10-13-2008

Assessing Students' Views Towards Punishment: A Comparison of Punitiveness Among Criminology and Non-Criminology Students

Diana L. Falco
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

ASSESSING STUDENTS' VIEWS TOWARDS PUNISHMENT: A COMPARISON OF PUNITIVENESS AMONG CRIMINOLOGY AND NON-CRIMINOLOGY STUDENTS

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Diana L. Falco

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

December 2008

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
The School of Graduate Studies and Research
Department of Criminology

We hereby approve the dissertation of

Diana L. Falco

Candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

_____ _____
Jamie S. Martin, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Criminology, Advisor

_____ _____
Kathleen Hanrahan, Ph.D.
Professor of Criminology

_____ _____
John Lewis, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Criminology

_____ _____
Jennifer Roberts, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Criminology

ACCEPTED

_____ _____
Michele S. Schweitz, Ph.D.
Assistant Dean for Research
The School of Graduate Studies and Research

Title: Assessing Students' Views Towards Punishment: A Comparison of Punitiveness Among Criminology and Non-Criminology Students

Author: Diana L. Falco

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Jamie S. Martin

Dissertation Committee Members: Dr. Kate Hanrahan
Dr. John Lewis
Dr. Jennifer Roberts

This study investigates the predictors of punitiveness among 519 undergraduate college students at one public university in the Northeast. Specifically, it compared levels of punitiveness among students majoring in criminology with students majoring in other academic disciplines. Due to the fact that criminology students may work as professionals within the criminal justice system after graduation, it is particularly important to assess their views towards the punishment of lawbreakers. The data collected in this study was guided by the current literature on punitiveness and student attitudes towards punishment. Using a stratified cluster sampling procedure, standardized surveys were distributed to students during January and February 2008. The data was then analyzed and discussed.

The results from the current study indicate that criminology students held less punitive views towards offender than did students majoring in other academic disciplines. This was a particularly interesting finding which will be discussed in more detail in Chapters V and VI. In addition, the findings indicate that year in school is an important predictor of punitiveness, with seniors holding the least punitive views and freshman holding the most punitive views. Furthermore, political ideology and three causal attribution theories (classical, structural positivism, labeling) were found to significantly impact punitiveness.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Throughout my doctoral studies at IUP I have had the privilege to work side by side with some of the most talented and hard working faculty and students. I am incredibly grateful for all of the guidance and support I received along the way. At times, this process was extremely difficulty and much of my success in completing the doctoral program and this dissertation is largely due to the mentorships and friendships made throughout my time at IUP.

I am forever grateful for the guidance, wisdom, and the support of my dissertation chair and faculty mentor, Dr. Jamie Martin. Jamie, your support over the past few years was invaluable and I would not have been able to accomplish my goals without your assistance. You continuously inspire me to work hard and to make every effort to be both an outstanding teacher and researcher. I have learned so much from you and I hope to pass on the many things you have taught me to my future students. Thank you so much for your commitment to my dissertation, my classroom experiences, and my future employment endeavors over the past few years.

I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Kate Hanrahan, Dr. Jennifer Roberts, and Dr. John Lewis. Your feedback and suggestions throughout this process were both instructive and helpful in making my research project successful. In addition, I would like to thank my committee and the rest of the criminology faculty at IUP that I have had the privilege to work with. Your guidance and mentorships (both in and out of the classroom) have helped me to become both a better teacher and researcher.

In addition, I owe a great deal of thanks to my family who has continuously supported me in achieving my goals (even though it took more than 10 years of college to do it)☺.

First, I would like to thank my partner and best friend Dennis whose support was invaluable. Thank you for taking this journey with me and for your encouragement along the way. Mom and Dad, I truly cannot thank you enough for all of your support. Through both the hard and the easy times throughout this process, you were there to help me push through the obstacles and uphill battles as well as to celebrate my accomplishments. To my brothers and their families, I have been extremely lucky to have such loving siblings who have been there to encourage and support me over the years.

Last, I would like to thank the amazing friends I have made during my time at IUP. To Jeff, I cannot believe we are finally seeing the light at the end of the tunnel. Tackling this crazy process with you by my side helped to make it an incredibly memorable and fun experience. To Tammy, Jen, and Danielle, I am forever thankful for the encouragement and support I received from you girls. You all helped me to stick with it especially when I doubted my ability to finish. I would also like to thank Bushy, Tina, Mari, and Alison for both your support as well as all of the amazing memories of the good times we have had together. In addition, I am very thankful to both James and Jason for your assistance in the data collection phase of my dissertation as well as the friendship and good times we have had over the past year. Last, I would like to thank my psychology friends Noelle, Quinne, and Tina for being such wonderful friends (and for reminding me to be grateful for being a criminology student rather than clinical psychology)☺. To everyone, we have had some amazing times over the past few years. I wish all of you the best of luck and look forward to seeing all of you again soon.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Chapter I	INTRODUCTION	1
	The Present Study	3
Chapter II	PUNITIVENESS	7
	Definitions of Punitiveness	7
	Operational Definitions of Punitiveness	9
	Punitiveness in the Current Study	12
Chapter III	FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH PUNITIVENESS	17
	Demographic Factors and Punitiveness	17
	Attitudinal Factors and Punitiveness	25
	Students' Attitudes	38
Chapter IV	METHODS	46
	Research Design	46
	Research Questions and Hypotheses	47
	Sampling	51
	Questionnaire Construction	54
	Procedures and Human Subjects Issues	59
Chapter V	ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	61
	Frequencies and Descriptive Statistics	62
	Factor Analysis	66
	Scale Variables	71
	Bivariate Correlations	84
	Multiple Regression	88
	Research Hypotheses	100
	Summary	106
Chapter VI	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	108
	Strengths and Limitations	109
	Discussion of Research Findings	112
	Educational Implications	122
	Directions for Future Research	125
	Conclusions	128
REFERENCES		130

APPENDICES……..141

Appendix A – Punitiveness Scale/Index Items……..……...141
Appendix B – Sampling Frame…….146
Appendix C – Student Attitudes Survey……...152
Appendix D – Access Letter to Professors……162
Appendix E – Informed Consent……...163

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Criminology Population/Sample Proportions……53
Table 2: Non-Criminology Population/Sample Proportions……54
Table 3: Frequencies and Percentages for Demographic Factors……62
Table 4: Frequencies and Percentages for Attitudinal Factors……65
Table 5: Frequencies and Percentages for Educational Factors…….....66
Table 6: Factor Analysis for Causal Attribution Items……68
Table 7: Descriptive Statistics for Scale Variables……..72
Table 8: Item-Total Correlations for Fear of Crime Scale and Alpha…….76
Table 9: Item-Total Correlations for Social Process Scale and Alpha……77
Table 10: Item-Total Correlations for Structural Positivism Scale and Alpha……78
Table 11: Item-Total Correlations for Individual Positivism Scale and Alpha……...79
Table 12: Item-Total Correlations for Subcultural Scale and Alpha……...80
Table 13: Item-Total Correlations for Labeling Scale and Alpha……...80
Table 14: Item-Total Correlations for Classical Scale and Alpha……...81
Table 15: Item-Total Correlations for Learning Scale and Alpha……...82
Table 16: Item-Total Correlations for Punitiveness Scale and Alpha…….83
Table 17: Bivariate Correlation Matrix……...85
Table 18: Educational Factors (Model 1)……90
Table 19: Educational Factors and Demographic Factors (Model 2)……..93
Table 20: Educational, Demographic, and Attitudinal Factors (Model 3)……..96
Table 21: Full Model (Model 4)……..98
Table 22: Causal Attribution Mean Comparisons by Major……..120

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Over the past few decades much of the public opinion research about crime and criminal justice issues has focused on public views towards the punishment of offenders. The interest in levels of punitiveness among the public is based on a belief that the harshness of our society's approach to dealing with crime and criminals should reflect and incorporate the views of the citizens. Thus, numerous studies and opinion polls have examined levels of punitiveness to assess whether our laws and punishments are grounded in our society's values (see Roberts & Hough, 2002). In addition, various factors associated with punitiveness have been examined (e.g., sex, ideology, education, etc.) (Applegate, Cullen, & Fisher, 2002; Chiricos, Welch, & Gertz, 2004; Costelloe, Chiricos, Burianek, Gertz, & Maier-Katkin, 2002; Hogan, Chiricos, & Gertz, 2005; Mackey & Courtright, 2000).. Due to the fact that American correctional policy has focused on a "get tough" approach towards crime and punishment it is important to assess levels of punitiveness among the public, criminal justice officials, and those who may work in the criminal justice field in the future (e.g., criminology/criminal justice college students).

Previous research studies examining punitiveness have operationalized this construct in a number of different ways. In addition, the research methods used to measure punitiveness also have varied considerably. Some researchers have examined punitiveness in terms of support for specific sanctions (e.g., life without parole, death penalty) while others have looked at punitiveness on a continuum of sanctions with some sanctions considered less punitive (e.g., probation) than others (e.g., prison). Additional

studies about punitiveness have examined public attitudes towards specific punitive crime control policies (e.g., mandatory minimums, three-strikes laws) or specific criminal offenders (e.g., juveniles).

The primary method of measuring public support for crime policies or the punishment of offenders has been through the use of simplistic questions asked during the administration of public opinion polls. Roberts (1997) argues that much of the conventional wisdom about American attitudes towards the punishment of criminal offenders is wrong, and that this myth is based on the limit of public opinion surveys. These public opinion polling questions fail to capture the complexity of public attitudes towards sentencing (Mackey & Courtright, 2000; Roberts, 1997; Roberts, 2003; Turner, Cullen, Sundt & Applegate, 1997).

McCorkle (1993) similarly argues that these methodological issues raise questions with regard to the use of these polls in the development of public policy. In return, the public may in fact be far less punitive than policymakers currently believe. Turner et al. (1997) argue that "if the complexity of citizen views is not fully understood, the possibility exists that the full range of policy options that the public would support will not be communicated to the politician or policy maker relying on the polling data" (p. 7). Consequently, it is essential that we continue to study levels of punitiveness among the public and others involved in the criminal justice system. Specifically, it is important that while studying punitiveness that the research methods used aim at capturing the complexity of beliefs on these issues.

There are a few problems inherent in some of the various approaches used to measure punitiveness. A number of these weaknesses have been addressed by adopting

the use of composite measures or indexes to gauge public support for various punitive statements or crime control policies. These measures attempt to capture the complexity of the construct of punitiveness by looking at a combination of attitudes towards crime and punishment. The current study intends to measure punitiveness in a similar manner in order to address some of the weaknesses in other approaches.

The Present Study

The purpose of the current study is to better understand the levels of punitiveness towards criminal offenders among college students who may work in the criminal justice field in the future. Given that most criminology majors will be working as professionals within the criminal justice system after graduation, it is important to assess their beliefs about punishment. For example, levels of punitiveness may influence their perceptions and actions towards offenders, victims, and criminal justice policies while working in the system. In addition, criminology students may become policymakers or work in various positions that influence criminal justice policies in this area. Farnworth, Longmire, & West (1998) similarly suggest that "criminal justice majors' views are particularly interesting because many of these students aspire to positions as practitioners and administrators with an opportunity to influence or implement crime control policies" (p. 39). Thus, if criminology majors are entering the workforce with elevated levels of punitiveness they may be more likely to support, implement, and favor more punitive crime policies. One method of assessing views among these students is to examine differences in punitiveness between criminology and non-criminology majors.

A large proportion of the research comparing theses two groups has found significant differences in attitudes and opinions between criminology and non-

criminology majors (Cannon, 2005; Courtright & Mackey, 2004; Courtright, Mackey & Packard, 2005; Farnworth et al., 1998; Hensley, Miller, Tewksbury, & Koscheski, 2003; Mackey & Courtright, 2000; McCarthy & McCarthy, 1981; Olivero & Murataya, 2001; Selke, 1980; Tsoudis, 2000; Ventura, Lambert, Bryant, & Pasupuleti, 2004). Many of the studies, however, suffer from a number of methodological flaws. For example, the vast majority of studies comparing views of criminal justice majors to non-majors have utilized non-probability sampling methods. The use of convenience samples threatens internal validity (i.e., selection bias), statistical conclusion validity (i.e., probability sampling and regression assumptions), and external validity (i.e., external inferences and generalizability). In addition, a number of studies have relied on mean comparisons and t-tests in their statistical analyses which does not control for the influence of other independent variables on the dependent variable. Furthermore, of those studies examining punitiveness between criminology and non-criminology majors, many of them have not included all of the independent variables previously found in the research to be correlated with punitiveness. Variables such as religion, crime salience, and causal attributions towards crime have not been extensively examined in more detail among criminology students. In order to address these methodological shortcomings, additional research, including the current study, needs to be conducted before any definitive conclusions can be drawn in regards to criminology students and levels of punitiveness.

The current study addresses a number of these issues. First, it uses a probability sampling method which will stratify students based on year in school and undergraduate major (criminology and non-criminology). Second, the current study includes independent variables that have been left out of much of the previous literature

examining punitiveness among students (e.g., religion, crime salience, causal attributions). These variables will be measured along with a number of variables that have traditionally found to be correlated with punitiveness (e.g., sex, geographic location, political ideology etc.). Moreover, the current study seeks to augment the literature and the statistical analysis used in previous studies by using multiple regression as the primary method of analysis.

Chapter II focuses on the dependent variable in the study; punitiveness. The chapter includes a review of how punitiveness has been both conceptually and operationally defined in the literature. The chapter then reviews and discusses the literature that has measured punitiveness in a similar manner to the current study (i.e., those studies that utilized a composite measure/index).

Chapter III explores a number of factors shown to be associated with punitiveness in the literature such as demographic variables like sex, education, and geographic location that have also been found to be correlated with punitiveness. Also, attitudinal factors such as political ideology, religion, fear of crime, victimization and causal attribution towards crime have also been found to be correlated with a person's degree of punitiveness. Chapter III concludes with a review of the literature about students' attitudes. Specifically, it explores the research that has compared students' views towards punishment between criminology/criminal justice students with non-criminology/criminal justice students.

Chapter IV describes the methodology that is utilized in the current study. The research questions and hypothesis are described as well as an overview of the entire research design. As well as an overview of the research design, the sampling procedures

are discussed in detail within the chapter. In addition, questionnaire procedures as well as human subject issues are addressed.

Chapter V describes the analysis that was conducted in the current study and presents the findings. First, frequencies and descriptive statistics will be provided about the variables that were included in the present study. The scale variables will also be discussed in detail within this section. Second, the bivariate correlations among the independent and dependent variables will be presented. Finally, the results of the multivariate analysis (i.e., multiple regression) will be provided and discussed.

Chapter VI provides a discussion of the research findings and conclusions. In addition, the educational implications, the strengths and weaknesses of the current study and a brief discussion of directions for future research are provided.

CHAPTER II

PUNITIVENESS

The purpose of this chapter is to first explore the dependent variable in this study; punitiveness. The various methods and definitions used to measure punitiveness will be briefly discussed. Those studies that used similar operationalizations of punitiveness to those employed in the current study will be discussed in more detail.

Definitions of Punitiveness

Numerous research studies have been conducted to measure punitiveness among the public, professionals, and students; however, much of this research is difficult to synthesize due to the variety of definitions and methods used to measure the construct. One of the major problems in this area of research is the lack of conceptual definitions for the term 'punitiveness'. Matthews (2005) discusses the concept of punitiveness and argued that there has been "little attempt to define or reconstruct it" and that it "remains a 'thin' and under-theorized concept" (p. 178). Punitiveness stems from the word *punitive* which is an adjective meaning "inflicting punishment" (e.g., punitive laws). Punitiveness as defined and measured in the criminological research and literature is typically discussed in the context of the punishment of law-breakers. Specific sanctions (e.g., the death penalty) may be considered to be punitive as well as specific policies (e.g., mandatory minimums and three-strikes laws). Punitiveness also may be measured on a continuum of sanctions with some sanctions considered less punitive (e.g., probation) than others (e.g., prison).

Providing one of the few conceptual definitions of punitiveness, Courtright and Mackey (2004) define it as "an attitude toward sanctioning and punishment that includes

retribution, incapacitation, and a lack of concern for offender rehabilitation" (p. 317). Typical research in this area is tapping into the correctional ideology of the people surveyed. Essentially, punitiveness is examining which goal of punishment (retribution, incapacitation, deterrence, rehabilitation, and restoration) is considered to be the most important by the respondent. Thus, people who support punishments for the purpose of retribution, incapacitation, and deterrence may be considered more punitive than those who support rehabilitation and restoration as the primary goals of punishment.

Matthews (2005) suggests that punitiveness is typically associated with the concepts of retribution and vengeance. Individuals who support punishment for the purpose of "just desserts" or "eye for an eye" would be in support of the retributive doctrine of punishment. It is important to note that von Hirsch (1976) suggests that punishment based on "just desserts" should be proportionate to a person's culpability or blameworthiness for their current offense and that punishment had as much to do with fairness and uniformity as vengeance. In addition, he suggests that punishment should be based solely on the wrong that was committed and that criminal history should play only a minor role at sentencing. However, the concepts of "just desserts" and retribution have moved away from these original ideas and the contemporary accounts tend to combine them with the ideas of vengeance and "punishment for punishment's sake". Furthermore, lengthy prison sentences for the purpose of incapacitation (removal from society to protect others) and deterrence (punishment to discourage future criminal behavior) also are considered to be associated with elevated levels of punitiveness. Thus, support for policies such as three-strikes laws may be considered an indication of more punitive beliefs.

Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) assessed whether respondents believed the purpose of prison was to punish criminals or to teach them to be law-abiding citizens. Thus, respondents who believed punishment is the primary purpose of prison would be considered to be more punitive than those who believed the purpose is to teach criminals to be law-abiding. These two options are tapping into the concepts of retribution and rehabilitation. Additionally, Tyler and Boeckmann (1997) define overall punitiveness based on "…public views about whether sentences are generally too lenient and criminals too often likely to be set free" (p. 243). Thus, if people do not believe that criminal sentences are serving the purposes of retribution, incapacitation, or deterrence they may argue for harsher criminal penalties. Public views towards the leniency of punishment may have contributed to policies such as mandatory minimums or truth in sentencing.

Operational Definitions of Punitiveness

A number of research studies have been conducted to measure support for arguably the most punitive policy in our criminal justice system; the death penalty (Barkan & Cohn, 1994; Bohm, Clark, & Aveni, 1991; Bohm & Vogel, 1991, 1994; Borg, 1997, 1998; Britt, 1998; Cochran & Chamlin, 2005; Grasmick, Bursik, & Blackwell, 1993; Howells, Flanagan, & Hagan, 1995; Robbers, 2006; Sandys & McGarrell, 1994, 1995, 1997; Tyler & Weber, 1982; Unnever, Cullen, & Roberts, 2005; Whitehead, 1998; Young, 1991, 1992). Borg (1997) examined punitiveness in the context of death penalty support and suggested that "punitiveness refers to the degree of punishment judged appropriate for individuals convicted of murder and is indicated by the respondents' view points on capital punishment" (p. 32-33). Other researchers have included a separate dependent variable measuring support for the death penalty with other dependent

variables seeking to measure additional aspects of punitiveness (Applegate, Cullen, & Fisher, 2002; Applegate, Cullen, Fisher, & Vander Ven, 2000; Cullen, Clark, Cullen, & Mathers, 1985; Evans & Adams, 2003; Farnworth et al., 1998; Grasmick, Cochran, Bursik, & Kimpel, 1993; Johnson, 2001; Leiber & Woodrick, 1997; Sims, 2003; Taylor, Scheppele, & Stinchombe, 1979; Unnever, Cullen, & Applegate, 2005; Young & Thompson, 1995). Additionally, a few studies have included an item gauging attitudes towards capital punishment (e.g., using the death penalty helps us to better control crime) as a component of an index measuring overall punitiveness (Chiricos, Welch, & Gertz, 2004; Costelloe, Chiricos, Burianek, Gertz, & Maier-Katkin, 2002; Courtright & Mackey, 2004; Mackey & Courtright, 2000; Tsoudis, 2000; Tyler & Boeckmann, 1997).

Another method employed by researchers studying punitiveness is the use of crime vignettes or scenarios. By utilizing this method the respondent can be provided with much more information about the offender, the crime committed, and the harm to the victim. This method may allow the respondent to sentence the hypothetical offender, assess the appropriateness of a sentence given in the scenario, or to generally react to statements about the offender in the scenario (Applegate, Cullen, Link, Richards, & Lanza-Kaduce, 1996; Blumstein & Cohen, 1980; Feiler & Sheley, 1999; Lane, 1997; McCorkle, 1993; Miller, Rossi & Simpson, 1986; Sprott, 1999; Turner, Cullen, Sundt, & Applegate, 1997). In a study using vignettes where participants chose a punishment for the offender Lane (1997) defined punitiveness "as the tendency to pick harsher punishments for the given set of crimes" (p. 192). Thus, respondents choosing a prison sentence for the offender would be considered more punitive than respondents choosing a probation sentence for the offender. Furthermore, research studies that utilize a factorial

survey approach in the creation of the vignettes can also account for variations in punitiveness that may be attributed to variables such as offender prior record, demographic characteristics of either offender or victim, and the severity of the crime.

Other research studies have been conducted that measure punitiveness towards a specific type of offender (e.g., juveniles). A few studies have examined punitiveness towards juveniles as its own dependent variable (Evans & Adams, 2003; Grasmick et al., 1993; Grasmick & McGill, 1994; Leiber & Woodrick, 1997; Schwartz, Guo, & Kerbs, 1993; Tsoudis, 2000) while others include an item regarding juveniles in a general punitiveness index (Chiricos et al., 2004; Costello et al., 2002; Hogan, Chiricos, & Gertz, 2005). Many of these studies examined support for things such as the use of the death penalty for juveniles, transfer of juveniles to adult court, juveniles receiving the same sentence as adults, and sentencing juveniles to adult jails and prisons. Those respondents who are more likely to support such policies and sanctions would be considered more punitive toward juvenile offenders than those who were opposed.

In addition to the previously mentioned research, a number of studies have examined support for harsher courts as a measure of punitiveness (Applegate et al., 2002; Applegate et al., 2000; Johnson, 2001; Taylor et al., 1979; Unnever et al., 2005). The studies examining support for harsher local courts typically utilized a question in the U.S. General Social Survey that assessed whether the respondents believed that courts in their area were dealing too harshly or not harshly enough with criminals. Other studies have examined support for specific punitive crime control policies (e.g., three-strikes legislation) (Applegate & Cullen, 1996; Tyler & Boeckmann, 1997). Support for such policies would indicate greater levels of punitiveness. Last, a few research studies have

included measures of support for rehabilitation as an indication of less punitive opinions (Applegate et al., 2000; Courtright & Mackey, 2004; Cullen et al., 1985; Cullen, Cullen, & Wozniak, 1988; Mackey, Courtright, & Packard, 2006).

Punitiveness in the Current Study

As presented above there have been numerous studies that have conceptualized and operationalized punitiveness. There are a few problems inherent in some of these approaches. For example, many of these studies are limited to examining punitiveness towards one specific type of offender or they are only examining support and views towards one specific criminal justice policy. Thus, the current study will attempt to address some of the weaknesses by adopting a composite measure or index that gauges support for several punitive statements or policies. These measures capture a range of support for various punitive beliefs. Instead of looking at one specific sanction, policy, or offender (e.g., death penalty, three-strikes, and juveniles), these measures examine levels of support for a combination of attitudes towards punishment. With the various operational definitions utilized in the research in this subject area, the current researcher believes that composite measures/scales tend to capture the most variation in peoples' views towards punishment by assessing views towards a variety of punitive beliefs. Appendix A presents additional information from the nine studies most closely related to the current study. In addition, Appendix A presents the punitiveness index items for each of the studies discussed below.

A number of studies have operationalized punitiveness through the use of composite measures and indexes similar to those detailed above. Cullen et al. (1985) measured punitiveness through the creation of a six-item index ($\alpha = .63$) indicating levels

of agreement or disagreement for punitive responses to offenders. It is important to note that DeVellis (2003) suggests that alpha levels between .60 and .65 are undesirable. Thus, the internal consistency of the index used in the Cullen et al. (1995) study is not very good. In addition, Cullen et al., (1988) used all six items from the 1985 study to create a punishment scale based on 13 statements that assessed support for the rationales of retribution (items 1-5), deterrence (items 6-10), and incapacitation (items 11-13). Sample index items include "the primary purpose of our legal system is to pay criminals back for their offense", "punishing criminals is the only way to stop them from engaging in more crimes in the future", and "since most criminals will commit crimes over and over again, the only way to protect society is to put these criminals in jail and throw away the key" (p. 307). Respondents utilized a 7-item Likert scale and a summed index score was created from the 13 items ($\alpha = .80$). Higher total scores indicated stronger punitive opinions. In addition, both Applegate et al. (2000) and Applegate et al. (2002) utilized four items from the Cullen et al. (1988) study to create a 4-item punitiveness index ($\alpha = .71$).

Sims (2003) asked respondents to indicate their level of support to four statements discussing how the criminal justice system should react to people who commit crime. Based on a five-point Likert scale respondents were to indicate their level of agreement with each statement (strongly disagree to strongly agree). A summed index score was created from the four items ($\alpha = .637$) where higher scores indicated stronger punitive views. Again, the low alpha level of .637 is undesirable and suggests further examination of the index being used in the study. The four items tapped into levels of support for retribution, specific deterrence, general deterrence, and incapacitation. Sample items

include “it is important that the criminal justice system see that people who commit crimes get what’s coming to them” and “it is important that the criminal justice system keep offenders locked up so they can’t commit more crimes” (p. 9).

Hogan et al. (2005) operationalized punitive attitudes through the creation of an index that assesses respondent support for various punitive crime control policies. Respondents were asked to rate on a scale of one to ten (one least supportive and ten most supportive) their level of support for each of eight proposals. The sum of item scores were totaled to form their overall punitiveness index score ($\alpha = .81$). Higher scores indicated higher levels of punitiveness due to the respondents’ increased support for the punitive proposals. This index measures support for retribution, incapacitation, and deterrence. Sample index items include “make sentences more severe for all crimes” and “prosecute juvenile offenders as adults” (p. 399). Hogan et al. suggest that their measurement of punitiveness is advantageous due to the fact that it includes policies that were considered or implemented at the time of the survey. They also argue it is more precise due to its range of policies (rather than just a measure of support for capital punishment, harshness of courts or reactions to hypothetical situations).

Chiricos et al. (2004) also measured punitive attitudes through an index of support for various methods of dealing with crime and offenders. On a scale of support from 0 to 10 (similar to that mentioned above) respondents were asked to indicate their level of support for eight crime control proposals. Sample items include “executing more murders” and “using more mandatory minimum sentencing statutes, like “Three Strikes” for repeat offenders” (p.369). Again, scores to each item were summed to form an overall punitiveness index ($\alpha = .88$) with higher scores indicating greater levels of

punitiveness. Scores on this index indicate respondents' level of support for retribution, incapacitation, and deterrence.

Additionally, Costelloe et al. (2002) used a five item index to measure punitiveness of respondents in their study. The five items included in their index are among those included in the indexes mentioned in the two previous studies. Score responses were summed to create an overall punitiveness index ($\alpha = .63$) with higher scores indicating greater levels of punitiveness. This index taps into levels of support for both retribution and incapacitation.

The current study intends to adopt both a similar conceptual definition of punitiveness provided by Courtright and Mackey (2004) that was previously mentioned in this chapter as well as their method of operationalizing the construct (see also Mackey & Courtright, 2000; Courtright et al., 2005). In their study they assessed students' attitudes towards punishment utilizing a 15-item punitiveness index ($\alpha = .85$). The internal consistency/reliability of this index is considered very good (DeVellis, 2003) and appears to be a much better measure of punitiveness than those used in some of the studies mentioned above (i.e., those indexes with alpha levels less than .70). Sample index items include "offenders should be harshly punished to make them pay for their crimes" and "to better control the crime problem, more prisons need to be built" (p. 440). The survey instrument provided respondents with a 10cm visual analog scale to which respondents placed a slash mark on the line to indicate their level of agreement with each statement. The score for each item could range from 0 to 10 (10 indicating the highest level of agreement). Again, item scores were combined to create an overall punitiveness index score. Higher scores indicated more punitive views.

