

12-2020

Examining the Indoctrination of Mexican American Criminal Justice Students

Noe Leal Jr.
The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.utrgv.edu/etd>



Part of the [Criminology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Leal, Noe Jr., "Examining the Indoctrination of Mexican American Criminal Justice Students" (2020).
Theses and Dissertations. 696.
<https://scholarworks.utrgv.edu/etd/696>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks @ UTRGV. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ UTRGV. For more information, please contact justin.white@utrgv.edu, william.flores01@utrgv.edu.

EXAMINING THE INDOCTRINATION OF MEXICAN
AMERICAN CRIMINAL JUSTICE STUDENTS

A Thesis

by

NOE LEAL, JR.

Submitted to the Graduate College of
The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

December 2020

Major Subject: Criminal Justice

EXAMING THE INDOCTRINATION OF MEXICAN
AMERICAN CRIMINAL JUSTICE STUDENTS

A Thesis
by
NOE LEAL, JR.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Dr. Lucas Espinoza
Chair of Committee

Dr. Rosalva Resendiz
Committee Member

Dr. Cynthia Jones
Committee Member

December 2020

Copyright 2020 Noe Leal, Jr.

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Leal, Jr. Noe., Examining the Indoctrination of Mexican American Criminal Justice Students.

Master of Science (MS), December 2020, 87 pp., 3 tables, 78 references, 37 titles.

Mexican American Criminal Justice students (MACJS) sometimes select a career in Department of Homeland Security, which has a history of systemic racism and oppression. The purpose of this thesis is to examine MACJS conformity to U.S. ideological hegemony and examine the differences in their understanding of human rights/ethics. A questionnaire was administered to MACJS (n=156) wishing to pursue a career in DHS. The survey instrument used is based on the concepts of Social Identification: Mexican versus U.S. American; Support for Nationalist Racist Policies, Internal Colonialism, Followership by engaging in policies/orders by the government; and Human Rights: Knowledge of Human Rights and Policies. The independent variable is the respondent's career choice in DHS. The first dependent variable is their response to answering orders without question and the second dependent variable is the curriculum of the Criminal Justice program. Internal colonialization variables are grouped as the following: Following Racist Policies, Being Unethical, Adhere to National Security, and the Knowledge of Human Rights.

The primary hypothesis (H1): MACJS that select a career in DHS will conform to the U.S. ideological hegemony. The secondary hypothesis (H2): MACJS that select a career in DHS will have a different understanding of rights/ethics with other MACJS that did not select a career in DHS. In order to test the hypotheses, ordinal regression was used as the primary data analysis. Results partially support both research hypotheses. The study found a significant difference in

conforming to the ideological hegemony and a difference between understanding human rights/ethics among criminal justice students.

Keywords: Racism, Internal Colonialism, Ideological Hegemony, Rights/Ethics, Mexican American, DHS

DEDICATION

I want to dedicate this paper to my family members: Elias Chapa Villarreal, grandfather; Maria del Rosario Garza Villarreal, grandmother; Diana M. Leal, mother; Eron Leal, brother; and all my other family members. They have framed the foundation of my character and encouraged me to continue my education. I appreciate them for always understanding that I am not always able to visit because of the time and effort needed in my research and graduate career. I love you all, *te amo*.

To my grandfather: Elias Chapa Villarreal, he may not be here in this world anymore but his memories, love, dedication, work ethic, morals, and wisdom still resides in me. I miss you *abuelo* and will always love you.

My grandmother, Maria del Rosario Garza-Villarreal, has shown me when to pick my battles, listen to the thoughts of others, and showered me with laughter and love in the times I was able to visit her. Your smile and love has brought much warmth and encouragement in my life. I love spending time with you and talk about my research and interests. You are truly incredible and remarkable. The countless stories we share will be kept as our little secret. You have taught me to keep a steady mind while under pressure. Your voice has and will always bring a smile upon my face.

To my mother: Diana M. Leal, you are the greatest and most understanding mother any person can wish for. Her love as a mother cannot be replicated by others—I am thinking of all the phone calls, Snapchat, and text messages to see if I am okay or needing anything, even when she knows the answer will always be that I am okay. Her motherly instincts are out of this world

for she knows when something is wrong. She would speak to me until we lost track of time and have to say our “see you until next time,” and had to continue with our day. A couple of minutes would go by and I would receive a text from her reminding me to eat or to pay a bill—she always left me laughing and with a smile on my face.

To my brother: Eron Leal, thank you for always being there for me even when there were times we argued and did not speak for a while. The love we have for one another cannot be replicated or replaced for our sibling love and bond is insane. We are polar opposites, but I am fortunate enough to have a brother that is willing to listen even when he has a strong willpower. Thank you, Eron, for always reminding me to explain my research and career goals.

For all my other family members, thank you for the words of encouragement and for being understanding for all that I do.

My last dedications are to all the underrepresented groups fighting for equality and equity in these troubling times, to all First-Generation college students, and all future researchers in the field: when times are rough and it seems like it is impossible, just know that there are stars around when the sun is out and that the stars shine with the moon in the night sky as the days go by.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to acknowledge the following people: Dr. Rosalva Resendiz, Dr. Lucas Espinoza, Dr. Cynthia Jones, Priscilla Palacios, Margarita Gonzalez, Patricia Ramirez, Emerlynee Piertenella, Dr. Luis Espinoza, Manuel Zavala, the Criminal Justice Department including Ms. Christina Loera-Aviles, and everyone else I have encountered upon my journey.

To Dr. Rosalva Resendiz and Dr. Lucas Espinoza, thank you for being the mentors and being amongst the people I am most grateful for. Your guidance and pedagogy left a mark in my life and I will forever cherish all our moments. Every moment, from being in your classes, to *El Cine Del Rey*, to study abroad, to the academic conferences we participated in, and your office hours was always an adventure and learning experience. For every laughter, there was always a lesson to be taught and for every lesson taught there was laughter at the end. Thank you, for pushing me, helping me figure out the foundation for my thesis, and seeing the potential in me, even when I did not see it myself at times. I truly love you both.

For Dr. Rosalva Resendiz: the moment that I always speak about to others is the moment you announced my assignment paper in the *Advanced Criminology* course to the students. It was the beginning of the Spring 2019 semester and you had returned the second assignment to the class. After the students received their assignments you reassured the students that they will be fine if they read and revised their papers. You explained to the students that the grades in the first week were probably from how nervous we may have been. After that, you used me as an example to the class, of how my first assignment needed improvement (not the exact verbiage haha) and how the second assignment was interesting enough to not take a sip from your glass of

wine. This moment is forever engraved in memory because it humbled me even more and will always be a good laugh. You inspire and show me that it is okay to be radical and be different than others. You also helped me know that others are wanting to speak for the underrepresented. Thank you, for recommending me to participate in the 50/50 Campaign when the entity reached out to you and you later told me why you did. Thank you, for always seeing the potential in me and pushing me beyond what my capabilities are. Thank you, for also expressing other doctoral schools to me and not allowing me to settle for less.

For Dr. Lucas Espinoza: the moment that always comes to mind is when I took the *Social Justice* course in Fall 2019. You had given the class an assignment to do, to create a list that gives us pain and pleasure, related to social justice. The class was silent with an open discussion about the four goals/dreams. I decided to state mine because I felt the awkward silence creeping in the room. I said, “I will fight for the people unheard.” You smiled and turned to write it on whiteboard but immediately turned back to correct me. You had said, “It is not to fight for the unheard because they are heard, it is fighting for the ones that are ignored.” This correction immediately sparked a fire in me because of the truth behind that. As you turned back to write it on the board, I scratched off unheard on the assignment and wrote ignored. I kept that assignment ever since then and have it pinned, with a dart, on top of my desk for whenever I look up, it is a friendly reminder of motivation. I am truly grateful for being your student and you being my mentor. The laughs and growth we share with one another are surreal, I am truly grateful to have a mentor like yourself. You truly helped me understand many lessons.

To Dr. Luis Espinoza: thank you for helping out when I needed it. Your statistical skills are truly remarkable. Thank you, for keeping a conversation with me in the late nights when you helped explain the ordinal regression analysis and for asking me what my academic goal is.

To the Office for Victim Advocacy & Violence Prevention: I am truly grateful for the opportunity to work with and meet every incredible person.

To Dr. Cynthia Jones: you are truly remarkable, thank you for allowing me to learn and work at the office, while also being one of my thesis commit members—you may be looking at my grammatical errors by now haha. You are strong-willed and determined to make an impact in the Rio Grande Valley, which you already have. Thank you for allowing me to push my research, programming ideas, and analytical capabilities.

To Priscilla Palacios: thank you for pushing me and allowing me to express my views while correcting me when I am wrong. Thank you for listening to my interests and acknowledging my weirdness at enjoying the “boring” things people would like to do such as analyzing and coding data—laughing out loud for remembering the number of times this happened.

To Margarita Gonzalez: thank you for always having a lending ear and listen to when I am stressed out and you notice it in the staff meetings. You are a free spirit. I appreciate you taking the time of your day to talk about topics all over the spectrum before and after COVID. I also appreciate all the relaxing meditation and other techniques that you are always sharing with.

To Emerlynne Pierternella: you are a comforting soul and an uplifting spirit. I appreciate you listening to the times when I would speak about my research—even when it seemed boring about what I would talk about lol. Thank you, for always thinking positively of and for me, you are one of the kindest people I have met in my life. I still remember the moment you presented to the international students, and brought me up to them about being a friend and helping you out with reassurance on the semesters—it made me smile knowing I made an impact in your life.

To Patricia Ramirez: you are a strong will individual. It has been a wild ride since we first started at OVAVP together! We are the originals of the little crew that was developed over time. Thank you, for always listening to me when I talked about the “fun” research I have been doing. I will always appreciate the jokes we throw at each other.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iii
DEDICATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	xi
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiii
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW.....	1
Colonialism & Implication: Indoctrination of Mexican Americans.....	2
Ideological Hegemony & the Pacification	4
Literature Review.....	5
Double Consciousness in Law Enforcement.....	5
A Brief History of Border Militarization	8
Mexican Americans as U.S. Immigration Officers.....	10
Concluding Summary.....	14
CHAPTER II. METHODOLOGY.....	15
Setting of the Rio Grande Valley.....	15
Sample.....	15
Hypotheses.....	16
Questionnaire.....	17

Independent, Dependent Variable, Demographic and Internal Colonialization	
Variables	19
IRB Board and Survey.....	24
Data Collection and Data Analysis.....	25
Chapter II Summary.....	25
CHAPTER III. RESULTS.....	27
Summary of Chapter.....	27
Descriptive Statistics.....	27
Ordinal Regression.....	28
CHAPTER IV. DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION.....	34
Findings.....	34
Hypothesis One.....	35
Hypothesis Two.....	39
Implications.....	41
Limitations.....	43
Future Research.....	45
Conclusion.....	46
REFERENCES.....	48
APPENDIX.....	55
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.....	88

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Demographics for study.....	75
Table 2. Ordinal regression estimates	76
Table 3. Ordinal regression.....	80

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

This thesis project focuses on Mexican American college students studying Criminal Justice at a Hispanic-serving institution situated in South Texas, along the Texas/Mexico border. Although Mexican Americans and/or Latinx people have suffered discrimination and marginalization by the U.S. government, many students are interested in a career with the Department of Homeland Security, which targets immigrants and people of color. It is the purpose of this thesis research to understand the paradox or desire to be part of an organization which continues to oppress their own community. The purpose of this thesis research is to try and explain why Mexican American Criminal Justice students (MACJS) select a degree and/or career in criminal justice such as agents in the Department of Homeland Security (DHS); and how do MACJS negotiate wanting to be part of the DHS, which has a history of systemic racism and oppression. This paradox is extremely important to understand considering the rise of white nationalism and racist rhetoric in the Trump era.

During his presidential campaign, Mr. Donald Trump was not shy about demonstrating racism towards people of color (Applebaum, 2018; Austin-Hillery, 2018). Mr. Trump created a narrative that depicted the people of Mexico as animals, drug dealers, gang members, associating Mexicans to MS-13 members, and rapists. Trump's focus on immigration policies has painted Mexicans, as the problem for the economic disadvantages the country is facing (Stopping Illegal Immigration and Securing the Border, n.d.; About Fair, 2020). Moreover, Trump's marginalizing speech against Mexican Americans and Latinx minorities has further induced fear,

discrimination, and racism. These minorities have experienced derogatory racial slurs, experienced violence from law enforcement, and treatment as second-class citizens (Alang, 2018; Price & Payton, 2017). Yet, Mexican Americans, Latinx, and/or Hispanics have joined the Department of Homeland Security and support these systems of oppression (Herra, 2020; Mordock, 2020; Zazueta-Castro, 2020). In order to understand this phenomenon, this current study frames this research through a lens of coloniality, which recognizes a history of conquest, racism, pacification, and oppression.

Colonialism & Imperialism: Indoctrination of Mexican Americans

Mexican Americans on the South Texas border have a history of colonialism and imperialism. The Texas/Mexican border was first conquered by the Spanish Empire with the arrival of Hernan Cortez, and later by Jose Escandon, who established the colony of Nuevo Santander. Nuevo Santander included a vast region of Northern Mexico, to the Gulf Coast, to the area now known as the Rio Grande Valley (Mirande, 1987; Rosenbaum, 1981).

In 1821, Mexico gained their independence from Spain, but it was short-lived. In 1836, Anglo colonists in the Tejas territory revolted against the Mexican government which had outlawed slavery, leading to the Texas revolution and then to the Mexican American War of 1846. By 1848, Mexico lost the war to the United States and lost much of its land, leaving behind many Mexican mestizos and indigenous people as subjects/citizens of the U.S.

The process of colonization has been systemic, violent, and militarized. One of the tools for settler colonialism has been the establishment of criminal justice systems (Mirande, 1987). King (2017) states, “one way that criminology is tied to colonialism is through the violence used in colonizing practices” (p.2). Criminologists and social researchers have acknowledged that there is a lack of discussions of colonialism in criminology. In order to understand more

comprehensively, there needs to be a move from the focus on how a criminal came to be to how colonialism has impacted society through the racialized structure of inequality and punishment. The effect that colonialism has on dismissing the exploitative and oppressive practices, is the product of a dominant class controlling the narratives and the ideological hegemony. Criminology is not the only realm of thought that has been affected by colonialism, sociology has been similarly impacted. As mentioned by Steinmetz (2020), American sociology has been fixated on modern-day social issues instead of recognizing the history that led to modern-day issues. Steinmetz further uses the work of DuBois to make the point that social sciences are being used as instruments to demonstrate the inferiority of the majority of the people of the world.

