

City University of New York (CUNY)

CUNY Academic Works

Student Theses

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Spring 5-28-2020

The Influence of Prison Sentence Length on the Societal Dehumanization of Ex-Offenders

Skye Jensen

skye.jensen@jjay.cuny.edu

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/jj_etds/153

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).

Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu

The Influence of Prison Sentence Length on the Societal Dehumanization of Ex-Offenders

Skye Jensen, B.A

Mark Fondacaro, J.D., PhD

John Jay College of Criminal Justice,

City University of New York (CUNY)

New York, NY

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
Dehumanization	6
Resource Allocation	7
Employment	8
Education	10
Housing	10
Felony Disenfranchisement	12
Sentence Length	13
The Current Study	16
Method	18
Design	18
Participants	18
Measures	19
Results	21
Discussion	45
Limitations and Future Research	56
References	58
Appendix A	61
Appendix B	65

Abstract

The current study examined the factors that influence the societal dehumanization of offenders, belief in offender redeemability, and support for resource allocation and offender re-enfranchisement. Specifically, the study investigated how prison sentence length influences public opinion on these measures. Two hundred and twenty-two individuals participated in this study and were randomly assigned to one of two conditions involving their responses to a vignette depicting an offender having served either five or 15 years. The results revealed that the length of the offender's prison sentence did not impact participants' dehumanization of offenders, belief in their redeemability, or support for reentry services. Separately, the study also examined the role of participants' demographic characteristics. Results indicated that working in law enforcement or human services and having children in the home impacted the participant's level of offender dehumanization, belief in offender redeemability, and support for re-entry services. Several demographic characteristics including: age, marital status, education, income, and sexual orientation influenced only support for reentry services. The findings of the current study indicate that societal dehumanization and restriction of re-entry services is more strongly related to the demographic background of the public than to the characteristics of the offender.

Keywords: Dehumanization, Offender, Re-entry, Disenfranchisement, Redeemability

The Influence of Prison Sentence Length on the Societal Dehumanization of Ex-Offenders

Prisons were often thought to be centers of rehabilitation, a way to punish criminal behavior and prevent future criminal acts. However, incarceration often has the opposite effect, possibly due in part to the obstacles faced upon release (Davis & Tanner, 2003). Ex-offenders often continue to feel the effects of imprisonment upon reentry into society due to its impact on employment opportunities, housing, and voting rights (Burch, 2017). They are left at a financial and social disadvantage which negatively impacts attempts at reintegration, often resulting in criminalization by society and an increased risk of recidivism (Johns, 2018). The disadvantages imposed are not only a result of having a criminal record but also due to the dehumanizing actions and treatment of the individual by society.

The process of dehumanization is already well underway by the beginning of the trial. Dehumanizing language in the courtroom influences how the individual is perceived by the judge and jury, leading to harsher sentencing as they view the individual as lacking human values and therefore in need of more severe punishment (Brock, Denson, & Haslam, 2013). After being sentenced and incarcerated, the individuals are deprived of their rights of citizenship; many are unaware of this loss, and do not often get them restored which has a negative impact on their reentry into society (Mauer, 2018). Having the obligation to participate in the community like everyone else without the same rights and the label of “felon” can often result in poor treatment by others in society both before and after fulfilling their sentence.

Dehumanization and moral outrage can influence the severity of punishment, sentence length, and the perception of whether or not the person’s previous behavior can be redeemed by their favorable actions (Brock, Denson, & Haslam, 2013). The sentencing of individuals is

considered a vital component of social control in society, making any disparities in sentencing decisions highly questionable (Cassidy & Rydberg, 2020). Due to the limited information available to judges, they often utilize stereotypes along with offense severity, criminal history, and their state sentencing guidelines to make sentencing decisions (Cassidy & Rydberg, 2020; Bradley & Engen, 2016). Strict penalties are supported for repeat offenders, violent criminals, and sex offenders while rehabilitative programs are more acceptable for first time offenders and nonviolent criminals (Garland et. al, 2013). Though this is evidence that the effects of dehumanization are prevalent from the start, there is little information on how it impacts individuals after their release. Some view felons as incapable or undeserving of rejoining society and morally exclude them under the belief that such dehumanizing treatment is appropriate (Brock, Denson, & Haslam, 2013; Opotow, Gerson, & Woodside, 2005). Some individuals go so far to say that ex-offenders are the “least deserving members of society for any free benefits from the government” (Garland et. al, 2013).

Gaining further understanding of the dehumanizing effects of society and what influences public opinion on what ex-offenders deserve from the community could be influential in reducing rates of recidivism. A basic knowledge of public opinion concerning ex-offenders would be valuable in creating influential reintegration support systems to increase the probability of successful reentry into society. As there can be differences in how prison sentences are determined, knowing how the amount of time an individual served in prison influences societal dehumanization and the public’s opinion of what the ex-offender deserves, in terms of government resources, would help to identify appropriate resources needed to increase the effectiveness of community reentry programs.

Dehumanization

It is not uncommon for individuals to feel safer in prison than in society and find that they utilize the identity created in prison to protect themselves from the mistreatment experienced following reentry (Johns, 2018). This mistreatment, or dehumanization, is often in response to criminal behavior due to the moral beliefs that the criminal is inhuman and not worthy of rehabilitation (Brock, Denson, & Haslam, 2013). Dehumanization is a form of moral exclusion that involves denying human attributes to those deemed undesirable or lacking prosocial values (Johns, 2018). Moral exclusion occurs when perceptions are changed, social order is reshaped, and the scope of justice is analyzed within a community confronted with a criminal act (Opatow, Gerson, & Woodside, 2005). When these modifications occur, people often engage in psychological distancing, condescension, and lack empathy (Haslam, 2006; Opatow, Gerson, & Woodside, 2005). With this mindset, it would be easy for someone to begin rationalizing their behavior toward this individual as they would only see negative characteristics, often leading to the communal restriction on opportunities (Opatow, Gerson, & Woodside, 2005).

An important aspect of dehumanization is its relationship to the public's belief in redeemability. Someone with a strong belief in redeemability is likely to be very supportive of ex-offenders' efforts to re-enter society, an important factor to consider because people tend to form an identity based on how others treat them (O'Sullivan et. al, 2017). This belief in redeemability also may impact what the public believes the individual deserves in terms of reintegration services from the community. If an individual is constantly treated like someone undeserving of support or help from their community, then it is understandable that they would begin acting as

such. How an individual is treated by society influences their social standing in the community and how they view their own personal value (Fondacaro et. al, 2002). Being viewed as undeserving of help that they need, such as employment and housing resources, can influence how the individual views themselves. Paying attention to the needs and well being of ex-offenders during decision making concerning employment, education, and housing services could help the ex-offender successfully reintegrate into society.

Support of reentry initiatives is largely dependent on people's opinions of ex-offenders and whether or not they believe they can change (Ouellette et. al, 2017). Those who have experience with the criminal justice system, either themselves or close friends, generally have a stronger belief in redeem-ability (O'Sullivan et. al, 2017). That is, they believe that the individual can or has changed and is deserving of a second chance from the community. Understanding what influences society's perception of who is or is not redeemable would aid in understanding how the public perceives ex-offender reintegration programs and what can be done to make them more common and successful.

Resource Allocation

As discussed above, dehumanizing actions impact not only the sentencing process but the individual's rehabilitation success. The stigma attached to a criminal record can create a type of social distance that negatively impacts the reintegration process (Ouellette et. al, 2017). Feelings of condescension, "other"-ing, and lacking empathy from society impacts the jobs ex-convicts are able to get, their ability to vote, and housing opportunities by limiting their access to supportive resources (Haslam, 2006). Though the public understands the importance of

reintegration services, they are unwilling to pay higher taxes for them and are concerned about giving ex-offenders an advantage over others (Ouellette et. al, 2017). Possibly, with a better understanding of the general public's view of ex-offenders, we would be able to provide more information that would help society support vital reintegration programs.

Employment

The labels of “ex-convict” or “incarcerated” often elicit negative social reactions, specifically a restriction on legitimate job networks and belief that the individual will have an “unwanted attitude” making employers reluctant to hire them (Davis & Tanner, 2003; Lockwood, Nally, & Ho, 2016). This is the most challenging obstacle ex-convicts are faced with upon release due to the fact that employers are unsympathetic and often view ex-convicts as untrustworthy (Lockwood, Nally, & Ho, 2016; Davis & Tanner, 2003). Though employers appear to be reluctant to hire ex-offenders, fellow employees largely support the hiring of ex-offenders (Ouellette et. al, 2017). The public generally believes that ex-offenders should not have to live a life of poverty and that they should have opportunities to gain employment. This could be because the general public views employment as redemptive, an opportunity for the ex-offender to prove they are worthy citizens (Ouellette et. al, 2017).

Despite this fact, society may still feel that ex-offenders deserve a different quality of life than their fellow citizens. It was found that most people support the idea that recently released prisoners should earn enough money to make a stable living but not as much as the average middle class person (Garland et. al, 2013). And when it comes to hiring, most people are in favor of employers giving preference to individuals who have never been in prison. Though many support the hiring of ex-offenders, their support for employment assistance and job training

lessens when it may diminish job prospects for lawful citizens (Ouellette et. al, 2017). When making hiring decisions between ex-offenders, it was also found that the public thought individuals who had been to prison multiple times were not as deserving of employment assistance as those who had only been in prison once (Garland et. al, 2013). This shows that there is not only a problem concerning the hiring of ex-offenders but there is a significant issue concerning the general public's belief about what specific employment opportunities offenders deserve, making it important to understand what aspects of a criminal record are considered most relevant by society.

The effects of dehumanization are quite easily seen when analyzing discrimination within the job market, especially with the availability of background checks (Valentine & Redcross, 2015). Those with criminal records often have the smallest incomes, the most reviewed work histories, and obtain the lowest number of jobs (Davis & Tanner, 2003). There are many reasons why this may occur, including the lack of empathy, exclusion from society, and educational restrictions. Incarceration leads to eroding job skills and job connections which, when combined with the fact that there are some occupations felons are specifically banned from, makes it easy to understand why it is so difficult to find a job after release (Valentine, & Redcross, 2015). It should also be noted that this significant obstacle massively influences recidivism rates, especially if the offender is unable to gain employment within the first year of release (Lockwood, Nally, & Ho, 2016). By analyzing employment alone, it is obvious that dehumanization has a huge impact on the successful reentry into society. Because employment is a significant aspect of release, it is important to understand how the restriction of employment opportunity impacts the individual's

reintegration into society and how it is influenced by the public opinion of who presents redeemable qualities.

Education

An important factor that contributes to the employment struggle for offenders is limited access or lack of available education services. It has been shown that those with less education are disproportionately unemployed and often end up back in prison (Lockwood, Nally, & Ho, 2016). Though there is a high unemployment rate among released offenders, it has been found that education is an incredibly important factor adding to the argument that correctional education would be beneficial (Lockwood, Nally, & Ho, 2016). Research has shown that education for recently released prisoners is supported by the public but such support declines for education programs past high school equivalency (Ouellette et. al, 2017). Garland et al. (2013) found great support for high school education or GED programs, however support declined when discussing two or four year college degrees. It could be due to the difficulty of attempting to reconcile their support for resources to aid in successful re-entry with their concern that ex-offenders not be rewarded for their behavior when law-abiding citizens often experience similar educational and employment difficulties (Ouellette et. al, 2017).

