University of Nevada, Reno

Relationship between Anticipatory Guilt and Self-Affirmation on Support for Questionable Crime Control Policies: A comparison of gender and student/community samples

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Art in Criminal Justice

by

Shelby Forsythe

Dr. Monica Miller/Thesis Advisor

May 2015

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

We recommend that the thesis
prepared under our supervision by

SHELBY FORSYTHE

Entitled

Relationship Between Anticipatory Guilt And Self-Affirmation On Support For Questionable Crime Control Policies: A Comparison Of Gender And Student/Community Samples

be accepted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Monica Miller, Advisor

Timothy Griffin, Committee Member

Mariah Evans, Graduate School Representative

David W. Zeh, Ph.D., Dean, Graduate School

May, 2015

Abstract

Recently, crime control policies have been developed in response to moral panics after rare, horrific crimes (e.g., child abduction-murder) that are difficult to predict and combat. Although these policies are popular with the public, policymakers, and victims' families, research suggests that some policies are "Crime Control Theater": they appear to address crime, but in reality rarely work and could have negative consequences (Griffin & Miller, 2008). Researchers have investigated why people continue to support these policies, but have not studied how guilt and self-affirmation relate to support. This experiment examined how self-affirmation and anticipatory guilt affect participants' support (e.g., belief the policy works, willingness to act to demonstrate support) toward one questionable policy (i.e. a law requiring students to have a microchip in their identification cards that would allow them to be tracked by GPS). While there were no significant effects for manipulated self-affirmation or guilt on an individual's support, measurements of these variables did predict support. Also, individuals with high self-esteem showed significantly more support for the policy than individuals with low self-esteem. Community members were more supportive of the policy than students. Females were more likely than males to support the policy. Possibly, such policies are more relevant to the lives of older adults and females, leading them to be more supportive. These results revealed that people might support questionable crime control policies based on emotion and not logic. Implications for policy-making and educating the public are discussed.

Table of Contents

Introduction……………………………………………………………………..…………1

Crime Control Theater………………………………………………………..…...2

Self-Affirmation……………………………………………………………..……….....10

Self-Esteem……………………………………………………………………….…...13

Anticipatory Guilt……………………………………………………………...…15

Sampling………………………………………………………………………….…...19

Relevance……………………………………………………………………….….…..23

Research Design………………………………………………..…………………...29

Method………………………………………………………………………….……….30

Results……………………………………………………………….……………...36

Discussion……………………………………………………………….……………43

Conclusion……………………………………………………….…………………...55

List of Appendices

Appendix A – Rosenburg Self-Esteem Measure

Appendix B – Allport—Vernon—Linzey Values Measure (Self-Affirmation)

Appendix C – Allport—Vernon—Linzey Values Measure (No Self-Affirmation)

Appendix D – Fictional Crime Control Policy

Appendix E – Support Measure

Appendix F – Belief Measure

Appendix G – “Willingness to Act” Measure

Appendix H – Self-Affirmation Manipulation Check

Appendix I – Anticipatory Guilt Manipulation Check

List of Tables

Table 1 – Overall Means Table

Table 2 – Regression Model 1: Belief Measure

Table 3 – Means on Gender

Table 4 – Means on Population

Table 5 – Regression Model 2: Belief Measure

Table 6 – Regression Model 1: Support Measure

Table 7 – Regression Model 2: Support Measure

Table 8 – Regression Model 1: “Willingness to Act” Measure

Table 9 – Regression Model 2: “Willingness to Act” Measure

Table 10 – Summary Table

Relationship between Anticipatory Guilt and Self-Affirmation on Support for Questionable Crime Control Policies: A comparison of gender and student/community samples

Crime control policies that appear effective, when in reality are unlikely to be effective as designed, have been designated as crime control theater (CCT) (Griffin & Miller, 2008). Many of these questionable policies are designed to prevent heinous, unpredictable crimes perpetrated against innocent victims, who are generally children or females. For instance, AMBER Alert is designed to rescue abducted children before they become victims of sexual assault and/or murder. Another example is Megan's Law, aimed at preventing children from becoming victims of sexual assault by notifying the community of convicted sex offenders in the area and prohibiting offenders from living in certain areas. These policies, along with many others, all exemplify characteristics of crime control theater, as will be detailed below. They were implemented in response to a media frenzy and moral panic over rare but horrific crimes including child abduction, rape, and murder (Zgoba, 2004). Although these policies superficially appear to be adequate solutions, when examined more closely, some researchers have discovered that they are ineffective and might actually be counterproductive (Griffin & Miller, 2008).

While the study of why individuals support these policies is just beginning (Sicafuse & Miller, 2010), there currently are no studies at all on how individuals' own emotions and self-perceptions affect support toward crime control policies. This study investigated whether anticipatory guilt and self-affirmation (as manipulated) related to one's support for crime control theater policies. Self-reported guilt and self-regard were

investigated to see how they affected individuals' support. The study also compared community and student samples' support and investigated differences between female and male participants. Once the reasons behind the support are better understood, researchers can explore ways to encourage people to support the modification or removal of these questionable policies.

Crime Control Theater

Crime control theater (CCT) is a term that describes a policy response to crime that appears to be, but in fact is unlikely to be, effective crime control (Griffin & Miller, 2008). While many CCT policies created in response to control crime are popular and widely supported, when analyzed more carefully they either do not work, are based on faulty assumptions, and/or have unintended negative consequences.

Criteria

Researchers have developed the criteria needed for CCT polices (Hammond, Miller, & Griffin, 2010), and investigated psychological influences that might encourage an individual's support for a CCT policy (Sicafuse & Miller, 2010). These include: a reactionary response to moral panic, unquestioned acceptance and promotion, appeal to mythic narratives, and empirical failure.

Reactionary response to moral panic. CCT policies often are impulsive responses to heinous crimes committed against innocent victims, usually females and children (Hammond et al., 2010). These heinous crimes result in moral panics from the public (Zgoba, 2004). Moral panics are the result of an exaggerated fear developed from a topic containing a moral component, e.g. child safety (Ben-Yehuda, 2009). Moral panics cause public officials to hastily implement reactionary policies to fix this problem—usually in

response to a particularly well-publicized and horrific crime. These policies can be explained as a "socially constructed solution to a socially constructed problem" (Griffin & Miller, 2008, p.159). The crime category in question is so rare that it is, in fact, a "socially constructed problem".

Moral panics are not physical panics. Instead, they are characterized by actions focused on moral issues such as sexual abuse and child abduction (Ben-Yehuda, 2009). It is not so much a collective emotional state, but a societal reaction to a perceived threat to treasured possessions (e.g., children) or social values. Goode and Ben-Yehuda (2009) have suggested five indicators of a moral panic. The first, Volatility, means the panic appears and disappears quickly. Hostility is the antagonism toward the group blamed for the panic, (e.g., the perpetrator of the crime). Measurable Concern is the awareness that the behavior has a negative effect on society. An example of this would be sexual crimes committed against children; society does not condone this behavior and does not want it taking place in the community. Consensus refers to the widespread agreement that the threat is serious. The last indicator is Disproportionality. This means that the action (e.g. legislation, policy) taken is not proportionate to the actual threat.

Unquestioned acceptance and promotion. With moral panic driving support for development of these policies, it is easy for the policy to receive unquestioned acceptance and promotion (e.g., unanimous legislation vote) (Armstrong, Miller, & Griffin, in press; Hammond, et al., 2010). CCT policies allow government officials and the public to address the issue and feel as though they have created a solution to the problem, even though they have not (Sicafuse & Miller, 2012).

Appeal to mythic narratives. One of the many possible factors that lead the public

to unquestionably accept CCT policies is the public's perception that the policy is an effective remedy for crime (Hammond et al., 2010). Society takes on the role of protector for these helpless child victims. The public fears crimes involving child victims (Zgoba, 2004). An essential criterion of appealing to mythic narratives is an innocent victim and a morally devoid perpetrator (e.g., the abduction and killing of 6 year old Adam Walsh by serial killer Otis Toole). By supporting these policies, individuals of a community might feel like they are helping save children; that they are essentially "rescuers" (Hammond et al., 2010).

Empirical failure. Although CCT polices appear as a solution to the problem, and bring comfort to community members, they sometimes do not work, or do not work as intended (Hammond et al., 2010; Sicafuse & Miller, 2012). For example, the AMBER alert rarely returns children from threatening perpetrators, and instead typically returns them from apparently non-threatening perpetrators (Griffin, 2010). As detailed next, CCT policies are ineffective and can pose negative consequences.

Examples of Crime Control Theater Policies

Three strikes laws, AMBER alert, and Megan's law all exemplify CCT (Sicafuse & Miller, 2012). Three strikes laws, enacted in various jurisdictions between the years 1993 and 1997, mandated extended sentences (generally 25 years to life) for habitual offenders (Chen, 2008). These laws, intended to keep repeat offenders off the streets, have crowded prisons and have not been successful in decreasing crime (Chen, 2008). The moral panic over habitual offender sentencing followed the heinous murders of young victims Kimber Reynolds and Polly Klaas. Because their perpetrators had long rap sheets of previous violent convictions (Sze, 1994), the public dreaded habitual offenders,

giving three strikes unquestioned support. Because the creation of these laws meets all four criteria, it can be appropriately labeled CCT.

Another policy enacted after a child was victimized is the AMBER alert system. Named after a 9-year-old victim of an abduction and murder, the system was developed to help rescue abducted children by distributing abduction-related information to the public (http://www.amberalert.gov). These alerts can be received via radio, telephone, email, text message, electronic billboards, social media, and other means. With the "fast" information being distributed, the public can take on the role of the rescuer. In line with the CCT criteria, this policy was implemented in response to a horrifying crime perpetrated on a child victim. Communities went into a moral panics fearing that their children were not safe. The public has apparently accepted this policy without question, as they believed it was an effective solution to child abductions (Sicafuse & Miller, 2012). However, AMBER alert generally only works in cases with relatively low apparent risk or when it is arguably superfluous (Griffin & Miller, 2008). Griffin (2010) found that AMBER alerts commonly involved miscommunications or abduction of the child by a family member or individual who was not a threat. Very rarely do 'successful' AMBER alerts involve the abduction of a child by a complete stranger (situations for which the system was designed; Griffin, 2010), suggesting that the policy is essentially ineffective in meeting its original goals. As with the examples given above, Amber Alert meets all four criteria, and thus can be appropriately labeled CCT.

Megan's Law was established to prevent crimes against children by notifying the community of convicted sex offenders in the area and restricting their residence options. Like other CCT policies, Megan's law was developed following a horrifying crime

against an innocent child victim, leading the public into a moral panic. The public feared that sexual offenses committed by strangers were more prevalent than they actually are, leading to unquestioned support for Megan's Law. However, to date there is no evidence Megan's Law has been effective in reducing sexual re-offenses or reducing the number of child victimizations (Zgoba, Witt, Dalessandro, & Veysey, 2008). Similarly, other sex offender registration laws have virtually no effect on sex recidivism. In a study comparing two cohorts of Iowa sex- offenders prior to, and after the implementation of sex offender registration notification (SORN), it was found that the recidivism rate was essentially identical (Tewksbury & Jennings, 2010). Therefore, Megan's law might invoke "false security" to community residents.

Each of the mentioned policies has the characteristics needed to constitute CCT. They were implemented hastily due to a moral panic over a heinous crime, enjoy unquestioned support for their implementation, appeal to mythic narratives, and fail to accomplish what they were intended to accomplish. Regardless of the drawbacks and negative consequences associated with these CCT policies, they continue to enjoy apparently unquestioned support from the public.

Why Do People Support Crime Control Theater Policies?

CCT policies are often presented to the public in a way that they target the public's emotions and make individuals feel guilty if they choose not to support the policy (Sicafuse & Miller, 2010). Sicafuse and Miller (2010) explored social psychological influences in individuals' support for these CCT policies; specifically, they examined social cognitive processes and attitudes regarding public support.

Heuristics

When individuals make decisions or form judgments, they often rely on heuristics (Sicafuse & Miller, 2010). A heuristic is a "default" reasoning mechanism that allows individuals to solve a problem or make a judgment quickly (Kunda, 1999). There are two types of heuristics that are relevant to making judgments: the affect heuristic and the availability heuristic. The affect heuristic attributes to individuals' judgments that are influenced by an emotional state. When in a heightened emotional state, people are more likely to rely on highly salient images (e.g., photographs of a young victim and the grieving family) and narratives (as presented through newspaper articles and television reports) produced by the media than logic or concrete evidence normally used to make judgments (Kunda, 1999; Sicafuse & Miller, 2010; Zgoba, 2004). The availability heuristic encourages individuals to assume that easily recalled events are more common than they really are (Siegrist & Gutscher, 2006). The remembered images from the emotion-provoking stimuli (e.g., the photos, news report from a child abduction) encourage the individuals to believe that the event (e.g., child abduction) is a common occurrence.

Hindsight Bias

Hindsight bias occurs when individuals overestimate their ability to have predicted an outcome after they know the actual outcome (Hawkins & Hastie, 1990). It is often called the "I knew it all along" effect. When AMBER alerts result in the safe return of a child, they are generally sensationalized in the news (Griffin, 2010; Griffin & Miller, 2008). Individuals who have been following the case in the news might believe that they knew all along that the child be rescued by the AMBER alert (Sicafuse & Miller, 2010). This could make individuals confident in the system and makes them think the system is

more effective than it actually is. Extensive promotion of the system by public safety officials could very likely facilitate this (Griffin, 2010). This might also affect individuals' judgments in cases in which an alert was not issued and the child is still missing or was found murdered (Sicafuse & Miller, 2010). Individuals might feel that if an alert had been issued, the child would have been returned home safely.

