CONTENTS

From the Editor

Dear Brethren,

It is with mixed feelings that I present to you the final (and extra) issue of my tenure as the *Southwest Journal of Criminal Justice* Editor. I am sad to leave the position as it has become part of my routine and has allowed me to remain engaged with the fine leadership of the Southwest Association of Criminal Justice. I must admit, however, I am elated to pick up some additional free time allowing me to pursue other interests. Before I do so, however, I would like to acknowledge a number of people who have helped make my tenure less burdensome.

I would like to thank my Sam Houston State University, College of Criminal Justice, graduate student Nap Reyes for his time, effort, and dedication to serving as the *Southwest Journal of Criminal Justice* Managing Editor. He has greatly helped to move this journal forward. I also would like to thank Jon Sorenson, the previous editor, for making the transition an easy one, and Wes Johnson, who was my co-editor for the first half of our three-year commitment to the journal. I must also thank Harriet Brewster and Christopher Fisher from the publications office in the College of Criminal Justice for their help and assistance in the copy-editing and web-based formatting of the journal. Finally, I would like to thank the Deans, Dean Richard Ward and Dean Vincent Webb, for providing me with the necessary resources to publish the journal. This team of professionals has been a great honor to work with, and I could not have done it without them.

This extra issue marks our movement forward to three issues per year, with the intent of eventually going to four issues per year. The number of submissions over the past three years, especially this last year, should easily allow for the continuation of this movement, as we hope to go to a quarterly journal and align ourselves with a print publication company. Leading the way from here on out, beginning with the Spring 2009 issue, will

be Roger Enriquez, the new editor, from the University of Texas at San Antonio. Thus, I would like to introduce the readers of the *SWJCJ* to your new editor.

Roger Enriquez holds a *juris doctor* degree from the University Of Iowa College Of Law. He is an associate professor of criminal justice at the University of Texas at San Antonio and serves as the Graduate Director for the Master's in Justice Policy. His research agenda includes policing, crime, courts, gangs, Latinos in the criminal justice system, and empirical testing of anecdotal legal theories with respect to jurors and secondary effects. He is well published in both law reviews and peer-reviewed journals. His most recent law review articles have appeared in the *Journal of Gender, Race & Justice*, *University of Texas Hispanic Journal of Law & Policy*, *Washington College of Law Criminal Law Brief*, *Criminal Law Bulletin,* and *American University Journal of Gender, Social Policy & the Law*. His most recent peer-reviewed publications have appeared in the *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *Western Criminology Review,* and *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*. He has also been active in applying and receiving grant funds from various federal and state agencies like the DOJ's National Institute of Justice and Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. He is a licensed attorney and member of the American Bar Association (so if you ever need a lawyer . . .), and he is a member of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, the American Society of Criminology, and, of course, the Southwest Association of Criminal Justice. Overall, I would say, Roger will bring a new style of editing with a number of new and innovative ideas that will continue to move our journal forward.

In closing, I would like to say once more, it has been an honor to serve the Southwest Association of Criminal Justice as its journal editor, and I wish Roger Enriquez all the best in his tenure as the new editor.

Willard M. Oliver
Sam Houston State University

The Impact of Restorative Justice on the Development of Guilt, Shame, and Empathy among Offenders

Arrick L. Jackson
University of North Texas

Abstract
Restorative justice as a philosophy consistently highlights the importance of dialogue among the offender, the victim, and the community as a significant component of repairing the harm done. However, without understanding whether or not offenders are developing the emotions of guilt, shame, and empathy which are necessary for reconciliation, the healing dialogue may be misguided. The present study utilizes a panel design approach with the primary goal of examining the effect of a Missouri Department of Corrections Restorative Justice Program—Victim Impact Training (VIT) on the emotional development of guilt, shame, and empathy among offenders. The MANCOVA results show no overall significant differences in VIT participant's pre- and post-test scores on their development of guilt, shame, and empathy. However, regression analysis results indicate significant relationships between shame and empathy among offenders. Results also indicate significant differences among gender, age, and race on guilt, shame, and empathy. These findings and their implications are discussed.

Key Words: restorative justice, rehabilitation, victim impact panel, guilt, shame, empathy

INTRODUCTION

Crime victims throughout the last two decades have gained the attention of academe, laymen, and policymakers within the criminal justice system. This level of interest has led to controversial policies that have allowed for the development of victim advocate groups, victim-centered programs, initiatives that increase efforts for restitution, and, more recently, an emphasis on victim impact training panels (C' de'Baca et al., 2001; Erez, 1994, 2000; Fors & Rojek, 1997; Henderson, 1985; Hillenbrand, 1990; Kelly, 1990). Although the objectives of victim impact training may vary, the ultimate goal is to have an "intense and emotional impact" (C' de'Baca et al., 2001, p. 615) on the offender, with the hope that these types of training programs will contribute to the goals of the criminal justice process: retribution, rehabilitation,

deterrence, and maintaining social order (Henderson, 1985). Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine if victim impact training (VIT) programs are having the desired emotional impact on offenders.

Victim Impact Training: Theoretical Framework and Evaluations

Theoretical rationales for the victim impact training (VIT) approach can be found in the restorative justice movement that emerged in the 1990s (Rojek, Coverdill, & Fors, 2003). Rationale for VIT can also be found in discussions by Braithwaite (1989) and Cohen (1985) who both discuss the ideas of inclusionary modes of social control and community shaming. Much of this theoretical approach is derived from the fact that the current criminal justice system is offender-focused, so much so, that it has all but ignored the victim. Currently, offenses committed in the United States are not crimes against persons, but are crimes against the state. This approach, although grounded in the ideas of the social contract, limits if not completely eliminates the role of the victim. The restorative justice model postulates that this approach is to the detriment of the criminal justice system and asserts that crime is a social interaction that impacts not only the state but the victim, the offender, and the community. Therefore, an approach that draws on inclusion versus the status quo of exclusion is more appropriate.

Over the last two decades, researchers, policymakers, and practitioners have begun to incorporate the concept of restorative justice into their decision-making template for punishing offenders. Conceptually, restorative justice has been defined as a normative theory of criminal justice that has taken on the characteristics of a reform movement. The primary focus of many restorative justice programs are to provide the offender, the victim, and the community at large the opportunity to engage in a reparative dialogue that encourages forgiveness and seeks to heal the harm done or resolve the conflict among parties (Dzur, 2003).

As noted in the definition, the goal of restorative justice is to create conditions whereby the victim or representatives can dialogue with offenders in order to repair the harm or resolve the conflict. This is what Cohen (1985) and Braithwaite (1989) assert when they discuss exclusionary versus inclusionary modes of social control. The basis of this distinction hinges on how the state utilizes the formal criminal justice process to condemn and punish offenders for their crimes. Braithwaite asserts that this approach isolates the offender from the community and interrupts the necessary reparative process. Thus, Braithwaite argues for a more inclusionary social control mechanism which entails a community shaming process. The community shaming process according to Braithwaite (1989) will do more to reintegrate the offender back into the community, which will ultimately prove to be a more effective social control instrument in comparison to the current disintegrative approaches. This approach generates questions on how best to reintegrate the offender back into the community and, at the same time, heal the harm caused by the offense and prevent its reccurrence (Morris, 2002; Rojek et al., 2003).

According to restorative justice researchers, the best way to heal the harm done and prevent its reoccurrence is through the use conferences (Dzur, 2003), victim impact panels (Rojek et al., 2003), victim impact statements (Erez, 1994, 2000; Erez, Roeger, & Morgan, 1997), and victim impact training (Jackson & Bonnacker, 2006)—all of which have been reported as being effective at contributing to the reparative process among the victim, offender, and community and at reducing the recidivism rate of offenders (Umbreit, Coates, & Vos, 2002; Rodriguez, 2005; Wemmers & Cyr, 2005). By establishing a dialogue among the victim, offender, and the com-

munity, offenders are made aware that their criminal activity not only impacts the victim, but also impacts the entire community. Further, through this dialogue, individual victims as well as the community can begin their healing process and ultimately move forward with their lives. Also, through dialogue, victims by having the opportunity to present their feelings of loss to the offender can possibly generate the emotional responses of guilt or shame within the offender (Dzur, 2003; Gilligan, 2003; Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972; Lutwak et al., 2001; Smith-Cunnien & Parilla, 2001; Takagi & Shank, 2004; Rodriguez, 2005; Tangney, 1991; Wemmers & Cyr, 2005). This emotional development of guilt or shame among offenders is important, because according to Tangney and Dearing (2002) it is the key to generating a dialogue of healing. Individuals who exhibit guilt as an emotion are more likely to express empathy and move towards healing a wrong. Whereas individuals who exhibit shame are more likely to not be empathic and are more likely to avoid dealing with the event, thus hindering the healing process (further conceptual differences between guilt and shame are made at a later point in the paper).

Although there is little research that examines VITs specifically, current literature is replete with empirical research on the many restorative justice models, programs, and practices that incorporate victim panel formats. For example, Umbreit and his colleagues (2002) in a review of 63 empirical studies evaluating the impact of restorative justice conferencing found that, overall, both victims and offenders who participated in mediation programs were satisfied with the program. Their report also found that the recidivism rates of offenders who participated in victim panels were consistently and significantly lower than the rates of offenders who did not participate in the program. Similar findings were reported by Rodriguez (2005) who, after examining the process of selecting offenders to participate in restorative programs, found that community and individual characteristics are important predictors of restorative justice program placement. Rodriguez concluded that those who participated and completed the programs were less likely to recidivate in comparison to those who did not participate in the program. Other research has examined whether or not mediation, which is a significant component of the restorative justice model, can be therapeutic for crime victims (Wemmers & Cyr, 2005). Wemmer and Cyr's findings indicate that, although many victims were afraid to confront offenders, procedural justice can facilitate healing. According to Dzur (2003) it is through this healing process that forgiveness and reintegration can begin.

Although the findings by Umbreit and colleagues, Wemmer and Cyr, and Rodriguez are supportive of the restorative justice models, other research has found the impact of the restorative model approach to be minimal at best. For example, Shinar and Compton (1995) in their study of DWI (driving while intoxicated) offenders found that offenders attending the victim impact panel programs demonstrated a higher average of violations and crashes in comparison to the control group (i.e., non-participants). Similar results were found in a study by C'de Baca et al. (2001), who examined the effectiveness of victim impact panels on reducing recidivism among drunk drivers, in which no significant difference was found (see also Polacsek et al., 2001; Wheeler et al., 2004). By contrast, Sprang and Compton (1998), Fors and Rojek (1997), and Rojek, Coverdill, and Fors (2003) all examined the effect of victim impact panels on DWI offenders and found that program participants were less likely to recidivate, which is consistent with the majority of the studies conducted on restorative model programs.

Despite the empirical support found in the literature, the restorative justice model is not without its critics. For example, Takagi and Shank (2004) point out that although Braithwaite and other theorists' arguments for the restorative model are compelling, they fail to acknowl-

edge the impact of societal structures. According to Takagi and Shank (2004), "Braithwaite does not discuss the issue of power, who holds it, how it is exercised, or how it is channeled into certain dominant structures, especially in class/race/gender relations of domination and subordination" (p. 158). Also, while many of the restorative justice programs focus on rebuilding the relationship between the offender and the community, restorative justice programs are all but absent from minority communities (Takagi & Shank, 2004). Further, despite restorative justice models' strong emphasis on guilt, shame, and empathy, out of the 100 projects reviewed by the University of Minnesota's Center for Restorative Justice, not one empirically focused on the relationship among these variables or examined whether or not offenders were developing these emotional responses (Umbreit et al., 2002). Thus, the goal of this paper is to examine if the Missouri Department of Corrections restorative practice VIT programs are generating the desired emotional responses (guilt, shame, and empathy).

Victim Impact Training

The Victim Impact Training class is an educational program designed to teach offenders about the human consequences of crime. Offenders are taught how crime affects the victim and the victim's family, friends, and community, and how it affects them and their own families, friends, and communities. Specific modules address property crimes, sexual assault, domestic violence, child abuse and neglect, elder abuse and neglect, drunk driving, drug-related crimes, gang violence, and homicide. Victim impact classes have been adapted for both adult and juvenile offenders in diversion, probation, prison, pre-release, detention, and parole supervised settings. A key element of the classes is the direct involvement of victims (not necessarily the victim of the offenders participating in the VIT program) and victim service providers. They tell their personal stories of being victimized or of helping victims to reconstruct their lives after a traumatic crime. Parents and relatives of incarcerated offenders and community representatives, such as insurance adjusters, may also speak to the class. Offenders are encouraged to enter into a dialogue with the guest speakers. Some programs utilize an indirect reparation approach in which the offender and victim are in contact about the same type of offense (Tutt, 2007). For example, many VIT programs integrate victim impact panels, composed of three to four victims of the particular type of crime being examined, into the curriculum. When the panel format is used, the class participants may ask questions at the end of the presentation, but usually do not engage in discussion with the victim presenters. The goals of the training program are to: (1) teach offenders about the effects of trauma victimization; (2) increase offenders' awareness of the negative impact of their crime on their victims and the community; (3) encourage offenders to accept responsibility for their harmful actions; (4) provide a forum for victims and victim service providers to educate offenders about their harmful behavior, with the hope of preventing a future re-offending; and (5) to build linkages between criminal and juvenile justice agencies. Underlying these goals is an attempt to generate the emotional responses of guilt, shame, and remorse (Stutz, 1994).

Conceptualizing Guilt, Shame, and Empathy

The conceptualization and causal relationship of guilt, shame, and empathy have received varying amounts of attention from a variety of disciplines. For example, researchers from the field of psychology have defined guilt as a response to the violation of internal norms (Harris, 2003; Harris, Walgrave, & Braithwaite, 2004; Tangney, 1991). When individuals are aware of

their own personal norm violation, they are also more likely to make some attempt to repair the wrong (Kugler & Warren, 1992; Leith & Baumeister, 1998; Tangney, 1991). As stated by Leith and Baumeister (1998), "guilt stimulates people to counteract the bad consequences of their actions, for example, by confessing, by apologizing, or by making amends" (p. 3). Thus, individuals who have the emotional response of guilt are more likely to emotionally relate to the victim (i.e., feel empathy) and are more likely to develop a need to repair the wrong (Tangney, 1991).

Conversely, when individuals' attention is externally focused, they are more likely to develop shame. Shame, unlike guilt, often forces individuals to run and hide or avoid situations that force them to confront their wrong-doings (Tangney, 1991). When individuals are shamed, they are more likely to develop feelings of failure and avoidance and develop other behaviors that may lead to further transgressions. Thus, "shame involves critical, painful scrutiny of the self as a whole, and the resultant distress may inhibit any simple or pragmatic effort to deal with the immediate situation" (Leith & Baumeister, 1998, p. 3-4). Shame-prone individuals in comparison to guilt-prone individuals may be more apt to respond with an avoidance reaction (denial of victim), in lieu of an empathic response (Tangney, 1991). Consequently, shame is not likely to produce the pro-social and relationship-enhancing responses that are attributed to guilt. In short, shame-prone individuals are less likely to develop empathy for victims in comparison to guilt-prone individuals.

In the field of criminal justice, shame has followed a different but related path of conceptualization. One of the well-known pieces of work on shame and crime is that of Braithwaite (1989). Braithwaite explores the role of shame in societies that are more communal and argues that if individuals commit acts that are considered crimes in their community, reintegrative shaming in comparison to disintegrative shaming (i.e., stigmatizing) is more effective at preventing further transgressions. According to Braithwaite, reintegrative shaming is shaming that occurs with the attempt to not only chastise the offender, but it also has the goal of forgiveness and acceptance of the individual back into the community. This is done not only to help the individual but also to repair the relationship among the victim, offender and the community. By contrast, disintegrative shaming is a shaming process that does more to ostracize and embarrass the offender, without the goal of repairing the relationship among the victim, offender, and community (Braithwaite, 1989). Braithwaithe's work has made significant contributions to the restorative justice model and has been the catalyst for many research programs that evaluate both theoretically and empirically the role of restorative conferences, victim impact panels, and victim-offender mediation.

Recently, Braithwaite's definition of shaming and the relationships among guilt, shame, and empathy has been challenged due to its inconsistency with more contemporary research on the conceptualization of guilt and shame and their impact on empathy development (Harris et al., 2004). According to Harris et al. (2004), guilt and shame are not distinguishable from each other and have been conceptualized by the authors as "guilt-shame." Further, they argue that individuals must first develop empathy in order to experience "guilt-shame." This conceptualization and ordering of variables is contrary to empirical research that has demonstrated that the concepts are in fact different and should not be used interchangeably and with literature that argues that guilt-prone individuals in comparison to shame-prone individuals are more likely to develop an empathetic response (i.e., individuals can emotionally see themselves in the victim's situation) (Ferguson & Crowley, 1997b; Leith & Baumeister, 1998; Lutwak et al., 2001; Tangney, 1990, 1991; Tangney et al., 1992; Tangney & Dearing 2002).

The concept of empathy along with guilt and shame has also been plagued with issues of conceptualization and empirical measurement. Pepinsky (1998) in his examination of the role of empathy in offender rehabilitation emphatically argues that empathy, in comparison to punitive measures, is a much more effective approach to rehabilitation. Without empathy (the ability to view yourself in the situation), offenders will not be able to truly understand the impact of their behavior nor be able to develop the impetus to repair their relationship with the victim or the community. Although Pepinsky's argument is logical, it relies heavily on anecdotal examples for support.

Others have taken a more empirical approach to examining the role of empathy in offender rehabilitation. For example, Tangney (1991) examined the relationship among guilt-proneness, shame-proneness, and the empathetic response and found that negative empathy was significantly correlated with shame and positively correlated with guilt. These results support the argument that guilt (particularly constructive guilt) is more likely to develop an empathetic response which is considered necessary for the repairing and healing of both intra- and interpersonal relationships. On the other hand, shame is more likely to lead to avoidance, thus impeding the necessary healing and repairing of intra- and interpersonal relationships. These results have also been found among research studies examining empathy development among adult sex offenders (McAlinden, 2005; Tierney & McCabe, 2001).

Similar to the debates over conceptualization of shame and guilt, there is debate over the conceptualization of empathy (Fisk & Taylor, 1991; Harris, 2003; Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972; Pepinsky, 1998; Tangney, 1991). For example, Davis (1983) points out that despite its common use in everyday language, empathy is not easily defined. Davis proposes four basic dimensions of empathy. The first dimension is fantasy. Within this dimension, individuals are viewed as being able to transpose (imaginatively) themselves into feelings and actions of a fictional character. The second dimension is perspective taking, which is defined as the ability to place oneself into another's situation and comprehend his or her experiences. The third dimension is empathetic concern. From this perspective individuals are viewed as being concerned about the welfare of others and are able to share the pain of their adversity. The final dimension is personal distress, which is defined as the anxiety that one develops upon hearing or learning of the suffering or distress of another. Although Davis (1983) identified more than one type of empathy, many researchers have adopted the "perspective taking" dimension as a common definition of empathy (Leith & Baumeister, 1998; Tangney, 1991). Following precedence, for the purpose of this study empathy will be conceptualized consistent with Davis's (1983) perspective taking dimension which emphasizes a shared emotional response between an observer and stimulus person. This definition requires that the individual possesses the cognitive ability to take another person's perspective into consideration and have the cognitive ability to accurately read cues regarding another person's particular emotional experience (see also Tangney, 1991).

Despite the debate over conceptualization, researchers have continually suggested that in order to develop a thorough understanding of the restorative justice programs' impact on offender behavior, empirical and theoretical examination of the development of emotional responses (i.e., guilt, shame, and empathy) among offenders is necessary (Kelly, 1990; Lutwak et al., 2001; Rodriguez, 2005; Rojek et al., 2003; Umbreit et al., 2002). Therefore, it is the goal of this study to examine not only the relationships among the three variables, but specifically examine the impact of guilt and shame on the development of empathy among offenders who have participated in a VIT program.

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

VIT/ICVC Program

Beginning in 1999, the Missouri Department of Corrections implemented a victim impact training program called the "Impact of Crime on Victims Classes (ICVC)." This ICVC program is based on a program developed by the California Youth Authority (California Youth Authority, 2008). The target audiences of ICVC classes in the community are young adult felony offenders and offenders who have demonstrated a need for this type of program who are on probation or parole. Offenders are selected for the classes primarily through referrals by the court and probation and parole officers. Classes held in the community (classes are also held in institutions) are taught by corrections staff or private vendors. The classes meet for two hours weekly for ten weeks during which several types of crimes are addressed. Program topics addressed include: Property Offenses, Drugs and Society, Domestic Violence, Child Maltreatment, Assault, Sexual Assault, Drunk Driving, Robbery, and Homicide. The material is presented by the use of text, videotaped victim stories, and guest victim speakers.[1] When guest victim speakers participate, the program resembles the *Victims as Leaders* model, which allows for victims' voices to be represented through other victims or victim advocate groups without the victims and the offenders meeting face-to-face. This model has been described as giving victims' voices authenticity and allows victims the opportunity to have a significant impact on offenders' behavior and on the dialogue of healing (Shaheed, 2006).

The program's strategy is to change behavior through education and to sensitize offenders to the effect of crime and develop in the offender sensitivity about his or her impact on the victim, the victim's family, and the community. ICVC classes should increase offender awareness about the cause and effect of his or her actions, develop respect for the rights of others, teach the offender to accept responsibility for his or her actions, and provide victims and victim service providers with a forum to educate offenders about the consequences of their criminal behavior.

Participants

Data for this study was collected from adult probationers being supervised by the Department of Corrections, Board of Probation and Parole, in the Southeast Region of Missouri. Study sites included probation and parole offices located in Farmington and Poplar Bluff, Missouri. Study sites were selected because of their proximity and the availability of ICVC classes provided for their offender populations. It was originally conceived that other counties that had ICVC classes would be used in the study, but these other counties either failed to hold a program, or there was a significant variation in the structure of the program; therefore, it was decided to focus only on the counties that utilized the ICVC program as originally devised by the Missouri Department of Corrections.

---

1. Although victims participate as guest speakers, they are not necessarily the victims of the offenders in the program. Since victim participation is voluntary, many victims prefer not to participate and prefer for victim advocate groups to represent them in these types of programs.

The participants in the study consisted of two groups of offenders (4-week and 10-week) in Butler and St. Francois, Missouri, counties who were court-ordered to participate in the community ICVC program. The study participants' offenses consisted of a "garden variety" of deviant behavior: failure to pay child support, burglary, DUI, drug violations, robbery, assault, fraud, leaving the scene of an accident, and tampering with a motor vehicle. The initial sample consisted of 45 offenders in the 10-week ICVC classes and 40 offenders in the 4-week ICVC classes. However, due to program attrition, the final sample consisted of 42 offenders ordered to participate in the 10-week ICVC class and 27 offenders in the 4-week ICVC class.[2] A total of 69 respondents completed the surveys at both pre-test and post-test. The overall attrition rate for the sample was approximately 18%. This attrition rate within the sample can be attributed to parole violations, re-arrest, or failure to complete the class through non-participation (for an overall description of population demographics by pre and post-test see Table 1 on page 13).

Measurements

Independent Variable(s)

Test of Self-Conscious Affect for Socially Deviant (TOSCA-SD). This study utilizes the TOSCA-SD which was developed by Hanson and Tangney (1995) after recognizing the limitations of the TOSCA when applying the instrument to deviant populations. The TOSCA-SD is a revision of the adult TOSCA developed for use with incarcerated respondents, as well as individuals from other "socially deviant" groups (Hanson & Tangney, 1995). Although there is some debate about whether the TOSCA is an appropriate measure of guilt and shame, Tangney (1991) concluded that scenario-based measures (such as the TOSCA) are nevertheless the best currently available measures of guilt and shame proneness (see also Ferguson & Crowley, 1997b). Like the TOSCA, TOSCA-SD employs a scenario-based approach to assess individual differences in shame-proneness and guilt-proneness. The TOSCA-SD consists of 13 scenarios designed primarily to assess the respondent's shame and guilt reactions to each situation. Each scenario is followed by several alternative responses representing brief phenomenological descriptions of shame, guilt, and defensive responses with respect to the specific scenario. Rather than relying on the often misused terms "shame" and "guilt" these TOSCA-SD items represent brief phenomenological descriptions of a shame or guilt experience, as defined in the theoretical, phenomenological, and empirical literatures (Lutwak et al., 2001; Tangney, 1989). The measure is not forced-choice in nature. Respondents were asked to rate on a 4-point Likert scale, their likelihood of responding in each manner indicated, allowing for the possibility that feelings of shame and guilt may co-occur in connection with a given situation. The TOSCA has been shown to have acceptable internal consistency (alpha = .76 and .66 for shame and guilt, respectively; Tangney et al., 1992), and maintained this consistency with the current total sample (.84 for guilt, .67 for negative-self appraisal, and .38 for behavioral avoidance). The TOSCA shame and guilt scales have been shown to be correlated in previous studies (r = .44;

---

2 Due to a shortage of resources (i.e., personnel to conduct classes) many of the counties in Missouri have accommodated the personnel shortage by offering a 4-week ICVC program. Therefore, the study sample consists of respondents from a 4-week and a 10-week ICVC program. Since this was not included as part of the overall theoretical argument, program type will be treated as a demographic variable and as a covariate within the MANCOVA model.

