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ABSTRACT

Across the English-speaking western world there has been much concern with the so called ‘punitive turn’ in sentencing policy and the resulting steep increases in the use of imprisonment. Much commentary has assumed this is the result of growing public dissatisfaction and demand for more punishment. However, in Australia, results from public opinion surveys conducted over the past twenty years indicate that public demand for punishment or ‘punitiveness’ is stable or declining (Indermaur & Roberts, 2005). To better understand public punitiveness in Australia we examine some of the demographic and attitudinal factors associated with it. Sequential multiple regression is used to analyse recent survey data. The results reveal that demographic factors, political orientation, religious attendance and media exposure are weak to moderate predictors of punitive attitudes. The strongest predictors of punitiveness were criminal justice knowledge and attitudes, suggesting there is a strong constellation of beliefs about crime and justice that coalesce, and are only partially influenced by demographic factors, political orientation, religious attendance and media use. It is people’s knowledge and beliefs of crime and the criminal justice system that best predict punitive attitudes, and thus provide the best insight into how to address public dissatisfaction and calls for harsher sentencing.
INTRODUCTION

The increasingly punitive policies witnessed across the English speaking western world over the last 15 years have enjoyed wide popularity and are typically seen as ‘vote winners’. But politics and the reality of public opinion are not as closely linked as is often assumed. Often public attitudes are based on faulty or incomplete information. Legislation introduced on the basis of such misinformation can never deliver the outcomes in terms of public safety that is promised or expected.

Determining the predictors of attitudes to punishment is important not only in understanding the phenomenon of punitiveness but also for exploring the likely impact of changes to sentencing practice in regard to public satisfaction with the justice system. Developing a good understanding of the nature of public opinion on punishment is central to ensuring that information on informed public opinion is available for policy and political purposes. Such an understanding is also fundamental to the efforts that need to be undertaken to overcome faulty information and to counter political exploitation of public fears. As part of this, it is important to understand what underlies punitive beliefs within the population. For example, are punitive attitudes linked to demographically similar sections of the population? Do other factors play a stronger role in determining punitive attitudes? In order to address these questions we use the most recent survey data available to examine the demographic and attitudinal factors that underlie punitive beliefs in Australia. This paper centres on an analysis of the Australian Survey of Social Attitudes (AuSSA) 2003 survey results presented by Indermaur and Roberts (2005). We begin by outlining differences in punitiveness of criminal justice policy at a global level.
Punitive nations versus public punitiveness?

Although there are differences in the level of punitiveness of nations around the world, comparative studies of western nations usually reveal the United States as the most punitive (based on measures of convictions, sentence lengths and rates of imprisonment) and Sweden and Switzerland the least punitive (Blumstein, Tonry, & Van Ness, 2005). There is ample evidence that the level of punitiveness of criminal justice practice in English speaking nations is increasing. Various authors (e.g., Roberts, Stalans, Indermaur & Hough, 2003; Pratt, Brown, Brown, Hallsworth, & Morrison, 2005) have documented the increasingly punitive penal policies in the United States, Canada, Britain and Australia. This ‘new punitiveness’ (Pratt et al., 2005) and ‘culture of control’ (Garland, 2001) has been attributed to a “a range of complex forces…some structural and global, others local” (Roberts et al., 2003:75) with a basis in “the broad social anxieties besting the middle class in this period” (Roberts et al., 2003:75) as well as the influence of an increasingly simplified tabloid media.

Given that many of these policies are based on claims that they meet public demand for punishment it is important to distinguish between the punitiveness of the legal system within a nation and the punitive attitudes of individuals within that nation. Support for such claims comes from the widely reported finding from public opinion surveys that sentencing is too lenient (e.g. see Roberts et al, 2003). When we examine punitive attitudes of the public within English-speaking western nations we indeed find a remarkable level of similarity in the desire for harsher sentences. In the 2003/4 British Crime Survey 79% of respondents indicated that sentencing is too lenient, (Allen, Komy, Lovbakke, & Roy, 2005). In Australia, 70% of respondents to the 2003
AuSSA survey indicated that people who break the law should be given stiffer sentences (Indermaur & Roberts, 2005), increasing to 73% in 2005 (Wilson et al., 2006). In the United States 67% of respondents to the nationwide 2002 General Social Survey reported that courts in their local area do not deal harshly enough with criminals (Pastore & Maguire, 2003: 141). While the questions and response options varied across countries, the overall picture that emerges is that more than two-thirds of the public in each country expressed dissatisfaction with the severity of sentences handed down by courts.

