functioning. The Internet can also provide a social outlet for individuals with intimacy or social deficits, where the online chat related to child pornography provides important and potentially otherwise absent feelings of social cohesion (Quayle & Taylor, 2002) and group justification of offending behaviour. Webb et al. (2007) found that after treatment, some online child pornography offenders still engaged in risky behaviours online, including gambling and increased use of adult pornography, which may suggest problematic use of the Internet in this group.

Some users of child pornography may not be driven by a particular sexual interest in children but instead are exhibiting what has been labelled as Internet

enabled pathology (Young, 2008). This conceptualises acquisition of online child pornography as the next step in deviant online experimentation by those with poor impulse control. This set of users would include the group Elliot and Beech (2009) labelled periodically prurient. When these pornography users become habituated to routine sexual themes they may seek to satisfy their sexual appetite with sexually inappropriate or deviant material (Young 2008).

Studies suggest that online child pornography offenders score highly on measures of impulsivity. When the online environment's playful nature is paired with anonymity, it can have a strong disinhibiting effect on users, diminishing impulse control (Middleton, Elliott, Mandeville-Norden & Beech, 2006). In addition the fact that online sexual pursuits occur within a familiar environment such as work or home may reduce any feelings of risk and encourage offending behaviour (Young, 2008). In such a disinhibiting environment, an individual high in impulsivity may act without thinking, without regard for consequences, making this type of risk taking behaviour more acceptable. In online child pornography, where a child is the victim of the risky decisions, the online environment can be very dangerous (Taylor, Holland, & Quayle, 2001).

Who are online child pornography offenders?

Research into how Internet sex offenders compare to individuals who commit sex offences against children in the offline world is still developing (Quayle, 2008), but there is a growing body of research showing that child pornography users are a heterogeneous group (McCarthy, 2010). However, while the heterogeneity means there was no typical profile of a child pornography offender, there were some likely commonalities: many were white, between the ages of 25 and 50 years old, employed and had education of high school

completion or above (Webb et al., 2007; Wolak, Finkelhor, & Mitchell, 2005; Wolak, Finkelhor, & Mitchell, 2011.). Research had returned mixed results on whether these offenders tended to be in a relationship or not at the time of offending (McCarthy, 2010).

Niveau's (2010) study of Internet child pornography offenders found that many could be diagnosed with personality disorders, with a high rate of fear and anxiety related traits. The Internet has a number of unique features as a medium for accessing and disseminating child pornography (Niveau 2010) that makes it makes it attractive to those with fear and anxiety related personality traits who have significant capacity to fantasise but a strong inhibition to follow through with actual acts (Cohen & Galynker, 2002). These are that the Internet is easily accessible, affordable, unlimited, low risk in terms of the possibility of apprehension and offers unlimited fantasy possibilities (Niveau 2010).

While online child pornography offenders are a heterogeneous group, they do possess some similarities including some demographic features. Many may also possess some fear and anxiety related personality traits, which may make the Internet an attractive vehicle for accessing material to facilitate fantasies.

Child sexual offending aetiology and cognitive distortions

There are a number of aetiological theories about sexual offending against children. It has been suggested that the most contemporary theories are exercises in “theory-knitting” (Elliot & Beech, 2009, p.182), bringing together knowledge. Ward’s (2000, 2002, 2006) body of work is often referred to, which includes Ward and Siegert's (2002) pathways model, which suggests there are a multitude of pathways leading to sexual offending against children. Genes, environment, culture and learning influence the development of five pathways which are:

deficits in intimacy, the distortion of sexual scripts, dysregulation of emotion, antisocial cognitions and multiple dysfunction of the primary psychological mechanisms. In this theory, Ward and Siegert (2002) define a psychological mechanism as a psychological process or a set of processes that produce a specific outcome or effect (Ward & Siegert, 2002). The mechanisms may interact and perpetuate each other, and more than one pathway can be operating at one time. The situational trigger for offending will differ between offenders (Ward & Siegert, 2002). A study by Middleton et al. (2006) examining the applicability of the Pathways Model found that the many, though not all, of the child pornography offenders in their sample could be assigned to at least one of the five pathways.

Ward and Beech (2006) outline the integrated theory of sexual offending, which seeks to unify previous theories. The integrated theory holds that biological factors as well as social learning factors from an individual's environment combine to create an individual's psychological functioning. In addition, that individual's ecological niche – that is, events encountered during their life – affects brain and neurobiological development. In sex offenders, this development of brain, neurobiology and psychological functioning interact to produce clinical phenomena/risk factors for sexual offending behaviour by creating deficits in three primary psychological mechanisms or systems. (Ward & Beech, 2006). These are (a) the motivational/emotional system, where problems with intimacy emerge; (b) the action selection and control system, associated with problems with self-regulation; and, (c) the perception and memory system, where distorted belief systems display, such as distorted sexual scripts and pro-offending attitudes. The factors can act distally, affecting an individual's psychological development,

which may facilitate sexually abusive behaviour, or as proximal triggers to offending (Ward & Beech, 2006).

Studies suggest this model can be applied to non-contact, or fantasy only, Internet child sex offenders as they exhibit the clinical phenomena identified (Elliot & Beech, 2009), though they might manifest in quite specific ways in these offenders.

Each domain of the integrated theory of sexual offending can be examined in regards to Internet-only child sex offenders as a group. In terms of self-regulatory control problems, earlier discussion in this paper looks at how the online environment supports child pornography consumption offending.

In terms of problems within the motivational/emotional system, social difficulties and deficits in relationships with adults can lead to online sexual behaviour by providing sexually stimulating material without any social demands. This can lead to accessing child pornography for those who are curious or who have an established sexual interest in children (Elliot & Beech, 2009). A pseudo-intimacy can develop between some fantasy-only offenders and particular pictures of children. The fantasy world is less intimidating or threatening than initiating or maintaining age-appropriate relationships. These offenders often have a range of traits or deficits that support and perpetuate this behaviour, such as high levels of self-consciousness, low assertiveness, a lack of empathy, low self-efficacy, low self-esteem, feelings of inadequacy, feelings of loneliness and a victim stance (Middleton et al., 2006).

The third domain of clinical phenomena is dysfunctional belief systems supporting offending against children. These are usually called cognitive distortions (Elliot & Beech, 2009). Cognitive distortions feature heavily in

modern theories of sex offending against children, as a mechanism for overriding inhibitions around offending and justifying and explaining the offence (Howitt & Sheldon, 2007). The cognitive distortions can motivate, trigger and justify offending and also ameliorate guilt post-offending.

The integrated model conceptualises cognitive distortions as implicit or core beliefs formed from an offender's experience and desires. Offenders use these implicit theories to explain and predict their own behaviour as well as that of others (Elliot & Beech, 2009) and they are a stable dynamic risk factor of sexual offending against children (Ward & Siegert, 2002).

Ward (2000) outlines five core beliefs involved in sexual offending against children. One of these beliefs is children are sexual beings who can desire and consent to sexual contact with adults (Ward, 2000). Internet-only offenders cannot be differentiated from contact offenders in regards to their level of these cognitive distortion overall but may have higher levels of belief in the specific distortion that children as sexual beings (Howitt & Sheldon, 2007). Howitt and Sheldon's study (2007) found Internet-only offenders were more likely than contact offenders to endorse the cognitive distortions indicating that a child may wish to engage in sexual activities with adults and is competent to make that decision. Howitt and Sheldon (2007) suggest Internet-only offenders may display such distortions because they have not had the experience of abusing children that contact offenders have had, which would likely disabuse them of such distortions.

Ward's (2000) cognitive distortions relate to offenders' global beliefs around sexual abuse of and sexual contact with children, which Howitt and Sheldon (2007) also focused on as a way to lead to, or justify, sexual offending against children. This can include accessing and using online child pornography.

But these may not be the only cognitive distortions encouraging offending behaviour in this group. Taylor and Quayle (2003) also identify offence-level cognitive distortions held by child pornography consuming offenders which may facilitate this behaviour. These include the justification of child pornography as only pictures, the normalisation of offending due to the numbers of others also engaging in the same behaviour and the reduction of the images to mere objects through the collecting process (Taylor & Quayle, 2003).

Elliot and Beech (2009) note that these offence-level distortions interact to support each other. By reducing child pornography images to mere commodities, it supports the formation of the distortion that child pornography images are “just pictures”, ignoring the content of the pictures.

There are many online forums or communities where paedophiles and/or online child pornography offenders can connect with others who reinforce the offending behaviour and the cognitive distortions that go with such behaviour (Quayle & Taylor, 2002). While it can be unclear whether such distortions exist before accessing online child pornography, engagement with online communities supporting this behaviour would reinforce any distortions (Quayle & Taylor, 2002). Colluding with online social networks of online child pornography users can even justify other engagement with children, perhaps including using those children to produce images (Elliot & Beech, 2009). Engagement in this type of social networking not only reinforces or encourages cognitive distortions, it also encourages immediate further offending as child pornography is used as a currency: trading such material establishes status, trust and good will (Quayle & Taylor, 2002).

The COPINE scale

The rise of the Internet and its associated utility as a means to access and disseminate child pornography created growing concern with law enforcement and child protection groups about the victimisation this type of material involved. This gave rise to the COPINE scale, the most “widely accepted psychological measure on child pornography” (Merdian et al., 2013, p.21) in relation to images. The COPINE (Combating Paedophile Information Networks in Europe) Project was a research group then-based at the University College Cork, Ireland. It was created in 1997 to address the gaps in understanding of the creation and use of abusive images of children on the Internet (Quayle, 2008). It was undertaken with close links with law enforcement in the United Kingdom and the United States of America (Quayle & Taylor, 2002).

The focus of the Project was always on the children as the victims of this offending. This focus is demonstrated in the way the images are classified by the COPINE scale. The images are classified on a continuum in terms of the degree or level of victimisation to the children or young people depicted, not in relation to the dangerousness of the offender accessing them (Quayle, 2008).

The scale has gained extensive recognition and has been used in studies and judicial decisions. For instance, in the United Kingdom a decision by the Sentencing Advisory Panel (2002) affirmed that an abridged or adjusted version of the scale has been used to guide sentencing decisions about child pornography offenders (Merdian, et al., 2013). The Sentencing Advisory Panel operates under the authority of the Sentencing Guidelines Council, which issues definitive guidelines which the courts must consider when sentencing offenders (Hebenton, Shaw, & Pease, 2009.) Under the guidelines, before sentencing an offender the court must determine which of three categories the indecent image(s) of a child or

children falls into, which will influence sentencing. While indecent images are not defined in the guidelines, further information is contained in the United Kingdom's Sexual Offences Act 2003. Merdian et al., (2013) describe the content of the Act's Part 6A2 as closely aligned to the COPINE scale. For sentencing purposes it describes five ascending levels of pornographic images of children starting with erotic posing which is Level Five of the original COPINE scale and cumulating in Level 10 of the original scale, sadism or penetration of, or by, an animal (Merdian et al., 2013). This omits the early levels of the original COPINE scale because the images classified under Levels One to Five of the scale are not illegal in the United Kingdom (Long, Alison, & McManus, 2012).

However, this increasing use of the scale by the courts, in both the United Kingdom and other jurisdictions, as a measure of the seriousness of child pornography offences or the danger presented by the offender is problematic (Quayle, 2008). There is no empirical evidence to indicate that the higher levels of the scale is correlated with higher levels of dangerousness, that is, a higher likelihood of the offender committing a contact offence (Quayle, 2008). What is clear is that not all Internet offenders go on to become contact offenders (Quayle, 2008) and that some might access and use online child pornography instead of committing a contact offence (Long et al., 2012).

