

The Pennsylvania State University

The Graduate School

Capital College

**RACIALIZATION OF CRIME:
A TEST OF CITIZENSHIP STATUS ON CRIMINAL PERCEPTIONS**

A Thesis in

Criminal Justice

by

Daniela Barberi Torres

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Arts

May 2017

The thesis of Daniela Barberi Torres was reviewed and approved* by the following:

Eileen M. Ahlin

Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice, Public Affairs

Thesis Advisor

Donald C. Hummer

Associate Professor of Criminal Justice, Public Affairs

Shaun L. Gabbidon

Distinguished Professor of Criminal Justice; Public Affairs

Patria de Lancer Julnes

Director of the School of Public Affairs

*Signatures are on file in the Graduate School

ABSTRACT

Criminal behavior can happen independent of country of origin, culture, religion, race, ethnicity, age, or gender. Discrimination against groups based on demographics such as race or ethnicity may be rooted in historical or cultural differences. In this thesis, the relationship between perceptions of criminality and offender race and ethnicity are examined. In order to study how participants might racialize criminal behavior, three main factors are analyzed. First, their citizenship status in the United States; second, exposure to various types of media (e.g., newscast, newspaper, television shows, and social media) as an influence on racial attitudes when judging criminal behavior; and third, interracial contact with others as a mechanism for reducing racial and ethnic prejudices. Results from the online survey showed that citizenship status is a statistically significant predictor of how participants racialized crime, but interracial contact and media exposure are not. Areas for future research and implications of this study are discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| List of Tables | v |
| Acknowledgements..... | vii |
| Chapter 1 Introduction | 1 |
| Chapter 2 Literature Review | 7 |
| Racialization of crime..... | 7 |
| Stereotype, prejudice, discrimination, and personal beliefs | 12 |
| Contact theory..... | 13 |
| News and social media | 15 |
| Citizenship status | 16 |
| Conclusion | 16 |
| Chapter 3 Methodology | 18 |
| Data..... | 18 |
| Sampling and procedure | 18 |
| Instrument | 20 |
| Key variables: Conceptualization and operationalization | 22 |
| Dependent variable..... | 23 |
| Independent variables | 24 |
| Control variables | 25 |
| Goals and hypotheses | 27 |
| Chapter 4 Results and Analysis | 29 |
| Chapter 5 Discussion and Conclusion | 41 |
| Future Research | 44 |
| Limitations..... | 45 |
| Conclusions | 46 |
| Tables | 48 |
| Appendix A FBI, UCR arrests on 2013 by Race | 50 |
| Appendix B FBI, UCR arrests on 2013 by Ethnicity..... | 51 |
| Appendix C Percentages by Race and Ethnicity of 2010 and 2015 Census in the United States | 52 |
| Appendix D Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, Fall 2016, Penn State Harrisburg | 52 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Appendix E Online Survey Questions | 53 |
| Appendix F Recruitment Material | 57 |
| References..... | 59 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 4-0: Characteristics of participants. | 29 |
| Table 4-1: Domestic violence rates per sample, U.S. citizens, and Non-US citizens. | 32 |
| Table 4-2: Property crime rates per sample, U.S. citizens, and Non-U.S. citizens. | 32 |
| Table 4-3: White collar rates per sample, U.S. citizens, and Non-U.S. citizens. | 32 |
| Table 4-4: Drug-related rates per sample, U.S. citizens, and Non-U.S. citizens. | 33 |
| Table 4-5: Alcohol-related rates per sample, U.S. citizens, and Non-U.S. citizens. ... | 33 |
| Table 4-6: Sexual violence rates per sample, U.S. citizens, and Non-U.S. citizens. ... | 33 |
| Table 4-7: Cybercrime rates per sample, U.S. citizens, and Non-U.S. citizens. | 34 |
| Table 4-8: Terrorism rates per sample, U.S. citizens, and Non-U.S. citizens. | 34 |
| Table 4-9: Murder rates per sample, U.S. citizens, and Non-U.S. citizens. | 34 |
| Table 4-10: Primary source and frequency of use per sample, U.S. citizens, and Non-U.S. citizens. | 35 |
| Table 4-11: Rates of use for each source to learn about criminal events. | 36 |
| Table 4-12: Perception of influence of media sources. | 36 |
| Table 4-13: Interracial contact, frequency, and avoidance. | 37 |
| Table 4-14: Correlation matrix of eight predictors (N=678) | 46 |
| Table 4-15: Results of <i>t</i> -test for Murder and seven predictors for the Color-Blind recode. | 46 |
| Table 4-16: Results of one-way ANOVA between Murder and Race/Ethnicity, Color-Blind recode. | 46 |
| Table 4-17: Model 1, Logistic Regression analysis of Murder for the Color-Blind recode. | 39 |
| Table 4-18: Results of <i>t</i> -test for Murder and seven predictors for the Racialization of Crime dataset | 46 |
| Table 4-19: Results of one-way ANOVA between Murder and Race/Ethnicity, Racialization of Crime dataset. | 47 |

Table 4-20: Model 2, Logistic Regression analysis of Murder for the Racialization
of Crime dataset.40

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank and express my sincere gratitude to my thesis advisor Dr. Eileen Ahlin. The door to Dr. Ahlin's office was always open whenever I ran into a trouble spot or had a question about my research or writing. I deeply appreciate her patience and motivation while guiding me during the elaboration of this paper. I could not have imagined having a better advisor and mentor for my Master's thesis. She consistently allowed this project to be my own work, but directed me in the right direction whenever she thought I needed it. I would also like to acknowledge Dr. Donald Hummer, member of the committee, because he generously invested a significant amount of time to assist me on the statistics sections of the thesis, which resulted in a personal improvement of my knowledge in this area. In addition, his experience in the field and with other theses made a significant influence during the development of this paper, making my process smooth and precise. Furthermore, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Shaun Gabbidon, member of my committee, for his insightful comments, recommendations, and time invested in this thesis. This accomplishment would not have been possible without any of them. I would also like to thank the School of Public Affairs who funded the survey for this research project.

Thank you,

Daniela Barberi

Chapter 1

Introduction

Criminal behavior can happen independent of country of origin, culture, religion, race, ethnicity, age, or gender. However, people from various backgrounds can discriminate or hold prejudicial opinions of others based on personal characteristics such as race, ethnicity, and immigrant status. Discrimination against other groups based on these demographics may be rooted in historical or cultural differences. In this thesis, the relationship between perceptions of criminality and race and ethnicity are examined, and whether they differ by country of origin (native or foreign born). The consideration of other influencing factors provides a more complete understanding of the relationships between race and ethnicity and their connection to perceptions of criminality. As such, three main factors are analyzed to study how participants racialize crime. First, their citizenship status in the United States (U.S.); second, whether exposure to various types of media (e.g., newscast, newspaper, television shows, and social media) can influence racial attitudes when judging criminal behavior; and third, the theoretical underpinnings of Contact Theory and how interracial contact may reduce racial and ethnic prejudice.

The importance of exploring if citizenship status in the U.S. can develop into a significant influence on the racialization of crime unfolds in this study by considering the historical concept of colonialism and the colonial model. This model describes how the colonial period in the United States was characterized by aggression and violence – physical and psychological- from the oppressor racial group –whites-, to the segregated ones including Native Americans and Blacks (Delsol, 2015; Gabbidon, 2010; Sulton, 1994; Tatum, 2000). Over time, these circumstances determined in the U.S. limits of

coexistence between the people who belonged to different races, and defining how they should behave, relate, perceive, and judge each other (Gabbidon, 2010; Gabbidon, 2015; Sulton, 1994; Tatum, 2000). Through the lens of this negative and judgmental period, marginal contact and stigmas evolved, influencing the present relations of people in the U.S. and the interactions among races and ethnicities. For that reason, disciplines such as criminology, psychology, and sociology have turned their attention to study and explore how racial prejudices are developed and established, seek to determine who is engaging in these practices, and how to prevent it, as well as understand some of its consequences (Bonilla-Silva, Goar, & Embrick, 2006; Devine, 1989; Dovidio, Kawakami, & Gaertner, 2002).

Consequently, key concepts such as “racialization of crime,” “criminalization of race,” and “racial profiling,” have materialized in the academic literature. On the one hand, the racialization of crime or the criminalization of race can be defined as how racial typologies are applied to understand criminal behavior, or how criminal identities intermingle with racial ones (Covington, 1995; Knepper, 2008; Saperstein, Penner, & Kizer, 2014). Then, in general, racial profiling has been defined as how people stereotype, judge, and can even discriminate against a person (or his/her actions) solely based on race or ethnicity (Chiricos & Eschholz, 2002; Devine, 1989; Delsol, 2015; Dovidio, Kawakami, & Gaertner, 2002; Higgins & Gabbidon, 2015; Sewpaul, 2013; Unnever & Cullen, 2012; Warren & Farrell, 2009; Welch, 2007; Wu, 2014). Arguably, the most prolific examination of racial profiling in the criminal justice field is how law enforcement agencies and/or officers stereotype and judge race/ethnicity as an essential factor of criminal behavior (Hughey, 2015; Warren & Farrell, 2009; Welch, 2007). Less

studied is whether civilians judge the criminal behavior of others depending on their race/ethnicity. In general, the extent literature about racialization of crime and racial profiling examines this phenomenon within populations who are U.S. citizens while less research has examined this concept between U.S. residents who are U.S. citizens in comparison to citizens of other countries (Alegria, 2014; Bonilla-Silva, Goar, & Embrick, 2006; Eberhardt, Dasgupta, & Banaszynski, 2003; Higgins & Gabbidon, 2015; King, 2015; Oliver et al., 2004; Welch, 2007). Thus, a primary aim of this thesis is to examine racial prejudices across various racial/ethnic groups, but also among U.S. citizens and non-U.S. citizens. Moreover, this thesis explores two well-studied potential contributors to racial prejudices when discussing criminal behavior: 1) media exposure and 2) interracial contact.

On the one hand, exposure to U.S. media and news coverage about criminal events may influence perceptions of the racial and ethnic composition of offenders (Bjornstrom et al., 2012; Chiricos & Eschholz, 2002; King, 2015; Lee & Thien, 2014; Lyon, 2008; Oliver et al., 2004; Ortiz & Harwood, 2013). Basic information about what is happening in your city, country, or even the world, is easily accessible by most anyone. However, the key point about this influence over perceptions is to emphasize that increased availability does not necessarily mean better and more reliable sources (King, 2015; Mastro et al., 2009; Ortiz & Harwood, 2013; Saeed, 2007). Media and news can be biased and misrepresent facts. Scholars have argued that U.S. news and media outlets are distorting the public's racial and ethnic perceptions toward the offenders and victims of crimes in the U.S. (Bjornstrom et al., 2012; Chiricos & Eschholz, 2002; Delsol, 2015; King, 2015; Lee & Thien, 2014; Lyon, 2008; Oliver et al., 2004; Ortiz & Harwood, 2013;

Warren & Farrell, 2009). Therefore, this thesis aims to explore the degree of influence on study participants of U.S. media and news and analyzes if the media exposure might affect their racial perceptions of offending behavior.

On the other hand, contact theory is a conceptual framework considered to have a significant impact on racial prejudices. This theory explains how positive, frequent, and meaningful interracial contact can reduce negative racial attitudes (Bohmert & DeMaris, 2015; Dixon & Rosenbaum, 2004; Martin, Trego, & Nakayama, 2010; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Shook & Fazio, 2008; Sigelman & Welch, 1993). From this theoretical approach, interracial contact under particular circumstances can mediate possible racialization of crime by affecting the racial and ethnic perceptions of some individuals. According to scholars, only constant, positive, voluntary, and meaningful¹ relationships with people from different racial and ethnic groups can reduce negative racial attitudes (Dixon & Rosenbaum, 2004; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Sigelman & Welch, 1993). If these *optimal* factors are not present in the interpersonal relationships, researchers determined that the impact of interracial contact to reduce racial prejudice might not be observable. Consequently, this study aims to explore if participants who have interracial relationships - aligned with the specific elements inherent in contact theory- are less likely to racialize crime than those who do not have that type of contact.

In summary, this thesis examines three primary phenomena. First, the study seeks to identify possible differences in the associations made by U.S. citizens and non-U.S. citizens about criminality and the offenders' race and ethnicity. Second, it explores if the exposure to various type of media influences the racialization of crime depending on

¹ Drakulich defines this as “when members of groups come into frequent contact with one another under relatively positive circumstances” (2012, p. 325).

citizenship status. Third, this study examines if positive and meaningful interracial contact affects racial prejudices depending on citizenship.

Understanding racial prejudices across different racial/ethnic groups, between U.S. citizens and non-U.S. citizens, while considering the influences of media/news and interracial contact is important for the criminal justice field because different agencies or institutions might benefit from these findings. For example, understanding racial profiling solely from the perspective of U.S. citizens, available from the current literature, gives scholars and practitioners only partial insight into the problem. Analyzing a phenomenon from within –how Americans racially profile in their country- provides valuable information, however looking at the same topic from a more objective and distant perspective –foreign and international participants- can provide the “out of the box” information that is pertinent in an era of increasing immigration issues. Perhaps this unique perspective on the issue can help identify the degree of influence U.S. media has compared to international sources. Further, it is important to promote positive interactions between people of different races/ethnicities in various settings (e.g., universities, police departments, work environment) to encourage understanding across cultures. It is also imperative to understand that a concept - such as racialization of crime or racial profiling - can be strongly tied to the historical background of one country, and must be used with caution when doing research in other settings.

