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ABSTRACT

Understanding public attitudes to sentencing is important given the potential impact of public confidence in the criminal justice system on law reform and the potential influence of perceptions about community attitudes toward sentencing on judicial policy. The current study comprised a partial replication of research by Carroll, Perkowitz, Lurigio and Weaver (1987) which investigated the impact of attitudes and beliefs on sentencing goal preferences in an American sample. This Australian community sample comprised 306 participants, 128 males (M = 46.33 years, SD = 15.56) and 178 females (M = 44.27 years, SD = 13.53). The relative importance of demographic characteristics, personality variables, beliefs about the causes of crime and fear of crime was investigated as predictors of attitudes towards the contrasting sentencing goals of punishment versus rehabilitation. Regression analyses found that endorsement of punishment was predicted by decreased level of education, increased authoritarianism and the belief that crime is caused by the personal characteristics of the offender. Support for rehabilitation was predicted by a set of beliefs attributing the causes of crime to the economic conditions in society and by higher satisfaction with the criminal justice system. A more detailed analysis of sentencing attitudes was obtained by clustering scores on both the punishment and rehabilitation scales. Results identified four subgroups within the sample. These subgroups were categorised as: High Punishment / High Rehabilitation, High...
Punishment / Low Rehabilitation, Low Punishment / Low Rehabilitation and Low Punishment / High Rehabilitation. Significant differences were found between the subgroups on the major study variables. For example, while educational level did not predict rehabilitation when the predictors of rehabilitation and punishment were investigated separately, the Low Punishment / High Rehabilitation group had significantly higher levels of education. Overall, results suggested that within the group who highly valued rehabilitation, differences were related to whether or not they also emphasised punishment as a goal of sentencing. Although authoritarianism scores were higher in the subgroups that endorsed punishment as a goal of sentencing, irrespective of their views on rehabilitation, authoritarianism was lower amongst educated participants who believed that crime was caused by the economic and social conditions in society. While fear of crime was not a significant predictor of punitive sentencing preferences when the punishment dimension was considered separately, fear of crime was significantly higher in subgroups that placed a high value on punishment irrespective of their beliefs about rehabilitation. Results highlight the importance of moving beyond conceptualising punishment and rehabilitation as separate unrelated dimensions and to consider the manner in which these dimensions interact to produce separate community groups.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Sentencing is a highly public issue often characterised by diverse and at times competing perspectives about what the justice system should try to achieve. This research investigates community attitudes towards the contrasting sentencing goals of punishment versus rehabilitation. This study partially replicates American research by Carroll, et al. (1987) who proposed a framework of attitudes, beliefs and personality characteristics thought to influence sentencing goal preferences. The impact of demographic characteristics, personality variables, beliefs and fear of crime on attitudes toward punishment versus rehabilitation is investigated. The predictors of fear of crime and the impact of fear of crime on sentencing goal preferences are examined and attitudes toward a range of sentencing strategies explored. Research on public attitudes to sentencing is important because of the impact public opinion and confidence in the criminal justice system may have on law reform (Roberts & Indermaur, 2007) and because perceptions about public attitudes to sentencing may influence judicial policy (Quimet & Coyle, 1991). The aim of this chapter is to place the current study in its context, describe the key variables and outline the aims and organisation of the research.
Background to the Study

Research in Western societies suggests that beliefs about the goals of sentencing range widely from the view that the primary aim of sentencing should be the punishment of offenders to the belief that sentencing should be aimed at rehabilitation of offenders. In recent decades, restorative approaches to justice have also emerged that incorporate elements of both retributive and rehabilitative justice and aim to address the needs of both offenders and victims (Daly, 2000; Daly, Hayes & Marchetti, 2006).

The Sentencing Act 1991 (Vic) defines five principles of sentencing that accommodate both punitive and rehabilitative objectives (Birgden, 2006). Principles central to the sentencing of offenders include just punishment, deterrence, rehabilitation, denunciation of offender conduct and the protection of the community. While sentencing is referred to as the imposition and administration of punishment (Findlay et al., 1999), a process with several competing aims (Bronitt & McSherry, 2001), the general purposes of sentencing typically refer to the aims of punishment or retribution, deterrence and rehabilitation (Findlay et al., 1999). In sentencing criminal offenders, deprivation of liberty is usually justified in terms of protection of the community (Birgden, 2006) and reflects the community’s desire for
retribution (Murugason & McNamara, 1997) and punishment of the offender in proportion to the harm caused (Bronnit & McSherry, 2001).

In Australia, new policy initiatives have established directions for reform to traditional retributive criminal justice processes. Problem oriented approaches aim to address disadvantage and the underlying causes of offending for those who are over-represented in the criminal justice system including defendants with mental impairment, drug dependence or homelessness (Birgden 2006). Despite these initiatives, the past four decades have seen an increase in the use of incarceration in Australia (Dawes, 2006). There appears to be little evidence of consensus about the goals of sentencing (Findlay, Odgers & Yeo 2003) and there are widespread differences in community opinion about what a criminal justice system should try to achieve. While some groups criticise sentencing practices they regard as too punitive, others criticise practices they consider to be too lenient.

Given that sentencing policies appear to be responsive to public concerns about crime (Hessing, Keijser & Elffers, 2001) and are partly based on claims that they meet public demand for punishment and justice (Quimet & Coyle, 1991), it is important to investigate whether judicial policy is commensurate with community attitudes toward sentencing (Roberts & Indermaur, 2007). While political expediency linked to public fears and anxieties about crime and criminals may be
useful in explaining a rise in the use of punitive criminal justice methods, the sentencing attitudes of the public may in reality, be more moderate and more complex than often assumed (Montorosso, 2008). Investigating the predictors of attitudes to punishment is important in understanding the nature of punitive beliefs (Indermaur & Roberts, 2007), how punitive attitudes toward offenders arise (Langworthy & Whitehead, 1986) and in evaluating public satisfaction with changes to penal practice (Indermaur & Roberts, 2007). Indemaur (1994) pointed out that confusion about the effectiveness of sentencing was reflected in the uncertainty of the courts, the public and offenders regarding the purposes of sentencing. He argued that the lack of psychological insight about the sentencing process is important because it allows the system to continue functioning in its present form.

The current study both partially replicates and extends Carroll et al.’s (1987) American research that investigated the impact of demographic variables, personality characteristics and beliefs about the causes of crime on attitudes toward punishment versus rehabilitation as the preferred goal of sentencing. This study explores whether Carroll et al.’s model remains relevant following two decades of significant economic, social and political change across the world and by investigating whether it can be applied across cultures to an Australian community sample.
Movements for social change in the past two decades have called for more humane and effective responses to offenders and victims in the criminal process. In the 1990’s alternative forms of criminal justice practice emerged including restorative justice that aims to address the needs of both offenders and victims, therapeutic jurisprudence that focuses attention on the impact of the law on emotional life and psychological wellbeing (Daly, Hayes & Marchetti, 2006) and Indigenous justice practices that provide indigenous people with a central role in responding to crime (Daly et al., 2006). These approaches emphasise the need for more effective forms of communication relating to rehabilitation and reintegration of offenders back into the community. Despite these reforms, indications of public dissatisfaction with the justice system were shown by Roberts and Indermaur (2007). Their analysis of the Australian Social Survey (2003) found that 70% of respondents were dissatisfied with the severity of sentencing decisions handed down by the judiciary and a further 70% advocated harsher sentencing strategies.

Investigating community attitudes to sentencing is important given the potential impact of public opinion on the development and direction of criminal justice policy (Roberts & Indermaur, 2007). Responses to crime may shift the direction of policy toward reform of traditional retributive measures, or toward reinforcement of established
penal practices (Daly et al., 2006). This study contributes to an understanding of the demographic characteristics, attitudes and beliefs found to underpin preferences for punitive sentencing policy (Roberts & Indermaur, 2007) and may provide further insight into public resistance to reform of the criminal justice system.

Although research has traditionally focused on the oppositional contrast between retributive and rehabilitative approaches to criminal justice, Daly (2000) suggested that the focus of criminal justice practice could more usefully incorporate elements of both traditional retributive methods and rehabilitative strategies. She suggested that while restorative justice practices incorporate retributive justice assumptions of individual culpability, they also coexist with a strong stance toward rehabilitation and reintegration of offenders back into society. Daly’s perspective highlights the potential for community members to support multiple justice principles and a combination of both punishment and rehabilitative methods in sentencing criminal offenders. An obstacle to widespread societal acceptance of restorative justice practices appears to be community attitudes toward punishment (Montorosso, 2007). Community subgroups that potentially influence criminal justice policy may differ not only in their support of punitive sentiment, but also in the way they think about sentencing that incorporates both punishment and rehabilitative goals.
The current study extends Carroll et al.’s (1987) research by exploring whether cluster analysis would identify meaningful subgroups with patterns of scores on punishment and rehabilitation scales and whether these subgroups differ from each other on the major study variables. Roberts and Indermaur (2005) linked an increase in punitive attitudes amongst women and the elderly to increased personal and social vulnerability experienced by these groups. Roberts and Indermaur (2007) found a strong cluster of beliefs about crime and justice underpinned punitive attitudes to punishment. The current research may add to our understanding about the endorsement of punitive attitudes of particular subgroups of the population who may be identified by their demographic and personality characteristics and by their beliefs about crime. This research is important given that subgroups of the population potentially exert strong influence on policy decisions and the direction of reform within the criminal justice system.

Fear of crime is another variable thought to influence attitudes towards sentencing, with some studies reporting increased fear associated with more punitive attitudes (Sprott & Doob, 1997) and other studies disputing this assertion (Quimet & Coyle, 1991). While it seems intuitively reasonable to assume that fear generates advocacy of more severe sentencing preferences, further research is needed to clarify the role of fear of crime in community attitudes toward sentencing. If
criminal justice policies are based on the assumption that the public fears crime and consequently demands more punitive sentences, then more research is needed to determine the extent to which these assumptions may be flawed. It is also important to explore the potential impact of type of crime on sentencing goal preferences given that some crimes, such as violent personal crime, arouse more fear than other crimes directed at property (Ferraro & LaGrange, 1992). The predictors of personal crime, property crime and terrorist crime are also explored.

Goals of Sentencing

In Australia there is considerable controversy surrounding the issue of sentencing those found guilty of a criminal offence. While there is broad agreement on the need for punishment of some sort, there is ambiguity regarding the aims of sentencing and divisions over the way in which penalties are to be justified and most fairly and effectively imposed (Findlay et al., 2003). In countries like Australia, the purpose of the criminal justice system is both symbolic and practical (Daly, 2006). Policies and practices are required to symbolically represent and reinforce what is collectively understood as right and wrong behaviour and the state, acting in the interests of the wider community, is required to respond to crime in practical ways by implementing strategies aimed at crime prevention and crime reduction (Daly, 2006). The general purposes
of sentencing typically refer to the aims of punishment or retribution, deterrence and rehabilitation (Findlay et al., 1999).

**Punishment**

Punishment has been identified as an essential element of the process of criminal justice in Australia (Finlay et al., 2003). The purpose of punishment is to deter individuals from violating the laws of the state, to prevent people from interfering with the rights of others and to enable the state to maintain social order (White & Haines, 2004). The importance of punishment is related to the need for the public to feel confident that those who deliberately harm others are justly punished (Davies & Raymond, 1999). From the public point of view, the judicial act of passing sentence can have symbolic significance (Parfitt, 1996). An offender is punished to prevent them at least symbolically from gaining benefits they may receive from breaking the law and to prevent the community from taking retaliatory action (Findlay et al., 2003). Retribution has been referred to as an important aim of punishment (Bronitt & McSherry, 2001) and is the leading goal of punishment in the Western world (Bagaric, 2000). Retribution is based on the principle of proportionality (Bronitt & McSherry, 2001), with severity of punishment in proportion to severity of harm caused to the offender.
Deterrence

Deterrence is primarily focused on prevention of harm and protection of the public (Ashworth, 1991). The primary aim of deterrence is to discourage individuals from engaging in future criminal activity (Bronitt & McSherry, 2001; Findlay et al., 2003). Imprisonment is traditionally thought to be an effective deterrent and means of reducing the crime rate (Davies & Raymond, 1999). The effect of deterrence is two fold. While ‘general’ deterrence is designed to inhibit others from committing a similar crime, ‘special’ deterrence prevents the offender being sentenced from committing other offences (White & Haines, 2004). For punishment to fulfil its purpose of deterrence, the punishment must evoke a sense of fear of the consequences of criminal behaviour (Murugason & McNamara, 1997).

Rehabilitation

The aim of rehabilitation, like deterrence, is concerned with prevention of crime by influencing offenders away from future criminal activity toward more lawful behaviour (Findlay et al., 2003). Rehabilitation assumes that crime results from personal deficiencies or inadequacies and attention is focused on the individual offender (Blackburn, 1992). The justification of rehabilitation as the goal of sentencing is based on the idea that identification of the causes for the
offence enables effective strategies to be developed that potentially
change an offender’s moral view of crime and thereby reduce the risk of
re-offending behaviour (Bagaric, 2000; Davies & Raymond, 1999).
Research has suggested that positive outcomes for offenders are more
likely when rehabilitation programs are based on psychological theory
and target criminogenic needs (Howells & Day, 1999), an approach that
is centred on certain risk factors associated with initial and subsequent
offending (Andrews & Bonta, 1998; Ward & Stewart, 2003). These
factors may include anti-social attitudes and feelings and difficulties
with problem solving skills or substance abuse (Howells & Day, 1999;
Ogloff, 2002).

Current Sentencing Trends

There have been shifts over time in preferred forms of
punishment and in recent decades, countries like Australia have
witnessed the rise of new forms of justice. While one trend appears to be
‘ground-breaking’, seeking to change existing practice and administer
justice differently, the other appears more ‘standard,’ seeking to
strengthen established criminal justice practices and administer justice in
efficient, and arguably more punitive ways (Daly, Hayes & Marchetti,
2006).
Proponents of change have advocated more inclusive practices such as restorative justice that holds offenders accountable for their crimes, practices that enable Indigenous people to participate in the justice process and more therapeutic approaches to justice that focus on rehabilitation and the wellbeing of the offender (Freiberg, 2002). A primary goal of restorative justice is the prevention of recidivism and it considers the rights of the community or victims of crime as distinct from the state (Zehr, 1998). This model is used in the treatment of sex offenders in countries like Australia, North America, the United Kingdom and New Zealand (Birgden & Vincent, 2000) and contains elements of both retributive and rehabilitative justice (Daly, 1999).

Despite new trends in criminal justice practice, the last 40 years have seen a dramatic increase in the prison population in Australia (Dawes, 2006). Prison building programs have increased and offenders are sentenced to longer periods of imprisonment both here and in the United States (Davies & Raymond, 2000; Mauer, 2004). In his discussion on the development of prisons in Australian society, Dawes (2006) reported a dramatic increase over the past 15 years in the use of imprisonment in Australia. According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics data for September 2004, 93% of the prison population were males with an imprisonment rate of 297 per 100,000 adult males. A total of 7% of the total prisoner population were female with an
imprisonment rate of 21 per 100,000 females (ABS, 2004). More than half the prisoners (58%) were reported as previously having served a prison sentence. Statistics for June 2004 (ABS, 2004) indicated that indigenous Australians make up 21% of the prison population and as Dawes (2006) pointed out, are imprisoned at a rate that is approximately 11 times that of other Australians.

There is also evidence that people with severe mental illness are more likely to be convicted of crimes than are mentally healthy individuals and tend to be incarcerated for longer periods (Lamberti, Weisman, Schwarzkopf, Price, Ashton & Trompeter, 2001). Although a weak association between mental disorder and violent behaviour has been demonstrated, it appears limited to people with mental illness not receiving treatment and who have a history of violence or substance abuse. (Steadman, Mulvey, Monahan, Robbins, Appelbaum, Grisso, Roth & Silver, 1998). If there is no fundamental causal link between mental illness and criminal behaviour, other factors must explain the over-representation of people with mental illness in the criminal justice system. Increasing criminalisation of mentally ill people highlights the importance of research investigating attitudes toward sentencing and may contribute to our understanding about whether the views of the community contribute to this social problem.
The rise in the prison population in Australia is similar to the trend observed in the United States. Mauer (2004) reported a 5-fold increase in the prison population in the United States from 330,000 in 1972 to 2.1 million in 2004. He argued that the dramatic increase in the use of incarceration as a sentencing option can be attributed to policies designed to imprison more people for longer periods of time, rather than to crime rates. He pointed out for example, that from 1980-1996 the prison population in the United States tripled. While 88% of the rise was due to changes in policy, only 12% was due to changes in levels of crime. Mauer argued that the trend toward more punitive policies has led to the expansion of mandatory sentencing practices and restriction on parole release.

The increasing prison rates observed in Australia and in the United States raise questions about the impact of imprisonment on crime and its consequences for society. As Monterosso (2007) suggests, a combination of both traditional retributive methods and the rehabilitative nature of restorative justice may contribute substantially to an improvement in the nature of the criminal justice system, although he notes that mainstream societal acceptance of restorative justice principles remains problematic.
The Effectiveness of Current Sentencing Practices

Critics of current sentencing practices have suggested that despite the growing trend toward more and longer prison sentences, imprisonment is only marginally related to crime reduction and rarely achieves most, and never achieves all, of the goals of sentencing (Davies & Raymond, 1999). Even if the importance of imprisonment is acknowledged as a necessary option in order to punish effectively in some cases and to satisfy a community sense of justice, it can be argued that imprisoning more people for longer periods of time is an expensive and ineffective strategy in its capacity to rehabilitate or deter future offenders (Davies & Raymond, 2000).

Although imprisonment is intended to communicate to an offender that they have received just punishment, many offenders lack remorse and express hostility toward the justice system (Indermaur, 1994). In his investigation of offenders’ beliefs about sentencing, Indermaur reported that of the 53 offenders that were interviewed in Western Australia (50 of whom were repeat offenders), half of the participants expressed no remorse for their activities and saw themselves as victims of an unfair criminal justice system. In view of his results Indermaur suggested that imprisonment offers limited success in terms of specific or general deterrence.
Critics of deterrence as a sentencing goal have suggested that it relies on predictions of prospective future criminal behaviour which potentially may or may not occur (Murugason & McNamara, 1997). Sentences may subsequently be inaccurate. Critics have also argued that general deterrence makes generalisations about what motivates offenders to commit crimes and attempts to cease criminal activity without knowing exactly why people engage in criminal behaviour (Bronitt & McSherry, 2001).

Although the prospect of imprisonment may deter some categories of offenders such as white collar offenders or police officers, the general deterrent effect on potential offenders is quite small (Indermaur, 1994). Mauer (2004) reported that since 1976 when capital punishment was ruled to be constitutional in the United States, more than 900 people have been executed and 3,500 were awaiting execution. Despite the implementation of the death penalty, Mauer pointed out that capital punishment had no deterrent effect on crime or murder in particular. He argued that incarceration may actually have a counterproductive impact on crime because an offender is unable to function as a parent or worker, upsetting the social bonds between families and neighbourhoods that normally contribute to public safety. He pointed out that in 2004 there were 1.5 million children in the United States who had a parent in prison and for African American children, 1
in 14 children had a parent imprisoned on any given day. He suggested that for these children, the loss of financial and psychological support and the shame and stigma associated with having a parent in prison has a profound impact on their lives.

Punishment should not be mistaken for rehabilitation or deterrence (Davies & Raymond, 1999). When rehabilitation is the goal of sentencing, the type of sentence handed down is regarded as therapeutic and specific to the needs of the offender (Findlay et al., 2003). While rehabilitation has been criticised by politically conservative groups as a ‘soft option’ in addressing the problem of crime (Blackburn, 1992), others have suggested that rehabilitation is the most constructive form of deterrence, particularly in the case of young offenders who have the potential for successful re-integration back into society (Davies & Raymond, 1999). Schemes to target and help families and communities most at risk of producing youthful offenders and investment in drug treatment and school completion programs may produce higher levels of crime reduction than an expansion of the prison system (Davies & Raymond, 2000; Mauer, 2004). Restorative justice practices may allow offenders the opportunity to be rehabilitated or reintegrated back into the community encouraging new psychological and practical strategies to reduce repeat offending (Darley & Pittman, 2003).
Ambiguity of Sentencing Goals

The criminal justice system now appears to be characterised by ambiguity of sentencing aims and inconsistency in justice policies and practice (Findlay, et al., 2003). Linked to conflicts about aims are conflicts over beliefs about what the criminal justice system ‘ought’ to be doing. The contrasting aims of sentencing appear to promote policies that are in conflict with one another. While retribution as a sentencing goal is primarily retrospective in nature with a focus on seriousness of the offence, culpability of the offender and the severity of penalties (Findlay et al., 2003), it may be considered to be a just, deserved and morally good reaction to past criminal activities that have disturbed the moral balance in society (Hessing, Keijser & Elffers, 2001). In contrast, deterrence and rehabilitation take a more prospective approach with a view to positive consequences and future crime reduction (Findlay et al., 2003; Lichtenberg, 2001). More recent initiatives such as restorative justice emphasises the importance of conflict resolution through the restitution of wrongs and losses created by the offender (Hessing et al., 2001) with a view to repair or compensate for the harm caused by the offence (Walgrave, 1994) and to reduce repeat offending (Davies & Raymond, 2000).

Ambiguity of sentencing goals has a range of consequences for the effective administration of justice. Findlay et al. (2003) suggested
that ambiguity in sentencing goals has generated an ‘intuitive’ approach to sentencing decisions, with judges required to select the most appropriate sentencing aim for a particular case based on factors such as the evidence, the relevance of sentencing laws and current public attitudes towards the offence, the offender and punishment. They suggested that selecting the aims of sentencing has become a highly subjective task and a practice that can lead to sentencing disparity. They argued that ambiguity of sentencing aims is compounded by factors including frequent shifts in sentencing reform policy, the perceived need by some politicians and judges for sentencing aims to reflect community expectations and attitudes toward punishment and divided community opinion over the priority that should be given to the competing justifications for punishment. This raises the important issue of what is actually known about community attitudes to sentencing. If judges and politicians are utilising perceived public attitudes to make decisions about punishment, then an important area of research and an essential aim of this study, is to set aside assumptions and clarify what community attitudes to sentencing actually are in Australia.

The reported ineffectiveness of current sentencing practices and ambiguity of sentencing goals gives rise to the important question of whether offenders are imprisoned too often or not enough. It also highlights the need for ongoing evaluation of the goals of sentencing to
inform public and professional debate about the purposes of imprisonment and the best way of achieving them.

A Shared Understanding of Sentencing Goals

It can be argued that one of the major causes of injustice in the system of sentencing in Australia is the absence of any clear articulation of sentencing aims (Findlay et al., 2003). This perspective is reflected in European research by Keijser (2000) who highlighted the need for a commonly shared understanding regarding the justification and goals of punishment and the way they should relate to actual sentences. He has argued that because punishment can be regarded as a morally problematic practice it needs a consistent moral justification.

Keijser (2000) investigated whether a clear and consistent link could be established between the goals of punishment derived from moral legal theory and the Dutch practice of punishment. He reasoned that if there was a consistent moral framework that underpinned the practice of punishment then it should in some way be reflected in practice. Almost half of all judges working full time in the criminal law divisions of the Dutch district courts and courts of appeal participated in the study. Penal attitudes were measured and four vignettes were presented to the judges based on a selection of real cases heard by criminal courts in the Netherlands. The study explicitly focused on
judges’ penal attitudes and goals of sentencing. Keijser could not establish a link between the goals of punishment and the practice of punishment. He found that in specific criminal cases there was no agreement on the goals of punishment. Sentences in the same criminal case differed widely and no consistent patterns of association between goals and sentences were found. Keijser concluded that there was no consistent moral framework underpinning the practice of punishment in the Netherlands and suggested that his study highlighted the possibility of judges being influenced by external factors such as short term criminal policies and media sensationalism regarding criminal justice decisions.

Other researchers have argued that one of the main reasons for having a penal system in a democracy is to bring punishment as a means of social control under the supervision of the state to prevent escalating retaliations between perpetrators and victims (Hessing et al., 2001). Hessing et al. suggested that it can therefore be expected that the goals of punishments held by judges as state representatives should reflect the main goals of punishments held by the general population. To ascertain whether this was the case they compared the goals of punishment of judges with the penal attitudes among the Dutch public. They distinguished among the public two dominant penal attitudes: harsh treatment and rehabilitation. Hessing et al. found that the public
demonstrated significantly higher scores on measures of harsh treatment for offenders as well as a whole range of punishment goals indicating a more punitive attitude than did judges. These findings raise questions about what the Australian public think the goals of sentencing should be.

Sentencing Goals and Public Opinion

The notion of justice which is posited as the hallmark of good sentencing practice is very much connected to public opinion (Findlay et al., 2003). Over the past several decades, periodic surveys have questioned the Australian public regarding support for policies involving the sentencing of criminal offenders. Indermaur and Roberts (2005) utilised data from the Australian Survey of Social Attitudes 2003 to explore perceptions of crime and criminal justice across Australia. They reported that the majority of respondents (70%) were dissatisfied with the legal system and were punitive in their attitudes toward sentencing. Respondents who wanted sentencing practices to reflect public opinion also tended to endorse harsh sentencing strategies including reinstatement of the death penalty for murder. Indermaur and Roberts linked negative public opinion about crime trends and lack of confidence in the courts to an inaccurate perception that the crime rate was rising.
Research has highlighted the different values placed by different groups in society on the varying purposes of sentencing. Findlay et al. (2003) have suggested that in the context of sentencing, the public would consider that justice was done if the sentence was sufficiently severe and there was consistency in sentencing. However, while judges might consider a sentence to be sufficiently severe, the public may think otherwise. Such disagreement undermines the ability of the judge to select a sentence that is just by community perceptions.

Johnston (2000) has argued that what is needed is a system that allows ‘properly informed’ public opinion to be taken into account in the criminal justice process including the construction and implementation of laws. According to Freiberg (2000) ‘properly informed’ means ‘being aware of the reality of crime and punishment’ (p. 6). He argued that research into public opinion and sentencing has found that respondents with more information about an offence are less punitive in their response to sentencing vignettes or simulated sentencing exercises than respondents who were given little information.

Recent research by Lovegrove (2008) supports this suggestion. Lovegrove found that when members of the public were made aware of the full facts of various violent criminal cases and details about the offenders, the public was less likely than judges to jail criminals for long periods of time. The finding that the more the public know, the less
punitive they tend to be, suggests that recent trends of increasing sentences and higher imprisonment rates (Dawes, 2006) may be based on inaccurate opinions about what the community want in regard to sentencing. Lovegrove’s research highlights the importance of not only improving public knowledge of crime and criminal justice, but also improving the quality of information available to the news media that inform the public (Sotirovic, 2001).

Variables Predicting Sentencing Goals

Attitudes toward the goals of sentencing are a key factor in the shift toward change in penal policy. Research has identified a range of variables thought to predict sentencing goals including demographic variables, personality variables, beliefs about the causes of crime and fear of crime.

Demographic Variables

Numerous studies have investigated the demographic predictors of punitive attitudes toward criminal offenders. Some studies have found that punitiveness increases with age (Indermaur & Roberts, 2005; Roberts & Indermaur, 2007), while other studies have reported no consistent relationship (Kury & Ferdinand, 1999). Research has found a significant relationship between punitiveness and gender with males demonstrating
more punitive attitudes toward offenders than females (Roberts & Indermaur, 2007). Punitive attitudes have also been shown to become less positive with increased years of education (Dowler, 2003; Roberts & Indermaur, 2007). Roberts and Indermaur (2007) suggest that an increased level of education over time may create the potential to reduce the level of punitiveness in the Australian community.

Hessing, et al. (2001) identified a range of demographic variables thought to predict attitudes to sentencing amongst the Dutch public. They distinguished among the public two dominant penal attitudes: harsh treatment and rehabilitation. They related these two penal attitudes to three groups of variables: demographic variables, attitudes with respect to the problem of criminality and political preference. They found that demographic variables, attitude variables and political affiliation were able to explain 17% of the variance in support for harsh treatment with level of education as the most important contributor, followed by attitudes with regard to crime and political affiliation. In the case of rehabilitation, the explained variance was lower (3.6%) with religiousness as the most important contributor followed by political affiliation.
Personality Variables

Research investigating attitudes toward sentencing has found that punishment as the preferred goal of sentencing was endorsed by individuals with authoritarian personality characteristics (Carroll et al., 1987). Investigation of the impact of authoritarianism on sentencing goal preferences may contribute to our understanding of the factors that underlie punitive beliefs and the nature of community resistance to change in traditional criminal justice practices. Exploring the relationship between anxiety and sentencing goal preferences is important given that individuals with high levels of anxiety have been shown to be more fearful of crime (Vitelli & Endler, 1993) and that increased fear of crime is associated with more punitive attitudes toward sentencing (Langworthy & Whitehead, 1986; Sprott & Doob, 1997).

Authoritarianism

The authoritarian personality was identified by Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson and Sanford (1950) as a pervasive tendency to condemn, reject and punish those who violate conventional moral values. Authoritarianism has been identified as an important predictor of more punitive attitudes toward offenders with a range of studies finding that jurors with high levels of authoritarianism are more rigid, intolerant and more prone toward the rendering of guilty verdicts (Mitchell &
Byrne, 1973; Moran & Comfort, 1986). A positive relationship has been found between authoritarianism and support for the death penalty (Moran & Comfort, 1986) and between authoritarianism and reliance on harsher sentencing strategies (Ryckman, Burns & Robbins, 1986). Studies have also shown that high scorers on authoritarianism are more likely to judge an offender as responsible for an offence, more likely to see the offence as serious and more likely to judge the offender as deserving the penalty than were low scorers on authoritarianism (Feather, 1996; 1998).

While traditional authoritarianism refers to respect for any type of authority and for following orders (Adorno et al., 1950), research has also focused on ‘legal’ authoritarianism referring to authoritarian beliefs about the legal system (Narby, Cutler & Moran, 1993). Narby et al., found that high scores on both traditional and legal authoritarianism were associated with high levels of punitiveness and the tendency to convict a criminal defendant. Studies have found legal authoritarian measures to be more highly correlated with type of verdict (Narby et al., 1993) and with a belief in the defendant’s guilt than traditional authoritarian measures (Chapdelaine & Griffin, 1997).
Anxiety

Anxiety is commonly characterised as a generally aversive feeling of tension and apprehension. Speilberger (1972) conceptualised anxiety both as a transitory emotional state and as a relatively stable personality trait. He theorised that anxiety could be experienced as a temporary emotional response to a specific situation, or as a personality trait characterised by a more pervasive tendency to experience elevated levels of anxiety across a range of different situations. Although research has found a positive relationship between anxiety and fear of crime (Vitelli & Endler, 1993; Norris & Kaniasty, 1994), there is little research on the impact of anxiety on attitudes toward sentencing. Investigating the role of anxiety in sentencing goal preferences is important given Speilberger’s (1973) suggestion that increased trait anxiety is associated with the tendency to appraise the world as threatening or dangerous. Individuals with high levels of trait anxiety have been shown to fear crime (Vitelli & Endler, 1993), a factor that may generate an increased desire for sentencing goals aimed at crime prevention.

The characteristics of the authoritarian personality as described by Adorno et al. (1950) and Tosi, Fagan and Frumkin (1968) suggest that highly authoritarian individuals tend to be more insecure, defensive and threatened than individuals with low levels of authoritarianism.
Given that perceived threat was found to be an important antecedent of authoritarian beliefs and behaviours (Doty et al., 1991), highly anxious people may advocate punishment of offenders in an effort to gain some sense of control over concerns about personal danger and a perceived lack of confidence to cope with the threat. Exploring a possible link between anxiety, authoritarianism and attitudes toward sentencing goals may add to our understanding about the nature of punitive beliefs and the factors that may contribute to community resistance to criminal justice reform.

Beliefs about the Causes of Crime

Research in Australia has shown that punitive beliefs about crime and criminal justice underpin punitive attitudes and provide insight into public demands for harsher sentencing (Roberts & Indermaur, 2007). Studies have found that beliefs about the causes of crime are related to attitudes toward sentencing. Hogarth (1971) found that the individual penal philosophies of judges were related to their beliefs about the causes of crime. While participants espousing rehabilitation attributed crime to socio-economic factors and believed many offenders to be mentally ill, participants preferring punishment attributed crime to low intelligence and alcoholism and believed few offenders to be mentally ill.
Carroll et al. (1987) proposed a model to explain an underlying pattern of attitudes, beliefs and personality variables thought to effect variation in sentencing goals. Their proposed model suggested an ordering of variables beginning with more fundamental and general characteristics, including demographic and personality variables, which then lead to more specific beliefs about crime derived from an individual’s previous knowledge of crime, criminal offenders and society. They suggested that this set of demographic and personality variables and beliefs about crime then contribute to sentencing goal preferences and to sentencing decisions.

Carroll et al. (1987) conducted two studies, one with law and criminology student participants and one with probation officers from the Chicago area. They developed measures of sentencing goals and beliefs about the causes of crime and related these to measures of ideology, personality and demographic information. Carroll et al. found that demographic variables, authoritarianism and beliefs about the causes of crime were significant predictors of sentencing goals. High scores on authoritarianism together with the belief that crime is caused by the personal characteristics of the individual significantly predicted endorsement of punishment as the goal of sentencing. Endorsement of punishment also increased with age. Rehabilitation as the goal of sentencing was predicted by the belief that crime is caused by social or
economic conditions in society. Carroll et al.’s proposed model suggesting an underlying coherent pattern among variables including sentencing goals, beliefs about the causes of crime, ideology and personality was supported by their results.

_Fear of Crime_

Although research has suggested that fear of crime may play a role in the formation of more punitive attitudes toward sentencing, the issue remains controversial. While some studies support the notion that higher fear levels are associated with more punitive sentencing attitudes (Langworthy & Whitehead, 1986; Sprott & Doob, 1997), other studies dispute this assertion (Quimet & Coyle, 1991). Investigating the impact of fear of crime on sentencing goal preferences is important given that criminal justice policy may be guided by the assumption that the community is highly fearful of crime and demands tougher sentencing when in reality, this assumption may be flawed.

A wide range of variables have been associated with higher levels of fear of crime. Variables including seriousness of crime (Warr, 1984), reporting of crime in the news media (Williams & Dickenson, 1993) and perceived risk of crime (Warr, 1984) have all been associated with elevated levels of fear. Feather’s (1996) research suggested that an offender’s perceived responsibility for an offence and the perceived
seriousness of an offence are key variables that influence judgements that an offender deserves to be punished. The more serious an offence was perceived to be the more the offender was seen to deserve the penalty and the more likely participants were to judge the penalty as too lenient or not harsh enough. Failure to incorporate measures of these types of perceptual variables in studies relating to fear of crime may distort the impact of demographic and crime related variables on sentencing attitudes (Meithe & Lee, 1984).

Other variables including gender (Keane, 1992; Smith & Torstenson, 1997), age (Pantazis, 2000) vulnerability (Hale, 1996) and the effects of direct and indirect victimisation (Smith & Hill, 1991) have also been associated with higher levels of fear. While some studies suggest that fear of crime is higher among the elderly (Ortega & Myles, 1987), other studies dispute these findings (Ferraro & LaGrange, 1992). Conflicting results have also been reported on the impact of previous victimisation on fear of crime. While some studies have reported higher levels of fear among previous victims (Kury & Ferdinand, 1998), others have found no significant relationship between these variables (Hill, Howell & Driver, 1985). Fear of crime can have a significant impact on the life of an individual, prompting people to psychologically withdraw from community life (Skogan, 1986), engage in extreme forms of crime preventive behaviour (Wenkel, Denkers & Vrij, 1994) or limit their
activities to safe places and safe times (Liska, Sanchirico & Reed, 1988).

