



**Universiteit
Leiden**
The Netherlands

Public support for Vigilantism

Haas, N.E.

Citation

Haas, N. E. (2010, November 23). *Public support for Vigilantism*. Netherlands Institute for the Study of Crime and Law Enforcement (NSCR), Leiden. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16171>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16171>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Appendices

Appendix 1: Measures of support for vigilantism

Survey information	Items	Findings
Data collection: Gallup Poll (1937) Survey method: personal Sample: 1,500 adults in US (approximation)	1. "Do you approve of the citizen groups, called vigilantes, which have sprung up recently in strike areas?"	24 % yes 76 % no
Data collection: Harris & Associates (1970) Survey method: personal Sample: 1,590 adults in US	2. "Many different types of people with new viewpoints have sprung up in this country over the past few years. Tell me which of the following you feel to be helpful to the country, which ones are harmful, and which are neither helpful nor harmful... Vigilante groups such as the Minutemen, White Citizens' Council, and the Like."	6 % helpful 58 % harmful 12 % neither helpful nor harmful 24 % not sure
Data collection: Harris & Associates (1973) Survey method: personal Sample: 1,546 adults in US	3. "(Let me ask you about different types of people in this country. For each, tell me if you feel they do more good than harm, more harm than good, or are neither helpful nor harmful?) ... Vigilante groups such as the Minutemen, white citizens' councils, and the Ku Klux Klan."	21 % more good than harm /neither / not sure 79 % do more harm than good
Data collection: Gallup Organization (1985) Survey method: telephone Sample: 1,009 adults in US	4. "Do you feel that taking the law into one's own hands, often called vigilantism, is justified by circumstances?"	3 % always 68 % sometimes 23 % never 6 % don't know
Data collection: Gallup Report (1985) Survey method: telephone Sample: 1,528 adults in US	5. "Do you feel that incidents like these (the recent incident in a New York City subway in which a man shot and wounded four teenagers who demanded money from him) – taking the law into one's hands, often called vigilantism – are sometimes justified because of the circumstances, or are never justified?"	8 % always 72 % sometimes 17 % never 3 % no opinion
Data collection: Schulman et al. (1991) Survey method: telephone Sample: 1,000 adults in US <i>(Limning, 2003, pp.230-236)</i>	6. "Do you think that vigilantism (sometimes when people lack confidence in the criminal justice system's ability to deal with a crime, they take the law into their own hands and attack the person who they think is responsible for the crime) is ever justified?"	33 % yes 61 % no 6 % not sure

Table A1 Single-item survey measures

Survey information	Items	Findings
<p>Data collection: Weisburd (1982) Survey method: personal Sample: 404 Gush Emunim settlers in Israel (Weisburd, 1989)</p>	<p>7. "It is necessary for settlers to respond quickly and independently to Arab harassments of settlers and settlements" (strongly) (dis)agree, 5pt scale</p>	<p>48 % strongly agree 28 % agree 13 % disagree 2 % strongly disagree 9 % no opinion</p>
<p>Data collection: annual survey Toledo (1984) Survey method: telephone Sample: 700 adults in Toledo, Ohio (Perry & Pugh, 1989)</p>	<p>8. "I would like to see the Guardian Angels in my own neighborhood" (strongly) (dis)agree, 5pt scale</p>	<p>(strongly) agree: 60 % (18-29 yrs old) 43 % (30-49 yrs old) 38 % (\geq 50 yrs old)</p>
<p>Data collection: Canadian Gallup Poll (1987) Survey method: personal Sample: 1,017 adults in Canada (http://www.library.carleton.ca/ssdata/surveys/doc/glp-87-jan517_1-doc)</p>	<p>9. "In the past few weeks, there have been a number of incidents involving firearms used by retail store owners. Do you feel that incidents like these – taking the law into one's own hands, often called vigilantism – are sometimes justified because of the circumstances, or are never justified?"</p>	<p>8 % always 68 % sometimes 21 % never 3 % no opinion</p>
<p>Data collection: NSCR (1996) Survey method: personal and by mail Sample: 2,152 adults in the Netherlands (Ter Voert, 1997)</p>	<p>10. "If crime control by the government is inadequate, citizens are justified to take the law into their own hands"</p>	<p>12 % fully agree 4 % agree 24 % agree nor disagree 44 % disagree 16 % fully disagree</p>