To explore these phenomena, Chapter 2 discusses the relevant literature around the racialization of crime, racial profiling, contact theory, and the influence of media and news on people’s attitudes towards offender criminality. Chapter 3 explains the selection and recruitment of study subjects and participants. This section also provides information

about the survey instrument, as well as describes the hypotheses, and research questions and data analysis approach. Chapter 4 outlines the study results and analysis, and chapter 5 provides a discussion of study findings, limitations, and consideration of future research on this topic.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Crime is a social problem often analyzed through the lens of race and ethnicity. As such, this research considers race and ethnicity to be principal factors influencing people's judgment about the likelihood of another individual to engage in criminal activity. Moreover, this thesis aims to examine three different influences and possible mediators of the racialization of crime. The first is interracial contact proposed by contact theory (Drakulich, 2012; Mancini et al., 2012; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Weaver, 2007), and the second is exposure to media and news (Chiricos & Eschholz, 2002; King, 2015; Lee & Thien, 2014; Mastro et al., 2009; Oliver et al., 2004; Ortiz & Harwood, 2013). Lastly, citizenship status is also introduced as a possible influence on racialized perceptions of criminality.

Racialization of Crime

Before exploring how the racialization of crime may be influenced by an individual's citizenship, experience with interracial contact or exposure to media, it is important to go one step back and define first two basic concepts: *race* and *ethnicity*. The literature tells us that the concepts of race and ethnicity are social and dynamic constructs unrelated to biological entities. Individuals also use them as a convenient way to distinguish groups among their societies (Delsol, 2015; Devine, 1989; Higgins & Gabbidon, 2015; Markus, 2008; Saperstein, Penner, & Kizer, 2014). Because these concepts are social constructs, the definition of a racial or ethnic group can vary widely depending on the setting or the person who is interpreting them (Alegria, 2014; Eberhardt, Dasgupta, & Banaszynski, 2003).

When talking about the racialization of crime and racial profiling the literature produces different but somehow similar definitions of the behavior. Knepper (2008, p. 507) says racialization of crime “explains how criminal identities become fused with racial identities.” Covington (1995, p. 548) defines it as “how racial typologies have been applied to the understanding of differences in crime rates between Blacks and Whites- that is, how criminal behavior has been racialized.” Buerger and Farrell (2002, p. 272) explain that racial profiling is “equating race or ethnicity with criminality.” Then, Warren and Farrell (2009, p. 53) mention that it “describes the practice of targeting or stopping an individual based primarily on his or her race, rather than on any individualized suspicion.” More recently, Higgins and Gabbidon (2015, p. 491) define racialization of crime as “the practice whereby law enforcement officials rely largely on race/ethnicity to determine the type of individuals who are likely to engage in a specific criminal activity.” Schildkraut (2009, p. 63) defines ethnic profiling “when law enforcement authorities use racial or ethnic characteristics to determine which people to subject to heightened scrutiny in order to prevent crimes from occurring.” Despite these varied definitions, which cast a wide net in labeling racialization of crime, they all have in common the use of race/ethnicity to judge the criminality of others.

It is also important to emphasize that research about the criminalization of race usually divides the targeted population between Whites and minority groups (Awad, Cokley, & Ravitch, 2005; Barot & Bird, 2001; Brewer & Heitzeg, 2008; Covington, 1995; Johnson, 2011; Knepper, 2008). Some scholars argue that White offenders are usually “unraced” and their motivation to commit crimes are explained regarding class, age, or gender (Covington, 1995). Meanwhile, for Blacks and other minority groups, race

and ethnicity seem to be an “assumed” and primary cause to their criminal behavior (Awad, Cokley, & Ravitch, 2005; Covington, 1995; Knepper, 2008; Saperstein, Penner, & Kizer, 2014). Moreover, the literature describes how the racialization of crime in the U.S. can have a significant influence on perceptions ranging from the historical roots of slavery and to a strategic approach stemming from sociological and economic points of view (Awad, Cokley, & Ravitch, 2005; Brewer & Heitzeg, 2008; Covington, 1995). For example, Brewer and Heitzeg (2008, p. 630) suggest, “the role of criminal justice in policing, prosecuting, imprisoning, and executing people of color has deep historical roots.” These authors emphasized that since the abolition of slavery, the laws in the U.S. never moved from an essential racism and that these are always focused on the “interests of the Whiteness” (Brewer & Heitzeg, 2008, p. 631). Also, scholars argue that the criminalization of race is a strategy to keep continuous *clients* in the criminal justice system (Brewer & Heitzeg, 2008; Johnson, 2011; Knepper, 2008). Therefore, the extant literature also examines how racial bias/stereotypes when observing the disproportionate rates of some incarcerated minorities may be attributed to the decisions made during the different stages of the criminal justice system (Hughey, 2015; Latessa & Holsinger, 2016; Saperstein, Penner, & Kizer, 2014).

The United States Census Bureau of 2010 and 2015 shows that White people – (61.6% in 2015 and 63.7% in 2010) are the highest percentage among all the U.S. population, followed by Hispanic or Latino (17.6% in 2015 and 16.3% in 2010), and then by Black or African Americans (13.3% in 2015 and 12.6% in 2010) (Appendix C). However, as some authors have argued, official reports of criminal activities do not show that one race or ethnicity is more hostile and prone to criminal behavior than others

(Higgins & Gabbidon, 2015; King, 2015). As can be observed from the data from the Uniform Crime Reports (UCR), provided by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) in 2013, the number of individuals from each race or ethnicity charged with different crimes varies widely (Appendix A and Appendix B). However, from all the 29 crimes listed in Appendix A, Blacks are the most frequently arrested race for only three crimes: murder and non-negligent manslaughter, robbery, and gambling. For the other 26 types of crimes, Whites are the most frequently arrested race. Then, as shown in Appendix B, for the same 29 crimes the non-Hispanic/Latino group is the most frequently arrested ethnicity across all offenses. Therefore, it is possible to observe that even if in the general population of the U.S., White people are more than double of Hispanic/Latinos and Black/African Americans, official reports show highest percentage of arrest for murder for minorities.

Although official reports show one scenario, currently the consequences of the racialization of crime continue to be negative not only for society, but also on how the public relates and thinks about the criminal justice system (Hughey, 2015; Kamalu, 2009; Lee & Gibbs, 2015; Saperstein, Penner, & Kizer, 2014; Schildkraut, 2009). When law enforcement officers associate criminal behavior with particular racial/ethnic groups, they may be perpetuating and bringing to the present stigmatized perceptions that date to the colonial period. The stigmatization of specific groups, reinforcement of racial tensions, overrepresentation of minorities in crime-related situations, and the harm to the relationship and trust between law enforcement and the minority community are not appropriate nor useful dynamics for the criminal justice system (Bonilla-Silva, Goar, & Embrick, 2006; Delsol, 2015; Eberhardt, Dasgupta, & Banaszynski, 2003; Hughey, 2015; Warren & Farrell, 2009). As Delsol (2015) points out, different components of the U.S.

criminal justice system are making decisions based not on what the individuals have done, but mainly on how they look or who they are. This type of profiling assumes a hazardous perception in which the race or ethnicity of a person will undoubtedly determine whether they are more likely to engage in criminal activities.

In addition, there are two main trends observed in the literature about the criminalization of race. First, numerous scholars describe their findings from a “White perspective” (Bonilla-Silva, Goar, & Embrick, 2006; Green, Staerke, & Sears, 2006; Mancini et al., 2012); and second, research is mostly conducted as an examination of U.S. citizens (Eberhardt, Dasgupta, & Banaszynski, 2003; Kamalu, 2009; King, 2015; Oliver et al., 2004; Welch, 2007). Considering the high representativeness of Whites in the U.S. population, these patterns in the literature are understandable. However, it is also important to emphasize that the U.S. has generally continued to welcome individuals of different races and ethnicities through the processes of immigration. This continued immigration opens the door for the need to assess the effects of these racial/ethnic demographic changes on the perception of citizens and non-citizens (Ortiz & Harwood, 2013; Saperstein, Penner, & Kizer, 2014; Weaver, 2007; Wu, 2014).

Martin et al. (2010) emphasize that today’s young White people are experiencing these changing demographics and have more opportunities to interact with individuals from different races/ethnicities than previous generations. Further, the authors also argue that by mid-21 century Whites will no longer be the majority. Likewise, Weaver (2007) and Wu (2014) assert that by 2050 the Hispanic/Latino population will represent about 24% of the United States population.

These types of scenarios show that demographics in the U.S. are changing and that keeping the trend of studying and understanding the relationships between Whites and non-Whites is not going to be sufficient to comprehend different phenomena in the future. Even though current racial prejudices issues are mostly explored between Blacks and Whites, it does not mean that other races/ethnicities are not being influenced by those negative attitudes and which could influence their relationship with law enforcement agencies or officers. For example, as Wu (2014) mentions, the perception of Hispanic Americans is that they are more violent and rebellious. Therefore, a study of the racialization of crime that includes different races and ethnicities beyond Black and White can provide a wider and less biased understanding of the current situation.

Stereotype, Prejudice, Discrimination, and Personal Beliefs

To understand how simple demographic characteristics such as race and ethnicity transform into the criminalization of race, it is important to consider the path from a sociological and psychological level. To do so, this paper briefly explains how *stereotypes* turn into *prejudices*, and finally into *discrimination*. As the psychologist Patricia Devine (1989) mentioned, stereotypes are ordinary and implicit social agreements. These social perceptions are automatically applied to the entire group of individuals who align with the stereotype. Next, Devine (1989) explains that with stereotyped groups, prejudice becomes a possible consequence. Someone has a prejudice when he/she accepts the stereotypes, assigns it to the general group, and adds a negative component or perception to it. Then discrimination, the final step of this categorization process, is when a person moves from solely thinking about a negative social agreement to engaging in an action that reflects the prejudice. However, Devine (1989) introduces a

final, independent, and crucial concept of this process: *personal beliefs*. These are individual propositions that can accept or reject stereotypes and therefore can stop the categorization process before prejudice and discrimination appear. Otherwise, the relevant question for this thesis is: How can people establish a positive personal belief about racial and ethnic minorities that can block the racialization of crime? To answer this question, contact theory is the theoretical framework used in this thesis because it offers an explanatory model for understanding the reduced negative racialization of attitudes.

Contact Theory

In 1954, Gordon W. Allport published *The Nature of Prejudice*, in which the author described the “contact hypothesis” (also known as intergroup contact theory, contact model, and later on contact theory). Allport pointed out that close contact between members of different races could promote positive racial attitudes and reduce prejudices (Bohmert & DeMaris, 2015; Dixon & Rosenbaum, 2004; Martin, Trego, & Nakayama, 2010; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Shook & Fazio, 2008; Sigelman & Welch, 1993). Over time, different scholars tested this hypothesis and found that, in fact, a particular type or optimal factors of interracial contact resulted in fewer prejudicial attitudes with diverse populations.

Pettigrew and Tropp’s (2006) meta-analysis of more than 500 studies found that interracial contact has a significant influence in reducing racial prejudice. However, not all interracial contact will produce these results. Since Allport’s seminal work, different authors have proposed multiple “optimal” factors in these relationships that can support the reduction of negative racial attitudes. The most studied and effective factors are: (1)

members are of equal status; (2) members are working together toward a common goal; (3) interaction is supported by higher authorities; (4) a cooperative interdependence atmosphere exists; (5) intimate relationship allows self-disclosure; (6) members have a friendship; (7) relationship begins voluntarily; (8) relationship is meaningful; and (9) relationship is recurrent (Bohmert & DeMaris, 2015; Dixon & Rosenbaum, 2004; Martin, Trego, & Nakayama, 2010; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Shook & Fazio, 2008; Sigelman & Welch, 1993).

Scholars have argued that the social distance between races and ethnicities can create segregation, which can transform into ignorance about each other, and later on promote the creation and validation of negative stereotypes against members of different groups (Drakulich, 2012; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Shook & Fazio, 2008; Sigelman & Welch, 1993). For example, Drakulich (2012, p. 326) explains in his research that when people meet with individuals from various races they “will confront new information about members of the other group with which to revise existing stereotypes.” Sigelman and Welch (1993) suggest that White individuals lack first-hand information about people from different races/ethnicities, which causes them to base their attitudes on external –and usually not constructive– sources, such as media coverage. For example, Mancini and colleagues (2012) explain that in an employment setting, knowing individuals from minority groups by their name, building a close friendship, or dating someone from a different race/ethnicity reduced prejudice against outer groups.

Although contact theory originated with Allport’s work explaining exclusively negative attitudes against Black individuals, numerous studies have tested this concept with different populations such as Asians, Pacific Islanders, and Hispanics (Dixon &

Rosenbaum, 2004; Martin, Trego, & Nakayama, 2010). In general, the tenets of contact theory argue that interracial relationships can effectively reduce negative racial and ethnic attitudes by reducing stigmatizing stereotypes and promoting positive perceptions of other racial/ethnic group members.

News and Social Media

The literature about the racialization of crime and racial profiling has focused considerable attention on the influence of media and news in the public's perception of the association of race/ethnicity with criminal behavior. Several scholars have argued that U.S. news, television shows, and other different types of social media are displaying in an overrepresented manner racial and ethnic minorities as the offenders of criminal activity in the country (Bjornstrom et al., 2010; Mastro et al., 2009; Ortiz & Harwood, 2013; Sigelman & Welch, 1993). The public may be creating or strengthening negative prejudices toward racial/ethnic minorities because of those sources and the exposure to unreliable and biased information. For example, if a person has the prejudice that Latinos are short tempered and prone to violence, the overrepresentation of this ethnic group portrayed in this way on television shows and news stories can be understood as a confirmation of the social categorization. Considering the section of this thesis about stereotyping and personal beliefs, the U.S. media and news might be biasing and suggestive that personal beliefs cannot stop or limit racial discrimination (Devine, 1989). People who have no interracial contact, no first-hand information about other races or ethnicities, and who are continuously exposed to a second-hand source that emphasizes the racialization of crime, may internalize and accept negative stereotypes, and possibly continue the process until a collective racist mindset emerges.

