

Pace University
DigitalCommons@Pace

Honors College Theses

Pforzheimer Honors College

Fall 12-2017

Criminal Justice Majors: Are They Tougher on Crime?

Anthony Javornik

Honors College, Pace University

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.pace.edu/honorscollege_theses



Part of the [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Javornik, Anthony, "Criminal Justice Majors: Are They Tougher on Crime?" (2017). *Honors College Theses*. 159.
http://digitalcommons.pace.edu/honorscollege_theses/159

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Pforzheimer Honors College at DigitalCommons@Pace. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors College Theses by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Pace. For more information, please contact rracelis@pace.edu.

Criminal Justice Majors: Are They Tougher on Crime?

Anthony Javornik

Criminal Justice with Homeland Security Minor

Advisor: Dr. Collica-Cox

Dyson College of Arts and Sciences

Presentation Date: December 12, 2017

Graduation: December 2017

Pace University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT..... 3

INTRODUCTION 4

 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW 4

 LITERATURE REVIEW..... 7

 PURPOSE AND HYPOTHESIS..... 12

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS 13

 PARTICIPANTS 13

 DESIGN..... 14

 INSTRUMENT 15

 SURVEY QUESTIONS AND POINT SYSTEM..... 15

FINDINGS 18

DISCUSSION..... 34

 LIMITATIONS..... 36

 FUTURE RESEARCH 37

REFERENCES..... 38

LIST OF TABLES 39

Abstract

The United States of America incarcerates more individuals than any other nation in the world. Therefore, the United States has one of the most active correctional systems and it is imperative to examine the system thoroughly. Generally speaking, there have been 3 accepted models of the correctional system since the 1940's: custodial, rehabilitation, and reintegration. Although it is possible to find institutions that subscribe to each of these models respectively, the custodial model is the most common in the United States. Therefore, this study seeks to examine college students' perception of crime, in order to help explain why the general public supports the custodial model of the corrections system. More specifically, this study will examine the perceptions of crime that Pace University's undergraduate students have, in an attempt to compare the perceptions of criminal justice majors to those of non-criminal justice majors. The hypothesis of the study is that criminal justice majors are more likely to hold punitive viewpoints of the corrections system and crime in general, and that they are more likely to agree with the characteristics that are similar to the custodial/crime control model. This study consists of a sample size of 70 respondents; 17 are criminal justice majors and 53 are non-criminal justice majors. The data shows that there were no differences in level of punitiveness among the students, regardless of major. This study is important because it collects a representative sample of the views of individuals who will soon be professionals in the field.

Introduction

Historical Overview

The United States of America is referred to as the land of the free, and while this notion certainly remains true in most aspects, it is important to consider that the United States has the largest population of individuals who have fundamentally been stripped of their freedom by the government. With an incarcerated population of over two million, the United States incarcerates more individuals than any other nation in the world (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2017). In fact, the United States' rate of incarceration is more than five times higher than most of the countries in the world, and its incarceration trends follow countries that exhibit political instability (Djik, Kesteren, & Smit, 2007). But why does the United States have such a large incarcerated population? Is it because people in the United States inherently commit more crimes? Or is it how the government writes, enforces, and interprets its laws? In order to answer this question, it is imperative to examine the United States' past judicial and legislative trends regarding the correctional system.

Although the history of the United States' corrections system can be explored back to when the country was founded, for the purposes of this project, this paper will begin its examination in the 1940s, as the study does not focus on issues of the criminal justice system before this time-period. Three models of incarceration have been prominent since the 1940s: the custodial model, the rehabilitation model, and the reintegration model (Clear, Cole, Reisig, & Petrosino, 2012). The custodial model is based on the notion that criminals are incarcerated in order to incapacitate them from committing further crimes, which, as a result, protects society. This model is considered to be the most punitive, as it emphasizes security, discipline, and the subordination of the prisoner (Clear et. al., 2012). The rehabilitation model of corrections

became popular with the advancement of social and behavioral sciences. The rehabilitation model operated under the assumption that individuals engaged in criminal behavior due to an underlying social, psychological, or biological deficiency and therefore, they should receive treatment accordingly (Clear et. al., 2012). Similar to the rehabilitative model, the reintegration model of corrections aims to help offenders, rather than just punish them. The reintegration model's fundamental objective is to ensure that the offender maintains his/her ties to society with the hope that he/she can successfully reintegrate, which in turn will reduce the rate of recidivism (Clear et. al., 2012). In the contemporary corrections system, institutions that subscribe to each of these models can be found; however, it is important to note that the custodial model is the most common, which alludes to one of the reasons why the United States has such a high incarceration rate.

The late 1960's marked an extremely important phase for the correctional system, as the Warren Court ditched the hands-off doctrine that had been implemented since the 19th century. Essentially, under the hands-off doctrine, the courts chose not to interfere with the correctional system as they felt it was a breach of their separation of powers (Haas, 1977). In addition, they believed criminal offenders were slaves of the state and therefore, they forfeited their constitutional rights. However, after the desertion of the hands-off doctrine, the courts could finally improve offenders' lives inside correctional institutions by ensuring that their constitutional rights were protected (Clear et. al., 2012). The increased judicial review of correctional institutions dramatically helped the incarcerated population, however, it did not aide in slowing the incarceration rate. In fact, beginning in the late 1960s through the early 1970s, the public became more concerned with the increasing crime rate, and opponents of the rehabilitation model of the corrections system became more popular (Clear et. al., 2012). For

example, Robert Martinson, a highly influential sociologist at the time, published a highly accepted article on the shortcomings of prisoner rehabilitation. Martinson (1974) summarized his findings by stating that the rehabilitation model of corrections did not meet its goal of reducing recidivism and therefore, it also failed at rehabilitating offenders. Due to the acceptance of these findings, and the increased awareness of recidivism, the public responded to the increasing crime rates (Clear et. al., 2012).

The 1980s truly mark the beginning of mass incarceration and the utilization of a punitive emphasis on the corrections system. Due to the political climate, and the fact that crime rates were at a record high, each branch of government worked together in order to implement a crime control model of corrections (Clear et. al., 2012). Essentially, the crime control model of corrections functions under the assumption that criminal activity can be controlled by the increased use of incarceration, or other forms of punishment. The most notable example of this was the effect that the War on Drugs had on the incarceration rate. Due to the enactment of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986, mandatory-minimum sentences were implemented for the possession of the narcotics of crack and crack-cocaine (United States Sentencing Commission, 2002). These mandatory-minimum sentences removed judges' authority to consider any mitigating factors when sentencing, which consequentially led to more individuals being sentenced for longer periods of time. The ramifications of the War on Drugs can still be observed today, for since its declaration, the United States' incarcerated population has increased by 500% (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2017).

Even after the declaration of a War on Drugs, and the ramifications that followed, new tough-on-crime initiatives were implemented. One of the most notable and recent examples of this is the legislation collectively and colloquially known as the "three strikes and you're out"

laws. In the early 1990s, there was a public outcry due to an onslaught of high profile cases wherein previously incarcerated individuals committed more crimes upon their release. In the criminal justice world, this notion is known as recidivism. Recidivism refers to an individual's relapse into criminal behavior, often after the person receives sanctions or undergoes intervention for a previous crime. In 1994, at the height of the three strikes movement, research showed that 67.5% of prisoners would recidivate, meaning they were arrested or convicted of another crime, within 3 years after their release (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2017). Due to the public's perception of the recidivism rates, government officials were pressured to implement legislation that dealt with habitual offenders. Therefore, by the year of 1997, 24 states and the Federal government enacted some version of the "three strikes and you're out" laws (Austin, Clark, and Henry, 1997). As the name suggests, the purpose of the legislation is to permanently remove an offender from society, by sentencing them to life in prison after the commission of 3 enumerated felonies (strikes), in order to fully incapacitate them from committing more crimes; therefore, the three strikes legislation directly coincides with the custodial and crime control model of corrections. Although the legislation was drafted with logical intentions, just like the War on Drugs, the onslaught of three strikes laws had negative ramifications, as they further contributed to the United States' mass incarceration problem.