The threat and occurrence of violence on a global scale towards civilians in the form of terrorist attacks also continues to affect the lives of many people. The experience of terrorism, particularly the attack on the World Trade Centre in 2001 and Bali in 2002 have had a significant impact on Australian society (Wooding & Raphael, 2004). Television, radio and newspapers provide instant coverage of traumatic events happening around the world. Psychological problems including acute stress disorder and post traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) can confront the survivors, rescuers and onlookers (whether present personally or via the media) of terrorist acts (Greig, 2006). Studies have suggested that although most Australians have never witnessed a significant act of terrorism, the terrorist threat is perceived to be a source of fear (Michaelsen, 2005). Others have argued that Australians experience a sense of uncertainty and ambiguity that can be defined as ‘dread’ rather than ‘fear’ of terrorism (Howie, 2005).

Aims of the Proposed Research

The primary objective of the current study was to investigate community attitudes toward the goals of sentencing. An important focus of the study was to examine the impact of demographic characteristics,
personality variables and beliefs about the causes of crime on the contrasting goals of punishment versus rehabilitation. This study partially replicates research by Carroll et al. (1987) who proposed a framework of underlying attitudes, beliefs and personality variables thought to influence variation in sentencing preferences. Carroll et al.’s research was conducted with a sample comprising law and criminology students and probation officers. The current study aimed to examine the impact of Carroll et al.’s proposed model of attitudes and beliefs in a contemporary Australian community sample.

Given that community attitudes toward sentencing are complex and include ideas that incorporate elements of both retributive and rehabilitative approaches to justice (Daly, 2000), this study also aimed to extend Carroll et al.’s (1987) research by exploring whether subgroups are detected from the data when scores on both punishment and rehabilitation variables are combined. A further aim was to investigate how these subgroups differ on demographic and personality characteristics, beliefs about crime causation and fear of crime. Moving beyond investigating punishment and rehabilitation in oppositional terms may provide an opportunity to explore the complexity of community attitudes to sentencing and add to our information about the relative importance of variables thought to predict sentencing goals. A more detailed analysis of subgroup attitudes may provide key information about the
impact of the study variables on sentencing attitudes that may not be evident when punishment and rehabilitation goals are examined separately.

This research is also important given the different values placed by different groups in society on the purposes of sentencing (Hessing et al. 2001) and research linking authoritarian personality characteristics to aggression toward out-group members (Adorno et al., 1950; Downing & Monaco, 1986). These studies raise questions about whether authoritarian attitudes endorsing punishment of offenders are linked primarily to the attitudes of subgroups in the population who may have a heightened sense of threat of crime (Doty et al., 1991), and increased fear of crime (Sprott & Doob, 1997). Exploring the sentencing attitudes of community subgroups is important given the potential of interest groups to influence criminal justice policy (Roberts & Indermaur, 2007). This creates a problem if the views of subgroups of the population are assumed to be representative of the community at large. Public fears and anxieties about crime and authoritarian sentiment and beliefs about the legal system may be more strongly endorsed by community subgroups than by the wider community. This research may contribute to a clearer picture of the predictors of punitive attitudes to sentencing and the characteristics of community groups most likely to endorse punitive sentiment.
In view of the debate in the literature surrounding the impact of fear of crime on attitudes toward sentencing, with some studies reporting a significant positive relationship between fear and more punitive attitudes (Sprott & Doob, 1997) and others disputing this suggestion (Quimet & Coyle, 1991), another aim of the study was to investigate the predictors of fear of crime and the impact of fear of crime on attitudes toward sentencing goals. Given that terrorism has also become an issue of public concern, particularly following the highly publicised terrorist activities undertaken in New York, London and Bali, the study investigated the predictors of fear of terrorism and whether fear of terrorism has an impact on attitudes toward the goals of sentencing.

A further exploratory aim of the research was to investigate attitudes toward more controversial sentencing options that have been raised over recent decades by governments in Australia and overseas and discussed in the media and in the wider community as ways to approach the problem of crime and punishment. A range of options for dealing with the problem of crime such as mandatory sentencing, home detention, public identification of sex offenders following their release from prison, reintroduction of the death penalty and attitudes toward the introduction of safe injecting rooms as a way of dealing with the problem of drug use in Victoria were explored.
Significance of the Research

To date little Australian research has addressed the way in which personality and beliefs effect community attitudes towards the contrasting positions of punishment and rehabilitation as the goals of sentencing (Findlay et al., 2003; Roberts & Indermaur, 2007). Much of the previous research on sentencing goals has been conducted in European countries and in the United States. The limited body of research on this issue highlights the importance of adding to the body of literature conducted in Australia using a broad community sample.

This research adds new concepts to the study of the relationship between authoritarianism and sentencing preferences with emphasis on authoritarian attitudes toward the legal system. Given evidence documenting increasingly punitive criminal justice policies in countries like the United States, Canada and Australia (Roberts, Stalans, Indermaur & Hough, 2003), determining the predictors of attitudes to punishment is important in developing an understanding of the phenomenon of punitiveness (Roberts & Indermaur, 2007) and what underlies punitive beliefs in the community. This research may contribute to a broader understanding of community attitudes that may hinder or potentially generate effective and meaningful reform and that may influence judge’s decisions. It may have implications for the way the public at large respond to sentencing decisions and contribute to
attempts to reduce sentencing disparity that may be generated by authoritarian personality characteristics and beliefs about the causes of crime. The investigation of community attitudes about a range of sentencing options that are periodically raised in the media may add to the debate about the future direction of sentencing practices.

This study may also contribute to a clearer understanding of the way the community thinks about crime and may provide psychologists working in a wide range of counselling settings with a broader understanding of the factors that contribute to elevated levels of fear of victimisation. It may be of interest to psychologists involved in the selection and training of police and those involved with counselling both victims of crime and offenders.

Organisation of the Thesis

Chapter 2 outlines the previous research examining beliefs about the causes of crime. The chapter investigates the psychological theories that describe four approaches to understanding criminal behaviour that include biological, trait, behavioural and cognitive perspectives. The concept of attitudes and the formation of beliefs are also discussed.

Chapter 3 provides an overview of the previous research on fear of crime and the impact of fear on attitudes toward sentencing. The chapter examines the definition of fear of crime and the consequences of
fear on the life of an individual and a community. The perceptual variables thought to impact on fear of crime are explored, including perceived seriousness of an offence, perceived vulnerability and the influence of the media. The impact of gender, age and previous victimisation on fear of crime is also explored. Fear of terrorism is also investigated.

Chapter 4 outlines the previous research examining the concepts of authoritarianism and anxiety. The concept of authoritarianism and its importance to the issue of sentencing is discussed. The chapter also examines the connection between societal perception of threat and authoritarianism. The concepts of traditional authoritarianism, right wing authoritarianism and legal authoritarianism are investigated and the relationship of these constructs to the issue of sentencing is discussed.

Chapter 5 provides an overview of the impact of demographic variables on fear of crime and sentencing goal preferences. A range of demographic variables are discussed including: age, gender, perceived vulnerability, previous victimisation and engagement in crime preventive behaviours.

Chapter 6 provides an overview of the scales used to measure the study variables while chapter 7 describes the general research methodology.
Chapter 8 examines the complex relationships within the data using hierarchical multiple regression and cluster analysis. Chapter 9 relates the study findings to the research questions being addressed and links the current findings to previous research. The implications of the current findings and are discussed in chapter 10 and future research directions identified.
CHAPTER 2
BELIEFS ABOUT THE CAUSES OF CRIME

Introduction

Research investigating attitudes toward sentencing has found that beliefs about crime and criminal justice influence endorsement of punitive approaches to the sentencing of criminal offenders (Carroll et al., 1987; Roberts & Indermaur, 2007). Carroll et al. found that preferences for punitive sentencing goals rose with increased endorsement of the belief that crime originates from the personal characteristics of the individual. This chapter examines psychological theories describing four approaches to explaining criminal behaviour that include biological, trait, behavioural and cognitive perspectives. These varying perspectives provide insight into the belief that crime originates from the characteristics of the individual. Social explanations for the causes of crime are also described. The concepts of attitudes and beliefs are discussed and the impact of beliefs on attitudes toward sentencing is reviewed.

Individual Explanations for the Causes of Crime

While no one theory or approach is capable of understanding all there is to know about criminal behaviour, psychological approaches examine how an individual’s biological makeup, personality, personal history and current circumstances generate criminal behaviour. Psychological theories have described four approaches to understanding criminal behaviour that include biological, trait, behavioural and cognitive
perspectives. These varying perspectives are important because they provide insight into the belief that crime is caused by the personal characteristics of the individual, a variable that Carroll et al. (1987) found predicted endorsement of punishment as the goal of sentencing.

**Biological Approaches**

Criminology began in the 19th century with a heavy focus on biological causes of crime theorising that criminals were genetically distinct from non-criminals (Stewart & Wortley, 2006). Given this emphasis on biology, Lombroso (1911) argued that the criminal was ‘born’ rather than made. White and Haines (2004) noted that the idea that a criminal was ‘born’ reflected the idea that crime is caused by characteristics unique to the individual. They pointed out that biological explanations of criminal behaviour tended to be pessimistic about prevention and rehabilitation of offenders because criminality was considered an essential aspect of some individual’s nature. Criminals whose crimes were biological in nature therefore needed to be isolated from society. White and Haines (2004) suggested that while it can be argued that biological factors may increase the likelihood of criminal behaviour, the complex interaction between biological, psychological and environmental variables are also important determinants of criminal activity.
Trait Approaches

Psychological theories explaining the causes of crime include a range of perspectives that centre attention on personal characteristics of the offender such as intelligence, personality and mental illness. Some studies have found a relationship between criminal behaviour and low intelligence (Quay, 1987). Allerton, Kenny, Champion and Butler (2003) tested the intelligence of young people in custody in New South Wales. They found that 74% of these offenders were below the average expected level of intelligence for their age. However, highly intelligent people have also been found to criminally offend.

Psychological approaches focusing on personal traits have also investigated the personality differences of offenders and non offenders. Proponents of personality theories argue that certain types of personality are more likely to respond to environmental stressors with antisocial or criminal behaviour. Personality approaches often make a connection between personality types, biological predispositions and developmental experiences (White & Haines, 2004). Eysenck (1977) suggested that personality was constructed according to three major dimensions that he labelled as psychoticism (solitary, troublesome, lacking in feeling), neuroticism (variable mood, anxious, restless, rigid) and extroversion (impulsive behaviour, sociability, activity). Research has found some support for the suggestion that individuals who score high on all three dimensions are expected to have the highest level of offending (Bartol & Bartol, 2004).
**Behavioural Approaches**

Behavioural approaches to explain the causes of crime assume that all behaviour is learned. Stewart and Wortley (2006) describe three principle models of learning that include classical conditioning, operant conditioning and social learning. They note Bandura’s (1977) argument that a substantial amount of human behaviour is learned vicariously through the process of modelling rather than exclusively through direct experience as classical and operant conditioning theorists might suggest. They point out that social learning theorists highlight the acquisition of criminal behaviours through observation and imitation. A unique aspect of social learning theory is the proposition that the behaviour to be imitated must be seen to be rewarding in some way (Vaughan & Hogg, 2005). Rewards that an offender may receive for committing criminal activities may consist of social reinforcers rather than tangible gains (Bandura, 1977). From this perspective, in regard to youth crime for example, approval from peers may be more important than other benefits received such as stolen property.

**Cognitive Approaches**

Cognitive approaches to the causes of crime focus on the ways people process information, engage in moral reasoning and problem solve and make decisions (Stewart & Wortley, 2006). Cognitive approaches have also focused on the values and attitudes that individuals hold, how these values and attitudes develop and how they guide behaviour (Kohlberg, 1964). Some studies have focused on the way offenders weigh
up the costs and benefits associated with criminal activity, assuming that offenders exercise a rational choice and commit crimes for a purpose (Cornish & Clarke, 1986, 2003; Clarke, 1997).

Social Explanations for the Causes of Crime

Carroll et al. (1987) found that endorsement of rehabilitation as the goal of sentencing was predicted by the belief that crime is caused by the economic conditions in society, including poverty and inequality and by social factors including family problems, criminal associates and drug use. Sociological perspectives examine the characteristics of society that produce criminal behaviour (Stewart & Wortley, 2006) and provide insight into the beliefs about the causes of crime that determine advocacy of sentencing goals aimed at rehabilitation.

Strain Theory

Rather than focusing on factors related to the individual, sociological perspectives of crime such as ‘strain’ theory, highlight aspects of social structure and social learning that contribute to the formation of criminal attitudes and behaviour (White & Haines, 2004). White and Haines point out that strain theory refers to the ‘tensions or ‘strains’ that are thought to be generated by the wider social processes and structures of society rather than by individual pathology. From this perspective, Merton (1938) theorised the activities and values of a criminal offender are shaped by inconsistencies in the distribution of wealth, status and success and the differing means available to individuals
of achieving their goals such as productive employment, education and family stability. He suggested that if people are prevented from achieving society’s goals for success through legitimate means, they may turn to criminal activity, such as robbery or drug dealing to achieve success. Crime is subsequently explained in terms of social pathology.

Research has suggested that beliefs about the causes of crime have a significant impact on attitudes toward the goals of sentencing. Carroll et al., (1987) found that beliefs representing individual, social or economic explanations for the causes of crime predicted attitudes toward sentencing goals. They argued that variables including personality characteristics and beliefs about the causes of crime cluster together and could be causally ordered by using concepts from attitude theory (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). According to Carroll et al.’s model, fundamental and general characteristics (demographic and personality characteristics) lead to intermediate level attitudes that are acquired later (ideology) that in turn contribute to specific beliefs about the causes of crime and attitudes toward sentencing goals.

Defining Attitudes

The concept of attitude has been the focus of attention in explanations of human behaviour offered by social psychologists. Numerous attitudes have been assessed over the years as new social issues have emerged. Studies have examined public attitudes about various aspects of punishment addressing issues such as why individuals should
be punished and how they should be sentenced (Payne, Gainy, Triplett &
Danner, 2004).

Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) and Ajzen (1988) proposed a
conceptual model that distinguished between attitudes, beliefs, intentions
and behaviour and described how these variables are related. They argued
that beliefs ultimately determine attitudes, intentions and behaviour, a
concept central to Carroll et al.’s (1987) proposed model. They suggested
that as an individual learns or forms beliefs about an object, these beliefs
in turn influence a person’s attitude toward it. From this perspective,
attitude is viewed as a general pre-disposition to respond favourably or
unfavourably with respect to a given aspect of an individual’s world.
Beliefs are posited to be a key determinant of attitude.

Defining Belief

Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) have asserted that whereas attitude
refers to feelings toward and evaluation of an aspect of an individual’s
world (affect), beliefs represent cognitive responses that associate what is
being evaluated with a range of possible attributes. From this perspective,
the term ‘beliefs’ represent a person’s knowledge, opinions and thoughts
about an aspect of a person’s world and associates this information with
an attribute such as a trait, a quality, a characteristics or an outcome.
When beliefs associate an object with primarily favourable attributes,
Fishbein and Ajzen suggested that a person’s attitude will generally be
positive. When attributes are evaluated unfavourably, they argue that a
person’s attitude will generally be negative. People form a range of
beliefs that serve as an informational base that ultimately determines their attitudes, intentions and behaviour (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Ajzen, 1988). While most people hold positive and negative beliefs about particular aspects of their world, a person’s attitude toward an object is related to a set of beliefs, not necessarily a particular belief (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Ajzen, 1988).

Belief Formation

Research has suggested that attitudes can be measured by assessing a person’s beliefs (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1972, 1975). Ajzen (1988) argued that beliefs may be formed by personal experience (descriptive belief), they may be self generated through inference (inferential belief) or they may be formed indirectly by receiving information from outside sources including friends or the media (informational belief). While some beliefs persist over time, others may weaken or disappear as new beliefs are formed. Although people may hold many beliefs about any given object, it is the most prominent beliefs held at a given moment that determine a person’s attitude (Ajzen, 1988).

Beliefs about Causes of Crime and Sentencing

Numerous criminological studies have examined punitive attitudes toward the sentencing of criminal offenders. Payne, Gainey, Triplett and Danner (2004) found that beliefs about the usefulness of deterrence and the importance of punishment were positively related to more punitive attitudes to sentencing. To investigate punitive attitudes in Australia
Roberts and Indermaur (2007) analysed results from the Australian Survey of Social Attitudes (AUSSA, Gibson, Wilson, Meager, Denmark & Western, 2004). They found that the strongest predictors of punitive attitudes toward sentencing, including endorsement of the death penalty were criminal justice attitudes. They argued that there is a subset of interrelated beliefs and knowledge about crime and criminal justice that cluster together and account for more variance in punitive attitudes than demographic factors, political orientation, religious attendance and media exposure.

Roberts and Indermaur (2007) pointed out that the notion that beliefs are interrelated and cluster together to predict attitudes toward sentencing is not new. Carroll et al. (1987) proposed a model that integrated a range of variables thought to predict variation in sentences including individual differences in penal philosophy, beliefs about the causes of crime and personality. They proposed a causal structure for these variables and suggested they build from more fundamental beliefs about people and society toward more specific beliefs about crime and sentencing. Variables were ordered from those considered to be more general, including demographic and personality variables, toward more specific variables that included beliefs and sentencing goals. Carroll et al. pointed out that these types of individual variables represent a range of related concepts and theories. Although they linked their model to the broad context of attitude and attribution theories, their proposed structure was organised using Alker and Poppin’s (1973) concept of ‘resonances’, a concept Carroll et al. described as a pattern of underlying, mutually
supporting beliefs thought to connect the variables related to sentencing. Carroll’s et al. model was also derived from concepts proposed by Ajzen and Fishbein (1975, 1980) describing the function of beliefs in the prediction of attitudes, intention and behaviour.

Carroll et al. (1987) conducted two studies, one with law and criminology students and another with probation officers. The aim of their study was to create measures of sentencing goals and relate these to demographic, personality and belief variables. Three factors emerged as the most meaningful representation of sentencing goals: Satisfactory Performance (the criminal justice is system performing well), Punishment (the criminal justice system is too lenient) and Rehabilitation (more and better rehabilitation programs will result in fewer crimes). Three factors related to beliefs about the causes of crime were labelled Social Causation (crime comes from family problems, criminal associates and drugs), Economic Causation (crime comes from poverty and inequality) and Individual Causation (crime is the result of lazy, uncaring and irresponsible people). Carroll et al. labelled Social and Economic Causation as external to the offender (such as an impoverished environment), stable over time (for example the offender’s intelligence) and unintentional in regard to the offender’s exercise of choice. Individual Causation was deemed internal to the offender and included factors such as personality.

Carroll et al. (1987) found that beliefs about the causes of crime, personality and demographic variables were significant predictors of attitudes toward sentencing goals. Participants who supported punishment
as the primary goal of sentencing held the belief that the individual characteristics of the offender were the most significant causes of crime. Participants who supported rehabilitation as the primary goal of sentencing held the belief that economic or social factors were most important in generating criminal behaviour. Carroll et al. argued their results demonstrated that sentencing goals, beliefs about the causes of crime and measures of personality are related.

In their discussion of the implications of their research, Carroll et al. (1987) pointed out that beliefs ‘resonated’ or clustered together and supported either punishment or rehabilitation goals. They suggested that attempts to influence goal preferences need to consider the beliefs supportive of that goal. As Payne et al. (2004) have suggested, a community that is primarily retributive is distinct from a culture that is primarily rehabilitative. The investigation of beliefs as predictors of attitudes toward sentencing is important in generating understanding about a community’s most fundamental beliefs and values.

Conclusion

The current study is focused on beliefs about the causes of crime and their impact on sentencing preferences. This chapter outlined the research suggesting that beliefs about the causes of crime may be focused on the biological or psychological characteristics of an individual and the kinds of choices that an individual makes or they may be located in the nature of social relationships or the economic conditions in society. The chapter investigated the concept of attitudes and beliefs and the
relationship between an individual’s beliefs and their perceptions about the goals of sentencing. Operationalising beliefs about the causes of crime in the current study was also discussed.

Chapter 3 examines the impact of fear of crime on attitudes toward sentencing. Research linking a range of variables to elevated levels of fear is reviewed including gender, age and previous victimisation. Perceptual variables related to higher levels of fear of crime, including perceived risk of crime, perceived vulnerability, perceived seriousness of an offence and the influence of media reports about crime are investigated.
CHAPTER 3
FEAR OF CRIME

Introduction

The literature on fear of crime has grown rapidly since the 1960’s and a range of variables have been identified as key factors influencing fear of crime. This chapter investigates the impact of fear of crime on attitudes toward sentencing. The chapter draws attention to the debate surrounding the issue of defining and measuring fear of crime. A range of variables identified in previous research as important contributors to fear of crime are discussed and the impact of fear of terrorism is also explored.

Defining Crime

Within the context of criminal law, crime may be defined by law and by procedural responses, such as prosecution, trial and penalty, to a prohibited behaviour (Findlay, 2006). From this perspective, the definition of crime is about the nature of institutional reaction to certain behaviour. In these terms, criminal justice becomes vital to the determination of crime. Finlay suggests that outside this definition, crime may be considered in terms of relationships between victim and offender and offender and the community. From this perspective, victim harm and social order largely become measures of the consequences of crime.
Defining Fear of Crime: Perceived Risk and Fear

The conceptualisation of fear of crime has received considerable attention with debate focusing on the issue of ambiguity in defining and measuring fear. In many studies the indicators used to measure fear of crime have tapped a general assessment of community safety rather than a personal reaction to different types of victimisation (Ferraro & LaGrange, 1987). Research has identified two dimensions of fear of crime: a cognitive component assessing the risk of victimisation and an emotional component assessing reactions to the threat of crime (Ferraro & LaGrange, 1987; Skogan, 1984; Warr, 1984). While perceived risk is associated with the recognition of certain situations or places as potentially dangerous for criminal victimisation (Ferraro, 1995), an emotional reaction of fear is associated with a sense of danger and anxiety and this could be prompted by a threat of physical harm (Garafalo, 1981). From this perspective, fear of crime is conceptualised as a uni-dimensional construct and should be studied with regard to the distinctions between cognitive and emotional components of various crime-specific fears (Rowntree & Land, 1997).

A number of studies have proposed a conceptual distinction between judgements of risk of crime and emotionally based fear (LaGrange, Ferraro & Supancic, 1992; Ferraro 1995; Warr, 1987). Warr (1987) examined the predictors of fear for up to 16 different offences. He found that although perception of risk was a predictor of fear, it was not perfectly correlated with fear. The arousal of fear also depended on the individual’s perceived
seriousness of the offence and an individual’s sensitivity to their own risk. Rountree and Land (1996) examined the indicators of judgement based risk perception and emotionally based burglary-specific fear. Their results suggested that risk perception and fear may have different socio-demographic predictors and supported the argument that perceived risk and fear represent distinct constructs. Mesch (2000) also confirmed the importance of differentiating perceived risk and fear of crime. He explored the relationship between socio demographic characteristics of perceptions of risk, night time activities and fear of crime. He found that respondents who had experienced previous victimisation or knew others who had been victims of crime reported higher levels of perceived risk. Women also showed higher levels of perceived risk than males. People with higher levels of perceived risk were less likely to engage in routine activities at night and were more likely to fear crime. Consistent with the findings of Rountree and Land, the predictors of perceived risk and fear of crime were found to be different.

**Type of Crime: Personal Crime, Property Crime and Terrorism**

Several researchers have argued that measures of fear of crime should make reference to specific categories of victimisation, given that some crimes arouse more fear than others, as in the case of crimes against a person involving physical violence as opposed to crimes that result in property loss or damage. Warr (1984) investigated gender and age differences for a range of personal and property crimes by classifying 16
criminal offences into crime specific indicators. He constructed three-subcales comprising personal, property and public order crimes and suggested that this categorisation represented a range of offences in the community. He found significant age and gender differences in fear associated with different types of offences. While fear generally increased with age, fear was highest among the elderly (66+years) for eight of the offences and was highest among the next oldest group (51-65) for the remaining seven offences. While young women (19-35years) feared rape more than any other crime, older participants (66+years) demonstrated higher levels of fear but significantly less fear of rape. Ferraro and LaGrange (1992) classified 10 different victimisations according to personal crime and property crime. They found that for property crime, older participants showed the lowest level of fear when compared to other age groups.

Terrorist crime in the 21st Century has also had a significant impact on people around the world. There is evidence to suggest that acute stress disorder or post traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) are among the psychological problems facing survivors and onlookers (whether personally present or watching via the media) of terrorist crime (Greig, 2006).

Although large scale terrorism has never occurred in Australia, the terrorist threat is perceived to be a source of fear (Michaelsen, 2005). Howie (2005) examined the threat of terrorism and how it is perceived by people working in five organisations operating in legal, financial, administrative and
retail sectors in inner city Melbourne. Howie found that respondents’
perception of a ‘terrorist’ was determined by factors including race, skin
colour, accent, dress, country of origin and political or religious affiliation.
Respondents expressed feelings of distrust and apprehension towards those
perceived to fit the ‘terrorist’ stereotype. Conflict emerged when co-workers
were asked about their religious views and poor service was observed when
employees and managers were unwilling to serve those perceived to be
Muslim or Arab. Decreased job satisfaction was felt by those who perceived
that the terrorist threat was high and who worked in the proximity of people
perceived to be of Muslim or Arab origin. Respondents attributed an increase
in occupational stress and feelings of anxiety and fear to the threat of
terrorism. They also believed that travelling and being at work heightened
their vulnerability to a terrorist attack.

Despite there being no specific terrorist threat to Australia, Howie
(2005) argued that many Australians perceive a threat that significantly
affects the workplace. Howie’s research raises questions about the
perceptions the public have of the typical ‘terrorist’ and how these
perceptions may be linked to beliefs people hold about the nature and
personal characteristics of the individual and the causes of crime. Increased
perception of threat may generate elevated levels of fear which may influence
more punitive sentencing preferences (Langworthy & Whitehead, 1986).
Investigating the impact of fear of terrorist crime on attitudes toward
sentencing goals may add to our understanding about the level of anxiety and
authoritarianism that may underpin fear of terrorism, especially given that authoritarianism is a personality factor likely to effect interpersonal bias (Downing and Monaco, 1986).

Fear of Crime and Attitudes to Sentencing

Research has suggested that fear of crime may play a role in the formation of more punitive views about sentencing. There has been considerable debate in the literature with some studies lending support to the notion that people with higher levels of fear demonstrate more punitive attitudes toward sentencing (Langworthy & Whitehead, 1986; Sprott & Doob, 1997) while other studies dispute this assertion (Ouimet & Coyle, 1991).

Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) have stressed the importance of investigating attitudes toward sentencing and discussed their research in the context of theoretical attempts to account for the punitive attitudes found in public opinion research. They explored the relationship between fear of crime, basic values such as liberalism and attitudes toward the purposes of sentencing. They examined the responses of 2,100 adults to a series of questions about crime and criminal justice issues including perceptions of crime, victimisation experience and fear of crime. Langworthy and Whitehead found that punitive attitudes toward sentencing rose with increased fear about the likelihood of crime victimisation.
Other research has disputed the suggestion that fear of crime is associated with more punitive attitudes toward sentencing. Ouimet and Coyle (1991) examined the relationship between the public fear of crime and the call for lengthy prison terms, as well as the relationship between judicial perceptions of public fear and their own sentencing decisions. They examined the effect of fear of crime on punitive sentencing attitudes in a sample of the general public ($N = 239$) and judges ($N = 235$). They found that fear of crime had no significant impact on preferences for harsh sentencing of criminal offenders.

Quimet and Coyle (1991) also examined the extent to which the court practitioners’ perception of public fear of crime influenced their own punitive sentences. They found that perceptions of public level of fear of crime influenced the court practitioners’ sentence recommendation for less serious offences. For very serious offences, the perception of public fear of crime had no significant impact on practitioners’ sentencing decisions.

Quimet and Coyle suggested that in regard to more serious offences, court practitioners may rely on the penalty prescribed by law and past practice as guides for imposing penalties rather than the perceived fear of crime in the community and public opinion. They pointed out that research on the relationship between fear of crime and sentencing preferences is important because in terms of policy making, it is intuitively reasonable to assume a positive relationship between fear of crime and the demand for more punitive sentences. They also suggested that although judges sometimes
justify lengthy custodial prison sentences based upon an idea that the public fears crime and consequently demands punitive sentences for offenders, their results did not support this assertion.

Other studies support the findings of Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) and have also reported a positive association between fear of crime and sentencing. Sprott & Doob (1997) analysed data collected from the 1993 General Social Survey program of Statistics Canada (1994) assessing personal risk, the prevalence of criminal victimisations and attitudes toward various aspects of the criminal justice system (N = 10,385). They found that fear of crime rose with increased dissatisfaction with the courts and the police and with increased dissatisfaction with perceived leniency of sentences. The impact of fear of crime on views of sentencing held for victims of crime (those with identifiable victimisations in the last 12 months) and for non-victims. For both groups, fear of crime increased with perceived leniency of sentences. Sprott and Doob concluded that people in the community who fear crime the most are more punitive toward offenders and most likely to evaluate the courts and police negatively. These findings raise questions about whether fear of crime generates preferences for harsh punishment of offenders because imprisonment is traditionally thought to be an effective deterrent and crime prevention strategy (Davies & Raymond, 1999).

The debate surrounding the definition and measurement of fear of crime (Ferraro & Lagrange, 1987; Garafalo & Laub, 1978; Lawton & Yaffe, 1980) highlights the importance of investigating fear of crime as a
multifaceted concept. The disparate findings in studies investigating the impact of fear of crime on attitudes toward sentencing also underlines the need for further research clarifying the role of fear as a predictor of sentencing attitudes in the community. As Ouimet and Coyle (1991) pointed out, although it may be reasonable to assume that fear of crime has a positive direct impact on punitive sentencing preferences, more research is needed to investigate this assumption. It could also be assumed that criminal justice policies are influenced by the idea that the public fears crime and consequently demands more punitive sentences or lengthy custodial prison terms. Further research is needed to determine the extent to which these assumptions may be flawed.

Perceptual Variables and Fear of Crime

Previous research has identified a range of perceptual variables associated with higher levels of fear of crime including: perceived risk of crime, perceived seriousness of crime and the influence of crime reports in the media. The following discussion outlines the impact of these variables on fear of crime and on attitudes toward sentencing. The impact of perceived risk of crime on fear of crime has already been discussed in relation to the issue of defining fear and the importance of differentiating between judgements of risk and emotionally based fear (LaGrange et al. 1992; Ferraro, 1995). Literature suggesting that perceived risk was associated with elevated levels of fear has also been outlined (Mesch, 2000).
Fear of Crime and Seriousness of Crime

Research has suggested that perceived seriousness of crime is associated with elevated levels of fear of crime. Warr (1984) investigated whether gender and age differences in fear were attributable to differences in perceived risk of victimisation. Perceived seriousness of the offences was also measured. Warr (1984) found that differences in fear among age and gender groups demonstrated what he called a ‘differential sensitivity to risk’. Identical levels of perceived risk did not produce equal levels of fear. Females displayed higher fear than males and older people displayed higher fear than younger people even if their perceived risk was lower.

Warr (1984) argued that differences in sensitivity to risk among age/sex groups may be determined in part by the perceived seriousness of the offence. Females viewed each offence as more serious than males and the perceived seriousness of the offences tended to increase with age. Warr (1984) also argued that some offences may generate higher fear because they are associated with other more serious offences. For example, the perceived probability of burglary may generate higher fear among women because assault or rape may be committed against them at the time of the burglary.

Seriousness of Crime and Attitudes to Sentencing

Studies have shown that perceptions about seriousness of crime may influence attitudes toward sentencing. Feather (1996) conducted two studies
in South Australia investigating three key variables assumed to influence the way people react to penalties imposed for offences relating to domestic violence, plagiarism, shoplifting and resisting police. These variables included the offender’s perceived responsibility for an offence, the perceived seriousness of an offence and the degree to which an offender is perceived to deserve punishment. Feather (1996) found a pattern of relationships linking these variables in a sequential way suggesting that the offender’s perceived responsibility for an offence and the perceived seriousness of an offence are key variables that influence judgements that an offender deserves to be punished. The more serious an offence was perceived to be the more the offender was seen to deserve the penalty and the more likely participants were to judge the penalty as too lenient or not harsh enough. Feather (1996) concluded that his study provided clear results about how people react to penalties for offences and may have relevance to the way the general public respond to sentencing decisions.

The Media and Fear of Crime

The role of the news media in the promotion of fear of crime has been the subject of extensive research. Williams and Dickinson (1993) have pointed out that as most people have neither been a victim or witness of a crime, the perception the community have of the ‘crime problem’ must be largely due to indirect sources of information. Research has suggested that
the beliefs of news consumers are believed to be a reflection of news media

Research has suggested that not all crime reports are equally fear
provoking. Heath (1980) found that the impact of sensationalism and
randomness of victim selection evident in newspaper reports of crime
depended on where the crime was committed. Respondents who read a high
proportion of local crime news reported higher levels of fear if the crimes
were predominantly sensational or appeared to be random rather than
precipitated. Heath argued that random crimes are frightening and without
some indication of victim precipitation of the incident, readers may consider
themselves as potential targets of victimisation. Liska and Baccaglini (1990)
also found that fear of crime was positively affected only by local homicide
stories that were initially reported in the first part of the newspaper.

Another key issue relating to the impact of media reports on fear
concerns the way in which particular audiences construct meaning from the
messages they receive. Chiricos, Escholz and Gertz (1997) found that the
frequency of watching television news and listening to news on the radio was
significantly related to fear of crime. Higher levels of fear were found among
white females aged 30 – 54 years prompting Chiricos et al. to suggest that an
affinity may exist between certain audiences and the content of news reports.
Regardless of actual victim experience, fear of crime may be higher among
those who identify with people similar to themselves being victimised
frequently on television news reports.
The Media and Attitudes to Sentencing

Research has suggested that the media may be influential in the formation of attitudes toward sentencing. Sotirovic (2001) investigated the effects of media use on preferences for crime policies that were either distinctively punitive or preventive. She examined the predictors of fear of crime and linked media use with complexity of thinking about crime, fear of crime and crime policies. She found that while preference for punitive crime policy aimed at harsh treatment of offenders was determined by an individual’s affective response, endorsement of preventive crime policy aimed at creating employment and rehabilitation of offenders was determined by an individual’s thinking processes. Respondents who were more exposed and who paid more attention to complex media content were likely to have more complex thinking about crime. Respondents who were more exposed and paid more attention to various reality-based, ‘pseudo’ news programs, talk shows and news magazines showed higher levels of fear of crime.

In her discussion of her results, Sotirovic (2001) suggested that simple media effects that focus on dramatic events and an individual’s emotional response to those events may undermine the ability of people to develop a more complex understanding of social issues. She pointed out that media presentations with an emphasis on drama and emotional conflict
may provoke simplistic reactions to social problems. People who are more fearful may prefer punitive ‘quick fixes’ over preventive measures and more complicated and long term solutions.

One of the ways the public form their views about crime and punishment is through media portrayals of crime and justice (Roberts and Indermaur, 2007). News stories about sentencing issues are typically brief, visually interesting and dramatic (Bloustein & Israel, 2006). Wilczynski and Sinclair (1999) reviewed over 1,300 articles about child abuse in Sydney newspapers and found that most of the discussion was trivial and distorted with a view to promoting outrage rather than understanding the causes of abuse and promoting prevention. Although not all television portrayal of crime characterises the offender as the ‘deviant other’, increasingly Australian journalism has portrayed criminality as the result of an individual’s defective personality rather than as a consequence of social, economic or political sources (Bloustein & Israel, 2006). Offenders are typically represented as deviant or dangerous rather than as a sad or miserable and an incident of criminal offending may not be reported in the social context with which it occurred (Wilczynski & Sinclair, 1999).