Tangney, 1990, 1991). TOSCA shame-proneness scores, but not guilt-proneness scores, have been related to a range of psychopathologies (Gilligan, 2003; Tangney, 1990, 1991). Previous studies' internal consistency specifically utilizing the TOSCA-SD reliabilities for the shame (negative self-appraisal and behavioral avoidance) and guilt measures were .89, .81, .74, respectively (Cripps, 1997; Hanson 1996). In a recent study by Jackson and Bonacker (2006) examining guilt, shame, and empathy development among victim impact training participants, the internal consistency for the TOSCA-SD was .85 for guilt, .62 for negative-self appraisal, and .65 for behavioral avoidance measures. The reliability scores for this study on shame sub-scales (negative self-appraisal and behavioral avoidance) and guilt were .84 for guilt, .67 for negative-self appraisal, and .38 for behavioral avoidance. These reliability scores are consistent with previous studies utilizing the TOSCA and the TOSCA-SD (Cripps, 1997; Hanson, 1996; Tangney, 1990, 1991; Tangney et al., 1992).[3]

Dependent Variable(s)

Mehrabian Emotional Empathy Scale (MEES). Mehrabian Emotional Empathy Scale (MEES) (Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972) is a measure of general empathy. It contains 33 statements that respondents are required to rate in a range +4 (very strong agreement) to -4 (very strong disagreement). In developing this scale, Mehrabian and Epstein (1972) selected only items that did not correlate with the Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960), to ensure that the scale was not confounded by social desirability. The MEES has been used in previous research on rapists and sex offenders (Tierney & McCabe, 2001) and has demonstrated a reliability alpha of .84. A modified MEES was utilized to measure empathy within this sample. The modified scale in this sample consists of 22-items from the original Mehrabian empathy scale (12 negative and 10 positive)[4] and unlike the original MEES, which was measured on a scale ranging from +4 (very strong agreement) to -4 (very strong disagreement), the scale for this study was modified and measured on a 4-point Likert scale 1 (very unlikely) to 4 (very likely) of which the negative empathy response items were reverse scored. Despite the changes, the scale still utilizes the primary questions of each dimension from the multidimensional construct. For example, Susceptibility to Emotional Contagion ("The people around me have a great deal of influence on my mood"); Appreciation of the Feelings of Unfamiliar and Distant Others ("Lonely people are probably unfriendly"); Extreme Emotional Responsiveness ("Sometimes the words of a love song can move me deeply"); Tendency to be Moved by Others' Positive Emotional Experiences ("I like to watch people open presents"); Tendency to be Moved By Others' Negative Emotional Experiences ("Seeing people cry upsets me"); Sympathetic Tendency ("Little children sometimes cry for no apparent reason"); and Willingness to be in Contact with Others Who Have Problems ("When a friend starts to talk about his problems, I try to steer the conversation to something else"). While the scale sets out to measure emotional components of empathy, it does include a few "cognitive" items such as "I would rather be a social worker than work in a job training center." Cronbach's alpha for the

3. Due to the low Cronbach's alpha level for the Shame Sub-scale Behavioral Avoidance, it will not be included in the final analysis.
4. Modifications of the scale were necessary due to the length of the survey and due to the population being surveyed. The scale has been pre-tested and has demonstrated a consistent Cronbach's alpha in a previous study utilizing this scale (Jackson and Bonacker, 2006).

empathy scale for the current sample is .78, which is an acceptable alpha and is consistent with previous research utilizing this scale (see Tierney & McCabe, 2001).

Socio-demographic Variables

Beyond the inclusion of theoretically relevant variables, this study controls for several demographic factors including offender ethnicity/race, marital status, prior ICVC participation, first felony, restitution, education, employment, income, program length, and gender. In the final analysis, all demographic variables were treated as dummy variables with the exception of income and education, which were coded as polytomous variables, and age, which remained continuous due to reliability issues in respondents' answers on demographic items (see Table 1, below, for overall percentages by participants and control).

TABLE 1. SAMPLE DESCRIPTION AND FREQUENCY BY PROGRAM LENGTH ($N = 69$)			
Variable	**Values**	**Frequency**	
		4-Week (n = 42)	**10-Week (n = 27)**
Gender	1 = Male	30 (71.4%)	17 (62.9%)
	2 = Female	12 (28.6%)	10 (23.8%)
Race	1 = Non-minority	36 (85.7%)	27 (100.0%)
	2 = Minority	6 (14.3%)	0(0.0%)
Prior ICVC	1 = Yes	3 (7.1%)	6 (22.0%)
	2 = No	39 (92.9%)	21 (77.8%)
Restitution	1 = Yes	15 (35.7%)	18 (66.6%)
	2 = No	27 (64.3%)	9 (21.4%)
First Felony	1 = Yes	0 (0.0%)	24 (88.8%)
	2 = No	39 (92.9%)	3 (11.1%)
	Missing	3 (7.1%)	
Education	1 = No HS Diploma	13 (30.9%)	6 (22.2%)
	2 = HS Diploma	10 (23.8%)	15 (55.5%)
	3 = Some College	12 (28.5%)	5 (18.5%)
	4 = College Degree	3 (7.1%)	1 (3.7%)
	Missing	15 (35.7%)	

TABLE 1. SAMPLE DESCRIPTION AND FREQUENCY BY PROGRAM LENGTH (*N* = 69) (CONTINUED)			
Variable	**Values**	**Frequency**	
		4-Week **(n = 42)**	**10-Week** **(n = 27)**
Marital Status	1 = Married	13 (30.9%)	5 (18.5%)
	2 = Not Married	29 (69.1%)	22 (81.5%)
Employment	1 = Employed	30 (71.4%)	19 (70.3%)
	2 = Unemployed	12 (28.5%)	8 (29.6%)
Income	1 = Below $19,000	30 (71.4%)	20 (74.1%)
	2 = $19,000-29,999	7 (16.7%)	5 (18.5%)
	3 = $30,000-39,999	3 (7.1%)	1 (3.7%)
	4 = $40,000-49,999	1 (2.4%)	1 (3.7%)
	5 = More than $50,000	1 (2.4%)	0 (0.0%)
	Missing		
Age	Years; range 18-66		

Note: X = 30.42; SD = 10.66

Administration of Instrument

The surveys for the ICVC participants were administered in person by the author or research assistants who visited all of the potential sites after approval had been obtained from the appropriate Missouri State officials. Prior to taking the survey, all participants were informed that their participation was voluntary and that they could choose not to complete the survey or refuse to answer any specific questions. All survey data was numerically coded by using the last four digits of the offender's social security number to ensure that the offender's pre- and post-test were matched.

Participants at the beginning of the ICVC (pre-test) received a booklet that included an informed consent form and a cover sheet with written instructions for completing the survey. ICVC participants were re-tested (post-test) following completion of the class. Upon their participation, the consent form was removed from each packet by the researcher and kept on file at the Missouri Department of Corrections Administration office to ensure anonymity and to ensure that the same respondents who participated at pre-test also participated at post-test.

Hypotheses

Using a panel-design research strategy, participants in the study were surveyed at pre-test and post-test and separated into two groups—4-week program participants and 10-week program participants. The primary goal of the study was to examine if offenders in the ICVC program were more likely to develop the emotional responses of guilt, shame, and empathy. Below are the three hypotheses tested within this study:

H1: Offenders after completing the ICVC class should indicate a significant difference between their pre-test and post-test scores on guilt, shame, and empathy.

H2: Offenders at post-test who experience higher levels of guilt are more likely to indicate empathy as an emotional response.

H3: Offenders at post-test who experience higher levels of shame are less likely to indicate empathy as an emotional response.

The research analysis is two-fold. Since hypothesis 1 has multiple dependent variables, a multiple analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) will be utilized to test for any significant differences between offender's pre- and post-test responses. Hypotheses 2 and 3 only utilize empathy as the dependent variable; thus, a regression model will be utilized to test their assumptions.

RESULTS

Before the analysis, data were prepared to meet the assumptions of this model (that is homogeneity of covariance, normality, and, whenever possible, outliers). Data collected in the pre- and post-test interviews were analyzed using a multiple analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) approach. This approach was chosen because it allows for the testing of two or more dependent variables and for the incorporation of one or more covariates into the analysis (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005). Since it is hypothesized in both current and prior literature that age, race, gender, income, restitution, employment, first felony, prior ICVC participation, and education are inter-correlated with the dependent variables, they were treated as covariates within the MANCOVA model (see Table 2, below, for Pre- and Post-test means and standard deviations of guilt, shame, and empathy scales).

Variables	10-Week (n = 42)		4-Week (n = 27)	
	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Constructive Guilt	X = 43.26	X = 43.91	X = 45.15	X = 45.15
	SD = 7.30	SD = 7.87	SD = 5.67	SD = 5.27
Negative Appraisal	X = 13.90	X = 14.60	X = 12.81	X = 12.55
	SD = 4.02	SD = 4.05	SD = 4.12	SD = 2.65
Empathy	X = 66.93	X = 68.48	X = 64.41	X = 68.22
	SD = 8.79	SD = 8.95	SD = 12.68	SD = 10.27

TABLE 2. PRE- AND POST-TEST MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF GUILT, SHAME, AND EMPATHY

Note: X = mean; SD = Standard Deviation

Multivariate Analysis of Covariance: Hypothesis 1

A multivariate analysis of covariance was conducted to determine the effect of time (pre- and post-test) and ICVC program type on guilt, shame, and empathy.[5] MANCOVA results revealed no significant relationship among pre- and post-test responses and the combined dependent variables guilt, shame, and empathy (Pillai's = .036, $F(3,103) = 1.294$, $p = .280$, multivariate $\eta^2 = .036$). However, program type (10-week vs. 4-week) demonstrated a significant relationship on the combined dependent variable shame (Pillai's = .105, $F(3, 103) = 4.029$, $p = .009$). The covariates race (Pillai's = .140, $F(3, 103) = 5.596$, $p = .001$), marital status (Pillai's = .080, $F(3, 103) = 2.984$, $p = .035$), gender (Pillai's = .283, $F(3, 103) = 13.561$, $p = .000$), first felony (Pillai's = .144, $F(3, 103) = 5.775$, $p = .001$), and whether or not the offender participated in an ICVC program before (Pillai's = .173, $F(3, 103) = 7.201$, $p = .000$) all had a significant impact on the combined dependent variables guilt, shame, and empathy.

Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted on each dependent variable as a follow-up test to MANCOVA. Race ($F(1, 105) = 11.646$, $p = .001$), marital status ($F(1, 105) = 8.170$, $p = .005$), gender ($F(1, 105) = 34.358$, $p = .000$), first felony ($F(1, 105) = 7.824$, $p = .006$), and program type ($F(1, 105) = 10.133$, $p = .002$) category differences were significant for negative appraisal (shame sub-scale). Gender ($F(1, 105) = 4.274$, $p = .041$) and first felony ($F(1, 105) = 6.340$, $p = .013$) category differences were significant for guilt. Whereas gender ($F(1, 105) = 5.214$, $p = .024$), restitution ($F(1, 105) = 4.816$, $p = .030$) and whether or not the offender participated in an ICVC program before ($F(1, 105) = 13.835$, $p = .000$) category differences were significant for empathy.

Regression Analysis: Hypotheses 2 and 3

In order to examine Hypotheses 2 and 3 a standard multiple regression was conducted to determine the accuracy of the independent variables guilt and shame predicting empathy among offenders. This analysis is unique to offenders' post-test results only. Prior to the regression analysis, a separate variance-covariance matrix for all variables in the model was calculated, using a two-tailed test of significance at the .05 level as the criterion. Bivariate correlations indicated that the relationships between variables were in the predicted directions (See Table 3, opposite). Furthermore, bivariate correlations, variance inflation factors (VIFs), and condition number tests indicated that there were no signs of multicollinearity. Regression results indicate that the overall model significantly predicts empathy $R^2 = .580$, $R^2_{adj} = .458$, $F(13, 45) = 4.755$,

---

5. Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was significant ($p=.032$) for MANCOVA testing Hypothesis 1; thus, Pillai's Trace is used for interpreting the homogeneity of the regression slopes and subsequent multivariate test. The first step in interpreting the MANCOVA results is to evaluate the preliminary MANCOVA results that include the Box's Test and the test for homogeneity of regression slopes. If Box's Test is not significant, the Wilks' Lambda statistic must be utilized when interpreting the homogeneity of regression slopes and the subsequent multivariate tests. If the Box's Test is significant, the researcher must use the Pillai's Traces (see Mertler and Vannatta, 2005). The Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices tests the null hypothesis that the variance/covariance matrices in the population are identical across cells. When the F statistics differ within a MANCOVA Pillai's Trace is often used because it is the most powerful and robust F statistic. Thus using Pillai's Trace and not Wilk's Lambda may improve the robustness of the test in the model.

		TABLE 3. BIVARIATE CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR GUILT, SHAME, AND EMPATHY													
Variables	**Empathy**	**Negative Self-Appraisal**	**Guilt**	**Age**	**Gender**	**Education**	**Restitution**	**Employed**	**Prior ICVC**	**Income**	**First felony**	**Pre/post-test**	**Program Length**	**Ethnicity**	**Marital Status**
Empathy	1														
Negative Self-Appraisal	**.277)	1													
Guilt	**.561	**.494	1												
Age	*.181	-.030	.166	1											
Gender	**.303	**.479	**.224	.166	1										
Education	*.178	.063	.130	**.283	.169	1									
Restitution	-.140	-.063	-.034	**.221	-.160	.150	1								
Employed	.000	.116	.000	**.263	**.328	-.021	-.032	1							
Prior ICVC	**.259	.091	.009	-.054	.147	.139	.035	-.008	1						
Income level	-.049	*-.171	-.031	.161	**-.233	.159	*.210	-.158	.002	1					
First felony offense	.079	.095	*-.179	-.163	-.085	.080	.081	-.030	.027	.115	1				
Pre-Post-test	.100	.038	.045	.003	.031	.000	.030	-.021	*-.203	.095	.000	1			
Program Length	-.056	*-.219	.083	**.220	.089	-.052	-.048	.054	-.064	-.110	**-.908	.000	1		
Ethnicity	.015	**.229	-.025	-.078	.010	*.206	-.019	-.024	.090	-.065	*.196	.000	**-.247	1	
Marital status	.065	.154	.048	*-.175	.159	*-.198	**-.307	-.076	-.006	**-.356	-.093	.000	.138	*-.168	1

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

p<.000. This model accounts for approximately 45.8% of the variance in empathy experienced among offenders within this sample. A summary of regression coefficients is presented in Table 4 [below] and indicates that only three (guilt, age, and prior ICVC participation) of the 13 variables entered into the model significantly contributed to the model.

TABLE 4. COEFFICIENTS FOR REGRESSION MODEL VARIABLES						
	B	**β**	**T**	**p**	**Bivariate r**	**Partial r**
Shame Neg Self Appraisal	-.400	-.150	-1.013	.317	.307	-.149
Program length	.851	.046	.189	.851	.009	.028
Guilt	.850	.613	5.076	***.000	.615	.603
Age	.205	.232	2.016	*.050	.237	.288
Gender	4.172	.216	1.824	.075	.358	.262
Education	-.881	-.087	-.736	.465	.113	-.109
Restitution	-3.130	-.164	-1.576	.122	-.192	-.229
Employment	-.602	-.028	-.262	.795	.115	-.039
Prior ICVC	4.942	.233	2.37	*.025	.307	.328
Income	-.999	-.123	-1.072	.289	-.193	-.158
First Felony	5.049	.267	1.139	.261	-.005	.167
Ethnicity	1.525	.042	.329	.744	.095	.049
Marital status	-.168	-.008	-.065	.948	.088	-.010

*sig. at .05; **sig. at .01; ***sig. at .001

Limitations of the Study

There are several caveats of this study that should be mentioned. First, the survey is a self-report study and therefore is limited by the well-documented limitations of this type of data collection (e.g., underreporting, exaggeration, incomplete answers, etc.) (for a complete summary of limitations see Mosher, Miethe, & Phillips, 2002). Second, the sample is an available sample of respondents in the ICVC classes who may have been more inclined to complete surveys. Since the survey was completely voluntary, only those respondents who were more inclined to complete the survey participated; thus the ability to generalize conclusions from this sample is limited. Third is the overall sample size and the attrition rate of 18%. In comparison to similar studies that had samples over 100, this sample is smaller primarily due to the attrition within the sample. However, this is not unusual for studies that utilize a panel-design to evaluate programs (Babbie & Maxfield, 2008). Nonetheless, it does have an overall impact on the analysis and results of this study. Therefore, all results from this study should be interpreted with caution.

Results Summary

Overall ICVC participation has no significant impact on the combined independent variables. Further although not included as a theoretical argument, program type does appear to have a significant impact on the combined independent variables shame, guilt, and empathy, more specifically on shame. It appears that offenders in the 4-week program were more likely

to be shame-prone in comparison to the offenders in the 10-week program. These results suggest that shorter ICVC programs are more likely to discourage guilt and enhance shame in the offender. As stated earlier, individuals that experience greater levels of shame after participating in these "restorative like" programs are also less likely to develop reparative behavioral strategies (Jackson & Bonacker, 2006). Hypotheses 2 and 3 were analyzed using multiple regression, and were unique to post-test results only. Overall support was found for Hypothesis 2, which suggested that offenders who experienced more guilt after completing the ICVC course would also be more empathetic. However, the data did not support Hypothesis 3. Based upon the findings of this study, guilt demonstrates a significant impact on empathy among offenders. This indicates that individuals, who are guilt-prone, are also more likely to experience empathy as an emotional response after participating in the ICVC program. These findings are consistent with both prior and current literature (Ferguson & Crowley, 1997b; Jackson & Bonacker, 2006; Leith & Baumeister, 1998; Lutwak et al., 2001; Tangney, 1990, 1991; Tangney et al., 1992). Also of particular interest is the strong significant relationship among gender, program type, guilt, shame, and empathy. The results suggest that females are more likely to benefit from these "restorative like" programs in comparison to their male counterparts. Further, these results suggest that longer programs may be more conducive to generating positive emotional responses among offenders participating in ICVC programs. Thus, the more exposure to programmatic treatment the more likely program managers are to witness positive change in offender's behavior. These findings are also consistent with prior research (Ferguson & Crowley, 1997b; Jackson & Bonacker, 2006; Leith & Baumeister, 1998; Lutwak et al., 2001; Tangney, 1990, 1991; Tangney et al., 1992; Tangney & Dearing, 2000; Walters, 1999).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The primary goal of this study was to examine if ICVC participation had a significant impact on the emotional development of guilt, shame, and empathy among a sample of offenders. MANCOVA was used to examine Hypothesis 1, and the results indicate that overall there were no significant differences between the ICVC participants' pre- and post-test responses on the combined dependent variables. However, although not part of the theoretical framework, program type (10-week vs. 4-week) did demonstrate a significant impact on the combined dependent variables. Further, regression analysis results indicate that offenders who are guilt-prone are also more likely to be empathetic. This finding is consistent with previous research which argues that individuals who are guilt-prone are also more likely to be empathetic and are more likely to want to reconcile their transgressions in order to repair any harm done (Ferguson & Crowley, 1997b; Jackson & Bonacker, 2006; Leith & Baumeister, 1998; Lutwak et al., 2001; Tangney, 1990, 1991; Tangney et al., 1992; Tangney & Dearing, 2002). Although reparative behavior or acceptance of responsibility was not measured in this study, the results do suggest that ICVC programs may have—however limited—a significant impact on changing offender emotional responses, and future research should attempt to connect positive emotional responses generated from ICVC participation to acceptance of responsibility measures or other outcome measures that indicate change in offender behavior.

Also, there were significant findings among the covariates and the combined dependent variables. Of particular interest are the results of gender on the offender's development of emotional responses. The results suggest that female offenders within this study were more likely

to develop guilt as an emotional response, more likely to view themselves negatively, and more likely to develop empathy as an emotional response in comparison to their male counterparts. Further, these findings also indicate that ICVC programs and possibly other community restorative justice/practice programs may prove to be more effective for female offenders than for male offenders who are less likely to develop the emotional responses that are necessary for a dialogue of healing and repairing. These findings are consistent with current research (Ferguson & Crowley, 1997a; Jackson & Bonacker, 2006; Karniol et al., 1998) and suggest that restorative justice/practice programs that emphasize guilt may be more successful at generating empathy.

The findings should also encourage policymakers and program managers to develop individualized programs that are gender specific. Currently, like many other non-custody rehabilitation training programs where males and females are placed in the same classroom and exposed to a narrow educational curriculum, gender issues are not considered as an important factor for programmatic success. This finding has consistently been noted in research that examines rehabilitation programs and gender (Efthim, Kenny, & Mahalik, 2001; Ellis, O'Hara, & Sowers, 2000; Hartwig & Meyers, 2003). For example, Hartwig and Meyers (2003) noted that existing rehabilitation programs are male-oriented and often fail to incorporate a focus on gender issues. Other researchers (Geiger & Fischer, 2005; Wood, May & Grasmick, 2005) have also noted that not only are gender issues important for the development of successful rehabilitation programs, but factors surrounding parenting and marriage for females should also be considered. Therefore, future programming and research should re-examine the impact of gender on restorative justice/practice programs specifically and rehabilitation programs in general.

An additional facet highlighted by the results of this study is the significant finding between program type (4-week vs. 10-week) and the shame sub-scale negative self-appraisal. This finding is of particular interest, primarily due to the fact that participants in the 4-week program were more likely to develop feelings of shame in comparison to offenders in the 10-week program. Due to the length of the program, ICVC instructor's within the 4-week program appear to be focusing on parts of the curriculum that are more likely to increase shame, which is a negative emotion, and thus offenders are less likely to develop guilt, which is necessary for reconciling the harm done and recognizing the victim. Conversely, ICVC instructors in the 10-week program appear to have more time to work with offenders, highlight their shortcomings, and focus on developing the necessary reparative skills within the offender to correct their wrongs. This conclusion suggests that the 4-week ICVC program offered by the State of Missouri Department of Corrections, although necessary due to the lack of resources and time, may not be having the desired impact on offenders as originally intended. Instead, the 10-week program, although challenging for resource management, may be the more appropriate and effective program approach for developing the necessary reparative behaviors among offenders. These results are consistent with previous research that examined the impact of program exposure on lifestyle changes among offenders, in which it was noted that offenders that had more exposure to programmatic efforts were more likely to have better outcomes (Walters, 1999).

In summary, although the findings of this study are interesting, it must be noted that it is difficult to generate specific emotions in human beings. It is often assumed that because people can hold back emotions (e.g., stop themselves from crying, not be angry, etc.), they must also be able to produce them on command. This of course is a false assumption. Restorative justice or restorative-like programs that emphasize directed shame, guilt, or empathy through course curriculum and reduced-sentence incentives must understand that "ordering oneself or

someone else to feel guilty [or shamed] might defeat its point by its very directness" (Green-span, 1995, p. 142). Program managers cannot demand guilt, shame, or empathy, as these are emotions that are instilled over time from childhood to adulthood, and if individuals are not inculcated with these emotions from childhood, they may find emotions understandable but difficult to internalize and turn into action-behavior. Thus, the results of this study appear to generate more issues for future research in this area. For example, although the issue of conceptualization remains a major obstacle for understanding the emotional impact of restorative justice/restorative practice programs in current literature, it appears from this study that this is less of a problem than originally thought. Braithwaite (1989) is arguing for the need of reintegrative shaming, and Tangney (1991), along with other researchers, is arguing for guilt development—specifically constructive guilt. A careful examination of the literature highlights that the differences between these two concepts are minimal at best. In fact, it appears that both camps are discussing the same topic, but sitting at different tables. Future research should do more to bridge the conceptual schism instead of continuing to argue over differences. Also, given the findings and the sample limitations of this study, future research should do more to incorporate emotional responses into the research designs, examining other restorative justice/practice programs in order to explore whether or not these programs are having some cathartic impact on offenders and victims.

