

Development and Validation of the Pedophilophobia Scale

Bogdan Tuziak^{1*}

ABSTRACT

This study describes the development and implications of the Pedophilophobia Scale in Ukrainian language, designed to detect the cognitive, affective, and behavioral components of phobia towards pedophiles in Ukrainian sample. The participants (n=40 for the trial test–retest and n=400 for test–retest reliability) were students from a large Podillia Ukrainian States university. The Scale represents the 25 Likert-type items questionnaire consisting of three factors: a factor that assesses mainly negative cognitions regarding pedophilia, a factor that assess primarily negative affect and avoidance of pedophile individuals, and a factor that assesses negative affect and aggression toward pedophile individuals. The scale was created on base of the Homophobia Scale and the concurrent validity was established according the IHP. The steps of Scale improvement and validation of the results are discussed. Study results suggest that the PPS may be used in forensic psychological and phobia assessment settings.

Keywords: Pedophilophobia, Phobia Of Pedophiles, Pedophile, Assessment, Psychometrics

Pedophilophobia (pedohysteria), a termed coined by Deryagin G.B. (2016), was originally defined as the dread (transmitted by mass-medias for political purposes) of pedophiles sexual violence towards the children as well as irrational fear, hatred, and intolerance by heterosexual individuals of pedophile men and women. Partially the research in pedophilophobia was markedly increased following the research on sexual types of OCD, continuing with the study of the repugnant obsessions (2004), treatment strategies in a case of OCD and finishing with study on pedophile OCD (POCD) (2015). In 2013 DSM-V revealed existing of pedophile sexual orientation, as a normal type of sexual orientation. After publication researchers quickly shifted their focus from trying to modify pedophile individuals' sexual orientation to studying the negative reactions of heterosexual individuals toward pedophile individuals. Also Deryagin G.B. (2016) asserted the existence of a pedophile orientation based on his clinical practice, emphasizing the exaggerated public attention to the phenomenon of pedophilia. He claimed that there was a tension in Russian society that could be presented on a psychological level in the form of phobia or panic, as a reaction to the phenomenon of pedophilia or to the pedophiles / imaginary pedophiles.

¹ BJur, MPsy; Associated Researcher, Department of Biotechnological and Applied Clinical Sciences, University of L'Aquila, L'Aquila, Italy

[*Responding Author](#)

Received: August 21, 2017; Revision Received: September 22, 2017; Accepted: September 25, 2017

Development and Validation of the Pedophilophobia Scale

However, during this resurgence in interest, researchers such Ehman generalized the term homophobia to denote any negative attitude, belief, or action (physical violence) toward individuals with pedophile sexual orientation, that isn't a predictor of sexual offending. According to Deryagin (2016) there are the "sexually healthy individuals (mostly married) with pedophilia orientation", named by Cantor (2016) "non-offending pedophiles" - a unique population of individuals who experience sexual interest in children, but despite common misperceptions, have neither had sexual contact with a child nor have accessed illegal child sexual exploitation material. Misunderstanding of the difference between sexual orientation and pedophile act of sexual violence is the cause of fear and other negative reactions to people with pedophile sexual orientation, describing a case of social phobia, frequent psychological disorder. These definitional problems also make comparisons across studies and information difficult, if not impossible, specially for politicization of this argument. Thus, a scientific understanding of the construct of pedophilophobia is in its infancy.

Among the available self-assessment instruments, the 25-item Pedophilophobia Scale (PPS) is the first measurement instrument of social phobia symptoms that appear towards pedophiles and pedophilia. The specific scales that can be used to measure phobia towards pedophiles for the moment are absent. Author used as the base homophobia scales which contain cognitive and affective statements that assess one's attitudes and beliefs about homosexuality, gay and lesbian individuals, adopting the psychometric components specifically from Homophobia Scale for its similar psychometric properties. Since there is no scales of pedophilophobia this scale is the first instrument to measuring different constructs. According to O'Donohue and Caselles (1993) for the moment, no homophobia scales in use can assess the full range of the domain of the phobia construct. This fact suggested to adopt the Pedophilophobia Scale questions to the anxiety and phobia symptoms described in the DSM-V (2013). One would expect that if pedophilophobia is a phobic component and has an anxiety response as defined in the Diagnostical and Statistical Manual for Mental Disorders-V (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). The behavioral component is the central point of the PPS being associated with aggressiveness.