Furthermore, despite its judicial and academic use, there is limited work establishing if the levels of the COPINE scale appropriately describe or define the content, or if they represent ascending seriousness of offending. In a study conducted by Merdian et al. (2013), the authors attempted to validate the COPINE typology "as a measure of the 'seriousness' of the depicted scenes" (Merdian, et

al., 2013, p.25). This was said to be the first study of the COPINE scale of an evaluating character.

The study was carried out by using text descriptions of each of the levels of the COPNE scale. Participants in the study were either postgraduate psychology students at a New Zealand University or registered psychologists employed with the Department of Corrections. They were asked in an online survey to rate the descriptions of the COPINE levels in order from '1' (i.e., material perceived to have the lowest sexual victimisation of the victim) to '10' (i.e., material that was perceived to have the highest sexual victimisation of the victim) (Merdian, et al., 2013).

The authors described the overall results of this study as supporting the notion that ten levels of the scale are empirically valid and related to image content seriousness; therefore "their inclusion in legal guidelines and for research purposes has merit" (Merdian, et al., 2013, p.32).

But the participants did make two major changes to the scale: Reversing levels Two and Four and reversing levels Seven and Eight. Merdian et al. (2013) suggested that reversal of Two and Four may have to do with the inclusion of nudity in the description of Level Two. In regards to Levels Seven and Eight, while both describe similar material, they differ in the absence or presence of an adult and it seems participants considered the involvement of an adult as less serious than sexual activity committed by the victims themselves (Merdian, et al., 2013).

However, there are limitations to this work, as acknowledged by the authors: it was only a small study, with a total of 84 participants self-selected from a limited audience and 26% of participants did not follow instructions, but

instead allocated the same levels of seriousness to more than one level of the COPINE scale as described in text items. (Merdian, et al., 2013).

The notion of harm

Another acknowledged limitation of the work by Merdian et al. (2013) is that embedded in a content analysis of the COPINE scale there is no empirical validation of the assumptions of the nature of harm in relation to the images. Mirkin (2009) challenged the notion of harm as inherent in all images that fall under the child pornography umbrella, pointing out that many of the images do not depict acts of sexual abuse, or even acts that are harmful to the children depicted. In some cases, the children may not even be aware their photo has been taken (Mirkin, 2009) or the original purpose of the photograph might be for a family album.

However, for some users or viewers of such ostensibly harmless images, arousal is not limited to images that may legally defined as objectionable; context is also important (Merdian et al., 2013). In a study of a small sample of 11 paedophiles Howitt (1995) found the use of explicit child pornography was the exception, not the norm and the participants preferred to view non-naked children in images and video. This result has been echoed by other studies which found that explicit deviant pornography appears to be used by only a minority of child abusers, while others prefer images from innocuous sources, such as clothing catalogues (Niveau, 2010).

Given this preference, Howitt concluded sexual stimulation was related to what was going on in the mind of the offender, not based on overt content (Howitt, 1995) as even non-sexualised images are used by offenders as masturbatory aids (Quayle & Taylor, 2002). Therefore, the sexualisation of the

images can be considered to be a psychological process (Taylor & Quayle, 2003). By including the innocuous images at the lower end of the scale, the COPINE scale recognises that images are sexualised via psychological processes (Taylor & Quayle, 2003).

Because the Internet fosters a sense of privacy and anonymity in users (Cooper, 2002) as mentioned earlier in this paper those with deviant desires may turn to the web to fulfil their desires, believing it to be both risk and victim-free (Taylor & Quayle, 2003). This is supported by the previously discussed cognitive distortion that child pornography images are just pictures, bolstering the belief that consumption and collection of child pornography is not actually hurting anyone and it is therefore not harmful. This is not true, as the children depicted in child pornography are real victims of real crimes. They have been harmed. Dissemination of such material via sharing and sale further victimises these children, and encourages the creation of new material with new victims (Quayle & Taylor, 2003).

The notion of harm is integral in Gray, Young, and Waytz' (2012) discussion of moral judgement. This judgement, these authors contend, is a result of perception. Humans develop a cognitive template for what we call morality, with two key elements: That of harmful intent on the part of one player and suffering and pain on the part of another. The greater the intent to cause harm and the more suffering inflicted, the greater the judgement of immorality. Furthermore, because of the cognitive association binding wrongdoing to harm, people tend to see harm where they see immorality or wrongdoing. (Gray et al., 2012.)

This means that people might view ostensibly harmless images of children as harmful when located in the collection of an online child pornography offender.

Personality and the Five Factor Model

In psychology, personality research has been used to help explain why some people behave as they do or how they view the world. While personality factors are among many which may influence outlook and behaviour, specific personality traits have been linked with certain types of behaviour or viewpoints, including socially deviant behaviour. As such, a consideration of personality is relevant to the current study, particularly in regards to perception of harm. It may be possible that those with particular personality traits perceive harm differently to others with different traits.

The Five Factor Model of Personality (FFM) organises specific personality traits into five domains, based on factor analyses of questionnaire data (Becerra-García, García-Leóna, Muela-Martínez, & Egan, 2013). This framework of these five dimensions of personality traits that describe differences between people has been accepted by the majority of personality traits psychologists and has been shown to replicate across a wide spectrum of cultural regions (Schmitt et al., 2007). It has application in a range of areas, including personnel selection, clinical psychology and studying those who commit offences, including those who sexually offend. Some of the domains have been linked to particular types of offending behaviour (see below), making an examination of the FFM relevant in the context of this study. The two most widely recognised Five-Factor models are that of Goldberg (1990) and McCrae and Costa (1987). The differences between the models are minor and in the naming conventions rather than substantive differences in the content of the five identified domains of

personality traits (Guenole & Chernyshenko, 2005). Those five domains are Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, what McCrae and Costa (1987) call Openness to Experience and Goldberg (1990) calls Intellect, and Neuroticism (McCrae & Costa, 1987), also called Emotional Stability (Goldberg, 1990).

As well as being robust across cultures, the FFM has been found to be robust within genders, and across age groups and languages (Guenole & Chernyshenko, 2005). Many studies have shown some between-gender differences, with women likely to score higher on Agreeableness and Conscientiousness and lower on Emotional Stability and Intellect (Guenole & Chernyshenko, 2005). Overall, the FFM has been shown to have high validity and reliability in studies spanning several decades across varying populations (Ahmetoglu & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2013).

The five domains can be briefly described as follows. Neuroticism is a factor or domain of negative affect. It includes a predisposition to experience a range of negative emotions, such as anger, anxiety, shame and depression. It has been said to predispose people to psychopathology (Costa, Terracciano & McCrae, 2001). It has been described by reference to traits such as worrying, insecurity, self-consciousness and being temperamental (McCrae & Costa, 1987). Neuroticism's negative affect includes the disturbed thoughts and behaviours that go along with emotional distress (McCrae & Costa, 1987). The opposite pole of Neuroticism is Emotional Stability (McCrae & Costa, 1987), which is what Goldberg (1992) chose to name this domain. He does note it is much easier to find English trait adjectives for the Neuroticism pole of Emotional Stability rather than the “positive” (Goldberg, 1992, p.32) pole.

Openness to Experience, or Intellect, can best be summarised as the possession of a tendency to take part in intellectual activities and new experiences, including activities, sensations and ideas. Openness to Experience, was described in early FFM work as relating to an individual's levels of originality, imagination, range of interests, daring and an openness to emotion (McCrae & Costa, 1987). Although this domain has been labelled Intellect by Goldberg (1990), Openness to Experience should not be used as a term interchangeable with intelligence. While the two are likely related in that Openness to Experience may help develop intelligence, or intelligence predispose Openness to Experience, they are different entities. However while these are separate, individuals high in this domain may view themselves, or be viewed by others, as more intelligent (McCrae & Costa, 1987).

Agreeableness is associated with friendly and considerate behaviour as well as behaving in a socially desirable manner (Ahmetoglu & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2013). Agreeableness is often best described by looking at the opposite end of this domain spectrum, which McCrae and Costa (1987) label antagonism. An individual with high levels of antagonism would likely display mistrust, scepticism, callousness, be uncooperative, rude and lacking empathy - in extreme cases, a person with high levels of antagonism may resemble one with sociopathy (McCrae & Costa, 1987).

The domain of Extraversion is linked to an individual's propensity to be outgoing, energetic, sociable and dominant. Extraversion is described by references to adjectives such as sociable, fun-loving and affectionate (McCrae & Costa, 1987). There is broad agreement this domain also includes activity levels, assertiveness and cheerfulness (McCrae & Costa, 1987). Extraversion and

Agreeableness are allied, in that Extraversion can be seen to combine dominance and love, while Agreeableness combines submission and love (Costa, Terracciano, & McCrae, 2001).

The final domain, Conscientiousness, is associated with an individual's level of responsibility, diligence, preparation for the future and self-discipline (Ahmetoglu & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2013). It can be described as a domain that relates to traits such as hardworking, energetic, ambitious, dutiful and scrupulous. A sense of direction is a key part of Conscientiousness, in that the opposite pole was labelled Undirectedness by McCrae and Costa (1987).

While some of the Five-Factor Model domains are described using language that appears value laden, they are not necessarily positive or negative traits unless a person scores at the extreme end of the domains, either extremely low or extremely high in any given domain. In these cases the scores may indicate the presence of traits that are potentially pathological (McCrae & Costa, 1987) and possibly indicating a personality disorder of some kind.

Guenole and Chernyshenko's (2005) New Zealand study found strong support for the validity of the FFM in New Zealand. They used Goldberg's 50-item International Personality Item Pool (IPIP) measure in their study. This was drawn from the IPIP website, which contains multiple public domain personality measure instruments. These include both 50-item and 100-item IPIP measures of the Goldberg (1992) markers for the FFM of personality.

Guenole and Chernyshenko's (2005) found criterion validity for the Five Factor markers in New Zealand, increasing confidence that this model is applicable in the context of this country. The authors found the 50-item IPIP measure had functioned well as a measure of these markers, producing results in

line with overseas research (Guenole & Chernyshenko's, 2005). These results included that New Zealand women scored lower on Emotional Stability and Intellect but higher on Agreeableness and Conscientiousness than men did.

The Five Factor Model and online child pornography offending

The FFM has been used in studies of people who display antisocial behaviour and offending, including those who commit sexual crimes. Some work has looked at links between the FFM and online child pornography users, though that has been limited (Wortley & Smallbone 2012). For example, in a survey of 307 internet users, including 30 self-identified online child pornographer users, Seigfried, Lovely and Rogers (2008) found no difference between the two groups on any of the FFM domains. However, Seigfried-Spellar (2013) found that child pornography offenders had higher scores for Agreeableness than non-consumers, which the author described as an unexpected finding. Due to the paucity of research using the FFM with online child pornography offenders the interpretation of findings has been speculative (Wortley & Smallbone 2012) and further research in this area would be valuable, particularly as there is more information available on FFM in relation to men who commit contact sexual offences against children. For example, a study by Becerra-García, García-León, Muela-Martínez, & Egan (2013) compared sexual offenders to non-offenders and found that as a group, sexual offenders, including those who offended against children, had higher Neuroticism and lower Extraversion when compared with a non-offender control group. Work by Dennison, Stough and Birgden, (2001) also indicated that child sex offenders differed significantly from a non-offender group, with higher levels of Neuroticism and lower levels of Extraversion and Conscientiousness found in the child sex offender group. However, child sex offenders may also

differ from other offenders. For instance, men who had offended sexually against children have been found to be higher in Agreeableness and Conscientiousness when compared to other offenders, but there were no significance differences for the remaining three domains (Egan, Kavanagh & Blair, 2005).