REFERENCES

Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame and reintegration.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Bazemore, G., Zaslaw, J. G., & Riester, D. (2005). Behind the walls and beyond: Restorative justice, instrumental communities, and effective residential treatment. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal, 56*, 53-73.

California Youth Authority. (2008). http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Victim_Services/victimintro.html

C' de Baca, J., Lapham, S. C., Liang, H. C., & Skipper B. J. (2001). Victim impact panels: Do they impact drunk drivers? A follow-up of female and male, first-time and repeat offenders. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 62*, 615-620.

Cohen, S. (1985). *Visions of social control.* Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

Cripps, J. E. (1997). The association between the neutralization of self-punishment, guilt, and psychopathy among extrafamilial child molesters. Upublished Masters Thesis. Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24*, 349-354.

Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44*, 113-126.

Dzur, A. W. (2003). Civic implications of restorative justice theory: Citizen participation and criminal justice policy. *Policy Sciences, 36*, 279-306.

Efthim, P. W., Kenny, M. E., & Mahalik, J. R. (2001). Gender role stress in relation to shame, guilt, and externalization. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 79*, 430-438.

Ellis, R. A., O'hara., M., & Sowers, K. M. (2000). Profile-based intervention: Developing gender-sensitive treatment for adolescent substance abusers. *Research on Social Work Practice, 10*, 327-326.

Erez, E. (1994). Victim participation in sentencing and the debate goes on.... *International Review of Victimology, 3*, 17-32.

Erez, E. (2000). Integrating a victim perspective in criminal justice through victim impact statements. In A. Crawford & J. Goodey (Eds.), *Integrating a victim perspective within criminal justice* (pp. 165-184). United Kingdom: Ashgate Dartmouth Publishing.

Erez, E., Roeger L., & Morgan, F. (1997). Victim harm, impact statements and victim satisfaction with justice: An Australian experience. *International Review of Victimology, 5*, 37-60.

Erez, E., & Rogers L. (1999). Victim impact statements and sentencing outcomes and processes: The perspectives of legal professionals. *The British Journal of Criminology, 39*, 216-239.

Ferguson, T. J., & Crowley, S.L. (1997a). Gender differences in the organization of guilt and shame. *Sex Roles, 37*, 19-44.

Ferguson, T. J., & Crowley, S. L. (1997b). Measure for measure: A multitrait-multimethod analysis of guilt and shame. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 69*, 425-441.

Fisk, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). *Social cognition.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fors, S. W., & Rojek, D. R. (1997). The effect of victim impact panels on DUI/DWI rearrest rates: A twelve-month follow-up. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 60*, 514-520.

Geiger, B., & Fischer, M. (2005). Naming oneself criminal: Gender difference in offenders' identity negotiation. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 49*, 194-209.

Gilligan, J. (2003). Shame, guilt, and violence. *Social Research, 70*, 1149-1180.

Greenspan, P. S. (1995). *Practical guilt: Moral dilemmas, emotions, and social norms.* Oxford University Press: New York, NY.

Hanson, K. R. (1996, November). Coping with culpability. Presentation at the 15th Annual

Research and Treatment Conference of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Chicago, IL.

Hanson, R. K., & Tangney, J. P. (1995). The Test of Self-Conscious Affect—Socially Deviant

Populations (TOSCA-SD). Corrections Research, Department of the Solicitor General of Canada, Ottawa.

Harris, N. (2003). Reassessing the dimensionality of the moral emotions. *British Journal of Psychology, 94*, 457-473.

Harris, N., Walgrave, L., & Braithwaite J. (2004). Emotional dynamics in restorative conferences. *Theoretical Criminology, 8*, 191-210.

Hartwig, H. J., & Myers J. E. (2003). A different approach: Applying a wellness paradigm to adolescent female delinquents and offenders. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 25*, 57-75.

Henderson, L. N. (1985). The wrongs of victim's rights. *The Stanford Law Review, 37*, 937-1021.

Hillenbrand, S. (1990). Restitution and victim rights in the 1980s. In A. J. Lurigio, W. G. Skogan & R. C. Davis (Eds.), *Victims of crime: Problems, policies, and programs* (pp. 188-204). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Jackson, A., & Bonacker, N. (2006). The effect of victim impact training on the development of guilt, shame, and empathy among offenders. *International Review of Victimology, 13*, 301-324.

Karniol, R., Gabay, R., Ochion, Y., & Harari, Y. (1998). Is gender or gender-role orientation a better predictor of empathy in adolescence? *Sex Roles, 39*, 45-59.

Kelly, D. P. (1990). Victim participation in the criminal justice system. In A. J. Lurigio, W. G. Skogan, & R. C. Davis (Eds.), *Victims of crime: Problems, policies, and programs* (pp. 172-187). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Kugler, K., & Warren H. J. (1992). On conceptualizing and assessing guilt. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*, 318-327.

Leith, K. P., & Baumeister R. F. (1998). Empathy, shame, guilt, and narratives of interpersonal conflicts: Guilt-prone people are better at perspective taking. *Journal of Personality, 66*, 1-37.

Lutwak, N., Panish, J. B., Ferrari, J. R., & Razzino, B. E. (2001). Shame and guilt and their relationship to positive expectations and anger expressiveness. *Adolescence, 36*, 641-653.

Maxfield, M. G., & Babbie, E. (2008). *Research methods for criminal justice and criminology.* Belmont, CA: Thomas/Wadsworth.

McAlinden, A. (2005). The use of shame with sexual offenders. *British Journal of Criminology, 45*, 373-394.

Mehrabian, A., & Epstein, N. (1972). A measure of emotional empathy. *Journal of Personality, 40*, 525-543.

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

Missouri Revised Statutes. (2004, August 28). http://www.moga.mo.gov/statutes/c200-299/217000077.htm.

Morris, A. (2002). Critiquing the critics: A brief response to critics of restorative justice. *British Journal of Criminology, 42*, 596-615.

Mosher, C. J., Miethe, T. D., & Phillips, D. M. (2002). *The mismeasure of crime.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Pepinsky, H. (1998). Empathy works, obedience doesn't. *Criminal Justice Policy and Review, 9*, 141-167.

Polacsek, M., Rogers, E. M., Woodall, G. W., Delaney, H., Wheeler, D., & Rao, N. (2001). MADD victim impact panels and stages of change in drunk-driving prevention. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 62*, 344-350.

Rodriguez, N. (2005). Restorative justice, communities, and delinquency: Whom do we reintegrate. *Criminology and Public Policy, 4*, 103-130.

Rojek, D. G., Coverdill, J. E., & Fors, S. W. (2003). The effects of victim impact panels on DUI rearrest rates: A five-year follow-up. *Criminology, 41*, 1319-1340.

Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1993). *Crime in the making: Pathways and turning points through life.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Shaheed, F. (2006). Rising phoenixes: Creative resistance by victimized women. *Development, 49*, 52-54.

Sherman, L. W., Strang, H., & Woods, D. J. (2000). *Recidivism patterns in the Canberra reintegrative shaming experiments (RISE).* Retrieved on July 2, 2004, from http://www.aic.gov.au/rjustice/rise/index.html.

Shinar, D., & Compton, R. P. (1995). The influence of victim impact panels on DWI recidivism. *Alcohol, Drugs and Driving, 11*, 73-87.

Smith-Cunnien, S. L., & Parilla, P. F. (2001). Restorative justice in the criminal justice curriculum. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 12,* 385-403.

Sprang, G., & Compton, R. (1998). Victim impact panels: An examination of the effectiveness of this program lowering recidivism and changing offenders' attitudes about drinking and driving. *Journal of Social Service Research, 22*, 73-84.

Stutz, W. (1994, May). *Victim awareness educational program evaluation.* Washington State Department of Corrections, Division of Community Corrections, Victim Witness Unit.

Takagi, P., & Shank, G. (2004). Critique of restorative justice. *Social Justice, 31*, 147-163.

Tangney, J. P. (1990). Assessing individual differences in proneness to shame and guilt: Development of the self-conscious affect and attribution inventory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 102-111.

Tangney, J. P. (1991). Moral affect: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*, 598-607.

Tangney, J. P. (1994). The mixed legacy of the superego: Adaptive and maladaptive aspects of shame and guilt. In J. M. Mashing & R. F. Bornstein (Eds.), *Empirical perspectives on object relation theory* (pp. 2-28). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Tangney, J. P., & Dearing, R. L. (2002). *Shame and guilt.* New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P., Fletcher, C., & Gramzow, R. (1992). Shamed into anger? The relation of shame and guilt to anger and self-reported aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*, 669-675.

Tierney, D. W., & McCabe, M. P. (2001). An evaluation of self-report measures of cognitive distortions and empathy among Australian sex offenders. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 30*, 495-519.

Tutt, N. (1997). Restorative justice in practice in Great Britain and Ireland. *European Journal of Criminal Policy and Research, 5*, 99-112,

Umbreit, M. S., Coates, R. B., & Vos, B. (2002). The impact of restorative justice conferencing: A review of 63 empirical studies in 5 countries. *Center for Restorative Justice and Peacemaking:* University of Minnesota.

Valore, T. G., & Siemen, K. A. (2003). Alternatives to punishment: Words and ice. *Reclaiming Children and Youth, 12*, 93-98.

Walters, G. D. (1999). Short-term outcome of inmates participating in the lifestyle change program. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 26*, 322-337.

Wemmers, J., & Cyr, K. (2005). Can mediation be therapeutic for crime victims? An evaluation of victims' experiences in mediation with young offenders. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 47*, 527-544.

Wheeler, D. R., Rogers, E. M., Tonigan, J. S., & Woodall, W. G. (2004). Effectiveness of customized Victim Impact Panels on first-time DWI offender inmates. *Accident Analysis and Prevention, 36*, 7-13.

Wilson, J. W. (1996). *When work disappears: The world of the new urban poor.* New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Wood, P. B., May, D. C., & Grasmick, H. G. (2005). Gender differences in the perceived severity of boot camp. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 40*, 153-175.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Arrick L. Jackson is currently the Program Coordinator for the Department of Criminal Justice at the University of North Texas Dallas Campus. Dr. Jackson received his Ph.D. in Political Science from Washington State University. Research and publications can be found in *Policing: International Journal of Police Strategies and Management, Criminal Justice Studies: A Critical Journal of Crime, Law, and Society, International Review of Victimology, Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* and the *Journal of Family Violence.*

Jail Visitation: An Assessment of
Organizational Policy and Information Availability

Alicia H. Sitren
University of North Florida

Hayden P. Smith
University of South Carolina

Brandon K. Applegate
University of Central Florida

Laurie A. Gould
University of Texas at Arlington

Abstract

Jail inmates face substantial emotional, economic, legal, and other challenges when they are incarcerated. The extent to which they are able to maintain contacts with individuals on the outside can substantially determine how well they cope with these concerns, and visitation is the primary way that such links may be maintained. To date, no systematic assessment of jail visitation policies has been conducted. The current study examined the availability of visitation policy information and the content of policies for national samples of large and small jails. The results suggest that large jails provide more opportunities for visitation and that they provide more information than small jails. Overall, there exists an opportunity for jails to substantially increase the availability of crucial visitation information. Policy implications are discussed.

Key Words: jails, visitation, inmate families, correctional policy

INTRODUCTION

In 1961, sociologist Erving Goffman defined total institutions as "place[s] of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an

appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life" (p. xiii). Local jails were among the institutions Goffman sought to capture with this description. He observed that within these institutions, scheduled activities occur predominately within groups, with all of one's basic daily functions (e.g., work, sleep, recreation) taking place exclusively within the confines of a sole, isolated structure. Whether modern jails truly constitute total institutions is debatable. Several scholars have observed that other actors in the local criminal justice system largely determine the size of a jail's inmate population (Bureau of Justice Assistance, 2000; Hall, Henry, Perlstein, & Smith, 1985; Surette, Applegate, McCarthy, & Jablonski, 2006). More broadly, Klofas (1990) argued that jails are best understood when considered within their larger social context, and Sturges and Hardesty (2005) suggested that jails should be viewed in reference to the ecosystem within which they exist. Farrington (1992, p. 6-7) contended that jails operate "in a relatively stable and ongoing network of diverse transactions, exchanges and relationships." Many jails are not self sufficient in matters of health care, food, clothing, work, education and spirituality, and staff routinely "carry" the facility into the community and the community back into the facility. Thus, jails may be more open than the "total institution" label suggests.

Nevertheless, Goffman's (1961) conception highlights one of the fundamental features of local jails—isolation. Inmates are separated from the general public as well as from family and friends. Some of the detrimental effects of isolation can be mitigated through visitation. Not all features of visitation at jails, however, are currently clear. In particular, no systematic evidence exists regarding the availability of information on visitation policies. Further, only one prior study has documented the restrictions that jail policies place on those who may wish to visit a friend or family member who is incarcerated. Sturges and Hardesty (2005) reported on the existence of seven possible visitation policies among Pennsylvania county jails. Based on survey responses from jail wardens, the authors discovered that most jails in this state required visitors to present identification, to sign in prior to visiting, to have their name on an approved list, to visit during a scheduled time, and to abide by a dress code. No study has yet looked beyond these particular policies or at jails in other states. The current study seeks to begin addressing these gaps in the literature. As a prelude to our analysis, we begin by reviewing the existing literature relevant to jail visitation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Transition from Society to Jail

The transition from society to jail can be a psychologically and socially jarring experience. Gibbs (1982) describes the process with adjectives such as "disruptive," "debilitating," "traumatic," and "cataclysmic"; an event associated with increased risk of self-injury and suicide. Toch (1975) states that this loss of equilibrium, coupled with missing social contacts and support from the family, can lead to a crisis of abandonment. Critics of local incarceration argue that jail operators actively punish inmates experiencing this transition through malign neglect (Irwin, 1985). Specifically, Irwin (1985) suggests that jail inmates experience a process of disintegration, disorientation, degradation, and preparation that strips the bonds between the inmate and the broader society. The aspect of this process most relevant to the issue of visitation is disintegration, the term Irwin uses to describe how being jailed erodes inmate ties to existing formal and informal social relationships. To Irwin, when the inmate is not given the

opportunity to meet basic obligations through interpersonal and familial interactions, an overall weakening of the family unit develops.

Interestingly, previous experiences with incarceration do not safeguard one from the psychological distress associated with adapting to the jail environment. In his qualitative study, Fleisher (1995) followed the lives of street dwellers in the Seattle area. Fleisher discovered that while jails frequently provide stability to street dwellers through a multitude of services and programs, the process of being jailed highlights and exacerbates the street dweller's minimal social networks. Without street-level interactions used to secure alcohol, drugs, and a place to sleep, this vulnerable population is also prone to dwell on past mistakes while in jail. A lack of social interaction with the outside world furthers the risk of chronic depression and anxiety. It appears that while street dwellers may have been frequently jailed in the past, having even a lone family member or friend visit can represent a crucial factor in their ongoing psychological adjustment and resilience.

According to Gibbs (1982), maintaining links with persons in the outside world is crucial to the street-jail transition. The importance is twofold. First, external relationships can offer financial support. Second, they offer "a sense of hope and adequacy in an uncontrollable and uncertain situation" (p. 100). Hairston (1988) also notes the significance of maintaining outside social networks for inmates. Families provide resources, information about life on the outside, and encouragement to participate in rehabilitative services. Similarly, a *lack* of family visitation has been associated with increased feelings of loneliness, isolation, guilt, anger, and despair (Gordon, 1999).

The Importance of Family Visits

Imprisonment produces far-reaching psychological, social, and financial damages that extend beyond the prisoner to the family (Arditti, Lambert-Shute & Joest, 2003). Incarceration places an immense strain on marriage and family life, as relationships with spouses and children become gradually more difficult to maintain (Gordon, 1999; Komorsky, 2004). For families, the emotional effect of incarceration has been likened to the death of a family member (Komorsky, 2004). In addition to the emotional trauma of incarceration, families have more practical concerns relating to finances. While the family unit often remains intact when a male is incarcerated, wives and partners can find themselves in the role of primary caretaker and provider for the family. In fact, two pressing issues for the wives and partners of incarcerated males repeatedly mentioned in the literature include raising children alone and dealing with financial problems (Arditti et al., 2003; Christian, 2005).

Arditti et al. (2003) describe the family members and children of incarcerated inmates as "survivor family members," acknowledging that they are left to confront daily life challenges without the support or contribution of the individual who has been incarcerated. In a separate analysis, Arditti (2003b) reported that these survivor family members also view themselves as victims of the criminal justice system. Both studies utilized data collected from interviews with caregivers and children visiting family members at a local jail. Survivor family members noted stresses on several dimensions including emotional, financial, parenting, and social stigma due to their connection with the inmate. The environmental conditions of the facility were typically unsanitary, crowded, and noisy. Visitors reported and interviewers witnessed incidences of being

disrespected and humiliated by correctional staff. Speculations of child stress were also made due to the loss of involvement with the incarcerated parent and the changing role of the other.

From the inmate's perspective, lost or weakened connections with family are a major concern. Hairston (1991) conducted a study that examined the importance of visitation for mothers incarcerated in jail. Through personal interviews with 38 women, Hairston revealed that separation from children was one of the most difficult aspects of incarceration. Indeed, most inmates indicated that their children had not visited them during their period of incarceration. Reasons for lack of visitation included distance from the child's home, lack of adequate transportation, and the institution's visiting policies. The institution's visitation policy allowed children to visit only on Saturdays for 30 minutes, and the maximum number of family visits allotted to each inmate was two per month. These findings are not gender specific. Weisheit and Klofas (2002) found that over 60% of male inmates in their research identified weakening family relationships as the primary jail-related problem they faced. The deleterious effects on the family bond were more significant to these inmates than were concerns for financial stability, living arrangements, ownership of property, and physical health.

Visitation provides a means to alleviate the stresses associated with incarceration and regular visits from family members are critical to adjusting to incarceration (Hairston, 1988; Hairston, 2004; Sturges, 2002; Sturges & Hardesty, 2005). There is some evidence to suggest that inmates who receive regular visits from family members are less likely to cause institutional problems. In a study conducted by Wooldredge (1999), frequency of visitation was significantly correlated with psychological well-being among inmates. Additional research indicates that inmates who receive regular visits are also less likely to recidivate upon release (Hairston, 1988; Howser & Macdonald, 1982; Kieser, 1991; Girshick, 1996; Martin, 1997).

Despite the importance of visitation for both inmates and families, very little research has investigated the nature or process of visitation. The work that has been done suggests that the visitation process is sometimes less than ideal. Correctional institutions play a major role in facilitating or blocking the visitation process, depending on the nature of their visitation policies (Rosen, 2001). In fact, several authors surmise that visitation procedures actually impede inmate-family connections (Hairston, 2004; Sturges & Hardesty, 2005).

Sturges (2002) conducted a qualitative evaluation of visitation at several county jails to assess the concerns that correctional officers and visitors had about the visitation process. Drawing on in-depth interviews and observations of visitation procedures at five county jails, Sturges found that correctional officers most often were concerned about safety and security issues and with problems related to unruly visitors. Different issues were salient to those seeking to visit an inmate. Many family members indicated that the "first-come-first-serve" visitation policy at one institution hampered their visiting experience because it increased the amount of time they had to wait. Other notable concerns included perceived mistreatment by correctional officers, the absence of physical contact visits, and the lack of activities in the waiting room.

Arditti's (2003a) largely descriptive study revealed some of the same challenges. The researcher conducted interviews with 56 family members of jail inmates and found that the lack of physical contact was the single largest concern, with 87% citing it as being a serious problem. Other serious concerns included the short length of the visit, no privacy, and long wait times. It is notable that Christian's (2005) examination of visiting at state correctional facilities

produced similar results and confirmed that a facility's visitation policies and procedures can have dramatic effects on inmates' and visitors' experiences.

In addition to these problems, families of inmates have found a lack of written rules and procedures for visitation. Obtaining information about facility visitation is often described as a frustrating experience (Arditti, 2003b; Hairston, 2004). The distribution of visitation rules and regulations to family members is not a standard correctional practice (Hairston, 2004). Edenfeld (2005) found the visitation policies of the jail where her husband was incarcerated so confusing or simply nonexistent that she penned an article in *American Jails* calling for improvement in 14 areas. In particular, Edenfeld recommended a clearly written handout for visitation that would provide "the address and directions to the jail, parking suggestions, hours and days of visitation, any restrictions, dress requirements, and rules regarding infant supplies" (p. 54). While organizational concerns for visitation programs becoming a vehicle for contraband smuggling are both valid and understandable, Edenfeld's request likely would increase the efficiency of the jail while decreasing stress for inmates and their visitors.

Summary

To date, research on the jail environment has focused on the significance of distal attributes such as drug addiction, poor health, and low socioeconomic status on the adaptation of the individual to the jail environment. Unfortunately, a gap remains in terms of the organizational directives that influence the level of access that jail inmates have to external social contacts. The loss of contact with family imposed by jail institutions represents a collateral cost to the inmate, one that occurs in addition to the overt loss of freedom. Additionally, these social and financial strains extend beyond the prisoner to the family. The current study is the first of its kind to systematically examine on a national level what information on visitation is made available to inmates and family members. Sturges and Hardesty (2005) examined only a few policies in only a single state. Furthermore, prior studies of the opportunities and restrictions that jails place on visitation have examined one or only a handful of institutions. We complement these studies by examining the content of visitation policies across a broader sample of local jails.

METHODOLOGY

The sampling frame for this study was the dataset of the Bureau of Justice Statistics' National Jail Census, 1999, provided through the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2003). The National Jail Census of 1999 identified 3,376 jails in operation in the United States. Of these, 3,084 provided data and were included in the ICPSR dataset. To avoid overcomplicating our analyses, we chose to focus only on locally administered jails. Eliminating regional, federal, and privately-operated jails resulted in a sampling frame containing 2,995 facilities. This sampling frame was then stratified by jail size—small jails were defined as having a capacity of 55 inmates or less, and large jails were defined as having a capacity of 800 inmates or more.[1] We randomly selected 30 small and 30 large jails. Despite the small number of cases selected, the

1. Definitions of jail size vary widely. Mays and Thompson (1988), for example, defined small jails as those with a capacity of ten or fewer inmates. Others might contend that jails of 100 inmates are still small compared to the largest jails in the country, which can house several thousand or more (Harrison

sample of small jails represents approximately 2% of the 1,528 small jails in the country; our sample of large jails constitutes approximately 20% of the 148 jails with a capacity of 800 inmates or more nationally. We chose to select an equal number of large jails despite the fact that they account for a far smaller proportion of jail facilities in the United States because they incarcerate the bulk of jail inmates. In 2006, jails with an average daily population of 1,000 or more inmates held half of all jail inmates in the country (Sabol et al., 2007).

For most of the sample, contact information was found in a directory produced by the American Jail Association (2003). Each jail was contacted by telephone. We requested that any materials relating to visitation that were normally provided to inmates and visitors be mailed or faxed to us. Specifically, we sought visitation policies and procedures, visitation schedules, standard operating procedures, and any information provided to the inmates in an inmate handbook. Typically someone in an administrative position, such as the sheriff or jail manager, had to approve sending visitation information in response to our request. In some cases, the researchers were directed instead to a recorded message about visitation that could be accessed by telephone.

A key concern of this study was the availability of information for visitors. We felt, however, that it would be inappropriate to mislead jails about the purpose of our request for information. When we contacted a jail, we did not pose as people wishing to visit an inmate. Therefore, our approach to obtaining information likely differed from that of potential visitors. All jails were initially contacted via telephone, and multiple contacts were necessary in most cases because the procedures for obtaining information varied from institution to institution. Following initial contact, a letter was mailed to the institution formally requesting the visitation information and indicating the purposes for the research. In five cases, the telephone number for the jail could not be located despite extensive searches of the American Jail Association (2003) directory, the Internet, and telephone directory assistance (i.e., "411"). These facilities were contacted by mail only. The extensive efforts we undertook to locate contact information highlight the potential difficulty that a visitor might encounter when trying to obtain necessary visitation information.[2]

Once visitation information was received, we coded the data into 17 dimensions of specific policy content. Six continuous variables were coded: the maximum number of visits allowed per week, the length of the visitation in minutes, the number of days a week available for visitation, the number of visitation hours available per week, the maximum number of adults allowed during a visit, and the maximum number of children allowed at a visit. The remaining eleven variables were dummy coded yes (1) or no (0): contact visitation; written information provided to inmates; inmate right to refuse the visit; written information provided to visitors; posted visitation information for visitors; posted visitation schedule only, not provided in writing, and

---

& Beck, 2005). We elected to cut "small" jails at 55 because the result was to place approximately half of the jails in our sampling frame into this category, and because it is approximately equal to the definition of small jails (average daily population of fewer than 50 inmates) adopted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (Sabol, Minton, & Harrison, 2007). Defining "large" jails as those with a capacity of 800 or more encompassed approximately 5% of all jails at the upper end of jail size.