The results obtained from global questions about sentencing in representative opinion polls and surveys provide a crude means of estimating punitive attitudes and tracking changes over time within and between nations. There is a growing body of literature that demonstrates that different methodologies used in measuring public opinion result in differing levels of public punitiveness according to the questioning technique employed, the form of the question and the level of information provided (see Hutton, 2005 for a recent exploration of this issue). However, despite the increasing punitiveness of western nations, there is some indication from results of public opinion surveys conducted over the past twenty years, as measured by standard questions about preferences for harsher sentencing, that public punitiveness is stable or declining, at least in Canada (Sanders & Roberts, 2000) and in Australia. Indermaur and Roberts (2005) plotted trends in attitudes to sentencing and the death penalty in Australia over two decades. The proportion of Australians who agree with stiffer sentences has declined from a peak in 1987, and agreement that the death penalty should be the punishment for murder has declined from a peak in 1993.
What predicts punitive attitudes?

There is now much evidence suggesting that attitudes to punishment are not based on facts or accurate information but rather reflect a sentiment for stronger boundary setting. It follows, as Roberts (2002) recently argued, that no amount of increased sentencing in policy or practice will satiate such a demand. Studies of individual differences in punitiveness reveal that demographic predictors, political orientation, the salience of crime (as indicated by victimization and fear of crime) and beliefs about crime are most relevant (Hogan, Chiricos & Gertz, 2005).

Early research in this area examined demographic predictors of punitiveness. Variables examined include age, sex, race, marital status, income and education. While some studies have reported increased punitiveness with age (e.g. Gerber & Engelhardt-Greer, 1996; Indermaur & Roberts, 2005), others have found no consistent relationship (Kury & Ferdinand, 1999). Findings on gender have also been inconclusive and vary according to the measure used. Applegate, Cullen and Fisher (2002) noted that male and female views on punishment diverge with females more likely to support offender treatment and less likely to support harsh punishment than males. Consistent with this, men have been found to be more likely to favour the death penalty than women (Kury & Ferdinand, 1999). African Americans are often reported to be less punitive than Caucasian Americans (Dowler, 2003). Those who are married (Dowler, 2003) or widowed (Gerber & Engelhardt-Greer, 1996) have been found to be more punitive. Mixed findings have been found in relation to income. One study found that those on the lowest incomes were the least punitive (Kury & Ferdinand, 1999) while another that those on lower incomes were more punitive (Dowler, 2003). Punitiveness has consistently been found to decrease with increased

Other demographic predictors of punitiveness examined include politics and religion. In terms of political persuasion, republicans and conservatives in the US are usually found to be more punitive (Gerber & Engelhardt-Greer, 1996). Rather than political party alignment it is often argued that it is a preference for dominance of moral power and a wish to see it enforced that appears to be most closely linked with punitiveness (e.g. Tyler and Boeckmann, 1997). It follows that punitiveness as a psychological construct may be part of, or conflated with, a conservative political orientation (e.g. Boshier & Rae, 1975; Wilson, 1973). Many measures of conservatism actually include preferences for enforcement of boundaries and standards. Earlier authors such as Adorno and others from the Frankfurt school formed the view that the central personality construct was the “authoritarian” personality (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson & Sanford, 1950). This approach was largely informed by psychoanalytic perspectives and an intense interest in understanding the rise or appeal of fascism in Germany (see also Weihofen, 1957). Contemporary reviews that have examined the relationship between fundamentalism and punitive beliefs (see, for example such Unnever, Cullen & Applegate, 2005) have found, unsurprisingly, that those with rigid religious beliefs were more punitive, while those believing in compassion, forgiveness and with an image of a nurturing God were less punitive. Those involved in religious activity were also less punitive. It is thus relevant here to remember that religiosity does not reflect religious involvement or activity but a willingness to embrace structures that promulgate moral authority.
As can be expected from the plethora of weak, often contradictory, correlational links between measures of punitiveness and other constructs, demographic factors have been, at best, weak predictors of punitiveness. For example, demographic variables were able to explain only 8% of the variance in attitudes to the death penalty in a US study (Fox, Radelet & Bonsteel, 1991). Consistent with research on general punitiveness, Longmire (1996) summarized previous research on the correlates of support for death penalty in America noting that higher levels of support were found for males, whites, the politically conservative, those supporting conservative and dogmatic religions, persons high in authoritarianism, and those living in rural areas. The highly educated were the least likely to support capital punishment. Similarly, factors that predict positive attitudes towards community sanctions (roughly the opposite of punitive attitudes) include higher education, being male and youth. However, these demographic variables explain only about 10% of the variation in public attitudes (Maruna & King, 2004).