Moore (1970) claims that the southern states of California, New Mexico, and Texas, have been subjugated by different forms of colonialism. New Mexico was influenced in the classically colonial situation, Texas experienced conflict colonialism, and California experienced economic colonialism. Each of these states underwent a form of colonialism that was motivated by the elite class, and these motivations were political and cultural changing as the United States stripped away these lands from Mexico.

Chavez (2011) notes that through internal colonialism, indigenous people are dominated through education and/or indoctrination that they are inferior and/or to accept the subjugation in their own homelands, which have been lost to the oppressor/colonizer/imperialist. This form of colonialism is a domestic subset of colonialism. Gutierrez (2004) also adds, “internal colonialism [is] a modern capitalist practice of oppression and exploitation of racial and ethnic minorities within the borders of the state characterized by relationships of domination, oppression, and exploitation” (p.289). To accomplish such tasks of internal colonialism, the

marginalization of the oppressed must occur. After marginalizing the group and creating separation, it forces them to assimilate into the dominant culture that is oppressing them.

Ideological Hegemony & the Pacification model

Gramsci (2003) explains hegemony as the ideological rule which controls the dominant ideas and influences the thinking and behaving of workers and citizens. Hence, the ideological hegemony is the control of the 'hearts and minds' of the people, which takes place as ideas become embedded that uphold, justify, and reinforce the existing arrangement of power, authority, status, and wealth in society. Heyman (2002) noted that there is limited evidence of literature discussing the submission to the ideological hegemony within Mexican Americans in immigration or law enforcement. The ideological hegemony also can instill the relations of domination and exploitation from the dominant classes (Mahutga & Stepan-Norris, 2015).

Richard Quinney, a critical criminologist, further discussed the role of ideological hegemony, which aims to further exploit and repress the population through pacification (Quinney, 1979/1970). Quinney is one of the few criminologists that notes that the pacification model is used to incorporate the surplus population (minorities) into the criminal justice industrial complex, which requires their assimilation into the system. This model of pacification absorbs the surplus as an army of workers who are used to control the rest of the surplus population. In other words, the population itself not only needs to be controlled, but they must accept the control willingly. Education and job opportunities are made available to minorities to further maintain a system of inequality by pacifying them with intermediate authority and financial stability.

Local and national issues, involving the Southern Border Region need to be discussed, highlighted, and addressed. A social justice perspective should be employed, along with a critical

methodology to decenter mainstream knowledge through a decolonizing method. One way to accomplish this is for current researchers, new scholars, and graduate students to conduct research in cross-cultural areas or highly understudied areas. These researchers must balance their ethical responsibility to a discipline and their responsibility to their own lived context (Lincoln and Gonzalez y Gonzalez, 2008). One goal of the current research is to understand how ideological hegemony and internal colonialism have affected their career choices of undergraduate MACJS.

Literature Review

There is limited research on ethnic minorities, internal colonialism, and the pacification model (Heyman, 2002). The following literature review discusses the few available studies on double consciousness of Black police officers and Mexican Americans in the federal criminal justice system.

Double consciousness in law enforcement

Dukes (2018) examined and measured the correlation between Merton's anomie theory and Dubois's double-consciousness in order to measure Black police officer's strain from their conflicting roles. Prior research focused on historical discrimination and alienation experienced by minority officers. Dukes's study of law enforcement culture is seminal in examining the role of racial identification, from historically white-dominant occupation. He posits that black officers will experience levels of strain while adapting to this culture of historical white masculinity, which is antithetical to minority values. He further hypothesized that there would be a relationship between conformity and double consciousness, retreatism and double consciousness, innovation and double consciousness, ritualism and double consciousness, and rebellion and double consciousness.

Dukes used hierarchical regression models on a national sample of 84 Black state and federal-level law enforcement officers to measure their conformity, innovation, ritualism, retreatism, and rebellion. The study revealed a significance of the double consciousness in Black law enforcement officers: “As discovered in this study, adaptation in which an officer desires to disassociate from members in the organization or the organization as a whole appears in many forms (retreatism, ritualism, rebellion, etc.)” (p.17). This conclusion by Dukes is significant to the current study because it highlights the constant struggle involved for a Black officer and other officers of color to disassociate from the organization. The results demonstrated that the Black officers conformed to law enforcement culture because they wanted acceptance. The Black officers were forced out by their community and had to create a new identity separate from their community. Dukes (2018) notes:

Since [B]lack officers' face consciousness was found to produce adaptation strategies through ritual, retreat, and rebellion occupational behaviors, it is imperative that agency leadership evaluate their internal occupational cultures to identify opportunities for improving their agencies' formal and informal cultures (p.19).

This form of consciousness explained by Dukes is a behavior that creates an ‘us versus them’ mentality between the Black officers and their community of color. Policing is not the only occupation in law enforcement where minorities have been coerced to conform and fight against their heritage.

Bornstein, et al., (2011), studied Black and Hispanic law enforcement agents in the New York City Police Department. The agents interviewed were caught between having to conform to law enforcement culture and being identifiable with the community, causing them to claim that they did not see color. Instead, they saw only citizens and stereotypes of criminals. Some of the

agents of Black and Hispanic mentioned they were treated as ‘Uncle Toms’ or sellouts by their own communities. Some of these agents justified their career path as a means to better their lives rather than being in the stereotypical criminal outcome. The officers also noted that they have seen racism but do not believe that the police department is racist because of the diversity amongst the ranks — these statements bear similarities to Heyman's interview with the Mexican American officers (2002). However, the acceptance of racial oppression is not noted through the studies (Hockman, 2012) instead, other factors were purported to explain the reasoning of minority law enforcement behavior of conformity.

Kienscherf (2019), analyzed the history of the United States policing from its origins in colonial times to its modern era. Since the beginning, policing has reinforced racial and class divisions. The state or the ruling classes continually create reinforcement of racial and class divisions. The concept of “race” has been a determining factor for most legislative decisions, the use of race as a concept in the United States happened to create a division between enslaved and free people. Internal colonialism has developed over time to what is now called as *liberal pacification*. Kienscherf describes as: “liberal pacification – a strategy for producing and reproducing populations capable of responsible self-governance through the selective and differentially targeted application of a combination of coercion, support, and consent” (p.424). Policing is seen as a method of liberal pacification, and in the United States policing is a form of class and racial oppression. The study stated:

In fact, US policing operates as an instrument of class and racial oppression precisely because it aims to coercively integrate marginalized populations into a social order characterized by the generalization of specific racial/class divisions through principles of formal legal equality and individual autonomy (p.433).

This demonstrates that policing is one of the social tools of control that the dominant groups use to control the population. Policing in the U.S. puts the interests of the dominant group above others and isolates the marginalized groups in order to maintain social control.

A Brief History of Border Militarization

The Border Patrol was created in 1924, although practices of immigration enforcement were used before its inception (U.S. Customs and Border Protection, n.d.; Rosales, 2011). The focus of the Border Patrol has been on the southern border of the United States, while the northern border has minimal agents patrolling that region. According to the United States Border Patrol (2019), there are 19,555 Border Patrol agents nationwide- 16,608 of these agents are in the Southwest Border Sectors between the U.S. and Mexico. The remaining agents are spread throughout the northern and coastal areas of the country.

In 1997, the military began working with Border Patrol (Dunn, 2001). This collaboration stemmed from drug enforcement policies that were a focus of national attention and legislation at the time. In 1997, there were 6,315 Border Patrol Agents in the southwest border sector, and a total of 6,895 agents nationwide (United States Border Patrol, 2019). According to Dunn (2001), the collaboration between the military and Border Patrol of the southwest sector raises significant human rights issues. For example, in 1997, Redford, Texas, where a young brown male was shot and left to die by the military because of his “unusual” activity (Dunn, 2001). Most of the military focus was on the United States and Mexico border region. The young man was attempting to protect his cattle, thinking at the distance the soldiers were animals at a distance in the woods. The soldiers who shot the young brown male did not try to identify themselves to him to defuse the confusion.. The young male shot warning shots in their direction, and the military fired back, knowing he was not trying to harm them. The soldiers showed no

remorse for the victim, which they profiled as a drug scout, and left him to die without emergency aid.

It is apparent that the threat narrative of “brown individuals crossing the border and causing criminal activities” had occurred before this event. The use of Border Patrol and soldiers has not always been used on the U.S.-Mexico border. During the first decade of the 20th century, there was an open border policy, which allowed Mexican nationals to cross over to work on the railroads (Aguirre, et al., 2011). Mexican nationals were utilized for their labor until the Mexican Revolution of 1910 happened. The threat of their political activism scared the United States government enough to create the Border Patrol. Yet, before the creation of the Border Patrol, the Texas government had the Texas Rangers and local police units to attempt and control migration (Hernandez, 2010). As stated by Aguirre, et al., (2011), “when laws are selectively enforced to target a specific racial and ethnic group, it is known as racial profiling” (p.698). The creation of the Border Patrol and the Texas Rangers and their collaboration with local law enforcement were methods the border regions in Texas reacted to immigrants and/or brown bodies.

In the late 1990s, the state of Arizona set up Operation Safeguard; the operation was launched to allow the Border Patrol agents to round up migrants in an open area (Palafox, 2001). It redirected migrant route traffic for Mexican migrants from urban areas to open spaces. Operation Safeguard is one of the three operations (in addition to Operation Hold-the-Line in Texas and Operation Gatekeeper in San Diego) that the Border Patrol created to targeted regions highly populated by undocumented people (Lybeck, 2008). The effects of rerouting Mexican migrants through the ports of entry made it possible for DHS agents to profile and pacify these migrants. These three operations resulted in heavily militarizing the US-Mexico borders. The Clinton administration in late 1993 created a national strategy to control the unauthorized

crossing (Palafox, 2001). The budgets of the Border Patrol were significantly increased, and military technology was distributed to agents in this southern border regions. Border Patrol agents increased in population throughout this time frame (Palafox, 2001).

Opposition against immigration from southern borders did not change in the 2000s. The notorious terrorist event of 9/11 led to policies and practices restricting immigration even further with the passing of the Patriot Act, which combined various immigration agencies under the umbrella term of the Department of Homeland Security (Scott, 2006; Barron, 2019). After the horrific event, President Bush and other government officials, from the state and federal levels, initiated policies that restricted immigration (Winders, 2007). The restriction of immigration coincided with police militarization after the 9/11 attacks, and it was accompanied with DHS (Department of Homeland Security) providing trainings for bioterrorism and improvised explosive devices (Katzenstein, 2020). The militarization of the law enforcement engulfed the agents of the dominant group with weaponry and tactics to suppress society and target specific ethnic groups. With the increased militarization of the border, job opportunities and recruitment for ethnic minorities increased as well (Fortune, 1984).

Mexican Americans as U.S. Immigration Officers

Research on Mexican American federal agents is limited to a few authors. Research on this topic begins with an anthropological perspective by Heyman (2002). Heyman (2002) notes that historically, the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) was a racist organization, which is currently under the auspices of the Department of Homeland Security. Heyman cites Operation Wetback (1954) as indicative of the racism of officers, which terrorized Mexican American communities in the border. Nevertheless, by the 1970s, Mexican Americans joined the INS in large numbers. Heyman's (2002) research initially focused on 104 interviews

of INS officers from the California and Arizona sectors. From the 104 interviews, 33 respondents were Mexican Americans: 13 were border patrol; 12 did inspections; and 8 were in investigations, adjudication, and detention. In general, Heyman found that Mexican Americans distinguished citizenship versus ethnicity, therefore placing their loyalties on their identity as a U.S. citizen.

The study consisted of addressing the limitations of empathy in situations of different citizenship statuses. Heyman noted, “identity as artificial and constructed, it concentrates on the words and ideas involved in group labels” (p.480). The importance of this statement signifies that identity is created by the social surroundings and engagement of a person. Heyman’s findings differ from formalist studies of other researchers as “it concerns itself with the content of citizenship rights, and it asks whether and how much content matters in people’s ideas and actions toward noncitizens” (p.480). Heyman argues that citizenship is a life process that can be traced back to the community, history, and personal stories.

Heyman also noted the stereotypes held by Anglo American officers: “Anglo-Americans treated ‘Mexicans’ not only as a biologically separate group but also as anti-citizens, people with a distinctive propensity for short-term labor and then return to a ‘natural’ homeland in Mexico” (p.482). The central argument from this study is “that there is a relationship between the substantive institutions of citizenship, the individual life story, and the attitudes people express toward outsiders” (p.488). In other words, their citizenship and their own lived reality affect how they treat others. The racial discrimination Mexican Americans endured from Anglo-Americans, noted in Heyman’s work, is as outsiders, although Mexican Americans have fought to be accepted as citizens (Heyman, 2002):

they have fought for fundamental needs of education, political, and job opportunities in public institutions and primary labor markets, pushing the door open a crack with military service and going on to careers in the governmental civil service-in the state and local police and as prison guards and immigration officers (p. 482).

Heyman's (2002) research interviews of the 33 Mexican American INS officers found that the Mexican American officers "held two basic propositions: they opposed ethnic prejudice and stereotyping inside the United States, and they rejected claims to a pan-Latino or pan-American solidarity of U.S. citizens with documented and undocumented aliens" (p. 485).

In general, the Mexican American officers held stricter views regarding immigration than the Anglo-Americans. Eighty-five percent of Mexican American officers and 79% of Anglo-American officers believed in strict immigration control. In regards to citizenship, 88% (n=29) of the Mexican American officers distinguished between their ethnicity and citizenship, while 56% of Anglo Americans did the same.

Heyman (2002) further investigated their attitudes by focusing on 4 case studies of Mexican American officers and found five common factors (Heyman, 2002):

(1) Expressed moral distance from recent immigrants and border-crossers, signaled not only by criticism but also by an onlooker's pity and the use of the third-person plural pronoun, "they"; (2) relatively restrictive positions on immigration policy and policy rationale questions; (3) the separation of personal identity, whether ethnic or not, from Latin America; (4) identification with the mission and camaraderie of the INS; and (5) a strong emphasis on the personal accomplishment of getting a good government job with redistributive benefits that support the household economy (p.488).