Citizenship Status

Citizenship status may have a significant influence on the relationship between racialization of crime, contact theory, and media intake. The U.S. and its population historically and contemporaneously experience strong social influences stemming from the colonial model (Delsol, 2015; Gabbidon, 2010; Sulton, 1994; Tatum, 2000). These historical prejudices and operational standards have over time created limits on the coexistence among all the different races and ethnicities in this country. Because of this, U.S. citizens may display in a more representative way racial prejudices and avoid interracial contact than non-U.S. citizens. The influence of U.S. media and news may be higher among citizens than non-citizens because local individuals have been exposed to U.S. information more than international participants. Depending on their time in the U.S. (e.g., first, second, or third-plus generation), the cultural underpinnings of colonialism that U.S. citizens may have grown up experiencing may also influence perceptions. Non-U.S. citizens may not experience the negative consequences and influences of the colonial experience, U.S. media, and news, and may not avoid interracial contact. Therefore, this group may not share the same racial prejudices or the same social distance from individuals of different races/ethnicities. Likewise, the influence and biases of U.S. news or media regarding race and ethnicity may not affect this group as much as the U.S. citizen group depending on their country of origin and experiences with colonialism.

Conclusion

In summary, when studying racial prejudice, we should consider the historical background of the country, and the multiple definitions, applications, and explanations of

the racialization of crime (Delsol, 2015; Hughey, 2015; Welch, 2007). Also, this thesis proposes the importance of examining how racial attitudes are developed and modified because of two significant influences: contact theory and exposure to media (Bjornstrom et al., 2010; Mastro et al., 2009; Ortiz & Harwood, 2013; Sigelman & Welch, 1993).

This comprehensive review of the literature demonstrates the gap in knowledge regarding racialization of crime and the influence of media exposure, interracial contact, and citizenship status. To address this void in the literature, this thesis investigates whether U.S. citizens and non-U.S. citizens racially stereotype criminal behavior differently, while also examining whether interracial contact reduces racialization of crime equally for U.S. citizens and non-citizens and assessing if exposure to U.S. news and media have the same influence on the U.S. citizens on as non-U.S. citizens. Investigating racialization of crime between U.S. citizens and non-U.S. citizens will allow the research to move beyond a U.S.-centric focus.

Chapter 3

Methodology

This thesis uses data from a cross-sectional survey of undergraduate and graduate student perceptions of criminality related to race and ethnicity. In this Chapter, the study data, sampling techniques, and human subjects' procedures are described. Next, the variables used to test the research questions are outlined. Finally, the data analysis approach is discussed.

Data

Sampling and Procedure

The sampling frame for this research consisted of all registered students in any residential academic program at Pennsylvania State Harrisburg located in Middletown, PA. The Office of Student Services (OSS) at Penn State Harrisburg provided a list of all email addresses of undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in a residential degree program. The sampling frame also contained a few key demographic variables (e.g., gender). The sampling frame was limited by the OSS to those students who were 18 years of age or older at the time the survey was disseminated. Potential participants were currently enrolled residential students on the campus and did not include students enrolled in the World Campus. Students who graduated or withdrew from a program at Penn State Harrisburg before Fall 2016 were not included in the sampling frame. According to the University Budget Office, by Fall 2016, this campus had 5,046 students enrolled as full and part-time students in undergraduate or graduate programs. Among these, the total number of international and non-U.S. citizen students is 716 (14.2%), making this campus a suitable study site to assess the role of citizenship on the

racialization of criminal behavior. In Fall 2016, Penn State Harrisburg had the second largest number of international students among all the Penn State campuses, with only University Park campus having a larger number of international students.

Data were collected using an online survey. As Don Dillman (2000) mentions in his book, *Mail and Internet Surveys: The Tailored Design Method*, using technological advances to reach research subjects brings benefits to different disciplines. In this particular project, study participants were students who have an email account specifically used for educational purposes. Thus, using an online survey is a tailored approach to the population that can benefit from the project. The electronic survey was developed using *Survey Monkey*. The survey was sent by email to all students in the sampling frame using the author's university email account. Every student received an email asking them to participate voluntarily in an online survey related to race, ethnicity, and crime (Appendix C: Survey Questions). The goal and basic information about confidentiality and participation in the survey were explained in the email (Appendix D: Recruitment Material), and at the bottom participants could find a web link to access the questionnaire.

Considering the data methodology collection, implied consent was approved for use by the Penn State's Institutional Review Board (IRB). At the beginning of the questionnaire, it was explained to all participants that by continuing with the survey they were providing consent to be a participant in the study. Basic information about the project, confidentiality, duration, and the incentive for participating was explicitly stated for all subjects. Students had the option of refusing to participate or withdrawing from the survey at any time, and there was no penalty for not participating or completing the

survey. Following the initial email two other email reminders, that also included all the information mentioned before, surveys were emailed to all the students to encourage participation and increase the response rate. Those who did not provide passive informed consent were not permitted to proceed with the survey, and replacement was not used for those who withdrew from the study prematurely (e.g., did not complete the entire survey).

As an incentive for participation, students were entered into a random drawing for a \$20 Lion Cash Gift Card. The winner was selected after the initial email, the two reminders were sent, and the period of data collection closed. After the random drawing was conducted, the principal investigator of this study contacted the winner by email. In order to send the incentive to the student's account the last name of the winning participant was required. However, considering that email addresses were the only personal information obtained from the participants in the sampling frame, the winner was asked after data collection ceased if he/she could provide that personal information in order to apply the Gift Card to his/her account. By waiting until data collection had closed, it improved the chances of the student feeling comfortable providing the requisite information, to assure the winner that their name would not be tied to his/her responses to the survey, and that this additional information was related exclusively to the incentive.

Instrument

To collect the data for this study, an online survey was designed. Survey Monkey was the platform used to develop all the indicators and to send the final version to the participants. The survey had 28 questions grouped into four different sections according to topic (Appendix C: Survey Questions). First, eight indicators asked the basic

demographic and control variables information such as age, gender, race/ethnicity, citizenship status, academic and semester standing. In the second section, nine indicators asked participants to associate nine different types of crime with a particular race/ethnicity.

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), the UCR, and the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) have published different reports and rates of crimes around the U.S. and divide the type of crime by violent and property crime (Truman, & Planty, 2015). Among violent crime, frequently presented are rates of murder, rape, and domestic violence. Likewise, a majority of offenders are perceived to be under the influence of alcohol or drugs at the time of their crime (BJS, 1990; Greenfeld, 1998). Less is known about cybercrime, though Rantala (2008) reports that businesses can experience different negative consequences from such crimes. These few examples, evidence that some of the most important official sources for the criminology and criminal justice fields, divide their analysis of crime rates in major categories such as the ones mentioned before. In addition, as Onwudiwe (2005) argues, after the terrorist attacks to the U.S. in 2001, terrorism has become a recent criminal phenomenon to study. For this reason, the types of crimes explored in this thesis match the central categories that these official sources use in their reports.

Considering that the target respondents for this study were students from different disciplines and academic backgrounds, they might not be aware of the definitions of each crime. For this reason, nine major crime categories were chosen because these would likely be more easily understood by the general student population. Nevertheless, when the instrument was designed, definitions of each crime were provided in the survey next

to the terms to avoid misunderstandings and validity threats in the analyses. The nine crimes were: (a) domestic violence, (b) property crimes, (c) white-collar crimes, (d) drug-related crimes, (e) alcohol-related crimes, (f) sexual violent crimes, (g) cyber-crime, (h) terrorism, and (i) murder. Each indicator offered seven possible options: (1) White / Caucasian, (2) Black / African American; (3) Asian; (4) Latino / Hispanic; (5) Middle Eastern; (6) Other; and (7) None of above.

In the third section, seven indicators asked about news and media exposure by addressing different sources for learning about criminal events. The first indicator asked for the primary source among five options: (i) U.S. news or newspapers, (ii) international news or newspapers, (iii) TV shows, (iv) family or friends, and (v) social media (e.g. Facebook, Twitter). Then, a five-point Likert scale indicator asked participants to select how frequently they use that primary source. The following four indicators asked participants whether they used options (i), (ii), (iv) and (v).² The last indicator of this group asked on a 4-point Likert scale the participant's perception of how using those sources could influence their previous responses. Lastly, three indicators explored the interracial contact of participants. The first question of this group asked if participants had meaningful and positive interracial contact with yes/no options.³ Finally, the last question asked participants if they avoided or not interracial contact.

Key Variables: Conceptualization and Operationalization

Dependent variable

² Television shows were not assessed as a source of news.

³ If participants responded positively, the survey intended to take them to a follow-up question on a 4-point Likert scale about the frequency of that contact. However, for unknown reasons, the Survey Monkey web page did not apply that skip pattern function, and all participants were asked to answer the frequency indicator. Therefore, the data for that variable had to be recoded prior to use.

The dependent variable in this study is “Racialization of Crime.” As was emphasized before, race and ethnicity are social and dynamic constructs (Case, 2008; Dovidio, Kawakami, & Gaertner, 2002; Sewpaul, 2013), and accordingly, the definition of racialization of crime, criminalization of race, racial or ethnic profiling can vary (Covington, 1995; Delsol, 2015; Higgins & Gabbidon, 2015; Knepper, 2008). Multiple discrepancies among the definitions exist (Barot & Bird, 2001; Schildkraut, 2009; Warren & Farrell, 2009; Welch, 2007). However, what is important for this thesis is that when scholars use one or the other nomenclature, they always define it by including negative prejudices toward racial and ethnic groups and an association with criminal behavior (Buerger & Farrell, 2002; Kamalu, 2016; Knepper, 2008; Schildkraut, 2009). Because this thesis aims to explore the racialized perceptions of non-law enforcement individuals toward others, the most proper definition for this study is the one provided by Buerger & Farrell (2002, p. 272) which is “equating race or ethnicity with criminality.”

Disciplines such as psychology and sociology have studied how people exhibit racial prejudices toward other individuals, how to reduce or avoid it, or how it can influence other factors in the individual’s life such as employment (Alegria, 2014; Hughey, 2015; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Welch, 2007). It is important to note that the definition of “racialization of crime” used in this research is strictly related to associating someone or a particular race/ethnic group to criminal behavior, but not necessarily from a particular institution, official, or agency of the criminal justice system. In this study, criminalization of race and ethnicity will be understood as the negative attitude an individual has toward another person when perceiving him/her as a criminal based only on his/her racial or ethnic characteristics.

To measure this outcome, three different recodings were necessary. As was mentioned in the previous section, the group of questions that assessed this topic included nine indicators, each one with one type of crime and seven possible options from which to choose. To analyze this outcome, the information was dichotomized. First, a binary recoding with the participants who chose the “None of above” option and those who picked a racial/ethnic group –without considering which one in specific. With this first recode, the study could observe the idea of people being “color-blind” in their attitudes such as that proposed and defined by Awad, Cokley, and Ravitch (2005, p. 1387) as a “belief that race should not and does not matter.” A second dichotomized recodification of the original data was done for the people who chose “White / Caucasian” and those who chose any other race/ethnicity. This change allows for an examination of the definitions of racialization of crime as a matter of Whites vs. minority groups. Lastly, a recode of the original data into Black and non-Black group was conducted with the goal of verifying the findings of the first two recodings.

Independent Variables

Two independent variables are explored in this study. First, the exposure to and influence of news and social media (*Media Exposure*) on the participants’ perceptions; and second, the interracial relationships subjects have (*Interracial Contact*). *Media Exposure* was intended to be measured using all the seven indicators that belonged to this group of questions. However, U.S. news was the most common option given that the sample is primarily U.S. citizens and all participants resided in the U.S. at the time of the survey. Moreover, the options of “TV shows” and “Family and Friends” were rarely chosen by the participants and not useful for analysis purposes. Therefore, this

independent variable was analyzed with the only one substantive variable available, social media. A dichotomized variable about participant's use of social media was created. Including this independent variable was key because the literature argues that the public can strengthen negative racial attitudes and prejudices toward specific groups because of how media and news disproportionately display minority races/ethnicities as offenders (Bjornstrom et al., 2010; King, 2015; Ortiz & Harwood, 2013).

The second independent variable is *Interracial Contact*. As the literature suggests, contact under optimal conditions between people of different races/ethnicities can reduce racial prejudices (Bohmert & DeMaris, 2015; Dixon & Rosenbaum, 2004; Martin, Trego, & Nakayama, 2010; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Shook & Fazio, 2008; Sigelman & Welch, 1993). Some types of relationships that can produce these results are those with family members, friends, romantic relationships, close classmates, or co-workers (Drakulich, 2012; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Considering the population of this study consisted of students in a university setting, scholars have argued that most of the optimal factors for positive interracial contact are present in this environment due to increased opportunities for interaction (Martin, Trego, & Nakayama, 2010; Shook & Fazio, 2008). Some scholars have even explored how racial prejudice changes when White students have roommates or friends from different races (Shook & Fazio, 2008). To analyze this independent variable only the first of the three indicators was used; this variable addressed if whether or not participants had or not a meaningful, close and positive interracial relationship.

Control Variables

Besides the dependent and the independent variables, the survey collected data on control variables to allow analyses of possible variations in the racialization of crime

depending on demographic characteristics. First, the survey asked participants about their gender from a close-ended list with four attributes (1) male, (2) female, (3) LGBTIQIA+, and (4) I do not wish to disclose. Because the number of subjects responding affirmatively for categories (3) and (4) were significantly low, during the analysis they were coded as missing. Second, participants were asked to select from a close-ended list their age with the youngest option being “18,” and the oldest category was “40 or more”. Third, students were asked to choose the one race or ethnicity that best describes them from a closed-ended list of seven options: (a) White/Caucasian; (b) Black/African American; (c) Asian; (d) Latino/Hispanic; (e) Middle Eastern; and (f) Other. Fourth, students were prompted to select their current year of academic study whether it was Undergraduate or Graduate level; likewise, participants had to choose the specific semester of their academic standing. Fifth, students were asked to identify themselves as a non-U.S. citizen or U.S. citizen; if a student picked “non-citizen,” a follow-up contingency question appeared asking how many years and months s/he has been in the U.S. Sixth, participants were asked to respond to a closed-ended yes-no question that asked if both of their parents were born in the U.S. In general, the questions regarding length of time in the U.S. were seeking to examine if differences existed between those who were less or more exposed to a different phenomena, such as more opportunities to have interracial contact (through more years in a university setting), or more exposure to U.S. media and news.

