



SCHOOL of
GRADUATE STUDIES
EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

East Tennessee State University
Digital Commons @ East
Tennessee State University

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Student Works

8-2009

The Formation of "Outsider" Through Labeling and Sentence Lengths for Immigrants of Hispanic Descent.

Jeremy Jason Smith
East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Smith, Jeremy Jason, "The Formation of "Outsider" Through Labeling and Sentence Lengths for Immigrants of Hispanic Descent." (2009). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 1822. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/1822>

This Thesis - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Works at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact digilib@etsu.edu.

The Formation of "Outsider" Through Labeling
and Sentence Lengths for Immigrants of Hispanic Descent

A thesis

presented to

the faculty of the Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology

East Tennessee State University

In partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

Master of Arts in Criminal Justice and Criminology

by

Jeremy J. Smith

August 2009

Dr. Larry S. Miller, Chair

Dr. Michael C. Braswell

Dr. Steven Ellwanger

Keywords: Insider, Outsider, Labeling, Non-U.S. Individual

ABSTRACT

The Formation of “Outsider” Through Labeling and Sentence Lengths for Immigrants of Hispanic Descent

by

Jeremy Smith

The purpose of this study was to determine if individuals who supported denying citizenship to children of foreign parentage and making English the sole language spoken in the United States held the opinion that a sentence length over 15 years was appropriate for non-U.S. individuals. Other purposes were to determine if individuals with high religiosity or who carried a lethal weapon also held the opinion that a sentence length over 15 years was appropriate for non-U.S. individuals.

Pearson’s Chi-Square was used to determine if a significant relationship existed between the independent variables and the dependent variable. The data indicated that a significant relationship existed between the length of the sentence imposed on non-U.S. individuals by those individuals who supported denying citizenship to children of foreign parentage, who want to make English the sole spoken language, individuals with high religiosity, and individuals who carried a lethal weapon.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis is the culmination of the hard work, dedication, and support of many individuals. First and foremost, I want to thank my family. I want to thank my mom and dad for their love and support. Their encouragement gave me the strength and confidence to pursue my goal of a higher education. The work ethic and discipline that they instilled in me helped in overcoming any obstacle put in front of me. I would like to acknowledge my brother Shane for all lessons we learned together and the fun we had while growing up. These memories will last longer than my lifetime. Knowing that you always have my back helps me face any challenge and any opponent. You kept me going when I felt like stopping, and you always made me laugh when I needed it the most. I love you Bro. I would also like to acknowledge my sister-in-law Christy. She made sure to keep me going when my brother wasn't able to be there, and she kept me grounded.

I want like to thank all the professors in the Criminal Justice Department. Each one of you took an interest in me personally and in my endeavors. You all gave me the opportunity to show what I could do and the knowledge to accomplish any goal. I would especially like to thank Dr. Miller for allowing me to be his graduate assistant. My time in this role was the best 2 years I've had in a long time. Your guidance throughout this process has helped me tremendously. I have learned a lot from my experience and any future research I do will be due to my time as your graduate assistant. To Dr. Braswell, thank you for your help and guidance as well. I have enjoyed getting to know you on both a personal and professional level. To Dr. Ellwanger, I truly appreciate you agreeing to be

on my committee. I know that you are extremely busy and I want to take this opportunity to say, “Thank you.”

To my committee as a whole, your support and assistance during my time as a graduate student has given me the knowledge I will need to pursue any future endeavor. Your hard work and dedication during my 2 years in the graduate program helped keep me focused on completing this thesis. The time and effort that you all put into me is truly appreciated and priceless.

This acknowledgement would not be complete if I didn’t extend a heartfelt “thanks” to my fellow graduate assistants. You all bore with me as I learned to trust and rely on others. I will never forget the fun we had together in that cramped office. Each one of you invited me into your personal lives and allowed me share in all your ups and downs. I know each and everyone of you will be successful in whatever you decide to do. Your friendships mean the world to me. Finally to Marjorie, you made everyday enjoyable. You were always there when I needed you; and I cannot express how much you truly mean to me.

I would also like to acknowledge my friends, both four legged and two legged, at the Washington County and Johnson City Animal Control Center. Everyone made my time there the most enjoyable I ever had. The support I received got me through the low points and made the high points that much more special. Thank you.

CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	3
LIST OF TABLES	9
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	10
Background of the Problem	11
Purpose of Research.....	12
Hypotheses.....	13
Limitations	14
Basic Assumptions.....	14
Definition of Terms.....	15
Labeling.....	15
Non-U.S. Individual.....	15
Insider and Outsider	16
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	17
Labeling Theory	18
Reintegration versus Stigmatizing.....	19
Social Bond.....	21
Societal Influences.....	26
Language.....	27

Religion.....	31
Citizenship.....	33
Safety of “Locals”	36
Looking Out for Community.....	37
Self-Policing	37
Societal Differences	39
Perceptions of Crime and Public Opinion	41
Immigration.....	45
Immigration Control.....	48
Fear.....	51
Security	52
3. METHODOLOGY	55
Procedure for Collecting Data.....	56
Apparatus.....	57
Independent Variables	58
Political Affiliation	58
Denying Citizenship	58
Making English the Sole Spoken Language	59
Religiosity.....	59
Carrying a Lethal Weapon.....	60
Dependent Variable	60
Procedure for Analyzing Data.....	61

4. RESULTS.....	62
Hypotheses.....	62
Recruitment.....	63
Coding of Independent Variables.....	64
Descriptive Statistics.....	65
Examination of Hypotheses.....	67
Hypothesis 1.....	67
Hypothesis 2.....	67
Hypothesis 3.....	69
Hypothesis 4.....	70
Hypothesis 5.....	71
Hypothesis 6.....	72
Summery.....	73
5. CONCLUSION.....	74
Findings.....	75
Denying Citizenship.....	76
Making English the Sole Spoken Language.....	77
Religious Attendance.....	77
Carrying a Lethal Weapon.....	78
Implications.....	79
Recommendations.....	80
Future Research.....	81

REFERENCES.....	83
APPENDIXES	86
Appendix A: Recruitment Letter.....	86
Appendix B: Informed Consent	87
Appendix C: Survey Instrument.....	89
VITA.....	103

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Descriptive Statistics of Participants.....	65
2. Cross-Tabulations for Gender	67
3. Cross-Tabulations for Political Affiliation.....	69
4. Cross-Tabulations for Denying Citizenship.....	70
5. Cross-Tabulations for Making English the Sole Spoken Language	71
6. Cross-Tabulations for Religious Attendance.....	72
7. Cross-Tabulations for Carrying a Lethal Weapon.....	73

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Immigration is an important issue for any society. How society addresses this issue determines who is classified as “insiders” (citizens) and “outsiders” (immigrants). Labeling individuals as “insiders” or “outsiders” determines who can participate in the society’s government. Governmental participation is essential to ensuring one’s beliefs and opinions are taken into account when laws are created and enforced.

The creation of laws is founded on the belief that educated individuals weigh the pros and cons of any issue before deciding on a course of action, and that the decision is weighed with reason and not emotion. According to Vago (2009) the functionalist approach to lawmaking is concerned with how laws emerge. This emergence has its origin in the informal customs of society. Laws are the government’s means of making the informal customs applicable to everyone and enforceable by legal sanctions. “Lawmaking is the restatement of some customs (for example, those dealing with economic transactions and contractual relations, property rights in marriage, or deviant behavior) so that they can be enforced by legal institutions” (Vago, p. 164). Enforcement of law is society’s way of establishing those who are “insiders” and “outsiders.” This is usually done by applying the label “criminal” to those deemed as “outsiders.” This is the central focus of labeling theory- how someone is labeled determines society’s perception of the individual.

Labeling theory proposes that an individual violates a law then is apprehended, prosecuted, convicted, and finally sentenced (labeled). When the individual is officially

labeled by society, the individual is perceived as the label dictates. If the individual is labeled a “thief”, he or she will have a hard time finding employment in the retail industry. Sometimes individuals do not have to be formally labeled for the stigma to be associated with them. These individuals will be perceived in the same manner as those who are officially labeled by the court system. These perceptions by society possibly may lead the labeled individual to seek out others who have been labeled. These individuals then create a subgroup that expounds their own norms and customs. Sometimes these new norms and customs are contrary to those of the larger society. However, individuals or groups are labeled as “outsiders” based on other factors not associated with the legal system.

Background of the Problem

History has shown that when a native population believed that their norms and customs were under pressure from external forces, or when the economic conditions of the society worsened, a group within that society would have been singled out as the sole cause for all social problems. To resolve these problems, societies would place restrictions upon individuals within the targeted group. These restrictions usually limited the individual’s involvement in the society’s government, and by extension the group’s influence on the society’s norms and customs. If the social problems persisted, then the focus of society changed from restricting the targeted group to removing the targeted group.

Removing the targeted group could be done by various methods. The group’s members could be forcefully assimilated into society, which occurred during the Spanish inquisition when the Jewish population was forcefully converted to Catholicism. Mass

deportations may be ordered to remove the targeted group from society. Once the group is no longer within the society, then any influence they may have exercised upon the society was eliminated. In its most extreme form, removal could take the form of genocide- such as that of the Jewish population in Germany during the 1930s and 1940s.

Because Hispanics make up the largest minority bloc as well as the largest immigrant bloc this group has the potential of being singled out as the cause for the social problems within the United States. Laws may be enacted that restrict the involvement and influence of Hispanics within American society. If the Hispanic population is continually targeted as the cause for the social problems in the United States, then other measures to restrict the population's influence may be seen as appropriate. By studying how citizens within the society view the Hispanic population, a determination can be made as to the most effective means for resolving the immigration issue.

Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this study was to determine if individuals who supported denying citizenship to children whose parents were not already citizens of the United States held the opinion that sentences over 15 years were adequate for individuals who are not citizens of the United States. Other purposes of the study are to determine if individuals with high religiosity and who support making English the sole language of the United States held the opinion that sentence lengths over 15 years were adequate for individuals who are not citizens of the United States. A final purpose of the study was to determine if gender, political affiliation, and carrying of a lethal weapon influenced opinions regarding sentence lengths for individuals who are not citizens of the United States.

Hypotheses

Based upon the literature, the following hypotheses were formulated:

1. Males support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than Females.
2. Conservatives support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than individuals of other political affiliations.
3. Individuals who support denying citizenship to children of foreign parentage although the children were born in the United States support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than individuals opposed to the denial of citizenship.
4. Individuals who believe that English should be the sole language of the United States support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than individuals opposed to making English the official language.
5. Individuals who attend religious services more frequently support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than individuals who do not frequently attend religious services.
6. Individuals who carry a lethal weapon support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than individuals who do not carry a weapon.

In order to test these hypotheses, the study used a survey format for data collection. The decision to use survey format over other forms of data collection was due to its compatibility with the internet. The internet was preferred because this medium allowed the respondent to determine when and where he or she wanted to participate. The internet further protected the respondent's identity because neither the researcher nor other respondents could physically view others taking the survey. The freedom of the

respondent to decide when, where, and how to take the survey was believed to place the respondent more at ease than he or she would be in a classroom setting; and hopefully generate more truthful responses.

Limitations

Every effort was made to make the study as inclusive as possible, but the study does have its limitations. The study was conducted using the student body of only one university. The university is of moderate size, located in the foothills of the Southern Appalachian Mountains, and services the surrounding counties. A lack of stratification exists and the university is not representative of all universities. Other limitations are the gender and race ratios. The study had predominantly white female respondents.

The use of an internet survey is limited by the number of respondents who received the recruitment e-mail and decided to participate in the survey. Another limitation was missing data. Some participants decided to skip specific questions or they neglected to finish the survey. A final limitation was response rate. Some potential respondents decided not to participate in the survey from the onset.

Basic Assumptions

Some of the basic assumptions of the study are that individuals who are not citizens of the United States will be labeled as “outsiders” due to their language and citizenship status. Individuals with high religiosity will see the commission of a crime by an individual who does not have citizenship as requiring a sentence length over 15 years. These same individuals may follow the Conservative ideology. Conservatives will hold the ideology that individuals who are undocumented are “illegal” and already criminals. This

may lead those with a conservative ideology in to supporting sentence lengths over 15 years. Also, as the protectors of society, males will feel the need to protect society from any external influence, especially by non-U.S. individuals. A final assumption of the study is that individuals who carry a lethal weapon, any weapon that can take a human life, will be fearful of the unknown. This fear will translate into longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals because these individuals exemplify the “unknown.” This “unknown” is assumed to be because many non-U.S. individuals potentially speak a different language other than the one used by many within the native populace.

Definition of Terms

Labeling

Labeling referred to the classification of an individual or group based on one or more characteristics that have been lawfully prohibited by society and used as a means to differentiate the labeled individual or group from the larger society. The label then became the primary means by which the public formed their perceptions of the labeled population.

Non-U.S. Individual

Non-U.S. individual referred to anyone who was not a legally recognized citizen of the United States (U.S.). This did not include those individuals who held dual-citizenships in which one is for the United States of America. The term also extended to include the languages, cultures, and other beliefs not predominately associated with the United States. Non-U.S. individuals therefore encompassed those characteristics that are used as common identifiers- language, religion, and citizenship.

Insider and Outsider

An “insider” was someone who could participate in society based on certain criteria that made him or her acceptable. These criteria may have been the individual’s lineage, language, religion, or even the territory where he or she was born. An “outsider” was anyone who failed to meet any of these criteria. Under the functionalist view, the “outsider” may have been the focus of legislation in order to protect the “insiders” from any ideas that ran contrary to society’s customs.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Before the Classical School of Criminology, crime was viewed through a spiritual lens. Criminals were “Godless”, possessed by “evil” spirits leading them to commit crimes. Many moral violations of Christianity become legal violations because many believed committing a moral violation victimized both society and God. The associated punishments usually entailed some form of torture that allowed those accused to confess their sins, cleanse their immortal soul, appease God’s displeasure with the society, and satisfy the society’s desire for justice. Because God and society were victims, every punishment was designed to allow God the opportunity to intervene. The spiritual view relied on the supernatural to explain criminal behavior. Classical theorists however viewed crime through a philosophical lens.