Heyman also notes that they have changed their identity for self-interest and lacked empathy for Mexican citizens. They have been given a position of authority and lost their national origins to conform to the ideological hegemony of the United States. Heyman (2002) further noted that there was a lack of literature in the field, in particular literature of “street-level bureaucrats (immigration officers, police, hospital and school personnel, social workers, etc.) who share a national origin with a client immigrant population” (p.494).

The second research, which focused on Mexican American immigration officers was a thesis by Aaron Hockman for the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Hockman (2012) examined the role of border patrol agents as he explored the subjective experiences of seven Mexican American agents located in the El Paso Sector of Texas. The study used ethnographic methodology to gain an understanding of their lived experience as immigration officials. He found that “the primary reason agents cite for joining the Border Patrol is economic” (p.12). These findings were consistent with the work of Heyman (2002). The importance of the reasoning to join the Border Patrol is not only for individualistic reasons but for financial-economic means. Hockman was able to identify that the agents created and constructed an identity to detach from the Mexicans they encountered which allowed them to continue with their role as an immigration officer and maintain their identity first as an agent and second as a Mexican American. An example noted in Hockman’s study was the use of derogatory words/slangs (i.e., illegal) and separating the identity of the Mexican immigrant to a mere body through fragmentation.

In general, the limited literature has explored the paradox or conflicting issues that a person of color undergoes when they work for agencies known to be racist. The research by Heyman (2002) and Hockman (2012) both identify that economics is a motivating factor for their

choice of career, while ethnicity is secondary regardless of a history of systemic racism in the Department of Homeland Security.

Concluding Summary

In Chapter I, I introduce my thesis research which purpose is to explain why Mexican American college students seek a degree and/or job in a federal criminal justice industrial complex such as the Department of Homeland Security. I briefly provide an overview of some key issues which frame the history of Mexican Americans on the Texas/Mexico border, from colonialism to border militarization. In reviewing the literature, we find that there are very few studies that look into internal colonialism or double consciousness of agents of color. In the upcoming chapter, I will discuss the methodology of the thesis project.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

This Chapter discusses the quantitative methodology used for researching Mexican American Criminal Justice students (MACJS) at the University of Texas-Rio Grande Valley. In using quantitative methods, I will provide an overview of the design, the setting, sample, hypotheses, questionnaire, data collection, and analysis. In this Chapter, the Dependent Variables, the Independent Variables, and the Control Variables used for this study are detailed as well.

Setting of the Rio Grande Valley

The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley (UTRGV) is located in the most southern part of the country, located in Hidalgo County, Cameron, and Starr County, along the Rio Grande Valley (History of The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley, n.d.). According to the United States Census (2018), the population in Hidalgo County consists of 865, 939 people and approximately 92.4 percent are Hispanic or Latino with more than 30 percent of the population living in poverty. Additionally, 60 percent of the population has a high school education with more than 16 percent earning a bachelor's degree.

Sample

The research design is nonprobability sampling, focusing on theoretical and purposive sampling. Theoretical sampling is a process of data collection for generating theory, as it is my goal to provide an understanding for internal colonialism.

Purposive sampling is used since the research focuses specifically on the attitudes and opinions of criminal justice students interested in a career with federal law enforcement (Neuman, 2011). The sample consists of Criminal Justice students from the University of Texas-Rio Grande Valley. The Hispanic enrollment for UTRGV in Fall 2019 was the highest among all four-year public universities in Texas at a total of 25,943 while the total headcount consisted of 28,909 students (UTRGV, n.d.). As of Spring 2020, the Hispanic Junior and Senior student population of the Criminal Justice undergraduate population consisted of 1,195 students (Office of Strategic Analysis and Institutional Reporting, n.d.-a). The UTRGV Enrollment Profile of Fall 2019 recorded approximately 92.5% of the students are from the Rio Grande Valley, and 89.4% are Hispanic (Office of Strategic Analysis and Institutional Reporting, n.d.-b). For Fall 2020, the Department of Criminal Justice department had 2,016 undergraduate majors recorded. The total of Juniors and Seniors recorded is 1,344. In other words, the total percentage of upper-level students is 66.7% in the undergraduate Criminal Justice program.

The sample selection of students was from the upper-level courses in criminal justice, from 3000 through 4000 courses. This group of students are the focus since they are closer to graduation and are intellectually prepared to understand human rights and ethics.

The original intent of this study was to collect a minimum of 230 completed questionnaires with no missing data. The sample was meant to reflect 30 to 40% of the criminal justice majors at the University of Texas-Rio Grande Valley, as well as the requirement for doing ordinal regression statistics. The questionnaires were to be examined after a completion of 250 questionnaires. However, the adaptation of the survey had to take place through an online application, called Qualtrics XM, due to COVID19 and UTRGV policies.

Hypotheses

In this current study, the hypotheses are the following, H1: MACJS that select a career in DHS will conform to the U.S. ideological hegemony, and the secondary hypothesis, H2: MACJS that select a career in DHS will have a different understanding of rights/ethics with other MACJS that did not select a career in DHS.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire used for this quantitative study was administered online and recorded through Qualtrics XM, to the sample of CJ students in the 3000-4000 level courses to assess the research hypotheses. The questions developed for the questionnaire come from the work of Ramon A. Gutierrez (2004). The questions consist of the concepts of Social Identification: Mexican versus U.S. American; Support for Nationalism Racist Policies; Followership by engaging in policies and orders by the government; and Human Rights: Knowledge of Human Rights and Policies (Andre & Velasquez, 1992; Gutierrez, 2004; Grabb et al., 1999; Greene, 2012; Jackson & Henderson, 2019; Ramirez III, 1967; and Yuxian, 2013).

Each of these was separated into its own categories within the survey. The categories and questions were influenced and adapted from the following researchers from their instruments or literature influence: Andre & Velasquez (1992); Gutierrez (2004); Grabb et al. (1999); Greene (2012); Jackson & Henderson (2019); Ramirez III (1967); and Yuxian (2013). The categories are in relation to Social Identification: Mexican versus U.S. American; Support for Nationalism Racist Policies: Xenophobia, Internal Colonialism, Political Orientation; and Followership by engaging in policies and orders by the government. A Likert Scale and ordinal categorization will be used. The questionnaire consists of a total of 60 questions with 50 questions using a six-

point Likert scale format (i.e., 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4- Agree, 5 = Strongly agree, 6 = Prefer not to answer).

The questions in the survey are grouped as follows:

- Questions 1- 9 are general demographic questions of who the participant is; to see what courses, news media outlets, and career choices are having an effect on the participant.

This set of questions were influenced by the instrument by (Jackson & Henderson, 2019). The news media outlets, in Question 8, were selected by the website Ad Fontes Media (Ad Fontes Media, n.d.). Ad Fontes Media is an independent source that analyzes news media and categorizes them accordingly to their political agendas.

- Questions 10 – 20 are on Social Identification: Mexican versus U.S. American.

The questions on Social Identification: Mexican versus the U.S. American is based on the ideologies of both cultures; this is understanding of the Mexican and American identities. The Mexican ideology questions are based on the culture's influence based on family-oriented values (Cultural Traditions, n.d.). The U.S. American ideology questions are based on individualistic qualities the American culture highly values (Yuxian, 2013; Grabb et al., 1999; Andre & Velasquez, 1992; Greene, 2012).

- Question 21 – 39 are based on the Support for Nationalism/Racist Policies:

Xenophobia, Internal Colonialism, and Political Orientation.

The set of questions created for this study were concerning the Support for Nationalism/Racist Policies: Xenophobia, Internal Colonialism, and Political Orientation. They are used to identify the participant's interest or understanding of nationalism. It is also used to identify the participant's understanding of policies created in the United States that target marginalized groups. The questions on Internal Colonialism are used to determine if the participant has been

embodied to believe militarization is still needed to prevent undocumented immigrants, thus testing if internal colonialism has occurred. The questions on Political Orientation is to see if the participant's answers correlate with progressive/liberal or conservative ideologies.

- Questions 40 – 60 are based on the concept of Followership.

The questions created for this study were concerning Followership are used to determine if the participant will follow commands or orders even if they are deemed as unethical/unreasonable.

Independent, Dependent, Demographic and Internal Colonialization Variables

This section will explain the variables associated with the current study (See Appendix F). The independent variable (IV) is the respondent's career choice (Q.9) (Career_choicetext). The dependent variables (DV) is the respondent answering (DV1) the obey orders without question (Q.40) (Obey_orders) and (DV2) the Criminal Justice curriculum (Q.54) (Curriculum). The control variables are sex, dummy coded to female (reference = male), age (reference 17-21 = others), and the First College (reference immediate family = no), the Upper Class (Junior-Senior Classification reference = underclass), CNN (reference = compared to others), Fox News (reference = compared to others) (See Table 1 at Appendix F) the covariates (demographics) of the study which are shown to be related to racial oppression and conformity to ideological hegemony. The Internal Colonialization variables (ICVs) consisted of the following questions in the survey: Question 23, 24, 25, 28, 41, 42, 44, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55, and 56 (See Appendix I).

The first DV was measured by the question, "Part of a job, in the Criminal Justice System, is to obey orders without question," (See Appendix D for Questionnaire). The question was presented as a Likert scale choice, the range of choices are as follow: 1-Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neutral, 4-Agree, 5-Strongly agree. The answers choices of the first DV, "4-Agree

and 5-Strongly agree” were coded to (3 - 4 =1 and everyone else = 0)” to stay in ordinal form. The first DV was used as a proxy to test if the respondent would conform to the ideological hegemony. The second DV was measured by the question, “The Criminal Justice curriculum has made me aware of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.” This question was presented as a Likert scale choice, the range of choice are as follow: 1-Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neutral, 4-Agree, 5-Strongly agree (See Appendix D). The second DV was proxied to test if the respondents have a different understanding of rights/ethics. The dependent variables are measured on a 5-mean point scale because it is the most consistent. These variables were selected for the most frequent and based on the review of the literature.

The question used to create the first independent variable was measured by the question, “What are your top three career choices in Criminal Justice? Please place a 1-being your most preferred, a 2 -being your second choice, and a 3-being your third option.” The question was presented with a ranking system choice as 1-being your most preferred, 2-being your second choice, and 3- being your third option. We restricted the IV (Mexican Americans wanting to pursue a career in DHS) it was dummy coded (others who did not select DHS as a career choice = 0 and those who selected DHS as a career choice).

The first demographic control variable (DCV) or covariate was Female, it was created from the question, “What is your sex?” Sex was used to identify if there was a significant effect between Mexican American males and Mexican American females conforming to the ideological hegemony and have a different understanding of rights/ethics. Sex was dummy coded (Female =1 and Male = 0) to better identify if there was a significant difference.

The next question used to create the second control variable was measured by the open-ended question, “What is your age?” Age was dummy coded (17-22 = and all else = 0). The

control variable was created because the literature indicates that age is a factor to conformity (Walker and Andrade, 1996; Colliander, 2019).

The third control variable was measured by the question, “Are you the first in your immediate family to attend college?” (Immediate). The generational status variable answer choices are “Yes and No”. The generational status was dummy coded (being first-generation =1 and the rest = 0).

The fourth control variable was measured by the question (See Appendix F) “Which of the following news media outlets do you use? Mark all that apply.” The answer choice are as follows: ABC News, BBC, CBS News, CNN, Estrella TV, Financial Times (FT), Fox News, The Economists, The New York Times, The Washington Post, Public Broadcasting Service, Politico, Telemundo, Televisa, TV Azteca, UniMas, and Univision. The answer choices were dummy coded (did not select = 0 and did select = 1).

In this current study, five Internal Colonialism variables (ICV) were created, the names of the variables are: (ICV1- AdhereRacist) Following Racist Policies, (ICV2- BeingUnethical) Engaging in Unethical Behavior, (ICV3- AdhereNationalSecurity) Adhere to National Security, and (ICV4-KnowledgeofHR) the Knowledge of Human Rights. Each of the questions was answered with a Likert scale ranging from 1- Strongly disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3- Neutral, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly agree.

Following Racist Policies (AdhereRacist) consisted of the following questions: 23, 24, 25, 28 (reverse coded), 31, 36, and 37:

- Question 23 was presented as, “The US government practices racist policies.”
(Racist_polices)

- Question 24 was presented as, “Law enforcement in the U.S. practices racial profiling.” (Racial_profiling)
- Question 25 was presented as, “There is a lack of racial diversity in the leadership of the United States.” (Racial_diversity)
- Question 28 was presented as, “Mexicans have been stereotyped negatively.” The answer choices for question 28 were reverse recoded (1 = 5, 2 = 4, 3 = 3, 4 = 2, 5 = 1). (Stereotyped_negatively)
- Questions 31 was presented as, “Most immigrants are violent criminals.” (Violent_criminals)
- Question 36 was presented as, “The DACA program encourages more illegal immigration.” (DACA)
- Question 37 was presented as, “Undocumented Veterans should be deported after U.S. military service.” (Veterans)

The variable (BeingUnethical, See Appendix I) Engaging in Unethical (ICV2) consisted of the following questions: 41, 42, 44, and 47:

- Question 41 was presented as, “A Whistleblower should be fired immediately because they cannot be trusted, even if it is against the law.” (Whistleblower)
- Question 42 was presented as “I am willing to compromise my own ethics in order to obey government orders.” (Own_ethics)
- Question 44 was presented as, “I would do anything for national security even if the orders are unethical, hurt families and children.” (National_security)

- Question 47 was presented as, “I would like to have an administrative leadership position even if that means I have to implement unethical orders or actions.”

(Administrative_leadership)

The variable ICV3 Adhere to National Security (AdhereNationalSecurity) consisted of the questions 43, 45, 46, and 48:

- Question 43 was presented as, “If I get a job with Customs Border & Protection, I am willing to arrest an undocumented family member.” (Willing_to_arrest)
- Question 45 was presented as, “National security is more important than civil rights.” (More_important)
- Question 46 was presented as, “I feel comfortable standing up to authority for others.” (Standing_up)
- Question 48 was presented as, “Eminent domain (governmental confiscation of private lands) is a sacrifice that must be accepted by landowners on the border for national security.” (Eminent_domain)

The variable ICV4 the Knowledge of Human Rights (KnowledgeofHR) consisted of the following questions: 49, 50, 51 (reverse coded), 52 (reverse coded), 55, and 56.