As Zhou (1997) explains, the process by which different generations of immigrants’ children acculturate in the host society can be due to segmented assimilation. In the case of the U.S., the amount of time a person has been influenced by American

culture might affect his/her racial attitudes. In fact, Zhou mentions that to acculturate to the American society, individuals must “free” themselves from their old cultures, and this process might be influenced by the length of time people are engaged in the new environment. Therefore, it is important to clarify who is considered a citizen and non-citizen of the U.S. In this study, U.S. citizens were defined as those who were born in this country, born abroad but raised in the U.S., and born abroad but for different reasons are now legal citizens of the U.S. (e.g., marriage or work scenarios). Also, those who are permanent residents or have a green card were also included in this first group. The non-U.S. citizen group was defined as those students who are currently on an F1 or J1 visa (two types of student visa), and, therefore, were born and raised with traditions and a culture different from the one of the United States. This kind of status establishes that these individuals will be in American soil exclusively while they pursuit an academic degree (e.g. four years Bachelor, two years Master, five years Doctoral degree).

Goals and Hypothesis

This thesis had three primary goals: (i) Explore if participants’ perceptions about the relationship between race/ethnicity and criminality varied depending on their citizenships status; (ii) Determine if the influence of media/news on participants’ racialized perceptions changed depending on citizenship status; and (iii) Examine if having positive, meaningful and close interracial contact differentially influences the perceptions of citizens compared to non-citizens.

The following hypotheses are used to test the central objectives of the thesis:

H1: U.S. citizen students will be more likely to racialize criminal behavior in comparison with non-U.S. citizens.

H2: Students who have greater exposure to media and news will racialize criminal behavior more.

H3: Students with positive, meaningful, and recurrent interracial contact, will be less likely to racialize criminal behavior.

Considering these three central goals, the following sub-objectives emerge. First, the indicators for studying the racialization of crime are used to explore whether a particular race/ethnicity is, in general, more prejudiced and likely to associate offenders with minority groups; and later on, if one race/ethnicity is consistently related to one specific crime. Second, this thesis examines whether students with parents who were both born in the U.S. answer differently to those who respond negatively to that indicator.

Chapter 4

Results and Analysis

The survey was sent to 4,996 Penn State Harrisburg students, and the overall response rate was 14.6%. The total number of responses from the online survey was 729.⁴ Table 4-0 presents in detail demographic characteristics of the participants. Of the total responses, approximately 46% were male, and 50% were female. The average age was 22 years old, with the youngest participants being 18 years old, and the oldest in the category of “40 or more”. More than half of the sample was White/Caucasian; followed by Asians, and Black/African Americans, which almost mirror the actual population of the campus (Appendix D). As expected, the majority of participants were U.S. citizens. Coincidentally, at Penn State Harrisburg, the percentage of all the Non-U.S. citizens is 14%, and in this thesis, the rates of the sample for both citizenship status resembles the percentages of local and international students in the population closely.

Table 4-0. Characteristics of participants

| | Percentage | Frequency |
|----------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Gender | | |
| <i>Male</i> | 46.50% | 339 |
| <i>Female</i> | 50.62% | 369 |
| <i>LGBTQIA+</i> | 1.65% | 12 |
| <i>I do not wish to disclose</i> | 1.23% | 9 |
| TOTAL | | 729 |
| Race / Ethnicity | | |
| <i>White / Caucasian</i> | 58.44% | 426 |
| <i>Asian</i> | 19.34% | 141 |
| <i>Black / African American</i> | 10.70% | 78 |
| <i>Latino / Hispanic</i> | 5.21% | 38 |
| <i>Middle Eastern</i> | 2.19% | 16 |

⁴ Analyses used all available data, and complete data were available for 91.5% of respondents.

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|------------|
| <i>Other</i> | 4.12% | 30 |
| TOTAL | | 729 |
| Academic Standing | | |
| <i>Undergraduate</i> | 81.21% | 592 |
| <i>Graduate</i> | 18.79% | 137 |
| TOTAL | | 729 |
| Semester | | |
| <i>1</i> | 28.87% | 209 |
| <i>2</i> | 2.90% | 21 |
| <i>3</i> | 21.69% | 157 |
| <i>4</i> | 5.52% | 40 |
| <i>5</i> | 12.15% | 88 |
| <i>6</i> | 5.80% | 42 |
| <i>7</i> | 11.33% | 82 |
| <i>8</i> | 3.04% | 22 |
| <i>9</i> | 2.49% | 18 |
| <i>10</i> | 0.97% | 7 |
| <i>11</i> | 0.97% | 7 |
| <i>12</i> | 0.55% | 4 |
| <i>13</i> | 0.28% | 2 |
| <i>14</i> | 0.41% | 3 |
| <i>15</i> | 0.14% | 1 |
| <i>16</i> | 0.41% | 3 |
| <i>17 or more</i> | 2.49% | 18 |
| TOTAL | | 724 |
| Both parents born in the U.S. | | |
| <i>Yes</i> | 64.14% | 465 |
| <i>No</i> | 35.86% | 260 |
| TOTAL | | 725 |
| Citizenship | | |
| U.S. Citizen | 84.18% | 612 |
| <i>White/Caucasian</i> | 69.3% | 424 |
| <i>Black/African American</i> | 11.8% | 72 |
| <i>Asian</i> | 8.3% | 51 |
| <i>Latino / Hispanic</i> | 4.7% | 29 |
| <i>Middle Eastern</i> | 1.9% | 12 |
| <i>Other</i> | 3.9% | 24 |
| Non-U.S. Citizen | 15.82% | 115 |
| <i>White/Caucasian</i> | 0.87% | 1 |
| <i>Black/African American</i> | 4.35% | 5 |
| <i>Asian</i> | 78.2% | 90 |
| <i>Latino / Hispanic</i> | 7.83% | 9 |
| <i>Middle Eastern</i> | 3.48% | 4 |
| <i>Other</i> | 5.21% | 6 |
| TOTAL | | 727 |

For each of the nine type of crimes, a crosstab compares the U.S. citizens' to non-U.S. citizens' responses. For the first category, "domestic violence," White/Caucasian was the most frequent race attributed to this crime (Table 4-1).⁵ However, when comparing the associations by citizenship status, for U.S. citizens the option with the highest percentage was White/Caucasian, but for non-citizens the option "None of above" represented the highest percentage. For the second type, "property crimes," the sample chose the Black/African American category as the most frequently associated race with the crime (Table 4-2). In this case, the first association for both citizens and non-citizens is similar. For the third type, "white-collar crimes," both citizenship statuses chose the White/Caucasian race as the most frequent race associated with this crime (Table 4-3). In the fourth type, "drug-related crimes," responses from citizens and non-citizens converge within both groups associating this offense with Blacks/African Americans (Table 4-4). For the fifth type, "alcohol-related crimes," Whites/Caucasians were most frequently associated with this kind of crime by the entire sample, U.S. citizens, and non-citizens (Table 4-5). Then, for the sixth crime type, "violent sexual crimes," the majority of the sample attributed this crime to Whites/Caucasians (Table 4-6). However, when looking into detail, the non-citizens group had "None of above" as the highest percentage option for violent sexual crimes. In the seventh type, "cybercrime," the majority of the sample, U.S. citizens, and non-citizens attributed this crime to Whites/Caucasians (Table 4-7). For the eighth type, "terrorism," all participants including U.S. citizens and non-U.S. citizens more frequently attributed this crime to the Middle Eastern race (Table 4-8).

⁵ Tables 4-1 through 4-16 appear in Appendix E.

Finally, in the ninth type, “murder,” the majority of the sample associated Blacks/African Americans with this crime. However, when looking at the non-citizens group the most frequent response was “None of above” (Table 4-9).

Table 4-1. Domestic violence rates per sample, U.S. citizens, and Non-U.S. citizens.

| | Sample | | U.S. Citizen | | Non –U.S. Citizen | |
|--------------------------|-----------|------|--------------|------|-------------------|------|
| | Frequency | % | Frequency | % | Frequency | % |
| White / Caucasian | 311 | 43.2 | 283 | 46.8 | 28 | 24.3 |
| Black / African American | 216 | 30.0 | 187 | 30.9 | 29 | 25.2 |
| Asian | 9 | 1.3 | 2 | 0.3 | 7 | 6.1 |
| Latino / Hispanic | 40 | 5.6 | 34 | 5.6 | 6 | 5.2 |
| Middle Eastern | 21 | 2.9 | 13 | 2.1 | 8 | 7.0 |
| Other | 9 | 1.3 | 9 | 1.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
| None Of Above | 114 | 15.8 | 37 | 6.1 | 37 | 32.2 |
| TOTAL | 720 | | 605 | | 115 | |

Table 4-2. Property crime rates per sample, U.S. citizens, and Non-U.S. citizens.

| | Sample | | U.S. Citizen | | Non –U.S. Citizen | |
|--------------------------|-----------|------|--------------|-------|-------------------|------|
| | Frequency | % | Frequency | % | Frequency | % |
| White / Caucasian | 134 | 18.7 | 125 | 20.73 | 9 | 7.9 |
| Black / African American | 368 | 51.3 | 324 | 53.73 | 62 | 54.4 |
| Asian | 3 | 0.4 | 2 | 0.33 | 1 | 0.9 |
| Latino / Hispanic | 53 | 7.4 | 49 | 8.13 | 4 | 3.5 |
| Middle Eastern | 5 | 0.7 | 3 | 0.50 | 2 | 1.8 |
| Other | 11 | 1.5 | 7 | 1.16 | 4 | 3.5 |
| None Of Above | 125 | 17.4 | 93 | 15.42 | 32 | 28.1 |
| TOTAL | 717 | | 603 | | 114 | |

Table 4-3. White collar rates per sample, U.S. citizens, and Non-U.S. citizens.

| | Sample | | U.S. Citizen | | Non –U.S. Citizen | |
|--------------------------|-----------|------|--------------|-------|-------------------|------|
| | Frequency | % | Frequency | % | Frequency | % |
| White / Caucasian | 554 | 77.6 | 496 | 82.53 | 58 | 51.3 |
| Black / African American | 29 | 4.1 | 19 | 3.16 | 10 | 8.8 |
| Asian | 21 | 2.9 | 15 | 2.50 | 6 | 5.3 |
| Latino / Hispanic | 14 | 2.0 | 12 | 2.00 | 2 | 1.8 |
| Middle Eastern | 6 | 0.8 | 5 | 0.83 | 1 | 0.9 |
| Other | 10 | 1.4 | 8 | 1.33 | 2 | 1.8 |
| None Of Above | 80 | 11.2 | 46 | 7.65 | 34 | 30.1 |

| | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|
| TOTAL | 714 | 601 | 113 |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|

Table 4-4. Drug-related rates per sample, U.S. citizens, and Non-U.S. citizens.

| | Sample | | U.S. Citizen | | Non –U.S. Citizen | |
|--------------------------|-----------|------|--------------|------|-------------------|------|
| | Frequency | % | Frequency | % | Frequency | % |
| White / Caucasian | 113 | 15.8 | 93 | 15.5 | 20 | 17.7 |
| Black / African American | 307 | 43.1 | 264 | 44.0 | 43 | 38.1 |
| Asian | 2 | 0.3 | 1 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.9 |
| Latino / Hispanic | 186 | 26.1 | 167 | 27.8 | 19 | 16.8 |
| Middle Eastern | 1 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 18 | 2.5 | 15 | 2.5 | 3 | 2.7 |
| None Of Above | 86 | 12.1 | 59 | 9.8 | 27 | 23.9 |
| TOTAL | 713 | | 600 | | 113 | |

Table 4-5. Alcohol-related rates per sample, U.S. citizens, and Non-U.S. citizens.

| | Sample | | U.S. Citizen | | Non –U.S. Citizen | |
|--------------------------|-----------|------|--------------|------|-------------------|------|
| | Frequency | % | Frequency | % | Frequency | % |
| White / Caucasian | 500 | 70.2 | 448 | 74.8 | 52 | 46.0 |
| Black / African American | 57 | 8.0 | 42 | 7.0 | 15 | 13.3 |
| Asian | 6 | 0.8 | 1 | 0.2 | 5 | 4.4 |
| Latino / Hispanic | 31 | 4.4 | 23 | 3.8 | 8 | 7.1 |
| Middle Eastern | 5 | 0.7 | 2 | 0.3 | 3 | 2.7 |
| Other | 18 | 2.5 | 15 | 2.5 | 3 | 2.7 |
| None Of Above | 95 | 13.3 | 68 | 11.4 | 27 | 23.9 |
| TOTAL | 712 | | 599 | | 113 | |

Table 4-6. Sexual violence rates per sample, U.S. citizens, and Non-U.S. citizens.

| | Sample | | U.S. Citizen | | Non –U.S. Citizen | |
|--------------------------|-----------|------|--------------|------|-------------------|------|
| | Frequency | % | Frequency | % | Frequency | % |
| White / Caucasian | 353 | 49.7 | 321 | 53.5 | 32 | 29.1 |
| Black / African American | 137 | 19.3 | 111 | 18.5 | 26 | 23.6 |
| Asian | 2 | 0.3 | 1 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.9 |
| Latino / Hispanic | 36 | 5.1 | 34 | 5.7 | 2 | 1.8 |
| Middle Eastern | 22 | 3.1 | 15 | 2.5 | 7 | 6.4 |
| Other | 19 | 2.7 | 16 | 2.7 | 3 | 2.7 |
| None Of Above | 141 | 19.9 | 102 | 17.0 | 39 | 35.5 |
| TOTAL | 710 | | 600 | | 110 | |