Table A2 Multiple-item survey measures

Survey information	Items	Findings																																																
<p>Data collection: Tankebe (2006)</p> <p>Survey method: survey at home</p> <p>Sample: 374 residents of Accra, Ghana</p> <p>(Tankebe, 2009)</p>	<p>(strongly (dis)agree, 5pt (?) scale)</p> <p>"It is all right for members of the public to beat up crime suspects."</p> <p>"People who kill armed robbers should not be blamed."</p> <p>"It is sometimes OK for people to take the law in their own hands if they feel the police are unable to protect them."</p> <p>"It is pointless to hand over a suspected criminal to the police because they won't bring the offender to justice."</p> <p>"Each community should organize itself to provide it with security against criminals even if the police disagree with that."</p>	<p>Overall mean: 3.15 (SD=.85).</p> <p>Agreement percentages per item are not available.</p>																																																
<p>Data collection: Norms and attitudes toward violence, active project, Pan American Health Organization (1996-1997)</p> <p>Survey method: personal</p> <p>Sample: 10,821 national adults in 7 Latin American cities and Madrid</p> <p>(Brievito-Léon et al., 2006)</p>	<p>(strongly (dis)agree, 5pt scale)</p> <p>"A person has the right to kill to defend his or her family"</p> <p>"A person has the right to kill to defend his or her property"</p> <p>(approve, disapprove but understand, neither approve nor understand)</p> <p>"Would you approve if ...</p> <p>- ...a person killed someone who had raped his daughter?"</p> <p>- ...there was a person who keeps a community in a state of uproar/anguish and someone killed him?"</p> <p>- ...a group of people began to carry out a social purge, that is, killing undesirable individuals?"</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Latin America</th> <th colspan="2">Madrid</th> </tr> <tr> <th>(s)agree</th> <th>(s)disagree</th> <th>(s)agree</th> <th>(s)disagree</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>60 %</td> <td>35 %</td> <td>47 %</td> <td>48 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>45 %</td> <td>50 %</td> <td>17 %</td> <td>79 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>approve</td> <td>understand</td> <td>approve</td> <td>understand</td> </tr> <tr> <td>44 %</td> <td>38 %</td> <td>19 %</td> <td>49 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>25 %</td> <td>46 %</td> <td>7 %</td> <td>29 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13 %</td> <td>34 %</td> <td>5 %</td> <td>14 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>neutral</td> <td>neither</td> <td>neutral</td> <td>neither</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5 %</td> <td>5 %</td> <td>5 %</td> <td>5 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>18 %</td> <td>30 %</td> <td>32 %</td> <td>64 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>53 %</td> <td>53 %</td> <td>81 %</td> <td>81 %</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Latin America		Madrid		(s)agree	(s)disagree	(s)agree	(s)disagree	60 %	35 %	47 %	48 %	45 %	50 %	17 %	79 %	approve	understand	approve	understand	44 %	38 %	19 %	49 %	25 %	46 %	7 %	29 %	13 %	34 %	5 %	14 %	neutral	neither	neutral	neither	5 %	5 %	5 %	5 %	18 %	30 %	32 %	64 %	53 %	53 %	81 %	81 %
Latin America		Madrid																																																
(s)agree	(s)disagree	(s)agree	(s)disagree																																															
60 %	35 %	47 %	48 %																																															
45 %	50 %	17 %	79 %																																															
approve	understand	approve	understand																																															
44 %	38 %	19 %	49 %																																															
25 %	46 %	7 %	29 %																																															
13 %	34 %	5 %	14 %																																															
neutral	neither	neutral	neither																																															
5 %	5 %	5 %	5 %																																															
18 %	30 %	32 %	64 %																																															
53 %	53 %	81 %	81 %																																															
<p>Data collection: Schadt and DeLisi (2007)</p> <p>Survey method: survey in class</p> <p>Sample: 218 undergraduate students in the US</p> <p>(Schadt & DeLisi, 2007)</p>	<p>(strongly (dis)agree, 5pt scale)</p> <p>"If anyone ever victimized my family ...</p> <p>- ...I would be tempted to hurt the person responsible"</p> <p>- ...I would hurt the person responsible"</p> <p>"If anyone hurt my family ...</p> <p>- ...I would be tempted to kill the person responsible"</p> <p>- ...I would kill the person responsible"</p> <p>"Revenge killing is always wrong"</p> <p>"If someone were to rape your mother then you would be morally justified in killing the perpetrator"</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>(s)agree</th> <th>disagree</th> <th>(s)disagree</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>9 %</td> <td>29 %</td> <td>13 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4 %</td> <td>38 %</td> <td>28 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>27 %</td> <td>10 %</td> <td>3 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11 %</td> <td>25 %</td> <td>6 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10 %</td> <td>22 %</td> <td>5 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12 %</td> <td>38 %</td> <td>12 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>neutral</td> <td>neutral</td> <td>neutral</td> </tr> <tr> <td>24 %</td> <td>24 %</td> <td>24 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7 %</td> <td>7 %</td> <td>7 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>31 %</td> <td>31 %</td> <td>31 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>36 %</td> <td>36 %</td> <td>36 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>19 %</td> <td>19 %</td> <td>19 %</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	(s)agree	disagree	(s)disagree	9 %	29 %	13 %	4 %	38 %	28 %	27 %	10 %	3 %	11 %	25 %	6 %	10 %	22 %	5 %	12 %	38 %	12 %	neutral	neutral	neutral	24 %	24 %	24 %	7 %	7 %	7 %	31 %	31 %	31 %	36 %	36 %	36 %	19 %	19 %	19 %									
(s)agree	disagree	(s)disagree																																																
9 %	29 %	13 %																																																
4 %	38 %	28 %																																																
27 %	10 %	3 %																																																
11 %	25 %	6 %																																																
10 %	22 %	5 %																																																
12 %	38 %	12 %																																																
neutral	neutral	neutral																																																
24 %	24 %	24 %																																																
7 %	7 %	7 %																																																
31 %	31 %	31 %																																																
36 %	36 %	36 %																																																
19 %	19 %	19 %																																																

Appendix 2: Vignette with experimental manipulations ⁵⁶

Ann is the owner of a clothing store downtown. For a few weeks now, she has been seeing a woman come into her store who looks around but always leaves without making a purchase. Ann starts to suspect that she takes clothes from her store without paying for them. This suspicion of theft is confirmed when Ann watches the tapes of her surveillance cameras. She sends the footage to the police, hoping that they will take some action.