Housing

Finding housing is the biggest obstacle for those attempting to re-enter society as it highly impacts employment status and mental health (Petersilia, 2003). Ex-offenders often do not have the funds for housing and even when they do, some landlords may reject an applicant after conducting a background check or require a credible work history that many offenders do not have due to their incarceration (Petersilia, 2003). Public housing is often the only resource ex-

offenders can turn to in order to find suitable housing. Unfortunately, federal regulations allow the Public Housing Authority to prohibit criminally involved individuals and certain offenders from living in supportive or public housing (Petersilia, 2003). Even if the individual does qualify, they may be put on a waitlist for years. In some cases, individuals are unable to return home to their families as, according to the “One strike and you’re out” policy, the public housing authority could evict the household for the criminal activities of one member (Petersilia, 2003). These challenges combined with the lack of resources available to help the offender find housing could make it incredibly difficult for the individual to successfully reintegrate and form social ties.

To help the individual successfully rehabilitate themselves, it is important to create a respectful environment that promotes health and independence (Johns, 2018). It has been found that people generally recognize the need for affordable housing but often resist the development of housing programs and facilities for ex-offenders when they learn the programs will result in higher taxes or housing units in their neighborhood (Ouellette et. al, 2017). Though they believe ex-offenders should be able to find housing, many express concerns when it comes to the possibility of having such housing in their neighborhood. These concerns include safety, declining property values, and a poor quality of life (Ouellette et. al, 2017). The lack of housing opportunities often results in many individuals becoming homeless or reliant on shelter systems. In turn, a large population of homeless individuals negatively influence crime rates, citizen fear, and violence (Petersilia, 2003). Some people do not believe that housing services are important and are even less supportive of housing assistance for offenders who have been in prison more than once. It was found that most people believe that preference for housing assistance should be given to those who have never been to prison (Garland et. al, 2013). The public’s negative

perception of an offender may influence their willingness to support housing assistance programs for ex-offenders.

Felony Disenfranchisement

Dehumanization also impacts the offender's rights as a citizen after release from prison in the form of disenfranchisement, shunning the entire group from the political process (Ruth, Matusitz, & Simi, 2017). A 2016 study found that 6.1 million Americans had lost the right to vote, many being non-incarcerated felons (Mauer, 2018; Ruth, Matusitz, & Simi, 2017). This could be due to the idea that prison is a type of punishment that makes the offender undeserving of the right to vote (Mauer, 2018). Some believe that disenfranchisement is the only reason offenders do not vote, while others believe that some offenders would like to vote and often are unaware that they could have their rights restored (Ruth, Matusitz, & Simi, 2017). Still, there are some offenders that are not aware that their right to vote has been taken away at all which can result in the offender unknowingly committing a criminal act by attempting to vote (Ruth, Matusitz, & Simi, 2017).

Support for three strike laws and the death penalty suggest that the public expects ex-offenders to pay a high price for their actions. However, these retributive attitudes do not always disappear after the offender completes their sentence as evidenced by the public support for felony disenfranchisement (Garland et. al, 2013). Currently, the U.S. is the only country to permanently disenfranchise ex-felons with no set guidelines across states concerning the extent of disenfranchisement (Ruth, Matusitz, & Simi, 2017). This is vastly different from disenfranchisement policies in European countries as nearly half do not restrict the voting rights upon conviction of a felony offense and only a quarter disenfranchise those in prison (Mauer,

2018). Most of the time these voting restrictions are limited to the prison term and do not continue after the individual completes their sentence, which matches the polling data of American views on the restoration of voting rights (Mauer, 2018).

The right to vote helps foster a sense of community which could help the offender overcome feelings of moral exclusion (Ruth, Matusitz, & Simi, 2017). In this way, the formation of fair and consistent re-enfranchisement laws can be beneficial to the rehabilitation process while potentially impacting the societal view of the redeem-ability of an ex-offender (Ruth, Matusitz, & Simi, 2017). It is possible that by keeping specific individuals from fully participating in society, the system is implying that those individuals present with unredeemable qualities and should not be embraced.

Sentence Length

Prison sentences limit the individual's opportunities to maintain social ties to their community which can negatively impact attempts at reintegration (Cassidy & Rydberg, 2020). Due to the immense impact incarceration has on reentry into society, it is important to understand the role of the judge in criminal sentencing. Though there are system guidelines intended to reduce the likelihood of individuals being sentenced to prison, sentencing guidelines change depending on the state. Many states allow judges discretion when it comes to sentence length- within the appropriate range- causing judges to rely on extralegal factors and the severity of the offense when considering severe punishments (Cassidy & Rydberg, 2020; Bradley & Engen, 2016; Hauser & Peck, 2017). Extralegal factors include race, ethnicity, gender, and age which all influence the decision for harsh sentencing (Jordan & Freiburger, 2015). In states without guidelines, African Americans and Hispanic males were significantly more likely to be sent to

prison than Caucasians (Bradley & Engen, 2016). This shows the amount of discretion afforded to judges can be influenced by personal bias which may continue to impact the offender when they attempt to reintegrate into society.

In many cases the appropriate sentence is obvious due to the seriousness of the offense, leading to less opportunities for the judges to consider extralegal factors (Cassidy & Rydberg, 2020). It does bring into question the judge's discretion concerning the severity of a crime. For instance, according to New York Penal Code Sections 120.00-120.12, the sentence range for aggravated assault is one to twenty-five years, depending on the felony, the penalties, and prior convictions. There are three main concerns that judges must consider during sentencing; blameworthiness, dangerousness to the community, and practical constraints such as correctional space, court case flow, and the individual's ability to serve time (Jordan & Freiburger, 2015). Older offenders may be seen as less dangerous, less likely to recidivate, and their time is seen as more valuable as their lifetime is diminishing. The same study suggests that younger offenders are more likely to be seen as dangerous, less likely to be harmed by prison, and that they should be held responsible for their actions (Steffensmeier, Painter-Davis, & Ulmer, 2017). It has been found that offenders in their 20s and early 30s are sentenced more harshly than offenders over the age of 50, while teenagers are thought to be more impressionable, and those in their late 30s and 40s are seen as less of a risk for being released into the community (Steffensmeier, Painter-Davis, & Ulmer, 2017). There have been several disparities noted concerning the differences in sentence length across race and ethnicity but few concerning how the amount of time served in prison impacts the reintegration process absent the offender's race.

It is generally believed that once an offender has gone through rehabilitation, they will have developed the necessary human capital needed to successfully reenter society (O'Sullivan et. al, 2017). By having this human capital, an ex-offender should be able to find a house, get a job, and create a supportive friendship network. However, as shown above, there is much more to an ex-offender's successful reintegration than simply being released from prison. It has been found that the ex-offender's criminal record plays a large role in what services the public believes should be provided and what the ex-offender deserves. Despite the fact that reentry services are most beneficial to individuals with a history of crime and incarceration, the public often sees criminal history as a sign that the ex-offender does not deserve help from the government (Garland et. al, 2013). Though there have been a variety of studies on prisoner reentry, most focused on how many times the individual has gone to prison and the type of crime committed. There is little research on how the length of an individual's sentence influences the dehumanizing effects of society.

The study by Brock, Denson, and Haslam (2013) found that there is a positive relationship between the length of the jail sentence, how harsh the sentence was, and societal dehumanization. They also found that dehumanization was related to harsher and longer punishment and negative feelings toward the possibility of rehabilitation. This could show that dehumanizing actions throughout the arrest and sentencing process can influence the individual's life throughout incarceration and release. It could also be related to how the public feels about whether or not the individuals possess redeemable qualities. However, it is not discussed thoroughly how the time an individual spends in jail specifically relates to the dehumanizing actions of society such as disenfranchisement and the limited access to employment and housing

resources. Some of the rights taken away due to incarceration are related to the sentence length of the individual and not all of them are returned upon release. Restrictions on voting rights in some countries, for example, are based on the length or type of sentence the individual is given (Ruth, Matusitz, & Simi, 2017).

Because reentry services have a strong base in the community, it is crucial to understand the public opinion concerning reintegration programs in order to improve connections within the community, clarify misunderstandings, and decrease resistance (Garland et. al, 2013). Though there is an assumption that after serving time and rehabilitation, the individual should be allowed to become re-enfranchised, some believe that by committing a felony the individual gives up their rights to be a part of society (Ruth, Matusitz, & Simi, 2017). However, there is little consideration of the specifics when it comes to a criminal record leading the public to focus solely on how long an individual was in prison without further knowledge of the situation. The failure to gain a complete understanding of an individual's criminal history may be tied to the fact that many in society look at all felons, disproportionately influenced by the images of those arrested for violent crimes, as "subhuman and beastly" (Denson & Haslam, 2013). There is no clear consensus on what specific aspects of a criminal record influence such a perspective. It is possible that simply knowing the amount of time spent in prison could be a factor.

The Current Study

While there are many studies analyzing the relationship of race, gender, and ethnicity of offenders and prison sentencing as well as successful reintegration, there are few that analyze how the amount of time spent in prison alone impacts successful reentry into society. The aim of the current study is to understand how public opinion influences the dehumanization experienced

by ex-offenders upon reentry into society. Specifically, we are looking to see if an ex-offender's prison sentence length alone, without considering the demographic characteristics of the offender, influences societal dehumanization of the offender and the public opinion of what resources should be available to the ex-offender. We hypothesize that the public will allocate less resources to the ex-offender who spent more time in prison than another ex-offender who committed the same crime. Furthermore, we seek to understand whether such dehumanization influences the resources available to ex-offenders such as housing and contributes to public support for disenfranchisement. We hypothesize that those who dehumanize ex-offenders based solely on the fact that they are ex-offenders will be less likely to allocate resources, believe in offender redeemability, and will be more likely to support disenfranchisement for ex-offenders. Specifically, the study addresses the following questions:

1. Does the amount of time an offender served in prison impact the study participants' ratings on the public perception measures of dehumanization, redeemability, and willingness to provide resources for assistance with education, employment, housing services, and the restoration of voting rights for ex-offenders?
2. Are the demographic characteristics of study participants related to their ratings of ex-offenders on measures of dehumanization, redeemability, and their willingness to provide resources for assistance with education, employment, housing services, and the restoration of voting rights for ex-offenders?
3. Does the participants' level of dehumanization and belief in redeemability directly influence their support for resource allocation and offender voting rights?

Method

Design

A two group, posttest comparison design was used to analyze the association between the independent variable of sentence length and the dependent variables of dehumanization and belief in redeemability. The study also analyzed the association between sentence length and the dependent variables of education, employment, housing services, government resources in general, and voting rights. Participants were randomly assigned into two groups, shown vignettes, and required to fill out the questionnaire concerning dehumanization, belief in redeemability, resource allocation, and voting rights.

Participants

Two hundred and thirty-six individuals were recruited for participation through Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk) in order to obtain a diverse sample. Participants had to be above the age of eighteen and reside in the United States. Results from 14 participants were excluded due to incomplete surveys, leaving 222 participants. The participants were randomly assigned to one of two groups. Group 1 was assigned a vignette describing an ex-offender with a sentence length of five years (N=115). Group 2 was assigned a vignette describing the same ex-offender with a sentence length of fifteen years (N=107).

The participants consisted of male (N=130), female (N=87) and those who identified as Non-binary or declined to say (N=5). The age range of the sample primarily consisted of 25-34 at 49.1% and 21.2% in the 35-44 range. The sample was predominantly made up of Caucasian (82.9%) participants and had an education level ranging from less than high school to a doctorate degree with a 4-year degree being most common (48.2%). The most common income range was

\$20,000-29,999 (18%). A small number of participants worked in law enforcement and/or human services, 11.7% and 23% respectively. Participants were asked if they had children living in their home (45%- "Yes", 54.1%-"No").