The shift in the nature of crime reporting from news to entertainment and the portrayal of offender’s as ‘deviant others’, raises questions about the influence of the media on beliefs about the causes of crime. Particularly relevant is research suggesting that advocacy of punishment as the goal of sentencing is determined by the belief that the
source of crime is related to the individual characteristics of an offender rather than to social or economic conditions in society (Carroll, et al.1987). It could be argued that stories about crime and policing represented in the print media, radio and television and the way crime is depicted in films, novels and music adds to a distorted community understanding of crime that not only contributes to heightened levels of fear (Chiricos, et al.1997; Findlay, 2006), it may also contribute to beliefs about the causes of crime that may in turn impact on attitudes toward sentencing (Carroll, et al.1987).

Crime Preventive Behaviour

One of the most significant impacts of crime on the quality of life for individuals and for communities is fear. Research has suggested that heightened fear may cause people to physically or psychologically withdraw from community life (Skogan, 1986). If people go out they may tend to constrain their behaviour to safe places at safe times (Liska, Sanchirico & Reed, 1988). Nikolic-Ristanovic (1995) found that avoidance behaviours occurred twice as frequently among women than among men (Mesch & Fishman, 1998). People tend to avoid activities they perceive as dangerous, such as walking down some streets or travelling on public transport (Patterson, 1985).

Research has suggested that the relationship between fear and behaviour is circular in that fear causes people to constrain their behaviour and this behaviour in turn elevates their level of fear (Liska et al., 1998). Fear
of crime may have adverse emotional effects on people inducing a sense of vulnerability (Denkers & Wenkel, 1998) which may lead people to engage in extreme forms of crime preventive behaviour (Winkel, Denkers & Vrij, 1994). Other research has suggested that fear may lead to increased punitiveness by reducing the appeal of more liberal penal policy (Langworthy & Whitehead, 1986; Sprott & Doob, 1997). Preferences for punitive sentencing methods may be underpinned by a desire for sentencing strategies aimed at crime prevention.

Conclusion

This chapter has provided an overview of the impact of fear of crime on attitudes toward sentencing preferences. The variables identified in previous research as influential in generating elevated levels of fear of crime were discussed. The relationship of variables associated with higher levels of fear including perceived risk of crime, perceived seriousness of crime and influence of the media were examined. The impact of fear of crime on crime preventive behaviour was also discussed.

Chapter 4 will outline the previous research examining the concepts of authoritarianism and anxiety. The connection between societal perception of threat and authoritarianism is explored. The concepts of traditional authoritarianism, right wing authoritarianism and legal authoritarianism are investigated and the relationship of these constructs to the issue of sentencing is discussed.
CHAPTER 4
PERSONALITY VARIABLES: AUTHORITARIANISM / ANXIETY

Introduction

Research has identified authoritarianism as an important variable in shaping public attitudes towards the goals of sentencing. This chapter provides a discussion of the construct of authoritarianism and the relevance of authoritarianism to attitudes towards sentencing. The relationship between authoritarianism and societal perception of threat is explored and the impact of authoritarian beliefs about the legal system on sentencing preferences is examined. The chapter also explores the concept of anxiety and the impact of anxiety on sentencing preferences.

Authoritarianism

Authoritarianism in a Social Context

The construct of authoritarianism has received considerable research attention following publication of the Authoritarian Personality by Adorno et al. (1950). Authoritarianism and the widely used California F Scale (Adorno et al.) became significant analytic tools for investigating the relationship between personality and opinions on many significant social issues. Research has shown that individual differences in authoritarianism are associated with endorsement of policies of powerful authorities as in the case of the United States involvement in the Vietnam
War (Izzett, 1971) and prejudice toward minority groups (Forbes, 1985). Other studies found an association between authoritarianism and social behaviours such as conformity (Crutchfield, 1955), an unwillingness to engage in forms of political protest (Cranberg & Corrigan, 1972) and the use of physical punishment (Epstein, 1965). Peterson, Doty and Winter (1993) found that high scores on authoritarianism were associated with endorsement of harsh punitive solutions to the problem of AIDS and drug abuse, hostility toward the environmental movement and the view that the homeless are responsible for their own plight.

**Authoritarianism and Perception of Threat**

Although the conceptual analysis of authoritarianism has emphasised conformity to legitimate authority and conventionalism as key aspects of this personality characteristic (Altemeyer, 1981; 1988), more psychodynamic interpretations of authoritarianism have also implicated the role of threat and the perception of a dangerous world as variables related to the formation of authoritarian beliefs and attitudes (Doty, Peterson & Winter, 1991; Peterson, Doty & Winter, 1993).

Sales (1973) investigated the relationship between societal threat and the components of authoritarianism as articulated by Adorno et al. (1950). He defined ‘threat’ to be high unemployment, low disposable income, increased numbers of major crimes, high levels of civil disorder, increased likelihood of war, assassinations and polling data about anxiety and fear (Sales, 1973). He compared social indicator measures of the components of authoritarianism from two of periods in United States
history when there had been shifts from relatively low threat to much
greater threat. Comparing the 1920’s (low threat period) with the 1930’s
(high threat period) and 1959-1964 (low threat) with 1967-1970 (high
threat), he found increases in most of the social indicator measures of
authoritarianism. Other research outcomes support this link (Jorgenson,
1975; Padgett & Jorgenson, 1982; Sales, 1972).

In view of the work of Fromm (1941) and Sales (1973), Doty et al.
(1991) attempted to clarify the relationship between environmental threat
and societal levels of authoritarianism. They designed their study to
replicate and extend the work of Sales for the period 1978-1982 (high
threat) and 1983- 1987 (low threat). Their results demonstrated increases
in societal indicators of many of the main components of the original
authoritarian syndrome during times of higher economic and political
threat. Doty et al. argued that their findings support Fromm’s original
theory linking threat and authoritarianism.

While Sales (1973) analysed the transition from periods of low
threat to periods of high threat and found increases in authoritarian
behaviour, Doty et al. (1991) examined the reverse sequence and found
decreases in authoritarian attitudes and behaviour. They argued that this
strengthens the argument in favour of a causal link between societal threat
and authoritarianism by helping to rule out the possibility that societal
measures of authoritarianism simply increase over time due to expanding
population, economic growth or other secular trends unrelated to threat
levels. They also examined time periods that were shorter and less
extreme than those used by Sales.
Doty et al. (1991) reported an unexpected pattern of results indicating a continuing long-term increase in punitive attitudes and behaviour with little or no variation during times of low threat. They speculated that this effect might involve differential reactions from two distinct groups of people. Aggression and punitiveness demonstrated by more authoritarian individuals (dispositional authoritarianism) and aroused during threatening times may continue at high levels even after the societal threat recedes, whereas individuals low on authoritarianism adjust their beliefs and behaviour in accord with diminishing perceptions of threat.

Doty et al. (1991) suggested that individuals who are either mildly authoritarian or non-authoritarian may be described as ‘situational authoritarians’ in response to threat. During high threat times they may buy powerful dogs, become more cynical and perhaps more superstitious and embrace more conventional values. As threat diminishes they return to their more customary outlooks and behaviour. Doty et al. argued that punitive attitudes may be maintained in part by prominent and graphic portrayals of crime in the news and entertainment media and the repeated emphasis on the threat of crime in the political appeals by candidates for public office. They make the point that although decreasing economic and foreign policy threats may moderate general authoritarian tendencies amongst the general population, the threat of crime seems to remain high, thereby generating high levels of specifically anti-criminal authoritarian aggression.
Many studies have suggested that authoritarianism may play a role in shaping public attitudes toward the goals of sentencing (Carroll et al., 1987). Doty’s et al. (1991) argument that punitive attitudes may be causally linked to perceptions of threat highlights the need to investigate the influence of the media on public attitudes toward the goals of sentencing. White and Haines (2004) suggested that the way crime is reported in the media may generate heightened fear among certain sections of the population and that this fear may lead to calls for more police, tougher sentences and greater police powers. They pointed out that although public fear may be heightened and public awareness of crime may be intensified, there may not have been an actual increase in crime. The increase exists only in public perception. If the perceived threat of crime remains high and authoritarian aggression is elicited as Doty et al., have suggested it can be, then it is important to investigate the effect of authoritarianism on shaping public attitudes toward the critical issue of sentencing practice in our criminal justice system.

Traditional Authoritarianism

The personality construct of authoritarianism was conceptualised by Adorno et al., (1950) within the context of psychoanalytic theory. Adorno et al., (1950) conceptualised authoritarianism as a personality syndrome, identified by a tendency to hold to conventional values, to act aggressively towards deviants and out-group members and to believe in the rightness of power and control (Narby, Cutler & Moran 1993). Authoritarianism referred to respect for any type of authority and for
following orders. Adorno et al.’s construct of authoritarianism has also been referred to as ‘traditional’ authoritarianism (Narby, Cutler & Moran, 1993).

According to Adorno et al., (1950) the authoritarian personality consisted of nine interrelated personality dispositions. These dispositions were labelled: Conventionalism (adherence to middle class values), Submission (exaggerated need to submit to authorities), Aggression (hostility toward non-authority figures), Destruction and Cynicism (rationalised aggression), Power and Toughness (overcompensation for perceived weakness) Superstition and Stereotypy (rigidity in thinking) Anti-intraception (impatience with subjectivity) Projectivity (internal problems transferred to the external world) and Sex (sex as an important concern). Adorno et al. conducted a research project and developed an inventory (the F-scale), that reflected aspects of their proposed underlying personality dimensions.

Adorno et al. (1950) hypothesised that the psychological origins of authoritarianism lay in a particular pattern of childhood socialisation. They found that high scorers on the F-scale considered their childhood as a time of strict obedience to parental authority. Adorno et al. characterised this type of upbringing as one in which the parents adopted a very harsh disciplinary approach towards their children. They argued that a child’s natural aggressive tendencies toward his or her parents would consequently be repressed and later displaced onto alternative targets, for example out-groups, or those who deviated from the societal norm. Adorno et al. further hypothesised that living under severe moralistic
restraints would foster a cognitive style of thought that facilitates the adoption and use of rigid stereotypes in the individual’s social judgements.

*Traditional Authoritarianism and Sentencing*

Adorno et al. (1950) argued that highly authoritarian individuals are likely to be particularly annoyed that other people are ‘getting away with something’ (p.232). As a consequence, they suggested that authoritarian individuals are more likely to condemn harshly those who violate conventional norms. Byrne and Kelly (1981) have suggested that individuals with high levels of authoritarianism may exhibit hostility toward people regarded as out-group members or members of other groups that may be easily identified by characteristics such as their race, political views or even crimes such as sexual offences. Research supporting this suggestion has found that respondents with high scores on authoritarianism are less inclined to judge a defendant with similar attitudes to themselves as guilty and more inclined to punish a dissimilar defendant more severely (Mitchell & Byrne, 1973).

Research has shown that authoritarianism is a personality factor likely to effect interpersonal judgemental bias. Downing and Monaco (1986) examined in-group and out-group bias as a function of authoritarian personality characteristics as conceptualised by Adorno et al., (1950). Participants waiting to take ski lessons were assigned to a subgroup identified by different colour racing ties. Each participant rated the skiing performance of other participants. Downing and Monaco found
that individuals with high scores on authoritarianism as measured by a modified version of the California F Scale (Adorno et al.) demonstrated a significant judgement bias favouring the performance of in-group versus out-group members despite the absence of any meaningful differences in group performance and the fact that group distinctions were minimal.

Consistent with Downing and Monaco’s (1986) perspective on authoritarianism and interpersonal bias, Narby, et al. (1993) have suggested that criminal trials represent an ideal situation for authoritarian attitudes to affect juror behaviour. They pointed out that several predefined groups emerge during a trial with in-group members, the jury representing the people, asked to determine the guilt or innocence of the defendant identified by the prosecution as an out-group member accused of violating the conventional norms of society. In their opinion, it is reasonable to suggest that an individual’s level of authoritarianism could affect the decision making process.

Given the description of traditional authoritarianism as a construct, Narby et al. (1993) argued that that authoritarianism could be expected to be positively related to the tendency to convict in criminal trials in which the defendant’s actions reject legitimate authority in the eyes of the jurors. Consistent with this expectation, research has indicated that highly authoritarian individuals impose more severe punishment on those found guilty of crimes than do individuals with low levels of authoritarianism (Bray & Noble, 1978; Mitchell & Byrne, 1973). Individuals with high scores on authoritarianism have also been found to recall more prosecution evidence than defence evidence (Garcia &
Griffitt, 1978), were more certain of the defendant’s probability of guilt and likely to convict (Werner, Kagehiro & Strube, 1982) and have also required more time to be served before a defendant judged guilty could be considered for parole (McGowan & King 1982).

Ryckman, et al. (1986) applied Adorno et al.’s (1950) construct of authoritarianism to investigate differences in sentencing strategies for high and low severity crimes. They found that preferences for harsh sentencing strategies rose with increased authoritarianism for high severity crimes such as murder, rape or manslaughter. For the most part, respondents high and low on authoritarianism did not differ when judging offenders who committed low severity crimes such as shop lifting, car theft and forgery. Respondents thought that offenders who had committed low severity crimes should be punished by being required to make restitution to their victims and not by being incarcerated. In view of their results, Ryckman et al. suggested that Adorno et al.’s theory did not account for situational factors in sentencing judgements for crimes of varying severity.

Research has demonstrated that authoritarianism is a variable of importance in predicting attitudes toward the goals of sentencing. Carroll et al., (1987) conducted two studies using a broad set of attitudinally based measures to investigate the connections underlying a range of variables relevant to sentencing. In their study with probation officer participants, Caroll et al. included a traditional F Scale measure of authoritarianism. They found that advocacy of punishment rose with increased authoritarianism.
Adorno et al., (1950) conceptualised a complex personality dimension with a view to measuring anti-Semitism and its correlates. Given that the authoritarian personality dimension was developed in the late 1940’s, Sanford (1977) suggested that the construct may be a time constricted one. This suggestion was largely based on the emphasis placed on situational factors in the development of authoritarianism. Several researchers appear to have responded to changing times and attempted to define authoritarianism in new ways (Altemeyer, 1996; Narby et al. 1993).

**Right-Wing Authoritarianism**

When authoritarian aggression covaries with authoritarian submission and conventionalism it is defined as Right-wing Authoritarianism (Altmeyer, 1981). Altemeyer’s (1996) concept of authoritarianism is based on the work of Adorno et al., (1950). Submission refers to adherence to authority’s ‘commands’, aggression refers to the tendency to engage in harmful behaviour towards others and conventionalism refers to adherence to traditional beliefs in regard to gender roles, religion and endorsement of conservative political ideology (Altemeyer, 1996).

Altemeyer (1981) measured these three covarying attitudinal clusters with a 30-item Right-Wing Authoritarianism Likert Scale. He found that scores were positively related to authoritarian behaviour including prescription of lengthy prison terms, willingness to prosecute communists and radicals, prejudice toward racial groups, hostility toward homosexuals and belief in the teachings of Christianity.
Wylie and Forrest (1992) included a measure of Right-wing authoritarianism in their study of religious behaviour and prejudice. They found that authoritarianism scores were highly correlated with religious fundamentalism scores. Authoritarianism was an important variable in predicting homophobia, racial and ethnic prejudice and punitiveness. In contrast to the more psychoanalytic approach adopted by Adorno et al., (1950) that places emphasis on parental influence, Altemeyer explained the formation of individual authoritarianism through principles of social learning. For example, Altemeyer argued that authoritarian aggression is not the result of repressed hostility but rather a function of being taught that self-righteousness and teaching that ‘the world is a dangerous place’.

Research has found that right wing authoritarianism is linked to a range of beliefs regarding social issues. Peterson et al. (1993) detailed a series of three studies in which they examined the relation between classic authoritarianism (Adorno et al., 1950), right-wing authoritarianism (Altemeyer, 1981) and attitudes toward various social issues. Their study was designed to extend the construct validity of authoritarianism as an organising dimension for attitudes about contemporary social issues. They reported that highly authoritarian individuals as measured by both scales tended to classify homeless people as an out-group responsible for their own plight. Highly authoritarian individuals were more likely to endorse harsh, punitive sentiments about the use of drugs and condemned all illegal drugs as equally reprehensible. Highly authoritarian individuals did not believe that improving people’s lives or spending money on drug education would solve the drug problem. They did not approve of making
drug use legal, favoured punitive treatment of people with AIDS and accepted institutional control of women’s rights to abortion. Peterson et al. (1993) concluded that authoritarianism was a relevant variable to current social issues and that it is applicable as an organising dimension for attitudes about issues that the authoritarian person considers as threatening the current stability of society.

Right Wing Authoritarianism and Sentencing

There is research evidence to suggest that right-wing authoritarianism is linked to reactions of people to illegal activities depending on the social status of the offender. Altemeyer (1981; 1988) reported that people with high scores on right wing authoritarianism were more accepting of illegal activities, including illegal wire tapping, illegal letter opening and searches without warrants when the offences were committed by government officials. These results are consistent with his concept of authoritarianism as involving respect for authority and a disposition to favour discipline and punishment and conformity to conventional values.

Research has linked authoritarianism to perceptions about the seriousness of an offence. Feather (1998) found that right wing authoritarianism and values influenced the perceived seriousness of an offense depending on the status of the offender. Participants with high scores on authoritarianism judged an offense as less serious when it was committed by an authority figure and more serious when it was committed by a member of the public when compared to the judgements
of those with low scores on authoritarianism. Feather (1998) suggested that status associated with legitimate authority provided the authority figure with a degree of protection when participants were high on authoritarianism. The same protection was not conferred on a member of the public and participants scoring high on authoritarianism judged the offence to be more serious. The results of Feather’s (1998) study further highlights the importance of adding to our understanding about the effect of authoritarianism on public attitudes toward the goals of sentencing given that the criminal justice system is meant to protect the welfare of all.

**Legal Authoritarianism**

Researchers have developed measures of constructs that have been classified as legal authoritarianism (Boehm, 1968; Kassin & Wrightsman, 1983). In their description of legal authoritarianism, Narby et al., (1993) pointed out that legal authoritarian items are similar to classic authoritarianism items but their content is focused on beliefs about the legal system. Measures of legal authoritarianism contain items that assess the respondents’ tendency to disregard the civil liberties and rights of the defendant in order to convict the person (Fitzgerald & Ellsworth, 1984).

**Legal Authoritarianism and Sentencing**

Numerous studies have identified legal authoritarianism as a factor influencing sentencing judgements. Legal authoritarianism has been found to correlate with the tendency to convict in a variety of
criminal cases, with higher scores on legal authoritarianism associated with defence case strength and increased defendant culpability (Dexter, Cutler and Moran, 1992; Kassin & Wrightsman, 1983).

Narby et al. (1993) conducted a meta-analysis of 20 studies that explored the relationship between authoritarianism and ratings of defendant culpability. In the studies reviewed, measures were categorised as assessing either traditional authoritarianism or legal authoritarianism. A number of moderator variables were examined across the studies. For example, type of crime was investigated as a moderator variable as Narby et al. considered it possible that authoritarianism could interact with crime characteristics. Other moderator variables included type of authoritarianism, type of subject and medium of trial presentation.

The results of Narby et al.’s (1993) analysis indicated a positive relationship between authoritarianism, both traditional and legal, and the likelihood of the jury delivering a guilty verdict as well as higher levels of punitiveness across all of the studies analysed. The results suggested that measures of authoritarianism are strongly correlated with attitudes toward a criminal defendant. Legal authoritarianism measures were found to be more highly correlated with perceptions of defendant culpability than were traditional authoritarianism measures. This outcome is consistent with research by Ajzen and Timko (1986), who found that behaviour-specific attitudes correlate more highly with the relevant behaviour than do attitudes that are more general.

Research examining the relationship between traditional and legal authoritarianism have largely employed mock trials (e.g., Bray &
Noble, 1978). In their meta-analysis Narby et al., (1993) stated that of the 20 studies reviewed, only 5 used actual jurors. This methodology has been criticised for its lack of realism and hence the extent to which the results of these studies reflect the actual relationship between authoritarianism and attitudes toward actual criminal defendants (Moran & Comfort, 1982).

The O. J. Simpson trial provided Chapdelaine and Griffin (1997) with the opportunity to examine the relationship between attitudes toward the legal system and views of a ‘real life’ trial. They examined the relationship between traditional and legal authoritarianism and attitudes toward Simpson with 125 male participants. They found that high scores on legal authoritarianism were positively correlated with belief in the defendant’s guilt, perceived trial fairness and more severe sentence recommendations. As legal authoritarianism increased, participants were more likely to view the defendant as guilty of breaking the law and therefore as more worthy of punishment. Consistent with previous research by Narby et al. (1993), legal authoritarianism was more highly correlated with belief in the defendant’s guilt than was traditional authoritarianism. Chapdelaine and Griffin reported that exposure to media coverage of the trial had no impact on beliefs in Simpson’s guilt or severity of sentence recommendations. They suggested that stable personality characteristics rather than exposure to the trial via the media largely shaped views of the Simpson trial. They concluded that the public’s reaction to the Simpson trial could be predicted by general individual differences in attitudes toward the legal system and authorities.
Research has found that punitive attitudes toward sentencing are increased with high levels of authoritarianism (Chapdelaine & Griffin, 1997; Narby et al., 1993). Increased authoritarianism has also been linked to interpersonal judgemental bias (Downing & Monaco, 1986). The findings of these studies raise questions about whether variables including authoritarianism and the belief that crime originates from the personal characteristics of the offender remain important variables in determining more punitive attitudes toward sentencing in contemporary Australia as they did in Carroll et al.’s (1987) research.

Research findings linking authoritarian personality characteristics to endorsement of conservative middle class values and aggression toward out-group members (Adorno et al., 1950; Downing & Monaco, 1986) raise questions about whether authoritarianism is increased among societal subgroups. Extending Carroll et al.’s research to explore whether subgroups in the current study differ in their attitudes to sentencing goals and identifying characteristics that differentiate these groups may provide a deeper understanding of the role of authoritarianism in generating punitive attitudes to sentencing. This research may also add to our understanding about what attitudes sections of the community actually hold toward sentencing and highlight attitudes that impact on change in sentencing practice.

Anxiety

Anxiety has emerged as a central problem and prominent theme of life in the 20th century. Freud (1936) recognised the experiential
qualities of anxiety as subjective feelings of nervousness and chronic apprehension. Anxiety is commonly described as an unpleasant experience characterised by feelings of tension, apprehension and worry and by physiological arousal (Speilberger, 1972). Anxiety may accompany any situation that threatens an individual’s well-being such as conflict, threat of physical harm, threat to self esteem and pressure to perform beyond the individual’s capability and is referred to as pathological when it is more persistent, frequent and severe than an individual might usually experience or have the capacity to tolerate (Judd & Burrows, 1992).

In discussing the etiology of anxiety, MacKinnon and Hoehn-Saric (2003) pointed out that anxiety is experienced in everyday life and serves an important biological function. They distinguished between normal emotional responses and pathological anxiety states characterised by exaggerated emotional responses. They suggested that a normal level of anxiety improves motivation and performance on tasks. Anxious feelings alert the individual to potentially dangerous situations and the need to formulate a course of action. Given that anxiety is an unpleasant emotion, the individual is motivated to avoid situations that provoke anxiety. MacKinnon and Hoehn-Saric suggested that although the intensity of some emotional responses may interfere with an individual’s ability to cope with a stressful situation, such a response may be in proportion to an understandable cause. These cases may be distinguished from pathological states in which an emotional response is either not
related or out of proportion to the stress that triggered the emotion and is associated with a cluster of symptoms that define a clinical syndrome.

*State and Trait Anxiety*

A conceptual distinction between anxiety as a transitory emotional state and anxiety as a relatively stable personality trait was introduced by Cattell and Schrieder (1961) and elaborated on by Speilberger, (1966, 1972). Speilberger (1972) described ‘State’ anxiety as a transitory emotional response involving unpleasant feelings of tension and apprehensive thoughts. He argued that an anxiety state is induced when a person perceives a particular situation as potentially harmful, dangerous or threatening. State anxiety varies in intensity and fluctuates over time depending on the level of stress that impinges on the individual. In contrast, Speilberger defined ‘Trait’ anxiety as a personality trait characterised by a relatively stable susceptibility to experience elevated levels of state anxiety frequently. The distinction between State and Trait anxiety was regarded as important because it suggested that anxiety assessment needed to separate transitory responses to a specific situation from a more pervasive tendency to experience anxiety across a range of different situations (Endler, Cox, Parker & Bagby, 1992), a distinction that may aid in differentiating anxiety from depression (Dobson, 1985).

Speilberger (1972) argued that individuals with high levels of trait anxiety have a disposition to perceive the world as more dangerous or threatening than individuals with low levels of trait anxiety. He suggested that although trait anxiety is not directly apparent in behaviour,
people with high levels of trait anxiety are more vulnerable to experience stress and state anxiety reactions of greater intensity and frequency over time when compared to people with low levels of trait anxiety.

**Anxiety as an Emotional Process**

Speilberger (1972) argued that anxiety states are embedded in a complex emotional process. He added the concept of ‘anxiety as an emotional process’ to the conceptual distinction between anxiety as a transitory emotional state and anxiety as a personality trait. According to Speilberger, ‘anxiety-as-process’ implies a theory of anxiety that includes stress, threat and state and trait anxiety as essential components. He described this process as the sequence of cognitive factors and affective and behavioural responses that occur as a reaction to some form of stress. External or internal stimuli that are cognitively appraised as dangerous are followed by an anxiety state reaction. Speilberger argued that since elevated levels of state anxiety are experienced as unpleasant, cognitive and behavioural responses are activated that serve to reduce or minimise the distress. According to Speilberger’s model, if an individual is unable to avoid the stress or reappraise the stressful circumstances that initiated the anxiety process, psychological defense mechanisms, for example repression, denial or projection may be activated to combat the anxiety.

In order to clarify the meaning of anxiety as an emotional process, Speilberger (1972) made a distinction between fear and anxiety. He argued that fear involves an emotional reaction to expected harm from some real or objective danger in the environment and that the intensity of
this reaction is proportional to the magnitude of perceived danger. In contrast, Speilberger argued that the term anxiety describes an emotional reaction to an ‘unknown’ stimulus and that this reaction is disproportionately greater in intensity than the extent of the perceived danger. According to this perspective, the concepts of fear and anxiety refer to emotional reactions or states that are generated by different processes.

Other definitions of anxiety have also incorporated the concept of a process or sequence of events that generates an anxiety state reaction. Lazarus and Avril (1972) highlighted the role of cognition in the arousal of anxiety. They argued that anxiety involves stress, a cognitive appraisal of threat, reappraisal of the stressor and an emotional reaction that includes behavioural and physiological responses. Epstein (1972) argued that anxiety arousal is produced by some form of threat that the individual is unable to direct into an appropriate reaction. Mandler (1972) argued that anxiety results when a plan or sequence of behaviour is interrupted. This interruption produces a level of distress and anxiety if the individual is unable to substitute appropriate behaviours to complete the interrupted plan.

In describing the process of anxiety, Speilberger (1972) made a distinction between the concepts of stress, threat and state anxiety. While he used the term ‘stress’ to describe the environmental conditions that are characterised by some degree of objective danger, he used the term ‘threat’ to describe the individual’s subjective appraisal of a situation as physically or psychologically dangerous. He argued that the appraisal of a
situation as threatening is dependent on factors including individual differences in skills, personality traits and by previous experience with similar situations. The intensity and duration of the anxiety response will be determined by the degree of perceived threat and the persistent appraisal of a situation as dangerous.

**Anxiety and Fear of Crime**

Previous research into fear of criminal victimisation has identified anxiety as a significant predictor of fear of crime. With reference to fear of crime, Vitelli and Endler (1993) suggested that anxiety involves the constant threat of injury and ambiguity associated with crime risk situations. Individuals who demonstrate high levels of general anxiety would be expected to be more fearful of crime. Similarly, Nelson and Phares (1971) posited that anxiety reflects a situation where a person anticipates victimisation and makes a negative judgement about the aversive consequences of crime.

Vitelli and Endler (1993) investigated the relationship between trait anxiety and fear of crime. The purpose of their study was to identify the psychological factors mediating level of apprehension concerning criminal victimisation in terms of general perceptions of risk and of level of anxiety in specific risk situations. Two studies were undertaken to examine the impact of the study variables on fear of crime. They found that anxiety rose with increased fear of crime. Females demonstrated significantly greater levels of anxiety about physical danger and significantly higher levels of fear of crime than did males. Another study
by Norris and Kaniasty (1994) investigated levels of psychological distress experienced by victims of violent and property crime offences. They collected data at 3 months, 9 months and at 15 months following victimisation and found that fear of crime rose with a medium level of state-anxiety symptoms.

**Conclusion**

Research has identified authoritarianism and anxiety as variables of importance in the formation of attitudes toward the goals of sentencing. This chapter has examined the construct of authoritarianism with a focus on authoritarian beliefs about the legal system. Previous research highlights the need for further investigation on the impact of authoritarianism on public attitudes toward sentences to inform debate about how more punitive attitudes towards offenders arise and how criminal justice can be more effective and meaningful. Chapter 5 examines the impact of demographic variables on fear of crime and attitudes toward sentencing.
CHAPTER 5
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Introduction

Research has identified a range of demographic variables thought to predict fear of crime and attitudes toward sentencing. This chapter provides a discussion of the demographic predictors of fear of crime. The impact of variables including previous victimisation, perceived likelihood of crime victimisation and perceived vulnerability to victimisation are outlined. According to Carroll et al.’s (1987) model, demographic characteristics influence beliefs about the causes of crime and attitudes toward sentencing goals. This chapter provides a discussion of the demographic variables identified in previous research as influential in predicting attitudes toward sentencing goals.

Demographic Predictors of Fear of Crime

A range of demographic variables have been shown to predict fear of crime. An important aim of this study is to investigate the relative importance of variables thought to predict fear of three types of crime: personal crime, property crime and terrorist crime. Research has demonstrated that other variables including perceived likelihood of crime, perceived seriousness of crime and perceived vulnerability also influence fear of crime. Previous victimisation has also been associated with increased fear of crime (Smith & Hill, 1991) and feelings of vulnerability (Gomme, 1988).
Gender and Fear of Crime

A consistent finding in the research literature on fear of crime indicates that females exhibit substantially higher fear of crime than males (Baumer, 1978; Box, Hale & Andrews, 1988; Gomme, 1988; LaGrange & Ferraro, 1989; Keane, 1992). While research has found that females are not only more likely than males to express a generalised fear of crime, young females living in urban areas with higher income and higher education also believe they are more likely to be victimised by particular events, such as assault, theft or property damage (Keane, 1992).

Research has suggested that females perceive themselves as more likely than males to be the victim of a serious personal crime, for example having someone break into your home while you are there, being raped or sexually assaulted or being attacked by someone with a knife (LaGrange and Ferraro, 1989). It appears that rape is prominent in the fears of many women. Warr (1984) found that among young women (19-35 years) rape was feared more than any other crime. LaGrange and Ferraro (1989) found that 47% of women in their sample reported that they were ‘somewhat’ or ‘very afraid’ of being raped or sexually assaulted. In contrast, 11% of men reported they were more afraid of being sexually assaulted, possibly from other men. Other studies have found that fear of crime varies with both gender and age. Box et al. (1988) found that after controlling for age, the gender-fear gap narrowed as people grew older.

Although research has suggested that women experience higher fear of crime than males, according to published crime figures and
victimisation surveys, women are less likely than men to be victimised
(Hale, 1996). A range of explanations have been suggested to explain this
‘fear-victimisation paradox’ (Warr, 1984). Women may under-report
actual victimisation and that the true rate of victimisation of women is
likely to be higher than that of men (Junger, 1987; Pain, 1995). Another
explanation suggests that women are more physically vulnerable to
Men may ‘discount’ the risk of victimisation given that they are socialised
to place a relatively high value on their physical abilities (Agnew, 1985;
Stanko & Hobdell, 1993; Goodey, 1997).

The relationship between loneliness, satisfaction and fear of crime
has also been investigated. Silverman and Kennedy (1985) found that the
number of people in the household was linked to fear among females, but
for males, age proved to be the best predictor of fear. For females, it was
living alone rather than loneliness that was linked to fear. For males,
living alone was related to loneliness but this did not necessarily lead to
fear. They suggested that while being alone leads to fear of crime as
feelings of vulnerability increase, being lonely does not necessarily lead
to fear of crime.

*Age and Fear of Crime*

The impact of fear of crime on the elderly and their quality of life
has generated a substantial research literature. A recurring theme in
studies that compare levels of fear within different age categories has
indicated that the elderly experience substantially higher fear of
victimisation than younger people (Clemente & Kleiman, 1976; Jaycox, 1978; Lindquist & Duke, 1982; Ortega & Myles, 1987) even though they are less likely to be victims of crime (Garafalo, 1981; Yin 1980). The seemingly paradoxical result that despite their much lower risk of criminal victimisation, older people demonstrate higher fear of crime than younger people has become known as the ‘fear-victimisation-paradox’ (Greve, 1996; Ferrao & LaGrange, 1992) and the suggestion that older adults are irrational in their fear of crime.

Reports indicating that fear of crime is higher among older adults (Clemente & Kleiman, 1976; Lindquist & Duke, 1982) have been questioned by a number of researchers (LaGrange & Ferraro, 1987, 1989; Lawton & Yaffé, 1980). Ortega and Miles (1987) found no direct effect of age on fear of crime. Although it has been argued that frightened older people isolate themselves from the outside world (Schooler, 1970), it has also been suggested that crime ranked below health and money as a matter of personal concern (Clarke & Lewis, 1982; Yin, 1982). Greve (1998) reported that older individuals fear being dependent, being sick, requiring intensive care or losing a close friend or relative. Yin (1982) found that only 1% of the 1,228 respondents included in his study listed fear of crime as a serious personal problem or worry compared to, for example, 25 % who mentioned poor health. He argued that the contradiction in fear of crime estimates is due primarily to measurement differences.

LaGrange and Ferraro (1989) argued that fear of crime measurement procedures greatly shape the outcomes of research and
therefore what is currently known about the determinants and impact of fear of crime. They suggested that global indicators, often used in survey research, ask respondents ‘How safe do you feel or would you feel walking alone in your neighbourhood at night?’ actually over-estimate the true level of fear for elderly people and lack relevance to the everyday lives of those who are least likely to travel alone on the streets at night.

By comparison, research utilising crime specific measures has demonstrated that older people are not highly fearful of crime (LaGrange & Ferraro, 1987; Ferraro and LaGrange, 1992; Warr, 1984). When fear of crime was measured with regard to specific types of crime, fear of crime was highest among younger people rather than the elderly (LaGrange & Ferraro, 1987). Ferraro and LaGrange (1992) found that fear of crime was lowest for respondents aged 55-64 years and highest for those aged 18-24 years even though the analysis controlled for perceived risk. An extremely high level of fear was found among participants aged 18-24 years. For fear of property crime, the 18-24 year category also showed the highest level of fear and the 75+ year category demonstrated the lowest level of fear. In support of previous studies by Warr (1984) and LaGrange and Ferraro (1989), Ferraro and LaGrange (1992) concluded that older people were not more likely to be any more fearful of crime than are other age groups.

Other researchers have also disputed suggestions of irrationality to explain higher levels fear of crime among the elderly. Warr (1984) offered two potential explanations for the variation observed between perceived fear and risk among age/gender groups. He suggested that for
any particular offence, differences in sensitivity to risk may stem from differences in perceived seriousness of the offence. He found that controlling for perceived seriousness eliminated most age effects. Another explanation for age and sex differences in sensitivity to risk suggests that some offences may generate high fear because they are associated with other more serious offences. Warr suggested that older respondents in his study aged 65+ years were more afraid of being approached by a beggar than were younger respondents because they may view begging as a prelude to other more serious offences, including assault and robbery.