Motivated Reasoning

Because individuals are motivated to reach a particular conclusion, they often conduct biased memory searches and misuse inferential rules (Sicafuse & Miller, 2010). Generally, individuals are motivated to reach a conclusion that confirms their pre-existing beliefs. This can be explained by the psychological phenomenon of confirmation bias, which is a tendency for individuals to seek out information that confirms their already held hypothesis and to disregard information that disconfirms their hypothesis (Nickerson, 1998). If an individual feels that a crime control policy is effective and should be maintained, that individual will be motivated to find information that confirms this held belief (Sicafuse & Miller, 2010). Individuals do not want to search for information that will contradict their support for a policy. Learning that a policy is ineffective might make them realize that they have little control over these heinous crimes.

Attitudes

Attitudes toward CCT policies are likely to be resistant to change (Sicafuse & Miller, 2010). These policies are likely developed because of fear appeals (Zgoba, 2004), which evoke strong attitudes toward the policy because of their foundation in emotion. These policies elicit strong emotions from people who feel sympathy toward the victim's

friends and family. Individuals might show their sympathy toward the victim by supporting the policy enacted to help prevent similar crimes.

In the last twenty years, the federal policies that have been implemented in response to child abductions have primarily targeted the stereotypical stranger abductions that only affect a very small portion of children (Muschert, Young-Spillers, & Carr, 2006). However, these policies remain widely supported and advocated, even for more common abductions such as abductions by a non-custodial parent (Sicafuse & Miller, 2010). Many of these policies are created in the aftermath of an unpredictable and heinous crime. Likely, people feel as though they have to “do something” to prevent these crimes, even if they are unlikely to work. Each of these social cognition factors: heuristics, hindsight bias, motivated reasoning, and attitudes affect individuals’ judgments and might play an important role in an individual’s support for a CCT policy (Sicafuse & Miller, 2010). An unstudied underlying reason that might explain why people support CCT policies is self-affirmation, to which the discussion will now turn.

Self-Affirmation

There are a number of psychological, sociological, and political reasons for the implementation and popularity of CCT policies (Sicafuse & Miller, 2010). One speculation is that CCT policies make individuals feel good (Sicafuse & Miller, 2012). Supporting the policy makes people feel like they are making a difference and supporting something that presumably helps prevent the victimization of innocent people: basically, it is good for the self-concept.

Self-affirmation is a psychological theory stating that people are motivated to maintain the integrity of the self (i.e., their morality) (Steele & Liu, 1983). When self-

integrity is threatened, it causes people to act in a way that helps restore their self-worth (i.e., self-esteem) (Steele, Spencer, & Lynch, 1993). Essentially, self-affirmations help individuals deal with information or events they perceive as threatening to their self-concept (i.e., their beliefs). For example, an individual who supports the AMBER alert might feel threatened if told the alert is essentially ineffective.

When presented with information that conflicts with individuals' already held beliefs, they experience a "cognitive dissonance". Festinger's (1957) theory of cognitive dissonance is described as the need for internal consistency following two inconsistent cognitions. Cognitions, which are mental thought processes acquiring knowledge and understanding, can become inconsistent when an individual learns of new information that contradicts previously held beliefs (Festinger, 1957). Because dissonance is an unpleasant feeling, individuals will strive to remove it. Common ways that individuals do this are by changing their beliefs or altering them to be consistent with the learned information. Therefore, an individual who feels dissonance when learning the AMBER alert is ineffective might stop supporting it. Self-affirmation theory states that affirming a valued aspect of a self-concept, whether it is related to the threat or not, helps individuals reduce dissonance (Aronson, Blanton, & Cooper 1995). The ease of affirming a valued aspect can depend on an individual's self-perception. Individuals with a "strong" self (i.e., they clearly know what they stand for) are able to effortlessly use self-maintenance strategies to avoid damage to their self-image. Self-affirming allows individuals to experience a rise in their self-esteem, making them more likely to accept new information (Aronson et al., 1995). Higher self-esteem can result in more openness.

Past Research and Predictions

When challenged with evidence that contradicts individuals' already held beliefs, they experience a threat to self that entails losing a source of self-esteem (Cohen, Aronson, & Steele, 2000). For example, a study that manipulated self-esteem through personality feedback found that low self-esteem participants were more responsive to self-evaluative feedback than high self-esteem individuals (Steele, Spencer, & Lynch, 1993). After facing a threat to their self-concept, individuals felt a drop in their self-esteem, making them more likely to affirm their self-adequacy any way they could. In this case, participants did so by responding to self-evaluating feedback.

For decades, cognitive dissonance researchers have investigated how individuals reduce dissonance (Aronson et al., 1995). One way people reduce this inconsistent information by affirming the self (Aronson, Cohen, & Steele, 2000). Through affirmation, individuals might experience increased feelings of self-clarity, which in turn causes them to be less concerned with cognitive dissonance. Adding a self-affirmation manipulation in between a dissonant act and an attitude measure can eliminate the initiation of dissonance by creating a self-justifying attitude (Galinsky, Stone, & Cooper, 2000; Steele & Liu, 1983). For example, Steel and Liu (1983) found that participants who completed a brief value measure after writing a counter attitudinal essay were able to eliminate dissonance-reducing attitude change when the value measure was self-relevant. The same value measure did not eliminate dissonant feelings when the value measure was not self-relevant. This is because the value measure could not reduce the intended importance of the dissonance-provoking inconsistency (Steel & Liu, 1983).

As applied to the current research, it is possible that individuals might support these ineffective policies because it reduces dissonance and affirms the self. For example,

individuals might support a policy aimed at protecting children from sexual abuse because they would feel negative emotions if they did not. By supporting the policy, they are able to get rid of anticipated dissonant feelings that would arise if they did not support the policy and are able to feel better about themselves. People might support the policy because it shows they oppose the perpetrators of these horrifying crimes, making them feel like good, righteous people, which raises their self-esteem. If individual's self-concepts are threatened, i.e. their self-esteem is lowered, they will be more likely to support a policy designed to protect innocent victims from horrible crimes because it will help them feel better about themselves and restore their self-concept. If individuals are given an opportunity to affirm the self, they might not support the CCT policy being proposed because their self-concept has already been bolstered.

People might also support crime control policies because they feel that "we have to do something" for these innocent victims. Because of this, individuals might experience dissonance (inconsistent cognitions) when their support for the policy is challenged. Self-affirmation allows an individual to justly evaluate information that would generally otherwise induce a defensive reaction (Correll, Spencer & Zana, 2004). For example, individuals who feel confident in themselves will be more open minded to opposing views than someone who is not confident. It is predicted that people who have the opportunity to self-affirm will be less likely to support the policy than those who did not have the opportunity, because they have already been able to bolster their self-concept. Individuals who are given the opportunity to self- affirm are expected to be less supportive of the CCT policy they read about in the study than those who are not given the opportunity to self-affirm. This follows past theory indicating that bias and resistance

are intermediate by identity-maintenance motives (Cohen et al., 2000).

Self-Esteem

While the interaction of self-esteem with self-affirmation will be investigawted, we will also test for a main effect of self-esteem on support. Self-esteem has been shown to coincide with self-affirmation, wherein individuals with high self-esteem generally resist compelling messages more than individuals with low self-esteem (Cohen et al., 2000). This is because individuals with high self-esteem tend to have more confidence in the validity of their beliefs (Cohen, 1959). In a research study investigating participants' feelings of dissonance after being stood-up by a friend, high self-esteem participants experienced less dissonance than low self-esteem participants (Nail, Masik, & Davis, 2003). This correlates with previous research findings that indicate that high self-esteem individuals can withstand threats better than low self-esteem individuals due to their greater supply of self-resources to make use of (Steele, 1988). In other words, they can help themselves without assistance from others.

It is hypothesized that people with high self-esteem will be more likely to have positive thoughts about themselves readily available, making them less likely to support the CCT policy. Low self-esteem people should not have these positive thought available, which will lead them to support the CCT policy to gain those positive thoughts. The effect for self-affirmation is expected to be qualified by an interaction with self-esteem. Specifically, self-affirmation will affect support for the policy, but only in participants with low self-esteem. This follows past findings, which indicate that individual differences in self-esteem resources can affect the affirmation process (Steele, Spencer, & Lynch, 1993).

Past research on self-esteem has produced mixed results on support. Low self-esteem has been linked to a variety of negative traits, such as depression and diminished life satisfaction (Orth et al., 2008; Sharma & Agarwala, 2014). Because of this, individuals with low self-esteem might use other outlets to raise their self-esteem, such as supporting a crime control policy that protects innocent victims. However, research has also linked high self-esteem to more supportive behaviors. Individuals with high self-esteem are not as worried about failing as are individuals with low self-esteem. Applying this to our research, high self-esteem individuals might support the policy more than low self-esteem individuals because their self-worth will not be affected as much if the policy fails to work as intended (Brown & Dutton, 1995).

Self-esteem differs across gender, with males on average reporting higher self-esteem and life satisfaction than females (Moksnes & Espnes, 2013). Self-esteem also varies with age. Generally, self-esteem increases during young adulthood and decreases with old age (after young adulthood) (Wagner et al., 2013). Thus, we predict females and younger participants should be more likely to support the crime control policy due to their lower relative levels of self-esteem. To measure participants' self-esteem, the Rosenberg self-esteem measure will be used.

The Rosenberg self-esteem measure, which is the first measure administered to participants in this study, will help reveal self-esteem interactions. Many self-affirmation researchers administer this measure at the start of a study to get participants to focus on themselves (Napper, Harris, & Epton, 2009). Research suggests that there might be a difference between high self-esteem and low self-esteem participants when they are not given the opportunity to self-affirm (Steele et al., 1993), such that individuals with high

self-esteem generally resist compelling messages (Cohen et al., 2000). Therefore, high self-esteem participants should be able to withstand the guilt message urging support more than individuals with low self-esteem.

Anticipatory Guilt

Guilt is an emotion that occurs when an individual fails to adhere to personal standards, beliefs, or values; this makes some aspect of the self seem deficient (Lazarus, 1991). *Anticipatory guilt* occurs when individuals contemplate violating their internal standards and feel the guilt they would feel if they went through with the violation (O'Keefe, 1999). This behavior might stem from the fact that individuals need internal consistency (Steele & Liu, 1983). Like self-affirmation, guilt can produce cognitive dissonance. When presented with information that contradicts individuals' perceptions, their self-image is at stake. Guilt and dissonance elicit similar actions in order to reduce them (Burnett & Lunsford, 1994). The most common reduction behaviors individuals use to relieve these feeling are compensation (i.e., being awarded something), expiation (e.g., making amends), and denial of responsibility (Burnett & Lunsford, 1994).

Moderate guilt appeals significantly increase individuals' negative feelings (Coulter & Pinto, 1995) causing them to act in a way that restores their original self-concept. Presenting working mother participants with an ad displaying a boy with his mother and the message "Moms who don't teach their children to eat good meals have children who don't always learn. You shape your child's eating habits, so don't let your family down" evoked higher guilty feelings than did the low guilt appeal with the message "Whoever said "Children will eat anything" had to be joking...Children have taste, too!" (Coulter & Pinto, 1995).

Guilt can provide explanations for individuals' charitable and compliant behavior (Burnett & Lunsford, 1994). Not only does guilt arise when individuals feel personally responsible for another's situation, but it also arises when they do not feel personally responsible (Baumeister, Stillwell, & Heatherton, 1994). This is displayed in the phenomenon of survivor guilt (Lifton, 1967); individuals feel guilty for surviving when others have died. Guilt generally is associated with pro-social actions such as apologies and attempts at repair (Estrada-Hollenbeck & Heatherton, 1998). Pro-social can be defined as a behavior that benefits another. As a result of this, guilt is frequently used as a tool to influence and manipulate an individual to act in a way that benefits the inducer (Baumeister et al., 1994). When individuals' experience feelings of guilt, they also experience a lowering of self-esteem (Burnett & Lunsford, 1994).

Past Research and Predictions

Anticipatory guilt plays a significant role in individuals' decision making (Burnett & Lunsford, 1994). Just like advertisements, crime control policies are viscerally presented in such a way as to make individuals feel guilty if they chose not to support them (Sicafuse & Miller, 2010). Individuals presented with a persuasive message to join the National Marrow Donor Program felt a significant amount of anticipated guilt; this lead them to engage in the suggested helping behaviors outlined in the message (Lindsey, 2005). In another study, the anticipation of guilt reduction, whether it was accurate or mistaken, provided people with motivation for compliance to suggested behaviors (i.e., volunteering for various clubs) (O'Keefe & Figge, 1999). In general, scholars investigating anticipated guilt have found that anticipated guilt can arise simply from the thought of a potential act of transgression (or lack of action), that individuals strive to

avoid, and this feeling motivates individuals to comply with requested behavior to avoid feelings of guilt (Lindsey, Yun, & Hill, 2007).

One thing that plays a role in an individual's level of guilt is control. It is more likely for individuals to feel guilt when they have control over the outcome. The more control an individual possesses over an outcome, the higher the expectation of guilt (Burnett & Lunsford, 1994). In situations where individuals feel they have no control, fear is likely to result rather than guilt (Burnett & Lunsford, 1994). Individuals could, for example, feel they can help control crime by supporting a particular crime policy.