Literature Review

Research shows that the perception of crime varies between criminal justice majors and non criminal justice majors. According to Tsoudis (2000), obtaining a higher education in the field of criminal justice gives individuals more accurate knowledge of crime and the criminal justice system, and therefore, they tend to have a more realistic approach to the subject. Tsoudis' study was conducted in an Urban, Midwestern University with a large criminal justice program.

The study utilized a survey methodology in which students answered questions regarding “beliefs of crime, criminal justice and criminals, correctional ideologies, perceptions of punishment effectiveness, and sources of crime information;” the data concluded that criminal justice majors tend to show less support for harsh punishment and that they are more supportive of offenders’ rights. In addition, criminal justice majors advocated for the unique, preferential treatment of juveniles when compared to adults, more so than non-majors. Overall, the study corroborated the claim that pursuing a higher education in criminal justice will have an influence on the way an individual perceives crime. By studying and gathering as much information as possible on the subject, criminal justice majors tend to have the most realistic views on crime and how to punish offenders appropriately. Unlike non-majors and the general public, criminal justice majors understand the true implications of crime, and the issues that may result from strict punitive measures. It appears that non-majors and the general public make decisions about crime subjectively, with the interest of retribution and public safety in mind.

Although Tsoudis’ (2000) study found that criminal justice majors hold less punitive views toward crime than non-majors, it is important to note that other studies in the field may dispute this claim. For instance, in a study conducted by Farnworth, Longmire, and West (1998) the data showed that criminal justice majors viewed the criminal justice system more punitively, by a small margin, than their non-criminal justice counterparts. In the study, a survey was distributed to 683 undergraduate students, from four different universities in a single state; the sample was compromised of 58% criminal justice majors and 42% of non-majors. The questions that were asked concentrated on “attitudes toward criminal justice policy, fear of crime, and victimization” (Farnwoth et. al., 1998). Although the criminal justice majors viewed the criminal justice system more punitively, the researchers’ data also suggested that there is a “liberalizing

effect” of the college experience and in gaining a higher education in general (Farnwoth et. al., 1998). The liberalizing effect is the notion wherein students’ view of the criminal justice system shifted from conservative, to more liberal, as their academic careers progressed. The idea of the liberalizing effect supports the claim that was made by Tsoudis (2000), in which receiving an education in criminal justice will affect the way that an individual views crime and punishment. However, it is important to note that criminal justice majors were less affected by the liberalizing effect than non-majors. While both majors and non-majors experienced the phenomenon, criminal justice major experienced it at a decreased rate from their freshman to senior years when compared to non-majors (Farnwoth et. al., 1998).

The study conducted by Farnwoth et. al. (1998) showed that criminal justice majors, when compared to non-majors, only viewed crime and the criminal justice system a little more punitively; in other words, there was not a distinct, or large, difference between the views presented by the criminal justice majors and the non-criminal justice majors. However, the data of some studies have suggested that the gap between the two groups may be more extensive. For example, Mackey and Courtright (2000) conducted a study of their own, in which they administered their survey instrument in 5 colleges across 4 states. Like the two studies that were previously mentioned, this study was conducted in order to determine if the attitudes toward criminal sanctioning were more punitive by criminal justice majors versus non-majors. The study showed that there was a significant difference between the viewpoints of criminal justice majors and non-majors. The data corroborated the claim that criminal justice majors were more punitive when compared to other students (Mackey & Courtright, 2000). However, the researchers also acknowledged the fact that education has an effect on the students’ perception of crime, as they found a negative correlation between grade level and punitiveness (the higher the grade, the

lower level of punitiveness) (Mackey & Courtright, 2000). Even though the results of the three studies mentioned do not coincide perfectly, each researcher concluded that the respondents' level of education on the subject matter influences students' perception on crime. Mackey and Courtright (2000) concluded that "students' attitudes of punitiveness may ultimately be tempered somewhat by the educational process."

Tajalli, De Soto, and Dozier (2013) also explored the punitive attitudes of college students regarding the criminal justice system. Interestingly, their study contained multiple research questions that are very important to consider when discussing college students' views of crime. Bearing in mind that an individual's personal beliefs are subjective, it is important to consider the effect of geographical location of the sample and how it affects their political ideology. Tajalli et al's. (2013) sample consisted of two Texas universities and two Wisconsin universities. Considering that Texas is renowned for its punitive criminal justice system and that Wisconsin is commensurate with the majority of other states, the geographical diversity made for a great contrast. One of Tajalli et al's. (2013) hypotheses stated that the Texas students would be more punitive than the Wisconsin ones. The hypothesis was affirmed, and was "especially true regarding crimes of a sexual nature" (Tajalli et al., 2013, p. 349). The study showed that the geographic location is an important variable to consider because a study conducted in the Northeast could garner different results.

Similarly to geographic location, it is necessary to examine how the size (population) of an individual's locality can affect their perception of crime. In other words, even though the respondents all attended a particular university, it is important to consider the environment from which they came from. For the purpose of Tajalli et al's. (2013) study, they classified localities as urban, suburban, or rural. They hypothesized that there would be a correlation between

smaller localities and having more punitive/conservative views. This hypothesis was strongly supported, as rural areas were most likely to hold a conservative ideology. In fact, in Mackey and Courtright (2000) came to the conclusion that the size of the respondent's residential town played an extremely important factor in terms of their punitiveness. Therefore, in terms of geographic location, and the size of the locality, it is likely that the respondents will adhere to the political ideological trends that are already understood in the United States. Tajalli et al. (2013) stated, "a respondent's [political] ideology was the surest predictor of his/her inclination to favor harsh treatments of criminal offenders" (p. 348). In this scenario, the respondents who lived in rural, or smaller, localities were more likely to favor the harsh treatments of criminal offenders.

It is also important to consider that individuals within the criminal justice major can express different levels of punitiveness in regard to the criminal justice system. For example, individuals who pursue a career in law enforcement may be more likely to have punitive views than a prospective corrections counselor. A study that was conducted by Mackey and Courtright (2004) examines this topic. The researchers conducted a study in which they surveyed a total of 633 students, in 5 universities, across 4 states. The objective of their study was to determine whether the students' view on crime correlated with their desired occupation in the criminal justice field. The data showed that the occupational attractiveness of law enforcement at the local, state, and federal level remains supreme for criminal justice majors (Mackey & Courtright, 2004). In addition, the data corroborated the claim that students who aspire to pursue a job in law enforcement will have more punitive views than those pursuing other fields (Mackey & Courtright, 2004). Although this fact is not that surprising and seems rather logical because by definition law enforcement officers have to enforce the law, which can require punitive measures.

Purpose and Hypothesis

As previously mentioned, the United States is responsible for incarcerating more people than any other nation in the world. By presenting a thorough review of the United States' historic crime initiatives, it is evident that the public's perception of crime, and by default the politicians' responses to their perceptions, can be held responsible for contributing to the mass incarceration problem in the United States. However, it is important to note that the public's perception of crime is not always accurate. For example, the overall crime rate has declined steadily from the year 1991, but the public still views crime as an increasing problem, and are therefore more likely to support tough on crime initiatives (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2017). Although there are many factors that contribute to this phenomenon, one of the strongest arguments derives from the idea that the public is just misinformed about actual crime trends, and that they are not well versed in the subject. That being said, it is important to consider the role that knowledge, or higher education in the subject, has on individual's perception of crime.