“Classical theory was developed in reaction to the harsh, corrupt, and often arbitrary nature of the legal system in the 1700s” (Cullen & Agnew, 2006, p. 19). Classical theory argued that individuals had free-will, were rational, and chose actions that gave them the most pleasure. Individuals, therefore, committed crime because the pleasure obtained from the crime outweighed the pain associated with the punishment. “Classical theorists argue that people will be deterred from crime if the pain associated with punishment outweighs the pleasure associated with crime” (Cullen & Agnew, p. 20). This philosophical outlook on crime would later be challenged by Caesar Lombroso and other Positivist theorists.

Caesar Lombroso, who was heavily influenced by Charles Darwin's *The Origin of Species* (1859), felt that the criminal was atavistic- an evolutionary throwback. Caesar Lombroso (1876), as cited by Cullen and Agnew (2006) on page 27, stated that "...criminals...exhibited numerous anomalies in the face, skeleton, and various psychic and sensitive functions, so that they strongly resemble primitive races." Therefore, these physical traits could be used to determine an individual's propensity to crime. This approach transforms the human from a creation of an "almighty" to another animal specie.

"According to evolutionary biology, humans are animals subject to laws of nature like all other animals" (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1994, p. 47). If humans are subject to the laws of nature like any animal, then no legal restriction will deter criminal activity because the "human animal" would be acting on instinct. Therefore one's safety, and that of loved ones, is left to the individual's ability to fend off any attack. Basically, like any animal species, the familial unit's survival depends on how well the unit's "protectors"- with humans either the police or the family patriarch or matriarch- defend their territory. One way this defense is mounted is through the employment of labels.

Labeling Theory

"The labeling perspective was important to the development of criminology as an empirical science because it fostered an appreciative stance toward offenders...the labeling perspective opened many eyes to the way offenders were choosing beings..."

(Braithwaite, 1989, p. 7). Labeling, as a theory, became popular during the 1960s; the theory "focuses on the manner in which society defines and creates deviance"(Raybeck, 1988, p.371). The Civil Rights movement, Vietnam Conflict, and a deepening distrust of

the government lead to a surge of support for labeling theory. The individual's actions, biology, or environment were no longer the main focus; instead it was the government's actions, or more appropriately their reactions, towards the individual's deviant acts.

Lemert (1951) saw the effects of labeling in two ways: primary and secondary deviance. With primary deviance, an individual commits some type of deviant act first and is then officially labeled by a judge after apprehension. The label causes the individual to commit more criminal acts associated with the label. The individual once again goes before a judge who reinforces the previous label with harsher punishments.

Secondary deviance occurs after the label is applied. No actual commission of a deviant act is required for someone to receive a deviant label under the concept of secondary deviance. Someone sees the individual associating with a criminal crowd and labels the individual according to his or her associates' criminal behavior. Once this labeling occurs, the individual will commit a deviant act as a reaction to his or her unjust label and as a means of retaliating to those who unjustly labeled him or her. These deviant acts, according to Braithwaite (1989), are what results when shaming is stigmatizing.

Reintegration versus Stigmatization

To understand how reintegration works we first need to define what is meant by "shaming." In his book *Crime, Shame, and Reintegration* Braithwaite (1989) cites Dienstbier et al. (1975) and French (1985) on page 57 when establishing his definition of shaming: "Shaming...follows transgressions with expressions of the lower esteem the offense has produced in the eyes of external referents like parents and neighbors..."

Shaming, therefore, is a physical manifestation of the emotional response to an

individual's transgression. This manifestation (shaming) is designed to elicit some form of regret within the transgressor. Depending on how this manifestation is used determines if the shaming is disintegrative (stigmatizing) or re-integrative. Because many use the words behavior and action interchangeably, a distinction must be made. Braithwaite (1989) argues that behavior is nothing more than physical; whereas action is meaningful due to the significance given by society (p. 2). Society's perception is what determines how harmful the act is to society.

Most children are taught not to fight, yet we as a society establish certain criteria where fighting is permitted. Children who fight to protect themselves or to protect another child are perceived as "standing up for what is right", whereas those who fight for personal gain are perceived as "bullies." Children are also taught that they do not want to be classified as a "bully", and this is reinforced by publicly shaming (punishing) those children who are labeled "bullies." This shaming usually follows the format of the teacher admonishing the "bully" in front of the class, or privately, an open apology by the bully to the victim; and some privilege of the "bully's" being taken away. As with society, the teacher had two options- either punish the offender in a manner that makes him or her feel like an "outsider" (stigmatizing) or in a manner that helps them reestablish ties to the class (reintegration).

In the same manner, society determines if their punishments are to be stigmatizing or re-integrative. Stigmatization occurs when the shaming is done for no other reason than to punish the offender as much as possible. This type of shaming can result in a complete rejection of the offender by society. By completely rejecting the offender,

society severs all ties with them and turns the offender into an “outcast.” The offender is now wondering aimlessly through society which propels them to seek out others they believe to be akin to themselves. Their search leads them to individuals who have neutralized the stigmatizing effect by rejecting society and accepting the label as something positive as well as accepting the offender without precondition. This new found acceptance helps to further alienate the offender from society; thus increasing his or her chances of recidivating.

Reintegration, however, allows the “outcast” to still feel a connection to the larger society. This connection prevents him or her from seeking out deviant subcultures which lowers his or her likelihood of recidivating. Through reintegration, the connection is maintained because both the offender and the victim or society are willing to “forgive and forget.” The offender seeks the forgiveness from the victim or society who in turn grants the offender his or her request. The offender is reaccepted by society and allowed to fully participate as if no violation occurred. This ability to reaccept the offender prevents them from violating social norms in the future by maintaining a bond with society. For this preventive measure to occur, reintegration relies on Hirsch’s (1969) social bond theory.

Social Bond

Social bond theory, according to Winslow and Zhang (2008), takes the view that individuals engage in delinquent activity because they have a lack of attachment (bonding) to their community (society). Wolf as cited by Winslow and Zhang states that social bonding is founded on four premises: attachment, commitment, involvement, belief. Each premise focuses on a different relationship between the individual and society (p. 148).

Attachment, viewed in an altruistic sense, argues that an individual refrains from delinquent activity when he or she has an emotional attachment to the feelings and opinions of others. It is the *fear* of breaking this attachment (disappointing those whom they have a connection) that prevents any delinquent activity on part of the individual.

Commitment revolves around the individual's social investments in society. The more social investment the individual has in the society, the less likely he or she will engage in delinquent activity. The CEO of a Fortune 500 company will be less likely to rob a liquor store at one o'clock in the morning than an individual who is unemployed and in need of money. The CEO is argued to have more invested in society than the unemployed individual.

Involvement is the frequency and duration of someone's commitment to society. Someone's involvement may range from having to satisfy work hours, volunteering with a community organization, or singing in the local church choir. This premise argues that individuals who are more involved within their community have little idle time to engage in any form of delinquency.

Belief is the acceptance of society's goals and the prescribed means of attaining them. Although individuals within the society may believe that the acquisition of wealth is a laudable goal, he or she may feel that any avenue that leads to achieving this goal is acceptable. Many individuals would frown upon someone killing his or her spouse to acquire wealth through life insurance, but some may be able to rationalize an individual marrying and then divorcing to acquire a part of someone's wealth.

With reintegration the "other" is brought back into society by the reestablishment

of each premise of the social bond theory. First, the label is disregarded and the former “other” is emotionally reaccepted by society. This emotional acceptance reestablishes the former “other’s” attachment to the larger collective. Second, his or her old social status is returned to reestablish his or her commitment to the society, and third, reestablishing involvement occurs through some form of community service to be fulfilled. Finally they are re-instilled with the society’s core beliefs which finalizes the “other’s” social bond to society.

Lemert (1951), Braithwaite (1989), Tannenbaum (1938) focused on how the label affected the individual’s criminal propensities. The primary obstacle with labeling theory is that it relies on the individual accepting the label and acting accordingly. The label cannot be the cause of someone’s criminality if he or she does not accept the label’s significance. However, when society accepts the label as representative of the individual, or group, then the label will be efficacious.

At any university, and in any department, there are professors who students want to learn from and professors who students would prefer to avoid. This is due to deindividuation. Deindividuation is “...a psychological state in which individual identity merges with that of the group... [and] is enhanced by uniforms, banners, slogans, and other devices that amplify one’s sense of affiliation with a group” (Cassel & Bernstein, 2001, p. 127).

Professors who demand that students read the assigned literature, write papers, participate in class discussions, and take cumulative exams are labeled as “hard”, “tough”, “demanding”, or other negative connotations used to reflect the student population’s

displeasure with the professor. Professors who are the opposite, allow for makeup tests to be administered, or even excused are labeled as “lenient”, “fair”, or an “easy ‘A’.”

Although the professors may not accept these labels imposed upon them by the students; if the student body accepts them as true, then the perceptions of incoming students about the professors will already be formed. These students will try to adjust their schedules to enroll in the class of the “lenient” professor due to nothing more than their acceptance of a label imposed by previous members of the student body. This occurs within national societies as well.

After World War II many politicians in the United States had to devise a label that would help elevate the culture above others by proclaiming the values they find deplorable. The label needed to represent everything opposite that of American values and elicit the greatest emotional acceptance from the citizenry. The label “communist” embodied this very concept. Although many who were accused of being communist denied (refused to accept) the label, but their careers were finished because the citizenry accepted the label as true.

Reviewing Roark et al. (1998) one finds that after World War II, many Americans were afraid of a Russian invasion primarily through the ideology of Communism. Executive Order 9835, issued in 1947, required that all government employees be investigated for communist leanings. In 1950, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy gained the undivided attention of the American populace when he claimed he had in his possession a list of Communists working in the State Department. What followed was absolute hysteria and an real world example of the devastating effect of labeling.

Roark et al. (1998) relates that Stephen Brunauer, in the 1920s, once belonged to a Communist youth party. He and his wife knew and associated with individuals who held sympathetic views to the Communist Party. The Brunauers were accused of being communists, but no evidence arose to support the government's claim. "In 1951, the navy suspended Stephen Brunauer on security grounds. Rather than contesting the suspension, he resigned. Esther...endured two more hearings, in which she was accused of 'close and habitual association' with her husband" (Roark et al., pp. 1045-1046). The habitual associations with her husband established Esther Brunauer as a communist sympathizer.

Labeling, then, creates the notion that someone is an "outsider," a threat to be defended against in which laws are created to do just this. These laws will be designed to restrict the "outsider's" ability to influence any part of the larger society. These extra restrictions increase the likelihood that some type of violation will occur. Because violations will be detected easier, this creates the perception of high criminality within the population. More legislation will be proposed further restricting the population's movements and enhancing the probability that a violation will be detected even further. The labeled population is then subjugated to a subclass and monitored for the protection of society. Therefore, "[o]ne result of the labeling process is often to place deviants in the position of 'outsiders' where their ability to interact with and influence the wider society is limited" (Raybeck, 1988, p. 372). Labels follow an evolutionary process that centers around the label's significance. The literal meaning of "immigrant"- someone moving from a foreign land- remains the same, but it is the significance that has evolved.

Societal Influences

Family ties are the first means by which individuals come to understand the concepts of “insider” and “outsider.” Children are taught that aunts, uncles, grandparents, and cousins are all family (insiders) and everyone else are “outsiders.” This distinction helps the child determine who to trust and who to avoid; thus protecting the child, assuring the family’s future lineage, and maintaining family unity. This can be seen in the small tribal units of hunters and gathers. Tribes are extensions of someone’s own family and many are related by blood. Individuals who are deemed as “outsiders” by the tribe are “...excluded from full social participation...” (Raybeck, 1988, p. 375). Excluding individuals from tribal participation protects it from those external influences that could weaken or damage the tribes unity.

In 1962, Colin Turnbull gathered evidence on the Pygmy BaMbuti tribe from northeastern Zaire. As cited by Raybeck (1988), Turnbull described the various acts perpetrated by tribal members and the associated labels imposed upon them. One of these examples was an incest violation. After committing the violation the culprit fled from the tribe for a day. Later he was reaccepted (reintegrated) by the tribe with full societal participation (citizenship) and later become one of the tribes respected members. If this crime occurred in modern industrialized societies the culprit would not have returned after only one day, and he or she would likely be shamed (stigmatized) for his or her entire life. The difference between the two societies is that hunting and gathering societies cannot afford to have members banished for long periods of time. Each member within the tribe is interdependent on the other members. This even includes the tribe’s “outcasts.” A tribe

is not only interdependent on its members, but upon the land as well.

The evolution from a hunting and gathering lifestyle to an agricultural one relies heavily on the region where the small band decides to settle. When nomadic individuals arrived at the southern region of Asia, Asia Minor, and the lower parts of Western Europe, they encountered a vast body of water sprinkled with inhabitable islands, some wild game, and a little farmable land.

The Aegean Sea developed into the lifeblood for all Greek cities. To eat, these nomadic individuals had to learn to fish; communication with neighbors was dependent upon the ability to sail; and, this new found skill allowed these small settlements to engage in industry with others. This interaction caused these former “outsiders” to view others based on a different set of criteria and form new definitions of “insider” and “outsider.” This new criterion now relied on regionalism instead of bloodlines, and “[i]n the smallest of them there was soon developed a close unity around a central town- Argos, Sparta, Athens, and later Thebes- cities [that] all played a considerable part in Greek destinies.” (Hatzfeld, 1966, p. 4). No longer was someone known by his or her “clan”, but instead he or she was first and foremost an Athenian, Spartan, Thebean, etc. Due to the extraordinary characteristics of Ancient Greece’s geography, the Greek culture and language was allowed to prosper.

Language

In 549 BC a revolution broke out in the region behind what was at the time the Lydian empire. This revolution displaced the Median empire with that of a Persian causing an uprising and leading Croesus to believe the time was right for an invasion of

the new Persian Empire. Croesus invaded Persia and found himself at the mercy of the Persian king. Ironically, the Greek language had been diffused into Persia throughout the previous centuries, but the Greeks and Persians could not comprehend the commonalities between their two languages. This inability may have been the result of Greek language evolving over several generations. Looking at the influence that Spanish and English have on each other may help in understanding this potential evolutionary process.

Before the cultural upheaval of the 1960s many Mexican immigrants were confined to the West and South sides of San Antonio. During this period the Spanish language spoken remained relatively the same as that spoken in Mexico. After the 1960s when other communities were opened up to these immigrants, government positions began to become available and a Mexican-American middle class started thriving, the Spanish language started changing and taking on some semantic characteristics of English and incorporating them.

