

City University of New York (CUNY)

CUNY Academic Works

Student Theses

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Spring 5-5-2021

White Racial Identity and its Impact on Punitive Attitudes Towards Juvenile Offenders

Rossol Gharib

John Jay College of Criminal Justice, rossol.gharib@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/187

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

White Racial Identity and its Impact on Punitive Attitudes Towards Juvenile Offenders

Rossol Gharib

Advisor: Dr. Mark Fondacaro

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of John Jay College of Criminal Justice in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Forensic Psychology

May 2021

Abstract

White Racial Identity is a relatively new concept with little to no consensus as to the operationalization of such identity. The first ever White Racial Identity model was developed by Janet E. Helms in 1990. The role of White racial identity has been studied in the context of the racial gap in employment and its influence on racial attitudes, but it has yet to be studied in the context of the juvenile justice system. The criminal justice system is racially imbalanced, with Black males imprisoned 5.5 times more than White males. One of the factors contributing to this imbalance is the interaction of racial prejudice and racial typification of criminality. To date, the literature excludes the exploration of White Racial Identity and its impact on the degree of punitive attitudes towards juvenile offenders, specifically Black juvenile offenders. To understand the connection of this racial identity and its impact on Black juvenile offenders, is to understand a potential avenue for juvenile justice reform in which racial biases do not dictate support nor opposition towards reform, but rather the efficacy of the reform is what is evaluated. This study investigated the relationship between healthy and unhealthy White Racial Identity and the level of punitiveness towards delinquency. This study collected data using the White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale and the Symbolic Racism 2000 Scale. A multiple regression implicated a significant relationship between the progression through the developmental stages of White Racial Identity and level of Symbolic Racism, as well as their impact on punitiveness towards delinquency.

White Racial Identity and its Impact on Punitive Attitudes Towards Juvenile Offenders

Racial disparity is embedded into the fabric of American history which has seeped into the current social and cultural norms. While this inequality may not be as severe as it was four hundred years ago when a Black man was considered 3/5th of a person, remnants of this discriminatory history are still present today (Ghandnoosh, 2014). This racial disparity is most evident in the American criminal justice system, with the public believing that minorities commit more criminal offenses than White individuals (Ghandnoosh, 2014; Robinson, 2000). As of 2019, the Department of Justice reported the imprisonment rate of Black males to be 5.5 times more than the imprisonment rate of White males with 1,446 per 100,000 Black adults being imprisoned compared to 263 per 100,000 White adults being imprisoned (Carson, 2020). One might rationalize the imprisonment rate as being reflective of increased criminality in Black males, but in reality Black individuals account for 27% of violent and nonviolent criminal arrests while White individuals accounted for 69% of violent and nonviolent criminal arrests (Federal Bureau of Investigations, 2019). The racialization of criminality shapes media portrayals of crime and actions taken by policymakers, who are guided by prejudicial attitudes. Unfortunately, juvenile offenders are also subjugated to such views, resulting in the advocacy for more punitive juvenile offender policies for Black youth; Black youth are five times more likely to be committed or detained in a juvenile detention center than White youth (The Sentencing Project, 2017). With White individuals holding a harsher view towards criminal offending than Black and Hispanic individuals, it is evident that part of that belief is due to the prejudiced racial typification of an offender (Johnson, 2008). In order to bridge this racial gap in the criminal justice system, it is vital for White individuals to acknowledge those discriminatory views as well as acknowledge the privilege they inherit from centuries of oppression of Black individuals.

To acknowledge that privilege is a leap in aiding in the establishment of a more rehabilitative approach to youthful offending while lessening the racial disparities in the juvenile justice system.

This study will examine the current literature regarding the factors driving the racial disparity within the juvenile and criminal justice system, an exploration of White racial identity, and the impact of White privilege awareness as it pertains to racially driven punitive criminal justice attitudes. This study will then discuss its own empirical examination of White racial identity development, in adherence to Janet Helm's (1990) model, as well as its findings pertaining to the relationship between White racial identity and punitiveness within the context of juvenile offenders.

Criminal Justice Racial Disparity Factors

Nazgol Ghandnoosh's 2014 report synthesizes twenty years of research regarding criminal justice racial disparity. Ghandnoosh credits news media as one factor in the racial distortion of crime. Since today's society heavily relies on media for current information, it is no surprise that news portrayals of crime contribute to the racialized perception of crime. Unfortunately, news media emphasizes criminal occurrences where the offender is Black and the victim is White, while neglecting the victimization of Black individuals. Some news outlets report for the purpose of sensationalization, with about 43% of homicide reporting centered around White victims when they only make up about 13% of the victim population (Ghandnoosh, 2014). If the public were to solely depend on news reports, it would be difficult to acknowledge that crime rates have decreased and that Black and Hispanic individuals are at more risk of being victims of crime than White individuals (Ghandnoosh, 2014).

With news media shaping public perception, policymakers utilize such biased perception of crime and criminality in aiding the implementation of punitive policies that inherently affect Black and Hispanic individuals at disproportionate rates (Ghandnoosh, 2014). Political figures also exploit this racialized “tough on crime” approach to further their careers; one such example can be found in George H. W. Bush’s integration of Willie Horton’s case into his presidential campaign against Massachusetts governor Michael Dukakis (Ghandnoosh, 2014). Willie Horton was an African American male living in Massachusetts. While he was on furlough for an unrelated crime, Horton had raped a White woman and assaulted her White fiancé. Horton was sentenced to life without parole which Bush believed to be too lenient of a punishment. He utilized Horton’s case to demonstrate his opponent’s “lax” view of crime all while furthering the historical narrative that Black men rape White women (Ghandnoosh, 2014; Patton & Snyder-Yuly, 2007). During his campaign, research showed that Bush’s tactics amplified the American public’s racial prejudice (Ghandnoosh, 2014). By shaping a presidential campaign around one anomalous case, significant prejudicial undertones were conveyed to the general public (Ghandnoosh, 2014).