This study will examine the perceptions of crime that Pace Universities' Undergraduate students have; more specifically, the students will be evaluated separately into two groups by major: criminal justice or non-criminal justice. The study uses the dichotomy of criminal justice and non criminal justice in the hope that it provides a comparison of those who have knowledge in the subject (criminal justice majors) to those who better represent the lay population (non-criminal justice majors). The study hypothesizes that criminal justice majors, when compared to their non-criminal justice major peers, will hold more punitive views regarding crime, corrections, and the criminal justice system as a whole; even though criminal justice majors have more knowledge in the subject, they will still remain tougher on crime than the lay-person. In

addition, the criminal justice majors' views will be in concurrence with the custodial model of corrections and the crime control model of the criminal justice system.

Although studies of this nature have been conducted before, which is evident by the literature review, this study is still considered to be of importance to the research question at hand, in addition to the criminal justice field as a whole. For one, the majority of the previous studies were conducted more than 10 years ago, with the exception of one study that was conducted in 2013. Considering that all of the studies involve the college demographic, the time period in which the studies were conducted is significant, because clearly there are generational disparities in regards to overall ideology. Therefore, the results of this study will provide valuable, up-to-date information on the current collegiate population. In addition, this study has a unique advantage in the fact that it is being conducted on a college campus in New York City. New York City is arguably the most progressive city in the United States, and therefore, the results of the study can provide important information on the influence that an individual's major actually has on their perception of crime; if the hypothesis is confirmed, and criminal justice majors do tend to hold more punitive views, then the fact that the sample was gathered from New York City will make the data that much more compelling.

Research Design and Methods

Participants

The sample for this study was gathered through a targeted sample. The sample includes all Pace University undergraduate students enrolled in Introduction to Criminal Justice, or CRJ 150, on the New York City campus, for the fall semester of 2016. The survey instrument was distributed in person to every available CRJ 150 course held on campus, therefore eliminating

online courses. The targeted sample of CRJ 150 was imperative for the research question, as it provides respondents from a variety of majors; the diversity of the respondent's majors allow for the comparison of views between criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors. In total, the study yielded a total of 70 respondents. Figure 1 displays the number of criminal justice majors (17) and non-criminal justice majors (53). In terms of demographic factors, the sample was extremely diverse. Figure 2 indicates that the respondents' age ranged from 17-25 years old, with the age of 18 years old being the mode. Furthermore, as shown by figure 3, the race of respondents varied and a little more than half of the respondents were from minority populations. Finally, figure 4 breaks down the respondents by their sex, wherein the majority of respondent's were female (77.1%). It is also important to note that the respondents' identity remained confidential, from the time the responses were collected, through the time the responses were recorded and the data was analyzed.

Design

The independent variable being examined for the study is the respondent's major. The respondent's major will be categorized into two groups: criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors. For the purposes of this study, criminal justice majors will be defined as any respondent who listed their declared major as "criminal justice." Furthermore, non-criminal justice majors will be defined as any respondent who listed anything other than criminal justice (i.e., English, business, sociology, etc.) for their major. The dependent variable being examined for the study is the respondent's level of punitiveness. Based on the instrument's Likert Scale style questions, a point system was created in order to measure the dependent variable, or respondent's level of punitiveness. The point system will be further explained in the next section of the paper.

Instrument

The survey instrument being used was developed from part of a larger study conducted by Dr. Collica-Cox. The particular segment chosen consists of quantitative measures in order to determine the respondent's level of punitiveness regarding certain topics within the criminal justice system. In order to ensure the reliability and validity of the survey instrument, the questions developed were borrowed and modified from previous studies. The particular segment chosen was adopted from Mackey and Courtright (2000). The questions utilize a Likert Scale and ask respondent's level of agreement with certain statements; their options are: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, or strongly disagree. The benefits of using a Likert Scale are that the respondents have a degree of opinion and do not have to respond simply with yes or no. In order to determine the respondent's level of punitiveness, a point system or scale will be implemented. There are a total of 24 questions that are asked, not including the ones that gather demographic factor data.

Survey Questions and Point System

The following shows the questions that were asked; the *italicized* portion was not included in the final copy for respondents, it only serves to explain the point system used for data analysis:

1. Please answer the following questions based on your feelings toward each statement (circle the answer that corresponds to how you feel about each statement where SA = strongly agree, A = Agree, N = Neutral, D=Disagree, and SD = Strongly Disagree):
 - a. We are entirely too soft on people convicted of crime.

SA	A	N	D	SD
<i>(4pts)</i>	<i>(3Pts)</i>	<i>(2pts)</i>	<i>(1pt)</i>	<i>(0pts)</i>
<i>Measured by Agreement with Statement</i>				
 - b. We are entirely too tough on crime.

SA	A	N	D	SD
<i>(0pts)</i>	<i>(1pt)</i>	<i>(2pts)</i>	<i>(3pts)</i>	<i>(4pts)</i>
<i>Measured by Disagreement with Statement</i>				

- c. Offenders should be harshly punished to make them pay for their crimes. SA A N D SD
(4pts) (3Pts) (2pts) (1pt) (0pts)
Measured by Agreement with Statement
- d. We should use the old saying “an eye for an eye” as a guideline for determining punishment for criminal SA A N D SD
(4pts) (3Pts) (2pts) (1pt) (0pts)
Measured by Agreement with Statement
- e. To better control the crime problem, more prisons need to be built. SA A N D SD
(4pts) (3Pts) (2pts) (1pt) (0pts)
Measured by Agreement with Statement
- f. Prisons today are much too lenient. SA A N D SD
(4pts) (3Pts) (2pts) (1pt) (0pts)
Measured by Agreement with Statement
- g. Using the death penalty better helps to control crime. SA A N D SD
(4pts) (3Pts) (2pts) (1pt) (0pts)
Measured by Agreement with Statement
- h. Jail and prison inmates deserve the humiliation, intimidation and degradation they may receive. SA A N D SD
(4pts) (3Pts) (2pts) (1pt) (0pts)
Measured by Agreement with Statement
- i. Drug dealers should be given life sentences for their crimes. SA A N D SD
(4pts) (3Pts) (2pts) (1pt) (0pts)
Measured by Agreement with Statement
- j. A person who sexually abuses children should never be released from prison. SA A N D SD
(4pts) (3Pts) (2pts) (1pt) (0pts)
Measured by Agreement with Statement
- k. Probation supervision is a joke. SA A N D SD
(4pts) (3Pts) (2pts) (1pt) (0pts)
Measured by Agreement with Statement
- l. A person who commits three very serious crimes (felonies) deserves life without the possibility of parole. SA A N D SD
(4pts) (3Pts) (2pts) (1pt) (0pts)
Measured by Agreement with Statement
- m. Rehabilitation in prison is possible. SA A N D SD
(0pts) (1pt) (2pts) (3pts) (4pts)
Measured by Disagreement with Statement
- n. Programs in prison can reduce recidivism. SA A N D SD
(0pts) (1pt) (2pts) (3pts) (4pts)

Measured by Disagreement with Statement

- o.** People choose to commit crime, therefore, they deserve the punishment they get. SA A N D SD
 (4pts) (3Pts) (2pts) (1pt) (0pts)

Measured by Agreement with Statement

- p.** We should use alternatives to incarceration when possible. SA A N D SD
 (0pts) (1pt) (2pts) (3pts) (4pts)

Measured by Disagreement with Statement

- q.** Harsh and severe punishments are necessary to preserve a sense of justice in our society. SA A N D SD
 (4pts) (3Pts) (2pts) (1pt) (0pts) *ample*