A few days later, Ann still has not heard back from the police, so she decides to contact them again herself. During the phone conversation with a police officer, it becomes clear to her that the police have no time to deal with the theft.

[or: A few days later, a local police officer visits Ann in her store. The officer asks her for additional information about the shoplifting. He emphasizes that he and his colleagues will keep an eye on things by increasing surveillance. He also gives her a phone number on which he can always be reached.]

After a few days, Ann sees the woman come into her store again. Ann watches her carefully and then sees her putting a shirt into her purse. She goes up to her to confront her with this, but the woman catches on and disappears into the crowd. She promises herself to teach her a lesson next time. The next day, Ann has a day off and walks around town when she suddenly runs into the same woman. She goes up to her without hesitation. The woman tries to run away, but Ann forcefully grabs her by her arm. **Ann then hits her in her face. The woman ends up with a black eye and a headache for a few days.** *[or: Ann then hits her in the face, after which the woman ends up on the ground. Ann then kicks her in the head a few times. The woman ends up with a broken jaw and a heavy concussion.]*

56 The parts that are printed in **bold** and *italics* represent different versions of the vignette in correspondence with the two experimental factors (police responsiveness and vigilante violence)

Appendix 3: Examples of vignettes

In this Appendix we present a selection of vignettes from the main study, which are indicated by boldface print and shading in Table A3. We first present all three versions of Vignette 1, followed by selected versions of Vignette 2. This is followed by an example of one of the two control vignettes (C2X). The English translation of the vignettes can be found in Appendix 4.

Table A3 Selected versions of Vignette 1 (all 3) and Vignette 2 (3 out of 10)

Vignette 1: precipitating event				Vignette 2: sentence + vigilantism				
	Precipitating event	Victim	Offender	Precipitating offender's sentence		Vigilantism	Offender (<i>vigilante</i>)	Victim
A	Traffic aggression	Alan	Dave	A1	acquittal	vandalism & assault	Alan	Dave
				A2	lenient			
				A3	normal			
				A4	severe			
B	Pedestrian crash	Betty	Ethan	B1	acquittal	vandalism & assault	George	Ethan
				B2	lenient			
				B3	normal			
				B4	severe			
C	Sex offense	Cathy	Fred	C2	lenient	vandalism & assault	Henry	Fred
				C4	severe			

Precipitating event vignette, version A (traffic aggression)



ALGEMEEN

Vrij 20 februari 2009. Het laatste nieuws lees je het eerst op NU.nl

Voorpagina

Algemeen

Economie

Sport

Internet

Achterklap

Opmerkelijk

Beurs

Wetenschap

Gezondheid

Lifestyle

Plugged

Lifehacking

Auto

Muziek

Dvd

Film

Boek

Games

Column

NU-blog

NUwerk

NUzakelijk

NUfoto

NUsport

NUjj

NUvideo

NUbijlage

NUvgids

NUkaart

NUik

NUtv

Man (39) zwaargewond door agressie in verkeer

Uitgegeven: 20 februari 2009 22:42

Laatst gewijzigd: 20 februari 2009 22:58

DORDRECHT – Een 39-jarige man uit Dordrecht is vrijdagmiddag door een auto klemgereden op een fietspad in zijn woonplaats.



Man zwaargewond na aanrijding

fotoserie

Het slachtoffer, Frank H., werd afgesneden toen hij met de fiets rechtsaf wilde slaan op de Mauritsweg. Hij reageerde daarop door zijn vuisten te ballen naar de bestuurder, Ruben S. Niet lang daarna werd H. door dezelfde man klemgereden op het fietspad, en kwam hij ten val.

Frank H. liep daarbij een gebroken been, een gebroken arm, gekneusde ribben en een zware hersenschudding op. Hij is per ambulance overgebracht naar een ziekenhuis in Rotterdam.

De 35-jarige bestuurder Ruben S. uit Rotterdam is voor verhoor ingesloten. Hij had tweemaal de maximaal toegestane hoeveelheid alcohol in zijn bloed.

© ANP

◀ Vorige artikel

Volgende artikel ▶

Precipitating event vignette, version B (pedestrian crash)



ALGEMEEN

Vrij 20 februari 2009. Het laatste nieuws lees je het eerst op NU.nl

- Voorpagina
- Algemeen
- Economie
- Sport
- Internet
- Achterklap
- Opmerkelijk
- Beurs
- Wetenschap
- Gezondheid
- Lifestyle
- Plugged
- Lifehacking
- Auto
- Muziek
- Dvd
- Film
- Boek
- Games
- Column
- NU-blog

- NUwerk
- NUzakelijk
- NUfoto
- NUsport
- NUjij
- NUvideo
- NUbijlage
- NUtgids
- NUkaart
- NUik
- NUtv

Meisje (9) zwaargewond na aanrijding

Uitgegeven: 20 februari 2009 22:42

Laatst gewijzigd: 20 februari 2009 22:58

DORDRECHT – Een 9-jarig meisje uit Dordrecht is vrijdagmiddag aangereden door een auto toen zij een zebrapad wilde oversteken.



Meisje zwaargewond na aanrijding

fotoserie

Het meisje liep een gebroken been, een gebroken arm, gekneusde ribben en een zware hersenschudding op. Ze is per ambulance overgebracht naar een ziekenhuis in Rotterdam.