Individuals who support CCT policies might do so because they feel they are making a difference. These policies are directed at individuals' emotions, making them feel like their support will help save lives (Hammond et al., 2010). Not supporting the policy might make them feel they are party to such crimes. Individuals might want to feel as though they have control over these crimes, when in reality, they do not. Accepting the fact that these crimes will take place regardless of their choices might cause fear, an unpleasant feeling for people.

When presenting guilt appeals, it is important for researchers to not exaggerate them (Coulter & Pinto, 1995). When researchers create intense guilt appeals, they might unintentionally provoke feelings of shame (Boudewyns, Turner, & Paquin, 2013). Unlike guilt, shame evokes negative feelings such as anger and rejection. Participants exposed to guilt-free shame (i.e., "pure shame") showed both anger and perceived threat, while those exposed to the shame-free guilt (i.e., "pure guilt") did not (Boudewyns et al., 2013). Conversely, there is a relationship between guilt and empathy. For example, one study found that empathy led to an increase in anticipated guilt, causing participants to increase

donation intention (Basil, Ridgway, & Basil, 2008). By using a moderate guilt appeal, participants might respond better than being presented with a high guilt appeal that evokes shame.

It is predicted that participants who receive the guilt appeal will be more likely to support the CCT policy they read about in this study than those who do not read about it. This is because individuals who receive the guilt appeal will anticipate the negative feelings they would experience if they chose to reject the proposed policy. Like the participants who complied with suggested volunteering behaviors to avoid feeling guilty (O'Keefe & Figge, 1999), we hypothesize that participants in the present study will support the policy to avoid feeling guilty. Coinciding with the self-affirmation manipulation, individuals who are made to feel guilty will respond more to the self-affirmation manipulation than individuals who are made to feel guilty but did not receive the self-affirmation opportunity. Guilt will also be measured as an individual difference to see if scores on the self-reported guilt measure effect support.

Sampling

For this study, the sample consisted of University of Nevada, Reno students and Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) workers. MTurk is an online system that provides a large diverse participant pool of community members (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011). With data being collected from two separate populations, we expect relevance to play a role (i.e., samples will relate differently to the proposed study). For example, females might relate to the proposed policy more than males due to the policy targeting female victims. Past research has shown that many differences exist between students and community members. How these differences relate to our study will be discussed below.

The use of Amazon MTurk Samples

Research has investigated the use of MTurk workers in experiments, and has also compared them to other samples, including students (Azzam & Jacobson, 2013; Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011; Goodman, Cryder, & Cheema, 2013). Many commonalities exist between MTurk participants and traditionally used samples with almost no significant differences in effect sizes (Goodman et al., 2013). While many similarities exist, and researchers encourage the use of MTurk samples, there are important differences. For instance, MTurk samples are likely to be skewed toward younger respondents with higher education levels when compared to the U.S. population (Ross et al., 2010). MTurk participants tend to be less extraverted and have lower self-esteem than other participant samples, which might cause challenges for some research purposes (Goodman et al., 2013). This might be an issue in our study because of our measures on self-esteem.

College Students versus Community Samples

While college student samples are heavily used in research, it is commonly debated whether or not they are appropriate samples (Bornstein, 1999; Lieberman et al., 2011). Of course, this depends on what population researchers are trying to generalize to. One of the biggest concerns is that student samples lack similar characteristics to that of the community (Chomos & Miller, under contract), individuals who disfavor use of college samples argue that college samples lack external validity (Sears, 1986), but this concern might be overstated. For example, research by Snook (2011) showed that differences in college students and other adults were extremely small. In fact, the effect size of a mean difference between college students and other adults is almost non-existent

(Snook, 2011). While some research has concluded that differences between community samples and students are small or nonexistent (Bornstein, 1999), research has also shown that the use of community samples is needed to help create generalizability beyond the use of student samples (Wiener et al., 2011). This is because students might offer different responses than the average community member, and vice versa.

Legal Attitudes

When investigating the use of college samples and community samples as mock jurors, differences have been found (Caparthe, 2011). A jury-decision making study found that community samples awarded more money for punitive damages, were more affected by compensatory-relevant information when making punitive decisions, and were more likely to support the plaintiff receiving the entire punitive award (Fox, Winegrove, & Pfeifer, 2011). One possibility of this, indicated by the researchers, is that community members can relate more to the plaintiff.

If our findings are consistent with past research, Mturk participants should be more likely to support the policy because they tend to favor the victim and want to make it harder on potential perpetrators. While differences have been discovered, similarities have as well (Hosch, Culhane Tubb, & Granillo, 2011). College samples can be similar to Mturk participants when storing evidence, evaluating it, and making decisions to a defendant's guilt.

Emotions

Students have been shown to score significantly higher than community members on the rational section of the rational versus experiential inventory measure (RVEI) (McCabe et al., 2010). Participants who score higher on the RVEI measure tend to be

more punitive (McCabe & Krauss, 2011). Individuals scoring lower on the inventory are also more likely to support the death penalty (Miller et al., 2013). Compared to college students, community members are more punitive and are more difficult to persuade (McCabe & Krauss, 2011). Research has also discovered that students are able to better correct their emotions and biases than community members (Miller et al., 2013). If students tend to be more rational than community members, and are able to control their emotions and biases, they will likely be more lenient when considering the policy. Instead of supporting the policy because of their emotions, students might be relatively more likely to think about the policy's effectiveness and logic.

Community members and students also differ on how they process information. While students and community members do not differ in their relationships between processing traits, they do differ in how they process information when received. For example, community members are more affected by how they process information at the time, and are less successful in correcting their emotions and biases compared to students (Miller et al., 2014).

Views toward Crime

Community members tend to be more punitive than students (McCabe et al., 2010). Community members have stronger support for the death penalty and are more likely to label individuals a sexual violent predator in sexual violence hearings (McCabe et al., 2010; Miller et al., 2013). A study comparing jury panelists and students found that jury panelists issued significantly more punitive damage awards than did students. Jury panelists were more likely to issue high punitive awards when compensatory damages were high (Fox et al., 2011). Based on these findings, Mturk participants might be more

supportive of the policy presented because of their likelihood to be more punitive. Because this policy is intended to protect college females from abduction and rape, Mturk participants should show more support as they have stronger feelings toward individuals who commit those crimes.

Summary of Findings

As described, there are various ways that MTurk samples differ from student samples. First off, MTurk samples are more community based and offer a larger diversity of age, race, socioeconomic backgrounds, etc. On the other hand, student samples have been shown to be generalizable to the general population in most cases. Another important thing to remember when using MTurk samples is that individuals who are of a lower social economic status and do not have computers are excluded. Students and Mturk workers differ in emotions, legal attitudes, and crime views, which will help our study with generalizability. The conclusion of both Chomos and Miller (under contract), and Weiner et al. (2011), is that a student sample is adequate, but should be followed up with a more generalizable sample. This has implications for our study because we are utilizing both a student sample and community sample. It is important to use a diversity of sampling measures to ensure a generalizable and heterogeneous group of participants.

Relevance

Relevance is how important an issue is in a person's life or the degree to which someone relates to a particular issue. Females will find this issue more relevant to their lives than males because the policy presented protects female victims. Also, students might find this issue more relevant than community members because it is implemented on a college campus. On the other hand, community members are more likely to be

parents who want to protect their children and thus they might find the issue more relevant than do students. Research has shown that relevancy plays an important role in a study (Taylor, For 2004). It is important to study relevancy because different samples used in research will relate to different matters. For example, a study investigating the differences in perceptions of ethics toward music piracy found differences between music majors and music business majors. Specifically, music business majors who had never illegally downloaded music before and had never taken an ethics course believed more strongly than those who had not downloaded music but had taken an ethics course that music piracy was unfair to the music industry (Taylor, 2004). This shows that individuals will react differently depending on how relevant the topic is to them.

Relevancy is also demonstrated in a study conducted by Reichert, Miller, Bornstein, and Shelton (2011). Community members and students differ in their perceptions of a medical malpractice case involving an obese patient. This difference might be because community members view the scenario as more personally relevant; they are more likely to have experienced weight issues. In contrast, students have less experience with weight gain and thus are less sympathetic to the overweight plaintiff. This relates to relevance in that community samples and college students have experienced different life outcomes shaping their views.

It is expected that gender differences will arise in this study as the policy focuses on a crime that generally has female victims because such policies are more relevant to females 's lives. Therefore, the policy presented is more relevant to females. In virtually all facets of crime, females report more fear than males (Chui et al., 2012). Applegate et al. utilized a statewide data set and variety of worldwide questions on crime policies,

punishment, and rehabilitation (2002). They discovered that females show greater support for offender treatment than males (Applegate et al., 2002). A study by Dodge et al. found that females were more likely than males to suggest incarceration for embezzlement and corporate offenses (2013). Females are also more supportive than males of preventative crime policies that seek to minimize harm (Gilligan, 1977).

When it comes to sex offenses, females tend to be less supportive than their male counterparts. One study found that males perceived sex abuse to be less serious and sex offenders to be less responsible than did females (Rogers & Davies, 2007). This finding could be attributed to Shaver's defensive attribution hypothesis, which states that because the majority of sex offenses have male perpetrators, males are more likely to identify with, and therefore less likely to blame sexual offenders than females (1970). Because the policy presented targets sexual offenders, females could be more supportive than males based on previous research.

Females also report higher levels of fear than males (Cops & Pleysier, 2011). This could be due to the socialization of females vs. males (e.g., males are taught to be "tough") (Goodey, 1997), or could be due to males "downplaying" their fear (Sutton et al., 2014). Another reason females tend to fear crime more than males is due to the "shadow" effect of sexual assault; females fear of rape over shadows their fear for any other crime (Fisher & Sloan, 2003; Wilcox et al., 2006). Regardless of how this fear is formed, fear has been linked to greater punitiveness (McCorkle, 1993). The policy presented in this study is intended to protect females from campus crimes such as sexual assault. Examples of past crimes are displayed in the policy summary that involves female victims who were abducted, sexually assaulted, and killed. Because females fear

rape, and are supportive of preventative crime policies that seek to minimize harm, it is expected that females will show more support for the crime policy presented in this study.

Because this study used two different samples, it is expected that relevancy will affect the way students and Mturk workers view the policy. The policy in this study will have different relevance for college students than community members as the policy is focused on implementation at a university. Even though the survey states that the policy will be implemented at "A University in your state", and not specifically at the University of Nevada, Reno (where half of the collect sample will be from), it will be more relevant to the college students because it is a policy that specifically affects people like them. College students will be more likely to relate to the policy and relate to the questions following asking about support. This policy will be less relevant for many of the MTurk workers, especially if they are not in college or do not have children in college, as they might not see themselves at risk for abduction or murder from a college campus, and the law not affect them (e.g., they do not have to carry an identification card). It is also likely that MTurk workers will not have as many friends in college as the college sample does and do not pay tuition, causing them to not relate to the tuition increases as much as the college student sample.

It is expected that gender differences will arise in this study as the policy focuses on a crime that generally has female victims. Females fear being victimized, and also fear being sexually assaulted (Cops & Pleysier, 2011; Fisher & Sloan, 2003; Wilcox et al., 2006). Because this policy is aimed at protecting females from campus crimes (e.g.,

abduction, sexual assault), females should show more support for the policy than males because the crime and proposed policy is more relevant to them.

Hypotheses and Research Questions

The following hypotheses/research questions were tested:

Hypothesis One: There will be a main effect of the self-affirmation manipulation, with the three measures (i.e., the belief measure, the support measure, and the "willingness to act" measure") as the dependent variables. Specifically, those given the opportunity to self-affirm on a topic related to the self will be less supportive of the policy than those who are not given the opportunity to self affirm on a topic related to the self. They also will score lower on the belief measures, and the "willingness to act" measures.

Hypothesis Two: There will be a main effect of the guilt manipulation, with the three measures as the dependent variables. Those given the narrative with the anticipatory guilt manipulation will score higher on the policy support measures, the belief measures, and the "willingness to act" measures than those who receive the narrative without the anticipatory guilt manipulation.

Hypothesis Three: There will be an interaction between the self-affirmation and guilt manipulations, such that those who receive the guilt manipulation but have no opportunity to self-affirm on a topic related to the self will have the most support of any other condition. They will score higher on the policy support measures, the belief measures, and the "willingness to act" measures than any other condition.

Hypothesis Four: There will be a main effect of self-regard, with the three measures as the dependent variables. Those scoring higher on the self-regard item from the self-affirmation measure will score lower on the policy support measures, the belief measures, and the "willingness to act" measures than those scoring higher on the self-regard measure.

Hypothesis Five: There will be a main effect of self-reported guilt, with the three measures as the dependent variables. Those scoring higher on the self-reported guilt measure will score higher on the policy support measures, the belief measures, and the "willingness to act" measures than those scoring lower on the self-reported guilt measure.

Hypothesis Six: Females will score higher on the policy support measures, the belief measures, and the "willingness to act" measures than males due to the relevancy of the policy protecting female victims.

Research Question One: Do scores on the Rosenburg self-esteem measure moderate the effects of the self-affirmation opportunity on crime control policy support, the beliefs measures, and the "willingness to act" measures?

Research Question Two: Will scores on the policy support measures, the belief measures, and the "willingness to act" measures differ between university students and Amazon MTurk workers?