Table 4-7. Cybercrime rates per sample, U.S. citizens, and Non-U.S. citizens.

| | Sample | | U.S. Citizen | | Non –U.S. Citizen | |
|--------------------------|-----------|------|--------------|------|-------------------|------|
| | Frequency | % | Frequency | % | Frequency | % |
| White / Caucasian | 388 | 54.9 | 348 | 58.2 | 40 | 36.7 |
| Black / African American | 5 | 0.7 | 5 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Asian | 139 | 19.7 | 117 | 19.6 | 22 | 20.2 |
| Latino / Hispanic | 2 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 1.8 |
| Middle Eastern | 40 | 5.7 | 34 | 5.7 | 6 | 5.5 |
| Other | 25 | 3.5 | 20 | 3.3 | 5 | 4.6 |
| None Of Above | 108 | 15.3 | 74 | 12.4 | 34 | 31.2 |
| TOTAL | 707 | | 598 | | 109 | |

Table 4-8. Terrorism rates per sample, U.S. citizens, and Non-U.S. citizens.

| | Sample | | U.S. Citizen | | Non –U.S. Citizen | |
|--------------------------|-----------|------|--------------|------|-------------------|------|
| | Frequency | % | Frequency | % | Frequency | % |
| White / Caucasian | 81 | 11.5 | 74 | 12.4 | 7 | 6.5 |
| Black / African American | 7 | 1.0 | 5 | 0.8 | 2 | 1.9 |
| Asian | 3 | 0.4 | 1 | 0.2 | 2 | 1.9 |
| Latino / Hispanic | 2 | 0.3 | 1 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.9 |
| Middle Eastern | 493 | 69.9 | 433 | 72.5 | 60 | 55.6 |
| Other | 23 | 3.3 | 19 | 3.2 | 4 | 3.7 |
| None Of Above | 96 | 13.6 | 64 | 10.7 | 32 | 29.6 |
| TOTAL | 705 | | 597 | | 108 | |

Table 4-9. Murder rates per sample, U.S. citizens, and Non-U.S. citizens.

| | Sample | | U.S. Citizen | | Non –U.S. Citizen | |
|--------------------------|-----------|------|--------------|------|-------------------|------|
| | Frequency | % | Frequency | % | Frequency | % |
| White / Caucasian | 188 | 26.8 | 164 | 27.7 | 24 | 22.0 |
| Black / African American | 320 | 45.6 | 288 | 48.6 | 32 | 29.4 |
| Asian | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Latino / Hispanic | 17 | 2.4 | 15 | 2.5 | 2 | 1.8 |
| Middle Eastern | 8 | 1.1 | 2 | 0.3 | 6 | 5.5 |
| Other | 21 | 3.0 | 18 | 3.0 | 3 | 2.8 |
| None Of Above | 148 | 21.1 | 106 | 17.9 | 42 | 38.5 |
| TOTAL | 702 | | 593 | | 109 | |

In the group of questions about Media Exposure, seven indicators were asked.

The first two asked about the primary source to learn about criminal events, and how

frequent they use that resource (Table 4-10). In general, the sample as a whole and the group of U.S. citizens selected “U.S. news or newspapers” as their primary media source. As expected, non-citizens were more likely to choose “international news or newspapers” as their primary resource. Then, four more indicators asked participants to check what other sources were used (Table 4-11). In general, when each of the four resources was asked, more than half of the sample and within both citizenship statuses responded positively. When analyzing the four indicators at the same time, U.S. citizens most commonly endorsed the use of “U.S. news and newspapers”; and for non-US citizens “Social Media” was the primary source of information. The last indicator for Media Exposure asked participants their perception about the possible influence of all the sources in their previous responses (Table 4-12). In general, more than half of the responses of the sample, including both U.S. citizens and non-U.S. citizens, selected “Agree.”

Table 4-10. Primary source and frequency of use per sample, U.S. citizens, and non-citizens.

| | Sample | | U.S. Citizens | | Non-U.S. Citizens | |
|----------------------------------|-----------|------|---------------|------|-------------------|------|
| | Frequency | % | Frequency | % | Frequency | % |
| U.S. news or newspapers | 357 | 50.9 | 336 | 56.6 | 21 | 19.4 |
| International news or newspapers | 88 | 12.5 | 54 | 9.1 | 34 | 31.5 |
| TV shows | 15 | 2.1 | 12 | 2.0 | 3 | 2.8 |
| Family or Friends | 18 | 2.6 | 15 | 2.5 | 3 | 2.8 |
| Social media (Facebook, Twitter) | 224 | 31.9 | 177 | 29.8 | 47 | 43.5 |
| TOTAL | 702 | | 594 | | 108 | |
| Frequency of use | | | | | | |
| <i>Very frequently</i> | 271 | 38.6 | 236 | 39.7 | 35 | 32.4 |
| <i>Somewhat frequently</i> | 212 | 30.2 | 179 | 30.1 | 33 | 30.6 |
| <i>Occasionally</i> | 153 | 21.8 | 129 | 21.7 | 24 | 22.2 |
| <i>Somewhat infrequently</i> | 37 | 5.3 | 25 | 4.2 | 12 | 11.1 |
| <i>Very infrequently</i> | 29 | 4.1 | 25 | 4.2 | 4 | 3.7 |

| | | | |
|--------------|-----|-----|-----|
| <i>TOTAL</i> | 702 | 594 | 108 |
|--------------|-----|-----|-----|

Table 4-11. Rates of use of each source to learn about criminal events.

| | Sample | | U.S. Citizens | | Non-U.S. Citizens | |
|----------------------|-----------|------|---------------|------|-------------------|------|
| | Frequency | % | Frequency | % | Frequency | % |
| U.S. Source | | | | | | |
| <i>Yes</i> | 554 | 79.0 | 482 | 81.3 | 72 | 66.7 |
| <i>No</i> | 147 | 21.0 | 111 | 18.7 | 36 | 33.3 |
| <i>TOTAL</i> | 701 | | 593 | | 108 | |
| International Source | | | | | | |
| <i>Yes</i> | 381 | 54.5 | 297 | 50.2 | 84 | 78.5 |
| <i>No</i> | 318 | 45.5 | 295 | 49.8 | 23 | 21.5 |
| <i>TOTAL</i> | 699 | | 592 | | 107 | |
| Family/Friends | | | | | | |
| <i>Yes</i> | 540 | 77.8 | 458 | 78.0 | 82 | 76.6 |
| <i>No</i> | 154 | 22.2 | 129 | 22.0 | 25 | 23.4 |
| <i>TOTAL</i> | 694 | | 587 | | 107 | |
| Social Media | | | | | | |
| <i>Yes</i> | 482 | 69.1 | 395 | 66.9 | 87 | 80.6 |
| <i>No</i> | 216 | 30.9 | 195 | 33.1 | 21 | 19.4 |
| <i>TOTAL</i> | 698 | | 590 | | 108 | |

Table 4-12. Perception of influence of media sources.

| | Sample | | U.S. Citizen | | Non-U.S. Citizen | |
|-------------------|-----------|------|--------------|------|------------------|------|
| | Frequency | % | Frequency | % | Frequency | % |
| Strongly Agree | 126 | 18.1 | 113 | 19.2 | 13 | 12.0 |
| Agree | 407 | 58.5 | 338 | 57.5 | 69 | 63.9 |
| Disagree | 119 | 17.1 | 98 | 16.7 | 21 | 19.4 |
| Strongly Disagree | 44 | 6.3 | 39 | 6.6 | 5 | 4.6 |
| <i>TOTAL</i> | 696 | | 588 | | 108 | |

The last group of indicators asked about the interracial relationships participants might have (Table 4-13). Three indicators were used to explore the third research question. The first indicator assessed if participants had a meaningful, close, and positive relationship with a person who belongs to a different race/ethnicity. The majority of the sample, including U.S. citizens and non-U.S. citizens, responded positively. Then, a follow-up indicator asked about the frequency of that relationship and, in general, the most common response was “Very frequently.” The last indicator asked if participants

avoided interracial contact and, all groups had the same most common response, which is “Never.”

Table 4-13. Interracial contact, frequency, and avoidance.

| | Sample | | US Citizen | | Non-US Citizen | |
|------------------------------|-----------|------|------------|------|----------------|------|
| | Frequency | % | Frequency | % | Frequency | % |
| Interracial Contact | | | | | | |
| <i>Yes</i> | 585 | 83.9 | 503 | 85.4 | 82 | 75.9 |
| <i>No</i> | 112 | 16.1 | 86 | 14.6 | 26 | 24.1 |
| <i>TOTAL</i> | 697 | | 589 | | 108 | |
| Frequency IC | | | | | | |
| <i>Very frequently</i> | 289 | 49.3 | 258 | 51.2 | 31 | 37.8 |
| <i>Somewhat frequently</i> | 174 | 29.7 | 144 | 28.6 | 30 | 36.6 |
| <i>Occasionally</i> | 75 | 12.8 | 63 | 12.5 | 12 | 14.6 |
| <i>Somewhat infrequently</i> | 20 | 3.4 | 14 | 2.8 | 6 | 7.3 |
| <i>Very infrequently</i> | 28 | 4.8 | 25 | 5.0 | 3 | 3.7 |
| <i>TOTAL</i> | 586 | | 504 | | 82 | |
| Avoid IC | | | | | | |
| <i>Always</i> | 6 | 0.9 | 4 | 0.7 | 2 | 1.9 |
| <i>Sometimes</i> | 51 | 7.3 | 35 | 6.0 | 16 | 14.8 |
| <i>Rarely</i> | 155 | 22.3 | 120 | 20.4 | 35 | 32.4 |
| <i>Never</i> | 484 | 69.5 | 429 | 73.0 | 55 | 50.9 |
| <i>TOTAL</i> | 696 | | 588 | | 108 | |

To assess more thoroughly how citizenship status might be related to racialization of crime, correlation, multiple *t*-tests, ANOVAs, and regressions were employed.

Considering what has been mentioned before, “Racialization of Crime” is presented in the literature as a matter of Whites vs. Non-Whites; therefore, to analyze this particular outcome the recoding of the original dataset into White vs. Non-Whites will be understood here as the Racialization of Crime dataset. On the other hand, to examine a possible Color-Blind perception from the participants, the dichotomize recoding of those participants who chose “None of Above” vs. those who selected a race/ethnicity will be used in here as the Color-Blind dataset.

The nine outcomes -types of crime- were analyzed in SPSS. However, considering that various statistical analyses were conducted to assess reliability, this text will describe the process for only one of the nine crimes assessed: Murder. This crime was chosen for further exploration because when comparing the information of the UCR data of 2013 with the U.S. Census of 2010 and 2015, it is possible to observe that minorities were overrepresented in the number of arrest for this particular crime, and murder is a crime that garners substantial media attention. A main goal of the thesis is to test whether respondents endorse racialized perceptions of crime, as well as the contribution of media exposure.

To begin, a correlation analysis demonstrates that there is no multicollinearity between predictor variables in the regressions models (Table 4-14). The eight predictors were: (1) Gender –male vs. females, (2) Age –traditional learner vs. adult learners, (3) Race/Ethnicity of the participant –White, Black, Asian, Latino, Middle Eastern or Other, (4) Academic Standing –Undergraduate vs. graduate, (5) Citizenship status – U.S. citizen vs. non-citizen, (6) Parents –both parent born in the U.S. vs non-U.S. citizen, (7) Social Media, and (8) Interracial Contact. The results of the correlation showed that these predictors would be suitable for regression analysis. Therefore, the following step in the analysis consisted of seven *t*-tests for the binary outcomes and one analysis of variance (ANOVA; for “Race/Ethnicity” because this variable had six attributes).

In the first place, for the Color-Blind recoding, the *t*-tests showed that there were statistically significant differences for the seven binary predictors –Gender, Age, Academic, Citizenship, Parents, Social Media, and Interracial Contact- and the outcome variable of Murder (see Table 4-15). Then, the one-way ANOVA (Table 4-16) showed a

significant effect of all the Race/Ethnicity attributes on the outcome at the $p < .05$ level [$F(1, 673) = 6.690, p = 0.010$]. Lastly, a logistic regression analysis (Table 4-17) tested which predictors influenced racialization of murder when they were added simultaneously to the model. Model 1 demonstrates a significant increase in the risk of not color-blinding murder among males. According to the odds ratio, men are 78% more likely than females to choose a race/ethnicity for this crime. Likewise, Model 1 demonstrates a significant decrease in risk of not color-blinding murder among non-U.S. citizens. Compared to U.S. citizens, non-U.S. citizens had a 57%⁶ reduced likelihood of choosing a race/ethnicity for the crime of murder.

Table 4-17. Model 1, Logistic Regression analysis of Murder for the Color-Blind recode.

| <u>Indep. Variable</u> | <i>Model 1</i> | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| | <u>β</u> | <u>S.E.</u> | <u>Wald</u> | <u>Sig.</u> | <u>OR</u> |
| Male | .575 | .206 | 7.764 | .005 | 1.778 |
| Young Learner | .008 | .295 | .001 | .979 | 1.008 |
| Race/Ethnicity | .080 | .143 | .313 | .576 | 1.083 |
| Graduate Student | -.220 | .308 | .511 | .475 | 0.803 |
| Non-U.S. Citizen | -.856 | .319 | 7.175 | .007 | 0.425 |
| Both Parents U.S. Citizens | .459 | .337 | 1.856 | .173 | 1.582 |
| Interracial Contact | .057 | .272 | .043 | .836 | 1.058 |
| Social Media | -.057 | .229 | .063 | .803 | .944 |
| Constant | .297 | .676 | .193 | .660 | 1.346 |
| Model χ^2 | = | 13.661 | $p = .091$ | | |
| Cox and Snell r^2 | = | .046 | | | |
| N | = | 654 | | | |

A separate analysis was conducted to assess the outcome of murder in the Racialization of Crime dataset; the t -tests reveal the same results demonstrated for the Color-Blind dataset recode strengthening confidence in the findings. There were statistically significant differences between murder and the seven predictors –Gender,

⁶ % = $100 \times [\exp(\beta \times \delta) - 1]$, where $\delta = 1$.