Whilst the analysis of demographic factors has failed to reveal any simple explanation of root causes, perhaps beliefs about crime and the fear of crime may be more directly relevant and therefore predictive of punitiveness. Fear of crime has been associated with punitive attitudes with increased fear of crime predicting increased punitiveness (Sprott & Doob, 1997, Dowler, 2003). The relationship holds constant regardless of victim status, age and gender (Sprott & Doob, 1997). The link between fear, insecurity and the desire to punish is at the heart of the psychoanalytic perspectives typified by the Frankfurt school. Whilst this observation is interesting and matches with expectations, Maruna and King (2004) estimated that instrumental variables such
as fear of crime provide an increase of only 4% in explanatory power of pro-community sanctions attitudes over that provided by demographic variables alone.

Some research has examined the relationship between punitive beliefs and other beliefs about society and, in particular, the criminal justice system. Expressive values such as collective efficacy, trust, anxiety about youth, crime salience, dispositional attributions and beliefs about crime as a choice and the belief in redeemability have all been associated with attitudes to criminal sanctions (Maruna & King, 2004). Hogan and colleagues (2005) examined the role of economic insecurity and blame on public punitiveness. Blaming affirmative action, welfare and immigration for stagnating incomes over the previous two decades were significant predictors of punitiveness. Hogan and colleagues argued that “punitiveness towards criminals is, in fact, part of a general constellation of resentment toward, and scapegoating of, what Gans has termed the ‘undeserving poor’” (p. 405). Punitive beliefs have also been associated with beliefs that judges are out of touch with society and that judges are doing a poor job (Hough & Roberts, 1999; Mirrlees-Black, 2001).

The general public forms their views about crime and punishment through personal experiences, political representations and media portrayals of crime and justice. Studies in Australia and Canada have found that the main source of information about the criminal justice system for the vast majority of the public is the media (Broadhurst & Indermaur, 1982; Roberts & Doob, 1989). The media increases the salience of crime and justice issues (Flanagan, 1996). Media programming that includes either fictional or factual treatment of crime also contributes to incorrect perceptions of crime (Pfeiffer, Windizio & Kleimann, 2005). Media reports that provide sentencing
information are typically brief, focus on offences against the person and typically involve a sentence of imprisonment with alternatives to incarceration seldom mentioned (Roberts & Doob, 1989). Studies that have examined the link between media exposure and punitiveness (e.g. O’Connell & Whelan, 1996) suggest that the news media tends to facilitate a hardening of attitudes to crime and punishment.

Despite these purported links no direct relationship has been reported between media consumption and punitive attitudes (Dowler, 2003). However, Indermaur and Roberts (2005) reported that the type of media relied upon for news and information was related to perceptions of crime rates, with individuals who relied on commercial television holding less accurate perceptions of crime rates than those who relied on other media sources. Generally an association can be observed between a shallow or limited perception of crime trends, use of commercial, broadcast or tabloid media and increased punitiveness. Whether or not all these variables are in turn related to another more relevant variable such as education level, socio-economic status or even intelligence is yet to be established.

A number of studies have found that a belief that crime is increasing is a significant predictor of the belief that court sentences are too lenient and a preference for stiffer penalties (Pfeiffer et al, 2005; Indermaur & Roberts, 2005; Sprott, 1999). Despite falling crime rates, the perception that crime rates are increasing is common in Australia (Weatherburn & Indermaur, 2004; Indermaur & Roberts, 2005) and other westernised countries (Hutton, 2005; Pfeiffer et al, 2005) and has largely been accepted as a ‘social fact’ (Garland, 2001).
Australian Research on Predicting Punitiveness

Limited research has been conducted in Australia that examines predictors of punitive attitudes. Broadhurst and Indermaur (1982) found no relationship between knowledge of sentencing and punitiveness. Walker, Collins and Wilson (1988) examined the socio-demographic correlates of sentencing preferences reporting that correlates of punitiveness were increased age, lower levels of education, and lower socio economic status. Kelley and Braithwaite (1990) examined predictors of support for the death penalty¹ and general punitiveness in Australia using data from the National Social Science Survey conducted in 1984. Least supportive of the death penalty were women, the more highly educated and those who were not married. There were no differences by age or place of residence. Least punitive on a general measure (excluding the death penalty) were men, the more highly educated and those who were not married. There were no significant differences in either measure by age or place of residence.

