

**Author(s)**

Dana Rösch (Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz) - daroesch@students.uni-mainz.de  
Julia Kirsch (Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz) - jkirsch@students.uni-mainz.de  
Linda Sroka (Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz) - lsroka@students.uni-mainz.de  
Stefan Gerhards (Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz) - stgerhar@students.uni-mainz.de  
Sonja Ruckelshaußen (Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz) - sruckels@students.uni-mainz.de

**1) Have any data been collected for this study already?**

No, no data have been collected for this study yet.

**2) What's the main question being asked or hypothesis being tested in this study?**

- 1) Offenders are perceived as more guilty when using the new revised concepts
- 2) Offenders are considered to have more insight into their offence when using the term intelligence impairment in contrast to using the term feeblemindedness
- 3) Offenders are considered more dangerous when using the term "Perversity" in contrast to using the term "Disorder"
- 4) All differences are more pronounced among laypersons than among those with prior knowledge

**3) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.**

- 1) "Einsichtsfähigkeit" (Measured via direct inquiry, scale formed out of the items to be able to see the injustice of the act, to understand abstract rules and to foresee the consequences)
- 2) Dangerousness (Measured via direct inquiry, scale formed out of the items danger, risk of relapse and willingness to inflict damage on others)

**4) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?**

Within subject: Every subject receives 4 case vignettes (2 for each feature each with new and old wording)

Between subject: Subjects are categorized into laypersons and people with prior knowledge by direct inquiry of whether previous knowledge is available.

**5) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.**

rmANOVAs are calculated for all hypotheses (within-subject-factor: old vs. new terminology, between-subject-factor: layperson vs. prior knowledge)

**6) Describe exactly how outliers will be defined and handled, and your precise rule(s) for excluding observations.**

Persons who meet at least one of the following exclusion criteria will be excluded:

Suspicion check: specification of the study objective (if a comparison of the old and new terms is mentioned)

Processing time: Less than 5 minutes

Not filled in to the end

Furthermore, we define outliers as deviating from the mean by 2.5 SD. These are eliminated as outliers.

**7) How many observations will be collected or what will determine sample size? No need to justify decision, but be precise about exactly how the number will be determined.**

We will offer the survey until 100 People per group (layperson and people with prior knowledge) have participated or until the 9th of June (whichever comes first)

**8) Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., secondary analyses, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)**

A further comprehensive exploratory examination of further AVs is carried out. We consider differences between lawyers and psychologists. We collect a direct evaluation of the individual terms as well as a direct comparison and look exploratively at how they turn out.

In addition, we look at the effects of the terms within the case vignettes on sympathy, susceptibility to therapy, impulsiveness, deviation from applicable norms and values, thoughtfulness of the act and full possession of mental powers.

Finally, we would like to consider the difference between new and old terms overall.