This incorporation of English semantics into Spanish still follows some grammatical guidelines of the Spanish language even though some speakers will disregard these rules entirely. Garcia (2001) points out on page 307 that:

Silva-Corvalán and others have suggested that later-generation bilingual speakers often change the co-occurrence rules ignoring semantic restrictions...resulting in a gradual loss of constraints and an expansion of semantic contexts in which the form may occur.

Those Mexican-Americans who were born in the United States to parents, who

themselves, were born in the United States start to change the lexicon and dialect of the Spanish he or she speaks. This change can potentially lead to the speaker's inability to speak his or her country's native Spanish. As more and more immigrants start to move into the same regions once occupied by these original immigrants, they bring with them the strict monolingual Spanish spoken in the Latin American countries. However; the Spanish spoken by the second- to fourth-generation Mexican-Americans is resistant to any influence of their native language.

Garcia (2001) found in the San Antonio sample that many third- and fourth-generation Mexican-Americans have to rely on various lexical resources from both languages to communicate. This demonstrates that as new generations are exposed to a bilingual system their native tongue is subjugated, or even lost, due to the influence of the host-country's native language. "These fourth-generation San Antonio speakers can be differentiated on the basis of fluency in Spanish, as characterized by hesitation phenomena, idiosyncratic lexicon, frequency of repairs, and violation of core grammar rules..." (Garcia, p. 308). This may have possibly occurred due to code-switching.

Code-switching, in essence, requires an individual to not only understand the grammatical characteristics of both his or her native language and the host language; but possibly be able to incorporate these characteristics into fairly grammatically correct sentences. Pfaff (1979) cites both Elías-Olivares and Sobin in noting that "...etymologically English verbs are frequently given Spanish tense/aspect and subject-agreement inflection, but English adjectives are never inflicted for gender or number" (Pfaff, p. 298). Pfaff also noted on page 298 that Sobin suggested that the term *tofudo*,

meaning “tough”, could not occur with an underlying adjective.

Unlike English, Spanish requires that all words agree with the subject in respect to both number and gender. This differentiation allows the Spanish speaker to omit the subject in certain instances. Also, the requirement that English verbs hold to this agreement may reveal that the speaker is trying to retain some aspect of his or her native language. This desire to retain a portion of one’s native language may be the result of the interactions the individual has with the host-country’s citizens. Whenever people interact with each other, especially along a national border, invariably they will begin to mix their languages in order to communicate.

Eddington (1995) tested the hypothesis that common phonological alternations play a vital role in how a native speaker views the morpheme (the smallest meaningful unit in grammar) between two words. “Central to this goal of speaker-oriented research, is an experiment designed to determine whether linguistically naive (sic) Spanish speakers treat the alternations which have received attention in the literature, differently than they do suppletive (sic) alternations” (Eddington, p. 875).

Eddington (1995) concluded that “the search for generalizations represents an attempt to codify phonological systems, which exist in the minds of language speakers” (pg. 883). Although not conclusive in itself, the study brought to light the possibility that a relationship existed between the generalizations found in a language and the speaker’s intimate knowledge of his or her own language. This modification of a language possibly occurs due to the influence of the host-country’s native language.

“When two forms converge semantically, the variability between the two may

eventually result in the loss of one in the language or dialect” (Garcia, 2001, p.300). It is unavoidable that this loss will occur. The acceptance of changes in sentence structure, grammatical uses, and even word meanings push this evolution of a language system.

Religion

Athenian plays rarely compared the religions of the Persians and Greeks in Athenian Tragedies; even though the two were complete opposites. It must be noted that religion in antiquity was not perceived in the same manner it is today. Religion was used as a way to appease the gods and not as a means for salvation. Also, many ancient religions were polytheistic and adaptable and the religion themselves had many gods and goddesses; a practitioner of one could find a similar god to the deity he or she worshipped within another religion. This allowed for religious ideas to be cross-fertilized and accepted without either religion being viewed as deteriorating or being inadequate. This was pointed out in Book I; 131 in Herodotus’ *The Histories*:

...Images and temples and alters they (the Persians) do not consider it lawful to erect, nay they even charge with folly those who do these things; and this as it seems to me, because they do not account the gods to be in the likeness of men, as do the Hellenes.

Many scholars use Aeschylus’ plays and their portrayal of the Persian religion to demonstrate how much this quote by Herodotus had on Aeschylus. First, the Aeschylus’ “barbarians”, like the Persians, worshipped the four elements: earth, wind, fire, and water. Second, Aeschylus alludes to a daimon that was malevolent towards the Persians. However, because the Greeks believed in daimones as well this may not be solely a “barbarous” belief. Third is Aeschylus’ use of the raising of Darius’ ghost, which many

scholars believe appealed to Aeschylus' "oriental" audience due to its mysticism. The fourth point, although ambiguous, some scholars put forth is the notion of king worship.

Olmstead, as quoted by Hall (1989), states "the queen is a wife of the Persian god and also mother of a god...When dead, her husband rules the underworld gods; no clearer proof could be found that the Persians had adopted king worship from their predecessors" (p. 91). Hall disagrees and points out that the Persians did not practice king worship.

Darius, according to Hall, used propaganda when comparing his reign, aided by his six conspirators, to that of the god Ahuramazda and his six Amesa Spentas.

Bassarae, Aeschylus' second play demonstrates Hall's (1989) point that Aeschylus did not differentiate between the two religions. In *Bassarae* Aeschylus wrote of Orpheus' decimation as a result of his refusal to accept or secede from the Dionysiac religion. Orpheus' refusal was based on his preference for the sun cult, a religion that is viewed by many Greeks as a religion for "barbarians" and primitive man. Human sacrifice was used by the Athenian playwrights as a means of differentiation between Athenians and "barbarians." Only the most barbaric of civilizations in Athenian tragedies performed human sacrifice. This last push by the playwrights, although it cannot be determined if it was voluntary, helped establish the perception of what a "barbarian" exemplified for many Athenians. The final meaning signified someone who speaks unintelligibly and is an emotional coward with an insatiable bloodlust.

Citizenship

No society, especially in today's world, is purely autonomous but relies on goods or services provided by other societies. This interdependence on other societies may result in the establishment of a colony by one society in order to gain direct access to the needed goods or services. The members of these colonies may have been constantly exposed to the region's "barbarian" culture. Depending on where one was located within the colony may have determined the amount of exposure one had with the region's "barbarians."

The early settlers formed what Cunliffe (1988) classified in his book *Greeks, Romans, and Barbarians: Spheres of Interaction* as the Inner Core. The Inner Core produced nothing of substance but held all religious festivals, was the "seat of government", maintained the colonies central market place, and consumed the vast majority of raw materials. The Inner Core was a possible clone of the home city-state. Laying on the edge of the Inner Core would have been the Inner Periphery.

This area produced more food and materials than it needed so that the materials could be sent to the Inner Core and possible back to the home city-state. The Inner Periphery was established between the Inner Core and the Outer Periphery (the area that bordered the "barbarian" land). The Inner Periphery was usually where the colony's manpower was acquired. The Outer Periphery, however, was where the two cultures meshed and possibly evolved. The Outer Periphery, having the most exposure to the "barbarian" lands beyond the colony may have acted as a type of filter. Certain elements of the "barbarian" culture, deemed non-detrimental to the colony's norms and customs,

may have passed through the Outer Periphery into the interior of the colony. This diffusion of culture may possibly influenced the colonists' offspring for generations.

Polanyi, as cited by Cunliffe (1988), coined three definitions to describe how two different cultural groups would have conducted daily transactions. First is the *gift trade*; here the gift "...links the partners in relationships of *reciprocity*...the *goods* are treasures, objects of elite circulation..." (Cunliffe, pp. 4-5 emphasis in original). This type of trade would be very useful for smaller colonies and those most recently established. The different zones would be superimposed upon each other allowing for contact to be made and hopefully guest-friendships formed; reinforcing the "Outer Periphery." Larger colonies would have been a good avenue for individuals on the Outer Periphery to establish friendship ties with those in the Barbarian Periphery.

The next form of trade was *administrative (treaty) trade*. The main feature here is the government either directly engages in trade or sponsors trade between the two cultures. This sponsorship causes a standardization of weights and measures so that neither side involved feels cheated. This would have been the most likely form of trade established for medium sized colonies or for those living within the Inner Periphery of larger settlements.

The final form was *market trade*; which would have been found in the Inner Core, and is predominately reserved for larger settlements. This market system is a combination of all the others. After some time, administrative trade aides a colony in becoming an autonomous city-state. This autonomy and mixing of different cultures has significant repercussions in the mother city-state.

This constant exposure between the two cultures may have created a mixed culture. One that held both Greek and “barbaric” parentage. This meshing of the two cultures may have led to a change in who was considered “insiders” and “outsiders.” This mixing of the two cultures may have led to Pericles’ law of 451/0 that mandated any Athenian citizen to prove both parents were of Athenian stock and of the citizenry in order for the individual to obtain the benefits of Athenian citizenship. Failing to prove one’s “purity” would result in losing all rights and privileges associated with being a citizen. This was an attempt to dwindle the citizens who could receive compensation for government work and aid.

The labels “insider” and “outsider” helped differentiate who is able to fully participate in the society. A citizen of any nation is afforded all rights and privileges associated with citizenship of that nation. Those who are transplanted can apply for and obtain citizenship that will grant them all rights and privileges associated with being a citizen. This does not mean that they will be fully accepted by those citizens who were born within the nation’s borders. In Ancient Greece, an individual born in Sparta was a Spartan citizen his or her entire life; even if he or she was raised in Athens from infancy.

This same sentiment came to light in a study conducted by Walklate (1998). She looked at two areas called Oldtown and Bankhill (the local citizenry asked that the actual names remain anonymous). The demographics of both areas was virtually identical. They had a high concentration of white, working-class citizens with similar unemployment rates. “Perhaps as a result of the area’s strong working-class make-up Oldtown was always seen as a ‘rough’ area...After the docks closed the area gained a reputation for crime and

disorder” (Walklate, p. 554). The study revealed three interesting aspects of Oldtown: the labeling of who is and is not a “local”; concept that everyone is out for the community’s better interests; and self-policing.

Safety of “Locals”

People tend to remember the neighborhood they grew up in. They remember their neighbors, other children, and local businesses and authorities. The neighborhood became a defining characteristic to determine who was a “local” (insider). Individuals who are “locals” may be granted more leniency than individuals who are considered outsiders. Walklate (1998) found that this attitude was held by some established residents in Oldtown.

One middle-aged male who resided in the area for 29 years viewed Oldtown as safe for “locals” but not for strangers. Another middle-aged man stated that he knew the local criminals and youth within Oldtown; he lived there for 35 years himself. An elderly female who resided in the area for 11 years believed that it was safe for locals because they knew each other and what the other is capable of. Interestingly this same view on one’s safety depending on their residency of Oldtown was offered by a police officer; “...It’s just like one big family, well not family as such, but one tight community. A clan. That’s it” (Walklate, 1998, p. 556). The concept the officer was trying to get across was that the community acted like a small tribal unit of hunters and gathers. Stealing was one of the “tribe’s” avenues for acquisition of goods. As with a traditional hunter and gatherer society, it was unproductive for a local (insider) to steal from other locals of Oldtown (the tribe).

Looking Out for Community

Some working-class areas have a preconceived notion that the thieves and other criminals within the community go outside the neighborhood to perpetrate their crimes. This was the same sentiment with some residents in Oldtown. According to Walklate (1998), a local female stated that “[c]riminals live here and rob elsewhere” (p.557). Some may feel there exists an altruistic connection to one’s neighborhood. A conversation between three Oldtown teenagers was reported by Walklate (1998) that demonstrates this point.

Sabine : No, but people who live down Oldtown don’t nick
out of Oldtown.

Erica : Look after their own.

Sonya : They look out for each other.

Sabine : Someone from Oldtown won’t nick off off [sic]
someone from Oldtown. They’d probably go down [to]
Bankhill to do it like Bankhill would come down here.

Erica : They don’t mug anyone, they do big firms.

They’re not going to lose owt [sic] are they (p. 557).

Self-Policing

Some small communities, like Oldtown, handle a violation of the community’s norms and customs informally. This idea of self-policing is felt by both the police and the community. An Oldtown police officer offered Walklate his opinion. The officer opined that the community has always been self-policing, and this self-policing has helped and

hurt the community. The police officer offered the community's dislike of vandalism and other crimes within their neighborhoods as an example. According to Walklate (1998), the officer felt that self-policing helps Oldtown because the community will take care of most criminal violations, especially minor infractions, without informing the police. This helps to alleviate some of the pressure off of the local authorities allowing them to focus on major crimes.

The officer feels that it hurts Oldtown because the younger generation is taught the old values of protecting one's community, friends, and the idea of "taking care of business." An elderly female living in the area revealed to Walklate (1998) how being labeled an "outsider" affects the manner in which the neighborhood residents "take care of business." According to Walklate (1998) the elderly woman stated: "...I've heard of a case...where a lad had broken these pensioner's windows and he'd ran off. Now a couple of people found out who he was, dragged him back to this house, and asked if it was him. When he said it was, they made him apologies, [and] gave him a thump..." (p.558). The elderly woman went on to state that the boy was threatened with physical violence if he ever returned to that location. She even hints at her acceptance of the actions taken because she wanted Walklate to know that the boy never returned. In neighborhoods, small communities, and even small societies the handling of offenders through informal means are effective measures of social control. This does not mean for larger, heterogeneous societies that informal punishments are adequate of maintaining social order.

Societal Differences

Smaller societies, it is argued, are better adapted at dealing with crime in an informal manner because they rely on reintegration as the basis for their punishments. Larger societies, however, have more members to accommodate. This leads to creating punishments that are meant to deter future offenders. These punishments tend to be stigmatizing in their application. In essence, a larger society must rely on some form of “banishment” in order to maintain social order. This “banishment” may be for short periods of time like an overnight jail sentence to a few months in jail. The “banishment” may be for longer periods like years of incarceration to executing the offender. The rationale for the difference is that citizenry in smaller societies know each other more intimately; whereas those in larger societies may be fortunate to know their neighbor.