- Question 49 was presented as, “Undocumented immigrants have the same basic human rights as US citizens.” (Same_basic)
- Question 50 was presented as, “It is a human rights violation to refuse asylum seekers.” (Refuse_asylum)
- Question 51 was presented as, “There are no human rights violations committed by U.S. law enforcement on the United States/Mexico border.” The answer

choices for question 51 were reverse recoded (1 = 5, 2 = 4, 3 = 3, 4 = 2, 5 = 1).
(Rights_violations)

- Question 52 was presented as, “Detained refugees do not need to be given basic healthcare needs.” The answer choices for question 52 were reverse recoded (1 = 5, 2 = 4, 3 = 3, 4 = 2, 5 = 1). (Same_basic)
- Question 55 was presented as “The Zero Tolerance policy does not violate any human rights violations.” (Zero_Tolerance)
- Question 56 was presented as, “U.S. policies are more important than human rights.” (US_Policies)

Questions 28, 51 and 52 were recoded to be reversed recoded on the answer choices because of how the questions were asked. For consistency with the scale, the reverse coding was necessary.

IRB Board and Survey

In order for this study to be conducted, the approval of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at UTRGV was obtained. An application packet was submitted containing the application form, a copy of the questionnaire, the online consent form, the email recruitment form, and verification that the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) for Human Subjects Research and Humanities Responsible Conduct of Research was successfully completed by the researcher and the thesis chair. Approval by the UTRGV IRB Board was granted on October 24, 2020 (Protocol # 20-0002).

In order for approval, the survey instrument was required to be added a sixth response to the Likert scale, considering the well-being of students. The response, “prefer not to answer” was added before receiving final approval.

Data Collection and Data Analysis

Once the study was approved by IRB, the questionnaires were to be distributed via email to the professors from the Department of Criminal Justice. First, the professors teaching upper-level courses were identified and emailed in order to recruit students for the research. Professors were emailed, along with the IRB consent form and the Email Recruitment form (See Appendix A, B, and C). Twenty-nine professors were contacted and 10 professors agreed to allow the recruitment of their students. The professors were informed about the topic of the project, and that the participation of the students was voluntary, confidential, and anonymous. In order to take the survey, students simply had to click on the link provided by Qualtrics XM. The students were provided the consent and all applicable IRB documents via email, after the approval by the instructor. Only 171 surveys were completed.

The main method of analysis for the study is ordinal regression as the dependent variables are ordinal. Statistical analyses were performed with IBM SPSS 26. Descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentages, and means were used to describe the characteristics of the sample, to check for violations of the assumptions underlying certain statistical techniques used.

Due to the limited number of participants, a bootstrap analysis was verified to determine significance. Upon review, it was determined the data was to be used as is because the results stayed consistent.

Chapter II Summary

Chapter II provides the methodology of the research design, the IRB approval documentation, the setting, and the independent and dependent variables. The research design uses a questionnaire that was influenced by researchers in various fields such as anthropology,

sociology, criminology, and criminal justice. The influence is based on the following factors:
UTRGV. In the upcoming chapter, the findings of the measures will be elaborated.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Summary of Chapter

Chapter III presents the Descriptive Statistics, Ordinal Regression, and the results of the study. A total of 171 respondents completed the survey in the 20-day time frame in which the questionnaire was distributed via Qualtrics XM. The chapter goes over various statistical results.

Descriptive Statistics

In order to examine the hypotheses outlined in this study, the following statistical techniques were utilized: descriptive and ordinal regression. Descriptive statistics such as percentages, and means were used to describe the sample characteristics, to check for any violations for assumptions underlying the certain statistical techniques used to describe the independent and dependent variables. A total of 171 respondents completed the questionnaire, but only 156 cases met the requirement for this study. The study was restricted to Mexican American respondents and those selecting to pursue a career in DHS. The sample size from 171 decreased to 156 respondents. The number of respondents that are Female is 51.9 % (n=81) compared to 75 males (48.1%). For age 17-22, there were 21 (18.8%) respondents, compared to all other ages (n=135). Almost 33 percent of respondents (n=38) were the first in their immediate family to attend college compared to those who were not (67.5%). 86.3% of the respondents were upperclassmen compared to 13.7%, this was due in part because the classes surveyed were 3000/4000 courses. 52.1% of the respondents (n=61) reported watching CNN news, while 45.3% of respondents (n= 53) reported watching Fox News.

The means of the Internal Colonialism Scales (following racist policies, engaging in unethical behavior, adhere to national security, and knowledge of human rights) were created for this study from multiple questions. On average, on the adhering to racist policies scale is 2.58 (above strongly disagree). On average, the unethical scale score was 2.77 (above strongly disagree). On average, on the adhering to national security was 3.24 (above neutral). On average, on the Knowledge of Human Rights scale, the score was 3.11 (above neutral) (See Appendix F).

Ordinal Regression

Also, to address the two hypotheses posed in this thesis the following statistical techniques were utilized. Ordinal regression was most appropriate because the dependent variables were ordinal, and they were transformed and reported as means. The means of the Internal Colonialism Variables (ICVs) were reported rather than as scales because there were too many questions used for each control variable. Chronbach's alpha was run with each set of questions used to create each group of internal colonialism controls to determine that each group of questions were higher than .7 which is acceptable. All were above .7. Multicollinearity was also assessed with correlations of independent variables and control variables (See Appendix E). Also, the test of parallel lines was conducted to assess the data's use for ordinal regression. No violations were noted.

The study tested a series of four ordinal regression models to determine the aspect that certain control variables (the demographic control variables and the Internal Colonialism Variables) were added to the independent variable of interest.

For the first ordinal regression (See Appendix G) was done in order to test H1: MACJS who select a career in DHS will conform to the ideological hegemony. The first dependent

variable *Obey_orders* was utilized. Table 2 reports the ordinal regression results observing how the variable explains an individual's ability to conform to order, even when unethical. Table 2 predicts the confidence in conforming to ideological hegemony. It was created to analyze the IV, the first DV, the demographic covariates, Internal colonialism covariates, and the news covariates. The estimates are recorded as "B =", the standard error is recorded in parenthesis, and the significance is recorded as the following: * $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, and *** $p \leq .001$.

In looking at Table 2, the best fit model statistics were used to determine the best-fitting model. Using the -2 Log-likelihood for Model (35), Model 2 (192), Model 3 (375), and Model 4 (373), the smaller the value, the better the fit. When examining Model Chi-Square, the larger the value, the better the fit, so Model 4 is selected. When examining the pseudo-R squared, the larger the value, the better the fit so Model 4 is the better fit with a value of .49. Overall, Model 4 is the most appropriate and is the best fit. In other words, all the predictor variables explain 49% of the variation in the likelihood of obeying orders among participants in the study (Table 2).

Model 1 presents the main indicator of interest in this study. It demonstrates that there was no significance in MACJS who select to pursue a career in DHS and conforming to ideological hegemony. Model 2 adds demographic covariates, it demonstrates when controlling for all variables, that there was no significance with MACJS who select to pursue a career in DHS in conforming to the ideological hegemony. There was no association between being female and male in conforming to ideological hegemony. There is no difference between 17-21 years old and other ages in conforming to ideological hegemony. There is no difference in generational status in conforming to ideological hegemony (Table 2).

Model 3 adds the 4 ICVs and the news outlet CNN (Table 2). When controlling for all variables, there is a statistical significance in females compared to males conforming to the

ideological hegemony ($B=0.52$, $SE=.21$, $p \leq .05$). When controlling for all variables, females are .479 less likely than males to conform to ideological hegemony. When controlling for all variables, there is a statistical significance in engaging in unethical behavior and conforming to ideological hegemony ($B= 1.41$, $SE= .19$, $p \leq .001$). When controlling for all variables, there is a statistical significance between adhering to national security and conforming to ideological hegemony ($B= -0.51$, $SE=.18$, $p \leq .001$) (Table 2).

In Model 3, when controlling for all variables, there is no significant difference with MACJS who select to pursue a career in DHS and conforming to ideological hegemony (Table 2). There is no difference between 17-21 years old and other ages in conforming to ideological hegemony. There is no difference in generational status in conforming to ideological hegemony. There is no significance between following racist policies and engaging in ideological hegemony. There is no statistical association between having knowledge of human rights and adhering to ideological hegemony. There is no association between watching CNN and adhering to ideological hegemony (Table 2).

Model 4 adds the 4 ICVs and the news outlet Fox News (Table 2). When controlling for all variables, there is a statistical significance among females compared to males in conforming to the ideological hegemony ($B=0.63$, $SE=0.21$, $p \leq .01$). Females are .373 less likely than males to conform to ideological hegemony. When controlling for all variables, there is a statistical significance between engaging in unethical behavior and conforming to ideological hegemony ($B= 1.41$, $SE=0.19$, $p \leq .001$). When controlling for all variables, there is a statistical significance between adhering to national security and conforming to ideological hegemony ($B= -.52$, $SE=0.18$, $p \leq .001$) (Table 2).

Model 4 reports when controlling for all variables, there is no significant difference with MACJS who select to pursue a career in DHS in conforming to ideological hegemony (Table 2). There is no difference between 17-21 years old and other ages in conforming to ideological hegemony. There is no difference in generational status in conforming to ideological hegemony. There is no statistical association between having knowledge of human rights and conforming to ideological hegemony. There is no difference between watching Fox News and conforming to ideological hegemony (Table 2).

For the second ordinal regression (See Appendix H) to test H2, is that MACJS that select a career in DHS will have a different understanding of rights/ethics than other Mexican Americans that did not select a career in DHS. I used the second dependent variable (Curriculum) see Table 3. Table 3 predicts the confidence in having a different understanding of rights/ethics by being exposed to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). It was created to analyze the IV, the first DV, the demographic covariates, Internal Colonialism covariates, and the news covariates. The estimates are recorded as “B =”, the standard error is recorded in parenthesis, and the significance is recorded as the following: * $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, and *** $p \leq .001$.

Model 1 presents the main indicator. It demonstrates that there was no significance in MACJS who select a career in DHS and having a different understanding of rights/ethics by being exposed to the UDHR. Model 2 adds demographic covariates, it demonstrates when controlling for all variables, that there was no significance with MACJS who select a career in DHS and having a different understanding of rights/ethics. There was no association between females and males in having a different understanding of rights/ethics. There is no difference between 17-21 years old and other ages in having a different understanding of rights/ethics.

There is no difference in generational status in having a different understanding of rights/ethics (Table 3).

Model 3 adds the 4 internal colonialism variables and the news outlet CNN. When controlling for all variables, there is a statistical significance in following racist policies and having a different understanding of rights/ethics by being exposed to the UDHR ($B= 1.01$, $SE=.39$, $p \leq .01$) (Table 3). There is no significant difference between MACJS who select a career in DHS and having a different understanding of rights/ethics. There was no association between being female and males in having a different understanding of rights/ethics. There is no difference between 17-21 years old and other ages having a different understanding of rights/ethics. There is no difference in generational status having a different understanding of rights/ethics. There is no statistical association between having knowledge of human rights and having a different understanding of rights/ethics. There is no association between watching CNN and having a different understanding of rights/ethics (Table 3).

Model 4 adds the 4 internal colonialism variables and the news outlet Fox News (Table 3). When controlling for all variables, there is a statistical significance in following racist policies and having a different understanding of rights/ethics by being exposed to the UDHR ($B= 1.00$, $SE=.38$, $p \leq .01$). When controlling for all variables, there is a statistical significance in having prior knowledge of human rights and having a different understanding of rights/ethics by being exposed to the UDHR ($B=0.87$, $SE=0.41$, $p \leq .001$) (Table 3).

In model 4, there is no significant difference between MACJS who select a career in DHS and having a different understanding of rights/ethics. There was no association between being female and males in having a different understanding of rights/ethics. There is no difference between 17-21 years old and other ages having a different understanding of rights/ethics. There

is no difference in generational status having a different understanding of rights/ethics. There is no statistical association between having knowledge of human rights and having a different understanding of rights/ethics. There is no association between watching Fox News and having a different understanding of rights/ethics.

Overall based on the results, I reject the null hypothesis which states: H0-1: MACJS that select a career in DHS will not conform to the ideological hegemony, and H0-2: MACJS that select a career in DHS will have the same understanding of rights/ethics with other MACJS that did not select a career in DHS. I partially accept, the research hypothesis H1: MACJS that select a career in DHS will conform to the U.S. ideological hegemony. In other words, there are differences among females being less likely than males to conform to ideological hegemony, differences in engaging in unethical behavior and conforming to ideological hegemony; and adhering to national security and conforming to ideological hegemony. I also partially accept the research hypothesis H2: MACJS that select a career in DHS will have a different understanding of rights/ethics than other MACJS that did not select a career in DHS. In other words, there is a difference in following racist policies and have a different understanding of rights/ethics; and having a prior knowledge of human rights with having a different understanding of rights/ethics by being exposed to the UDHR.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

Chapter IV summarizes the findings of the study, discusses the implications of the findings, assesses contributions, demonstrates limitations of the study, and discusses the recommendations for future research.

Findings

While reviewing the data, it was determined we could not examine the mere raw data beyond our analyses due to some of the response categories on specific questions having no responses. For it to be acceptable there should have been a minimum of 300 completed surveys with a minimum of at least 50 respondents for each response category. Therefore, the association of the variables was analyzed rather than the individual data.

The hypotheses for this study are H1: MACJS that select a career in DHS will conform to the U.S. ideological hegemony, and H2: MACJS that select a career in DHS will have a different understanding of rights/ethics with other MACJS that did not select a career in DHS.

The current study found that there is a difference among MACJS who select a career in DHS and conforming to the ideological hegemony; that there is a difference between MACJS who select a career in DHS and MCJS who do not select a career in DHS and their understanding of human rights/ethics. Researchers and scholars in racial ethnic studies should be interested in studying how MACJS who select a career in DHS adhere to U.S. ideological hegemony aspects (i.e., white nationalism) and also examine the differences in the level of knowledge and understanding of human rights/ethics.