Research Design

This study was a 2 (self-affirmation: present or absent) x 2 (anticipatory guilt: present or absent) between subjects design. Participants completed an online study and

were randomly assigned to one of the four conditions. Half of the participants were allowed to self-affirm on a topic related to the self, while the other half were allowed to self-affirm on a topic unrelated to the self. All participants then read a fictional crime policy that exhibited crime control theater. One condition had a narrative with a guilt manipulation while the other did not. Participants then indicated their support for the policy. The present study predicted that people who had the opportunity to self-affirm on a topic related to the self would be less likely to support the policy than those who affirmed on a topic not related to the self, because they have already been able to bolster their self-conceptions. It was also predicted that the participants who received the guilt appeal would be more likely to support the questionable crime control policy than those who did not receive the guilt appeal. The guilt appeal should prompt them to support the policy because they would feel badly if they chose not to. An additive interaction between the manipulated variables was also expected. Specifically, participants who were not given the opportunity to self-affirm and received the guilt manipulation were predicted to be the most likely to support the policy. In turn, participants who were given the opportunity to self-affirm and did not receive the guilt manipulation would be the least likely to support the policy. The other two groups were predicted to be between these two extreme groups.

Method

Sample

Power analyses indicated that a minimum of 40 participants in each of the eight conditions (320 participants total) was required to detect medium-sized effects for the proposed analyses in investigating the hypotheses and research questions. To account for

participant attrition, missing data issues, and potential more complex post-hoc analyses, data from 402 participants were collected.

Participants consisted of University of Nevada, Reno students and Amazon MTurk workers. Students were 18 years of age and currently enrolled in a course at the University of Nevada, Reno. Student participants were recruited through the University of Nevada, Reno's SONA system. SONA is an online database for students to complete research studies for class credit. Two hundred adult U.S. citizens, recruited through Amazon.com M-Turk survey system received $2.00 each for participating [1].

Procedure

Participants first completed the Rosenburg Self-Esteem measure (Rosenburg 1965). Participants were then given the opportunity to self-affirm (on a topic related to the self or not related to the self). Participants read a narrative about a fictitious crime control policy that exemplified crime control theater. The fictional crime policy proposed GPS tracking devices be issued to female college students to help protect them from sexual predators on and around University campuses. This proposed policy is currently relevant as a school district in Texas passed a policy requesting the mandatory use of GPS ID cards by all students in 2012 at their high school to help with safety issues (Miller, 2012). While participants were not blatantly informed of the policy's limitations, the policy meets the required criteria to be considered CCT. Specifically, this policy meets the criteria of moral panic because it describes a policy response to crime that appears to be, but in fact is unlikely to be effective crime control (Griffin & Miller,

[1] The American Psychology-Law Society awarded us a research grant of $740.00 to pay for Mturk participants.

2008). Policies aimed at protecting innocent children and woman continuously receive unquestioned support from the public. By issuing GPS tracking systems, the public might feel that they can control abductions taking place (appeal to mythic narratives). Finally, limitations are evident in that such a GPS system would use limited resources and money to address very rare events—abductions. While abductions are horrible, so are other more common crimes. This money could be used to address more common causes of death and injury (e.g., DUI, date rape) and ultimately protect more females. Another limitation of the policy is that people might not always carry the card with them. They could feel it as invasive and many people might not want law enforcement and others to know where they are or where they have been. In sum, this policy appears like an effective policy for campus crime, when in reality, it is likely not.

In the current study, one narrative describing this policy included a guilt appeal, while the other did not. This consisted of an additional paragraph stating, "Campus violence could be avoided if more people like you supported the implementation of the policy. Without your support, students will remain targets of sexual predators on and around University campuses. You have the opportunity to take a stand against violent and sexual crimes against females. Your support may save a life!" Half of the participants received the guilt manipulation while half did not.

Participants then completed a measure measuring their support, beliefs toward the policy, and their "willingness to act". Two manipulation checks were administered to see if individuals who were given the chance to self-affirm on a topic related to the self differed from those who self-affirmed on a topic not related to the self (Cohen, Aronson, & Steele, 2000), and to see if the participants in the anticipatory guilt condition actually

did experience more guilt than those who were not in the anticipatory guilt condition (Lindsey, 2005).

Materials

The Rosenberg (1965) self-esteem measure, located in Appendix A, was the first measurement presented to participants. The measure consists of 8 questions (e.g., “I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal playing field with others”) with a four point answer measure: strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree. For purposes of analyses, the measure was transformed to a 0-100 measure for scoring. The measure scores participants on self-esteem. Cronbach’s alpha is a measure of scale reliability. The standard for acceptable reliability is 0.7. The Cronbach’s alpha for this measure was .889, which not only meets, but also exceeds the standard. All question items were summed and averaged so missing data would not affect accuracy.

The measure used for the self-affirmation manipulation is a version of the Allport–Vernon–Lindzey values measure, located in Appendix B (AVL; Allport, Vernon, & Lindzey, 1960). Participants rated 11 values and qualities in order of importance. Participants ranked these characteristics on a measure from 1 to 11 (1=most important item, 11= least important item). Participants then typed the value they identified as most important (“1”) in the available space. Then, in a few paragraphs, participants explained why the value or characteristic they rated as “1” in the previous exercise is important to them and how they use that value or characteristics in everyday life. Participants then indicated a specific occasion when this value or characteristic determined what they did, or described a time in their life when this value or characteristic proved meaningful. The control condition was not given the opportunity to self-affirm on a topic related to the

self, but was given an equivalent type of task (shown in Appendix C). As with the participants affirming on a topic related to the self, control participants ranked 11 values and qualities in order of importance on a measure from 1 to 11. However, they indicated the value or characteristic they ranked as ninth most important ("9"). Then, in a few paragraphs, they explained why the value or characteristic they rated as "9" in the previous exercise might be important to another college student. They were also asked how another college student might use this value or characteristic in everyday life. The measure was scored as either having the opportunity to affirm on a topic related to the self (scored 1) or not having the opportunity to self- affirm on a self-related topic (scored 2).

The fictional crime policy (ACT! Policy) narrative described a policy which proposes that GPS tracking devices be issued to female college students to help protect college females from the growing number of sexual predators on and around University campuses. One version of this policy included a guilt appeal, while the other did not. Those who were given the guilt manipulation received an extra paragraph designed to make them feel guilty if they choose not to support the policy. This CCT policy narrative is located in Appendix D.

When finished reading the crime control theater policy, participants indicated their support for the policy on a measure established by the researchers. This measure, located in Appendix E, consisted of three questions with a measure of 1 to 7. The standard for acceptable reliability is 0.7. The Cronbach's alpha for this measure was .932, which not only meets, but also exceeds the standard. Question one asks if the policy is Harmful (1), Undecided (4), or Beneficial (7). Question two asks if the policy is Wise (1),

Undecided (4), or Foolish (7). Question three asks if the policy is Negative (1), Undecided (4), or Positive (7). For purpose of analyses, the measure was transformed to a 0-100 measure. All question items were summed and averaged so missing data would not affect accuracy.

The "belief measure" was created by the researchers and used a measure of 1 to 7, with "1" indicating extremely strong disagreement, and "7" indicating extremely strong agreement, to measure how strongly participants agreed with the following four statements: (1) I believe that implementing the ACT! Policy at a University in my state will help save females' lives, (2) Implementing the ACT! Policy, would not make the University or surrounding areas safer (this item was reversed coded), (3) Implementing the ACT! Policy at a University in my state will help protect my friends, family members, or significant other from becoming a victim of sexual assault or murder, (4) Implementing the ACT! Policy at a University in my state will help protect me from becoming a victim of sexual assault or murder. This measure had a Cronbach's alpha of .746, which meets the standard for acceptable reliability. For purpose of analyses, the measure was transformed to a 0-100 measure. All question items were summed and averaged so missing data would not affect accuracy. This measure is located in Appendix F.

The "willingness to act" measure, created by the researchers, asked participants to indicate the degree to which they would support the implementation of the Program at a large University in their state, if (1) All registered students were assessed a $10 fee per semester in order to fund the Program, (2) All registered students were assessed a $30 fee per semester in order to fund the Program, (3) All registered students were assessed a $50

fee per semester in order to fund the Program, (4) Students would not have to pay any additional fees in order to fund the Program, but some money that is presently being used to fund other University programs (e.g., athletics, scholarships, social events, transportation services, academic help centers) would instead be cut to fund the Program, (5) Students would not have to pay any additional fees in order to fund the Program, but the Program would be funded by an additional state "vice" tax imposed on alcohol and tobacco products. Participants answered these questions on a measure of 1-7 with "1" indicating the absolute lowest level of support, "4" indicating moderate support, and "7" indicating the absolute highest level of support. For purpose of analyses, the measure was transformed to a 0-100 measure. All question items were summed and averaged so missing data would not affect accuracy. This measure had a Cronbach's alpha of .792, which meets the standard for acceptable reliability. This measure is located in Appendix G.

Two measures (Appendix H and I) assessed whether the self-affirmation and guilt manipulations were effective. These measures were both manipulation checks and independent variables in this study. The self-affirmation check consisted of 1 question ("How do you feel about yourself *right now*?") on a 9-point measure with "1" indicating extremely negative and "7" indicating extremely positive. For purpose of analyses, the question was transformed to 0-100 scoring. When using the self-affirmation measure only one question was used as an IV to test self-regard (i.e., "How do you feel about yourself *right now*?"). Past research has used both the mood question and self-regard question to disconnect the effects of the affirmation that could have resulted from heightened mood and heightened self-regard (Cohen et al., 2000). The self-reported guilt measure consisted

of 3 questions (e.g., "I would feel remorseful if I did not express my support for the ACT! Program and the program was not adopted due to low levels of student support") on a 7-point measure with "1" indicating strongly disagree and "7" indicating strongly agree. For purpose of analyses, the measure was transformed to a 0-100 measure. For the guilt measure, the Cronbach's Alpha was .759, which meets the standard for acceptable reliability.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Initial data analysis indicated no outliers or other data anomalies on all relevant variables. To test whether the manipulations were successful, t-tests for a difference of means indicated no significant difference between participants given the self-affirmation opportunity and participants who were not given the self-affirmation opportunity on the self-regard manipulation check question (p = .80). T-tests indicated no significant difference between participants who received the guilt manipulation and participants who did not receive the guilt manipulation on the guilt measure questions (p = .78). This indicates that both the self-affirmation manipulation and the guilt manipulation failed.

Descriptive statistics show that the mean for the belief measure was 62.9 (*SE* = 24.9, minimum= 0, maximum = 100), for the support measure 74.0 (*SE* = 23.8, minimum= 0, maximum = 100), and for the "willingness to act" measure 49.13 (*SE* = 22.8, minimum= 0, maximum = 100). There were no ceiling or floor effects for any of the measures used in this study. A ceiling effect takes place when large portions of participants score at the upper limit of available responses. Floor effects are the opposite, with a large portion of participants scoring at the lower end of available responses

(Hessling et al., 2004). Because of this, we can conclude that ceiling and floor effects were not the cause of the failed manipulations. Frequencies were run to see if any demographic differences existed between the 140 student participants and the 198 MTurk participants. Chi-square analyses indicated no significant differences in gender, race, or education across the two samples (**ps* $> .18$) T-tests showed a significant difference in age between the two samples, the mean age of Mturkers was 33.5, and the mean age of students was 25. There were 103 participants in the self-affirmation/no-guilt condition; 67 in the no self-affirmation/no guilt condition; 81 in the self-affirmation/guilt condition; and 87 in the in no self-affirmation/guilt condition. One-way ANOVA showed no significant difference in age across the four manipulated conditions ($p = .085$). Chi-square analyses indicated there were also no significant differences in gender, race, or education across the four conditions (**ps* $> .18$)

Belief Measure

The mean score on the belief measure was 62.9 (see table 1). First, we conducted a linear regression with the belief measure as a dependent variable. The independent variables included the reported self-affirmation manipulation, guilt manipulation, population (Mturk or student), the Rosenberg self-esteem score, gender, an interaction term created by multiplying the self-affirmation manipulation variable and the Rosenberg self-esteem score, and an interaction term created by multiplying the self-affirmation manipulation and guilt manipulation (see table 2). The overall model was significant ($F = 2.94$, $df = 6, 316$, $R^2 = .336$, $p < .001$) and accounted for 33.6% of variance. Hypothesis one was not confirmed; those given the self-affirmation manipulation (self-affirming on a topic related to the self) did not score lower on the belief measure than those who were

not given the manipulation (self-affirming on a topic not related to the self) ($p < .370$). Hypothesis two was not confirmed because those given the narrative with the anticipatory guilt prime did not score higher on the belief measure ($p < .511$).

Hypothesis three was not confirmed because there was not a significant interaction between the guilt manipulation and those who did not have the opportunity to self-affirm on a topic related to the self ($p < .749$). Hypothesis six was confirmed; there was a significant main effect of gender ($B = -10.12$, $SE = 2.63$, $p < .001$). Females ($M = 68.1$) had significantly higher scores on the belief measure than males ($M = 57.6$) (see table 3). Research question one was answered in the affirmative; those scoring higher on the self-esteem measure had significantly higher scores on the belief measure than those scoring lower ($B = .254$, $SE = .098$, $p = .01$). However, the interaction between self-esteem and the self-affirmation manipulation had no significance ($p > .199$). Research question two was answered in the affirmative (see table 4); MTurk workers ($M = 66.9$) scored significantly higher on the belief measure than did students ($M = 57.2$) ($B = .240$, $SE = 2.72$, $p < .001$).