The suggestion that fear expressed by older people is irrational has also been questioned on the grounds that the fear of crime among the elderly varies across different locations, being higher where there is greater risk and lower or non-existent where risk is less (Hale, 1996). Jaycox (1978) found that the elderly demonstrated a higher fear of crime in high crime areas. Other studies have found that the effect of age was strongest in inner cities and weakest in small towns and rural areas (Baumer, 1985; Clemente & Kleiman, 1976; Lebowitz, 1975). Lebowitz found that older people were more fearful of crime in low income areas than they were in high income areas. Hale (1996) pointed out that people in low socioeconomic groups may be less able to protect themselves or their property or to manage situations that might lead to heightened anxiety.

Age differences in fear of crime have been found to vary across different environmental conditions in Australia. Boorah and Carach (1997) found that the relationship between age and fear of housing crime
depended on whether the household lived in a rural area. Younger people aged less than 35 years living in rural areas were 24% more likely to be afraid than those living in urban areas. For females living in rural areas, fear of crime increased with age, peaking at the 25-34 year age group before declining. Level of fear for both males and female in urban areas decreased with age. It was also suggested that the high level of fear demonstrated by females in the 25-34 year age group may be heightened by a sense of vulnerability associated with the geographical isolation of rural areas in Queensland (Boorah & Carach, 1997).

A model to explain fear of crime in Queensland was developed by Carach, Frampton, Thomas and Cranich (1995). Their study utilised data from the 1991 Crimes Victims Survey initiated by the Queensland Criminal Justice Commission. They found that labour force status interacted with age and gender. Carach et al. suggested that labour force status acts in different ways when considering different age-gender groups. They pointed out that while reductions in fear of crime derived from an improvement in labour force status are of about the same magnitude among younger and older females, older males had a substantially lower level of fear when compared to younger males.

*Previous Victimisation and Fear of Crime*

Research has shown that victims of crime may suffer from a variety of psychological problems. These symptoms may include anxiety, hostility, fear, sexual dysfunction and post traumatic stress (Frieze, Hymer & Greenberg, 1987; Atkeson, Calhoun, Resnick & Ellis, 1982).
Victims of crime, particularly of sexual assault, may experience enduring psychological problems such as fear and anxiety long beyond the initial trauma (Atkeson et al., 1992; Calhoun, Atkeson, & Resnick, 1982). Norris and Kaniasty (1994) investigated levels of psychological distress following criminal victimisation at 3 months, 9 months and 15 months post-crime and found that after 3 months, victims showed pervasive symptoms of depression, anxiety, somatisation, hostility and fear. Although all victims exhibited a similar profile of symptoms, violent crime victims were more symptomatic than property crime victims who were in turn, more distressed than non-victims. Consistent with the findings of previous research (Cohen & Roth, 1987), lasting symptomology was found to be contingent on the experience of subsequent exposure to crime and violence.

Experiences of criminal victimisation have been categorised into two modalities: direct first hand experiences where individuals themselves have been victimised and indirect experiences that include both informal social communication and the influence of the media (Gomme, 1988; Tyler, 1980). A common notion among the public at large and also among professionals working with crime victims, is that direct experience with criminal victimisation is more important than indirect experiences in formation of judgements and emotional reactions to crime (Tyler, 1980). However, studies seeking to clarify the relationship between prior victimisation experience and fear of crime have yielded mixed results. While some studies have suggested that previous victimisation generates an increase in fear of crime (Baumer, 1978;
Linquist & Duke, 1982; Smith & Hill, 1991), other studies report a weak relationship (Garafalo, 1979) or no relationship (Hill, Howell & Driver, 1985) between prior victimisation and fear.

Gomme (1988) suggested that the experience of direct victimisation in regard to personal or property crime increases an individual’s feelings of vulnerability. He interviewed 640 respondents in three Canadian cities and found that both direct and indirect experience had statistically significant but small effects on fear of crime with higher scores on both dimensions of victimisation associated with higher levels of fear. Gomme suggested that when prior victimisation is violent, the victim is likely to experience increased anxiety about similar crimes occurring in the future. For indirect victimisation, he suggested that more remote sources of information may have had less impact on fear than primary sources. He argued that factors such as media reports of crime in other locations and limited reports about victim characteristics may contribute to a ‘distancing effect’ that serves to diminish a sense of immediate danger and need for assessment of personal risk.

Research has also suggested that psychological victimisation is associated with elevated levels of fear of crime. In a Canadian study with female respondents, Keane (1992) found that regardless of the relationship of the offender to the victim, psychological victimisation including sexual harassment and emotional abuse were predictors of fear of crime. He argued that the threat of victimisation may have as harmful an effect as an actual victimisation. According to Keane, this finding supports the suggestion that women experience a wide range of
victimising incidents and that although physical assaults are more severe, they are also typically less frequent than harassment and emotional abuse. Psychological victimisation may occur regularly over an extended period of time and may serve as a chronic reminder to women that they are vulnerable.

Feelings of vulnerability resulting from victimisation experiences are a common response noted in other research (Janoff-Bulman & Frieze, 1983; Perlof, 1983). Denkers and Winkel (1998) found that amongst the Dutch population, although victims of either violent or property crime in the month after the incident were not more afraid of crime than non-victims, they felt more vulnerable than non-victims. After two months, victims seemed to regain their feelings of invulnerability. The effect of victimisation on fear of crime was more pronounced among victims of violent crime than among victims of property crime. Victims of violent crime reported lower levels of positive affect than victims of property crime and were less positive about the benevolence of the world and a sense of self-worthiness than non-victims.

Although some studies have established a positive relationship between direct experiences of crime and elevated fear of crime (Gomme, 1988), other studies have reported situations where victims are no more likely than non-victims to experience elevated levels of fear (Box, Hale & Andrews, 1988). Box et al. found that the arousal of fear was dependent on an interactive effect between neighbourhood incivility and previous victimisation. They found that while previous victimisation was positively related to fear in neighbourhoods with high levels of incivility, victims
living in neighbourhoods with low levels of incivilities had a negative relationship to fear. They suggested that in areas of low incivility, the absence of constant signs of threat or danger make it easier for victims to take what they perceive to be effective crime preventive measures.

Further highlighting the incongruities in research on previous victimisation and fear of crime, Australian research has reported mixed findings. Caracach, Frampton, Thomas and Cranich (1995) found that while variables including gender, perceived level of neighbourhood incivility and level of education predicted fear of crime, previous victimisation as a single variable had no significant impact on levels of fear. Another study conducted by Boorah and Carach (1997) found that previous victimisation had a weak positive influence on fear of personal crime. The effect of having been a victim of housing crime had a more pronounced positive effect on fear of housing crime. Boorah and Carach suggested that while respondents who had been a victim of personal crime either may have attributed it to ‘bad luck’ or regarded it as an event that could in future potentially be avoided, victims of housing crime may have felt specifically ‘targeted’ and their anxiety may be compounded by the belief that they are unable to avoid future targeting. Notably, these Australian studies utilised a single item global measure of fear of crime as opposed to a crime specific scale, a factor that may reduce the generalisability of their findings.

Research has shown that enhanced fear of crime may be more likely to occur in a subgroup of victims who are more susceptible to distinctive cognitive response mechanisms. Winkel (1998) argued that
susceptibility to enhanced fear after victimisation is determined by a set of personal traits indicative of a deficit in ‘adaptative’ coping responses. He argued that fear of crime and previous victimisation variables are related to each other through a process of cognitive mediation. He sampled 200 victims of personal crime and 200 victims of property crime and measured the extent to which participants engaged in a process of ‘downward comparison’, a process that involves selection of more optimistic appraisals of the negative consequences associated with victimisation. Winkel found that victimisation experience tended to generate increased perceptions of victimisation risk, together with a decrease in perceived negative impact associated with victimisation. He suggested that these upward and downward cognitive shifts tend to neutralise each other resulting in the non-emergence of fear of crime arising from a victimisation incident. From this perspective, fear of crime is a conditional (rather than automatic) response that will only emerge if these cognitive mediators are involved.

**Vulnerability and Fear of Crime**

Vulnerability has been defined in different ways. Many definitions of perceived vulnerability have emphasised a cognitive or an affective component (Perloff, 1983). Perloff suggested that vulnerability contains both cognitive and affective components, with a belief in future susceptibility of negative outcomes accompanied by feelings of anxiety, fear and apprehension.
Perceived vulnerability has also been viewed as a multidimensional construct. Killias (1990) identified three factors to explain the emergence of fear. Factors included exposure to significant risk, loss of control associated with a lack of efficient protective measures and possibilities of escape and anticipation of serious consequences. He integrated these factors into a model that included physical, social and situational dimensions of vulnerability such as gender, age, living in certain areas and several dimensions of threat including probability of crime, seriousness of feared consequences and feeling of having no control. Killias used his model to explain the higher rates of fear observed among women, people considered to be in ‘risky’ jobs such as taxi drivers and sex workers and among people living in high crime areas, or areas with visible signs of incivility.

Research conducted over the last decade has indicated that vulnerability is significantly related to fear of crime. Killias and Clerici (2000) examined a variety of objective and subjective measures of personal vulnerability and their impact on fear of crime in six different situational contexts. They found that fear of crime increased according to gender, physical vulnerability and age and with neighbourhood characteristics correlated with objective risks, such as graffiti, people hanging around or litter in the streets. They argued that personal fear of crime may best be explained by how respondents themselves think they are able to cope with potential threats rather than by interviewer ratings. They recommended that future research on fear of crime should include a question on respondent’s self-perceived ability to escape or defend
themselves against a possible young assailant. The current study embraced their recommendation and included perceived vulnerability among the study variables investigating fear of crime.

*Gender Differences in Vulnerability.*

Studies have consistently shown that women demonstrate higher levels of fear of crime than men (LaGrange & Ferraro, 1989; Keane, 1992). Several studies offer support for the assertion that women fear crime more than men because of their greater vulnerability (LaGrange and Ferraro (1989). Gender differences in perceptions of vulnerability may be linked to psychological, social and attitudinal or personality factors (Hale, 1996; Pantazis, 2000). Some studies have attributed women’s greater fear to feelings of passivity and dependency (Garafalo, 1979) while others see it as reflecting women’s greater feeling of powerlessness (Sacco & Glackman, 1987).

Research has suggested that even with the same levels of perceived risk as men, women may be more likely to fear crime because they believe the consequences of crime to be more serious (Warr, 1984). Perceptions of serious consequences could be amplified if women believe they lack an effective defence or means of escape because they may be inferior in physical strength when compared to an offender (Hale, 1996). Studies have found that women who were able to defend themselves were less fearful (Riger, Gordon & Bailley 1978). Pantazis (2000) found that younger women (24-34 years) felt more unsafe if they believed they were
unable to defend themselves against a man or were unsure they could do so.

**Age Differences in Vulnerability**

Perceived vulnerability has also been associated with age (Clarke & Lewis, 1982). Warr argued that the greater fear of crime reported by older people can be attributed to their ‘differential sensitivity to risk’ despite their lower exposure. Perceptions of safety of older people may also be related to economic vulnerability. Pantazis (2000) found that the experience of feeling unsafe when alone on the streets after dark was higher for older people living in circumstances of poverty. The likelihood of the older age group feeling unsafe was heightened for women who lacked access to a vehicle.

**Previous Victimisation and Vulnerability**

Research has suggested that people generally regard themselves as relatively invulnerable (Taylor & Brown, 1988). According to Denkers and Wenkel (1998), becoming the victim of a crime may ‘shatter’ this perception and potentially lead to an increase in fear of crime or extreme preventive behaviour (Winkel, et al. 1994).

Tyler (1998) examined the impact of direct and indirect experiences of crime victimisation on the formation of judgments about crime including estimates of the community crime rate, judgements about personal vulnerability of participants to crime victimisation and concern or worry about crime victimisation. Tyler (1980) found that judgements
about personal vulnerability were primarily influenced by direct experiences of victimisation and to a lesser extent by indirect experiences. While estimates of the crime rate were determined by indirect experiences of crime, crime prevention behaviour was determined by perceived vulnerability. Tyler suggested that these findings counter the conventional assumption that direct victimisation experiences have more influence than do indirect experiences on the formation of judgements about crime and the determination of crime-preventive behaviours.

Demographic Predictors of Sentencing Attitudes

Research has suggested that attitudes toward sentencing vary according to a number of demographic variables, such as age, gender, educational attainment and experience of victimisation. Studies have reported that gender is a key factor that influences endorsement of more retributive approaches to punishment (Walker, Collins & Wilson, 1987; Applegate, Cullen & Fisher, 2002). Research has found gender differences in attitudes to punishment with females more likely to endorse treatment for offenders as opposed to harsh punishment when compared with males (Applegate, Cullen and Fisher, 2002; Blumstein & Cohen, 1980). A consistent finding in research investigating support for capital punishment is that females are less supportive of the death penalty than are males (Grasmick, Cochran, Bursik & Kimpel, 1993; Kury & Ferdinand, 1999). Stalans and Lurigio (1995) also found that in response to incidents of domestic violence, women more likely to endorse
treatment as well as punishment of an offender and more likely to endorse the use of restraining orders when compared to men.

Other studies suggest that the extent and nature of gender differences in attitudes to sentencing is unclear. Some studies have found no significant gender differences in support for rehabilitation (McCorkle, 1993; Warr & Stafford, 1984), while others have reported that men are less punitive than women (Haghighi & Lopez, 1998) or that no significant relationship was found between gender and punitiveness (Applegate, Cullen, Link, Richards & Lanza-Kaduce, 1996). Sprott (1999) found that the relationship between gender and punitiveness varied according to the type of question posed. Although women were found to be significantly less punitive than men when sentencing a specific juvenile offender, no significant gender differences were found in participant responses to global questions about the harshness of sentencing decisions. Applegate, Cullen and Fisher (2002) found that women were slightly more supportive of rehabilitative programs than men and significantly less punitive than men in their responses to a hypothetical vignette of a violent robbery.

The relationship between age and level of punitiveness also appears unclear. While some studies reported increased punitiveness with age (Indermaur & Roberts 2005) others have reported an inverse relationship with older people less likely to be punitive (Langworthy & Whitehead, 1986) or no consistent relationship between age and punitiveness (Kury & Ferdinand, 1999). Some of these differences may be explained by the way crime attitudes were measured (Roberts & Indermaur, 2007).
Research has consistently shown that increased education is linked to a decrease in punitive attitudes to sentencing (Dowler, 2003; Indermaur & Roberts, 2005; Kury & Ferdinand, 1999). Walker, Collins and Wilson (1987) found that individuals with higher education tended to endorse more lenient sentences than respondents with less formal education. They found that more educated respondents were less inclined to endorse use of the death penalty for heroin trafficking and fatal stabbing offences. Hessing et al’s. (2001) investigation of penal attitudes among the Dutch public found that level of education was the most important contributor to endorsement of harsh treatment of offenders, while religiousness and political affiliation were found to be the most important predictors of rehabilitation.

Research focusing on the impact of previous victimisation experiences on attitudes toward sentencing has found no direct relationship between previous victimisation and attitudes to punishment (Langworthy & Whitehead, 1986) and has suggested that political and social attitudes rather than concerns about the problem of crime and experiences of crime victimisation influenced sentencing attitudes (Tyler & Weber, 1982). Sprott and Doob (1997) found that while victims of crime as a group were no more likely than non-victims to consider sentences were too lenient, certain subgroups of victims were more punitive in their attitudes to sentencing than others. They reported that although most victims of crime were somewhat more negative in their views of the courts and the police than were non-victims, individuals who were home when an attempt was made to break into their homes were the
most negative in their attitude toward the courts and the police. This group of people were also the most fearful of crime and the most punitive in their attitudes to sentencing. Sprott and Doob found that people who had experienced the most serious victimisations were not necessarily more punitive in their views of sentencing. While sexual assault victims reported relatively high levels of fear, they were also the least punitive in their attitude toward sentencing. Research has suggested that victims of crime are likely to be supportive of restorative justice options that focus on victim needs as a priority, as opposed to retributive sentencing practices (Dzur & Olsen, 2004; Regehr & Allagia, 2006).

Conclusion

This chapter has provided an overview of the impact of demographic variables on sentencing goal preferences. Demographic variables identified in previous research as influential in generating elevated levels of fear of crime were also discussed.

Chapter 6 will describe the instruments used to measure the study variables and discuss the methodological issues associated with these measures. The following chapter concludes with the specific research questions that have been developed in response to the literature review.
CHAPTER 6

THE CURRENT STUDY

Introduction

This chapter describes the instruments used to measure the study variables. The methodological issues associated with these measures are discussed and more recent refinements to improve the original versions of the scales are outlined. This chapter concludes with the specific research questions that have been developed in response to the literature review.

Measuring Sentencing Goals

The current study is based on Carroll et al.’s (1987) research that investigated the predictors of sentencing goals. The scales used in the current study were developed by Carroll et al. to measure sentencing goals and beliefs about the causes of crime.

Carroll et al. (1987) originally constructed a 160 item ‘Attitudes to Crime Survey’ that consisted of 104 sentencing goal items and 56 items designed to measure beliefs about the causes of crime. Sentencing goal items were divided across eight categories of sentencing goals: Punishment, Rehabilitation, Incapacitation, General Deterrence and Special Deterrence, Educating the Public about Improper Behaviour, Improving the Criminal Justice System and Enhancing the Security of the System. The sentencing items were further classified into three types:
What the criminal justice system is currently doing, What the system is attempting to do and What it should be doing.

After conducting a factor analysis of the sentencing goal items, Carroll et al. (1987) selected a three-factor solution as the most meaningful representation of sentencing goals. The factors were labelled: Satisfactory Performance (the criminal system does its job reasonably well, is trying hard and seeks improvement), Punishment (the criminal system is too lenient with criminals and increased penalties will produce fewer crimes) and Rehabilitation (more and better rehabilitation programs, diversion and scientific research will result in fewer crimes).

Carroll et al. (1987) argued that the Satisfactory Performance subscale represented an overall evaluation of the criminal justice system. It appeared not to be a sentencing goal and had a very low correlation with the other two goals ($r = .08$ for Punishment and $r = .01$ for Rehabilitation). Carroll et al. suggested that Satisfactory Performance included a broad range of statements about what the criminal justice system is doing and what it is trying to do. Participants tended to believe in the satisfactory performance of the criminal justice system if they were less educated and had fewer crime victimisation experiences. The remaining items clustered into two sentencing-goal factors that focused on punishment and rehabilitation. The punishment and rehabilitation factors were negatively correlated ($r = -.42$). While advocacy of punishment as a sentencing goal indicated a predisposition to get tough, advocacy of rehabilitation suggested an appreciation of how prison experience could be made useful.
Measuring Beliefs about the Causes of Crime

The current study utilised Carroll et al.’s (1987) Attribution Scale to measure beliefs about the causes of crime. To create their scale, Carroll et al. conducted a factor analysis of their original 56 item designed to measure beliefs about the causes of crime. A three factor solution was selected as the most meaningful representation of beliefs about the causes of crime with each factor representing a different behavioural mechanism underlying crime. The factors were labelled Social Causation (crime is the result of family problems or criminal associates), Economic Causation (crime is the result of social conditions in society) and Individual Causation (crime is a product of the uncaring and irresponsible individuals). Scores on these dimensions correlated only slightly ($r$ values were under .20).

Carroll et al. (1987) suggested that sentencing goals were predicted by beliefs about the causes of crime, ideology and personality characteristics. To investigate their proposed model, Carroll et al. conducted one study with student participants and another with probation officers in the Chicago area. They used multiple regression analysis to identify the predictors of each of the three attribution factors. They found that Social Causation was predicted by the belief that life is difficult and people get what they eventually deserve. Participants who believed in Economic Causation agreed with the concept of government welfare and the responsibility of the government for its citizens. Advocacy of punishment and belief in Individual Causation tended to reflect more authoritarian attitudes with strict moral overtones. In both studies,
advocacy of punishment was related to participants’ belief in individual causes of crime. Advocacy of rehabilitation of offenders was related to Social Causation and Economic Causation. Carroll et al. emphasised the importance of beliefs about the causes of crime in the formulation of judges’ sentencing recommendations.

Measuring Fear of Crime

Critics of much fear of crime research maintain that conceptual cloudiness and inappropriate methodologies minimise the usefulness of many empirical findings (Ferraro & LaGrange, 1987; Garafalo & Laub, 1978; Lawton & Yaffe, 1980). Research has suggested that a cognitive dimension of fear tapping into perception of victimisation risk should be distinguished from an emotional dimension of fear more closely tapping psychological or physiological reactions to the threat of victimisation (Ferraro & LaGrange, 1987). Several studies have demonstrated that the covariates of risk models and fear models vary in important respects (Ferraro, 1995; LaGrange & Ferraro, 1989; Rountree & Land 1996). Other studies have demonstrated the distinctiveness of these two concepts by showing that perceived risk mediates the effects of emotionally based fear (Chiricos, Hogan & Gertz, 1997; LaGrange, Ferraro & Suspanic, 1992; Liska, Lawrence & Sanchirico, 1982).

How specifically fear of crime is measured has also been the subject of criticism. Many studies have relied on data containing a single-item indicator commonly referred to as a ‘global’ measure because the question makes no reference to any specific crime (Hale, 1996) and is
usually worded in a broad and generic sense (Haghighi & Sorensen, 1996). Ferraro and LaGrange (1987) pointed out that many studies have used the same two measures because of widespread access to surveys that contain these indicators. In particular they noted that the National Crime Survey (NCS) routinely asks, ‘How safe do you feel being out alone in your neighbourhood at night?’ and the General Social Survey (GSS) asks ‘Is there an area around here where you feel safe at night?’ It has been argued that global single-item indicators do not differentiate across types of crime and this makes it difficult to assess their reliability (Ferraro & LaGrange, 1992). Certain offences, such as violent crimes, are inherently more fear provoking than others. Asking respondents to think about their perceived safety when they are out alone at night could evoke exaggerated levels of fear of crime, especially for females and the elderly. This activity may be outside their normal routine and the validity of using a potentially non-existent activity to measure fear should be questioned (Hale, 1996).

Other criticisms have focused on the terminology used in single-item indicators. For example, (Hale, 1996) pointed out that the term ‘neighbourhood’ or ‘area’ is open to differing interpretations by different people. Although the NCS measure asks for an assessment of safety in the neighbourhood at night, it does not ask about fear (Ferraro & LaGrange, 1992; LaGrange & Ferraro, 1989; Taylor & Hale, 1986; Warr, 1984). LaGrange et al. (1992) argued that the NCS item is a better measure of perceptions of risk rather than feelings of fear because it asks respondents how ‘safe’ they feel rather than how ‘afraid’ they feel.
Ferraro and LaGrange (1987) have made recommendations aimed at improving the measures used in the study of fear of crime. They suggested that fear of crime indicators should tap the emotional state of fear rather than judgements or concerns about crime. They argued that questions should include how ‘afraid’ the individual feels and that risk assessment and concern for crime at the personal and neighbourhood level should be included in the study of fear of crime. They also suggested that items should make explicit reference to crime and that specific categories of victimisation should be used, for example fear of personal crime or property crime. Furthermore, they recommended that questions should not be hypothetical. Respondents should be asked how they feel in ordinary situations, not how they ‘would’ feel under certain circumstances.

Ferraro and LaGrange (1992) utilised an alternative strategy for measuring fear of crime in a study designed to examine the relationship between age and fear of crime. Their 10 item scale included two subscales: Personal Crime and Property Crime. They distinguished between fear of crime items that tapped an emotional dimension and fear of risk items that tapped a cognitive assessment of risk. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients indicated high reliability for the general Fear of Crime Scale (.90) and the general perceived Risk of Crime Scale (.87). Alpha coefficients for the Fear of Personal Crime subscale and the Fear of Property Crime subscale were .90 and .82 respectively. Alpha coefficients for the Risk of Personal Crime subscale and the Risk of Property Crime subscale were .87 and .77 respectively. Ferraro and LaGrange found that their scales were consistent in measuring their respective domains.
significant relationship was found between age and fear of crime. In fact, older participants showed lower levels of fear of property crime than younger respondents.

In view of research recommendations made by Ferraro and LaGrange (1987) in regard to the measurement of fear of crime, the current study utilised the 10 item offence specific scale (Ferraro & LaGrange, 1992) that differentiated fear of crime from risk of crime.

Measuring Authoritarianism

The current study focused on measuring the impact of legal authoritarianism on sentencing goal preferences. Authoritarian legal attitudes were originally measured using the Legal Attitudes Questionnaire (LAQ) designed by Boehm (1968). She constructed the scale by classifying 30 items into Authoritarian, Anti-Authoritarian or Equalitarian subscales. She argued that Authoritarian items expressed right wing philosophy and were essentially punitive (e.g., ‘Defendants in a criminal case should be required to take the witness stand’), Anti-Authoritarian items implied that the blame for antisocial acts rested with society (e.g., ‘Where there is a ‘hung’ jury in a criminal case the defendant should always be freed’) and Equalitarian items endorsed traditional, non-extreme positions on legal questions (e.g., ‘When determining a person’s guilt or innocence, the existence of a prior arrest record should not be considered’). Boehm found that significantly higher Authoritarian subscale scores were associated with conviction of a criminal defendant.
Subsequently researchers (e.g., Cutler, Moran, & Narby, 1992; Kravitz, Cutler, & Brock, 1993; Moran & Comfort, 1982, 1986) have revised Boehm’s (1968) LAQ. Kravitz et al. (1993) compared the reliability and validity of the original LAQ scale with two revised versions of the scale, the Revised Legal Attitudes Questionnaire (RLAQ) and the 23-item Revised Legal Attitudes Questionnaire (RLAQ23). Kravitz et al., (1993) reported that these scale revisions were completed by participants with fewer errors, were more reliable and had higher construct validity when compared with Boehm’s (1968) LAQ. They found that acceptable internal reliability was established for the RLAQ ($\alpha = .81$) and the RLAQ23 ($\alpha = .83$). Kravitz et al. established substantial support for the construct validity of the RLAQ and the RLAQ23 scales. In both studies it was found that the Authoritarian and the Equalitarian subscales correlated positively as expected with the Balanced F-Scale and with attitudes toward the death penalty. In view of these results, Kravitz et al. favour the revised measurement approach taken by Moran and Comfort (1982) and Moran and Cutler (1989) and recommended the use of the RLAQ23 in future research.

Measuring Anxiety

The concepts of state and trait anxiety, as refined and elaborated by Speilberger (1972; 1979) provided a conceptual model for constructing the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI) (Speilberger, 1983). Speilberger (1972) distinguished between state and trait anxiety arguing that while state anxiety refers to the temporary arousal of anxiety in response to
demands or dangers, trait anxiety reflects the existence of an individual’s stable and enduring disposition to respond with anxiety to the perception of threat. Speilberger, Gorsuch & Lushene’s (1970) initial goal was to identify a set of items that could be administered to assess the intensity of State anxiety and individual differences in Trait anxiety.

Twenty items adapted from existing anxiety measures were selected for the preliminary form of the STAI and these items were administered to large samples of university students and psychiatric patients with different instructions for assessing State and Trait anxiety (Speilberger & Reheiser, 2004). Given the difficulties in measuring state and trait anxiety with the same items (Speilberger et al. 1970), the best items for assessing each construct were selected to form the revised STAI (Speilberger, 1983). The revised STAI consists of two 20 item self report measures, the State scale and the Trait scale with items rated on a 4-point Likert scale. Although the two versions of the STAI are highly correlated, several items were changed and have subsequently improved the psychometric properties of the inventory (Oei, Evans & Crook, 1990).

The current study was focused on measuring Trait anxiety using the Trait scale from the State Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI) (Speilberger, 1983). While the STAI State scale assesses how a respondent feels in the current moment, the STAI Trait scale targets how respondents generally feel (Gros, Antony, Simms & McCabe, 2007). The current study utilised Speilberger’s (1983) Trait scale in order to explore how respondents with high levels of anxiety respond to the issue of crime and sentencing of criminal offenders when compared to respondents who
are less predisposed to more generalised and enduring feelings of worry and uneasiness.

The STAI has been used extensively in psychological research and has demonstrated strong psychometric features with good internal consistency reported for the State scale (α = .90) and the Trait scale (α = .93) (Speilberger, 1983). Other psychometric studies of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory have reported similar findings with alpha reliabilities above .90 for State and Trait scales (Endler, Cox, Parker & Bagby, 1992; Gros et al., 2007 & Ramanaiah, Franzen & Schill, 1983). Barnes, Harp and Jung (2002) conducted a reliability study for the STAI reviewing a total of 816 research articles utilising the STAI between 1990 and 2002. The results of the study suggested that internal consistency reliability estimates for both State (mean α = .92) and Trait scales (mean α = .89) were relatively stable across a broad range of studies involving various populations. The STAI Trait scale also showed good test-retest reliability (average r = .88) at multiple time intervals. Both State and Trait scales have evidenced adequate convergent and discriminant validity (Gros et al., 2007).

Aims of the Current Research

The current study partially replicates Carroll et al.’s (1987) research that investigated the impact of demographic variables, personality characteristics and beliefs about the causes of crime on attitudes toward punishment versus rehabilitation as the goal of sentencing. An important finding of their research was that authoritarian
personality characteristics and the belief that crime is caused by the personal characteristics of the offender were significant predictors of endorsement of punishment as the goal of sentencing.

Given that Carroll et al.’s research was conducted in America during the 1980’s with law students and probation officers, the current study aims to investigate the impact of these variables in an Australian community sample following two decades of significant social, political and economic change across the world. In recent decades in Australia, new policy initiatives such as restorative justice have emerged that aim to hold offenders accountable for crime in ways that are constructive. Despite new initiatives that have endeavoured to change established forms of criminal justice, an important issue is whether community attitudes have changed.

This study explores to what extent the predictors of attitudes toward punishment and rehabilitation found in Carroll et al.’s (1987) research remain relevant in determining community response to the important social issue of the goals of sentencing criminal offenders. In the broadest sense, the current study explores the question of continuity over time in the relationship of personality and belief variables to attitudes supportive of punishment versus rehabilitative sentencing goals. This study extends Carroll et al.’s research by exploring whether there are subgroups in the sample with patterns of scores on both punishment and rehabilitation and investigating how these subgroups differ on demographic characteristics, personality variables, beliefs and fear of crime.
The current study also investigates the impact of fear of crime on attitudes toward sentencing. Although a significant act of terrorism has not occurred in Australia, research has suggested that Australians’ perception of threat has led to occupational stress in the workplace, discrimination and changing organisational culture (Howie, 2005). Further research is needed to clarify the predictors of fear of terrorism and to determine the similarities and differences in predictors of fear of terrorism when compared with personal and property crime.

**Goals of Sentencing**

Aim 1: The aim of the current study was to investigate the impact of demographic variables, personality characteristics, beliefs about the causes of crime and fear of crime as predictors of punishment versus rehabilitation as the goals of sentencing.

Demographic variables that have been shown to predict endorsement of harsh treatment of offenders include political affiliation and level of education while religiousness has been shown to predict endorsement of rehabilitation of offenders (Hessing et al., 2001). Research in Australia has found a positive relationship between authoritarianism and sentencing goals and linked authoritarianism to perceived seriousness of an offence (Feather, 1998). Few studies have investigated the role of anxiety on sentencing goal preferences, so it was included in this study. Given research suggesting that elevated anxiety is associated with increased fear of crime (Vitelli & Endler, 1993), highly anxious individuals may advocate more punitive sentencing goals that are
traditionally viewed as a deterrent or crime prevention strategy. Research has highlighted the importance of beliefs about crime and justice as predictors of punitive attitudes (Roberts & Indermaur, 2007) and the impact of beliefs about the causes of crime on endorsement of either punishment or rehabilitation as the goal of sentencing (Carroll et al., 1987). While some studies have reported a significant positive relationship between fear of crime and more punitive attitudes toward sentencing (Sprott & Doob, 1997), others dispute this assertion (Quimet & Coyle, 1991). The current research is designed to clarify the role of fear of crime in determining sentencing goal preferences.

Aim 2: A second aim of this study was to investigate the predictors of punishment as the preferred goal of sentencing.

A range of variables have been shown to predict endorsement of punishment as a sentencing goal including demographic variables, personality characteristics and beliefs about crime (Carroll et al., 1987; Hogan, Chiricos & Gertz, 2005). While some studies have found that punitive attitudes increase with age (Indermaur & Roberts, 2005), other studies have found no consistent relationship between these variables (Kury & Ferdinand, 1999). Variables identified in research as significant predictors of punishment as the goal of sentencing include: a low level of education (Hessing et al., 2001; Roberts & Indermaur, 2007), a high level of authoritarianism (Chapdelaine & Griffith, 1997; Narby et al., 1993), the belief that the personal characteristics of the individual cause crime (Carroll et al., 1987) and fear of crime (Sprott & Doob, 1997). Roberts
and Indermaur (2007) argued that the strongest predictors of punitive attitudes toward sentencing are criminal justice attitudes and beliefs about crime.

Aim 3: A third aim of this study was to investigate the predictors of rehabilitation as the preferred goal of sentencing.

Research has shown that endorsement of rehabilitation as a sentencing goal was predicted by religiousness and political affiliation (Hessing, et al., 2001). Some studies have found gender differences in attitude to punishment with females more likely than men to support rehabilitative programs (Applegate, Cullen & Fisher, 2002). Other studies have shown that support for harsh treatment of offender’s decreases with increased level of education (Indermaur & Roberts 2005). Carroll et al. found that the belief that crime is caused by the economic or social conditions in society as opposed to the personal characteristics of the individual and high levels of satisfaction with the criminal justice system significantly predicted endorsement of rehabilitation as the preferred goal of sentencing.

Aim 4: A further aim of this study was to extend Carrolls et al.’s (1987) research by investigating whether cluster analysis results for punishment and rehabilitation scales would identify meaningful subgroups in the sample and to investigate how these subgroups differ from each other on the study variables.
Research has suggested that different groups value the purpose of sentencing in different ways (Hessing et al., 2001). Research linking authoritarian personality characteristics to aggression toward out-group members (Adorno et al., 1950; Downing & Monaco, 1986) raises questions about whether authoritarian attitudes toward criminal offenders are reflective of the socialised attitudes of subgroups of the population. Investigating whether there are subgroups in the sample with patterns of scores on both punishment and rehabilitation may provide more clarity about the relative importance of the study variables as predictors of sentencing goals, above that provided by exploring the predictors of punishment and rehabilitation separately.

Fear of Crime

Aim 5: Another aim of this study was to investigate the similarities and differences in predictors of fear of three types of crime: Personal Crime, Property Crime and Terrorist Crime.

Research has shown that a range of variables have been associated with elevated levels of fear of crime. Significant age and gender differences in fear have been associated with different types of offences (Warr,1984), with older people reporting the lowest level of fear of property crime when compared to other age groups (Ferraro & LaGrange, 1992). Other variables including an increased sense of vulnerability (Smith & Torstensson, 1997), perceived risk of crime (Mesch, 2000), perceived seriousness of the offence (Warr, 1984) and the influence of the media (Chiricos et al.,1997) have also been associated
with elevated levels of fear of crime. The threat of terrorism is also perceived to be a source of fear (Michaelsen, 2005). Further research will provide information about the relative importance of the predictors of fear of terrorism and its impact on sentencing goal preferences.

Sentencing Options

Aim 6: A further exploratory aim of the current research was to investigate the predictors of sentencing options raised by governments in Australia and discussed in the media and in the community as ways of addressing the issue of crime and punishment. Sentencing options include: mandatory sentencing, home detention, public identification of sex offenders after their release, re-introduction of the death penalty and the introduction of safe injecting rooms in Victoria.