The Australian Survey of Social Attitudes (AUSSA, Gibson, Wilson, Meagher, Denemark & Western, 2004) is the most recent published Australian survey series to include questions on sentencing. A descriptive overview of the results of the crime and justice questions in the 2003 survey has been provided in Indermaur and Roberts (2005). The majority (70%) of respondents indicated that they had ‘not very much’ (46%) or ‘no’ (24%) confidence in the courts and legal system. Further, the majority (63%) agreed with the statement that “judges should reflect public opinion about crimes when sentencing criminals”, seven out of ten believed that those who break the

¹ Capital punishment in Australian states was abolished between 1922 (Queensland) and 1984 (Western Australia), with the last execution in 1967 in Victoria.
law should be given stiffer sentences, and almost half (47%) agreed that the death penalty should be the punishment for murder.

There is evidence in the survey for the link between punitiveness and a belief in the importance of public opinion. Those who agreed that judges should reflect public opinion when sentencing were about twice as likely to agree with statements that stiffer sentences should be applied and that death should be the penalty for murder. Not surprisingly those seeking stiffer sentencing were five to six times more likely than those who do not to support the death penalty for murder.

**Methodology**

**Data Source**

The results presented in this paper are based on the analysis of AuSSA 2003 (Gibson et al, 2004). The sampling frame for this survey was the 2002 Australian Electoral Commission Electoral Roll from which a stratified systematic random sample of 11,380 adults proportional to population on a state basis was drawn. The survey was administered as a self-completion mail survey with an introductory letter and two reminder letters sent. In total, 4270 surveys were completed, providing an adjusted response rate of 44% (Gibson, Wilson, Meagher, Denemark & Western, 2005).

The AuSSA constitutes a good fit to the Australian population. The recognized biases in the AUSSA 2003 sample, in common with other social surveys, are an over representation of older Australians, females and the more highly educated. A
comparison of the raw data with data weighted to the Australian population did not produce differences large enough to warrant weighting the data (Gibson et al., 2005).

**Constructing a measure of punitiveness**

Three sentencing questions in the AuSSA survey relating to stiffer sentencing, the death penalty and sentences reflecting public opinion were combined to produce a punitiveness scale that reflects the level of punitiveness or preference for punishment. The three questions combined to form the scale were:

Here are some statements about crime and the law in our society. Please tell us how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

a. The death penalty should be the punishment for murder
b. People who break the law should be given stiffer sentences

Here are some statements about law enforcement. Please tell us how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

a. Judges should reflect public opinion about crimes when sentencing criminals

Analysis of the psychometric properties of the scale indicated that the scale is suitable for research purposes (single component factor structure and Cronbach’s alpha = .7). High scores on the scale reflect more punitive attitudes. Hereafter this scale will be referred to as the Roberts Indermaur punitiveness measure (RI punitive measure).
Analysis

Sequential (hierarchical) multiple regression using SPSS was used to determine the factors that best predict scores on the RI punitiveness measure. The predictor variables of interest\(^2\) (based on previous research in this area, the availability of items included in the survey and significant univariate relationships with the punitiveness scale) were entered in four steps: demographic variables, religion and politics, main source of news and criminal justice attitudes.

RESULTS

The results of the sequential multiple regression are presented in Table 1. In total, just over a third (35.6%) of the variance in punitiveness scores was explained by the thirteen predictor variables. This is considered to be a large effect size\(^3\) in this type of research (Cohen, 1998).

In Step 1 demographic variables were entered into the regression equation as they are assumed to be causally prior to other variables. Demographic variables alone accounted for 12.8% of variance in punitive scores, and as such provide a small to medium effect (Cohen, 1998). Increased punitiveness was associated with being male, older and self-described as working class. Punitiveness decreased with years of education.

\(^2\) The questions with coding are presented as Appendix A

\(^3\) Cohen (1998) proposed the convention of \(R^2\)’s of .02, .13 and .26 for defining small, medium and large effect sizes.
In Step 2 religious and political variables were added to the equation. Having a right-wing political orientation and being a liberal or national supporter was associated with greater punitiveness. Attending religious services at least once per month was associated with reduced punitiveness. Together, the religious and political variables were able to account for an additional 10% of the variance in punitiveness scores, again providing a small to medium effect size (Cohen, 1998).

In Step 3, commercial television as the main source of news was added to the regression equation. This variable alone accounted for an additional 2.3% of the variance in punitiveness scores, representing a significant increase with a small effect size.

In Step 4 five criminal justice attitudes were added to the regression equation. People who were knowledgeable about crime rate trends and disagreed that immigrants increase crime were less punitive. Similarly, those who had confidence in the courts and believed the police were not corrupt were less punitive. However, having confidence in the police was associated with greater punitiveness. Together these attitudinal variables were able to account for an additional 14.5% of the variance in punitiveness scores over that provided by demographics, politics and religion, and media use variables. Combined, criminal justice attitudes variables provide a medium effect size (Cohen, 1998).