Another linear regression was conducted. The overall model was significant ($F = 22.7$, $df = 6, 253$, $R^2 = .356$, $p < .001$). In this regression, the independent variables were: gender, self-esteem, self-regard, self-reported guilt, population (Mturk vs students), and an interaction between self-reported guilt and self-regard. The dependent variable was the belief measure (see table 5). Hypothesis three was not confirmed because there was not a significant interaction between self-regard and self-reported guilt ($p = .64$). Hypothesis four was not confirmed because self-regard did not significantly affect scores on the belief measure ($p < .063$). Hypothesis five was confirmed; self-reported guilt

significantly affected scores on the belief measure (*B* = .57, *SE* = .168, $p < .01$). The higher one scored on self-reported guilt, the higher their beliefs. Hypothesis six was confirmed; females (68.1) indicated higher belief scores than males (57.6). Research question one was not answered in the affirmative; self-esteem did not have a significant effect belief scores ($p < .257$). Research question two was answered in the affirmative; Mturkers (*M* = 66.9) scored significantly higher on the belief measure than students (see table 4) (*M* = 57.2) (*B* = 8.02, *SE* = 3.0, $p < .01$).

Support Measure

The mean score on the support measure was 74.8 (see table 1). We conducted (see Table 6) a linear regression with the support measure as a dependent variable. The independent variables were: self-affirmation manipulation, guilt manipulation, population (Mturk vs students), gender, the Rosenberg self-esteem score, an interaction term created by multiplying the self-affirmation manipulation variable and the Rosenberg self-esteem score, and an interaction term created by multiplying the self-affirmation manipulation and guilt manipulation as independent variables. The overall model was significant (F = 7.56 df = 7, 316, $p < .001$/ R^2 = .143) and accounted for 14.3% of the variance. Hypothesis one was not confirmed because there was not a significant difference in scores between those who were given the opportunity to self-affirm and those who were not ($p < .545$). Hypothesis two was not confirmed because there was no significant difference in support between those given the narrative with the anticipatory guilt prime and those were not ($p < .672$).

Hypothesis three was not confirmed because there was no interaction between the guilt manipulation and the self-affirmation manipulation ($p < .434$). Hypothesis six was

confirmed; there was a significant main effect of gender (*B* = -11.67, *SE* = .246, $p <$ .001). Females (*M* = 80.3) had significantly higher scores on the support measure than males (*M* = 69.1) (see table 3). Research question one was answered in the affirmative; those scoring higher on the self-esteem measure had significantly higher scores on the support measure than those scoring lower (*B* = .246, *SE* = .092, $p = .004$). However, the interaction between self-esteem and the self-affirmation manipulation had no significance on support scores ($p < .441$). Research question two was answered in the affirmative (see table 4); MTurk workers (*M* = 68.8) scored significantly higher on the support measure than did students (*M* = 79.3) (*B* = 12.71, *SE* = 2.56, $p < .001$).

Another linear regression was conducted. The overall model was significant (F = 23.7, df = 6, 251, $R^2 = .353$, $p < .001$). In this regression, the independent variables were: gender, self-esteem, self-regard, self-reported guilt, population (Mturk vs students), and an interaction between self-reported guilt and self-regard. The dependent variable was the support measure (see table 7). Hypothesis three was not confirmed because there was not a significant interaction between self-regard and self-reported guilt ($p = .89$). Hypothesis four was not confirmed because self-regard did not significantly affect scores on the support measure ($p < .25$). Hypothesis five was confirmed; self-reported guilt significantly affected support on the support measure guilt (*B* = .44, *SE* = .151, $p < .01$). The higher one scored on self-reported guilt, the higher their support. Hypothesis six was confirmed; females (80.3) indicated higher support scores than males (69.1). Research question one was not answered in the affirmative; self-esteem had no significance on support scores ($p < .718$). Research question two was answered in the affirmative (see

table 4); Mturkers (*M* = 79.3) scored significantly higher on the support measure than students (*M* = 68.7) (*B* = 8.50, *SE* = 2.72, $p < .01$).

"Willingness to Act"

The mean score on the "willingness to act" measure was 49.1 (see table 1). Next conducted (see Table 8) was a regression with the "willingness to act" measure as dependent variable. The independent variables were: the self-affirmation manipulation, the guilt manipulation, population (students vs. MTurkers), gender, the Rosenberg self-esteem score, an interaction term created by multiplying the self-affirmation manipulation variable and the Rosenberg self-esteem score, and an interaction term created by multiplying the self-affirmation manipulation and guilt manipulation The overall model was significant (*F* = 5.41, *df* = 7, 314, $R^2 = .088$, $p < .001$) and accounted for 8.8% of the variance. Hypothesis one was not confirmed because there was not a significant difference in scores between those who were given the opportunity to self-affirm and those who were not ($p > .341$). Hypothesis two was not confirmed because there was no significant difference in support between those given the narrative with the anticipatory guilt prime and those were not ($p < .141$).

Hypothesis three was not confirmed because there was no interaction between the guilt manipulation and the self-affirmation manipulation ($p < .802$). Hypothesis six was confirmed; there was a significant main effect of gender (*B* = -9.04, *SE* = 2.46, $p < .001$). Females (*M* = 53.1) had significantly higher scores on the "willingness to act" measure than males (*M* = 44.7) (see table 3). Research question one was answered in the affirmative; those scoring higher on the self-esteem measure had significantly higher scores on the "willingness to act" measure than those scoring lower (*B* = .206, *SE* = .092,

p = .026). However, the interaction between self-esteem and the self-affirmation manipulation had no significance on "willingness to act" scores ($p < .199$). Research question two was answered in the affirmative (see table 4); MTurk (*M* = 52.5) workers scored significantly higher on the "willingness to act" measure than did students (*M* = 44.3) (*B* = 10.26, *SE* = 2.56, $p < .001$).

Another linear regression was conducted. The overall model was significant (*F* = 23.7, *df* = 6, 251, $R^2 = .353$, $p < .001$). In this regression, the independent variables were: gender, self-esteem, self-regard, self-reported guilt, population (Mturk vs students), and an interaction between self-reported guilt and self-regard. The dependent variable was the "willingness to act" measure (see table 9). Hypothesis three was not confirmed because there was not a significant interaction between self-regard and self-reported guilt (*p* = .89). Hypothesis four was not confirmed because self-regard did not significantly affect scores on the "willingness to act" measure ($p < .25$). Hypothesis five was confirmed; self-reported guilt significantly affected support on the "willingness to act" measure (*B* = .44, *SE* = .151, $p < .01$). The higher one scored on self-reported guilt, the higher their "willingness to act" scores. Hypothesis six was confirmed; females (53.1) indicated higher "willingness to act" scores than males (44.7). Research question one was not answered in the affirmative; self-esteem had no significance on "willingness to act" scores (p < 72.). Research question two was answered in the affirmative; Mturk workers (*M* = 52.5) scored significantly higher on the "willingness to act" measure than students (*M* = 44.3) (*B* = 8.50, *SE* = 2.72, $p < .01$).

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to further research on why individuals support CCT policies that are possibly ineffective. Because the manipulations in this study were not successful, hypothesis one, two and three were not supported. Hypothesis one predicted that when participants' self-concepts were threatened (i.e., no self-affirmation opportunity), it was predicted that they would be more likely to support the policy designed to protect innocent victims from horrible crimes because it would help them feel better about themselves and restore their self-concept (Sicafuse & Miller, 2012). However, participants who were given the opportunity to self-affirm on a topic related to the self had no difference in support rate than individuals who did not.

Hypothesis two predicted that individuals exposed to the guilt manipulation would show more support for the policy than those were not exposed to the guilt manipulation. However, individuals who were exposed to the guilt manipulation had no significant difference in scores than those who did not. Hypothesis three predicting an interaction between the self-affirmation and guilt manipulations, such that those who receive the guilt manipulation but have no opportunity to self-affirm on a topic related to the self will have the most support of any other condition was not supported by the data.

The manipulation check analyses indicate that the self-affirmation measures and guilt measures could have been unsuccessful for a variety of reasons. Because this was an online study, participants might not have paid as close attention to the materials as they would have if it were in-person participation. In a study measuring participation inattentiveness, it was discovered that 3-9% of participants were highly inattentive, failed to comply with instructions, and completed self-report measures inconsistently and aimlessly (Maniaci & Rogge, 2014). Therefore, the participants in this study could have

not have been paying as close attention to the online measures making their responses inconsistent.

One reason the guilt manipulation might have been unsuccessful could be due to individuals feeling they had no control over campus crime. As mentioned earlier, when individuals feel they have no control over a crime, they feel fear instead of guilt (Burnett & Lunsford, 1994). The guilt manipulation could have been too strong or too weak for individuals to feel the proper amount of guilt. When guilt manipulations are too strong, they can provoke feelings of shame. Unlike guilt, shame invokes feelings of anger and rejection (Boudewyns, Turner, & Paquin, 2013). If the guilt manipulation in this study was too strong, individuals could have rejected it.

Another reason the manipulations might have failed is because of their quality. For example, our manipulations might have manipulated what they were intended to, but our manipulation checks were not able to detect that. Therefore, the manipulations could have worked, but the manipulation checks did not. An additional reason the manipulations might not have worked is because they did not last long enough. For example, we could have in fact successfully induced guilt at the time the manipulation was presented, but the feelings could have been gone by the time participants were presented with the manipulation check questions (e.g., the feelings had worn off).

What is interesting about this study is that although the guilt manipulations did not work, the measured variables of guilt did work. Manipulating someone into feeling guilty is different than someone truly feeling guilty. Although prior studies might have been able to successfully manipulate guilt (Lindsey, 2005; O'Keefe & Figge, 1999), it is possible that guilt is something that happens naturally and cannot be manipulated. It is

also possible that the measurement of guilt is a more sensitive measure and a more thorough distinction than utilizing a simple guilt/no guilt manipulation. Another reason the measured variables of guilt could have worked while the manipulation of guilt did not, is because they are measuring two different constructs. Measuring actual guilt will reveal different results than measuring guilt that is not naturally felt. This can be especially true when using an online survey. A person manipulated into feeling guilty could still answer what they naturally feel because they are behind a computer screen. This might have been different if manipulated guilt was measured in a face-to-face setting. In regards to our study, measured guilt could have been successful because the guilt was natural and did not change regardless of the study setting (online versus in-person).

Hypothesis four predicted that those scoring higher on the self-regard item from the self-affirmation measure would score lower on the policy support measures, the belief measures, and the "willingness to act" measures than those scoring lower on the self-regard measure. However, those scoring higher on the self-regard item had no significant difference in support for the three measures than those scoring lower.

Hypothesis five predicted that there would be a main effect of self-reported guilt, such that those scoring higher on the self-reported guilt measure would score higher on the policy support measures, the belief measures, and the "willingness to act" measures than those scoring lower on the self-reported guilt measure. This hypothesis was supported as those with higher self-reported guilt scored higher on the belief measure, support measure, and “willingness to act” measure.

Hypothesis six predicted that females would score higher on the policy support measure, the belief measure, and the "willingness to act" measure than males due to the relevancy of the policy protecting female victims. This hypothesis was supported with females showing higher support than males all three measures.

Research question one investigated whether or not scores on the Rosenburg self-esteem measure moderated the effects of the self-affirmation opportunity on crime control policy support, the beliefs measures, and the "willingness to act" measures. When analyzing the scores on the Rosenberg self-esteem measure, it was discovered that individuals who scored higher on the self-esteem measure scored significantly higher on the support measure, belief measure, and the "willingness to act" measure. While this finding contradicts a large portion of self-affirmation literature (Aronson et al., 1995; Cohen et al., 2000; Steele et al., 1993), which predicts that individuals with low self-esteem will raise their self-esteem by doing a good deed (such as supporting a crime control policy), there is literature that could explain our findings. Following failure, feelings of self worth in individuals with low self-esteem greatly plummet, while feelings of self worth in individuals with high self-esteem remained relatively high (Brown & Dutton, 1995). Failure could have been felt in this study when participants were not given the opportunity to self-affirm. Therefore, individuals with high-self esteem could be more likely to support CCT policies because they have less fear of losing self-worth if the policy fails. While this study did not specifically look at self-worth, future research could focus on self-esteem and self-worth to see if these results hold.

Research question two investigated differences between Mturk and students. The MTurk sample had significantly higher scores on the support measure, and "willingness

to act" measure than did students, which was somewhat surprising due to the presented policy targeting college students. This shows that the general population might perceive policies differently than students. A study comparing MTurk and community samples discovered that MTurk participants scored lower on extraversion and emotional stability (Goodman et al., 2013). If consistent with this study, MTurk participants could have been more likely to support the CCT policy due to a lack of emotional stability. Therefore, supporting the policy could have helped to stabilize their emotions. Students could have been more emotionally stable to begin with, so did not need to support the policy to stabilize emotions. Students also tend to be less punitive than community members (McCabe et al., 2010), which could explain why the Mturk sample showed more support for the policy.

As explained in the results section, the mean level for the support measure was exceptionally high, with females showing significantly higher support than males. Females also scored higher on the belief measure and the "willingness to act" measure, confirming hypothesis six. This is consistent with previous research that found females tend to be more compassionate and more protective when it comes to crime, punishment, and corrections (Applegate et al., 2002). Females are more supportive than males of preventative crime policies that seek to minimize harm (Gilligan, 1977). Females were likely more supportive, more believing, and more willing to support this policy because it aimed to protect female victims. This policy and crime was more relevant to females, so it is likely the females feared the consequences of this crime more than men.

The mean level of support drops from the support measure to the "willingness to act" measure, indicating that participants might not have acted on their support.