Hypothesis One

The H1: MACJS who select a career in DHS will conform to the U.S. ideological hegemony is partially supported. The current study did show differences when comparing females and males in terms of conforming to the ideological hegemony when asked if they would engage in unethical behavior and adhering to national security.

The current study found an association between females being less likely to conform than to men to the ideological hegemony. In the last two decades, one study has shown that men are more likely to conform to unethical behavior (Wahn, 2003). Wahn's study demonstrates that men, compared to women, conform to unethical behaviors with organizational behaviors to behave unethically. The internal colonization amongst minorities as supported by the works of Chavez (2011) and Moore (1970), adds to the internal conflict of conforming to the structure set by the dominant group.

The association between unethical behavior and conformity to the ideological hegemony is also noted in the work of Haslam and Reicher (2012). They explain Zimbardo's Stanford Prison Experiment and Milgram's research on obedience to authority (using shock). As explained by Haslam and Reicher, the study by Milgram on obedience is among a predominantly male volunteer population. The study concluded that normal civilian men would be willing to inflict harm on a stranger because of obedience to authority. The Stanford Experiment consisted of randomly assigning the roles of guard and prisoner to a group of students, they observed the interactions of the groups without a malevolent authority. The findings of the Stanford Experiment were that people descend into tyranny because of the conformity and the toxic roles that inherently came from being the role of a guard without a need for specific rules or orders.

From the findings in this current study, unethical behavior and adhering to national security is associated with conforming to the ideological hegemony. The importance of this finding is the similarities to Heyman's study (2002) and Hockman's thesis research (2012). In their findings, each found that respondents were likely to conform to the ideological hegemony of DHS, which has a history of unethical behavior. In other words, by the students selecting a career in DHS, they are willing to be in a system that perpetuates control, order, and oppression.

The association between national security and conforming to the ideological hegemony is also noted in Heyman's study (2002). The INS officers conformed to their authoritative position in national security and will likely conform to adhering to national security because of the officer's positions as an agent of the federal government. Richard Quinney's Pacification model also reaffirms the case for conformity to the national security since the main objective is to indoctrinate individuals from the surplus population to suppress their own community (Quinney 1979/1970).

When looking at MACJS conforming to the ideological hegemony the literature explains that conformity of diverse groups is less likely to happen than homogeneous groups (Kets & Sandroni, 2015). However, this current study lacks ethnic diversity because the student population is 89% Hispanic (Office of Strategic Analysis and Institutional Reporting, n.d.-a). A future examination will be needed to retest this variable. The other variables, which had no association was age, generational status, following racist policies, the knowledge of human rights, and the selection of CNN and Fox News.

The lack of association with the age differences and conforming to the ideological hegemony is noted by the work of Walker & Andrade (1996). They found that age is not associated with conformity. Walker & Andrade's study was on the demonstration that age affects

conformist behaviors by using Asch's paradigm on obedience. The participants in their study ranged from 154 male participants between the ages of 3 and 17 years. They tested each participant with six trials and the participants were assessed if the participants identified as non-confederates would conform to the confederates group. The study had a confederate group and the rest of the participants. The confederates were used to determine if the rest of the participants would conform to the confederates' confidence in judgment for each trial. Their findings demonstrate that conformist behavior decreases with age from childhood into adulthood. The no association between both news outlets and conforming to ideological hegemony is not demonstrated in this current study and it is surprising. Colliander (2019), explains that society can be influenced by news media outlets to conform to the ideological hegemony. He examined the effects of conformity to others online when individuals respond to fake news. The findings for Colliander's study were that the more critical comments on a fake news article had fewer positive comments and fewer sharing of fake news. The comparison to other comments that were not critical to the fake news post had a significant amount of sharing. The importance of reporting Colliander's study to this current is to the possibility of the respondents using social media as a news outlet instead of non-biased sources. Another possible influence on the no association between Fox News and conformity to ideological hegemony is by Mr. Trump's criticism of Fox News in his presidential campaign run (Obeidallah, 2020). The criticism by Mr. Trump towards Fox News led his followers to Newsmax, a right-wing conservative news outlet that has Mr. Trump's approval (Grynbaum & Koblin, 2020).

This current study notes that there was no relationship between generational status and conformity. Olson (2011) states, "First, to date, all studies that have examined the concept of social class identity dissonance have been qualitative, with this study being the first that

examines this concept in a quantitative nature” (p.84). The comparison with Olson’s study and this current study is the use of a quantitative method in assessing conformity among different generational status. Olson’s study (2011) consisted of both first-generation college students and non-first-generation college students. The students were recruited from two colleges located in the western United States, Metropolitan State College of Denver (Metro State) an urban and public institution. The second college, Adam State College, is a small liberal arts college, which had 28% of Latino students. The study found that there was no association between first-generation college students and non-first-generation college students in the amount of social class identity differences.

In this thesis study, there was no association between following racist policies and conforming to the ideological hegemony. However, the history of DHS and the United States indicate that there is conformity to the ideological hegemony. For example, enforcement agents enforcing and abiding by racial policies such as the Arizona Senate Bill 1070, which was mentioned in the literature (Nier, et al., 2012). The Senate bill was passed and enforced training that focused on racially profiling Mexicans and Mexican Americans. Law enforcement agents enforced the senate bill indicating their willingness to conform to the ideological hegemony of the dominant group. Heyman’s study (2002) can strengthen this claim because of the similar factors he found in his study did indicate the conformity of Mexican Americans to the ideological hegemony of the INS.

Hypothesis Two

The H2: MACJS that select a career in DHS will have a different understanding of rights/ethics with other MACJS that did not select a career in DHS is partially supported. The study did find an association of the respondents following racist policies and understanding

rights and ethics from the curriculum, but they may still follow the racist policies. The study also did find that the respondents having prior knowledge of human rights had a different understanding of rights/ethics before being exposed to the UDHR.

The association between following racist policies and understanding rights/ethics from the curriculum is supported by Heyman's study. There is an association between following racist policies and understanding human rights/ethics. The meaning of this association is the respondent understands a policy is possibly racist but may still follow the policy. Heyman (2002) interviewed the INS officers who had followed and obeyed orders from an agency that has passed and practiced racial policies. For example, Hockman (2012) outlines "The duties of a BP agent present moral and emotional challenges, because as gatekeepers an agent's primary duty is to arrest undocumented migrants, a majority of whom are of Mexican descent" (p.11) which may result on the agent following policy that makes them uneasy or uncomfortable to follow.

There is an association with having prior knowledge of human rights before being exposed to the UDHR. This current study shows the significance of that understanding by demonstrating that the students do have a prior knowledge of human rights before being exposed to the UDHR.

The comparison of being Mexican American did not have a difference of having a better understanding of human rights, neither did the variables of sex, age, generational status, engaging in unethical behavior, and adhering to national security. There is no association between MACJS and understanding human rights/ethics than other MACJS that did not select a career in DHS. The reasoning is due to the lack of diversity in the sample size. The majority of the students answered Mexican American while the other respondents were of another ethnic group.

The lack of differences between females and males in their understanding of rights/ethics than other MACJS that did not select a career in DHS is supported by the work of Carol Gilligan. She notes that there is a separation between adolescent Females and Males in understanding rights/ethics (Capeheart & Milovanovic, 2007). As stated by Capeheart & Milovanovic (2007), “The conclusion by Gilligan was that two distinct ethics, one more male-oriented, one more female-oriented due to socialization, were operative in moral development” (p.22). The possibility noted of this study is that MACJS responses were possibly done from a social desirability bias and due to the sensitivity of the topic on human rights/ethics (Grimm, 2010).

The no relationship between age and understanding human rights/ethics than other MACJS that did not select a career in DHS can be possibly questioned by the work of Ruegger and King (1992) who conducted a study with students enrolled in business courses. They found age did play a role in understanding ethical conduct, the age group of 40 plus years were the most ethical than other groups in their study. However, for this current study, most of the respondents were 17-22 years of age. There cannot be a possible comparison because of Ruegger and King’s work in this current study. Age does not show an association with having a better understanding of human rights/ethics.

Further, the no relationship between adhering to national security and understanding rights/ethics than other MACJS that did not select a career in DHS can be explained by Richard Quinney. Within the Criminal Justice field, to be a useful agent of the dominant class, the individual must be indoctrinated into the “brotherhood” of National Security (Quinney, 1979/1970). If there is no association between MACJS selecting a career in DHS than other MACJS that did not select a career in DHS understanding rights/ethics and adhering to national security, then there may be a matter of indoctrination in the Criminal Justice program. The

students not being aware of the ethical violations that national security practices are a possible concern. Students may not be provided the information or may be unable to differentiate in their understanding of human rights and adhering to National Security.

The lack of an association between unethical behavior and understanding rights/ethics than other MACJS that did not select a career in DHS is possibly demonstrated by the work of Stanley Milgram on obedience. Stanley Milgram's experiment indicates that people have an understanding of violations occurring and will proceed on with the violations (Greenwood, 2018.)

Implications

The study is unique and can potentially pioneer researchers to enhance a rather limited field of study (Heyman, 2002). The implications of this study demonstrate that there is a potential to learn about the issues in the practitioner field of law enforcement on ethics and conformity. The results in this current study demonstrate the potential risks of men conforming to the ideological hegemony. The conformity can potentially lead to unethical behavior and discrimination towards a marginalized group, as the literature explains. This current study can be the framework for understanding the indoctrination of MACJS desire to pursue a career as a practitioner in law enforcement.

An ideal implication from this current study is to do a study on new recruits within the various federal law enforcement agencies. The new recruits would have to be, but not limited to, Mexican descent. We can go further and interview recruits joining DHS before and post their field training to examine if there are differences of conformity to the ideological hegemony and understanding of rights/ethics as a civilian and then as an agent. Currently, the trainings that are provided by DHS vary from Bioterrorism Training and Education, Center for Domestic

Preparedness, Centers for Public Health Preparedness, DHS Training and Exercise, First Responder Training, Homeland Security Exercise, and Evaluation Program, Nation Counterterrorism Center, etc. (Training Resources, n.d.). However, after searching for the training sources available, there is not one ethics or human rights course that could be identified.

This study can implicate, a need for more education to make students aware of ethical behavior and human rights. An example would be to have weekly open roundtable discussions by faculty, or by local criminal justice practitioners to address topics that demonstrate ethical and human rights violations and processes. By doing so, it would bring awareness to the students of what not to do once they enter the field as practitioners. Border Patrol agents have a history of abusing and violating migrant women on the U.S.-Mexico Border (Vera, 2013; Vinas, 2019; Dominguez, 2020). The students who wish to pursue a career in DHS should be taught ways to negotiate to be ethical, and ensuring human rights are not violated. Researchers should take more of a consideration on expounding from this study to educate people wanting a career in DHS on ethical behaviors.

The importance of creating a human rights and ethics course as a requirement in the curriculum of Criminal Justice can potentially lessen the number of human rights/ethics violations that may happen. DHS has investigated and documented the number of rights violations their agents and facilities have committed (DHS Inspector General Finds Egregious Rights Violations at Immigration Prisons, 2017; Homeland Security, 2017; AV Press Releases, 2019; DHS Documents Reveals Allegations of Abuse on ICE Air Deportation Flights, 2019). This study's implication can be the stepping blocks of deconstructing the disconnection of understanding human rights/ethics and deconstructing conformity to the ideological hegemony of DHS and Criminal Justice.

The UTRGV Criminal Justice Program can replicate or create a major foundational ethics course like the State of California requirements (Burke & Rosales, 2020; Fensterwald, 2020). Kaptein (2015) found that the effectiveness of implementing an ethics program will decrease the frequency of the amount of unethical behavior and develops a sequence of implementation for an ethics program. Additionally, Pena, et al. (2014), states that a course on ethics can be a foundation for federal ethics.

Limitations

There were several limitations to this study. The first factor was the data collection time frame and sample size. Part of this issue was the restricted time frame of the data collection, which lasted approximately two weeks towards the end of the semester due to the COVID-19 pandemic and adaptation policies (UTRGV, 2020). The survey was originally intended to be done face-to-face as a hard copy, but adjustments were needed to follow the IRB guidelines response to COVID-19. The time frame and adaption to academia being virtual restricted the amount of reach the study had to recruit participants.

The second limitation was the amount of faculty that participated in the research. Contacted 29 and only 10 agreed to support the thesis project (See Appendix M) (Department of Criminal Justice, n.d.). The breakdown of the faculty that responded on allowing their students to participate in the survey consisted of 4 males and 6 females. 25 % males and 46 % females of the faculty members contributed to this study. In other words, 35% of the faculty supported the project.

The third limitation was the push back received regarding this study by faculty and a student. With consultation with my thesis advisors. (See Appendix J). The response was in reaction to his attempt to invalidate my study by stating,

I did have have [sic] some questions for you. You stated, ‘How do Mexican American College Students negotiate wanting to be part of DHS with a history of categorized by systemic racism and oppression during the Trump Era?’ DHS was created in 2003 and 52% of Border Patrol Agents are Hispanic Americans. Have you considered that fact? When do you assume that systemic racism and oppression began in North America? I thought it began in the year 1492. Can we, as scholars, really the 3 year and 10 month [sic] Trump Administration to be an ‘Era’? I don’t believe that period of time meets even the black letter definition of Era. So, no I don’t suppose I really understand your premise well.

After my response of appreciating his feedback, I stated the following (See Appendix K),

I appreciate your questions. My thesis proposal was reviewed and approved by my co-chairs Dr. Rosalva Resendiz and Dr. Lucas Espinoza and committee member Dr. Cynthia Jones, she is an ethicist. In working on my thesis proposal, the literature review research pointed out that systemic oppression within the Department of Homeland Security, law enforcement, and the military are social facts. In regards to the use of the term “era,” scholars from political science to sociologists/criminologists have used the term in their research, in particular when analyzing presidential periods. The study uses Post-Colonial and Decolonizing methodologies which acknowledges the systemic issues since colonization and its effects on the structural system. I hope this explanation helps and you will support my work.

If you are interested in allowing your students in the upper-level (3000-4000 courses) to participate, please share the documents I have shared with you from the previous email.