Measured by Agreement with Statement

- r.** Treatment programs can help reduce crime. SA A N D SD
 (0pts) (1pt) (2pts) (3pts) (4pts)

Measured by Disagreement with Statement

- s.** Speedy, severe and certain penalties are the only way to prevent people from committing crime SA A N D SD
 (4pts) (3Pts) (2pts) (1pt) (0pts)

Measured by Agreement with Statement

- t.** Inmates who participate in programs while confined (such as educational, vocational training, counseling, etc.) do so only because they are trying to impress the parole board so they can possibly gain an early release. SA A N D SD
 (0pts) (1pt) (2pts) (3pts) (4pts)

Measured by Agreement with Statement

- u.** College programming should be offered to inmates. SA A N D SD
 (0pts) (1pt) (2pts) (3pts) (4pts)

Measured by Disagreement with Statement

- v.** More programs are needed in prisons. SA A N D SD
 (0pts) (1pt) (2pts) (3pts) (4pts)

Measured by Disagreement with Statement

- w.** Inmates should have access to GED classes. SA A N D SD
 (4pts) (3Pts) (2pts) (1pt) (0pts)

Measured by Disagreement with Statement

- x.** Inmates should have access to vocational training. SA A N D SD
 (0pts) (1pt) (2pts) (3pts) (4pts)

Measured by Disagreement with Statement

There are a total of 24 questions asked. The point system dictates that an individual can score anywhere from 0 and 96 points. The punitiveness scale will be categorized by the following point scores: (0pts-24pts) = not punitive, (25pts-48pts) = minimally punitive, (49pts-73pts) moderately punitive, (74pts-96pts) = highly punitive.

Findings

The hypothesis of the study held that 1.) Criminal justice majors, when compared to their non-criminal justice major peers, would hold more punitive views regarding crime, corrections, and the criminal justice system as a whole; and 2.) Criminal justice majors would be more likely to agree with the principals of the custodial model of corrections and the crime control model of the criminal justice system. The data revealed that the first part of the hypothesis was refuted; there was no statistically significant data showed that criminal justice majors were more punitive than their non-criminal justice peers. Figure 5 displays the mean punitiveness scores between the responses of criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors. The means are relatively identical at a punitiveness value of about 38, making the average respondent, regardless of major, “minimally punitive.”

Leniency of the Criminal Justice System

Figure 6 displays the responses of criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors for the question labeled “a” on the survey instrument. The question was used to determine if respondent’s felt that the criminal justice system was too lenient of convicted offenders. The level of the respondents’ punitiveness was measured by their agreement with the statement; if respondents expressed that the criminal justice system was too lenient, then an inference can be

drawn that they would rather have a harsher, more punitive, criminal justice system. The data revealed that no respondents “strongly agreed” with the statement, and that 17.6% of criminal justice majors “agreed” with the statement, whereas only 5.6% of non-criminal justice majors “agreed” with the statement. Furthermore, the same percentage of criminal justice majors (17.6%) “disagreed” with the statement with an additional 11.7% “strongly disagreed” with the statement. Therefore, the data refuted the hypothesis. For one, criminal justice majors did not express more punitive views than their non-criminal justice major peers; and secondly, their views did not coincide with the principals of the crime control model of the criminal justice system, which advocates for increased use of incarceration or other forms of harsh punishment (Clear et. al., 2012).

Toughness of the Criminal Justice System

Figure 7 displays the responses of criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors for the question labeled “b” on the survey instrument. Although the question is essentially contradictory to question “a,” as it asks the respondents if they believe that the criminal justice system is too tough on crime, the question was included to show consistency in the students’ responses. The level of the respondents’ punitiveness was measured by their disagreement with the statement; if the students disagreed that the criminal justice system is too tough on crime, then they were viewed as more punitive. The data revealed that the responses were not consistent with the previous answers. For example, the total of number respondents (20) who “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” that the criminal justice system was too harsh, was greater than those that expressed it to be too lenient in the previous question (6). In terms of criminal justice majors, 23.5% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” with the statement; whereas 30.2% of non-criminal justice majors “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” with the statement. This refuted the

hypothesis that criminal justice majors are more punitive than their non-criminal justice peers. According to the responses for question “b,” it appears that criminal justice students do not prefer a harsher criminal justice system, and therefore, their views are not in concurrence with the crime control model; in fact, based on the responses, it appears that non-criminal justice majors were more in favor of harsh punishment.

Harsh Punishment for Offenders

Figure 8 corresponds with the responses of both criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors for question “c” of the survey instrument. The purpose of the question was to determine if the respondents believed that harsh punishment served as a form of retributive justice. The level of the respondents’ punitiveness was measured by their agreement with the statement; if they believed that harsh punishment corresponded with the offenders paying for their crimes, then they were viewed as punitive. The data revealed that criminal justice majors were not in favor of retributive justice. For example, only 17.6% of criminal justice respondents “agreed” with the statement, whereas 29.4% of respondents “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” with the statement. In addition, there was a higher percentage (28.3%) of non-criminal justice majors who “strongly agreed” or “disagreed” with the statement. The data refuted the hypothesis; more criminal justice students opposed the idea of retributive justice than those who desired it. Furthermore, since only non-criminal justice majors responded with “strongly agree,” the argument can be made that non-criminal justice students are more punitive in regard to retributive justice. Due to the fact that criminal justice students were not in favor of retributive justice, the hypothesis is further refuted, because retributive justice can be viewed as a core principal of the crime control model.

“Eye for an Eye” as Punishment

Figure 9 corresponds with the responses of both criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors for question “d” on the survey instrument. This particular question used the analogy of an “eye for an eye,” or the law of retaliation, in order to determine if respondents agreed with the idea that the punishment should fit the crime. Essentially, the principal behind an “eye for and eye,” states that an individual should be punished to a similar degree, or in a similar manner, for a crime they committed. The level of the respondents’ punitiveness was measured by their agreement with the statement. The data showed that the majority of total respondents (57.1%), regardless of major, either “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” with the statement; no respondents “strongly agreed” with the statement. In terms of criminal justice majors, only 17.6% “agreed” with the statement, whereas 17.6% “disagreed” and 23.5% “strongly disagreed.” More criminal justice majors were opposed to the “eye for an eye” ideology than in favor of it. Therefore, the data refutes the hypothesis.

More Prisons Should be Built

Figure 10 displays the responses for both criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors for question “e” on the survey instrument. The purpose of this question was to determine if the respondents agreed with an idea that is in concurrence with the custodial model of corrections. The custodial model of corrections views incarceration as the most important method to prevent crime; if offenders are incarcerated, then they are incapacitated from committing more crimes against society (Clear et. al., 2012). The question refers to the correlation between crime and amount of prisons. The respondents’ level of punitiveness was measured by their agreement with the statement; if they advocated for more prisons, then they were viewed as more punitive and in concurrence with the custodial model. The data revealed that the majority of criminal justice majors (70.1%) either “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”

with the statement. Furthermore, there was a higher percentage of non-criminal justice majors (17%) that were in favor of more prisons, when compared to criminal justice majors (5.9%). The data refutes the hypothesis; criminal justice majors were less punitive than non-criminal justice majors, and criminal justice majors did not express view that were in concurrence with the custodial model of corrections.