Some in western societies may support the statement that modern societies are too heterogeneous and complex for reintegration to work. Japan, a modern country itself, still relies on its traditional form of shaming to punish offenders. Japan’s shaming process is based on reintegrating the offender. “The fact that convicted American offenders are more than twenty times as likely to be incarcerated as convicted Japanese offenders says something about the respective commitments of these societies to outcasting versus reintegration” (Braithwaite, 1989, p. 63).

This difference between the two cultures may be attributed to whom the recipient is for the societal goals. In United States, the recipient of the society’s goals is the individual. The American Dream centers on personal wealth and happiness. American society founded on this belief, and that individual liberty is the most important aspect of

someone's life. The culture within the United States relies heavily on punishing those who deviate from the prescribed goals and means. Japanese culture on the other hand centers around the collective. What is best for the collective sometimes takes precedent over the individual's liberties. "When an individual is shamed in Japan, the shame is often born by the collectivity to which the individual belongs as well- the family, the company, the school- particularly by the titular head of the collectivity" (Braithwaite, 1989, p.63). It is not unusual for the CEOs of companies to resign in "disgrace" for the action(s) of junior employees, a defective product that might have caused bodily harm, or event that brought shame to the company. The reason why the punishments in the two societies are different may be attributed to the manner in which each society looks at "human nature."

Japanese culture perceives the "human" as inherently good; someone who can be lead astray to commit deplorable acts. Although their actions may have caused significant harm, they are still capable of reentering society as law abiding. Wagatsuma and Rosett (1986), as cited by Braithwaite (1989), see apology as a central characteristic to the reintegration of the offender. Criminals are not seen as acting under their own devices, but controlled by an external force that can be isolated. This ability to isolate the external force enables the offender to reenter society without guilt (p. 64).

The culture within the United States views the individual as hedonistic and at times damnable, especially after the commission of a heinous crime. According to the American perspective, those who choose to commit a crime are intentionally disassociating themselves from the larger collective (society). To protect society, laws and punishments must be enacted to limit the pleasure gained from committing certain acts. The limitation

may take the form of an extensive sentence length that separates the individual from the rest of society. This allows a society to degrade the offender both formally and informally. Society formally degrades the offender by labeling them as “criminals”, sometimes by the specific crime they committed; then informally degrades them by forcing the offender’s friends, family, and other intimate associates to distance themselves for fear of having the offender’s label indirectly imposed upon them. Any support offered by an offender’s friends or family members, which ironically is what American society values in “true” friends and family, leads to the supporter being perceived as capable of, if not already committing, the same acts as the offender; which leads to the supporter becoming an outcast themselves.

Society’s acceptance of the label’s significance further subjugates the labeled individual. A citizenry that believes (accepts a label) someone is a child molester, will act accordingly to protect the children of the community. The perceived child molester will be watched vigilantly, shunned at social gatherings, have every action scrutinized for perceived deviant behavior, and have this behavior counted as evidence of their “perverted” nature- no matter how trivial. The individual is therefore successfully labeled as a threat, shamed in a stigmatizing manner, and forced to either move from the neighborhood or succumb to the label’s meaning.

Perceptions of Crime and Public Opinion

An individual’s perceptions are formed in various ways. One is through personal experience and the other is through the media. The media has two goals: to disseminate information and sell their product. The media is the primary source for disseminating

information to the masses. The information is compiled from interviews and investigations designed to elicit the truth, then the information is reported to the public. Through editorials, radio call-ins, or other formats for opining, the public comments on the information presented to them, and a relationship forms between the media and the public. The second goal of the media is selling its main product- itself. The media is a business like all others and sufficient revenue or fail. In order to sell papers, advertising spots, or increase ratings the media focuses on those events that attract the most attention.

Crime plays on the fears of everyone. Whenever a heinous crime does occur, both forms of media (print and broadcast) saturate their respective markets with details of the crime. This saturation creates an impression that the crime occurs more frequently than it actually does. Although the media follows a proscribed method of ascertaining the accuracy of the information they report, many critics still believe the media falls short in properly informing the public about specific events- especially crime. "...[w]hile defenders of the media can point to the increasing use of official statistics in both the print and broadcast media in recent years, critics argue that the propagation of such statistics does not necessarily result in greater public knowledge" (Warr, 1980, p. 457).

According to Warr (1980) most critics of the media reduce their arguments to the following four assertions: (1) various forms of distortions arise from the media's coverage of crime, (2) media coverage is important and, possibly, the sole source of information on crime for the public, (3) the information presented by the media is unquestionably accepted as accurate, and (4) the public is therefore misinformed about crime (p. 458).

"During 1974-75, four independent surveys (two in each year) were conducted on

random samples of the adult residents of a major Southwestern metropolitan area (estimated 1970 population > 250,000)” (Warr, 1980, p. 460). Respondents were asked to estimate, for 17 different offenses, how often they perceived each offense to be officially reported. Warr concluded that “...results of [the] study demonstrate a remarkable degree of correspondence between official information and public perceptions, a finding which runs counter to the literature on media coverage of crime¹” (p. 467). Even though the public’s perception of a crime’s frequency and the official reports are in virtual agreement, this does not mean the public’s opinion about the crime or its associated punishment will change. A female may be able to estimate the frequency of rapes on her school’s campus, but this does not alleviate her fear of being raped or her likelihood of supporting tougher rape legislation.

Public opinion can be split into two categories: dyadic and collective. Dyadic analyses look at the correlation between a legislator’s voting habit and some measure of his/her constituency’s preferences. Simply stated, dyadic studies measure how well a politician follows the actual wishes of their constituency. There are two drawbacks to dyadic studies. One is the fact that a politician’s vote may be in tune with their constituency’s wishes one hundred percent, but this does not mean that this vote will translate into law (e.g. banning flag burning, making marriage constitutionally protected, the Equal Rights Amendment, etc). Another drawback is that public opinion has to be clearly divided on a specific issue (e.g. abortion, gun control, gay marriage, immigration,

¹ Warr also wants it to be known that the study’s findings cannot be inferred onto other types of belief.

etc).

Collective analyses use actual laws to measure the relationship between public opinion and public policy. It can be argued that collective analyses are more reliable since a law, with a viable punishment, actually exists. Both however can be used to get a more accurate picture of how public opinion (perception) influences legal sanctions.

According to Monroe (1998) most studies of this nature are ones of congruence. This approach is advantageous due to the inclusion of “time”². Using this concept of “time” allows a researcher to increase his or her confidence in making inferences about causality; however, because society may change its opinions on a specific issue or collectively be homogeneous in its opinion, then congruency can not be established. Also, the type of policy determines how measurable it is in regards to congruency. Government spending is easily measured, whereas a proposal and adoption of a new Constitutional Amendment is not.

What Monroe’s study found was that consistency between public opinion and policy declined across the board except in regards to national defense. Also, a large decline was noticed for the two largest policies: Economic and Labor Policy and Foreign Policy. The Economic and Labor Policy dealt with the issue of taxation- especially during the 1980s. Foreign Policy however had an above-average level of consistency, yet many survey items transcend boundaries (i.e. they can be used in different categories). Two structural features existed that apply to few cases but have an influential effect on

² Time represents a period from a set starting point to a set ending point.

consistency. One was the idea that a constitutional amendment either needs to be passed or not. The other was retroactive approval³. Just because a proposal has strong support from both political parties and their constituencies does not mean that it will become public policy. For one reason or another the proposal becomes lost in the labyrinth of Washington D.C. Another reason for the inability of a popular proposal failing to make policy changes may be due to the citizenry's unwillingness to change. If a vast majority of the citizenry wants a proposal passed and made into policy, then politicians will expedite the process. One of the most important issues that any society faces is immigration. Immigrants help societies advance by bringing with them new cultures, ideologies, and specialized skills. Not every immigrant can be allowed into the society though.

Immigration

Every society has to establish its genesis. This is done by tracing the migration of the individuals who formed the society and then tracing their ancestry to form a common link. Once this link is established the society infers it onto all the citizenry creating a societal ancestry. Looking at the history of the United States helps to underscore this concept.

Before the settlement of Jamestown in 1606 there was a vibrant indigenous population already established. The indigenous population stretched from the Pacific to the Atlantic Ocean and extended as far north to what is present-day Canada. With their

³ Retroactive approval occurs when a survey question asks about a policy decision that has already been made.

own customs, rules, and languages these societies interacted with each other for centuries. Even after the settlement of Jamestown and the subsequent migration of Europeans, the large indigenous population occupied a vast majority of the continent.

Once the first few settlements started thriving, many European nations sent envoys to the “New World” to expand their power and revenue base. By the time of the American Revolution much of the continent was controlled by Europe’s three world powers: England, France, and Spain.

The Mississippi River formed the western border of the United States in 1800. Even though France controlled a portion of the Western United States, it lost much of its territory to Spain; therefore, leaving a vast majority of the present-day Mid-West and Western United States under Spanish rule. It follows logically that the populations of these areas would either be converts to their new rulers or citizens of the mother country sent to firmly establish the country’s control. It also follows that these individuals would either have a fluent knowledge or working knowledge of the country’s language, culture, and beliefs. Yet, the United States is supposed to be the “offspring” of England. This may be because the “Founding Fathers” were descendants of the early British settlers.

George Washington influenced latter politicians by his actions as the first President. His refusal to run for a third term was followed by successive presidents until 1912 when Theodore Roosevelt sought a third term. This led to the adoption of the Twenty-second Amendment in 1951, which set a limit on the number of terms to two. Alexander Hamilton’s proposal of a national bank in which it would be the government’s fiscal agent influenced the model currently used by many financial institutions today.

Under Hamilton's model the government would buy 20% and leave the other 80% open to private investors. These private investors would be citizens who bought the bank's stocks through either gold or silver or federal securities. Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson, along with others, have influenced how the citizenry of the United States views their relationship with their government through their writings.

Immigration is vital to any society. In a nation's first stages of existence immigrants are necessary to help establish its legitimacy. The more population a nation has, the more legitimate the government appears. When politicians talk about having a "mandate" they are referring to the number of votes received in comparison with the total voting population. The higher their vote count, the more consensus there is between the politician and his or her constituency, thereby creating a "mandate." However, when a nation reaches its population's limits due to natural resources (e.g. land, food production, sanitation), it has to restrict who may and may not enter the nation.

In Ancient Greece, "...Thucydides notes that so many Greeks fled to Athens and became citizens that it became overpopulated" (Koslowski, 2002, p. 388). Once the Athenian city-state reached its natural limit for human sustainability, then outward migration began. These Athenians emigrated to Asia Minor and along with other Greeks helped form the area known as Ionia. "This migration from Athens influenced the formation and dynamics of the Greek city-state system and proved crucial to the subsequent growth in Athenian power by laying the demographic basis for Athenian mastery of the Aegean" (Koslowski, p. 386). Another concern with immigration is the spread of deadly diseases.

Immigration Control

“We pride ourselves on being a ‘nation of immigrants,’ and yet many tend to view recent waves of immigrants with skepticism if not outright hostility” (Espenshade, 1995, p. 201). In 1875 the first restrictions on immigration were introduced in the United States. This lasted until the beginning of the Second World War. During World War II there was a shortage of labor and the Bracero Program was initiated. This program allowed foreign nationals to enter the United States as laborers to help alleviate the labor crisis. Once the native born citizens started returning from the war though, many immigrants found themselves at odds with the returning native population. This conflict eventually lead to the end of programs like the Bracero Program.

“Termination of the bracero program in the mid-1960s and the industrialization of the Sunbelt in the 1970s attracted record numbers of undocumented migrants from Mexico” (Jones, 1995, p. 715). The large influx of immigrants may have lead to the less tolerant attitudes towards immigrants in the 1970s and 1980s.

Because many immigrants, either “legal” or “illegal”, will do various jobs for less pay, employers will usually hire them without concern for their legal status, thus creating a lack of jobs for native workers. To protect themselves the native citizenry demands the enactment of laws regulating the immigrant population’s ability to gain employment. Many of these laws center around the concept of whether an immigrant is legally allowed to be here. The Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 was one such piece of legislation.

The Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) penalized employers who hired

“illegal” immigrants, and allowed those “illegal” immigrants who have resided within the nation’s borders since 1972 to qualify for immediate legal permanent residency. This helped alleviate the immigration issue on paper by making previously “illegal” immigrants “legal.” “A substantial number of applications for the IRCA amnesty program are believed to have been fraudulent” (Arrhenius & Zavodny, 2003, p. 439).

During the 1970s a Maya community was established in Houston, Texas. This immigrant population constructed and maintained extensive ties with their kinsmen in their native Guatemala. When the first wave of the Maya community started arriving in the United States they still held strong native culture traits that included the way they dressed, the language they spoke, and even the food they eat. These commonalities enhance the community’s cohesion and aids them in withstanding the rigors of another country. As much as these commonalities help, they also make the community stand out and a potential target for discrimination.

Discrimination based on physical appearance and cultural traits leads all individuals of similar appearance and language to be classified as ethnically the same. The term Hispanic is used to denote those individuals whose derives their ancestry from the early Spanish conquests of the New World, in particular the Caribbean as well as Central and South America. In the United States though, the term Hispanic denotes someone of Mexican ancestry. This clumping of individuals into an arbitrary ethnic category hinders the passing of viable immigration policies.

Puerto Rico is a territory of the United States and because of this, Puerto Ricans are permitted to vote in national elections. Cubans usually arrive in this country illegally

but gain citizenship due to being labeled as political refugees. Due to their physical and language similarities, these individuals are classified as “Mexican” by some within the native population. European countries are not even immune from having to deal with the issue of immigration.

In Britain, Commonwealth citizens were allowed to travel freely to and from most destinations. This right was reaffirmed in 1948 by the Nationality Act, but due to the immigration issue the freedom of mobility was restricted in 1962 by the Commonwealth Immigrants Act. The Commonwealth Immigration Act (1958-1962) was passed due to a combination of dramatic events; in 1958 two cities saw anti-black riots and the issue of immigration was put before the public for the first time since World War II. The cities involved were Notting Hill and London. In Notting Hill over a thousand individuals gathered and threatened local blacks for two consecutive days. In London many blacks were attacked in the streets and in their homes for three consecutive days. Some in England’s Conservative party actually blamed the riots on immigration. This led to Britain’s Conservative Party passing a resolution in favor of restricting immigration.