Prejudicial Beliefs and Delinquent Typification

With the perpetuation of this “Black men offend against White women” meme, the American public creates one specific typification of what a criminal offender looks like, which in return guides the support of harsh crime policies (Patton & Snyder-Yuly, 2007; Unnever & Cullen, 2012). The present racial distortion in the American criminal justice system is in large part due to the public’s prejudiced perception of Black men overwhelmingly committing more crime (Unnever & Cullen, 2012). The public’s racial typification of an offender has the power to shape how the public remedies criminal misconduct. As Unnever and Cullen (2012) concluded in

their research, White individuals perceive African Americans as five times more violent than White individuals, and perceive Hispanic individuals to be two times more violent than White individuals. The policymakers have reason to further advance prejudicial beliefs when news media further exacerbates those views, which in return only helps solidify the White public's view of Black and Hispanic individuals as being criminals (Unnever & Cullen, 2012).

Not only does the public have a general distorted perception of crime, but a racially distorted view of juvenile delinquency as well. As Pickett and Chiricos (2012) demonstrated in their research, racial typification of delinquency and racial resentment strongly relate to the punitive attitudes toward juvenile offenders as well as support for lowering the minimum age of criminal justice jurisdiction. Ghandnoosh (2014) highlighted that individuals who believe offenders to be similar to themselves will respond in an empathetic manner and will be more willing to understand the underlying circumstances that pushed the offender to offend. When individuals believe the offender to be different than themselves, they are more likely to respond to the "other" with anger and outrage (Ghandnoosh, 2014; Peffley et al., 2017). Because race is a shared trait, those who are White will have a different response to a White offender than to a Black offender (Ghandnoosh, 2014). Not only does this fear of the "other" drive the public to support more of a retribution-based system, but ultimately harms all juveniles that come into contact with the criminal justice system (Ghandnoosh, 2014). This increase in harshness is not seen in Black individuals, likely due to their acknowledgment of the present racial distortions (Ghandnoosh, 2014). Hetey and Eberhardt (2014)'s research illustrated that Whites who were exposed to the racial disparity within the incarceration system were more in favor of harsh crime policies than more rehabilitative ones. This demonstrates how White individuals utilize their

prejudiced racial typification of criminal offending to propagate a system that disproportionately targets people of color.

This disproportionate targeting of people was demonstrated in Metcalfe et al. (2015)'s research. Metcalfe and his colleagues used path analysis to explore the direct and indirect associations between racial typification, punitive attitudes towards juveniles, belief of delinquency to be attributed to dispositional factors, and level of empathy. The results indicated that White respondents who believe that Black youth commit more crimes relative to White youth, are more supportive of punitive juvenile justice policies. Specifically, politically conservative White individuals with high media exposure who perceive juvenile offending to be increasing, hold more punitive views of juvenile delinquency. The results also demonstrated a strong positive correlation between racial typification and dispositional attribution, meaning that White individuals who racially typify juvenile offenders as Black tend to attribute delinquency to dispositional causes, believing young violent offenders possess adult criminal intentions. This discriminatory view that Black delinquency is somehow a personality trait is not just a false belief held by the public, but also held by those working in the criminal justice system (Bridges & Steen, 1998). Bridges and Steen (1998) uncovered that those employed in the court system, such as probation officers and Judges, attributed Black delinquency to personality traits, with Black delinquents being perceived as more culpable and dangerous (Bridges & Steen, 1998). From the perspective of officials associated with the juvenile justice system, to be a Black juvenile offender is to be seen as one that cannot be rehabilitated (Bridges & Steen, 1998). This inaccurate and unrealistic ideology drives White members of society to push for more harsh punishment, since they believe that criminal misconduct is embedded in Black youth personality makeup.

What it Means to be White

In order to understand the discriminatory attitudes often held by White, it is imperative to dissect the White Racial Identity. Janet Helms' (1990) theory of White Racial Identity Development established five fluid developmental stages: contact, disintegration, reintegration, pseudo-independence, and autonomy. This theory adheres to the theoretical framework that part of racial identity development is the awareness of the privilege that each stage of identity carries. The first stage, contact, is denial or obliviousness to race in general, believing that no race is more privileged than the other (Helms, 1990; Kleinman-Fleischer, 2010). When a White individual starts to become aware of institutional racism or their own racist attitudes, they move towards the disintegration stage. Disintegration stage refers to an individual's confusion regarding their awareness of the privilege associated with being White (Helms, 1990). In this stage one is unsure whether to acknowledge such awareness or to suppress that knowledge and follow the societal normalization of racism (Helms, 1990). The suppression of this awareness can lead the individual into the reintegration stage where they justify their privilege by believing that minorities can only blame themselves for their disadvantages (Helms, 1990). This stage can be accompanied by White superiority views that White people worked hard to get to where they are and that other races should do the same (Helms, 1990). The pseudo-independence stage is when one is confronted with an undeniable racist occurrence that pushes the individual to confront society's racism and advocate for racial equality (Helms, 1990). However, during this stage, the individual may be pushing people of color to accommodate to the White mainstream society. Finally, at the fifth stage, autonomy, a White individual comprehends the role Whites play in the contribution to a racist society (Helms, 1990). These stages are not static but fluid, with White individuals being able to regress as well as advance at varying times (Helms, 1990).

As Murray (2012) explains, to possess full White racial consciousness is to possess historical, psychological, and political consciousness as it pertains to race relations. Historical consciousness refers to the acknowledgment of a troubled race relations past filled with racism and Jim Crow laws to control Black individuals (Murray, 2012). Psychological consciousness is the awareness of unconscious racism such as the automatic association of Black being bad (Murray, 2012). Political consciousness is the comprehension of the link that exists between racial stereotyping of perceived criminals and the political system that strengthens those views by creating policies that in return target minority groups and criminalizes them (Murray, 2012). To achieve White racial consciousness is to acknowledge the privilege that is inherited from the historical, psychological, and political oppression of Black individuals (Murray, 2012).