The fear towards pedophiles according to criteria of the DSM-5 300.23 (F40.10) is a Social Anxiety Disorder (Social Phobia). Patients with social phobia exhibit a wide range of sexual dysfunctions. Men have mainly performance problems, and women have a more pervasive disorder. Patients with a Social Anxiety Disorder of both genders show difficulties in sexual interaction. So, it is important that clinicians having the evaluate instrument such is PPS for identification of this particular type of social phobia. Having information on the interactions between the cognitive, affective, and behavioral components of social phobia could greatly increase author's understanding of what has been labeled pedophilophobia.

The goal of this study was to develop, validate, and present the initial psychometric properties of a scale that assesses the cognitive, affective, and behavioral components of pedophilophobia. The purpose is to determine if individuals who self-report negative cognitions and or affect toward pedophilia and pedophile individuals also self-report

Development and Validation of the Pedophilophobia Scale

engaging in negative behaviors (aggression and avoidance) as proposed by O'Donohue and Caselles (1993) in case of their tripartite model of homophobia. The author hypothesized that the PPS under development will result in three subscales (cognitive, affective, and behavioral), adopted from the HS, that will yield important information regarding reactions to pedophile individuals and pedophilia, in general.

Pilot Testing of Items for the Pedophilophobia Scale

The first passage

To begin with, from the representatives of the University was obtained the permission to conduct questioning using PPS (Ukrainian version). The first phase taken to begin constructing the Pedophilophobia Scale was to pilot test potential items for the scale. Pilot testing was conducted among undergraduate students at the Podillia University, and included two separate phases. The initial phase of pilot testing involved 40 participants (20 males, 20 females; M age=18.3 years; SD=1.14). They compiled the PPS for 15 minutes. After the participants answered a series of questions about their reactions towards the scale items, if the PPS text was easily understood. According to student's suggestions the scale items was modified and shirtd.

The second passage

Next, 46 participants (21 males, 25 females; M age=18.6 years; SD=0.8) were invited to fill in the PPS with corrected items. After compilation the participants gave feedback about the items in terms of their comprehensibility and relevance to the topics just discussed in the group. The results of this tape suggested that the text had a good comprehensibility and was adequate for using in the study.

Study 1

The next stage of scale construction, Study 1, involved administering the pool of items to a larger group of participants. The goals of Study 1 were (1) to establish test-retest reliability and concurrent validity, (2) to determine the factor structure of the Pedophilophobia Scale, and (3) to evaluate its internal psychometric properties.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Participants included other 40 undergraduate students (20 men; 20 women; M age 19.91 years; SD=2.43) who were randomly selected from an educational-veterinary subject pool at a Podillia university. The ethnic breakdown of the sample was 92% Ukrainian, 15% Russian, 5% Turkish. Their marital status was 81% single, 10% married, 1% divorced, and 7% living together. Their religion was 2.5% Judaic, 5% Catholic, 5% Muslims, 50% Orthodox, 27.5% atheists. Participants filled out a self-report questionnaire while meeting in groups of no more than 20. Their average education was 12.5 years (SD =.50 years).

Materials and Procedures

Students completed questionnaires on two separate occasions, 2 weeks apart. The first

Development and Validation of the Pedophilophobia Scale

administration consisted of the Pedophilophobia Scale and a short demographic form. During the first and second administrations participants completed the revised version of the scale, coding the questionnaires with the nickname and number of the first or second scale administration in order to match the data from the first to the second. The questionnaires were completed in university classrooms. The average time of testing for the first administration was 15 min. Approximately 1 week after the first testing session, same 40 participants (20 men; 20 women; M age 19.91 years; SD=2.43) returned to complete the retest-test. The average time of testing was 10 min.