Germany at one time had a lenient immigration policy. Political refugees were allowed asylum via the Basic Law in Germany’s Constitution. This started to change with Germany’s growing immigrant population. The rights provided by the Basic Law were restricted on visa standards and an employment ban was developed for immigrants in the 1980s, later followed by a constitutional amendment in 1993.

Germany’s liberal immigration policies were the result of the 1973 recruitment of foreign nationals as guest workers. “...Article 16 of the constitution offered an

unconditional right to asylum for politically persecuted persons, which the courts interpreted to include extensive rights to judicial review” (Karapin, 1999, p. 433). However, due to an increase in asylum applications between 1979-1980, Germany toughened its visa requirements and passed an employment ban.

Fear

In 2000, Ackah published a study that looked at immigrant’s fear of crime in Washington D.C. The study’s respondents were the Ghanaians, immigrants from Ghana which is situated on the western coastline of Africa. The Ghanaian culture still holds that one must have respect for family, his or her elders, and his or her religion. The study looked at how living in the “murder capital of the world” at that time affected one’s perception of being victimized.

The study reported that many Ghanaians felt some level of fear, but this level was associated with their previous residency in Ghana. If a Ghanaian was from the inner-cities of Ghana he or she held a lower level of fear than a Ghanaian from the country. Interestingly, the length of stay in the United States had no affect on a Ghanaian’s level of fear. Many Ghanaians still were fearful of strangers, but this may be partly due to an attempt to hold onto the traditions brought with them while trying to live in an evolving country.

Many immigrants bring with them their fear, distrust, and sometimes hatred of other immigrants. These emotions stem from the culture norms and values of their native country. For instance, many Mexican immigrants view Guatemalans in the same manner that many “Americans” view the Mexican immigrant. Perceptions such as these may be

rooted in an ethnic community's fear for its future and the survival of its culture. No matter where one resides, grows up, or is educated there is some connection they have with the region of their birth and childhood. Many in these communities see strife as a means of obtaining what they need- usually in the form of political power. These individuals will use the fears of the community, the community's cultural taboos, and even their grievances with other nationalities to create a perception of hopelessness and victimization. The individual incites the community's fears in order to obtain allies in his or her personal quest for power.

Once this power base is obtained they use the same fears and taboos to remain in power. This usually leads to an instance of ethnic conflict when the state is viewed as too weak to protect its citizenry or provide them with adequate resources. These conflicts usually involve some form of misrepresentation of a group's desires and usually follows three courses.

One, the groups try to bluff their way into obtaining the scarce resource. Bluffing entails exaggerating one's strength, size, motivation, or their goals. Second, an aggressive group will try to down play their violent attributes in order to be seen as "protecting themselves." Lastly, many third parties try to end a potential conflict by asking each side to reveal their strategy for battle. It is hoped that each will see how futile their efforts will be and end any aggressive maneuvering.

Security

The more disposable income an individual has, the more security he or she is able to buy procure. Items such as guns, knives, locks, security alarms, or even tracking

devices are all products sold to protect an individual's person, property, and loved ones. The amount of security bought depends on the value associated with the item being protected. The higher the item is in monetary value, the more security will be perceived as needed to protect it.

Buying the services of a tracking company to monitor your vehicle if it ever gets stolen may be viewed as a prudent investment; yet, the same person may feel safe leaving his or her CDs, mail, receipts, or other forms of personal identification laying in open view inside an unprotected vehicle. If an offender ever subverts the protective measures set in place and obtains the item being protected, then the victimized individual perceives himself or herself as incapable of self-protection. This incapability leads to an increase level of fear, especially for the safety of an individual's loved ones.

A study conducted by Warr and Ellison (2000) found that 63% of their respondents were fearful for their personal safety, but this increased to approximately 84% when the focus turned to a respondent's fear for his or her loved ones. An interesting finding was that parents not only are more fearful for their children, but the age and gender of the child affects the level of fear. Younger children, regardless of sex, are worried over the same by the parent. The older the child gets the parent's fear tends to abate. By the ages of 6 to 10 a parent's fear for their sons decreases while their fear for daughters increases. Yet, between the ages of 11 and 15 the parent's fear for their sons and daughters is virtually identical. After the child reaches 20 years of age the discrepancy noticed for the ages of 6 to 10 reappear (pp. 559-560).

This fluctuation may be caused by the fact that younger children (1-5) can walk

and are under the constant supervision of a parent. By the ages of 6 to 10 the child is in elementary school. For approximately 8 hours a day a capable guardian is watching over the child. The responsibility for the child's safety is now shared. The latter ages (11-15) the child is emerging as an autonomous individual. He or she is now interacting with others outside of the supervision of parents or other capable guardians. However, by this time male children will be viewed as capable of defending themselves. Females though will always be seen as potential victims for physical and sexual assaults due to the perceived inability to physically defend themselves.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to determine if individuals who supported denying citizenship to children whose parents were not already citizens of the United States held the opinion that sentences over 15 years were adequate for non-U.S. individuals. Other purposes of the study are to determine if individuals with high religiosity and who support making English the sole language of the United States held the opinion that sentence lengths over 15 years were adequate for non-U.S. individuals. A final purpose of the study was to determine if Gender, political affiliation, and carrying of a lethal weapon influenced opinions regarding sentence lengths for non-U.S. individuals. Based upon the literature, the following hypotheses were formulated:

1. Males support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than Females.
2. Conservatives support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than individuals of other political affiliations.
3. Individuals who support denying citizenship to children of foreign parentage, although the children were born in the United States support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than individuals opposed to the denial of citizenship.
4. Individuals who believe that English should be the sole language of the United States support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than individuals opposed to making English the official language.
5. Individuals who attend religious services more frequently support longer

sentences for non-U.S. individuals than individuals who do not frequently attend religious services.

6. Individuals who carry a lethal weapon support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than individuals who do not carry a weapon.

Procedure for Collecting Data

The recruitment of respondents was accomplished with a mass e-mail sent out to the entire student body of a selected university. A mass e-mail was one in which all potential respondents' e-mail addresses were placed in the recipient field and one e-mail sent to everyone simultaneously. This was done to ensure the respondent's anonymity was maintained. The school e-mail was used because everyone who enrolls at the university has an e-mail address assigned to them.

Before the university's administration allowed the e-mail to be sent, the primary researcher had to give the school administration the recruitment letter to be used along with the website housing the survey. The recruitment letter advised respondents of why the purpose of the study and asked for their participation. Within the recruitment letter the web address of the website containing the survey was made available along with the researcher's school e-mail address for those respondents who may have encountered problems with the survey or in need of some clarification about the survey. If a respondent did contact the researcher, he or she was now identifiable as far as knowing that the individual was participating, but no identification could be made between the respondents who contacted the researcher and their responses on the survey.

The student population of the selected university was approximately 12,000

students. Potential respondents were any student enrolled at the university when the study was open to participation. Both undergraduate and graduate students were allowed to participate. This was done to obtain a more stratified sample.

The survey was open for participation from mid-November 2008 until January 1, 2009. This was done to offer any potential respondent adequate opportunity to complete the survey. Both Thanksgiving and Christmas fell within this timeframe and it is unknown if these holidays affected the survey response rate. After the survey was closed, the data were downloaded to a Microsoft Excel program and then coded into a Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The question and response sequences on the internet survey followed the coding sequence derived for SPSS. Any missing data were examined to determine if data were missing due to a respondent refusing to answer a particular question or just omitting a response due to the previous question.

Apparatus

A survey was employed to collect data because it allowed respondents anonymity and placed them more at ease when they answered questions. The more relaxed a respondent was potentially allowed for more honest and complete answers. The survey instrument employed certain questions designed to obtain demographic characteristics of the respondent. These questions asked respondents to identify themselves based on gender, age, race, relationship status (i.e. if they were single, married, divorced, etc.); and whether the respondent was a parent, and which college the respondent was in within the university.

The survey was divided into different sections that measured certain demographics

and opinions the respondent possessed. The background section measured certain demographics about respondents such as political affiliation, gender, race, age, or whether the respondent is a parent. Other sections asked questions that measured the opinions respondents held about denying citizenship to children of foreign parentage, making English the sole language spoken in the United States, how many times the respondent attends religious services, and the type of weapon the respondent carried if they did carry a weapon.

Independent Variables

Political Affiliation

Political affiliation was divided into three categories: Conservative, Liberal, and Independent. Previous studies have divided political affiliation dichotomously as either Conservative or Liberal. Some respondents may not identify with either political party or identify with some aspects of both parties. To determine if political affiliation had a significant relationship with sentence length all political factors must be considered.

Denying Citizenship

Citizenship was a composite measure comprised of 3 questions inquiring about a respondent's opinion about the granting of citizenship to children born to parents with a foreign nationality. All three questions used the same scale: "Strongly Agree", "Agree", "Neutral", "Disagree", and "Strongly Disagree."

The first question asked respondents if their opinion of the statement "citizenship should only be granted to those children whose parents are already U.S. citizens." This question was asked to determine if the respondent agreed with denying citizenship to a

child based on where the child's parents were born instead of where the child was born. The second question was "children, of foreign citizens, born in the US should get automatic citizenship." The first and second questions inquired about the same topic, but from different directions. The second question was recoded in order that both measured "citizenship" in the same direction. The third question asked respondents if they agreed with the question "children of non-US citizens should have to wait for citizenship although they may be born within the borders of the United States." A Cronbach's Alpha of .837 was produced. Citizenship was dichotomized into "Agree" and "Disagree."

Making English the Sole Spoken Language

"Language" could not be assessed using a composite measure. Only one question was used to determine if a respondent believed in making English the sole language of the United States. The question was: "English should be the only language of the United States (it would be illegal to speak another language outside of one's home or a school setting). This question is based on the literature that societies have used language as a means of differentiating themselves from other societies. The qualifier, along with the question's directness, allows the question to adequately assess a respondent's opinion about the differentiation of societies based on language.

Religiosity

Religiosity was a composite measure comprised of three questions: "How many times a month do you attend religious services", "How many times a month do you attend morning worship services", and "How many times a month do you attend evening worship services." Conducting a reliability analysis produced a Cronbach's Alpha of .928. To

answer the three questions, respondents were given the options “Do not Attend”, “1-3 times a month”, “4-6 times a month”, and “Over 6 times a month.” Once “Religiosity” was constructed it was recoded into two categories: “Low Religiosity (do not attend or attend 1-3 times a month) and “High Religiosity (Over 3 times a month).”

Carrying a Lethal Weapon

The question used for this variable was: “What kind of protective device do you carry?” The options a respondent had to chose from were gun, knife, mace or pepper spray, tazer, and does not carry a protective device. The question was recoded along each weapon’s lethality. The category “lethal” was comprised of the options gun and knife; the category “non-lethal” was comprised of the options mace or pepper spray and tazer. The final category was “do not carry a weapon.”

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable for this study was a composite measure- “Violent predatory crimes.” The composite measure is comprised of three questions that asked respondents to choose the sentence length (in years) they felt was adequate if the respondent’s boyfriend, girlfriend, or spouse was assaulted; if they were robbed; and if they were raped by a non-US individual. The choices available to the respondents were (in years) 1-5; 6-10; 11-15; 16-20; Over 20; and Life. A reliability analysis produced a Cronbach’s Alpha of .820. The dependent variable was recoded into a new variable and dichotomized into “1-15 Years” and “Over 15 Years.” The responses were divided in this manner because it helped in the simplifying data for analysis and it helped in balancing out the distribution of data.

Procedure for Analyzing Data

Because both independent and dependent variables were measured at the nominal level, chi-square was used to determine significant relationships. If chi-square (χ^2) was significant, then a Phi (Φ) and Cramer's V were used to determine the measure of association. Both measures of association were reported in Table 2 for each hypothesis tested. Phi (Φ) was reported because it was used to measure the association within a 2 X 2 table whereas Cramer's V was used for tables greater than 2 X 2. However, for Table 6 Gamma was used in place of Phi (Φ) and Cramer's V as the measure of association. This was due to the ability of both the independent and dependent variables be measured on an ordinal level.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to determine if individuals who supported denying citizenship to children whose parents were not already citizens of the United States held the opinion that sentences over 15 years were adequate for non-U.S. individuals. Other purposes of the study are to determine if individuals with high religiosity and who support making English the sole language of the United States held the opinion that sentence lengths over 15 years were adequate for non-U.S. individuals. A final purpose of the study was to determine if gender, political affiliation, and carrying of a lethal weapon influenced opinions regarding sentence lengths for non-U.S. individuals.

Hypotheses

Based upon the literature, the following hypotheses were formulated:

1. Males support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than females.
2. Conservatives support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than individuals of other political affiliations.
3. Individuals who support denying citizenship to children of foreign parentage, although the children were born in the United States support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than individuals opposed to the denial of citizenship.
4. Individuals who believe that English should be the sole language of the United States support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than individuals opposed to making English the official language.
5. Individuals who attend religious services more frequently support longer

sentences for non-U.S. individuals than individuals who do not frequently attend religious services.

6. Individuals who carry a lethal weapon support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than individuals who do not carry a weapon.

Recruitment

A mass e-mail was sent to the entire student body at East Tennessee State University for the recruitment of respondents. East Tennessee State University's student population was approximately 12,000 students. From this, 636 students viewed the survey, but only 337 respondents were able to be used after filtering the cases along the criteria that the potential respondent answered the questions "If your boyfriend/girlfriend/spouse were raped, would you feel that you have failed as a boyfriend/girlfriend/spouse" and "How many years do you believe foreign citizens should wait before obtaining citizenship status."

Approximately 1% of respondents contacted the researcher with concerns regarding the survey. These concerns ranged from those respondents who considered the website containing the survey took too long to download to those respondents who believed that their opinions were not specifically addressed by the survey's questions.

It was believed that many respondents skipped certain questions that they felt did not pertain to them. It is possible that by answering "some", "a few times", "neutral", "unsure", etc. may have been perceived as committing to opposition or support of a given scenario. In other words, the respondent may not have felt either support nor opposition to a given scenario. However, they may have felt that by answering in the neutral they

would have been committing to some degree of both support and opposition. Giving the option to respond “don’t know”, “no opinion”, or “does not pertain to me”, etc., the respondent was allowed to comment on the scenario without feeling any obligation to either side.