As can be gathered from the studies above, the adoption of a composite measure/index for the dependent variable in the current study will allow the researcher to capture a larger variation in punitive beliefs through this method of measurement. The aim of this chapter was to provide a synthesized overview of the various definitions and methods used to address the construct of punitiveness. In addition, this chapter focused on those studies that have operationalized punitiveness in a similar manner to the current study. The following chapter will address those factors (e.g., demographic and attitudinal variables) that have been found to be significantly related to punitiveness.

CHAPTER III

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH PUNITIVENESS

As discussed in the previous chapter, punitiveness can be conceptualized and operationalized in various ways. This chapter will describe the factors that have been found to be associated with those measures of punitiveness. A number of both demographic and attitudinal variables have been shown to have a significant impact on a person's attitude towards criminal punishment. Demographic variables such as sex, education, and geographic location have been found to be correlated with a person's degree of punitiveness. Traditionally, these demographic variables alone do not account for a significant portion of the variance in punitiveness, thus it is important to examine other independent variables as well. Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) suggest that "the complex interactions of demographic variables and intervening attitudinal variables makes it difficult at best and erroneous at worst to try to predict punishment attitudes from demographic characteristics alone" (p. 586). Thus, this section also will discuss the attitudinal variables about political ideology, religion, fear of crime, victimization, and causal attribution towards crime. All of these variables have been shown to be correlated with punitiveness.

Demographic Factors and Punitiveness

Sex and Punitiveness

A number of research studies have examined the relationship between sex/gender and punitiveness. The research findings have suggested that the relationship between those two variables is both mixed and complex. Although most of the research results point to findings that are rather small, inconsistent, and difficult to interpret almost every

study examining punitiveness includes sex as a variable in their study. Some research studies have found males to be more punitive than females (Applegate et al., 2002; Evans & Adams, 2003; Schwartz et al. 1993; Sprott, 1999) while other studies have found females to be more punitive than males (Cohn, Barkan, & Halteman, 1991; Haghighi & Lopez, 1998; Miller et al., 1986; Tsoudis, 2000). Furthermore, a number of studies have included sex as a variable in their model but were unable to find any statistically significant differences between sex and their punitiveness measure (Applegate, et al., 2000; Applegate, Cullen, Link et al., 1996; Chiricos et al., 2004; Mackey & Courtright, 2000; Sims, 2003).

Applegate et al. (2000) found that men were more supportive of capital punishment than women and that women were more supportive of rehabilitation than men. In the same study, however, they were unable to find any significant difference between men and women in their punitiveness index or in support for harsher local courts. Cullen et al. (1985) similarly found that females were more supportive of rehabilitation and less supportive of capital punishment. However, they did not find any significant differences between those two groups in a measure of their general punishment philosophy (punitiveness). Likewise, both Unnever et al. (2005) and Sims (2003) found males to be more supportive of the death penalty than females but did not find significant differences between them in regards to support for harsher local courts (Unnever et al.) or punitiveness (Sims).

In an examination of these variables, Applegate et al. (2002) examined public views toward correctional policies to test whether a gender gap existed. The findings from their study suggest that women were more supportive of rehabilitation, less

supportive of capital punishment and less punitive toward specific offenders in vignettes. Although significant differences between males and females were found, sex/gender only accounted for a fairly small percent (.5% – 3.8%) of the variation in punitiveness. In general, the authors suggest that men and women shared similar views towards crime and correctional policies. They propose that "even on those variables that did show significantly different views among men and women, the divergence was a matter of degree; men's and women's attitudes were not opposite" (p.97).

Additionally, Hurwitz and Smithey (1998) examined gender differences in attitudes toward crime and punishment. In general, female respondents were significantly more supportive of crime prevention efforts (such as drug rehabilitation, restricting hand guns, and spending money on job training programs). They also found sex to be a significant predictor of respondent attitudes towards punitive crime policies (such as increasing prison terms and capital punishment); however, there was difficulty in recognizing a consistent pattern between male and female attitudes. The authors suggest that "gender patterns on punitive measures are clearly context specific" (p. 100). For example, they found that men were more supportive of the death penalty than women but that men held less punitive views towards offenders selling drugs to children.

Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) suggest that the relationship between sex and punitiveness is very complex and that sex has both a direct and indirect relationship towards punitiveness. They found that a direct relationship exists where men were found to be generally more punitive than women. An indirect relationship, however, also exists through both liberalism (support for spending on social programs) and fear of crime (concerns about victimization). The findings suggest that "women tend to be less

punitive both directly and indirectly because they tend to favor government spending on social programs, but if they worry about being a crime victim they may well be more punitive" (p. 584).

The relationship between sex and punitiveness among students also remains relatively unknown. Mackey and Courtright (2000) did not find any statistically significant differences between male and female students in their model examining punitiveness (although results were in their hypothesized direction where male students were more punitive than female students). In a study examining students' perceptions of criminal justice, Tsoudis (2000) found that female students supported harsher punishments (e.g., death penalty, caning, and criminal suffering). Although Farnworth et al. (1998) suggest that significant gender differences exist between criminal justice students (more males) and non-criminal justice students (more females) they did not discuss the relationship between sex and punitiveness in their analysis. Additional research is needed to examine the relationship between male and female students, and more specifically, between male and female criminal justice/criminology majors and non-majors.

All of the research studies mentioned above add to our understanding of the complexity of the relationship between sex and punitiveness. Much of the disparity in the findings may be due to the inclusion or exclusion of other independent variables that may account for the difference in attitudes towards punishment among males and females. The relationship also appears to be context specific and may vary based on how the dependent variable is operationalized (e.g., support for the death penalty, punitiveness

indexes, or sanctioning offenders in vignettes). Additional research needs to be conducted in this area before any definitive conclusions can be drawn.

Education and Punitiveness

Numerous research studies have looked at the relationship between education and punitiveness. The findings in this area are rather consistent and show a direct negative relationship between the two variables (Applegate, et al., 2000; Chiricos, et al., 2004; Costelloe et al., 2002; Grasmick & McGill, 1994; Hogan et al., 2005; McCorkle, 1993; Schwartz et al., 1993; Tyler & Boeckmann, 1997). The research suggests that people with higher levels of education tend to be less punitive toward criminal offenders. A few studies, however, found that the relationship between education and punitiveness failed to achieve statistical significance (Cullen et al., 1985; Cohn et al., 1991; Unnever et al., 2005). In addition, both Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) and Sims (2003) found education to have an indirect relationship with punitiveness. Furthermore, Welch (2004) suggests that there is a lack of empirically supported theories about the relationship between education and punitiveness. An increased understanding of both our theoretical and conceptual understandings of this relationship would greatly contribute to the research literature in this area.

Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) found that education has an indirect relationship with punitiveness through two attitudinal variables; liberalism (support for spending on social programs) and fear of crime (concern for victimization). Their findings suggest that respondents with higher levels of education were less likely to support government spending on social programs (liberalism) and thus were more likely to support punitive policies. Their findings, however, also suggest that respondents with

higher levels of education were less fearful of crime and thus were less likely to support punitive policies.

This indirect relationship is similarly explained in Sims' (2003) examination of the relationship between causal beliefs towards criminal behavior (causal attribution) and punitiveness. The findings suggest that education is indirectly related to punitiveness through five of their attribution factors. They found that respondents with higher levels of education were more likely to support social process, subcultural and labeling perspectives and were less likely to support structural and classical perspectives towards criminal behavior. Their level of support for each of these perspectives acted as an intervening variable between education and their overall degree of punitiveness. The findings from these two studies suggest that the relationship between education and punitiveness may be more complex than a simple direct negative relationship as suggested in previous research.

A few studies have examined punitiveness among undergraduate college students; however, the variation in educational levels was limited within this population. Traditionally, differences in punitiveness were examined between grade levels (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) and between majors (criminology, non-criminology). Mackey and Courtright (2000) found a negative relationship between grade level and punitiveness. Both criminal justice and non-criminal justice majors in their senior year had significantly lower levels of punitiveness than those in the grades below them. Farnworth et al. (1998) also found that students in their senior year were less punitive than students in their freshman year. They suggested their findings provided support for the liberalizing effect of a college education. Eskridge (1999) suggests that caution needs

to be made when drawing such a conclusion based on cross-sectional data. A longitudinal study would need to be conducted about student punitiveness before any definitive conclusions can be drawn. Additional research about student attitudes will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

Location of Residence and Punitiveness

The relationship between location and punitiveness is typically examined in two ways. First, research studies have looked at regional variations in punitiveness such as living in the Northern, Southern, Eastern, or Western portions of the United States (Barkan & Cohn, 1994; Borg, 1997; Chiricos et al., 2004; Ellison, 1991; Rossi & Berk, 1997; Young & Thompson, 1995; Unnever et al., 2005) or through international comparisons (Costelloe et al., 2002). Second, research studies also have looked at location in terms of the size of the community in which one lives (Mackey & Courtright, 2000; Rossi & Berk, 1997; Young & Thompson, 1995). This may be determined by population size or through general urban/rural operationalizations. In addition, numerous studies examining punitiveness have not included location as a variable of interest (Applegate et al., 2002; Cullen et al., 1985; Evans & Adams, 2003; Grasmick et al., 1993; Grasmick & McGill, 1994; Hogan et al., 2005; Tyler & Boeckmann, 1997) which may be primarily due to a lack of geographical or population variations in their samples (e.g., sample of residents of one city or in one state).

Among those studies examining this relationship the findings have been rather consistent. Barkan and Cohn (1994) found southerners to be more supportive of capital punishment than non-southerners. Additionally, Borg (1997) found that southerners who are religious fundamentalists and politically conservative were more supportive of capital

punishment. Other studies have found southerners to be more punitive in general (Chiricos et al., 2004; Rossi & Berk, 1997) and North Easterners to hold the least punitive beliefs (Rossi & Berk, 1997).

Furthermore, those studies examining size of town and punitiveness have found that people from smaller towns tend to hold more punitive beliefs (Mackey & Courtright, 2000; Rossi & Berk, 1997). Most relevant to the current study is the research conducted by Mackey and Courtright (2000) about punitiveness among criminal justice and non-criminal justice students. They found size of town to be among the four most statistically significant variables predicting overall punitiveness. To measure location size students were asked to indicate the size of the place where they grew up. This variable was ultimately collapsed into small (less than 25,000 people) or large (more than 25,000) towns. Their findings suggest that students from small towns held significantly more punitive beliefs. The current study hopes to explore this relationship further by examining a student population that draws from both rural and urban locations.

In summary, there has been a great deal of research that has examined the relationship between various demographic variables and punitiveness. Although some of the research about how these variables are correlated with punitiveness is mixed and/or complex, there are some general conclusions that can be drawn. The research about demographic variables generally suggests that men, whites, people with less education, and people from the South or non-urban areas tend to hold more punitive views than women, minorities, people with more education, and people from the North or urban areas. The strength of these demographic variables alone on punitiveness tends to be weak and/or indirect. Thus, it is extremely important to look at the influence of these

demographic variables as well as the influence of other attitudinal factors that may account for additional variation in punitiveness.

Attitudinal Factors and Punitiveness

Political Ideology and Punitiveness

Copious studies have examined the relationship between people's political views and punitiveness. This relationship has typically been measured in two ways. A number of studies have examined a person's political party identification such as Democrat, Independent, or Republican (Applegate et al., 2000; Applegate et al., 2002; Grasmick et al., 1993; Grasmick & McGill, 1994; Hurwitz & Smithey, 1998). Other studies have more commonly examined whether respondents were self-identified as liberal, moderate, or conservative or held beliefs attributable to liberalism or conservatism (Applegate et al., 2000; Chiricos et al., 2004; Costelloe et al., 2002; Hensley et al., 2003; Hogan et al., 2005; Hurwitz & Smithey, 1998; Langworthy & Whitehead, 1986; Mackey & Courtright, 2000; Tyler & Boeckmann, 1997; Unnever et al., 2005). Research studies that have found a statistically significant relationship between ideology and punitiveness suggest that liberals and Democrats hold less punitive beliefs than conservatives and Republicans.

A number of studies have found political party identification to be significantly related to punitiveness. Applegate et al. (2000) found that Democrats were significantly less supportive of capital punishment and more supportive of rehabilitation than Republicans and Independents. Similarly, Hurwitz and Smithey (1998) found that Democrats were more likely to support preventative crime policies and less supportive of punitive crime policies. It is important to note that, although significant, they found party identification to be less predictive of views than ideology measured in terms of

liberalism/conservatism. In addition, Grasmick et al. (1993) suggest that Democrats were significantly less supportive of the death penalty for adults, creating stiffer laws, and the use of deadly force than Republicans. Grasmick & McGill (1994), however, did not find any statistically significant differences in punitiveness towards juvenile offenders based upon political party identification. This may have been due to the inclusion of additional independent variables (e.g., religion and attribution style) that may be accounting for the differences in party identification. In general, the research suggests that we can tentatively conclude that Democrats are less punitive than either Republicans or Independents.

Various studies have explored the extent to which being politically liberal, moderate, or conservative is related to punitiveness. Similar to political party identification, the research in this area has been rather consistent and has suggested that those who are politically conservative tend to hold more punitive views than those who are politically liberal (Applegate et al., 2000; Borg, 1997; Chiricos et al., 2004; Costelloe et al., 2002; Hogan et al., 2005; Hurwitz & Smithey, 1998; Langworthy & Whitehead, 1986; Mackey & Courtright, 2000; Unnever et al., 2005). Although some differences have been found in terms of the strength of the relationship between these two variables, in general, the findings suggest that Liberals hold less punitive views than Conservatives.

The relationship between political ideology and punitiveness also has been examined to a lesser extent among students. Mackey and Courtright (2000) found political ideology to be among four of the strongest predictors of punitiveness in their model. Utilizing a ten centimeter line ranging from “extremely liberal” to “extremely conservative” students self-identified their political orientation. Their results suggested

that students who identified as being more conservative held more punitive views. In another study, Hensley et al. (2003) examined student attitudes towards inmate privileges. They found that liberal students were more supportive of weight lifting, smoking and television privileges (indicating somewhat less punitive views) than more conservative students. Additional research about student attitudes and punitiveness, such as the studies conducted by Farnworth et al. (1998) and Tsoudis (2000) did not include political ideology as a variable of interest. Future research studies examining punitiveness among students should further explore the relationship between political ideology and punitiveness.

Crime Salience and Punitiveness

A range of research studies have explored the relationship between crime salience variables and punitiveness. Much of this research has operationalized crime salience through measures of victimization and fear of crime. Victimization at the individual level is typically measured through respondents reporting the number of times they have been the victim of one or more crimes. Fear of crime or fear of victimization is typically measured through respondents reporting their level of fear of being a victim of a specific crime, fear of walking in their neighborhood at night, or general concerns over crime rates in their community.

A number of studies have examined victimization and its relationship to punitiveness (Applegate et al., 2000; Applegate et al., 2002; Costelloe et al., 2002; Cullen et al., 1985; Evans & Adams, 2003; Langworthy & Whitehead, 1986; Sprott & Doob, 1997; Taylor et al., 1979) and the results suggest a rather weak relationship between the two variables. In addition, numerous studies exploring punitiveness did not even include

victimization as a variable of interest (Cohn et al., 1991; Grasmick et al., 1993; Grasmick & McGill, 1994; Hogan et al, 2005; Leiber & Woodrick, 1997; Schwartz et al., 1993; Sims, 2003; Unnever et al., 2005; Young & Thompson, 1995). Of those studies that included a measure of victimization, a number of them did not find a statistically significant relationship between victimization and their dependent variables assessing punitiveness (Applegate et al., 2000; Costelloe et al., 2002; Cullen et al., 1985; Evans & Adams, 2003; Taylor et al., 1979). One explanation for the statistically insignificant relationship may be due to the low number of respondents reporting any previous victimization in the samples being studied.

In one study that found a significant relationship between the two variables, Applegate et al. (2002) suggest that previous victimization is related to punitiveness differently for men and women. They suggest that prior victimization had a significantly greater impact on punitiveness for female respondents than for male respondents. Women who indicated prior victimization showed a reduction in support for rehabilitation and for liberal crime control policies. Victimization also was different between men and women in attitudes towards the death penalty. They found that men who experienced victimization were more likely to support the death penalty while women who experienced victimization were less likely to support the death penalty. These research findings add to our understanding of the complexity of the relationship between victimization and punitiveness.

In another study, Lanworthy and Whitehead (1986) suggest that victimization is indirectly related to punitiveness through fear of crime. In their measures of both direct victimization and vicarious victimization (neighbor to a victim) they found that

victimization was positively and directly related to fear of crime. Furthermore, they found that fear of crime is positively and directly related to punitiveness. Additional research needs to be conducted about this relationship before any definitive conclusions can be drawn. Thus, the relationship between fear of crime (another measure of crime salience) and punitiveness will be explored below.

Fear of crime has generally been shown to have a positive relationship to punitiveness indicating that people who are more fearful of crime hold more punitive views towards punishment (Costelloe et al., 2002; Evans & Adams, 2003; Hogan et al., 2005; Langworthy & Whitehead, 1986; Schwartz et al., 1993). Additional studies, however, have found the relationship between these two variables to be weak or failing to reach statistical significance (Applegate et al, 2000; Chiricos et al., 2004; Sims, 2003; Taylor et al., 1979). Although some inconsistencies in the findings appear to exist, the bulk of the research in this area generally suggests that fear of crime is positively and significantly associated with greater degrees of punitiveness.

Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) argue that fear of crime has a direct and positive relationship to punitiveness and that income, education, race, sex, and victimization are all indirectly related to punitiveness through fear of crime. Cohn et al. (1991) suggest that fear is positively associated with punitiveness but that an interaction exists between fear and race. They suggest that fear of crime among white respondents had almost no effect on punitiveness while fear of crime among black respondents garnered considerable differences in punitiveness. Similarly, Hogan et al. (2005) suggest that fear of crime was not significantly related to punitiveness among white males but it was statistically significant among other respondents. In addition, Applegate et al. (2002)

found that women were more influenced by fear of crime than men. Although additional research needs to be conducted in this area one can generally argue that a positive relationship exists between these two variables; however, it remains unknown if this relationship extends to the student population.

Religion and Punitiveness

The relationship between religion and punitiveness has been measured in a number of ways. Some researchers explore membership to different types of religions or denominations (e.g., Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Evangelical) (Blumstein & Cohen, 1980; Grasmick et al., 1993; McCorkle, 1993; Young & Thompson, 1995) while others attempt to measure religious salience (i.e., the level of importance religion plays in their life) (Applegate et al., 2000; Evans & Adams, 2003; Grasmick & McGill, 1994; Lane, 1997; Lieber & Woodrick, 1997; Unnever et al., 2005). Additionally, other researchers have examined different aspects of a person's religious beliefs or adherence to specific religious ideas (e.g., biblical literalness, compassion, forgiveness) (Applegate et al., 2000; Applegate, Cullen, Link et al., 1996; Grasmick & McGill, 1994; Unnever et al., 2005; Young & Thompson, 1995). In general, the research findings in this area have been rather consistent and suggest that stronger religious beliefs tend to have a salient impact on a person's views towards the punishment of criminal offenders.

In one study, Applegate et al. (2000) found that a stronger belief in a punitive God was positively associated with punitiveness and that a stronger belief in religious forgiveness was negatively associated with both punitiveness and support for capital punishment. They also found that biblical literalism and religious salience were negatively associated with support for rehabilitation and forgiveness was positively

associated with support for rehabilitation. In another study, Evans and Adams (2003) found that religious fundamentalism was found to be positively associated with their measure of general punitiveness. In addition, Unnever et al. (2005) found compassion and a gracious image of God to be negatively associated with both support for the death penalty and support for harsher local courts. They also found religious rigidity (i.e., moralistic approach to religion) to be positively related to support for the death penalty and biblical literalism to be positively related to support for harsher courts. They did find, however, fundamentalist church membership to be negatively associated with support for harsher courts (contrary to one of their hypotheses).

In addition, Grasmick et al. (1993) examined the relationship between membership to different religions or religious denominations. In this study they compared liberal/moderate Protestants to evangelical/fundamentalist Protestants. Their sample also included Catholics as well as those with no religious affiliation. Their findings suggest that liberal/moderate Protestants were less likely than evangelical/fundamentalist Protestants to support: 1) the death penalty for juveniles and adults, 2) stiffer laws, and 3) harsher courts. Furthermore, they found that Catholics were significantly less likely to support the death penalty for both juveniles and adults than Protestants. They also found that those with no religious affiliation were less likely to support the death penalty for juveniles and adults as well as less likely to support stiffer laws. Similarly, Blumstein and Cohen (1980) found in a study utilizing vignettes that those with no religious affiliation were significantly more lenient than those with other religious memberships. Their findings suggest that Jews were generally more lenient than Protestants and Catholics, and that Protestants and Catholics sentence offenders

rather similarly. On the other hand, McCorkle (1993) did not find any statistically significant differences between those who identified as Protestants, Catholics and others as compared to those with no religious affiliation.

Some of the studies exploring this relationship found a more complex relationship between religion and punitiveness. Grasmick and McGill (1994) found that people who adhered to a more literal interpretation of the bible held more punitive views towards juvenile offenders. This relationship, however, became insignificant at the .05 level once they added their dispositional attribution variable to their model. They suggest that biblical literalness may have a direct effect on attribution style. Similarly, Leiber and Woodrick (1997) found some of their measures of religion to have a significant interaction with their measure of attribution style. Thus, further research needs to be conducted to see if in fact a direct relationship exists between some of these religious variables and punitiveness or if an indirect relationship exists through variables such as causal attribution to crime.

In addition, Young and Thompson (1995) suggest that their religious variables were more significantly related to punitiveness for black respondents than for white respondents. They found that fundamental church membership, biblical literalism, and evangelism (.06) was significantly related to punitiveness for black respondents. They also found that belief in the punishment of sin was negatively associated to support for capital punishment for blacks and was positively associated to capital punishment for whites. This research suggests that the relationship between religion and punitiveness may vary based on the race of the respondent.

Although additional research needs to be conducted in this area, some general conclusions can be drawn. First, it appears as though religious salience (i.e., the importance and devotion one has to their religion) is positively associated with punitiveness. Also, those who believe in the literal interpretation of the bible and/or belong to a religious fundamentalist church are more likely to have more punitive views towards offenders. In addition, those who hold stronger beliefs in religious forgiveness, compassion, and a gracious image of God hold less punitive beliefs towards offenders. Moreover, the research suggests that those with no religious affiliation or more liberal/moderate Protestants tend to hold less punitive views towards the punishment of lawbreakers.

Causal Attribution and Punitiveness

A few studies examining punitiveness have researched the relationship between beliefs about the causes of criminal behavior and punitiveness. The research suggests that what a person attributes to the causes of crime, or how they explain criminal behavior, has an influence on the level or strength of punishment a person prefers for lawbreakers (Carroll, Perkowitz, Lurigio & Weaver, 1987; Cullen et al., 1985; Evans & Adams, 2003; Grasmick & McGill, 1994; Leiber & Woodrick, 1997; Sims, 2003). Causal attribution to crime is measured through support for specific criminological theories (Sims, 2003) or schools of thought (Cullen et al., 1985) or by assessing the level of attribution to crime towards the individual or society (Carroll et al., 1987; Evans & Adams, 2003; Leiber & Woodrick, 1997; Sims, 2003).

Cullen et al. (1985) utilized a 7-item attribution scale to assess whether a participant adopted a classical or positivist view of criminal behavior. Classical views

were associated with rational thought and individual behavior choices by criminals when they break the law. Positivist views were associated with social ills and constraints (e.g., poverty) in influencing criminal behavior. Their study suggests that people who held a more positivist orientation towards criminality held less punitive views and were less supportive of capital punishment than those who held a more classical orientation. In addition, they found that people with more positivist views also were more likely to support rehabilitation efforts for criminals.

In another study, Sims (2003) assessed causal attributions towards crime through support for different theories of crime. Through the use of factor analysis the 31 question attribution scale produced seven factors. The theories of crime assessed in the scale included classical, biological, psychological, structural (strain and critical), social process (social learning, social control), subcultural, and labeling. The findings suggest that classical, social process, and subcultural orientations were positively associated with punitiveness and that classical orientations were the strongest predictor in their model. In addition, the findings suggest that structural and labeling orientations were negatively associated with punitiveness. Biological and psychological orientations, however, were not found to be significantly related to punitiveness. The study also found that classical and positive orientations were more likely to support the death penalty and that structural, psychological, and labeling orientations were negatively associated with death penalty support. An interesting aspect of Sims' study is the increase in the variance explained in punitiveness in their regression models by including attribution as an independent variable. For example, the first regression model only included demographic variables and thus produced and R-square of .02. The second regression model, which included

both demographic and attribution variables, produced an R-square of .20. Therefore the inclusion of the causal attribution variables increased the variance explained by 18%.

In a similar study, Grasmick & McGill (1994) assessed dispositional attribution style by examining agreement with criminal behavior being associated with bad character, being born criminal, being selfish people, or lazy. Their findings suggest that people with a dispositional attribution style were significantly and positively associated with an increase in punitiveness towards juvenile offenders. Thus, if people attribute criminal behavior to individual dispositions and rational behavior they were more likely to be punitive towards offenders. Similar to the Sims (2003) study, when Grasmick & McGill included attribution style to their model the R-square increased from .100 (model including only demographic and religion variables) to .312. Again, this demonstrates that attribution style may account for a significant portion of the variance in punitiveness.

Evans and Adams (2003) also examined the relationship between the causal attributions towards crime and punitiveness. They assessed whether people attributed crime to either individual or situational dispositions. Attribution style was assessed through agreement or disagreement with the statement "many people are driven into crime by the frustration they feel when they fail at school or cannot get a job" (p. 24). The authors suggest that agreement with this statement suggest positivist thinking and attribution towards situational factors. Their findings indicate that participants who agreed with this statement were significantly less likely to support the death penalty for younger offenders, were less supportive of trying younger offenders as adults, were more supportive of rehabilitation, and were less punitive towards offenders.

In another study, Leiber and Woodrick (1997) assessed this relationship with a sample of criminal justice professionals. This study examined attributions towards crime through three causation factors: blaming the person, blaming the family/peer, and blaming societal factors. They found that blaming family/peers for criminal behavior was positively associated with punishment. This is somewhat inconsistent with previous research that suggests that attribution to outside factors tends to decrease punitiveness. This may, however, suggest that participants may associate family/peer relationships to be a measure of individuality. The findings also suggest that blaming society was negatively associated with support for stricter courts which may indicate that situational attributions to criminal behavior may decrease punitiveness. The findings, however, suggest that blaming society is negatively associated with support for diversion (their measure of rehabilitation) which may be considered a less punitive form of punishment. In addition, they found a significant interactive effect between their biblical literalness variable and societal attribution. Participants who embraced a more literal interpretation of the bible and who also blamed society for criminal behavior were more likely to support the death penalty. Furthermore, the blaming the person variable was not found to be statistically significant for any of their dependent variables (punishment, death penalty, stricter courts, diversion). In the previously mentioned studies variables attributing criminal behavior to the individual have been one of the strongest variables predicting greater degrees of punitiveness. The lack of statistical significance in this study may be due to the low alpha level ($\alpha = .53$) of the instrument being used to measure the variable. Moreover, the findings from this research study were not consistent across all dependent variables and suggest a possible weak relationship or the presence of

methodological flaws in the study design. This study also utilized a sample of criminal justice professionals which may account for the difference in the relationship between causal attribution and punitiveness between professionals and members of the general public.

Research studies examining causal attribution and punitiveness among college students also are limited. Carroll et al. (1987) examined attitudes towards criminal behavior and punishment among a sample of 384 law school students and undergraduate criminal justice students. They measured social causation (i.e., family, friends, drugs), economic causation (i.e., poverty, inequality) and individual causation (i.e., lazy, irresponsible, uncaring). They found that students who believed in individual causation were more likely to support punishment. Additionally, they found that students who believed in economic or social causation but not individual causation were more likely to support rehabilitation.

Additional research needs to be conducted to further explain the relationship between these two variables among students. It would be particularly interesting to make a comparison between criminology and non-criminology majors about attitudes towards the origins of criminal behavior as well as how those opinions may influence their views towards punishment. One may speculate that criminology majors would have differing views towards criminality due to an increased knowledge and exposure to criminological theories. One also may assume that criminology majors in their senior year will have significantly different views than criminology majors in the freshman year. Again, further research needs to be conducted in this area before conclusions can be drawn.