Het meisje wilde met de fiets aan de hand de Mauritsweg oversteken. Toen ze op het zebrapad liep werd ze aangereden door een auto die met hoge snelheid kwam aanrijden.

De 35-jarige bestuurder Ruben S. uit Rotterdam is voor verhoor ingesloten. Hij had tweemaal de maximaal toegestane hoeveelheid alcohol in zijn bloed.

© ANP

◀ Vorige artikel

Volgende artikel ▶

Precipitating event vignette, version C (sex offense)



ALGEMEEN

Vrij 20 februari 2009. Het laatste nieuws lees je het eerst op NU.nl

Voorpagina

Algemeen

Economie

Sport

Internet

Achterklap

Opmerkelijk

Beurs

Wetenschap

Gezondheid

Lifestyle

Plugged

Lifehacking

Auto

Muziek

Dvd

Film

Boek

Games

Column

NU-blog

NUwerk

NUzakelijk

NUfoto

NUsport

NUij

NUvideo

NUbijlage

NUtgids

NUkaart

NUik

NUtv

Meisje (9) van fiets getrokken en onzedelijk betast

Uitgegeven: 20 februari 2009 22:42

Laatst gewijzigd: 20 februari 2009 22:56

DORDRECHT – Een 9-jarig meisje uit Dordrecht is vrijdagmiddag door een man van haar fiets getrokken en onzedelijk betast.



Meisje van fiets getrokken en betast

fotoserie

Een 35-jarige man uit Rotterdam is vrijdag aangehouden op verdenking van het onzedelijk betasten van een 9-jarig meisje in Dordrecht.

Het meisje was op weg van school naar huis. Plotseling kwam er een man naast haar fietsen die haar hardhandig van haar fiets trok. Nadat het meisje ten val kwam, werd ze door de man onzedelijk betast.

Omdat het meisje zich verzette, kon ze weggkomen en de politie waarschuwen. De man, Ruben S., werd later op de dag op basis van het signalement aangehouden.

© ANP

◀ Vorige artikel

Volgende artikel ▶



ALGEMEEN

Zat 25 juli 2009. Het laatste nieuws lees je het eerst op NU.nl

Voorpagina

Algemeen

Economie

Sport

Internet

Achterklap

Opmerkelijk

Beurs

Wetenschap

Gezondheid

Lifestyle

Plugged

Lifehacking

Auto

Muziek

Dvd

Film

Boek

Games

Column

NU-blog

NUwerk

NUzakelijk

NUfoto

NUsport

NUjj

NUvideo

NUbijlage

NUtvgids

NUkaart

NUik

NUtv

Man (35) mishandeld door voormalig slachtoffer

Uitgegeven: 25 juli 2009 15:07

Laatst gewijzigd: 25 juli 2009 15:18

ROTTERDAM – Een 35-jarige man uit Rotterdam is vrijdagavond mishandeld door een 39-jarige man uit Dordrecht die hij in februari had aangereden.

Het slachtoffer van de mishandeling, Ruben S., werd afgelopen dinsdag door de rechter vrijgesproken van een ernstig verkeersongeval.

Bij dat ongeval in februari raakte de 39-jarige Frank H. uit Dordrecht zwaargewond. De bestuurder, Ruben S., bleek met drank op achter het stuur te hebben gezeten. Hij werd echter vrijgesproken vanwege een vormfout omdat in de dagvaarding de verkeerde datum stond. De rechter zei dat hij Frank H. wel had aangereden, maar dat dit niet op de aangegeven datum gebeurde. Hij sprak S. daarom vrij.

Drie dagen na zijn vrijspraak werd S. opgeschrikt toen er een baksteen door de ruit van zijn woonkamer werd gegooid. Toen hij naar buiten liep, werd hij bij de voordeur door Frank H. opgewacht, die hem begon te schoppen en te slaan. S. hield er twee gebroken tanden, een gebroken neus en kneuzingen aan over.

© ANP

◀ Vorige artikel

Volgende artikel ▶

Vigilantism + sentence vignette, version B3 (normal sentence)



ALGEMEEN

Zat 25 juli 2009. Het laatste nieuws lees je het eerst op NU.nl

Voorpagina

Algemeen

Economie

Sport

Internet

Achterklap

Opmerkelijk

Beurs

Wetenschap

Gezondheid

Lifestyle

Plugged

Lifehacking

Auto

Muziek

Dvd

Film

Boek

Games

Column

NU-blog

NUwerk

NUzakelijk

NUfoto

NUsport

NUjij

NUvideo

NUbijlage

NUtvgids

NUkaart

NUik

NUtv

Vader mishandelt man die dochter had aangereden

Uitgegeven: 25 juli 2009 15:07

Laatst gewijzigd: 25 juli 2009 15:18

ROTTERDAM – Een 35-jarige man uit Rotterdam is vrijdagavond mishandeld door een man uit Dordrecht wiens dochter hij in februari had aangereden.

Het slachtoffer van de mishandeling, Ruben S., werd afgelopen dinsdag door de rechter veroordeeld tot een werkstraf van 180 uur, 2 maanden voorwaardelijke gevangenisstraf en een rijontzegging van 1 jaar in verband met een ernstig verkeersongeval.