Materials

Dehumanization measure

Dehumanization was assessed using a modified version of the measure created by Bastian, Denson, and Haslam (2013) on human nature and uniqueness. Participants were asked to respond to eight statements concerning ex-offenders on a Likert scale from 1 (*strongly agree*) to 7 (*strongly disagree*). Positively worded statements were reverse-coded so, in all cases, higher scores reflect low dehumanization. A low average response would indicate high dehumanization. An example statement is: "I feel like ex-offenders in the justice system are refined and cultured." (Table1). This measure has a Cronbach's alpha of 0.817, indicating a high level of internal consistency.

Belief in Redeemability measure

Surveys concerning belief in redeemability (BIR) and public stance on prisoner reentry (O'Sullivan et. al, 2017; Ouellette et. al, 2017) were modified to analyze the relationship between the challenges faced during the reintegration process and society's beliefs about the criminality of the specific offender and offenders in general. Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with each statement on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly agree*) to 7 (*strongly disagree*). Negatively worded statements were reverse-coded so, in all cases, higher scores reflect weak belief that the offender is redeemable. Low scores reflect a strong BIR. An example

statement is: “*After committing a crime, changing your life is more about personal effort than luck.*” (Table 1). The BIR measure for offenders in general has a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.653. For the specific offender, the BIR measure has a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.730. Both results indicate a high level of internal consistency.

Public Support for Resource Allocation and Enfranchisement Measure

Participants were asked about their views on what ex-offenders in general should be provided and what the specific offender deserves in terms of re-entry services, resource allocation, and civil rights. Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with each statement on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly agree*) to 7 (*strongly disagree*). Negatively worded statements were reverse-coded so, in all cases, higher scores reflect weaker support for re-entry resources. A low score would indicate strong support for the allocation of re-entry resources. An example statement is: “Employment assistance should be provided to this ex-offender.” (Table 2). This measure has a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.940, indicating a high level of internal consistency.

Vignettes

Participants were provided a vignette and asked to use the information to answer the questionnaire. The vignette assigned to each group was identical in all respects (e.g., age at time of release, gender, education, crime committed by ex-offender) with the exception of sentence length (5 or 15 years). The vignette:

Mark is a 35 year old male. He has a high school education and little work experience at the time of his sentencing. Mark served (5 or 15 years) in prison for aggravated assault.

Demographics

Participants were asked to provide general information about themselves such as age, gender, race, education, marital relationship, employment status, income range, and the type of area they live in (urban, rural, suburban). They were also asked if they have children and if they or anyone they know have been arrested or have gone to prison. (Appendix B).

Procedure

Participants were recruited through Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk) to participate in a study on the relationship between incarceration and society. Participants were randomly assigned one of two vignettes and a questionnaire. The participants were asked to read the vignette, answer the questionnaire, and then fill out the demographic survey at the end.

Results

A multivariate analysis of variance was run to evaluate the relationship of prison sentence length with dehumanization, resources (education, employment, housing), voting, and BIR. A series of MANOVAs, followed by One-Way ANOVAs and planned contrasts, were run to evaluate the relationship of the participants' demographic characteristics with the dependent variables. Planned contrasts were conducted as it was anticipated specific demographic characteristics, such as income and education level, would impact support for resources. Pearson correlations were used to analyze the relationship between dehumanization and BIR with voting rights and resource allocation. Lastly, multiple regression tests were conducted to analyze predictors of dehumanization and BIR. The mean scores and percent of the sample that agree with the statements for each measure are presented in Tables 1 and 2. A low score indicates high dehumanization, high BIR, and strong support for resource allocation. Results show a low

dehumanization, high BIR, and strong support of resources regardless of the condition they participants were placed in, either five or 15 years.

Table 1

Mean Scores on Offender Dehumanization and Belief in Offender Redeemability and Percent

Agreement on Individual Items

	Percent Agree	Mean Support	Standard Deviation
Dehumanization			
I feel like ex-offenders in the justice system are open-minded, like they can think clearly about things.	63.5	4.86*	1.50
I feel like ex-offenders in the justice system are emotional, like they can be responsive and warm.	74.3	5.12*	1.42
I feel like ex-offenders in the justice system are superficial, like they have no depth.	25.7	4.77	1.79
I feel like ex-offenders in the justice system are mechanical and cold, like robots.	28.9	4.75	1.94
I feel like ex-offenders in the justice system are refined and cultured.	35.2	3.96*	1.69
I feel like ex-offenders in the justice system are rational and logical, like they are intelligent.	57.2	4.67*	1.53
I feel like ex-offenders in the justice system lack self-restraint, like animals.	30.2	4.56	1.76
I feel like ex-offenders in the justice system are unsophisticated.	43.7	3.97	1.74
Belief in Redeemability			
After committing a crime, changing your life is more about personal effort than luck.	77.1	2.66	1.61
Once a criminal always a criminal.	24.8	3.27*	1.74
People who have committed crimes have as much control over their future as anyone else.	52.7	3.71	1.90
People who have committed crimes deserve the opportunity to regain the respect of the community.	81.5	2.55	1.48
Having committed a crime should be no obstacle to becoming a valued member of society again.	75.3	2.79	1.52
People who have recently been released from prison deserve as much help from society as people who have never been incarcerated.	74.3	2.81	1.59

Ex-offenders are not as deserving of help as law-abiding citizens.	29.3	3.32*	1.93
Most people who commit crimes just can't manage to go back to living straight.	34.3	3.61*	1.86
It's possible for this ex-offender to change and lead a law-abiding life.	83.8	2.34	1.41
This ex-offender still deserves the opportunity to build the best life they can have.	84.7	2.34	1.41
The amount of time this ex-offender served in prison should not impact their life, financially or socially, once released.	68	3.04	1.59
This ex-offender is not as deserving of help as law-abiding citizens.	28.4	3.32*	1.77

To compute means and standard deviations, all items were coded 1 (*strongly agree*) through 7 (*strongly disagree*).

*This item was reverse-coded.

Table 1 shows the average level of agreement and the percent of the participants that agreed with each statement concerning dehumanization and BIR. These results indicate a relatively low level of dehumanization within the sample. More than half of the sample agreed with the positive statements about offenders, an average of approximately 54.2%, with the question concerning the refined nature of offenders receiving the lowest percent of agreement among the positive statements. On the dehumanization measure, an average of 28.2% of the participants agreed with the negative statements, except for the statement about the sophistication of the offender, with which 43.7% of the sample agreed. The average percentage of the participants that agreed with the negatively worded statements on the BIR measure was low, 29%. On average, 74.7% of the participants agreed with the positive statements, with the statement concerning the offender having the opportunity to build the best life possible receiving the most support, 84.7%. Overall, a large portion of the sample reported a high BIR for offenders overall.

Table 2

Mean Support for Resource Allocation and Enfranchisement and Percent of the Sample in Agreement with Individual Items

	Percent Agree	Mean Support	Standard Deviation
Housing Services			
Ex-offenders should be banned from public housing.	24.9	2.97*	1.90
Those who have not been to prison should have access to services such as housing and employment first, before this offender. (Also considered a variable of Employment).	41.9	4.23*	1.71
This ex-offender should be banned from public housing.	21.7	3.01*	1.82
Housing services should be provided to this offender once they are released to help him find an affordable home.	80.1	2.71	1.53
I support temporary housing programs for recently released prisoners. Helping recently released prisoners find a place to stay after release should be a high priority on our state agenda.	76.2	2.77	1.61
Education Services			
It is not worth the money or time to provide services such as educational assistance to this ex-offender.	24.8	3.06*	1.93
Educational services should be provided to ex-offenders.	79.7	2.55	1.59
Employment Services			
Education, mental health treatment resources, and employment training should be provided to this offender. (Also considered a variable of Education)	79.7	2.64	1.70
Employers should give preference in their hiring decisions to people who have no prison record over this ex-offender.	40.1	4.23*	1.58
This offender should have access to employment services in order to help them get a good job.	83.7	2.44	1.48
Employment assistance should be provided to this ex-offender.	82.4	2.57	1.51
We should strive to have recently released prisoners earning enough money to make a stable living.	82	2.64	1.53
Voting Rights			
All citizens deserve the right to vote.	77.5	2.41	1.65
People who have been to prison should not be able to have the ability to vote.	25.7	3.00*	1.94
This ex-offender deserves the right to vote.	77	2.73	1.73
Government Resources			
This ex-offender should be banned from receiving government assistance.	27	3.03*	1.99

This ex-offender is not worthy of government assistance.	23	3.03*	1.86
Ex-offenders currently receive all the government assistance (housing services, job training, etc.) that they deserve.	30.7	3.76*	1.73
Communities should have programs and services in place to help recently released prisoners.	82.4	2.51	1.51
It is not worth providing resources to help this ex-offender rejoin society.	24.4	2.92*	1.95

To compute means and standard deviations, all items were coded 1 (*strongly agree*) through 7 (*strongly disagree*).

*This item was reverse-coded.

Table 2 indicates a moderately high level of support for reentry services and offender voting rights. Support for housing was high, 80.1% of the participants agreed the specific offender deserved housing services, while 76.2% supported housing for offenders in general. Seventy-nine point seven percent of the sample supported education services for offenders, 75.2% supported education services for the specific offender. Eighty-three point seven percent of the sample agreed this specific ex-offender deserved employment services and 82% agreed all ex-offenders deserve employment services. Approximately the same percentage of the participants agreed that all ex-offenders, including the offender in the vignette, deserved voting rights. Eighty-two point three percent of the sample agreed that communities should have reentry services for recently released offenders and 75.6% agreed the specific offender is worthy of reentry services. Further analysis examined the influence of prison sentence length and participant characteristics on level of dehumanization, BIR, and support for reentry resources and offender voting rights.

Hypothesis 1 Analyses

The results of the MANOVA to test the hypothesis that the amount of time an ex-offender spent in prison negatively impacts dehumanization and BIR revealed no significant multivariate

main effect on the measures, Pillai's Trace=0.013, $F(3, 218) = 0.960$, $p=0.413$. The mean score for each variable is listed in Table 3.

Table 3*Dehumanization and Belief in Redeemability Means by Condition (5 or 15 years)*

	<i>Dehumanization</i>	<i>BIR: General Offenders</i>	<i>BIR: Specific Offender</i>
<i>Five Years</i>	4.66	3.02	2.65
<i>Fifteen Years</i>	4.51	3.16	2.89
<i>Total</i>	4.58	3.09	2.77

The results of the MANOVA conducted to test the hypothesis that the amount of time an ex-offender spent in prison would negatively impact the public's willingness to allocate resources (education, housing, employment services, and voting rights) found that this did not have a significant main effect on public opinion regarding resource allocation, Pillai's Trace=0.035, $F(10, 211) = 0.768$, $p=0.660$. The mean score for each variable is listed in Table 4.

Table 4*Mean Level of Support for Resource Allocation and Voting Rights by Condition (5 or 15 years)*

<u>Offenders in General</u>					
	Housing	Education	Employment	Voting	Resources
<i>Five Years</i>	2.72	2.44	2.47	2.56	3.06
<i>Fifteen Years</i>	3.03	2.65	2.82	2.86	3.22
<i>Total</i>	2.87	2.54	2.64	2.71	3.13
<u>The Specific Offender</u>					
	Housing	Education	Employment	Voting	Resources
<i>Five Years</i>	3.22	2.80	3.18	2.56	2.86
<i>Fifteen Years</i>	3.41	2.89	3.27	2.90	3.13
<i>Total</i>	3.31	2.84	3.22	2.73	2.99

Hypothesis 2 Analyses

The results of the MANOVAs conducted to test if the participants' demographic characteristics impact their responses to the measures of dehumanization, BIR, and support for resource allocation and voting rights indicate that these characteristics do influence levels of agreement and support. The results of the significant MANOVAs are listed in Table 5.