In summary, there has been a great deal of research that has examined the relationship between various attitudinal variables and punitiveness. Although some of the research about how these variables are correlated with punitiveness is mixed and/or complex, there are some general conclusions that can be drawn. In general, the research suggests that liberals and Democrats hold less punitive views than conservatives and Republicans. In addition, those with prior victimizations and/or are more fearful of crime tend to hold more punitive views towards offenders. It also has been argued that religious beliefs impact punitiveness and that increased punitiveness has been associated with religious fundamentalism and a belief in the literal interpretation of the Bible. Furthermore, the findings also suggest that people who associate personal responsibility with the causes of crime tend to hold more punitive views than those who suggest environmental, economic, and societal causes of crime. As these attitudinal factors are examined in more detail in future studies it will continue to increase our understanding of punitiveness in general.

Students' Attitudes

The following section will examine the current research that assesses attitudes among students in criminology, criminal justice, law enforcement, and similar majors related to crime and criminal justice. Given that most criminology students will be working as professionals within the justice system after graduation, it is important to assess their beliefs about the criminal justice system. Farnworth et al. (1998) similarly suggest that "criminal justice majors' views are particularly interesting because many of these students aspire to positions as practitioners and administrators with an opportunity to influence or implement crime control policies" (p. 39). Thus, students' attitudes may

influence their perceptions and actions towards offenders, victims, and criminal justice policies while working in the system. As such, attitudes and opinions of criminology students will be explored in more detail below.

Several studies have examined criminology student attitudes prior to and after taking a criminal justice course to assess attitudinal change (Blankenship & Giacopassi, 1990; Bohm et al., 1991, Bohm & Vogel, 1991; Cochran & Chamlin, 2005; Gainey & Payne, 2003; Giacopassi & Blankenship, 1991; Lane, 1997). In addition, numerous studies have compared criminology majors to students majoring in other academic disciplines. Comparisons have been made between these two groups in regards to attitudes towards crime and the criminal justice system (McCarthy & McCarthy, 1981; Tsoudis, 2000; Wolfer & Friedrichs, 2001), gun control (Payne & Riedel, 2000), inmate privileges (Hensley, Miller, Tewksbury, & Koscheski, 2003), school violence (Benekos, Merlo, Cook, & Bagley, 2002), and knowledge about crime (Lambert & Clarke, 2004; Vandiver & Giacopassi, 1997). Additional research studies have compared attitudes among criminology and non-criminology students toward hate crimes (Miller, 2001) and homosexuals (Cannon, 2005; Olivero & Murataya, 2001; Ventura, Lambert, Bryant, & Pasupuleti, 2004). Moreover, the research most closely related to the current study is those studies that have examined attitudes towards punishment among criminology and non-criminology students (Courtright & Mackey, 2004; Courtright et al., 2005; Farnworth et al., 1998; Mackey & Courtright, 2000, Selke, 1980).

Criminology Students and Punitiveness

Selke (1980) assessed crime orientations among criminal justice and non-criminal justice majors. Classes were randomly selected in the author's department and both

introductory and advanced level courses were included. The sampling technique used in this study was not discussed in great detail. This may be due to the fact that the author was primarily interested in assessing the utility of the crime orientation scale being used in the study rather than generalizing the findings from this sample. This study, however, was one of the first studies examining differences in punishment attitudes among criminal justice students. Through the use of two-tailed t-tests the findings suggest that criminal justice students held less punitive orientations than non-majors and that no significant differences in treatment orientations existed between majors. In addition, the findings suggest that females were less punitive than males and that upper classmen were less punitive than underclassmen. One interesting finding was that under classmen held both more punitive orientations as well as more treatment orientations than upperclassmen in the sample. This suggests that these students wanted offenders to be simultaneously punished as well as rehabilitated.

Farnworth et al. (1998) compared views toward criminal sanctions and social control between criminal justice majors and students with majors in other academic disciplines. This study compared 683 students enrolled in criminal justice or history classes at four universities in Texas through the use of a non-probability sampling method. Universities were chosen to obtain regional diversity within the state and include two universities from metropolitan areas and two universities from non-urban areas. In addition, one of the four universities had a religious affiliation while the other three were part of the public state system. Furthermore, faculty at each university were contacted and recruited to distribute questionnaires to the students. Due to the absence of

a random sample the authors suggested caution in generalizing the findings and focused their analysis on identifying apparent patterns through means comparisons.

Attitudes toward capital punishment, other sanctions, and the war on drugs were assessed through three attitudinal indexes (α = .73 - .79). They found that, in general, seniors held less punitive views than freshman and suggested that the college experience has a liberalizing effect on attitudes towards punishment. Among criminal justice majors, however, they found that seniors were more supportive of capital punishment than freshmen. In addition, the authors hypothesized the existence of "the criminal justice effect" which suggests that criminal justice majors, at all levels, would hold more punitive views than non-criminal justice majors. They found some support that criminal justice majors held slightly more punitive views towards the death penalty (i.e., more support for the policy) than non-criminal justice majors. This difference, however, did not extend to views towards other sanctions or the war on drugs. Finally, the findings did not support their hypothesis that students with experience in the criminal justice system would have substantial differences in attitudes than those students without criminal justice experience.

In a response to Farnworth et al. (1998), Eskridge (1999) suggests that caution should be used when using this data to support the liberalizing effect of the college experience. He suggests that their study suffered from methodological concerns that limit the ability to draw conclusions about the liberalization effect. He suggests that the liberalization effect may be due to conservative students dropping out and thus those that remain until their senior year may support more liberal ideologies. He suggests that future evaluations must be conducted before further conclusions and implications can be

drawn. Additional research about the liberalizing effect of a college education should focus on longitudinal data rather than cross-sectional designs.

Mackey & Courtright (2000) conducted the most detailed examination of differences in punitiveness between criminal justice and non criminal justice majors to date. They assessed levels of punitiveness among college students in their sample of 633 students from five colleges and universities located within four states in the Northeast. The authors referred to their sampling method as "a cross between a purposive and a convenience sample" (p. 431). They selected schools based on different criteria (e.g., size, public/private, and religious affiliation) but also used schools that were readily available to the researchers. In all, their sample included two small Catholic colleges and three medium/large state universities. Within the chosen universities they purposely selected classes in both lower and upper level divisions as well as criminal justice and non-criminal justice courses. Although the authors utilized a non-probability sample, their analysis and statistical techniques assume the use of a random sample. Thus, their results should be interpreted with caution because they violated the statistical assumptions of regression.

The findings from this study suggest that criminal justice majors held more punitive attitudes than students majoring in other academic disciplines. Using an independent samples t-test they found that criminal justice majors scored significantly higher on the punitiveness index (M = 88.7) than non-criminal justice majors (M = 83.1). In addition, they found that punitiveness decreased with additional years in school for both criminal justice and non-criminal justice majors. Criminal justice majors, however, maintained higher degrees of punitiveness than their non-major counterparts at each

grade level. Furthermore, their regression model of all students in the sample (major was either not included or not reported as an independent variable in their regression model) suggest that the salient predictors of punitiveness among their sample included grade level, political ideology, size of town, and the attractiveness of law enforcement occupations. Thus, students who were lower classmen, conservative, from smaller towns, and who found law enforcement as a highly desirable occupation were significantly more likely to hold punitive beliefs.

Using the same dataset, Courtright and Mackey (2004) examined the relationship between punitiveness and law enforcement job desirability in more detail. Surveys examined the occupational attractiveness of a number of criminal justice careers (law enforcement, corrections, security, and research) as well as levels of punitive attitudes among criminal justice and non criminal justice majors. Criminal justice majors found law enforcement careers to be more attractive than non-criminal justice majors. This study also found that punitiveness was highly correlated with desirability for jobs in law enforcement among criminal justice majors. Thus, criminal justice students who found law enforcement jobs more appealing held more punitive views than those who found law enforcement jobs to be less attractive.

Similarly, Courtright et al. (2005) assessed the difference in empathy levels between criminal justice majors and other college majors. The study found that criminal justice majors self-reported significantly lower levels of empathy than students with other college majors. Male criminal justice majors possessed the lowest empathy levels while females from other majors possessed the highest empathy levels. The study also found a

strong negative relationship between empathy and punitiveness. Thus, students demonstrating low levels of empathy were more likely to possess higher punitive views.

Furthermore, Mackey et al. (2006) examined support for rehabilitation among students using the same sample in the previously mentioned studies. To assess support for the rehabilitative ideal they utilized a 12-item rehabilitation index ($\alpha = .72$). An interesting finding from this study was that students did not have statistically significant differences in the regression model in support for rehabilitation based on major or grade level. The findings, however, suggest that the factors influencing support for rehabilitation include gender, occupational attractiveness (for working as a correctional counselor), ideology, size of town, and empathy. Thus, students who were female, liberal, from a large town/city, who found the occupation of correctional counselor to be desirable, and who were more empathetic were more supportive of rehabilitation than other students in the sample.

Additional research needs to be conducted before definitive conclusions are made and before we can generalize these findings to the broader criminology student population. The current study intends to address some of the issues and methodological flaws associated with the previous studies in this area in order to expand our understanding of the relationship between college major and punitiveness. First, the current study intends to employ a probability sampling technique to assess punitiveness between criminology and non-criminology majors at one Northeastern university. In addition, the study will attempt to include a number of independent variables shown to be correlated with punitiveness that have not been examined in the literature with similar samples. Last, the study will use multiple regression in the analysis phase in order to

control for the influence of other independent variables on the dependent variable. Chapter IV will describe the methods and sampling techniques for the current study in more detail.

CHAPTER IV

METHODS

The purpose of this study was to better understand the levels of punitiveness among college students who may work in the criminal justice field in the future. Specifically, this study explored whether differences in punitiveness exist between criminology and non-criminology majors at one Northeastern university. This study sought to augment the literature about punitiveness by utilizing a probability sampling method which will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter. Furthermore, this study wanted to increase our understanding of students and punitiveness by including variables shown to be correlated with punitiveness (e.g., religion, crime salience, causal attribution) that have been left out of much of the students' attitudes research. These variables were measured along with a number of variables that have traditionally been found to be correlated with punitiveness (e.g., sex, geographic location, political ideology etc.).

Research Design

The following research study was quantitative with both descriptive and explanatory properties addressing punitiveness among college students. The study intended to examine the factors that shape people's attitudes about the punishment of offenders (punitiveness). It first described any existing patterns and then attempted to explain why those patterns exist. Thus, the researcher was able to examine the relationship between variables (e.g., education and punitiveness) as well as predict degrees of punitiveness based on the impact of other variables (e.g., education).

The study was cross-sectional with the collection of data occurring at one point in time. The research design employed a survey methodology through the form of a self-administered standardized questionnaire. Babbie (2001) describes this mode of observation and suggested that "survey research is probably the best method available to the social researcher who is interested in collecting original data for describing a population too large to observe directly" (p. 238). He goes on to state that "surveys are also excellent vehicles for measuring attitudes and orientations in a large population" (p. 238). Thus, the current study surveyed students through the use of a questionnaire examining punitiveness.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Based on the review of the literature in the previous chapter it still remains unknown (due to conflicting results) as to whether any significant differences in punitiveness exist between criminology students and students majoring in other academic disciplines. Due to the inconsistent results in the research, it is also important to assess the influence of other independent variables on punitiveness among the college student population. As such, this study attempted to address ten research questions:

1. Are there statistically significant differences in levels of punitiveness between disciplines, specifically, criminology and non-criminology majors?
2. Are there statistically significant differences in levels of punitiveness between those with different class standing (i.e., year in college)?
3. Are there statistically significant differences in levels of punitiveness between college women and college men?

4. Are there statistically significant differences in levels of punitiveness based on geographic location of residence?
5. Are there statistically significant differences in levels of punitiveness between students with differing political ideologies?
6. Are there statistically significant differences in levels of punitiveness based on students' religiosity?
7. Are there statistically significant differences in levels of punitiveness based on students' prior victimizations?
8. Are there statistically significant differences in levels of punitiveness based on students' fear of crime?
9. Are there statistically significant differences in levels of punitiveness based on students' causal attributions towards crime?
10. Can an individual's level of punitiveness be predicted by these selected educational, demographic, and attitudinal variables?

Based upon the review of the literature in Chapter II and Chapter III, the following hypotheses were formulated for the current study. The null hypothesis (Ho) in each case is that no significant differences or effects are present. The first two alternative hypotheses address the educational factors associated with punitiveness in the literature. Although the relationship between college major (criminology versus non-criminology) was explored in more detail in the current study, there is some evidence that suggests that criminology students are more punitive than non-criminology majors. Farnworth et al. (1998) suggest that criminal justice majors are more supportive of the death penalty than non-majors. In addition, Mackey and Courtright (2000) found that criminal justice

majors held more punitive views than non-majors. Furthermore, a number of studies examining student attitudes found that students in the junior/senior years were less punitive than students in their freshman/sophomore years (Farnworth et al., 1998; Mackey & Courtright, 2000; Selke, 1980). These findings suggest that students become less punitive with increased years in college. Therefore, the following hypotheses were explored:

Ha (1): Criminology students will be more punitive than non-criminology students.

Ha (2): Under class students will be more punitive than upper class students.

In addition to the educational level factors, other demographic factors have been found to be significantly related to punitiveness. The following hypotheses addressed the demographic variables of sex and geographic location. Numerous research studies have found males to be more punitive than females (Applegate et al., 2002; Evans & Adams, 2003; Schwartz et al., 1993; Selke, 1980; Sprott, 1999; Tsoudis, 2000). In terms of geographic location, those studies examining size of town and punitiveness have found that people from smaller towns tend to hold more punitive beliefs (Mackey & Courtright, 2000; Rossi & Berk, 1997). Therefore, the following two hypotheses related to demographic variables were explored:

Ha (3): College men will be more punitive than college women.

Ha (4): Students who grew up in rural locations will be more punitive than students who grew up in suburban/urban location.

In addition to demographic factors discussed above, there are a number of attitudinal factors that have been found to be significantly related to punitiveness. Factors such as political ideology, political party identification, religiosity, victimization,

fear of crime, and causal attributions towards crime have all been found to be correlated with punitiveness. A number of studies have found Republicans to hold more punitive views than Democrats (Applegate et al., 2002; Grasmick et al., 1993; Hurwitz & Smithey, 1998). Similar to political party identification, the research has suggested that those who are politically conservative tend to hold more punitive views than those who are politically liberal (Applegate et al., 2000; Borg, 1997; Chiricos et al., 2004; Costelloe et al., 2002; Hogan et al., 2005; Hurwitz & Smithey, 1998; Langworthy & Whitehead, 1986; Mackey & Courtright, 2000; Unnever et al., 2005). In terms of religious beliefs a number of researchers have attempted to measure religious salience (i.e., the level of importance religion plays in their life) and have found religious salience to be positively associated with punitiveness (Applegate et al., 2000; Evans & Adams, 2003; Grasmick & McGill, 1994). Additional research studies have suggested that victimization is positively associated with punitiveness (Applegate et al., 2002; Langworthy & Whitehead, 1986) as well as fear of crime (Costelloe et al., 2002; Evans & Adams, 2003; Hogan et al., 2005; Langworthy & Whitehead, 1986; Schwartz et al., 1993). Furthermore, the findings also suggest that people who associate personal responsibility with the causes of crime tend to hold more punitive views than those who suggest environmental, economic, and societal causes of crime (Carroll et al., 1987; Cullen et al., 1985; Evans & Adams, 2003; Grasmick & McGill, 1994; Leiber & Woodrick, 1997; Sims, 2003). The following six hypotheses addressed these attitudinal factors:

> Ha (5): Students with more conservative political ideologies will be more punitive than students with more liberal political ideologies.

Ha (6): Students who are more devoted to their religious beliefs will be more punitive than other students.

Ha (7): Students with prior criminal victimizations will be more punitive than students without prior victimization.

Ha (8): Students who are more fearful of crime will be more punitive than students who are less fearful of crime.

Ha (9): Students who support classical theory, social process theory and subcultural theory will be more punitive than students who support structural positivism theory, labeling theory, and individual positivism theory.

Sampling

The current study sampled groups of undergraduate students based on college major and class level. A stratified cluster sampling design was utilized for this project. Lists of course offerings in both criminology and liberal studies (i.e., the sampling frames) were stratified based on class level (e.g., freshman, sophomore, junior/senior). Appendix B details the sampling frame for both criminology and non-criminology sub-samples. A specific sub-sample of classes was randomly selected from each of the three strata in both the criminology and liberal studies lists. A random numbers table was generated for each strata and courses were then assigned their order for random selection based upon the table generated. Each selected course served as a cluster of students and who were then asked to voluntarily participate in the study. Once a class was randomly selected from the list, permission to administer the questionnaire to students was sought from the faculty member teaching the class. Any students who turned up in multiple

courses were instructed not to participate a second time. Additionally, any students under the age of 18 were instructed not to participate in the study.

A stratified cluster sampling design was specifically chosen to create a representative sample of criminology and non-criminology students as well as to reduce possible sampling error. The number of courses selected within each strata were representative of the population size of students within that strata. For example, if 30% of criminology students are freshmen, then 30% of the intended sample were from freshmen level criminology courses. This same rule applied to the selection of Liberal Studies courses from each of the strata within that sub-sample. Information on the current student population was obtained from the school's Trendbook which tracks student demographic information. Babbie (2001) suggests that in a nonstratified sample of university students "representation by class would be subject to the same sampling error as other variables" and that "in a sample stratified by class, the sampling error on this variable is reduced to zero" (p. 201).

In order to have the statistical power to perform the intended analysis and test each hypothesis, the current study needed fifteen cases per independent variable (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005). With fifteen independent variables in this study, an estimated sample size of 225 was considered ideal for performing the statistical analyses for each sub-sample. Thus, an estimated total sample size of 450 was established. In order to organize the sampling procedures as well as to allow for comparisons between groups during the analysis phase, construction of criminology and non-criminology sub-samples was completed separately.

Construction of Samples

The sampling frame for the criminology sample was comprised of a list of all of the criminology classes being offered during the spring semester. This list was then stratified based on the typical/designated grade level of the students in the class. For example, CRIM 101 and CRIM 102 are freshmen level courses that criminology students take during their first year. Other classes, such as CRIM 400 and CRIM 401 are generally taken during junior and seniors years. Classes chosen from within each strata should represent a proportionate number of students within the department population. Thus, the sample taken from within each strata should be a proportionate percentage of the target sample size of 225. Table 1 presents the sampling strategy that was employed within each strata to generate a proportionate sample.

Table 1

Criminology Population/Sample Proportions

Class Level	Proportion of Population
Freshman	◦ Freshmen = 30% of the criminology student population ◦ 30% of 225 (n) = 68 ◦ Class clusters were randomly selected until registered enrollments from courses were equal to or greater than 68.
Sophomore	◦ Sophomores = 26% of the criminology student population ◦ 26% of 225 (n) = 59 Class clusters were randomly selected until registered enrollments from courses were equal to or greater than 59.
Junior/Senior	◦ Upperclassmen = 44% of the criminology student population ◦ 44% of 225 (n) = 99 ◦ Class clusters were randomly selected until registered enrollments from courses were equal to or greater than 99.

The construction of the non-criminology sample followed similar procedures as that described above with the criminology student sample. A list of liberal studies

courses offered served as the sampling frame for this sample. This list also was then stratified based on the typical/designated grade level of the students in the class. Similar to the criminology courses described above, English 101 and History 195 are designated as first year courses in the liberal studies requirements. In addition, English 121 and 202 are traditional sophomore level courses while Liberal Studies 499 (a required synthesis course) is designated as a second semester junior or senior level course. Classes were randomly selected from within each strata that proportionately represented the total student population (minus criminology students) from within that strata. Table 2 presents the sampling strategy employed with the non-criminology student sample.

Table 2

Non-criminology Population/Sample Proportions

Class Level	Proportion of Population
Freshman	◦ Freshmen = 36% of the student population ◦ 36% of 225 (n) = 81 ◦ Class clusters were randomly selected until registered enrollments from courses were equal to or greater than 81.
Sophomore	◦ Sophomores = 20% of the student population ◦ 20% of 225 (n) = 45 ◦ Class clusters were randomly selected until registered enrollments from courses were equal to or greater than 45.
Junior/Senior	◦ Upperclassmen = 44% of the student population ◦ 44% of 225 (n) = 99 ◦ Class clusters were randomly selected until registered enrollments from courses were equal to or greater than 99.

Questionnaire Construction

To test each of the ten hypotheses in the current study, a survey questionnaire was designed to examine punitiveness among students in the sample. Questions were designed to examine the impact of educational factors, demographic factors, and

attitudinal factors on punitiveness. The questionnaire included items that operationalized the fifteen independent variables and the one dependent variable in the study. The questionnaire is presented in Appendix B.

Independent Variables

Educational factors. The first group of independent variables incorporated in this study included educational factors previously found to influence punitiveness. Questions were designed to measure both class status (i.e., year in school) and undergraduate major. To measure class status students were asked to choose whether they are within freshman, sophomore, junior, or senior status. Due to the fact this study is primarily interested in comparing criminology majors to non-majors, students were then asked if they are criminology majors (with yes or no response categories). If yes, students were asked how many criminology courses they have taken. If students were not criminology majors they were asked to provide a written response indicating their undergraduate major.

Demographic factors. The second group of independent variables included in the questionnaire was intended to measure the demographic characteristics of respondents. As mentioned previously in this chapter as well as Chapter III, the research suggests that sex and geographic location have both been shown to be correlated with punitiveness. Participants were first asked to identify their sex (male and female response categories). In addition, students were asked to describe the size of town in which they grew up. Mackey and Courtright (2000) also asked students this same question but utilized different response categories (e.g., less than 25,000, suburbs, 25,000-50,000 etc.). The current study, however, asked students to identify their home towns as rural, suburban, or urban. This was chosen due to the fact that students may not be familiar with the

population of the places they grew up. In addition, Mackey & Courtright (2000) ended up collapsing their response categories into rural and suburban/urban during their analysis phase.

Attitudinal factors. The last group of independent variables included in this study addressed the attitudinal factors associated with punitiveness. Students were first asked to identify which political party they most closely identify (e.g., Democrat, Independent, Republican). Next they were asked to indicate where they fall in terms of their political ideology through the use of a 10cm visual analog scale. The scale will range from "extremely liberal" on the far left end to "extremely conservative" on the far right end. This same tool was used by Mackey and Courtright (2000) to measure political ideology among college students.

In addition to political ideology, students were asked to identify their level of devotion to their religion. Student respondents were asked to indicate how committed they are to their religious beliefs (e.g., devout, moderate, inactive). This question has been used in a General Information Questionnaire (GIQ) that included items about religiosity that have been previously used with students and community members (Bradizza, Collins, Vincent, & Falco, 2006). These questions should help assess how salient and important religion plays in the lives of the student respondents.

The two crime salience variables included in this study were fear of crime/victimization and prior criminal victimization. Fear of crime was measured using Chiricos et al.'s (2004) fear of criminal victimization scale. Chiricos et al. reported an alpha of .92 for this fear of crime scale. Students were asked to indicate on a scale from 0-10 how fearful they are of six crimes (e.g., having car stole, being raped or sexually

assaulted). Scores on each of the six crimes were summed to form their total fear of crime score (potential range 0-60). In addition to fear of victimization/crime, participants were asked to identify their criminal victimization experiences over the past 12 months. Using Cullen et al.'s (1985) victimization scale, respondents stated the number of times they were a victim of six crimes. Cullen et al.'s response method included participants simply checking off or placing an X next to the crime to which they were a victim. The current study asked students to identify the number of times, if any; they were a victim of each crime. Thus, if they had property stolen from their house/apartment/dorm multiple times within the past year they can state the number of occurrences. A total victimization score was represented by the total number of victimization experiences for each of the six presented crimes.

As mentioned previously in this chapter as well as Chapter III, a person's causal attribution towards criminal behavior has been shown to be correlated with punitiveness. The current study examined student attitudes towards six theoretical perspectives attributed to criminal behavior: structural positivism, social process theory, classical theory, individual positivism (biological and psychological), subcultural theory, and labeling theory. The measurement of these six theoretical perspectives was based off the work of Sims (2003) who created a set of 31 causal attribution statements that were included in a national opinion survey about crime and justice. The causal attribution items were intended to tap into 10 criminological theories (classical, biological, psychological, social disorganization, strain, subcultural, social learning, social control/bonding, labeling, and critical). Factor analysis, however, was conducted on the 31 statements using principal component analysis and produced seven total factors. The

decrease in factors from 10 to 7 is due to the strain and critical variables loading together (structural) as well as the social learning and social control variables loading together (social process). In addition, the statements related to social disorganization theory were dropped from the final analysis due to low factor loadings (leaving a total of 27 statements). Participants in the current study were provided with all 31 statements about crime causation (a factor analysis was then conducted in the analysis phase). Reponses to each statement ranged in Likert format from strongly disagree to strongly agree and responses were totaled to form their overall scale scores on each of the six theoretical perspectives. It was hypothesized that students who support classical theory, social process theory and subcultural theory will be more punitive than students who support structural positivism theory, labeling theory, and individual positivism theory.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable, punitiveness, is defined as "an attitude toward sanctioning and punishment that includes retribution, incapacitation, and a lack of concern for offender rehabilitation" (Courtright & Mackey, 2004; p.317). The current study employed a fifteen item punitiveness scale developed by Mackey and Courtright (2000) (see also Courtright & Mackey, 2004; Courtright et al., 2005) that operationalized punitiveness by primarily tapping into the constructs of retribution and incapacitation. Cronbachs alpha for this scale was .85 in their previous studies. Sample items included "offenders should be harshly punished to make them pay for their crimes" and "a person who has three convictions for very serious crimes (felonies) should receive life without the possibility of parole" (see Appendix B for full scale). Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement through the use of a 10cm visual

analog scale. Responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Participants' scores were measured and totaled to form their overall punitiveness score. Higher scores on this scale indicated greater levels of punitiveness.

Procedures and Human Subjects Issues

One of the first procedural steps was to randomly select classes from the sampling frames. Once a class was selected a letter was sent to the instructor of record for that class (Appendix C). The letter requested access to distribute the questionnaires to students enrolled in the course during class time. Students present during class at the time of questionnaire administration were asked to voluntarily participate in the study. All questionnaires were self-administered (i.e., the students completed the surveys on their own and without the assistance of the administrator). Students under the age of 18, however, were instructed not to participate in the study and asked to write "withdraw" on the survey and to hand it in at the same time as those students who choose to complete the questionnaire. Students were informed about their voluntary participation as well as the purpose of the study. An informed consent form (Appendix D) was attached to the front of the questionnaire and was also read aloud by the survey administrator to the class. Students were made aware that their participation was completely voluntary and that they could choose not to participate without penalty. In addition, students were made aware that their responses were anonymous (i.e., they were instructed not to place any identifying information, such as their name, on the surveys). Furthermore, if students chose not to participate they were instructed to write "withdraw" on their survey and to submit their uncompleted survey at the same time as those students who have completed the questionnaire. Once students completed the questionnaires they were collected by the

survey administrator. All questionnaires are secured by the researcher in a locked office. Access to the data is restricted to the researcher and the dissertation committee. Data collected from the surveys was coded and entered into SPSS for analysis.

As mentioned above, students were informed of their voluntary participation through an informed consent form attached to the front of the questionnaire. In addition, all student responses were anonymous. The questionnaire did not ask for identifying information (e.g., name, address etc.) and student participants were instructed not to place any identifying information on the questionnaire. Thus, anonymity was guaranteed because the researcher "cannot identify a given response with a given respondent" (Babbie, 2001, p. 472).

A number of ethical issues in social research will arise as part of a questionnaire study. Issues such as voluntary participation, informed consent, harm to participants, and anonymity were addressed in the current study. Babbie (2001) states that "social research should never injure the people being studied, regardless of whether they volunteer for the study" (p. 471). Thus, every effort was made to protect study participants from harm. Participants in this study were not subject to risk beyond a minimal level. The current study only sought to discuss participants' opinions about a subject area (i.e., crime and punishment) that is frequently discussed outside of our research environment. No information was withheld from participants. Participants had full knowledge of the focus and scope of the research study. Thus, debriefing was not necessary in this research study because participants were aware of the focus of the study.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the analysis that was conducted in the current study and to present the findings. First, frequencies and descriptive statistics are provided about the variables that were included in the present study. The scale variables will also be discussed in detail within this section. Second, the bivariate correlations among the independent and dependent variables are presented. Finally, the results of the multivariate analysis (i.e., multiple regression) are provided and discussed.