Prisons are too Lenient

Figure 11 corresponds with the responses of both criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors for question “f” on the survey instrument. The purpose of the question is to determine if respondents are in favor of harsher prisons, which coincides with the custodial model of corrections. The respondents’ level of punitiveness was measured by their agreement with the statement; if they were in favor of harsher prisons, then they were viewed as more punitive. The data revealed that neither criminal justice majors nor non-criminal justice majors were in favor of harsher prisons. Only 3 out of the 70 total students responded with “strongly agree” or “agree,” and they all were non-criminal justice majors. In terms of criminal justice majors, the only responses listed were “neutral” (41.2%) and “disagree” (58.8%). The data refutes the hypothesis. Criminal justice majors were not any more punitive than their non-criminal justice counterparts, and their answers directly contradict the characteristics of the custodial model of corrections. Not only does the custodial model employ the idea of increased incarceration, it also emphasizes security, discipline, and the subordination of the prisoner (Clear et. al., 2012).

Death Penalty Controls Crime

Figure 12 shows the responses of both criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors to question “g” on the survey instrument. This particular question gathers information on the students’ views of the death penalty and if they believe it is a suitable deterrence to crime. The death penalty is the most punitive sentence in the criminal justice system; therefore, the respondents’ level of punitiveness was measured by their agreement with the statement. If respondents agreed that the death penalty served as a deterrence factor, then they were viewed as more punitive and in accordance with the crime control model, which advocated for harsh punishments (Clear et. al., 2012). The data showed that the majority of criminal justice majors (70.6%) either “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” with the statement. Similarly, 64.2% of non-criminal justice majors “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” with the statement. Furthermore, only one non-criminal justice respondent “strongly agreed” with the statement, and 6 out of the 7 total respondents who “agreed” with the statement were also non-criminal justice students. The data refutes the hypothesis. First, the majority (70.6%) of criminal justice system disagreed with the most punitive form of punishment possible; secondly, because of this disagreement, their views are not in concurrence with the crime control model. Criminal justice majors were found to not be anymore punitive, in regard to the death penalty, than their non-criminal justice counterparts.

Inmates Deserve Humiliation

Figure 13 corresponds with the responses of both criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors for question “h” on the survey instrument. The purpose of this question was to determine if the students’ views coincided with the principals of the custodial model of corrections. The question referred to the emotional trauma an offender might face in prison (e.g. humiliation, intimidation, degradation, etc.), which directly corresponded with the custodial

models emphasis on the subordination of the prisoner (Clear et. al., 2012). The level of the respondents' punitiveness was measured by their agreement with the statement; if the respondents felt that prison inmates deserve emotional trauma, then they were viewed as punitive. The data shows that the majority of respondents, regardless of major, disagreed with the statement. In terms of criminal justice students, 23.5% either "strongly agreed" or "agreed" with the statement, 11.8% were "neutral," and 64.7% either "disagreed" or "strongly disagreed." The data for this question revealed something that can be considered unordinary up until this point. Since only 13.2% of non-criminal justice majors either "strongly agreed" or "disagreed," (compared to 23.5% of criminal justice majors) it appears as if criminal justice majors expressed more punitive views for this particular question. Overall, the data still refutes the hypothesis. The majority of criminal justice majors opposed the emotional trauma prisoners faced, and therefore, their views directly contradicted the principals of the custodial model of corrections.

Life Sentences for Drug Dealers

Figure 14 shows the responses of both criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors for question "i" on the survey instrument. The purpose of this question is to gather information on the respondents' views for one of the most infamous crime control policies, the War on Drugs. The War on Drugs is the pinnacle of the crime control model, as it established severe, mandatory-minimum sentences, as well as elongated sentences, for drug offenders (United States Sentencing Commission, 2002). The level of the respondents' punitiveness was measured by their agreement with the sentence; if the respondents believed that drug offenders should serve life sentences, then they were viewed as more punitive. In terms of criminal justice majors, the data reveals that 53% "disagree" with the statement and 47% "strongly disagree" with the statement; for criminal justice majors, 100% of respondents were opposed to life

sentences for drug offenders. By contrast, a small percentage of non-criminal justice majors (17%) “agreed” on the issue or remained “neutral.” The data for this particular question strongly refuted the hypothesis; For one, criminal justice majors did not express more punitive views when compared to their non-criminal justice counterparts, and two, their views on drug sentencing policy directly contradicted the crime control model. In addition, because of their disapproval of life sentences, their views also contradicted the custodial model of corrections, which further refuted the hypothesis.

Punishment for Sexual Offenders

Figure 15 corresponds with the responses for both criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors for question “j” on the survey instrument. The purpose of this question was to determine if the students’ views coincided with both the custodial model of corrections and the crime control model. The question mentioned the criminal offense of sexual activity with a child and the consequence of a life sentence. The respondents’ level of punitiveness was measured by their agreement with the statement. The data for this particular question revealed an anomaly. The majority of respondents (78.6%), regardless of major, expressed highly punitive views. In terms of criminal justice majors, 29.4% “strongly agreed” and 53% “agreed” with the statement; whereas, for non-criminal justice majors, 40% “strongly agreed” and 37.7% “agreed” with the statement. The data both supported and refuted the hypothesis. The hypothesis was supported in the fact that criminal justice majors expressed views in accordance with both the custodial model of corrections and the crime control model. However, the hypothesis was refuted in the fact that non-criminal justice majors expressed the same, punitive views. The abnormality of responses most likely stems from the type of crime mentioned in the question, as the sexual abuse of a child is considered to be a particularly heinous crime.

Probation is a Joke

Figure 16 corresponds with the responses of both criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors for question “k” on the survey instrument. The question refers negatively to probation, which is an alternative sentence to incarceration and a form of supervised release. The purpose of the question is to determine if students’ views are in accordance with the custodial model of corrections. The custodial model emphasizes incarceration over alternative forms of sentences (Clear et. al., 2012); therefore, the respondents’ level of punitiveness will be measured by their agreement with the statement. The data revealed that the majority of respondents (44.3%), regardless of major, were indifferent towards the concept of probation as they were “neutral.” Furthermore, a higher percentage of non-criminal justice majors (20.8%) either “strongly agreed” or “agreed” with the statement, making their views more punitive. The data refuted the hypothesis. For one, the criminal justice majors did not express more punitive views than their non-criminal justice counterparts. In addition, the criminal justice majors’ views did not coincide with the principals of the custodial model of corrections, as their responses did not reflect negative views of probation.

“Three Strikes and You’re Out”

Figure 17 shows the responses of both criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors for question “l” on the survey instrument. The purpose of the question is to determine if the students’ views are in accordance with the custodial model of corrections and the crime control model. The question references “three strikes and you’re out” legislation. As a reminder, the purpose of the legislation is to permanently remove an offender from society, by sentencing them to life in prison after the commission of 3 enumerated felonies (strikes), in order to fully incapacitate them from committing more crimes; therefore, the three strikes legislation directly

coincides with the custodial and crime control models. For this question, the respondents' level of punitiveness was measured by their agreement with the statement. In terms of criminal justice majors, 23.5% "strongly agreed" with the statement, 17.6% "agreed," 41.2% remained "neutral," and 17.6% "strongly disagreed." Although a higher percentage of criminal justice students expressed more punitive views in this instance, because there was such a high percentage of respondents that remained neutral, it is hard to determine if the criminal justice students were more punitive as a whole. Furthermore, interestingly enough, the same trend was found in the responses for non-criminal justice majors as well. Although 43.4% of non-criminal justice majors either "strongly agreed" or "agreed" with the statement, 22.7% remained "neutral" on the subject. The data for this question refutes the hypothesis. Criminal justice students shared a similar level of punitiveness with their non-criminal justice peers. In addition, because a large percentage of the respondents were indifferent toward "three strikes" legislation, it is hard to determine if their views coincided with the custodial and crime control model.