Individuals might not have thought about the implications of the policy until it came time to utilize their own funds to support it. There were no actual consequences in this study, so students were able to support the policy without having to defend it or “back up” their support. This can be explained in previous research that has investigated the link between attitudes and behavior. One study discovered that positive attitudes toward organ donation generally did not transfer into behavior (i.e., participants felt positively about donating but did not actually donate) (Mohs & Hübner, 2013). This study also discovered that the link between attitudes and intention to sign an organ donor card were stronger for males than females. Therefore, the participants in this study who supported the policy might have had no intention to follow through with their support.

This was a survey measuring individuals’ beliefs and intentions and did not present real world consequences. When faced with the actual decision (e.g., if the campus cashier asks an individual to give $20 right now for implementation of a policy) they might act differently. Another limitation is that participants are not being held “accountable” for their actions. We are simply asking them for their support, without making them justify it or defend it, which could have an affect on their responses (Bornstein & McCabe, 2005). Verisimilitude, which is the appearance of being real, is an issue because participants might not view the crime or presented policy as authentic. While verisimilitude and consequentiality are limitations, research has indicated that they are typically not major issues (Bornstein, 1999; Bornstein & McCabe, 2005). However, future studies should reduce this limitation by using real (or more realistic) consequences. Future research should also utilize a real crime control policy, as opposed to a fictional one like the policy in this study.

This study helps identify the underpinnings of individual's support (i.e., gender differences, self-esteem, guilt), which is the first step in the process of development, implementation, and acceptance of more effective measures.

Implications

Both policymakers and psychologists can use information from this study. Because participants who reported higher feelings of guilt showed more support, belief, and willingness to act, emotions could play a role in why individuals support CCT policies. The public needs to be discouraged from supporting policies based on emotion (i.e., supporting because they feel guilty). Policymakers should be required to present policies without using guilt or emotions to gain support. For example, although family members want to use their child's name when proposing policies that intend to prevent child abductions or rape, the public then supports the policy out of guilt and not for the policies effectiveness. Therefore, the policies intentions, and possible drawbacks, should be presented to the public. If policies are presented in a logical manner, and not with guilt messages, individuals might think through their support more thoroughly.

This research helps contribute further information about CCT policies and how self-esteem, gender, and population (Mturk vs student) all affect support. There is now more literature on how Mturk samples differ from student samples, and how females differ from males when it comes to supporting a crime control policy. Females might have been more supportive of the policy due to relevancy (i.e., the CCT policy presented targeted a crime with female victims). Also, females tend to be report more fear than males (Cops & Pleysier, 2011). Therefore, individuals who fit a victim type for a policy should be aware of the implications that come with a policy, and should be educated to

not support a policy based on fear. Because Mturk participants and students differ, researchers should utilize both samples when investigating policy attitudes. If using only one population, the results might not be generalizable. Future research should investigate the specific reasons why students and Mturk participants have differing views of crime control policies. This could help reveal if the differences are due to age, education, or something else.

This study found that individuals with higher self-esteem showed greater support for the policy. This finding did not support our expectations, and did not support a large portion of past self-affirmation research. Because of this, research should be done to further clarify our findings. Was this study an anomaly, or does self-esteem play a major role in support for CCT policies.

It is likely that politicians will continue to use emotional and fear appeals to gain support for policies. While criminologists cannot stop them from doing this, they can counteract it through education. Future research could investigate the effects of a rational, educational, informative campaign about CCT policies. This could be delivered in conjunction with or after an emotional/fear appeal. By furthering education on the use of emotion and fear appeals, policy makers will be less likely to present policies with them, as the public will be educated on them.

The manipulations in this study did not work, but have worked for other researchers who conducted this research in-person or in a lab (Cohen, et al. 2000; Steele & Liu, 1983). There could be an issue going on such that internet primes are less effective than in-person primes. Future research could explore this by comparing in-person studies and online studies investigating the same thing to see if results are similar.

Limitations

This study has several limitations. Participants were students from the University of Nevada, Reno and Amazon MTurk workers; therefore they might not be representative of the entire population, making the study lack in external validity. Also, this study might not be generalizable to other crime control policies, other countries, and other time periods. Research has found that utilizing student convenience samples can be an issue as students have different characteristics and different decision-making processes (Miller & Chomos, 2013; Wiener, Krauss, & Lieberman, 2011). Mturk participants might not be representative because they exclude certain individuals. For example, people who do not have computers and people who do not understand how to utilize programs such as Amazon Mturk will not be represented. Also, individuals who are of a lower social economic status will not be represented, as it is likely they do not have computers. However, research has shown that MTurk participants are diverse and more representative of traditional samples (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling 2011). The results from our study show that community members and students do differ. Therefore, in this study, the differences between the two samples did matter. However, by utilizing both populations, this study was able to create a generalizable sample.

Aside from some personality differences such as self-esteem, Mturk participants have consistently produced reliable results in previous decision-making research (Goodman et al., 2013). Students recruited through SONA were students in a social science related major (psychology, sociology, criminal justice, etc.) which could have lead to a more homogeneous or biased sample. These students might know more about crime control policies and this type of research so might be more likely to respond in a

certain way than a student from a different major would. Criminal Justice majors are more punitive than other majors (Mackey & Courtright, 2000). Because a good portion of participants were likely criminal justice majors, they could have been more critical of the policy's effectiveness. This is a limitation because a large number of participants were likely more critical than the average participant.

Another limitation is that this is an online study, which raises the concern of external validity because it might not be generalizable to other situations (e.g., in-person studies). While this has many benefits, such as participants being able to complete the study in the convenience of their home on their own time, there is a possibility that people might not have taken it as seriously as an in-person study. Although participants were able to contact the investigators for further information, the investigators were not available to immediately clarify. Amazon Mturk has a built in safeguard; participants will not get paid if they do not do well, thorough work. Student samples do not have this safeguard. Outside factors cannot be controlled for and there is no good way of screening out individuals who are distracted, confused, or otherwise do not care about the study. For our online survey, participants were randomly assigned to one of the four conditions. However, because this was random, we had no control of how many participants were assigned to each condition. Because of this, some conditions had a larger amount of participants than others (e.g., the self-affirmation/no guilt condition had 103, while the no self-affirmation/no guilt condition had 67). This is an issue because some conditions might be more generalizable (with larger variety and number of participants) than others.

There are also a number of other things that might have been "relevant" to this study that were not measured (e.g., whether someone was a parent, whether participants

had college aged kids/friends, etc.). Participants who had children might have been more supportive of the policy because they feared their children could become victims. Participants who had college aged children, or had a large base of college aged friends could have been more fearful of the crime affecting one of their loved ones. Construct validity was an issue for the “willingness to act” DV because asking participants to donate money, and actually having them donate money are two different things. Another limitation is that the guilt manipulation could have been too strong or too weak. If the guilt prime was too strong, students might have felt they had no control over the crime making them feel fear instead of guilt (Burnett & Lunsford, 1994). Future research should address the limitations mentioned.

Recommendations and Future Research

These results help explain why people continue to support ineffective crime control policies that do not prevent crime. Gender, self-esteem, and Mturk vs student sample all affected how much support participants gave. Future examinations of specific CCT policies are needed to help uncover their effectiveness and success. Not only should future research focus on further understanding of CCT, but more research should also focus on applying psychological theories to crime control policies and to individuals' support for these policies. Currently, little research has applied psychology theories to crime policies, or has applied them to individuals' support.

To address the limitations found in this study, future research should use a real CCT policy. Using a real policy as opposed to a fictional one might evoke more genuine responses from the participants. This could be a policy that is already in effect or a policy that is on a voting ballot. Researchers could contact individuals who supported the

initiation of a CCT policy and ask why they chose to. If wanting to portray a fictional policy, researchers could ask community members to sign their name in support for a policy being put on a ballot. This will address the consequentiality limitation because people will be required to take action immediately. Another way to collect genuine responses would be to interview people immediately following an event (e.g., an abduction and issued AMBER Alert) to search for themes in guilt and self-affirmation (i.e., are people saying they feel bad). To account for the potential problems with the "willingness to act" measure, participants could be asked to give actual money to support a policy instead of stating how much they would give hypothetically. Because differences in support were discovered in MTurk and student samples, future research should continue to use both samples to see if the results hold. Future research should also utilize a self-esteem component to see if the same results discovered in this experiment will remain consistent.

Conclusion

Many people support crime control policies that are merely theater. Various researchers have investigated reasons why people continue to support these policies (Sicafuse & Miller, 2010), but have not investigated how individuals' own emotions and self-perceptions play a role in individuals' support. This research showed that individuals support and believe that a CCT policy is effective, but do not show as much support when it comes time to act on it. It was also discovered that community members showed more support for crime control policies than did students. The high support levels could be due to a lack of education on the implications of CCT policies.

A large amount of money and resources are currently used on CCT policies that could be better spent. For example, the efforts and resources spent on AMBER Alert and other CCT policies to help rescue a small number of children could instead be used to help the millions of children abused and neglected each year who are over nine times more likely to die at the hands of their parents than by a stranger (Child Welfare Information Gateway, 2013). With the results of this study, and recommendations for further research, changes to individuals' attitudes might be made to help support the process of development, implementation, and acceptance of more effective crime control policies.

References

Applegate, B., Cullen, F., & Fisher, B. (2002). Public views toward crime and correctional policies: Is there a gender gap? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *30*, 89-100. doi: 10.1016/S0047-2352(01)00127-1

Armstrong, M. M., Miller, M. K., & Griffin, T. W. (in press). The psychology of sex offender registration and notification laws: popular but ineffective? In M. Miller, J. Blumenthal, & J. Chamberlain (Eds.). *Handbook of community sentiment*. New York: Springer.

Aronson, J., Blanton, H., & Cooper, J. (1995). From dissonance to disidentification: selectivity in the self-affirmation process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *68*(6), 986-996. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.68.6.986

Basil, D. Z., Ridgway, N. M., & Basil, M. D. (2008). Guilt and giving: A process model of empathy and efficacy. *Psychology and Marketing*, *25*(1), 1-23. doi: 10.1002/mar.20200

Baumeister, R., Stillwell, A., & Heatherton, T. (1994). Guilt: an interpersonal approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115(2), 243-267.

Ben-Yehuda, N. (2009). Foreword: Moral panics--36 years on. *British Journal of Criminology*, *49*(1), 1-3. doi:10.1093/bjc/azn076

Blanchard-Fields, F., Jahnke, H., & Camp, C. (1995). Age differences in problem-solving style: The role of emotional salience. *Psychology and Aging, 10*(2), 173-180. doi:10.1037/0882-7974.10.2.173

Bornstein, B. H. (1999). The ecological validity of jury simulations: Is the jury still out? Law and Human Behavior, 23, 75-91.

Bornstein, B. H., & McCabe, S. G. (2005). Jurors of the absurd? The role of consequentiality in jury simulation research. *Florida State University Law Review*, *32,* 443-467.

Boudewyns, V., Turner, M., & Paquin, R. (2013). Shame-Free Guilt Appeals: Testing the emotional and cognitive Effects of shame and guilt appeals. *Psychology and Marketing*, 30(9), 811-825. doi: 10.1002/mar.20647

Brown, J. D., & Dutton, K. A. (1995). The thrill of victory, the complexity of defeat: Self-esteem and people's emotional reactions to success and failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *68*(4), 712-722. doi: 0022-3514/95

Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's mechanical turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives in Psychological Science*, 6, 3-5. doi: 10.1177/1745691610393980

Burnett, M. S., & Lunsford, D. A. (1994). Conceptualizing guilt in the consumer decision-making Process. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *11*(3), 33-43. doi: 10.1108/07363769410065454

Caprathe, W. J. (2011). Commentary: Participant differences and validity of jury studies. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 29, 328-330. doi: 10.1002/bsl.988

Chen, E. Y. (2008). Impacts of "three strikes and you're out" on crime trends in California and throughout the United States. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *24*(4), 345-370. doi: 10.1177/1043986208319456

Chomos, J. & Miller, M.K. (under contract). Understanding how community sentiment is related to individual difference factors using an example of Safe Haven Laws and a student sample. In M. Miller, J. Blumenthal, & J. Chamberlain (Eds.).

Handbook of community sentiment. New York: Springer.

Chui, W., Cheng, K., & Wong, L. (2013). Gender, fear of crime, and attitudes toward prisoners among social work majors in a Hong Kong University. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 57*(4), 479-494.

Cohen, A. R. (1959). Some implications of self-esteem for social influence. In I. L. Janis (Ed.),

Personality and persuasibility (pp. 102-120). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Cohen, G. L., Aronson, J., & Steele, C. M. (2000). When beliefs yield to evidence: Reducing biased evaluation by affirming the self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *26*(9), 1151-1164. doi:10.1177/01461672002611011.

Cops, D., & Pleysier, S. (2011). 'Doing Gender' in fear of crime: The impact of gender identity on reported levels of fear of crime in adolescents and young adults. *British Journal of Criminology*, *51*(1), 58-74. doi: 10.1093/bjc/azq065

Correll, J., Spencer, S., & Zanna, M. (2003). An affirmed self and an open mind: Self-affirmation and sensitivity to argument strength. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *40*(2004), 350-356. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2003.07.001

Coulter, R., & Pinto, M. B. (1995). Guilt appeals in advertising: What are their effects? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *80*(6), 697-705.

Dillard, J. P., & Pfau, M. (2002). Guilt as mechanism of persuasion. *The persuasion handbook: developments in theory and practice* (pp. 329-360). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dodge, M., Bosick, S., & Antwerp, V. (2013). Do men and women perceive white-collar and street crime differently? Exploring gender differences in the perception of seriousness, motives, and punishment. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 29*(3), 399-415.