Bij dat ongeval in februari raakte de 9-jarige dochter van Frank H. uit Dordrecht zwaargewond. De bestuurder, Ruben S., bleek met drank op achter het stuur te hebben gezeten. De straf komt overeen met de eis van het Openbaar Ministerie (OM).

Drie dagen na zijn veroordeling werd S. opgeschrikt toen er een baksteen door de ruit van zijn woonkamer werd gegooid. Toen hij naar buiten liep, werd hij bij de voordeur door Frank H. opgewacht, die hem begon te schoppen en te slaan. S. hield er twee gebroken tanden, een gebroken neus en kneuzingen aan over.

© ANP

◀ Vorige artikel

Volgende artikel ▶



ALGEMEEN

Zat 25 juli 2009. Het laatste nieuws lees je het eerst op NU.nl

- Voorpagina
- Algemeen**
- Economie
- Sport
- Internet
- Achterklap
- Opmerkelijk
- Beurs
- Wetenschap
- Gezondheid
- Lifestyle
- Plugged
- Lifehacking
- Auto
- Muziek
- Dvd
- Film
- Boek
- Games
- Column
- NU-blog

- NUwerk
- NUzakelijk
- NUfoto
- NUsport
- NUjij
- NUvideo
- NUbijlage
- NUtgids
- NUkaart
- NUik
- NUtv

Vader mishandelt man die dochter onzedelijk had betast

Uitgegeven: 25 juli 2009 15:07

Laatst gewijzigd: 25 juli 2009 15:18

ROTTERDAM – Een 35-jarige man uit Rotterdam is vrijdagavond mishandeld door een man uit Dordrecht wiens dochter hij in februari onzedelijk had betast.

Het slachtoffer van de mishandeling, Ruben S., werd afgelopen dinsdag door de rechter veroordeeld tot een werkstraf van 240 uur, 4 maanden voorwaardelijke gevangenisstraf en een schadevergoeding van 400 euro in verband met de onzedelijke betasting van een minderjarig meisje.

In februari werd de 9-jarige dochter van Frank H. uit Dordrecht op weg naar huis door Ruben S. van haar fiets getrokken en onzedelijk betast. De door de rechter opgelegde straf is zwaarder dan de eis van het Openbaar Ministerie (OM), dat om een werkstraf van 180 uur, 2 maanden voorwaardelijke gevangenisstraf en een schadevergoeding van 250 euro had gevraagd.

Drie dagen na zijn veroordeling werd S. opgeschrikt toen er een baksteen door de ruit van zijn woonkamer werd gegooid. Toen hij naar buiten liep, werd hij bij de voordeur door Frank H. opgewacht, die hem begon te schoppen en te slaan. S. hield er twee gebroken tanden, een gebroken neus en kneuzingen aan over.

© ANP

◀ Vorige artikel

Volgende artikel ▶

Control group vignette, version C2X (sex offense + lenient sentence)



ALGEMEEN

Zat 25 juli 2009. Het laatste nieuws lees je het eerst op NU.nl

Voorpagina

Algemeen

Economie

Sport

Internet

Achterklap

Opmerkelijk

Beurs

Wetenschap

Gezondheid

Lifestyle

Plugged

Lifehacking

Auto

Muziek

Dvd

Film

Boek

Games

Column

NU-blog

NUwerk

NUzakelijk

NUfoto

NUsport

NUjj

NUvideo

NUbijlage

NUvgids

NUkaart

NUik

NUtv

Vader mishandelt man die dochter onzedelijk had betast

Uitgegeven: 25 juli 2009 15:07

Laatst gewijzigd: 25 juli 2009 15:18

ROTTERDAM – Een 35-jarige man uit Rotterdam is vrijdagavond mishandeld door een 39-jarige man uit Dordrecht wiens dochter hij in februari onzedelijk had betast.



Meisje van fiets getrokken en betast

fotoserie

Het slachtoffer van de mishandeling, Ruben S., werd afgelopen dinsdag door de rechter veroordeeld tot een werkstraf van 40 uur en een schadevergoeding van 100 euro in verband met de onzedelijke betasting van een minderjarig meisje.

In februari was de 9-jarige dochter van Frank H. op weg van school naar huis, toen er plotseling een man naast haar kwam fietsen die haar hardhandig van haar fiets trok. Nadat het meisje ten val kwam, werd ze door de man onzedelijk betast. Omdat het meisje zich verzette, kon ze weggelopen en de politie waarschuwen. Ruben S. werd later op de dag op basis van het signalement aangehouden.

De werkstraf van 40 uur tezamen met de schadevergoeding van 100 euro is lager dan de eis van het Openbaar Ministerie (OM), dat om een werkstraf van 180 uur, 2 maanden voorwaardelijke gevangenisstraf en een schadevergoeding van 250 euro had gevraagd.

Drie dagen na zijn veroordeling werd S. opgeschrikt toen er een baksteen door de ruit van zijn woonkamer werd gegooid. Toen hij naar buiten liep, werd hij bij de voordeur door Frank H. opgewacht, die hem begon te schoppen en te slaan. S. hield er twee gebroken tanden, een gebroken neus en kneuzingen aan over.