Rehabilitation from Prison Programs

For the purpose of simplifying the findings, figures 18 and 19 will be analyzed together. Figures 18 and 19 correspond with the responses of both criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors to the questions "m" and "n" of the survey instrument. The analysis of these questions can be grouped together because of the similarity of the material asked. Figure 18 and question "m" refers to the possibility of rehabilitation in prison. Figure 19 and question "n" ponders whether or not programs in prison can reduce the rate of recidivism. The two questions are essentially interrelated; without prison programs, it is unlikely an individual will become rehabilitated in prison, and if the individual is not rehabilitated, then the chances of recidivating increase. Due to the fact that these questions reference these ideas in a positive manner, the level

of the respondents' punitiveness will be measured by their disagreement with the statement, because the crime control and custodial model certainly do not stress rehabilitation and they view recidivism as inevitable. The data showed that the responses for each question were very similar. Both figures 18 and 19 revealed that there were minimal responses that disagreed with the statements. In fact, it appeared that 0% of criminal justice majors opposed the idea of prison programs, and believed that rehabilitation was in fact possible. Furthermore, for both questions, the data showed the majority of respondents, regardless of major, either "strongly agreed" or "agreed" with the statements. The data refuted the hypothesis; criminal justice majors did not express more punitive views than non-criminal justice majors, and because criminal justice majors expressed the possibility of rehabilitation and reduced recidivism, their views do not align with the ideal of the crime control and custodial models.

People Deserve Punishment for Their Crime

Figure 20 corresponds with the responses of both criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors for question "o" of the survey instrument. The purpose of the question is to determine whether or not students' believe that offenders deserve to be punished as a consequence of their criminal actions, which is an idea that coincides with the crime control model of criminal justice. The respondents' punitiveness was measured by their agreement with the statement. The data revealed that non-criminal justice majors appeared to be more punitive in their responses. For instance, 60.1% of non-criminal justice majors either "strongly agreed" or "agreed" with the statement, whereas only 35.3% of criminal justice majors did the same. However, it is important to note that the majority of criminal justice respondents' (47.1%) remained "neutral" in their responses, so it is difficult to determine those respondents' level of punitiveness without an explanation for their indifference. The data refuted the hypothesis. For

one, non-criminal justice majors appeared to be more punitive in their views than criminal justice majors. Secondly, the large percentage of neutral respondents made it difficult to determine if criminal justice majors' views corresponded with the ideals of the crime control model.

Use Alternatives to Incarceration

Figure 21 shows the responses of both criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors for question "p" of the survey instrument. The question refers the progressive and positive use of alternative sentences over incarceration. The purpose of the question is to determine if students' views are in concordance with the custodial model of corrections. Since the custodial model emphasizes incarceration over alternative forms of sentencing (Clear et. al., 2012) the respondents' level of punitiveness were measured by their disagreement with the statement. The data showed that the large majority of respondents, regardless of major, supported the idea of using alternative sentences. In terms of criminal justice students, 64.7% or respondents either "strongly agreed" or "agreed" with the statement. Similarly, 60.4% of non-criminal justice majors answered the same way. There were relatively few respondents, in either group, that opposed the idea the idea of using alternative sentences. Therefore, the data refuted the hypothesis. The criminal justice majors' views on alternative sentencing were minimally punitive and parallel to those of non-criminal justice students. In addition, criminal justice majors directly contradicted the custodial model of corrections through their support of alternative sentences.

Use Harsh and Severe Punishments

Figure 22 corresponds with the responses of both criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors for question "q" of the survey instrument. The purpose of the question is

to determine if the students view punishment as a form of justice to society. The level of the respondents' punitiveness was measured by their agreement with the statement; if they believe that justice to society can come in the form of harsh punishment, then they will be viewed as punitive. The data showed that the majority of respondents, regardless of major, remained indifferent about the topic. In terms of criminal justice majors, there were a high percentage of respondents (35.3%) that opposed the idea of punishment as justice; whereas, only 17.6% of criminal justice majors believed punishment could equate to justice. Furthermore, non criminal justice majors answered more punitively than criminal justice majors. 26.4% of non-criminal justice majors either "strongly agreed" or "disagreed" with the statement, which is a greater percentage than criminal justice majors exhibited. Therefore, the hypothesis is refuted, since criminal justice majors did not express more punitive views when compared to their non-criminal justice counterparts.

Treatment Programs Reduce Crime

Figure 23 shows the responses of both criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors for question "r" on the survey instrument. The purpose of this question is to determine whether or not students believe in the rehabilitation of treatment programs in prison, and their ability to reduce the recidivism rate. Since the question suggests the idea that treatment programs will have a positive outcome, the level of the respondents' punitiveness were measured by their disagreement with the statement. In addition, it is important to note that the crime control and custodial model neglect the notion of rehabilitation, and view recidivism as unavoidable. The data shows that the majority of respondents, regardless of major, expressed minimally punitive views. In terms of criminal justice majors, 88.2% of respondents either "strongly agreed" or "agreed" with the statement. Likewise, 81% of non-criminal justice majors "strongly agreed" or

“agreed” with the statement. The data refuted the hypothesis. The data indicates that criminal justice majors were proponents, rather than opponents, of prison treatment programs, and therefore their answers were not viewed as punitive. In addition, criminal justice majors expressed that recidivism can be reduced through the use of treatment programs, which directly challenged the principals of both the crime control model and the custodial model of corrections.

Use Speedy and Severe Punishment

Figure 24 corresponds with the responses of both criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors for question “s” on the survey instrument. The purpose of this question was to determine if the students believed that harsh, punitive measures of punishment were the most efficient way to lower the crime rate, which is an idea in accordance with both the crime control model and custodial model of corrections. Therefore, the respondents’ level of punitiveness was measured by their agreement with the statement. The data showed that the majority of the respondents did not answer the question punitively; there was not a single respondent, regardless of major, that answered “strongly agree” to the statement. In addition, the highest percentage of respondents (37.1%) showed disagreement with the statement. In terms of criminal justice majors’ answers, it does not appear that their views were anymore punitive than their non-criminal justice major counterparts. Therefore, the hypothesis is refuted; criminal justice majors did not express more punitive views than non-criminal justice majors, and criminal justice majors’ views were not in concordance with the crime control and custodial model.

Inmates and Impressing the Parole Board

Figure 25 shows the responses of both criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors for question “t” on the survey instrument. This question asks students to contemplate about the true intentions of inmates when they participate in programs; are inmates participating in the programs because they want to become rehabilitated, or do they participate in programs to impress the parole board? A parole board is a panel of people who decide whether an offender should be released from prison on parole, a form of early release, after serving at least a minimum portion of their sentence. The question suggests that inmates only participate in programs in order to impress the parole board and to attain early release. Therefore, the respondents’ level of punitiveness was measured by their agreement with the statement. The data revealed that the majority of the respondents, regardless of major, were either indifferent on the subject or expressed disagreement with the statement. For example, 35.7% of total respondents remained “neutral,” whereas 40% of respondents “disagreed” with the statement. In terms of the comparison of criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors, the data showed that the two groups shared similar views. Since criminal justice majors did not express more punitive views than non-criminal justice majors, the data refuted the hypothesis.