Based on this research, no definitive statements can be made about the link between online child pornography offenders and the FFM. Those who commit contact offenses against children may well exhibit higher levels of Neuroticism and lower levels of Extraversion and Conscientiousness than the general population but it is not clear if this results would also extend to online child pornography offenders. In research that does not focus on the FFM, online child pornography offenders reported lower levels of aggression, hostility and dominance (Magaletta, Faust, Bickart, & McLearen, 2014). In research conducted by Magaletta et al. (2014) using the Personality Assessment Inventory, online child sex offenders reported lower levels of aggression, hostility and dominance than both contact child sex offenders and a normative male sample (Magaletta, et al., 2014.) This raises some interesting possibilities for the FFM. As extraversion is a dominance-related personality trait (Seibert, Miller, Few, Zeichner, & Lynam, 2011), this research may suggest that online child pornography offenders are low in extraversion but such an idea can be only speculative at this stage.

The question of any links between the FFM and online child pornography offending is relevant because it may also help explain what initiates, facilitates or perpetuates such offending. Studies drawing participants from the general population have found that people with higher scores for Neuroticism, and lower for Agreeableness, Conscientiousness and Extraversion had been arrested more often (Becerra-García et al., 2013). In studies, this triad of lower scores has also

been correlated to antisocial personality disorder symptoms, higher aggression and hostility, while low Agreeableness and Conscientiousness have been associated with violent behaviour (Becerra-García et al., 2013).

This data is said to support the proposal that higher Neuroticism and lower Agreeableness and Conscientiousness are related to the two higher order factors of antisocial personality, which are impulsivity and withdrawal (Blackburn, Renwick, Donnelly, & Logan, 2004). The relationship between antisocial behaviour and offending has been established in a number of studies, as has the relationship between psychopathy and offending. (Salekin, Debus, & Barker, 2010.)

The seminal work of Widiger and Lynam in 1998 developed the idea that the domains of Agreeableness and Conscientiousness from the FFM can be negatively correlated with psychopathy - that is, scoring low on both those domains has been correlated with psychopathy. This has been well supported in later studies and may be in line with some earlier personality work. Eysenck's (1991, 1992) personality model opposing the Five-Factor Model had Agreeableness and Conscientiousness collapsed into a single trait named Psychoticism.

Extraversion and Openness to Experience/Intellect may also be negatively correlated to psychopathy, but the evidence for this is less conclusive. Research probing the relationship between psychopathy and Extraversion, Openness to Experience/Intellect and Emotional Stability/Neuroticism returned less clear results than that looking at psychopathy in relation to Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. The mixed and inconclusive results of these studies may be

due to differences at facet/individual trait levels of these domains. (Salekin et al., 2010.)

Hypotheses

Based on this literature, there are three hypotheses for the current study.

They are

1. A majority of participants will start to find harmfulness at the Erotica level of the COPINE scale, consisting surreptitious photographs of children in situations where it is normal to be naked, in underwear or swimwear.

This is Level Three of the COPINE scale. The children or young people depicted are either naked, in underwear or wearing swimwear in safe environments such as play areas. While Mirkin (2009) questioned how an image classified as child pornography can be harmful when no abuse is depicted and the child is not aware it has been taken, this type of image is common in the collections of online child pornography offenders. The cognitive template (mental models developed to interpret the world around a person) discussed by Gray et al., (2012) states that for an action or inaction to be considered immoral, or wrong, it needs to consist of malevolent intent on the part of one individual and harm to the other. Given this cognitive template “harmless” images could become “harmful” in the context of how they are used and where they are found, such as in the collection of child pornography offenders. Many people would consider the use of child pornography as immoral, that is, morally wrong. That makes it likely images found in a collection of a child pornography offender could be seen as harmful to the children or young people depicted even if assessed in isolation, the images would not be considered harmful. It is suggested that this judgement of harm will

start at Level Three rather than Level One because Level Three is the first level to involve photographs taken surreptitiously, potentially prompting a judgement of wrongdoing.

2. As the COPINE levels ascend, or increase, so too will the number of participants who rate images described by that level as harmful to the children/adolescents who might be depicted.

This hypothesis is also linked to the cognitive template binding harm to wrongdoing. Therefore, as the descriptions of the scale levels become more sexual in nature, the more harm will be found to those depicted.

3. Individuals lower in the FFM domains of Agreeableness and Conscientiousness will be more likely to rate the images described by the different levels of the COPINE scale as not harmful than those individuals higher in those traits.

This is based on the literature exploring the idea that lower Agreeableness and Conscientiousness have been associated with violent behaviour, aggression, hostility, antisocial personality disorder and psychopathy (Becerra-García et al., 2013). This suggests that those scoring low in these domains may be less likely to display empathy, likely affecting their perception of harm to others. However, because studies probing potential relationships between other Five Factor Model domains and psychopathy have been inconclusive or produced mixed results (Salekin et al., 2010) all five personality domains will be explored for any potential links or unexpected correlations of any kind.

Chapter Two: Method

Participants

The participants in this study were a self-selected sample of University of Waikato students studying at both undergraduate and postgraduate level. This group was selected because the study involved text descriptions of typologies of child pornography and asked participants to reflect on questions related to this. Some psychology students may have an academic interest in the psychological aspects of crime and offenders, including sex offenders, and may have already been introduced to such topics through papers they have studied. This meant they may be likely to find such a study less distressing or confronting than those without any experience or interest in this type of topic and may have been more likely to choose to take part in the survey. Approximately 137 electronic surveys were collected from 137 participants but 43 of the surveys were incomplete and excluded from analysis. One participant's data was excluded because they identified that they were not a university student and therefore outside the scope of this study. Of the remaining participants ($n = 93$), 89% ($n = 83$) were female and 11% ($n = 10$) were male. The participants ranged in age, which was measured in bands. A majority of 73% ($n = 68$) were aged 18 to 24 years old, while 10% ($n = 9$) were 25 to 30 years old, 7% ($n = 6$) were 31 to 35 years old, 4% ($n = 4$) were 36 to 40 years old, 2% ($n = 2$) were 41 to 45 years old and 4% ($n = 4$) were 45 to 50 years old. Regarding ethnicity, 74% ($n = 69$) identified as New Zealand European, 19% ($n = 18$) identified as New Zealand Maori, 3% ($n = 3$) identified as Pacific, 3% ($n = 3$) identified as Asian, and 12% identified as 'other'. Of this group, 3% ($n = 3$) identified as South African, 1% ($n = 1$) identified as American, 1% ($n = 1$) identified as Canadian, 1% ($n = 1$) identified as European, 1% ($n = 1$)

identified as German, 1% ($n = 1$) identified as Kiwi, 1% ($n = 1$) identified as New Zealander, 1% ($n = 1$) identified as South American, and 1% ($n = 1$) identified as United Kingdom European.

All participants were University of Waikato students, 91% ($n = 85$) at undergraduate level and 9% ($n = 8$) at postgraduate level.

Almost all ($n = 89$) of participants had no experience in the treatment and/or assessment of sexual offenders, while 4% ($n = 4$) did. Of those four, one had experience in the police force, one had worked as a Youth Justice Social Worker, one had worked at a prison with offenders and one had observational experience. As the COPINE scale has not been formally used in New Zealand, these four participants were not excluded from analysis.

Sampling Procedure

Participants self-selected to be part of this study by responding to electronic invitations to University of Waikato students to participate. Participation was not limited to psychology students, but invitations to participate were only posted on electronic forums open to psychology students. An invitation to participate in the study was posted on a page open to all psychology students on the University of Waikato's internal website Moodle. The invitation was also posted on Facebook, on the Waikato Psychology Student's Association page. Email invitations to participate were sent to all enrolled psychology students, at both undergraduate and graduate level. As the initial response numbers were low, another invitation was posted on Moodle and emailed in June, with the additional offer of 1% course credit for three of the University of Waikato's undergraduate psychology papers. In August, another invitation to participate offered 1% course

credit for four more University of Waikato undergraduate psychology papers, provided respondents had not already completed the survey.

While self-selection meant the sample would not necessarily be reflective of the demographics of University of Waikato psychology students, the nature of the material in the study made this method of selection important as discussed above.

Design

This study examined the relationship between personality domains and perceptions of inappropriateness of child sexual material and degree of perceived harm in that material. It was carried out using the COPINE scale as a typology of child pornography, which it is frequently used thus (Meridian et al., 2013). A study by Meridian (2012) helped validate the scale as representing ascending seriousness of offending.

The personality component of this study was based on the Five Factor Model of Personality, measured by a personality scale made up of 100 questions. This scale was taken from the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP) website. This site contains a collection of personality measures in the public domain. The measure used was the 100-item IPIP representation of the Goldberg (1992) markers for the Five Factor Model of Personality. The five domains the measure was designed to correlate with are those of Intellect (Openness to Experience), Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness and Emotional Stability (Neuroticism). The Five-Factor Model is accepted by many researchers to be an appropriate categorisation of individual differences and numerous personality tests have been created based on the FFM (Beng-Chong & Ployhart, 2006). However, many of these test instruments are proprietary and where research

projects are constrained by budget, reliance on propriety tests may hinder such work due to costs (Beng-Chong & Ployhart, 2006). The various IPIP tests available on their website offer a viable alternative.

Beng-Chong and Ployhart (2006) assessed the equivalence of Goldberg's 50-item IPIP scale to the NEO-FFI, a shorter item of the NEO-PR-I, the "primary instrument" (p.33) developed to measure the FFM domains. They found a good fit for the FFM underlying the IPIP scale as well as evidence of the convergent and discriminate validity of the scales. They also found evidence for the interchangeability of the IPIP scale with the NEO-FFI.

Gow, Whiteman, Pattie and Deary (2005) found the IPIP Big Five factor markers correlate highly with the relevant scales of the NEO-FFI and the EPQ-R, saying this provided concurrent validity for the IPIP scale.

While the work in these two studies (Beng-Chong & Ployhart, 2006, Gow et al., 2005) was conducted using the 50-item measure of Goldberg's FFM domains, the validity and interchangeability extends to the 100-item scale as the two scales are highly correlated (Beng-Chong & Ployhart, 2006). See Table 1 for characteristics of the 100-item scale.

Table 1

Characteristics of the Preliminary IPIP Scales Measuring the Big-Five Domains

Big Five Domain	Number of Items	Mean Item Intercorrelation	Coefficient Alpha	Correlation with Markers
Extraversion	20	.34	.91	.76 [.84]
Agreeableness	20	.28	.88	.57 [.65]
Conscientiousness	20	.27	.88	.74 [.84]
Emotional Stability	20	.35	.91	.74 [.81]
Intellect	20	.32	.90	.69 [.77]
Total/Mean	100	.31	.90	.70 [.78]

Notes. Values in brackets are correlations corrected for unreliability; these may be underestimates, given that the reliabilities of the factor markers were assumed to be the same as those of their corresponding IPIP scales.

Adapted from International Personality Item Pool. (2015). Retrieved March 13, 2015.

Guenole and Chernyshenko (2005) found the 50-item version of this measure had good predictive validity in the New Zealand study and functioned well, producing results in line with overseas research.

Materials

An online survey was created with the website <http://www.qualtrics.com/> using the COPINE scale and the FFM of personality. The full survey is contained in Appendix A. The link to the survey was included in all invitation to participate. Examples of the invitations to participate are contained in Appendix B and all

participants used Internet enabled devices of their choice to complete the survey. No data was collected about this. All information collected was exported by Qualtrics and analysed using SPSS predictive analytics software.

Procedure

Potential participants were given an IP address that led to the electronic survey. The first screen was an information sheet. To begin the survey, participants had to indicate consent by selecting that option. This began the survey. The initial questions collected demographical information, including gender, age ranges, ethnicity, student status and if participants had any experience in the treatment and/or assessment of sexual offenders.

Participants were then asked to sort text descriptions of child pornography from the least intrusive to the most severe form. The text descriptions were taken from the descriptions of the COPINE scale that had been converted into plain English (see Table 2).