The survey is targeting the students in the upper-level (3000-4000 courses) in the Criminal Justice program.

If you have any questions, please feel free to ask my advisors and myself. I am carbon copying them to this email so you can hit reply all and they can be up-to-date.

It is unknown if this faculty member's students participated in the study. The Criminal Justice faculty members that contacted me beyond that email communication were the faculty willing to disseminate the study to their students. All of the participating professors were from the Edinburg campus of UTRGV, which houses the face-to-face graduate program in criminal justice. The unequal support from the faculty was concerning since they are the gatekeepers for the students in learning the criminal justice curriculum.

The fourth limitation of the study is the focus on the upper-level 3000/4000 level Criminal Justice courses. The lack of focus on the other students in the undergraduate Criminal Justice Program can be expanded to see if there is a difference between lower-level and upper-level students. An additional limitation is not testing to see if the respondents know ethics by asking specific questions and looking at instruments that tested the understanding of ethics.

Future Research

Considering the findings that male students are willing to endorse U.S. racist policies, ethics needs to be a focus for future research. The study of Carol Gilligan demonstrates that there is a difference in understanding ethics between the genders (Capeheart & Milovanovic, 2007). A comparison between students in the liberal arts degrees that have taken an ethics course compared to those who have not taken the course is a way to assess differences.

Another form of research that can be examined in the future is the comparison of other liberal arts degree students compared to the students in criminal justice. The study can replicate

the methodology of this study. Future research can expand to other degrees in the liberal arts and do a focus group, as other studies have conducted in their respective fields (Wang & Calvano, 2015; Kaplan, 2006).

Future research can do a comparison to other regions on the Mexico-U.S. border, such as the universities like Arizona State University (ASU), The University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP), and Texas A&M International—these are to name a few along the southern border. The University of Texas at El Paso has a similar number of enrolled students compared to UTRGV. As reported by the UC Staff (2020), the number of enrolled students at UTEP is 24,879 for Fall 2020.

Lastly, an extension of Heyman's study can be conducted on law enforcement agents in the border regions of the US-Mexico border. A mixed methodology study should be employed to compare the conformity of the different agencies' agents and their understanding of human rights/ethics. The questionnaire can consist of having a similar framework of this thesis and extend to Heyman's approach in interviewing randomly selected or volunteer participants.

Conclusion

It is evident given the findings of this study there is still a substantial need to study MACJS wanting to pursue a career in DHS. Given the current atmosphere of racism that continues to befall our society and the systemic racism in the field of Criminal Justice. Criminal justice programs need to utilize Ethics, Ethnicity, and Social Justice studies to address the ideological hegemony. Also, there is a need to examine the racial-ethnic understanding that courses on ethics and human rights are provided in a liberal arts degree to be able to prepare students for ethical and compassionate behavior in their careers.

REFERENCES

- About Fair. (2020). *Federation for American Immigration Reform*.
<https://guides.himmelfarb.gwu.edu/APA/web-page-no-author>
- Ad Fontes Media, (n.d.) *The Media Bias Chart*. Ad Fontes Media.
<https://www.adfontesmedia.com/interactive-media-bias-chart-2/> Aguirre, A., Rodriguez, E., & Simmers, J. K. (2011). The cultural production of Mexican identity in the United States: an examination of the Mexican threat narrative. *Social Identities*, 17(5), 695–707.
- Alang, S. (2018). The More Things Change, the More Things Stay the Same: Race, Ethnicity, and Police Brutality. *American Journal of Public Health*, 108(9), 1127–1128.
- Andre, C. & Velasquez, M. (1992). Creating the Good Society. *Issues in Ethics* 5(1).
<https://www.scu.edu/mcae/publications/iie/v5n1/homepage.html>
- Applebaum, A. (2018, June 22). *The dark history behind Trump’s inflammatory language*. The Washington Post. https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/global-opinions/the-dark-history-behind-trumps-inflammatory-language/2018/06/22/54288982-7649-11e8-b4b7-308400242c2e_story.html
- Austin-Hillery, N. (2018, May 22). *Trump’s Racist Language Serves Abusive Immigration Policies*. Human Rights Watch.
<https://www.hrw.org/news/2018/05/22/trumps-racist-language-serves-abusive-immigration-policies>
- AV Press Releases. (2019, November 15). *Internal DHS Report Confirms Multiple Human Rights Violations Under the Trump Administration’s “Remain in Mexico” Policy*. America’s voice. https://americasvoice.org/press_releases/internal-dhs-report-confirms-multiple-human-rights-violations-under-the-trump-administrations-remain-in-mexico-policy/
- Barron, J. (2019, September 11). *Remembering Those Lost 18 Years Ago*. The New York Times.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/09/11/nyregion/september-11-tribute-ceremony.html>

- Bornstein, A., Charles, S., Domingo, J., & Solis, C. (2011). Police Narratives about Racial and Ethnic Identities on Patrol. *New York, NY: John Jay College*.
http://johnjay.jjay.cuny.edu/files/Bornstein_Charles_Domingo_and_Solis.pdf
- Burke, M & Rosales, B. M. (2020, June 19). *California moves toward requiring CSU students to take ethnic studies to graduate*. EdSource. <https://edsource.org/2020/california-moves-toward-requiring-csu-students-to-take-ethnic-studies-to-graduate/634101>
- Capeheart, L. & Milovanovic, D. (2007). *Social Justice: Theories, Issues, and Movements*. Rutgers University Press.
- Chavez, J.R. (2011). Aliens in their native lands: The persistence of Internal Colonial Theory. *Journal of World History*, 22(4), 785-809.
- Colliander, J. (2019) “*This is fake news*”: Investigating the role of conformity to other users’ views when commenting on and spreading disinformation in social media. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 97, 202-215.
- Cultural Traditions (n.d.). *Stanford School of Medicine*.
<https://geriatrics.stanford.edu/ethnomed/latino/fund/traditions.html>
- DHS Document Reveals Allegations of Abuse on ICE Air Deportation Flights. (2019). *Center for Human Rights University of Washington*.
<https://jsis.washington.edu/humanrights/2019/08/16/ice-air-deportation-flight-complaints/>
- DHS Inspector General Finds Egregious Rights Violations at Immigration Prisons. (2017, December 14). *National Immigrant Justice Center*. <https://immigrantjustice.org/press-releases/dhs-inspector-general-finds-egregious-rights-violations-immigration-prisons>
- Dominguez, A. (2020, January 29, 2020). *Border Patrol Chief Leaves Behind A Legacy of Abuse and Impunity*. ACLU Texas. <https://www.aclutx.org/en/news/border-patrol-chief-leaves-behind-legacy-abuse-and-impunity>
- Dunn, T. J. (2001). Border Militarization Via Drug and Immigration Enforcement: Human Rights Implications. *Social Justice*, 28(2), 7–30.
- Dukes, W. V. (2018). Measuring double consciousness among black law enforcement officers to understand the significant role of race in law enforcement occupational cultures. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*, 16(1), 1–21.
- Fensterwald, J. (2020, September 1). *California to require ethnic studies to graduate high school under bill headed to Gov. Newsom*. Ed Source. <https://edsource.org/2020/california-to-require-ethnic-studies-to-graduate-high-school-under-bill-headed-to-gov-newsom/639432>

- Fortune, E. P. (1984). Iv A Model for Recruiting and Retaining Minority Students in Criminal Justice Majors. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 7(1), 43–62.
- Gutiérrez, R. (2004). Internal Colonialism: An American Theory of Race. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race*, 1(2), 281-295.
- Gramsci, A. (2003). Hegemony. In M. Slattery (Ed.), *Key ideas in sociology* (pp. 121–126). Nelson Thornes LTD.
- Grabb, E, Baer, D, & Curtis, J (1999). The Origins of American Individualism: Reconsidering the Historical Evidence. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers canadiens de sociologie*, 24(4), 511-533.
- Greene, T. W. (2012). Three Ideologies of Individualism: Toward Assimilating a Theory of Individualisms and their Consequences. *Association for Critical Sociology*, 35(1), 117-137.
- Greenwood, J. (2018, July 24). *How Would People Behave in Milgram’s Experiment Today?* Behavioral scientist. <https://behavioralscientist.org/how-would-people-behave-in-milgrams-experiment-today/>
- Grimm, P. (2010). Social Desirability Bias. *Wiley International Encyclopedia of Marketing*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444316568.wiem02057>
- Grynbaum, M. M. & Koblin, J. (2020, Nov. 22). *Newsmax, Once a Right-Wing Also-Ran, Is Rising, and Trump Approves*. The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/11/22/business/media/newsmax-trump-fox-news.html>
- Haslam, A & Reicher, S. D. (2012). Contesting the “Nature” of Conformity: What Milgram and Zimbardo’s Studies Really Show. *PLOS Biology*, 10(11).
- Heyman, J. M. (2002). U.S. Immigration Officers of Mexican Ancestry as Mexican Americans, Citizens, and Immigration Police. *Current Anthropology*, 43(3), 479–507.
- Hernández, K. L. (2010). *Migra!: A history of the U.S. border patrol*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- History of The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley. (n.d.). *UTRGV- The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley*. <https://www.utrgv.edu/en-us/about-utrgv/history/index.htm>
- Hockman, A. (2012). Blurring Boundaries: Mexican-American Border Patrol Agents Performing Border Guard Roles and Experiencing Emotional Labor. *UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones*, 1–149.

- Homeland Security. (2017). *Concerns about ICE Detainee Treatment and Care at Detention Facilities*. <https://www.oig.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/assets/2017-12/OIG-18-32-Dec17.pdf>
- Jackson, D. R., & Henderson, H (2019). Criminal Justice Students' Perceptions and Awareness of Racism and Discrimination. *Race and Justice*, 1-24.
- Kaplan, L. E. (2006). Moral Reasoning of MSW Social Workers and the Influence of Education. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 42(3), 507-522.
- Kaptein, M. (2015). The Effectiveness of Ethics Programs: The Role of Scope, Composition, and Sequence. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 132(2), 415-431.
- Katzenstein, J. (2020, September 16). *The Wars Are Here: How the United States' Post-9/11 Wars Helped Militarize U.S. Police*. Watson Institute International & Public Affairs Brown University. (Cost of War Working Paper). https://watson.brown.edu/costsofwar/files/cow/imce/papers/2020/Police%20Militarization_Costs%20of%20War_Sept%2016%202020.pdf
- Kets, W. & Sandroni, A. (2015, November 16). *Challenging Conformity: A Case for Diversity*. Brown University. (Working Paper). [https://www.brown.edu/conference/nsf-decentralization/sites/brown.edu.conference.nsf-decentralization/files/uploads/13%20Diversity_2015-1115%20\(1\).pdf](https://www.brown.edu/conference/nsf-decentralization/sites/brown.edu.conference.nsf-decentralization/files/uploads/13%20Diversity_2015-1115%20(1).pdf)
- Kienscherf, M. (2019). Race, class and persistent coloniality: US policing as liberal pacification. *Capital & Class*, 43(3), 417–436.
- King, S. (2017). Colonial criminology: A survey of what it means and why it is important. *Sociology Compass*, 11 (3), 1-11.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & González Y González, E. M. (2008). The Search for Emerging Decolonizing Methodologies in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 14(5), 784–805.
- Lybeck, D. L. (2008) The Policy of Border Fencing between the United States and Mexico: Permeability and Shifting Functions. *Journal of Southwest*, 50(3), 335-351.
- Mahutga, M. C., & Stepan-Norris, J. (2015). Ideological Hegemony. *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*. doi: 10.1002/9781405165518.wbeosi008.pub2
- Mirande, A. (1987). *Gringo Justice*. University of Notre Dame Press.
- Moore, J. W. (1970). Colonialism: The Case of the Mexican Americans. *Social Problems*, 17(4), 463-472.
- Mordock, J. (2020, June 28). 'Morale is lower with White officers' in wake of George Floyd's death in police custody. The Washington

- Times. <https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2020/jun/28/black-cops-say-systemic-racism-exists-policing/>
- Neuman, W. L. (2000). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Nier, J. A., Gaertner, S. L., Nier, C. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2012). Can Racial Profiling Be Avoided Under Arizona Immigration Law? Lessons Learned From Subtle Bias Research and Anti-Discrimination Law. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 12(1), 5–20.
- Office of Strategic Analysis and Institutional Reporting. (n.d.-a). *University Enrollment Explorer*. Office of Strategic Analysis and Institutional Reporting (SAIR). <https://www.utrgv.edu/sair/tableaureports/universityenrollmentexplorer.htm>
- Office of Strategic Analysis and Institutional Reporting. (n.d.-b). *UTRGV Enrollment Profile Fall 2019*. https://www.utrgv.edu/sair/_files/documents/fall-2019-student-profile.pdf
- Olson, A. N. (2011). First-Generation College Students' Experiences with Social Class Identity Dissonance. (486) *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 486.
- Palafox, J. (2001). Introduction to "Gatekeeper's State: Immigration and Boundary by Policing in an Era of Globalization. *Social Justice*, 28(2), 1–5.
- Pena, V., Mineiro, M. C., & Whelan, R. M. (2014). *Federal Ethics Rules and Their Impacts on Recruiting and Retaining Federal Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Employees*. Institute for Defense Analyses.
- Price, J. H., & Payton, E. (2017). Implicit Racial Bias and Police Use of Lethal Force: Justifiable Homicide or Potential Discrimination? *Journal of African American Studies*, 21(4), 674–683.
- Quinney, R. (1979/1970). *Criminology*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Ramirez III, M (1967). Identification with Mexican Family Values and Authoritarianism in Mexican-Americans. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 77 (1), Pages 3-11.
- Rosales, F. A. (2011). Migra! A History of the U.S. Border Patrol. *Hispanic American Historical Review*, 91(3), 586–588.
- Rosenbaum, R. J. (1981) *Mexicano Resistance in the Southwest*. Southern Methodist University Press.
- Ruegger, D. & King, E. W. (1992). A study of the effect of age and gender upon student business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 179-186.