2. Because of resource constraints, we did not physically visit any of the jails in the sample. In this way, we did not attempt one of the avenues that might result in information being provided to a potential visitor—appearing at the jail and requesting a visit.

subject to change; visitors required to schedule an appointment; visitors required to provide valid photo ID at the time of the visit; locker provided to visitors; and visitors allowed to bring designated items for inmates during visitation. We also coded whether visitors were logged in manually (0) or electronically (1).

RESULTS

The results are presented in two sections. First, to demonstrate the availability of information, we compare what data were provided by small and large jails across all variables. Second, among those jails that made information available to us, we assess the content of jail visitation policies for small and large jails.

Table 1 [below] reports the availability of visitation information and allows comparison by jail size. There are three important results that can be surmised from this table. First, despite our repeated efforts to obtain information, a substantial number of jails did not make visitation information available. Only 58% of all the jails contacted provided visitation information. Of the 30 large jails contacted, 23 or 77% provided information, and of the 30 small jails contacted, 12 or 40% supplied information about their visitation policies. The gap between large and small jails was a statistically significant difference (t = -3.051, p < .05); thus, large jails were much more likely to provide visitation information than small jails.

TABLE 1. PERCENT OF JAILS PROVIDING VISITATION INFORMATION			
	All Jails (n = 60)	Small Jails (n = 30)	Large Jails (n = 30)
Any Information	58	40	77
Specific Policy Areas			
Visits per week	45	23	67
Visitation length	45	23	67
Days per week	47	27	67
Hours per week	47	27	67
Adults	40	17	63
Children	13	3	23
Contact visit	43	30	57
Written for inmate	57	40	73
Refuse visit	13	0	27
Written for visitor	42	27	57
Posted for visitor	33	23	43
Posted schedule only	30	23	37
Schedule appointment	22	13	30
Photo ID	47	23	70
Visitor log-in	27	10	43
Locker	27	10	43
Specified items for inmate	42	27	57

Second, regardless of jail size, a large amount of information about specific areas of visi-tation policy is not being made available. As shown in Table 1 [page], less than half of all jails provided information in almost all of the areas under examination, with the exception of written information provided to inmates (57%). Jails supplied particularly limited information in the following areas: the maximum number of children allowed at a visit (13%), whether an inmate has the right to refuse a visit (13%), appointment scheduling (22%), availability of lock-ers for visitors (27%), and the posting of the visitation schedule (30%).

Third, large jails were far more likely to provide information on specific policy areas than were small jails. For example, whether visitors were required to show valid photo identifica-tion at the time of their visit was made available by 70% of the large jails compared to only 23% of small jails. Additionally, 63% of large jails made available information concerning the maximum number of adults allowed at a visit compared to 17% of small jails. As demonstrated in Table 1, less extreme examples still indicate that large jails were substantially more likely to provide information than small jails. Whether a visitation schedule was posted only and not provided in writing was made available by 37% of large jails and 23% of small jails. Whether visitors were required to schedule an appointment for visitation was made available by 30% of large jails and only 13% of small jails.

Among those jails that provided information to us, we next evaluate the content of jail visitation policies for small and large jails. Table 2 [below] reports mean values and *t*-tests for differences in visitation policy variables by jail size. The first few variables presented in the table focus on the parameters that jails set for visitation. For both large and small jails, rela-

TABLE 2. CONTENT RESULTS FOR JAIL VISITATION POLICY VARIABLES BY JAIL SIZE			
	Small Jails	Large Jails	*t*
Visits per week	2.43	2.65	-0.293
Visitation length (minutes)	32.86	44.00	-1.105
Days per week	3.50	5.15	-2.068*
Hours per week	9.06	32.28	-4.031*
Adults	2.20	2.32	-0.301
Children	1.00	1.43	-0.750
Contact visit (0=no, 1=yes)	0.56	0.65	-0.440
Written for inmate (0=no, 1=yes)	0.67	0.95	-1.929
Refuse visit (0=no, 1=yes)	N/A	1.00	N/A
Written for visitor (0=no, 1=yes)	0.00	0.53	-4.243*
Posted for visitor (0=no, 1=yes)	0.57	0.92	-1.627
Posted schedule only (0=no, 1=yes)	0.71	1.00	-1.549
Schedule appointment (0=no, 1=yes)	0.50	0.44	0.171
Photo ID (0=no, 1=yes)	1.00	1.00	N/A
Visitor log-in (0=manual, 1=electronic)	0.00	0.31	-2.309*
Locker (0=no, 1=yes)	0.67	0.85	-0.683
Specified items for inmate (0=no, 1=yes)	0.12	0.29	-1.000

* p < .05

tively few visits were allowed—less than three per week. Average visitation length also was modest for both small and large jails—44 minutes for large jails and 33 minutes for small jails. The average number of days per week that visits are allowed was significantly greater for large jails. Additionally, large jails also reported a significantly greater number of hours available for visitation per week compared to small jails. The average number of hours of visitation among large jails was more than three times greater than the hours of visitation among small jails. The maximum number of adults allowed during a visit was not significantly different for large and small jails; approximately two adults were allowed during a visit. The maximum number of children allowed during a visit was relatively small for large and small jails alike, often limited to one or none. Approximately 56% of small jails allowed contact visits compared to 65% of large jails, a difference that was not statistically significant.

The remaining variables in Table 2 describe how information is provided to inmates and visitors and what visitors can expect to experience when they call on someone at the jail. Written information was provided to inmates at a greater rate for large jails, 96% of the time, compared to small jails supplying information to inmates only 67% of the time. Inmates had the right to refuse a visit 100% of the time for large jails. Unfortunately, we were unable to report the content of this policy for small jails because this information was not made available to us. Large jails posted and provided written visitation information to visitors at a significantly higher rate than did small jails. In fact, written information was not provided to visitors by any of the small jails that responded to our request to provide information about their policies. In contrast, about half of the large jails provided visitation information to visitors in a written form. Visitation information was posted for visitors 57% of the time for small jails compared to 92% of the time for large jails. Large jails also posted a visitation schedule more often than small jails. A visitation schedule was posted by 100% of large jails that provided information and 71% of small jails. Visitors were required to schedule an appointment for visitation by half of the small jails and a slightly smaller portion of the large jails. Visitors were required to present valid photo identification at the time of their visit 100% of the time for both large and small jails. Results indicated significant differences for the visitor log-in. Small jails recorded visitors manually 100% of the time; thus, electronic recording or the use of a computer system was not employed. Nearly 70% of large jails tracked visitors through a manual system, but the remaining 31% utilized an electronic system. Small jails provided lockers to visitors at the time of the visit for personal belongings 67% of the time compared to 85% of large jails. And finally, nearly 30% of large jails allowed visitors to bring specified items to inmates at the time of their visit, compared to only 12% of small jails.

DISCUSSION

There are several key findings in this research that require explication. First, we found that a large number of jails were reluctant to supply even basic information regarding visitation. The researchers clearly identified themselves and their purpose, yet the responses to requests for information in many cases ranged from confusion to outright suspicion and refusal. A potential visitor's request may well have been viewed differently—hopefully, with fewer questions about its legitimacy—but prior research on actual visitors' experiences suggests that they frequently confront similar difficulties (Arditti, 2003b; Arditti et al., 2003; Hairston, 2004). The resistance by jails to reveal how they handle visitation is a notable finding. Specific pieces

of information—days and hours of visitation, the number of visitors allowed, restrictions on the number of visits per week, the need to show identification, and so on—are critical for potential visitors to know *before* they undertake the sometimes substantial effort required to make a visitation trip (Arditti, 2003a, 2003b; Sturges, 2002; see also Christian, 2005). Hairston (2004) further notes the additional strain placed on inmate-family connections when visitation policies and procedures are unclear to visitors.

Second, some rather substantial gaps were uncovered between the content of large jails' and small jails' visitation policies. For every jail visitation variable, large jails were more likely to provide the service than small jails. This was particularly salient in the statistically significant differences for written instructions for the visitor and the accessibility of days/hours for visitation. None of the small jails surveyed had developed written instructions for visitors. Lacking a written document may mean that information is less accessible for visitors and that policies may be applied less consistently.

The relatively narrow window of opportunity for visitation at small jails suggests that separation problems for inmates and families may be more difficult to overcome. The available visitation hours in small jails constituted a 9-hour-per-week window compared to a 32-hour-per-week window in large jails. Gibbs (1982) observed that people booked into jail experience anxiety and other emotional problems stemming from their separation from society. They also may need help with even simple tasks such as learning about their legal status or informing employers about their situation in hopes of keeping a job. Families and friends are important sources of emotional, psychological, and instrumental support (Arditti, 2003b; Hairston, 1988; Hairston, 2004; Rosen, 2001). When visitors must make appointments, and days and times are limited, fewer visits may be possible. Moreover, visitation sessions, particularly at small jails, were relatively short, demanding a level of efficiency during a visit that may be beyond the abilities of many inmates and their visitors.

Several possible explanations for the large jail-small jail policy gap may exist. Economies of scale could be partly responsible for these differences; that is, large jails may possess more resources to develop these strategies. Large jails also need to pursue formality and efficiency to handle the larger number of visitors that likely come with a bigger inmate population. Another possibility is that the differences in jail visitation policies between the large and small jails indicate broader differences in functionality. Klofas (1990) has demonstrated that differentiating jails by their average daily population rate and booking rate predicts several jail characteristics, including crowding, percent female, percent sentenced, and the percentage of inmates held for other jurisdictions. Although we examined only one dimension of jail size, our results reveal another area of differences between large and small jails.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Visitation represents a critical dimension of understanding jails within a larger social ecosystem, and the results presented here suggest some fruitful avenues for jail policy. Jail administrators should seek to make information on their jail's policies, processes, and procedures for visitation as easily and widely available as possible. Dissemination of such information requires relatively little effort and resources compared to the strains that miscommunication and misunderstanding among visitors can cause for jail staff (Sturges & Hardesty, 2005). A clearly written handout as recommended by Edenfeld (2005) would help educate inmates and potential

visitors about expectations and requirements. In our sample, less than six in ten jails provided written policies for inmates and fewer than half of the jails provided them for visitors. Other options for disseminating visitation information also exist, including a visitation "hotline." A few of the jails in the current study have already implemented a dedicated telephone number that potential visitors can call to learn about a jail's visiting hours, dress code requirements, and other essential information.

Jails should also consider whether their policies truly help them reach their organizational goals. Certain policies are necessary to maintain institutional security, foster the safety of inmates and correctional officers, and allow for possibilities of reformation and reintegration. Indeed, the universal requirement for visitors to present valid personal identification is a very minor burden to potential visitors—particularly if they are informed ahead of time about what identification will be accepted—but promotes smooth institutional operation and accountability. In contrast, tight restrictions on the number of visits per week or the number of hours that an inmate may receive visitors might be relaxed without compromising organizational objectives.

It is notable that we also uncovered substantial variations among jails, particularly between small and large facilities. Standardization of jail policies, as recommended previously by Sturges and Hardesty (2005), could be beneficial in numerous ways. Such standardization would make officer training more consistent and universal. Sturges and Hardesty (2005) suggest that it would also decrease confusion among visitors and reduce inmates' and visitors' feelings of discrimination and arbitrariness that can arise from confronting different policies at different institutions. National organizations such as the American Correctional Association, American Jail Association, and National Institute of Corrections already pursue efforts to develop standards, disseminate information about best practices, and provide training. They are well situated to lead standardization of visitation policies and could be particularly influential in bridging the gap between large and small jails.

There are certainly compelling operational and safety reasons for jails to control and limit visitation. Most of the Pennsylvania wardens in Sturges and Hardesty's (2005) study expressed concern for security and passing of contraband, and some worried about visitors creating complications for jail officers by attempting to contravene policies. Lankenau's (2001) finding that black-market economies were more likely to develop in prisons where inmates had greater interaction with other inmates, staff, officers, and visitors lends some support to these concerns. Our results demonstrate, however, that there may be room to reconsider the content of some visitation policies. More importantly, at least some jails could make substantial strides increasing the availability of crucial visitation information. Restrictions and conditions of visitation may support a jail's pursuit of its institutional mission to keep inmates, staff, and the general public safe and secure. It is unclear, however, what is to be gained when contacts with friends and family members are impeded by a lack of information. The only result seems to be to harm family relations, increase inmate isolation, and interfere with the ecological interconnections between the jail and outsiders, moving the jail toward a more total institution.

REFERENCES

American Jail Association. (2003). *Who's who in jail management 4ᵗʰ ed*. Hagerstown, MD: American Jail Association.

Arditti, J. (2003a). Humanizing family visiting in corrections settings. *American Jails*, *17*(5), 9-17.

Arditti, J. (2003b). Locked doors and glass walls: Family visiting at a local jail. *Journal of Loss and Trauma, 8*, 115-138.

Arditti, J., Lambert-Shute, J., & Joest, K. (2003). Saturday morning at the jail: Implications for families and children. *Family Relations, 52*(3), 195-204.

Bosco, R. V. (2002). Video visitation: Increased security, at less cost. *Sheriff, 54*(1), 34-62.

Bureau of Justice Assistance. (2000). *A second look at alleviating jail crowding: A systems perspective*. Washington, DC: author.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2003). *National jail census, 1999* [computer file]. Conducted by U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2ⁿᵈ ICPSR ed. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research.

Christian, J. (2005). Riding the bus: Barriers to prison visitation and family management strategies. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *21*, 31- 49.

Edenfeld, A. (2005). My husband's arrest resulted in a "family arrested." *American Jails*, *19*(1), 49-56.

Farrington, K. (1992). The modern prison as total institution? Public perception versus objective reality. *Crime and Delinquency, 38*, 6-26.

Fleisher, M. S. (1995). *Beggars and thieves: Lives of urban street criminals*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Gibbs, J. J. (1982). The first cut is the deepest: Psychological breakdown and survival in the detention setting. In R. Johnson & H. Toch (Eds.), *The pains of imprisonment* (pp. 97-114). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Girshick, L. B. (1996). *Soledad women: Wives of prisoners speak out*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.

Gordon, J. (1999). Are conjugal and familial visitations effective rehabilitative concepts? *The Prison Journal, 79*, 119-136.

Hairston, C. F. (1988). Family ties during imprisonment: Do they influence future criminal activity? *Federal Probation, 52*(1), 48-52.

Hairston, C. F. (1991). Mothers in jail: Parent-child separation and jail visitation. *Journal of Women and Social Work, 6*, 9-38.

Hairston, C. F. (2004). Prisoners and families: Parenting issues during incarceration. In J. Travis and M. Waul (Eds.), *Prisoners once removed* (pp. 259-282). Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

Hall, A., Henry, D. A., Perlstein, J. J., & Smith, W. F. (1985). *Alleviating jail crowding: A systems perspective*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Harrison, P. M., & Beck, A. J. (2005). *Prison and jail inmates at midyear 2004*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Howser, J., & Macdonald, D. (1982). Maintaining family ties. *Corrections Today, 44*(4), 96-98.

Irwin, J. (1985). *The jail: Managing the underclass in American society*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Klofas, J. M. (1990). The jail and the community. *Justice Quarterly, 7,* 69-102.

Komorosky, D. (2004). The impact of jail visitation on the parent-child bond. *American Jails*, *18*, 13-16.

Lankenau, S. E. (2001). Smoke 'em if you got 'em: Cigarette black markets in U.S. prisons and jails. *The Prison Journal, 81*, 142-161.

Martin, M. (1997). Connected mothers: A follow-up study of incarcerated women and their children. *Women & Criminal Justice, 8*, 12-31.

Mattick, H. (1974). The contemporary jails of the United States: An unknown and neglected area of justice. In D. Glasser (Ed.), *Handbook of criminology* (p. 777-848). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Mays, G. L, & Thompson, J. A. (1988). Mayberry revisited: The characteristics and operations of America's small jails. *Justice Quarterly, 5*, 421-440.

Rosen, D. (2001). Mass imprisonment and the family: A legal perspective. *Marriage & Family Review, 32*, 63-82.

Sabol, W. J., Minton, T. D., & Harrison, P. M. (2007). *Prison and jail inmates at midyear 2006*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Sturges, J. (2002). Visitation at county jails: Potential policy implications. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, *13*, 32-45.

Sturges, J., & Hardesty, K. (2005). Survey of Pennsylvania jail wardens: An examination of visitation policies within the context of ecosystem theory. *Criminal Justice Review, 30*, 141-154.

Surette, R., Applegate, B., McCarthy, B., & Jablonski, P. (2006). Self destructing prophesies: Long term forecasting of municipal correctional bed need. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 34*, 57-72.

Toch, H. (1975). *Men in crisis: Human breakdowns in prison*. Chicago: Aldine.

Weisheit, R. A., & Klofas, J. M. (1990). The impact of jail: Collateral costs and affective response. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation*, *14*, 51-65.

Wooldredge, J. (1999). Inmate experiences and psychological well-being. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *26*, 235-251.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

Alicia H. Sitren is an assistant professor at the University of North Florida in the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice. Her published work has been devoted to punishment philosophies and revisions of deterrence theory. Her research agenda includes studies in corrections and policing as well as continuing to examine central elements of deterrence theory using data drawn from convicted offenders.

Hayden Smith is an assistant professor, at the University of South Carolina, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice. His principal focus of study is the intersection of the criminal justice and public health systems. Current works address the dynamic processes of self-injurious behaviors in corrections, jail diversion programs, and reentry issues facing mentally ill inmates. Other areas of interest include criminological theory and corrections.

Brandon K. Applegate is an associate professor at the University of Central Florida in the Department of Criminal Justice and Legal Studies. He has published more than 40 articles on punishment and rehabilitation policy, correctional treatment, juvenile justice, public views of correctional policies, jail issues, drunk driving, and decision making among criminal justice professionals. He is also co-author of *Offender Rehabilitation: Effective Correctional Intervention*.

Laurie A. Gould is an assistant professor at the University of Texas at Arlington in the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice. Her main research interests include gender and crime, comparative penology, and correctional trends and practices.

Death Penalty Attitudes in an Increasingly Critical Climate: Value-Expressive Support and Attitude Mutability

Scott Vollum
James Madison University

Stacy Mallicoat
California State University—Fullerton

Jacqueline Buffington-Vollum
James Madison University

Abstract

Although a majority of citizens supports the death penalty, there is increasing concern surrounding numerous issues with its application. Currently, little is known about the nature and dynamics of death penalty attitudes in the context of these issues. In an attempt to examine such dynamics and the reception and impact of information about these issues, this article examines attitudes among college students in Texas and California. The results indicate that, although substantial proportions of respondents are receptive to information critical of the death penalty, such information is unlikely to have an impact on death penalty support. This article offers evidence that death penalty attitudes are often value-expressive rather than rational or instrumental and further finds that a value-expressive attitudinal orientation toward the death penalty is a significant predictor of such receptivity and attitude mutability.

Key words: death penalty, death penalty attitudes

INTRODUCTION

The death penalty has become a defining institution in American culture. While executions in the United States increased significantly throughout the 1990s and reached a record high in 1999 (n=98), the practice has slowed to 42 executions in 2007. The United States is rather isolated in carrying out this practice. In 2006, the United States followed only China, Iran, Pakistan, Iraq and Sudan in number of executions and stood alone among Western coun-

tries in retaining the death penalty (Death Penalty Information Center [DPIC], 2007). At the same time, cries for moratoria and investigations into the administration of the death penalty have become louder and more visible in the United States (Kirchmeier, 2002; Turow, 2003; Vollum, Longmire, & Buffington-Vollum, 2004), and international trends have been directed toward abolition of the death penalty in practice and law (DPIC, 2007; Hood, 2002; Trail, 2002). Issues such as wrongful convictions and the potential of innocent inmates being executed (Niven, 2004) as well as international disdain for the United States' use of the death penalty (ACLU, 2004; Hood, 2002; Trail, 2002) currently dominate death penalty discourse. This discourse has begun to infiltrate the national consciousness, often driven by substantial media coverage. However, the effect on public and political sensibilities is subtle at best, as the use of the death penalty, although experiencing recent declines in application, does not appear to be going away in the United States.

Capital punishment remains a political and emotional hot button and polarizing point of debate as one of the de jour controversial issues in the realm of criminal justice and politics. Perhaps in part related to these factors, the public has become less supportive of the death penalty, as general support has been declining slowly since 1995 (DPIC, 2007) and appears increasingly interested in alternatives to the death penalty, such as life in prison without parole (Bohm, 2007). According to a 2006 Gallup poll, support declined below 50% when the option of life without parole was offered (Newport, 2007). A true sign of changing attitudes comes from a study in which a majority of Texans, notoriously the staunchest supporters of the death penalty, were found to lack confidence in the death penalty (Vollum et al., 2004). Nevertheless, far more inmates are being executed annually than had been executed in the first two decades of the modern, post-*Furman*, death penalty era.

In recent years, there continues to be much academic, legal, political and public focus on the death penalty in America. Issues regarding death penalty attitudes and opinions (Bohm, 1989, 2007; Bohm, Clark, & Aveni, 1990, 1991; Bohm & Vogel, 2004; Cochran, Boots, & Heide, 2003; Durham, Elrod, & Kinkaid, 1996; Ellsworth & Gross, 1994; Lambert & Clarke, 2004; Vollum et al., 2004), arguments and rationale for support and opposition of the death penalty (Bedau & Cassell, 2004, Bohm, 2007; Radelet & Borg, 2000; Turow, 2003), and the social, cultural, psychological, and political consequences of the death penalty (Bowers & Pierce, 1980; Cochran & Chamlin, 2000; Hood, 2002; Radelet, 1989; Sarat, 2001) have been thoroughly examined and debated.[1] In this increasingly contentious and polarized public debate, several key issues have taken center stage, including wrongful convictions in capital cases, the deterrent (or lack of deterrent) value of the death penalty, the needs for closure for victims' families, the costs of the death penalty, racial discrimination in the application of the death penalty, the competence of legal representation in capital cases, and international criticism of the United States' use of the death penalty. In regard to each of these issues, increasing criticism has been levied against the use of the death penalty in the United States and has become common in the political, legal, academic, and media dialogues surrounding the death penalty.

---

1. The works cited here are only several of those representing the voluminous body of literature covering each of these areas. A thorough consideration of this literature is outside the scope of the present article.

UNDERSTANDING PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR THE DEATH PENALTY

Literature on the issue of public support for the death penalty, beyond simply measuring the level of support, has centered itself around two general themes: (1) assessing the levels of public knowledge regarding the death penalty and (2) investigating the reasons why people support the death penalty. The present research seeks to blend these two areas of inquiry as it is believed these two issues are interrelated in developing an understanding of public support for the death penalty.

Based on Supreme Court Justice Marshall's hypothesis (stated in *Furman*) that death penalty support hinges on knowledge about the application of the death penalty, much research has focused on rational assessments of practical information or on instrumental policy interests as the foundation for death penalty attitudes (Bohm et al., 1991; Bowers, Vandiver, & Dugan, 1994; Fox, Radelet, & Bonsteel, 1990-1991; Longmire, 1996; Murray, 2003; Sarat & Vidmar, 1976; Vidmar & Dittenhoffer, 1981). However, much of the research on the Marshall hypothesis is inconclusive as information does not appear to dramatically shift opinions, and when a shift is detected the change appears to be temporary (Bohm et al., 1990; Bohm & Vogel, 2004). Research also raises questions about the underlying assumption of Marshall's hypothesis, finding that death penalty attitudes are often not so rationally founded, but instead rest on deeply held value systems or other non-rational foundations not as susceptible to the influence of information or rational argument (Ellsworth & Gross, 1994; Stack, 2003; Tyler & Weber, 1982; Vollum et al., 2004). Marshall, himself, hypothesized that information and knowledge about the death penalty would be less likely to affect death penalty support when retribution was the foundation for that support (Bohm et al., 1991; *Furman v. Georgia*, 1972). This lesser known hypothesis of Marshall's has found some support in research (Bohm, 1992; Bohm et al., 1991). Bohm et al. (1991), for example, found that subjects who had higher foundations of death penalty support based on retribution were significantly less likely to change their support following a semester long course on the death penalty. They concluded that "to the degree that retribution provided the basis for support of the death penalty, knowledge had little effect on opinions" (Bohm et al., 1991, p. 379).