Age, Academic Status, Citizenship, Parents, Social Media, and Interracial Contact (see Table 4-18).⁷ The one-way ANOVA (Table 4-19) showed a significant effect of all the race/ethnicity attributes on the outcome at the $p < .05$ level [$F(1, 673) = 5.640, p = 0.018$]. Finally, a logistic regression analysis (Table 4-20) was used to test what predictors may influence racialization of murder when they are simultaneously entered into the model. Model 2 demonstrated a significant increase in the risk of racializing murder among males. Compared to females, males had an 121% greater chance of racializing the crime of murder. Likewise, Model 2 demonstrated a significant decrease in risk of racializing murder among non-U.S. citizens. Compared to U.S. citizens, non-citizens had a 60% reduced likelihood of racializing murder.

Table 4-20. Model 2, Logistic Regression analysis of Murder for the Racialization of Crime dataset.

| <u>Indep. Variable</u> | <i>Model 2</i> | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| | <u>β</u> | <u>S.E.</u> | <u>Wald</u> | <u>Sig.</u> | <u>OR</u> |
| Male | .793 | .192 | 17.148 | .000 | 2.211 |
| Young Learner | -.674 | .287 | 5.529 | .019 | 0.510 |
| Race/Ethnicity | .162 | .120 | 1.832 | .176 | 1.176 |
| Graduate Student | .130 | .291 | .200 | .655 | 1.139 |
| Non-U.S. Citizen | -.929 | .319 | 8.503 | .004 | 0.395 |
| Both Parents U.S. | -.356 | .287 | 1.543 | .214 | 0.700 |
| Interracial Contact | .145 | .213 | .461 | .497 | 1.156 |
| Social Media | -.169 | .254 | .444 | .505 | 0.844 |
| Constant | -1.331 | .616 | 4.668 | .031 | 0.264 |
| Model χ^2 | = | 10.553 | $p = .159$ | | |
| Cox and Snell r^2 | = | .063 | | | |
| N | = | 654 | | | |

⁷ Tables 4-18 and 4-19 appear in Appendix E.

Chapter 5

Discussion and Conclusion

In general, the literature on racialization of crime, criminalization of race, or the color-blind approach to criminal behavior focuses attention on how Whites or minorities judge offenders depending on that one demographic characteristic (Awad, Cokley, & Ravitch, 2005; Barot & Bird, 2001; Brewer & Heitzeg, 2008; Covington, 1995; Johnson, 2011; Knepper, 2008). In other words, the literature about the racialization of crime is mainly and primarily concentrated on how people in the U.S., depending on their own race/ethnicity, are more or less likely to associate specific races/ethnicities to particular crimes. Considering that citizenship status has not yet been studied as a mediator of racialization of crime, the findings presented in this thesis are important. Model 1 and 2 showed that citizenship status was a statistically significant predictor of the outcome, racializing murder. In other words, the non-U.S. citizens were less likely to racialize crime, and to have a more color-blind perspective when associating a particular race/ethnicity to the crime of murder.

The existing literature shows that scholars generally test two primary mediators when discussing factors that can influence people's perceptions when relating criminal behavior to a particular race or ethnicity. This study included variables that assess those two possible causes: (1) contact theory and the impact of interracial contact, and (2) media exposure. For the first one, scholars have argued that positive relationships among people from different races/ethnicities can reduce racial prejudices (Bohmert & DeMaris, 2015; Dixon & Rosenbaum, 2004; Martin, Trego, & Nakayama, 2010; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Shook & Fazio, 2008; Sigelman & Welch, 1993). Therefore, the research

for this thesis explored this concept by asking participants if they had these types of relationships. However, Models 1 and 2 demonstrate that having interracial contact was not a predictor of the racialization of murder. In other words, those subjects who stated that they had a positive, meaningful, and close relationship with someone who belonged to a different race/ethnicity, did not differentially racialize the crime of murder compared to those who did not report having interracial contact with others.

Then, for the second mediator, the literature argues that media and news coverage about criminal events may influence perceptions of the racial and ethnic characteristics of the offenders (Bjornstrom et al., 2012; Chiricos & Eschholz, 2002; King, 2015; Lee & Thien, 2014; Lyon, 2008; Oliver et al., 2004; Ortiz & Harwood, 2013). For that reason, this study explored through different indicators how participants learn about criminal events, their primary source for news, the frequency of use, and their perceptions of how those sources could influence their general responses. As was mentioned before, for different reasons exposure to Social Media was the only variable included in the logistic regressions. Unfortunately, Models 1 and 2 evidenced that this type of media exposure was not a statistically significant predictor of the racialization of murder. This means that those participants who confirmed using Social Media as a source to learn about criminal events did not respond differently to those who answered differently to this indicator.

From a different perspective and for future research purposes, Models 1 and 2 indicated a significant statistical result for one variable that has not been widely studied in research on racialization; gender. Logistic regressions revealed that males were more likely than females to racialize crime, and also to be less color-blind when associating murder to a particular race/ethnicity. These results were consistent across analyses,

suggesting that gender is a variable that could be a key factor when studying the racialization of crime. More nuanced analyses about the gendered nature of racialization of crime would contribute to the extant literature.

One possible explanation to why men are significantly more likely to racialize the crime of murder is gender roles. As Cullen, Agnew, and Wilcox (2014) mentioned when describing feminist criminology is that female behavior is socially expected to be “maternal, passive, and gentle” (p. 325). Perhaps this passive social expectation translates to a color-blind perspective on criminal behavior. Any other behavior outside of those traditionally feminine parameters could be considered abnormal or unnatural. As Sutton and Farrall, (2005) also argue, socially desirable behavior could be another characteristic that is generally expected from women. Therefore, when combining these features, women might be responding less judgmental to the indicators of the survey because of what it is socially acceptable for them to answer, and not necessarily for what they truly believe. The racialization of crime may in fact be gendered.

Another possible explanation to the results of this project is that because of exposure to media or sources that are over-representing some racial/ethnic minority groups as the offenders and white people as victims. As Bjornstrom et al. (2010) and Mastro et al. (2009) mentioned, U.S. news and media often distort the perceptions of the general public about the criminal trends in the U.S. by displaying minorities as violent and dangerous individuals. Media can influence perceptions of victims, particularly as related to domestic violence and women (see Berns, 2004). Perhaps, men are more likely to encounter, watch, or discuss about violent offending behavior. Because of that higher exposure, men could exhibit more biased perceptions than women, and respond with a

more racialized perception. This requires more in-depth investigation and test of Johnson and colleagues' (1997) work which demonstrates that women consider media influences more strongly than males when making determinations of criminal racialization.

On the other side, citizenship status was also a significant predictor of the racialization of murder. The results showed that non-U.S. citizens were more likely to be color-blind and less likely to racialized crime when associating murder to a race/ethnicity. These finding are consistent with the initial idea of this thesis that the historical background of U.S. citizens could be differently shaping their perceptions about criminality when comparing them to other nationalities. Perhaps, the environments and cultures that influences the international participants raises them in a manner that race/ethnicity is not consider a key factor or a characteristic that provides enough information to judge criminal behavior. The culture of honor deeply rooted in American history and the use of violence, particularly the in the southern regions of the U.S., and the racial associations of violent behavior (see Nisbett & Cohen, 1996).

Future Research

The gendered nature of the results is one area for future investigation. Adding gender to the response categories, to determine if racialization of crime is not only different by race but also gender, would allow us to explore if criminalization extends beyond the offender's race. It is not clear from the results if the respondents were picturing males or females as the offender presented in each question. While males are more frequently criminal offenders than females, we cannot make the assumption that males were the focus of respondents' racialization. It would also be interesting to explore whether there are culture of violence differences between U.S. citizens and non-citizens

in this northern region of the U.S., where the study was conducted, as typically the use of violence as a means of protection or response to disrespect is stronger among southern samples (Nisbett, 1993, but see Anderson, 1999). Another area of exploration could involve understanding why non-citizens are not racializing crimes. It may be because they have no knowledge about the crime trends in the U.S., and perhaps they prefer to respond in a nonjudgmental way. Future studies could examine whether exposure to historical influences of violence residents of the U.S. have encountered over time and more recently in the media influence racial perceptions of criminality.

Limitations

When reviewing the results of this thesis it is important to consider that this study had some limitations. First, the study does not take into account the specific cultural underpinnings of the home countries of the non-U.S. citizen respondents that might create different influences among this international group (e.g. strong patriarchal cultures, different gender roles, contemporary perceptions about crime). The process of how the consequences of colonialism develop in each country or region can be different and might be shared or not with what happened in the U.S. (Gabbidon, 2010). Therefore, it is important to consider that another external factor could be modifying the results; in fact, the interracial contact was not significant in this study suggesting it may not influence racialization of crime as expected in this study.

Second, the two well-studied mediators of racial prejudice that were included in this project –contact theory and influence of media- were not significant. Perhaps, these two were not addressed in a correct manner in this study and that is why these were not predictors in the models. Therefore, adding indicators that are more specific or narrowing

the exploration to specific sources might improve future research. Third, it is important to consider an external influence that might be affecting the results and is the location of where this project was done. This campus might be place in a region of the U.S. that is characterized by traditional and conservative values that can influence my results.

Finally, the use of a web-based survey could contribute to the low response rate compared to other methods of data collection (e.g., telephone, in-person surveys). Dillman (2000) highlights the increased use and reliance on web-based surveys as a methodological advance. The use of a web-based survey, for a population of students, might be a more appropriate means of gathering information given students' increased reliance on electronics and exposure to web-based instruction on a college campus. A more in-depth discussion with respondents would provide participants an opportunity to explain their answers related to offending perceptions and allow for more probing into respondent histories and experiences with colonialism, culture of violence, and use of media in the U.S.

Conclusions

Crime is a social problem often examined through the lens of race and crime. For example, fear of crime, neighborhood safety, official reports, death at the hands of law enforcement, traffic stops or airport profiling have been studied from a racialized perspective (Alergia, 2014; Case, 2008; Chiricos & Eschholz, 2002; Delsol, 2015; Dovidio, Kawakami, & Gaertner, 2002; Higgins & Gabbidon, 2015; Hughey, 2015; Unnever & Cullen, 2012; Warren & Farrell, 2009; Welch, 2007; Wu, 2014). The literature clearly demonstrates the important role of race/ethnicity in the administration of criminal justice and perceptions of criminality, while the influence of citizenship remains

less clear. The current study included race/ethnicity while also examining the role of citizenship status as it relates to racialization of criminality. The central mediator analyzed in this thesis was citizenship status, U.S. citizen or non-U.S. citizen, and analyses tested whether it was a predictor of the racialization of criminal behavior, particularly murder. Despite the limitations of the study, the findings suggest citizenship may influence the relationship between race/ethnicity and perceived criminality. For policy implications, considering the setting in which this project was done, some programming or event that improves cultural competence and tolerance among college students could be beneficial and perhaps reduce racial prejudice. In conclusion, this thesis found that citizenship status and gender could be considered predictors of the racialization of the crime of murder.

Tables

Table 4-14. Correlation matrix of eight predictors (N=678).

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|------------------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|---------|-------|------|---|
| 1. Gender | - | | | | | | | |
| 2. Age | -.004 | - | | | | | | |
| 3. Race/Ethnicity | .039 | -.136** | - | | | | | |
| 4. Academic | .095* | .544** | -.048 | - | | | | |
| 5. Citizenship | -.044 | -.061 | .523** | .042 | - | | | |
| 6. Parents | -.015 | .135** | -.737** | .052 | -.581** | - | | |
| 7. Social Media | .195** | -.186** | .123** | -.070 | .106** | -.074 | - | |
| 8. Interracial Contact | -.008 | -.062 | .088* | -.046 | -.093* | -.048 | .013 | - |

Table 4-15. Results of *t*-test for Murder and seven predictors for the Color-Blind recode.

| | <i>t</i> | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference |
|---------------------|----------|-----|-----------------|-----------------|
| Gender | 80.968 | 707 | .000 | 1.521 |
| Age | 78.142 | 728 | .000 | 1.244 |
| Academic | 12.980 | 728 | .000 | .188 |
| Citizenship | 11.680 | 726 | .000 | .158 |
| Parents | 35.984 | 724 | .000 | .641 |
| Social Media | 39.438 | 697 | .000 | .691 |
| Interracial Contact | 60.294 | 696 | .000 | .839 |

Table 4-16. Results of one-way ANOVA between Murder and Race/Ethnicity, Color-Blind recode.

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Between Groups | 7.904 | 1 | 7.904 | 6.690 | .010 |
| Within Groups | 795.112 | 673 | 1.181 | | |
| Total | 803.016 | 674 | | | |

Table 4-18. Results of *t*-test for Murder and seven predictors for the Racialization of Crime dataset.

| | <i>t</i> | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference |
|---------------------|----------|-----|-----------------|-----------------|
| Gender | 80.968 | 707 | .000 | 1.521 |
| Age | 78.142 | 728 | .000 | 1.244 |
| Academic | 12.980 | 728 | .000 | .188 |
| Citizenship | 11.680 | 726 | .000 | .158 |
| Parents | 35.984 | 724 | .000 | .641 |
| Social Media | 39.438 | 697 | .000 | .691 |
| Interracial Contact | 60.294 | 696 | .000 | .839 |

Table 4-19. Results of one-way ANOVA between Murder and Race/Ethnicity, Racialization of Crime dataset.