Coding of Independent Variables

For various questions in the study, extra options of “don’t know” or “no opinion” were given in order to increase the number of completed surveys. Because the answers “don’t know” or “no opinion” left the possibility that the respondent could fluctuate in their support or opposition to certain hypothetical situations, these optional answers were coded as “Neutral.” This allowed the respondent to comment on the given scenario without feeling an obligation to either side. Although this appeared self-defeating, many scenarios were helped by constructing the responses in this manner.

The religion questions had the option “Does not pertain to me” along with responses of “yes” or “no.” The “Does not pertain to me” response was offered because respondents may have been an atheist or if they were religious, they did not attend services. If this option was chosen the responses were coded as “No.” Respondents who answered the question “Do you attend religious services during the evening (night)” as does not pertain to them, then this meant they did not attend religious services at night and these responses were coded as “No.” If any religious questions offered an option of “No Opinion” or “Don’t Know”, then these were coded as “Unsure” to help with coding but maintain the significance of the “Don’t Know” response.

Gender was divided into male and female and political affiliation was separated

into Conservative, Liberal, and Independent. Although political affiliation could have been dichotomized into conservative and liberal, the independent political ideology has come into its own within the past few decades. The denying of citizenship to children whose parents were not already citizens of the United States was separated into those respondents who either supported, were neutral, or opposed this idea. The variable that focused on making English the sole language legally spoken within the United States was dichotomized into those respondents who supported or opposed this measure. Religiosity was divided into a respondents religious attendance during the month; as well as his or her attendance for both morning and evening worship services. The categories for Religiosity were: “1-3”, “Over 3”, and “Do not Attend.” The question pertaining to carrying a weapon was divided into three categories: “Lethal”, “Non-Lethal”, and “Do not Carry a Weapon.”

Descriptive Statistics

As the data in Table 1 indicate, the typical respondent was a white female, approximately 23 years-old who was dating someone and had no children. Table 1 further revealed that she held neither Conservative or Liberal political affiliations.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics of Participants

	Characteristics	N	%
Gender	Male	72	21.4
	Female	247	73.3
	Total	319	94.7
	Missing	18	5.3

Table 1 (continued)

Age	17-30	218	64.7
	31-40	45	13.4
	Over 40	55	16.3
	Total	318	94.4
	Missing	19	5.6
Relationship Status	Single	54	16.0
	Dating	146	43.3
	Married	102	30.3
	Divorced	7	2.1
	Other	10	3.0
	Total	319	94.7
	Missing	18	5.3
Race	White	298	88.4
	Black	3	0.9
	Hispanic	5	1.5
	Asian	5	1.5
	Other	8	2.4
	Total	319	94.7
	Missing	18	5.3
Parent	Yes	91	27.0
	No	228	67.7
	Total	319	94.7
	Missing	18	5.3
Political Affiliation	Conservative	114	33.8
	Liberal	81	24.0
	Other	124	36.8
	Total	319	94.7
	Missing	18	5.3

Examination of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis was: males support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than females. As the data in Table 2 indicate, there was no significant relationship between gender and sentence length ($\chi^2 = .018$). This meant that the null hypothesis was unable to be rejected ($P = .894$). Males and females were about even in their support for a sentence length over 15 years for a non-U.S. individual. The percentage of males who supported a sentence length over 15 years for a non-U.S. individual was 44.3%, whereas females who supported a sentence length over 15 years for a non-U.S. individual was 43.4%.

Table 2
Cross-Tabulations for Gender

Sentence Length	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
1-15 Years	39	55.7	137	56.6	176	56.4
Over 15 Years	31	44.3	105	43.4	136	43.6
Total	70	100.0	242	100.0	312	100.

$\chi^2 = .018$ $df = 1$ $P = .894$

Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis was: Conservatives support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than other political affiliations. As the data in Table 3 indicate, there was no significant relationship between political affiliation and sentence length ($\chi^2 = .774$). This meant that the null hypothesis was unable to be rejected ($P = .679$). Respondents who affiliated themselves with either conservative or liberal political ideology were

approximately even in their support for a sentence length over 15 years for a non-U.S. individual.

The percentage of respondents that chose to affiliate themselves with the conservative ideology and who supported a sentence length over 15 years for a non-U.S. individual, was 46.8%. Only 41% of respondents who chose to affiliate themselves with a liberal ideology supported a sentence length over 15 years for non-U.S. individuals. Even 42.3% of those respondents who did not affiliate themselves with either conservative or liberal ideologies supported a sentence length over 15 years for non-U.S. individuals. The percentage of support for a sentence length over 15 years for an non-U.S. individual was approximately even along all political ideologies.

This was somewhat interesting given the literature in which individuals of a conservative (republican) ideology were more supportive of measures limiting the involvement of non-U.S. individuals. The current study specifically looked at the sentence lengths for non-U.S. individuals; and during the late-1980s and early-1990s, the Republican Party's support of Propositions 187, 209, and 227 (which focused on a specific group) pushed many Californians who previously identified themselves as Republicans into the Democratic Party.

Table 3
Cross-Tabulations for Political Affiliation

Sentence Length	Conservative	%	Liberal	%	Other	%	Total	%
1- 15 Years	59	53.2	46	59.0	71	57.7	176	56.4
Over 15	52	46.8	32	41.0	52	42.3	136	43.6
Total	111	100.0	78	100.	123	100.0	312	100.0

$\chi^2 = .774$ $df = 2$ $P = .679$

Hypothesis 3

The third hypothesis was: individuals who support denying citizenship to children of foreign parentage, although the children were born in the United States support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than individuals opposed to the denial of citizenship.

As the data in Table 4 indicate, there was a significant relationship between denying citizenship and sentence length ($\chi^2 = 8.348$). The null hypothesis was able to be rejected ($P = .004$). The data Table 4 indicated that 51.3% of respondents who supported denying citizenship to children whose parents were not already citizens of the United States supported a sentence length over 15 years for non-U.S. individuals. Only 34.9% of respondents who opposed denying citizenship supported a sentence length over 15 years for non-U.S. individuals.

The strength of the relationship between denying citizenship and sentence length was determined by Phi (Φ). This measure of association indicated that the relationship was somewhat moderate ($\Phi = .166$); and when support for denying citizenship increased, the sentence length increased.

Table 4
Cross-Tabulations for Denying Citizenship

Sentence Length	Agree	%	Disagree	%	Total	%
1-15 Years	73	48.7	99	65.1	172	57.0
Over 15 Years	77	51.3	53	34.9	130	43.0
Total	150	100.0	152	100.	302	100.0

$\chi^2= 8.348$ $df=1$ $\Phi=.166$ $P=.004$

Hypothesis 4

The fourth hypothesis was: individuals who believe that English should be the sole language of the United States support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than individuals opposed to making English the official language.

As the data in Table 5 indicate, there was a significant relationship between making English the sole language in the United States and sentence length ($\chi^2= 5.259$). The null hypothesis was able to be rejected ($P= .022$). It was determined from the data in Table 5 that 64.3% of those respondents who supported making English the sole language of the United States supported a sentence length over 15 years for non-U.S. individuals. Only 41.8% of respondents who opposed making English the sole language of the United States supported a sentence length over 15 years for non-U.S. individuals.

The relationship between making English the sole language of the United States and sentence length was determined by Phi (Φ). This measure of association indicated that the relationship was fairly weak ($\Phi= .130$). As indicated by Phi (Φ), when opposition to making English the sole language of the United States increased, support for a sentence

length over 15 years for non-U.S. individuals decreased.

Table 5
Cross-Tabulations for Making English the Sole Spoken Language

	Support	%	Oppose	%	Total	%
1-15 Years	10	35.7	166	58.2	176	56.2
Over 15	18	64.3	119	41.8	137	43.8
Total	28	100.0	285	100.0	313	100.0
$\chi^2= 5.259$	df= 2	Phi= .130	P= .022			

Hypothesis 5

The fifth hypothesis was: individuals who attend religious services more frequently support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than individuals who do not frequently attend religious services.

As the data in Table 6 indicate, there was a significant relationship between frequent religious attendance and sentence length ($\chi^2= 11.900$). The null hypothesis was able to be rejected (P= .001); as the data Table 6 indicate, 55.9% of respondents who attended religious services more than 3 times, supported a sentence length over 15 years for non-U.S. individuals. For those individuals with low religiosity (do not attend religious services or attends 1-3 times a month) only 35.9% of respondent supported a sentence length over 15 years for non-U.S. individuals.

The strength of the relationship between religious attendance and Violent Predatory Crimes was moderate (Gamma= .386). From Gamma it was determined that as the number of respondents who attend religious services increased so too did their support for a sentence length over 15 years.

Table 6
Cross-Tabulations for Religious Attendance

Sentence Length	Low Religiosity (1-3)	%	High Religiosity (Over 3)	%	Total	%
1-15	98	64.1	64	44.1	162	54.4
Over 15	55	35.9	81	55.9	136	45.6
Total	153	100.0	145	100.0	298	100.0

$X^2 = 11.900$ df= 1 Gamma= .386 P= .001

Hypothesis 6

The sixth hypothesis was: individuals who carry a lethal weapon support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than individuals who do not carry a weapon.

As the data in Table 7 indicated, there was a significant relationship between carrying a weapon and sentence length ($\chi^2= 6.065$). The null hypothesis was able to be rejected (P= .048). The data in Table 7 indicate that 60.5% of respondents who carry a lethal weapon supported a sentence length over 15 years for non-U.S. individuals. The data also indicated that 42.3% of respondents who carried a non-lethal weapon supported a sentence length over 15 years for non-U.S. individuals. Those respondents who did not carry a weapon, only 40.0% supported a sentence length over 15 years for non-U.S. individuals.

Cramer's V indicated that the relationship between carrying a weapon and sentence length was moderate (Cramer's V= .143). The relationship is inverse; as the number of respondents who did not carry a weapon increased, support for a sentence length over 15 years for non-U.S. individuals decreased.

Table 7
Cross-Tabulations for Carrying a Lethal Weapon

Sentence Length	Lethal	%	Non-Lethal	%	Does not Carry	%	Total	%
1-15 Years	17	39.5	30	57.7	120	60.0	167	56.6
Over 15 Years	26	60.5	22	42.3	80	40.0	128	43.4
Total	43	100.0	52	100.0	200	100.0	295	100.0

$\chi^2= 6.065$ $df= 2$ Cramer's V= .143 $P=.048$

Summary

After cross-tabulations were conducted, it was determined that a significant relationship did not exist between gender and sentence length. The relationship between political affiliation and sentence length also failed to reach significance. The percentage of support for a sentence length over 15 years for a non-U.S. individual was approximately along both gender and political ideologies were approximately even. However, the analysis did reveal that denying citizenship was significantly related to sentence length. Respondents who supported denying citizenship to children whose parents were not already citizens of the United States supported a sentence length over 15 years for non-U.S. individuals. This association was the same for those individuals who feel that English should be the only language permissibly spoken within the United States outside of one's home or an academic setting. The data also indicated that respondents who attended religious services over 3 times for a selected period supported a sentence length over 15 years for non-U.S. individuals. This was the same for respondents who carried a lethal weapon.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to determine if individuals who supported denying citizenship to children whose parents were not already citizens of the United States held the opinion that sentences over 15 years were adequate for non-U.S. individuals. Other purposes of the study are to determine if individuals with high religiosity and who support making English the sole language of the United States held the opinion that sentence lengths over 15 years were adequate for non-U.S. individuals. A final purpose of the study was to determine if Gender, political affiliation, and carrying of a lethal weapon influenced opinions regarding sentence lengths for non-U.S. individuals. Based upon the literature, the following hypotheses were formulated:

1. Males support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than Females.
2. Conservatives support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than individuals of other political affiliations.
3. Individuals who support denying citizenship to children of foreign parentage, although the children were born in the United States support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than individuals opposed to the denial of citizenship.
4. Individuals who believe that English should be the sole language of the United States support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than individuals opposed to making English the official language.
5. Individuals who attend religious services more frequently support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than individuals who do not frequently attend religious

services.

6. Individuals who carry a lethal weapon support longer sentences for non-U.S. individuals than individuals who do not carry a weapon.

Findings

The findings revealed that the relationship between gender and sentence lengths was not significant. Females were just as likely to impose a sentence length over 15 years for non-U.S. individuals as males. This may be due to males and females following their protective instincts. Males may impose sentence lengths over 15 years to protect the society; whereas females may be imposing lengthy sentences to protect their offspring.

Interestingly, there was no significant difference between a respondent's political affiliation and sentence length. The literature indicated that individuals of the conservative ideology were more likely to support legislation that placed restrictions on the immigrant population. Respondents who identified themselves as liberals imposed sentences over 15 years for non-U.S. individuals at approximately the same rate as respondents who identified themselves as conservatives. This lack of significance may indicate that individuals from all political affiliations view the immigration issue as a contributing factor to some of society's problems. Other findings revealed that the relationship between making English the sole language spoken within the United States; a respondent's religiosity; and if the respondent carried of a lethal weapon had significant relationships with sentence lengths over 15 years.

Denying Citizenship

Respondents who supported the denial of citizenship to children with foreign parentage and sentence lengths over 15 years for non-U.S. individuals, may have done so in order to limit the influence of the immigrant population. By controlling the amount of influence a population can exert onto society's norms and customs, the status quo can maintain its power structure. The study did not focus on the refusal of citizenship to adult immigrants but to the immigrant's children who may have been born within the nation's borders. What makes this interesting is that some respondents were willing to deny children born within the nation's borders automatic citizenship. Automatic citizenship is established by the first sentence in Section 1 of the 14th Amendment. This part of the 14th Amendment states: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside" (Roark et al. 1998, Vol. I, A-15).

Limiting citizenship of children with foreign parentage indirectly restricts the influence of that particular immigrant population associated with the parent. Because parents instill their society's norms and customs in their children, then the children as citizens of the United States would become vessels for integrating their parents' norms and customs with those of American society. Therefore, the denial of citizenship to children with foreign parentage may be a way that the respondents way of protecting the norms and customs of American society.

Making English the Sole Spoken Language

Although English had a weak association with sentence length, the relationship is still important. This is because the purpose of any language is to effectively communicate one's wants and intentions. Respondents may have wanted to make English the sole spoken language in order to comprehend the wants and intentions of an individual not a citizen of the United States. Being able to comprehend a non-U.S. individual's wants and intentions helps society regulate those norms and customs within the immigrant population that it finds unacceptable.