Table 5

Dehumanization and Belief in Redeemability

Demographic Characteristics	Pillai's Trace	F	df
<i>Have you worked in law enforcement?</i>	.072**	2.71	6
<i>Have you worked in human services?</i>	.075**	2.83	6
<i>Are there children living in your home?</i>	.060**	2.26	6

Support for Resource Allocation and Enfranchisement

Demographic Characteristics	Pillai's Trace	F	df
<i>Have you worked in law enforcement?</i>	.376*	4.88	20
<i>Have you worked in human services?</i>	.263*	3.20	20
<i>Ethnicity</i>	.313**	1.41	50
<i>Marital Status</i>	.379*	2.21	40
<i>Sexual Orientation</i>	.268**	1.51	40
<i>Income</i>	.705**	1.32	120
<i>Age</i>	.311**	1.40	50
<i>Education</i>	.432**	1.39	70
<i>Are there children living in your home?</i>	.203*	2.38	20

* $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$

One-Way ANOVAs were conducted to evaluate the relationships between demographic characteristics that had produced significant MANOVA results and each of the dependent

variables. Planned contrasts were then conducted, based on the significant One-Way ANOVAs, to analyze how specific demographic characteristics affected the dependent variables.

Questions concerning whether or not the participant worked in law enforcement or in human services were asked in order to investigate the possibility that professional contact with crime may influence views on dehumanization, redeemability, and re-entry services. Table 6 first lists the significant One-Way ANOVAs, of which there are 10 out of the 13 ANOVAs conducted, and the results of the planned contrasts for each of the 10 significant ANOVAs. Law enforcement employment did significantly influence responses to dehumanization, BIR overall, housing services overall, education, employment, and government resources for the specific offender, and voting rights for offenders in general. The results of the significant planned contrasts show participants who worked in law enforcement reported higher levels of dehumanization, lower BIR for offenders overall, and less support for resources and offender voting rights compared to participants who did not work in law enforcement.

Table 6

Significant Univariate Effects of Law Enforcement Employment

Dependent Variable	F	df	p
<i>Dehumanization</i>	3.35	2	.037
<i>BIR: Offenders in General</i>	7.27	2	.001
<i>BIR for the Specific Offender</i>	4.34	2	.014
<i>Housing Services: Offenders in General</i>	10.02	2	.000
<i>Housing Services: Specific Offender</i>	6.81	2	.001
<i>Education Services: Specific Offender</i>	10.50	2	.000
<i>Employment Services: Specific Offender</i>	3.21	2	.042
<i>Voting: Offenders in General</i>	5.26	2	.006
<i>Resources: Offenders in General</i>	4.11	2	.018

*Resources: Specific Offender	32.99	2	.000
-------------------------------	-------	---	------

Significant Planned Contrasts for Law Enforcement Employment (at $p < 0.05$)

Law Enforcement Employment	Dependent Variable	M Support	SD	N	t	df	r
	<i>Dehumanization</i>						
-Yes vs. No		4.11 4.67	0.87 1.15	26 178	-2.9 6	39.16	.42
	<i>BIR: Offenders in General</i>						
-Yes vs. No		3.48 2.98	0.58 0.94	26 178	3.70	46.42	.47
	<i>BIR: Specific Offender</i>						
-Yes vs. No		3.14 2.66	1.12 1.17	26 178	2.06	219	.13
	<i>Housing: Offenders in General</i>						
-Yes vs. No		3.65 2.67	1.04 1.44	26 178	3.41	29.06	.53
	<i>Housing: Specific Offender</i>						
-Yes vs. No		3.92 3.18	0.98 1.12	26 178	3.22	28.74	.51
	<i>Education: Specific Offender</i>						
-Yes vs. No		3.71 2.62	1.09 1.48	26 178	3.58	28.67	.55
	<i>Employment: Specific Offender</i>						
-Yes vs. No		3.52 3.13	0.73 1.11	26 178	1.74	28.67	.30
	<i>Voting: Offenders in General</i>						
-Yes vs. No		3.31 2.55	1.11 1.59	26 178	3.06	41.77	.42

<i>Resources: Offenders in General</i>						
-Yes vs.	3.65	1.05	26	2.36	219	.15
No	3.01	1.35	178			
<i>Resources: Specific Offender</i>						
-Yes vs.	5.05	1.47	26	7.52	219	.45
No	2.58	1.59	178			

Thirteen One-Way ANOVAs were conducted to investigate the relationship between working in human services and the dependent variables. The seven significant ANOVAs are listed in Table 7 followed by the results of the significant planned contrasts. Univariate results show working in human services influenced the participant's level of dehumanization, BIR for offenders in general, support for housing services overall, support for education and government resources for the specific offender, and voting rights for offenders in general. Planned contrasts revealed participants who worked in human services reported higher levels of dehumanization, lower levels of BIR for offenders in general, and less support for the resources tested compared to participants who did not work in human services.

Table 7

Significant Univariate Effects of Human Services Employment

Dependent Variable	F	df	p
<i>Dehumanization</i>	6.54	2	.002
<i>BIR: Offenders in General</i>	4.54	2	.012
<i>Housing Services: Offenders in General</i>	7.78	2	.001
<i>Housing Services: Specific Offender</i>	5.38	2	.005
<i>Education Services: Specific Offender</i>	7.47	2	.001
<i>Voting: Offenders in General</i>	4.27	2	.015
<i>Resources: Specific Offender</i>	21.61	2	.000

Significant Planned Contrasts for Human Services Employment (at $p < 0.05$)

Human Services Employment	Dependent Variable	M Support	SD	N	t	df	r
	<i>Dehumanization</i>						
-Yes vs. No		4.12 4.73	1.03 1.10	51 164	-3.5 3	219	.23
	<i>BIR: Offenders in General</i>						
-Yes vs. No		3.40 2.98	0.66 0.97	51 164	3.51	122.73	.30
	<i>Housing: Offenders in General</i>						
-Yes vs. No		3.51 2.66	1.24 1.45	51 164	3.83	219	.25
	<i>Housing: Specific Offender</i>						
-Yes vs. No		3.75 3.18	1.06 1.12	51 164	3.28	219	.21
	<i>Education: Specific Offender</i>						
-Yes vs. No		3.46 2.62	1.42 1.48	51 164	3.58	219	.23
	<i>Voting: Offenders in General</i>						
-Yes vs. No		3.21 2.53	1.32 1.61	51 164	3.02	101.03	.28
	<i>Resources: Specific Offender</i>						
-Yes vs. No		4.22 2.56	1.82 1.57	51 164	6.32	219	.39

Thirteen One-Way ANOVAs were conducted to investigate which variables are influenced by having children in the home. Table 8 lists the 11 significant ANOVAs and significant planned contrasts. Univariate results show having children in the home influenced

dehumanization, BIR levels, support for housing services, employment services and government resources overall. Additionally, it also influenced support for education services for the specific offender, and voting rights for offenders in general. Significant planned contrasts revealed participants who had children living in their home reported higher levels of dehumanization, less BIR overall, and less support for the resources compared to participants with no children living in the home.

Table 8*Significant Univariate Effects of Children in the Home (at $p < 0.05$)*

Dependent Variable	F	df	p
<i>Dehumanization</i>	3.87	2	.022
<i>BIR: Offenders in General</i>	4.22	2	.016
<i>BIR: Specific Offender</i>	4.27	2	.015
<i>Housing Services: Offenders in General</i>	8.79	2	.000
<i>Housing Services: Specific Offender</i>	7.16	2	.001
<i>Education Services: Specific Offender</i>	7.63	2	.001
<i>Employment Services: Offenders in General</i>	4.44	2	.013
<i>Employment Services: Specific Offender</i>	4.44	2	.013
<i>Voting: Offenders in General</i>	9.42	2	.000
<i>Resources: Offenders in General</i>	7.49	2	.001
<i>Resources: Specific Offender</i>	17.83	2	.000

Significant Planned Contrasts for Children in the Home (at $p < 0.05$).

Children in the Home	Dependent Variable	M	SD	N	t	df	r
	<i>Dehumanization</i>						
-Yes vs.		4.38	1.03	100	-2.39	219	.15
No		4.73	1.15	120			
	<i>BIR: Offenders in General</i>						

-Yes vs. No	3.26 2.97	0.95 0.88	100 120	2.36	219	.15
	<i>BIR: Specific Offender</i>					
-Yes vs. No	3.01 2.57	1.14 1.15	100 120	2.76	219	.18
	<i>Housing: Offenders in General</i>					
-Yes vs. No	3.29 2.55	1.42 1.35	100 120	3.95	219	.25
	<i>Housing: Specific Offender</i>					
-Yes vs. No	3.61 3.09	1.03 1.14	100 120	3.48	219	.22
	<i>Education: Specific Offender</i>					
-Yes vs. No	3.27 2.50	1.53 1.40	100 120	3.91	219	.25
	<i>Employment: Offenders in General</i>					
-Yes vs. No	2.97 2.37	1.66 1.37	100 120	2.92	219	.19
	<i>Employment: Specific Offender</i>					
-Yes vs. No	3.45 3.04	0.95 1.15	100 120	2.86	219	.18
	<i>Voting: Offenders in General</i>					
-Yes vs. No	3.18 2.33	1.52 1.48	100 120	4.19	219	.27
	<i>Resources: Offenders in General</i>					
-Yes vs. No	3.50 2.84	1.23 1.31	100 120	3.81	219	.24
	<i>Resources: Specific Offender</i>					
-Yes vs. No	3.72 2.40	1.87 1.44	100 120	5.76	183.99	.39

Participants were asked about their marital status and sexual orientation to investigate whether or not their interpersonal relationships impact their responses to the measures. Out of the 13 One-Way ANOVAs conducted, nine were significant. Table 9 lists the nine significant ANOVAs and the significant planned contrasts. Univariate results showed marital status significantly influenced housing services, employment services, government resources, and voting rights overall, as well as education services for the specific offender. Results of the significant planned contrasts revealed married participants reported the least support for housing and employment services, education services for the specific offender, voting rights, and government resources compared to participants of different marital statuses. Widowed participants report the highest level of support for each significant resource, however it is necessary to note that the category of “Widow” has the smallest amount of participants.