Privilege Awareness and Punitiveness

Considering the significance and reach of racial consciousness, what happens when awareness of privilege and the presentation of racial inequality occurs? As Helms (1990) model illustrates, White individuals who become aware of their privilege can either develop a White supremacy complex, in that minorities are to blame for their disadvantage, or can develop a level of understanding pertaining to historical and present race relations (Kleinman-Fleischer, 2010). In a study conducted by Branscombe et al. (2007), the results suggested that privilege awareness increased racist attitudes among White participants. It appeared that those who scored high on a White Racial Identification scale had increased racist attitudes (Branscombe et al., 2007). This finding in part aligns with Helms' theory, but it may be inaccurate to assume that those who identify with their race are more likely to hold racist beliefs. Branscombe et al. (2007) does not explore the difference of a healthy White racial identity and an underdeveloped White racial identity. One can have a healthy White identity and not hold racist beliefs; therefore, it is

dangerous to automatically associate racial identification with racist beliefs. In contrast, Stewart et al. (2012) concluded that heightened awareness of White privilege leads to the reduction of prejudicial views of African Americans. The authors specifically explored the willingness of White college students to support the initiative to hire more African American professors at a college with a predominantly White faculty. When students were made aware of both their White privilege and that they can use that privilege to aid in lessening the racial gap at the university, students were willing to help in the initiative. Additionally, this study found that reduction in prejudicial views did not change the White students' attitudes towards their own race (Stewart et al., 2012). This demonstrates that one can have a healthy White identity and not hold negative beliefs of other racial groups. If White individuals are aware of the privilege that they have and comprehend how it can be utilized, they may work harder to lessen the racial gap and support more rehabilitative policies and abandon punitive justice views.

Even though Whites are at less risk of being victims of criminal offenses, they are more likely to endorse a "get tough on crime" approach than Black and Hispanic persons. It is not enough that Black and Hispanic individuals hold less punitive beliefs, it is imperative that White individuals do the same and act accordingly. The White person, unlike any minority, holds the privilege of navigating a society that favors them. By utilizing that privilege to support more rehabilitative criminal justice policies, Whites can decrease that racial distortion in the criminal justice system. Inherent to this outcome is the support for rehabilitative juvenile justice policies instead of retributive ones. Once individuals, particularly White individuals, are able to acknowledge their biases and prejudices as well as varying degrees of privilege, then the system can stop treating Black delinquency as a fixed personality trait and establish more child saving initiatives that do not discriminate based on race.

Current Study

It is an indisputable fact that there is a racial disparity within the American criminal justice system (Ghandnoosh, 2014). Many criminal justice policies are more punitive than rehabilitative, created and supported with the preconceived notion that crime is primarily committed by Black individuals (Ghandnoosh, 2014; Unnever & Cullen, 2012). The current research indicates that juvenile offenders are not spared from this prejudicial punitive attitude toward criminal offending (Bridges & Steen, 1998; Metcalfe et al., 2015). Since crime is prejudicially attributed to Black and Hispanic individuals, the general White population tend to attribute delinquency to dispositional causes, believing that young offenders possess adult criminal intentions (Metcalfe et al., 2015). With this racial distortion in a predominantly White country, it is important to understand the role of White racial identity in the criminal justice system. When White individuals make decisions about criminal justice policies, prejudicial views seem to aid in the formulation of these decisions (Johnson, 2008).

This study adheres to the definition of White racial identity as put forth by Helms (1990) that defines such identity in accordance with five developmental stages. These stages allow for the advancement of a White individuals consciousness of race, race related issues, and privilege awareness, as well as a regression within that consciousness. Just as one is able to progress in development, one is also able to regress. Privilege awareness is also intertwined within the model where privilege awareness increases as one progresses through the developmental stages.

This study's focal aim is to investigate the impact of White individuals' level of consciousness regarding their racial identity and its influence on the degree to which they support harsh criminal punishment of Black and Hispanic juvenile offenders. This study operates on the assumption that White individuals racially typify juvenile offenders to be Black or

Hispanic as per the findings of numerous studies reported in the research literature (Patton & Snyder-Yuly, 2007; Pickett & Chiricos, 2012; Robinson, 2000; Unnever & Cullen, 2012). The results are expected to demonstrate that White individuals who are in the later stages of racial identity development are less likely to hold negative beliefs about other racial groups and less likely to support harsh juvenile criminal justice policies. Alternatively, White individuals who are in the earlier stages of racial identity development are expected to be more likely to hold negative attitudes towards other racial groups and be in opposition of a more rehabilitative approach to juvenile offending.

Methods

Research Design

This within subjects, correlational study examined the relationship between White Racial Identity stages, racial attitudes, and level of punitiveness towards juvenile delinquency. Every participant received the same questionnaires and surveys. The study examined whether the level of White Racial Identity development stage a White individual possesses according to Helms' theoretical framework and their present beliefs about other racial groups have any bearing on harsh punishment preferences when dealing with youthful offending.

Participants

The current study specifically examined the level of White racial development with the aim of being representative of the present White American population in order to establish generalizability of the findings. Only White, English speaking participants living in the United States of America were recruited. G*Power 3.1 statistical power analysis software using a linear multiple regression at an effect size of 0.12 and a power of 0.95, indicated a total sample size of

132 was required for a moderate effect. A total of 200 participants were recruited using Mechanical Turk which is an online platform that employs individuals to complete virtual tasks ("Amazon Mechanical Turk", n.d.). Participants were paid two U.S. dollars to complete the study (see Appendix A). Out of the 200 participants that were recruited, only 141 participants had acceptable survey submissions because of their performance on the attention checks throughout the survey. The sample age distributions were, 8 (5.7%) within 18 to 24 range, 57 (40.4%) within 25 to 34 range, 32 (22.7%) within 35 to 44 range, 27 (19.1%) within 45 to 54 range, 11 (7.8%) within 55 to 64 range, and 6 (4.3%) within the 65 to 74 range. Out of 141 participants, 61% (86) were male, 36.2% (51) female, and 2.1% (3) identifying other than male or female. Twenty-nine participants had been arrested for an offense with 20 participants having been convicted of a juvenile offense. The 29 participants were included in the study because their responses did not yield any significant findings, demonstrating that this group's criminal justice involvement did not have any bearing on their views of punitiveness.

Procedure

The study used the online platform, Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk) for participant recruitment. The participants took part in the study remotely, in the environment of their choosing. In order to ensure participant confidentiality, MTurk assigned participants with alphanumeric worker IDs. Only MTurk had the knowledge of the participants' identities, the investigators did not ("Amazon Mechanical Turk", n.d.). Through MTurk, participants were directed to complete the study through the survey generator, Qualtrics. To ensure participant confidentiality through this online platform, Qualtrics assigned random numerical sequences to the response's participants provide to ensure confidentiality. Responses gathered were stored on a password protected computer and were only accessible to authorized research members.