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Between Groups | 6.674 | 1 | 6.674 | 5.640 | .018 |
| Within Groups | 796.343 | 673 | 1.183 | | |
| Total | 803.016 | 674 | | | |

Appendix A

Federal Bureau of Investigation, Uniform Crime Reports, arrests on 2013 by Race: White, Black, Asian, and Other

| Offense Charged | White | | Black | | Asian | | Other** | |
|--|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| | Total | % | Total | % | Total | % | Total | % |
| Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter | 3,799 | 45% | 4,379 | 52% | 101 | 1.2% | 104 | 1.2% |
| Rape ³ | 8,946 | 66% | 4,229 | 31% | 173 | 1.3% | 167 | 1.2% |
| Robbery | 32,945 | 42% | 44,271 | 56% | 649 | 0.8% | 673 | 0.9% |
| Aggravated assault | 183,092 | 63% | 98,748 | 34% | 4,423 | 1.5% | 4,768 | 1.6% |
| Burglary | 136,990 | 68% | 61,709 | 30% | 2,196 | 1.1% | 2,194 | 1.1% |
| Larceny-theft | 677,173 | 68% | 284,358 | 29% | 12,605 | 1.3% | 16,800 | 1.7% |
| Motor vehicle theft | 34,864 | 67% | 15,960 | 31% | 725 | 1.4% | 758 | 1.4% |
| Arson | 6,198 | 74% | 1,925 | 23% | 107 | 1.3% | 134 | 1.6% |
| Violent crime | 228,782 | 58% | 151,627 | 39% | 5,346 | 1.4% | 5,712 | 1.5% |
| Property crime | 855,225 | 68% | 363,952 | 29% | 15,633 | 1.2% | 19,886 | 1.6% |
| Other assaults | 573,546 | 65% | 283,357 | 32% | 9,717 | 1.1% | 14,466 | 1.6% |
| Forgery and counterfeiting | 31,208 | 64% | 16,375 | 34% | 677 | 1.4% | 321 | 0.7% |
| Fraud | 74,682 | 66% | 35,958 | 32% | 1,094 | 1.0% | 1,186 | 1.1% |
| Embezzlement | 7,882 | 63% | 4,386 | 35% | 207 | 1.6% | 99 | 0.8% |
| Stolen property; buying, receiving, possessing | 50,237 | 67% | 22,687 | 30% | 862 | 1.2% | 755 | 1.0% |
| Vandalism | 113,842 | 71% | 42,566 | 26% | 1,638 | 1.0% | 3,032 | 1.9% |
| Weapons; carrying, possessing, etc. | 65,317 | 58% | 44,671 | 40% | 1,251 | 1.1% | 989 | 0.9% |
| Prostitution and commercialized vice | 22,666 | 54% | 17,378 | 41% | 1,492 | 3.6% | 410 | 1.0% |
| Sex offenses (except rape and prostitution) | 33,695 | 72% | 11,462 | 25% | 744 | 1.6% | 652 | 1.4% |
| Drug abuse violations | 815,181 | 68% | 365,785 | 30% | 12,930 | 1.1% | 10,266 | 0.9% |
| Gambling | 1,433 | 28% | 3,362 | 67% | 226 | 4.5% | 34 | 0.7% |
| Offenses against the family and children | 51,017 | 65% | 25,519 | 33% | 511 | 0.7% | 1,418 | 1.8% |
| Driving under the influence | 766,440 | 84% | 113,928 | 13% | 16,831 | 1.8% | 13,271 | 1.5% |
| Liquor laws | 222,201 | 80% | 40,665 | 15% | 3,672 | 1.3% | 10,906 | 3.9% |
| Drunkenness | 288,146 | 81% | 56,885 | 16% | 3,550 | 1.0% | 7,846 | 2.2% |
| Disorderly conduct | 231,604 | 62% | 129,782 | 35% | 2,775 | 0.7% | 8,041 | 2.2% |
| Vagrancy | 13,732 | 64% | 6,802 | 32% | 222 | 1.0% | 598 | 2.8% |
| All other offenses (except traffic) | 1,741,855 | 67% | 790,854 | 30% | 25,090 | 1.0% | 45,140 | 1.7% |
| Suspicion | 499 | 61% | 303 | 37% | 11 | 1.3% | 12 | 1.5% |
| Curfew and loitering law violations | 25,007 | 53% | 21,351 | 45% | 630 | 1.3% | 634 | 1.3% |
| TOTAL | 7,298,204 | 68.5% | 3,065,234 | 28.8% | 126,088 | 1.2% | 171,272 | 1.6% |

Appendix B

Arrests on 2013 by Ethnicity: Hispanic/Latino and Non-Hispanic/Latino.

| <i>Offense charged</i> | <i>Hispanic/Latino</i> | | <i>Non-Hispanic/ Latino</i> | | <i>Total</i> |
|--|------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|--------------|------------------|
| | Total | % | Total | % | |
| Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter | 1,052 | 22% | 3,798 | 78% | 4,850 |
| Rape | 2,006 | 21% | 7,665 | 79% | 9,671 |
| Robbery | 8,481 | 20% | 34,994 | 81% | 43,475 |
| Aggravated assault | 43,604 | 24% | 135,213 | 76% | 178,817 |
| Burglary | 24,035 | 20% | 96,632 | 80% | 120,667 |
| Larceny-theft | 62,954 | 13% | 432,207 | 87% | 495,161 |
| Motor vehicle theft | 8,203 | 26% | 23,252 | 74% | 31,455 |
| Arson | 661 | 16% | 3,470 | 84% | 4,131 |
| Violent crime | 55,143 | 23% | 181,670 | 77% | 236,813 |
| Property crime | 95,853 | 15% | 555,561 | 85% | 651,414 |
| Other assaults | 65,939 | 15% | 387,806 | 86% | 453,745 |
| Forgery and counterfeiting | 3,864 | 15% | 22,136 | 85% | 26,000 |
| Fraud | 5,323 | 9% | 53,032 | 91% | 58,355 |
| Embezzlement | 721 | 10% | 6,659 | 90% | 7,380 |
| Stolen property; buying, receiving, possessing | 9,990 | 23% | 33,522 | 77% | 43,512 |
| Vandalism | 15,173 | 18% | 67,936 | 82% | 83,109 |
| Weapons; carrying, possessing, etc. | 15,282 | 26% | 44,305 | 74% | 59,587 |
| Prostitution and commercialized vice | 3,801 | 18% | 17,709 | 82% | 21,510 |
| Sex offenses (except rape and prostitution) | 6,065 | 27% | 16,100 | 73% | 22,165 |
| Drug abuse violations | 118,827 | 19% | 509,421 | 81% | 628,248 |
| Gambling | 276 | 19% | 1,175 | 81% | 1,451 |
| Offenses against the family and children | 2,509 | 6.2% | 37,907 | 94% | 40,416 |
| Driving under the influence | 106,377 | 21% | 399,411 | 79% | 505,788 |
| Liquor laws | 18,692 | 13% | 128,726 | 87% | 147,418 |
| Drunkenness | 44,007 | 17% | 210,201 | 83% | 254,208 |
| Disorderly conduct | 20,110 | 11% | 171,005 | 90% | 191,115 |
| Vagrancy | 1,728 | 14% | 10,242 | 86% | 11,970 |
| All other offenses (except traffic) | 204,652 | 15% | 1,132,423 | 85% | 1,337,075 |
| Suspicion | 6 | 4.6% | 124 | 95% | 130 |
| Curfew and loitering law violations | 5,593 | 17% | 26,529 | 83% | 32,122 |
| TOTAL | 950,927 | 16.7% | 4,750,831 | 83.3% | 5,701,758 |

Appendix C

Percentages by Race and Ethnicity of 2010 and 2015 Census in the United States

| Race/Ethnicity | Percentage |
|--|------------|
| White alone, percent, July 1, 2015 | 77.1% |
| White alone, percent, April 1, 2010 | 72.4% |
| Black or African American alone, percent, July 1, 2015 | 13.3% |
| Black or African American alone, percent, April 1, 2010 | 12.6% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone, percent, July 1, 2015 | 1.2% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone, percent, April 1, 2010 | 0.9% |
| Asian alone, percent, July 1, 2015 | 5.6% |
| Asian alone, percent, April 1, 2010 | 4.8% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone, percent, July 1, 2015 | 0.2% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone, percent, April 1, 2010 | 0.2% |
| Two or More Races, percent, July 1, 2015 | 2.6% |
| Two or More Races, percent, April 1, 2010 | 2.9% |
| Hispanic or Latino, percent, July 1, 2015 | 17.6% |
| Hispanic or Latino, percent, April 1, 2010 | 16.3% |
| White alone, not Hispanic or Latino, percent, July 1, 2015 | 61.6% |
| White alone, not Hispanic or Latino, percent, April 1, 2010 | 63.7% |

Appendix D

Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, Fall 2016, Penn State Harrisburg

| Race/Ethnicity | Population | Percentage |
|----------------------------------|------------|------------|
| White | 2,872 | 56.9% |
| Black / African American | 465 | 9.2% |
| Asian | 420 | 8.3% |
| Hispanic/Latino | 309 | 6.1% |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | 6 | 0.1% |
| American Indian/ Alaska Native | 6 | 0.1% |
| Two/More Races | 129 | 2.6% |
| International | 716 | 14.2% |
| TOTAL | 5,046 | |

Appendix E

Online Survey Questions

- 1) What is your gender?
 - Male
 - Female
 - LGBTQIA+
 - I do not wish to disclose

- 2) What is your age?
(Dropdown list of options, from “18” to “40 or more”)

- 3) Which race/ethnicity best describes you?
 - White / Caucasian
 - Black / African American
 - Asian
 - Latino / Hispanic
 - Middle Eastern
 - Other (please specify)

- 4) What is your academic standing?
 - Undergraduate
 - Graduate

- 5) In which semester of your studies are you?
(dropdown list of options, from “1” to “17 or more”)

- 6) Which of the following describes your current status?
 - U.S. Citizen**
(Those who were born in this country, born abroad but raised in the U.S., permanent residents, those who have a green card or were born abroad but are now legal citizens of the U.S.)
 - Non-U.S. Citizen**
(Currently on a visa -probably F1 or J1 for students-, were born and raised with traditions and a culture different from the one of the U.S.)

- 7) How many years and/or months have you been in the United States under this status?***
(approximately)
Number of Years:
Number of Months:

- 8) Were both of your parents born in the United States?
 - Yes
 - No

- 9) In the United States, which race/ethnicity do you most associate with **domestic violence**:

(Violence between spouses, or spousal abuse but can also include cohabitants and non-married intimate partners.)

- White / Caucasian
- Black / African American
- Asian
- Latino / Hispanic
- Middle Eastern
- Other
- None of above

10) In the United States, which race/ethnicity do you most associate with **property crimes:**

(Household burglary, motor vehicle theft and property theft)

- White / Caucasian
- Black / African American
- Asian
- Latino / Hispanic
- Middle Eastern
- Other
- None of above

11) In the United States, which race/ethnicity do you most associate with **white-collar crimes:**

(Non-violent crimes committed through deceptive practices, for the purpose of financial gain)

- White / Caucasian
- Black / African American
- Asian
- Latino / Hispanic
- Middle Eastern
- Other
- None of above

12) In the United States, which race/ethnicity do you most associate with **drug-related crimes:**

(Violations of laws prohibiting or regulating the possession, distribution, or manufacture of illegal drugs. Drug's pharmacologic effects can contribute and influence the crime per SE)

- White / Caucasian
- Black / African American
- Asian
- Latino / Hispanic
- Middle Eastern
- Other
- None of above

13) In the United States, which race/ethnicity do you most associate with **alcohol-related crimes:**

(Violations of laws caused by the effects of alcohol, which contributes and influences the crime. Can include drunkenness offenses for driving with excess alcohol.)

- White / Caucasian
- Black/ African-American

- Asian
- Latino / Hispanic
- Middle Eastern
- Other
- None of above

14) In the United States, which race/ethnicity do you most associate with **sexual violent crimes:**

(Any sexual act or attempt to obtain a sexual act by violence or coercion, unwanted sexual comments or advances, acts to traffic a person or acts directed against a person's sexuality, regardless of the relationship to the victim. Includes rape, sexual harassment, sexual assault, sexual exploitation, elder abuse, military rape, multiple-perpetrator sexual assault, among others.)

- White / Caucasian
- Black / African American
- Asian
- Latino / Hispanic
- Middle Eastern
- Other
- None of above

15) In the United States, which race/ethnicity do you most associate with **cyber-crime:**

(Spyware, adware, hacking, phishing, spoofing, ping, port scanning, Computer viruses, electronic vandalism or sabotage, embezzlement, fraud, theft of intellectual property, and theft of personal or financial data)

- White / Caucasian
- Black / African American
- Asian
- Latino / Hispanic
- Middle Eastern
- Other
- None of above

16) In the United States, which race/ethnicity do you most associate with **terrorism:**

(Premeditated, politically motivated, violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets. Can involve citizens of more than one country.)

- White / Caucasian
- Black / African American
- Asian
- Latino / Hispanic
- Middle Eastern
- Other
- None of above

17) In the United States, which race/ethnicity do you most associate with **murder**:

(Intentionally causing the death of another person without extreme provocation or legal justification OR causing the death of another while committing or attempting to commit another crime.)

- White / Caucasian
- Black / African American
- Asian
- Latino / Hispanic
- Middle Eastern
- Other
- None of above

18) Which of the following is your **primary** source to learn about criminal events?