Table 9*Significant Univariate Effects of Marital Status*

Dependent Variable	F	df	p
<i>Housing Services: Offenders in General</i>	4.96	4	.001
<i>Housing Services: Specific Offender</i>	6.12	4	.000
<i>Education Services: Specific Offender</i>	4.08	4	.003
<i>Employment Services: Offenders in General</i>	2.91	4	.022
<i>Employment Services: Specific Offender</i>	2.74	4	.030
<i>Voting: Offenders in General</i>	5.90	4	.000
<i>Voting: Specific Offender</i>	4.66	4	.001
<i>Resources: Offenders in General</i>	5.13	4	.001
<i>Resources: Specific Offender</i>	9.85	4	.000

Significant Planned Contrasts for Marital Status (at $p < 0.05$)

Marital Status	Dependent Variable	M	SD	N	t	df	r
	<i>Housing: Offenders in General</i>						
-Married vs. Never Married		3.29 2.50	1.40 1.40	105 92	2.33	217	.15
-Married vs. Divorced		3.29 2.40	1.40 1.34	105 15	4.00	217	.26
	<i>Housing: Specific Offender</i>						
-Married vs. Never Married		3.63 2.96	1.14 0.97	105 92	4.44	217	.28
-Married vs. Widowed		3.63 2.47	1.14 0.80	105 5	2.38	217	.15
	<i>Education: Specific Offender</i>						
-Married vs. Never Married		3.23 2.50	1.50 1.41	105 92	3.57	217	.23
-Married vs. Widowed		3.23 1.70	1.50 0.98	105 5	2.30	217	.15
	<i>Employment: Offenders in General</i>						
-Married vs. Never Married		2.99 2.37	1.71 1.34	105 92	2.89	217	.19
	<i>Employment: Specific Offender</i>						
-Married vs. Never Married		3.43 3.01	1.05 1.08	105 92	2.79	217	.18
-Married vs. Widowed		3.43 2.40	1.05 0.90	105 5	2.13	217	.14
	<i>Voting: Offenders in General</i>						
-Married vs. Never Married		3.17 2.23	1.61 1.36	105 92	4.39	217	.28
-Married vs. Widowed		3.17 1.60	1.61 0.89	105 5	2.31	217	.15
	<i>Voting: Specific Offender</i>						

-Married vs. Never Married	2.99 2.36	1.80 1.46	105 92	2.64	217	.17
<i>Resources: Offenders in General</i>						
-Married vs. Never Married	3.53 2.77	1.31 1.19	105 92	4.18	217	.27
-Married vs. Widowed	3.53 2.30	1.31 0.84	105 5	2.12	217	.14
<i>Resources: Specific Offender</i>						
-Married vs. Never Married	3.69 2.30	1.91 1.34	105 92	5.91	186.29	.39
-Married vs. Divorced	3.69 2.49	1.91 1.47	105 5	2.65	21.28	.49
-Married vs. Widowed	3.69 1.87	1.91 1.14	105 5	2.42	5.12	.73

Participants were asked about their sexual orientation to investigate the relationship with the dependent variables. Thirteen One-Way ANOVAs were conducted, one was significant and is listed in Table 10 with the following significant planned contrasts. Univariate results revealed sexual orientation only had a significant effect on support for government resources for the specific offender. Planned contrasts showed that bisexual participants reported low levels of support compared to heterosexual and homosexual participants.

Table 10

Significant Univariate Effects of Sexual Orientation

Dependent Variable	F	df	p
<i>Resources: Specific Offender</i>	2.55	4	.040

Significant Planned Contrasts for Sexual Orientation (at p<0.05)

Sexual Orientation	Dependent Variable	M	SD	N	t	df	r
		Support					

<i>Resources: Specific Offender</i>						
-Heterosexuality vs. Bisexuality	2.91 4.00	1.73 1.98	187 21	-2.6 9	217	.17
-Homosexuality vs. Bisexuality	2.33 4.00	1.33 1.98	11 21	-2.5 6	217	.17

Thirteen One-Way ANOVAs were conducted to investigate which variables were significantly influenced by the participant's age range. The two significant ANOVAs and significant planned contrasts are listed in Table 11. Univariate results indicate age range significantly influenced support for education services and government resources for the specific offender. Significant planned contrasts revealed participants within the age range of 25 to 34 reported significantly less support than participants who were 55 to 64 years old.

Table 11

Significant Univariate Effects of Age

Dependent Variable	F	df	p
<i>Education Services: Specific Offender</i>	3.69	5	.003
<i>Resources: Specific Offender</i>	3.73	5	.003

Significant Planned Contrasts for Age (at $p < 0.05$)

Age	Dependent Variable	M Support	SD	N	t	df	r
<i>Education: Specific Offender</i>							
-25-34 vs. 55-64		3.19 2.38	1.57 1.09	109 17	2.65	27.45	.45
<i>Resources: Specific Offender</i>							
-25-34 vs. 55-64		3.40 2.06	1.94 0.82	109 17	4.90	50.09	.56

Of the 13 One-Way ANOVAs conducted to examine which variables were influenced by the participant's education level, four were significant. The significant ANOVAs and the following significant planned contrasts are listed in Table 12. Univariate results indicate education level significantly influences housing services overall, employment services for the specific offender, and voting rights for the specific offender. The levels of support for housing services overall and employment services for the specific offender was relatively high. Planned contrasts revealed participants with a high school education reported the highest level of support for housing services overall and employment services for the specific offender compared to participants with some college, a four-year degree, and those with a professional degree. Participants with a professional degree reported the least support for each resource compared to those with a high school education and those with a four-year degree. Though univariate results indicate a significant effect on voting rights for the specific offender, planned contrasts indicate the participant's education levels did not influence significantly different levels of support.

Table 12*Significant Univariate Effects of Education*

Dependent Variable	F	df	p
<i>Housing Services: Offenders in General</i>	2.27	7	.030
<i>Housing Services: Specific Offender</i>	2.18	7	.037
<i>Employment Services: Specific Offender</i>	2.29	7	.029
<i>Voting: Specific Offender</i>	2.23	7	.033

Significant Planned Contrasts for Education Level (at $p < 0.05$)

Education	Dependent Variable	M	SD	N	t	df	r
		Support					

<i>Housing: Offenders in General</i>						
-High School vs.	2.19	1.01	24	-2.1	214	.14
4 Year Degree	2.88	1.38	107	8		
-Some College vs.	2.76	1.35	39	-2.5	214	.17
Professional Degree	3.70	1.70	24	8		
-High School vs.	2.19	1.01	24	-3.7	214	.24
Professional Degree	3.70	1.70	24	5		
<i>Housing: Specific Offender</i>						
-High School vs.	2.70	0.84	24	-2.7	214	.18
4 Year Degree	3.38	1.03	107	2		
-Some College vs.	3.25	1.13	39	-2.1	214	.14
Professional Degree	3.86	1.32	24	4		
-High School vs.	2.70	0.84	24	-3.6	214	.24
Professional Degree	3.86	1.32	24	2		
<i>Employment: Specific Offender</i>						
-High School vs.	2.64	0.86	24	-2.4	214	.16
4 Year Degree	3.22	0.88	107	1		
-Some College vs.	3.24	1.19	39	-2.0	214	.14
Professional Degree	3.82	1.44	24	8		
-High School vs.	2.64	0.86	24	-3.8	214	.25
Professional Degree	3.82	1.44	24	5		
-High School vs.	2.64	0.86	24	-2.2	214	.14
Some College	3.24	1.19	39	0		

Thirteen One-Way ANOVAs were conducted to investigate which variables were significantly influenced by the participants income level. Table 13 lists the nine significant ANOVAs and the following significant planned contrasts. Univariate results show income level

significantly influences support for all resources except employment services for the specific offender. Planned contrasts revealed income levels significantly impacted support for housing services overall, employment services, and voting rights for offenders in general, as well as education services and government resources for the specific offender. Income level had a smaller impact on education services and government resources for offenders in general and voting rights for the specific offender.

Planned contrasts revealed participants who earned less than \$39,999 reported more support for resources and voting rights than those who earned more than \$40,000 with a few exceptions. It was shown that when compared to participants who earned between \$80,000 and \$89,999, participants who made \$20,000 to \$29,999 reported less support for government resources for offenders in general. Contrasts also revealed participants who earned \$40,000 to \$49,999 reported less support for housing services overall compared to those who earned between \$80,000 and \$89,999. When compared to participants who earned between \$100,000 and \$149,999, participants who made between \$70,000 and \$79,999 reported more support for employment services for offenders in general and participants who made between \$80,000 and \$89,999 showed more support for housing services for the specific offender. Participants who earned more than \$150,000 reported the least support compared to participants who made between \$20,000 and \$29,999. With the exception of the average scores from participants who earned more than \$150,000 and those who earned between \$50,000 and \$59,999, specifically concerning government resources for the specific offender, support for resources was relatively high across all income ranges.

Table 13

Significant Univariate Effects of Income

Dependent Variable	F	df	p
<i>Housing Services: Offenders in General</i>	2.20	12	.013
<i>Housing Services: Specific Offender</i>	1.91	12	.035
<i>Education Services: Offenders in General</i>	2.27	12	.010
<i>Education Services: Specific Offender</i>	2.37	12	.007
<i>Employment Services: Offenders in General</i>	2.44	12	.006
<i>Voting: Offenders in General</i>	3.12	12	.000
<i>Voting: Specific Offender</i>	2.35	12	.008
<i>Resources: Offenders in General</i>	2.38	12	.007
<i>Resources: Specific Offender</i>	2.75	12	.002

Significant Planned Contrasts for Annual Income Range (at p<0.05)

Income	Dependent Variable	M	SD	N	t	df	r
		Support					
<i>Housing: Offenders in General</i>							
-<\$10,000 vs. 40,000-49,999		2.28 3.40	1.11 1.40	16 30	-2.6 0	37.43	.39
-<\$10,000 vs. \$50,000-59,999		2.28 3.73	1.11 1.13	16 17	-3.7 2	30.95	.55
-\$10,000-19,999 vs. \$50,000-59,999		2.87 3.73	1.69 1.13	35 17	-2.11	44.77	.30
-\$20,000-29,999 vs \$50,000-59,999		2.81 3.73	0.93 1.13	29 17	-2.3 0	37.53	.35
-\$40,000-49,999 vs. \$80,000-89,999		3.40 2.45	1.40 1.17	30 12	2.21	24.14	.41
<i>Housing: Specific Offender</i>							
-<\$10,000 vs. \$20,000-29,999		2.79 3.40	0.80 1.11	16 40	2.30	38.26	.34
-<\$10,000 vs. \$40,000-49,999		2.79 3.66	0.80 0.90	16 30	-3.3 1	34.08	.49

-<\$10,000 vs. \$50,000-59,999	2.79 3.45	0.80 0.94	16 17	-2.1 6	30.74	.36
-\$40,000-49,999 vs. \$80,000-89,999	3.66 2.90	0.90 0.67	30 12	3.01	27.39	.49
-\$80,000-89,999 vs. \$100,000-149,999	2.90 3.82	0.67 1.11	12 9	-2.2 0	12.25	.53

*Education: Offenders in
General*

-<\$10,000 vs. \$40,000-49,999	1.81 2.97	1.04 1.69	16 30	-2.4 3	209	.16
-<\$10,000 vs. \$50,000-59,999	1.81 3.18	1.04 1.84	16 17	-2.5 5	209	.17
-\$20,000-29,999 vs. >\$150,000	2.50 5.50	1.63 2.38	40 4	-3.7 3	209	.24

*Education: Specific
Offender*

-<\$10,000 vs. \$20,000-29,999	1.65 2.94	0.83 1.47	16 40	4.10	47.62	.51
-<\$10,000 vs. \$40,000-49,999	1.65 3.23	0.83 1.40	16 30	-4.7 9	43.34	.58
-<\$10,000 vs. \$50,000-59,999	1.65 3.62	0.83 1.42	16 17	-4.8 8	26.08	.69
-<\$10,000 vs. \$60,000-69,999	1.65 2.82	0.83 1.61	16 13	-2.5 6	17.07	.52

*Employment: Offenders
in General*

-<\$10,000 vs. \$40,000-49,999	2.00 3.00	0.96 1.38	16 30	-2.8 6	40.72	.40
-<\$10,000 vs. \$50,000-59,999	2.00 3.29	0.96 1.89	16 17	-2.4 9	24.09	.45
-\$10,000-19,999 vs. \$40,000-49,999	2.23 3.00	1.30 1.38	35 30	-2.2 9	60.17	.28
-\$10,000-19,999 vs. \$50,000-59,999	2.23 3.29	1.30 1.89	35 17	-2.0 1	23.66	.38
-\$20,000-29,999 vs. >\$150,000	2.77 4.75	1.58 2.63	40 4	2.23	44.55	.31