Numerous studies have identified authoritarianism as a factor influencing sentencing preferences. Research has shown that individuals with high levels of authoritarianism are more likely to judge a defendant as guilty when compared with individuals with low levels of authoritarianism (Narby et al., 1993). Highly authoritarian individuals have been shown to prefer harsher sentencing strategies than individuals with low levels of authoritarianism (Narby et al., 1993), particularly when judging crimes of high severity (Ryckman et al., 1986). Research has found that political and social beliefs have a significant impact on sentencing preferences. Tyler and Weber (1982) found that an individual’s beliefs concerning the retributive value, deterrence value and lack of cruelty of the death penalty, rather than an individual’s crime related experiences and fears, predicted support for capital punishment.
They argued that beliefs underlying support for capital punishment and other punitive policies are associated with political and social attitudes including conservatism and authoritarianism.

Hypotheses

The Model

Research has shown that specific sentencing goal preferences are related to an individual’s fundamental attitudes about society and people. Carroll et al. (1987) found that demographic variables, personality characteristics and beliefs about the causes of crime predicted the contrasting positions of punishment or rehabilitation as the goals of sentencing.

Hypothesis 1. Based on research by Carroll et al. (1987) it was expected that the proposed model would constitute a fit with the data with demographic variables, personality variables, beliefs about the causes of crime and fear of crime expected to predict the contrasting sentencing goals of punishment and rehabilitation.

Predictors of Punishment as the Goal of Sentencing

Research has shown that a range of variables are associated with more punitive treatment of offenders and punishment as the preferred goal of sentencing. Variables include: educational level (Hessing, et al., 2001), high scores on authoritarianism (Chapdelaine & Griffin, 1997; Narby et al., 1993), the belief that the crime is caused by the individual
characteristics of the offender (Carroll et al., 1987) and fear of crime (Sprott & Doob, 1997).

Hypothesis 2. It was therefore expected that punishment as the goal of sentencing would be predicted by educational level, high scores on anxiety and authoritarianism, high scores on the belief that crime is caused by the personal characteristics of the individual and high levels of fear of crime.

Predictors of Rehabilitation as the Goal of Sentencing

Research has shown that a range of variables are associated with rehabilitation as the preferred goal of sentencing. Demographic variables include: religiousness (Hessing et al., 2001) and age (Carroll et al., 1987). According to Carroll et al’s (1987) model, the belief that the crime is caused by social or economic conditions in society predicts rehabilitation as the goal of sentencing.

Hypothesis 3. It was therefore expected that a similar pattern of results would emerge. Rehabilitation as the goal of sentencing was expected to be predicted by demographic variables, high scores on the belief that crime is the result of social or economic conditions in society and by high levels of satisfaction with the criminal justice system. Low scores on anxiety, authoritarianism and the belief that the characteristics of the individual cause crime were also expected to predict rehabilitation.
**Exploration of Cluster Analysis Results for Punishment and Rehabilitation Scales**

Given that different groups value the purpose of sentencing in different ways (Hessing et al, 2001) and the suggestion that community views on sentencing support multiple justice principles (Daly, 2000), the current study aimed to extend Carroll’s et al (1987) research by exploring whether sentencing goal preferences are linked to the attitudes of subgroups of respondents that can be categorised according to demographic variables, personality characteristics, beliefs and fear of crime.

Hypothesis 4. It was expected that cluster analysis results would identify meaningful subgroups with patterns of scores on both punishment and rehabilitation and that these subgroups would differ significantly from each other on demographic variables, personality characteristics, beliefs about the causes of crime and fear of crime.

**Predictors of Fear of Personal Crime**

Research has identified a range of demographic variables associated with higher levels of fear of crime. Demographic variables include: gender (Smith & Torstensson, 1997), age (Warr, 1987), location (Smith & Torstensson, 1997) and vulnerability (Killias, 1990). While some studies have found previous victimisation to be associated with higher fear of crime (Kury & Ferdinand, 1998; Smith & Hill, 1991) other studies dispute this assertion (Hill et al., 1985).
Given research that has linked high levels of authoritarianism to perceptions of societal threat (including threat of increase in major crimes) (Doty et al., 1991; Sales, 1973) and to advocacy of punishment as the goal of sentencing (Carroll et al., 1987), it seems reasonable to suggest that anxiety and authoritarianism predict fear of personal, property and terrorist crimes. The relative importance of these personality variables may differ according to type of crime. Similarly, research that has linked the belief that crime is caused by the personal characteristics of the individual to more punitive sentencing options (Carroll et al., 1987) could lead to a reasonable expectation that belief in individual causation may be related to elevated levels of fear of crime, particularly personal crime and terrorist crime that appear directed at causing personal harm to individuals. Research has also found a range of variables associated with higher levels of fear of crime including: perceived risk of crime (Mesch, 2000), perceived seriousness of crime (Warr, 1984) and exposure to media reports about crime (Chiricos, Escholz, & Gertz, 1997).

Hypothesis 5. It was therefore expected that high scores on fear of personal crime would be predicted by: demographic variables including gender and vulnerability, high scores on anxiety and authoritarianism, high scores on the belief that crime is caused by personal characteristics of the individual and high scores on variables related to perceptions about crime including perceived risk of personal crime and perceived seriousness of personal crime. Age was not expected to be a significant
predictor of fear of crime given the use of crime specific indicators of fear in the current study as opposed to global measures.

**Predictors of Fear of Property Crime**

Research has demonstrated that fear of personal crime differs markedly from fear of property crime offences (Meithe & Lee, 1984). While younger people are more afraid of having their car or property damaged than older people (Ferraro & LaGrange 1987; 1992), individuals most likely to believe they would be the victim of theft or property crime are young females living in urban areas with a higher income and education (Keane, 1992). Research has also suggested that fear of perceived likelihood of personal crime may be associated with heightened fear of property crime given the potential for personal assault to also occur when a property offence is committed (Warr, 1984).

Hypothesis 6. It was expected that high scores on fear of property crime would be predicted by: gender, high scores on anxiety and authoritarianism, the belief that crime is caused by social or economic conditions in society, perceived likelihood of property crime, perceived likelihood of personal crime and perceived seriousness of property crime.

**Predictors of Fear of Terrorist Crime**

In recent years following the terrorist attack on the World Trade centre (WTC) in 2001 and in Bali in 2002, Australia has taken a strong anti-terrorism position and has enacted legislation to strengthen its anti-
terrorism laws. Research has shown that terrorism can have a significant impact on the psychological well being of people (Wooding, 2004) and the health of economies that rely on tourism (Smyth, Neilsen, & Mishra, 2000).

Hypothesis 7. It is expected that fear of terrorism will be predicted by gender, educational level, high scores on anxiety and authoritarianism, high scores on the belief that crime is caused by the personal characteristics of the individual and high levels of perceived risk of terrorism.

Conclusion

This chapter has described the instruments used to measure the study variables and outlined recent refinements to improve the original versions of the scales. The specific research questions that have been developed in response to the literature review and areas of possible relationships have been identified. The following chapter describes the methods chosen to address these research questions and relationships between the data.
CHAPTER 7
THE RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction
This chapter discusses the general methodology used in the study as well as a description of the participants, the development of the research materials and the procedure for gathering the data.

Demographic Characteristics of Participants
The sample comprised 306 participants, 128 males and 178 females. Ages ranged from 18 to 83 years ($M = 44.27$ yrs, $SD = 13.53$ for females; $M = 46.33$ yrs $SD = 15.56$ for males). Participants in the study were drawn from the wider community with the majority residing in the outer eastern suburbs of Melbourne. Postcodes were categorised according to distance intervals from the Melbourne General Post Office (GPO) (Melway, 2006). While the majority of participants (48%) lived at a distance of 30-40km from the GPO, 19% lived 20 -30km from the GPO and 15% lived beyond 40km from the GPO. Only 3% of participants lived at a distance of up to 7km from the GPO and 1% lived at a distance of 7-10km from the GPO. These two subgroups were subsequently combined with those living 7-20km from the GPO. This group subsequently comprised 17% of the sample. While the majority of participants (93%) lived with others, 7% lived alone.
The educational level of respondents ranged from secondary qualifications to a completed university degree. While the majority of participants (41%) reported their highest level of education as secondary school, approximately a quarter of the sample (24%) reported having completed a university degree and 16% had reached tertiary level. While 13% of participants indicated that TAFE was their highest level of education, 6% reported having achieved undergraduate university level. The majority of respondents (82%) indicated that they were not currently studying, 10% were studying part time and 8% of respondents were full time students. While the majority of respondents (51%) were in full time employment, the remainder were either employed part time (25%) or not currently in paid employment (24%).

The number of respondents who reported having experienced incidents of previous personal or property victimisation either directly or indirectly was investigated. Direct victimisation of personal crime referred to the participant’s previous experience of crime, such as assault, rape or being robbed on the street, either during the last year or before the last year. Indirect victimisation of personal crime referred to the respondent’s experience of crime indirectly through family and friends who had been victims of a personal crime. Direct property victimisation referred to the participant’s experience of property crime, such as having their house vandalised or their car stolen either during the last year or before the last year. Indirect victimisation of a property crime referred to the respondent’s experience of property crime through family members, close friends or workmates who had been victims of a property crime. The
percentages of respondents in each victimisation subgroup are presented in Table 7.1.

Table 7.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Victim Last Year</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Victim Before Last Year</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Personal Victim</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Victim Last Year</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Victim Before Last Year</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Property Victim</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 306

As Table 7.1 shows, Property victimisation was more frequently reported than was personal victimisation. Indirect Property Victimisation was the most frequently reported subgroup of previous victimisation experiences with 80% of respondents indicating that they had known a victim of property crime. More than half the respondents reported having personally been a victim of property crime.

While 43% of respondents did not attend a place of worship, 38% attended occasionally and 18% attended regularly.
Design of the Study

The design of the study was correlational. The independent variables were: authoritarianism; anxiety; the belief that the personal characteristics of the offender cause crime; the belief that social conditions in society cause crime; the belief that the economic conditions in society cause crime; fear of personal crime; fear of property crime; fear of terrorism; perceived risk of crime; perceptions about crime seriousness and media exposure to crime.

The dependent variables were: punishment as the preferred goal of sentencing and rehabilitation as the preferred goal of sentencing. Other dependent variables related to more punitive sentencing options included: endorsement of mandatory sentencing; support for the death penalty and identification of sex offenders after release from prison. Other sentencing strategies focusing on rehabilitation of offenders and addressing the issue of drug use included endorsement of home detention and introduction of safe injecting rooms in Victoria.

Materials

The questionnaire consisted of scales relating to personality variables, beliefs about the causes of crime, fear of crime and sentencing goal preferences. Participants were also asked about their attitudes toward a range of different sentencing options that have been suggested as ways to deal with the problem of crime and punishment. The following section provides details about the scales used in the study and the types of questions that were asked of participants.
Authoritarianism

Legal Authoritarianism was measured using the Revised Legal Attitudes Questionnaire (RLAQ23) developed by Kravitz, Cutler and Brock (1993). Items measuring Legal Authoritarianism are focused on authoritarian beliefs about the legal system (Narby, Cutler & Moran, 1993). The 23 item scale is designed to assess the respondent’s tendency to disregard the civil liberties and rights of the accused person for example, the presumption of innocence, the exclusive burden of proof borne by the prosecution and various constitutional safeguards (Fitzgerald & Ellsworth, 1984).

Items on the RLAQ23 are classified into Authoritarian, Anti-Authoritarian or Equalitarian subscales. According to Kravitz et al. (1993), Authoritarian items are essentially punitive (e.g., ‘Defendants in a criminal case should be required to take the witness stand’), Anti-Authoritarian items imply that the blame for antisocial acts rests with society (e.g., ‘Where there is a ‘hung’ jury in a criminal case the defendant should always be freed’) and Equalitarian items support traditional, non-extreme positions on legal questions (e.g., ‘When determining a person’s guilt or innocence, the existence of a prior arrest record should not be considered’). Responses were recorded on a Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree).

Descriptive information was obtained for the Authoritarian subscale ($M = 4.78, SD = .948$), the Anti-Authoritarian subscale ($M = 3.25, SD = .914$) and Equalitarian subscale ($M = 3.91, SD = .770$) of the
Acceptable internal consistency was established for the Authoritarian subscale ($\alpha = .67$). Examination of the alpha co-efficient for the Anti-Authoritarian subscale ($\alpha = .54$) and the Equalitarian subscale ($\alpha = .48$) indicated low reliability and they were subsequently dropped from the analysis.

**Anxiety**

Anxiety was measured using the State-Trait Anxiety Scale (Speilberger, 1983). Respondents indicated the extent to which 20 items describing dispositional tendencies expressed how they generally felt (e.g., I tire quickly; I try to avoid facing a crisis or difficulty). Responses were recorded on a 4-point Likert Scale (1 = almost never; 4 = almost always). Possible scores ranged from a minimum of 20 to a maximum of 80, with higher scores indicating higher levels of anxiety. Descriptive information was obtained for the STAI Trait scale ($M = 38.03$, $SD = 9.33$). Examination of the alpha co-efficient for the STAI Trait scale indicated that good internal consistency was established ($\alpha = .90$).

**Beliefs about the Causes of Crime**

Beliefs about the causes of crime were measured using the 16-item Attribution scale developed by Carroll et al. (1987). This instrument is designed to assess beliefs about the causes of crime along three causal dimensions; Social Causation (7 items), Economic Causation (4 items) and Individual Causation (5 items). Items measuring Social Causation attribute crime to offender’s family problems, criminal
associates or drug use (e.g., ‘At the root of much crime are early family problems’). Items measuring Economic Causation attribute the causes of crime to societal conditions of poverty and inequality (e.g., ‘Many crimes are more the result of flaws in society than any basic criminality in the offender’). Items measuring Individual Causation attribute the causes of crime to irresponsible and uncaring individuals (e.g., ‘Most criminals deliberately choose to prey on society). Responses were recorded on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly agree; 7 = strongly disagree)

Descriptive information was obtained for the Social Causation subscale ($M = 5.31$, $SD = .786$), the Economic Causation subscale ($M = 3.58$, $SD = 1.05$) and the Individual Causation subscale ($M = 3.98$, $SD = .934$). Acceptable internal consistency was established for each of the three subscales, Social Causation ($\alpha = .76$), Economic Causation ($\alpha = .73$) and Individual Causation ($\alpha = .67$).

Goals of Sentencing

Participants’ attitude toward the goals of sentencing was measured using the seventeen-item Sentencing Goal scale formulated by Carroll et al. (1987). Three factors were labelled Satisfactory Performance (6 items), Punishment (6 items) and Rehabilitation (5 items). Satisfactory performance of the criminal justice system was measured by indicating level of agreement with statements like; ‘The criminal system works extremely well the way it is now’. Items representing endorsement of punishment as the goal of sentencing focused on a more punitive stance toward crime (e.g., ‘More emphasis should be place on keeping criminals
behind bars’). Endorsement of rehabilitation as the goal of sentencing was measured using level of agreement with statements like; ‘More and better rehabilitation programs for prisoners should be developed’. Responses were recorded on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly agree; 7 = strongly disagree).

Descriptive information was obtained for the Satisfactory Performance subscale ($M = 3.70$, $SD = .917$), the Punishment subscale ($M = 5.27$, $SD = 1.15$) and the Rehabilitation subscale ($M = 4.78$, $SD = .968$). Acceptable internal consistency was established for each of the three subscales, Satisfactory Performance ($\alpha = .80$), Punishment ($\alpha = .70$) and Rehabilitation ($\alpha = .76$).

**Fear of Crime**

Fear of Crime (FOC), Perceived Victimisation Risk (ROC) and perceived Victimisation Seriousness were measured using the 10-item offence specific scale developed by Ferraro and LaGrange (1992). The scale included two subscales: Personal Crime (6 items) and Property Crime (4 items). Items assessing Fear of Crime asked participants to indicate how afraid they were of becoming a victim of each of the 10 different types of crimes. An example of items include; ‘How afraid are you of … being attacked by someone with a weapon’ (Personal Crime). ‘How afraid are you of … Having your car stolen’ (Property Crime). Responses were recorded on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = not afraid at all; 7 = extremely afraid). The same items were used to assess perceived Risk of Crime. Using a 7-point Likert scale where 1 = completely unlikely and 7
= completely likely, participants rated the chance that a specific crime will happen to them in the coming year. For example; ‘How likely do you think it is that you will…be attacked by someone with a weapon’. Participants also indicated how serious they considered each crime to be on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = not at all serious; 7 = extremely serious).

In order to explore any differences that may result from the use of more global single item questions when compared with the offence-specific scales (Ferraro & LaGrange, 1992), two global questions about fear of crime were included in the study. The questions were designed to assess perceptions about safety in the neighbourhood at night and during the day. Items include: ‘How safe do you feel out alone in your neighbourhood during the day?’ and ‘How safe do you feel out in your neighbourhood during the night?’ Responses were recorded on a 4-point Likert scale (1 = very safe; 4 = very unsafe).

Descriptive information was obtained for the Fear of Crime Scale (M = 4.44, SD = 1.38), the Personal Crime subscale (M = 4.56, SD = 1.80) and the Property Crime subscale (M = 4.29, SD = 1.23).

Descriptive information was also obtained for the perceived Risk of Crime Scale (M = 3.04, SD = .88), the Risk of Personal Crime subscale (M = 4.56, SD = 1.80) and for the Risk of Property Crime subscale (M = 3.58, SD = .95). Acceptable internal consistency was established for Fear of Crime Scale (α = .90), the Personal Crime subscale (α = .93) and the Property Crime subscale (α = .80). Acceptable internal consistency was also established for the perceived Risk of Crime scale (α = .89), the
perceived Risk of Personal Crime subscale ($\alpha = .71$) and for the perceived Risk of Property Crime subscale ($\alpha = .71$).

_Fear of Terrorism_

Fear of Terrorism was measured using a victimisation specific scale formulated by the researchers. The nine-item scale included two subscales: Fear of Terrorism (4 items) and perceived Risk of Terrorism (3 items). Respondents were asked to rate their fear of…. ‘Becoming a victim of a terrorist attack while travelling on a plane’, of ‘Becoming a victim of random violence (e.g., car bomb)’, of ‘Becoming a victim of a chemical attack (e.g., anthrax) and of ‘Becoming a victim in a tall building’. Responses were recorded on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Not afraid at all, 7 = Extremely afraid). Perceived Risk of Terrorism was measured by asking respondents to rate the chance that the same specific attacks will happen to them in the coming year. Responses were recorded on a 7-point Likert scale where 1 = Completely unlikely and 7 = Completely likely.

_Perceived Seriousness of Crime_

Crime seriousness was measured using the Crime Seriousness scale developed by Warr (1984). He examined age and sex differences in fear of victimisation for 16 offences designed to measure fear and perceived risk of crime. He examined perceived seriousness of the offence as a possible explanation for differences in sensitivity to risk among age/gender groups. From this perspective, Warr (1984) posited that the
more serious the offence is perceived to be, the faster fear would increase with perceived risk and/or the greater the fear would be at all levels of perceived risk.

Warr (1984) obtained data from 339 participants using a mail survey of Seattle residents. Respondents were asked to rate the seriousness of a variety of personal, property and public order offences. Responses were recorded on an 11-point scale ranging from, *not at all afraid* (0) to *very afraid* (10). Data reported by Warr (1984) indicated consistent differences among age/gender groups in the mean perceived seriousness of the offences. Females viewed each offence as more serious than males. The perceived seriousness of the offences tended to increase with age although the pattern was more consistent for females than for males. Warr (1984) concluded that a principal source of age differences in sensitivity to risk was age-related variation in perceived seriousness of offences.

**Crime Victimisation Experiences**

To assess previous victimisation experiences, participants were asked whether they had been a victim of a personal or property crime in the last year or prior to the last 12 months. For example, ‘During the last year have you ever been a victim of a personal crime (e.g., assault, rape, robbed on the street etc.)’, (1 = yes; 2 = no) and ‘During the last year were you ever a victim of property crime (e.g., house vandalised or broken into, car stolen)’. Participants were also asked whether they had known someone who had been a victim of personal or property crime. For example; ‘Do you know of a family member, close friend neighbour or workmate who
has been a victim of personal crime?’ (1 = yes, 2 = no) and ‘Do you
know of a family member, close friend neighbour or workmate who has
been a victim of property crime?’ (1 = yes, 2 = no).

Perceived Vulnerability

Perceived vulnerability was measured using two items designed
to assess the respondent’s perceived ability to defend him or herself if
personally assaulted. Items include: ‘How would you rate your level of
fitness at the moment? Do you consider it to be…’ (1 = not at all fit, 5 =
extremely high) and ‘Imagine that you are assaulted by a young unarmed
man. Do you think that in this situation you would be able to run away or
defend yourself?’ (1 = I would definitely become a victim, 4 = I would
certainly defend myself or run away).

Crime-Preventive Behaviours

Crime-Preventive Behaviours were measured using a modified
version of the scale used by Williams, Singh and Singh (1994).
Respondents were asked to consider a list of 12 crime-preventive
behaviours and circle all the behaviours they engaged in. For example; ‘I
carry a whistle’; ‘I learn self defence’; ‘I have a burglar alarm in my
home’. Scores ranged from a possible 0 = not engaging in any behaviours
to 12 = engaging in all behaviours.
Media

Respondents were asked about how frequently they watched each of three different types of television programs focused on the issues of law and order. The question ‘How often do you watch these types of television shows? News programs (e.g., Current Affair), Police/Law Dramas (e.g., Law & Order, The Practice) and Documentaries (e.g., ABC & SBS) was recorded on a 7-point Likert scale where 1 = Rarely and 7 = Daily. One item required respondents to indicate how frequently they listened to radio news and one item asked about how often participants read news magazines (e.g., Time). Responses were recorded on a 7-point Likert scale where 1 = Rarely and 7 = Daily. An additional item asked respondent’s to consider 6 different sources of information about crime and circle the option that indicated where they obtained most of their news (e.g., Do you get most of your news about crime from television, newspapers, radio, magazines, co-workers or friends and neighbours?).

Sentencing Options

Attitudes toward more controversial sentencing options were measured by asking respondents to indicate their level of agreement with each of six statements about current issues related to sentencing and the problem of drug use. Two items asked participants to respond to statements about mandatory sentencing (‘Mandatory sentencing is a good idea’ and ‘Minimum mandatory sentences are a good idea for serious crimes’). Three items asked participants to indicate their level of agreement with statements about other ways to deal with the problem of
crime and imprisonment (‘Some offenders could be placed on home detention provided they wear a non-removable tracking device’, ‘Sex offenders should be identified to the public after they have served their sentence’ and ‘The death penalty should be reintroduced in Victoria’).

Participant’s opinion about the introduction of safe injecting rooms as a way to help deal with the issue of drug use was measured by asking them to indicate their level of agreement with the statement ‘Safe injecting rooms should be introduced in Victoria’. Responses were recorded on a 7-point Likert scale where 1 = Completely disagree and 7 = Completely agree).

Pilot Study

The questionnaire was piloted with a number of community members. One aim of the testing was to examine the introduction, items and format for comprehension, ambiguity and response difficulty (Punch, 2003). Participants generally reported that the questionnaire was clear and easily understood. Piloting did not suggest that items needed to be changed or modified. The questionnaire was also tested for length and time required for completion. Participants reported that the questionnaire required approximately 40 minutes to complete.

Procedure

Sample Selection

Questionnaires were distributed through acquaintances of the researcher using the snowball technique. Eligibility criteria included a
minimum age of 18 years and the ability to read and write in English at a level appropriate for completion of the questionnaire. Respondents were informed that their participation was voluntary and anonymous and they were free to withdraw at any time. Respondents were provided with a reply-paid envelope. Confidentiality was maintained since no identifying details were required. Participants were supplied with an information sheet that outlined the aims of the study and contact details for the research team if respondents had any queries or concerns regarding participating in the study (refer Appendix C).

Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the general methodology used in the study and provided a description of the participants, the development of the research materials and the procedure for gathering the data. Results from the analyses are reported in Chapter 8.
CHAPTER 8
ANALYSES OF THE DATA

Introduction

This chapter outlines descriptive information, correlation and multiple regression analyses of the study variables. In order to investigate the relationships between the study variables, inter-correlations between all the scale scores were calculated. A series of hierarchical multiple regression analyses were computed to investigate the relative contribution of the study variables as predictors of sentencing goals and fear of crime. Variables were entered in steps beginning with more general demographic characteristics and personality variables, followed by more specific beliefs about crime that according to Carroll et al.’s (1987) proposed model, lead to attitudes toward sentencing goals. Hierarchical multiple regression analyses was also conducted to investigate the relative importance of the study variables as predictors of fear of personal crime, fear of property crime, fear of terrorism and endorsement of punitive sentencing options.

To extend Carroll et al.’s (1987) research, hierarchical cluster analysis was computed to explore whether cluster analysis would identify subgroups of respondents with patterns of scores on punishment and rehabilitation and whether these subgroups differed from each other.
on the major study variables. A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore how the cluster groups differed from each other on the study variables.

**Preliminary Analyses**

Data were analysed using SPSS 11.0 (Norusis & SPSS Inc., 2000). Prior to analysis the data were screened for any potential outliers, missing values and normality. Only two missing values were found and these were replaced with the scale mean.

**Descriptive Information**

Descriptive statistics were calculated for the study scales and are presented in Table 8.1. Independent samples t-tests were conducted to investigate gender differences for each of the study variables. Mean scores, standard deviations and gender differences for the study variables are presented in Table 8.1.
Table 8.1.

**Mean Scores, Standard Deviations and T–Test Results for Study Variables for Males and Females**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>2.27 (0.23)</td>
<td>2.37 (0.25)</td>
<td>2.33 (0.24)</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>3.53***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Auth</td>
<td>4.67 (0.97)</td>
<td>4.86 (0.93)</td>
<td>4.78 (0.95)</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>1.70 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Causes</td>
<td>5.27 (0.83)</td>
<td>5.34 (0.75)</td>
<td>5.31 (0.79)</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>0.75 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiv Causes</td>
<td>3.98 (0.90)</td>
<td>3.98 (0.96)</td>
<td>3.98 (0.93)</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>0.03 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ Causes</td>
<td>3.57 (1.07)</td>
<td>3.59 (1.04)</td>
<td>3.59 (1.05)</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>0.21 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear Personal</td>
<td>3.55 (1.55)</td>
<td>4.83 (1.47)</td>
<td>4.30 (1.63)</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>7.30***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear Property</td>
<td>4.08 (1.24)</td>
<td>4.45 (1.22)</td>
<td>4.30 (1.24)</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>2.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear Terrorism</td>
<td>2.70 (1.41)</td>
<td>3.42 (1.60)</td>
<td>3.13 (1.56)</td>
<td>291.07</td>
<td>4.20***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>5.24 (1.20)</td>
<td>5.30 (1.12)</td>
<td>5.28 (1.15)</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>0.50 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>4.67 (0.99)</td>
<td>4.86 (0.94)</td>
<td>4.78 (0.97)</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>1.72 ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 306


Table 8.1 shows that the mean response for Anxiety was 2.33 out of 4 (with 1 = almost never anxious and 4 = almost always anxious) suggesting that participants generally experienced average levels of anxiety. The standard deviation was small (SD= .24) indicating low
variability in participant responses with 65% of the sample (n= 181) rating their level of anxiety between 2.05 and 2.5 out of 4. The mean response for Legal Authoritarianism was 4.78 out of 7 (with 1 = not at all authoritarian and 7 = completely authoritarian) indicating that participants demonstrated moderate levels of authoritarianism. The low variability in participant responses is evidenced by the high frequency of responses falling between 4 (mid-way response) and 5 (moderately authoritarian) reflecting over one third (43%) of the sample (n = 131).

As shown in Table 8.1, the mean score for belief in Social Causation was 5.31 out of 7 (with 1= completely disagree to 7 = completely agree) suggesting that participants moderately agreed that social conditions in society cause crime. The most frequent response for Social Causation was 5, with 12% (n=38) of the sample choosing this response. The mean score for Individual Causation (M = 3.98) and for Economic Causation (M = 3.59) was lower than for Social Causation. The most frequent response for Individual Causation was 4 (midway response), indicating that 10% (n=32) of the sample neither agreed or disagreed that the personal characteristics of the individual is the primary cause of crime. This suggested that participants experienced moderately low levels of endorsement of the belief that either the
personal characteristics of the individual or the economic conditions in society primary cause crime.

Table 8.1 shows that the mean response for Fear of Personal Crime and Fear of Property Crime was 4.30 out of 7 (with 1 = not afraid at all and 7 = extremely afraid) indicating that participant’s fear of personal and property crime were in the average range (midway response). Variability in participant responses was higher for Fear of Personal Crime (SD = 1.63) than for Fear of Property Crime (1.24). The mean response for Fear of Terrorism was 3.13 out of 7 (with 1 = not afraid at all and 7 = extremely afraid) suggesting that participants experienced moderately low levels of Fear of Terrorism.

As shown in Table 8.1, the mean score for Punishment as the goal of sentencing was 5.28 out of 7 (with 1 = completely disagree with Punishment as a sentencing goal and 7 = completely agree with Punishment as a sentencing goal) suggesting that participants showed moderate levels of endorsement of Punishment as the goal of sentencing. The mean score for Rehabilitation as the goal of sentencing was 4.78 out of 7 (with 1 = completely disagree and 7 = completely agree) indicating that participants in the sample endorsed Punishment more strongly they endorsed Rehabilitation as the preferred goal of sentencing.

Results in Table 8.1 show significant gender differences in mean scores for Anxiety and Fear of Crime variables. Females indicated
higher levels of anxiety and higher levels of fear of all types of crime than did males. The highest level of fear indicated by females was Fear of Personal Crime. No significant gender differences were found for beliefs about the causes of crime and sentencing goal preferences.

**Multicollinearity**

Given that multiple regression analysis is sensitive to a violation of the assumption of multicollinearity, which exists when the independent variables are highly correlated (Pallant, 2001), intercorrelations between the scale scores were calculated (refer Appendix A). The correlations between the study variables did not exceed .7 as recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (1996). The finding that Fear of Personal Crime and Fear of Property Crime were moderately correlated with each other ($r = .58$) suggested that these two variables, although related, measured separate dimensions and were distinct enough to investigate independently. Intercorrelations between the belief variables, Individual Causation, Social Causation and Economic Causation ranged between ($r = -.05$) and ($r = .30$) and a correlation of ($r = -.35$) between Punishment and Rehabilitation indicated that the assumption of multicollinearity was not violated.
Predictors of Sentencing Goals

Goals of Sentencing Correlates: Demographic Variables

In order to investigate the relationships between demographic variables and goals of sentencing, intercorrelations between the demographic variables including Gender, Age, Educational Level and Worship and the Sentencing Goals were calculated and the results presented in Table 8.2.

Table 8.2.

Intercorrelations Between Demographic Variables and Sentencing Goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Punishment</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.03ns</td>
<td>.10ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-.03ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worship</td>
<td>-.10ns</td>
<td>.08ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 306

Note: * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

As shown in Table 8.2, two demographic variables were significantly correlated with the Goals of Sentencing. A significant positive correlation was found between Age and Punishment and a moderate negative correlation was found between Educational Level and Punishment with higher levels of education associated with lower scores on Punishment. A small positive correlation was found between
Educational Level and Rehabilitation with higher levels of education associated with higher scores on Rehabilitation. Gender and Worship were not significantly correlated with the Goals of Sentencing.

Goals of Sentencing Correlates: Personality

In order to investigate the relationship between the personality variables and the goals of sentencing, intercorrelations between Anxiety, Legal Authoritarianism and the sentencing goals were calculated and the results presented in Table 8.3.

Table 8.3.

Intercorrelations Between Personality Variables and Sentencing Goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Punishment</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.01ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Authoritarianism</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 306

Note: * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

As shown in Table 8.3, a strong positive correlation was found between Legal Authoritarianism and Punishment with higher scores on Authoritarianism associated with higher scores on Punishment. Whilst a small positive correlation was found between Anxiety and Punishment, Anxiety was not significantly correlated with Rehabilitation.
Goals of Sentencing Correlates: Fear of Crime Variables

The relationship between the variables related to fear of crime and the goals of sentencing was investigated with intercorrelations between the Fear of Crime, Likelihood of Crime, Seriousness of Crime, Fear of Terrorism and Likelihood of Terrorism calculated and results presented in Table 8.4.

Table 8.4.

Intercorrelations Between Fear of Crime Variables and Sentencing Goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Punishment</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Personal Crime</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.03ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Property Crime</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-.10ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Personal</td>
<td>.10ns</td>
<td>-.08ns</td>
<td>2.80 (.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Property</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.10ns</td>
<td>3.58 (.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriousness Personal</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.09ns</td>
<td>6.62 (.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriousness Property</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>5.17 (.89)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 306

Note: * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001 Likelihood Personal = Likelihood of Personal Crime, Likelihood Property = Likelihood of Property Crime, Seriousness Personal = Seriousness of Personal Crime, Seriousness Property = Seriousness of Property Crime

Table 8.4 shows that five variables were significantly correlated with Punishment, with the strongest correlations found between Fear of Property Crime and Punishment and Seriousness of Property Crime and
Punishment. Fear of crime and perceived seriousness of crime rose with increased endorsement of Punishment. Only one variable was significantly correlated with Rehabilitation with a small negative correlation found between Seriousness of Property Crime and Rehabilitation. Perceived Seriousness of Property Crime increased with reduced endorsement of Rehabilitation.

Goals of Sentencing Correlates: Beliefs about the Causes of Crime

To investigate the relationship between beliefs about the causes of crime and the goals of sentencing, intercorrelations between Social Causation, Individual Causation, Economic Causation and Sentencing Goals were calculated and the results presented in Table 8.5. The correlation between Satisfactory Performance of the Criminal Justice System and Sentencing Goals was also calculated and the results given in Table 8.5.
Table 8.5.

Intercorrelations Between Beliefs about the Causes of Crime, Satisfactory Performance of the Criminal Justice System and Sentencing Goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Punishment</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Causation</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.04ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Causation</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Causation</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory Performance</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 306

Note: * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001 Satisfactory Performance = Satisfactory Performance of the Criminal Justice System.

Table 8.5 shows that Individual Causation, Social Causation and Economic Causation were all significantly correlated with Punishment. Endorsement of Punishment increased when the causes of crime were attributed to either the personal characteristics of the individual or to the social conditions in society. Support for Punishment decreased when the causes of crime were attributed to the economic conditions in society. Endorsement of Rehabilitation increased as satisfaction with the criminal justice system rose and when the causes of crime were attributed to the economic conditions in society. Support for rehabilitation decreased when crime was attributed to the personal characteristics of the offender.
Overview of Hierarchical Regression Analyses

Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted to investigate the relative importance of the study variables as predictors of sentencing goals and fear of crime. Using hierarchical multiple regression enabled investigation of the causal ordering of variables proposed by Carroll et al. (1987). According to Carroll et al.’s model, more fundamental and general attitudes about society and people lead to more specific attitudes about crime and sentencing. Carroll et al. proposed an ordering of variables beginning with more fundamental and general characteristics, including demographic features and personality variables that contribute to intermediate level beliefs about crime that are more specific and that in turn, lead to attitudes toward sentencing goals. The present study added to Carroll et al.’s proposed model by investigating the impact of fear of crime as well as other crime related variables including perceptions about the likelihood and seriousness of crime in the causal ordering of variables.

Five hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted. The first two hierarchical regressions investigated the predictors of the goals of sentencing with Punishment treated as the dependent variable in the first analysis and Rehabilitation treated as the dependent variable in the second analysis. The next two hierarchical multiple regressions investigated the predictors of two aspects of fear of crime including Fear
of Personal Crime and Fear of Property Crime. The final regression investigated predictors of Fear of Terrorism.

Although Pallant (2001) recommended that it is preferable to include independent variables in the regression analysis that correlate above .3 with the dependent variable, for theoretical reasons some variables that were significantly correlated above .2 with the dependent variables were included in the hierarchical regression analyses. For example, Satisfactory Performance of the Criminal Justice System had a correlation of $r = .22^{**}$ with Rehabilitation and was included in the regression analysis given previous Australian research that linked public dissatisfaction with the courts and legal system to increased preference for harsher sentencing (Indermaur & Roberts, 2005).