Table 2

COPINE typology with added translation into plain English

Original headings	Original description	Description (plain English)
Level 1: Indicative	Non-erotic, non-sexualised pictures of children in underwear, swimming, playing out of commercial sources, family pictures. Context or organisation of pictures indicates inappropriateness	Pictures of normally dressed children and/or teenagers in daily-life situations (e.g., kids playing, school pictures). These pictures could be from catalogues, commercials, family albums, or brochures.
Level 2: Nudist	Naked or semi-naked children in appropriate nudist settings, legitimate sources	Pictures of children and/or teenagers in daily-life situations where it is normal to be naked, or in underwear or swimwear.

Level 3: Erotica	Surreptitiously taken photographs of children in play areas or other safe environments showing either underwear or varying degrees of nakedness	This could be on the beach or in a bathtub. These pictures could be from catalogues, commercials, family albums, or brochures. Pictures of children and/or teenagers in daily-life situations where it is normal to be naked, or in underwear or swimwear. This could be on the beach or in a bathtub. These pictures were taken without the child and/or teenager knowing it.
Level 4: Posing	Deliberately posed pictures of children where amount, context and organization suggests sexual interest	Pictures where the child and/or adolescent knowingly pose for the camera but the picture is not “sexy” on its own.
Level 5: Erotic posing	Deliberately posed pictures in sexualised or provocative poses.	Pictures where the child and/or adolescent knowingly pose for the camera, in order to be “sexy”. For example, they might pretend to be model, a filmstar, or a pornography actor/actress.
Level 6: Explicit erotic Posing	Emphasising genital areas, regardless if clothed or naked	Pictures of children and/or teenagers where the main attention is on a boy’s penis and a girl’s vagina and/or breasts.
Level 7: Explicit sexual Activity	Touching, mutual or self masturbating, oral sex and intercourse by child, no adult involvement	Pictures of children and/or adolescents engaged in a sexual activity, either alone or with other children/adolescents. They might touch each other, masturbate, have oral sex, or sexual intercourse.
Level 8: Assault	Children as subject of sexual assault- including digital touching, involving an adult	Pictures of children and/or adolescents where the child/adolescent touches an adult or an adult touches the

Level 9: Gross assault	Grossly obscene pictures of sexual assault, involving penetrative sex, masturbation or oral sex	child/adolescent in a sexual way. Pictures of children and/or adolescents engaged in a sexual activity with an adult. They might masturbate, have oral sex, or sexual intercourse.
Level 10: Sadistic/bestiality	(a) child tied, bound, beaten, whipped, or other pain implied (b) animal involved in sexual relation	(a) Pictures of children and/or adolescents where they experience pain. For example, the child/adolescent might be tied, bound, beaten, or whipped. (b) Pictures of children and/or adolescents where they engage in a sexual activity with an animal. They might masturbate, have oral sex, or sexual intercourse over or with an animal.

Note. Adapted from Merdian (2012).

For each of the text descriptions, participants were asked how harmful (or not) they would consider this scenario to be for the children/adolescents who might be depicted in this kind of image. Level 10 of the scale describes two types of image, so these were separated into two questions in this section of the survey. Participants were then asked to summarise the reason for this answer.

Finally, participants were asked a series of 100 personality questions with a five-point Likert scale of possible responses, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. These questions assessed five personality trait domains of Intellect, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness and Emotional Stability. This personality scale was scored using the information on the IPIP website. Each domain was measured with 20 questions, including both positive

and negative keyed items. The latter were reverse scored during analysis. The domain of Extraversion had 10 positive keyed items and 10 negative. The domain of Agreeableness had 14 positive keyed items and six negative. The domain of Conscientiousness had 11 positive keyed items and nine negative. The domain of Emotional Stability had five positive keyed items and 15 negative. The final domain, that of Intellect, had 13 positive keyed items and seven negative.

Ethical and Cultural Concerns

The research was approved by the University of Waikato's Human Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, as contained in Appendix C. The study presented a number of potential ethical issues. Due to the nature of the material being studied, it was anticipated that participants may feel some discomfort or distress. In an attempt to keep this to a minimum, a clear description of the type and area of questions was provided both in the invitation to participate and the information form at the beginning of the survey, with the expectation that anyone who may find this research too distressing would self-select out. Every invitation to participate in the online survey contained the following information: "There are textual descriptions of sexual activities and/or behaviours with children. Some of the description may be upsetting so please do not volunteer to take part in if you feel you do not wish to be exposed to this topic". This information was also included in the information sheet presented online to participants as the first screen at the beginning of the survey. The information form at the beginning of the survey also noted that it was possible to exit the browser at any stage of the survey. Information from surveys where participants exited before completion was excluded from analysis.

The information sheet at the beginning of the electronic survey was followed by a series of questions to indicate consent. If participants did not consent to any questions in this section (indicated by clicking 'disagree'), they were directed away from the survey and could not continue. While IP addresses were not collected as part of the survey results, the system prevented unique browsers completing the survey more than once.

Details for potential sources of support were given at the end of the study. These were the phone numbers for Lifeline, Rape Crisis and the counselling service offered to students by the university.

Due to a desire to be culturally inclusive, feedback on the proposed survey and study design was sought from the University of Waikato's School of Psychology's Maori and Psychology Research Unit and the Department of Corrections' Pacific regional advisors to minimise any such problems with these specific cultural groups. There was some concern these groups may self-select out of the survey due to the type of subject matter dealt with in the study.

Consultation was undertaken with Mohi Rua, from the School of Psychology's Maori and Psychology Research Unit and Leilani Clarke and Sosefo Bourke, both Department of Corrections Pacific regional advisors. All three indicated that Maori and Pacific groups may prefer face to face contact rather than an electronic survey. To cater for this, an invitation was added to the information sheet at the beginning of the survey, to contact the author directly via email if they would prefer to take the survey in person. Had they chosen to do so, identifying details would not have been collected or stored in any way. However, no potential participants contacted the author expressing a desire to complete the survey in this manner.

Chapter Three: Results

This section presents the results of the analysis of participants' data, looking at how they ranked the typology of the COPINE scale, how that differs to the original scale and their perception of the harm inherent in the material described by the scale. It also looks at any correlation between personality domains and perception of harm.

Ranking of the COPINE Scale

Participants were asked to sort text descriptions of child pornography from least intrusive to most severe form using the 10 levels of the COPINE scale that had been converted into plain English (see Table 2 above). Participants' ranking were converted into percentages for each level of the COPINE scale (see Table 3) so that results could be compared to original scale. Modes were also calculated to compare to the original scale (see Table 4).

Table 3

Participants' Ranking of the COPINE Scale Levels by Percentages

	COPINE scale level									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Participants' ranking	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Level 1	78	0	2	6	1	0	1	1	0	10
Level 2	3	30	9	37	6	1	1	3	9	0
Level 3	1	31	20	22	10	2	7	3	2	12
Level 4	2	12	26	14	31	6	1	7	1	0
Level 5	1	9	29	3	37	14	1	3	0	2
Level 6	1	5	7	3	7	59	2	14	0	2
Level 7	1	3	5	2	5	15	10	53	1	5
Level 8	1	8	2	1	1	2	49	13	13	9
Level 9	0	1	0	11	1	0	23	1	52	10
Level 10	10	1	0	0	1	1	3	1	22	60

Note. Percentages rounded to exclude decimal places

Table 4

Modes of Participants' Ranking of the COPINE Scale Levels

COPINE scale level	Mode of participants' rankings
1	1
2	3
3	5
4	2
5	5
6	6
7	8
8	7
9	9
10	10

Differences to COPINE Original Rankings

The results show that the current study participants' rankings clearly differed in some respects to the original COPINE scale. Level Four is repositioned as Level Two in participants' ranking. In these new rankings, the original Level Two moves to Level Three and the original Level Three to Level Four. The mode of both Level Five and Level Three is the same at five. However, looking to the percentages, Level Five has greater support for its original position (37% compared to 29% for Level Three) so Level Three would become Level Four in this new ranking.

Some 49% of participants ranked the original Level Seven of the COPINE scale as Level Eight and a clear majority (53%) ranked Level Eight as Level Seven. This reversal is confirmed by the modes of those levels' rankings, with the original Level 7 re-ranked to Level 8 and the original Level 8 re-ranked to Level Seven.

Of the 84 people who completed the ranking exercise, seven people appeared to have ranked the scale in reverse from most harmful to least harmful. However, as that cannot be determined, their results were included in analysis.

Perception of Harm

For each level of the COPINE scale, participants were asked “How harmful (or not) would you consider this scenario to be for children/adolescents who might be depicted in this kind of image?” The results of this is displayed in Table 5.

Table 5

Participants' Rating of Harmfulness

COPINE scale level	% rated harmful	% rated not harmful	% rated unsure
Level 1	6	6	11
Level 2	18	43	39
Level 3	55	16	29
Level 4	7	69	23
Level 5	61	11	29
Level 6	89	1	10
Level 7	97	0	3
Level 8	100	0	0
Level 9	100	0	0
Level 10a	99	0	1
Level 10b	99	1	0

Note. Percentages rounded to exclude decimal places

There were two hypotheses about the findings of harmfulness. The first was that higher COPINE levels will correlate with a higher number of participants

who rate images described by that level as harmful. The second was that a majority of participants will start to find harm at Level 3 of the COPINE scale

As was hypothesised, a majority (55%) of respondents started finding harmfulness at Level Three. However, the finding of harm did not follow a strictly linear path, with many participants (69%) rating the images described in Level Four as not harmful, which possibly reflects the repositioning of that level within the scale by participants. From Level Five to Level Eight ratings of harmfulness increased as predicted, hitting 100% at Level Eight and staying there for Level Nine. However, the rating of harmfulness decreased to 99% for Levels 10a and 10b.

Explanations for Perception of Harm

Participants were then asked to summarise their reasons for rating each level of the COPINE scale as harmful, not harmful to the children/adolescents depicted, or why they were unsure.

In regards to Level One, the majority of participants answered that they did not believe these images were harmful, with many participants using the words “normal”, “daily life” or “everyday” to describe the images.

Some respondents identified that context was important, as the way the images were perceived depended on who was looking at them.

“I would like to think of this as non-harmful as they are just regular (non-sexual) photos. [B]ut there is still the potential for these to be harmful in the wrong hands.”

The most ratings of unsure were given in Level Two than any other level, with a large percentage (39%) unsure if the images described were harmful or not harmful. While a number of respondents again identified that this type of picture

was “normal” many referred to nudity as potentially problematic if the images were available outside the context of family photographs. Context and use was identified as important.

“Naked pictures from personal albums can be harmful if they are shown to the wrong people but kept within the family seems not harmful”.

“Not harmful but dependant on who took the pics and for what purpose. This question could go into the harmful category depending on these factors.”

Another respondent noted that culture may play a role in the perception or whether or not such images would be harmful.

“We really have to consider culture here. I have been various places around the world where in some countries this is acceptable and normal while others completely inappropriate.”

More than half of the participants rated Level Three as harmful (55%), while only 16% viewed it as not harmful. Many participants discussed the idea that the intent of taking or using the photograph was important.

Others found the lack of knowledge the photograph was being taken clearly problematic, as expressed by one participant who wrote “I feel this is normal but the fact that the kids/teens don't know these photos are being taken then that's not ok”.

Others were unsure. One participant wrote: “It is a breach of privacy for the young person as I think the most concerning fact is that it is taking a photo of the child or adolescent which they did not know about whilst they were in whatever state of undress. But then if the child did not know about the pictures it can't really be harmful for them? I'm a little bit unsure on this one because there

is a bit of a fine line between normalizing our bodies and sexualising them and it would be up to the viewer of the photo how that is depicted.”

In contrast to Level Three, a clear majority (69%) found Level Four to be not harmful, while only 7% found it harmful. Again participants described this as “normal” and “everyday” images, such as “normal photos of young people don't seem to be harmful” though many noted that their answer might be dependent on what the way the photograph is used.