-\$30,000-39,999 vs \$100,000-149,999	2.24 3.78	1.21 1.78	29 9	-2.4 1	10.40	.59
-\$70,000-79,999 vs \$100,000-149,999	2.25 3.78	0.88 1.78	8 9	-2.2 7	11.99	.54

*Voting: Offenders in
General*

-<\$10,000 vs. \$40,000-49,999	2.15 3.40	1.33 1.47	16 30	-2.9 0	33.49	.44
-<\$10,000 vs. \$50,000-59,999	2.15 3.68	1.33 1.43	16 17	-3.1 5	31.00	.49
-\$10,000-19,999 vs. \$40,000-49,999	2.29 3.40	1.50 1.47	35 30	-3.0 1	61.85	.35
-\$10,000-19,999 vs. \$50,000-59,999	2.29 3.68	1.50 1.43	35 17	-3.2 2	33.22	.48
-\$20,000-29,999 vs. \$50,000-59,999	2.80 3.68	1.51 1.43	40 17	-2.0 8	31.62	.34
-\$40,000-49,999 vs. \$80,000-89,999	3.40 2.33	1.47 1.24	30 12	2.37	23.89	.43

*Voting: Specific
Offender*

-\$10,000-19,999 vs. \$40,000-49,999	2.09 3.20	1.37 1.56	35 30	-3.0 2	58.45	.36
-\$10,000-19,999 vs. \$50,000-59,999	2.09 3.41	1.37 1.80	35 17	-2.6 7	25.41	.46

*Resources: Offenders in
General*

-<\$10,000 vs. \$50,000-59,999	2.62 3.94	1.20 1.03	16 17	-3.3 7	29.60	.52
-\$10,000-19,999 vs. \$50,000-59,999	3.03 3.94	1.50 1.03	35 17	-2.5 6	44.10	.35
-\$20,000-29,999 vs. \$80,000-89,999	3.20 3.12	1.39 1.02	40 12	-2.2 2	40.73	.32

*Resources: Specific
Offender*

-<\$10,000 vs. \$20,000-29,999	1.75 3.20	0.98 1.85	16 40	3.81	49.41	.47
-----------------------------------	--------------	--------------	----------	------	-------	-----

-<\$10,000 vs. \$40,000-49,999	1.75 3.36	0.98 1.60	16 30	-4.2 0	42.94	.53
-<\$10,000 vs. \$50,000-59,999	1.75 4.23	0.98 1.67	16 17	-5.2 5	26.24	.71
-<\$10,000 vs. \$60,000-69,999	1.75 3.51	0.98 2.23	16 13	-2.6 5	15.79	.55
-\$10,000-19,999 vs. \$50,000-59,999	2.83 4.23	1.82 1.67	35 17	-2.7 5	34.50	.42
-\$20,000-29,999 vs. \$50,000-59,999	3.20 4.23	1.85 1.67	40 17	-2.0 6	33.44	.33

Hypothesis 3 Analysis

Pearson correlations were conducted to investigate how dehumanization and BIR impact the resource allocation measure if at all. The tests indicated that dehumanization has a significant negative relationship with all dependent variables. BIR of offenders in general had a significant negative relationship with dehumanization and significant positive relationships with BIR of the specific offender and the components of resource allocation. BIR in the specific offender had a significant negative relationship with dehumanization and significant positive relationships with BIR of offenders in general and the components of resource allocation. The results of the Pearson correlations are listed in Table 14.

Tables 15 through 17 (Appendix A) list the results of the multiple regression tests that were calculated to analyze predictors of dehumanization, BIR of offenders in general, and BIR of the specific offender. These tests revealed dehumanization was mainly predicted by the BIR of offenders in general. The predictors of BIR of offenders in general include; dehumanization, BIR of the specific offender, and support for government resources for the specific offender. Lastly,

BIR for offenders in general and support for employment services for offenders in general were found to be predictors of BIR for the specific offender.

Table 14

Pearson Correlations

	<i>Dehumanization</i>		<i>BIR: Offenders in General</i>		<i>BIR: Specific Offender</i>	
	<i>r</i>	<i>p=</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p=</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p=</i>
<i>Dehumanization</i>	1.00	-	-.439	.000	-.359	.000
<i>BIR: Offenders in General</i>	-.439	.000	1.00	-	.772	.000
<i>BIR: Specific Offender</i>	-.359	.000	.772	.000	1.00	-
<i>Housing: Offenders in General</i>	-.439	.000	.661	.000	.708	.000
<i>Housing: Specific Offender</i>	-.363	.000	.581	.000	.624	.000
<i>Education: Offenders in General</i>	-.217	.000	.491	.000	.619	.000
<i>Education: Specific Offender</i>	-.276	.001	.641	.000	.722	.000
<i>Employment: Offenders in General</i>	-.276	.001	.602	.000	.688	.000
<i>Employment: Specific Offender</i>	-.352	.000	.660	.000	.752	.000
<i>Voting: Offenders in General</i>	-.375	.000	.595	.000	.609	.000
<i>Voting: Specific Offender</i>	-.257	.000	.497	.000	.548	.000
<i>Resources: Offenders in General</i>	-.337	.000	.594	.000	.702	.000
<i>Resources: Specific Offender</i>	-.436	.000	.661	.000	.667	.000

Discussion

The current study sought to understand the extent to which the length of time an offender spent in prison, and the participant's demographic characteristics, influenced the public's level of dehumanization of the offender, BIR, and public support of government resources such as housing, employment, and education services as well as the voting rights of ex-offenders. The overall purpose of the study was to gain an understanding of how offender and participant

characteristics influence the societal dehumanization of ex-offenders, the restriction of government resources, and the enfranchisement of offenders.

Though there have been multiple studies investigating the relationship between offenders, sentence length, and public opinion, there have been no studies to date that have focused on how prison sentence length alone influenced public opinion (O'Sullivan et. al, 2017; Ouellette et. al, 2017; Cassidy & Rydberg, 2020). The results of this study provide a small window into the societal views on the deservingness of offenders and could be generalizable to other populations. The results from the first hypothesis indicate that the amount of time an offender spent in prison, either five or 15 years, did not impact the participant's level of dehumanization, how redeemable they felt the offender was, or their support for government resources (housing, education, and employment services) and offender voting rights. Overall results of the study found the public on average shows low dehumanization, high BIR, and is supportive of services such as housing, education, and employment as well as the enfranchisement of offenders.

The findings of the current study are consistent with those of previous research indicating empathy and BIR play a large role in supporting reentry services for offenders (O'Sullivan et. al, 2017; Haslam, 2006). Participants with who reported less dehumanization, indicating potentially more empathy, were more supportive of allocating resources for offenders than highly dehumanizing participants. The high level of support for housing and education services corroborate the results of Ouellette et. al (2017), which showed an overall belief that offenders should have access to these resources. Though support for offender employment services was high, there are some indications of the conflict mentioned by Ouellette et. al (2017) concerning the possibility of these services negatively impacting lawful citizens. These results show an

understanding of the need for employment services and a potential belief that offenders should only receive assistance after law-abiding citizens. Future research should analyze how suggesting implementation of these services in the participants neighborhood influences support as it is possible the participants would view the offenders as competition for resources.

The overall support for offender voting rights could be indicative of the understanding of the relationship between rehabilitation and fair enfranchisement laws discussed in previous literature (Ruth, Matusitz, & Simi, 2017). These results also reflect a disconnect between government voting laws and public opinion given that, as Mauer (2018) discussed, a more than half of the U.S. still do not allow ex-offenders to vote. This conflict shows a need for further examination of the federal views of felony enfranchisement as, based on the current study, society sees offenders as deserving the right to vote. Overall, results indicate the amount of time an offender spends in prison has little to do with the societal dehumanization experienced upon release or public opinion of what the offender deserves in terms of resources and social interactions. It is possible that the dehumanization experienced by offenders and the limited reintegration resources available may be due to the standards and beliefs of the government rather than public opinion. Further research should be conducted to understand how the type of offense and offender characteristics, such as gender and race, influence public opinion concerning these measures.

To address the second hypothesis, demographic characteristics were analyzed to determine the role they play in societal dehumanization and successful offender reintegration. Characteristics such as age, gender, education, ethnicity, income, and exposure to crime were examined as some studies have shown they are related to support for rehabilitation and

punitiveness (Ouellette et. al, 2017;O'Sullivan et. al, 2017). Law enforcement and/or human service employment, having a child in the home, and marital status were also analyzed.

Consistent with findings noted in O'Sullivan, Holderness, Bright, and Kemp (2017), whether or not someone was a parent, education level, income, marital status, and the participant's age did impact support for reentry services. The current study found the following demographic characteristics to have the most significant impact on support for resource allocation: working in law enforcement or human services, marital status, and having children in the home. Though levels of dehumanization, BIR, and support overall were fairly high, the average amount of support for resources, concerning offenders in general or the specific offender, differed significantly depending on the participant's demographic characteristics.

Results showed experience working in law enforcement or human services and having a child in the home significantly impacted dehumanization, BIR, and support for resource allocation. These results varied by whether the characteristics significantly influenced support for the resource for offenders in general, the specific offender, or both. Participants who worked in law enforcement and had children in the home were more dehumanizing and had a lower BIR for both categories while participants who worked in human services reported the same results only concerning offenders in general. Working in close proximity to the criminal justice system can be extremely emotionally taxing and possibly forces individuals to either connect with others' humanity or suppress it in order to prevent burnout. It is our humanity that is thought to make us worthy of moral treatment, praise, and rehabilitation (Bastian, 2011). Our moral responsibility is what impacts social relations, often determining deservingness of punishment and the reduction of moral treatment in the case of offenders (Bastian, 2011). This could possibly be related to why

having children leads to being more punitive, because the parents view offenders as more deserving of punishment and less worthy of moral treatment.

The fact that working closely with the criminal justice system negatively influences dehumanization and BIR can be associated with the results found by previous studies. Following the findings of Nick Haslam (2006) and Diana Johns (2018) it is possible that participants in these fields are denying human attributes to offenders in order to make working closely with such a population more straightforward. In doing so, they are engaging in negative, dehumanizing behaviors such as condescension and lacking empathy (Haslam, 2006; Opotow, Gerson, & Woodside, 2005). It is possible that in focusing on negative characteristics of the offender, participants would see offenders as unredeemable and less deserving of support and resources, as previous studies have indicated (Opotow, Gerson, & Woodside, 2005; Viki, Fullerton, Raggett, Tait, & Wiltshire, 2012). The results of the current study could confirm the theory discussed in previous literature concerning support of reentry initiatives being dependent on people's opinions of ex-offenders and whether or not they believe they can change (Ouellette et. al, 2017). Viewing offenders as more deserving of punishment and unredeemable may be a reason participants who worked in either field, law enforcement or human services, and those who had children were less supportive of each resource compared to those who did not work in these fields or have children.