Researchers have gone beyond the notion of retribution to examine more fundamental underlying foundations and functions of death penalty support. For example, Tyler and Weber (1982) found that support of the death penalty rests more on symbolic foundations manifested in political-social ideology than on instrumental or utilitarian grounds. Subsequent studies have supported Tyler and Weber, finding that political affiliation and other ideological stances are the most potent predictors of death penalty attitudes (Curtis, 1991; Payne & Coogle, 1998) and that emotionality plays an important role in death penalty support (Lynch, 2002; Vandiver, Giacopassi, & Gathje, 2002). Others have turned their attention to personality characteristics as foundational for death penalty attitudes. Cochran, Boots, and Heide (2003) found that personal attributional style (particularly whether one tends to attribute blame on dispositional as opposed to inherent factors) was predictive of death penalty support. Stack (2003) found that authoritarianism as a characteristic of one's personality is also a significant predictor of support for the death penalty. Most recently, Robbers (2006) focused attention on a constellation of personality traits finding that extroversion, conscientiousness and neuroticism are predictive of death penalty support while openness and agreeableness are predictive of death penalty opposition.

The current study focuses on the broader notion that death penalty attitudes serve a value-expressive function (Vollum et al., 2004). Value-expressiveness refers to the degree to which attitudes function as an expression of underlying values rather than a more rational or instrumental assessment of policy (Herek, 1986; Katz, 1960; Vollum et al., 2004). Vollum et al. (2004) found that although individuals may lack confidence in the death penalty, a large proportion of these individuals support the death penalty anyway. They interpret this as indicating that much death penalty support is value-expressive as opposed to rational or instrumental. Moreover, the authors suggest that the lack of confidence in relation to specific "problems" with its application (wrongful convictions, inadequate counsel, class and race discrimination, and inadequate access to appeal processes) and subsequent continued support for the death penalty is a direct challenge to Marshall's original hypothesis that knowledge about the death penalty process (and, in this case, *problems* with that process) would result in opposition. The present study seeks to build on this research by examining respondents' receptivity to information critical of the death penalty and the mutability of their attitudes in light of this critical information.

Given the increasingly critical climate surrounding the death penalty, it is logical to wonder what impact such critical information might have on attitudes about the death penalty. The levels of understanding of the nature and dynamics of death penalty attitudes in the context of this climate continue to evolve. In an attempt to examine such dynamics and the reception and impact of information about these issues, the present study examines attitudes among college students in the two states which sentence the most people to death: Texas and California. In addition to examining levels of support for the death penalty, the present study goes beyond simple analyses of death penalty attitudes by looking at underlying bases for support and respondents' reactions to information about the key critical issues surrounding the death penalty. In the interest of examining the dynamics of knowledge about the death penalty in relationship to the value-expressive foundations for death penalty support, the present study investigates three major issues: 1) The *receptivity* to information regarding the death penalty (whether or not respondents find certain information compelling), 2) the *mutability* of death penalty support in light of such information (whether or not the information makes a person less likely to support the death penalty), and 3) The degree to which death penalty support is *value-expressive*, and whether value-expressiveness impacts receptivity to information and mutability of support.

METHODOLOGY

Data Collection

The data collected for this study were obtained through the administration of surveys to college students at mid-sized universities in Texas and California. Due to the nature of collecting data in a college classroom setting, participants were drawn from nonrandom convenience samples. Nevertheless, many were general education classes and thus students represented a relative diversity of backgrounds. The total sample consisted of 927 respondents: 495 in Texas and 432 in California.

Questions were included regarding overall opinion of the death penalty and its use in various circumstances, and responses to these were elicited in terms of either support or opposition. Respondents were also presented with a series of 13 statements indicating specific rationale and arguments for the use of the death penalty. These statements covered a range of rationale incorporating morality-, revenge-, justice-, and values-oriented themes. Overall, the items to-

gether offer a fair and broad-based measure of value-expressive sentiments about the death penalty, including items such as "Supporting the death penalty is a matter of principle," "The death penalty is necessary because acts provoking public outrage and anger must be dealt with accordingly," "It is immoral to allow a killer to live when the victim was not given the same opportunity," and "The criminal justice system has a duty to avenge particularly brutal murders." The respondents were asked to indicate the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree; 5 = Strongly Agree). Based on responses to these items, a summary scale was constructed to measure the value-expressive nature of death penalty support (α = .95).

Acknowledging the potential interaction of value-expressive death penalty support and support based on a retributive orientation (See Vollum et al., 2004), retributive support-orientation was independently measured based on qualitative verbatim responses to the following: "In the simplest terms possible, please indicate why you support or oppose the death penalty." This item was located at the beginning of the survey. The retributive-orientation variable was dummy coded with a "1" representing retributive death penalty support and a "0" indicating that support was not retributively based. Retribution was defined broadly to include statements referring to revenge, just deserts, "an eye for an eye," or other similar sentiments. Based on a detailed coding protocol, three separate coders rated all verbatim responses. Interrater reliability was examined and percentage agreement among raters was 93% with a Scott's Pi[2] of .89.

Participants were also asked to read a number of statements about specific critical issues in the use and administration of the death penalty in the United States. They were then asked to indicate (1) the degree to which they found the information compelling and (2) whether the information was likely to impact their opinion of the death penalty (whether it had no effect or made them more or less likely to support the death penalty). They were asked to respond to each of these questions in regard to each presented statement (See the Appendix for the specific statements).[3] Summary scales were constructed for each set of responses for each question across all statements. The first is an index measuring respondents' overall openness or "receptivity" to the information being presented (Receptivity Index; Range = 1–4) and the second is a measure of the overall likelihood of their support being diminished by such critical information (Mutability Index; Range = 0–1).

Data Analysis

General support (based on a dichotomous yes/no item) for the death penalty (for the crime of murder) was examined in regard to sex, race, political party, college class, college major, religion, and location (Texas vs. California). Basic percentages of support within each demographic group were reported along with Chi-square results testing statistical significance of

---

2. Scott's Pi is a test of interrater reliability in which the proportion of agreement occurring by chance is taken into account. Scores in the .80 to .90 range are considered to be strong indicators of reliability. See Riffe, Lacy, and Fico (1998) for a more thorough discussion of Scott's Pi and interrater reliability.
3. These statements were designed to be representative of critical information about the death penalty typical of rhetoric and arguments the public is likely to hear in opposition of the death penalty. Given that the objective of the present study was to examine death penalty support in light of information challenging the death penalty, the statements presented are, by design, one-sided and represented negative views toward the death penalty.

differences across groups. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to examine mean differences in the value-expressive nature of death penalty attitudes across demographic categories, identifying statistically significant differences between the groups in each category.

Receptivity of critical information about the death penalty and mutability of support were examined among death penalty supporters. First, simple percentages were computed for each presented statement in regard to receptivity (those finding the statement compelling) and mutability (those less likely to support the death penalty as a result of the information). Second, ordinary least squares (OLS) regression models were computed to examine the impact of numerous variables on receptivity and mutability among death penalty supporters. Independent variables included the various demographic groups (dummy coded for inclusion in the models), the value-expressive attitude index, and the retributive support orientation variable. For models in which mutability was the dependent variable, receptivity was also included as an independent variable. Finally, separate models for Texas and California were constructed in order to compare the findings on these two very different states.

FINDINGS

Table 1 [opposite] presents percentages of death penalty support in general and across demographic categories. Across the full sample (both Texas and California respondents), 72.6% (*N*=673) of respondents supported the death penalty for the crime of murder. This is slightly higher than what is typically reported in contemporary polls of support at the national level (65%, according to a 2006 Gallup Poll; See DPIC, 2007). However, closer examination reveals that much of the elevated nature of this figure in comparison to national figures may be accounted for by the Texas sample. In Texas, 78.8% of respondents reported supporting the death penalty whereas only 65.2% in California reported general death penalty support ($\chi^2 = 20.599$, $p < .001$). Males were significantly more likely to support the death penalty than females ($\chi^2 = 13.320$, $p < .001$) with nearly 80% of males supporting it compared to only 68.5% of females. White respondents were also significantly more likely to support the death penalty (80.0%) than respondents of other racial or ethnic groups, with Black respondents being the least likely to support the death penalty (54.1%; $\chi^2 = 38.270$, $p < .001$). Republicans (85.2%) and Protestants (76.4%) were significantly more likely to support the death penalty than their respective counterparts ($\chi^2 = 43.268$, $p < .001$ and $\chi^2 = 14.646$, $p = .002$, respectively). These are not surprising findings given prior knowledge about death penalty support (Bohm, 2007; Vollum et al., 2004). Finally, criminal justice majors were more likely to support the death penalty than those majoring in other areas ($\chi^2 = 22.521$, $p < .001$).

Table 2 [page 228] presents mean index score measures of the value-expressive nature of death penalty attitudes compared across demographic categories. Significant differences were identified using ANOVA and Bonferroni post hoc tests. Overall, the mean level of value-expressiveness of death penalty attitudes is relatively high (3.33 on a scale of 1 to 5). Males are significantly more likely to hold value-expressive attitudes about the death penalty than females (3.49 vs. 3.23; F = 16.621, p < .001). Whites are much more likely to hold value-expressive attitudes than Blacks (3.46 vs. 2.97; F = 5.197, p < .001). Republicans are more likely to be value-expressive in their attitudes than those from other political parties. This is not surprising as ideology and values are often at the heart of political affiliation. A bit more surprisingly, criminal justice majors were more likely to have value-expressive attitudes about

TABLE 1. GENERAL DEATH PENALTY SUPPORT (PERCENTAGE WITHIN DEMOGRAPHIC CATEGORIES)			
	Support Death Penalty for Crime of Murder		
	Percentage Supporting Death Penalty		χ^2
Overall	**72.6%**	**(N=673)**	
Sex			
Males	79.6%	(N=285)	χ^2 = 13.320
Females	68.5%	(N=354)	p < .001
Race			
White	80.0%	(N=373)	
Black	54.1%	(N=33)	
Hispanic	62.7%	(N=128)	χ^2 = 38.270
Asian	64.4%	(N=47)	p < .001
Bi/Multi-Racial	81.6%	(N=40)	
Other	76.2%	(N=16)	
Political Party			
Republican	85.2%	(N=282)	χ^2 = 43.268
Democrat	63.1%	(N=178)	p < .001
Independent	65.8%	(N=52)	
Class			
Freshman	74.5%	(N=184)	
Sophomore	66.1%	(N=160)	χ^2 = 18.589
Junior	72.7%	(N=165)	p = .002
Senior	82.0%	(N=132)	
Major			
Criminal Justice	80.0%	(N=341)	χ^2 = 22.521
Other	65.9%	(N=309)	p < .001
Religion			
Protestant	76.4%	(N=265)	
Catholic	66.2%	(N=182)	χ^2 = 14.646
Other	69.5%	(N=107)	p = .002
Don't Know	82.7%	(N=91)	
Location			
Texas	78.8%	(N=386)	χ^2 = 20.599
California	65.2%	(N=264)	p < .001

the death penalty than other majors (3.46 vs. 3.21; F = 17.268, p < .001). In spite of these individuals being ostensibly more educated about the practical and instrumental side of criminal justice and criminal punishments, their attitudes reflect a more underlying expressive and non-rational orientation when it comes to the death penalty. Finally, Texans are more likely than Californians to have value-expressive attitudes about the death penalty (3.39 vs. 3.26; F

TABLE 2. VALUE-EXPRESSIVE NATURE OF DEATH PENALTY ATTITUDES (BY DEMOGRAPHIC GROUP)		
	Value-Expressive Nature of Attitudes (Mean Index Score)	
Overall	**3.33**	
Sex		
Males	3.49	F = 16.621
Females	3.23	p < .001
Race		
White	3.46	
Black	2.97	
Hispanic	3.19	F = 5.197
Asian	3.31	p < .001
Bi/Multi-Racial	3.27	
Other	3.11	
Political Party		
Republican	3.61	F = 14.698
Democrat	3.12	p < .001
Independent	3.11	
Class		
Freshman	3.36	
Sophomore	3.26	F = 1.583
Junior	3.35	p = .162
Senior	3.39	
Major		
Criminal Justice	3.46	F = 17.268
Other	3.21	p < .001
Religion		
Protestant	3.40	
Catholic	3.28	F = 4.743
Other	3.13	p = .003
Don't Know	3.50	
Location		
Texas	3.39	F = 4.313
California	3.26	p = .038

= 4.313, p = .038). Given prior research on the value-expressive nature of Texans' attitudes about the death penalty (Vollum et al., 2004) and the cultural vehemence in regard to the value of the death penalty in Texas, this is not at all unexpected. What is perhaps surprising is that the difference is relatively small.

Table 3 [below] examines the receptivity to information about the death penalty and mutability of death penalty support for each of the previously discussed statements addressing different critical issues (see the Appendix). For each statement, the percentage of respondents who found it compelling (receptivity) and who reported being less likely to support the death penalty as a result (mutability) are indicated. In all cases, a majority of respondents were receptive to (found compelling) the information presented to them. By far, the greatest receptivity was reported for information about wrongful convictions and the execution of innocent inmates, with more than 90% of respondents finding this information compelling. Over 70%

TABLE 3. RECEPTIVITY TO INFORMATION AND ATTITUDE MUTABILITY AMONG SUPPORTERS (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY STATEMENT PRESENTED					
	Total		Texas		California	
	Receptivity	Mutability	Receptivity	Mutability	Receptivity	Mutability
	% Finding Information Compelling	% Less Likely to Support Death Penalty	% Finding Information Compelling	% Less Likely to Support Death Penalty	% Finding Information Compelling	% Less Likely to Support Death Penalty
Statement 1: Lack of Evidence of Deterrent Effect	57.6%	10.3%	49.6%	9.4%	69.3%	11.5%
Statement 2: Innocence/Wrongful Convictions	90.8%	36.7%	90.6%	33.2%	91.2%	41.9%
Statement 3: Lack of Closure or Help for Victims' Families	70.5%	21.0%	64.5%	17.4%	79.2%	26.2%
Statement 4: Costs More than LWOP	72.7%	33.3%	65.8%	24.5%	82.7%	46.2%
Statement 5: Discrimination based on Offender/Victim Race	75.1%	24.0%	69.8%	19.2%	82.9%	31.1%
Statement 6: Incompetent/Inadequate Legal Representation	76.0%	24.9%	74.2%	18.9%	78.7%	33.9%

of respondents found information pertaining to cost, racial discrimination, incompetent legal representation, and lack of closure for co-victims compelling. Of the six statements presented, the information about the lack of the deterrent effect of the death penalty was the least well-received with only 57.6% finding it compelling.

In contrast to the very high levels of receptivity in regard to the critical information, far lower proportions of respondents reported that it would have any effect on their support for the death penalty. For example, although 90.8% of respondents found the information about innocence and wrongful convictions compelling, only 36.7% said that it made them less likely to support the death penalty. This suggests that attitudes are relatively robust and withstand rational attacks on the fundamental underpinnings of death penalty use, even if those attacks are received as compelling. In short, it suggests that attitudes may be more value-expressive than rational or instrumental in their functions and bases. Interestingly, the least amount of discrepancy between receptivity and mutability was found for the most instrumental and rational issue: cost. This suggests that where attitudes are instrumental or rational, support is more mutable. This does not, however, counteract the fact that attitudes seem to be predominantly value-expressive.

Table 3 also offers a salient comparison between the two states that sentence the most offenders to death but who differ in many important ways (not least of which is the fact that Texas actually carries out executions frequently whereas California rarely does). Across every statement both receptivity and mutability are greater among death penalty supporters in California than in Texas. In most cases the difference is substantial. Only in regard to receptivity to information pertaining to innocence and mutability in response to the lack of deterrence are the samples similar. In both states, the statement regarding innocence was the most compelling, and that pertaining to a lack of deterrence was least compelling; in California the lack of deterrence statement was still compelling to nearly 70% of the sample—almost twenty percentage points higher than in Texas. Overall, Californians are much more likely to find information critical to the use of the death penalty compelling and to report that such information makes them less likely to support the death penalty. Anyone familiar with the social and political climates of California and Texas in regard to the death penalty would not be surprised by this finding.

In an attempt to examine factors that impact receptivity and mutability, OLS linear regression analyses were conducted on overall receptivity and overall support mutability (based on summary indexes computed across all six statements). Included in each model are dummy coded demographic variables and key attitude and support dimension variables, including the value-expressive nature of attitudes and the retributive support orientation. The receptivity measure was also included in the mutability model (Model II). Table 4 [opposite] presents the results for each of these regression models.

As evidenced by the regression models in Table 4, the value-expressive nature of participants' death penalty support has a significant impact on both receptivity and mutability of that support. Those holding more value-expressive support for the death penalty are found to be less receptive to the information presented in the first place ($\beta = -.109$, $p < .01$) and much less likely to indicate that such information has an impact on their attitudes about the death penalty ($\beta = -.173$, $p < .01$). In fact, value-expressiveness is the second most potent predictor of mutability, following receptivity (which, obviously, has a strong positive effect on mutability). The retributive nature of support has no effect on receptivity but does have a negative impact on

	MODEL I			MODEL II		
	Receptivity to Information among Supporters			*Mutability of Death Penalty Attitudes among Supporters*		
	B	***Beta***	**S.E.**	**B**	***Beta***	**S.E.**
Constant	3.599***		.161	-.037		.095
Gender (Male)	-.166***	-.139	.045	-.008	-.014	.020
Race						
Black	.115	.043	.108	.042	.032	.047
Hispanic	.078	.053	.065	.014	.020	.029
Asian	.027	.012	.095	.037	.034	.042
Bi/Multi-Racial	-.073	-.030	.094	-.040	-.033	.041
Other	-.241*	-.064	.145	-.048	-.026	.064
Political Party						
Republican	-.190***	-.159	.054	-.023	-.040	.024
Independent	.001	.000	.087	-.073*	-.068	.038
Other	-.361***	-.113	.125	-.045	-.029	.055
Class						
Freshman	.134**	.102	.065	.056**	.087	.029
Sophomore	.179***	.130	.068	.018	.027	.030
Junior	.094	.069	.067	.018	.027	.030
Criminal Justice Major	-.070	-.059	.050	-.006	-.011	.022
Religion						
Protestant	-.035	-.029	.055	.012	.021	.024
Other	-.068	-.043	.068	-.022	-.028	.030
Location (Texas)	-.150***	-.124	.058	-.039	-.067	.025
Value-Expressive Attitude	-.109***	-.109	.039	-.085***	-.173	.017
Retributive Support Orientation	-.042	-.033	.048	-.050***	-.081	.021
Receptivity				.221***	.451	.018
R²	**0.161 (F = 6.57, p < .01**			**0.328 (F = 15.79, p < .01**		

TABLE 4. FACTORS RELATED TO RECEPTIVITY OF INFORMATION AND MUTABILITY OF DEATH PENALTY SUPPORT, OLS REGRESSION RESULTS

Constants: Race: White; Class Status: Senior; Political Party: Democrat; Religion: Catholic
***p < .01, ** p < .05, *p < .10

mutability (β = -.081, p < .01). Those whose support is based on retributive grounds are less likely to indicate a potential change in attitude.

Several demographic variables are also significant predictors of receptivity and mutability. First, males are less likely to be compelled by (receptive to) information critical of the death penalty (β = -.139, p < .01). Likewise, Republicans (β = -.159, p < .01) and Texans (β = -.124, p < .01) are less receptive to such information challenging the death penalty. Again, this is not surprising as such information is potentially perceived as attacking of strongly held ideological beliefs and value systems. Those identifying themselves as "other" in regard to political affiliation are also less likely to be receptive to the information presented (β = -.113, p < .01). Interestingly, those respondents in their earlier years of college (freshmen and sophomores) are significantly more receptive to the information presented (β =.102, p < .05 and β = .130, p < .01, respectively). Demographic variables are less predictive of mutability of death penalty support as only college class level is found to be a significant predictor. Here, freshmen are more likely than their counterparts to report their support waning in light of the presented information (β = .087, p < .05). The measures of the various dimensions of death penalty attitudes, however, are found to be highly predictive of receptivity and mutability, in general.

Table 5 [opposite] displays similar OLS regression models for each state (Texas and California), allowing for basic comparison between the two. Value-expressive attitude is a strong negative predictor of receptivity in Texas (β = -.148, p < .01) but has no effect in California. Also, in contrast to Texas (and the full sample), being male or Republican in California does not appear to predict receptivity (i.e., these groups do not appear to be less receptive). In Texas, those responding as "other" to the race item were less receptive to information challenging the death penalty (β = -.100, p < .05), and in California, those responding as "other" on the political party item were less receptive (β = -.155, p < .05). It is difficult to meaningfully interpret these findings without further information about these individuals. Finally, in California, being Protestant was predictive of lower receptivity (β = -.142, p < .05). In other words, Protestants in California were less likely to find the critical information compelling.

The models for Texas and California in regard to the mutability of death penalty support (Models V and VI) were a bit more similar. In both, value-expressive attitude had a negative impact (β = -.164, p < .01 and β = -.162, p < .01, respectively) and receptivity had a positive impact on attitude mutability (β = .450, p < .01 and β = .467, p < .01, respectively). What is perhaps most interesting is that retributive support orientation had a strong negative impact on mutability in Texas (β = -.170, p < .01) but no impact in California. In fact, in the Texas sample, retributive support orientation was a stronger predictor of mutability than was value-expressive attitude. Others (Vollum et al., 2004) have suggested that there may be a confluence between the value-expressive and retributive nature of death penalty support and have asserted that this was an important distinction that needed to be examined in further research. In light of this possible confluence, it is interesting to observe that both factors seem to have an impact on mutability in Texas, but only the value-expressive measure has an impact in California. Also, it is important to note that value-expressiveness is the more consistent predictor, having a significant impact on receptivity in the full sample and in Texas and having a strong impact on mutability in both locations and in the full sample.