© ANP

Appendix 4: Translated texts of selected vignettes

Precipitating event vignette A

Traffic aggression

Man (39) heavily injured by aggression in traffic

DORDRECHT – On Friday afternoon, a 39-year-old man from Schiedam was forced off the road by a car on a bicycle path in his home town. The victim, Frank H., was cut off when he wanted to turn right into the Mauritsweg on his bicycle. He reacted to this by raising his fists to the driver, Ruben S. Shortly afterwards, H. was forced off the road by the same driver, causing him to fall. Frank H. ended up with a broken leg, a broken arm, bruised ribs and a heavy concussion. He was taken to a hospital in Rotterdam by ambulance. The 35-year-old driver Ruben S. from Rotterdam was taken in for interrogation. He was found to have a blood-alcohol level that was twice the legal limit.

Precipitating event vignette B

Pedestrian crash

Girl (9) heavily injured after car accident

DORDRECHT – On Friday afternoon, a 9-year-old girl from Dordrecht was hit by a car when she was walking on a pedestrian crossing. The girl ended up with a broken leg, a broken arm, bruised ribs and a heavy concussion. She was taken to a hospital in Rotterdam by ambulance. The girl wanted to walk her bicycle across the Mauritsweg. While she was walking on the pedestrian crossing, she was hit by a car that was driving at high speed. The 35-year-old driver Ruben S. from Rotterdam was taken in for interrogation. He was found to have a blood-alcohol level that was twice the legal limit.

Precipitating event vignette C

Sex offense

Girl (9) pulled from bicycle and sexually assaulted

DORDRECHT – On Friday afternoon, a 9-year-old girl from Dordrecht was pulled off her bicycle and sexually assaulted by a man. A 35-year-old man from Rotterdam was apprehended on Friday for the sexual assault of a 9-year old girl in Dordrecht. The girl was on her way home from school. Suddenly a man pulled up next to her on his bicycle and forcefully pulled her off her bicycle. After the girl had fallen onto the ground, he sexually assaulted her. As the girl resisted, she was able to get away and notify the police. The man, Ruben S., was later apprehended on the basis of her description.

Vigilantism + sentence vignette A1**Acquittal**

Man (35) beaten up by former victim

ROTTERDAM – A 35-year-old man from Rotterdam was beaten up Friday night by a 39-year-old man from Dordrecht, whom he had hit by car in February. The victim of the beating, Ruben S., was acquitted by a judge on Tuesday from involvement in a serious traffic accident. As a result of the accident in question, 39-year-old Frank H. from Dordrecht was seriously injured. The driver, Ruben S., was found to have been driving while under the influence of alcohol. He was acquitted, however, due to a technicality, as the summons reported the wrong date. The judge said that he did collide with Frank H., but that this did not happen on the indicated date. He thus acquitted Ruben S. Three days after his acquittal, S. was startled when a brick was thrown through the window of his living room. When he walked outside, he was awaited near the front door by Frank H., who started hitting and kicking him. S. was left with two broken teeth, a broken nose and contusions.

Vigilantism + sentence vignette B2**Normal sentence**

Father beats up man who collided with his daughter on the road

ROTTERDAM – A 35-year-old man from Rotterdam was beaten up Friday night by a 39-year-old man from Dordrecht, whose daughter he had hit by car in February. The victim of the beating, Ruben S., was sentenced by the judge last Tuesday to 180 hours of community service, a 2-month suspended prison sentence and a suspended driver's license for 1 year due to his involvement in a serious traffic accident. As a result of the accident in question, the 9-year old daughter of Frank H. from Dordrecht was seriously injured. The driver, Ruben S., was found to have been driving while under the influence of alcohol. The sentence matches the Public Prosecutor's demand. Three days after his conviction, S. was startled when a brick was thrown through the window of his living room. When he walked outside, he was awaited near the front door by Frank H., who started hitting and kicking him. S. was left with two broken teeth, a broken nose and contusions.

Vigilantism + sentence vignette C4

Severe sentence

Father beats up man who molested his daughter

ROTTERDAM – A 35-man from Rotterdam was beaten up Friday night by a 39-year-old man from Schiedam, whose daughter he sexually assaulted in February. The victim of the beating, Ruben S., was sentenced by a judge last Tuesday to 240 hours of community service, a 4-month suspended prison sentence and 250 euro compensation as a result of the sexual assault of an under age girl. In February the 9-year old daughter of Frank H. from Dordrecht was on her way home when she was pulled off her bicycle and sexually assaulted by Ruben S. The judge's sentence is more severe than the Public Prosecutor's demand, which was 180 hours of community service, a 2-month suspended prison sentence and 250 euro compensation. Three days after his conviction, S. was startled when a brick was thrown through the window of his living room. When he walked outside, he was awaited near the front door by Frank H., who started hitting and kicking him. S. was left with two broken teeth, a broken nose and contusions.

Control vignette C2X

Sex offense + lenient sentence

Father beats up man who molested his daughter

ROTTERDAM – A 35-man from Rotterdam was beaten up Friday night by a 39-year-old man from Schiedam, whose daughter he sexually assaulted in February. The victim of the beating, Ruben S., was sentenced by a judge last Tuesday to 40 hours of community service and 100 euro compensation as a result of the sexual assault of an under age girl. In February the girl was on her way home from school when a man suddenly pulled up next to her on his bicycle and forcefully pulled her off her bicycle. After the girl had fallen onto the ground, he sexually assaulted her. As the girl resisted, she was able to get away and notify the police. Ruben S. was later apprehended on the basis of her description. The 40 hours of community service in combination with the 100 euro compensation is less severe than the Public Prosecutor's demand, which was 180 hours of community service, a 2-month suspended sentence and 250 euro compensation. Three days after his conviction, S. was startled when a brick was thrown through the window of his living room. When he walked outside, he was awaited near the front door by Frank H., who started hitting and kicking him. S. was left with two broken teeth, a broken nose and contusions.