- Scott, J. (2006, Sept. 6). *9/11 Leaves Its Mark on History Classes*. The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2006/09/06/nyregion/06history.html>
- Steinmetz, G (2020). American Sociology and Colonialism, 1890-1960s. In Kelly, D. J, Jacobsen, K, and Morgan, H. M, (Eds.), *Reconsidering American Power: Pax Americana and the Social Sciences*. Oxford Scholarship Online.
- Stopping Illegal Immigration and Securing the Border. (n.d.). *Homeland Security*. <https://www.dhs.gov/stopping-illegal-immigration-and-securing-border>
- Training Resources. (n.d.). *Homeland Security*. <https://www.dhs.gov/science-and-technology/frg-training>
- UC Staff. (2020) *UTEP Reports Steady Enrollment, Increased Retention in Fall 2020*. <https://www.utep.edu/newsfeed/campus/utep-reports-steady-enrollment-increased-retention-in-fall-2020.html>
- United States Border Patrol. (2019). *Border Patrol Agent Nationwide Staffing by Fiscal Year*. United States Border Patrol. <https://www.cbp.gov/sites/default/files/assets/documents/2019-Mar/Staffing%20FY1992-FY2018.pdf>
- United States Census. (2018). *U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: Hidalgo County, Texas*. <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/hidalgocountytexas>.
- U.S. Customs and Border Protection. (n.d.). *Border Patrol History*. U.S. Customs and Border Protection. <https://www.cbp.gov/border-security/along-us-borders/history>
- UTRGV Criminal Justice Stats. (2020). *CJ Enrollment*.
- UTRGV (2020). UREGENT: Actions for Human Subject Research during COVID-19 Outbreak. University Updates/Resources Related to COVID-19. <https://www.utrgv.edu/coronavirus/updates/2020-03-21/index.htm>
- Vera, V. (2013). Border Patrol's Not-So-Secret: the Normalized Abuse of Migrant Women on the U.S.-Mexico Border. *International Affairs Review*. https://www.usfca.edu/sites/default/files/arts_and_sciences/international_studies/border_patrols_not-so-secret-_the_normalized_abuse_of_migrant_women_on_the_u.s.-mexico_border_-_university_of_san_francisco_usf.pdf
- Vinas, S. (2019) *Immigrant Detainees Say They Were Sexually Abused In CBP Custody*. NPR. <https://www.npr.org/2019/03/24/706295417/immigrant-detainees-say-they-were-sexually-abused-in-cbp-custody>

- Walker, M. B., & Andrade, M. G. (1996). Conformity in the Asch Task as a Function of Age. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 136*(3), 367-372. DOI: 10.1080/00224545.1996.9714014
- Wang, L. C., & Calvano, L. (2015). Is Business Ethics Education Effective? An Analysis of Gender, Personal Ethical Perspectives, and Moral Judgement. *Journal of Business Ethics, 126* (4), 591-602.
- Wahn, J. (2003). Sex Differences in Competitive and Compliant Unethical Work Behavior. *Journal of Business and Psychology, (18)*1,121-128.
- Winders, J. (2007). Bringing Back the (B)order: Post-9/11 Politics of Immigration, Borders, and Belonging in the Contemporary US South. *Antipode, (39)*5, 920-942.
- Yuxian, Z. 2013. The Embodiment of Individualistic Values in American Nationality. *Studies in Sociology of Science, 4*(3), 36-42.
- Zazueta-Castro, L. (2020, July 22). *CBP confirms firing, suspensions over Facebook posts*. The Monitor. <https://www.themonitor.com/2020/07/22/cbp-confirms-firings-suspensions-facebook-posts/>

APPENDIX A

IRB BOARD APPROVAL ITEMS



October 24, 2020

PI: Noe Leal

Advisor: Lucas Espinoza

Title: Examining the indoctrination of Criminal Justice Students

Re: IRB Exempt Determination for Protocol Number IRB-20-0002

Dear Noe,

A University of Texas Rio Grande Valley IRB reviewer has determined that this project meets the below criteria for Exemption under DHHS 45 CFR 46.104(d). The determination is effective as of October 24, 2020 within the exempt category of:

Category (2) Research that only includes interactions involving educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior and information obtained is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the identity of the human subjects cannot readily be ascertained, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

Research that is determined to be Exempt from IRB review is not exempt from ensuring protection of human subjects. The Principal Investigator (PI) is responsible for the following through the conduct of the research study:

1. Assuring that all investigators and co-principal investigators are trained in the ethical principles, relevant federal regulations, and institutional policies governing human subjects research.
2. Disclosing to the subjects that the activities involve research and that participation is voluntary during the informed consent process.
3. Providing subjects with pertinent information (e.g. risks and benefits, contact information for investigators, and IRB/ORC) and ensuring that human subjects will voluntarily consent to participate in the research when appropriate (e.g. surveys, interviews).
4. Assuring the subjects will be selected equitably, so that the risks and benefits of the research are justly distributed.
5. Assuring that the privacy of subjects and confidentiality of the research data will be maintained appropriately to ensure minimal risk to subjects.

Exempt research is subject to the ethical principles articulated in The Belmont Report, found at the Office of Human Research Protections (OHRP) Website:

www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/guidance/belmont.html

Brownsville • Edinburg • Harlingen



Unanticipated Problems: Any unanticipated problems or complaints must be reported to the IRB/ORC promptly. Further information concerning unanticipated problems can be found in the IRB procedures manual.

Continuing Review: Exempt research is not subject to annual review by the IRB.

Modifications: Any change to your protocol requires a Modification Request for review and approval prior to implementation. The IRB may review the exempt status at that time and request an application for approval as non-exempt research.

Closure: Please notify the IRB when your study is complete through submission of a final report. Upon notification, we will close our files pertaining to your study.

If you have any questions please contact the Office of Research Compliance by phone at (956) 665-2093 or via email at irb@utrgv.edu.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kimberly Fernandez".

Kimberly Fernandez
Senior Research Compliance Specialist
Office of Research Compliance

APPENDIX B

IRB CONSENT FORM



Online Informed Consent form

[Examining the Indoctrination of Mexican American Criminal Justice Students

This survey is being conducted by Noe Leal, Jr., Graduate student at The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley

The purpose of this study is to determine why do Mexican American College Students select a career as agents in DHS (Being Border Patrol, Custom Border Protection, Immigration, and Customs Enforcement) and how do Mexican American College Students negotiate wanting to be part of DHS with a history of categorized by systemic racism and oppression during the Trump Era?

This survey should take about 90 minutes to complete.

Participation in this research is completely voluntary. If there are any questions which you are uncomfortable with answering, feel free to discontinue answering the questions. Also, please be aware that you are entitled to withdraw from the study and terminate your participation at any time without question or comment.

Choosing not to participate will not adversely affect your grade or standing in the class.

State any inclusion/exclusion criteria such as:

You must be at least 18 years old to participate. If you are not 18 or older, please do not complete the survey.

All survey responses received will be treated confidentially and stored on a secure server. However, given that the surveys can be completed from any computer (e.g., personal, work, school), there is no guarantee of the security of the computer on which you choose to enter your responses. As a participant in this study, please be aware that certain technologies exist that can be used to monitor or record data and/or websites that are visited.

De-identified data may be shared with other researchers in the future, but will not contain information about any specific individual identity.

This research has been reviewed and approved by the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Protection (IRB). If you have any questions about your rights as a participant, or if you feel that your rights as a participant were not adequately met by the researcher, please contact the IRB at (956) 665-3598 or irb@utrgv.edu.

APPENDIX C
EMAIL RECRUITMENT FORM

The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley

Email Recruitment

Hello,

My name is Noe Leal, Jr., I am a student from the Department of Criminal Justice at the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley (UTRGV). I would like to invite you to participate in my research study to determine why do Mexican American College Students select a career as agents in DHS (Being Border Patrol, Custom Border Protection, Immigration and Customs Enforcement) and how do Mexican American College Students negotiate wanting to be part of DHS with a history of categorized by systemic racism and oppression during the Trump Era?.

This research study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRB) at the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley.

In order to participate you must be 18 years or older. Participation in this research is completely voluntary, you may choose not to participate without penalty.

As a participant, you will be asked to complete an online survey which should take about 90 minutes to complete. All data will be treated as anonymous ***because the results and names of the participants will not be accessible. The only persons that will have access to the data will be myself (the primary investigator). The participation is anonymous, meaning I will not know your information.***

If you would like to participate in this research study, please click on the survey link below and read the consent page carefully. If you would like to complete the survey, click on "I agree". If not, simply exit the web browser or click on "I do not want to participate".

Survey Link: https://utrgv.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_ekOpdSuay3aHaKN

If you have questions related to the research, please contact me by telephone at (956) 353-4430 or by email at noe.leal01@utrgv.edu.

Thank you for your cooperation!



Noe Leal Jr.
Graduate Student – Criminal Justice
Edinburg, Texas: 956-353-4430
noe.leal01@utrgv.edu
Brownsville • Edinburg • Harlingen

APPENDIX D
QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: Please circle the most appropriate answer that applies to you.

1) What is your sex?

Male Female

2) What is your age? _____

3) What is your race and/or ethnic group? (Please circle)

Mexican American White Asian American African American

Native American Other, please explain: _____

4) Are you the first in your immediate family to attend college? Yes or no.

5) What is your educational classification?

Freshman (0-29 hrs) Sophomore (30-59 hrs) Junior (70-89 hrs)

Senior (90 hrs or higher)

6a) What is your major? _____

6b) What is your minor? _____

7) Please select the courses you have taken:

- CRIJ 1301 Introduction to the Criminal Justice System
- CRIJ 1306 Courts Systems and Practices
- CRIJ 1307 Crime in America
- CRIJ 1310 Fundamentals of Criminal Law
- CRIJ 1313 Juvenile Justice System
- CRIJ 2313 Correctional Systems and Practices
- CRIJ 2328 Police Systems and Practices
- CRIJ 3303 Criminology/Nature of Crime
- CRIJ 3304 Criminal Justice Research Methods
- CRIJ 3305 Statistical Applications
- CRIJ 3310 The Constitution and Criminal Law
- CRIJ 3316 Criminal Evidence and Proof
- CRIJ 3322 Juvenile Delinquency and Justice
- CRIJ 3325 Violent Crime and Offenders
- CRIJ 3331 Legal Aspects of Corrections
- CRIJ 3341 Probation and Parole
- CRIJ 3344 Gender, Crime, and Criminal Justice
- CRIJ 4312 Principles of Law Enforcement and Supervision
- CRIJ 4313 Seminar: Issues in Law Enforcement
- CRIJ 4314 Private Security and Loss Prevention
- CRIJ 4316 Environmental Crime and Justice
- CRIJ 4320 Criminal Justice Organization and Management
- CRIJ 4321 White-Collar and Organized Crime
- CRIJ 4335 Restorative and Community Justice
- CRIJ 4341 Correctional Casework and Counseling

- CRIJ 4343 Current Issues in
Corrections
- CRIJ 4350 Peace, Nonviolence, and
Justice
- CRIJ 4355 Current Issues in Courts
- CRIJ 4356 Law and Society
- CRIJ 4357 Crime Prevention
Techniques
- CRIJ 4322 Terrorism
- CRIJ 4361 Comparative Criminal
Justice Systems
- CRIJ 4362 Special Topics in
Criminal Justice

8) Which of the following news media outlets do you use? Mark all that apply.

- ABC News
- BBC
- CBS News
- CNN
- Estrella TV
- Financial Times (FT)
- Fox News
- The Economists
- The New York Times
- The Washington Post
- Public Broadcasting Service
- Politico
- Telemundo
- Televisa
- TV Azteca
- UniMas
- Univision

9) What are your top three career choices in Criminal Justice? Please place a 1-being your most preferred, a 2 -being your second choice, and a 3-being your third option.

____ City (Crime Scene Investigation, Dispatcher, Detective, Law Enforcement, Private Security)

____ County (Bailiff, Constable, Court Security Officer Detention Officer, Jailer, Sheriff, Probation, Parole,)

____ State (Corrections Officer, Texas Department of Public Safety, Texas Rangers)

____ Federal- Department of Homeland Security (Customs & Border Protection, Immigration & Customs Enforcement, Border Patrol)

____ Federal- General (Central Intelligence Agency, Corrections Officer, Drug Enforcement Agency, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Federal Probation & Parole, National Security Agency, U.S. Marshall)

____ Social work- (Adult Protection Services or Child Protection Services, Case Management)

____ Other, please explain: _____

Directions: Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. If you feel like discontinuing the survey at any time, please leave it with the personal investigator.

10) I grew up speaking Spanish in my household.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

11) In my family we practice and respect Mexican traditions.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

12) I am proud to be of Mexican descent.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

13) I am proud to be an American.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

14) The only loyalty I have is to myself, not my family.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

15) Family is more important than my job.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

16) I have respect for elders and authority, even if they are wrong.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

17) I am obligated to support my family even when the circumstances are unethical.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

18) One of my goals is to obtain a financially stable career even if I have to leave my family

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

19) I am outspoken when people of color are mistreated.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

20) American English should be the official language of the United States.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

21) Currently, the United States is a unified country.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

22) Under the Trump Presidency, there has been less discrimination in the U.S.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

23) The US government practices racist policies.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

24) Law enforcement in the U.S. practices racial profiling.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

25) There is a lack of racial diversity in the leadership of the United States.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

26) There is a lack of gender diversity in the leadership of the United States.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

27) Undocumented immigrants entering the US are taking jobs away from US citizens.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

28) Mexican have been stereotyped negatively.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

29) The Border wall does not hurt the environment and/or endangered species.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

30) Increase in crime is due to the lack of militarization on the border.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

31) Most immigrants are violent criminals.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

32) Most immigrants are refugees seeking a better life.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

33) Undocumented children must be separated from their families in order to safeguard our national security.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

34) Deaths of immigrants are necessary/expected in detention centers.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

35) DACA (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals) recipients need to be detained and deported for they are a threat to national security.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

36) The DACA program encourages more illegal immigration.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

37) Undocumented Veterans should be deported after U.S. military service.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

38) Sanctuary Cities violate the safety of the United States by protecting asylum seekers from Customs & Border Protection.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

39) We should deny automatic citizenship to American-born children of undocumented immigrants.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

40) Part of a job, in the Criminal Justice System, is to obey orders without question.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

41) A Whistleblower should be fired immediately because they cannot be trusted, even if it is against the law.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

42) I am willing to compromise my own ethics in order to obey government orders.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

43) If I get a job with Customs Border & Protection, I am willing to arrest an undocumented family member.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

44) I would do anything for national security even if the orders are unethical, hurt families, and children.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

45) National security is more important than civil rights.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

46) I feel comfortable standing up to authority for others.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

47) I would like to have an administrative leadership position even if that means I have to implement unethical orders or actions.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

48) Eminent domain (governmental confiscation of private lands) is a sacrifice that must be accepted by landowners on the border for national security.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

49) Undocumented immigrants have the same basic human rights as US citizens.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

50) It is a human rights violation to refuse asylum seekers.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

51) There are no human rights violations committed by U.S. law enforcement on the United States/Mexico border.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

52) Detained refugees do not need to be given basic healthcare needs.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

53) A whistleblower is patriotic because they denounce unethical and/or criminal actions.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

54) The Criminal Justice curriculum has made me aware of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

55) The Zero Tolerance policy does not violate any human rights violations.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

56) U.S. policies are more important than human rights.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

57) I am willing to protest against unethical/criminal government actions, even if my career is endangered.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

58) Immigrant children who have been separated from their parents and placed up for adoption without parental consent are victims of human trafficking.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

59) Refusing entries of asylum-seekers at US ports-of-entry does not violate any human rights.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

60) The construction of the border wall does not violate any U.S. environmental laws.