Durham, M. D. & Dane, F. C. (1999). Juror knowledge of eyewitness behavior: Evidence for the necessity of expert testimony. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 14*(3), 299-308.

Duwe, G. & Donnay, W. (2008). The impact of Megan's law on sex offender recidivism: The Minnesota experience. *Criminology*, 46: 411–446. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-9125.2008.00114.x

Estrada-Hollenbeck, M., & Heatherton, T. (1998). Avoiding and alleviating guilt through prosocial behavior. *Guilt and Children* (pp. 215-231). San Diego: Academic Press.

Fisher, B. S., & Sloan, J. J. (2003). Unraveling the fear of victimization among college females: Is the shadow of sexual assault hypothesis supported? *Justice Quarterly*, 20, 633–659. doi: 10.1080/07418820300095641

Fein, S., & Spencer, S. J. (1997). Prejudice as self-image maintenance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 31-44.

Fox, P., Wingrove, T., & Pfeifer, C. (2011). A comparison of students' and jury panelists' decision making in split recovery cases. Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 29(3), 358-375. doi: 10.1002/bsl.968.

Galinsky, A. D., Stone, J., & Cooper, J. (2000). The reinstatement of dissonance and psychological discomfort following failed affirmations. European Journal of Social Psychology, 30(1), 123-147.

Gilligan, C. (1977). Concepts of the self and of morality. *Harvard Educational Review*, 47, 481 – 517.

Goode, E., & Yehuda, N. (2009). Moral panics: the social construction of deviance (2nd ed.). Chichester, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell.

Goodey, J. (1997). Boys don't cry: Masculinities, fear of crime, and fearlessness. *British Journal of Criminology*, 37, 401–418.

Goodman, J. K., Cryder, C. E., & Cheema, A. (2013). Data collection in a flat world: The strengths and weaknesses of mechanical turk samples. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, *26*(3), 213-224. doi: 10.1002/bdm.1753

Griffin, T., & Miller, M. K. (2008). Child abduction, AMBER alert, and crime control theater. *Criminal Justice Review*, *33*(2), 159-176. doi: 10.1177/0734016808316778

Griffin, T. (2010). An empirical examination of AMBER alert 'successes'. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *38*(5), 1053-1062. doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.07.008

Hammond, M., Miller, M., & Griffin, T. (2010). Safe haven laws as crime control theater. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *34*, 542-552. doi: 10.1016/j.chiabu.2009.11.006

Harris, P. R., & Napper. (2005). Self-affirmation and the biased processing of threatening health-risk information. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *31*(9), 1250-1263. doi: 10.1177/0146167205274694

Hawkins, S. A., & Hastie, R. (1990). Hindsight: Biased judgments of past events after the outcomes are known. *Psychological Bulletin, 107*, 311-327.

Hessling, R., Nicole, T., & Schmidt, T. (2007, September 15). *Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods : SAGE Knowledge*. Retrieved December 27, 2014, from http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412950589

Hibbert, S., Smith, A., Davies, A., & Ireland, F. (2007). Guilt appeals: Persuasion knowledge and charitable giving. *Psychology and Marketing*, *24*(8), 723-742. doi: 10.1002/mar.20181

Hosch, H. M., Culhane, S.E., Tubb, V.A., & Granillo, E.A. (2011). Town vs. gown: A direct comparison of community residents and student mock jurors. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 29,452-466. doi: 10.1002/bsl.970

Kugler, K., & Jones, W. H. (1992). On conceptualizing and assessing guilt. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 318-327. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.62.2.318

Kunda, Z. (1999). Social cognition: Making sense of people. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lifton, R. J. (1967). Death in life. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Lindsey, L. L. (2005). Anticipated guilt as behavioral motivation: An examination of appeals to help unknown others through bone marrow donation. *Human Communication Research*, *31*(4), 453-481. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.2005.tb00879.x

Lindsey, L. L., Ah Yun., & Hill, J. B. (2007). Anticipated guilt as motivation to help

unknown others: An examination of empathy as a moderator. *Communication Research*, *34*(4), 468-480. doi:10.1177/0093650207302789.

Mackey, D. A., & Courtright, K. E. (2000). Assessing punitiveness among college students: A comparison of criminal justice majors with other majors. *The Justice Professional*, *12*(4), 423-441. doi: 10.1080/1478601X.2000.9959561

Maniaci, M. R., & Rogge, R. D. (2014). Caring about carelessness: Participant inattention and its effects on research. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *48*, 61-83. doi: 10.1016/j.jrp.2013.09.008

McCabe, J. G., Krauss, D. A., & Lieberman, J. D. (2009). Reality check: A comparison of college students and a community sample of mock jurors in a simulated sexual violent predator civil commitment. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, *28*, 730-750. doi: 10.1002/bsl.902

McCabe, J. G., & Krauss, D. A. (2011). The effect of acknowledging mock jurors' feelings on affective and cognitive biases: It depends on the sample. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 29*(3), 331-357. doi: 10.1002/bsl.990.

McCorkle, R.C. (1993). Research note: punish and rehabilitate? Public attitudes toward six common crimes. *Crime and Delinquency, 39*, 240-252.

McKay-Nesbitt, J., Manchanda, R. V., Smith, M. C. & Huhmann, B. A. (2011). Effects of

age, need for cognition, and affective intensity on advertising effectiveness. *Journal of Business Research*, 64, 12-17. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2009.09.013

McQueen, A., & Klein, W. (2006). Experimental manipulations of self-affirmation: A systematic review. *Self and Identity*, *5*(4), 289-354. doi:

10.1080/15298860600805325

Miller, J. (2012, September 12). Student-tracking system at Texas schools prompts privacy concerns. *Fox News*. Retrieved January 8, 2014, from http://www.foxnews.com/us/2012/09/12/texas-school-district-defends-use-student-tracking-mart-id-card/.

Miller, M., Wood, S., & Chomos, J. (2013). Relationships between support for the death penalty and cognitive processing: A comparison of students and community members. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 41(6), 732-750. doi: 10.1177/0093854813509369

Mohs, A., & Hübner, G. (2013). Organ donation: the role of gender in the attitude-behavior relationship. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43, E64-E70. doi: 10.1111/jasp.12042

Moksnes, U. K., & Espnes, G. A. (2013). Self-esteem and life satisfaction in adolescents—gender and age as potential moderators. *Quality of Life Research*, 22(10), 2921-2928. doi: 10.1007/s11136-013-0427-4

Muschert, G. W., Young-Spillers, M., & Carr, D. (2006). "Smart" policy decisions to combat a social problem: The case of child abductions 2002-2003. *Justice Policy Journal, 3*, 1-32.

Nail, P., Misak, J., & Davis, R. (2004). Self-affirmation versus self-consistency: A comparison of two competing self-theories of dissonance phenomena1. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *36*(8), 1893-1905. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2003.08.019

O'Keefe, D.J., & Figge, M. (1999). Guilt and expected guilt in the door-in-the-face technique. *Communication Monographs*, 66(4) 312-324.

Orth, U., Robins, R. W., & Soto, C. J. (2010). Tracking the trajectory of shame, guilt, and pride across the life span. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99(6), 1061-1071. doi: 10.1037/a0021342.

Renner, S., Lindenmeier, J., & Tscheulina, D. K. (2013). Guilt appeals and prosocial behavior: An experimental analysis of the effects of anticipatory versus reactive guilt appeals on the effectiveness of blood donor appeals. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, *25*(3), 237-255. doi: 10.1080/10495142.2013.816595

Rogers, P., & Davies, M. (2007). Perceptions of credibility and attributions of blame Towards victim in a childhood sexual abuse case: Gender and age factors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22*, 566–584.

Robin Higie Coulter, June Cotte, and Melissa Lunt Moore (1999) ,"Believe it or not: Persuasion, manipulation and credibility of guilt appeals", in NA - Advances in Consumer Research Volume 26, eds. Eric J. Arnould and Linda M. Scott, Provo, UT : *Association for Consumer Research*, Pages: 288-294.

Rossner, Meredith, David Tait, and Jane Goodman-Delahunty. (2014). Students vs. jurors: Responding to enhanced video technology. *Laws*, (3), 618–635. doi:10.3390/laws3030618

Sears, D. (1986). College sophomores in the laboratory: Influence of a narrow data base on social psychology's view of human nature. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*, 515-530. doi: 0022-3514/86/

Senol-durak, E., & Durak, M. (2011). Factor structure and psychometric properties of the emotional approach coping measure in turkish university students and community members. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 33*(2), 264-272. doi: 10.1007/s10862-011-9223-z.

Sharma, S., & Agarwala, S. (2014). Self-esteem and collective self-esteem as predictors of depression. *Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, 24(1).

Shaver, K. G. (1970). Defensive attribution: Effects of severity and relevance on the responsibility assigned for an accident. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 14*(2), 101–113.

Sicafuse, L., & Miller, M. (2010). Social psychological influences of the popularity of amber alerts. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *37*(11), 1237-1254. doi: 10.1177/0093854810379618

Sicafuse, L., & Miller, M. (2012). The effects of information processing and message quality on attitudes toward the amber alert system. *Applied Psychology in Criminal Justice*, *8*(2), 69-86. doi: 89252169

Siegrist, M., & Gutscher, H. (2006). Flooding risks: A comparison of lay people's perceptions and expert assessments in Switzerland. *Risk Analysis, 26*, 971-979. doi: 10.1111/j.1539-6924.2006.00792.x

Steele, C. M., & Liu, T. J. (1983). Dissonance processes as self-affirmation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *45*(1), 5-19.

Steele, C. M., Spencer, S. J., & Lynch, M. (1993). Self-image resilience and dissonance: The role of affirmational resources. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *64*(6), 885-896.

Sutton, R. M., Robinson, B., & Farrall, S. D. (2011). Gender, fear of crime, and self-presentation: an experimental investigation. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *17*(5), 421-433. doi: 10.1080/10683160903292261

Sze, V. (1995). A tale of three strikes slogan triumphs over substance as our bumper-sticker mentality comes home to roost. *Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review*, *28*(3), 1048-1098.

Taylor, S. L. (2004). Music piracy – Differences in ethical perceptions of business majors and music business majors. *Journal of Education for Business, 79(*5), 306-310. doi: 10.3200/JOEB.79.5.306-310

Wiener, R. L., Krauss, D. A., & Lieberman, J. D. (2011). Mock jury research: Where do we go from here? Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 29(3), 467-479. doi:10.1002/bsl.989.

Wilcox, P., Jordan, C. E., & Pritchard, A. J. (2006). Fear of acquaintance versus stranger rape as a 'master status': Towards refinement of the "shadow of sexual assault". *Violence and Victims*, *21*, 355–370. doi: 0886-6708

Zgoba, K. (2004). Spin doctors and moral crusaders: The moral panic behind child safety legislation. Criminal Justice Studies: *A Critical Journal of Crime, Law, and Society*, *17*, 385-404.

Zgoba, K., Witt, P., Dalessandro, M., Veysey, B. (2008). Megan's Law: Assessing the practical and monetary efficacy. *Washington: U.S. Department of Justice.*

Appendix A: Rosenburg Self-Esteem measure (Rosenburg, 1965)

Instructions: Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements (select one answer for each item).

1. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

Appendix B: Allport–Vernon–Lindzey values measure (AVL; Allport, Vernon, & Lindzey, 1960).

INSTRUCTIONS: Below is a list of characteristics and values, some of which might be important to you, some of which might be unimportant. Please rank these values and qualities in order of their importance to you, from 1 to 11 (1 = most important item, 11= least important item). Use each number only once.

_____ Artistic skills/aesthetic appreciation

_____ Sense of humor

_____ Relations with friends/family

_____ Spontaneity/living life in the moment

_____ Social skills

_____ Athletics

_____ Musical ability/appreciation

_____ Physical attractiveness

_____ Creativity

_____ Business/managerial skills

_____ Romantic values

INSTRUCTIONS: From the exercise above, please type the value you identified as most important to you (“1”) in the space below. Then, in a few paragraphs, please explain why the value or characteristic you ranked as “1” in the previous exercise is important to you. How do you use this value or characteristic in everyday life? If possible, please describe specific occasions on which this value or characteristic determined what you did, or describe a time in your life when this value or characteristic proved meaningful.
Value _______________________

Appendix C

INSTRUCTIONS: Below is a list of characteristics and values, some of which might be important to you, some of which might be unimportant. Please rank these values and qualities in order of their importance to you, from 1 to 11 (1 = most important item, 11= least important item). Use each number only once.

_____ Artistic skills/aesthetic appreciation

_____ Sense of humor

_____ Relations with friends/family

_____ Spontaneity/living life in the moment

_____ Social skills

_____ Athletics

_____ Musical ability/appreciation

_____ Physical attractiveness

_____ Creativity

_____ Business/managerial skills

_____ Romantic values

INSTRUCTIONS: We are interested in your thoughts and opinions about how certain values and characteristics might benefit other college students who might be very different from you. From the exercise above, please type the value or characteristic you ranked as ninth most important ("9") in the space below. Then, in a few paragraphs, Then, in a few paragraphs, please explain why the value or characteristic you ranked as "9" in the previous exercise might be important to another college student. How might another college student use this value or characteristic in everyday life?
Value ______________________

Appendix D: Fictional Crime Control Policy

INSTRUCTIONS: You have been selected to review and respond to information regarding a campus policy that might be implemented at UNR in the future. Please read the following information carefully.