Prior to proceeding with the survey, participants received an electronic version of an informed consent (see Appendix B). They were instructed to click on the yes icon if they agreed to proceed with the study and to click on the no icon if they did not wish to proceed. Before proceeding to complete the questionnaire, participants were asked whether they identified as White. They were then asked to complete a brief demographics questionnaire (see Appendix C), followed by the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (Helms & Carter, 1990) and the Symbolic Racism 2000 Scale (Henry & Sears, 2002). These scales provided the participants with instructions specific to each measure. Participants were instructed to read a scenario regarding harsh juvenile legislation. The scenario informed the participants that the governor of their state was contemplating amending existing legislation and making the new legislation more rehabilitative in nature than retributive (see Appendix D). Attention checks were placed throughout the survey to ensure reliability of participant responses. Upon completing the questionnaires, participants were provided with the contact information of the investigators of this study, to answer any participant inquiries. This study adhered to all IRB procedures.

Materials

Demographic Questionnaire

Participants were asked to provide their age, gender, race/ethnicity, the state they reside in, education level, and if they had any contact with the criminal justice system. Even though the initial survey question asked participants if they identified as White, a race/ethnicity question was added to the demographic questionnaire as a second filter to separate the responses of those who did not fit the criteria. Participants reserved the right to refuse answering any of the demographic items. The questionnaire followed the general questioning style of other general

demographic questionnaires, such as inquiring about gender, age, residence, socioeconomic status, etc. (see Appendix C).

White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS; Helms & Carter, 1990)

The White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS) is a 50-item inventory, containing five subscales that measure the stage or status a White individual is situated in their White racial development. It also assesses the level of privilege awareness as dictated by Helms' (1990) model of White Racial Identity development (Helms, 1990; Pope-Davis et al., 1999). This model is assessed on a five-point Likert scale with 1 representing strongly disagree and 5 representing strongly agree. The inventory subscales are Contact, Disintegration, Reintegration, Pseudo-Independence, and Autonomy. The model is separated into two phases. The first phase of White identity development is abandoning racist beliefs. This phase encompasses Contact, Disintegration, and Reintegration. The second phase is the formation of a healthy White identity which encompasses stages Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy (Helms & Carter, 1990; Pope-Davis et al., 1999).

The current study's alpha reliabilities for each subscale are as follows, Contact had a Cronbach's alpha of .61, Disintegration was .93, Reintegration was also .93, Pseudo-Independence was .75, and Autonomy was .70. This study's reported alpha reliabilities either fell within the range or were higher than the alpha reliabilities reported by Helms and Carter (1990). Helms and Carter (1990) reported Cronbach's alpha ranging from, .55 to .67 for Contact, .76 to .77 for Disintegration, .75 to .80 for Reintegration, .65 to .71 for Pseudo-Independence, and .65 to .67 for Autonomy.

In order to ensure the validity of this measure with its conceptualization of White Racial Identity, the WRIAS was tested against the Oklahoma Racial Attitudes Scale-Preliminary Form (ORAS-P). The ORAS-P is a scale that also measures the concept of White identity as well as the individual's state of racial consciousness (Pope-Davis et al., 1999). As per Pope-Davis et al. (1999) study, both the WRIAS and ORAS-P yielded similar results, indicating that both measures are evaluating the same construct. Items on the scale could not be listed because doing so would be in violation of copyright laws.

Symbolic Racism 2000 scale (Henry & Sears, 2002)

The Symbolic Racism 2000 scale is an 8-item scale that measures the concept of the new form of racism towards Black individuals (Henry & Sears, 2002). The responses are measured on a four-point Likert scale with the exception of item number seven that is measured on a three-point Likert scale. This new form of racism is the formulation of a belief system that racism is no longer a serious issue that establishes limitations on Black individuals. It also encompasses the notion that disadvantages that Black persons face are from their own doing and that they are not justified in their demand for better treatment. The scales adhere to four themes of symbolic racism. The first is work ethic and responsibility which means that the disadvantages Black individuals face are due to their own shortcomings. An item example of this theme is asking participants whether they agree to the following statement, "It's really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if blacks would only try harder, they could be just as well off as whites.". The second theme is excessive demands, meaning Black individuals demand too much. An item example of this theme is "How much of the racial tension that exists in the United States today do you think blacks are responsible for creating?". The third theme is denial of continued discrimination, meaning the belief that Black individuals are not faced with serious levels of

prejudice. An item example of denial of continued discrimination is “How much discrimination against blacks do you feel there is in the United States today, limiting their chances to get ahead?”. The final theme is undeserved advantage, which is the belief that Black persons have already received resources and aid more than they deserve. An item example of the undeserved advantage theme is “Over the past few years, blacks have gotten less than they deserve.”. The creators of this scale tested the reliability of this measure on a White sample and yielded an alpha level of .77 (Henry & Sears, 2002) (see Appendix E). The current study yielded a Cronbach’s alpha of .88. This instrument does not report a validity score, but the instrument has been utilized in several studies exploring racist attitudes in the White population (Carr et al., 2012; Green et al., 2006; Inzlicht et al., 2012). Results of those studies demonstrate that the instrument is in fact measuring racism.

Juvenile Policy Reform Vignette and Assessment of Punitiveness

This brief scenario presents a harsh penalty for a third juvenile drug offense. Participants were informed that the governor of their state is seeking to change the legislation that would provide more of a rehabilitative course of action rather than a retributive one. Participants were then instructed to answer the questions following the passage. The self-made three-part questionnaire subsequent to the vignette was created to gauge punitiveness. The Yes or No questions inquired whether participants believed the original punishment for a third juvenile drug offense was harsh, if they were in favor of the more rehabilitative proposed legislation, and if participants believed that juvenile offenders and adult offenders should be charged the same. This was created for the sole purpose of this study (see Appendix D).