TABLE 5. FACTORS RELATED TO RECEPTIVITY OF INFORMATION AND MUTABILITY OF DEATH PENALTY SUPPORT, OLS REGRESSION RESULTS BY STATE

	MODEL I			MODEL II			MODEL III			MODEL IV		
	Receptivity to Information among Supporters						*Mutability of Death Penalty Attitudes among Supporters*					
	B	*Beta*	S.E.	B	*Beta*	S.E.	B	*Beta*	S.E.	B	*Beta*	S.E.
Constant	3.637***		.201	3.189***		.279	-.081		.111	-.114		.170
Gender (Male)	-.201***	**-.162**	.063	-.094	**-.090**	.067	-.015	**-.027**	.026	-.012	**-.020**	.033
Race												
Black	.037	**.015**	.132	.187	**.050**	.247	.100*	**.093**	.053	-.115	**-.054**	.120
Hispanic	.086	**.046**	.101	.082	**.074**	.085	-.025	**-.029**	.040	.018	**.029**	.042
Asian	-.537	**-.063**	.421	.080	**.059**	.097	.350**	**.090**	.169	.009	**.011**	.047
Bi/Multi-Racial	-.197	**-.076**	.129	.165	**.079**	.140	-.043	**-.036**	.052	-.026	**-.022**	.068
Other	-.541**	**-.100**	.269	-.084	**-.033**	.167	.144	**.059**	.108	-.133	**-.092**	.081
Political Party												
Republican	-.254***	**-.206**	.076	-.102	**-.093**	.078	-.019	**-.034**	.031	-.012	**-.019**	.038
Independent	-.002	**-.001**	.122	.-084	**-.044**	.127	-.044	**-.043**	.049	-.077	**-.070**	.062
Other	-.298*	**-.097**	.164	-.500**	**-.155**	.207	-.010	**-.007**	.066	-.088	**-.048**	.102
Class												
Freshman	.109	**.083**	.080	.138	**.113**	.126	.050	**.084**	.032	.058	**.085**	.061
Sophomore	.195**	**.123**	.090	.171	**.157**	.119	.025	**.035**	.036	-.036	**-.059**	.058
Junior	.044	**.029**	.087	.140	**.126**	.120	.088**	**.129**	.035	-.072	**-.114**	.059
Criminal Justice Major	-.049	**-.036**	.067	-.121	**-.103**	.081	.026	**.043**	.027	-.029	**-.044**	.039
Religion												
Protestant	.019	**.016**	.075	-.168**	**-.142**	.085	.013	**.024**	.030	-.002	**-.003**	.042
Other	-.071	**-.044**	.097	-.043	**-.030**	.098	-.010	**-.007**	.066	-.020	**-.024**	.048
Value-Expressive Attitude	-.144***	**-.148**	.050	-.025	**-.025**	.066	-.072***	**-.164**	.020	-.090***	**-.162**	.032
Retributive Support Orientation	-.072	**-.053**	.068	.017	**.016**	.068	-.105***	**-.170**	.027	-.005	**-.008**	.033
Receptivity							.204***	**.450**	.021	.265***	**.467**	.032
R²	**0.156 (F = 3.91, p < .01)**			**0.115 (F = 1.80, p < .05)**			**0.345 (F = 10.49, p < .01)**			**0.350 (F = 6.99, p < .01)**		

Constants: Race: White; Class Status: Senior; Political Party: Democrat; Religion: Catholic *** p < .01, **p < .05, *p < .10

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In the increasingly critical climate that surrounds the death penalty in America, it is ever more important to examine the attitudes and sensibilities about this ultimate punishment. As is the case with attitudes surrounding abortion, gay marriage and other morally- and emotionally-laden issues, one's attitudes about the death penalty seem to be, for many, a form of value system barometer. Zimring (2003) points out that the important focal point of death penalty attitudes "is in the intensity with which people identify with the death penalty rather than in the proportion of respondents who express support" (p. 11). For this reason, it is especially important to go beyond simple examinations of the amount of support or opposition and to begin investigating the nature, foundation, and intensity of such attitudes. In this research, we have attempted to do exactly that. By specifically examining the value-expressive nature of death penalty support, the present research extends an important line of inquiry only initially tapped in prior research (Vollum et al., 2004). By considering the receptivity to information critical of the death penalty and attitude mutability in light of such information, the present research offers a glimpse at the more dynamic nature of death penalty attitudes. This research provides compelling evidence that death penalty support is not simply an expression of rational or instrumental thought processes but often is a function of more deeply held value systems.

The notion that attitudes may, in many cases, be driven by value expression as opposed to rational or instrumental mindsets is not new. In 1960, Katz proposed what he termed the value-expressive function of attitudes, asserting that an individual's attitudes sometimes "have the function of giving positive expression to his central values and to the type of person he conceives himself to be…and [he] will hold attitudes which are the appropriate indication of his central values" (p. 173). Indeed, it appears that death penalty attitudes often reflect such underlying values, and to the degree that they do, they appear more robust and resistant to change in spite of information challenging its fairness and efficacy. Although much of the research on death penalty attitudes and their foundations, functions, and mutability has centered around Marshall's hypothesis that support for the death penalty is contingent upon awareness and knowledge of the realities of the death penalty, some have challenged this hypothesis, suggesting a more value-expressive nature of death penalty attitudes (Ellsworth & Gross, 1994; Garland, 1990, 2002; Vollum et al., 2004)

In the present study, this notion of value-expressive death penalty support was examined by looking at responses to information challenging the efficacy of the death penalty. Specifically, the degree to which respondents were receptive to such information in the first place and whether or not attitudes were mutable in light of such information were assessed. The findings offer important new information pertaining to the nature of death penalty attitudes and relatively compelling evidence for a value-expressive dimension of death penalty support.

A substantial majority of respondents found information critical of the death penalty compelling (i.e., were receptive). For each statement presented, a majority of respondents (for most statements, over 70%) reported finding the statement compelling. However, a much smaller proportion of respondents indicated that such information was likely to change their support for the death penalty. In spite of the overwhelming receptivity to the presented information, a third or less of respondents indicated that their support was likely to change in response to the information. For example, over 90% of respondents found information pertaining to wrongful convictions and the execution of innocent defendants compelling, yet only 36.7% indicated

that they would be less likely to support the death penalty in light of such information. The wide disparity between receptivity to information critical of the application of the death penalty and mutability of death penalty support in light of such information challenges Marshall's more rational, instrumental hypothesis. Rather, it appears that, in contrast to Marshall's hypothesis, death penalty support is often robust and, it is argued, value-expressive in its nature.

Regression analyses examining the factors related to receptivity and mutability among those supporting the death penalty support this contention. Value-expressiveness proved to be a key factor in regard to both receptivity and mutability. Those scoring higher on the value-expressiveness scale were significantly less likely to be receptive to information critical of the death penalty or to indicate that such information was likely to change their support. In regard to mutability, value-expressiveness was second only to receptivity in its predictive power.

Although these findings, by and large, challenge the Marshall hypothesis position, it is not suggested that support of the death penalty never follows this more rational and instrumental process. Indeed, some mutability of death penalty support among respondents was detected. The smallest discrepancy between receptivity and mutability was in regard to the statement regarding cost of the death penalty, a very instrumental concern. Regression analysis for mutability suggests, however, that receptiveness to such information in the first place may be a key mediating factor previously not considered by Marshall or those who have researched his hypothesis.

As mentioned, a primary concern in prior explorations of the value-expressive nature of death penalty attitudes (Vollum et al., 2004) was the possible overlap/confluence with simple retributively-based rationale. Bohm et al. (1991) previously argued that to the degree that death penalty support is based on retribution-oriented attitudes, little change in support would occur regardless of the awareness of information about the application of the death penalty. Vollum et al. (2004), although offering evidence for a value-expressive foundation for death penalty support, were unable to adequately differentiate between value-expressive support and support based on retribution. The present study rectified this problem by including an independent measure of retributive support orientation in the regression analyses of receptivity and mutability. Value-expressiveness was found to have a distinct impact beyond retribution on both receptivity and mutability. In fact, retributive support orientation was not found to be significantly related to receptivity and, in comparison to value-expressiveness, was a weak predictor of mutability. This is important evidence of a distinctly value-expressive component of death penalty attitudes and that this component plays a significant role in the formation and maintenance of death penalty support.

Another important aspect of the present research is the comparison of Texas and California, two significant yet different states in regard to the death penalty. Texas is by far the leader in executions in the United States, whereas California has the largest death row population but rarely actually carries out executions. Not surprisingly, some important differences in death penalty attitudes between the samples were detected. Texans were more likely to hold value-expressive death penalty attitudes. It follows, then, that Texans were generally less likely to be receptive to information critical of the death penalty or to have mutable death penalty support. In short, Texans were more resistant to challenges to the death penalty and more likely to hold strong to their support of the death penalty in light of such challenges. As Table 4 indicated, this was true for each and every statement presented to respondents. One possible reason for this may be what Stack, Cao, and Adamzyck (2007) suggest is an effect of crime volume on "law and

order" sensibilities as represented in public opinion. Simply, those who reside in communities or societies with high volumes or rates of crime are argued to be more likely to hold punitive or crime-control perspectives in regard to criminal justice policy. A comparative review of homicide rates for California and Texas, however, does not bear this out. Homicide rates are actually lower in Texas than in California (United States Department of Justice, 2007). Therefore, other factors must be responsible for this difference.

There were some interesting distinctions between Texas and California in regard to the factors related to receptivity and mutability. In Texas, value-expressiveness was the second strongest predictor (after gender) of receptivity, significantly reducing the likelihood of finding information challenging the death penalty compelling. This was not found to be the case among death penalty supporters in California. Furthermore, value-expressiveness was found to be predictive of mutability of death penalty support in both Texas and California. However, retributive support orientation was found to be just as strong a predictor of mutability as value-expressiveness in Texas, but it had no effect in California. These findings seem to expose certain idiosyncratic distinctions between Texans and Californians and may suggest particular cultural phenomena restricted to Texas (or perhaps the South as a whole) in regard to the underlying foundation and function of death penalty support. This is consistent with others' hypotheses that cultural forces play a significant role in support of the death penalty in Southern states (Borg, 1997; Vandiver, 2006; Zimring, 2003). Although this study is unable to adequately explore the role culture might play in the value-expressive nature of death penalty attitudes or in the mutability of death penalty support, the findings herein certainly suggest the potential centrality of culture to the formation and maintenance of death penalty attitudes and death penalty support.

Of course, the present study is limited in that it only examines two states: Texas and California. It would be interesting to incorporate into future analyses a broader array of countries, states, and populations. For example, it would be a logical next step to include non-death-penalty states and countries. Moreover, identifying and using other methods to analyze the role of cultural factors in death penalty attitudes (e.g., ethnographic and other qualitative methods), and especially the value-expressive nature of these attitudes, would be a worthwhile, albeit challenging, endeavor.

It is a further limitation that this study is based on a convenience sample of college students at two particular universities. Using student-based convenience sampling certainly has benefits in terms of gathering respondents for research. Indeed, the use of student samples is not new in research on death penalty attitudes (See, for example, Bohm, 1989; Bohm et al., 1990, 1991; Bohm & Vogel, 2004; Lambert & Clarke, 2004). As the characteristics of a student population may vary from those of the general population, caution should be taken in making any generalizations regarding hard numbers (proportions, percentages) related to death penalty support or opposition. However, given the nature and objectives of this research (i.e., examining the very presence of underlying attitudinal foundations and dynamics), this is not of great concern. In addition, it is salient that some of the students within this sampling frame may someday work as practitioners or policy makers in the criminal justice system, where their knowledge regarding system issues will be important. Nevertheless, future research should endeavor to examine broader and more representative samples.

Future research would also do well to continue to develop and refine measures of key concepts such as the value-expressive and retributive nature of death penalty attitudes. Although it is believed that the measures here are sound, there is a need for ongoing development and exploration of these conceptual ideas. Similarly, more sophisticated methods for examining attitude mutability would allow for a more rigorous examination of the impact or lack of impact of information critical to the death penalty on individuals' attitudes toward and support of the death penalty. Future research employing more extensive forms of experimental design would likely be enlightening in this regard. Finally, with the relatively brief presentations of information, it is not purported that they mirror the impact of such information occurring more naturally and over longer periods of time. Indeed, the attitudes being studied have developed through years of immersion in societal, familiar, and peer-value systems. Moreover, there is no pretense that a brief statement presenting information is equitable to the "knowledge" Marshall had in mind when he proposed his hypothesis. Nevertheless, this study produces compelling evidence that the rational, instrumental basis at the heart of Marshall's hypothesis is inadequate for developing a complete understanding of the nature and dynamics of death penalty support. Without a doubt, much more research is needed to fully understand the development of death penalty attitudes and the impact of more complexly communicated information in altering such culturally-based, emotionally-laden attitudes.

In spite of its limitations, the present study provides important findings that go beyond prior attempts to understand death penalty attitudes and offer insight into the mechanisms and processes which play a role in people's attitudes about and support for the death penalty. To the degree that support for the death penalty rests on value-expressive foundations, information challenging its efficacy, justness, and integrity will have limited impact on attitudes. This is potentially important information for attorneys representing capital defendants as well as activists trying to garner support for moratoria or abolition. Quite simply, views about the death penalty and its implementation appear to be more resistant to change than many have suggested, especially when resting on value-expressive foundations.

APPENDIX: PRESENTED DEATH PENALTY STATEMENTS IN EXAMIN-ING RECEPTIVITY AND ATTITUDE MUTABILITY

Statement 1:
In spite of decades of studies, researchers have failed to find the death penalty to be a general deterrent (i.e., the death penalty has not been found to deter or stop other people from committing murder).

Statement 2:
Over the past few years there have been a number of cases in which someone on death row was found to be innocent. Furthermore, conservative counts indicate that at least 16 innocent people have been executed over the last two decades. Findings of innocence have been based on, among other factors, DNA evidence and actual offender confession.

Statement 3:
Contrary to popular perceptions, many families of murder victims do not want to see the offender executed. In fact, studies have revealed that victims' family members and other "survivors" often are not helped by the execution and even experience further victimization and traumatization from the associated criminal justice process.

Statement 4:
Recent studies have found that the average cost per execution is between $2.5 million and $5 million. This is 2.5 to 5 times more expensive than the cost of keeping an offender in prison for their natural life (which, on average, costs $1 million).

Statement 5:
Numerous sudies have found that race of both offender and victim plays a role in the adminstration of the death penalty. All relevant research shows that racial minorities are significantly more likely to receive the death penalty than White and/or wealthy individuals. Furthermore, offenders whose victims are racial minorities are substantially less likely to receive the death penalty than offenders whose victims are White.

Statement 6:
Organizations such as the American Bar Association, countless observers and participants in capital trials, capital jurors, and scholarly research studies have all testified to the grossly incompetent legal representation offered to many capital defendants during their trials and sentencing. In addition to the often ill-prepared, ill-equipped, inexperienced, or simply incompetent representation in many capital cases, numerous cases of mentally ill, drunken, and sleeping lawyers have been documented in recent years.

REFERENCES

American Civil Liberties Union. (2004). *How the death penalty weakens U.S. international interests*. New York: Author.

Bedau, H. A., & Cassell, P. G. (2004). *Debating the death penalty: Should America have capital punishment?* New York: Oxford University Press.

Bohm, R. M. (1989). The effects of classroom instruction and discussion on death penalty opinions: A teaching note. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 17,* 123-131.

Bohm, R. M. (1992). Retribution and capital punishment: Toward a better understanding of death penalty opinion. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 20,* 227-236.

Bohm, R. M. (2007). *Deathquest III: An introduction to the theory and practice of capital punishment in the United States*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Co.

Bohm, R. M., Clark, L. J., & Aveni, A. F. (1990). The influence of knowledge on reasons for death penalty opinions: An experimental test. *Justice Quarterly 7*, 175-188.

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

Bohm, R. M., & Vogel, B. L. (2004). More than ten years after: The long-term stability of informed death penalty opinions. *Journal of Criminal Justice 32,* 307-327.

Borg, M. J. (1997). The southern subculture of punitiveness? Regional variation in support for capital punishment. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 34*(1), 25-45.

Bowers, W. J., & Pierce, G. L. (1980). Deterrence or brutalization: What is the effect of executions? *Crime and Delinquency, 26*(4), 453-484.

Bowers, W. J., Vandiver, M., & Dugan, P. H. (1994). A new look at public opinion on capital punishment: What citizens and legislators prefer. *American Journal of Criminal Law, 22*, 77-150.

Cochran, J. K., Boots, D. P., & Heide, K. M. (2003). Attribution styles and attitudes toward capital punishment for juveniles, the mentally incompetent, and the mentally retarded. *Justice Quarterly, 20*(1), 65-93.

Cochran, J. K., & Chamlin, M. B. (2000). Deterrence and brutalization: The dual effects of executions. *Justice Quarterly, 17*(4), 685-706.

Curtis, M. S. (1991). Attitude toward the death penalty as it relates to political party affiliation, religious belief, and faith in people. *Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology, 19*(2), 205-212.

Death Penalty Information Center. (2007) Retrieved on June 20, 2007, from http://www.deathpenaltyinfo.org/

Durham, A. M., Elrod, H. P., & Kinkade, P. T. (1996). Public support for the death penalty: Beyond Gallup. *Justice Quarterly, 13*(4), 705-736.

Ellsworth, P. C., & Gross, S. R. (1994). Hardening of the attitudes: Americans' views on the death penalty. *Journal of Social Issues, 50*(2), 19-52.

Fox, J. A., Radelet, M. L., & Bonsteel, J. L. (1990-1991). Death penalty opinion in the post-Furman years. *Review of Law and Social Change, 18*, 499-528.

Furman v. Georgia, 408 U.S. 238 (1972).

Garland, D. (2002). The cultural uses of capital punishment. *Punishment & Society, 4*(4), 459-487.

Garland, D. (1990). *Punishment and modern society: A study in social theory*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Herek, G. M. (1986). The instrumentality of attitudes: Toward a neofunctional theory. *Journal of Social Issues, 42*(2), 99-114.

Hood, R. (2002). *The death penalty: A worldwide perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Katz, D. (1960). The functional approach to the study of attitudes. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 24*(2), 163-204.

Kirchmeier, J. L. (2002). Another place beyond here: The death penalty moratorium movement in the United States. *University of Colorado Law Review, 73*, 1-116.

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

Longmire, D. R. (1996). Americans' attitudes about the ultimate weapon: Capital punishment. In T. J. Flanagan & D. R. Longmire (Eds.), *Americans view crime and justice: A national public opinion survey* (pp. 93-108). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lynch, M. (2002). Capital punishment as moral imperative: Pro-death penalty discourse on the internet. *Punishment and Society, 4*(2), 213-236.

Murray, G. R. (2003). Raising considerations: Public opinion and the fair application of the death penalty. *Social Science Quarterly, 84*(4), 753-770.

Newport, F. (2007, October 12). Sixty-nine percent of Americans support death penalty. *Gallup News Service*. Retrieved on January 13, 2008, from http://www.gallup.com/poll/101863/Sixtynine-Percent-Americans-Support-Death-Penalty.aspx

Niven, D. (2004). Southern newspaper coverage of exonerations from death row. *Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture, 11*(1), 20-31.

Payne, B. K., & Coogle, V. (1998). Examining attitudes about the death penalty: Race and political affiliation are factors most likely to influence opinion. *Corrections Compendium, 23*(4), 1-5; 24-26.

Radelet, M. L. (1989). *Facing the death penalty: Essays on a cruel and unusual punishment*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Radelet, M. L., & Borg, M. J. (2000). The changing nature of death penalty debates. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26*, 43-61.

Riffe, D., Lacy, S., & Fico, F. G. (1998). *Analyzing media messages: Using quantitative content analysis in research*. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

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

Sarat, A. (2001). *When the state kills: Capital punishment and the American condition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Sarat, A., & Vidmar, N. (1976). Public opinion, the death penalty, and the Eighth Amendment: Testing the Marshall hypothesis. *Wisconsin Law Review, 1*, 171-197.

Stack, S. (2003). Authoritarianism and support for the death penalty: A multivariate analysis. *Sociological Focus, 36*(4), 333-352.

Stack, S., Cao, L. & Adamzyck, A. (2007). Crime volume and law and order culture. *Justice Quarterly, 24*(2), 291-308.

Trail, R. (2002). The future of capital punishment in the United States: Effects of the international trend towards abolition of the death penalty. *Suffolk Transnational Law Review, 26*, 105-131.

Turow, S. (2003). *Ultimate punishment: A lawyer's reflection on dealing with the death penalty*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

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

United States Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2007). *Crime in the United States, 2006*. Retrieved on May 28, 2008, from http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2006

Vandiver, M. (2006). *Lethal punishment: Lynchings and legal executions in the South*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Vandiver, M., Giacopassi, D. J., & Gathje, P. R. (2002). "I hope someone murders your mother!": An exploration of extreme support for the death penalty. *Deviant Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 23*, 385-415.

Vidmar, N., & Dittenhoffer, T. (1981). Informed public opinion and death penalty attitudes. *Canadian Journal of Criminology, 23*, 43-56.

Vollum, S., Longmire, D. R., & Buffington-Vollum, J. (2004). Confidence in the death penalty and support for its use: Exploring the value-expressive dimension of death penalty attitudes. *Justice Quarterly, 21*(3), 521-546.

Zimring, F. E. (2003). *The contradictions of American capital punishment*. New York: Oxford University Press.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

Scott Vollum is an assistant professor of justice studies at James Madison University. His current research focuses on the human side of the death penalty, death penalty attitudes, violence against animals, and violence in prison. He has had his work published in a variety of journals including *Justice Quarterly, Violence & Victims, The Prison Journal,* and *Society & Animals* and is co-author of the book *The Death Penalty: Constitutional Issues, Commentaries and Case Briefs.*

Stacy Mallicoat is an assistant professor of criminal justice with the Division of Politics, Administration and Justice at California State University, Fullerton. Her current research interests focus on capital punishment, women and crime, and juvenile delinquency. Her previous work has been published in *Feminist Criminology* and the *Journal of Crime and Justice*.

Jacqueline Buffington-Vollum is an assistant professor of justice studies at James Madison University and a licensed forensic clinical psychologist. Her most recent work concentrates on mental illness and the criminal justice system, the role of mental health professionals in capital trials, violence in prison, and hate crimes. Her work has appeared in numerous journals including *Justice Quarterly*, *Law and Human Behavior*, and *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*.

A Local Case Study on Students' Perceptions of Truancy and Delinquent Behaviors

Dianne Reed
Sam Houston State University

Carrie Butler
Sam Houston State University

Lee LeGrice
Lena Pope Home, Inc.

Abstract

The purpose of our study was to assess the levels of truancy and related juvenile behaviors at a local junior high and high school campus. Specifically, we collected self-report data on students' perceptions of truancy, drug use, violence, victimization, and strategies for prevention and intervention of delinquent behavior. We utilized quantitative methodology with descriptive statistics to assess students' perceptions regarding the current issues related to truancy, drug use, violence, victimization, and strategies for prevention and intervention of delinquent behaviors at the selected school district. A comparison was made with the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Survey (1998) for perspective on the local district levels of violence and drug use to issues across the United States. The findings of our exploratory study indicated consistent patterns of frequency data with national data on violence and drug use. Local student percentages on violence were higher than national reports. Local students reported an unusually high percentage of non-prescribed medication use. In addition, based on students' responses regarding strategies for prevention and intervention strategies for delinquent behaviors, the local high school initiated a class for at-risk youth, community service projects, and implemented a more comprehensive anti-drug "zero tolerance" policy.

Key words: truancy, juvenile delinquency

INTRODUCTION

Serious delinquent activity in youth and related negative behaviors have been linked to truancy, or unexcused absence from school (Bell, Rosen, & Dynlacht, 1994; Garry, 1996). In past research, truancy has been found to be related to various types of delinquency, including gang activity, alcohol and drug abuse, and serious property crimes (Baker, Sigmon, & Nugent, 2001). Not only do these issues present immediate concerns, there are also ramifications of these issues that can affect a person later in adulthood.

Adults who were frequently truant as teenagers are much more likely than those who were not to have poorer health and mental health, lower paying jobs, an increased chance of living in poverty, more reliance on welfare support, children who exhibit problem behaviors, and an increased likelihood of incarceration (Bell, Rosen, & Dynlacht, 1994; Hawkins & Catalano, 1995; Ingersoll & LeBoeuf, 1997). For example, recent school shootings and plots to harm teachers and students such as those that occurred in Colorado, Oregon, and Georgia create the urgency to address violence and victimization in schools. Examining the correlates of truancy can facilitate more appropriate prevention and intervention efforts.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This section provides a review of the literature surrounding seven broad categories: (a) correlates of truancy, (b) truancy and delinquent behavior, (c) juvenile crime, school crime, (d) truancy related school crime, (e) community coalition, and (f) local community coalition. These categories were selected for two purposes:

1. to identify and organize issues related to the local school district and coalition, and
2. to review current issues in contemporary literature.

Correlates of Truancy

In general, the correlates of truancy fall into four broad categories (Baker, et al., 2001): (a) family factors, (b) school factors, (c) economic variables, and (d) student variables. Family factors are those related to a lack of guidance or parental supervision, domestic violence, poverty, drug or alcohol abuse in the home, lack of awareness of attendance laws, and differing attitudes toward education. School factors are those related to school climate issues – such as school size and attitudes of teachers, other students, administrators, and inflexibility in meeting the diverse cultural and learning styles of the students. Schools often have inconsistent procedures in place for dealing with chronic absenteeism and may not have meaningful consequences available for truant youth. Economic variables are those related to employment of students, single-parent homes, high mobility rates, parents who hold multiple jobs, and a lack of affordable transportation and childcare. Finally, student variables are those related to drug and alcohol abuse, lack of understanding of attendance laws, lack of social competence, mental health difficulties, and poor physical health.

Truancy and Delinquent Behavior

One of the early warning signs that youth are headed for potential delinquent activity, social isolation, and educational failure is truancy. Research has established lack of commitment

to school as a risk factor for substance abuse, delinquency, teen pregnancy, and school drop out (Bell, Rosen, & Dynlacht, 1994; Huizinga, Loeber, & Thornberry, 1995; Rohrman, 1993).

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's (OJJDP) Program of Research on the Causes of Delinquency indicated that truancy may be a precursor to serious violent and nonviolent offenses and that the connection between truancy and delinquency appeared to be particularly acute among males (Kelly, Loeber, Keenan, & DeLamarte, 1997). In addition, OJJDP's Study Group on Very Young Offenders indicated that chronic truancy in elementary school is linked to serious delinquent behavior at age 12 and under (Loeber & Farrington, 2000).