Education Programs in Prison

In order to simplify the results of the data, figures 26-29 will be analyzed in conjunction with one another. Figure 26 corresponds with question “u” on the survey instrument, figure 27 with “v,” figure 28 with “w,” and figure 29 with “x.” The reasoning behind the combination of these four questions is that their subject matters all refer to inmates’ access to educational programs, and the data revealed that there was a similarity in responses between all four questions. The four questions referenced college programming, GED training, Vocational training, and of course, treatment programs in general. Since the questions mentioned these

programs as something inmates should have access to, the respondents' level of punitiveness was measured by their disagreement with all four statements. The data revealed that the majority of respondents felt that inmates should have access to these types of programs; the majority of students, regardless of major, either "strongly agreed" or "agreed" with the statement, and therefore, their views were not punitive. However, out of the four questions, the question that produced the largest discrepancy was question "u" (figure 26) because it contained the subject matter of a college education. The data revealed that students were the least likely to support an inmate's access to college education. For example, this particular question had the largest number of respondents (albeit 6) that expressed disagreement with the statement. However, the data revealed that the respondents were generally in favor of all educational type programs, and therefore, the hypothesis was refuted.

It is important to note that multiple statistical analyses were used in order to determine if there was a statistical significance between criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors. An independent t test was used, which is an inferential statistical test that determines whether there is a statistically significant difference between the means in two unrelated groups. In this case, the two unrelated groups being tested were criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors and the means being tested were the level of the group's punitiveness score (figure 5). The results of the independent t test are shown by figure 30. The test revealed that the difference between the two groups was not statistically significant (the .043 value is not significant at the $P < .05$ value). Therefore, the hypothesis was not supported. There was no significant difference between the levels of punitiveness between criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors. However, the null hypothesis was supported.

In addition, chi-squared tests were used to compare whether there were statistically significant differences between criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors for each question on the survey instrument. The survey instrument included numerous statements that involved a variety of criminal justice topics and depending on the respondents' answers, they were deemed to be punitive or non-punitive. Figure 31 displays a chi-squared test that corresponds with question "a" on the survey instrument, and the data shown in figure 6. The test revealed that the criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors did not have significantly different opinions, therefore refuting the study's hypothesis. Although chi-squared tests were ran for every question on the survey instrument, the remainder of the figures are not listed in this publication, as each chi-squared test garnered similar results.

Discussion

Overall, the results of the study revealed that the hypothesis was refuted. Criminal justice majors, when compared to non-criminal justice majors, did not express more punitive views. Even though the sample of this study consisted of college kids from a later generation, the results of this study correlated with previous literature on the subject. For example, Tsoudis' (2000) study found that criminal justice majors held less punitive views towards crime than non-majors. However, the data of this study was also inconsistent with previous literature as well. For instance, both Farnsworth et. al.'s (1998) and Mackey & Courtwright's (2000) studies revealed that criminal justice majors did in fact express more punitive views than their non-criminal justice counterparts. Although the findings of Farnsworth et. al.'s (1998) and Mackey & Courtwright's (2000) studies would have corroborated the current study's hypothesis if it was affirmed, this was not the case, as the data refuted the hypothesis. Overall, the issue of whether

or not criminal justice majors were more punitive than non-criminal justice majors remains ambiguous, as studies have shown inconsistent and conflicting results.

In addition, given that the dichotomy chosen was separated solely based on major, there were numerous extraneous variables that could have affected the results of the study. For example, Tajalli et al's. (2013) study found that the size of the respondents' locality can affect their views on crime, and that a respondents' political ideology relates directly to their level of punitiveness. In addition, Mackey and Courtwright (2000) came to the same conclusion, wherein they found that the size of the respondent's residential town played an extremely important factor in terms of their punitiveness. Even though the current study asked respondents to disclose where they were from in the demographic section of the survey, for the purpose of this experiment, this information was not considered during data analysis. In addition, there are more extraneous factors that could have affected the study's results. For example, a respondents' age, race, gender, etc. could all have an effect on the way they view the criminal justice system. Although these factors were not considered during data analysis, it would be interesting to consider what role these factors actually have on a respondent's view of the criminal justice system. If interested, figures 2-4 report on some of the demographic factors for the respondents of this study.

Furthermore, the current study also hypothesized that criminal justice majors would hold views that were in concurrence with the custodial model of corrections, as well as the crime control model of the criminal justice system. This part of the hypothesis was also refuted. Not only were criminal justice majors not punitive, their views were more likely to correspond with rehabilitative models of the criminal system, which is the direct counter-approach to both the crime control and custodial models.

Limitations

One of the most notable limitations of the study was the sample size. The sample size consisted of 70 respondents, which is rather small when compared to the other studies that were conducted from the previous literature. In addition, the sample did not contain an equal number of respondents between both criminal justice majors (17) and non-criminal justice majors (53). Although there are certain statistical analyses that can help to alleviate this problem, in terms of raw data, it would have been easier to make sure that there was an even number of respondents in both categories. However, given the nature study, and that CRJ 150 courses were selected to gather the sample, it was impossible to ensure that there would be an even number of respondents in the two groups.

Future Research

It is necessary to continue research on this subject in order to see if criminal justice majors are in fact more punitive in other settings. This research is essential as it gathers data on a representative sample of the population who will eventually become professionals in the field. It is important to have this information because future professionals, whether they become law-enforcement, judges/lawyers, or even civilians who work in corrections, will inevitably have an effect on criminal justice policy. Therefore, in terms of future research, it is imperative to continue the research on the criminal justice population. In addition, it would also be interesting to determine if a respondents' major is actually the controlling factor behind their punitive/not punitive views of the criminal justice system. In other words, are there other demographic factors such as race, gender, socioeconomic status, etc. that can greater affect the respondents' views. Furthermore, although no differences were found in this study between majors and non-majors, the real issue may be their original geographical location. Future researchers may want to

consider if location has more of a controlling effect on the level of punitiveness than major or educational level, especially because New York State is routinely considered to be one of the most liberal states.

References

- Austin, J., Clark, J., Hardyman, P., & Henry, D. A. (1999). The impact of Three strikes and You're Out'. *Punishment & Society, 1*(2), 131-162.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics Home page. (n.d.). Retrieved October 16, 2017, from <https://www.bjs.gov/>
- Clear, T. R., Cole, G. F., Reising, M. D., & Petrosino, C. (2012). American Corrections in Brief.
- Dijk, J. V., Kesteren, J. V., & Smit, P. (2007). *Criminal victimisation in international perspective*. Boom Juridische Uitgevers.
- Fanworth, M., Longmire, D. R., & West, V. M. (1998). College students' views on criminal justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice education, 9* (1), 39-57.
- Haas, K. C. (1977). Judicial politics and correctional reform: An analysis of the decline of the hands-off doctrine. *Detriot College of Law Review 14*), 795-832.
- Mackey, D. A., & Courtright, K. E. (2000). Assessing punitiveness among college students: A comparison of criminal justice majors with other majors. *The Justice Professional, 12*, 423- 441.
- Mackey, D. A., & Courtright, K. E., (2004). Job desirability among criminal justice majors: Exploring relationships between personal characteristics and occupational attractiveness. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 15*(2), 311-326.
- Martinson, R. (1974). What works?-Questions and answers about prison reform. *The public interest, (35)*, 22.
- Tajalli, H., De Soto, W., & Dozier, A. (2013). Determinants of punitive attitudes of college students toward criminal offenders. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 24*(3), 339.
- Tsoudis, O. (2000). Does majoring in criminal justice affect perceptions in criminal justice? *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 11* (2), 385-236.
- United States Sentencing Commission. (2002). *Cocaine and federal sentencing policy*. The Commission.