Results

Pearson correlations were computed to assess relationships among the various WRIAS subscales. Reintegration ($M = 2.49$, $SD = 1.02$) and Disintegration ($M = 2.50$, $SD = 1.01$) subscales had a strong positive relationship ($r = 0.95$, $p < .001$) which was to be expected due to the similarities in constructs as well as closeness in stage sequence. Disintegration ($M = 2.50$, $SD = 1.01$) and Pseudo-Independence ($M = 3.68$, $SD = 0.59$) had a weak negative relationship ($r = -0.24$, $p < .01$). Contact ($M = 3.26$, $SD = 0.54$) had a moderate positive relationship with the later stages of White Identity, Pseudo-Independence ($r = 0.44$, $p < 0.001$) and Autonomy ($r = 0.52$, $p < .001$). Contact was found to have a weaker than expected correlation with the earlier stages of White Identity, Disintegration ($r = 0.36$, $p < .001$) and Reintegration ($r = 0.32$, $p < .001$). Contact's relationship with the later stages of development was inconsistent with Helms' (1990) conceptual model but was consistent with the empirical findings of Helms and Carter (1990) who reported positive correlations between Contact and both Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy. Autonomy ($M = 3.69$, $SD = 0.56$) and Pseudo-Independence ($M = 3.68$, $SD = 0.59$) had a strong positive correlation ($r = 0.80$, $p < .001$) which could be due to the stages' closeness in sequence in development.

Due to the interrelatedness of the subscales, the five subscales were divided into two categories, Positive White Identity and Negative White Identity to distinguish between two phases of development that were proposed by Helms (1990). Helms categorized the five stages into two developmental phases with Contact, Disintegration, and Reintegration being the phase marked by working towards abandonment of racist beliefs, and Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy encompassing a healthy racial identity phase (Helms, 1990). As per Helms (1990) classification, Positive White Identity housed the Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy stages.

The Negative White Identity housed the Contact, Disintegration, and Reintegration stages. Each participant had two scores, one score for the positive category and one score for the negative category which were calculated by combining the averages of the corresponding subscale scores and dividing them by the number of stages encompassed in each category.

Pearson's correlations were computed to assess the relationships among White Racial Identity, Symbolic Racism, and Punitiveness. Symbolic Racism ($M = 17.2$, $SD = 5.53$) was found to have a significant positive relationship with Negative Identity ($r = 0.50$, $p < .001$) and a significant negative relationship with Positive Identity ($r = -0.33$, $p < .001$). Symbolic Racism was also significantly related to Punitiveness ($r = 0.38$, $p < .001$). Finally, Punitiveness was positively related to Negative Identity ($r = 0.44$, $p < .001$) and negatively related to Positive Identity ($r = -0.22$, $p < .01$). Correlation matrix of the findings can be seen in table 1.

Table 1

WRIAS, Symbolic Racism, and Punitiveness Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Contact	3.26	.56	---								
2. Disintegration	2.50	1.01	.36***	---							
3. Reintegration	2.49	1.02	.32***	.95***	---						
4. Pseudo-Independence	3.68	.59	.44***	-.24**	-.22**	---					
5. Autonomy	3.69	.56	.52***	-.16	-.17*	.80***	---				
6. Negative Identity	2.75	.75	.55***	.97***	.96***	-.10	-.03	---			
7. Positive Identity	3.69	.54	.51***	-.21*	-.21*	.95***	.95***	-.07	---		
8. Symbolic Racism	17.2	5.53	-.02	.52***	.60***	-.31***	-.32***	.50***	-.33***	---	
9. Punitiveness	.72	.83	.07	.47***	.46***	-.23**	-.19*	.44***	-.22**	.38***	---

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

A multiple regression was computed to predict punitiveness as it related to Negative Identity and Symbolic Racism. A significant regression was found ($F(2, 138) = 20, p < .001$) with both predictors explaining 22.5% of variance. Both Negative Identity ($\beta = 0.33, p < .001$) and Symbolic Racism ($\beta = 0.21, p < .05$) were significant predictors of punitiveness. A multiple regression was also calculated to predict punitiveness based on Positive Identity and Symbolic Racism. A significant regression was found ($F(2, 138) = 12.3, p < .001$) with both predictors accounting for 15.1% of variance. Positive Identity ($\beta = -0.1, p = .22$) was not a significant predictor of punitiveness whereas Symbolic Racism ($\beta = 0.34, p < .001$) was. A multiple regression analysis was done to predict punitiveness based on Negative and Positive White Identity. Both identities were found to be significant predictors ($F(2, 138) = 20.3, p < .001$) of Punitiveness with both predictors accounting for 22.7% of variance. Negative Identity ($\beta = 0.42, p < .001$) was a slightly more significant predictor than Positive Identity ($\beta = -0.19, p < .05$). A final multiple regression was computed to predict punitiveness based on Positive Identity, Negative Identity, and Symbolic Racism. A significant regression was found ($F(3, 137) = 14.6, p < .001$) with all three predictors accounting for 24% of variance. Negative Identity ($\beta = 0.35, p < .001$) was significant predictor of Punitiveness but Positive Identity ($\beta = -0.14, p = .08$) and Symbolic Racism ($\beta = 0.15, p = .1$) were not significant predictors. See tables 2, 3, 4, and 5 for the regression models.

Table 2

Negative Identity and Symbolic Racism Predicting Punitiveness

Predictors	Estimate	SE	95% Confidence Interval		β	<i>P</i>
			Lower Limit	Upper Limit		
Intercept	-. 828	.253	-1.328	- .327		.001
Negative Identity	.367	.096	.178	.556	.332	<.001
Symbolic Racism	.031	.013	.006	.057	.21	.017

Note: $R^2 = .225$

Table 3

Positive Identity and Symbolic Racism Predicting Punitiveness

Predictors	Estimate	SE	95% Confidence Interval		β	<i>P</i>
			Lower Limit	Upper Limit		
Intercept	.418	.579	- .726	1.562		.472
Positive Identity	- .158	.127	- .407	.093	- .103	.218
Symbolic Racism	.051	.012	.027	.076	.342	< .001

Note: $R^2 = .151$

Table 4

Negative Identity and Positive Identity Predicting Punitiveness

Predictors	Estimate	SE	95% Confidence Interval		β	<i>P</i>
			Lower Limit	Upper Limit		
Intercept	.489	.496	- .491	1.469		.325
Negative Identity	.469	.083	.305	.632	.425	< .001
Positive Identity	- .286	.114	- .512	- .061	- .188	.013

Note: $R^2 = .227$

Table 5

Negative Identity, Positive Identity, and Symbolic Racism Predicting Punitiveness