One participant summarised the answer as “photos of children are normal, but if someone is using them in an inappropriate way there is a problem.” Another participant wrote “pictures can always be warped into having sexual connotations for someone that is trying to do so, so I would still emphasise privacy and assuring the pictures are not available to those who would do this.”.

In regards to Level Five, 61% of participants found it harmful, while 11% found it not harmful. Almost 29% were unsure. Study participants used words like “inappropriate” or noted that children should not be depicted or posed in this way. While some still wrote it might depend on context, intent or use of the pictures, less respondents noted this than previous levels.

A number of participants mentioned that this may be children imitating what they see on television by celebrities they admire. In one answer, a participant wrote that “[c]hildren idolize pop culture icons and posing can be a form of imaginative play for the child.”

At Level Six, 89% of participants rated the images harmful, while only 1% rated them as not harmful. 10% were unsure. These picture were described as “inappropriate”, “disturbing” and many participants reflected that sexualising and

objectifying children was inherently wrong such as saying “[h]armful because [it] is sexualizing [a] child”.

Almost all participants (97%) found the images described in Level Seven of the COPINE scale to be harmful, while 3% were unsure. None rated the images as not harmful. Participants described it as “inappropriate” and “abuse”.

One participant summarised their reason for finding it harmful as “[t]he act is abuse, documenting it compounds the abuse and leaves the child vulnerable long term, through publication of the image or further fantasies being built around the child and then acted upon.”.

Some participants suggested that while it may be developmentally appropriate for children to engage in this behaviour with each other, recording it through photographs or video turned it into abuse. Many wrote that sexual activity was not appropriate for children or adolescents at all.

All participants (100%) found the images described in Level Eight of the COPINE scale to be harmful. It was described as “abuse”, a “violation” and “wrong” and likely to have ongoing negative effects for the child or adolescent. One participant described it as “[e]xtremely harmful, as children should not engage or be involved or exposed to such behaviour. Neither should pictures be taken or shared. That just causes further harm after the incident has taken place.”

At Level Nine of the COPINE scale, participants were also unanimous that the images were harmful and when summarising their reasons for this used descriptive words including “disturbing”, “wrong”, “abusive”, “disgusting” and “rape”.

As Level 10 of the COPINE scale contains two different descriptions of image typology, these were separate questions.

For Level 10a, almost all (99%) rated the images as harmful, with the single remaining response (1%) unsure. A response stating “Obviously the worst kind of sexual abuse” seemed typical of the reasons expressed for finding harm.

In regards to Level 10b, only one participant (1%) found the images not harmful while 99% rated them harmful. The reason given for not finding harm was somewhat contradictory and seemed instead to explain why it was harmful, perhaps reflecting a misunderstanding of the question. It was: “Not harmful because engaging in sexual activity with an animal is wrong. Animal should not experience this kind of pain.”

For those that did rate the images as harmful they described it as abuse of both the child and the animal, “wrong”, “awful” and “disgusting”.

Rating of Harm and Five Factor Model of Personality

The third hypothesis stated that individuals lower in Agreeableness and Conscientiousness would be more likely to rate the images as not harmful than those individuals higher in those traits. This was not supported by the findings of the current study, with no significant correlation found between these variables.

Chapter Four: Discussion

The COPINE scale, produced by the research group behind the COPINE Project, is the most widely accepted psychology measure of child pornography (Merdian, 2012). It is a psychological tool which provides a standardised assessment of the material found in the collections of online child pornography offenders for the purposes of treatment. A modified version of the COPINE scale is used to guide sentencing of child pornography offenders in the United Kingdom.

The COPINE scale does not purport to be an objective measure of indecency; indeed, the incorporation of only an abbreviated form of the original scale into United Kingdom sentencing guidelines was criticised for making it appear as if there was an objective measure (Gillespie, 2003). The COPINE scale was never intended to be a measure of indecency or a censorship guide and is not organised based on this. Rather the images are classified on a continuum in terms of the degree or level of victimisation to the children or young people depicted (Quayle, 2008). Merdian et al. (2013) criticised this saying it includes “assumptions of the nature of harm in relation to the images that are not based on empirical validation” (p.32). While the COPINE scale is frequently used as a typology in studies involving child pornography (Merdian et al., 2013) there has been limited work aimed at exploring or establishing if the levels of the COPINE scale represent ascending seriousness of offending. In a study conducted by Merdian (2012), the author attempted to validate the COPINE typology “as a measure of the 'seriousness' the depicted scenes” (Merdian, et al., 2013, p.25). This was said to be the first study of the COPINE scale of an evaluating character.

Meridian et al. (2013) noted this was an important area of study because the COPINE scale is used for legal purposes and academic and scientific studies. The current study replicated a number of the conditions in Meridian's study with some important distinctions.

Meridian had limited participation to psychologists employed by the Department of Corrections and postgraduate psychology students. Meridian found a significant correlation with the original scale ($r_s = .952, p < .001$) but found participants reversed levels Two and Four, as well as levels Seven and Eight.

COPINE Ranking Behaviour

The current study extended participation to University of Waikato students only. Even with this non-expert audience, the results were very similar to that of Meridian (2012) in regards to the ranking of the COPINE scale

Based on both the extracted modes and percentages, participants' ranking of the COPINE scale resulted in the following order:

Level One

Level Four

Level Two

Level Three

Level Five

Level Six

Level Eight

Level Seven

Level Nine

Level 10

Divergence from Original Scale

Levels Two to Five

The first major departure from the original scale in the results of the current study was the repositioning of Level Four to Level Two, and the corresponding move of the original Level Two to Level Three and the original Level Three to Level Four. The mode of both Level Five and Level Three has them vying for the Level Five spot but looking to the percentages, Level Five has greater support for its original position (37% compared to 29% for Level Three) so Level Three would become Level Four in this new ranking. This ranking activity in the current study is similar to the results of Merdian's (2012) work, though in that study Levels Two and Four were simply reversed. The reason for this re-ranking in the current study likely lies in the text descriptions of the levels.

The description of Level Two is: Pictures of children and/or teenagers in daily-life situations where it is normal to be naked, or in underwear or swimwear. This could be on the beach or in a bathtub. These pictures could be from catalogues, commercials, family albums, or brochures.

Level Three is: Pictures of children and/or teenagers in daily-life situations where it is normal to be naked, or in underwear or swimwear. This could be on the beach or in a bathtub. These pictures were taken without the child and/or teenager knowing it.

Level Four is as follows: Pictures where the child and/or adolescent knowingly pose for the camera but the picture is not “sexy” on its own.

The difference between the text description of Level Two and that of Level Three and Level Four is the latter two both include nudity, albeit in situations where that is normal, and it seems participants viewed this as more serious. In a study looking at broadcasting standards in New Zealand, Hill and

Zwaga (2001) examined attitudes towards the broadcasting of “innocent nudity” (p.152) without sexual components, such as teenage boys removing their clothing and swimming naked. They found that 39% of people found this acceptable, but 44% found it unacceptable. (Hill & Zwaga, 2001). It may be that New Zealanders do find the depictions of nudity unacceptable, even without sexual connotations. As the majority of participants in the current study identified as New Zealand European (74%, $n = 69$) or New Zealand Maori (19%, $n = 18$), this may have influenced their ranking of the scale, with nudity considered more harmful. Potential cultural differences in attitudes to nudity were noted by one of the study participants. When asked to explain their rating for the images that fall under Level Three of the COPINE scale as harmful or not to the children/adolescents depicted, the participant noted that: “I have been various places around the world where in some countries this is acceptable and normal while others completely inappropriate.”

In addition, nakedness can be associated with obscenity and immorality and there has been an increased trend for naked representation that might once have been viewed as nonsexual to be sexualized or eroticized (Cover, 2003). In the same way that participants may have been primed to find harm because the topic of the survey was child pornography (discussed below) they may have been primed to sexualise nudity or consider it obscene, immoral or unacceptable in this context.

Levels Seven and Eight

In the current study, some 49% of participants ranked the original Level Seven of the COPINE scale as Level Eight. The second most popular ranking for Level Seven was as Level Nine, with 23% of participants choosing this position.

Only 10% of participants ranked Level Seven in the same position as the original scale. A clear majority (53%) ranked Level Eight as Level Seven. Interestingly, the second most popular ranking was for Level Eight was as Level Six, with 14% of participants selecting this ranking, though it was followed closely by Level Eight (13%), the position it occupies in the original scale. It seems clear that many participants did not consider Level Eight belonged in its actual position on the COPINE scale.

The text description of levels Seven and Eight are as follows:

Level Seven: Pictures of children and/or adolescents engaged in a sexual activity, either alone or with other children/adolescents. They might touch each other, masturbate, have oral sex, or sexual intercourse.

Level Eight: Pictures of children and/or adolescents where the child/adolescent touches an adult or an adult touches the child/adolescent in a sexual way.

Given these descriptions it seems clear that participants viewed touching in a sexual way between an adult and the young person as less harmful to the young people depicted than sexual activity between young persons. This may be because the text description of Level Seven explicitly goes beyond touching to include masturbation, oral sex and sexual intercourse. It may be that participants also considered it would be more harmful to the child or young person's ongoing wellbeing to take an active role in their own victimisation or to become an abuser of other victims as suggested by Merdian (2012) in regards to a similar reversal found in her study. While it might be less harmful in terms of ranking, all participants considered the images that make up Level Eight of the COPINE scale as harmful. However, only 97% of participants ranked Level Seven's images as

harmful, with 3% unsure. These harmful ratings correspond more closely with the original COPINE scale, making it curious that the levels were reversed in the rankings. It is perhaps accounted for in that slightly more people completed the questions on harmfulness ($n = 94$) than ranked the scale ($n = 87$).

It is possible that using the original titles of the scale levels (see Table 2) with the plain text descriptions may have altered ranking behaviour, as those titles do offer further guidance to what the levels consist of. However, it seems clear that participants in this study did not typologise textual descriptions of child sexual abuse material in the same way as the COPINE scale, with several levels ranked in different position than they occupy in the original COPINE structure. This may mean that in the eyes of this non-expert group the COPINE scale does not validly represent ascending levels of seriousness of child pornography offending as it stands.

COPINE Typology and Harm

The current study went beyond the ranking activity to look at whether or not participants found each level of the COPINE scale harmful to the children/adolescents who might be depicted in the images, not harmful or were unsure.

By the way it is constructed, the COPINE scale acknowledges arousal is not limited to images that are legally objectionable. The scale is a psychological rating measure and as such, it recognises that context impacts how viewers perceive an image (Meridian, 2012). When assessing the images contained in the collections of online child porn offenders, it is not just the content of images that can give rise to concern, it is where those images are stored, how they are organised, or the themes which they illustrate (Taylor & Quayle, 2003). This

means that the images in the early levels of the scale may include those that would not be out of place in a family photography album. In fact both Levels One and Two of the COPINE scale consist of pictures from legitimate sources, which would include family pictures, as well as commercial sources, such as advertising catalogues and commercials. It is the context or organisation of the pictures that indicates inappropriateness when they are found as part of a collection of an online child pornography. This also attempts to capture those online child pornography offenders who prefer apparently innocuous images to explicit images, which may be a large group (Howitt, 1995).

Given this, it was considered unlikely for participants to find harmfulness at the earliest levels of the scale, as was reflected in the results. A majority started to find harmfulness at Level Three, as hypothesised, though this was reversed in Level Four before climbing again from Level Five onwards.

Many online child pornography offenders may justify the consumption and collection of such material by reasoning it is a “victimless crime” as the images are already in existence. However, it is clear this is not true, as the children depicted in child pornography are real victims who are further victimised by dissemination of such material. Furthermore, consumption of child pornography creates a demand maintaining a market for documenting primary victimisation of children (Magaletta et al., 2014).