Religious Attendance

Respondents who have a high religiosity may be more legalistic and therefore feel that longer sentence lengths may be needed as a deterrent. This may alleviate a respondent's fear that their society's norms and customs, as well as their religious norms and customs, are under external pressure to change. The individual may consider the commissions of assault, robbery, and rape as heinous and requiring longer sentences.

Those respondents with high religiosity may adhere more strictly to their religious teachings. If these teachings advocate a punishment for the commission of a wrong, then the respondent may feel it is their duty as a devoted follower to incorporate these teachings into their overall decision. This does not mean that their religious teachings are the basis, or even a majority, for their support of longer sentences. This only means that the respondent may use his or her teachings as one of many reasons he or she supports longer sentences.

Finally, individuals with high religiosity may hold a "tough on crime" ideology.

These individuals may see the need for punishing any form of crime and may also consider assault, robbery, and rape as heinous and requiring longer sentence lengths. The fact that the offender was not a citizen of the United States may only exacerbate the commission of these crimes.

Carrying a Lethal Weapon

In regards to the immigration issue, the type of weapon carried may symbolize the respondent's approach to best way for resolving the immigration issue. The significance of this relationship may be more symbolic than literal. Society has a least three options for dealing with any immigration issue: (1) remove the immigrant population entirely from American society, (2) restrict the immigrant population's influence on American society's norms and customs, and (3) accept the inevitable change associated with any society's evolution.

Guns and knives do not restrict the location or occurrence of a potential threat; these weapons remove the threat from the society entirely. Nonlethal weapons like mace or pepper spray or a tazer do not remove a threat from society entirely, but only restrict its occurrence. By not carrying a weapon, an individual may accept that crime is a part of every society and there is nothing they can really do to protect themselves.

Respondents who carry a lethal weapon may impose a sentence length over 15 years as the best alternative to removing the non-U.S. individual influence from society entirely. Respondents who carry non-lethal weapons like mace or pepper spray or a tazer may impose a sentence length over 15 years as a means of restricting the non-U.S. individual's influence on society. Respondents who did not carry a weapon usually

imposed sentence lengths ranging from 1 to 15 years, this may symbolize their acceptance of the influence of an immigrant population as a part of any society's evolution.

Implications

By imposing lengthy sentences on non-U.S. individuals, society is labeling this specific population as "outsiders." Once a specific population is labeled as "outsiders" they are seen as a contributing factor to society's problems. This was the problem with Proposition 187. This proposition allowed governmental authorities to refuse governmental support to any "undocumented" alien and allowed authorities to refuse governmental support for individuals suspected of being "undocumented" aliens. "The campaign supporting Proposition 187 was contentious, and the actual provision passed could be perceived as an attack on all Latinos" (Pantoja & Segura, 2003, p. 270).

The continuing use of the "outsider" label could stigmatize the immigrant population entirely and create friction between it and the larger society. This friction may lead into a strained relationship with both the immigrant population and their home-country. Citizens of the immigrant population's home-country may decide to impose a sentence length over 15 years for US individuals for a violation of any law within that country's borders. This could create more tension between both societies and lead to laws that only exacerbate the problem. These new laws would be passed as a means of "protecting" American society's norms and customs from some characteristic of the immigrant population's culture. These "protective" laws may focus on the economic strain the immigrant population potentially places upon the society, the crimes committed by members of the immigrant population who do not have citizenship, or any arbitrarily

chosen characteristic deemed as detrimental to American society's norms and customs. In many of these "protective" laws, citizenship would become the criterion that either aggravates or mitigates any criminal act by non-U.S. individuals. If this did not solve the immigration dilemma, or alleviate the tension between both societies, then more laws may be enacted that focus on other characteristics of the immigrant population that eventually lead to "Jim Crow" style legislation enacted to "protect" American society.

Recommendations

One method for alleviating the growing tension would be to implement more programs that help both native and immigrant children learn both English and Spanish. Unlike previous periods in the nation's history, the children residing in the United States today have a high probability of interacting with someone from another culture at some point in their lifetime. By learning another language, native children will expand their knowledge of other cultures and open up more of the opportunities the world has to offer. Knowledge of another language may also help to maintain the nation's competitiveness in the future.

Because native children would be learning another language, this will help their parents become more familiarized with the immigrant population through their children's studies. This will occur slowly over time since the main quality associated with the immigrant population is the language difference. After a few generations of parents learning the Spanish language indirectly from their children, and these children growing up to be future parents themselves, then the immigrant population may become viewed less as "outsiders" and possibly more as "insiders", just without citizenship. Future research is

needed in this area to gain a better understanding of this relationship affects the nation's laws.

Future Research

Because it was not a focus of this study, future research needs to look at why individuals may feel it is more beneficial to deny citizenship to children of foreign parentage than to allow them citizenship and teach them American society's norms and customs like any other child born in the United States. These possible participants could be informed about the Fourteenth Amendment granting automatic citizenship to anyone born within the nation's borders and then asked if they still supported denying citizenship to children with foreign parentage. If a significant relationship is still found then future research can be conducted to determine why the respondents support denying citizenship to children with foreign parentage and determine if those respondents would support amending the Constitution to either repeal or revise the Fourteenth Amendment. Focusing on the relationship between denying citizenship and immigration, future research can determine if American society wants to restrict or remove the immigrant population's influence, or the population itself, from society. Knowing this could help create better immigration policies by targeting the reasons for the tension between the native and immigrant populations instead of just the number of immigrants allowed to be in the nation.

Future studies also need to be conducted to determine if the immigration issue is a regional phenomena or national. This research may want to focus on the opinions of citizens residing in nonborder states to determine if they feel the same about the immigrant

population as citizens who reside in border states. This research could determine if citizens of the United States would support the deportation of non-U.S. individuals for any criminal act or only the most serious violations of law.

Finally, research can be conducted to determine why citizens of the United States may view the immigrant population as “outsiders.” Determining the causes of this relationship may help in the creation of more equitable and adequate immigration policies as well. More efficient foreign policies may be created and implemented as a result of the knowledge gained from these future studies. These new foreign policies may help to alleviate the need for many individuals to immigrate to the United States.

REFERENCES

- Ackah, Y. (March 2000). Fear of crime among an immigrant population in the Washington D.C. Metropolitan Area. *Journal of Black Studies*, 30, 553-573.
- Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame, and reintegration*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cullen, F. T., & Agnew, R. (2006). *Criminological theory* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Roxbury.
- Cunliffe, B. W. (1988). *Greeks, Romans, and Barbarians: Spheres of interaction*. New York: Methuen.
- Diamond, J. (1999). *Guns, germs, and steel*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Espenshade, T. J. (1995). Unauthorized immigration to the United States. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 21, 195-216.
- Friedman, L. M. (1993). *Crime and punishment in American history*. New York: BasicBooks.
- Garcia, M. (May, 2001). Siempre and todo el tiempo: Investigating semantic convergence in a bilingual dialect. *Hispania*, 84, 300-312.
- Gottfredson, M., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hatzfeld, J. (1966). *History of Ancient Greece*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Herodotus (2005). *The histories*. New York: Barnes & Noble.

- Jones, R. C. (1995). Immigration reform and migrant flows: Compositional and spatial changes in Mexican migration after the Immigration Reform Act of 1986. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 85, 715-730.
- Karapin, R. (July, 1999). The politics of immigration control in Britain and Germany: Subnational politicians and social movements. *Comparative Politics*, 31, 423-444.
- Koslowski, R. (September 2002). Human migration and the conceptualization of pre-modern world politics. *International Studies Quarterly*, 46, 375-399.
- Monroe, A. D. (Spring 1998). Public opinion and public policy. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 62, 6-28.
- Orrenius, P. M., & Zavodny, M. (Aug., 2003). Do amnesty programs reduce undocumented immigration? Evidence from IRCA. *Demography*, 40, 437-450.
- Pantoja, A., & Segura, G. M. (Sep., 2003). Fear and loathing in California: Contextual threat and political sophistication among Latino voters. *Political Behavior*, 25, 265-286.
- Pfaff, C. W. (Jun., 1979). Constraints on language mixing: Intrasentential code-switching and borrowing in Spanish/English. *Language*, 55, 291-318.
- Raybeck, D. (December 1988). Anthropology and labeling theory: A constructive critique. *Ethos*, 16, 371-391.

- Roark, J., Johnson, M.P., Cohen, P.C., Stage, S., Lawson, A. & Hartman, S.M. (1988).
The American promise: A history of the United States from 1865 (Vol. 2).
Boston: Bedford Books.
- Vago, S. (2009). *Law and society* (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Vold, G., Bernard, T.J. & Snipes, J.B. (2002). *Theoretical criminology*
(5th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Walklate, S. (December 1998). Crime and community: Fear or trust? *The British Journal of Sociology*, 49, 550-569.
- Warr, M. (December 1980). The accuracy of public beliefs about crime. *Social Forces*, 59, 456-470.
- Warr, M., & Ellison, C.G. (November 2000). Rethinking social reactions to crime: Personal and altruistic fear in family households. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 106, 551-578.
- Winslow, R.W., & Zhang, S.X. (2008). *Criminology: A global perspective*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

RECRUITMENT LETTER

Sir or Madam:

My name is Jeremy Smith and I am a graduate student in the Criminal Justice Department here at ETSU. I am working on my thesis and would like you to participate in my survey. The survey will assess the relationship between one's fear of being victimized and their perception of criminality among the immigrant population. The information obtained from this survey may possibly enhance the current policies and procedures for dealing with crime. It would be a great benefit to me, and the social sciences, if you would be so kind as to complete the survey. This extraordinary study is an exciting opportunity for you to help advance the current knowledge.

The survey itself is for research purposes and is strictly voluntary. The survey should take no longer than 15-20 minutes. I cordially ask that you take the time to complete my survey. I know that your schedule is very busy and will appreciate your participation in this survey. If you have any questions regarding this survey please feel free to contact me at zjjs7@goldmail.etsu.edu. Thank you for reading this e-mail and considering my request; I hope you have a good day and wonderful semester. Again, thank you for your time.

<http://www.esurveyspro.com/Survey.aspx?id=de21ca95-8176-4983-bd4f-16e4b171b49e>

APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT

Principal Investigator: Jeremy Smith
Fear of Victimization and the Perception of Criminality
in the Immigrant Population

This Informed Consent will explain about being a participant in a research study. It is important that you read this material carefully and then decide if you wish to be a volunteer.

PURPOSE:

The purpose(s) of this research study is/are as follows: To gain an understanding of how someone's fear of victimization affects their perception of an immigrant's potential criminality. This study will be an aide to policymakers and practitioners in developing more sound immigration policies. Although this is a strictly voluntary study, your participation will give the investigator much needed information into how fear one has of being a victim reinforces the concept of "outsider"; thus, reinforcing their need to create laws to protect themselves and others.

DURATION:

The length of this study, for anyone wishing to volunteer, depends on the individual. The study itself should not take more than 15-20 minutes; allowing for participants' different reading styles, the 15-20 minute time frame should be viewed as a guideline and not a cut off point.

PROCEDURE:

This study is made up of a series of questions that the investigator will use to determine a participant's level of fear, their religious affiliations, and their perceptions toward an immigrant's criminality. The questions are in no particular order and are designed to minimize the level of intrusion while producing a thorough amount of knowledge. You (the participant) will be given different choices (on a scale format) to answer questions; as well as, to offer your approximations for other questions. Once you (the participant) are finished with the survey, you can click "finish." This will redirect you (the participant) away from the webpage. No additional information will be asked of you (the participant) before leaving the survey's webpage. This applies to both those participants who completed the survey and those who voluntarily opted to quit.

POSSIBLE RISKS/DISCOMFORTS:

The possible risks and/or discomforts of your involvement include: feeling that your religious convictions are being questioned; you may even feel uncomfortable about answering religious questions. You might have to think about being victimized, or a loved

one being victimized. If you were victimized, those feelings may resurface. Also, you may have to face your racial preferences as well; and you may experience anxiety at having to take a voluntary survey.

POSSIBLE BENEFITS:

The possible benefits of your participation are: There are no direct benefits to the participants at the time of the survey. All information obtained from the survey will be used to help further existing knowledge and could help generate policies and procedures that better safeguard the participant and/or their loved ones in the future.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION:

Participation in this research experiment is voluntary. You may refuse to participate in the survey. If you decide to take the survey, you can quit at any time. If you quit or refuse to participate, the benefits or treatment to which you are otherwise entitled will not be affected. You may quit by clicking the button "quit survey."

CONTACT FOR QUESTIONS

If you have any questions, complaints, or any problems at any time, you may e-mail the Principal Investigator (Jeremy Smith) at zjjs7@goldmail.etsu.edu. You may call the Chairman of the Institutional Review Board at 423-439-6054 for any questions you may have about your rights as a research subject. If you have any questions or concerns about the research and want to talk to someone independent of the research team or you can't reach the study staff, you may call an IRB Coordinator at 423-439-6055 or 423-439-6002.

CONFIDENTIALITY:

Every attempt will be made to see that your study results are kept confidential. The flashdrive holding the data from this study will be stored in a lockbox for at least 5 years after the end of this research. The results of this study may be published and/or presented at meetings without naming you as a subject. Although your rights and privacy will be maintained, the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, the ETSU IRB, and personnel particular to this research (Jeremy Smith) have access to the study records.

By clicking "next" you confirm that you have read or had this document read to you; and you freely and voluntarily choose to be in this research project.