- U.S. news or newspapers
- International news or newspapers
- TV shows
- Family or Friends
- Social media (e.g. Facebook, Twitter)

19) How frequent do you use this source?

Very frequently- Somewhat frequently- Occasionally- Somewhat infrequently- Very infrequently

20) To stay aware of the current **criminal events**, do you hear/watch/read **U.S.** news or newspapers?

- Yes
- No

21) To stay aware of the current **criminal events**, do you hear/watch/read **international** news or newspapers?

- Yes
- No

22) To stay aware of the current **criminal events**, do you talk to family or friends?

- Yes
- No

23) To stay aware of the current **criminal events**, do you use social media (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, etc.)?

- Yes
- No

24) Do you think using these sources may have influenced all your previous answers?

Strongly Disagree – Disagree – Agree - Strongly Agree

25) Do you have a meaningful, close, and positive relationship with someone who belongs to a different race/ethnicity than your own? (e.g. family members, close friends, romantic partner, roommate)

- Yes
- No

26) How frequent is the contact you have in these relationships?

Very frequently - Somewhat frequently - Occasionally - Somewhat infrequently - Very infrequently

27) Do you avoid any kind of relationship with people who belongs to a different race/ethnicity than your own?

Never - Rarely - Sometimes - Always

28) Do you think the answers from students who are U.S. citizens and non-U.S. citizens are going to be different?

- Yes
- No

Appendix F

Recruitment material

“I am writing to you to request your participation in a brief survey about race, ethnicity and crime. As you may recall today’s news and social media are concentrating great amount of their time to talk about racial discrimination from different agencies of the criminal justice system toward civilians. As a graduate student of the Criminal Justice program, my thesis examines this very specific topic: Racial Profiling. However, my thesis’ goal is not to uncover if the criminal justice system is racially profiling or not. My objective is to examine how “regular” non-law enforcement people perceive this problem. For this reason, you are invited to take part in a research study of the perceptions of criminality and race and ethnicity. A total of 25 questions will be asked. No essay questions are included. Completing the survey will take you about 15 minutes of your time. In gratitude for your participation, you will be entered into a random drawing for a LionCash Gift Card of \$20.00. Taking part in this study is completely voluntary. If

you choose to be in the study you can withdraw at any time without any consequences. There are no anticipated risks to you if you participate in this study, beyond those encountered in everyday life. Confidentiality will be maintained to the degree permitted by the technology used, and your name and email address will not be linked to your survey responses. All the data collected will be accessed and analyzed only by the study team, and will be kept on a password protected computer. Any report or articles written based on this research that is made available to the public will not include your name or any other individual information by which you could be identified. If you have any questions about the study please feel free to contact Daniela Barberi (dwb5473@psu.edu), or Dr. Eileen M. Ahlin (ema105@psu.edu). Please follow the link below to start the survey.”

References

- Alegria, S. (2014). Constructing racial difference through group talk: An analysis of White focus groups' discussion of Racial Profiling. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 37(2), 241-260.
- Anderson, E. (1999). *Code of the Street*. New York: Norton.
- Awad, G. H., Cokley, K., & Ravitch, J. (2005). Attitudes toward affirmative action: A comparison of color-blind versus modern racist attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 35(7), 1384-1399.
- Barot, R., & Bird, J. (2001). Racialization: The genealogy and critique of a concept. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24(4), 601-618.
- Berns, N. (2004). *Framing the victim: Domestic violence, media, and social problems*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Bjornstrom E.E., Kaufman, R.L, Peterson, R.D., & Slater, M.D. (2010). Race and ethnic representations of lawbreakers and victims in crime news: A national study of television coverage. *Social Problems*, 57(2), 269–293.
- Bohmert, M. N., & DeMaris, A. (2015). Interracial friendship and the trajectory of prominority attitudes: Assessing intergroup contact theory. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 18(2), 225-240.
- Bonilla-Silva, E., Goar, C., & Embrick, D. G. (2006). When Whites flock together: The social psychology of White habitus. *Critical Sociology*, 32(2-3), 229-253.
- Brewer, R. M., & Heitzeg, N. A. (2008). The racialization of crime and punishment: Criminal justice, color-blind racism, and the political economy of the prison industrial complex. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51(5), 625-644.
- Buerger, M. E., & Farrell, A. (2002). The evidence of racial profiling: Interpreting documented and unofficial sources. *Police Quarterly*, 5(3), 272-305.

- Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS). Drugs and crime facts, 1989. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Case, P. F. (2008). The relationship of race and criminal behavior: Challenging cultural explanations for a structural problem. *Critical Dociology*, 34(2), 213-238.
- Chiricos, T., & Eschholz, S. (2002). The racial and ethnic typification of crime and the criminal typification of race and ethnicity in local television news. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 39(4), 400-420.
- Covington, J. (1995). Racial classification in criminology: The reproduction of racialized crime. *Sociological Forum*, 10(4) 547-568).
- Cullen, F. T., Agnew, R. & Wilcox, P. (2014). *Criminology Theory: Past to Present Essential Readings*. Oxford University Press.
- Delsol, R. (2015). Racial profiling. *Criminal Justice Matters*, 101(1), 34-35.
- Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56(1), 5-17.
- Dixon, J. C., & Rosenbaum, M. S. (2004). Nice to know you? Testing contact, cultural, and group threat theories of anti-black and anti-Hispanic stereotypes. *Social Science Quarterly*, 85(2), 257-280.
- Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., & Gaertner, S. L. (2002). Implicit and explicit prejudice and interracial interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(1), 62-68.
- Drakulich, K. M. (2012). Strangers, neighbors, and race a contact model of stereotypes and racial anxieties about crime. *Race and Justice*, 2(4), 322-355.

- Eberhardt, J. L., Dasgupta, N., & Banaszynski, T. L. (2003). Believing is seeing: The effects of racial labels and implicit beliefs on face perception. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(3), 360-370.
- Gabbidon, S. L. (2010). *Race, ethnicity, crime, and justice: An international dilemma*. Sage Publications.
- Gabbidon, S. L. (2015). *Criminological perspectives on race and crime*. Routledge.
- Gabbidon, S. L., Higgins, G. E., & Nelson, M. (2011). Public support for Racial Profiling in airports: Results from a statewide poll. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 23(2) 254-269.
- Galinsky, A. D., & Moskowitz, G. B. (2000). Perspective-taking: decreasing stereotype expression, stereotype accessibility, and in-group favoritism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(4), 708-724.
- Green, E. G., Staerkle, C., & Sears, D. O. (2006). Symbolic racism and Whites' attitudes towards punitive and preventive crime policies. *Law and Human Behavior*, 30(4), 435-454.
- Greenfeld, L. A. (1998). Alcohol and crime: An analysis of national data on the prevalence of alcohol involvement in crime. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Higgins, G. E. & Gabbidon, S. L. (2015) Revisiting the generality of public opinion on Racial Profiling: a statewide study of White perceptions. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 38(4), 491-507.
- Hughey, M. W. (2015). The five I's of five-O: Racial ideologies, institutions, interests, identities, and interactions of police violence. *Critical Sociology*, 41 (6), 857-871.
- Johnson, J. (2011). Mass incarceration: A contemporary mechanism of racialization in the United States. *Gonz. Law Review*, 47, 301-318.

- Johnson, J. D., Adams, M. S., Hall, W., & Ashburn, L. (1997). Race, media, and violence: Differential racial effects of exposure to violent news stories. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 19*(1), 81-90.
- Kamalu, N. C. (2016). African Americans and racial profiling by us law enforcement: An analysis of police traffic stops and searches of motorists in Nebraska, 2002–2007. *African Journal of Criminology and Justice Studies, 9*(1), 187-206.
- King, M. (2015). The ‘knockout game’: moral panic and the politics of White victimhood. *Race & Class, 56*(4), 85-94.
- Knepper, P. (2008). Rethinking the racialization of crime: the significance of black firsts. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 31*(3), 503-523.
- Latessa, E. J. & Holsinger, A. (2016). *Correctional contexts: Contemporary and classical readings*. Oxford University Press.
- Lee, J. & Gibbs, J. (2015). Race and attitudes toward police: The mediating effect of social distance. *Policing an International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 38*(2), 314 – 332.
- Lee, S. T., & Thien, N. P. (2014). Media, race and crime: Racial perceptions and criminal culpability in a multiracial national context. *International Communication Gazette, 77*(1), 24-50.
- Lyon, R. (2008). Media, race, crime and the punishment: Re-framing stereotypes in crime and human rights issues. *DePaul L. Review, 58*, 741-758.
- Mancini, C., Mears, D. P., Stewart, E. A., Beaver, K. M., & Pickett, J. T. (2012). Whites' perceptions about black criminality: A closer look at the contact hypothesis. *Crime & Delinquency, 61*(7), 996-1022.

- Markus, H. R. (2008). Pride, prejudice, and ambivalence: toward a unified theory of race and ethnicity. *American Psychologist*, 63(8), 651-670.
- Marshall, I. H. (1997). *Minorities, migrants, and crime: Diversity and similarity across Europe and the United States*. Sage Publications.
- Martin, J. N., Trego, A. B., & Nakayama, T. K. (2010). College students' racial attitudes and friendship diversity. *The Howard Journal of Communications*, 21(2), 97-118.
- Mastro, D., Lapinski, M. K., Kopacz, M. A., & Behm-Morawitz, E. (2009). The influence of exposure to depictions of race and crime in TV news on viewer's social judgments. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 53(4), 615-635.
- Metcalfe, C., Pickett, J. T., & Mancini, C. (2015). Using path analysis to explain racialized support for punitive delinquency policies. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 31(4), 699-725.
- Nisbett, R. E. (1993). Violence and US regional culture. *American Psychologist*, 48(4), 441.
- Nisbett, R. E., & Cohen, D. (1996). *Culture of honor: The psychology of violence in the south*. Westview Press.
- Oliver, M. B., Jackson, R. L., Moses, N. N., & Dangerfield, C. L. (2004). The face of crime: viewers' memory of race-related facial features of individuals pictured in the news. *Journal of Communication*, 54(1), 88-104.
- Onwudiwe, I. (2005). Defining terrorism, racial profiling and the demonisation of Arabs and Muslims in the USA. *Safer Communities*, 4(2), 4-11.
- Ortiz, M., & Harwood, J. (2013). The subjective group dynamics of inter-and intragroup criminality in the news the role of prior television news viewing as a moderator. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 90(3), 540-558.

- Peffley, M., & Hurwitz, J. (2002). The racial components of “race-neutral” crime policy attitudes. *Political Psychology, 23*(1), 59-75.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(5), 751.
- Phillips, C., & Bowling, B. (2003). Racism, ethnicity and criminology. Developing minority perspectives. *British Journal of Criminology, 43*(2), 269-290.
- Quick Facts, United States Census Bureau. (2015). Retrieved from the URL on February, 2017: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045216/00>
- Quillian, L., & Pager, D. (2001). Black neighbors, higher crime? The role of racial stereotypes in evaluations of neighborhood crime. *American Journal of Sociology, 107*(3), 717-767.
- Rantala, R. R. (2008). Cybercrime against businesses, 2005. *Bureau of Justice Statistics (report no. NCJ 221943)*, 1-20.
- Saeed, A. (2007). Media, racism and Islamophobia: The representation of Islam and Muslims in the media. *Sociology Compass, 1*(2), 443-462.
- Saperstein, A., Penner, A. M., & Kizer, J. M. (2014). The criminal justice system and the racialization of perceptions. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 651*(1), 104-121.
- Schildkraut, D. J. (2009). The dynamics of public opinion on ethnic profiling after 9/11 results from a survey experiment. *American Behavioral Scientist, 53*(1), 61-79.
- Sewpaul, V. (2013). Inscribed in our blood challenging the ideology of sexism and racism. *Affilia, 28*(2), 116-125.
- Shook, N. J., & Fazio, R. H. (2008). Interracial roommate relationships an experimental field-test of the contact hypothesis. *Psychological Science, 19*(7), 717-723.

- Sigelman, L., & Welch, S. (1993). The contact hypothesis revisited: Black-White interaction and positive racial attitudes. *Social Forces*, 71(3), 781-795.
- Steele, C. M. (2010). *Whistling Vivaldi: and other clues to how stereotypes affect us*. Norton & Company.
- Sulton, A. T. (1994). *African American Perspectives on Crime Causation*. Criminal Justice Administration, and Crime Prevention.
- Sutton, R. M., & Farrall, S. (2005). Gender, socially desirable responding and the fear of crime are women really more anxious about crime?. *British Journal of Criminology*, 45(2), 212-224.
- Talaska, C. A., Fiske, S. T., & Chaiken, S. (2008). Legitimizing racial discrimination: Emotions, not beliefs, best predict discrimination in a meta-analysis. *Social Justice Research*, 21(3), 263-296.
- Tatum, B. L. (2000). *Crime, violence and minority youths*. Ashgate Pub Limited.
- Truman, J. L., & Planty, M. (2015). Criminal victimization, 2011. *Bureau of Justice Statistics (report no. NCJ 239437)*, 1-24.
- Unnever, J. D., & Cullen, F. T. (2012). White perceptions 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.
- Warren, P. Y., & Farrell, A. (2009). The environmental context of Racial Profiling. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 623(1), 52-63.
- Weaver, C. N. (2007). The effects of contact on the prejudice between Hispanics and non-Hispanic Whites in the United States. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 29(2), 254-274.

Welch, K. (2007). Black criminal stereotypes and Racial Profiling. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 23(3), 276-288.

Wu, Y. (2014) Race/ethnicity and perceptions of the police: a comparison of White, Black, Asian and Hispanic Americans. *Policing and Society*, 24(2), 135-157.

Zhou, M. (1997). Segmented assimilation: Issues, controversies, and recent research on the new second generation. *International Migration Review*, 975-1008.