Appendix 5: Measures of reactions to vignettes ⁵⁷

Items in response to Vignette 1 (precipitating event)	Items in response to Vignette 2 (sentence + vigilantism)
<p><i>Aversive state</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I find it terrible what happened to X 2. I pity X 3. When reading this article, I realize that what happened to X can also happen to me 4. I feel for X 5. Y's behavior is not justifiable in any way 6. Y's behavior is morally reprehensible 7. I am angry at Y 8. I feel sympathy for Y 9. Y's behavior is understandable 10. I feel for Y 	<p><i>Aversive state</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I find it terrible that Y was beaten up 2. I pity Y 3. When reading this article, I realize that what happened to Y can also happen to me 4. I feel for Y 5. X's behavior is not justifiable in any way 6. X's behavior is morally reprehensible 7. I am angry at X 8. I feel sympathy for X 9. X's behavior is understandable 10. X was completely right in beating up Y 11. X is the victim of this situation, not the offender
<p><i>Blame</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. X has herself/himself to thank for the car collision/sex crime 12. X is ... for the car collision/sex crime* 13. Y is ... for the car collision/sex crime* 	<p><i>Blame</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 12. Y has himself to thank for the assault 13. X is ... for the assault* 14. Y is ... for the assault*
<p><i>Derogation</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 14. X is unwise 15. X is irresponsible 16. X is stupid 	<p><i>Derogation</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 15. Y is stupid 16. Y is crazy 17. Y is bad
<p><i>Desire for punishment</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 17. Y should be prosecuted for what he did 18. Y should do penance for his behavior 19. The authorities should ignore the car collision/sex crime 	<p><i>Desire for punishment</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 18. X should be prosecuted for what he did 19. X should do penance for his behavior 20. The authorities should ignore the assault

⁵⁷ The labels of the 7-point response scales are 1 = fully disagree and 7 = fully agree. For the items with an *, the labels are 1 = not to blame and 7 = completely to blame. A few additional questions were posed with alternative response scales (e.g. yes or no). See Section 7.4.6 for more details on these questions.

Appendix 6 : Items to measure confidence in the criminal justice system

Item	Object	Concept	Source
Judges are prejudiced	judges	procedural justice	De Keijser et al. (2006)
Judges treat people fairly	judges	procedural justice	Jackson & Sunshine (2007)
Judges are trustworthy	judges	procedural justice	Ter Voert (1997)
You can count on the judges to take decisions that are best for society	judges	procedural justice	Sunshine & Tyler (2003)
I respect judges	judges	procedural justice	Sunshine & Tyler (2003)
Judges deserve respect among citizens	judges	procedural justice	
If a judge passes a light sentence, he will have a good reason for that.	judges	procedural justice	
Judges' verdicts are well deliberated	judges	performance	
Judges do their job well	judges	performance	Dekker et al. (2004)
Judges know what's going on in society	judges	performance	Koomen (2006)
Citizens' rights are not protected well by judges	judges	performance	Sunshine & Tyler (2003)
The Public Prosecution is prejudiced	prosecutors	procedural justice	De Keijser et al. (2006)
The Public Prosecution treats people fairly	prosecutors	procedural justice	Jackson & Sunshine (2007)
The Public Prosecution is trustworthy	prosecutors	procedural justice	Ter Voert (1997)
You can count on the Public Prosecution to take decisions that are best for society	prosecutors	procedural justice	Sunshine & Tyler (2003)
The Public Prosecution deserves respect among citizens	prosecutors	procedural justice	
I respect the Public Prosecution	prosecutors	procedural justice	Sunshine & Tyler (2003)
If the Public Prosecution recommends a light sentence, it will have a good reason for that.	prosecutors	procedural justice	
The Public Prosecution does its job well	prosecutors	performance	Dekker et al. (2004)
The Public Prosecution succeeds in prosecuting the right people	prosecutors	performance	
Sentence recommendations are well-deliberated by the Public Prosecution	prosecutors	performance	
Citizens' rights are not protected well by the Public Prosecution	prosecutors	performance	Sunshine & Tyler (2003)

Item	Object	Concept	Source
The police are trustworthy	police	procedural justice	Ter Voert (1997)
The police care about the well-being of the everyday citizen	police	procedural justice	
You can count on the police to take decisions that are best for society	police	procedural justice	Sunshine & Tyler (2003)
The police take citizens seriously	police	procedural justice	
If the police decide not to arrest someone, they will have a good reason for that	police	procedural justice	
I do not respect the police	police	procedural justice	Sunshine & Tyler (2003)
Police orders do not always need to be obeyed	police	procedural justice	
The police do their job well.	police	performance	Dekker et al. (2004)
Citizens' rights are not protected well by the police	police	performance	Sunshine & Tyler (2003)
The police are effective in combating crime	police	performance	
The police are there when you need them	police	performance	Ter Voert (1997)
The Dutch criminal justice system is fair	CJS	procedural justice	
The Dutch criminal justice system is trustworthy	CJS	procedural justice	Ter Voert (1997)
I trust the way in which laws in the Netherlands are maintained	CJS	procedural justice	
Citizens can count on it that their case is properly dealt with in the Dutch CJS	CJS	procedural justice	
Sometimes it is better to ignore the law and solve problems yourself	CJS	procedural justice	
I respect the Dutch criminal justice system	CJS	procedural justice	
On the condition that you don't harm anyone, it's acceptable to disobey a law	CJS	procedural justice	
The Dutch criminal justice system functions properly	CJS	performance	
The Dutch justice system succeeds in bringing criminals to justice	CJS	performance	Caldeira et al. (1995)
The Dutch justice system is effective in combating crime	CJS	performance	Sunshine & Tyler (2003)
In the Dutch justice system, there is too much emphasis on the rights of perpetrators	CJS	performance	Rattner et al. (2001)