APPENDIX C
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Background

1) What is your gender?	Male Female
-------------------------	----------------

2) What is your age (in years)?	_____
---------------------------------	-------

3) What is your current relationship status?	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Single</td> <td style="width: 50%;">Separated</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dating</td> <td>Divorced</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Engaged</td> <td>Widowed</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Married</td> <td>Other</td> </tr> </table>	Single	Separated	Dating	Divorced	Engaged	Widowed	Married	Other
Single	Separated								
Dating	Divorced								
Engaged	Widowed								
Married	Other								

4) How many months have you been in your current relationship?	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">1-6</td> <td style="width: 50%;">19-24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7-12</td> <td>25-36</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13-18</td> <td>Over 36</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Does not apply</td> </tr> </table>	1-6	19-24	7-12	25-36	13-18	Over 36		Does not apply
1-6	19-24								
7-12	25-36								
13-18	Over 36								
	Does not apply								

5) What is your level of education?	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Less than HS</td> <td style="width: 50%;">Bachelors</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High School</td> <td>Masters</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Some College</td> <td>Doctorate</td> </tr> </table>	Less than HS	Bachelors	High School	Masters	Some College	Doctorate
Less than HS	Bachelors						
High School	Masters						
Some College	Doctorate						

6) What is your ethnicity?	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">White</td> <td style="width: 50%;">Asian</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>Other</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	White	Asian	Black	Other	Hispanic	
White	Asian						
Black	Other						
Hispanic							

7) Were you born and raised in Tennessee?	Yes No
---	-----------

8) What geographical region are you from? Northeast: CT, DE, District of Columbia, IL, IN, ME, MD, MA, MI, NH, NJ, NY, OH, PA, RI, VT, WI Northwest: ID, IA, KS, MN, MO, MT, NE, ND, OR, SD, WA, WY South: AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, WV	(Please find your home state's abbreviation for geographical location) Southwest: AR, AZ, CA, CO, LA, NV, NM, OK, TX, UT Pacific: HI, AK Not from the United States
9) How many years have you live in the above specified location? 1-5 6-10 11-15	16-20 Over 20
10) Are you a natural citizen of the United States?	Yes No
11) What geographical region of the world are you from? North America Central America South America Asia Eastern Europe	European Union Africa Middle East The Caribbean Other
12) How many years have you lived in the above specified region? 1-5 6-10 10-15	16-20 Over 20
13) Are you currently enrolled at an institution for formal education? Yes	(e.g. GED classes, community college, university, etc.) No
14) What type of formal education are trying to obtain? GED Bachelors Master's	Doctorate Other Not enrolled in any formal classes

15) If attempting a bachelors degree, or higher, which college houses your major?	College of Arts and Sciences College of Business and Technology School of Continuing	College of Nursing College of Public and Allied Health Does not apply to me
16) How many semesters have you been working on your major?	1 2 3	4 More than 4 Does not apply to me
17) Are you a parent?		Yes No
18) How many children do you have?		_____
19) How many... boy(s)_____ girl(s)? _____		Do not have any children
20) What is the age of the... Oldest (or your only child)? _____		Youngest? _____
21) What is your political affiliation?	Conservative Independent	Liberal No political Affiliation
<u>Social Life</u>		
1) Do you consider yourself outgoing?		Yes No
2) How many nights do you go out in a week?		_____
3) How many nights do you go out in a month?		_____
4) If you do go out, usually how many hours do you stay out?		_____
5) Do you feel safe when you go out?		_____
6) Do you go out alone at night?	Never Seldom	Often Always

7) Are the places you go to alone at night safe?	None Some	All Don't Know
8) When you go out alone, do you carry a protective device?	Yes	(Protective devices are guns, knives, mace, tazers, etc.) No
9) What kind of protective device do you carry?	Gun Knife Mace/Pepper Spray	Tazer Do not carry a protective Device Other
10) How many months have you carried a protective device?	1-6 7-12 13-18	19-24 25-30 Over 30
11) I live in a safe neighborhood. Strongly agree	Agree Neutral	Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know
12) How many years have you lived in your current neighborhood?		Less than 1 1-5 More than 5
13) I feel safe walking alone within 1 mile of my home during the day?	Strongly agree Agree Neutral	Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know
14) I feel safe walking alone within 1 mile of my home at night?	Strongly agree Agree Neutral	Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know

15) If a stranger approached me on the street, I would feel_____.	Very Safe Safe Neutral	Unsafe Very Unsafe Don't Know
16) If a stranger was standing near a door I had to pass by, I would feel_____.	Very Safe Safe Neutral	Unsafe Very Unsafe Don't Know
17) If a stranger approached me on the street, I would be afraid of being	Murdered Raped Robbed Assaulted	Conned Other Wouldn't be afraid
<u>Relationships</u>		
1) My boyfriend/girlfriend/spouse lives in a safe neighborhood.	Strongly Agree Agree Neutral	Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know
2) How many years has your boyfriend/girlfriend/ spouse lived in their current neighborhood?		Less than 1 1-5 More than 5
3) I worry about my boyfriend/girlfriend/spouse walking alone within 1 mile of their home during the day?	Strongly Agree Agree Neutral	Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know
4) I worry about my boyfriend/girlfriend/spouse walking alone within 1 mile of their home at night?	Strongly Agree Agree Neutral	Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know

5) If a stranger approached my boyfriend/ girlfriend/spouse on the street, I would feel worried?	Strongly Agree Agree Neutral	Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know
6) If a stranger was standing near the door where my boyfriend/girlfriend/spouse had to pass by, I would feel worried?	Strongly Agree Agree Neutral	Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know
7) If a stranger approached my boyfriend/ girlfriend/spouse on the street I would worry they would be_____.	Murdered Raped Robbed Assaulted	Conned Other Would not worry
8) "A stranger is a friend that you haven't met yet," do you agree with this statement?	Strongly Agree Agree Neutral	Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know
9) Do you worry when your boyfriend/ girlfriend/spouse goes out at night?		Yes No
10) How worried do you get?		Very Worried Don't Know Not Worried
11) Will you try calling them when you believe they should be returning home?		Yes No Don't Know
12) If they don't answer the first time you call, how many times, in a day, do you try to make contact?		1-3 4-6 More than 6 Do not try

13) If you cannot make contact during the night, do you try first thing in the morning?	Yes No
14) Have you ever thought about calling the police when you couldn't get an answer?	Yes No
15) How long do you wait if you decide to contact the police?	Hours Days Weeks Do not contact the police
16) If your boyfriend/girlfriend/spouse was robbed and the offender caught, how many years should the offender receive?	1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 Over 20 Life
17) If the offender was a non-U.S. individual, how many years should the offender receive?	1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 Over 20 Life
18) If your boyfriend/girlfriend/spouse was assaulted and the offender caught, how many years should the offender receive?	1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 Over 20 Life
19) If the offender was a non-U.S. individual, how many years should the offender receive?	1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 Over 20 Life

20) If your boyfriend/girlfriend/spouse was raped and the offender caught, how many years should the offender receive?	1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 Over 20 Life
21) If the offender was a non-U.S. individual, how many years should the offender receive?	1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 Over 20 Life
22) Would you still stay with your boyfriend/girlfriend/spouse if they were raped?	Yes No Don't Know
23) If your boyfriend/girlfriend/spouse were raped, would you feel that you have failed as a boyfriend/girlfriend/spouse?	Yes No Don't Know
<u>Miscellaneous</u>	
1) There is no redeeming qualities about the state of Tennessee.	Strongly Agree Agree No Opinion Disagree Strongly Disagree
2) A "true" Tennessean is someone born and raised in Tennessee.	Strongly Agree Agree No Opinion Disagree Strongly Disagree
3) How many months have you lived in Tennessee?	1-6 7-12 13-18 19-24 25-36 Over 36

4) The opinions of all Tennessee residents, whether born in the state or not, should be taken seriously on issues concerning the State of Tennessee.	Strongly Agree Agree No Opinion Disagree Strongly Disagree						
5) Tennessee is the greatest state in the United States.	<table border="0"> <tr> <td data-bbox="430 546 625 577">Strongly Agree</td> <td data-bbox="836 546 950 577">Disagree</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="430 583 511 615">Agree</td> <td data-bbox="836 583 1063 615">Strongly Disagree</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="430 621 576 651">No Opinion</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Strongly Agree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	
Strongly Agree	Disagree						
Agree	Strongly Disagree						
No Opinion							
6) Anyone who resides in Tennessee is a “true” Tennessean.	<table border="0"> <tr> <td data-bbox="430 751 625 783">Strongly Agree</td> <td data-bbox="836 751 950 783">Disagree</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="430 789 511 821">Agree</td> <td data-bbox="836 789 1063 821">Strongly Disagree</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="430 827 576 856">No Opinion</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Strongly Agree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	
Strongly Agree	Disagree						
Agree	Strongly Disagree						
No Opinion							
7) The opinions of those Tennesseans, born and raised in the state, should be taken more seriously than those of the individuals who moved to the state.	Strongly Agree Agree No Opinion Disagree Strongly Disagree						
8) There is a difference between a “true” Tennessean and a resident of Tennessee.	<table border="0"> <tr> <td data-bbox="430 1161 625 1192">Strongly Agree</td> <td data-bbox="836 1161 950 1192">Disagree</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="430 1199 511 1230">Agree</td> <td data-bbox="836 1199 1063 1230">Strongly Disagree</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="430 1236 576 1266">No Opinion</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Strongly Agree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	
Strongly Agree	Disagree						
Agree	Strongly Disagree						
No Opinion							
9) Anyone, whether born in the state or not, who lives in Tennessee is a Tennessean.	Strongly Agree Agree No Opinion Disagree Strongly Disagree						
10) Other languages are better than English.	<table border="0"> <tr> <td data-bbox="430 1570 625 1602">Strongly Agree</td> <td data-bbox="836 1570 950 1602">Disagree</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="430 1608 511 1640">Agree</td> <td data-bbox="836 1608 1063 1640">Strongly Disagree</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="430 1646 576 1675">No Opinion</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Strongly Agree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	
Strongly Agree	Disagree						
Agree	Strongly Disagree						
No Opinion							

11) English should be the official language of the United States.	(i.e. Other languages could be spoken in public, but English would be the language used for any type of transaction.)
Strongly Agree Agree No Opinion	Disagree Strongly Disagree
12) Citizenship should only be granted to those children whose parents are citizens of the United States.	Strongly Agree Agree No Opinion Disagree Strongly Disagree
13) How many years do you believe foreign citizens should wait before obtaining citizenship status?	Over 15 Should never obtain citizenship Don't Know
1-5 6-10 11-15	
14) Children, of foreign citizens, born in the United States should be granted automatic citizenship.	Strongly Agree Agree No Opinion Disagree Strongly Disagree
15) English should be the only language of the United States.	(i.e. No other language could be lawfully spoken outside one's home, or outside of a school setting)
Strongly Agree Agree No Opinion	Disagree Strongly Disagree
16) How many years do you think it should take for a foreign citizen (who wants to become a U.S. citizen) to learn English?	Less than 1 1-5 Over 5 Could never learn enough English
17) The United States should have a dual language system.	(e.g. Quebec laws mandating everything be advertised in both French and English)
Strongly Agree Agree No Opinion	Disagree Strongly Disagree

18) Only those individuals born in the United States respect the nation's laws.	Strongly Agree Agree No Opinion	Disagree Strongly Disagree
19) Children of non-US citizens, although born in the United States, should have to wait for a specified time period before being granted citizenship.		Strongly Agree Agree No Opinion Disagree Strongly Disagree
20) How many years should the time period be set for?	1-5 6-10 11-15	16-20 Over 20 Don't Know
<u>Religion</u>		
1) Do you belong to a religious institution?		Yes No
2) What religious denomination do you belong?	No Affiliation Catholic Jewish Muslim	Protestant (Non-Evangelical) Protestant (Evangelical) Other
3) Do you attend religious services?		Yes No Not Applicable
4) How many times per month do you attend religious services?	1-3 4-6	Over 6 I do not attend religious services
5) How many times per week do you attend religious services?	1-3 4-6	Whenever religious services are held I do not attend religious services
6) Do you attend religious services during the day?		Yes No Does not pertain to me

7) How many times per month do you attend morning religious services?	1-3 4-6	Over 6 I never attend religious services
8) Do you attend religious services during the evening (night)?		Yes No Does not pertain to me
9) How many times per month do you attend evening (night) religious services?		1-3 4-6 Over 6 I do not attend religious services
10) Do you participate in the church beyond worship services?		Yes No Does not pertain to me
11) Do you consider yourself religious?		Yes No
12) How religious would you consider yourself?	Very Religious Religious Somewhat	Unreligious Very Unreligious This question does not pertain to me
13) Do you read the Bible?		Yes No
14) If you read the Bible, how many times do you read it each week?	1-5 6-10 11-15	More than 15 times I never read the Bible
15) Do you believe that the Bible is the literal word of God?		Yes No
16) Do you believe there should be a separation of Church and State?		Yes No No Opinion
17) Do you believe that Christianity should be the dominant religion of the United States?		Yes No Don't Know

18) Do you believe America has fallen out of favor with God?	Yes No Don't Know
19) Do you feel that your god will keep you from harm?	Yes No This question does not pertain to me
20) Do you still hold the same religious preferences as your parents?	Yes No This question does not pertain to me
<u>Crime</u>	
1) Have you ever been a victim of a crime?	Yes No Don't Know
2) How many months ago did this happen? 1-6 7-12	Over 12 Cannot Remember I have never been the victim of a crime
3) Did you know the assailant? Yes No	It is not important to me Does not apply to me
4) Was the assailant the same ethnicity as yourself? Yes No Can't remember	Its not important to me Does not apply to me
5) Was the assailant caught? Yes No Can't remember	Its not important to me Does not apply to me
6) Was the assailant prosecuted? Yes No Don't Know	Its not important to me Does not pertain to me
7) Was the assailant convicted? Yes No Don't Know	Its not important to me Does not apply to me

8) Did you carry a protective device
before the incident?

Yes

(Protective devices are guns, knives, mace,
tazers, etc.)

No

Does not apply to me

VITA

JEREMY JASON SMITH

- Personal Data: Date of Birth: August 30, 1978
 Place of Birth: Johnson City, Tennessee
 Marital Status: Single
- Education: Public Schools, Johnson City, Tennessee
 B.A. Criminal Justice and Criminology, East Tennessee
 State University, Johnson City, Tennessee 2002
 M.A. Criminal Justice and Criminology, East Tennessee
 State University, Johnson City, Tennessee 2009
- Professional Experience: Security Officer, IPC International/Mall at Johnson City;
 Johnson City, Tennessee 2003-2004
 Security Officer, Northeast State Technical Community
 College; Blountville, Tennessee 2006-2007
 Graduate Assistant, East Tennessee State University,
 College of Arts and Sciences 2007-2009
 Animal Control Officer, Washington County/Johnson City
 Animal Control Center; Johnson City, Tennessee 2008-
 2009
- Honors and Memberships: Dean's List
 Sigma Delta Pi
 American Criminal Justice Society
 American Society of Criminology
 Alpha Phi Sigma