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neutral 4-Agree 5-Strongly Agree

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY!

APPENDIX E

CORRELATION MATRIX

	Mexican	Female	Age	First_College	Upper_class	CNN	Fox_News	Adhere_Racist	BeingUnethical	Adhere_National Security	KnowledgeofHR
Mexican	1										
Female	-.041	1									
Age	-.139	-.022	1								
First_College	.116	.255**	.005	1							
Upper_class	.063	-.103	.083	.103	1						
CNN	.056	.068	-.173*	-.042	.104	1					
Fox_News	.017	-.182*	.009	-.091	.023	.171*	1				
Adhere_Racist	-.096	-.052	.136	-.174*	-.028	-.009	-.018	1			
BeingUnethical	.028	-.048	-.124	-.022	.107	-.086	.105	.150	1		
Adhere_National Security	.038	-.098	.002	-.022	.107	-.084	.127	.049	.646**	1	
KnowledgeofHR	.054	.103	.047	.064	.089	-.128	-.028	-.006	.160*	.335**	1

Note: N=156, **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

APPENDIX F

TABLE 1 DEMOGRAPHICS FOR STUDY

Table 1 Demographics for study				
Demographics	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	Std Deviation
Female (reference =male)	81	51.9	0.5	0.50
Age 17-22 (reference =others)	21	18.8	1.58	1.06
First Generation(reference= No)	38	32.5	0.38	0.49
Upper Class (Junior-Senior Classification reference= underclass)	101	86.3	0.83	0.37
CNN (reference=compared to others)	61	52.1	0.54	0.50
Fox News (reference=compared to others)	53	45.3	0.41	0.49
	Mean			
Adhering to Racist Policies (created the means)	2.58			
Being unethical	2.77			
Adhere to National Security	3.24			
Knowledge of Human Rights	3.11			
	Original	Restricted		
Sample Size	171	156		

APPENDIX G

TABLE 2

ORDINAL REGRESSION ESTIMATES PREDICTING CONFIDENCE IN CONFORMING TO IDEOLOGICAL HEGEMONY, UTRGV CRIMINAL JUSTICE STUDENTS, 2020

Table 2. Ordinal regression estimates predicting confidence in conforming to ideological hegemony, UTRGV Criminal Justice Students, 2020				
Indicator	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Threshold 1	-0.66**	-0.67*	1.97*	1.98*
	(0.2)	(0.28)	(0.97)	(0.96)
Threshold 2	0.08	0.004	3.08**	3.08*
	(0.20)	(0.28)	(0.99)	(0.97)
Threshold 3	0.96***	0.90*	4.30***	4.33***
	(0.22)	(0.3)	(1.02)	(1.00)
Threshold 4	2.17***	2.14***	5.74***	5.77***
	(2.89)	(0.35)	(1.06)	(1.05)
Threshold 5	4.48***	5.09***	8.79***	8.82***
	(0.73)	(1.03)	(1.45)	(1.44)

Mexican Americans pursue a career in DHS	0.16	0.06	0.01	0.001
	(0.22)	(0.23)	(0.25)	(0.25)
Female (Ref=Male)		0.300	0.52*	0.63*
		(0.19)	(0.21)	(0.21)
Age 17-22 (Ref=Others)		-0.10	-0.06	-0.060
		(0.090)	(0.100)	(0.1)
First Generation (Ref=No)		0.05	0.05	0.04
		(0.19)	(0.21)	(0.21)
Following Racist Policies			-0.05	-0.06
			(0.22)	(0.22)
Engaging in Unethical Behavior			1.41***	1.41***
			(0.19)	(0.19)
Adhere to National Security			-0.51*	-0.52*

			(0.18)	(0.18)
Knowledge of Human Rights			0.28	0.26
			(0.24)	(0.24)
CNN Channel			0.06	
			(0.2)	
Fox News Channel				0.27
				(0.2)
-2 log likelihood	35	192	375	373
Model χ^2	0.55	4.63	91.54	93.11
Pseudo R ²	0.004	0.03	0.48	0.49
Degrees of Freedom	1	4	9	9
N	156	151	147	147
*p ≤ .05 **p ≤ .01 ***p ≤ .001				

Notes: Standard errors are in parentheses. For ordinal regression, the assumption that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories is met.

APPENDIX H

TABLE 3

ORDINAL REGRESSION ESTIMATES PREDICTING CONFIDENCE IN HAVING A DIFFERENT UNDERSTANDING OF RIGHTS/ETHICS BY BEING EXPOSED TO UDHR, UTRGV CRIMINAL JUSTICE STUDENTS, 2020

Table 3. Ordinal regression estimates predicting confidence in having a different understanding of rights/ethics by being exposed to UDHR, UTRGV Criminal Justice Students, 2020				
Indicator	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Threshold 1	-9.96*	-9.46*	-3.97	-3.23
	(4.39)	(4.21)	(4.09)	(4.18)
Threshold 2	-2.88***	-2.65***	2.33	3.24
	(0.74)	(0.76)	(1.75)	(1.78)
Threshold 3	-0.32	-0.18	4.66**	5.61***
	(0.29)	(0.39)	(2.0)	(1.76)
Threshold 4	2.41***	2.59**	7.66***	8.64***
	(0.64)	(0.72)	(2.0)	(2.09)

Mexican Americans pursue a career in DHS	-0.09	0.02	0.22	0.26
	(0.32)	(0.33)	(0.37)	(0.38)
Female (Ref=Male)		0.160	0.26	0.37
		(0.27)	(0.31)	(0.32)
Age 17-22 (Ref=Others)		-0.09	-0.1	-0.73
		(0.12)	(0.15)	(0.15)
First Generation (Ref=No)		-0.1	-0.19	-0.21
		(0.28)	(0.32)	(0.33)
Following Racist Policies			1.01**	1.00**
			(0.39)	(0.38)
Engaging in Unethical Behavior			-0.02	-0.05
			(0.23)	(0.24)
Adhere to National Security			0.08	0.13
			(0.27)	(0.280)
Knowledge of Human Rights			0.710	0.87*

			(0.39)	(0.41)
CNN Channel			-0.3	
			(0.30)	
Fox News Channel				0.36
				(0.31)
-2 log likelihood	29	154	368	367
Model χ^2	0.08	0.42	13.54	14.2
Pseudo R ²	0.001	0.003	0.1	0.1
Degrees of Freedom	1	4	9	9
N	156	151	147	147
*p ≤ .05 **p ≤ .01 ***p ≤ .001				

Notes: Standard errors are in parentheses. For ordinal regression, the assumption that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories is met. There are four thresholds because not enough respondents answered the strongly disagree as an option.

APPENDIX I

INTERNAL COLONIALISM VARIABLES

Internal Colonialism Scales	Questions Associated
AdhereRacist	<p>Q23) The US government practices racist policies.</p> <p>Q24) Law enforcement in the U.S. practices racial profiling.</p> <p>Q25) There is a lack of racial diversity in the leadership of the United States.</p> <p>Q28) Mexican have been stereotyped negatively.</p>
BeingUnethical	<p>Q 41) A Whistleblower should be fired immediately because they cannot be trusted, even if it is against the law.</p> <p>Q 42) I am willing to compromise my own ethics in order to obey government orders.</p> <p>Q 44) I would do anything for national security even if the orders are unethical, hurt families and children.</p> <p>Q 47) I would like to have an administrative leadership position even if that means I have to implement unethical orders or actions.</p>

<p>AdhereNationalSecurity</p>	<p>Q43) If I get a job with Customs Border & Protection, I am willing to arrest an undocumented family member.</p> <p>Q45) National security is more important than civil rights.</p> <p>Q46) I feel comfortable standing up to authority for others.</p> <p>Q48) Eminent domain (governmental confiscation of private lands) is a sacrifice that must be accepted by landowners on the border for national security.</p>
<p>KnowledgeofHR</p>	<p>Q 49) Undocumented immigrants have the same basic human rights as US citizens.</p> <p>Q 50) It is a human rights violation to refuse asylum seekers.</p> <p>Q51) There are no human rights violations committed by U.S. law enforcement on the United States/Mexico border.</p> <p>Q52) Detained refugees do not need to be given basic healthcare needs.</p> <p>Q55) The Zero Tolerance policy does not violate any human rights violations.</p> <p>Q56) U.S. policies are more important than human rights.</p>

APPENDIX J

FACULTY RESPONSE

[REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@utrgv.edu](mailto:[REDACTED]@utrgv.edu)>

Date: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 at 2:56 PM

To: Noe Leal <noe.leal01@utrgv.edu>

Subject: Re: Thesis Survey Follow-Up •

I did have have some questions for you. You stated, “how do Mexican American College Students negotiate wanting to be part of DHS with a history of categorized by systemic racism and oppression during the Trump Era?” DHS was created in 2003 and 52% of Border Patrol Agents are Hispanic Americans. Have you considered that fact? When do you assume that systemic racism and oppression began in North America? I thought it began in the year 1492. Can we, as scholars, really the 3 year and 10 month Trump Administration to be an “Era”? I don’t believe that period of time meets even the black letter definition of Era. So, no I don’t suppose I really understand your premise well.

APPENDIX K

MY RESPONSE TO THE FACULTY MEMBER

I appreciate your questions. My thesis proposal was reviewed and approved by my co-chairs Dr. Rosalva Resendiz and Dr. Lucas Espinoza and committee member Dr. Cynthia Jones, she is an ethicist. In working on my thesis proposal, the literature review research pointed out that systemic oppression within the Department of Homeland Security, law enforcement, and the military are social facts. In regards to the use of the term "era," scholars from political science to sociologists/criminologists have used the term in their research, in particular when analyzing presidential periods. The study uses Post-Colonial and Decolonizing methodologies which acknowledges the systemic issues since colonization and its effects on the structural system. I hope this explanation helps and you will support my work.

If you are interested in allowing your students in the upper-level (3000-4000 courses) to participate, please share the documents I have shared with you from the previous email. The survey is targeting the students in the upper-level (3000-4000 courses) in the Criminal Justice program.

If you have any questions, please feel free to ask my advisors and myself. I am carbon copying them to this email so you can hit reply all and they can be up-to-date.

Best,
Noe Leal, Jr.

APPENDIX L

CRIMINAL JUSTICE FACULTY PARTICIPATION

Number	Gender	Title	Participation
1	Female	Associate Professor	Yes
2	Male	Assistant Professor	Yes
3	Female	Associate Professor	Yes
4	Female	Associate Professor	Yes
5	Female	Lecturer II	No
6	Female	Lecturer III	Yes
7	Male	Professor	No
8	Female	Part-Time Lecturer	No
9	Male	Part-Time Lecturer	No
10	Male	Assistant Professor	No
11	Female	Lecturer I	No
12	Male	Lecturer I	No
13	Male	Lecturer II	No
14	Female	Part-Time Lecturer	Yes
15	Male	Professor	No
16	Male	Lecturer II	Yes
17	Female	Professor	No
18	Male	Part-Time Lecturer	No
19	Female	Part-Time Lecturer	Yes
20	Male	Professor	No
21	Male	Part-Time Lecturer	Yes
22	Female	Lecturer II	No
23	Male	Associate Professor	Yes
24	Male	Professor	No
25	Female	Lecturer I	No
26	Male	Professor	No
27	Male	Lecturer I	No
28	Female	Lecturer I	No
29	Male	Professor	No

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Mr. Noe Leal, Jr. started his academic career at the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley (UTRGV), Fall 2014. He is a First-Generation college student and received his undergraduate degree in the Bachelor of Science Criminal Justice (BSCJ), and graduated from UTRGV in December 2020 with his Master of Science in Criminal Justice (MSCJ). Noe Leal, Jr started as a graduate research assistant at the Office for Victim Advocacy & Violence Prevention (OVAVP). He is trained as an advocate for victims and survivors of interpersonal violence. He received training from Women Together/*Mujeres Unidas*, as a volunteer advocate; the Office for Victims of Crime Training & Technical Assistance Center; and from the Men Can Stop Rape – Healthy Masculinity Training Institute. During Noe’s academic career he was invited as a panel speaker, *Paranoid Android*, and moderator, *Boundaries, and Consent*, for the Fourth Annual Coalition Against Violence and Exploitation (CAVE). He was also the conference assistant to CAVE. Noe was invited by major professors to speak in a roundtable, *Trump’s Border Politics: Myths and Facts from the Rio Grande Valley*, at the International Conference of American Society of Criminology, in San Francisco, California. Noe was appointed to discuss his thesis research project at the Confronting Structural Racism: Deconstructing/disrupting Border Narratives, National Association Chicana & Chicano Studies Tejas Foco Conference- Chicanx Praxis. Noe was elected and served as the Treasurer of Alpha Phi Sigma (APS) Criminal Justice Honor Society in January 2019 through September 2020. He was elected as President of APS in September 2020 and served until graduation. Mr. Leal is originally from Rio Grande City, Texas, and can be contacted by email at noe.leal0109@gmail.com