Juvenile Crime

Juvenile crime and victimization have received considerable attention over the past two decades. Violent juvenile crime started its incline in the early 1980's and peaked in the mid-1990's (Sickmund, Snyder, & Poe-Yamagata, 1997). More recent statistics revealed that juvenile arrests and violent juvenile crimes have decreased since 1995 (Snyder, 2001). Reasons for this promising trend may be the result of comprehensive gun-reduction strategies adopted by communities across the United States (OJJDP, 1999). Other explanations are limited in the literature regarding the reduction of violent juvenile crime; however, the gun reduction strategies including community coalitions and partnerships may provide a plausible account for some of this result (Snyder, 2005).

Similarly to overall juvenile crime trends, school crime has also declined (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2001). Despite this optimistic pattern, the looming threat and presence of school violence and victimization (which may not be readily reported) continue to threaten safe school environments.

School Crime

According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (2001), approximately 13% of all public middle and high school students reported being physically attacked or in a fight with a weapon. In 1999, approximately 18% of students reported carrying weapons at some time during a one-month period (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2001). Students may act in ways to protect themselves at school as a means of coping with these threats. Stephens (1993) reported that students carry weapons for protection, to fit in, and to intimidate others; and it seems that formal consequences for carrying weapons are not serving as deterrents for their behavior. Current data showed that younger teens are becoming more violent; the arrest rate for individuals under the age of 15 is increasing despite the overall reduction in violent crimes over the past decade for all teens (Snyder, 2005).

Students' perceptions of discipline consistency and enforcement procedures contribute to components of school violence and students' feelings of insecurity (McDaniel, 1994; Nuttal & Kalesnik, 1987). School-related crimes not only instill fear in students that they may become victims of violent crimes, but the threat of violence also makes it difficult for them to concentrate on their academic performance (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2001; Stern, 1992).

Truancy and Related School Crime

Truancy and related school crime have several negative consequences that affect student safety, prosocial behavior, and academic performance. About 19% of middle school and high school students reported gang presence in their schools (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2001). Gang activity and violence are theoretically linked in the literature (Spergel, 1992; Snyder 2001). Given the repercussions of these consequences on the school environment, and also the larger community, school needs assessments and the implementation of effective prevention and intervention strategies seem necessary to combat these issues. Likewise, a viable "game plan" is essential in order to produce effective and lasting results.

Community Coalitions

In 1999, the OJJDP published a bulletin on comprehensive strategies to reduce firearm-related violence. Community coalitions targeted juvenile and adult community problems for specific prevention and intervention initiatives that incorporated several community facets: Law enforcement, prosecution, mental health, school, and local residence. Agencies, organizations, and neighborhood groups worked collaboratively to reduce crime in "hotspot" areas; wherein, these communities reported significant crime reduction in the targeted areas. Moreover, the coalitions identified the collaborative efforts as key factors for successful outcomes, as opposed to agencies and organizations working independently to solve the problems. The bulletin responsibly noted that success on part of the coalitions could not be directly tied to their efforts, because it was virtually impossible to partial out the effects that each facet had on the targeted issues; however, their reports indicated that cooperative efforts produced the results the coalitions hoped to achieve (OJJDP, 1999).

This study assessed junior high and high school students' perceptions of truancy and delinquency in the local area and provides prevention and intervention implications for the coalition. Similarly to those initiatives described in the bulletin by the OJJDP (1999), the local area identified in the current study formed a coalition of community entities to assess and address the issues of truancy and related juvenile crime.

Local Community Coalition

The coalition of school districts, law enforcement agencies, juvenile courts, and community youth agencies in southeastern Texas has reported concerns regarding truant behavior that may contribute to school and community juvenile crime (Texas Commission on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse, 2003). The objectives of the coalition include: (a) assessing the prevalence of truancy and school crime; (b) targeting funding for prevention and intervention services for at-risk youth and their families in an effort to reduce truancy, substance abuse, and juvenile delinquency; and (c) to evaluate the prevention and intervention services for continued support and funding.

PROBLEM STATEMENT, PURPOSE, AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The school police officers and administrators were concerned that truancy was related to other delinquent behaviors on and off campus. The purpose of our study was to assess the levels of truancy and related juvenile behaviors at a local junior high and high school campus. Specifically, we collected self-report data on students' perceptions of truancy, drug use, violence, vic-

timization, and strategies for prevention and intervention of delinquent behavior. Student surveys, in which student perceptions can be obtained, not only help to circumvent issues related to unreported crimes to the police and school administrators, but also school crime data is often difficult to acquire because of the sensitive nature of juveniles in the justice system. This survey served as an assessment of the current state of truancy in the target community. Our study was significant because it provided information to the local district administration regarding the students' perceptions of the aforementioned issues and added to the greater body of literature on current issues related to truancy and delinquency in rural school districts. Therefore, in an effort to identify the extent of both truancy and other delinquent behaviors, the researchers identified the following research questions:

1. What are students' perceptions regarding truancy, drug use, violence

(including gang fighting), and victimization?

2. What are students' perceptions regarding strategies for prevention and intervention for truancy and delinquent behaviors on their campus?

3. How does the current local data compare to national levels of violence and drug use?

METHOD

We utilized quantitative methodology with descriptive statistics to assess students' perceptions regarding the current issues related to truancy, drug use, violence, victimization, and strategies for prevention and intervention of delinquent behaviors at the selected school district. A comparison was made with the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Survey (1998) for perspective on the local district levels of truancy and delinquency to issues across the United States. Data was collected using self-report measures which are widely used in the social sciences to help control for unreported crime to the police. Although self-report measures run the risk of inflated or deflated responses to items on truancy and related delinquency, they provide one of the best means of gaining information from an adolescent population (Hindelang, Hirschi, & Weis, 1981).

Student surveys from the local district provided self-reported data to capture perceptions of truancy, drug use, and violence (including gang fighting) and victimization at the junior high and high school campuses. The survey consisted of 103 items and students were given one class period to complete the survey. All students in attendance on the day of survey administration participated in the survey; 1,211 surveys were submitted to the researchers for analysis.

The survey included original items as well as items from previously designed national surveys. This allowed for the current student data to be compared to statistics on a nationwide level; however this survey was not a standardized instrument and may only reflect patterns of behavior from individuals who attended the schools represented.

Participants

The entire student body consisted of approximately 1,300 students in grades 7–12 for the 2001–2002 school year. The school was able collect 1,211 of the 1,300 surveys that were distributed. The population composition is outlined below in terms of ethnicity, gender, and grade in Table 1 [page 248].

TABLE 1. PERCENTAGES OF STUDENT BODY COMPOSITION BY ETHNICITY, GENDER, AND GRADE LEVEL					
Race/Ethnicity		Gender		Grade	
American Indian	2	Males	53	7th Grade	25
African American	7	Females	47	8th Grade	23
Mexican American	7			9th Grade	17
Asian American	1			10th Grade	16
Caucasian	78			11th Grade	10
Other	5			12th Grade	9

Design and Procedure

Prior to data collection, we secured approval from the Sam Houston State University Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects. In addition, approval was obtained from the school district superintendent and school board. We collaborated with school district representatives for the development of the 103-item modified surveys, which included previously designed items from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Survey (NICHHD) (1998). The survey represented items on truancy; types of delinquent behaviors that were exhibited at school and in the community; and school and community interventions which might assist in deterring delinquent behavior. The following measures were used in the survey:

1. **Truancy**. Truancy in this study referred to students' absence from school without excused permission. The truancy variable was dichotomized into "yes" and "no" responses for skipping school since the beginning of the school year.

2. **Drug Use**. Drug involvement included the following variables: Tobacco use, alcohol consumption, marijuana use, and the use of other hard substances (methamphetamines, cocaine, heroin, and non-prescribed medications). Variables for tobacco, alcohol, and marijuana use were dichotomized into responses of "yes" and "no" for use during a one-month period. Variables for methamphetamines, cocaine, non-prescribed medications, and heroin were dichotomized into responses of "yes" and "no" during the students' lifetime. A response of "yes" indicated that students used the aforementioned drugs for the time period previously indicated. A response of "no" indicated that students denied drug use.

3. **Violence**. In this study, violence was measured by actions that harm other people or have the potential of harming other people and included variables such as physical fighting; gang fighting (physical fighting for the purpose of the gang); carrying weapons; and experiencing thoughts of school attacks. The violence variables were categorized into "yes" or "no" responses for the period of the past 12 months. A "yes" response from students indicated that the students were actively engaged in a violent incident, and a response of "no" indicated that the students were not engaged in a violent incident.

4. **Victimization**. Victimization was included in the modified survey to determine how students perceive their safety when at school. Victimization refers to the mistreating,

bullying, and threatening of students by other students. Threatening remarks and be-haviors referred to incidences on the way to and from school, and on school property for the period of the past 12 months prior to the completion of the survey. Victimization variables were categorized into "yes" or "no" responses.

5. **Prevention and Intervention Recommendations**. Prevention and intervention rec-ommendations indicated students' ranking of different approaches to handle truancy, violence, and drug activity. Students were asked to rank the following: talking to a counselor; harsher consequences for misconduct; more consistent discipline; encour-agement by teachers or principals to achieve positive goals; and involvement in after-school activities.

The survey was distributed to students in grades 7-12 by classroom teachers during one class period. Although the survey administration procedure produced a threat of validity to student responses, teachers read aloud a cover sheet explaining confidentiality, the importance of honest student responses, and a guarantee of anonymity in order to promote accurate student responses. The surveys were placed in covered boxes and immediately given to the school representative for safe keeping in a locked office. The school district representative collected 1,211 completed surveys from the classroom teachers and submitted them to the researcher.

LIMITATIONS

Several limitations exist in this study, including survey administration procedures, using a self-report measure, and a systematic bias within the data for dependent variables. The sample included students from one junior high and high school campus in a Southeastern Texas school district. The results cannot be generalized beyond the scope of the school. During adminis-tration of the survey, teachers were present while students completed the surveys, and this dynamic may have potentially interfered with students' honest portrayal on survey items. The survey was completed by students on a self-report basis and may create a threat to the valid-ity of the measure. Although self-report as a measure may pose a threat to the accuracy of the data, self-report is generally considered an acceptable method of data collection (Esbensen & Osgood, 1997). Esbensen and Osgood (1997) used self-report measures for delinquency and gang membership in their national evaluation of the *Gang Resistance Education and Training Program*, funded through the National Institute of Justice.

FINDINGS

Local and National Data Comparison

Based on the following findings, the local school district has implemented prevention and intervention programs, which will be addressed in the implications section. The findings of this exploratory study on students' perceptions of truancy, violence, drug use, and strategies for pre-vention and intervention of delinquent behaviors indicate consistent patterns of frequency data with national data on violence and drug activity (NICHHD, 1998). Local student percentages on violence are higher than national reports. Additionally, local students reported an unusually high percentage of non-prescribed medication use.

Frequency results revealed consistent patterns with the local district's data and national data on variables for violence and drug activity (NICHHD, 1998). Table 2 [below] illustrates

percentages of the local district's student data on monthly use of alcohol (43), tobacco (20), and marijuana (21) and that from the NICHHD (1998) regarding alcohol

(54), tobacco (35), and marijuana (24). Table 2 [below] also illustrates percentages of the local district's student data on use of hard substances such as cocaine (10) and intravenous drugs (20) and that from the NICHHD (1998) regarding cocaine (9) and intravenous drugs (9). While the percentages of all reported student drug use at the selected local high school are similar to the percentages from the NICHHD (1998), they are nonetheless alarming to the administration and the school personnel because of the harmful effects of drug use on students' academic performance.

TABLE 2. PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF THE NICHHD AND THE SELECTED LOCAL HIGH SCHOOL'S DATA ON ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, AND MARIJUANA (MONTHLY) AND CO-CAINE AND INTRAVENOUS DRUG USE (LIFETIME)		
Drug Variables	Local High School	NICHHD
Alcohol	43	54
Tobacco	20	35
Marijuana	21	24
Cocaine	10	9
Intravenous Drug Use	20	9

Local Descriptive Data on Student Variables

Although students in the local district have consistent patterns of behavior with that of national reports, the local district's statistics on truancy, drug use, and violence raise concerns of safety and prosocial adolescent development. The following sections provide specific discussions on the findings.

Truancy. Table 3 [below] illustrates the local district's level of truancy since the beginning of the school year, indicating that 35% of the students skipped school without legitimate excuses. Approximately 61% of these students reported that skipping school was "not very hard" to "very easy."

TABLE 3. FREQUENCY PERCENTAGES ON TRUANCY SINCE THE BEGINNING OF THE SCHOOL YEAR (74% OF THE STUDENTS REPORTED THAT SKIPPING SCHOOL WAS "NOT VERY HARD TO "VERY EASY")	
Yes	No
61	39

Drug use. Results on drug use in Table 4 [below] indicates that 53% of students reported using alcohol in the past 30 days; 28% of students used tobacco within a 1-month period; and 25% of students used marijuana within a 1-month period. In addition, Table 4 shows that 14% of students tried methamphetamines in their lifetimes; 13% of students used some type of cocaine in their lifetimes; 22% of students used nonprescribed medication, such as Xanax, during their lifetimes; and approximately 6% of students reported using heroin during their lifetimes.

TABLE 4. FREQUENCY PERCENTAGES ON ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, AND MARIJUANA (WITHIN ONE MONTH) AND METHAMPHETAMINES, COCAINE/SUBSTANCES, UNAUTHORIZED MEDICATION AND HEROIN (LIFETIME)		
Drug Involvement	Yes	No
Alcohol	53	47
Tobacco	28	72
Marijuana	25	75
Methamphetamines	14	86
Cocaine/Substances	13	87
Unauthorized Medication	22	78
Herion	6	94

Violence. Table 5 [below] illustrates that for incidences of violence, 33% of students reported getting into a physical fight in the past 12 months; approximately 13% of students reported having thoughts of school attacks during the past 12 months; 11% of students reported carrying a weapon to school in the past 30 days; and about 19% of students indicated being in a gang fight. In comparison to NICHHD data (Table 6, bottom), the local district was slightly higher than the national survey percentages on physical fighting (33 and 31, respectively); however, on carrying weapons, the local district (11%) exceeded the national survey percentage (6%).

TABLE 5. FREQUENCY PERCENTAGES ON VIOLENCE AT THE LOCAL HIGH SCHOOL DURING THE LAST 30 DAYS		
Violence	Yes	No
Physical Fight	33	67
Weapons	11	89
Attack thoughts	13	87
Gang fight	19	81

TABLE 6. PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF THE NICHHD AND THE SELECTED LOCAL HIGH SCHOOL'S DATA ON VIOLENCE DURING THE LAST 30 DAYS		
Violence	Local District	NICHHD
Physical Fight	33	31
Weapon to School	11	6

Victimization. Victimization was included in the modified survey to determine how students perceive the school in terms of safety. Victimization referred to the mistreating, bullying, and threatening of students by other students. Threatening remarks and behaviors referred to incidences on the way to and from school and on school property for the period of the past 12 months prior to the completion of the survey. Victimization variables were categorized into "yes" or "no" responses. Table 7 [below] illustrates that 10% of students reported being threatened; approximately 10% of students reported being threatened with a weapon on school property; and 24% of students feel that they have been bullied at school.

TABLE 7. FREQUENCY PERCENTAGES ON STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF VICTIMIZATION WITHIN 12 MONTHS		
Victimization	Yes	No
Threat by Others	10	90
Threat with a Weapon	10	90
Bullied	24	76

Students' perceptions for potential prevention and intervention initiatives. Involvement in activities and recommendations for prevention and intervention are included in Table 8 for ideas toward potential change. Previous studies have indicated the benefits of activities involvement as deterrents to juvenile crime. Students' recommendations for prevention and intervention are closely related to their levels of activities involvement, which yields important research and practice implications consistent with recommendations from local school students.

Prevention and intervention recommendations. Students were asked their perceptions on effective prevention and intervention strategies to deter truancy and related behaviors. Reviewing truancy and discipline policies, and perhaps including qualitative student feedback, may prove helpful to school administrators and school police officers, as students are often keenly aware of the more pressing issues on school campuses.

Variables of prevention and intervention recommendations indicated that student rankings of "5" and "6" on a 6-point scale were considered effective strategies for prevention and intervention (Table 8, below). For students' responses on strategies to decrease drug involvement among students, 34% of the students indicated that harsher consequences would be effective, and 26% rated involvement in activities as effective in reducing drug use among students. For strategies to reduce violence among students, 29% of students indicated again that harsher consequences would be effective, and 28% reported that involvement in activities would be an effective approach. For truancy problems, 29% of students reported that involvement in activities would be effective, and 25% indicated that harsher consequences would help to control truancy.

TABLE 8. FREQUENCY PERCENTAGES ON STRATEGIES TO DECREASE DRUG INVOLVEMENT, VIOLENCE, AND TRUANCY		
Variables	Harsher Consequences	Involvement in Activities
Drug Involvement	34	26
Violence	29	28
Truancy	25	29

Students' recommendations for harsher consequences support the current punitive model of the criminal justice system in response to delinquent behavior of youth. Tougher policies on absenteeism or perhaps revising existing policies may prove effective. More staff support to help address truancy should also be considered. For fighting and drug-related problems, harsher consequences were again rated the most effective approach. Involvement in activities was also considered effective among students to control these issues.

IMPLICATIONS

While truancy, drug use, and violence among teens seem ever present in our society today, these problems continue to instill fear and disappointment among students, teachers, and administrators alike. Results of the selected local high school student surveys indicated a number of areas to improve to ensure students' likelihood for school success. Although the findings are descriptive in nature, the local district and community coalition initiated proactive measures to reduce truancy and other delinquent behaviors on the campus.

Three approaches have been implemented to address the serious issues of truancy and related delinquent behaviors among students. Two different school districts that participate in the coalition have received grant funding to provide the *Reconnecting Youth Class* to manage and organize coalition directives, and to evaluate the coalition's effectiveness. These initiatives are currently in the progress of evaluation. The *Reconnecting Youth Class* is conducted daily by local social service personnel that targets issues such as substance abuse, delinquency prevention, and decision-making. Students receive state-level credit towards graduation for an elective class. For participation in this class, students are identified by school counselors and administrators. In the *Community Beautification Project,* the coalition incorporates a community component in that the program is offered by a local community organization. The activities in the program include beautification and landscaping projects. The program affords school-age students the opportunity to participate in clean-up campaigns, gardening, and media initiatives to support a drug-free and safe community and school environment. Further, as a result of the student surveys, the local high school initiated a revised, more comprehensive anti-drug "zero tolerance" policy.

Consistent with the local coalition's mission, community strategies have shown promising results nationwide in reducing juvenile drug and delinquent activities. The strategies mentioned above outline effective approaches in combating these issues that have been implemented in other cities. The coalition has implemented similar approaches and will continue to seek strategies effective in truancy, drug, and delinquency prevention.

In a 1999 publication by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), several comprehensive violence reduction programs were reviewed in terms of their effectiveness. Eight programs included in this bulletin were the *Baltimore Comprehensive Communities Program,* the *Boston Strategy to Prevent Youth Violence,* the *Buffalo Weed and Seed Initiative*, the *Comprehensive Homicide Initiative*, the *East Bay Public Safety Corridor Partnership*, the *Indianapolis Weed and Seed Initiative*, the *Minnesota HEALS (Hope, Education, and Law and Safety)* project, and the *Partnership for the Prevention of Juvenile Gun Violence*. These programs were considered comprehensive in that they employ a systemic approach to combating violence involving several facets of the community in the intervention process. Identification of risk factors for prevention and intervention strategies includes some of the following: gang

involvement, illegal possession of firearms, lack of adequate parental supervision, signs of an-tisocial behaviors during childhood, and truancy (OJJDP,1999). Similar techniques used in the various intervention programs include "targeted police responses, surveillance of probationers, situational crime prevention using problem-solving strategies, parental supervision, peer medi-ation and conflict resolution, school-based interventions, community mobilization, legislation restricting youth access to guns, and tough sentences for crimes involving firearms" (p. 18).

CONCLUSION

School and community programs, intended or not, serve as vehicles to socialization for young people, and their cooperative efforts in prevention and intervention solutions are essen-tial to effective outcomes for school-age youth. This study does not include the evaluation of the aforementioned intervention and prevention strategies implemented by the school district and coalition. However, recommendations for future research include evaluation of the impact of these programs on the reduction of truancy and other delinquent behaviors that occur at the selected campus.

Comprehensive strategies have been documented as promising for reducing juvenile crime. The programs listed by OJJDP have each utilized extensive social control variables to achieve success: increased law enforcement, increased visibility of police, involvement of community residents in crime reduction strategies, specific attention to at-risk behaviors and locations, and consistent reinforcement of the consequences. Multi-systemic strategies seem to hold the most promise for reducing juvenile crime and delinquency. Spergel (1992) articulated this best, "Schools, churches, and local youth service agencies operate independently in regard to youth gang problems and seem unable to establish relationships with vulnerable youth or to properly serve their needs for education and socialization" (p. 1). He also notes that "lack of social control, denial, and lack of coordination between school, churches, and community agencies contribute to the problem and delay appropriate action" (p. 21).

REFERENCES

Baker, M. L., Sigmon, J. N., & Nugent, M. E. (2001). *Truancy reduction: Keeping students in school.* U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, NCJ 184176. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Bell, A. J., Rosen, L. A., & Dynlacht, D. (1994). Truancy intervention. *The Journal of Research and Development in Education, 57*(3), 203-211.

Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice. (1998). *Weapons in school.* NCJ 116498. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Center for Education Statistics. (2001). *Indicators of school crime.* NCJ 184176 Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Esbensen, F., & Osgood, D.W. (1997). *National evaluation of G.R.E.A.T.* Research in Brief. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

Garry, E. M. (1996). *Truancy: First steps to a lifetime of problems.* Bulletin. Washington, DC U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Hawkins, J. D., & Castalano, R. (1995). *Risk focused prevention: Using the social development strategy.* Seattle, WA: Developmental Research and Programs, Inc.

Hindelang, M., Hirschi, T., & Weis, J. (1981). *Measuring delinquency.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Huizinga, D., Loeber, R., & Thornberry, T. (1995). *Urban delinquency and substance abuse: Initial findings.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Ingersoll, S., & LeBoeuf, D. (1997). *Reaching out to youth out of the education mainstream.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Kelley, B. T., Loeber, R., Keenan, K., & DeLamarte, M. (1997). *Developmental Pathways in boy's disruptive and delinquent behavior.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Loeber, R., & Farrington, D. (2000). Young children who commit crime: Epidemiology, developmental origins, risk factors, early interventions, and policy implications. *Development and Psychopathology, 12*(4), *737-762.*

McDaniel, T. R. (1994). A back-to-basics approach to classroom discipline. *The Clearing House, 67*(5), 254-256.

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (1998). Retrieved March 2004 from www.nih.gov/about/almanac/1998/organization/nichd.

Nuttal, E. V., & Kalesnik, J. (1987). Personal violence in the schools: The role of the school counselor. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 65,* 372-375.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, US Department of Justice. (1999). *Promising strategies to reduce gun violence.* Washington, DC: author.

Rohrman, D. (1993). Combating truancy in our schools—A community effort. *Bulletin, 76*(549), 40-51.

Sickmund, M., Snyder, H. N., & Poe-Yamagata, E. (1997). *Juvenile offenders and victims: 1997 update on violence.* Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention.

Snyder, H. N. (2001). Juvenile offenders and victims. *National Report Series: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.* Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.

Snyder, H. N. (2005). Juvenile arrests 2003. *Office of Justice Programs: Partnerships for Safer Communities, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.* Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.

Spergel, I. A. (1992). Youth gangs: An essay review. *Social Service Quarterly, 66*, 121-140.

Stephens, R. D. (1993). *School-based interventions: Safety and security the gang intervention handbook*. Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Stern, D. (1992). Structure and spontaneity: Teaching with the student at risk. *English Journal, 81*(6), 49-55.

Texas Commission on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse. (2003). Retrieved March 2004 from http://www.texas_commission_on_alcoholism_and_drug_abuse.state.tx.us/.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

Dianne Reed is an associate professor and Principal Preparation Program Coordinator in the Educational Leadership Program at Sam Houston State University. Her research interests include issues regarding cultural proficiency; organizational climate and culture; leadership; recruitment, training, and mentoring of minority principals and assistant principals; and training and information for students at risk of school failure. She is the author of several publications in educational journals and books.