**Testing assumptions**

Prior to conducting each hierarchical multiple regression analysis, the assumptions underlying its use were tested. Sample size requirements as recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (1996) were checked to ensure that the number of cases was appropriate for the number of independent variables used in the analysis. A sample size of 306 participants was sufficient for the number of independent variables included in the analysis. Pearson’s correlation coefficients were used to check for multicollinearity. Inspection of the correlation table (Refer to
Appendix A) showed no Pearson correlation coefficient above .7 indicating that the variables could be used as separate independent variables (Tabachnick & Fidell 1996). The residuals scatterplot and Normal Probability Plot of the regression standardised residuals generated by SPSS indicated that the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity were satisfied.

The Proposed Model

Hypothesis 1

Following Carroll et al.’s model, Hypothesis 1 stated that the model proposed in the current research would constitute a good fit with the data with demographic variables, beliefs about the causes of crime and fear of crime expected to predict the contrasting sentencing goals of punishment and rehabilitation. To test Hypothesis 1, five hierarchical regression analyses were conducted and the results presented below.

Predictors of Punishment as the Goal of Sentencing

Hypothesis 2

Following Carroll et al.’s (1987) model, Hypothesis 2 stated that high scores on Punishment as the primary goal of sentencing would be predicted by three sets of variables, including demographics and high
scores on Anxiety, Authoritarianism, Fear of Crime and Individual Causes of Crime.

To test Hypothesis 2, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was calculated with scores on Punishment as the dependent variable. The independent variables were entered in four steps. The first step was comprised of Educational Level, the second step was comprised of Legal Authoritarianism and the third step included Fear of Personal Crime, Fear of Property Crime and Seriousness of Property Crime. The fourth set of predictors included Individual Causation and Social Causation. The results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis are presented in Table 8.6.
Table 8.6.

Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Punishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Step1</th>
<th>Step2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>-.37***</td>
<td>-.15***</td>
<td>-.15***</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Authoritarianism</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Personal Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Property Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriousness Property</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Causation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Causation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R = .36 \quad R = .69 \quad R = .69 \quad R = .73$

$R^2 = .13 \quad R^2 = .47 \quad R^2 = .48 \quad R^2 = .54$

$N = 306$

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Educational Level explained 13.4% of the variance in Punishment as the goal of sentencing. A low score on Educational Level ($t = 6.85, p < .001$) was a significant independent predictor of endorsement of Punishment. The inclusion of Legal Authoritarianism at Step 2 significantly improved the model ($F_{\text{change}} (1, 303 = 193.83, p < .001$) and accounted for a further 33.8% of the variance in Punishment. A high level of Legal Authoritarianism ($t = 13.92, p <$...
.001) was a significant independent predictor of Punishment. Educational Level ($t = 3.41, p < .001$) remained a significant predictor at this step. Adding Fear of Personal Crime, Fear of Property Crime and Seriousness of Property Crime variables at Step 3 did not significantly improve the model and none of these variables were significant independent predictors of Punishment. At Step 4 the inclusion of Social Causation and Individual Causation significantly improved the model ($F_{change} (2, 298 = 18.34, p < .001$) and accounted for a further 5.4% of the variance in Punishment. A high score on Individual Causation ($t = 5.97, p < .001$) was a significant independent predictor of Punishment. The independent effect of Social Causation on Punishment was not significant. Legal Authoritarianism ($t = 8.30, p < .001$) and Educational Level ($t = 2.77, p < .01$) remained significant predictors at this step. Overall, the model presented a statistically significant equation ($F (7, 298) = 50.10, p < .001, R = .74$) and explained 54.1% of the variance in Punishment (refer to Figure 8.1).

The results of the hierarchical regression analysis support the hypothesis that Punishment as the goal of sentencing would be predicted by Educational Level, Legal Authoritarianism and Individual Causes. The hypothesis that Anxiety and Fear of Crime would uniquely predict Punishment as the goal of sentencing was not supported.
Figure 8.1. Final Regression Model Representing Predictors of Punishment as the Goal of Sentencing.  
Note:*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.
Predictors of Rehabilitation as the Goal of Sentencing

Hypothesis 3

Following Caroll et al.’s (1987) model, Hypothesis 3 stated that high scores on Rehabilitation as the primary goal of sentencing would be predicted by demographic variables, low scores on Legal Authoritarianism and Individual Causation and by high scores on Social Causation and Economic Causation.

Table 8.2 shows that none of the demographic variables were significantly correlated above .2 with Rehabilitation. As shown in Table 8.3, Legal Authoritarianism was significantly correlated above .2 with Rehabilitation and was subsequently included in the hierarchical regression. Table 8.4 shows that none of the variables related to fear of crime and seriousness of crime were significantly correlated above .2 with Rehabilitation. As shown in Table 8.5, variables related to beliefs about the causes of crime, including Economic Causation and Individual Causation as well as Satisfactory Performance of the Criminal Justice System were all correlated above .2 with Rehabilitation and were subsequently included in the hierarchical regression analysis.

To test hypothesis 3, a hierarchical multiple regression was conducted to examine the relative influence of each of these sets of variables on Rehabilitation as the goal of sentencing. Rehabilitation was treated as the dependent variable. To test Carroll et al.’s model, the
independent variables were entered in two steps. The first step
comprised Legal Authoritarianism and the second step comprised
Satisfactory Performance of the Criminal Justice System, Individual
Causation and Economic Causation. The results of the hierarchical
multiple regression analysis are presented in Table 8.7.

Table 8.7.

*Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables
Predicting Rehabilitation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Step1</th>
<th>Step2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Authoritarianism</td>
<td>-.25***</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory Performance</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Causation</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Causation</td>
<td>-.22***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R = .25 \quad R = .45 \]
\[ R^2 = .06 \quad R^2 = .20 \]

\(N = 306\)

*Note: * \(p < .05\), ** \(p < .01\), *** \(p < .001\) Satisfactory Performance =
Satisfactory Performance of the Criminal Justice System.

Legal Authoritarianism accounted for 6% of the variance in
Rehabilitation. A low level of Legal Authoritarianism \((t = 4.41, p < .001)\) was a significant independent predictor of Rehabilitation. The
inclusion of Satisfactory Performance of the Criminal Justice System,
Individual Causation and Economic Causation at Step 2 made a further significant contribution to the model \( (F_{\text{change}} (3, 301), = 17.49, p < .001) \) and accounted for an additional 14.3% of the variance in Rehabilitation. High scores on Satisfactory Performance of the Criminal Justice System \( (t = 2.745, p < .01) \), high scores on Economic Causation \( (t = 5.47, p < .001) \) and low scores on Individual Causation \( (t = -3.45, p < .001) \) were significant independent predictors of Rehabilitation. Legal Authoritarianism did not remain a significant predictor at this step. Overall, the model presented a statistically significant equation \( (F (4,301) = 19.14, p < .001, R = .45) \) and explained 20.3% of the variance in Rehabilitation (refer Figure 8.2).

The overall results of the hierarchical multiple regression support the hypothesis that Rehabilitation as the primary goal of sentencing would be predicted by high scores on Satisfactory Performance of the Criminal Justice System, high scores on Economic Causation and low scores on Individual Causation. The hypothesis that Rehabilitation would be predicted by demographic variables, low scores on Legal Authoritarianism and Fear of Crime and by Social Causation was not supported.
Figure 8.2. Final Regression Model Representing Predictors of Rehabilitation as the Goal of Sentencing.

Note: *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001. Satisfactory Performance = Satisfactory Performance of the Criminal Justice System.
Exploration of Cluster Analysis Results for Punishment and Rehabilitation Scales

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 stated that cluster analysis results would identify meaningful subgroups and that these subgroups would differ significantly from each other on variables including demographic and personality characteristics, beliefs about the causes of crime and fear of crime.

To test Hypothesis 4, an exploratory hierarchical cluster analysis using Ward’s method and squared Euclidean difference was conducted to explore whether there were subgroups in the sample with patterns of scores on attitudes to punishment and rehabilitation. According to the dendogram attached (refer Appendix B), four clear clusters were found. Mean scores for Punishment and Rehabilitation variables were calculated and on the basis of these scores, the cluster groups were labelled High Punishment /High Rehabilitation, High Punishment /Low Rehabilitation, Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation and Low Punishment /Low Rehabilitation. Although the fourth cluster was labelled Low Punishment /Low Rehabilitation, it should be noted that mean scores for this group were in the mid range. Mean scores for the cluster groups are presented in Table 8.8.
Table 8.8.

**Mean Scores for Cluster Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Punishment</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Punish/High Rehab</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Punish/Low Rehab</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Punish/High Rehab</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>5.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Punish/Low Rehab</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 306

*Note:* High Punish High Rehab = High Punishment /High Rehabilitation, High Punish Low Rehab = High Punishment /Low Rehabilitation, Low Punish High Rehab = Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation, Low Punish Low Rehab = Low Punishment /Low Rehabilitation.

As shown in Table 8.8, the High Punishment /High Rehabilitation group scored high on both Punishment and Rehabilitation, the High Punishment /Low Rehabilitation group scored high on Punishment and low on Rehabilitation, the Low Punishment /High rehabilitation group scored low on Punishment and high on Rehabilitation and the Low Punishment / Low Rehabilitation group scored low on both Punishment and Rehabilitation.

A one-way between groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore how the cluster groups differed from each other on the study variables including Age, Anxiety, Authoritarianism, Individual Causation, Social Causation, Economic Causation, Fear of Personal Crime and Fear of Property Crime. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 8.9.
Table 8.9.

One-way Between Groups Analysis of Variance for Study Variables and Cluster Subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster Subgroups</th>
<th>High Punishment High Rehabilitation ( (n = 69) )</th>
<th>High Punishment Low Rehabilitation ( (n = 84) )</th>
<th>Low Punishment High Rehabilitation ( (n = 38) )</th>
<th>Low Punishment Low Rehabilitation ( (n = 115) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>( SD )</td>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>( SD )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>49.51(^a)</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>46.61</td>
<td>13.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism</td>
<td>5.35(^a)</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>5.20(^a)</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>2.37(^a)</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Causation</td>
<td>4.39(^a)</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>4.43(^a)</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Causation</td>
<td>5.61(^a)</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>5.30(^a)</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Causation</td>
<td>3.83(^a)</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3.12(^b)</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Personal Crime</td>
<td>4.74(^a)</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>4.22(^a)</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Property Crime</td>
<td>4.55(^a)</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>4.58(^a)</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( N = 306; \) Scores in any row with different superscript are significantly different, \( p < .05 \) (Tukey post hoc tests)
As Table 8.9 shows, a significant main group effect for all eight study variables. However, Levene’s test of equality of variances was significant for the Anxiety and Economic Causation scales indicating a violation of the assumption of equality of variances. Levene’s test of equality of variances for the other six scales was not significant. Therefore it was decided to proceed with the analyses which should be interpreted with caution. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD tests showed significant differences on the following subscales: for Authoritarianism the Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation group differed significantly from the Low Punishment /Low Rehabilitation group, the High Punishment /Low Rehabilitation group and the High Punishment /High Rehabilitation group; for Anxiety the High Punishment /High Rehabilitation group differed significantly from the Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation group; for Individual Causation the Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation differed significantly from the Low Punishment /Low Rehabilitation group, High Punishment /High Rehabilitation group and the High Punishment /Low Rehabilitation group; for Social Causation the Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation group differed significantly from the Low Punishment /Low Rehabilitation group, the High Punishment /Low Rehabilitation group and the High Punishment /High Rehabilitation group; for Economic Causation the High Punishment /Low
Rehabilitation group differed significantly from the Low Punishment/ Low Rehabilitation group, the High Punishment /High Rehabilitation group and the Low Punishment/ High Rehabilitation group; for Fear of Personal Crime, the Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation group differed significantly from the High Punishment /Low Rehabilitation group, the Low Punishment /Low Rehabilitation group and the High Punishment /High Rehabilitation group; and for Fear of Property Crime, the Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation group differed significantly from the High Punishment/ High Rehabilitation group and the High Punishment /Low Rehabilitation group.

The Pearson’s chi-square test for independence was calculated to explore the relationship between the demographic variables and the cluster groups. In order to satisfy the assumption of chi-square concerning ‘minimum expected cell frequency’ of 5 or greater (Pallant, 2001), level of education was recoded into two categories: Secondary Level and Tertiary Level. The results of the Pearson chi-square test are presented in Table 8.10.
Table 8.10.

Pearson’s Chi Square Tests for Educational Level and Cluster Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Punish</th>
<th>Low Punish</th>
<th>Low Punish</th>
<th>High Punish</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Rehab</td>
<td>Low Rehab</td>
<td>High Rehab</td>
<td>Low Rehab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=306 NB. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5.
High Punish High Rehab = High Punishment /High Rehabilitation,
Low Punish Low Rehab = Low Punishment / Low Rehabilitation,
Low Punish High Rehab = Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation,
High Punish Low Rehab = High Punishment /Low Rehabilitation.

A significant relationship was found between Educational Level and the cluster groups ($\chi^2 = 19.180$, df = 3, $p < .000$).

Examination of the cell frequencies indicated that the low punishment cluster groups were endorsed by the majority of respondents with a tertiary level of education, whereas high punishment clusters were endorsed by respondents with a secondary level of education. The Low Punishment High Rehabilitation cluster was endorsed by a majority (79%) of respondents with a tertiary level of education when compared with a minority (21%) of respondents with a secondary level of education. The majority of participants within the Low Punishment Low Rehabilitation cluster were also more highly educated when compared with the other cluster groups.
Overall the results of the exploratory cluster analysis support the hypothesis that meaningful subgroups would be detected and that these subgroups would differ significantly from each other on variables including demographic and personality characteristics, beliefs about the causes of crime and fear of crime.

Predictors of Fear of Crime

*Correlates of Fear of Crime: Demographic Variables*

In order to investigate the relationships between the demographic variables and fear of crime, intercorrelations between Gender, Age, Educational Level and Worship and the fear variables including Fear of Personal Crime and Fear of Property Crime, were calculated and the results given in Table 8.11.

Table 8.11.

*Intercorrelations Between Demographic Variables and Fear of Crime.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fear of Personal Crime</th>
<th>Fear of Property Crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.02ns</td>
<td>.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worship</td>
<td>.01ns</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001*
Table 8.11 shows that two demographic variables were significantly correlated with the Fear of Personal Crime. A moderate positive correlation was found between Gender and Fear of Personal Crime and a small negative correlation found between Educational Level and Fear of Personal Crime. A higher Level of Education was associated with a lower level of Fear of Personal Crime. A small positive correlation was also found between Gender and Fear of Property Crime. While Fear of Property Crime increased with Age, it decreased as level of Worship rose.

_Fear of Crime Correlates: Personality_

In order to investigate the relationship between fear of crime and the personality variables, intercorrelations between Anxiety and Legal Authoritarianism and the fear variables including Fear of Personal Crime and Fear of Property Crime were calculated and the results presented in Table 8.12.
Table 8.12.

*Intercorrelations Between Personality and Fear of Crime Variables.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fear of Personal Crime</th>
<th>Fear of Property Crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Authoritarianism</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( N = 306 \)

*Note: * \( p < .05 \), ** \( p < .01 \), *** \( p < .001 \)*

Table 8.12 shows that significant positive correlations were found between the personality variables and the fear variables with moderate positive correlations found between Legal Authoritarianism and both Fear of Personal Crime and Fear of Property Crime. Fear of Personal Crime and Fear of Property Crime rose with increased Anxiety and Authoritarianism.

*Fear of Crime Correlates: Likelihood of Crime and Seriousness of Crime*

In order to investigate the relationship between the likelihood of crime, the seriousness of crime and the fear of crime variables, intercorrelations between Likelihood of Personal Crime, Likelihood of Property Crime, Seriousness of Personal Crime, Seriousness of Property Crime and the fear variables including Fear of Personal
Crime and Fear of Property Crime were calculated and the results presented in Table 8.13.

Table 8.13.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fear of Personal Crime</th>
<th>Fear of Property Crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Personal</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Property</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriousness Personal</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriousness Property</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.31**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 306

*Note:* *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001. Likelihood Personal = Likelihood of Personal Crime, Likelihood Property = Likelihood of Property Crime, Seriousness Personal = Seriousness of Personal Crime, Seriousness Property = Seriousness of Property Crime.

Table 8.13 shows that likelihood and seriousness variables were significantly correlated with fear of crime, with moderate positive correlations found between the Likelihood of Personal Crime, Likelihood of Property Crime and Fear of Personal Crime and Fear of Property Crime variables. Fear of both Personal Crime and Fear of Property Crime rose as the perceived seriousness of these types of crime rose and as the perceived likelihood of becoming a victim of these types of crimes increased.
Fear of Crime Correlates: Beliefs

In order to investigate the relationship between beliefs about the causes of crime and fear of crime, intercorrelations between belief variables including Social Causation, Individual Causation and Economic Causation and the fear variables including Fear of Personal Crime and Fear of Property Crime were calculated and the results given in Table 8.14. The correlation between Satisfactory Performance of the Criminal Justice System and fear of crime was also calculated and the results presented in Table 8.14.

Table 8.14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fear of Personal Crime</th>
<th>Fear of Property Crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Causation</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Causation</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Causation</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory Performance</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 306

Note: * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001. Satisfactory Performance = Satisfactory Performance of the Criminal Justice System.

Table 8.14 shows that significant positive correlations were found between beliefs about the causes of crime and both types of Fear of Crime with the strongest correlations found between Individual Causation and Fear of Property Crime and Fear of
Personal Crime. Endorsement of the belief that crime is caused by the personal characteristics of the offender (Individual Causation) was associated with the highest levels of Fear of Personal Crime and Fear of Property Crime. A significant negative correlation was found between Satisfactory Performance of the Criminal Justice System and Fear of Property Crime with higher levels of fear associated with lower levels of satisfaction with the criminal justice system.

Predictors of Fear of Personal Crime

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 stated that high scores on Fear of Personal Crime would be predicted by Gender, high scores on personality variables including Anxiety and Authoritarianism and high scores on variables related to perceptions about crime including Seriousness of Personal Crime and Likelihood of Personal Crime. A high score on Individual Causation was expected to predict high levels of Fear of Personal Crime.

To test Hypothesis 4, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the relative influence of each of these sets of variables on Fear of Personal Crime. Fear of Personal Crime was treated as the dependent variable. The independent variables were entered in four steps. The first step comprised
Gender, the second set of predictors included Anxiety and Legal Authoritarianism, the third step comprised Likelihood of Personal Crime and the fourth step included Individual Causation. The results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis are presented in Table 8.15.

### Table 8.15.

**Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Fear of Personal Crime**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Step 1 Beta</th>
<th>Step 2 Beta</th>
<th>Step 3 Beta</th>
<th>Step 4 Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.24***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Causation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
R = .38 \quad R = .52 \quad R = .61 \quad R = .61 \\
R^2 = .15 \quad R^2 = .27 \quad R^2 = .37 \quad R^2 = .37
\]

N = 306

Note: * \( p < .05 \), ** \( p < .01 \), *** \( p < .001 \), Likelihood Personal = Likelihood of Personal Crime

Gender explained 14.9% of the variance in Fear of Personal Crime. Gender (\( t = 7.30, p < .001 \)) was a significant independent
predictor of Fear of Personal Crime. The inclusion of Anxiety and Authoritarianism at Step 2 significantly improved the model \( (F_{\text{change}} (2, 302), = 26.173, p < .001) \) and accounted for a further 12.6% of the variance in Fear of Personal Crime. High levels of Anxiety \( (t = 2.66, p < .01) \) and high levels of Authoritarianism \( (t = 6.34, p < .001) \) were significant independent predictors of Fear of Personal Crime. Gender remained a significant predictor at this step. Adding Likelihood of Personal Crime at Step 3 made a further significant contribution to the model \( (F_{\text{change}} (1, 301) = 46.323, p < .001) \) accounting for an additional 9.7% of the variance in Fear of Personal Crime. A high level of Likelihood of Personal Crime \( (t = 6.80, p < .001) \) was a significant independent predictor of Fear of Personal Crime. Gender \( (t = 5.62, p < .001) \), Anxiety \( (t = 2.61, p < .01) \) and Authoritarianism \( (t = 5.85, p < .001) \) remained significant predictors at this step. The addition of Individual Causation at Step 4 did not significantly improve the model and it was not a significant independent predictor of Fear of Personal Crime. Overall, the model presented a statistically significant equation \( (F (5, 300) = 35.810, p < .001, R = .61) \) and explained 37.4% of the variance in Fear of Personal Crime (refer Figure 8.3).

The hypothesis that Fear of Personal Crime would be predicted by Gender, Anxiety, Legal Authoritarianism and
Likelihood of Personal Crime was supported. The hypothesis that Individual Causation would predict Fear of Personal Crime was not supported.
Figure 8.3. Final Regression Model Representing Predictors of Fear of Personal Crime.
Predictors of Fear of Property Crime

Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 stated that high scores on Fear of Property Crime would be predicted by Gender, high scores on personality variables including Anxiety and Authoritarianism, high scores on variables related to perceptions about crime including Seriousness of Personal Crime, Likelihood of Personal Crime, Likelihood of Property Crime and high scores on belief variables including Social Causation and Economic Causation.

The seven variables that were significantly correlated above .2 with Fear of Property Crime were subsequently included in the hierarchical regression analysis. Table 8.11 shows that none of the demographic variables were significantly correlated above .2 with Fear of Property Crime. As shown in Table 8.12, the personality variables correlated above .2 with Fear of Property Crime included Anxiety and Legal Authoritarianism. Table 8.13 shows that Likelihood of Property Crime, Likelihood of Personal Crime and Seriousness of Property Crime were all moderately correlated with Fear of Property Crime. Other variables with correlations above .2 with Fear of Property Crime related to beliefs about the causes of crime. As shown in Table 8.14, these variables included Individual Causation and Social Causation.
To test Hypothesis 5, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the relative influence of each of these sets of variables on Fear of Property Crime. Fear of Property Crime was treated as the dependent variable. The independent variables were entered in three steps. The first step comprised Anxiety and Legal Authoritarianism, the second step comprised Seriousness of Property Crime, Likelihood of Personal Crime and Likelihood of Property Crime and the third set of variables included Social Causation and Individual Causation. The results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis are presented in Table 8.16.
### Table 8.16

**Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Fear of Property Crime**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Step1 Beta</th>
<th>Step2 Beta</th>
<th>Step 3 Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.17***</td>
<td>.17***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Authoritarianism</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriousness Property</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Property</td>
<td></td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Personal</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Causation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Causation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- $R = .38$
- $R^2 = .15$
- $R = .56$
- $R^2 = .31$
- $R = .57$
- $R^2 = .33$

$N = 306$

*Note:* * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. Seriousness Property = Seriousness of Property Crime, Likelihood Property = Likelihood of Property Crime, Likelihood Personal = Likelihood of Personal Crime.

Legal Authoritarianism and Anxiety explained 14.5% of the variance in Fear of Property Crime. A high score on Legal Authoritarianism ($t = 5.43, p < .001$) and a high score on Anxiety ($t = 3.89, p < .001$) were significant independent predictors of a higher
Fear of Property Crime. The inclusion of Seriousness of Property Crime and Likelihood of Property Crime at Step 2 significantly improved the model ($F_{\text{change}} (3, 300), = 24.598, p < .001$) and accounted for a further 16.9% of the variance in Fear of Property Crime. High levels of Seriousness of Property Crime ($t = 3.79, p < .001$) and high levels of Likelihood of Property Crime ($t = 4.30, p < .001$) were significant independent predictors of Fear of Property Crime. Legal Authoritarianism and Anxiety remained significant predictors at this step. The effect of Likelihood of Personal Crime on Fear of Property Crime was not significant. The addition of Individual Causation and Social Causation at Step 3 made a further significant contribution to the model ($F_{\text{change}} (2, 298) = 3.552, p < .05$) accounting for an additional 1.6% of the variance in Fear of Property Crime. A high level of Social Causation ($t = 2.17, p < .05$) was a significant independent predictor of Fear of Property Crime. The effect of Individual Causation on Fear of Property Crime was not significant. Anxiety ($t = 3.57, p < .001$), Seriousness of Property Crime ($t = 3.43, p < .01$) and Likelihood of Property Crime ($t = 3.98, p < .001$) remained significant predictors at this step. Legal Authoritarianism did not remain a significant predictor. Overall, the model presented a statistically significant equation ($F (7, 298) =$
22.03, $p < .001, R = .57$) and explained 33% of the variance in Fear of Property Crime (refer Figure 8.4).

The hypothesis that Fear of Property Crime would be predicted by variables including Anxiety, Legal Authoritarianism, Seriousness of Property Crime, Likelihood of Property Crime and Social Causation was supported. The hypothesis that Gender, Economic Causation and Likelihood of Personal Crime would predict Fear of Property Crime was not supported.
Figure 8.4. Final Regression Model Representing Predictors of Fear of Property Crime. Note:*p<.05,**p<.01,***p<.001.
Correlates of Fear of Terrorism: Demographic Variables

In order to investigate the relationships between the demographic variables and fear of terrorism, intercorrelations between Gender, Age, Educational Level and Worship and Fear of Terrorism were calculated and the results presented in Table 8.17.

Table 8.17.

Intercorrelations Between Demographic Variables and Fear of Terrorism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.08ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worship</td>
<td>.07ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 306

Note: * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 8.17 shows that two demographic variables were significantly correlated with Fear of Terrorism. A significant positive correlation was found between Gender and Fear of Terrorism and a significant negative correlation was found between Educational Level and Fear of Terrorism, with higher levels of education associated with lower levels of fear.
Correlates of Fear of Terrorism: Personality

In order to investigate the relationships between the personality variables and fear of terrorism, intercorrelations between Anxiety, Legal Authoritarianism and Fear of Terrorism were calculated and the results presented in Table 8.18.

Table 8.18.

**Intercorrelations Between Personality Variables and Fear of Terrorism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fear of Terrorism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Authoritarianism</td>
<td>.32**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 306

Note: * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 8.18 shows that significant positive correlations were found between each of the personality variables and Fear of Terrorism, with a moderate positive correlation found between Legal Authoritarianism and Fear of Terrorism. Fear of Terrorism rose with increased Anxiety and increased Legal Authoritarianism.

Fear of Terrorism Correlates: Beliefs about the Causes of Crime

In order to investigate the relationship between beliefs about the causes of crime and fear of terrorism, intercorrelations between
belief variables including Social Causation, Individual Causation and Economic Causation and Fear of Terrorism were calculated and the results given in Table 8.19. The correlation between the Likelihood of Terrorism and Fear of Terrorism was also calculated presented in Table 8.19.

Table 8.19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fear of Terrorism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of Terrorism</td>
<td>.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Causation</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Causation</td>
<td>.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Causation</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(N = 306\)

Note: * \(p < .05\), ** \(p < .01\), *** \(p < .001\).

As shown in Table 8.19, a significant positive correlation was found between Likelihood of Terrorism and Fear of Terrorism. As the perceived likelihood of becoming a victim of terrorist crime rose, Fear of Terrorism also increased. Significant positive correlations were found between beliefs about the causes of crime and Fear of Terrorism with the highest levels of fear associated with the belief that crime is caused by the personal characteristics of the offender.
Hypothesis 6 stated that fear of terrorism would be predicted by demographic variables including gender and educational level, high scores on anxiety and authoritarianism, the belief that crime is caused by the personal characteristics of the individual and perceived risk of terrorism.

To test Hypothesis 6, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the relative influence of each of these sets of variables on Fear of Terrorism. Fear of Terrorism was treated as the dependent variable. The independent variables were entered in four steps. The first step comprised Gender and Educational Level, the second step included Anxiety and Legal Authoritarianism, the third step comprised Likelihood of Terrorism and the final set of variables included Social Causation and Individual Causation. The results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis are presented in Table 8.20.
Table 8.20.

**Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Fear of Terrorism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Step 1 Beta</th>
<th>Step 2 Beta</th>
<th>Step 3 Beta</th>
<th>Step 4 Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>-.26***</td>
<td>-.18***</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Authoritarianism</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of Terrorism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Causation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Causation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[R = .35 \quad R = .44 \quad R = .61 \quad R = .62\]
\[R^2 = .12 \quad R^2 = .20 \quad R^2 = .38 \quad R^2 = .39\]

\[N = 306\]

*Note: * 
*\(p < .05\), **\(p < .01\), ***\(p < .001\).*

Gender and Educational Level explained 12.2% of the variance in Fear of Terrorism. Gender \((t = 3.94, p < .001)\) and a low score on Educational Level \((t = -4.88, p < .001)\) were significant independent predictors of Fear of Terrorism. The inclusion of Anxiety and Authoritarianism at Step 2 significantly improved the model \((F_{\text{change}} (2, 301), = 13.978, p < .001)\) and accounted for a further 7.5% of the variance in Fear of Terrorism. High levels of Anxiety \((t = 3.03, p < .01)\) and high levels of Legal Authoritarianism
were significant independent predictors of Fear of Terrorism. Gender ($t = 3.11, p < .01$) and Educational Level ($t = -3.22, p < .001$) remained significant predictors at this step. The addition of Likelihood of Terrorism at Step 3 made a further significant contribution to the model ($F_{\text{change}} = 86.07, p < .001$) accounting for an additional 17.9% of the variance in Fear of Terrorism. A high level of Likelihood of Terrorism ($t = 6.80, p < .001$) was a significant independent predictor of Fear of Terrorism. Gender ($t = 2.06, p < .05$), Educational Level ($t = -3.01, p < .01$), Anxiety ($t = 1.97, p < .05$) and Legal Authoritarianism ($t = 3.31, p < .001$) remained significant predictors at this step. The addition of Individual Causation and Social Causation at Step 4 did not significantly improve the model and they were not significant independent predictors of Fear of Terrorism. Overall, the model presented a statistically significant equation ($F(7, 298) = 26.79, p < .001, R = .62$) and explained 38.6% of the variance in Fear of Terrorism (refer to Figure 8.5).
FIGURE 8.5. Best Fitting Model Representing Predictors of Fear of Terrorism. Note:*p<.05,**p<.01,***p<.001.
Predictors of Sentencing Options

An exploratory aim of this research was to investigate the predictors of a range of sentencing options as ways of addressing the issue of crime and punishment.

Correlates of Punitive Sentencing Options: Demographic Variables

In order to investigate the relationships between the demographic variables and punitive sentencing options intercorrelations between the demographic variables including Gender, Age, Educational Level and Worship and the Sentencing Options were calculated and the results presented in Table 8.21.

Table 8.21.

Intercorrelations Between Demographic Variables and Punitive Sentencing Options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Punitive Sentencing Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.03ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.03ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worship</td>
<td>.07ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 306

Note: * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Table 8.21 shows that one demographic variable was significantly correlated with Punitive Sentencing Options. A significant positive correlation was found between Educational Level and Punitive Sentencing Options with higher levels of education associated with lower scores on Punitive Sentencing Options. Gender, Age and Worship were not significantly correlated with the Punitive Sentencing Options.

**Correlates of Punitive Sentencing Options: Personality Variables**

In order to investigate the relationship between the personality variables and Punitive Sentencing Options, intercorrelations between Anxiety, Legal Authoritarianism and the sentencing options were calculated and the results presented in Table 8.22.

**Table 8.22.**

*Intercorrelations Between Personality Variables and Punitive Sentencing Options.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Punitive Sentencing Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>.10ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Authoritarianism</td>
<td>.63**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N = 306  
Note: *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001*
Table 8.22 shows that a significant positive correlation was found between Legal Authoritarianism and Punitive Sentencing Options with higher levels of authoritarianism associated with endorsement of Punitive Sentencing Options. Anxiety was not significantly correlated with the Punitive Sentencing Options.

*Correlates of Punitive Sentencing Options: Fear of Crime and Seriousness of Crime Variables*

The relationship between fear of crime, perceived likelihood of victimisation, perceived seriousness of crime and the endorsement of punitive sentencing strategies was investigated. Intercorrelations between Fear of Personal Crime, Fear of Property Crime, Fear of Terrorism, Likelihood of Personal Crime, Likelihood of Property Crime, Seriousness of Personal Crime Crime and Punitive Sentencing Options were calculated and results presented in Table 8.23.
Table 8.23.

**Intercorrelations Between Fear of Crime Variables, Perceived Seriousness of Crime and Punitive Sentencing Options.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Punitive Sentencing Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Personal Crime</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Property Crime</td>
<td>.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Personal</td>
<td>.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Property</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Terrorism</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of Terrorism</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriousness Personal</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriousness Property</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 306$

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ Likelihood Personal = Likelihood of Personal Crime, Likelihood Property = Likelihood of Property Crime, Seriousness of Personal = Seriousness of Personal Crime, Seriousness Property = Seriousness of Property Crime.

Table 8.23 shows that all fear of crime variables were significantly correlated with Punitive Sentencing Options. Endorsement of punitive sentencing strategies increased as fear of crime and perceived likelihood of victimisation rose. The strongest correlation was found between Fear of Property Crime and Punitive Sentencing Options. A small significant correlation was also found between advocacy of Punitive Sentencing Options and perceived Seriousness of Personal Crime and perceived Seriousness of
Property Crime offences. Preferences for punitive sentencing methods rose as the perceived seriousness of crime increased.

Correlates of Punitive Sentencing Options: Beliefs about the Causes of Crime

The relationship between the variables related to beliefs about the causes of crime and the Punitive Sentencing Options was investigated with intercorrelations between Social Causation, Individual Causation, Economic Causation and Punitive sentencing Options calculated and results presented in Table 8.24.

Table 8.24.
Intercorrelations Between Beliefs about the Causes of Crime, Satisfactory Performance of the Criminal Justice System and Punitive Sentencing Options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Punitive Sentencing Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Causation</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Causation</td>
<td>.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Causation</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory Performance</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 306

Note: * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001 Satisfactory Performance = Satisfactory Performance of the Criminal Justice System.

Table 8.24 shows that significant positive correlations were found between Punitive Sentencing Options and Individual
Causation and Social Causation. While increased support for punitive sentencing methods was primarily associated with the belief that crime is caused by the personal characteristics of the offender, support for harsh sentencing practices also rose with endorsement of the belief that crime is caused by the social conditions in society. A significant negative correlation was found between Economic Causation and Punitive Sentencing Options with decreased support for punitive sentencing methods associated with increased endorsement of the belief that crime is caused by the economic conditions in society. A significant negative correlation was also found between Satisfactory Performance of the Criminal Justice System and Punitive Sentencing Options with increased satisfaction associated with decreased support for punitive sentencing strategies.

Predictors of Punitive Sentencing Options

A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the relative influence of demographic characteristics, personality variables, beliefs about the causes of crime and fear of crime on Punitive Sentencing Options. Punitive Sentencing Options was treated as the dependent variable. The independent variables were entered in four steps. The first step comprised Educational Level, the second step comprised Legal Authoritarianism and the
third step included Fear of Personal Crime, Fear of Property Crime, Perceived Likelihood of Property Crime, Fear of Terrorism and perceived Seriousness of Property Crime. The final set of variables included Individual Causation, Social Causation and Economic Causation. The results of the hierarchical regression analysis are presented in Table 8.25.
Table 8.25.

**Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Punitive Sentencing Options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>-.28***</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Authoritarianism</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Personal Crime</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Property Crime</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Property</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Terrorism</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriousness Property</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Causation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Causation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Causation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R = .28 \quad R = .64 \quad R = .66 \quad R = .67 \]
\[ R^2 = .07 \quad R^2 = .41 \quad R^2 = .43 \quad R^2 = .45 \]

\[ N = 306 \]

*Note: * \( p < .05, ** \( p < .01, *** \( p < .001 \). Likelihood Property = Likelihood of Property Crime, Seriousness Property = Seriousness of Property Crime.*

Educational Level explained 8% of the variance in Punitive Sentencing. A low score on Educational Level (\( t = 5.10, p < .001 \)) was a significant independent predictor of Punitive Sentencing. The inclusion of Legal Authoritarianism at Step 2 significantly improved
the model \(F_{\text{change}} (2, 303), = 104.71, p < .001\) and accounted for a further 33% of the variance in Punitive Sentencing. A high level of Legal Authoritarianism \(t = 13.00, p < .001\) was a significant independent predictor of Punitive Sentencing. Educational Level did not remain a significant predictor at this step. Adding Fear of Personal Crime, Fear of Property Crime, Likelihood of Property Crime, Seriousness of Property and Fear of Terrorism did not significantly improve the model and none of these variables were significant predictors of Punitive Sentencing. At Step 4 the inclusion of Social Causation, Individual Causation and Economic Causation significantly improved the model \(F_{\text{change}} (10, 295), = 24.51, p < .001\) and accounted for a further 2% of the variance in Punitive Sentencing. A low score on Economic Causation \(t = 2.79, p < .01\) was a significant independent predictor of Punitive Sentencing. A high score on Individual Causation \(t = 2.25, p < .05\) was a significant independent predictor of Punitive Sentencing. The independent effect of Social Causation on Punitive Sentencing was not significant. Legal Authoritarianism \(t = 7.91, p < .001\) remained significant at this step. Overall, the model presented a statistically significant equation \(F (10, 295) = 24.51, p < .001, R = .67\) and explained 45.4% of the variance in Punitive Sentencing (refer Figure 8.6).
Figure 8.6. Final Regression Model Representing Predictors of Punitive Sentencing Options.
Note:*p<.05,**p<.01,***p<.001.
The results of the hierarchical regression analysis found that Punitive Sentencing was predicted by personality characteristics and beliefs about the causes of crime. High scores on Legal Authoritarianism and Individual Causation and low scores on Economic Causation significantly predicted Punitive Sentencing.

Conclusion

This chapter has outlined descriptive information, correlation and multiple regression analyses of the study variables. Using hierarchical multiple regression enabled investigation of the causal ordering of variables proposed by Carroll et al. (1987). Demographic characteristics, personality variables, beliefs about the causes of crime predicted attitudes toward sentencing goals. The relative importance of the study variables as predictors of fear of crime varied according to type of crime. Clustering scores on both punishment and rehabilitation scales together detected four subgroups that differed significantly from each other on the major study variables.

Chapter 9 provides a discussion of the data analysed in this chapter with a focus on the specific research questions addressed in this study.
CHAPTER 9
DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter provides a discussion of the specific research questions addressed in this study. In addressing these questions, links are also made with the findings of previous research and issues raised in the literature.

Summary of the main findings of the research

The main findings of the research were:

(1) Demographic variables, personality characteristics and beliefs about the causes of crime significantly predicted endorsement of punishment and rehabilitation as the goals of sentencing. Fear of crime was not found to be a significant predictor of sentencing goals.

(2) The predictive power of demographic variables, personality characteristics and beliefs about the causes of crime was different for the contrasting goals of punishment versus rehabilitation. While demographic variables and personality characteristics emerged as significant predictors of punishment as the goal of sentencing, beliefs about the causes of crime emerged as significant predictors of rehabilitation.

(3) A set of variables including a low level of education, a high level of legal authoritarianism and a strong endorsement of the belief that crime is caused by the personal characteristics of the individual emerged as the most important predictors of punishment as the goal of sentencing.
Advocacy of rehabilitation was predicted by endorsement of the belief that crime is caused by the economic conditions in society, a denial that crime is caused by the intrinsic personal characteristics of the individual and by a high level of satisfaction with the performance of the criminal justice system.

A cluster analysis found that participants could be grouped into four subgroups: High Punishment High Rehabilitation, High Punishment Low Rehabilitation, Low Punishment Low Rehabilitation and Low Punishment High Rehabilitation.

Significant differences were found between the subgroups on demographic variables, personality characteristics, beliefs about the causes of crime and fear of crime.

Variables predicting fear of Personal Crime, Property Crime and Terrorist Crime were found to be different. Although the belief that crime is caused by the social conditions in society predicted fear of property crime and fear of terrorism, it was not a significant predictor of fear of personal crime. While level of education predicted fear of terrorism, it was not a significant predictor of fear of personal crime or fear of property crime.

Personal experience of crime, including previous victimisation and vicarious victimisation and perceptual variables including perceived seriousness of the offence and perceived vulnerability were not found to significantly predict fear of crime or sentencing goals.
Goals of Sentencing

Aim 1: To investigate the impact of demographic variables, personality characteristics, beliefs about the causes of crime and fear of crime as predictors of punishment versus rehabilitation as the goals of sentencing.

Hypothesis 1

It was expected that the current proposed model would constitute a fit with the data. Demographic characteristics, personality variables, beliefs about the causes of crime and fear of crime were expected to predict the contrasting sentencing goals of punishment versus rehabilitation.

Results of the current study partially supported Hypothesis 1. The proposed model constituted a good fit with the data and supported the findings of Carroll et al. (1987). Consistent with Carroll et al.’s model, investigation of the predictors of sentencing goals found that characteristics that are more fundamental and general, including demographics and personality characteristics, together with beliefs about the causes of crime predicted attitudes toward sentencing goals. The present study added to Carroll et al.’s model by investigating the impact of fear of crime as well as other crime related variables including perceptions about the likelihood and seriousness of crime as predictors of sentencing goals. In contrast to the hypothesis, the inclusion of Fear of Personal Crime, Fear of Property Crime and Seriousness of Property Crime variables did not significantly improve the model.
Predictors of Punishment as the Goal of Sentencing

Aim 2. To investigate the predictors of punishment as the preferred goal of sentencing.

Hypothesis 2. It was expected that punishment as the goal of sentencing would be predicted by high scores on variables including anxiety, authoritarianism, the belief that crime is caused by the personal characteristics of the individual and fear of crime. A low level of education was also expected to predict punishment.

As expected, results showed that low scores on level of education predicted punishment as the preferred goal of sentencing. The results suggest that less educated respondents prefer retributive sentencing goals as opposed to rehabilitative options. This finding is consistent with previous research in Australia that found university educated respondents less supportive of harsh punishment strategies (Indermaur & Roberts, 2005). The inverse relationship found between level of education and support for punishment may find an explanation in the context of public misperceptions of crime trends. Research has suggested that the public is not well informed about crime trends and that less educated respondents hold more inaccurate perceptions of the crime rate (Indermaur & Roberts, 2005). Inaccurate information about crime trends is also associated with more punitive attitudes (Roberts & Indermaur, 2007). These findings could suggest that preferences for punitive sentencing goals advocated by less educated individuals may be related to an increased desire for
punishment to serve as an effective deterrent and means of reducing the crime rate (Davies & Raymond, 1999).

Recent research has found that when members of the public are fully aware of the facts of criminal cases and details about the offender, they are less likely to endorse traditional retributive approaches that recommend sentencing criminals for extended periods of imprisonment (Frieberg, 2000; Lovegrove, 2008). Less educated respondents may rely more heavily on sources of information that provide superficial treatment of criminal justice issues and may consequently be less informed on these issues than their more educated counterparts. Highly educated respondents may think about justice issues in more complex ways than respondents with limited education. For example, more highly educated respondents may be more familiar with the constructive outcomes of sentencing options that encourage new strategies aimed at the rehabilitation and reintegration of offenders back into society (Darley & Pittman, 2003).

Consistent with the hypothesis, endorsement of punishment as the goal of sentencing was predicted by high levels of authoritarianism. Authoritarianism was also found to be the strongest independent predictor of punishment. Relationships between these variables are consistent with previous research suggesting that individuals who have a tendency to disregard the rights and civil liberties of an offender demonstrate a more punitive attitude to sentencing (Fitzgerald & Ellsworth, 1984) and studies that found that high levels of legal authoritarianism, as opposed to traditional authoritarianism, were associated with more punitive attitudes
toward offenders (Chapdelaine & Griffith, 1997; Narby et al., 1993). The results of the current study suggest that an individual’s attitude toward the legal system is an important determinant of sentencing goal preferences and that individuals with authoritarian beliefs about the legal system appear more likely to endorse the view that the primary aim of sentencing is the punishment of offenders. It’s interesting that these results are so consistent with Carroll et al.’s findings despite cultural differences and significant social and economic change that has occurred over time.

The positive relationship between authoritarianism and endorsement of punishment as the goal of sentencing may find an explanation in the work of Sales (1973) and Doty et al. (1991) who established a link between societal levels of threat and authoritarian beliefs and behaviours as conceptualised by Adorno et al. (1950). Doty et al. suggested that elevated levels of authoritarianism aroused during times of high societal threat may persist in highly authoritarian individuals even when the threat recedes, whereas individuals who are less authoritarian or non authoritarian adjust their beliefs and behaviour in accord with diminishing perceptions of threat. They argued that when the threat of crime is high, authoritarian aggression toward criminal offenders remains high. The finding in the current study that authoritarianism increased with increased fear of crime could also suggest that highly authoritarian individuals are more concerned about the threat of crime and are more fearful of crime than respondents who are less authoritarian. The perception of the threat of crime may be sustained and perhaps elevated in part by prominent and graphic portrayal of crime in the media (Bloustein
& Israel, 2006). Highly authoritarian individuals may perceive crime rates to be higher than they actually are and this sustained sense of threat and fear of crime may contribute to a desire for more punitive treatment of offenders.

Consistent with the hypothesis, the current study found that participants who endorsed the belief that crime is caused by the personal characteristics of the individual advocated punishment as the goal of sentencing. This finding is consistent with Carroll et al.’s (1987) argument that causal beliefs have a significant impact on sentencing goal preferences and their finding that punishment as a sentencing goal was advocated by participants who believed that individual personality characteristics, values and choices of the offender are the primary cause of criminal behaviour.

White and Haines (2004) noted that people who subscribe to individual explanations for criminal behaviour tended to be pessimistic about prevention and rehabilitation of offenders because criminality may be considered an integral part of an individual’s nature, necessitating the offender’s isolation from society. Individual explanations for criminal behaviour emphasis the role of cognition, assuming that offenders exercise a rational choice and commit crimes for a purpose (Cornish & Clarke, 2003) after giving consideration to costs and benefits of committing the offence (Stewart & Wortley, 2006). Given Feather’s (1998) research connecting perceptions of offender responsibility and deservingness to beliefs about justice, it may be that participants in the current study attributed crime to the characteristics of the individual,
believing offenders to be individually responsible for their actions and therefore deserving of punishment as opposed to rehabilitation as the goal of sentencing.

The hypothesis that high levels of fear of crime would predict endorsement of punishment as the goal of sentencing was not supported. This finding is consistent with Quimet and Coyle’s (1991) findings but in contrast to findings reported by Langworthy and Whitehead (1986) and Sprott and Doob (1997) who found that fear of crime was a significant predictor of more punitive attitudes towards offenders. Given that Quimet and Coyle’s study and Sprott and Doob’s research were both conducted in Canada utilising a sample from the general public, the disparate findings in these studies could be explained by differences in the definition and measurement of fear of crime. Sprott and Doob (1997) used two global questions that have been criticised in previous research for a lack of specificity and potential to over-estimate true levels of fear of crime (Ferraro & LaGrange, 1989; Yin, 1982). In contrast, both the current research and the Quimet and Coyle study assessed respondent’s fear of becoming a victim of different crimes. Quimet and Coyle argued that this strategy involved a conscious assessment of danger rather than an assessment of the general mental state of the individual. The current study also measured fear of crime with regard to the distinction between cognitive assessment of risk of victimisation and emotional response of fear of a range of personal and property crime offences.

The findings of the current study support Quimet and Coyle’s (1991) suggestion that although it may be reasonable to assume that fear
of crime has a positive direct impact on punitive sentencing preferences, this assumption may be flawed. Although research in Australia has found a trend toward public dissatisfaction with a legal system that they regard as too lenient and has demonstrated a preference for retribution above other sentencing goals (Parfitt, 1996), the current findings suggest that this trend may not be generated by fear of crime. If more punitive criminal justice policies are influenced by the assertion that the public fears crime and therefore demands more punitive sentences (Quimet & Coyle) the results of the current study suggest this assertion may be unfounded.

In summary, the current study found that demographic variables, personality characteristics and beliefs about the causes of crime predicted advocacy of punishment as the preferred goal of sentencing. A high level of authoritarianism was the most important predictor of punishment as the preferred goal of sentencing. Individuals with less education demonstrated higher levels of authoritarianism than did more highly educated participants and were more likely to endorse retributive sentencing goals. More punitive penal philosophies also appear to be related to an individual’s beliefs that crime is caused by the personal characteristics of the offender.

Predictors of Rehabilitation as the Goal of Sentencing

Aim 3. To investigate the predictors of rehabilitation as the preferred goal of sentencing.
Hypothesis 3. It was expected that rehabilitation as the goal of sentencing would be predicted by demographic variables, high scores on the belief that crime is the result of social or economic conditions in society and by high levels of satisfaction with the criminal justice system. Endorsement of rehabilitation was expected to increase as scores on variables including anxiety, authoritarianism and endorsement of the belief that the characteristics of the individual cause crime decreased.

Consistent with expectations, the current study found that support for rehabilitation as a sentencing goal was predicted by the belief that crime is caused by the economic conditions of poverty and inequality in society. Economic causation was found to be the strongest independent predictor of rehabilitation. The hypothesis that low scores on the belief that crime is caused by the personal characteristics of the individual would significantly predict rehabilitation was also supported. The impact of these beliefs regarding the causes of crime on rehabilitation is consistent with Carroll et al.’s (1987) results. In contrast to the hypothesis, the belief that crime is caused by the social conditions in society such as family problems, criminal associates and drug use was not a significant predictor of rehabilitation. This finding was inconsistent with Carroll et al.’s research that found that social causation was a significant predictor of rehabilitation.

The disparity in the findings between Carroll et al.’s (1987) research and the current study may be explained by cultural differences given that Carroll et al.’s study was conducted in America where the
social conditions in society may differ significantly from those in
Australia. A time difference of two decades may have also contributed to
the different findings between the two studies as they were conducted in
different social contexts. The belief that crime is caused by the social
conditions in society may be more strongly linked to rehabilitation among
specific groups in the general population rather than among members of
the wider community. Differences in the demographic characteristics of
the sample utilised in the two studies may have also contributed to the
differences in the findings. While Carroll et al. utilised a sample of law
students, the current research was conducted with a community sample
representing a more diverse population who may think differently about
the issues of criminal justice than university students specialised in the
field of law.

As expected, the current study found that high levels of
satisfaction with the performance of the criminal justice system
significantly predicted endorsement of rehabilitation as the goal of
sentencing. Respondents with high levels of satisfaction responded
positively to the idea that the criminal justice system was performing
reasonably well and taking the initiative to find ways to improve. Item
indicators of level of satisfaction suggest that the criminal justice system
is attempting to prevent repetition of criminal behaviour by finding ways
to rehabilitate offenders. The content of the items appears to imply that
rehabilitation is a priority of the criminal justice system, so it seems
reasonable to find that respondents who were satisfied with the criminal
justice system endorsed rehabilitation as opposed to punishment as the
goal of sentencing. The finding that support for rehabilitation rose with increased satisfaction with the criminal justice system is also consistent with previous research linking lack of confidence in the legal system to public calls for harsher sentencing (Indermaur & Roberts, 2005).

It was anticipated that respondents with low levels of anxiety and low levels of authoritarianism would endorse rehabilitation as the goal of sentencing. In contrast to expectations, levels of anxiety had no significant impact on preferences for rehabilitation. The strong impact of beliefs about the causes of crime on rehabilitation appeared to diminish the significance of authoritarianism in the regression model. In contrast to expectations, none of the demographic variables measured in the current study were significant determinants of rehabilitation as the goal of sentencing.

In summary, the results of the current study found that beliefs about the causes of crime, as opposed to demographic and personality characteristics were the most important predictors of rehabilitation as the preferred goal of sentencing. The belief that crime is caused by the economic conditions in society and a denial of the belief that crime is caused by the personal characteristics of the offender significantly predicted endorsement of rehabilitation. Individuals with high levels of satisfaction with the performance of the criminal justice system were more likely to advocate rehabilitative ideals.
Exploration of Cluster Analysis on Results for Punishment and Rehabilitation Scales.

Aim 4: To extend Carrolls et al.’s (1987) research by investigating whether there were subgroups in the sample with patterns of scores on punishment and rehabilitation and exploring how these subgroups differ from each other on the study variables.

Hypothesis 4. It was expected that cluster subgroups would be detected from the data and that these subgroups would differ significantly from each other on demographic variables, personality characteristics, beliefs about the causes of crime and fear of crime.

Consistent with expectations, the current study found that four cluster groups were detected from the data when scores on both punishment and rehabilitation variables were combined. These subgroups included respondents who scored high on punishment and high on rehabilitation, those who scored high on punishment and low on rehabilitation, respondents with low scores on punishment and low scores on rehabilitation and those who scored low on punishment and high on rehabilitation. Cluster subgroups were found to differ significantly from each other on the major study variables.

High Punishment /High Rehabilitation

The High Punishment /High Rehabilitation subgroup endorsed both punishment and rehabilitation as the primary goal of sentencing. This
subgroup of respondents advocated sentencing goals that include harsh punishment strategies together with a strong emphasis on rehabilitation. Endorsement of both punishment and rehabilitation goals suggests that this group is not completely punitive in their attitude toward sentencing. Both punishment and rehabilitation strategies are regarded as equally important responses to criminal offences.

The High Punishment /High Rehabilitation subgroup was comprised of respondents with the highest mean age (49.51 years) when compared to the other three cluster groups and differed significantly in age from the Low Punishment /Low Rehabilitation subgroup (42.18 years). Although multiple regression analysis found that age was not found to be a significant predictor of punishment or rehabilitation when considered in isolation, when scores on these variables were combined, age was found to be a significant variable in categorising respondents in the High Punishment /High Rehabilitation subgroup. This finding suggests that this subgroup of older people appear to endorse a combination of sentencing goals aimed at both punishment and rehabilitation as opposed to strategies aimed exclusively at one or other sentencing goal.

A comparison of the cluster groups found that the High Punishment /High Rehabilitation subgroup comprised substantially fewer respondents (45%) with a tertiary education when compared with the percentage of respondents in the Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation subgroup (79%) with a tertiary education. Although a low level of education was found to be a significant predictor of endorsement of
punishment when punishment and rehabilitation variables were examined separately, a high level of education was not found to significantly predict endorsement of rehabilitation as a separate variable. Exploring scores on these variables together suggests that a high level of education appears to moderate respondent views on punishment as the preferred goal of sentencing. Tertiary educated individuals may have a more informed understanding of the theories, processes and practices of criminal justice in Australia and this information may have contributed to a high endorsement of rehabilitative practices.

The High Punishment /High Rehabilitation subgroup demonstrated the highest level of anxiety when compared to the other three subgroups and significantly higher levels when compared with the Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation subgroup. This finding suggests that respondents who endorse sentencing practices that are directed toward the rehabilitation of the offender cannot be assumed to have reduced levels of anxiety. This study found that regardless of their views on rehabilitation, the subgroup of individuals who have a predisposition to perceive the world as more dangerous or threatening endorsed harsher sentencing strategies than less anxious individuals.

The High Punishment /High Rehabilitation subgroup and the High Punishment /Low Rehabilitation subgroup demonstrated significantly higher levels of authoritarianism when compared with the Low Punishment /Low Rehabilitation group and the Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation group. This finding suggests that respondent’s level of authoritarianism in the high punishment groups remained high despite
their views on rehabilitation. Multiple regression analysis found that a high level of authoritarianism was the strongest predictor of punishment when punishment and rehabilitation variables were examined separately. Exploring scores on these variables together indicates that respondents who advocated a more punitive approach to sentencing maintained significantly higher levels of authoritarianism regardless of their views on rehabilitation.

Respondents in the high punishment groups demonstrated higher levels of fear of crime than did respondents in the low punishment groups. The High Punishment /High Rehabilitation group and the High Punishment /Low Rehabilitation subgroup demonstrated significantly higher levels of fear of personal crime and fear of property crime than did the Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation group. Although fear of personal crime and fear of property crime were not found to be significant predictors of punishment or rehabilitation when these variables were examined separately, exploring scores on these variables together suggests that subgroups of more fearful respondents endorse strategies that are primarily aimed at punishment of criminal offenders regardless of their views on rehabilitation.

Respondents in both high punishment groups also endorsed beliefs about the causes of crime that differed significantly from the low punishment groups. The high and low punishment groups differed significantly in their endorsement of the belief that the personal characteristics of the individual primarily cause crime with high punishment groups demonstrating significantly higher levels of
endorsement than the low punishment groups. When punishment and rehabilitation were examined separately, the belief that the individual characteristics of the person primarily cause crime was found to significantly predict endorsement of punishment as the primary goal of sentencing. Clustering scores on these variables together suggests that respondents who advocated punishment as the primary goal of sentencing endorsed this belief despite their views on rehabilitation.

High Punishment /Low Rehabilitation

The High Punishment /Low Rehabilitation subgroup endorsed sentencing strategies focused on the punishment of offenders together with a low endorsement of rehabilitation as the preferred goal of sentencing. The High Punishment /Low Rehabilitation subgroup was comprised of respondents who were the second oldest group of the four cluster groups with an average age of 46.6 years. The educational level of respondents in the High Punishment Low Rehabilitation group was the lowest of the four cluster groups. The majority of respondents in the High Punishment /Low Rehabilitation group reported having secondary school as their highest educational achievement. Respondents in this subgroup also demonstrated higher levels of anxiety than did respondents in the low punishment groups and significantly higher levels of authoritarianism, significantly higher levels of endorsement of the belief that the individual characteristics of the person is the primary cause of crime and significantly higher levels of fear of crime than the low punishment groups.


Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation

The Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation subgroup differed significantly on a number of the study variables when compared to the other three cluster groups. This subgroup of respondents advocated sentencing goals that include reduced emphasis on punishment strategies together with a strong emphasis on rehabilitation of offenders. The Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation subgroup was comprised of younger and more highly educated respondents. This subgroup comprised the second youngest respondents of the 4 cluster groups with an average age of 42 years. Seventy nine per cent of respondents within this subgroup reported tertiary as their highest level of education, the highest percentage of any cluster group. This finding suggests that this younger and more highly educated subgroup of respondents value the purpose of sentencing in different ways than older and less educated groups, placing a higher priority on rehabilitation of offenders as opposed to punishment strategies.

The Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation subgroup also demonstrated the lowest level of anxiety when compared to the other cluster groups and showed significantly lower levels of anxiety when compared with the High Punishment /High Rehabilitation group. This finding suggests that high levels of anxiety are demonstrated by respondents who place a high priority on the punishment of offenders despite also acknowledging the importance of rehabilitation.

The Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation subgroup showed significantly lower levels of authoritarianism when compared to the other
three cluster groups. Although, as already mentioned, the high punishment groups demonstrated significantly higher levels of authoritarianism when compared to the low punishment groups, the Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation group and the Low Punishment /Low Rehabilitation group also differed significantly from each other on authoritarianism. The subgroup of respondents who placed a low priority on both punishment and rehabilitation of offenders demonstrated significantly higher levels of authoritarianism when compared with the subgroup of respondents who placed a low priority on punishment and a high priority on rehabilitation of offenders. This finding suggests that high levels of authoritarianism are maintained in respondents who endorse punishment regardless of their views on rehabilitation but also in respondents who place a low priority on rehabilitation. Although levels of authoritarianism appear to be reduced in individuals who place a reduced priority on punishment as a sentencing goal, it appears that authoritarianism is least apparent in the subgroup of respondents who also value sentencing strategies aimed at rehabilitation. It therefore should not be assumed that authoritarianism is linked exclusively to punishment preferences.

The Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation subgroup also demonstrated significantly lower levels of endorsement of the belief that crime is caused by the personal characteristics of the individual when compared to the other cluster groups. Significant differences were not only found between the high punishment groups and the low punishment groups but also between the two subgroups that placed a low priority on
the punishment of offenders. The Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation subgroup demonstrated significantly lower endorsement of the belief that the personal characteristics of the individual primarily cause crime than did the Low Punishment /Low Rehabilitation subgroup. Examining punishment and rehabilitation as separate variables found that belief in individual causation significantly predicted punishment as the preferred goal of sentencing. Exploring scores on these variables together suggests that this particular belief is significantly less evident in respondents who not only place a reduced priority on punishment but who also place a high priority on rehabilitation. Again, it should not be assumed that belief in individual causation is exclusively linked to high endorsement of punishment as a sentencing goal. This study found that belief in individual causation is also demonstrated in a subgroup of people who place a low priority on rehabilitation.

The Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation subgroup also demonstrated significant differences when compared to the other cluster groups on their level of endorsement of the belief that crime is caused by the economic or social conditions in society. The Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation subgroup showed significantly higher endorsement of the belief that crime is caused by the economic or social conditions in society when compared with the other cluster groups. Examination of punishment and rehabilitation as separate variables found that belief in the economic factors as the primary cause of crime significantly predicted rehabilitation as the preferred goal of sentencing. Belief in social causation was not found to significantly predict rehabilitation. Exploration of scores on
these variables together suggests that the belief that crime is the result of the economic or social conditions in society is endorsed at significantly higher levels in the subgroup of respondents who not only place a low priority on punishment but who also place a high priority on rehabilitation.

The Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation subgroup also demonstrated significantly lower levels of fear of personal crime when compared with the other three cluster groups and significantly lower levels of fear of property crime when compared with the high punishment groups. Although examination of punishment and rehabilitation variables separately found that the impact of fear of personal crime and fear of property crime on attitudes toward punishment or rehabilitation was not significant, exploration of these variables together found that fear of personal crime was significantly lower in the particular subgroup of respondents with a low priority on punishment and a high priority on rehabilitation of offenders. Fear of property crime was significantly lower in both low punishment groups when compared with the high punishment groups, regardless of their views on rehabilitation.

Low Punishment /Low Rehabilitation

The Low Punishment /Low rehabilitation subgroup was comprised of respondents who advocated sentencing goals that place a low priority on punishment of offenders and a low priority on rehabilitation. This subgroup of respondents was the youngest of the four cluster groups and significantly younger than the High Punishment /High
Rehabilitation group. The Low Punishment /Low Rehabilitation group comprised more highly educated respondents than both high punishment groups with 68% of the cluster indicating tertiary as their highest level of education.

The Low Punishment /Low Rehabilitation subgroup as mentioned above demonstrated significantly higher levels of authoritarianism than the Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation group and significantly lower levels of authoritarianism than both high punishment groups. The Low Punishment /Low Rehabilitation subgroup’s endorsement of the belief that personal characteristics of the individual primarily cause crime was significantly higher than the Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation subgroup and significantly lower than the two punishment groups.

The Low Punishment /Low Rehabilitation group demonstrated a significantly higher level of endorsement of the belief that economic or social factors primarily cause crime than the Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation group. No significant differences on economic or social causation variables were found between the Low Punishment /Low Rehabilitation group and the high punishment groups. This finding suggests that placing a low priority on rehabilitation linked the Low Punishment /Low Rehabilitation group more closely to the high punishment groups than to the Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation group.

The Low Punishment /Low Rehabilitation subgroup also demonstrated significantly higher fear of personal crime than did the Low
Punishment /High Rehabilitation group. No significant differences in fear of personal crime were found between the Low Punishment /Low Rehabilitation group and the high punishment groups. This again suggests that a high level of fear of personal crime linked the Low Punishment /Low Rehabilitation subgroup more closely linked to the high punishment groups than to the Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation group.

Summary

Consistent with Carroll et al.’s (1987) research, the current study investigated the predictors of punishment versus rehabilitation as the preferred goal of sentencing. To extend Carroll et al.’s research, this study clustered scores on both punishment and rehabilitation variables together. Four subgroups were detected from the data. These subgroups differed significantly from each other on demographic variables, personality characteristics, beliefs about the causes of crime and fear of crime.

This study found that subgroups who demonstrated low endorsement of punishment differed significantly from subgroups who demonstrated high endorsement of punishment, irrespective of their views on rehabilitation. The low punishment subgroups were comprised of younger and more highly educated respondents with significantly lower levels of both anxiety and authoritarianism when compared to the high punishment groups. In particular, the subgroup of respondents who placed a low priority on punishment and a high priority on rehabilitation of offenders differed significantly on a range of variables including authoritarianism, beliefs about the causes of crime and fear of crime when
compared to the other three subgroups. In the Low Punishment /High Rehabilitation subgroup, levels of authoritarianism and levels of fear of personal and property crime were significantly reduced. This group also endorsed a cluster of beliefs about the causes of crime characterised by significantly less endorsement of the belief that the personal characteristics of the individual cause crime and significantly higher endorsement of social and economic factors as causes of crime when compared to the other three groups.

In contrast, respondents who demonstrated high levels of support for punishment as a sentencing goal, regardless of their views on rehabilitation, were older and less educated when compared with respondents who placed a low priority on punishment. The high punishment subgroups also maintained significantly higher levels of authoritarianism, despite their views on rehabilitation when compared with respondents who placed a low priority on the punishment of offenders. The high punishment subgroups also showed significantly higher endorsement of the belief that the personal characteristics of the offender primarily cause crime than did respondents in the low punishment groups.

Exploring scores on punishment and rehabilitation variables together also found that subgroups of respondents significantly differed from each other in their endorsement of beliefs about the causes of crime. The results suggest that there is a strong constellation of beliefs about crime and justice that cluster together in a subgroup of people that are less punitive toward criminal offenders and more focused on rehabilitation.
The finding that younger and more highly educated respondents are less punitive and more committed to rehabilitative practices suggests that increased education may be an important factor in expanding knowledge of criminal justice issues and may in time generate changes in punitive attitudes toward sentencing. The results are consistent with Roberts and Indermaur’s (2007) suggestion that knowledge and beliefs about crime and the criminal justice system underpin punitive attitudes toward sentencing.

Although some research has shown that increased fear of crime is associated with more punitive attitudes toward sentencing (Sprott & Doob, 1997), the current study found that when punishment and rehabilitation variables were examined separately, fear of crime was not found to be a significant predictor of punishment. Exploring punishment and rehabilitation variables together found significant differences in fear of crime and attitudes to sentencing among the cluster groups. The subgroup of respondents who placed a low priority on punishment and a high priority on rehabilitation demonstrated significantly lower levels of fear of personal crime when compared with the other three cluster groups. This subgroup also demonstrated significantly lower levels of fear of property crime when compared with respondents in the two subgroups that placed a high priority on punishment. This finding suggests that fear of personal crime may be associated with the sentencing preferences of particular subgroups of people, particularly those who place a high priority on punishment regardless of their views on rehabilitation or those who place a low priority on rehabilitation.
Consistent with the suggestion that different groups value the purpose of sentencing in different ways (Hessing et al., 2001), this study found that attitudes toward sentencing are linked to subgroups of respondents who differ significantly from each other in their demographic characteristics, personality variables, beliefs and fear of crime. These findings are consistent with Monterosso’s (2008) suggestion that the public should not be assumed to be generally punitive in their attitude toward sentencing. It appears that the public may be, as Monterosso suggests, ‘selectively punitive’ given that harsh punishment strategies were advocated by a subgroup of respondents who also endorsed a strong emphasis on rehabilitation of offenders.

Predictors of Fear of Personal Crime


Hypothesis 5. It was expected that fear of personal crime would be predicted by: demographic variables including gender and vulnerability, high scores on anxiety and authoritarianism, high scores on the belief that crime is caused by personal characteristics of the individual and high scores on variables related to perceptions about crime including perceived risk of personal crime and perceived seriousness of personal crime. Age was not expected to be a significant predictor of fear of crime given the use of crime specific indicators of fear in the current study as opposed to global measures.
Consistent with expectations, the current study found that personality variables significantly predicted fear of personal crime. As expected, highly anxious respondents demonstrated higher levels of fear of personal crime than did less anxious respondents. This finding is consistent with previous research demonstrating that personality characteristics such as trait anxiety are associated with elevated levels of fear of crime (Vitelli & Endler, 1993). The current findings are consistent with Norris and Kaniastys’ (1994) suggestion that highly anxious people may be more susceptible to irrational concerns that generate elevated levels of fear of crime.

As anticipated, the current study found that authoritarianism significantly predicted fear of personal crime with higher levels of authoritarianism associated with higher fear of personal crime. The positive relationship between authoritarianism and fear of crime may be linked to perceptions of threat (Doty et al., 1991) and authoritarian beliefs and behaviours conceptualised by Adorno et al. (1950). Highly authoritarian individuals may perceive crime rates to be higher than they actually are and this perception may sustain their sense of threat and subsequent fear of crime.

The current study also found that authoritarianism was a more powerful predictor of fear of personal crime that it was for fear of property crime. The greater impact of authoritarianism on fear of personal crime could have been a result of participants linking physical and psychological harm more closely to being the victim of an offence.
directed at a person as opposed to a property crime offence. Personal crime, particularly more violent offences, may generate a heightened sense of threat in more authoritarian participants than property crime offences.

Consistent with the expectations, the current study found that respondents’ perceived likelihood of personal crime was a significant predictor of fear of personal crime. Results suggest that individuals who considered their risk of becoming a victim of personal crime to be high tended to demonstrate higher levels of fear of personal crime than did individuals who perceived themselves to be at low risk. This finding is consistent with previous research that demonstrated the direct effect of perceived risk on fear of crime (Meithe & Lee, 1984; Mesch, 2000). It may be that individuals who think about crime in certain ways or evaluate their social environment as highly threatening, regardless of actual risk, may experience elevated levels of fear of crime. Believing that the consequences of crime victimisation may be physically or psychologically harmful may prompt people to constrain their behaviour and this behaviour in turn may generate heightened fear of personal crime (Liska et al., 1998).

It was anticipated that other variables including perceived vulnerability and perceived seriousness of the offence would significantly predict fear of personal crime. In contrast to the hypothesis, perceived vulnerability and perceived seriousness had no significant impact on fear of personal crime. The current findings are in contrast to previous studies suggesting that fear of personal crime is best explained
by variables related to self-perceived ability to cope with a potential assault (Killias, 2000) and seriousness of the offence (Warr, 1984). Although these variables may be important in understanding fear of crime, the current findings suggest that an individual’s perceived risk of personal crime is the most powerful predictor of offence-specific fear of personal crime.

The disparate findings between the current study and previous research regarding the impact of vulnerability on fear of personal crime may be explained by differences in the measurement of fear. Killias and Clerici (2000) used global questions about walking in the respondent’s neighbourhood or home from the train, bus or tram to measure fear of crime as opposed to the offence-specific measure used in the current study. The reduced impact of perceived vulnerability and perceived seriousness may also be explained by the sizeable proportion of variance in fear of personal crime attributed to the impact of gender and perceived likelihood of becoming a victim of an offence. The significant impact of gender on fear of crime, despite the measures used, is well documented in previous research (Keane, 1992). A high level of perceived risk of becoming the victim of a personal crime may provoke intense fear among women because of the serious consequences of sexual assault such as rape (Warr, 1984).

In contrast to expectations, the current study found that beliefs about the causes of crime had no significant impact on fear of personal crime. The hypothesis that the belief that crime is the result of the personal characteristics of the individual would predict elevated levels of
fear of crime was not supported. It may be that the strong impact of
gender and perceived likelihood on fear of personal crime may over-ride
the impact of beliefs about the causes of crime on fear levels.

The finding in this study that age was not a significant predictor
of fear of personal crime was consistent with expectations. This finding is
similar to other studies that have utilised multifaceted, offence specific
measures of fear of crime and found no significant relationship between
age and fear responses (LaGrange & Ferraro, 1992). Results suggest that
fear of crime among older people when compared to younger age groups
may have been over-estimated in earlier studies using a single-item global
measure of fear of crime.