The analysis presented in the current chapter is based on a sample of 519 undergraduate college students at one public university in the Northeast. Using a stratified cluster sampling procedure, standardized surveys were distributed to students during January and February 2008. Surveys were distributed to students in 10 criminology classes and 8 non-criminology courses based on the sampling procedure previously described. A total of 600 students were present during survey administration. Of those students present in class, a number of them had previously participated in the study in another class were asked not to participate a second time (n = 52). Thus, a total of 548 surveys were distributed to the students. A number of surveys were returned incomplete or students withdrew from the questionnaire prior to completion (n = 18). In addition, a number of students withdrew from participation in the questionnaire altogether (i.e., they did not complete the survey at all) (n = 11). The final sample size after removing blank and partially completed surveys was 519. The overall response rate is 94.7%.

Frequencies and Descriptive Statistics

Demographic Factors

Table 3 presents the frequencies and percentages of the demographic factors included in this study. Both the raw numbers as well as valid percentages are presented for sex, age, and size of town. The overall sample consisted of 283 (54.5%) males and 234 (45.5%) females. According to the university Trendbook (2005-2006), males in the overall student population only accounted for 44.7% of the student body and females accounted for 55.3% of students. The total sample appears to have an overrepresentation of male students due, in part, to the large sub-sample of criminology students. For example, the criminology sub-sample consisted of 60.5% males and 39.5% females. The non-criminology sub-sample, however, was 48.4% male and 51.6% female.

Table 3

Frequencies and Percentages for Demographic Factors

Variable	Valid n	Valid%
Sex		
Male	283	54.5
Female	236	45.5
Age		
18	81	15.9
19	117	23
20	80	15.7
21	90	17.7
22	89	17.5
23	26	5.1
>23	26	5.1
Size of Town		
Rural	232	44.7
Suburban	189	36.4
Urban	98	18.9

Age was measured as a continuous variable with students writing in their age on the survey instrument. The median age of respondents was 20 years. Although the age range for the total sample was 18-40 years, the vast majority (94.9%) of undergraduates reported their age to be between 18 and 23. Students over the age of 23 years only represented 5.1% of the overall sample.

Student respondents were also asked to report the size of town or geographic region in which they were primarily raised/grew up. Almost half (44.7%) of the students surveyed reported that they grew up in a rural area. The remaining students reported that they were primarily raised in either suburban (36.4%) or urban (18.9%) areas.

Attitudinal Factors

A number of attitudinal factors were included as independent variables in the current study. The attitudinal factors of political ideology, political party identification, religion, religious salience, crime salience and causal attributions towards crime were assessed. These variables were included due to previous research findings that suggest they play a significant role in one's attitudes towards punishment (see Chapter III for a more detailed description of these relationships).

The attitudinal factors that were coded at the ordinal level or were dichotomously coded are presented in Table 4 (attitudinal variables measured as scales will be reported in a later section). Respondents were asked to report on both their political and religious identification. First, the variable assessing political party identification asked students to report which political party that they most closely identify with. The current student sample consisted of those identifying most closely as a Democrat (43%), Republican (33.5%), Independent (16.2%), or another political party (7.3%).

In addition, the crime salience variable of victimization was included as an independent variable. Victimization at the individual level is typically measured through respondents reporting the number of times they have been the victim of one or more crimes. In the current study, respondents were asked to indicate the number of times, if any, that they were a victim of six stated crimes within the past year. A total victimization scale was created by adding the total number of reported incidents of victimization together. Total scale scores were then dichotomized due to the fact that more than half of the sample did not report any incidents of victimization within the past year. Thus, the variable was broken into "no reported victimization" (58.4%) and "one or more reported victimizations" (41.6%).

In addition to political party identification, the survey instrument included a few questions assessing students' religious views. First, student respondents were asked to describe their religious background. This question included categorical responses such as Catholic (36.4%), Protestant (26.8%), and Christian (20%). Additional response categories such as None (9.4%), Jewish (.8%), Muslim (1.0%), and other (5.6%) were included but they were certainly among the minority within the religious background category. Furthermore, once students responded to the previous question they were then asked to report their attendance at religious services. The majority (63.9%) of students reported that they did not go to church regularly, attending yearly or less than once a year. Other students reported attending religious services monthly (20.7%) while even fewer reported attending services on a weekly basis (14.3%).

Table 4

Frequencies and Percentages for Attitudinal Factors

Variable	Valid n	Valid%
Political Party Identification		
Democrat	223	43.0
Independent	84	16.2
Republican	174	33.5
Other	38	7.3
Victimization		
No reported victimization	303	58.4
One or more victimizations	216	41.6
Religious Background		
Catholic	189	36.4
Protestant	139	26.8
Christian	104	20.0
Jewish	4	0.8
Muslim	5	1.0
None	49	9.4
Other	29	5.6
Attendance at Religious Services		
More than once a week	6	1.2
Weekly	74	14.3
Monthly	107	20.7
Yearly	164	31.7
Less than once a year	167	32.2

Educational Factors

Of particular interest to the current study is the academic level and major of student respondents. Table 5 presents the frequencies and percentages of student class levels within both the criminology and non-criminology sub-samples. Due to the stratification process used during sampling, this table also reports the percentage of students within each class level in the total student population. Differences between the samples and the actual population are also provided.

Table 5

Frequencies and Percentages for Educational Factors

Sub-sample & Variable	Valid n	Valid %	Population %	% Difference
Criminology Majors (N=266)				
Freshman	71	26.7	29.5	-2.8%
Sophomore	61	22.9	26.1	-3.2%
Junior/Senior	134	50.4	44.4	+6.0%
Non-Criminology Majors (N=253)				
Freshman	89	35.2	36.4	-1.2%
Sophomore	56	22.5	20.1	+2.4%
Junior/Senior	107	42.3	43.5	-1.2%

The total student sample is split rather evenly between criminology majors (51.3%) and non-criminology majors (48.7%). An estimated sample size of 225 was sought within each sub-sample. In order to have the statistical power to perform the intended analysis and test each hypothesis, the current study needed a minimum of fifteen cases per independent variable (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005). Thus, with fifteen independent variables the current study sought a minimum sample of 225 students within both the criminology and non-criminology subsamples (n = 450 total). As mentioned in the previous chapter, university classes served as clusters and were randomly selected within each of the class status levels (i.e., freshmen, sophomore, junior/senior). This sampling method was relatively effective in obtaining a sample of students that looks like the population in terms of academic status by year.

Factor Analysis

A principal component factor analysis using Varimax rotation was conducted on the 31 items assessing causal attributions towards crime created by Sims (2003). According to Floyd & Widaman (1995) factor analysis can be used "to identify the

underlying dimensions of a domain of functioning, as assessed by a particular measuring instrument…an instrument designed to assess a domain of functioning is factor-analyzed to identify separable dimensions, representing theoretical constructs, within the domain" (Floyd & Widaman, 1995, 286). Although Sims (2003) also conducted a factor analysis on these items, the current research study wanted to conduct a factor analysis to assess whether the items loaded in a similar manner.

The results of the factor analysis are presented in Table 6. The principle component factor analysis resulted in the following 7 factors (with Eigen values over 1): social process, structural positivism, individual positivism (biological and psychological), labeling, subcultural, classical, and learning. The current study followed similar criteria for maintaining items within each factor as Sims (2003). First, factor loadings had to be .35 or greater. Second, if an item did not load as expected there had to be a theoretical argument for retaining it with another factor. In addition to the two criteria used by Sims (2003), the current research study also conducted a reliability analysis on each of the seven factors. If an item had a moderately low factor loading (.35-.50) and the sub-scale's Cronbach's alpha increased with the deletion of that item it was then removed from the factor.

One of the first interesting findings from the factor analysis is that a number of social control/bonding, social learning, and social disorganization items loaded together onto the first factor ("social process"). Sims (2003) also found that both control/bond items and learning items loaded together onto one factor. An interesting finding in this analysis is that two social disorganization variables (which ended up being dropped from Sims' final analysis) also loaded onto the "social process" factor. After examining the

items in more detail, it is not surprising that these items loaded together due to the fact that respondents may attribute criminal behavior to interactions and connections with one's friends, family, and community.

Another finding from the factor analysis is that both strain and critical items loaded together onto one factor. Again, this was a similar finding to the Sims (2003) study who also found that these theories combined to form a "structural positivism" factor. After examining the items further, it can be similarly argued that "the questions appear to attribute criminal behavior as a reasonable response to an environment in which structural and cultural phenomena work to create a polarized society" (Sims, 2003, 10).

Table 6

Factor Analysis for Causal Attribution Items

Underlying Theoretical Dimension	Items	Factor Loading
Factor 1: Social Process		
	Crime is committed by young people who are not involved enough in wholesome activities such as spending time with parents or working on school projects.	.710
	Crime occurs in our society when there is a breakdown in families and schools which keeps people from feeling a sense of community.	.590
	Young people commit crimes if all they do is hang around on the corner because there are no youth groups or summer jobs.	.564
	People commit crime when family, friends, or others either approve of the crime or do not discourage their criminal behavior.	.556
	People commit crime because their ties to family, school, or friends are weak or broken.	.552
	Kids are likely to break the law when they do not feel close to their parents or do not care what their parents think of them.	.432

Factor 2: Structural Positivism		
	Crime occurs in this country because the American economic system has produced a society where some people have a lot and others have nothing.	.809
	A major reason why we have so much crime these days is because America still has too much poverty, racism, and social injustice.	.781
	The reason the United States has such a high crime rate is that too many of its people are exploited by a system that makes sure that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.	.754
	Crime occurs in our society because it provides the only opportunity for some people to succeed.	.425
	People are bound to turn to crime when they are taught to want success, money, and fancy cars but then can't get them legally.	.414
Factor 3: Individual Positivism		
	Many people who commit crimes do so because they can't control their anger and other impulses.	.743
	People who commit crimes do so because they have emotional problems.	.666
	Many people commit crimes because they were born that way.	.549
	Today's criminals were yesterday's abused children who have been emotionally damaged.	.538
	People commit crime because they are not intelligent enough to do otherwise.	.427
Factor 4: Labeling		
	What the criminal justice system does to young people who break the law makes them even more criminal.	.669
	Putting offenders in prison may make them even more criminal because prisons are schools of crime.	.653
Factor 5: Subcultural		
	Kids often become criminals because they live in neighborhoods where it is okay to break the law.	.643
	People commit crime just because it is part of a culture which has a value system that is different from the rest of society.	.582
	Crime is caused by members of a criminal subculture (i.e., a group of people who share similar behavioral and cultural beliefs) that supports and encourages criminal activity.	.437
	People commit crime because they live in bad neighborhoods that are run down and disorganized.	.435

Factor 6: Classical		
	Crime in this country occurs because the criminal justice system does not make the punishment severe enough.	.761
	People break the law because our criminal justice system does not punish criminals quickly enough.	.740
Factor 7: Learning		
	Some people learn criminal behavior from imitating family, friends, and others they see doing wrong.	.698
	Crime is like any other behavior: It is learned from the people around you.	.525

The third factor named "individual positivism" combined both psychological and biological theory items. Sims (2003) similarly had one psychological item load onto the biological factor but still maintained two separate factors (individual positivism-biological and individual positivism-psychological). In the current study, three biological items and two psychological items loaded together to form one common factor (i.e., "individual positivism"). Again, a theoretical argument can be made that respondents may be attributing factors outside of a person's control (i.e., emotions, intelligence) to both biological and psychological influences.

The next factor produced two items to form the "labeling" perspective. A third item intended to assess classical theory also loaded onto the labeling factor. The item stated "crime is the product of a person's free will (i.e., people are not forced to commit crimes; it is their choice)". Although this item loaded onto the "labeling" factor with a factor loading of .469, it was later removed from future analysis. This decision was based on two issues. First, a strong theoretical argument could not be made as to how this classical item captured a labeling perspective of crime causation. Second, after assessing sub-scale reliability, it was apparent that this particular item was not highly

correlated with the other items in the sub-scale. Further, once the "classical" item was removed from the labeling scale the Cronbach's alpha increased from .045 to .580.

Another result of the factor analysis was the production of a two item "classical" scale. The results of the factor analysis indicated that two items loaded strongly together (i.e., factor loadings of .740 and .761) to form the "classical" factor. These same two factors loaded together in the Sims (2003) study. Sims, however, had one additional item in the "classical" sub-scale. The item stated "the main reason why people break the law is that they figure they can get away with it". Although this item originally loaded onto the "classical" factor with a factor loading of .442 it was later dropped from the analysis. Again, this decision was made for a number of reasons. First, this same item also had moderate loadings (>.35) on two other factors (i.e., labeling and learning) which indicates that this item may not be accurately capturing the construct it is intended to assess. Second, after conducting reliability analysis on the "classical" sub-scale it was apparent that by removing this item from the "classical" scale that it would increase the scale's Cronbach's alpha from 499 to .564.

The last finding from the factor analysis was that two "learning" items loaded together to form a two item scale assessing views towards a social learning perspective. The two items loaded together with factor loadings of .698 and .525. In the Sims (2003) study, these items loaded onto the "social process" factor and did not form their own "learning" factor.

Scale Variables

A number of scales were utilized to measure four independent variables (political ideology, religious devotion, fear of crime and causal attribution) and the dependent

variable (punitiveness). The measurement of these variables includes the use of two scales (e.g., political ideology and religious devotion) that were measured using a visual analog scale (e.g., 10cm line). In addition, the study utilized an additive scale from six fear of crime statements to create a total fear of crime scale. The study also used a 31-item causal attribution scale that assessed attitudes towards seven different theoretical perspectives. Last, the study's dependent variable consists of a 15-item additive scale. The rest of this section will present the descriptive statistics for these scale variables as well as report their scale reliability.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for Scale Variables

Variable	Mean	SD	Actual Minimum	Actual Maximum
Political Ideology	4.99	2.13	1	10
Religious Devotion	4.78	2.87	1	10
Fear of Crime	22.96	16.55	0	60
Social Process	20.67	3.52	7	30
Structural Positivism	16.87	3.72	5	25
Individual Positivism	13.59	3.08	5	21
Classical	5.65	1.79	2	10
Labeling	6.09	1.66	2	10
Subcultural	12.95	2.44	4	19
Learning	7.96	1.17	3	10
Total Punitiveness	85.47	24.56	26	150

The variables "political ideology" and "religious devotion" were both measured using a visual analog scale. For political ideology respondents were asked to place a vertical slash mark on the line indicating where they believe they fall in terms of their political ideology. The line ranged from "extremely liberal" on the left end of the line to "extremely conservative" on the right side of the line. Thus, those with higher scores

identify as having a more conservative political ideology. The mean score for this scale was 4.99, and a standard deviation of 2.13, with responses ranging from 1 to 10. Religious devotion was also measured using a visual analog scale with "inactive" being weighted on the left end of the line and "devout (strong)" on the right end. Higher scores on this scale indicate more commitment to one's religious beliefs. The mean score for this scale was 4.78, and a standard deviation of 2.87, with responses ranging from 1 to 10.

The variable "fear of crime" was measured using a 6-item additive scale. Respondents were asked to state on a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 being not fearful at all and 10 being very fearful, how much they fear six different crimes. Scores from each of the six items were totaled to form an overall scale score. Higher scores on this scale indicate higher levels of fear. The mean score for this scale was 22.96, and a standard deviation of 16.55, with responses ranging from 0 to 60.

The remaining attitudinal variables included in the current study consist of seven independent variables measuring students' perceptions towards the causes of crime. These variables were incorporated based on the argument that what a person attributes to the causes of crime, or how they explain criminal behavior, has an influence on the level or strength of punishment a person prefers for lawbreakers. The causal attribution scale consists of 31-items that cover seven theoretical perspectives of crime causation. A factor analysis (detailed below) was used to extract seven theoretical perspectives, including social process, structural positivism, individual positivism, labeling, classical, subcultural, and learning theories. Higher scores indicate stronger support for the specific perspective. Each respondent was instructed to indicate their level of agreement with

each statement through the use of 5-item Likert scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree).

The first subscale is "social process" which includes social control, social disorganization, and social learning items. This six-item additive scale has a mean score of 20.67, a standard deviation of 3.52, and a range of 7 to 30. The next subscale is "structural positivism" which includes items for both a critical and strain perspectives. This 5-item additive scale has a mean score of 16.87, a standard deviation of 3.72, and a range of 5 to 25. The third subscale is "individual positivism" which includes both biological and psychological items. The mean score for this 5-item scale is 13.59, with a standard deviation of 3.08, and a range of 5 to 21. A fourth subscale included 3-items that assessed views towards a "subcultural" perspective towards crime. The mean score for this scale is 12.95, a standard deviation of 2.44, and a range of 4 to 19.

The last three subscales were each 2-item scales that assessed views towards "labeling", "classical", and "learning" perspectives. The mean score for the labeling scale is 6.09 with a standard deviation of 1.66. The mean score for the classical scale is 5.65 with a standard deviation of 1.79. Last, the mean score for the learning scale is 7.96 and a standard deviation of 1.17. Responses ranged for both labeling and classical subscales from 2 to 10, and responses ranged from 3 to 10 for the learning subscale.

The last scale variable included in the study is a 15-item "punitiveness" scale that is being used to operationalize the dependent variable. The punitiveness scale measured students' views towards the punishment of offenders. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the 15 statements. Agreement with each statement was measured through the use of a visual analog scale anchored by "strongly disagree"

on the left end and "strongly agree" on the right end. A total scale score was then computed by adding together response scores for each of the 15 items. Higher scale scores indicate stronger punitive views. The mean score for this scale is 85.47, with a standard deviation of 24.56, and a range of 26 to 150.

Scale Reliability

As mentioned in the previous section, the current study included nine variables that were operationalized through the use of multiple item scales. Before moving on to other analyses, it is important to assess the reliability of each of these scales. DeVellis (2003) states that "scale reliability is the proportion of variance attributable to the true score of the latent variable" (27). Scale reliability is focusing on the homogeneity of the items in the scale. It assesses whether scale items are varying in cooperation with one another and thus are correlated with one another. The researcher needs to make sure that the items within the scale are logically connected (i.e., demonstrating internal consistency) to each other as well as the latent variable the scale is intended to assess.

The current study will be using coefficient alpha as the primary method of assessing scale reliability. Cortina (1993) examines coefficient alpha and describes it as "one of the most important and pervasive statistics in research involving test construction and use" (Cortina, 1993, 98). According to DeVellis (2003), "alpha is defined as the proportion of a scale's total variance that is attributable to a common source, presumably the true score of a latent variable underlying the items" (31). Alpha values can range from 0.0 to 1.0 but DeVellis (2003) advises that there are acceptable and unacceptable ranges. He proposes "below .60, unacceptable; between .60 and .65, undesirable; between .65 and .70, minimally acceptable; between .70 and .80, respectable; between

.80 and .90, very good; much above .90, one should consider shortening the scale" (p. 95-96). Thus, higher alpha levels suggest that the scale items have greater internal consistency and are measuring the same underlying construct.

The following section will present reliability assessment information for each of the scales used in the current study. Tables 8 through 16 provide scale items, corrected item-total correlations, and Cronbach's alpha for each scale. According to Netemeyer, Bearden, and Sharma (2003), item total correlations "reflect the extent to which any one item is correlated with the remaining items in a set of items under consideration" (144). Although, no one unitary standard exists as to acceptable item-total correlations, Bearden, Hardesty, and Rose (2001) maintained items in their scale that had item-total correlations of .35 and above. Clark and Watson (1995) suggest that average inter-item correlations should be .40 or higher for narrowly defined constructs. Other researchers, however, suggest that a higher standard of .50 and above should be held (Netemyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996; Spangenber, 1998).

Table 8

Item-Total Correlations for Fear of Crime Scale and Alpha

Item	Item-Total Correlation
Having your car stolen	.528
Having someone break into your house/apartment/dorm	.714
Being robbed or mugged on the street	.866
Being raped or sexually assaulted	.780
Being beaten up or assaulted by strangers	.832
Being murdered	.773

NOTE: Cronbach's Alpha = .907

The scale for "fear of crime" consisted of six items that asked respondents to state (on a 0-10 scale) how fearful they are of six different crimes. Each of the six scale items,

corrected item-total correlations, and Cronbach's alpha are presented in Table 8. The findings illustrate that all of the item-total correlations are between .528 and .866 which are all within acceptable ranges. In addition, the Cronbach's alpha for the scale is .907. Again, this alpha level falls within the "very good" range as reported by DeVellis (2003). These findings suggest that the "fear of crime" scale is reliable and should be maintained in future analyses.

Table 9

Item-Total Correlations for Social Process Scale and Alpha

Item	Item-Total Correlation
Crime is committed by young people who are not involved enough in wholesome activities such as spending time with parents or working on school projects.	.555
Crime occurs in our society when there is a breakdown in families and schools which keeps people from feeling a sense of community.	.516
Young people commit crimes if all they do is hang around on the corner because there are no youth groups or summer jobs.	.339
People commit crime when family, friends, or others either approve of the crime or do not discourage their criminal behavior.	.364
People commit crime because their ties to family, school, or friends are weak or broken.	.505
Kids are likely to break the law when they do not feel close to their parents or do not care what their parents think of them.	.421

NOTE: Cronbach's Alpha = .712

The "social process" scale consisted of six items assessing participants' views towards social control, social disorganization, and social learning theories of crime. Although item three has an item-total correlation of less than .35 the item was still maintained in the social process scale. First, item three loaded well onto the social process scale after conducting the factor analysis on the causal attribution items (suggesting unidimensionality). Second, the Cronbach's alpha for the overall scale score would not increase if item three was removed from the scale. In addition, the Cronbach's

alpha for this scale is .712 which is again within the "respectable" range (DeVellis, 2003) and suggests that the "social process" scale is reliable.

Table 10

Item-Total Correlations for Structural Positivism Scale and Alpha

Item	Item-Total Correlation
Crime occurs in this country because the American economic system has produced a society where some people have a lot and others have nothing.	.571
A major reason why we have so much crime these days is because America still has too much poverty, racism, and social injustice.	.550
The reason the United States has such a high crime rate is that too many of its people are exploited by a system that makes sure that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.	.577
Crime occurs in our society because it provides the only opportunity for some people to succeed.	.425
People are bound to turn to crime when they are taught to want success, money, and fancy cars but then can't get them legally.	.375

NOTE: Cronbach's Alpha = .736

The item-total correlations as well as the scale items for the "structural positivism" scale are presented in Table 10. Again, the item-total correlations are within the acceptable ranges presented above. Although, item five is at the low end of the acceptable range, the item was maintained both because it loaded well in the factor analysis and because the alpha level for the scale would not increase if the item was deleted. The alpha level for the "structural positivism" scale is .736. Again, this falls within the "respectable" range and suggest that this scale is reliable.

Table 11

Item-Total Correlations for Individual Positivism Scale and Alpha

	Item-Total Correlation
Many people who commit crimes do so because they can't control their anger and other impulses.	.509
People who commit crimes do so because they have emotional problems.	.467
Many people commit crimes because they were born that way.	.312
Today's criminals were yesterday's abused children who have been emotionally damaged.	.407
People commit crime because they are not intelligent enough to do otherwise.	.319

NOTE: Cronbach's Alpha = .647

Table 11 presents information in regards to the 5-item "individual positivism" scale which assesses participants' support for both biological and psychological theories of crime. Two of the items included in this scale had relatively weak item-total correlations (slightly less than .35). Again, these items were maintained in the scale due to the fact that they loaded onto the same factor (after conducting a factor analysis) and the overall scale score suggest internal consistency due to the "minimally acceptable" alpha of .65. In addition, the alpha would not increase if either items three or five were removed from the scale. Thus, all items were retained and the scale will be maintained for future analyses.

Table 12

Item-Total Correlations for Subcultural Scale and Alpha

Item	Item-Total Correlation
Kids often become criminals because they live in neighborhoods where it is okay to break the law.	.312
People commit crime just because it is part of a culture which has a value system that is different from the rest of society.	.307
Crime is caused by members of a criminal subculture (i.e., a group of people who share similar behavioral and cultural beliefs) that supports and encourages criminal activity.	.321
People commit crime because they live in bad neighborhoods that are run down and disorganized.	.313

NOTE: Cronbach's Alpha = .525

Table 12 presents information on the "subcultural" scale. This 4-item scale assesses students' views towards a subcultural perspective of crime causation. Again, after conducting a factor analysis these four items were found to be measuring a single construct (i.e., subcultural theory). The item-total correlations, however, fall below the acceptable ranges suggested above. In addition, the alpha level for this scale is also below the suggested range. This scale will be maintained for future analysis; however, this scale may ultimately need to be dropped due to its low reliability.

Table 13

Item-Total Correlations for Labeling Scale and Alpha

Item	Item-Total Correlation
What the criminal justice system does to young people who break the law makes them even more criminal.	.410
Putting offenders in prison may make them even more criminal because prisons are schools of crime.	.410

NOTE: Cronbach's Alpha = .580

After conducting a factor analysis, the "labeling" scale consisted of two items assessing student views towards a labeling perspective of crime causation. As shown in

Table 13, the item-total correlations fall within acceptable ranges. The Cronbach's alpha, however, is only .58 for the overall scale. According to DeVellis (2003) this scale would fall within the "unacceptable" range. However, the current research study seeks to maintain this scale for future analyses for a number of reasons. First, the previous factor analysis suggests that these items load onto one common factor (i.e., labeling theory). Second, the alpha for this scale may be low due to the fact that it only consists of two items. Future research studies should attempt to introduce additional labeling items in the hopes of increasing the scale reliability in the future. Third, it is not uncommon for published studies to include scales with alpha levels ranging from .50 to .65. Fourth, a preliminary regression analysis has suggested that the "labeling" variable is significantly related to punitiveness and it was able to achieve this significance with only two items in the scale. Overall, the current researcher believes that this scale falls within a minimally acceptable range due to the components mentioned above. Thus, this scale will be maintained for future analysis.

Table 14

Item-Total Correlations for Classical Scale and Alpha

Item	Item-Total Correlation
Crime in this country occurs because the criminal justice system does not make the punishment severe enough.	.393
People break the law because our criminal justice system does not punish criminals quickly enough.	.393

NOTE: Cronbach's Alpha = .564

A similar argument can be made for both the "classical" scale (presented in Table 14) and the "learning theory" scale (presented in Table 15). In both of these cases, the item-total correlations fall within the acceptable ranges (>.35) mentioned previously in

this section. Furthermore, the low alpha levels in these scales (.564 and .512) may again be low due to the fact that these scales only consist of two items. Future researchers should attempt to increase the number of items within these scales. Again, these scales will be maintained for further analysis.

Table 15

Item-Total Correlations for Learning Scale and Alpha

Item	Item-Total Correlation
Some people learn criminal behavior from imitating family, friends, and others they see doing wrong.	.359
Crime is like any other behavior: It is learned from the people around you.	.359

NOTE: Cronbach's Alpha = .512

The last scale used in the current study is a 15-item punitiveness scale which is the dependent variable in the study. The Cronbach's alpha for the punitiveness scale is .882. This is within the "very good" range according to DeVellis (2003) and it is slightly higher than the alpha reported in the Mackey and Courtright (2000) study (.85).

After examining the item-total correlations among the 15 items it was found that 3 items had relatively low correlations in comparison to the other 12 items. Items 9, 10, and 15 had item-total correlations of .364, .410, and .381 respectively. To further address these three items, a factor analysis was conducted and the results suggested that the 15-items loaded onto 2 factors. The second factor consisted of the 3 items (9, 10, and 15) mentioned above. After reviewing the items there does not appear to be any conceptual reasoning as to why these three factors loaded together. The problems with these three factors may simply be due to statement wording as well as item ordering in the survey. The current researcher chose to remove these three problem items from the final scale.

The removal of these items slightly decreased the Cronbach's alpha from .882 to .881. However, this change is very small and may be a consequence of shortening the scale when removing items. In addition, the alpha level remains in a "very good" range.