Carrie M. Butler has been a member of the Sam Houston State University College of Criminal Justice faculty since 2001. She conducts program evaluations for various school- and community-based initiatives, and her primary research and teaching areas include juvenile justice and delinquency, youth gangs, and school crime and violence. From 2002 – 2005, she was the Program Evaluator for the Partners of the Safe Schools Initiative (PSSI), funded by the Texas Commission on Alcoholism and Substance Abuse, and the Principal Investigator for Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) in the Southern District of Texas, funded by the Department of Justice. She is currently the Program Evaluator for the Roots of Change Coalition Phoenix House –Dallas and Montgomery County Youth Services funded by the Office of National Drug Control Policy and the United States Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Drug Free Communities Grant. Her educational background includes a B.S. in Education, a M.Ed. in Counseling and Human Development, a Master of Science in Social Work (M.S.S.W.), and a Ph.D. in Social Work.

Lee LeGrice received her Ph.D. in social work from University of Texas at Arlington in 2003. In 1995, she joined Lena Pope Home, Inc., a private not-for-profit organization located in Fort Worth, Texas, serving children, adolescents and families since 1930. The services include therapeutic foster care, alternative education, in-home family preservation, and outpatient clinical counseling. The agency specializes in treating children involved in delinquent activities. Dr. LeGrice is currently executive director of programs and is leading the agency in identifying and implementing evidence-based practices across all programs. She is passionate about bridging the gap between research and practice so that all families receive treatment that works.

BOOK REVIEW

St. Jean, P. K. B. (2007). Pockets of Crime: Broken Windows, Collective Efficacy, and the Criminal Point of View. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Beth C. Freeman, Sam Houston State University

With the publication of *Pockets of Crime*, Peter K.B. St. Jean (2007) upholds the Chicago School's longstanding tradition of examining crime from an ecological perspective in a sociological framework. Engaging and provocative, *Pockets of Crime* is a synthesis of methodological approaches to the study of urban crime. St. Jean weaves the stories of neighborhood insiders and outsiders into his innovative examination of crime in a historically infamous neighborhood on Chicago's south side. The "reputable" and the "disreputable" alike poignantly expound on their lived experiences in the complex microcosm of their physical and social milieu. Beat 213 in the Wentworth police district comes alive as St. Jean recounts his participant-observer role over a five-year period in conjunction with the Wentworth Area Neighborhood Study (WANS). He carefully guides the reader through the substance of his research and his logical extension of the theories of broken windows and collective efficacy.

St. Jean earned his Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of Chicago (UC) in 2002 (St. Jean, 2008). *Pockets of Crime* is an offshoot of St. Jean's doctoral dissertation entitled "Not on My Block: The Criminogenic Life-course of Place on Chicago's South Side" (St. Jean, 2002). Robert J. Sampson, now the Henry Ford II Professor of the Social Sciences and Chair of the Department of Sociology at Harvard University, was St. Jean's dissertation advisor at UC (Sampson, 2008). Sampson, a leading scholar in neighborhood and urban studies of social disorganization, states in the Foreword to *Pockets of Crime*, "One is tempted to say that science has perhaps for the first time met urban ethnography in this book" (p. x). St. Jean's innovative approach is a blend of ethnography, traditional survey research, official statistics, and contemporary technology. *Pockets of Crime* embodies UC's motto: C*rescat scientia; vita excolatur*—Let knowledge grow from more to more; and so be human life enriched (University of Chicago, 2008).

Currently, St. Jean is serving as an assistant professor in the Department of Sociology at the State University of New York at Buffalo (St. Jean, 2008). Since 2002, he has extended his research to the Buffalo Area Neighborhood Study (BANS): A Study of the Relationships between Neighborhood Contents, Neighborhood Action, and Neighborhood Outcomes, among other Buffalo area projects (St. Jean, 2008). His most recent research focuses on the impacts of crime and incarceration, as well as issues in community policing in his native country of Dominica (St. Jean, 2008). His first book, *Lessons from Grand Bay: Prospects for Maintaining Low Crime in Dominica, Nature Island of the Caribbean*, was published in 2006.

Although qualitative data are the core of *Pockets of Crime*, St. Jean offers a detailed methodological appendix of his statistical findings, complete with tables and maps of crime hotspots, warmspots, and coldspots in each neighborhood block. The richly detailed descriptions provided by the neighborhood's law-abiding residents ("neighborhood experts"), law enforcement

agents, and offenders reveal the links between ecologically advantageous and ecologically dis-advantageous locations and the offenders' motivations to select particular locations within the neighborhood as sites for concentrated criminal activity or "hotspots." These hotspots form the "pockets of crime" that St. Jean explores.

St. Jean's data collection methods include: official crime statistics, neighborhood surveys, in-depth field interviews, Geographic Information Systems (GIS) mapping, participant obser-vation, and Systemic Social Observation (SSO). St. Jean devised an innovative combination of SSO, video ethnography, and audio recordings that he simply refers to as "SSO video ethnog-raphy" (p. 27). St. Jean explains:

> SSO is a data gathering method that uses video data from cameras mounted to each side of a vehicle while it is slowly driven through neighborhood streets so that physical and social appearances can be captured for in-depth analyses. Such analyses include quantitative coding of the conditions of buildings, properties, and vacant lots, and the prevalence of behaviors like loitering, public drinking, and panhandling. Qualitative analyses of the video data were also used as a cross-reference to obtain a visual sense of the features of street blocks that make them attractive to offenders such as drug dealers. (pp. 26-27)

St. Jean converted the SSO videos into uploadable digital movies and transferred them to a laptop computer for use in the field. Interview subjects were able to view the movie while their running commentaries were recorded on audio tape. These narratives, in concert with SSO video ethnography, provide the foundation for St. Jean's conclusions concerning methodologi-cal implications for future studies of neighborhoods and the issues that are embedded within their ecological contexts. Cross-referencing and cross-validation are key factors in assessing the reliability and validity of St. Jean's integrated methodological approach, and he leaves few stones unturned in his assessment of these multiple data gathering techniques.

The purpose of *Pockets of Crime* is best stated by Sampson in the Foreword: "[St. Jean] specifically wanted to collect data that would allow him to interrogate two theoretical perspec-tives on crime—'broken windows' and 'collective efficacy'" (p. xi). Sampson asserts that St. Jean, "true to ethnographic form," sought to "challenge and revise" some fundamental aspects of these theories, and St. Jean did just that. His concepts of "ecological disadvantage" or "eco-logical advantage" are derived from the integration of ethnographic techniques, official statis-tics, and the critical step of defining and mapping geospatial hotspots.

St. Jean's basic research question is: "Why [do] crimes occur more frequently in certain neighborhood locations as opposed to others?" (p. 31).The underlying aim of St. Jean's re-search is to revisit broken windows and collective efficacy theories and fill an empirical void by "...utilizing intensive field research and extensive interviews with offenders and others to understand how abstract measures of neighborhood disorder and collective efficacy influence their crime-related actions in everyday life" (p. 46). This is the essence of the book's contribu-tion to the literature.

St. Jean focuses tightly on the crimes of robbery, drug dealing, and battery and dedicates a chapter to each (i.e., Chapters 5, 6, and 7, respectively). In Chapter 2, St. Jean thoroughly walks the reader through the logic and limitations of broken windows and collective efficacy theories. The concept of ecological disadvantage is proposed as an extension, and as a criticism of two "reactive" theories, in contrast to "the proactive aspects associated with offending" (p. 32). St.

Jean asserts, "...the presence of crime is attributed by conventional theories to the failure of others, not to the successful strategies of offenders" (p. 32).

The upshot of St. Jean's research is that offenders will strategically evaluate and select locations that are ecologically advantageous to the success of their criminal enterprises—an ecological advantage for an offender is an ecological disadvantage for a neighborhood. St. Jean found that the prevalence of drug dealing, robbery, and battery are dependent on the specific characteristics of favorable locations. For example, successful drug dealers rely on the stability of three ecological advantages: "high demand," "high supply," and "high exchange opportunities" (p. 100). Robberies frequently occur in spaces where potential victims are most likely to have money in their possession and are easily distracted (i.e., near businesses such as convenience stores, liquor stores, and check-cashing outlets). St. Jean further finds that neighborhood blocks housing a core of disruptive families are concentrated hotspots for battery.

These types of neighborhood characteristics provide context-dependent structures of opportunity for criminal activity, especially when inequality of geospatial zoning, development, and use result in a concentration of factors that represent an ecological disadvantage to a neighborhood. Broker, whom St. Jean described as a "serious, steady, and discreet drug dealer," sums it up nicely, "Similar to the business of real estate, it is an issue of location, location, location" (p. 115).

At times, St. Jean's carefully crafted prose seems to indicate a quiet patience with readers who may reluctantly be drawn into the minute details of a big picture. St. Jean aptly captures images of Wentworth's Beat 213 and deftly conveys them to the reader. He describes his journey through this neighborhood in a manner that renders its inhabitants and its visitors immediately "knowable" in a dense and closely-knit contextual fabric where fine threads are revealed on closer inspection.

In addition to the Methodological Appendix, *Pockets of Crime* includes appendices with lists of recent studies related to the theories of broken windows and collective efficacy. Each study is described under headings of author and citation, research methods, research focus, major findings, and a heading that indicates the level of support for the respective theory. Appendix B (broken windows) and Appendix C (collective efficacy) are useful to readers who desire a short summary of the relevant literature without combing through pages of references and conducting a search and retrieval mission. *Pockets of Crime* is adequately structured for ease of reference, is a fast read, and leaves the reader with an accomplished sense of understanding of St. Jean's explanation, exploration, and extension of broken windows' and collective efficacy's theoretical components and their application to the contextual intricacies of a neighborhood and its ecology.

Pockets of Crime is a must-read for sociologists and criminologists who desire a fresh look at broken windows and collective efficacy theories. It has the additional benefits of comprehensive explanations of multi-method approaches to the study of crime, and the innovative SSO video ethnographic approach to ecological micro-analysis. The book is also appropriate for graduate students in sociology and criminology as supplemental reading in courses related to integrated qualitative and quantitative research, or for any level of instruction in the areas of theory, policy, or urban geography and planning.

REFERENCES

Sampson, R. J. (2008, July). Faculty biography. Retrieved on September 8, 2008, from Harvard University Department of Sociology Web site: http://www.wjh.harvard.edu/soc/faculty/sampson/

St. Jean, P. K. B. (2002). Not on my block: The criminogenic life-course of place on Chicago's south side. Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Chicago, United States–Illinois. (Publication No. ATT 3060269).

St. Jean, P. K. B. (2008, April). Curriculum vitae. Retrieved on September 8, 2008, from State University of New York at Buffalo Department of Sociology Web site: http://sociology.buffalo.edu/contrib/faculty_staff/faculty/documents/St._Jean_CV_May1st2008.pdf

University of Chicago. (2008). *About the university*. Retrieved on September 8, 2008, from University of Chicago Web site: http://www.uchicago.edu/about/

BOOK REVIEW

Vollum, S. (2008). Last Words and the Death Penalty: Voices of the Condemned and Their Co-Victims. New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC.

Natalia D. Tapia, Sam Houston State University

Dr. Scott Vollum wrote *Last Words and the Death Penalty* with the purpose of giving voice to the two populations that are the most directly impacted by the death penalty process: those condemned to die by execution and those co-victims "in whose name this brand of justice is often served" (p. 248). He examined their perspectives by analyzing the last statements given by the offenders prior to their execution, and the statements made by co-victims to local newspaper reporters at the time of execution. He also explored the content of those statements for signs of the principles of restorative justice.

Data for this study was collected from executions that took place in Huntsville, Texas, from December 1982 to March 2004. Statements (N: 292) made by offenders at the time of execution were obtained from their "factsheets" posted on the Texas Department of Criminal Justice website. Co-victim statements (N: 159) were obtained from articles reporting on executions in *The Huntsville Item*, the local newspaper. Statements of those co-victims who were unwilling to speak to the media and those who chose not to attend the execution of their offender were not accounted for. Vollum employed qualitative and inductive analysis. The statements were examined to determine their meaning and develop theoretical categories based on the themes of the statements.

According to the author, the death penalty, the most extreme and severe of penal sanctions in the United States, is one of the most potent generators of human casualties. He starts by analyzing the three spheres of the death penalty and its human casualties: the capital punishment process, which includes the period of sentencing and residence on death row; the "rituals of death" such as deathwatch and "deathwork," and the death penalty´s broader social context. He makes clear that the consequences of the death penalty and executions are not limited to the condemned and the co-victims. Rather, he says, there is a whole "death row community" of individuals who are impacted by an execution: the condemned and his loved ones, co-victims, correctional staff, members of the media and of the legal community.

The most obvious impact of this process is on the inmates awaiting their own execution who experience the ups and downs of the often false hopes surrounding appeals, clemency hearings, and pleas for executive mercy. Vollum highlights that although much of the focus on the death penalty in the context of the Eighth Amendment's prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment has focused on the execution itself, it can be argued that the confinement of the condemned awaiting execution represents the truly cruel and unusual aspect of the death penalty. This impact extends to inmates' families and friends who experience prolonged grief because of the impending loss of their loved ones, who at the same time are responsible for the co-victims loss.

According to Vollum, a less considered impact is on the co-victims of the crime who suffer the uncertainty about the conclusion to this traumatic event in their lives. His research suggests that the death penalty process might constitute a secondary victimization on co-victims that only prolongs their period of grieving, and interrupts their healing process. Some co-victims express relief and satisfaction that the offender has been sentenced to death, but often this is followed by extreme dissatisfaction as the process takes years and sometimes decades before the execution. This is exacerbated by media attention that usually focuses on the offender and not the victims. Some will find closure once the inmate is executed, but for others the execution will actually impede their healing.

When addressing the impact of murder on co-victims and their needs for healing and closure, Vollum suggests that restorative justice might offer the best possibility for accommodating those needs among co-victims, offenders, offenders' families and the community in the wake of a capital murder. He cautions that the death penalty process, however, only exacerbates the grief and harm of crime by failing to attend to those needs and inhibits the potential for meaningful restorative justice processes. "The claim that there is a duty to deliver justice and retribution for the victims and co-victims is one of the most dominant and emotionally powerful arguments for the death penalty; however co-victims and their needs are largely ignored or forgotten in the aftermath of a tragic murder and the subsequent capital trial and appeal process" (p. 47).

To talk about restorative justice and its relation (or lack thereof) to the death penalty, Vollum refers to Zehr's paradigmatic book "Changing Lenses" (1990) which helped generate the modern movement toward restorative justice. According to Zehr, restorative justice views crime as a violation of people and relationships in which there is a tear or rupture in these relationships that needs repair and restoration. Restorative justice aims to place the status of victim back into the hands of those who actually experience the victimization, empowering victims and making them active participants in the justice process. The focus, in regards to offenders, is on accountability and responsibility, which are central to the healing and reconciliation of all who are impacted by crime. Retributive justice, on the other hand, views crime as a violation against the state, relegates the needs and rights of victims to secondary status by making the state the victim, focuses on determination of guilt and punishment for the offender, and offers little or no consideration of the community in the justice process. It discourages or impedes accountability. Vollum says that the death penalty, being the ultimate manifestation of retributive justice, is no different (p. 242).

Even though Vollum emphasizes that restorative justice cannot truly co-exist with the death penalty because this type of punishment contradicts the essential principles of restorative justice—where reconciliation and second opportunities are desirable—he is not implying at all that the criminal justice system should act leniently towards capital murderers. He simply suggests that restorative justice, within the sphere of life imprisonment, could more adequately assist co-victims in achieving healing and closure by avoiding the prolonged wait for an execution that only seems to trigger more feelings of despair, and by acknowledging the possibility of redemption inherent in our human nature. The abolition of the death penalty is desirable, as most of the world has come to accept, based on evolving standards of decency. However, acknowledging that the death penalty is not going to disappear anytime soon, Vollum offers an innovative approach by advocating for the inclusion of certain elements of restorative justice within the context of capital punishment.

Vollum searches for elements of restorative justice within the last words of condemned inmates. According to him, these statements "represent one of the most unique communiqués in human societies. It is exceedingly uncommon for humans to be asked to make a statement before they are killed. When they have finished uttering the last words which will ever leave their mouths, they are put to death and their voice is forever silenced" (p. 40). Last statements of executed offenders in Texas were examined. Ten major themes found across the statements were identified: well wishes, religion, contrition, gratitude, personal reconciliation, denial of responsibility, criticism of death penalty, anger and resentment, resignation, and accountability. Statement themes were examined in regard to the characteristics of the condemned, their offense, and the context of their time on death row (and the characteristics of the execution). Interesting findings include the fact that condemned inmates with more education were more likely to express contrition and less likely to make religious statements. Other findings suggested, for example, that in cases where there was a codefendant, the condemned was less likely to express contrition or any form of personal reconciliation. Condemned inmates who had been sentenced to death for killing a police officer were three times more likely to criticize the death penalty and express anger and resentment. Inmates were significantly more likely to express contrition in their last statements when co-victims were present at the execution.

An overwhelming majority (74%) of the last statements of the condemned included some restorative element, and only a small proportion included a non-restorative theme (18.2%). This was more frequent when they had family or friends present at the execution. "Such attempts to connect to others in their last minutes of life represent interesting assertions of humanity at the very moment when one´s humanity is being taken away"(p. 232). Vollum's work reveals that redemption and transformation are possible and expressed regularly among condemned inmates.

Statements made by the condemned's co-victims at the time of the execution were gathered from the local newspaper stories on each execution. The major themes were identified and examined in the context of the offender, offense, and execution characteristics. These themes were: healing and closure, satisfaction/dissatisfaction, justice and revenge, memorializing or honoring the victim, removal of condemned, forgiveness, sympathy, rationalization (dehumanizing the condemned and separating themselves from the execution), death penalty support, and religion. Interesting findings suggest that very few co-victims (2.5%) indicated that the execution provided emotional catharsis for them, and 20.1% of co-victims reported it brought no healing or closure. Religion was the least common theme among co-victims.

An analysis of the restorative nature of co-victim statements was also conducted. In 75.5% of the cases, however, co-victims made statements that were explicitly non-restorative. Their statements were more characterized by pain, anger, and frustration. Vollum notes that, as the length of time between sentencing and execution increased, non-restorative statements were more likely to occur. There is ambivalence in regard to whether executions assist or hinder the meeting of co-victims' needs for healing or closure.

Vollum concludes his work by suggesting that future research should include deeper interviews of condemned inmates and co-victims that would reveal a more profound understanding of their sentiments. Research should also be extended to offenders and co-victims in murder cases in which the offender is not sentenced to death in order to make a comparison. Finally,

he says that if we want to understand the full human impact of the death penalty, future studies should expand to family and friends of the condemned, correctional staff, and even juries.

Vollum's work is an invaluable contribution to the study of the death penalty that offers a new angle and adds to the scarce research on the statements of condemned inmates and co-victims. It highlights the death penalty's deep human consequences, which expand beyond the most obvious actors involved in it, and reclaims the voices of those executed by the state and of the co-victims in whose name this penalty is carried out. Even though he explicitly reveals his opposition to the death penalty, Vollum performs an extraordinarily objective analysis that is worth serious consideration. The book is very well structured and organized and flows logically. Although it encompasses rigorous social science research, it nevertheless is engaging and easy to read. I would recommend it without reservation.

BOOK REVIEW

Hallcox, J., & Welch, A. (2006). Bodies We've Buried: Inside the National Forensic Academy, the World's Top CSI Training School. New York: Berkley Books

Edward J. Schauer, Prairie View A&M University

In *Bodies We've Buried*, Hallcox and Welch build upon the earlier, excellent, and most scientific work by Bass and Jefferson, *Death's Acre* (Bass, B., & Jefferson, J. (2003). *Death's Acre: Inside the Legendary Forensic Lab the Body Farm, Where the dead do tell tales.* New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.). In the present volume, the authors explain the development of the *Body Farm*, from its humble beginnings as a scientific human forensics laboratory at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville, to its becoming the premier training center for police detectives from across the United States. Secondly and often in gruesome detail, Hallcox and Welch describe training techniques for the various topics of crime scene investigation, experiences with setting up and leading the training sessions, and developments in training techniques and settings which grew out of their learning through previous academy trainings.

In his illuminating foreword, Dr. Bill Bass explains that there are only two areas of science in which the investigators destroy in order to reveal the data: Archaeological excavations and crime scene investigations. Therefore he declares that the crime scene investigation must absolutely be done correctly the first time since there is usually no opportunity to do it a second time. Photography is the required first step; to be thorough, dozens of photographs must be taken by the crime scene investigator (CSI) of every aspect of the crime scene location before, as, and after the crime scene is processed.

The National Forensics Academy (NFA) was begun during the first two years of the 21st century. "Nowhere else in the world can CSIs receive comprehensive hands-on forensic training and learn the most cutting-edge techniques, taught by the best practitioners" (p., 2). Graduates of the NFA come from a variety of law enforcement agencies, large and small, federal, state, county, local, and international. Admission into the NFA is selective and highly competitive.

The authors of *Bodies We've Buried*, Hallcox and Welch, are in charge of the NFA training. They provide oversight in every training scenario from burying bodies to note rates of decay, to setting up mock crime scenes, to engineering the settings for the arson investigation training. The actual instructors are brought in from all over the United States and are selected for their expertise in particular forensic investigation knowledge and skills.

In Chapter One, the authors explain how crime scene management is taught at the NFA. They explain that without the O. J. Simpson murder trial with its emphasis on faulty crime scene management, plus the ubiquitous public reaction to the same, the funding may not have been forthcoming to begin and sustain the NFA in its first years of operation. The authors explain the critical value of photography in crime scene investigation in Chapter Two. Quality photographs—precise, well-lit, and clear—are vital to preserve the initial crime scene and its surroundings, as well as the avenues of possible entrance or exit of victims or suspects. They emphasize that proper crime scene photography appears to be a dying art in police departments

across the nation. The authors emphasize the scientific methods of latent print development in Chapter Three. They discuss the many methods used, state which methods they favor, and explain the pros and cons of each method.

Hallcox and Welch provide a change of pace for the reader in Chapter Four as they explain the historic development of the body farm and the *time since death research* which has been carried on at the Anthropological Research Facility of the University of Tennessee at Knoxville for well over thirty years. When Dr. Bill Bass was called in to investigate a deteriorating body back in 1971, he "realized then and there that no one really knew anything about how a body decomposes" (p., 74). He began the body farm to lead his students in research to discover scientific answers to time and circumstances of death questions which would be helpful to CSIs in the field.

The authors devote Chapter Five to the subject of training in burial recovery, and Chapter Six to postmortem printing, which is fingerprinting the dead. In the postmortem printing training, NFA students are taught various techniques to 1) lift the fingerprints of the dead, and 2) lift fingerprints which have been left upon a cadaver by others. Chapter Seven the authors dedicate to the training of CSIs for their special role in interacting with medical examiners in the autopsy process, and in Chapter Eight they record CSIs' training in observation, knowledge, and skills relating to death investigations.

In Chapter Nine, Hallcox and Welch explain the hands-on training in bloodstain pattern analysis for which they receive outdated human blood from local blood banks. After the students practice slinging blood with various weapons, spewing blood, and impacting bloody forms with clubs and pokers, they study the blood patterns on floors, walls, ceilings, and objects. Later they are tested in a staged, blood-splattered crime scene in which they must interpret what happened there.

The authors cover arson in Chapter Ten. During the arson training, CSI students observe and record the fires and the effects of at least two fires set in living rooms, in one of which an accelerant was used. They devote Chapter Eleven to bombs and how to investigate and interpret the effects of bombing. One of the popular bombing trainings includes the blowing up of a number of automobiles with bombs of differing types. In closing, the authors dedicate Chapter Twelve to the recognizing, collecting, and analyzing of trace evidence. Other types of evidence such as hair, glass particles, gunshot residue, and even DNA are lumped together into the tenth week of training which the authors call "trace evidence" (p., 226).

While Hallcox and Welch inform the reader about the training sequence and breadth of topic matter of the National Forensic Academy, in *Bodies We've Buried* the authors present a fascinating introduction to the practice of professional crime scene investigation. In studying this volume, the reader will comprehend the breadth of topic matter and the scientific grounding of crime scene investigation. In presenting this tome, the authors have produced a valuable addition to the literatures of criminal justice and the police sciences.