Predictors	Estimate	SE	95% Confidence Interval		β	P
			Lower Limit	Upper Limit		
Intercept	.059	.556	-1.04	1.158		.915
Negative Identity	.388	.096	.199	.577	.351	< .001
Positive Identity	-.216	.121	-.455	.023	-.142	.076
Symbolic Racism	.023	.014	-.004	.05	.153	.097

Note: $R^2 = .242$

Discussion

The aims of this study were to understand the role of White racial identity development in possibly lessening the racial disparity within the juvenile criminal justice system as well as its impact on the push for more rehabilitative policies. The findings of this study were in support of the alternative hypothesis that White individuals who are in the later stages of racial identity development would be less likely to hold negative beliefs about other racial groups and would be less likely to support harsh juvenile criminal justice policies. The results also supported the second alternative hypothesis that White individuals who are in the earlier stages of racial identity development are more likely to hold negative attitudes towards other racial groups and be in opposition of a more rehabilitative approach to juvenile offending.

Due to the interrelatedness of Helms' (1990) inventory constructs, it was difficult to truly distinguish between the differences of participants in the varying stages of racial development. This interrelatedness was especially evident in the reported moderate linear relationship between Contact and the later stages of racial development, Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy. This

could in part be due to the inventory lending itself to act as a profile that does not permit an individual to just encompass one stage but encompass multiple stages to varying degrees (Helms & Carter, 1990). Even though Helms' White Racial Identity Attitude Scale utilizes constructs surrounding race relations and prejudicial views, this measure does not explicitly seek to measure racism. This was apparent in the reported moderate correlational findings between WRIAS and Symbolic Racism.

This study found Negative White Identity and Symbolic Racism to be significant predictors of punitiveness, with Negative White Identity being a slightly more significant predictor. Although Positive White Identity had a weak negative beta, it was still a significant predictor of punitiveness. This demonstrates that as Positive White Identity increases, punitiveness decreases but further research is required to dissect this relationship. These findings are vital in understanding the impacts Negative White Identity and Positive White Identity have when it comes to voting on criminal justice legislation. Due to the majority of The United States racial makeup being White, it is imperative how White individuals view their race within society as well as how they view other races because such views can have detrimental effects on youth, specifically Black youth, within our juvenile justice system (U.S. Census Bureau, 2020). Given their majority status, White individuals may have fewer pressures and incentives than people of color to understand their own White Racial Identity development – they may seem to have greater latitude on whether to ignore issues of race or to become educated about their own racial identity because they do not personally experience racism (Helms, 1990). However, everyone experiences the harmful effects of racism including the moral, social, and economic costs of overly punitive and discriminatory criminal justice policies that fuel mass incarceration. Helping

White individuals to understand and foster Positive White Identity may contribute to greater public acceptance of constructive transformation of our juvenile and criminal justice system.

Limitations

This study operated on the assumption that participants already have a racial typification of a delinquent offender as concluded in multiple studies (Metcalf et al., 2015; Pickett & Chiricos, 2012; Unnever & Cullen, 2012) and that there is a link between racial attitudes and racial typification of offending. However, the present study presumed but did not directly assess whether the participants' prototype of a juvenile offender was in fact that of a Black individual, which should be incorporated in future research. Another limitation of this study was the use of a scenario that was not validated in prior research. The scenario was developed for the sole purpose of this study and could have possibly had an effect on the results and should be validated in future research. Similarly, the study's use of a self-made punitiveness scale could be viewed as a limitation in that the scale was not previously validated but the results of the present study could be considered a first step in the evaluation of this measure for research in this context. The use of an online survey could also be seen as a limitation in that there is no monitoring who is completing the survey. The Symbolic Racism 2000 Scale's lack of a formal validity score can be seen as limitation due to the uncertainty of the scale's ability to gauge what it is intending on measuring. However, the survey has been utilized and modified in other research and was demonstrated in the present study to be related to variables such as Negative White Identity and Punitiveness in expectable ways that tend to support its construct validity. Finally, a potential limitation of this study is its use of the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (Helms & Carter, 1990) which can be viewed as adhering to outdated constructs of White identity due to the scale having been created more than 30 years ago.

Future Research

The current literature has yet to fully understand the components of White racial identity as well as its impact within the juvenile and criminal justice system. This study has only touched upon such a vital issue that future research should further dissect. A plethora of research has explored the detrimental impacts of racial biases on the criminal justice system but not many have explored the specific impact of White identity (Bridges & Steen, 1998; Ghandnoosh, 2014; Green et al., 2006). It is unclear what the consequences of an unhealthy White identity are as well as the benefits of a healthy one. The current study demonstrated a negative relationship between Positive White Identity and punitiveness which may imply the identity's lack of punitiveness but due to a weak beta score, such a relationship requires further exploration. Current research has also yet to demonstrate the implications of White privilege awareness education and its impact on the criminal justice system's racial disparity. Racial identity is a multifaceted concept that is difficult to operationalize, but it is crucial for future research to continue to study the White identity construct and its various facets. Although Helms and Carter (1990) were pioneers in studying White racial identity, it is imperative for future research to work towards an updated version of such a scale that does not adhere to racial constructs of 30 years ago. White racial identity has evolved and continues to evolve as society's view on White racial identity continues to develop and current research requires an updated scale to reflect such evolution. The extent to which educating White individuals on their White privilege has an effect on their support for a more rehabilitative approach to juvenile criminal misconduct, requires further study. Overall, future research on the development of a Positive White Identity and the development of empathy and compassion for the people of who are disproportionately entangled

in an overly punitive juvenile and criminal justice system is sorely needed to aid in closing the present racial gap.