Table 16

Item-Total Correlations for Punitiveness Scale and Alpha

Item	Item-Total Correlation
We are entirely too soft on people convicted of crime.	.643
Offenders should be harshly punished to make them pay for their crimes.	.655
We should use the old saying "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" as a guideline for determining punishment for criminals.	.577
To better control the crime problem, more prisons need to be built.	.474
Prisons today are much too easy.	.525
Using the death penalty helps us better control crime.	.567
Prison and jail inmates deserve the humiliation, intimidation, and degradation they may receive.	.638
Drug dealers should be given life sentences for their crimes.	.544
A person who sexually abuses children should never be released from prison.	.364
Probation supervision, where offenders serve their sentence in the community under the supervision of a probation officer, is a joke.	.410
A person who has three convictions for very serious crimes (felonies) should receive life without the possibility of parole.	.499
People choose to commit crimes; therefore, they deserve the punishment they get.	.635
Harsh and severe punishments are necessary to preserve a sense of justice in our society.	.696
Speedy, severe, and certain penalties are the only way to prevent people from committing crime.	.534
Inmates who participate in programs while confined (such as education, counseling, vocational training, etc.) do so only because they are trying to impress the parole board so they can possibly gain an early release.	.381

NOTE: Cronbach's Alpha = .882

Bivariate Correlations

Bivariate correlations were conducted among the independent variables included in the study as well as the one dependent variable in the study. These correlations were used to assess whether significant relationships existed between variables, not to determine if cause and effect relationships exist. As mentioned in a previous chapter, this step is also intended to check for multicollinearity among the independent variables. If the independent variables are highly correlated then the results in further analyses (e.g., multiple regression) become inaccurate. Absence of perfect or severe multicollinearity is one of the assumptions of multiple regression (Lewis-Beck, 1980). Additional tests for multicollinearity, such as the tolerance statistic and the variance inflation factor, will be used when further testing the assumptions of regression analysis in the next section. According to Cohen, Cohen, West and Aiken (2003), correlation coefficients are considered small (.1 to .3), medium (.3 to .5), and large (.5 to 1.0). Table 17 presents the results of the bivariate correlation matrix. Pearson's correlation coefficient, sample size, and significance at both the .01 and .05 levels are indicated for each of the fifteen independent variables and the one dependent variable in the study.

Table 17

Bivariate Correlation Matrix

Variable	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**
Sex **1**	1 (519)							
Class **2**	-.063 (519)	1 (519)						
Major **3**	.124** (519)	-.070 (519)	1 (519)					
Town **4**	.082 (519)	-.086* (519)	.047 (519)	1 (519)				
Fear **5**	.354** (519)	-.091* (519)	.220** (519)	.143** (519)	1 (519)			
Victim **6**	-.112* (519)	-.016 (519)	-.034 (519)	.052 (519)	.029 (519)	1 (519)		
Ideology **7**	-.198** (519)	-.008 (519)	-.155** (519)	-.069 (519)	-.085 (519)	-.035 (519)	1 (519)	
Devotion **8**	.117** (518)	-.040 (518)	.071 (518)	.007 (518)	.131** (518)	-.007 (518)	.195** (518)	1 (518)
Social **9**	-.034 (519)	.099* (519)	-.138** (519)	.001 (519)	.018 (519)	-.021 (519)	.160** (519)	.129** (519)
Structural **10**	.091* (519)	.071 (519)	-.059 (519)	.029 (519)	.122** (519)	-.004 (519)	-.302** (519)	-.083 (519)
Individual **11**	-.006 (519)	-.046 (519)	-.009 (519)	.034 (519)	.107* (519)	.037 (519)	.101* (519)	.044 (519)
Labeling **12**	-.093* (519)	.135** (519)	-.116** (519)	.055 (519)	-.087* (519)	.098* (519)	-.104* (519)	-.109* (519)
Subcultural **13**	-.133** (519)	.057 (519)	-.158** (519)	-.011 (519)	-.052 (519)	.022 (519)	.080 (519)	-.040 (519)
Classical **14**	.017 (519)	.010 (519)	.086 (519)	-.150** (519)	-.005 (519)	-.053 (519)	.088* (519)	.127** (519)
Learning **15**	-.083 (519)	.044 (519)	-.176** (519)	-.026 (519)	-.023 (519)	-.016 (519)	.039 (519)	-.018 (519)
Punitiveness **16**	-.036 (519)	-.157** (519)	.173** (519)	-.128** (519)	.063 (519)	-.084 (519)	.253** (519)	.118** (519)

NOTE: ** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)
(n) in parenthesis

Variable	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Sex **1**								
Class **2**								
Major **3**								
Town **4**								
Fear **5**								
Victim **6**								
Ideology **7**								
Devotion **8**								
Social **9**	1 (519)							
Structural **10**	.169** (519)	1 (519)						
Individual **11**	.443** (519)	.155** (519)	1 (519)					
Labeling **12**	.079 (519)	.305** (519)	.051 (519)	1 (519)				
Subcultural **13**	.407** (519)	.160** (519)	.332** (519)	.030 (519)	1 (519)			
Classical **14**	.136** (519)	-.062 (519)	.114** (519)	-.049 (519)	.145** (519)	1 (519)		
Learning **15**	.375** (519)	.155** (519)	.160** (519)	.046 (519)	.307** (519)	-.027 (519)	1 (519)	
Punitiveness **16**	.085 (519)	-.163** (519)	.124** (519)	-.225** (519)	.125** (519)	.511** (519)	.027 (519)	1 (519)

NOTE: ** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)
(n) in parenthesis

After examining the correlation matrix, it was found that a number of the independent variables were significantly associated with each other. The highest correlations among the independent variables typically occurred among the causal attribution items. For example, the highest correlation occurred between "social process" and "individual positivism" variables (r =.443, $p < .001$). In addition, positive and significant correlations (with moderate correlation coefficients, $r = .3$ or above) were found among the following causal attribution scales: "social process" and "subcultural" (r

= .407, p <.001), “social process” and “learning” (r = .375, p <.001), “structural positivism” and “labeling” (r = .305, p < .001), “individual positivism” and “subcultural” (r = .332, p < .001), “subcultural” and “learning” (r = .307, p < .001). These findings were not surprising due to the fact that each of these sub-scales is assessing views towards the causes of crime. Thus, it would be expected that some of these variables would be moderately correlated with each other. In addition, none of the correlation coefficients are large enough to believe that any of the causal attribution items are so highly correlated that they are measuring the same construct.

Upon further investigation of the correlation coefficients it is apparent that ten of the fifteen independent variables are significantly correlated with the dependent variable (“punitiveness”) at the .01 level. Negative correlations were found between “class” (r = -.157), “town” (r = -.128), “structural positivism” (r = -.163), and “labeling” (r = -.225) and “punitiveness”. These results suggest that students in upper classes, who grew up in suburban/urban areas, and who support structural and labeling perspectives of crime causation tend to hold less punitive views. In addition, positive correlations were found between “major” (r = .173), “ideology” (r = .253), “religious devotion” (r = .118), “individual positivism” (r = .124), “subcultural” (r = .125), and “classical” (r = .511). These results indicate that students in academic disciplines outside of criminology, who hold a more conservative political ideology, who are more devoted to their religion, and who support individual positivism, subcultural, and classical perspectives of crime causation tend to hold more punitive views.

It is important to note that the highest correlation between any of the variables in the study was found between the “classical” causal attribution scale and the dependent

variable "punitiveness" (r = .511). Due to the fact that the classical items in the survey were assessing views towards deterrence (e.g., swiftness and severity of punishment), it does not come to any surprise that these two variables would be moderately correlated. However, the correlation coefficient for these two variables is not high enough to conclude that the scales are measuring the same construct.

Multiple Regression

Although the bivariate analysis reported above provides interesting information it is limited in its ability to make predictions of strength and to draw conclusions about cause/effect relationships. The main limitation to bivariate analysis is that it does not control for the influence of other independent variables on the dependent variable. For example, an independent variable may found to be significantly associated with punitiveness in the bivariate analysis but it may no longer be significant in regression analysis. This change typically occurs when we can control for the influence of the other independent variables, and thus isolate the influence of each independent variable on the dependent variable. Thus, multiple regression models will be used due to the presence of multiple independent variables and one continuously measured dependent variable. The aim of multiple regression is "to estimate the effect of several independent variable on a dependent variable" (Bachman & Paternoster, 1997, p. 490). This technique aids in the prediction of the value of the dependent variable based on a linear combination of independent variables. More specifically, the current study will be able to illustrate the effect of education factors, demographic factors, and attitudinal factors on punitiveness.

The following equation will be used to estimate these effects in the full regression model:

$$\hat{y} = a_0 + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + b_3x_3 + \ldots + b_kx_k + e$$

Where:

a_0 = constant

x_1 = class status

x_2 = major

x_3 = sex

x_4 = size of town

x_5 = fear of crime

x_6 = victimization

x_7 = political ideology

x_8 = religious devotion

x_9 = social process theory

x_{10} = structural positivism

x_{11} = individual positivism

x_{12} = labeling theory

x_{13} = subcultural theory

x_{14} = classical theory

x_{15} = learning theory

The regression procedures are split into four models. The first base model examines the effects of the educational factors on punitiveness (e.g., class status and major). The next model then adds the demographic factors (sex, size of town) to the model. The third model adds the attitudinal factors (political ideology, fear of crime,

victimization, and religious devotion). The final model adds the causal attribution variables and thus is a full model of all independent variables in the study. This sequential multiple regression method allows the researcher to assess the amount of variance accounted for by each group of factors predicting punitiveness.

Model 1: Educational Factors

For this model a linear regression was first run with the educational factors in the study. The two independent variables included in this model are "class status" and "major". The dependent variable is "total punitiveness". Table 18 illustrates the results from the Model 1.

Table 18

Educational Factors (Model 1)

Independent Variable	Unstandardized Slopes (Std. Error)	Standardized Coefficients (Beta)	T
Constant	80.769 (4.046)		19.962
Class level status	-2.868 (.846)	-.146**	-3.392
Criminology major	7.980 (2.111)	.163**	3.781
R-square = .051			
F = 23.975			
Standard Error = 23.975			

NOTE: * Significance at the .05 level
** Significance at the .01 level

The R-square reports the proportion of the variance in the dependent variable that is explained or accounted for by the independent variables. The R-square ranges in value from 0 to 1, with the values closer to 1 indicating the independent variables account for more of the variation in the dependent variable. The R-square in this model is .051. This can be interpreted as the independent variables of class and major account for 5.1% of the variance in the dependent variable punitiveness. You can also state that we can reduce

our prediction error by 5.1% when taking into account these independent variables instead of just using the mean to predict the dependent variable. The current R-square of .051 is very weak and leaves a large portion of the variance in punitiveness unexplained.

The null hypothesis for the F-test is that all the slopes in the regression equation are equal to zero. The F in this model is 13.869 (Sig. <.0001). A significant F score provides good evidence that at least one of the slopes in the regression equation does not equal zero. Thus, at least one of the independent variables is significant. The significance level indicates that there is less than one chance in a thousand that we would see the slope values in this equation when they are actually zero.

The slope indicates the average change in the dependent variable associated with a one unit increase in the independent variable (when the other independent variables are held constant). The null hypothesis for the corresponding t-tests is that each particular slope is equal to zero. Thus, the independent variable is not associated with the dependent variable. The significance value associated with the t-value indicates the change that we would see the slope value in our equation when the slope is actually zero. If the alpha level is .05 or less we can reject the null hypothesis.

The slope for class level is -2.868. This can be interpreted as, for a one unit increase in the independent variable of class level there is a -2.868 decrease in punitiveness. Thus, this slope suggests that students at higher class levels (e.g., seniors) hold less punitive views than students at lower class levels (e.g., freshmen). The t-value for class level is -3.392 (Sig. <.01). Thus, we can reject the null hypothesis and conclude that the slope is greater than zero.

The slope for criminology major is 7.980. Major is coded as 1 for criminology major and 2 for non-criminology major. This can be interpreted as, for a one unit increase in the independent variable of major (moving from criminology major to non-major) there is a 7.980 increase in punitiveness. These results indicate that students majoring in other disciplines (i.e., non-criminology majors) tend to hold more punitive views than criminology majors. The t-value for major is 3.781 (Sig. <.01). Thus, we can reject the null hypothesis and conclude that the slope is greater than zero.

It is important to note that Beta weights are standardized coefficients that provide the standardized slopes so we can compare strength across the independent variables. The beta weight for class level is -.146 and the beta weight for major is .163. These scores are relatively close, but it indicates that major has a slightly stronger effect on punitiveness than class level.

In summary, this first model provided some interesting findings. The current study has found that criminology students hold less punitive views than non-majors. This relationship is not in the hypothesized direction (i.e., criminology majors will be more punitive than non-majors). A discussion of this relationship is provided in future sections. In addition, class status was also found to be significantly associated with punitiveness and it fell in the hypothesized direction (i.e., upperclassmen hold less punitive views). However, although these two variables were found to be significant they only accounted for a small portion of the variance (5.1%) in punitiveness. These results indicate that this first model is poorly specified and that all relevant variables are not included in the model. Thus, we will now add the demographic variables to the next model.

Model 2: Educational Factors and Demographic Factors

For this model, a linear regression was run with the educational factors from the previous model as well as the demographic factors of sex and size of town. The R-square for this model is .076. This can be interpreted as the independent variables of class, major, sex, and size of town account for 7.6% of the variance in the dependent variable punitiveness. Although, the R-square has increased in this model from 5.1% to 7.6%, it still remains relatively low and leaves a very large portion of the variance unexplained. Moreover, the addition of the two demographic variables only increase the variance explained by 2.5%. Furthermore, the F for this model is 10.609 (Sig. <.01). This score and alpha level provide good evidence that at least one of the slopes in the regression equation does not equal zero. Again, this tells us that at least one of the independent variables is significant.

Table 19

Educational Factors and Demographic Factors (Model 2)

Independent Variable	Unstandardized Slopes (Std. Error)	Standardized Coefficients (Beta)	T
Constant	95.746 (5.795)		16.521
Class level status	-3.167 (.840)	-.161**	-3.770
Criminology major	8.603 (2.103)	.175**	4.091
Sex	-2.734 (2.114)	-.055	-1.293
Size of town	-7.198 (2.108)	-.146**	-3.416
R-square = .076			
F = 10.609			
Standard Error = 23.700			

NOTE: * Significance at the .05 level
** Significance at the .01 level

Three of the variables in this model were found to be significant at less than the .01 level. Again, both the slopes for class (-3.167) and major (8.603) remained

significant and in the same directions. The slope for size of town was -7.198. This variable is a dichotomous variable where rural=1 and suburban/urban=2. This indicates that for a one unit increase in size of town (i.e., moving from rural to suburban/urban) there is a -7.198 decrease in punitiveness. Thus, this indicates that students who grew up in suburban/urban areas hold less punitive views than students from rural areas. In addition, the t-value for size of town is -3.416 (Sig. <.01). Thus, we can reject the null hypothesis and conclude that the slope is greater than zero.

The slope for sex is -2.734. Sex was coded as 1 for males and 2 for females. This indicates that for a one unit increase in sex (i.e., as we move from males to females) there is a -2.734 decrease in punitiveness. This can additionally be interpreted as female students hold less punitive views than male students. The t-value for sex is -1.293 (Sig. <.198). This t-value is very low and does not meet the minimally accepted alpha level of .05. Thus, we fail to reject the null hypothesis. One should be cautious about drawing conclusions about the relationship between sex and punitiveness based on the slope discussed above because this relationship is not statistically significant (and indicates that the independent variable is not associated with the dependent variable).

In addition, the beta weights were compared to assess the strength of the independent variables in this model. Major remains the strongest predictor of punitiveness with a beta weight of .175. Class level status is not as strong as major but stronger than size of town. Class holds a beta weight of -.161. Of the three significant variables in the equation, size of town was not as strong of a predictor of punitiveness as the other two variables. The beta weight for size of town is -.146.

In summary, the second model has provided additional interesting findings. First, both class and major remained significant variables in the model. Second, the size of town in which a student grew up was also found to significantly influence punitiveness. Third, the addition of the demographic factors helped to increase the variance explained in the dependent variable. However, the small R-squared again indicates that there may be some relevant variables being left out of the model. Thus, our third model will add in some of the attitudinal factors found to be associated with punitiveness in previous research studies.

Model 3: Educational, Demographic, and Attitudinal Factors.

The third model adds in the following attitudinal factors: fear of crime, victimization, political ideology, and religious devotion. The addition of these four variables increased the R-square to .152. This suggests that the independent variables in this model account for 15.2% of the variance in punitiveness. The addition of these attitudinal factors increased the variance explained by 7.6% from the previous model. Again, the F-statistic is 11.393 (Sig. <.01) and suggests that at least one of the independent variables in the model is significant.

The slopes and t-tests again indicate that the three previous significant variables (class, major, and size of town) remain significant and in the same directions. The only attitudinal factor found to be significant in this third model is political ideology. The slope for ideology is 2.856. This indicates that for a one unit increase in ideology (moving from liberal to conservative) there is a 2.856 increase in punitiveness. These results suggest that students who hold more conservative political ideologies also hold

more punitive views. Furthermore, the beta weight for ideology is .247 which is the strongest among the independent variables in the model.

Table 20

Educational, Demographic, and Attitudinal Factors (Model 3)

Independent Variable	Unstandardized Slopes (Std. Error)	Standardized Coefficients (Beta)	T
Constant	76.098 (6.759)		11.260
Class level status	-2.970 (.812)	-.151**	-3.659
Criminology major	8.982 (2.076)	.183**	4.328
Sex	-2.118 (2.228)	-.043	-.951
Size of town	-6.619 (2.019)	-.134**	-3.230
Fear of crime	.089 (.067)	.060	1.329
Victimization	-3.531 (2.060)	-.071	-1.714
Political ideology	2.856 (.498)	.247**	5.729
Religious devotion	.416 (.364)	.049	1.144
R-square = .152			
F = 11.393			
Standard Error = 22.812			

NOTE: * Significance at the .05 level
** Significance at the .01 level

The addition of the other attitudinal variables of fear of crime, victimization, and religious devotion did not produce significant slopes. The t-values and corresponding significance tests indicate that these three variables are not significantly associated with punitiveness. It is interesting to note that prior victimization was nearing significance (Sig. <.09). The slope indicates that for a one unit increase in victimization (i.e., moving from not reporting prior victimization to reporting prior victimization) there is a -3.531 unit decrease in punitiveness. Although one should draw caution when interpreting this slope (due to the fact that it is not found to be significant at the typically accepted .05 level) it is interesting to note that the relationship is not in the hypothesized direction.

These results indicate that those with previous victimizations are less punitive than those with no previous victimization.

Again, the addition of these attitudinal variables has contributed to an increase in the variance explained in punitiveness. However, only one of the four additional variables was found to be significant (i.e., ideology). The final model will again attempt to address any issues of specification error and will add the causal attribution items to the final model in hopes of including all of the relevant variables associated with punitiveness.

Model 4: Full Model

The full model includes the following independent variables: class, major, sex, size of town, fear of crime, victimization, ideology, religious devotion, social process, structural positivism, individual positivism, labeling, subcultural, classical, and learning. The R-square for the full model is .394. This indicates that the independent variables in this model account for 39.4% of the variation in punitiveness. It can also be stated that the prediction error is reduced by 39.4% when taking into account the independent variables in our model rather than using the mean to predict punitiveness. The addition of the causal attribution scales increases the variance explained by 24.2% from the previous model. This significant increase in the R-square indicates that what a person attributes to the causes of crime plays a significant role in how they believe people should be punished for criminal activity. In addition, the F-test indicates that the model is significant (F=21.801, Sig. <.001) and that at least one independent variable is significant in the model.

Table 21

Full Model (Model 4)

Independent Variable	Unstandardized Slopes (Std. Error)	Standardized Coefficients (Beta)	T
Constant	44.922 (10.565)		4.252
Class level status	-2.649 (.702)	-.135**	-3.773
Criminology major	6.642 (1.825)	.135**	3.639
Sex	-2.405 (1.915)	-.049	-1.256
Size of town	-2.868 (1.771)	-.058	-1.619
Fear of crime	.096 (.058)	.065	1.660
Victimization	-2.361 (1.766)	-.047	-1.337
Political ideology	1.957 (.452)	.170**	4.332
Religious devotion	-.055 (.315)	-.006	-.175
Social process	-.132 (.307)	-.019	-.430
Structural positivism	-.579 (.265)	-.088*	-2.183
Individual positivism	.352 (.321)	.044	1.097
Labeling	-1.801 (.557)	-.122**	-3.232
Subcultural	.663 (.408)	.066	1.627
Classical	6.239 (.502)	.454**	12.434
Learning	1.179 (.816)	.056	1.446
R-square = .394			
F = 21.801			
Standard Error = 19.409			

NOTE: * Significance at the .05 level
** Significance at the .01 level

Of the newly added variables, three of them were found to have significant slope estimates. The variable structural positivism was found to be negatively associated with punitiveness. The slope for this variable is -.579 (t=-2.183, Sig. <.05). This indicates that a one unit increase in the structural positivism scale, there is a -.579 decrease in punitiveness. This suggests that students who attribute crime to this theoretical philosophy (i.e., critical and strain theories) tend to hold less punitive views. In addition, labeling theory was also found to be negatively associated with punitiveness. The slope

for labeling is -1.801 (t=-3.232, Sig. <.01). These results indicate that for a one unit increase in the labeling scale there is a -1.801 decrease in punitiveness. Again, this suggests that students who attribute crime to a labeling perspective tend to hold less punitive views. Furthermore, classical theory was also found to be associated with punitiveness, but in this case there is a positive relationship between the two variables. The slope for the classical scale is 6.239 (t=12.434, Sig. <.01). This finding indicates that for a one unit increase in the classical scale there is a 6.239 increase in punitiveness. Again, this suggests that students who attribute crime to a more classical perspective tend to hold more punitive views. The four other causal attribution scales failed to achieve significance at the .05 level.

Three of the four previously mentioned significant variables were still found to be significant in the final model. However, size of town failed to reach significance in the final model (although the relationship remained in the same direction). Due to the fact that this is the final model, it is important to reassess the slopes of the other three variables. First, the slope for class level is -2.649. Thus, for a one unit increase in class there is a -2.649 decrease in punitiveness. The relationship has remained stable across these models and continues to indicate that student tend to hold less punitive views as their class level status increases. The slope for major is 6.642. This suggests that for a one unit increase in major (i.e., moving from major to non-major) there is a 6.642 increase in punitiveness. Again, this relationship has remained constant across models and continues to indicate that non-criminology majors tend to hold more punitive views than criminology majors. Last, the relationship between ideology and punitiveness has also remained significant and in the same direction. The slope for ideology is 1.957 and

suggests that for a one unit increase in ideology there is a 1.957 increase in punitiveness. This can similarly be interpreted as more conservative students tend to hold more punitive views than more liberal students.

With the results of the full model, we can now interpret the strength of these significant variables on the dependent variable by assessing the beta weights. The beta weight for the classical scale is .454 which is the largest among the independent variables in the model. This indicates that the classical scale has the strongest effect on punitiveness. Ideology is the next strongest predictor of punitiveness with a beta weight of .170. An interesting finding was found between class and major in that they share the same beta weight (+/-.135). This suggests that both class and major share similar strength in their ability to predict punitiveness. The next strongest variable is labeling with a beta weight of –.122 followed by structural positivism (beta = -.088) with the weakest effect.

Research Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Major

The first hypothesis stated that criminology students would be more punitive than non-criminology students. This hypothesis was based upon previous research studies that found students majoring in criminal justice held more punitive views than non-criminal justice majors (Courtright & Mackey, 2002; Farnworth et al., 1998; Mackey & Courtright, 2000). The bivariate results found a significant positive relationship between major and punitiveness ($r = .173$, $p < .01$). In the multivariate analysis, major again was found to be a statistically significant variable in each of the four regression models. Within the full model (including all 15 independent variables) major was found to be

significant (B = 6.642, p <.01). The interesting finding is that criminology majors were found to be less punitive than non-criminology majors. These results do not support the current literature that has been conducted in this area. In addition, these results suggest Hypothesis 1 was not supported in this study. A more detailed discussion of these results will be provided in Chapter VI.

Hypothesis 2: Class

The second hypothesis predicted under class students to be more punitive than upper class students. A number of studies examining student attitudes found students in the junior/senior years were less punitive than students in their freshman/sophomore years (Farnworth et al., 1998; Mackey & Courtright, 2000; Selke, 1980). The current study found a significant correlation between class level and punitiveness in the bivariate analysis (r = -.157, p < .01). This significant relationship was again seen in all four of the regression models. In the full model, class level was found to have a significant negative relationship with punitiveness (B = -2.649, p <.01). In general, these findings suggest that students become less punitive with increased years in college. Therefore, the hypothesis that students in lower class levels hold more punitive views than students in higher class levels was supported in the current study.

Hypothesis 3: Sex

The third hypothesis suggests that college men will hold more punitive views than college women. Numerous research studies have found males to be more punitive than females (Applegate et al., 2002; Evans & Adams, 2003; Schwartz et al., 1993; Selke, 1980; Sprott, 1999; Tsoudis, 2000). Although previous research studies have found males to be more punitive, a significant relationship between sex and punitiveness was not

found in the bivariate analysis (r = -.036, p =.418). In addition, sex was not found to be significant independent variable in any of the three regression models where sex was included. In the full model, sex was found to be negatively associated with punitiveness (i.e., female students were less punitive than male students) but this relationship was not significant at the .05 level (B = -2.405, p = .210). These results suggest that hypothesis 3 was not supported in this study.

Hypothesis 4: Size of Town

The fourth hypothesis suggests that students who grew up in rural locations will be more punitive than students who grew up in suburban/urban location. Those studies previously examining size of town and punitiveness have found that people from smaller towns tend to hold more punitive beliefs (Mackey & Courtright, 2000; Rossi & Berk, 1997). The variable "size of town" was included in the study and asked students to describe the size of town in which they grew up (with response categories, rural, suburban, and urban). This variable was later dichotomized to the response categories of rural and suburban/urban. In the bivariate analysis size of town was found to be significantly and negatively correlated with punitiveness (r = -.128, p <.01). As a variable in the multivariate analysis, size of town was found to be significant in the first three regression models. The first three models suggested that students from rural areas held more punitive views than students from suburban/urban areas. Size of town, however, did not reach significance in the full model (B = -2.868, p = .106). After the addition of the causal attribution scales, size of town was not found to be statistically significant when controlling for the influence of these additional variables. These findings suggest that there are other variables (i.e., causal attribution) that may account

for the variation in punitiveness that was previously attributed to size of town. In general, these findings suggest that hypothesis 4 was not supported in the final model in this study.

Hypothesis 5: Political Ideology

Based on the literature, the fifth hypothesis was that students with more conservative political ideologies would be more punitive than students with more liberal political ideologies. The research has suggested that those who are politically conservative tend to hold more punitive views than those who are politically liberal (Applegate et al., 2000; Borg, 1997; Chiricos et al., 2004; Costelloe et al., 2002; Hogan et al., 2005; Hurwitz & Smithey, 1998; Langworthy & Whitehead, 1986; Mackey & Courtright, 2000; Unnever et al., 2005). In the current study, ideology was found to be significantly correlated with punitiveness in the bivariate analysis ($r = .253$, $p < .01$). In addition, ideology was found to be significant in each of the four regression models. In the full model, ideology remained significant (B = 1.957, $p < .01$) when controlling for the influence of all the other independent variables in the study. These results suggest that students with more liberal political ideologies were less punitive than students with more conservative political ideologies. Furthermore, the findings from this study support hypothesis 5.

Hypothesis 6: Religious Devotion

Students who are more devoted to their religious beliefs were hypothesized to be more punitive than students who are less devoted to their religious beliefs in hypothesis 6. The hypothesis was based on the research that found religious salience to be positively associated with punitiveness (Applegate et al., 2000; Evans & Adams, 2003; Grasmick &

McGill, 1994). The current study assessed students' commitment to their religious beliefs (from inactive to strongly devoted). In the bivariate analysis religious devotion was found to be positively and significantly associated with punitiveness ($r = .118$, $p < .01$). In the multivariate analysis, however, devotion was not found to be a statistically significant variable in any of the three models in which it was included. In the final model religious devotion was not found to be significant at the .05 level (B = -.055, $p = .861$) when controlling for the influence of the other variables in the study. Furthermore, the final model found devotion to one's religion to be a very weak negative relationship. Thus, the mixed and insignificant findings do not provide strong support for Hypothesis 6.