Child pornography is viewed with abhorrence by many and is classified as wrongdoing legally and arguably morally by a large section of society. This was expressed by participants in the current study, with many noting that that sexualising and objectifying children was inherently wrong. To classify something as wrongdoing, Gray et al. (2012) argue that humans employ a cognitive template

with two key elements: That of harmful intent on the part of one player and suffering and pain on the part of another. The greater the intent to cause harm and the more suffering inflicted, the greater the judgement of immorality. Given that the cognitive template binds wrongdoing to harm, people tend to see harm where they judge immorality or wrongdoing to be present. (Gray et al., 2012.)

By using this template “harmless” images could become “harmful” in the context of how they are used and where they are found, such as in a text description of a scale assessing the type of images found in the collections of child pornography offenders. That this was the purpose of the COPINE scale was stated in the current study’s information sheet at the beginning of the study, so participants may have been primed to find harm early on.

Mirkin (2009) challenged the notion of harm as inherent in all images that fall under the child pornography umbrella, because as is clear in the COPINE scale, many of the images do not depict acts of sexual abuse, or even acts that are harmful to the children depicted. Furthermore, in some cases, the children may not even be aware their photo has been taken, so there can be no harm Mirkin (2009) argues. However in contrast, the hypothesis suggesting harm would be found from Level Three onwards suggested it was likely to be fixed to this point because it was the first level to involve photographs taken surreptitiously. It is expressly stated that these photographs were taken in situations where it would be normal to be naked, in swimwear or underwear, so there is no suggestion of abuse in these images. That the surreptitiousness of the photographs could create harm did seem to be reflected in participants' responses in the current study. In explaining their reasons for rating levels of the scale as harmful or not harmful to the children depicted in the images, a number of participants grappled with the

idea of privacy and whether harm could occur if the children didn't know their pictures were being used in this manner. This was primarily in regard to the lower levels of the scale and included responses such as:

In response to Level Two. "If they don't know what their pictures are being used for then I don't see them being impacted, unless the posing leads to abuse further down the track."

However, many participants located the harmfulness to the children or adolescents depicted in the images in the way the picture was used, not the intention in taking the picture or its nature. Discussing level two of the COPINE scale, one participant noted that "[t]he nature of the picture is mostly irrelevant. The prospect of causing the child harm is governed by the way that the picture is used. For example, if it is associated with any form of sexual gratification then it is likely to cause harm, because the picture was not taken with consent or the intention of being sexualised."

Overall, participants identified that the context and use of the images were vital considerations when assessing harm, particularly when nudity was depicted in the photographs. There was also concern about photographs taken without the knowledge of those depicted.

The Five Factor Model of Personality and Perception of Harm

Contrary to the hypothesis, no correlation was found between the five-factor personality domains of Agreeableness and Conscientiousness and participants' findings of whether various levels of the COPINE scale were harmful to the young people depicted in the images. There was no correlation between any of the FFM domains and ratings of harmfulness.

There are a number of possible reasons for these results. It may be that there is simply no correlation between these variables. The hypothesis was based on the literature findings that scoring low on the five-factor domains of Agreeableness and Conscientiousness has been correlated with psychopathy (Widiger & Lynam, 1998). Those scoring low in these domains may be less likely to display empathy, possibly affecting their perception of harm to others.

In addition, research has shown that low scores in Agreeableness, Conscientiousness and Extraversion has also been correlated to antisocial personality disorder symptoms, higher aggression and hostility while low Agreeableness and Conscientiousness have been associated with violent behaviour (Becerra-García et al., 2013).

Given this, it may be that participants needed to have low scores in all three domains of Agreeableness, Conscientiousness and Extraversion before a correlation would appear between these and whether or not they found harm at various levels of the COPINE scale. To explore the interaction of the three traits and any correlation with question of harm or not would require a more sophisticated methodology than has been employed in this current study. Alternatively, it may be that the domains of Agreeableness, Conscientiousness and Extraversion, individually or as a group, would not correlate with findings of harmfulness or no harmfulness in the current study unless those traits are found at pathological levels within an individual. This would be unlikely to show up in a study with this sample size of 93. It is estimated that less than 1% of the population display traits consistent with psychopathy, and only 3-5% of the general population would fit the criteria for Antisocial Personality Disorder (Ogloff, 2006).

Another possibility is that the gender of participants may have influenced the results. A number of studies have found that women score higher in Agreeableness and Conscientiousness and lower on Emotional Stability and Intellect, including a New Zealand study (Guenole & Chernyshenko, 2005). Some 89% ($n = 83$) of participants in the current study were female. Given that the hypothesis centred around low scores on Agreeableness and Conscientiousness it is possible that a study with a more even gender balance in participants may have returned different results.

A further possibility is that the subject matter within this current study lacked sufficient “grey” areas where judgement on whether something was harmful or not could diverge. The COPINE scale has only 10 levels which are broad categories. Using an instrument with more narrowly defined categories of child pornography may have allowed for a more nuanced examination of this topic. As well as being a potentially emotive topic, as previously discussed the issue of child pornography is likely considered objectively wrong as presented by the COPINE scale and thus widely thought to be harmful regardless of personality traits.

Limitations and Direction for Future Research

This study had a number of limitations. The sample was small, consisting of 93 people. Allowing for participant self-selection meant the sample of participants was overwhelming female (89%) which may have influenced the results, particularly in regards to the finding of no correlation between FFM personality domains and perception of harm. A future study could use purposive sampling to ensure a gender balanced sample.

The COPINE scale, while widely used for academic purposes, may not be the best instrument to use as a typology of all child abuse images found online. It contains only 10 categories, which means each category is broad. Using a more finely-tuned instrument with more narrowly defined categories of child pornography may result in a ranking that more closely corresponds with the levels of ascending seriousness of offending the COPINE scale attempts to capture. More categories could also allow for a more nuanced perception of harm and potentially uncover links to FFM personality domains. In addition, Quayle (2009) notes that while COPINE typology also allows a discussion of child pornography images without having to view the images, this method is problematic because it distances participants from the content of the images, which may have influenced the results in this study. It is difficult to see how that could be overcome in studies with non-expert audience, due to ethical challenges inherent in both using such images and exposing participants to them.

Chapter Five: Conclusion

This study examined perceptions of inappropriateness of child sexual abuse material, the degree of perceived harm in that material and any relationship the latter had to the FFM personality domains. It also probed whether a non-expert group of university students would typologise textual descriptions of child sexual abuse material in the same way as the COPINE scale.

Typology Ranking

The overall ranking by a non-expert sample of university students revealed a similar profile as a more expert audience in an earlier study. Reporting her results, Merdian (2012) advanced the claim that the levels of the COPINE scale are both empirically valid and related to seriousness of image content. This, the author stated, means the including the scale in legal guidelines and for research purposes is merited (Merdian, 2012). However the departure from the original order that has been found in this current study as well as the earlier one raises some areas of concern that need further exploration. The COPINE scale does not appear to yield a unanimously agreed upon order of deviance. While Levels One, Five and 10, the anchors of the scale, were placed in the original position, there was movement in other levels. In particular, the vast movement in the lower levels, with levels Two, Three and Four moving from their original positions, suggests some major disagreement as to whether the COPINE scale validly represents ascending levels of seriousness of child pornography offending as judged by this non-expert audience of University of Waikato students.

Harmfulness

When assessing the potential harm to the children/adolescents depicted in the images described to be part of the COPINE scale typology, some themes emerged from study participants.

Concern was expressed about how images that appear innocent could be misused. Context and use were important, so to whom the images were available and the perception of that viewer were identified as vital considerations when assessing harm. This was particularly highlighted when the images involved nudity. Study participants were also concerned about photographs taken without the knowledge of those depicted.

As hypothesised, overall, as the levels of the COPINE scale ascended, participants were more likely to find the images harmful. From Level Five onwards many found the images described to be inappropriate and “wrong” regardless of use or context of the picture. Wrongdoing and harm appeared linked to participants and many reflected that sexualising and objectifying children was inherently wrong.

Harm Not Linked to Five Factor Model Domains

While this study uncovered no correlation between the personality domains of the Five-Factor Model as presented by Goldberg (1990, 1992), it may be the COPINE scale was too blunt an instrument for this purpose. While the scale represents an attempt to provide a typology of online child pornography images (Quayle, 2008), the categories are broad and a more nuanced examination may return different results, as might ensuring participants were more demographically representative of the population as a whole.

References

- Ahmetoglu, G., & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2013). *Personality 101*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Becerra-García, J. A., García-León, A., Muela-Martínez, J. A., & Egan, V. (2013). A controlled study of the Big Five personality dimensions in sex offenders, non-sex offenders and non-offenders: Relationship with offending behaviour and childhood abuse. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology, 24*(2), 233–246.
- Beng-Chong, L., & Ployhart, R. E. (2006). Assessing the convergent and discriminant validity of Goldberg's International Personality Item Pool. *Organizational Research Methods, 9*(1), 29–54.
- Blackburn, R., Renwick, S., Donnelly, J. P., & Logan, C. (2004). Big Five or Big Two? Superordinate factors in the NEO five factor inventory and the antisocial personality questionnaire. *Personality and Individual Differences, 37*, 957–970.
- Briere J., & Runtz, M. A. (1989). University males' sexual interest in children: Predicting potential indices of “pedophilia” in a nonforensic sample. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 13*, 65–75.
- Caplan, S. E. (2002). Problematic Internet use and psychosocial well-being: Development of a theory-based cognitive-behavioral measurement instrument. *Computers in Human Behavior, 18*, 553–575
- Carr, A. (2004). *Internet traders of child pornography and other censorship offenders in New Zealand: Updated Statistics (November 2004)*. Wellington, NZ: Department of Internal Affairs.

- Cohen L. J., & Galynker, I. I. (2002). Clinical features of pedophilia and implications for treatment. *Journal of Psychiatric Practice*, 8(5), 276–289
- Cooper, A. (2002). *Sex and the internet: A guidebook for clinicians*. New York, NY: Brunner-Routledge.
- Costa, P. T., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: Robust and surprising findings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(2), 322–331.
- Cover, R. (2003). The naked subject: Nudity, context and sexualization in contemporary culture. *Body & Society*, 9(3), 53–72.
- Cozby, P. C., & Bates, S. C. (2012). *Methods in behavioral research* (11th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Dennison, S. M., Stough, C., & Birgden, A. (2001). The big 5 dimensional personality approach to understanding sex offenders. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 7(1–4), 243–261.
- Egan, V., Kavanagh, B., & Blair, M. (2005). Sexual offenders against children: The influence of personality and obsessionality on cognitive distortions. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 17, 223–240.
- Elliot, I. A., & Beech, A. R. (2009). Understanding online child pornography use: Applying sexual offense theory to Internet offenders. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 14, 180–193.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1991). Dimensions of personality: 16, 5, or 3? Criteria for a taxonomic paradigm. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 12, 773–790.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1992). Four ways five factors are not basic. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13, 667–673.

- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3rd ed.). London, UK: Sage.
- Gillespie, A. A. (2011). *Child pornography: Law and policy*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative “description of personality”: The Big-Five Factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *59*(6), 1216–1229.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five Factor structure. *Psychological Assessment*, *4*(1), 26–42.
- Goldberg, L. R., Johnson, J. A., Eber, H. W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M. C., Cloninger, C. R., & Gough, H. (2006). The international personality item pool and the future of public-domain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *40*, 84–96.
- Gow, A. J., Whiteman, M. C., Pattie, A & Deary, I. J. (2005). Goldberg's IPIP Big-Five factor markers: Internal consistency and concurrent validation in Scotland. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *39*, 317–329.
- Gray, K., Young, L., & Waytz, A. (2012). Mind perception is the essence of morality. *Psychological Inquiry: An International Journal for the Advancement of Psychological Theory*, *23*(2), 101–124.
- Green, R. (2002). Is pedophilia a mental disorder? *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *31*(6), 467–471.
- Guenole, N., & Chernyshenko, O. S. (2005). The suitability of Goldberg's big five IPIP personality markers in New Zealand: A dimensionality, bias and criterion validity evaluation. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, *34*(2), 86–96.