On average, participants with these characteristics were less supportive of housing, education, and employment services for the specific offender. This could be due to exposure to failed reintegration attempts observed through working with the criminal justice system or fear that offenders could obtain housing in close proximity to family homes. It is possible that support

for education and employment services was low because of the belief that offenders do not deserve education. Education is often thought of as a privilege and those who have more exposure to the negative aspects of the criminal justice system may be less willing to support what could be seen as a reward. However, previous studies have shown that society views working as redemptive, so it is interesting that support for employment services for the specific offender would be low (Ouellette et. al, 2017). It is possible that there is something about the specific offender's crime and the participant's personal knowledge of the criminal justice system that is influencing support for reentry services and offender voting rights. Interestingly, participants who worked in law enforcement or human services, and those who had children were more supportive of voting rights for the specific offender than for offenders in general while participants who did not have these characteristics showed the reverse. Perhaps having some specific information on the offender provides a better understanding of their situation or makes them appear more human, making it somewhat easier for participants familiar with these types of individuals to support their rights of citizenship. Our results suggest that working closely with the criminal justice system and having something to protect, such as family, greatly influence societal dehumanization, BIR, and support for reentry services. Further research should be conducted to more thoroughly understand how exposure to offenders and having children impacted support for re-entry services.

It is important to note that although participants with these characteristics gave less support than those who work in other fields or do not have children, they did generally support offender resources. However, they were particularly unsupportive of government resources for the specific offender. Whereas participants without relatively consistent exposure to the criminal

justice system and offenders, as well as those without children not only supported government resources for both categories, gave more support for government resources for the specific offender. These results are consistent with previous research indicating the public's belief that ex-offenders are the "least deserving members of society for any free benefits from the government" (Garland et. al, 2013). Given there is a discrepancy between support for government resources depending on demographic characteristics, it would be beneficial for further research to investigate how exposure to the criminal justice system influences support and understanding of government resources specifically for ex-offenders.

Marital status was surprisingly very influential, impacting support for all resources, for offenders in general and the specific offender, except concerning education services for the specific offender. Married participants consistently gave less support for each resource, especially concerning resources for the specific offender, than participants who had never been married, were divorced, or were widowed. While widowed participants reported the most support for reentry resources, except concerning education services for offenders in general. Surprisingly, support for voting rights for the specific offender was higher than for offenders in general among married participants. These results suggest that though married participants believe that the specific offender deserves less access to reentry resources overall, they do support the offender being represented within the government. It is interesting that participants who are seen as having a strong support network, their spouse, would be less supportive of the same resources they benefit from daily. It is possible that these resources are taken for granted or that the unique struggles involved in obtaining these resources upon reentry are unknown. Further research into the influence of marital status would be valuable to understanding how to educate about reentry

services and promote them to communities in order to reduce the potential discomfort of being near ex-offenders.

Income level was very influential concerning support for reentry resource allocation. On average, participants who made less money were more supportive of housing and education services for both offenders in general and for the specific offender. There were interesting differences between participants who made less than or approximately minimum wage and those who made significantly above minimum wage. Those who made \$40,000 or just below were particularly punitive compared to those who made approximately \$80,000. These results could be related to previous research indicated the public belief that offenders should be able to earn a stable living but not as much as the average citizen (Garland et. al, 2013). Perhaps this translates into the belief that offenders deserve enough resources and support to survive but not more than anyone without a criminal record. It is possible that individuals who are making what is supposed to be enough to live off of are struggling and therefore less willing to give services to a population they deem less deserving. On the other hand, participants who are “living comfortably” may see the value in these resources and not feel as though opportunities are being taken away. These results indicate the need to educate more well off citizens on the value of and the obstacles offenders face in order to find employment to ensure a societal understanding that employing offenders can do more good for the community than harm.

Education level was not as influential as hypothesized, only significantly influencing support for housing services for offenders overall and employment services for the specific offender. Participants with lower levels of education, such as high school graduates or those with some college experience, were more supportive of housing services for both offenders in general

and the specific offender than those with a four-year degree or a professional degree. It was surprising that a higher education level increased punitiveness, though it could be related to the findings of Garland et al. (2013) which showed support for education services specifically declined for college level programs. Perhaps support for other resources decreases after what the public believes is the bare minimum of what the specific offender deserves from society. These results may suggest a need to incorporate more humanities education into advanced educational training.

Age was also not as influential as anticipated as it only influenced support for education services and government resources for the specific offender. Contrary to what was expected, younger participants showed less support for these resources than older participants, possibly indicative of the participants' own struggles with these resources. Perhaps it is representative of the obstacles younger individuals face and the common theme of believing that offenders should receive help only after law-abiding citizens.

The study also asked about government resources as a whole, meaning a combination of resources like housing and employment service. Results showed that overall support for reentry services was high. It was interesting that government resources was the only resource to be influenced by the participant's sexual orientation and even more so that it only influenced support for the specific offender. Homosexual participants reported the most support for government resources for the specific offender while bisexual participants reported the least support when compared to both homosexual and heterosexual participants. It is possible that the participants own experience with the government influences their perspective toward providing resources to discriminated populations. This could be influenced by the fact that homosexual

individuals often experience more discrimination than heterosexual individuals. For example, businesses that can choose not to serve, or hire, homosexual individuals. It is possible that, though these are very different forms of discrimination, bisexual participants were thinking of their own struggles with the government when considering what resources should be available for the specific offender. Further research is needed to understand the relationship between sexual orientation and government resources overall.

There were some demographic characteristics that were not as influential as initially hypothesized. Unexpectedly, gender did not significantly impact levels of dehumanization, BIR, or support for reentry services and voting rights. The average responses of male and female participants were similar across all measures. The four participants who identified as nonbinary reported the lowest level of dehumanization, the highest BIR, and the most support for resources. Ethnicity was also found to have a non-significant impact on each measure separately, though it was found to have a significant effect on the measures as a whole. Given that previous research found the ethnicity to be influential to sentencing decisions (Bradley & Engen, 2016), it is worth investigating why our results would indicate ethnicity would not impact the societal treatment of offenders. These conflicting results indicate a need for further research with a larger, potentially more diverse sample.

Previous studies suggest exposure to the criminal justice system or crime itself influences an individual's perspective on offenders deservingness of societal inclusion (O'Sullivan et al., 2017). However, following the findings of Ouellette et. al (2017), the results of the current study showed that being arrested or being a victim of a crime did not significantly influence the level of dehumanization, BIR, or support for reentry services. Similar to the results found by

O'Sullivan et al., (2017), the participants' exposure to crime by either having been arrested previously or having been a victim of a crime showed a relatively high BIR score. The results of the study found that having previous experience with crime did not make participants more or less punitive than the others.

Regarding the final hypothesis, dehumanization was negatively related to BIR, resource allocation, and offender voting rights. This follows previous studies in which dehumanization was found to be negatively associated with "perceived suitability for rehabilitation" (Bastian, 2013). This could be due to the public seeing the offender as lacking human qualities, therefore more deserving of punishment and less capable of successfully joining society (Bastian, 2013). Multiple regression analysis indicated the participant's BIR of offenders in general was a strong predictor of the participant's dehumanization level. As the beta coefficient was negative, higher BIR for offenders was related to less dehumanization.

Statements concerning redeemability were split into two groups: BIR for offenders in general and BIR for the specific offender. As such, separate analyses were conducted to understand public opinion of offenders overall and how offender characteristics influence public opinion. BIR overall was negatively correlated with dehumanization and positively correlated with BIR in the specific offender, resources allocation, and offender voting rights. As "Belief in Redeemability" in this study was used as an indicator of general support for rehabilitation, the relationship with dehumanization and resource allocation is expected. Individuals who believe that offenders can change are more likely to support reintegration services than those who believe that criminality is innate (Ouellette et. al, 2017).

Finally, multiple regression results indicated the participants' level of dehumanization, BIR of the specific offender, and support for government resources for the specific offender are significant predictors of BIR for offenders in general. Multiple regression results indicate BIR for offenders in general and support for employment services for offenders in general are significant predictors of BIR of the specific offender.

Though we set out to understand how the amount of time an offender spent in prison would impact societal treatment of the offender, we found that demographic characteristics of the participants had the more significant effect. There are a few reasons why sentence length did not have a significant effect: perhaps the provided characteristics of the offender influenced the participants responses more than the sentence served. Future studies could eliminate all identifying characteristics except for the sentence length to ensure it is the only influential characteristic. Moreover, in order to understand how different offender characteristics influence public opinion, multiple vignettes with varying gender, age, race, and type of offense, along with the time served, could be implemented.

Limitations of the Current Study and Future Research

It is important to note the limitations of the study. The largest concern is the generalizability of the sample. Although participants were from across the United States, the sample size was small and few cities had more than a few participants represented. These results provide a modest insight into the broad public opinion across the country and should lead to further research. It would be worthwhile to continue research with a larger sample size either to be more generalizable to the country or to provide a more in-depth comparison from city to city.

Another limitation is the validity and effectiveness of the vignette. The vignettes were short and it was difficult to ensure the participants both read and used the information provided to answer the questionnaire. This could be remedied by further psychometric testing and knowledge checks throughout the questionnaire. Future research could include a testimonial from an ex-offender concerning specific re-entry services or an article about how beneficial such services are to the community in order to understand how society relates to offenders and the impact of further education about reintegration, rehabilitation, and recidivism.

It is also possible that the effectiveness of the questionnaire was negatively impacted by the randomization of questions concerning the specific offender and offenders in general. In future studies, it may be beneficial to ask questions concerning offenders in general before providing the vignette and then asking directed questions about the specific offender. This could also help with ensuring the participants are paying attention to the study.

It is worth considering that the current study does not examine how different crimes, the gender of the offender, or the race of the offender impact the level of dehumanization, BIR, or support for reentry services. Given that past literature has found the characteristics of the offender to be influential in aspects of sentencing, it would be valuable to understand how offender characteristics impact societal dehumanization and public support for reentry initiatives.

Despite the limitations of this study, the results contribute to the current literature by examining some of the aspects of the public that influence societal dehumanization and support for reentry services. Results indicate the public overall has a relatively low level of dehumanization, high BIR, and is moderately supportive of reentry resources and offender enfranchisement regardless of the considered prison sentence lengths, five or 15 years, or

participant demographics. The significant differences lie within specific characteristics and reveal how social classes impact an offender's successful reintegration. This study shows that demographic characteristics of the public are influential factors associated with dehumanization and BIR of ex-offenders and support for reintegration services.