Hypothesis 7: Victimization

The next hypothesis argues that students with prior criminal victimizations will be more punitive than students without prior victimization. Research studies have suggested that victimization is positively associated with punitiveness (Applegate et al., 2002; Langworthy & Whitehead, 1986). In the current study students were asked to report the number of times they had been a victim of six different crimes. This variable was later dichotomized with response categories being "no prior victimization" and "one or more previous victimizations". In the bivariate analysis victimization was not found to be statistically significant at the .05 level (r = -.084, p = .057) but neared significance. Victimization was then included in two of the regression models, however, it was not found to be statistically significant. In the full model, victimization was found to be negatively associated with punitiveness (B = -2.361, p = .182) but this association failed to achieve significance. These findings do not provide strong support for Hypothesis 7.

Hypothesis 8: Fear of Crime

The eighth hypothesis argues that students who are more fearful of crime will be more punitive than students who are less fearful of crime. The research suggests that there is a positive relationship between fear of crime and punitiveness (Costelloe et al., 2002; Evans & Adams, 2003; Hogan et al., 2005; Langworthy & Whitehead, 1986; Schwartz et al., 1993). In the bivariate analysis in the current study fear of crime was not found to be significantly correlated with punitiveness ($r = .063$, $p = .151$). In addition, fear of crime failed to achieve significance in the multivariate analysis. Although fear of crime was found to be positive associated with punitiveness ($B = .096$, $p = .098$) this relationship was not significant at the .05 level. Again, these results suggest that hypothesis 8 was not supported in the current study.

Hypothesis 9: Causal Attribution

Based upon previous research, the ninth hypothesis argues that students who support classical theory, social process theory and subcultural theory will be more punitive than students who support structural positivism theory, labeling theory, and individual positivism theory. Previous studies indicate that people who associate personal responsibility with the causes of crime tend to hold more punitive views than those who suggest environmental, economic, and societal causes of crime (Carroll et al., 1987; Cullen et al., 1985; Evans & Adams, 2003; Grasmick & McGill, 1994; Leiber & Woodrick, 1997; Sims, 2003). The current study assessed students' views towards seven theoretical perspectives: social process, structural positivism, individual positivism, labeling, subcultural, classical, and learning. In the bivariate analysis, five of the seven scales were found to be significantly correlated with punitiveness. However, the current

study found that only three of the seven causal attribution scales achieved significance in the multivariate analysis. Both labeling theory (B = -1.801, $p < .01$) and structural positivism (B = -.579, $p < .05$) were found to be negatively and significantly associated with punitiveness in the full model. In addition, classical theory was found to be positively and significantly associated with punitiveness (B = .454, p <.01). Moreover, classical theory was found to be the strongest predictor (Beta = .454) of punitiveness out of all the independent variables in the study. All three of these significant variables were found to be in the hypothesized direction. The other four variables failed to achieve significance, when controlling for all the other variables in the study, and thus there is only partial support for hypothesis 9.

Summary

The results from the current study provided a number of interesting findings. In general, the results suggest that a number of the independent variables in the study were found to be significantly related to punitiveness. These variables include class level, major, ideology, structural positivism theory, labeling theory, and classical theory. The most surprising of these results was that criminology students were not found to be more punitive than non-criminology students. In fact, criminology students were significantly less punitive towards offenders than students majoring in other disciplines. This relationship may be due to a number of factors which will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

The other significant variables that predict punitiveness were all in the hypothesized directions. Class status, structural positivism theory, and labeling theory were all found to be negatively associated with punitiveness. Furthermore, major,

ideology, and classical theory were all found to be positively associated with punitiveness. These findings suggests that upper class students and those who hold a more structural or labeling perspective of crime causation hold less punitive views. In addition, non-criminology majors, students with a more conservative political ideology, and those who hold a more classical view of crime causation hold more punitive views.

Another interesting finding is that by adding variables assessing ones views towards crime causation (i.e., causal attribution) one can explain greater variation in punitiveness. The addition of the causal attribution items increased the variance explained by more than 20 percent. These findings lend support to the idea that one's theoretical perspective towards crime will play a significant role in how one believes an offender should be punished.

A discussion of the findings from Chapter V will be presented in Chapter VI. A summary of the findings, methodological implications, educational implications, and strengths and limitations of the current study will be discussed. In addition, directions for future research will also be presented.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Over the past few decades American criminal justice policies have focused on a "get tough" approach towards crime and punishment. In order to cast themselves as "tough on crime" both Democrats and Republicans have thrown their support towards strategies that present very little electoral liability for the elected officials. The political liability of appearing "soft on crime" results in the creation of criminal justice policies that are politically expedient but may not align with public attitudes concerning punishment.

The current criminal justice process focuses on arrest, prosecution and punishment of offenders and focuses little attention on crime prevention, alternatives to incarceration, and offender reintegration. The policies and programs associated with this "get tough" movement have significantly increased the jail and prison populations throughout the U.S. as well as significantly increased costs for the criminal justice system.

In addition, many of these policies, and/or the programs resulting from these policies, do not correspond with what we know to be effective based on scientific evaluations (see Sherman, Farrington, Welsh, & MacKenzie; 2002). It is important to note that crime and criminal justice policies in this country cost billions of dollars, and thus, it is important that we are allocating our resources as effectively as possible (especially when CJ policies have to compete with issues such as education, social welfare and national security for funding). Moreover, the unintended consequences of these policies (i.e., court and prison overcrowding) may create problems for our system

for years to come. Thus, it is important to assess attitudes towards punishment in order to evaluate whether or not the views of citizens are reflected in our current policies.

Within the past few years there has been a growing interest in public opinion towards the punishment of criminals in the United States. Much of this interest has been based on concern for the consequences of the punitive correctional policies of the past two decades (i.e., interest in assessing if public opinion matches these punitive policies). Many researchers are interested in understanding attitudes towards punishment and examining the factors that influence people's levels of punitiveness (Applegate, Cullen, & Fisher, 2002; Applegate, Cullen, Fisher, & Vander Ven, 2000, Chiricos, Welch, & Gertz, 2004; Costelloe, Chiricos, Burianek, Gertz, & Maier-Katkin, 2002; Hogan, Chiricos, & Gertz, 2005; Mackey & Courtright, 2000). The current study built on this prior research and focused on examining punitiveness among college students and the factors that influence those views. More specifically, the current research compared punitiveness between students studying criminology to those students in other academic disciplines. The results from this study produced a number of interesting findings. This chapter provides a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the current study, the research findings, the educational implications, and a brief discussion of directions for future research.

Strengths and Limitations

Strengths

The current study sought to augment the literature in this area in a number of ways. First, a probability sampling method (i.e., stratified cluster sampling) was used to improve upon previous research studies that used convenience and purposive samples.

The vast majority of studies comparing views of criminal justice majors to non-majors utilized non-probability sampling methods. The use of convenience samples threatens internal validity (i.e., selection bias), statistical conclusion validity (i.e., probability sampling and regression assumptions), and external validity (i.e., external inferences and generalizability). The current sample suggests that the number of students selected within each strata were representative of the population size of students within that strata. The procedure produced a sample that looked like the population from which it was obtained. Thus, this sampling method proved to be an effective method of obtaining a representative sample and reduced sampling error by a large degree.

An additional strength of the current study is the inclusion of a number of independent variables that have not been consistently included in the research on punitiveness. In an attempt to include all of the relevant independent variables that have been found to be significant in previous research, the current study assessed the influence of fourteen different variables on punitiveness. Specifically, many of the previous studies examining punitiveness among students did not include all of the independent variables previously found in the research to be correlated with punitiveness. Variables such as religion, crime salience, and causal attributions towards crime were not extensively examined in more detail among criminology students. The inclusion of these variables helped to increase the variance explained in punitiveness and provided for a well specified model for analysis.

A final strength of the current study was the improvement upon the statistical analyses used in prior research. Previous studies in this area relied heavily on mean comparisons and t-tests in their statistical analyses which does not control for the

influence of other independent variables on the dependent variable. The current study used multiple regression analysis which allowed the researcher to assess the influence of multiple independent variables on punitiveness. This technique aided in the prediction of the value of punitiveness based on a linear combination of various independent variables. More specifically, the current study was able to illustrate the effect of education factors, demographic factors, and attitudinal factors on punitiveness.

Limitations

One of the major limitations of this study is that the sample was obtained from only one mid-sized public university in the Northeast. The examination of attitudes among students at one university significantly limited the generalizability to this study. Specifically, it limits generalizability to the specific population studied (i.e., the students at that one university). Replication of this study among students at both public and private universities as well as students at universities in various geographic locations across the U.S. would substantially increase the generalizability of the findings.

Another limitation of this study was the lack of diversity within the population studied. For example, the students at the university where this study took place are predominantly Caucasian and from middle-class backgrounds. Thus, the current study was unable to take into account the influence on race/ethnicity as well as income/SES on punitiveness. In addition, due to the lack of variation in age within the college student population this variable was also left out of the current analysis.

Finally, a number of the causal attribution variables had Cronbach's alpha levels that were lower than expected. For example, the variables for subcultural, labeling, classical, and learning theories had Cronbach alphas between .50 and .60. As stated in

previous chapters, an alpha of .70 and above is considered acceptable. Thus, these scales were not as reliable as hoped. In addition, three of the scales (labeling, classical, and learning) only included two items. Future studies should attempt to increase the reliability of these scales through the use of additional items and the improvement of item wording.

Discussion of Research Findings

The findings from the current study suggest that the main predictors of punitiveness were major, year in school, political ideology, and one's perceptions of the causes of crime (specifically, support for classical, labeling, and structural positivism theories). A brief discussion on the variables that are not found to significantly impact punitiveness is also provided.

Major

Given that most criminology students will be working as professionals within the justice system after graduation, it is critical to assess their beliefs about that system. More specifically, it is important to inquire about student views towards the punishment of law breakers. As mentioned previously, Farnworth et al. (1998) similarly suggested that "criminal justice majors' views are particularly interesting because many of these students aspire to positions as practitioners and administrators with an opportunity to influence or implement crime control policies" (p. 39). Thus, students' attitudes may influence their perceptions and actions towards offenders, victims, and criminal justice policies while working in the system.

One of the most particularly interesting findings in the current study is the fact that criminology students were found to hold less punitive views than non-criminology

majors. This finding was not in the hypothesized direction. Previous research studies that similarly assessed views towards punishment found that criminal justice students held more punitive views than non-criminal justice students (Courtright & Mackey, 2004; Courtright et al., 2005; Farnworth et al., 1998; Mackey & Courtright, 2000). In the current study criminology students were found to be significantly less punitive than non-majors (regardless of year in school).

There are a number of potential explanations for this finding. First, it is possible that the sampling procedures used in the current study had an impact. Much of the previous research in this area used convenience samples (Courtright & Mackey, 2004; Courtright et al., 2005; Farnworth et al., 1998; Mackey & Courtright, 2000). The use of convenience samples may lead to unrepresentative samples of students and a high degree of sampling error. For example, the criminal justice students surveyed may not be representative of all criminal justice students in a particular population of students (due to the lack of random selection). The current study's use of a stratified cluster sampling procedure substantially reduced the sampling error and produced a more representative sample of students by major. Thus, the current research study was better able to assess differences between groups (i.e., criminology majors versus non-criminology majors) knowing that the students samples were rather representative of their overall student population.

Second, the criminal justice majors that comprised the samples in other studies were, in many cases, students in a "Criminal Justice Administration" program whereas the students in the current study are enrolled in a "Criminology" program. One could legitimately argue that there may be few differences between the two and that the

difference is in name only. On the other hand, some maintain that a difference between criminology and criminal justice programs does exist. For example, criminology programs focus on explaining criminal behavior while criminal justice programs focus on explaining the "behavior" of the criminal justice system. Thus, it is likely that criminology programs require more theory courses and/or incorporate theoretical perspectives into the curriculum more so than do criminal justice administration programs. The current study assessed levels of punitiveness among students in a criminology program. Students majoring in criminology are required to complete two theory courses (one at the freshman/sophomore level and one at the junior/senior level). In addition, criminological theories are incorporated and discussed throughout the criminology curriculum at this university. Thus, students at this particular university (and possibly other criminology programs) may be exposed to more theory than students majoring in criminal justice. Hence, it is possible that having a fuller picture or understanding of the causes of criminality may lead one to support responses to this behavior that are less punitive.

It would be remiss to not suggest that the differences found in the current study may also be due to something unique about the students and/or something unique about the curriculum and faculty at this particular university. For example, one could argue that the criminology faculty at this particular university tends to hold more liberal political ideologies and these views could be communicated to students in the classroom. In addition, the faculty consists primarily of full-time academics, with very few working as criminal justice practitioners (i.e., little to no practitioner adjunct instructors). Furthermore, the specific curriculum presented at this university may be causing students

to moderate their views towards punishment. Overall, future research should consider examining this relationship in multiple criminology and criminal justice programs to allow for comparison and generalization.

Year in School

An additional variable found to significantly influence punitiveness was one's year in school. The findings indicate that as one's level of education increases there is a decrease in their level of punitiveness. In the current study, freshmen students held the most punitive views while seniors held the least punitive views. This relationship was consistent across major (i.e., both the mean score for criminology and non-criminology majors decreased for each additional year in school). This finding was similar to other studies that suggest that both years in school (among college students) and/or the level of one's education is negatively associated with punitiveness (Applegate, et al., 2000; Chiricos, et al., 2004; Costelloe et al., 2002; Courtright & Mackey, 2004; Courtright et al., 2005; Farnworth et al., 1998; Grasmick & McGill, 1994; Hogan et al., 2005; McCorkle, 1993; Schwartz et al., 1993; Tyler & Boeckmann, 1997).

Farnworth et al. (1998) suggests that there is a liberalizing effect of the college educational experience that may account for the decrease in punitiveness among college students. Specifically within higher education, students are exposed to various perspectives and taught to think critically about the issues presented to them. Furthermore, students within the criminology program are provided with exposure to various theoretical perspectives as well as numerous systemic factors about the criminal justice system. The introduction of new material, research, and theoretical perspectives may expand and/or challenge one's views towards the punishment of lawbreakers.

Future research, however, should attempt to measure students attitudes longitudinally before any definitive conclusions can be drawn.

Political Ideology

One of the strongest predictors of punitiveness in the current study is political ideology. Again, these findings are consistent with previous research that indicates that those with a more conservative political ideology hold more punitive views than those with a more liberal political ideology (Applegate et al., 2000; Chiricos et al., 2004; Costelloe et al., 2002; Hensley et al., 2003; Hogan et al., 2005; Hurwitz & Smithey, 1998; Langworthy & Whitehead, 1986; Mackey & Courtright, 2000; Tyler & Boeckmann, 1997; Unnever et al., 2005).

Students attending the university where the current study took place generally come from rural (44.7%) and suburban (36.4%) portions of the state. Based on personal observations, the criminology students to whom the researcher has been exposed at the university generally adhere to a more conservative political ideology. Because of this, the current researcher expected criminology students to be both more conservative and more punitive than non-majors. After conducting an independent samples t-test, the findings indicate that criminology majors ($M = 5.23$) were more conservative than non-majors ($M = 4.74$) ($t = 2.634$, $p<.01$), but, as stated above they are not more punitive. Through the use of OLS regression, the findings suggest that criminology students were less punitive even when controlling for the influence of political ideology.

The fact that criminology students were found to be less punitive regardless of their more conservative political ideology than non-majors has proven to be a rather interesting finding. One explanation for this is that the students' exposure to the

criminology curriculum could be reducing their levels of punitiveness, but at the same time allowing them to maintain their overall political and ideological views. For example, the criminology students may have incorporated some of the information and knowledge they received during their college careers. Criminology students are exposed to information not only on the causes of crime but also to "who" is punished and "how" they are punished. Thus, the information presented in their classes not only provides information on the possible causes of crime but also the ways in which our correctional policies are carried out. Consequently, the students may moderate some of their specific beliefs (i.e., related to crime/criminal justice/ punitiveness), while maintaining their overall political views. In addition, due to the fact that non-majors may have little exposure to the criminology curriculum, they may rely more heavily on their political ideology when determining views towards punishment. Furthermore, although we tend to dichotomize ideological views into conservative and liberal, these views tend to fall into a continuum where one may hold specific views on both ends of the spectrum, and yet identify more closely with one side. Thus, this suggests that one can hold less punitive views towards offenders yet hold rather conservative views in general.

Causal Attributions

A total of seven theoretical perspectives that attempt to explain the causes of crime were assessed in the current study. Three of these perspectives were found to be significantly related to punitiveness: classical theory, labeling theory, and structural positivism (strain/critical) theory. The findings indicate that students who support classical theory and its perspective on the causes of crime tend to hold more punitive views. In fact, support for classical theory was the strongest predictor of punitiveness in

the current study. This indicates that students who attribute crime to free will (i.e., a voluntary decision) and support punishment based on the idea that it results in deterrence had higher levels of punitiveness than those who did not support this theory. In addition, students who indicated stronger levels of support for both labeling theory and structural positivism theory tended to hold less punitive views. The findings indicate that students who attribute crime as a consequence of the criminal justice system, the American economic system, and/or societal injustices (i.e., poverty, racism) tend to hold less punitive views towards offenders.

In general, the examination of student support for specific criminological theories and how it influences their attitudes towards punishment provided for a number of interesting findings. First, the addition of the seven causal attribution variables to the full regression model increased the variance explained by more than twenty percent. This relationship indicates one's beliefs about the causes of crime and criminal behavior will strongly influence their views towards punishment.

The current study also provided for an assessment of differences between criminology and non-criminology majors in regards to their causal attributions towards crime. The idea to explore this relationship in more detail came during the examination and discussion of the findings. Table 22 includes the results of independent sample t-tests that briefly explored this relationship. Although this relationship will need to be explored in more detail in future research studies, the findings from the current study indicate that criminology majors had statistically significant differences than non-criminology majors in support for various criminological theories. These findings

suggest that criminology students may hold less punitive views due to differences in their causal attributions towards criminal behavior.

Criminology majors were significantly more supportive of learning theory, subcultural theory, labeling theory, and social process theory than non-criminology majors. In addition, criminology majors were slightly less supportive of classical theory than non-criminology majors (Sig = .051). Finding differences between criminology majors and non-criminology majors in terms of their beliefs about the causes of crime was not unexpected. One would expect that as criminology students are exposed to different theoretical perspectives, as well as the research that has been conducted on them, that their views towards these theories will evolve. Non-criminology majors may be more supportive of classical theory due to the fact that the vast majority of current criminal justice policies are based upon this perspective. Furthermore, this is most likely the theoretical perspective that non-majors have had the most exposure to. Criminology majors, however, may be less supportive of the classical perspective due to exposure to research and knowledge that many of the policies/programs derived from this perspective have not been effective in our current criminal justice system. Moreover, criminology students may become more supportive of other theoretical perspectives (e.g., learning, subcultural, labeling, and social process theories) as they become exposed to information and research on the influence of things such as delinquent peers, criminal subcultures, the American economic system, and the consequences of the criminal justice system on criminal behavior.

This relationship and the findings discussed above have not been thoroughly examined in the literature. The preliminary analysis indicates that significant differences

exist between criminology and non-criminology majors in terms of both their attitudes towards crime causation as well as their attitudes towards punishment. This supports the use of future research to investigate these relationships in more detail.

Table 22

Causal Attribution Mean Comparisons by Major

Theory	Mean	t-value	Sig.
Classical Theory			
Criminology Majors	5.5	-1.956	.051
Non-Criminology Majors	5.8		
Learning Theory			
Criminology Majors	8.16	4.067	.000
Non-Criminology Majors	7.75		
Subcultural Theory			
Criminology Majors	13.33	3.646	.000
Non-Criminology Majors	12.56		
Labeling Theory			
Criminology Majors	6.29	2.645	.008
Non-Criminology Majors	5.90		
Individual Positivism Theory			
Criminology Majors	13.62	.203	.839
Non-Criminology Majors	13.57		
Structural Positivism Theory			
Criminology Majors	17.08	1.345	.179
Non-Criminology Majors	16.64		
Social Process Theory			
Criminology Majors	21.15	3.172	.002
Non-Criminology Majors	20.17		

Additional Independent Variables

A number of the independent variables included in the current study failed to achieve statistical significance. The demographic variable of sex was not found to be significantly related to punitiveness in the full regression model. Previous research that has examined the relationship between sex and punitiveness tended to find rather small and/or inconsistent findings in this area. It was hypothesized that male students would be

more punitive than female students based upon previous research studies (Applegate et al., 2002; Evans & Adams, 2003; Schwartz et al. 1993; Sprott, 1999). However, a number of additional studies included sex as a variable in their model but were unable to find any statistically significant differences between sex and their punitiveness measure (Applegate, et al., 2000; Applegate, Cullen, Link et al., 1996; Chiricos et al., 2004; Mackey & Courtright, 2000; Sims, 2003). The results from the current study suggest that sex did not have a direct and significant relationship with punitiveness. Although some differences between male and female views were seen, one explanation for the lack of significant finding may simply be due to the fact that ideology is capturing the major difference in views between male and female respondents (and not sex). The current study found that male students (M = 5.37) were more conservative than female students (M = 4.53), and thus their ideology may have acted as a stronger predictor of punitiveness than sex.

In addition, the attitudinal variables of fear of crime and victimization failed to achieve significance in the models. These variables were specifically included in the current study due to the lack of previous research examining these relationships among college students. The current study did not find fear of crime to be significantly nor positively associated with punitiveness as hypothesized. The findings support a few previous studies that found the relationship between these two variables to be weak or failing to reach statistical significance (Applegate et al, 2000; Chiricos et al., 2004; Sims, 2003; Taylor et al., 1979).

The lack of statistically significant findings for the relationship between victimization and punitiveness was not all that uncommon in the research. Of those

studies that included a measure of victimization, a number of them did not find a statistically significant relationship between victimization and their dependent variables assessing punitiveness (Applegate et al., 2000; Costelloe et al., 2002; Cullen et al., 1985; Evans & Adams, 2003; Taylor et al., 1979). One explanation for the statistically insignificant relationship may be due to the low number of respondents reporting any previous victimization in the samples being studied.

Furthermore, a number of the causal attribution scales were not found to be significantly related to punitiveness in the full-model. Although classical, labeling, and structural positivism scales were found to be associated with punitiveness; the learning, subcultural, social process, and individual positivism scales did not achieve statistical significance at the .05 level. Future studies should consider improving the reliability and construct validity of these scales before re-examining these relationships.

Educational Implications

Due to the fact that the current study assessed views towards punishment among students, this section will focus on the educational implications associated with the study's findings. As discussed previously, one of the most interesting findings from the current study is that criminology students held less punitive views than students in other academic disciplines. Although future research needs to be conducted before any definitive conclusions can be drawn, one could argue that attitudes towards punishment may change with increased exposure to different criminological theories and perspectives. For example, many of our current criminal justice policies are based upon classical/neo-classical theories, which emphasize punishment based on deterrence. Much

of what we know about these deterrence based policies is that they have not been very effective in our criminal justice system.

As suggested previously, our students are exposed to multiple theoretical explanations of criminality as well as information about the success and/or failures of policies based on those theoretical underpinnings. The current findings suggest that criminology students were less supportive of classical theory (the strongest predictor of punitiveness) than non-majors. This may result in the students embracing less punitive policies based on theoretical perspectives such as learning, subcultural, labeling, and social process theory. Again, increased exposure and understanding to different perspectives of criminal behavior may lead to a decrease in punitiveness among students.

Students studying criminal justice administration at other institutions may have less exposure to criminological theories. A lack of exposure to the theoretical explanations of crime may inadvertently create a body of students who are entering jobs within the criminal justice system after graduation with heightened levels of punitiveness. Future research studies could also examine and review the curriculum requirements within both criminal justice administration and criminology programs (and to examine differences between programs). Results from future studies could lead to curriculum changes for criminal justice administration programs throughout the country. In order for students to be fully prepared for work within the criminal justice system it is important for them to have considered the possible causes of criminal behavior. To this end, theoretical perspectives should be incorporated into the curriculum and courses throughout a criminal justice administration and/or a criminology student's college career.

Students studying criminology and criminal justice administration may also have different perspectives on punishment due to increased exposure and knowledge of evidence based crime prevention strategies. As students become more knowledgeable of what works and what does not work among criminal justice policies they may form less punitive views towards punishment. Results from the current study indicate that seniors were less punitive than freshman. This finding may be due to an increased understanding of a variety of criminal justice policies in general as well as an increased understanding of the causes of crime. In addition, students are exposed to various "goals of punishment" (i.e., retribution, incapacitation, deterrence, rehabilitation, and restoration) and they may be less likely to support retribution/incapacitation as the primary goal of punishment after being exposed to these additional goals. Thus, criminology students may also be holding less punitive views due to a lack of support for retribution/incapacitation as the primary goals of punishment. Although the current study did not directly assess this relationship, future research may be able to examine this relationship in more detail.

The findings of the current study clearly indicate that criminology students are less punitive than non-majors. Still, it is difficult to assess exactly why this is the case, especially when previous research has consistently found criminal justice students to be more punitive than non-majors. It is possible, however, that the findings from the current study suggest that the difference between students studying criminology and students studying criminal justice administration may be more significant than a difference in name alone.

The results have provided a number of interesting findings that should be examined in more detail. Future research studies may want to evaluate differences in attitudes among students in these separate academic programs (e.g., criminology and criminal justice administration) as well as changes in attitudes before/after taking classes on criminological theories.

Directions for Future Research

As an attempt at improving upon the current study, future research studies should replicate this study at additional colleges/universities. The findings from the current study are limited due to the fact that only one public college/university in the Northeast was sampled. Future studies should be diversified based upon geographic region, public/private schools, and religious affiliation. Replication of the current study at additional schools will allow researchers to assess whether these findings can be generalized to a larger student population.

Another method of improving upon the current study would be to reassess the views of students throughout their college career. The current research is limited due to the fact that it is a cross sectional study. Thus, the researcher is unable to assess change in attitudes among each participant. Future research studies should attempt to longitudinally assess students' levels of punitiveness from freshman to senior year. The findings from the current study suggest that students are getting less punitive as they move from freshman to senior years. However, similar to Eskridge's (1999) argument, caution should be used when using cross-sectional data to support the liberalizing effect of the college experience. A longitudinal study would allow the researcher to better

examine the issue of whether there is a liberalizing effect of the college education and whether students are becoming less punitive after each year of college.

Future researchers may also be interested in examining differences between criminology and criminal justice administration programs. The current findings suggest that criminology students held less punitive views than students in other academic disciplines. This finding is particularly interesting due to previous research suggesting that criminal justice students hold more punitive views than non-majors. As discussed previously, this difference may be due to differences between criminology and criminal justice programs. Future research may be able to assess differences between students studying criminology and students studying criminal justice administration. In addition, differences in curriculum between these two programs could be assessed. Currently, we tend to lump criminology and criminal justice administration programs together. This is problematic because these programs may have fundamental differences and the students choosing to major within these disciplines may be very different as well. Furthermore, it may be interesting to do a large national comparison of the differences between criminology and criminal justice administration curricula to determine if there actually are differences or if the difference in name only.

Moreover, future studies may also assess both changes in knowledge as well as attitudinal change before and after taking a college/class. Various studies have been previously conducted assessing student attitudes prior to and after taking a criminal justice course (Blankenship & Giacopassi, 1990; Bohm et al., 1991, Bohm & Vogel, 1991; Cochran & Chamlin, 2005; Gainey & Payne, 2003; Giacopassi & Blankenship, 1991; Lane, 1997). Most of these previous studies have concentrated on attitudinal

change among students enrolled in death penalty or corrections courses. Future studies may want to assess both punitiveness as well as causal attributions towards crime among students enrolled in courses examining criminological theories. This would be particularly interesting due to the fact that the current study suggests that more than twenty percent of the variance in punitiveness is attributed to one's causal attributions towards crime. Exposure to various theoretical orientations within criminology may produce attitudinal change among students. In addition, knowledge assessments may also be used to determine if information about criminology and/or the criminal justice system influences views towards punishment.