References

- Amazon Mechanical Turk*. Mturk.com. Retrieved 26 June 2020, from <https://www.mturk.com/>.
- Branscombe, N. R., Schmitt, M. T., & Schiffhauer, K. (2007). Racial attitudes in response to thoughts of white privilege. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 37*, 203-215.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.348>
- Bridges, G. S., & Steen, S. (1998). Racial disparities in official assessments of juvenile offenders: Attributional stereotypes as mediating mechanisms. *American Sociological Review, 63*(4), 554-570.
- Carr, P. B., Dweck, C. S., & Pauker, K. (2012). "Prejudiced" behavior without prejudice? Beliefs about the malleability of prejudice affect interracial interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 103*(3), 452-471. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028849>
- Carson, E. A. (2020). *Prisoners in 2019* (Prisoners Issue. U. S. D. o. Justice.
<https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=7106>
- Federal Bureau of Investigations. (2019). Arrests by Race and Ethnicity.
<https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2019/crime-in-the-u.s.-2019/tables/table-43>
- Ghandnoosh, N. (2014). *Race and punishment: Racial perceptions of crime and support for punitive policies* <https://www.sentencingproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Race-and-Punishment.pdf>

Green, E. G. T., Sears, D., & Staerklé, C. (2006). Symbolic racism and Whites' attitudes toward punitive and preventive crime policies. *Law and Human Behavior, 30*, 435-454.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-006-9020-5>

Helms, J. E. (1990). Toward a Model of White Racial Identity Development. In J. E. Helms (Ed.), *Black and White Racial Identity: Theory, Research, and Practice* (pp. 49-66). Praeger Publishers.

Helms, J. E., & Carter, R. T. (1990). Development of the White Racial Identity Inventory In *Black and White Racial Identity: Theory, Research, and Practice* (pp. 49 - 80). Greenwood Press.

Henry, P. J., & Sears, D. O. (2002). The symbolic racism 2000 scale. *Political Psychology, 23*(2), 253-283. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/0162-895X.00281>

Hetey, R. C., & Eberhardt, J. L. (2014). Racial disparities in incarceration increase acceptance of punitive policies *Psychological Science, 25*(10), 1949-1954.

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797614540307>

Inzlicht, M., Gutsell, J. N., & Legault, L. (2012). Mimicry reduces racial prejudice *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology 48*, 361-365. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2011.06.007>

Johnson, D. (2008). Racial prejudice, perceived injustice, and the Black-White gap in punitive attitudes. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 36*(2), 198-206.

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2008.02.009>

- Kleinman-Fleischer, B. (2010). White Racial Identity Development. In C. S. Clauss-Ehlers (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Cross-Cultural School Psychology* (pp. 1038-1040). Clauss-Ehlers C.S. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-71799-9_450
- Metcalfe, C., Pickett, J. T., & Mancini, C. (2015). Using path analysis to explain racialized support for punitive delinquency policies. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 31, 699-725. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-015-9249-6>
- Murray, J. (2012). Reimagining criminal prosecution: Toward a color-conscious professional ethic for prosecutors. *American Criminal Law Review*, 49(3), 1541-1598.
- Patton, T. O., & Snyder-Yuly, J. (2007). Any four Black men will do: Rape, race, and the ultimate scapegoat. *Journal of Black Studies*, 37(6), 859-895. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934706296025>
- Peffley, M., Hurwitz, J., & Mondak, J. (2017). Racial attributions in the justice system and support for punitive crime policies. *American Politics Research*, 45(6), 1032-1058. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1532673x17692326>
- Pickett, J. T., & Chiricos, T. (2012). Controlling other people's children: Racialized views of delinquency and Whites' punitive attitudes toward juvenile offenders. *Criminology*, 50(3), 673-710. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2012.00280.x>
- Pope-Davis, D. B., Vandiver, B. J., & Stone, G. L. (1999). White racial identity attitude development: A psychometric examination of two instruments. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 46(1), 70-79. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.46.1.70>

Robinson, M. (2000). The construction and reinforcement of myths of race and crime. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 16(2), 133-156.

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986200016002002>

Stewart, T. L., Latu, I. M., Branscombe, N. R., Phillips, N. L., & Denney, H. T. (2012). White privilege awareness and efficacy to reduce racial inequality improve White Americans' attitudes toward African Americans. *Journal of Social Issues*, 68(1), 11-27.

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2012.01733.x>

Unnever, J. D., & Cullen, F. T. (2012). White perception of whether African Americans and Hispanics are prone to violence and support for the death penalty *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 49(4), 519-544.

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427811415533>

U.S. Census Bureau. (2020). Race and Hispanic Origin.

<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/HSG650219#HSG650219>

Appendix A: Amazon's Mechanical Turk Advertisement

Participants Needed for an Online Psychological Study

Study: This study is investigating attitudes regarding policy reform.

Qualifiers: In order to participate in this study, you must be a White individual living in the United States and speak English. You must also be 18 years or older. Those who are not eligible will not be compensated.

Duration: Approximately 30-60 minutes.

Compensation: \$2.00 (Will be compensated through MTurk. Participant submission of incomplete surveys or surveys that reflect inconsistency within responses, will not be compensated. Participants who do not qualify to be part of the study yet complete the study will not be compensated due to their neglect of the advertised qualifiers for the study.)

Appendix B: Informed Consent**THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
John Jay College of Criminal Justice
Forensic Psychology Department****CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY**

Title of Research Study: White Racial Consciousness and its Impact on Punitive Attitudes Towards Juvenile Offenders

Principal Investigator: Rossol Gharib, B.A.
M.A. Student

Faculty Advisor: Dr. Mark Fondacaro, Ph.D, J.D.
Faculty

You are being asked to participate in a research study because you are a White individual living in the United States, are an English speaker, and are 18 years of age or older.

Purpose:

The purpose of this research study is to understand the varying attitudes individuals have about juvenile policy reform. This study also seeks to understand the possible sources of those attitude.

Key Information:

- Participation in this study is voluntary. You may stop participation at any time during the course of the study.
- This research is looking to investigate attitudes regarding juvenile policy reform and the possible sources of those attitudes. The expected duration of the study is approximately 60 minutes. You will be instructed to answer a demographic questionnaire. You will then be instructed to read a scenario and answer a brief questionnaire regarding the passage. This will be followed by two questionnaires.
- You may endure slight discomfort due to the length of the questionnaires.
- You will not directly benefit from partaking in this study, but your participation will contribute to our understanding of juvenile policy reform.

Procedures:

If you volunteer to participate in this research study, we will ask you to do the following:

- Demographic Questionnaire: You will be asked to complete a brief survey about your background, such as your age, gender, education, what state you reside in, and criminal justice contact. This should take about 5 minutes to complete and will be done in the setting of your choosing.
- Scenario: You will be instructed to read the given passage and answer a short set of questions about it. This will take about 10 minutes to complete and will be done in the setting of your choosing.
- Questionnaires: Following the scenario questions, you will be asked to complete two questionnaires that aid in understanding the possible reasons of your responses about the scenario. This section should take about 45 minutes to complete and will be done in the setting of your choosing.