- Hebenton, B., Shaw, D., & Pease, K. (2009) Offences involving indecent photographs and pseudo-photographs of children: An analysis of sentencing guidelines. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 15(5), 425–440.
- Hill, M., & Zwaga, W. (2001). Community attitudes towards broadcasting standards in New Zealand. *Asian Journal of Communication*, 11(1), 143–165
- Howitt, D. (1995). *Paedophiles and sexual offences against children*. Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Howitt, D., & Sheldon, K. (2007). The role of cognitive distortions in paedophilic offending: Internet and contact offenders compared. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 13(5), 469–486.
- International Personality Item Pool: A scientific collaboratory for the development of advanced measures of personality traits and other individual differences*. (2015). Retrieved from International Personality Item Pool website: <http://ipip.ori.org/>
- Internet Watch Foundation*. (2015). Retrieved from <https://www.iwf.org.uk/>
- Long, M. L., Alison, L. A., & McManus, M. A. (2012). Child pornography and likelihood of contact abuse: A comparison between contact child sexual offenders and noncontact offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 25(4), 370–395.
- Magaletta, P. R., Faust, E., Bickart, W., & McLearn, A., M. (2014). Exploring clinical and personality characteristics of adult male Internet-only child pornography offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 58(2) 137–153.

- McCarthy, J. A. (2010). Internet sexual activity: A comparison between contact and non-contact child pornography offenders. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 16*(2), 181–195.
- McCrae, R., & Costa, P. (1987). Validation of the Five-Factor Model of Personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*(1), 81–90.
- Merdian, H. L. (2012). *Offenders who use child sexual exploitation material: Development of an integrated model for their classification, assessment and treatment*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/>
- Merdian, H. L., Thakker, J., Wilson, N., & Boer, D. (2013). Assessing the internal structure of the COPINE scale. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 19*(1), 21–34.
- Middleton, D., Elliott, I. A., Mandeville-Norden, R., & Beech, A. R. (2006). An investigation into the applicability of the Ward and Siegert Pathways Model of child sexual abuse with Internet offenders. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 12*(6), 589–603.
- Mirkin, H. (2009). The social, political, and legal construction of the concept of child pornography. *Journal of Homosexuality, 56*(2), 233–267.
- Niveau, G. (2010). Cyber-pedocriminality: Characteristics of a sample of Internet child pornography offenders. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 34*, 570–575.
- Ogloff, J. R. P. (2006). Psychopathy/antisocial personality disorder conundrum. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 40*, 519–528.
- Qualtrics (2015). Retrieved from <http://www.qualtrics.com>
- Quayle, E. (2008). The COPINE Project. *Irish Probation Journal, 5*, 65–83.

- Quayle, E. (2009). Child pornography. In Y. Jewkes & M. Yar (Eds.), *Handbook of Internet crime* (pp 343–368). Cullompton, UK: Willan Publishing.
- Quayle, E., & Jones, T. (2011). Sexualized images of children on the Internet. *Sex Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 23(7), 7–21.
- Quayle, E., & Taylor, M. (2002). Paedophiles, pornography and the Internet: Assessment issues. *British Journal of Social Work*, 32, 863–875.
- Quayle, E., Vaughan, M., & Taylor, M. (2006). Sex offenders, Internet child abuse images and emotional avoidance: The importance of values. *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 11, 1–11.
- Salekin, R. T., Debus, S. A., & Barker, E. D. (2010), Adolescent psychopathy and the Five Factor Model: Domain and facet analysis. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 32, 501–514.
- Schmitt, D. P., Allik, J., McCrae, R. R., Benet-Martinez, V., Alcalay, L., Ault, K., ... Zupaneie, A. (2007). The geographical distribution of Big Five personality traits: Patterns and profiles of human self-description across 56 nations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 38(2), 173–212
- Sentencing Advisory Panel (2006, June). *Sexual Offences Act 2003: The panel's advice to the sentencing guidelines*. Retrieved from <http://www.sentencing-guidelines.gov.uk/docs/advice-sexualoffences.pdf>.
- Seibert, L. A., Miller, J. D., Few, L. R., Zeichner, A. & Lynam, D. R. (2011). An examination of the structure of self-report psychopathy measures and their relations with general traits and externalizing behaviors. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 2(3), 193–208.

- Seigfried, K. C., Lovely, R. W., & Rogers, M. K. (2008). Self-Reported Online Child Pornography Behavior: A Psychological Analysis. *International Journal of Cyber Criminology*, 2(1), 286–297.
- Seigfried-Spellar, K. (2013). Individual differences of Internet child pornography users: Peculiar findings in a community-based study. *International Journal of Cyber Criminology*, 7(2), 141–154.
- Smiljanich, K., Hills, D., & Briere, J. (1996). Self-reported sexual interest in children: Sex differences and psychosocial correlates in a university sample. *Violence and Victims*, 11(1), 39–50
- Taylor, M., & Quayle, E. (2003). *Child pornography: An internet crime*. Hove, UK: Brunner Routledge.
- Ward, T. (2000). Sexual offenders' cognitive distortions as implicit theories. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 5(5), 491–507.
- Ward, T., & Beech, A. R. (2006). An integrated theory of sexual offending. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 11, 44–63.
- Ward, T., & Siegert, R. J. (2002). Toward a comprehensive theory of child sexual abuse: A theory knitting perspective. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 8(4), 319–351.
- Webb, L., Craissati, J., & Keen S. (2007). Characteristics of Internet child pornography offenders: A comparison with child molesters. *Sexual Abuse*, 19, 449–465.
- Widiger, T. A., & Lynam, D. R. (1998). Psychopathy as a variant of common personality traits: Implications for diagnosis, etiology, and pathology. In T. Millon (Ed.), *Psychopathy: Antisocial, criminal, and violent behavior* (pp. 171–187). New York, NY: Guilford.

- Wild, M. (2011, October 5). *Interview: Steven Wright*. Retrieved from <http://www.avclub.com/article/steven-wright-62772>
- Wolak, J., Finkelhor, D., & Mitchell, K. J. (2005). *Child pornography possessors arrested in Internet-related crimes: Findings from the national juvenile online victimization study*. National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. Retrieved from <http://www.unh.edu/ccrc/pdf/jvq/CV81.pdf>
- Wolak, J., Finkelhor, D., & Mitchell, K. (2011). Child Pornography Possessors: Trends in offender and case characteristics. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 23(1), 22–42.
- Wortley, R., & Smallbone, S. (2012). *Internet child pornography: Causes, investigation and prevention*. Santa Barbara, Calif: Praeger.
- Young, K. (2008). Understanding sexually deviant online behavior from an addiction perspective. *International Journal of Cyber Criminology*, 2(1), 298–307.

Appendix A

Final Version of Full Survey

Participant Information Sheet

My name is Ann Aitken Worth and I am assessing the validity of the COPINE scale, which is used to rate the severity of the image collection of child pornography offenders. This research is for my Masters degree (MSocSc), conducted at the University of Waikato and supervised by Armon Tamatea and Jo Thakker (both University of Waikato)

The scale was developed at the University of Cork as part of the Combating Paedophile Information Networks in Europe (COPINE) project. However, this scale has never been rated by a non-expert audience in New Zealand, so the validity of its use in this country is not clear. This study aims to start that work by looking at how university students rate the scale's levels.

I am also looking at how personality may impact ratings by looking at the Big Five personality factors.

FOR PSYCHOLOGY STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WAIKATO, YOU CAN EARN UP TO 1% COURSE CREDIT, for PSYC208, PSYC229, PSYC317 or PSYC319 if you submit your completed survey by 23 August.

This information will NOT be cross referenced with your responses to the questionnaire answers. Your name and selected course will be viewed by School of Psychology administration in order to allocate your course credit.

While no images are displayed in this survey, there are textual descriptions of sexual activities and/or behaviours with children. Some of the description may be upsetting so please stop and exit this browser window if you feel you do not wish to be exposed to this topic. You may withdraw from the survey at any stage for any reason without penalty by exiting your browser window.

The scale has 10 levels. You will be asked to sort them by assigning a number to each level, with "1" being the least harmful and "10: describing the most harmful form of child pornography in your opinion.

One hundred brief questions about personality will also be asked, with a multi-choice answer format.

The survey takes approximately 20 minutes.

This survey is anonymous – no names or IP addresses (I will not be able to match your name with your answers) are collected. While you will be invited to submit your student ID number for course credit, this is voluntary and will not be cross referenced with your answers. A summary of results of the study will be made

available on the Psychology Cafe page on Moodle and the Waikato Psychology Students Association Facebook page.

If you would prefer to complete this survey in person, in a face-to-face interview, I can be reached by emailing ann.aitkenworth@windowslive.com.

For further information about the study, you may also contact me at ann.aitkenworth@windowslive.com.

This research project has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Any questions about the ethical conduct of this research may be sent to the Secretary of the Committee, email fass-ethics@waikato.ac.nz, postal address, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Te Kura Kete Aronui, University of Waikato, Te Whare Wananga o Waikato, Private Bag 3105, Hamilton 3240.

Consent Form

I have read the Participant Information Sheet (or it has been read to me) and I understand it.

- Agree (1)
- Disagree (2)

I have been given sufficient time to consider whether or not to participate in this study.

- Agree (1)
- Disagree (2)

I am satisfied with the information I have been given regarding the study.

- Agree (1)
- Disagree (2)

I understand that taking part in this study is voluntary (my choice) and that I may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

- Agree (1)
- Disagree (2)

I have the right to decline to participate in any part of the research activity.

- Agree (1)
- Disagree (2)

I know who to contact if I have any questions about the study in general.

- Agree (1)
- Disagree (2)

I understand that my participation in this study is confidential and that no material, which could identify me personally, will be used in any reports on this study.

- Agree (1)
- Disagree (2)

Declaration by participant: I agree to participate in this research project and I understand that I may withdraw at any time. If I have any concerns about this project, I may contact the convenor of the Psychology Research and Ethics Committee (Dr James McEwan, Tel: 07 838 4466 ext 8295, email: jmcewan@waikato.ac.nz).

Clicking 'Agree' represents an electronic signature.

- Agree (1)
- Disagree (2)

While this survey is anonymous, it would be helpful if you could provide some demographic information about your person to identify possible influencing variables.

Gender

- Male (1)
- Female (2)

Age

- 18-24 (1)
- 25-30 (2)
- 31-35 (3)
- 36-40 (4)
- 41-45 (5)
- 45-50 (6)
- Over 50 (7) _____

Ethnicity

- NZ European (1)
- NZ Maori (2)
- Pacific (3)
- Asian (4)
- Middle Eastern (5)
- Other (Please specify) (6) _____

Are you a University of Waikato student?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Please choose your current level of study

- Undergraduate (1)
- Postgraduate (2)
- Not a student (3)

Do you have any experience in the treatment and/or assessment of sexual offenders?

- No (1)
- Yes Please specify: (2) _____

Please sort these levels of child pornography by dragging and dropping the text descriptions, with “1” being the least intrusive and “10” describing the most severe form of child pornography. Each number can only be matched to one description

_____ Pictures where the child and/or adolescent knowingly pose for the camera, in order to be “sexy”. For example, they might pretend to be model, a filmstar, or a pornography actor/actress.

_____ Pictures of children and/or teenagers in daily-life situations where it is normal to be naked, or in underwear or swimwear. This could be on the beach or in a bathtub. These pictures were taken without the child and/or teenager knowing it.