Lastly, future studies examining punitiveness should attempt to provide a better conceptual definition and/or conceptual understanding of punitiveness. As described in Chapter II, the current study conducted a comprehensive review of the research examining punitiveness. One major limitation found in the research was the lack of conceptual definitions of punitiveness. In addition, punitiveness was operationalized in so many different ways that it was difficult to draw conclusions and/or compare findings between studies. Furthermore, as Matthews (2005) suggests punitiveness remains a "'thin' and under-theorized concept" (p. 178). There has been very little attempt to conceptually and/or theoretically understand this construct. Again, due to the fact that causal attributions were found to have such a strong impact on punitiveness, future studies may be interested in examining the relationship between attribution theory and punitiveness.

Conclusions

The "get tough" movement in penal policies over the past few decades has led to a need to understand whether current polices are representative of society's beliefs and values. Numerous studies have been conducted to assess public support for crime policies and many of them have found that much of the conventional wisdom about public attitudes towards crime and criminals is wrong (McCorkle, 1993, Roberts, 1997; Turner et al. 1997). In fact, the public may be much less punitive and more willing to support a wider range of policy options than previously believed. Furthermore, it is important to recognize the complexity of citizen views towards punishment if public opinion continues to influence our criminal justice policies.

One major problem with public opinion research regarding crime is that the results are based on an examination of attitudes among an "under-informed" public. The public is typically misinformed and/or has little knowledge about the effectiveness of criminal justice programs as well as the full range of policy and penal options available to lawmakers. In an examination of the evolution of public attitudes towards punishment, Roberts and Hough (2002) argue that public opinion can change and that if the public were better informed about penal policies they would be less punitive and less supportive of incarceration as the primary punishment option. They go on to argue that there is a need to propose ways to improve public knowledge and understanding of crime and justice issues.

The current study was specifically interested in assessing the views of students studying criminology due to their likelihood of working in the criminal justice system after graduation. For example, levels of punitiveness may influence their perceptions and

actions towards offenders, victims, and criminal justice policies while working in the system. Furthermore, examining views among criminology students is also interesting due to their exposure to information regarding criminological theories, research, and criminal justice policies throughout their undergraduate education. Essentially, the two sub-samples used in the current study represent "informed" versus "under-informed" groups. Criminology students are exposed to a significant amount of information about criminal behavior, crime, and the criminal justice system throughout their college career. In theory, they should be more knowledgeable of the effectiveness of programs/policies and more aware of alternative penal options (including rehabilitation and restorative responses).

The findings from the current study indicated that criminology students held less punitive views than non-criminology majors did. These results lend support to Roberts and Hough's (2002) argument that the better-informed and more knowledgeable people are about crime and criminal justice the less punitive they will be. Criminology students may hold less punitive views due to their exposure to information regarding punishment and criminal behavior. However, students leaving criminology and entering the criminal justice system after graduation may actually experience conflict between what they know to be true (i.e., what works and what does not among criminal justice policies) and what may be asked of them in their future employment endeavors. Still, some hope can be drawn that individuals, even those who hold conservative views, are willing to ponder and accept information about our criminal justice system and its' policies that is very different from that which is portrayed by our politicians and the media.

REFERENCES

Applegate, B. K., & Cullen, F. T. (1996). Assessing public support for three-strikes- and you're-out laws: Global verses specific attitudes. *Crime &Delinquency,* 42(4), 517-535.

Applegate, B. K., Cullen, F. T., & Fisher, B. S. (2002). Public views toward crime and correctional policies: Is there a gender gap? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30, 89-100.

Applegate, B. K., Cullen, F. T., Fisher, B. S., & Vander Ven, T. (2000). Forgiveness and fundamentalism: Reconsidering the relationship between correctional attitudes and religion. *Criminology*, 38(3), 719-753.

Applegate, B. K., Cullen, F. T., Link, B. G., Richards, P. J., & Lanza-Kaduce, L. (1996). Determinants of public punitiveness toward drunk driving: A factorial survey approach. *Justice Quarterly*, 13(1), 57-79.

Babbie, E. (2001). *The practice of social research* (9th Ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Bachman, R., & Paternoster, R. (1997). *Statistical methods for criminology and criminal justice.* New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Barkan, S. E., & Cohn, S. F. (1994). Racial prejudice and support for the death penalty by whites. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 31(2), 202-209.

Bearden, W. O., Hardesty, D., and Rose. (2001). Consumer self-confidence: Refinements in conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28, 121-134.

Benekos, P. J., Merlo, A. V., Cook, W. J., & Bagley, K. (2002). A preliminary study of student attitudes on juvenile justice policy. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 13(2), 273-296.

Blankenship, M. B., & Giacopassi, D. J. (1990). Limitations of assessing attitudinal change among students of criminal justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 1(2), 255-259.

Blumstein, A., & Cohen, J. (1980). Sentencing of convicted offenders: An analysis of the public's view. *Law & Society Review*, 14(2), 223-261.

Bohm, R. M., Clark, L. J., & Aveni, A. F. (1991). Knowledge and death penalty opinion: A test of the Marshall Hypothesis. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 28(3), 360-387.

Bohm, R. M., & Vogel, R. E. (1991). Educational experiences and death penalty opinions: Stimuli that produce changes. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 2(1), 69-80.

Bohm, R. M., & Vogel, R. E. (1994). A comparison of factors associated with uninformed and informed death penalty opinions. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 22(2), 125-143.

Borg, M. J. (1997). The southern subculture of punitiveness? Regional variation in support for capital punishment. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 34(1), 25-46.

Borg, M. J. (1998). Vicarious homicide victimization and support for capital punishment: A test of Black's theory of law. *Criminology*, 36(3), 537-567.

Bradizza, C. M., Collins, R. L., Vincent, P. C., & Falco, D. L. (2006). It does the job: Young adults discuss their malt liquor consumption. *Addictive Behaviors*, 31, 1559-1577.

Britt, C. L. (1998). Race, religion, and support for the death penalty: A research note. *Justice Quarterly*, 15(1), 175-191.

Cannon, K. D. (2005). "Ain't no faggot gonna rob me!": Anti-gay attitudes of criminal justice undergraduate majors. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 16(2), 226-243.

Carroll, J. S., Perkowitz, W. T., Lurigio, A. J., & Weaver, F. M. (1987). Sentencing goals, causal attributions, ideology, and personality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(1), 107-118.

Chiricos, T., Welch, K., & Gertz, M. (2004). Racial typification of crime and support for punitive measures. *Criminology*, 42(2), 359-389.

Clark, L. A., and Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological Assessment*, 7(3), 309-319.

Cochran, J. K., & Chamlin, M. B. (2005). Can information change public opinion? Another test of the Marshall hypothesis. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33, 573-584.

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., and Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cohn, S. F., Barkan, S. E., & Halteman, W. A. (1991). Punitive attitudes toward criminals: Racial consensus or racial conflict. *Social Problems*, 38(2), 287-296.

Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(1), 98-104.

Costelloe, M. T., Chiricos, T., Burianek, J., Gertz, M., & Maier-Katkin, D. (2002). The social correlates of punitiveness toward criminals: A comparison of the Czech Republic and Florida. *The Justice system Journal*, 23(2), 191-213.

Courtright, K. E., & Mackey, D. A. (2004). Job desirability among criminal justice majors:Exploring relationships between personal characteristics and occupational attractiveness. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 15(2), 311-326.

Courtright, K. E., Mackey, D. A., & Packard, S. H. (2005). Empathy among college students and criminal justice majors: Identifying predispositional traits and the role of education. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 16(1), 125-144.

Cullen, F. T., Clark, G. A., Cullen, J. B., & Mathers, R. A. (1985). Attribution, salience, and attitudes toward criminal sanctioning. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 12(3), 305-331.

Cullen, F. T., Cullen, J. B., & Wozniak, J. F. (1988). Is rehabilitation dead? The myth of the punitive public. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 16, 303-317.

DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Ellison, C. G. (1991). An eye for an eye? A note on the Southern subculture of violence thesis. *Social Forces*, 69(4), 1223-1239.

Eskridge, C. W. (1999). A brief response to "Students' views on criminal justice," by Farnworth, Longmire, and West. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 10(2), 291-295.

Evans, T. D., & Adams, M. (2003). Salvation or damnation?: Religion and correctional ideology. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28(1), 15-35.

Farnworth, M., Longmire, D. R., & West, V. M. (1998). College students' views on criminal justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 9(1), 39-57.

Feiler, S. M., & Sheley, J. F. (1999). Legal and racial elements of public willingness to transfer juvenile offenders to adult court. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(1), 55-64.

Floyd, F. J., and Widaman, K. F. (1995). Factor analysis in the development and refinement of clinical assessment instruments. *Psychological Assessment*, 7(3), 286-299.

Gainey, R. R., & Payne, B. K. (2003). Changing attitudes toward house arrest with Electronic monitoring: The impact of a single presentation. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 47(2), 196-209.

Giacopassi, D. J., & Blankenship, M. B. (1991). The effects of criminal justice pedagogy on student attitudes. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 16(1), 97-103.

Grasmick, H. G., Bursik, R. J., & Blackwell, B. (1993). Religious beliefs and public support for the death penalty for juveniles and adults. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 16(1): 59-86.

Grasmick, H. G., Cochran, J. K., Bursik, R. J., Kimpel, M. (1993). Religion, punitive justice, and support for the death penalty. *Justice Quarterly*, 10(2), 289-314.

Grasmick, H. G., & McGill, A. L. (1994). Religion, attribution style, and punitiveness toward juvenile offenders. *Criminology*, 32(1), 23-46.

Haghighi, B., & Lopez, A. (1998). Gender and perception of prisons and prisoners. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 26(6), 453-464.

Hensley, C., Miller, A., Tewksbury, R., & Koscheski, M. (2003). Student attitudes toward inmate privileges. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(2), 249-262.

Hogan, M. J., Chiricos, T., Gertz, M. (2005). Economic insecurity, blame, and punitive attitudes. *Justice Quarterly*, 22(3), 392-412.

Howells, G. N., Flanagan, K. A., & Hagan, V. (1995). Does viewing a televised execution affect attitudes toward capital punishment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 22(4), 411-424.

Hurwitz, J. & Smithey, S. (1998). Gender differences on crime and punishment. *Political Research Quarterly*, 51(1), 89-115.

Johnson, D. (2001). Punitive attitudes on crime: Economic insecurity, racial prejudice, or both? *Sociological Focus*, 34(1), 33-54.

Lambert, E., & Clarke, A. (2004). Crime, capital punishment, and knowledge: Are criminal justice majors better informed than other majors about crime and capital punishment? *The Social Science Journal*, 41, 53-66.

Langworthy, R. H., & Whitehead, J. T. (1986). Liberalism and fear as explanations of punitiveness. *Criminology*, 24(3), 575-591.

Lane, J. S. (1997). Can you make a horse drink? The effects of a corrections course on attitudes toward criminal punishment. *Crime & Delinquency*, 43(2), 186-202.

Leiber, M. J., & Woodrick, A. C. (1997). Religious beliefs, attributional styles, and adherence to correctional orientations. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 24(4), 495-511.

Lewis-Beck, M. S. (1980). *Applied regression: An introduction*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Mackey, D. A., & Courtright, K. E. (2000). Assessing punitiveness among college students: A comparison of criminal justice majors with other majors. *The Justice Professional*, 12, 423-441.

Mackey, D. A., Courtright, K. E., & Packard, S. H. (2006). Testing the rehabilitative ideal among college students. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 19(2), 153-170.

Matthews, R. (2005). The myth of punitiveness. *Theoretical Criminology*, 9(2), 175-201.

McCarthy, B. R., & McCarthy, B. J. (1981). Criminal justice student views of the criminal justice system: The impact of education and self-selection and their implications for the human services. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 8, 610-622.

McCorkle, R. C. (1993). Punish and rehabilitate? Public attitudes toward six common crimes. *Crime & Delinquency*, 39(2), 240-252.

Mertler, C. A., & Vannatta, R. A. (2005). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods: Practical application and interpretation* (3rd Ed.). Glendale, CA: Pyrczak Publishing.

Miller, A. J. (2001). Student perceptions of hate crimes. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 25(2), 293-307.

Miller, J. L., Rossi, P. H., & Simpson, J. E. (1986). Perceptions of Justice: Race and gender differences in judgments of appropriate prison sentences. *Law & Society Review*, 20(3), 313-334.

Netemeyer, R. G., Bearden, W. O., and Sharma, S. (2003). *Scaling procedures: Issues and applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., and McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work-family conflict and family-work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4), 400-410.

Olivero, J. M., & Murataya, R. (2001). Homophobia and university law enforcement students. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 12(2), 271-280.

Paternoster, R., Brame, R., Mazerolle, P., & Piquero, A. (1998). Using the correct statistical test for the equality of regression coefficients. *Criminology*, 36(4), 859-866.

Payne, B. K., & Riedel, R. (2002). Gun control attitudes and the criminal justice student: Do differences exist? *College Student Journal*, 36(2), 314-322.

Robbers, M. (2006). Tough-mindedness and fair play: Personality traits as predictors of attitudes toward the death penalty – an exploratory gendered study. *Punishment & Society*, 8(2), 203-222.

Roberts, J.V. (1997). American attitudes about punishment: Myth and reality. In Tonry, M. & Hatlestad, K. (Eds.) *Sentencing reform in overcrowded times: A comparative perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, J. V., and Hough, M. (2002). *Changing attitudes to punishment: Public opinion, crime and justice*. Portland: Willan Publishing.

Roberts, J. V., Stalans, L.J., Indermaur, D., and Hough, M. (2003). *Penal populism and public opinion: Lessons from five countries*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rossi, P. H., & Berk, R. A. (1997). *Just punishments: Federal guidelines and public views compared*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Sandys, M., & McGarrell, E. F. (1994). Attitudes toward capital punishment among Indiana legislators: Diminished support in light of alternative sentencing options. *Justice Quarterly*, 11(4), 651-675.

Sandys, M., & McGarrell, E. F. (1995). Attitudes toward capital punishment: Preference for the penalty or mere acceptance? *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 32(2), 191-213.

Sandys, M., & McGarrell, E. F. (1997). Beyond the Bible belt: The influence (or lack thereof) of religion on attitudes toward the death penalty. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 20(1), 179-190.

Selke, W. L. (1980). The impact of higher education on crime orientations. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 8, 175-184.

Schwartz, I. M., Guo, S., & Kerbs, J. J. (1993). The impact of demographic variables on public opinion regarding juvenile justice: Implications for public policy. *Crime & Delinquency*, 39(1), 5-28.

Sims, B. (2003). The impact of causal attribution on correctional ideology: A national study. *Criminal Justice Review*, 28(1), 1-25.

Sprott, J. B. (1999). Are members of the public tough on crime? The dimensions of public "punitiveness". *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(5), 467-474.

Sprott, J. B., & Doob, A. N. (1997). Fear, victimization, and attitudes to sentencing, the courts, and the police. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, July, 275-291.

Taylor, D. G., Scheppele, K. L., & Stinchombe, A. L. (1979). Salience of crime and support for harsher criminal sanctions. *Social Problems*, 26(4), 413-424.

Tsoudis, O. (2000). Does majoring in criminal justice affect perceptions of criminal justice? *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 11(2), 225-236.

Turner, M. G., Cullen, F. T., Sundt, J. L., & Applegate, B. K. (1997). Public tolerance for community-based sanctions. *The Prison Journal*, 77(1), 6-26.

Tyler, T. R., & Boeckmann, R. J. (1997). Three strikes and you are out, but why? The psychology of public support for punishing rule breakers. *Law & Society Review*, 31(2), 237-265.

Tyler, T. R., & Weber, R (1982). Support for the death penalty: Instrumental response to crime, or symbolic attitude? *Law & Society Review*, 17(1), 21-45.

Unnever, J. D., Cullen, F. T., & Applegate, B. K. (2005). Turning the other cheek: Reassessing the impact of religion on punitive ideology. *Justice Quarterly*, 22(3), 304-339.

Unnever, J. D., Cullen, F. T., & Roberts, J. V. (2005). Not everyone strongly supports the death penalty: Assessing weakly-held attitudes about capital punishment. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 29(2), 187-216.

Vandiver, M., & Giacopassi, D. (1997). One million and counting: Students' estimates of the annual number of homicides in the U.S. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 8(2), 135-143.

Ventura, L. A., Lambert, E. G., Bryant, M., & Pasupuleti, S. (2004). Differences in Attitudes toward gays and lesbians among criminal justice and non-criminal justice majors. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28(2), 165-180.

Von Hirsch, A. (1976). *Doing justice: The choice of punishments*. NY: Hill & Wang.

Whitehead, J. T. (1998). Good Ol' Boys and the Chair: Death penalty attitudes of policy makers in Tennessee. *Crime & Delinquency*, 44(2), 245-256.

Wolfer, L., & Friedrichs, D. O. (2001). A commitment to justice at a Jesuit university: A comparison of criminal justice majors to non-majors. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 12(2), 319-336.

Young, R. L. (1991). Race, conceptions of crime and justice, and support for the death penalty. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 54(1), 67-75.

Young, R. L. (1992). Religious orientation, race and support for the death penalty. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 31(1), 76-87.

Young, R. L., & Thompson, C. Y. (1995). Religious fundamentalism, punitiveness, and firearms ownership. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 18(2), 81-98.

APPENDIX A

Studies of Punitiveness Related to the Current Study

Year	Author	Sample	Method	Dependent Variables	Predictors
1985	Cullen, Clark, Cullen, & Mathers	n = 156 Galesburg, Illinois residents n = 274 criminal justice participants	Quantitative, Cross-Sectional Survey Design Mail Questionnaires	- ***Support for punitive responses (punitiveness)*** - Support for rehabilitation - Death penalty support - Attitudes towards white collar criminals	Attribution, age, sex, profession
1988	Cullen, Cullen, & Wozniak	n = 156 Galesburg, Illinois residents	Quantitative, Cross-Sectional Survey Design Mail Questionnaires	- ***Punishment index (punitiveness)*** -Rehabilitation index	NA
2000	Applegate, Cullen, Fisher, & Vander Ven	n = 559 Ohio residents	Quantitative, Cross-Sectional Survey Design Mail Questionnaires	- Attitudes towards punishment (death penalty, harsher courts, ***punitiveness index***) - Attitudes towards rehabilitation (main goal of prison, importance of goal, rehabilitation index)	Religion, Sex, Age, Education, Fear, Political ideology
2000	Mackey & Courtright (see also Courtright & Mackey, 2004; Courtright, Mackey, & Packard, 2005)	n = 633 Students from 5 Colleges and Universities in 4 Northeastern States	Quantitative, Cross-Sectional Survey Design Classroom Questionnaire Distribution	- ***Punitiveness index*** - Rehabilitation index	Grade level, political ideology, size of town, attractiveness of law enforcement jobs, empathy

2002	Applegate, Cullen, & Fisher	n = 559 Ohio residents	Quantitative, Cross-Sectional Survey Design Mail Questionnaires	- Attitudes toward offender treatment (rehabilitation policy index, vignette rehabilitation index, importance of rehabilitation goal) - Attitudes towards punishment (capital punishment, attitudes towards local courts, ***punishment policy index***, vignette punitiveness index) - Crime policy support (liberal crime policy index, conservative crime policy index)	Sex
2002	Costelloe, Chiricos, Burianek, Gertz, & Maier-Katkin	n = 2250 Florida residents	Quantitative, Cross-Sectional Survey Design Telephone Interviews	- ***Punitiveness index***	Race, education, marital status, political ideology, fear of crime, concern for crime and drug trafficking, perceptions of equal treatment by police
2003	Sims	n = 1085 National sample	Quantitative, Cross-Sectional Survey Design Telephone Interviews	- ***Punitiveness index*** - Support for capital punishment	Ethnicity, education, income, fear of crime, causal attribution
2004	Chiricos, Welch, & Gertz	n = 885 National sample	Quantitative, Cross-Sectional Survey Design Telephone Interviews	- ***Punitive attitudes towards crime index (punitiveness)***	Age, race, education, political ideology, racial prejudice, location
2005	Hogan, Chiricos, & Gertz	n = 1476 Leon County, Florida residents	Quantitative, Cross-Sectional Survey Design Telephone Interviews	- ***Punitive attitudes index (punitiveness)***	Education, political ideology, fear, crime problem, crime increase, blame

Punitiveness Scale/Index Items

Mackey and Courtright (2000)

1) We are entirely too soft on people convicted of crime.
2) Offenders should by harshly punished to make them pay for their crimes.
3) We should use the old saying "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" as a guideline for determining punishment for criminals.
4) To better control the crime problem, more prisons need to be built.
5) Prisons today are much too lenient.
6) Using the death penalty helps us to better control crime.
7) Prison and jail inmates deserve the humiliation, intimidation, and degradation they may receive.
8) Drug dealers should be given life sentences for their crimes.
9) A person who sexually abuses children should never be released from prison.
10) Probation supervision is a joke.
11) A person who has three convictions for very serious crimes (felonies) should receive life without the possibility of parole.
12) People choose to commit crimes; therefore, they deserve the punishment they get.
13) Harsh and severe punishments are necessary to preserve a sense of justice in our society.
14) Speedy, severe, and certain penalties are the only way to prevent people from committing crime.
15) Inmates who participate in programs while confined (such as education, counseling, vocational training, etc.) do so only because they are trying to impress the parole board so they can possibly gain an early release.

Cullen et al. (1988)

1) Criminals deserve to be punished because they have harmed society with their crime.
2) The amount of punishment that a criminal receives should be equal to the harm that the victim of the crime was forced to suffer.
3) The more serious an offense is, the more the criminal deserves to be punished.
4) How much harm a crime caused – and not the criminal's background or why the criminal committed the crime – should be the major factor that determines how long a sentence a criminal receives.
5) The primary purpose of our legal system is to pay criminals back for their offense.
6) Stiffer jail sentences will help reduce the amount of crime by showing criminals and crime does not pay.
7) Punishing criminal is the only way to stop them from engaging in more crimes in the future.
8) Sending criminals to jail will not stop them from committing crimes.
9) Putting people in prisons does not make much sense since it will only increase crime because prisons are schools of crime.

10) Punishing criminals will reduce crime by setting an example and showing others that crime does not pay.
11) We should put criminals in jail so that innocent citizens will be protected from criminals who will victimize them- rob or hurt them – if given a chance.
12) We should put criminals in prison because it removes them from the community and protects citizens from further crimes that they might commit.
13) Since most criminals will commit crimes over and over again, the only way to protect society is to put these criminals in jail and throw away the key.

Cullen et al. (1985)

1) Criminals deserve to be punished because they have harmed society.
2) Sending criminals to jail will not stop them from committing crimes.
3) Punishing criminals is the only way to stop them from engaging in more crimes in the future.
4) Putting people in prisons does not make much sense since it will only increase crime because prisons are schools of crime.
5) We should put criminals in jail so that innocent citizens will be protected from criminals who will victimize them – rob or hurt them – if given the change.
6) Since most criminals will commit crimes over and over again, the only way to protect society is to put these criminals in jail and throw away the key.

Sims (2003)

1) It is important that the criminal justice system see that people who commit crimes get what's coming to them.
2) It is important that the criminal justice system discourage people already convicted of committing a crime from committing future crimes.
3) It is important that the criminal justice system discourage others from committing crimes by showing them that crime doesn't pay.
4) It is important that the criminal justice system keep offenders locked up so they can't commit more crimes.

Hogan, Chiricos, and Gertz (2005)

1) Eliminate parole and require all convicted criminals to serve at least 85 percent of their sentences.
2) Make sentences more severe for all crimes.
3) Put more police on the streets, even if it means paying higher taxes.
4) Limit appeals to death sentences.
5) Use chemical castration for sex offenders.
6) Prosecute juvenile offenders as adults.
7) Make prisoners work on chain gangs
8) Take away television and recreational privileges from prisoners.

Chiricos, Welch, and Gertz (2004)

1) Making sentences more severe for all crimes.
2) Executing more murderers.
3) Making prisoners work on chain gangs.
4) Taking away television and recreation privileges from prisoners.
5) Using more mandatory minimum sentencing statutes, like "Three Strikes" for repeat offenders.
6) Locking up more juvenile offenders.
7) Using the death penalty for juveniles who murder.
8) Sending repeat juvenile offenders to adult courts.

Costelloe et al. (2002)

1) Making sentences more severe for all crimes.
2) Using the death penalty for juveniles who murder.
3) Sending repeat juvenile offenders to adult court.
4) Putting more police on the streets, even if it means paying higher taxes.
5) Taking away television and recreational privileges from prisoners.