RESULTS

The questionnaire yielded an overall *a* reliability coefficient of $r = .914$, ($p < .01$) and a 1-week test-retest reliability coefficient of $r = .942$ ($p < .01$). The mean total score for the scale based on 40 participants was 31.23 (SD = 17.96). The mean score for the men participants ($n = 20$) was 41.38 (SD = 19.32). The mean score for the women participants ($n = 20$) was 28.74 (SD = 17.61). An independent-samples *t* test revealed a significant difference based on gender of participants [$t(20) = 4.05$, $p < .0001$]. This finding was replicated using retest data as well [$t(20) = 3.79$, $p < .005$]. Concurrent validity was established comparing the obtained data with the Index of Homophobia (IPH; Hudson & Ricketts, 1980). A Pearson correlation coefficient was computed using overall scores for the IHP and the Pedophilophobia Scale. The results yielded a significant correlation ($r = .627$, $p < .01$), indicating that the two scales are measuring a similar construct.

For the determination of the factor structure, an exploratory factor analysis was computed on the 25-item revised version of the Pedophilophobia Scale using the principal-components analysis solution (Harman, 1976) with direct oblimin rotation. Based on scree plot analysis (Catell, 1966) as well as the examination of eigen values greater than one (Nunnally, 1978), a three-factor solution emerged that accounted for 69.05% of the scales variance. Factor loadings are presented in Table I.

Development and Validation of the Pedophilophobia Scale

Table I. Factor Analysis and Loadings for the 25-Item Pedophilophobia Scale (Study 1)

Item	Factor loading
Factor 1. Behavior/Negative Affect (41.57%)	
1. Talk about pedophiles makes me nervous	.789
2. Pedophiles deserve a death penalty (castration)	.715
4. If my friend was speaking positively about pedophiles, I would be very worried	.695
5. I think pedophiles should not work with children	.746
6. I am angry hearing about the new lawlessness of pedophiles	.838
7. I would love if my child was in a pedophile group	-.503
9. Watching the news about the pedophile arrest, I say to myself "animal" or "abomination"	.714
10. I'm not worried that my friends are watching child pornography	-.620
11. I would not be annoyed, knowing that my best friend is a pedophile	-.513
22. I'm not embarrassed when I see a man kissing a small child on the lips in a public place	-.554
Factor 2. Affect/Behavioral Aggression (23.11%)	
12. Pedophilia is immoral	.626
13. I despise and hate pedophiles	.874
14. I think I mustn't allow to approach a pedophile to child	.866
15. I am afraid that pedophiles will cling to my children	.845
17. I teased friends who dating a younger ones for themselves, calling them "pedophiles"	.917
19. I would beat a stranger who would have offered my child to get into his car	.924
21. I try not to talk about pedophiles	.876
23. When I hear about pedophiles, I think "What a shit"	.885
24. Seeing an adult among a group of young children, I try to understand whether he is a pedophile	.861
25. I have a good relationship with people I suspect in pedophilia	.909
Factor 3. Cognitive Negativism (4.37%)	
3. Pedophilia does not surprise me	-.709
8. Marriage between an adult and a minor is acceptable	-.814
16. The court must take into account the acquittal of the pedophile	-.721
18. I would not be embarrassed to see my roommate watching child pornography	-.503
20. Behavior pedophiles should not be subject to criminal punishment	.438

The first factor, Behavioral/Negative Affect, accounted for 41.57% of the scale's variance and contained 10 items that assessed primarily negative affect and avoidance behaviors. Factor 1 yielded a subscale score $M = 10.24$ ($SD = 7.96$).