Information about the courts

Dutch (original) version:

Het Openbaar Ministerie (OM) zorgt ervoor dat strafbare feiten worden opgespoord en vervolgd. Het OM is in de rechtszaal vertegenwoordigd door een officier van justitie. Komt een zaak voor de rechter, dan legt de officier van justitie uit waarvan iemand wordt verdacht en welke straf hij eist. De rechter onderzoekt vervolgens of de verdachte een strafbaar feit heeft gepleegd en daarvoor gestraft moet worden.

English version:

The Public Prosecution Service (PPS) is responsible for the detection and prosecution of criminal offenses. In court the PPS is represented by a prosecutor. When a case is taken to court, the prosecutor explains the charges that have been filed against the defendant and requests a sanction. The judge subsequently investigates whether the defendant has committed a crime and to what extent he will be sanctioned for it.

Appendix 7: Attitude measures

General concern over crime (De Keijser et al., 2007)

Total volume of crime in the Netherlands has, over the past years, increased strongly
 Crime is a problem that causes me great concern
 In general, sentences for crimes in the Netherlands are too lenient
 Offenders in the Netherlands are currently punished more severely than they were ten years ago

General support for vigilantism

If an offender is not sentenced by the legal system, I approve of it when a citizen takes the law into his own hands
 If the government is not successful in their fight against crime, citizens are justified to take the law into their own hands*
 Citizens should take the law into their own hands more frequently
 Some cases of citizens taking the law into their own hands are justified
 Citizens who take the law into their own hands should always be prosecuted
 If an offender is not sentenced by the legal system, I find it understandable for a citizen to take the law into his own hands
 Citizens who take the law into their own hands form a danger to society
 Under no condition do I approve of people who take the law into their own hands

* Based on Ter Voert (1997)

Belief in a just world for others (Lipkus et al., 1996)

I feel that people get in life what they are entitled to have
 I feel that the world treats people fairly
 I feel that people are treated unfairly in life (*new*)
 I feel that people treat each other fairly in life
 I feel that the world is an unfair place (*new*)
 I feel that people earn the rewards and punishments they get
 I feel that the world is a fair place (*new*)
 I feel that people treat each other with the respect they deserve
 I feel that people get in life what they deserve
 I feel that people's efforts are noticed and rewarded
 I feel that when people meet with misfortune, they have brought it upon themselves

Appendix 8: General support for vigilantism

Table A4 General support for vigilantism – agreement percentages per item ⁵⁸

Item	disagree	neutral	agree
1. If an offender is not sentenced by the legal system, I approve of it when a citizen takes the law into his own hands	62	20	18
2. If the government is not successful in their fight against crime, citizens are justified to take the law into their own hands *	60	19	21
3. Citizens should take the law into their own hands more frequently	71	18	11
4. Some cases of citizens taking the law into their own hands are justified	33	21	46
5. Citizens who take the law into their own hands should always be prosecuted	25	22	53
6. If an offender is not sentenced by the legal system, I find it understandable for a citizen to take the law into his own hands	34	20	46
7. Citizens who take the law into their own hands form a danger to society	26	24	50
8. Under no condition do I approve of people who take the law into their own hands	38	25	37

*Based on Ter Voert (1997)

58 The items were measured on a 7-point scale. In this table, scores 1-3 are in the 'disagree' category, score 4 is labeled as 'neutral', and scores 5-7 together constitute the 'agree' percentages.

Table A5 Results of two-way ANOVAs on four reactions to vigilantism (N = 1972)

Empathy with vigilantism victim				
SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F
precipitating event	673.30	2	336.15	152.81**
sentence level	104.62	3	34.87	15.85**
precipitating crime * sentence level	3.01	4	.75	.34
error	4315.87	1962	2.20	
Outrage at vigilante				
SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F
precipitating event	539.33	2	269.66	184.48**
sentence level	78.62	3	26.21	17.93**
precipitating crime * sentence level	3.45	4	.86	.59
error	2868.02	1962	1.46	
Blame and derogation of vigilantism victim				
SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F
precipitating event	538.52	2	269.26	139.46**
sentence level	8.35	3	2.78	1.44
precipitating crime * sentence level	3.93	4	.98	.51
error	3788.21	1962	1.93	
Desired punishment for vigilante				
SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F
precipitating event	539.38	2	269.69	12.79**
sentence level	84.98	3	28.33	12.69**
precipitating crime * sentence level	5.02	4	1.26	.56
error	438.77	1962	2.23	

** $p < .01$