Predictors of Fear of Property Crime

Hypothesis 6. It was expected that high scores on fear of property crime
would be predicted by a range of variables including gender, high scores
on anxiety and authoritarianism, the belief that crime is caused by social
or economic conditions in society, perceived likelihood of both property
crime and personal crime and perceived seriousness of property crime.

Consistent with expectations, the current study found that
personality variables, including anxiety and authoritarianism, significantly
predicted fear of property crime. Fear of property crime rose with
increased anxiety. This finding is consistent with previous research
(Vitelli & Endler, 1993) suggesting that in relation to fear of crime,
anxiety involves the constant threat of injury and ambiguity associated
with crime risk situations. The impact of authoritarianism on fear of property crime differed from its impact on fear of personal crime. The addition of beliefs about the causes of crime to the regression model diminished the impact of authoritarianism on fear of property crime. In contrast, the relationship between authoritarianism and fear of personal crime remained significant throughout each step of the regression analysis. It may be that authoritarian aggression (Adorno et al., 1950) may not be so readily aroused when crimes are directed toward property as opposed to the person and when they are believed to be caused by societal factors as opposed to personal characteristics of the offender.

Consistent with the hypothesis, this study found that high levels of perceived likelihood of property crime and perceived seriousness of property crime were significant independent predictors of fear of property crime. Together, these variables accounted for 16.5% of the variance in fear of property crime. This finding is consistent with previous research that demonstrated the direct effect of perceptual variables on fear of property crime (Meithe & Lee, 1984). The inclusion of perceived likelihood of property crime and perceived seriousness of property crime to the regression model also reduced the impact of authoritarianism on fear of property crime. This suggests that the impact of personality variables on fear of property crime is mediated to some extent by perceptual variables.

The results of this study suggest that beliefs about the causes of crime also impact on individual differences in levels of fear of property crime. Consistent with the hypothesis, the belief that social conditions in
society causes crime significantly predicted fear of property crime. The hypothesis that the belief that economic conditions cause crime would directly impact on variation in fear of property crime was not supported. The current study found that whereas beliefs about the causes of crime had no significant impact on fear of personal crime, individuals who endorsed the belief that social conditions in society causes crime demonstrated higher levels of fear of property crime. This finding could suggest that perceptions of social incivility may play a role in heightened levels of fear of property crime offences (LaGrange, Ferraro, & Supancic, 1992). If perceptions of neighbourhood unrest such as unsupervised youth, graffiti, excess noise and property crime offences are linked to the social issues of drug use and family problems, respondents who believe that their neighbourhood incivility is high may experience a heightened sense of potential risk and subsequent fear of property crime offences.

In contrast to expectations, the current study found that demographic variables had no significant impact on fear of property crime. Gender was not a significant predictor of fear of property crime although it was for fear of personal crime. It may be that women judge the potential harm to their physical and psychological well being to be higher for personal crime offences than for property crime offences.

Predictors of Fear of Terrorism

The current study investigated the predictors of fear of terrorist crime to explore any similarities and differences that fear of terrorism may have with fear of personal crime and fear of property crime offences.
Hypothesis 7. It is expected that fear of terrorism would be predicted by gender, educational level, high scores on anxiety and authoritarianism, high scores on the belief that crime is caused by the personal characteristics of the individual and high levels of perceived risk of terrorism.

The results suggest that the predictors of fear of terrorism are similar to the predictors of fear of personal and property crime offences. Consistent with expectations, a combination of demographic variables, personality characteristics and perceptual variables had a significant impact on fear of terrorist crime. As expected, gender was found to be a significant independent predictor of fear of terrorist crime with females demonstrating higher levels of fear than males. This finding is similar to the impact of gender on fear of personal crime. Although property is usually damaged when terrorist crimes are committed, female respondents may tend to associate terrorist activities with violent crimes directed against people as opposed to property offences, a connection that may contribute to their elevated levels of fear when compared to males.

As expected, respondents with low levels of education demonstrated higher levels of fear of terrorism than did respondents with higher levels of education. More highly educated individuals may have a more realistic perception of their own risk of terrorist crime than less educated individuals and this evaluation may contribute to a reduction in
fear of terrorist activity. It may be that individuals who are more highly educated may think in more complex ways about the issue of terrorism.

Consistent with the hypothesis, personality variables were found to have a significant impact on fear of terrorism. Fear of terrorism rose with increased anxiety. The positive relationship between anxiety and fear of terrorism is consistent with the positive relationship found between anxiety and fear of both personal and property crime offences. This finding suggests that more highly anxious individuals are likely to demonstrate heightened levels of fear of a wide range of criminal offences than individuals who are less anxious.

As expected, authoritarianism was a significant predictor of fear of terrorist crime. Fear of terrorism rose with increased authoritarianism. The positive relationship between authoritarianism and fear of terrorism is consistent with the positive relationship found between authoritarianism and fear of personal crime. The strength of the relationship between authoritarianism and fear of personal crime and fear of terrorist crime is similar. Highly authoritarian respondents may consider terrorist activity as a threat to the existing political, economic and social order of society and to the values of security and conformity strongly endorsed by authoritarian individuals (Adorno et al., 1950). The results could suggest that abstract impressions of threat presented by images of terrorist crime in the media may arouse fear responses in highly authoritarian individuals (Doty et al., 1991). Previous research has found that Australians’ perception of threat has led to occupational stress in the workplace, discrimination and changing organisational culture (Howie, 2005). High
levels of authoritarianism and fear of terrorism may play a role in the arousal of distrust and apprehension toward individuals or groups in the community perceived to fit stereotypical images of a terrorist. Consistent with this suggestion, research has shown that authoritarianism has been associated with prejudice toward minority groups (Forbes, 1985).

As expected, perceptions about the likelihood of becoming a victim of terrorism significantly predicted fear of terrorist crime. Individuals’ who perceived themselves to be at high risk of becoming a victim of terrorist activity demonstrated significantly higher fear levels than those who perceived themselves to be a low risk. The positive relationship between perceived risk of crime and fear of crime was consistent across the three different types of crime assessed in this study: personal crime, property crime and terrorist crime. The perceived likelihood of terrorist crime was the strongest independent predictor of fear levels when compared to the impact of perceived likelihood on fear of personal crime or property crime offences. Whether the perceived threat of crime is irrational or merely inflated, its effect can have a significant impact in the workplace (Howie, 2006) and in the lives of individuals who may constrain their activities (Liska et al., 1998) or engage in extreme forms of crime-preventive behaviour (Winkel, Denkers, & Vrij, 1994).

In contrast to expectations, beliefs about the causes of crime had no significant impact on fear of terrorist crime. The non-significant impact of beliefs on fear of terrorism was similar to the impact of belief variables on fear of personal crime. The pattern of results suggests that
demographic variables, personality characteristics and perceived likelihood of becoming a victim of crime are more powerful determinants of fear of more violent crime than beliefs about crime causation.

In summary, the current study found that the predictive power of demographic variables, personality characteristics and beliefs about the causes of crime varied according to type of crime. The perception of the likelihood of becoming a victim of crime was the most powerful independent predictor of fear of personal crime, fear of property crime and fear of terrorism. This finding suggests that cognitive beliefs are an important determinant of fear responses. Individuals who assessed their own personal risk of victimisation to be high demonstrated higher levels of fear of crime than those who perceived their personal risk to be low.

In this study, the impact of anxiety and authoritarianism on fear of crime differed according to type of crime. Although individual differences in levels of anxiety emerged as significant predictor of personal, property and terrorist crime, authoritarianism significantly predicted fear of personal crime and fear of terrorism. The impact of authoritarianism on fear of property crime was not significant. It may be that highly authoritarian individuals maintain an elevated sense of threat (Doty et al., 1991) prompted in part by the impact that violent personal crime or terrorist activities may have on society. This perception of threat may sustain the elevated levels of fear of violent criminal activity observed among highly authoritarian respondents.

The current study found that the impact of beliefs about the causes of crime on levels of fear of crime also varied according to the
type of crime. While the belief that social conditions in society caused crime significantly predicted fear of property crime, beliefs about the causes of crime were not found to be significant predictors of fear of personal crime or fear of terrorism. It may be that perceptions of neighbourhood disorder may play a role in heightened levels of fear of property crime offences (LaGrange, Ferraro, & Supancic, 1992). Respondents who evaluate their environment as threatening as a result of numerous incidents of neighbourhood incivility may experience an elevated sense of potential risk and fear of property crime offences.

The impact of demographic variables on fear of crime was not consistent across the three different types of crime. While gender emerged as a significant predictor of fear of personal crime and fear of terrorism, the impact of gender differences on fear of property crime was not significant. This finding could be indicative of the perception of heightened personal harm that women may associate with violent criminal activity. Although educational level emerged as a significant determinant of fear of terrorism, it was not a significant predictor of fear of personal or property crime. It may be that more highly-educated individuals read more widely about terrorist activities and evaluate their own personal risk of terrorist crime more realistically than individuals with less education.

Predictors of Sentencing Options

Aim 6. To investigate the predictors of a range of sentencing options that include: mandatory sentencing, home detention, public identification
of sex offenders after their release, re-introduction of the death penalty and the introduction of safe injecting rooms in Victoria.

The current study investigated the predictors of a range of sentencing options frequently raised in the media and among community groups as ways of addressing the problem of crime. While mandatory sentencing, public identification of sex offenders following their release from prison and re-introduction of the death penalty represented a more punitive set of sentencing options, home detention and the introduction of safe injecting rooms represent a less punitive orientation. The results suggest that the predictors of more punitive sentencing options are similar to the predictors of punishment as the goal of sentencing. A combination of personality characteristics and beliefs about the causes of crime had a significant impact on endorsement of more punitive sentencing options. Demographic variables, fear of crime and perceptions about the seriousness of crime had no significant impact on support for more punitive strategies.

The findings of this study suggest that authoritarianism was the most powerful independent predictor of endorsement of more punitive sentencing options. Respondents with high levels of authoritarianism demonstrated significantly higher levels of support for punitive sentencing strategies than did respondents with low levels of authoritarianism. This finding is consistent with the significant impact of authoritarianism on support for punishment as the preferred goal of sentencing found in the current study and in Carroll et al.’s (1987)
research. Other studies have also found a positive relationship between authoritarianism and preference for harsher sentencing strategies (Chapdelaine & Griffith, 1997; Ryckman et al., 1986).

Consistent with Carroll et al.’s (1987) research, the current study found that preferences for more punitive sentencing strategies rose with increased endorsement of the belief that crime is caused by the personal characteristics of the offender. This study also found that preferences for punitive sentencing strategies increased with decreased endorsement of the belief that crime is caused by the economic conditions in society. The results suggest that punitive sentencing options are more likely to be endorsed by highly authoritarian individuals, those who attribute the causes of crime to the intrinsic nature of the offender and by those who discount the impact of economic factors in society on criminal behaviour.

This study found that fear of crime had no significant impact on support for punitive sentencing options. This finding is similar to the non-significant impact that fear of crime had on punishment as the goal of sentencing in the current study but in contrast to previous research linking fear of crime to willingness to support punitive reaction to criminal offenders and perception of the effectiveness of punishment (Sprott & Doob, 1997; Thomas & Foster, 1975). Given that Thomas and Foster’s work was conducted in America in the 1970’s, their disparate findings with the current study may be explained by demographic, social and cultural differences as well as significant change in world events that have occurred over time. Sprott and Doob’s study was also conducted in
America and unlike the present study they used global indicators to measure fear of crime.

In summary, the current study found that the predictors of punitive sentencing options were similar to the predictors of punishment as the goal of sentencing. Authoritarianism and the belief that crime is caused by the individual characteristics of the offender and not economic conditions in society significantly predicted support for punitive sentencing strategies. An individual’s demographic profile and fear of crime had no significant impact on punitive sentencing preferences.

Conclusion

This chapter examined the research questions posed in this study and linked the findings to previous literature. A combination of demographic variables, personality characteristics and beliefs about the causes of crime emerged as key determinants of attitudes toward sentencing and fear of crime. Four subgroups of respondents were detected in the data. These subgroups demonstrated significant differences on the study variables. The following chapter discusses the implications of this research and suggestions for future research directions.
CHAPTER 10

IMPLICATIONS OF THE CURRENT RESEARCH AND
IDENTIFICATION OF FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS.

Implications of the Current Research

The current study investigated community attitudes toward the contrasting sentencing goals of punishment and rehabilitation. Understanding community attitudes toward sentencing is important given that attitudes to sentencing make a major contribution to community confidence in criminal justice policy. The potential impact of perceptions about public opinion on justice policy highlights the importance of understanding how different groups in the community value the purpose of sentencing in different ways.

This study partially replicated Carroll et al.’s (1987) American research investigating the impact of demographic variables, personality characteristics and beliefs about the causes of crime on sentencing goal preferences. Given the current confusion about the purposes of sentencing (Findlay et al., 2003; Indermaur, 1994), the aim of the current research was to take a more recent look at the issue of sentencing goals in an Australian context and investigate whether there have been changes in the predictors of the alternative goals of punishment and rehabilitation. Given new initiatives that have endeavoured to change established forms of criminal justice (Daly,
Hayes & Marchetti, 2006), an important question is whether community attitudes have changed.

To date little Australian research has addressed the impact of demographic variables, personality characteristics and beliefs about the causes of crime on sentencing goal preferences. Much of the research on sentencing goals has been conducted in European countries and in the United States. While Carroll et al. (1987) conducted their research in America with law students and probation officers, the current study was conducted in Australia utilising a broad community sample. Community members may have different views about criminal justice issues when compared with law students and probation officers and different groups in the community prioritise the goals of sentencing in different ways. The social and economic conditions in America also differ from those experienced in Australia and there are significant cultural differences between the two countries.

In the broadest sense this study explored the question of continuity over time and across cultures in the relationship between demographic variables, authoritarianism, beliefs about the causes of crime and the important social issue of community attitudes toward the goals of sentencing. Results of the current study revealed that despite cultural differences and the significant social and economic changes that have occurred since the 1980s, the current Australian data were remarkably similar to Carroll et al.’s (1987) model.
Consistent with Carroll et al.’s (1987) model, this study found that authoritarianism remains a variable of importance in the formation of punitive attitudes toward the punishment of offenders. This is despite the fact that Carroll et al.’s sample was comprised of law and criminology students and probation officers and this Australian sample was comprised of community members. Despite this being a snow ball sample, it was very similar to Australian Bureau of Statistics demographic data, with only the percentage of people with tertiary education being slightly higher than the Victorian population. A low level of education and the belief that crime is caused by the nature and intrinsic characteristics of the individual are also significant predictors of preferences for punishment as the primary goal of sentencing. These results are consistent with previous research identifying the importance of beliefs about crime and the criminal justice system as key determinants of punitive attitudes toward sentencing (Roberts & Indermaur, 2007).

Addressing punitive community attitudes towards the punishment of offenders presents a challenge to the implementation of innovative policy promising to hold offenders accountable in ways that are constructive as opposed to punitive. Youthful offenders who arguably have the best prospects for rehabilitation are among the most numerous of offenders (Davies & Raymond, 1999) and consideration must be given to ways to help young people become re-integrated into society. These challenges highlight the need to address resistance to reform in the community that may be
generated by authoritarian aggression and conventionality and negative beliefs about the intrinsic nature of the offender that may be embedded in the Australian culture.

The findings of the current study are consistent with previous research suggesting that attempts to implement change in law reform need to focus on education and addressing the beliefs that generate punitive attitudes toward criminal offenders (Roberts & Indermaur, 2007). Given that in the current study, endorsement of rehabilitation was predicted by a high level of satisfaction with the performance of the criminal justice system, shifting punitive attitudes may require strategies to increase confidence in the justice system (Roberts & Indermaur, 2007). As Carroll et al. (1987) pointed out, shifting a punishment orientated person toward a more rehabilitative perspective could not be accomplished without giving consideration to the beliefs that support that goal. They suggested that disparity-reducing interventions require a structure that is related to a clear set of policy goals.

The current study adds to our information about the relative importance of the predictors of sentencing attitudes within subgroups of the population. Cluster analysis of the beliefs about punishment and rehabilitation as the goals of sentencing revealed significant findings. Four separate groups were identified that differed according to demographic and personality characteristics, beliefs about the causes of crime and fear of crime. This research has provided empirical support for the complexity of community attitudes toward criminal justice issues and supports Daly’s (2000) suggestion
that community attitudes reflect elements of seemingly contrary justice practices. Community members’ views on sentencing include ideas about punishing offenders as well as helping them towards rehabilitation.

The results of this study suggest that it would be a misconception to assume that the public are not necessarily punitive if they value rehabilitative ideals. This study found that there is a subgroup of community members who equally value and place a high priority on both rehabilitation and punishment. Although this subgroup endorsed the need for rehabilitation, they shared characteristics and beliefs that were closely aligned with the group that placed a high priority on punishment and a low priority on rehabilitation. Irrespective of their views on rehabilitation, the subgroups that placed a high priority on the punishment of offenders had significantly higher levels of both anxiety and authoritarianism and higher fear of crime when compared with other groups. They also endorsed beliefs supportive of the idea that crime is caused by the personal characteristics of the offender.

The results of this study found that the strongest support for rehabilitation was demonstrated by a small subgroup of community members who not only placed a high value and priority on rehabilitation, they also placed a low priority on punishment. This particular group was comprised of younger and more highly educated respondents who demonstrated significantly lower levels of both anxiety and authoritarianism and reduced fear of crime when compared with other groups. This group also endorsed a cluster of beliefs that linked the causes of crime to the economic and social
conditions in society. A significant finding of this research is that increased education was consistently related to a belief in the value of rehabilitation together with a reduced emphasis on punishment.

Changing punitive attitudes and viewpoints on sentencing could involve specific educational programs that might be aimed at subgroups of the population. Studies have shown that when the public are fully informed about the facts of a criminal case they are less punitive (Lovegrove, 2008). The finding in the current study that less education is a significant predictor of more punitive sentencing preferences highlights the importance of improving public knowledge of crime and criminal justice (Roberts & Indermaur, 2007). Improving the quality of information available through the media that inform the public is also important (Lovegrove, 2008). Brief media reports that are often sensationalised may provoke simplistic reactions to complex social problems among subgroups in the community.

The current study adds to our information about the impact of fear of crime on attitudes toward sentencing. While some studies have asserted that higher fear levels are associated with more punitive sentencing attitudes (Sprott & Doob, 1997), other studies have disputed this suggestion (Quimet & Coyle, 1991). When the predictors of punishment and rehabilitation were examined separately, results suggested that fear of crime was not a significant predictor of punishment as the goal of sentencing. However, clustering scores on punishment and rehabilitation together identified subgroups of
respondents who differed significantly from each other in their level of fear of crime and preference for harsh sentencing measures.

In this study, fear of crime was significantly higher among respondents who placed a high priority on punishment and a low priority on rehabilitation. This group also demonstrated significantly higher levels of anxiety, increased authoritarianism and attributed the causes of crime to the personal characteristics of the offender when compared with other subgroups. This group of more highly anxious and fearful people may consider the threat of crime to be high and their endorsement of more punitive sentencing practices may be related to a desire for crime prevention measures. Changing punitive attitudes among this group of people may require more accurate education about crime rates and introducing measures aimed at increasing confidence in the criminal justice system (Roberts & Indermaur, 2007). The findings of the current research suggest that it cannot be assumed that the public at large fear crime and therefore demand more punitive sentencing (Quimet & Coyle, 1991) when fear of crime is highest among particular identifiable groups in the community.

The findings of the current study have implications for psychologists who work in the criminal justice system or who offer counselling services to offenders and their families. Participants in the current study who endorsed the belief that crime is caused by the intrinsic nature of the individual, also advocated punishment as the goal of sentencing. If these perceptions are shared by the wider community, police officers, social service providers and
health care workers, these beliefs may impact on the quality of services and support that offenders and their families receive. The findings in the current study also highlight the importance of psychological and cognitive processes in understanding individual differences in fear of crime. This finding may have implications for therapists treating individuals with excessive crime-related fears. Therapists might usefully explore personality variables including levels of anxiety and authoritarianism as well as perceptions of victimisation risk to gain a better understanding of how fearful emotions may have originated.

Implications for Future Research

The current study highlights the complexity of community attitudes towards the goals of sentencing. It is important that future research investigating sentencing attitudes consider that community members may fall into four subgroups that differ in their demographic and personality characteristics, beliefs about the causes of crime and fear of crime. As Daly (2000) has pointed out, community members’ attitudes to criminal justice issues are comprised of multiple justice principles. To accommodate the complexity of sentencing attitudes, it would be useful for future research to move beyond conceptualising punishment and rehabilitation in oppositional terms, as separate unrelated dimensions and to consider the manner in which these dimensions interact to produce separate community groups. Considering retributive and rehabilitative beliefs together may be an
important step toward promoting change in the criminal justice system
(Montorosso, 2007).
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Inter-correlations between Selected Demographics, Personality, Beliefs, Fear of Crime and Sentencing Goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Gender</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Educational Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Worship</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Authoritarianism</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Individual Causation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Social Causation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Economic Causation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Fear of Personal Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Likelihood Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Fear of Property Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Likelihood Property</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Serious Personal Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Serious Property Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Fear of Terrorism</td>
<td></td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Satisfactory Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Punishment</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 306

APPENDIX B

Dendogram for Cluster Groups
PLEASE NOTE

Appendix B is unable to be reproduced online. Please consult print copy held in the Swinburne Library.
Perceptions of Crime and Sentencing

This project is conducted by Diana White and forms the basis of a Doctoral Thesis in Psychology at Swinburne University of Technology. The project is to be supervised by Associate Professor Ann Knowles, Head of the Psychology Discipline.

We are interested in the concerns people have about various types of crimes and attitudes toward the sentencing of offenders. As a participant, you will be asked to complete a questionnaire about your attitudes and feelings toward a variety of current sentencing practices, including mandatory prison terms, home detention and the severity of penalties for serious criminal offences. Questions also address concerns about crimes affecting personal safety and property damage. You may find the exercise interesting and your participation may contribute to a more complete understanding of the scope and intensity of community concerns about crime. It is expected that you would spend approximately 30 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

Participation in this project is voluntary, anonymous and confidential. You are free to withdraw consent and to discontinue involvement at any time. The names of participants will not be recorded on the answer sheets and even though the results may be published, no individual will be identifiable. The original questionnaires and analyses will be stored in a secure location and will not be made available to anyone other than my supervisor and myself.

Please answer every question as honestly as possible, bearing in mind that there are no right or wrong answers. Simply complete the questionnaire and return it in the pre-paid envelope provided.

Further questions regarding this study can be directed to Diana White, on telephone number 9736 2233 or Associate Professor Ann Knowles, on telephone number 9214 8205. Any complaints arising from participation in this study can be directed to The Chair, Human Ethics Committee, Swinburne University of Technology at P.O. Box 218, Hawthorn Victoria 3122 or on telephone 9214 5223.

Participation in this study is warmly invited and greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

Diana White
Perceptions of Crime and Sentencing

1 Sex \textit{(please circle)}
   1 Male
   2 Female

2 Age \underline{\text{years}}

3 Home post code

4 Highest level of education \textit{(Please circle one number)}
   1 Secondary level
   2 Tertiary level
   3 TAFE
   4 Undergraduate University
   5 Completed University Degree

5 Student status \textit{(Please circle one number)}
   1 Full-time
   2 Part-time
   3 Not currently studying

6 Occupational status \textit{(Please circle one number)}
   1 Full-time
   2 Part-time
   3 Not currently in paid employment
7 Do you attend a place of worship (Please circle one number)

1 Never
2 Occasionally
3 Frequently
4 Regularly

8 Do you live alone or with other(s) (please circle one number)

1 Alone
2 With other(s)

9 Sometimes people engage in behaviours or actions in order to reduce their fear of crime. Have you ever engaged in any of the behaviours listed below? (please circle all that apply)

1 carry a whistle
2 I prefer to go out at night with other people or an escort
3 I carry some form of weapon (e.g., pepper spray)
4 I learn self-defense
5 At night I leave the lights on in my house when I’m out
6 I leave the television or radio on in my house when I’m out
7 I have a burglar alarm in my house
8 I own a guard dog
9 I have security locks in my house
10 I have a car alarm
11 I avoid public transport services after dark
12 I avoid certain streets, public areas or parks
13 Other (Please specify)
10 How would you rate your level of personal fitness at the moment. Do you consider your level of fitness to be? (Please circle one number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not at all fit</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>high</th>
<th>extremely high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 Imagine that you are assaulted by a young unarmed man. Do you think that in this situation you would be able to run away or defend yourself? (Please circle one number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I would definitely become a victim</th>
<th>I would probably become a victim</th>
<th>I could probably defend myself or run away</th>
<th>I could certainly defend myself or run away</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 During the last year have you ever been a victim of personal crime (e.g., assault, rape, robbed on the street etc.)? (Please circle one number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 Before last year were you ever a victim of personal crime (e.g., assault, rape robbed on the street etc.)? (Please circle one number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 Do you know of a family member, close friend, neighbour or workmate who has been a victim of personal crime? (Please circle one number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 During the last year have you ever been a victim of property crime (e.g., house vandalised or broken into, car stolen)? (Please circle one number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16  Before last year were you ever a victim of property crime (e.g., house vandalised or broken into, car stolen)? (Please circle one number)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17  Do you know of a family member, close friend, neighbour or workmate who has been a victim of property crime? (Please circle one number)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of statements which people have used to describe themselves are given below. Read each statement carefully and then circle the appropriate number to the right of the statement to indicate how you generally feel. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any one statement but give the answer which seems to describe how you generally feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>almost never</th>
<th>almost always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(continued)

A number of statements which people have used to describe themselves are given below. Read each statement carefully and then circle the appropriate number to the right of the statement to indicate how you generally feel. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any one statement but give the answer which seems to describe how you generally feel.

1 = almost never  
2 = sometimes  
3 = often  
4 = almost always

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel that difficulties are piling up so that I cannot overcome them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I worry too much over something that really doesn’t matter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am happy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I am inclined to take things hard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I lack self confidence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I feel secure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I try to avoid facing a crisis or difficulty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I feel blue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I am content.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Some unimportant thoughts run through my mind and bother me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I take disappointments so keenly that I can’t put them out of my mind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I am a steady person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I get in a state of tension and turmoil as I think over my recent concerns and interests.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please read each of the following statements and circle a number to show how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair treatment of underprivileged groups and classes is the chief cause of crime.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many obviously guilty persons escape punishment because of legal technicalities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence illegally obtained should be admissible in court if such evidence is the only way of obtaining a conviction.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search warrants should clearly specify the person or things to be seized.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one should be convicted of a crime on the basis of circumstantial evidence, no matter how strong such evidence is.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no need in a criminal case for the accused to prove his or her innocence beyond a reasonable doubt.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any person who resists arrest commits a crime.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When determining a person's guilt or innocence, the existence of a prior arrest record should not be considered.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiretapping by anyone and for any reason should be completely illegal.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defendants in a criminal case should be required to take the witness stand.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All too often, minority group members do not get fair trials.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please read each of the following statements and circle a number to show how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 Because of the oppression and persecution minority group members suffer, they deserve leniency and special treatment in the courts.  

12 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13 Citizens need to be protected against excess police power as well as against criminals.  

13 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14 It is better for society that several guilty men be freed than one innocent one be wrongfully imprisoned.  

14 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15 Accused persons should be required to take lie detector tests.  

15 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16 When there is a ‘hung’ jury in a criminal case, the defendant should always be freed and the indictment dismissed.  

16 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17 A society with true freedom and equality for all would have very little crime.  

17 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18 It is moral and ethical for a lawyer to represent a defendant in a criminal case even when he believes his client is guilty.  

18 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19 Police should be allowed to arrest and question suspicious looking persons to determine whether they have been up to something illegal.  

19 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20 The law coddles criminals to the detriment of society.  

20 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21 The freedom of a society is endangered as much by overzealous law enforcement as by the acts of individual criminals.  

21 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22 In the long run, liberty is more important than order.  

22 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23 Upstanding citizens have nothing to fear from the police.  

23 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
At one time or another, most of us have experienced fear about becoming the victim of crime. Some crimes probably frighten you more than others. We are interested in how afraid people are in everyday life of being a victim of different types of crimes. Please rate your fear on a scale of 1 to 7 where 1 means you are not afraid at all and 7 means you are extremely afraid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not afraid at all</th>
<th>Unafraid</th>
<th>Moderately unafraid</th>
<th>Neither afraid or unafraid</th>
<th>Moderately afraid</th>
<th>Afraid</th>
<th>Extremely afraid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Being approached on a street by a beggar.
2. Being cheated, conned, or swindled out of your money.
3. Having someone break into your home while you are away.
4. Having someone break into your home while you are there.
5. Being raped or sexually assaulted.
7. Being attacked by someone with a weapon.
8. Having your car stolen.
9. Being robbed or mugged on the street.
10. Having your property damaged by vandals.
You have already rated your fear of different kinds of crimes; now I want you to rate the chance that a specific thing will happen to you during the coming year. On a scale of 1 to 7 where 1 means completely unlikely and 7 means it’s completely likely, how likely do you think it is that you will...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely unlikely</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neither likely or unlikely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Completely likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Be approached by a beggar.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Be cheated, conned or swindled out of your money.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Have someone attempt to break into your home while you are away.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Have someone break into your home while you are there.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Be raped or sexually assaulted.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Be murdered.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Be attacked by someone with a weapon.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Have your car stolen.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Be robbed or mugged on the street.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Have your property damaged by vandals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. How safe do you feel out alone in your neighbourhood during the day?
   Do you feel:
   
   - very safe
   - somewhat safe
   - somewhat unsafe
   - very unsafe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very safe</th>
<th>somewhat safe</th>
<th>somewhat unsafe</th>
<th>very unsafe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. How safe do you feel out alone in your neighbourhood during the night? Do you feel:
very safe  somewhat safe  somewhat unsafe  very unsafe
1  2  3  4

There are many different types of crime. Some are considered to be very serious, others not so serious. We are interested in your opinion about how serious each type of crime is. On a scale of 1 to 7 where 1 means least serious and 7 means extremely serious, please circle a number that indicates how serious you consider each crime to be.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all serious</th>
<th>Not very serious</th>
<th>Slightly serious</th>
<th>Moderately serious</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Very serious</th>
<th>Extremely serious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Being approached on the street by a beggar.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Being cheated, conned or swindled out of your money.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Having someone break into your home while you are away.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Having someone break into your home while you are there.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Being raped or sexually assaulted.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Being murdered.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Being attacked by someone with a weapon.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Having your car stolen.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Being robbed or mugged on the street.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Having your property damaged by vandals.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please read each of the following statements and circle a number to show how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completely disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>At the root of much crime are early family problems.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Drugs are a factor in many crimes.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>People learn to be criminal from associating with people who are criminal.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Drugs and alcohol cause crime because people can no longer control their behaviour.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Who a person associates with has an influence on whether he/she will commit a crime.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>At the root of much crime are early family problems.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Many people who become criminals were neglected by their parents.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Poverty and inequality in society are responsible for much of crime.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Many crimes are more the result of flaws in society than any basic criminality in the offender.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>People who commit crimes are usually forced to by the situations they find themselves in.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Equitable distribution of wealth in society is the only way we can expect to eliminate crime.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>People need to survive and sometimes crime is the only alternative.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please read each of the following statements and circle a number to show how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. People who are too lazy turn to crime.  
14. Most criminals deliberately choose to prey on society.  
15. Criminals are people who don’t care about the rights of others or their responsibility to society.  
16. Once a criminal, always a criminal.  
17. On the whole, welfare measures such as unemployment insurance and social assistance have made crime worse.

Please read each of the following statements and circle a number to show how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The criminal justice system works extremely well the way it is now.  
2. The criminal justice system presently devotes much of its energy to preventing people from repetitive criminal acts.  
3. The criminal justice system is constantly finding better ways to combat crime.  
4. The criminal justice system is trying hard to find better ways to rehabilitate criminals.
Please read each of the following statements and circle a number to show how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Police, courts and corrections are constantly seeking ways to improve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Police, courts and correction systems attempt to show each criminal the fatalitiy of criminal behaviour.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Many new correctional procedures are too lenient.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Most of those who advocate lenient treatment of criminals do not attach sufficient weight to the seriousness of the crimes they commit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 More emphasis should be placed on keeping criminals behind bars.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Authorities should adopt a ‘get tough’ attitude with repeat offenders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 If lawmakers would make tougher laws against crime, we wouldn’t have so many criminals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Criminals should be punished for their crimes in order to make them repay their debt to society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 More and better rehabilitation programs for prisoners should be developed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 If judges would divert more people from prisons into rehabilitation programs, there would be less crime.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please read each of the following statements and circle a number to show how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 The current trend in diverting people from prison to rehabilitation programs should be continued.

16 The criminal justice system works extremely well the way it is now.

17 We're wrong to think the only thing we can do for criminals is throw them in jail.

18 If social scientists and lawmakers would get together more often, we would have an improved criminal justice system.

Please read each of the following statements and circle a number that best describes your opinion.

How often do you watch these types of television shows? Please circle one number between 1 (rarely) and 7 (daily)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1 News programs (e.g., Current Affair) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2 Police/law dramas (e.g., Law & Order, The Practice) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3 Documentaries (e.g., ABC & SBS documentaries) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4 How often do you listen to radio news? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5 How often do you read a newsmagazine? (e.g., Time) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. Do you get most of your news about crime from television, newspapers, radio, magazines, co-workers or friends and neighbours?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Television</th>
<th>Newspapers</th>
<th>Radio</th>
<th>Magazines</th>
<th>Co-workers</th>
<th>Friends/other neighbours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please read each of the following statements and circle a number to show how much you agree or disagree with the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Completely agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In recent years some parts of Australia have made prison mandatory for people convicted of some crimes.

1. Mandatory sentencing is a good idea.  

2. Minimum mandatory prison sentences are a good idea for serious crimes.

3. Some offenders could be placed on home detention providing they wear a non-removable tracking device attached to their wrist.

4. Sex offenders should be identified to the public after they have served their sentence.

5. The death penalty should be reintroduced in Victoria.

6. Safe injecting rooms should be introduced in Victoria.

The following measures have been suggested as ways to deal with the problem of crime and imprisonment.

The introduction of safe injecting rooms has been suggested as a way to help deal with the problem of drug use.
Lately there has been community concern about the possibility of terrorism. We are interested in how afraid people are in everyday life of becoming a victim of a terrorist attack. Please rate your fear on a scale of 1 to 7 where 1 means you are not afraid at all and 7 means you are extremely afraid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not afraid at all</th>
<th>Unafraid</th>
<th>Moderately unafraid</th>
<th>Neither afraid or unafraid</th>
<th>Moderately afraid</th>
<th>Afraid</th>
<th>Extremely afraid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your fear of...

1. Becoming a victim of a terrorist attack while travelling on an plane
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. Becoming a victim of random violence (e.g., car bomb)
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. Becoming a victim of a chemical attack (e.g., anthrax)
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. Becoming a victim in a tall building
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Now that you have rated your fear of different kinds of terrorist attacks, we would like you to rate the chance that a specific attack will happen to you in the coming year. On a scale of 1 to 7 where 1 means completely unlikely and 7 means completely likely, how likely do you think it is that you will...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely unlikely</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>unlikely</th>
<th>Neither likely or unlikely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Completely likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Become a victim of a terrorist attack while travelling on an plane
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. Become a victim of random violence (e.g., car bomb)
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. Become a victim of a chemical attack (e.g., anthrax)
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Is there any other kind of attack you are afraid of or consider yourself to be at risk of? (please specify)
If you have been a victim of any type of crime and would be willing to participate in a brief telephone interview, please leave a contact number in the space provided below. To ensure participant confidentiality, you will not be asked to give your name. Only the researcher will see the number and following completion of the study it will be destroyed.

I am willing to participate in a telephone interview.                   Yes / No

My contact number is ____________________________________________

Time and day of the week to call _______________________________________

Thank you for your participation in this study.