References

- Bastian, B., Denson, T. F., & Haslam, N. (2013). The roles of dehumanization and moral outrage in retributive justice. *PLoS ONE*, 8(4), E61842. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0061842
- Bradley, M., & Engen, R. (2016). Leaving Prison: A Multilevel Investigation of Racial, Ethnic, and Gender Disproportionality in Correctional Release. *Crime & Delinquency*, 62(2), 253-279. DOI: 10.1177/0011128714557023
- Burch, M. (2017). (Re)entry from the bottom up: Case study of a critical approach to assisting women coming home from prison. *Critical Criminology*, 25(3), 357-374.
DOI: 10.1007/s10612-016-9346-3
- Cassidy, M., & Rydberg, J. (2020). Does Sentence Type and Length Matter? Interactions of Age, Race, Ethnicity, and Gender on Jail and Prison Sentences. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 47(1), 61-79. DOI: 10.1177/0093854819874090
- Davies, S., & Tanner, J. (2003). The long arm of the law: Effects of labeling on employment. *Sociological Quarterly*, 44(3), 385-404. DOI: 10.1111/j.1533-8525.2003.tb00538.x
- Fondacaro, M., Jackson, R., & Luescher, S. (2002). Toward the Assessment of Procedural and Distributive Justice in Resolving Family Disputes. *Social Justice Research*, 15(4), 341-371. DOI: 10.1023/A:1021219124369
- Garland, B., Wodahl, E., & Schuhmann, R. (2013). Value Conflict and Public Opinion Toward

- Prisoner Reentry Initiatives. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 24(1), 27-48. DOI: 10.1177/0887403411424081
- Haslam, N. (2006). Dehumanization: An integrative review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10(3), 252-264. DOI:10.1207/s15327957pspr1003_4
- Hauser, W., & Peck, J. (2017). The Intersection of Crime Seriousness, Discretion, and Race: A Test of the Liberation Hypothesis. *Justice Quarterly*, 34(1), 166-192. DOI: 10.1080/07418825.2015.1121284
- Johns, D. (2018). Confronting the disabling effects of imprisonment: Toward prehabilitation. *Social Justice*, 45(1), 27-55,131.
- Jordan, K., & Freiburger, T. (2015). The Effect of Race/Ethnicity on Sentencing: Examining Sentence Type, Jail Length, and Prison Length. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*, 13(3), 179-196. DOI: 10.1080/15377938.2014.984045
- Lockwood, S. K., Nally, J. M., & Ho, T. (2016). Race, education, employment, and recidivism among offenders in the united states: An exploration of complex issues in the indianapolis metropolitan area. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences*, 11(1), 57-74.
- Mauer, M. (2018). Confronting felony disenfranchisement: Toward a movement for full citizenship. *Social Justice*, 45(1), 13-25,131.
- Opotow, S., Gerson, J., & Woodside, S. (2005). From moral exclusion to moral inclusion: Theory for teaching peace. *Theory into Practice*, 44(4), 303-318. DOI: 10.1207/s15430421tip4404_4
- O'Sullivan, K., Holderness, D., Hong, X. Y., Bright, D., & Kemp, R. (2017). Public attitudes in

- australia to the reintegration of ex-offenders: Testing a belief in redeemability (BiR) scale. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 23(3), 409-424.
DOI: 10.1007/s10610-016-9328-8
- Ouellette, H., Applegate, B., & Vuk, M. (2017). The Public's Stance on Prisoner Reentry: Policy Support and Personal Acceptance. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 42(4), 768-789. DOI: 10.1007/s12103-016-9382-2
- Petersilia, J. (2003). How We Hinder: Legal and Practical Barriers to Reintegration. When Prisoners Come Home: Parole and Prisoner Reentry (pp. 105-137).
- Ruth, T., Matusitz, J., & Simi, D. (2017). Ethics of disenfranchisement and voting rights in the U.S.: Convicted felons, the homeless, and immigrants. *American Journal of Criminal Justice : AJCJ*, 42(1), 56-68. DOI: 10.1007/s12103-016-9346-6
- Steffensmeier, D., Painter-Davis, N., & Ulmer, J. (2017). Intersectionality of race, ethnicity, gender, and age on criminal punishment. *Sociological Perspectives*, 60(4), 810-833. DOI: 10.1177/0731121416679371
- Valentine, E. J., & Redcross, C. (2015). Transitional jobs after release from prison: Effects on employment and recidivism. *IZA Journal of Labor Policy*, 4(1), 1-17. DOI: 10.1186/s40173-015-0043-8
- Viki, G. Tendayi, Fullerton, Iona, Raggett, Hannah, Tait, Fiona, & Wiltshire, Suzanne. (2012). The Role of Dehumanization in Attitudes Toward the Social Exclusion and Rehabilitation of Sex Offenders.(Report). *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 2349. DOI:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.00944

Appendix A:**Multiple Regression Tables****Table 15**

Linear model of predictors of Dehumanization with 95% bias corrected and confidence intervals reported in parentheses

	B	SE B	Beta	P
<i>Step 1</i>				
<i>Constant</i>	6.21 (5.74, 6.67)	0.24		<i>p=0.000</i>
BIR: Offenders in General	-0.48 (-0.71, -0.26)	0.12	-0.40	<i>p=0.000</i>
BIR: Specific Offender	-0.05 (-0.23, 0.13)	0.09	-0.05	<i>p=0.603</i>
<i>Step 2</i>				
<i>Constant</i>	6.13 (5.57, 6.69)	0.28		<i>p=0.000</i>
BIR: Offenders in General	-0.33 (-0.57, 0.09)	0.12	-0.27	<i>p=0.008</i>
BIR: Specific Offender	0.07 (-0.15, 0.30)	0.11	0.08	<i>p=0.513</i>
Housing: Offenders in General	-0.16 (-0.35, 0.02)	0.09	-0.21	<i>p=0.079</i>

Housing: Specific Offender	-0.03 (-0.23, 0.18)	0.11	-0.03	p=0.813
Education: Offenders in General	0.05 (-0.09, 0.19)	0.07	0.07	p=0.487
Education: Specific Offender	0.03 (-0.18, 0.23)	0.10	0.04	p=0.792
Employment: Offenders in General	0.02 (-0.12, 0.16)	0.07	0.03	p=0.770
Employment: Specific Offender	0.01 (-0.27, 0.30)	0.14	0.01	p=0.936
Voting: Offenders in General	-0.05 (-0.19, 0.09)	0.07	-0.07	p=0.486
Voting: Specific Offender	-0.01 (-0.12, 0.10)	0.06	-0.02	p=0.819
Resources: Offenders in General	-0.02 (-0.21, 0.18)	0.10	-0.02	p=0.879
Resources: Specific Offender	-0.09 (-0.26, 0.09)	0.09	-0.14	p=0.316

Note: $R^2 = .19$ for Step 1, the change in $R^2 = 0.25$ for Step 2 ($ps < .000$).

Table 16

Linear model of predictors of belief in redeemability for offenders in general, with 95% bias corrected and confidence intervals reported in parentheses.

	B	SE B	Beta	P
<i>Step 1</i>				
Constant	2.25 (1.80, 2.70)	0.23		p=0.000
Dehumanization	-0.15 (-0.23,-0.08)	0.04	-0.19	p=0.000

BIR: Specific Offender	0.56 (0.49, 0.63)	0.04	0.71	p=0.000
<hr/>				
<i>Step 2</i>				
<hr/>				
<i>Constant</i>	1.86 (1.36, 2.36)	0.25		p=0.000
<hr/>				
Dehumanization	-0.10 (-0.18, -0.03)	0.04	-0.12	p=0.008
BIR: Specific Offender	0.39 (0.28, 0.51)	0.06	0.50	p=0.000
Housing: Offenders in General	0.03 (-0.07, 0.13)	0.05	0.05	p=0.560
Housing: Specific Offender	-0.01 (-0.13, 0.10)	0.06	-0.01	p=0.842
Education: Offenders in General	-0.03 (-0.11, 0.05)	0.04	-0.05	p=0.484
Education: Specific Offender	-0.04 (-0.16, 0.07)	0.06	-0.07	p=0.466
Employment: Offenders in General	0.06 (-0.01, 0.14)	0.04	0.10	p=0.112
Employment: Specific Offender	0.09 (-0.07, 0.25)	0.08	0.11	p=0.248
Voting: Offenders in General	0.03 (-0.05, 0.11)	0.04	0.06	p=0.410
Voting: Specific Offender	0.02 (-0.04, 0.08)	0.03	0.04	p=0.504
Resources: Offenders in General	-0.05 (-0.16, 0.06)	0.05	-0.07	p=0.348
Resources: Specific Offender	0.10 (0.01, 0.20)	0.05	0.20	p=0.035

Note: $R^2 = 0.63$ for Step 1, the change in $R^2 = 0.66$ for Step 2 ($ps < 0.000$).

Table 17

Linear model of predictors of belief in redeemability for the specific offender, with 95% bias corrected and confidence intervals reported in parentheses.

	B	SE B	Beta	P
<i>Step 1</i>				
<i>Constant</i>	-0.08 (-0.78, 0.63)	0.36		<i>p</i> =0.833
Dehumanization	-0.03 (-0.12, -0.07)	0.05	-0.03	<i>p</i> =0.603
BIR: Offenders in General	0.96 (0.84, 1.08)	0.06	0.76	<i>p</i> =0.000
<i>Step 2</i>				
<i>Constant</i>	-.49 (-1.10, 0.12)	0.31		<i>p</i> =0.113
Dehumanization	-0.03 (-0.06, 0.11)	0.04	0.03	<i>p</i> =0.513
BIR: Offenders in General	0.47 (0.34, 0.61)	0.07	0.38	<i>p</i> =0.000
Housing: Offenders in General	0.07 (-0.04, 0.19)	0.06	0.09	<i>p</i> =0.199
Housing: Specific Offender	0.01 (-0.12, 0.13)	0.06	0.01	<i>p</i> =0.923
Education: Offenders in General	0.01 (-0.07, 0.10)	0.04	0.02	<i>p</i> =0.765
Education: Specific Offender	0.09 (-0.03, 0.21)	0.06	0.12	<i>p</i> =0.156
Employment: Offenders in General	0.11 (0.03, 0.20)	0.04	0.15	<i>p</i> =0.007
Employment: Specific Offender	0.16 (-0.02, 0.33)	0.09	0.14	<i>p</i> =0.076
Voting: Offenders in General	0.01 (-0.08, 0.09)	0.04	0.01	<i>p</i> =0.911

Voting: Specific Offender	0.05 (-0.02, 0.12)	0.03	0.07	p=0.161
Resources:Offenders in General	0.08 (-0.03, 0.20)	0.06	0.10	p=0.154
Resources: Specific Offender	-0.02 (-0.13, 0.09)	0.05	- 0.03	p=0.710

Note: $R^2 = 0.60$ for Step 1, the change in $R^2 = 0.74$ for Step 2.

Appendix B:

Demographic survey

1. Gender: 1= Male, 2= Female, 3= Non-binary, 4= Prefer Not to Say
2. Have you, or someone close to you, ever been arrested? 1=Yes, 2=No, 3= Prefer Not to Say
3. Have you, or someone close to you, ever been the victim of a crime? 1=Yes, 2=No, 3= Prefer Not to Say
4. Have you ever worked in the field of law enforcement? 1=Yes, 2=No, 3= Prefer Not to Say
5. Have you ever worked in the field of human services such as healthcare or social work? 1=Yes, 2=No, 3= Prefer Not to Say
6. Ethnicity: 1=White, 2= Black or African American, 3= American Indian or Alaska Native, 4= Asian, 5= Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, 6= Other, 7= Prefer Not to Say
7. Marital Status: 1= Married, 2= Widowed, 3=Divorced, 4= Never Married, 5= Prefer Not to Say

8. Sexual Orientation: 1= Heterosexual, 2= Homosexual, 3= Bisexual, 4= Other, 5= Prefer Not to Say
9. Income: 1=Less than \$10,000, 2= \$10,000-19,999, 3=\$20,000-29,999, 4=\$30,000-39,999, 5=\$40,000-49,999, 6= \$50,000-59,999, 7= \$60,000-69,999, 8= \$70,000-79,999, 9=\$80,000-89,999, 10= \$90,000-99,999, 11=\$100,000-149,999, 12= More than \$150,000, 13= Prefer Not to Say
10. Age: 1=18-24, 2=25-34, 3=35-44, 4= 45-54, 5= 55-65, 6= 65+
11. Children living at home? 1=Yes, 2= no, 3= Prefer Not to Say
12. Employment: 1=Full time, 2=Part time, 3= Unemployed looking for work, 4= Unemployed not looking for work, 5= Retired, 6=Student, 7=Disabled, 8= Prefer Not to Say
13. Education: 1= Less than high school, 2=high school graduate, 3=Some college, 4= 2 year degree, 5= 4 year degree, 6= Professional degree, 7= Doctorate, 8= Prefer Not to Say
14. What type of community do you live in: 1= Rural, 2= Urban, 3= Suburban, 4= Prefer Not to Say