APPENDIX B

Non-Criminology Sampling Frame

Freshman Non-Criminology

Course	Section	Days	Time	Room	Instructor
ENGL101	1	TR	2:00-3:15	LENRD 101	Nancy Hayward
ENGL101	2	MWF	8:00-8:50	LENRD 213	Elaine Ware
ENGL101	3	MWF	9:05-9:55	LENRD 204	Marlen Harrison
ENGL101	4	MWF	9:05-9:55	LENRD 118	Deepak Pant
ENGL101	5	MWF	9:05-9:55	LENRD 213	Elaine Ware
ENGL101	6	MWF	10:10-11:00	KEITH 137	Jill Wagner
ENGL101	7	MWF	10:10-11:00	LENRD 213	Elaine Ware
ENGL101	8	MWF	10:10-11:00	KEITH 104	So Young Baek
ENGL101	9	MWF	10:10-11:00	LENRD 204	Stephen Swartz
ENGL101	10	MWF	11:15-12:15	LENRD 214	Reena Dube
ENGL101	11	TR	11:00-12:15	LENRD 214	Bradley Lint
ENGL101	12	MWF	11:15-12:05	LENRD 213	Lea Masiello
ENGL101	13	MWF	11:15-12:05	LENRD 204	Jeffrey Schragel
ENGL101	14	MWF	11:15-12:05	LENRD 101	Michael Williamson
ENGL101	15	MWF	12:20-1:10	LENRD 204	Susan Kanter
ENGL101	16	TR	2:00-3:15	LENRD 214	Bradley Lint
ENGL101	17	MWF	12:20-1:10	LENRD 219	Bryce Lucas
ENGL101	18	MWF	12:20-1:10	LENRD 213	Stephen Swartz
ENGL101	19	MWF	1:25-2:15	LENRD 118	John Dean
ENGL101	20	MWF	1:25-2:15	LENRD 204	Susan Kanter
ENGL101	21	MWF	1:25-2:15	KEITH 104	Judith Villa
ENGL101	22	MWF	1:25-2:15	LENRD 213	Stephen Swartz
ENGL101	23	TR	3:30-4:45	LENRD 214	Bradley Lint
ENGL101	24	MWF	2:30-3:20	LENRD 204	Pamela Rodgers
ENGL101	25	MW	3:35-4:50	LENRD 101	Kimberly Socha
ENGL101	26	MWF	11:15-12:05	KEITH 104	Judith Villa
ENGL101	27	TR	8:00-9:15	LENRD 211	Mais Alqutami
ENGL101	28	TR	9:30-10:45	LENRD 101	Mary Gainer
ENGL101	29	TR	9:30-10:45	LENRD 213	Qisi Zhang
ENGL101	30	TR	11:00-12:15	LENRD 101	Mary Gainer
ENGL101	31	TR	11:00-12:15	LENRD 204	Barbara Kraszewski
ENGL101	32	TR	11:00-12:15	LENRD 202	Allyson Marino
ENGL101	33	TR	11:00-12:15	LENRD 105	David Pozza
ENGL101	34	TR	12:30-1:45	LENRD 202	Allyson Marino
ENGL101	35	TR	12:30-3:45	LENRD 101	Stacy Miller
ENGL101	36	TR	12:30-1:45	LENRD 204	Lisa Straight
ENGL101	37	TR	2:00-3:15	LENRD 118	David Pozza
ENGL101	38	TR	3:30-4:45	LENRD 213	Allyson Marino
ENGL101	39	TR	3:30-4:45	LENRD 204	Tina Peschock
ENGL101	40	TR	3:30-4:45	LENRD 118	David Pozza
ENGL101	41	M	6:00-8:45	LENRD 204	Brian Cope
HIST195	1	MWF	9:05-9:55	KEITH 231	Elizabeth Marcus
HIST195	2	MWF	10:10-11:00	KEITH 231	Elizabeth Marcus
HIST195	3	MW	3:35-4:50	KEITH 233	Wayne Bodle

HIST195	4	MW	5:05-6:20	KEITH 233	Wayne Bodle
HIST195	5	TR	8:00-9:15	KEITH 238	Lynn Botelho
HIST195	6	TR	9:30-10:45	KEITH 238	Lynn Botelho
HIST195	7	MWF	11:15-12:05	KEITH 233	Kevin Britz
HIST195	8	MWF	1:35-2:15	KEITH 233	Kevin Britz
HIST195	9	MWF	2:30-3:20	KEITH 233	Kevin Britz
HIST195	10	TR	2:00-3:15	KEITH 134	Sharon Franklin-Rahkonen
HIST195	11	TR	9:30-10:45	KEITH 134	Werner Lippert
HIST195	12	TR	11:00-12:15	KEITH 134	Werner Lippert
HIST195	13	MWF	12:20-1:10	KEITH 233	Elizabeth Marcus
HIST195	14	MWF	10:10-11:00	KEITH 130	Staff
HIST195	15	MWF	11:15-12:05	KEITH 130	Staff
HIST195	16	MWF	1:15-2:15	KEITH 130	Staff
HIST195	17	MWF	9:05-9:55	KEITH 233	Steven Schwamenfeld
HIST195	18	MWF	10:10-11:00	KEITH 233	Steven Schwamenfeld
HIST195	19	MWF	1:25-2:15	KEITH 231	Steven Schwamenfeld
HIST195	20	TR	8:00-9:15	KEITH 233	Angela White
HIST195	21	TR	9:30-10:45	KEITH 233	Angela White
HIST195	22	TR	12:30-1:45	KEITH 233	Angela White
HIST195	23	MWF	2:30-3:20	KEITH 130	Staff
HIST195	24	MWF	2:30-3:20	KEITH 231	Steven Schwamenfeld
HIST195	25	TR	2:00-3:15	KEITH 233	Angela White
HIST195	26	MWF	9:05-9:55	KEITH 134	Staff
HIST195	27	MWF	10:10-11:00	KEITH 134	Staff
HIST195	28	MWF	1:25-2:15	KEITH 134	Staff
HIST195	29	MWF	2:30-3:20	KEITH 134	Staff
HPED143	1	MWF	1:25-2:15	ZINK 202	Emily Vetere
HPED143	2	MWF	10:10-11:00	ZINK 203	Robert Kostelnik
HPED143	3	MW	1:25-2:40	ZINK 107	Carmine Cortazzo
HPED143	4	MWF	2:30-3:20	ZINK 106	James Racchini
HPED143	5	MW	3:35-4:50	ZINK 106	Richard Hsiao
HPED143	6	TR	11:00-12:15	ZINK 107	Andrew Shim
HPED143	7	MW	11:45-1:00	ZINK 106	Julie Brunetto
HPED143	8	MWF	8:00-8:50	ZINK 202	Emily Vetere
HPED143	9	TR	12:30-1:45	ZINK 108	Andrew Shim
HPED143	10	TR	9:30-10:45	ZINK 107	Leslie Stenger
HPED143	11	MW	3:35-4:50	ZINK GYM A	Kevin McKee
HPED143	12	TR	12:30-1:45	ZINK 107	James Racchini
HPED143	13	MWF	11:15-12:05	ZINK 202	Leslie Stenger
HPED143	14	M	5:05-7:45	ZINK GYM A	Kevin McKee
HPED143	15	MWF	2:30-3:20	ZINK 201	Emily Vetere
FDNT143	1	MWF	8:00-8:50	ACKER 116	Cassondra Burgess
FDNT143	2	MWF	9:05-9:55	ACKER 116	Cassondra Burgess
NURS143	1	MW	3:35-4:50	ZINK 105	Constance Settlemyer
NURS143	2	MW	5:05-6:20	ZINK 105	Constance Settlemyer
NURS143	3	MW	6:35-7:50	ZINK 105	Constance Settlemyer
MLSC102	A01	MF	6:00-7:00	PIERC	Eric Steele
MLSC102	A02	W	6:00-7:00	PIERC	Dennis Renner
MLSC102	A03	W	6:00-7:00	PIERC	Dennis Renner
MLSC102	A04	W	6:00-7:00	PIERC	Brian Farester

MLSC102	A05	MF	6:00-7:00	PIERC	Dennis Renner
MLSC102	A06	W	6:00-7:00	PIERC	Benjamin McBride
MLSC102	A07	W	6:00-7:00	PIERC	Benjamin McBride
ARHI101	1	MWF	8:00-8:50	SPRWL AUD	Jason John
ARHI101	2	MWF	11:15-12:05	SPRWL 118A	Irene Kabala
ARHI101	3	MWF	1:25-2:15	SPRWL AUD	Irene Kabala
ARHI101	4	MWF	3:35-4:25	SPRWL AUD	Michael Stadler
ARHI101	5	TR	11:00-12:15	SPRWL 118A	Penny Rode
ARHI101	6	TR	5:05-7:35	SPRWL AUD	Penny Rode
THTR101	1	MWF	9:05-9:55	SPRWL AUD	Patrick McCreary
THTR101	2	MWF	10:10-11:00	SPRWL AUD	Jason Chimonides
THTR101	3	TR	11:00-12:15	SPRWL AUD	Cecil Ault
THTR101	4	TR	12:30-1:45	SPRWL AUD	Cecil Ault
MUHI101	1	MWF	11:15-12:05	SPRWL AUD	Linda Jennings
MUHI101	2	MWF	12:20-1:10	SPRWL AUD	James Dearing
MUHI101	3	M	5:05-7:45	SPRWL AUD	Linda Jennings
MUHI101	4	R	5:05-7:45	SPRWL AUD	Ronald Horner
DANC102	1	MWF	9:05-9:55	ZINK DNST	Holly Boda-Sutton

Sophomore Non-Criminology

Course	Section	Days	Time	Room	Instructor
ENGL121	1	MWF	8:00-8:50	LENRD 219	Carolyn Camp
ENGL121	2	MWF	9:05-9:55	LENRD 219	Carolyn Camp
ENGL121	3	MWF	10:10-11:00	LENRD 219	Shimberlee Jiron-King
ENGL121	4	MWF	11:15-12:05	LENRD 218	Anthony Farrington
ENGL121	5	MWF	11:15-12:05	LENRD 219	Shimberlee Jiron-King
ENGL121	6	MWF	1:25-2:15	LENRD 219	Reena Dube
ENGL121	7	MWF	2:30-3:20	LENRD 219	Reena Dube
ENGL121	8	MWF	2:30-3:20	LENRD 218	Staff
ENGL121	9	MW	3:35-4:50	LENRD 218	Marlen Harrison
ENGL121	10	TR	9:30-10:45	KEITH 137	Michael Williamson
ENGL121	11	TR	9:30-10:45	LENRD 218	Amy Hagenrater-Gooding
ENGL121	12	TR	9:30-10:45	LENRD 219	Lingyan Yang
ENGL121	13	TR	11:00-12:15	LENRD 219	Michael Williamson
ENGL121	14	TR	12:30-1:45	LENRD 210	Jo Anne Kerr
ENGL121	15	TR	12:30-1:45	LENRD 211	Staff
ENGL121	16	MW	5:05-6:20	LENRD 218	Veronica Watson
ENGL121	17	TR	2:00-3:15	LENRD 211	Wendy Carse
ENGL121	18	TR	2:00-3:15	LENRD 219	Barbara Kraszewski
ENGL121	19	TR	3:30-4:45	LENRD 218	Barbara Kraszewski
ENGL202	1	T	11:00-1:30	LENRD 213	David Hanauer
ENGL202	2	MWF	8:00-8:50	LENRD 211	Dawn Fels
ENGL202	3	MWF	9:05-9:55	LENRD 211	Dawn Fels
ENGL202	4	MWF	9:05-9:55	LENRD 202	Kenneth Sherwood
ENGL202	5	MWF	9:05-9:55	LENRD 210	Bryce Lucas
ENGL202	6	MWF	10:10-11:00	LENRD 118	Sung Chow
ENGL202	7	MWF	10:10-11:00	LENRD 211	Lea Masiello
ENGL202	8	MWF	10:10-11:00	LENRD 202	Kenneth Sherwood
ENGL202	9	MWF	10:10-11:00	LENRD 210	Bryce Lucas

ENGL202	10	MWF	11:15-12:05	LENRD 118	Sung Chow
ENGL202	11	MWF	11:15-12:05	LENRD 202	Susan Welsh
ENGL202	12	MWF	12:20-1:10	LENRD 202	Marlen Harrison
ENGL202	13	MWF	12:20-1:10	LENRD 211	Whitney Tudor
ENGL202	14	MWF	12:20-1:10	LENRD 210	So Young Baek
ENGL202	15	MWF	1:25-2:15	LENRD 218	Carolyn Camp
ENGL202	16	MWF	1:25-2:15	LENRD 202	Marlen Harrison
ENGL202	17	MWF	1:25-2:15	STOUF 110	Rosalee Stilwell
ENGL202	18	MWF	1:25-2:15	LENRD 210	So Young Baek
ENGL202	19	MWF	2:30-3:20	LENRD 118	Christine Pristash
ENGL202	20	MWF	2:30-3:20	STOUF 110	Rosalee Stilwell
ENGL202	21	MWF	2:30-3:20	LENRD 210	So Young Baek
ENGL202	22	MW	3:35-4:50	LENRD 202	Claude Hurlbert
ENGL202	23	MW	3:35-4:50	LENRD 204	Kimberly Thomas
ENGL202	24	MW	3:35-4:50	LENRD 118	Jennifer Woolston
ENGL202	25	MWF	4:40-5:40	STOUF 110	Rosalee Stilwell
ENGL202	26	TR	8:00-9:15	LENRD 210	Susan Comfort
ENGL202	27	TR	8:00-9:15	LENRD 202	Laurel Black
ENGL202	28	TR	9:30-10:45	LENRD 118	Mahmoud Amer
ENGL202	29	TR	9:30-10:45	LENRD 210	Susan Comfort
ENGL202	30	TR	9:30-10:45	KEITH 104	Matthew Holman
ENGL202	31	TR	11:00-12:15	LENRD 118	Mahmoud Amer
ENGL202	32	TR	11:00-12:15	KEITH 104	Rebecca Garvin
ENGL202	33	TR	11:00-12:15	LENRD 210	Helen Sitler
ENGL202	34	TR	11:00-12:15	KEITH 137	Amanda Yannella
ENGL202	35	TR	12:30-1:45	KEITH 104	Rebecca Garvin
ENGL202	36	TR	12:30-1:45	KEITH 137	Amy Hagenrater-Gooding
ENGL202	37	TR	12:30-1:45	LENRD 218	Thomas Slater
ENGL202	38	TR	2:00-3:15	KEITH 104	Staff
ENGL202	39	TR	2:00-3:15	KEITH 137	Amy Hagenrater-Gooding
ENGL202	40	TR	2:00-3:15	LENRD 218	Thomas Slater
ENGL202	41	TR	3:30-4:45	LENRD 210	Amy Hagenrater-Gooding
ENGL202	42	TR	3:30-4:45	LENRD 202	Sue Johnson
ENGL202	43	TR	6:35-7:50	LENRD 202	Sue Johnson
ENGL202	H44	MWF	11:15-12:05	LENRD 105	John Marsden

Junior/Senior Non-Criminology

Course	Section	Days	Time	Room	Instructor
LBST499	1	TR	11:00-12:15	MCELH 205	Nicholas Karatjas
LBST499	2	TR	12:30-1:45	MCELH 205	James Dyal
LBST499	3	TR	5:05-6:20	STRGT 320	David Smith
LBST499	4	TR	6:35-7:50	STRGT 320	David Smith
LBST499	5	M	5:05-7:45	DAVIS 320	Beatrice Fennimore
LBST499	6	TR	12:30-1:45	KEITH 007	Michael Korns
LBST499	7	TR	2:00-3:15	KEITH 007	Michael Korns
LBST499	8	TR	9:30-10:45	LENRD 015	Gail Sechrist
LBST499	9	TR	9:30-10:45	SPRWL 211	Marjorie Mambo
LBST499	10	W	5:05-7:45	ECB 121	Terry Ray
LBST499	11	MW	3:35-4:50	LENRD 214	Sung Chow

LBST499	12	MWF	1:35-2:15	LENRD 211	Lea Masiello
LBST499	13	TR	11:00-12:15	LENRD 218	Stacy Miller
LBST499	14	T	5:00-7:45	STOUF 111	Rosalee Stilwell
LBST499	15	TR	12:30-1:45	LENRD 118	Lingyan Yang
LBST499	16	TR	12:30-1:45	ECB 212	Anita Henry
LBST499	17	TR	2:00-3:15	ECB 212	Anita Henry
LBST499	18	MWF	10:10-11:00	STRGT 3002	Yu-Ju Kuo
LBST499	19	TR	3:30-4:45	ACKER 110B	Thomas VanDyke
LBST499	20	W	3:30-5:50	ECB 209	Lucinda Willis
LBST499	21	MW	3:35-4:50	ECB 321	Stephen Osborne
LBST499	22	R	6:00-9:00	SPRWL 118A	Cecil Ault
LBST499	23	W	3:30-6:10	MCELH 103	Robert Heasley
LBST499	24	TR	2:00-3:15	STOUF 110	Eugene Thibadeau
LBST499	25	T	5:05-7:45	STOUF 110	Eugene Thibadeau
LBST499	26	R	5:05-7:45	STOUF 110	Eugene Thibadeau
LBST499	27	MWF	2:30-3:20	COGSW 201	Stanley Chepaitis

Criminology Sampling Frame

Freshman Criminology Course	**Section**	**(S2008) Days**	**Time**	**Room**	**Instructor**
CRIM102	1	TR	9:30-10:45	WILSN219	Jamie Martin
CRIM102	2	TR	11:00-12:15	WILSN219	Jamie Martin
CRIM102	3	MWF	11:15-12:05	WILSN201	Shannon Phaneuf
CRIM102	4	MWF	1:25-2:15	WILSN201	Shannon Phaneuf
CRIM102	5	MWF	2:30-3:20	WILSN201	Shannon Phaneuf
Sophomore Criminology					
CRIM205	1	TR	8:00-9:15	WILSN301	Paul McCauley
CRIM205	2	TR	9:30-10:45	WILSN301	Paul McCauley
CRIM215	1	MWF	2:30-3:20	WILSN219	Kenethia McIntosh
CRIM215	2	MWF	2:30-3:20	WILSN301	Jeffrey Cohen
CRIM225	1	MWF	10:10-11:00	ZINK108	Shannon Phaneuf
CRIM225	2	TR	2:00-3:15	WILSN201	Rosemary Gido
CRIM235	1	TR	9:30-10:45	WILSN201	Alida Merlo
CRIM235	2	TR	11:00-12:15	WILSN201	Alida Merlo
CRIM255	1	MWF	11:15-12:05	ZINK108	Mehmet Sozer
CRIM255	2	TR	12:30-1:45	WILSN201	Eric Kocian
Junior/Senior Criminology					
CRIM306	1	TR	9:30-10:45	WILSN319	Jake Gibbs
CRIM306	2	TR	11:00-12:15	WILSN319	Jake Gibbs
CRIM306	3	TR	12:30-1:45	WILSN219	Kate Hanrahan
CRIM306	4	TR	2:00-3:15	WILSN219	Kate Hanrahan
CRIM354	1	TR	12:30-1:45	WILSN319	Paul McCauley
CRIM354	2	TR	2:00-3:15	WILSN319	Paul McCauley

CRIM374	1	MWF	1:25-2:15	ZINK108	Dave Strauss
CRIM374	2	TR	2:00-3:15	WILSN301	Alison Burke
CRIM384	1	MWF	1:15-2:25	ZINK105	Jennifer Roberts
CRIM384	2	TR	3:30-4:45	WILSN201	Brian Fedorek
CRIM394	1	MWF	11:15-12:05	WILSN219	Byung Cho
CRIM394	2	MWF	12:20-1:10	WILSN219	Byung Cho
CRIM400	W01	MWF	9:05-9:55	WILSN219	Willard Austin
CRIM400	W02	MWF	10:10-11:00	WILSN219	Willard Austin
CRIM400	W03	TR	11:00-12:15	WILSN301	Robert Mutchnick
CRIM400	W04	TR	12:30-1:45	WILSN301	Robert Mutchnick
CRIM401	1	MWF	1:25-2:15	WILSN319	John Lewis
CRIM401	2	MWF	2:30-3:20	WILSN319	John Lewis
CRIM403	1	MWF	9:05-9:55	WILSN301	Randy Martin
CRIM403	2	MWF	11:15-12:05	WILSN301	Randy Martin
CRIM403	W03	MWF	10:10-11:00	WILSN301	Erika Frenzel
CRIM410	1	MWF	12:20-1:10	WILSN301	Mari Pierce
CRIM410	2	MWF	1:25-2:15	WILSN301	Mari Pierce
CRIM450	1	MWF	11:15-12:05	WILSN319	Cathy Marcum
CRIM450	2	MWF	12:20-1:10	WILSN319	Cathy Marcum
CRIM470	W01	MWF	1:25-2:15	WILSN219	Willard Austin

APPENDIX C

Student Attitudes Survey

Part I Directions: Please answer all of the following questions. We ask that you answer each as honestly as possible and remind you that all information you provide is strictly confidential. Please do not skip any of the questions. Unless instructed to circle all that apply, circle one answer only for each question or write your answer in the space provided. If you have any questions, be sure to ask.

1. What is your sex?
   (1) Male
   (2) Female

2. What is your age? _____

3. What is your class level status?
   (1) Freshman
   (2) Sophomore
   (3) Junior
   (4) Senior

4. Are you a criminology major?
   (1) Yes
   (2) No

   If yes, how many criminology courses have you taken? _____

   If no, what is your major? _____

5. Are you a criminology minor?
   (1) Yes
   (2) No

   If yes, how many criminology courses have you taken? _____

6. How would you describe the size of town or geographic region in which you were primarily raised/grew up?
   (1) Rural
   (2) Suburban
   (3) Urban

7. To which political party do you most closely identify with?

(1) Democrat
(2) Independent
(3) Republican
(4) Other (please specify) _____

8. Please place a slash mark on the line below indicating where you believe you fall in terms of your political ideology:

Extremely Liberal _____ Extremely Conservative

9. How would you describe your religious background?

(1) Catholic
(2) Protestant (e.g.,, Baptist, Methodist, Lutheran)
(3) Christian (e.g., Evangelical, Fundamentalist)
(4) Jewish
(5) Muslim
(6) None
(7) Other (please specify) _____

10. Please place a slash mark on the line below indicating how committed you are to your religious beliefs:

Inactive _____ Devout (Strong)

11. On a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 being not fearful at all and 10 being very fearful, how much would you say you fear being the victim of the following crimes? (Place your numerical response in the space provided)

(A) Having your car stolen _____

(B) Having someone break into your house/apartment/dorm _____

(C) Being robbed or mugged on the street _____

(D) Being raped or sexually assaulted _____

(E) Being beaten up or assaulted _____

(F) Being murdered _____

12. Please indicate the number of times, if any, that you were a victim of any of the following crimes within the past year: (Place your numerical response in the space provided)

(A) Someone broke into your house/apartment/dorm _____

(B) Had property stolen from your house/apartment/dorm _____

(C) Someone broke into your car _____

(D) Had your wallet pick-pocketed or purse stolen _____

(E) Someone threatened to beat you up on the street and/or robbed you _____

(F) Someone beat you up in a fight that you did not start _____

Part II Directions: The second part of the survey will ask you to respond to statements that look to assess your opinions regarding criminal behavior and the causes of crime. Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement by circling whether you "strongly agree", "agree", "neither agree nor disagree", "disagree" or "strongly disagree".

(A) A reason we have so much crime these days is because some people turn to crime as a way of achieving the American dream.
1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

(B) People commit crime because they live in bad neighborhoods that are run down and disorganized.
1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

(C) Crime is the product of a person's free will (i.e., people are not forced to commit crimes; it is their choice).
1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

(D) Crime in this country occurs because the criminal justice system does not make the punishment severe enough.
1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

(E) Crime occurs in this country because the American economic system has produced a society where some people have a lot and others have nothing.
1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

(F) People commit crime just because it is part of a culture which has a value system that is different from the rest of society.
1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

(G) Crime is caused by members of a criminal subculture that supports and encourages criminal activity.
1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

(H) Some people learn criminal behavior from imitating family, friends, and others they see doing wrong.
1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

(I) Crime occurs in our society because it provides the only opportunity for some people to succeed.
1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

(J) The main reason why people break the law is that they figure they can get away with it.
1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

(K) Kids are likely to break the law when they do not feel close to their parents or do not care what their parents think of them.
1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

(L) A major reason why we have so much crime these days is because America still has too much poverty, racism, and social injustice.
1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

(M) People are bound to turn to crime when they are taught to want success, money, and fancy cars but then can't get them legally.
1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

(N) Many people commit crimes because they were born that way.
1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

(O) Today's criminals were yesterday's abused children who have been emotionally damaged.
1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

(P) People commit crime when family, friends, or others either approve of the crime or do not discourage their criminal behavior.
1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

(Q) People break the law because our criminal justice system does not punish criminals quickly enough.
1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

(R) People commit crime because they are not intelligent enough to do otherwise.
1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

(S) Many people who commit crimes do so because they can't control their anger and other impulses.
1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

(T) The reason the United States has such a high crime rate is that too many of its people are exploited by a system that makes sure that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.
    1) Strongly Disagree
    2) Disagree
    3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
    4) Agree
    5) Strongly Agree

(U) Kids often become criminals because they live in neighborhoods where it is okay to break the law.
    1) Strongly Disagree
    2) Disagree
    3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
    4) Agree
    5) Strongly Agree

(V) Putting offenders in prison may make them even more criminal because prisons are schools of crime.
    1) Strongly Disagree
    2) Disagree
    3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
    4) Agree
    5) Strongly Agree

(W) People who commit crimes do so because they have emotional problems.
    1) Strongly Disagree
    2) Disagree
    3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
    4) Agree
    5) Strongly Agree

(X) People commit crime because their ties to family, school, or friends are weak or broken.
    1) Strongly Disagree
    2) Disagree
    3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
    4) Agree
    5) Strongly Agree

(Y) Crime is committed by young people who are not involved enough in wholesome activities such as spending time with parents or working on school projects.

1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

(Z) What the criminal justice system does to young people who break the law makes them even more criminal.

1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

(AA) One reason why so many offenders go back into crime is that when they are released from prison they can't get a job because they have a criminal record.

1) Strongly Disagree
2) Disagree
3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
4) Agree
5) Strongly Agree

Part III Directions: The third part of the survey will ask you to respond to statements by placing a slash on the scale indicating your level of agreement with the following items.

For example, if you strongly agree with the statement "the price of gas it too high" then you would respond in the following manner:

Strongly Disagree _____/_____ Strongly Agree

The following statements look to assess your opinions regarding punishment for criminal offenders and criminal offenses:

(A) We are entirely too soft on people convicted of crime.

Strongly Disagree _____ Strongly Agree

(B) Offenders should by harshly punished to make them pay for their crimes.

Strongly Disagree _____ Strongly Agree

(C) We should use the old saying "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" as a guideline for determining punishment for criminals.

Strongly Disagree _____ Strongly Agree

(D) To better control the crime problem, more prisons need to be built.

Strongly Disagree _____ Strongly Agree

(E) Prisons today are much too lenient.

Strongly Disagree _____ Strongly Agree

(F) Using the death penalty helps us to better control crime.

Strongly Disagree _____ Strongly Agree

(G) Prison and jail inmates deserve the humiliation, intimidation, and degradation they may receive.

Strongly Disagree _____ Strongly Agree

(H) Drug dealers should be given life sentences for their crimes.

Strongly Disagree _____ Strongly Agree

(I) A person who sexually abuses children should never be released from prison.

Strongly Disagree _____ Strongly Agree

(J) Probation supervision is a joke.

Strongly Disagree _____ Strongly Agree

(K) A person who has three convictions for very serious crimes (felonies) should receive life without the possibility of parole.

Strongly Disagree _____ Strongly Agree

(L) People choose to commit crimes; therefore, they deserve the punishment they get.

Strongly Disagree _____ Strongly Agree

(M) Harsh and severe punishments are necessary to preserve a sense of justice in our society.

Strongly Disagree _____ Strongly Agree

(N) Speedy, severe, and certain penalties are the only way to prevent people from committing crime.

Strongly Disagree _____ Strongly Agree

(O) Inmates who participate in programs while confined (such as education, counseling, vocational training, etc.) do so only because they are trying to impress the parole board so they can possibly gain an early release.

Strongly Disagree _____ Strongly Agree

APPENDIX D
Access Letter to Professors

Dear Dr./Professor:

My name is Diana Falco and I am a doctoral candidate in the department of criminology at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. I have recently defended my dissertation proposal to research punitiveness among college students. I am currently seeking your assistance in the data collection phase of my dissertation.

The focus of my study is to examine attitudes towards punishment among criminology and non-criminology undergraduate students. This project has been approved by the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at IUP. All student participants will be informed that participation in the study is completely voluntary and their anonymity will be protected.

As a method of improving on previous research studies in this area a probability sampling method will be employed (i.e., stratified cluster sampling). Your current class _____ has been randomly selected from a sampling frame of possible courses to be included in the study. I am seeking your permission to administer a questionnaire to the students enrolled in your course. Due to the random nature of course selection, I would greatly appreciate your assistance and help in this project by allowing me to administer my questionnaire to your class and students.

The process of questionnaire distribution, informed consent, and survey completion is expected to take approximately 20 minutes. I can administer the questionnaire at either the beginning or end of class time. As a Temporary Faculty member at IUP I can appreciate the value of class time and I thank you in advance for considering my request.

I would be happy to provide you with any additional information or answer any questions you may have. Please feel free to contact me or my dissertation chair, Dr. Jamie Martin. I look forward to speaking with you soon.

Respectfully,

Diana L. Falco, M.S.
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Criminology
G-1 McElhaney Hall
441 North Walk
Indiana, PA 15705
Phone: (724) 357-5611
Email: d.l.falco@iup.edu

Jamie Martin, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Criminology
G-1 McElhaney Hall
441 North Walk
Indiana, PA 15705
Phone: (724) 357-
Email: jmartin@iup.edu

APPENDIX E

INFORMED CONSENT

You are invited to participate in this research study. The following information is provided in order to help you to make an informed decision whether or not to participate. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to ask. You are eligible to participate because you are an undergraduate student at IUP and because your class was randomly chosen to participate in the study. Students under the age of 18, however, are not permitted by law to complete this survey. Although the opinions of those under the age of 18 are important it would be appreciated if those under 18 would write "withdraw" on their survey and submit it blank at the same time as the other students who choose to complete the survey.

My name is Diana Falco and I am asking for your participation to help me gather information to complete my dissertation. The purpose of this study is to assess opinions towards crime and punishment among undergraduate college students. Participation in this study will require approximately twenty minutes of your time. Participants in this study will not be subject to risk beyond a minimal level. I am only seeking to discuss participants' opinions on a subject area that is frequently discussed outside of this research environment.

Your participation in this study is **VOLUNTARY**. You are free to decide not to participate in this study or to withdraw at any time. If you choose not to participate you may withdraw at any time by writing "withdraw" on your survey. Upon your request to withdraw, all information pertaining to you will be destroyed. If you choose to participate your identity will remain anonymous. Please do not place your name or any other identifying information on the survey. In addition, your responses will be considered only in combination with those from other participants. The information obtained in the study may be published in scientific journals or presented at scientific meetings but your identity will remain anonymous. Thus, the researcher will be unable to identify which response came from a particular student who completes the survey.

Again, your participation in this study is completely voluntary. Thank you in advance for your consideration and assistance with this project. If you have any questions or comments please feel free to contact me or my dissertation chair, Dr. Jamie Martin.

Diana L. Falco, M.S.
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Criminology
G-1 McElhaney Hall
441 North Walk
Indiana, PA 15705
Phone: (724) 357-5611
Email: d.l.falco@iup.edu

Jamie Martin, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Criminology
G-1 McElhaney Hall
441 North Walk
Indiana, PA 15705
Phone: (724) 357-
Email: jmartin@iup.edu

The Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board has approved this project for the Protection of Human Subjects (Phone: 724-357-7730).

I have read and understand the information on the form and I consent to volunteer to be a subject in this study. I understand that my responses are completely anonymous and that I have the right to withdraw at any time. Completing and returning this survey implies my consent to participate.