_____ Pictures of children and/or adolescents where the child/adolescent touches an adult or an adult touches the child/adolescent in a sexual way.

_____ Pictures of children and/or teenagers where the main attention is on a boy’s penis and a girl’s vagina and/or breasts.

_____ Pictures of normally dressed children and/or teenagers in daily-life situations (e.g., kids playing, school pictures). These pictures could be from catalogues, commercials, family albums, or brochures.

_____ Pictures of children and/or teenagers in daily-life situations where it is normal to be naked, or in underwear or swimwear. This could be on the beach or in a bathtub. These pictures could be from catalogues, commercials, family albums, or brochures.

_____ (a) Pictures of children and/or adolescents where they experience pain. For example, the child/adolescent might be tied, bound, beaten, or whipped. (b) Pictures of children and/or adolescents where they engage in a sexual activity with an animal. They might masturbate, have oral sex, or sexual intercourse over or with an animal.

_____ Pictures where the child and/or adolescent knowingly pose for the camera but the picture is not “sexy” on its own.

_____ Pictures of children and/or adolescents engaged in a sexual activity with an adult. They might masturbate, have oral sex, or sexual intercourse.

_____ Pictures of children and/or adolescents engaged in a sexual activity, either alone or with other children/adolescents. They might touch each other, masturbate, have oral sex, or sexual intercourse.

Please consider the following scenario: Pictures where the child and/or adolescent knowingly pose for the camera, in order to be “sexy”. For example, they might pretend to be model, a filmstar, or a pornography actor/actress. How harmful (or not) would you consider this scenario to be for children/adolescents who might be depicted in this kind of image?

- Harmful (1)
- Not harmful (2)
- Unsure (3)

Please summarise your main reason(s) for this answer.

Please consider the following scenario: Pictures of children and/or teenagers in daily-life situations where it is normal to be naked, or in underwear or swimwear. This could be on the beach or in a bathtub. These pictures were taken without the child and/or teenager knowing it. How harmful (or not) would you consider this scenario to be for children/adolescents who might be depicted in this kind of image?

- Harmful (1)
- Not harmful (2)
- Unsure (3)

Please summarise your main reason(s) for this answer.

Please consider the following scenario: Pictures of children and/or adolescents where the child/adolescent touches an adult or an adult touches the child/adolescent in a sexual way. How harmful (or not) would you consider this scenario to be for children/adolescents who might be depicted in this kind of image?

- Harmful (1)
- Not harmful (2)
- Unsure (3)

Please summarise your main reason(s) for this answer.

Please consider the following scenario: Pictures of children and/or teenagers where the main attention is on a boy’s penis and a girl’s vagina and/or breasts.

How harmful (or not) would you consider this scenario to be for children/adolescents who might be depicted in this kind of image?

- Harmful (1)
- Not harmful (2)
- Unsure (3)

Please summarise your main reason(s) for this answer.

Please consider the following scenario: Pictures of children and/or adolescents engaged in a sexual activity with an adult. They might masturbate, have oral sex, or sexual intercourse. How harmful (or not) would you consider this scenario to be for children/adolescents who might be depicted in this kind of image?

- Harmful (1)
- Not harmful (2)
- Unsure (3)

Please summarise your main reason(s) for this answer.

Please consider the following scenario: Pictures of normally dressed children and/or teenagers in daily-life situations (e.g., kids playing, school pictures). These pictures could be from catalogues, commercials, family albums, or brochures. How harmful (or not) would you consider this scenario to be for children/adolescents who might be depicted in this kind of image?

- Harmful (1)
- Not harmful (2)
- Unsure (3)

Please summarise your main reason(s) for this answer.

Please consider the following scenario: Pictures where the child and/or adolescent knowingly pose for the camera but the picture is not “sexy” on its own. How harmful (or not) would you consider this scenario to be for children/adolescents who might be depicted in this kind of image?

- Harmful (1)
- Not harmful (2)
- Unsure (3)

Please summarise your main reason(s) for this answer.

Please consider the following scenario: Pictures of children and/or teenagers in daily-life situations where it is normal to be naked, or in underwear or swimwear. This could be on the beach or in a bathtub. These pictures could be from catalogues, commercials, family albums, or brochures. How harmful (or not) would you consider this scenario to be for children/adolescents who might be depicted in this kind of image?

- Harmful (1)
- Not harmful (2)
- Unsure (3)

Please summarise your main reason(s) for this answer.

Please consider the following scenario: Pictures of children and/or adolescents engaged in a sexual activity, either alone or with other children/adolescents. They might touch each other, masturbate, have oral sex, or sexual intercourse. How harmful (or not) would you consider this scenario to be for children/adolescents who might be depicted in this kind of image?

- Harmful (1)
- Not harmful (2)
- Unsure (3)

Please summarise your main reason(s) for this answer.

Please consider the following scenario: Pictures of children and/or adolescents where they experience pain. For example, the child/adolescent might be tied, bound, beaten, or whipped. How harmful (or not) would you consider this scenario to be for children/adolescents who might be depicted in this kind of image?

- Harmful (1)
- Not harmful (2)
- Unsure (3)

Please summarise your main reason(s) for this answer.

Please consider the following scenario: Pictures of children and/or adolescents where they engage in a sexual activity with an animal. They might masturbate, have oral sex, or sexual intercourse over or with an animal. How harmful (or not)

would you consider this scenario to be for children/adolescents who might be depicted in this kind of image?

- Harmful (1)
- Not harmful (2)
- Unsure (3)

Please summarise your main reason(s) for this answer.

Personality Factors

In the following questions, describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself, in relation to other people you know of the same sex as you are, and roughly your same age. Indicate for each statement whether it is 1. Very Inaccurate, 2. Moderately Inaccurate, 3. Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate, 4. Moderately Accurate, or 5. Very Accurate as a description of you.

I am the life of the party.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I insult people

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I am always prepared.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I get stressed out easily.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I have a rich vocabulary.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I often feel uncomfortable around others.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I am interested in people.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I leave my belongings around.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I am relaxed most of the time.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I have difficulty understanding abstract ideas.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I feel comfortable around people.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I am not interested in other people's problems.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I pay attention to details.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I worry about things.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I have a vivid imagination.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I keep in the background.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I sympathise with others' feelings.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I make a mess of things.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I seldom feel blue.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I am not interested in abstract ideas.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I start conversations.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I feel little concern for others.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I get chores done right away.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I am easily disturbed.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I have excellent ideas.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I have little to say.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I have a soft heart.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I often forget to put things back in their proper place.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I am not easily bothered by things.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I do not have a good imagination.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I talk to a lot of different people at parties.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I am not really interested in others.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I like order.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I get upset easily.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I am quick to understand things.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I don't like to draw attention to myself.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I take time out for others.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I shirk my duties.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I rarely get irritated.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I try to avoid complex people.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I don't mind being the center of attention.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I am hard to get to know.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I follow a schedule.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I change my mood a lot.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I use difficult words.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I am quiet around strangers.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I feel others' emotions.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I neglect my duties.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I seldom get mad.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I have difficulty imagining things.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I make friends easily.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I am indifferent to the feelings of others.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I am exacting in my work.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I have frequent mood swings.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I spend time reflecting on things.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I find it difficult to approach others.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I make people feel at ease.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I waste my time.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I get irritated easily.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I avoid difficult reading material.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I take charge.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I inquire about others' well-being.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I do things according to a plan.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I often feel blue.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I am full of ideas.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I don't talk a lot.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I know how to comfort others.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I do things in a half-way manner.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I get angry easily.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I will not probe deeply into a subject.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I know how to captivate people.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I love children.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I continue until everything is perfect.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I panic easily.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I carry the conversation to a higher level.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I bottle up my feelings.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I am on good terms with nearly everyone.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I find it difficult to get down to work.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I feel threatened easily.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I catch on to things quickly.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I feel at ease with people.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I have a good word for everyone.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I make plans and stick to them.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I get overwhelmed by emotions.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I can handle a lot of information.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I am a very private person.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I show my gratitude.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I leave a mess in my room.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I take offense easily.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I am good at many things.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I wait for others to lead the way.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I think of others first.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I love order and regularity.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I get caught up in my problems.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I love to read challenging material.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I am skilled in handling social situations.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I love to help others.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I like to tidy up.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I grumble about things.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

I love to think up new ways of doing things.

- Very inaccurate (1)
- Moderately inaccurate (2)
- Neither accurate nor inaccurate (3)
- Moderately accurate (4)
- Very accurate (5)

If participation in this study has raised personal issues which you wish to discuss, potential sources of support are:

Lifeline: 0800 543 354.

Rape Crisis National Call Line: 0800 883 300.

University of Waikato Student Counselling Services. For an appointment: 07 838 4037.

Thank you for participating in this survey. FOR PSYCHOLOGY STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WAIKATO, YOU CAN EARN UP TO 1% COURSE CREDIT.

This information will NOT be cross referenced with your responses to the questionnaire answers. Your name and selected course will be viewed by School of Psychology administration in order to allocate your course credit.

Please select your preferred course from the options below to receive your course credit:

- PSYC208 (1)
- PSYC229 (2)
- PSYC317 (3)
- PSYC319 (4)

Please enter your University of Waikato student ID number:

Appendix B

Invitation to Participate

Course credit for participating in masters research!

My name is Ann Aitken Worth and I am looking for participants to take an anonymous survey assessing how university students rate the COPINE scale, which is used to classify the severity of the image collection of child pornography offenders in the UK.

The scale was developed at the University of Cork by an expert group as part of the Combating Paedophile Information Networks in Europe project. However, this scale has never been examined by a non-expert audience in New Zealand, so the potential validity of its use in this country is not clear. This study aims to start that work by looking at how university students rate the scale.

If you haven't already taken part in the survey, eligible psychology students can earn 1% course credit for PSYC208, PSYC229, PSYC317 or PSYC319 if you submit your completed survey by August 21 2015.

I am also looking at how personality may impact rating of the scale by looking at the Big Five traits.

The survey takes approximately 20-25 minutes.

While no images are displayed in the survey, there are textual descriptions of sexual activities and/or behaviours with children. Some of the description may be upsetting so please do not volunteer to take part in if you feel you do not wish to be exposed to this topic.

This survey is anonymous – no names or IP addresses are collected. While you will be invited to submit your student ID number for course credit, this is voluntary and will not be cross referenced with your answers. A summary of results of the study will be made available on the Psychology Cafe page on Moodle and the Waikato Psychology Students Association Facebook page.

To take part in the study, please go to:

https://qtrial2014az1.az1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_9Z9V2mUfiNFB3sF

Or contact Ann on ann.aitkenworth@windowslive.com

If you would prefer to complete this survey in person, in a face-to-face interview, I can be reached by emailing ann.aitkenworth@windowslive.com.

This research is for my Masters degree (MSocSc), conducted at the University of Waikato and supervised by Armon Tamatea and Jo Thakker (both University of Waikato).

Appendix C

Ethics Approval

School of Psychology
The University of Waikato
Private Bag 3108
Hamilton 3240
New Zealand

Phone 64-7-858 2868
Facsimile 64-7-858 8122
www.waikato.ac.nz/psychology



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

9 April 2015

Ann Aitken Worth
27b Arama Street
Nukuhau
Taupo 3330

Dear Ann

Ethics Approval Application – # 15:05
Title: Non-expert assessment of the COPINE scale and personality

Thank you for your ethics application which has been fully considered and approved by the Psychology Research and Ethics Committee.

Please note that approval is for three years. If this project has not been completed within three years from the date of this letter, you must request reapproval.

If any modifications are required to your application, e.g., nature, content, location, procedures or personnel these will need to be submitted to the Convenor of the Committee.

I wish you success with your research.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'James McEwan', written over a horizontal line.

Dr James McEwan
Convenor
Psychology Research and Ethics Committee
School of Psychology
University of Waikato