Tables

Figure 1

Respondents by Major

		MAJOR			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	CJ	17	24.3	24.3	24.3
	Non-CJ	53	75.7	75.7	100.0
	Total	70	100.0	100.0	

Figure 2

Respondents by Age

AGE * MAJOR Crosstabulation

Count		MAJOR		
		CJ	Non-CJ	Total
AGE	17.00	2	1	3
	18.00	12	21	33
	19.00	1	14	15
	20.00	0	8	8
	21.00	1	6	7
	22.00	0	1	1
	23.00	1	1	2
	25.00	0	1	1
	Total		17	53

Figure 3**Respondents by Race****RACE * MAJOR Crosstabulation**

Count

		MAJOR		Total
		CJ	Non-CJ	
RACE	White	7	25	32
	African American	5	10	15
	Latino	3	7	10
	Asian	1	5	6
	Native American	0	1	1
	Other	1	5	6
Total		17	53	70

Figure 4**Respondents by Sex****SEX * MAJOR Crosstabulation**

Count

		MAJOR		Total
		CJ	Non-CJ	
SEX	Male	2	12	14
	Female	15	39	54
	Intersexed	0	1	1
	Transmale	0	1	1
Total		17	53	70

Figure 5

Punitiveness Scale for Criminal Justice Majors and Non-Criminal Justice Majors

Report

Score			
MAJOR	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
CJ	38.1765	17	7.01102
Non-CJ	38.8235	51	10.64088
Total	38.6618	68	9.81411

Figure 6

a. We are entirely too soft on people convicted of crime

Count

		SOFT					Total
		Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	NR	
MAJOR	CJ	3	9	3	2	0	17
	Non-CJ	3	25	21	2	2	53
Total		6	34	24	4	2	70

Figure 7

b. We are entirely too tough on crime

Count

		HARSH					Total	
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		NR
MAJOR	CJ	0	2	11	2	2	0	17
	Non-CJ	3	6	26	15	1	2	53
Total		3	8	37	17	3	2	70

Figure 8

c. Offenders should be harshly punished

Count

		TOUGH PUN						
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	NR	Total
MAJOR	CJ	0	3	9	4	1	0	17
	Non-CJ	3	12	25	10	1	2	53
Total		3	15	34	14	2	2	70

Figure 9

d. Eye for an Eye as punishment

Count

		EYE4EYE					
		Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	NR	Total
MAJOR	CJ	3	7	3	4	0	17
	Non-CJ	5	13	24	9	2	53
Total		8	20	27	13	2	70

Figure 10

e. Build more prisons

Count

		MOREPRIS						
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	NR	Total
MAJOR	CJ	0	1	4	9	3	0	17
	Non-CJ	1	8	12	17	13	2	53
Total		1	9	16	26	16	2	70

Figure 11

f. Prisons are too lenient

Count

		LENIENT						
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	NR	Total
MAJOR	CJ	0	0	7	10	0	0	17
	Non-CJ	1	2	20	21	7	2	53
Total		1	2	27	31	7	2	70

Figure 12

g. Death penalty controls crime

Count

		DEATH						
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	NR	Total
MAJOR	CJ	0	1	4	6	6	0	17
	Non-CJ	1	6	10	10	24	2	53
Total		1	7	14	16	30	2	70

Figure 13

h. Inmates deserve humiliation

Count

		DESHUM						
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	NR	Total
MAJOR	CJ	2	2	2	6	5	0	17
	Non-CJ	1	6	9	19	16	2	53
Total		3	8	11	25	21	2	70

Figure 14

i. Drug dealers should be given life sentences

Count

		DRUGLIFE					
		Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	NR	Total
MAJOR	CJ	0	0	9	8	0	17
	Non-CJ	4	5	23	19	2	53
Total		4	5	32	27	2	70

Figure 15

j. a person who sexually abuses children should never be released

Count

		SEXCHILD						
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	NR	Total
MAJOR	CJ	5	9	1	1	1	0	17
	Non-CJ	21	20	6	1	3	2	53
Total		26	29	7	2	4	2	70

Figure 16

k. probation is a joke

Count

		PROBJOKE						
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	NR	Total
MAJOR	CJ	0	3	8	5	1	0	17
	Non-CJ	1	10	23	15	2	2	53
Total		1	13	31	20	3	2	70

Figure 17

I. three strikes penalty

Count

		THREESTRIKE						
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Nr	Total
MAJOR	CJ	4	3	7	0	3	0	17
	Non-CJ	8	15	12	9	7	2	53
Total		12	18	19	9	10	2	70

Figure 18

m. Rehabilitation in prison is possible

Count

		REHABPOSS					
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	NR	Total
MAJOR	CJ	7	8	2	0	0	17
	Non-CJ	16	21	8	6	2	53
Total		23	29	10	6	2	70

Figure 19

n. programs reduce recidivism

Count

		PROGRECID					
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	NR	Total
MAJOR	CJ	4	8	5	0	0	17
	Non-CJ	16	16	18	1	2	53
Total		20	24	23	1	2	70

Figure 20

o. people deserve the punishment for a crime they commit

Count

		DESPUNISH						
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	NR	Total
MAJOR	CJ	1	5	8	2	1	0	17
	Non-CJ	8	24	10	8	1	2	53
Total		9	29	18	10	2	2	70

Figure 21

p. use alternatives to incarceration

Count

		ALTPUN					
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	NR	Total
MAJOR	CJ	2	9	4	2	0	17
	Non-CJ	12	20	16	3	2	53
Total		14	29	20	5	2	70

Figure 22

q. use harsh and severe punishments

Count

		HARSHNEC						
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	NR	Total
MAJOR	CJ	0	3	8	5	1	0	17
	Non-CJ	2	12	19	8	10	2	53
Total		2	15	27	13	11	2	70

Figure 23

r. Treatment programs reduce crime

Count

		TREAT					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	NR	
MAJOR	CJ	6	9	2	0	0	17
	Non-CJ	19	24	7	1	2	53
Total		25	33	9	1	2	70

Figure 24

s. use speedy, severe penalties

Count

		PREVENT					Total
		Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	NR	
MAJOR	CJ	5	4	7	1	0	17
	Non-CJ	11	22	14	4	2	53
Total		16	26	21	5	2	70

Figure 25

t. Inmates do programs for the parole board

Count

		PROGREL					Total	
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		NR
MAJOR	CJ	0	0	8	9	0	0	17
	Non-CJ	2	7	17	19	6	2	53
Total		2	7	25	28	6	2	70

Figure 26

u. provide college programming for inmates

Count

		COLLEGE						
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	NR	Total
MAJOR	CJ	5	7	3	2	0	0	17
	Non-CJ	14	22	11	3	1	2	53
Total		19	29	14	5	1	2	70

Figure 27

v. more programs needed

Count

		MOREPROG						
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	NR	Total	
MAJOR	CJ	4	10	3	0	0	17	
	Non-CJ	21	16	13	1	2	53	
Total		25	26	16	1	2	70	

Figure 28

w. inmates should have access to GED classes

Count

		GED						
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	NR	Total
MAJOR	CJ	8	8	0	1	0	0	17
	Non-CJ	21	18	10	0	1	3	53
Total		29	26	10	1	1	3	70

Figure 29

x. inmates should have access to vocational training

Count

		VOCAT					NR	Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
MAJOR	CJ	8	6	2	1	0	0	17
	Non-CJ	20	17	13	0	1	2	53
Total		28	23	15	1	1	2	70

Figure 30

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Score	Equal variances assumed	4.277	.043	-.234	66	.816	-.64706	2.76810	-6.17375	4.87963
	Equal variances not assumed			-.286	42.067	.776	-.64706	2.26088	-5.20949	3.91537

It is not statistically significant. Because the significance is less than .05 (.043), therefore equal variances cannot be assumed. With that in mind, the significance score of the two-tailed test is .776 and that is not statistically significant either at the .05 p value. This means there is no difference between the groups. Data does not support the hypothesis.

Figure 31**Chi-Square Tests: Question a: too soft on crime**

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.139 ^a	4	.189
Likelihood Ratio	6.363	4	.174
N of Valid Cases	70		

a. 6 cells (60.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .49.

Not significant at .05