The second factor, Affect/ Behavioral Aggressive, accounted for 23.11% of the scale's variance and contained 10 items that assessed primarily aggressive behaviors and negative affect. Factor 2 yielded a subscale score $M = 13.63$ ($SD = 12.51$). The third factor, Cognitive Negativism, accounted for 4.37% of the scales variance and contained five items that assessed negative attitudes and cognition, with higher scores indicating more negative attitudes/cognitions regarding homosexual individuals. Factor 3 yielded a subscale score $M=6.92$ ($SD=4.78$).

Development and Validation of the Pedophilophobia Scale

Study 2

The next phase of scale construction, Study 2, involved administering the pool of items to a larger group of participants. The aims of Study 2 were (1) to establish test-retest reliability and concurrent validity, (2) to determine the factor structure of the Pedophilophobia Scale, and (3) to evaluate its internal psychometric properties.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Participants included 400 undergraduate students (200 men; 200 women; M age 20.64 years; SD=3.18) who were randomly selected from the veterinary faculties (2nd – 4th courses) at a Podillia university. The ethnic breakdown of the sample was 86.75% Ukrainian, 5.75% Russian, 3.5% Turkish, 1.75% Polish, 1.25% Hungarian and 1% Israeli. Their marital status was 42% single, 18.25% married, 1.25% divorced, and 22.5% living together. Their religion was 2% Judaic, 3% Catholic, 4.75% Muslims, 57.75% Orthodox, and 32.5% atheists. Participants filled out a self-report questionnaire while meeting in groups of no more than 50 (one class). Their average education was 14.25 years (SD =2.48 years).

Materials and Procedures

Students completed questionnaires on two separate occasions, 2 weeks apart. The first administration consisted of the Pedophilophobia Scale and a short demographic form. During the first and second administrations participants completed the revised version of the scale, coding the questionnaires with the nickname and number of the first or second scale administration (with date) in order to match the data from the first to the second. The questionnaires were completed in university classrooms and in the library. The average time of testing for the first administration was 10-15 min. Approximately 2 weeks after the first testing session, same 400 participants (200 men; 200 women; M age 24.65 years; SD=4.73) returned to complete the retest-test in two days. The average time of testing was 7-10 minutes.

RESULTS

The scale yielded an overall *a* reliability coefficient of $r = .928$, ($p < .01$) and a 2-weeks test-retest reliability coefficient of $r = .951$ ($p < .01$). The mean total score for the scale based on 400 participants was 32.46 (SD = 19.35). The mean score for the men participants ($n = 200$) was 40.76 (SD = 19.64). The mean score for the women participants ($n = 200$) was 28.74 (SD = 17.61). An independent-samples *t* test revealed a significant difference based on gender of participants [$t(200) = 4.05$, $p < .0001$]. This finding was replicated using retest data as well [$t(200) = 3.79$, $p < .005$]. Concurrent validity was established comparing the obtained data with the Index of Homophobia (IPH; Hudson & Ricketts, 1980). A Pearson correlation coefficient was computed using overall scores for the IHP and the Pedophilophobia Scale. The results yielded a significant correlation ($r = .627$, $p < .01$), indicating that the two scales are measuring a similar construct.

A Pearson correlation coefficient was computed using education level and the total score

Development and Validation of the Pedophilophobia Scale

from the first administration of Study 1 of the Pedophilophobia Scale. A significant negative correlation was found ($r = -.287, p < .01$), indicating that more educated participants were less homophobic. The correlation between age and total scale score was not significant.

For the determination of the factor structure, an exploratory factor analysis was computed on the 25-item revised version of the Pedophilophobia Scale using the principal-components analysis solution (Harman, 1976) with direct oblimin rotation. Based on scree plot analysis (Catell, 1966) as well as the examination of eigenvalues greater than one (Nunnally, 1978), a three-factor solution emerged that accounted for 68.95% of the scales variance. Factor loadings are presented in Table II.