University life can be stressful for many college students. Students might have difficulty adjusting to college life, face academic challenges, and experience difficulties in their personal relationships. However, these issues might pale in comparison to a much more serious problem facing college students, and college females in particular. Increasing incidents of sexual assault, abduction, and murder of college females on and around traditionally "safe" college campuses have aroused high levels of concern and anxiety among law enforcement, community members, University officials, and college students. The randomness of assaults on innocent college females and their devastating consequences suggest that these concerns are well founded. A recent examination of cases involving rape and murder committed on and around college campuses shows that the victims often differed in age, personality, ethnic background, and physical attractiveness. Thus, *all* college females might be at risk, regardless of their individual characteristics. Moreover, many of these females were caught off-guard and considered "low risk" victims. For example, a stranger abducted college senior Kaitlyn Moore during a Saturday afternoon while walking to her car in a shopping center parking lot less than half a mile from her campus. Her body was discovered in a field three months later; she had been sexually assaulted and strangled. Sarah Johannsen, a sophomore at a well-known University located in the western United States, was abducted from her locked apartment adjacent to campus. Campers discovered Sarah's body near a riverbank in a state park not far from the University. She had been raped and stabbed over 15 times. Police speculate that a stranger also murdered Sarah, and her attacker has not yet been caught.

The circumstances surrounding these cases were unforeseeable, and sadly, Kaitlyn and Sarah could have done little to prevent their deaths. However, a promising campus safety program developed by the US Department of Justice in conjunction with local law enforcement agencies, state legislators, and females's safety advocacy groups (e.g., National Campus Coalition for Females's Safety, Speak Out for Lost Daughters) might prevent other college students across America from losing their lives. Known as the ACT! (Achieving Campus Safety Today) Protection Program, this initiative is designed to protect college females from unpredictable acts of violence, abduction, sexual assault, and murder. Campuses adopting the ACT! Program provides all registered students with an individual ID card with an embedded Global Positioning System (GPS) tracking device. If a student carrying the card is reported missing, law enforcement agencies will be able to determine her precise location though information transmitted through the device to computer systems installed at both campus safety headquarters and local police departments. Law enforcement might then be immediately dispatched to the victim's location, dramatically increasing the likelihood that the perpetrator will be apprehended

before he has the chance to commit sexual assault or murder. Due to privacy concerns, law enforcement officials will not be able to legally access information regarding a student's whereabouts *until* the student is reported missing, and this information will *only* be used for the purposes of locating and rescuing a student who might be in serious danger. However, because rapid response from law enforcement increased the chances that a student will be saved, individuals who are unable to locate a friend or family member with a campus-issued GPS tracking device and are concerned about the student's safety are urged to contact police immediately.

Local and federal law enforcement officials believe that the ACT! Program will be highly effective in protecting college females from the growing number of sexual predators on and around University campuses. Recognizing the need to address the problem of campus safety threats, officials at the University of Nevada Reno are strongly considering adopting the ACT! Program. The GPS card would be made available to any interested students (both male and female) who are registered for at least 6 credits. Campus police contend that participating in the ACT! Program is an easy and efficient means of preventing violent crimes against UNR students. At present, UNR officials conducting surveys and interviews with UNR students to assess student support for the ACT! Program. If results indicate that most students strongly support the ACT! Program, the program will be implemented in Fall 2014.

Additional sentence for anticipatory guilt manipulation:

Campus violence could be avoided if more people like you supported the implementation of the policy. Without your support, students will remain targets of sexual predators on and around University campuses. You have the opportunity to take a stand against violent and sexual crimes against females. Your support may save a life!

Appendix E: Support Measure

TO MEASURE SUPPORT:

INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate your beliefs about the ACT! policy using the following 1-7 measure..

1. The ACT! policy is...

1--------2--------3-------4--------5--------6--------7

Harmful Undecided Beneficial

2. The ACT! policy is...

1--------2--------3-------4--------5--------6--------7

Wise Undecided Foolish

3. The ACT! policy is...

1--------2--------3-------4--------5--------6--------7

Negative Undecided Positive

Appendix F: Belief Measure

INSTRUCTIONS: On a measure of 1 to 7, with "1" indicating extremely strong disagreement, "4" indicating you are undecided, and "7" indicating extremely strong agreement, please indicate how strongly you agree with the following four statements. Please type your numeric response in the space provided. There are no right or wrong answers.

1. I believe that implementing the ACT! Policy at a University in my state will help save females's lives.

1--------2--------3-------4--------5--------6--------7

Extremely Strong Disagreement | Undecided | Extremely Strong Agreement

2. Implementing the ACT! Policy would not make the University campus or surrounding areas safer.

1--------2--------3-------4--------5--------6--------7

Extremely Strong Disagreement | Undecided | Extremely Strong Agreement

3. Implementing the ACT! Policy at a University in my state will help protect my friends, family members, or significant other from becoming a victim of sexual assault or murder.

1--------2--------3-------4--------5--------6--------7

Extremely Strong Disagreement | Undecided | Extremely Strong Agreement

4. Implementing the ACT! policy, at a University in my state will help protect me from becoming a victim of sexual assault or murder.

1--------2--------3-------4--------5--------6--------7

Extremely Strong Disagreement | Undecided | Extremely Strong Agreement

Appendix G: "Willingness to Act" Measure

INSTRUCTIONS: Though school officials are considering implementing the Program in the Fall of 2014, they have not yet determined how the program will be funded. The University might receive a federal grant to implement the program. In this case, the University or students would not incur any costs related to the Program. However, the University might have to fund the program through other means, such as raising tuition.

The following scenarios describe potential ways of funding the Program. On a 1-7 measure, with "1" indicating the absolute lowest level of support, "4" indicating moderate support, and "7" indicating the absolute highest level of support, please indicate the degree to which you support the implementation of the Program at the University of Nevada, Reno considering each funding scenario.

Please indicate the degree to which you would support the implementation of the Program at a University in your state if…

1. All registered students were assessed a $10 fee per semester in order to fund the Program.

1--------2--------3-------4--------5--------6--------7

Absolute lowest level of Support	Moderate Support	Highest level of Support

2. All registered students were assessed a $30 fee per semester in order to fund the Program.

1--------2--------3-------4--------5--------6--------7

Absolute lowest level of Support	Moderate Support	Highest level of Support

3. All registered students were assessed a $50 fee per semester in order to fund the Program.

1--------2--------3-------4--------5--------6--------7

Absolute lowest level of Support	Moderate Support	Highest level of Support

4. Students would not have to pay any additional fees in order to fund the Program. Rather, some money that is presently being used to fund other University programs (e.g., athletics, scholarships, social events, transportation services, academic help centers) would instead be used to fund the Program.

1--------2--------3-------4--------5--------6--------7

Absolute lowest level of Support	Moderate Support	Highest level of Support

5. Students would not have to pay any additional fees in order to fund the Program. Rather, the Program would be funded by an additional state "vice" tax imposed on alcohol and tobacco products.

1--------2--------3-------4--------5--------6--------7

Absolute lowest level of Support	Moderate Support	Highest level of Support

Appendix H: Self-Affirmation Manipulation Check

INSTRUCTIONS: The following two questions are designed to assess your *current* emotional state. Please respond to each item using the measure provided (1 = extremely negative, 4 = neutral, 9 = extremely positive).

1. How would you describe your mood ***right now***?

1----------2----------3---------4----------5----------6----------7----------8----------9

Extremely Negative | Neutral | Extremely Positive

2. How do you feel about yourself ***right now*****?**

1----------2----------3---------4----------5----------6----------7----------8----------9

Extremely Negative | Neutral | Extremely Positive

Appendix I: Anticipatory Guilt Manipulation Check

INSTRUCTIONS: Please think back to your thoughts and feelings when reading about the ACT! Program and indicate how strongly you agree with the following statements using the measure provided (1 = strongly disagree, 4 = neutral, 7 = strongly agree).

1. I would feel remorseful if I did not express my support for the ACT! Program and the program was not adopted due to low levels of student support.

1--------2--------3-------4--------5--------6--------7

Strongly Disagree | Neutral | Strongly Agree

2. I would not feel sorry for declining to support the ACT! Program.

1--------2--------3-------4--------5--------6--------7

Strongly Disagree | Neutral | Strongly Agree

3. I would feel guilty if I did nothing to try to prevent females on my campus from becoming victims of sexual assault and murder.

1--------2--------3-------4--------5--------6--------7

Strongly Disagree | Neutral | Strongly Agree

Table 1

Overall Means

Scale	*M*	Minimum	Maximum
Belief Measure	62.9	0	100
Support Measure	74.8	0	100
"Willingness to Act" Measure	49.1	0	100

Table 2

Regression Model 1: Belief Measure

Variable	*B*	*SE*	β	*p*	t
Self-Affirmation Condition	10.05	11.2	0.2	0.37	0.89
Guilt Condition	2.6	3.94	0.05	0.51	0.66
Self-Affirmation x Guilt Interaction	1.7	5.31	0.03	0.75	0.32
Esteem	0.25	0.09	0.19	0.01	2.59
Self-Esteem x Self-Affirmation					
Opportunity	-0.16	0.14	-0.26	0.26	-1.13
Population	11.94	2.73	0.24	0	4.37
Gender	-10.12	2.63	-0.2	0	-3.85

Table 3

Means on gender

Scale	Gender	*M*
Belief Measure	Female	68.1
	Male	57.6
Support Measure	Female	80.3
	Male	69.1
"Willingness to Act" Measure	Female	53.1
	Male	44.7

Table 4

Means on Population

Scale	Population	*M*
Belief Measure	Student	57.2
	Mturk	66.9
Support Measure	Student	68.7
	Mturk	79.3
"Willingness to Act" Measure	Student	44.3
	Mturk	52.5

Table 5
Regression Model 2: Belief Measure

Variable	*B*	*SE*	β	*p*	t
Self-Regard	0.28	0.15	0.25	0.063	1.8
Self-Reported Guilt	0.57	0.16	0.65	3.4	3.4
Population	8	3	0.14	0.008	2.6
Esteem	-0.05	0.08	-0.04	0.48	-0.69
Gender	-1.1	2.6	-0.02	0.66	-0.43
Self-Reported Guilt x Self-Regard	-0.002	0.002	-0.1	0.63	-0.47

Table 6
Regression Model 3: Support Measure

Variable	*B*	*SE*	β	*p*	t
Self-Affirmation Condition	6.4	10.5	0.14	0.55	0.6
Guilt Condition	1.6	3.7	0.03	0.67	0.42
Self-Affirmation x Guilt Interaction	3.9	4.9	0.07	0.43	0.78
Esteem	0.26	0.09	0.21	0.004	2.88
Self-Esteem x Self-Affirmation Opportunity	-0.1	0.13	-0.17	0.44	-0.77
Population	12.8	2.6	0.268	0	5.01
Gender	-11.7	2.5	-0.25	0	-4.73

Table 7

Regression Model 4: Support Measure

Variable	*B*	*SE*	β	*p*	t
Self-Regard	0.15	0.13	0.15	0.25	1.1
Self-Reported Guilt	0.44	0.151	0.512	0.004	2.9
Population	8.5	2.7	0.16	0.002	3.1
Esteem	-0.02	0.075	-0.2	0.71	-0.36
Gender	-1.5	2.3	-0.03	0.51	-0.66
Self-Reported Guilt x Self-Regard	0	0.002	0.03	0.89	0.13

Table 8

Regression Model 5: "Willingness to Act" Measure

Variable	*B*	*SE*	β	*p*	t
Self-Affirmation Condition	9.9	10.4	0.21	0.34	0.95
Guilt Condition	5.4	3.7	0.12	0.14	1.5
Self-Affirmation x Guilt Interaction	1.2	4.9	0.02	0.8	0.25
Esteem	0.21	0.09	0.17	0.02	2.2
Self-Esteem x Self-Affirmation Opportunity	-0.17	0.13	-0.29	19	-1.3
Population	10.6	2.5	0.22	0	4
Gender	-9.03	2.5	-0.19	0	-3.7

Table 9

Regression Model 6: "Willingness to Act Measure"

Variable	*B*	*SE*	β	*p*	t
Self-Regard	0.15	0.13	0.15	0.25	1.1
Self-Reported Guilt	0.44	0.151	0.512	0.004	2.9
Population	8.5	2.7	0.16	0.002	3.1
Esteem	-0.02	0.075	-0.2	0.71	-0.36
Gender	-1.5	2.3	-0.03	0.51	-0.66
Self-Reported Guilt x Self-Regard	0	0.002	0.03	0.89	0.13

Table 10: Summary of Findings

	Hypo 1	Hypo 2	Hypo 3	Hypo 4	Hypo 5	Hypo 6	RQ 1	RQ 2
Analyses 1	.037/Not Confirmed	.51/Not confirmed	.75/Not confirmed	n/a	n/a	.001/ Confirmed	.01/ Affirmative	.001/ Affirmative
Analyses 2	n/a	n/a	.64/Not Confirmed	.63	.01/ Confirmed	.01/ Confirmed	.25/ Negative	.01/ Affirmative
Analyses 3	.54	.67	.43/Not Confirmed	n/a	n/a	.001/ Confirmed	.004/ Affirmative	.001/ Affirmative
Analyses 4	n/a	n/a	.81/Not Confirmed	.25	.001/ Confirmed	.01/ Confirmed	.71/ Negative	.001/ Affirmative
Analyses 5	.34	.14	.8/Not Confirmed	n/a	n/a	.001/ Confirmed	.02/ Affirmative	.001/ Affirmative
Analyses 6	n/a	n/a	.89/Not Confirmed	.25/Not Confirmed	.01/ Confirmed	.01/ Confirmed	.72/ Negative	.001/ Affirmative