Time Commitment:

Your participation in this research study is expected to last for a total of 60 minutes.

Potential Risks or Discomforts:

You may experience slight discomfort with the length of the questionnaires.

Potential Benefits:

You will not directly benefit from your participation in this research study. Your contribution will help in understanding people's beliefs of juvenile policy reform which can influence future policymaking.

Payment for Participation:

Participants will be compensated \$2.00 for completing the study. Participants will receive their compensation from MTurk using Worker ID's. Incomplete survey submissions will not qualify for compensation. If there are any issues with compensation, the participant can contact the principle investigator to help resolve the issue.

New Information:

You will be notified about any new information regarding this study that may affect your willingness to participate in a timely manner.

Confidentiality:

We will make our best efforts to maintain confidentiality of any information that is collected during this research study, and that can identify you. We will disclose this information only with your permission or as required by law.

MTurk users are issued alphanumerical Worker IDs which are potential identifiers. Participants will be recruited through MTurk but Qualtrics will be used to collect your responses. Qualtrics will not use your Worker ID to keep track of your response, it will generate a random series of numbers for your participation. The only time your Worker ID will be utilized is when we compensate you for your completion of the survey. Qualtrics will not store any of your personal information, such as IP address, name, or any other type of

personal information. Responses will be stored on a password protected computer and will only be accessible to authorized research members.

The research team, authorized CUNY staff, and government agencies that oversee this type of research may have access to research data and records in order to monitor the research. Research records provided to authorized, non-CUNY individuals will not contain identifiable information about you. Publications and/or presentations that result from this study will not identify you by name.

We might remove identifiers from the information collected from you as part of this study and use it for future research studies or distribute it to another investigator for future research studies without additional informed consent.

Participants' Rights:

Your participation in this research study is entirely **voluntary**. If you decide not to participate, there will be no penalty to you, and you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

You can decide to withdraw your consent and stop participating in the research at any time, without any penalty.

Questions, Comments or Concerns:

If you have any questions, comments or concerns about the research, you can talk to one of the following researchers:

- Rossol Gharib, M.A., John Jay College
Email: rossol.gharib@jjay.cuny.edu
- Mark Fondacaro, Ph.D., J.D., Professor, John Jay College
Email: mfondacaro@jjay.cuny.edu

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, or you have comments or concerns that you would like to discuss with someone other than the researchers, please call the CUNY Research Compliance Administrator at 646-664-8918 or email HRPP@cuny.edu. Alternatively, you may write to:

CUNY Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research
Attn: Research Compliance Administrator
205 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017

If you would like to continue with this study please click **YES**, otherwise click **NO**.

Appendix C: Demographic Questionnaire

1. What is your age? (select from the dropdown menu)
2. What is your gender?
 - a. Female
 - b. Male
 - c. Transgender
 - d. Other (please specify)
 - e. Prefer not to answer
3. What is your race/ethnicity? Select all that apply
 - a. White/European-American
 - b. Black/African-American
 - c. Asian/Asian-American
 - d. American Indian or Alaska Native
 - e. Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
 - f. Arab/Arab-American
 - g. Hispanic or Latino
 - h. Other (please specify)
4. Which state do you live in? (please select from the dropdown menu)
5. What is the highest-level education you have completed?
 - a. Some high school
 - b. Completed high school
 - c. Some college
 - d. Associate's degree
 - e. Bachelor's degree
 - f. Doctoral degree
 - g. Professional degree (MD, JD)
6. What is an estimate of your household income?
 - a. \$0 - 10,000
 - b. \$10,001 – 20,000
 - c. \$20,001 – 40,000
 - d. \$40,001 – 60,000
 - e. \$60,001 – 80,000
 - f. \$80,001 – 100,000
 - g. > \$100,000
7. Have you had any contact with the criminal justice system?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 1. If yes, were you convicted of a juvenile offense?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

Appendix D: Scenario

Your state's governor is proposing to do away with a law that mandates youthful offenders to serve a mandatory 6-year sentence for a third drug possession offense. The governor is proposing a new law that would mandate youthful offenders to serve two years of probation which would enforce strict guidelines on school attendance. The offender will have to attend mandatory drug counseling for one year.

What was the brief passage about?

- A. Policy reform regarding sexual assault
- B. Policy reform regarding mass incarceration
- C. Policy reform regarding juvenile drug offense
- D. Policy reform regarding adult drug offense

Do you believe 6 years is a harsh sentence for a third drug possession offense?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Would you vote in favor of the new law?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Do you believe that if a juvenile and an adult commit the same offense, both should be charged the same?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Appendix E: The Symbolic Racism 2000 Scale

1. It's really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if blacks would only try harder they could be just as well off as whites. (1, strongly agree; 2, somewhat agree; 3, somewhat disagree; 4, strongly disagree)
2. Irish, Italian, Jewish, and many other minorities overcame prejudice and worked their way up. Blacks should do the same. (1, strongly agree; 2, somewhat agree; 3, somewhat disagree; 4, strongly disagree)
7. Some say that black leaders have been trying to push too fast. Others feel that they haven't pushed fast enough. What do you think? (1, trying to push too fast; 2, going too slowly; 3, moving at about the right speed)
9. How much of the racial tension that exists in the United States today do you think blacks are responsible for creating? (1, all of it; 2, most; 3, some; 4, not much at all)
11. How much discrimination against blacks do you feel there is in the United States today, limiting their chances to get ahead? (1, a lot; 2, some; 3, just a little; 4, none at all)
12. Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for blacks to work their way out of the lower class. (1, strongly agree; 2, somewhat agree; 3, somewhat disagree; 4, strongly disagree)
15. Over the past few years, blacks have gotten less than they deserve. (1, strongly agree; 2, somewhat agree; 3, somewhat disagree; 4, strongly disagree)
16. Over the past few years, blacks have gotten more economically than they deserve. (1, strongly agree; 2, somewhat agree; 3, somewhat disagree; 4, strongly disagree)