Table II. Factor Analysis and Loadings for the 25-Item Pedophilophobia Scale (Study 2)

Item	Factor loading
Factor 1. Behavior/Negative Affect (40.62%)	
1. Talk about pedophiles makes me nervous	.816
2. Pedophiles deserve a death penalty (castration)	.662
4. If my friend was speaking positively about pedophiles, I would be very worried	.695
5. I think pedophiles should not work with children	.655
6. I am angry hearing about the new lawlessness of pedophiles	.826
7. I would love if my child was in a pedophile group	-.503
9. Watching the news about the pedophile arrest, I say to myself "animal" or "abomination"	.727
10. I'm not worried that my friends are watching child pornography	-.585
11. I would not be annoyed, knowing that my best friend is a pedophile	-.528
22. I'm not embarrassed when I see a man kissing a small child on the lips in a public place	-.597
Factor 2. Affect/Behavioral Aggression (23.73%)	
12. Pedophilia is immoral	.657
13. I despise and hate pedophiles	.859
14. I think I mustn't allow to approach a pedophile to child	.816
15. I am afraid that pedophiles will cling to my children	.903
17. I teased friends who dating a younger ones for themselves, calling them "pedophiles"	.924
19. I would beat a stranger who would have offered my child to get into his car	.921
21. I try not to talk about pedophiles	.909
23. When I hear about pedophiles, I think "What a shit"	.898
24. Seeing an adult among a group of young children, I try to understand whether he is a pedophile	.882
25. I have a good relationship with people I suspect in pedophilia	.855
Factor 3. Cognitive Negativism (4.68%)	
3. Pedophilia does not surprise me	-.720
8. Marriage between an adult and a minor is acceptable	-.814
16. The court must take into account the acquittal of the pedophile	-.708
18. I would not be embarrassed to see my roommate watching child pornography	-.511
20. Behavior pedophiles should not be subject to criminal punishment	.445

The first factor, Behavioral/Negative Affect, accounted for 40.62% of the scale's variance and contained 10 items that assessed primarily negative affect and avoidance behaviors. Factor 1 yielded a subscale score $M = 10.04$ ($SD = 8.13$).

Development and Validation of the Pedophilophobia Scale

The second factor, Affect/ Behavioral Aggressive, accounted for 23.73% of the scale's variance and contained 10 items that assessed primarily aggressive behaviors and negative affect. Factor 2 yielded a subscale score $M = 13.92$ ($SD = 12.27$). The third factor, Cognitive Negativism, accounted for 4.68% of the scales variance and contained five items that assessed negative attitudes and cognition, with higher scores indicating more negative attitudes/cognitions regarding homosexual individuals. Factor 3 yielded a subscale score $M=7.33$ ($SD=4.64$).

DISCUSSION

The intention of this study was to develop, validate and provide the initial psychometric properties of a scale, designed to assess the cognitive, affective, and behavioral components of pedophilophobia. The scale has three subscales: a subscale that is primarily cognitive in content, a subscale that is comprised of items that assess negative affect and some avoidance behavior, and a subscale that is comprised mainly of items that assess aggressive behavior and negative affect. The scale in English is given in Table III and Ukrainian in Table IV.

Development and Validation of the Pedophilophobia Scale

Table III. The Pedophilophobia Scale

This questionnaire is designed to measure your thoughts, feelings, and behaviors with regard to homosexuality. It is not a test, so there are no right or wrong answers. Answer each item by circling the number after each question as follows:

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

1. Talk about pedophiles makes me nervous	1	2	3	4	5
2. Pedophiles deserve a death penalty (castration)	1	2	3	4	5
3. Pedophilia does not surprise me	1	2	3	4	5
4. If my friend was speaking positively about pedophiles, I would be very worried	1	2	3	4	5
5. I think pedophiles should not work with children	1	2	3	4	5
6. I am angry hearing about the new lawlessness of pedophiles	1	2	3	4	5
7. I would love if my child was in a pedophile group	1	2	3	4	5
8. Marriage between an adult and a minor is acceptable	1	2	3	4	5
9. Watching the news about the pedophile arrest, I say to myself "animal" or "abomination"	1	2	3	4	5
10. I'm not worried that my friends are watching child pornography	1	2	3	4	5
11. I would not be annoyed, knowing that my best friend is a pedophile	1	2	3	4	5
12. Pedophilia is immoral	1	2	3	4	5
13. I despise and hate pedophiles	1	2	3	4	5
14. I think I mustn't allow to approach a pedophile to child	1	2	3	4	5
15. I am afraid that pedophiles will cling to my children	1	2	3	4	5
16. The court must take into account the acquittal of the pedophile	1	2	3	4	5
17. I teased friends who dating a younger ones for themselves, calling them "pedophiles"	1	2	3	4	5
18. I would not be embarrassed to see my roommate watching child pornography	1	2	3	4	5
19. I would beat a stranger who would have offered my child to get into his car	1	2	3	4	5
20. Behavior pedophiles should not be subject to criminal punishment	1	2	3	4	5
21. I try not to talk about pedophiles	1	2	3	4	5
22. I'm not embarrassed when I see a man kissing a small child on the lips in a public place	1	2	3	4	5
23. When I hear about pedophiles, I think "What a shit"	1	2	3	4	5
24. Seeing an adult among a group of young children, I try to understand whether he is a pedophile	1	2	3	4	5
25. I have a good relationship with people I suspect in pedophilia	1	2	3	4	5

The Pedophilophobia Scale demonstrated in both studies (Study 1 and Study 2) very good internal consistency and 2-weeks test-retest reliability. It appears that the scale is assessing a stable construct and that level of homophobia remained stable over a 2-weeks period of time. The significant correlation between the Pedophilophobia Scale and the IHP provides initial support for the construct validity of the inventory. However, the moderate to strong correlation of $r = .629$ between the two scales suggests that the Pedophilophobia Scale is measuring something different than the IHP does. In addition to attitudinal items found on both scales, the inclusion of items intended to measure social avoidance and aggressive acting-out on the Pedophilophobia Scale differentiates it from the IHP.

Development and Validation of the Pedophilophobia Scale

Scores on the Pedophilophobia Scale were found to correlate significantly negatively with educational level which confirmed by Waite et al. (1958). As appears from the research education can reduce pedophilophobia.

The male participants scored significantly higher on all three subscales and on the total score on the Pedophilophobia Scale, indicating that men have more negative cognitions, more negative affect, more social avoidance, and more behavioral acting-out, i.e., aggression, than women, showing that men are more homophobic than women.

Three subscales were obtained, but the author did not derive a primarily affective component and a primarily behavioral component. The results suggested that the emotional level was more important than the cognitive level to production of the aggressive behaviors. It appears from these results that the “pedophile-negativity” may actually exist and is comprised of negative cognitions about pedophilia, persons with the pedophile sexual orientation, pedophile individuals in the absence of negative affect and negative behaviors (i.e., high scores on factor 3 only). It appears that pedophilophobia may be accompanied by two symptoms: fear or aggression. The results of a factor analysis showed two reliable factors measuring avoidance and aggressive behavior toward men pedophiles emerging in research of behavioral components of pedophilophobia.

Since there were major differences in scores between men and women, separate factor analyses for these two sexes may be required and might clarify these findings. Finally, some items (i.e., pedophilia, is immoral) that theoretically would appear to load on different factors (i.e., factor 3 rather than factor 2) did not follow in the expected direction. The future refinement the scale will be necessary.

CONCLUSION

The Pedophilophobia Scale showed generally good reliability and validity properties in Ukrainian population. Strengths with the study were the amount of patients and the repeated expert panel evaluations. The scale's items corresponds to the DSN-5 criteria for Anxiety Disorders (Phobias). Psychologists and other mental health professionals can use Ukrainian version of Pedophilofobia Scale (UPPS) to help develop treatment plans; help answer legal questions (forensic psychology); screen job candidates during the personnel selection process; or as part of a therapeutic assessment procedure.

Acknowledgments

This work is fully supported by the Author.

Conflict of Interest

The authors report no conflicts of interest.

Supporting Information

Tables: I, II, III. Appendix 1 (Ukrainian version of the PPS)

REFERENCES

- ADAA.(2014) *Social Anxiety Disorder*. ADAA. Retrieved February 28, 2014 from <http://www.adaa.org/understanding-anxiety/social-anxiety-disorder>
- Cantor, J. M., and Ian V. McPhail. "Non-offending pedophiles." *Current Sexual Health Reports* 8.3 (2016): 121-128.
- . Clayton AH, Durgam S, Tang X, Chen C, Ruth A, Gommoll C. *Characterizing sexual function in patients with generalized anxiety disorder: a pooled analysis of three vilazodone studies*. *Neuropsychiatr Dis Treat*. 2016; 12:1467-76. Epub 2016 Jun 21.
- Deriagin G.B. (2016). *Psychiatric Independent Journal, Moscow*, Vol. 1, 73-80.
- Ehman, Robert. "What Really Is Wrong with Pedophilia." *Public Affairs Quarterly*, vol. 14, no. 2, 2000, pp. 129–140. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/40441281.
- Freund K., Costell R. *The structure of erotic preference in the nondeviant male // Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 1970, Vol. 8(1), pp. 15-20
- Gordon, W.M. (2002). *Sexual obsessions and OCD*. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, 17(4), 343-354.
- Gray J, McNaughton N. *The neuropsychology of anxiety: An enquiry into the functions of septo-hippocampal system*. 2nd ed. Oxford (UK): Oxford University Press; 2000. p. 440.
<https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/culturally-speaking/201212/could-i-be-pedophile-the-worst-kind-ocd>
- Moskowitz, D. A., Rieger, G., & Roloff, M. E. (2010). Heterosexual Attitudes towards Same-Sex Marriage. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 57(2), 325–336.
<http://doi.org/10.1080/00918360903489176>
- Naveed S, Sana A, Rehman H, Qamar F, Abbas SS, et al. (2015) Prevalence and Consequences of PHOBIAS, Survey Based Study in Karachi. *J Bioequiv Availab* 07:140-143. doi: 10.4172/jbb.1000228
- NIH. (2014) *What is Social Phobia (Social Anxiety Disorder) NIH*. Retrieved February 28, 2014 from <http://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/topics/social-phobia-social-anxiety-disorder/index.shtml>
- O’Neil, S.E., Cather, C., Fishel, A.F., & Martin Kafka, M. (2005). "Not Knowing If I Was a Pedophile . . ." - Diagnostic Questions and Treatment Strategies in a Case of OCD. *Harvard Review of Psychiatry*, 13, 186-196.
- O'Donohue, W. & Caselles, C.E. *J Psychopathol Behav Assess* (1993) 15: 177.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01371377>
- Purdon, C. (2004). Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment of Repugnant Obsessions. *Journal of Clinical Psychology/In Session*, 60: 1169-1180.
- Review A two-dimensional neuropsychology of defense: fear/anxiety and defensive distance. McNaughton N, Corr PJ *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 2004 May; 28(3):285-305.
- The Galway Study of Panic Disorder. II: Changes in some peripheral markers of noradrenergic and serotonergic function in DSM III-R panic disorder. Butler J, O'Halloran A, Leonard BE *J Affect Disord*. 1992 Oct; 26(2):89-99.
- Waite R. R., Sarason S. B., Lighthall F. F., Davidson K. S. A study of anxiety and learning in children. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1958, 57, 267–270.

Development and Validation of the Pedophilophobia Scale

Williams, M. T., Wetterneck, C., Tellawi, G., & Duque, G. (2015). Domains of distress among people with sexual orientation obsessions. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 14 (3), 783-789. doi: 10.1007/s10508-014-0421-0

Wright, L. W., Adams, H. E., & Bernat, J. (1999). Development and validation of the Homophobia Scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 21, 337-347

How to cite this article: Tuziak B (2017). Development and Validation of the Pedophilophobia Scale. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, Vol. 4, (4), DIP:18.01.140/20170404, DOI:10.25215/0404.140