**DISCUSSION**

The results indicate that demographic variables alone have limited value in the prediction of punitive attitudes. Within the demographic variables tested, the number
of years of education was the strongest predictor, with the RI punitiveness measure declining as years of education increased. This suggests that as education levels increase over time, there is the potential for a reduction in the level of punitiveness within the Australian population.

Punitiveness was also predicted by religious and political variables, with a right wing orientation associated with higher levels of punitiveness and attendance at religious services associated with lower levels of punitiveness. A weak effect was found for media use, with those who relied on commercial television as the main source of news slightly more punitive than those who relied on other sources.

However, the strongest predictors of punitiveness were criminal justice attitudes. Even after demographic, religious and political and media use variables were controlled for, criminal justice attitudes significantly increased the proportion of variance in punitive attitudes that could be explained. Indeed, criminal justice attitudes accounted for more of the variance in punitive attitudes than demographics, religious and political variables or media use.

The results suggest there is a strong constellation of beliefs about crime and justice that coalesce\(^4\), and are only partly influenced by demographics. It appears to be people’s knowledge and beliefs of crime and the criminal justice system that underpin punitive attitudes to a greater extent than demographics, political orientation, religious attendance or media use. The notion that attitudes are not independent but interrelated

\(^4\) To further test this assumption, a scale consisting of the punitive scale items and five attitudinal predictors was created. This overall scale of criminal justice attitudes has acceptable reliability (Cronbach’s alpha = .84) but was not unidimensional, suggesting that punitive attitudes represent a subset of criminal justice attitudes.
is not new. Within the mind attitudes may be linked in molar cognitive structures (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993) and associated not only with other attitudes but also with images, beliefs, emotions and experiences (Stalans, 2002).

The importance of public attitudes to sentencing lies in their potential to influence the development of policy guiding the criminal justice system. This poses a problem if public attitudes are not based on accurate information. The results of this research indicate that inaccurate perceptions of crime are associated with more punitive attitudes. The general public in Australia has a distorted perception of crime rates in Australia, with 7 out of 10 survey respondents believing that crime had increased when generally crime has stabilised or decreased (Indermaur & Roberts, 2005). In addition, the public has false expectations about what sentencing can deliver in terms of crime reduction and containment (Roberts & Stalans, 1998).

Green (2006) noted that “ignorance pervades the interplay between crime, politics and public opinion” (p. 132). The results reported here suggest a need to educate the public about crime trends and the effects and limits of criminal justice system. Informed debate about the criminal justice system in Australia is currently hampered by the superficial treatment provided to criminal justice issues by the media, politicians and pollsters (Casey & Mohr, 2005). In addition to the general public, there is a need to educate criminal justice professionals (Roberts & Stalans, 1998), policy makers (Roberts et al, 2003) and the media about public opinion.

However, the provision of information alone may not be enough to change attitudes, with values and principles rated by the public as more important than statistical
information (Stead, McFadyen & Hastings, 2002). People may hold attitudes and beliefs and seek out information that supports these. Maruna and King (2004) argued that “If attitudes toward criminal punishment are driven largely by emotive rather than instrumental concerns … then rational appeals to the benefits of various justice options will have only limited impact on public views” (p. 101). Public education must therefore embrace or contain some capacity to expand consciousness and/or address the symbolic and emotional issues that punitiveness reflects (see Frieberg, 2001).

In addition to misperceptions about crime trends, the findings from this research highlight the role of confidence in the courts. Three quarters of survey respondents had ‘not very much’ or ‘no’ confidence in the courts (Indermaur & Roberts, 2005), and this was a significant predictor of punitive attitudes. It may be that this frustration with procedural justice finds expression in answers to questions about the level of the punishment preferred. There is a need to find realistic, practical strategies that address public trust in the criminal justice system. This may include courts taking action to regain the trust of the people. Here symbolic gestures and respectful gestures might do more than a bevy of information.

The strength of association between punitive beliefs and other criminal justice beliefs suggests that changing punitive attitudes will require both educating the public about crime rates and the criminal justice and increasing their confidence in the court system.
APPENDIX A

Variables used in Regression Equations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Age in years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Firstly, are you...female? male?</td>
<td>1=male 0=female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>All up, how many years of education have you completed?</td>
<td>Years completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>Which social class would you say you belong to?</td>
<td>1=working class 0=other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends religious services</td>
<td>How often do you attend religious services?</td>
<td>1=once p. month+ 0=other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right political spectrum</td>
<td>In politics people sometimes refer to being on the left or on the right.</td>
<td>0 to 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal/National</td>
<td>Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as Labor, Liberal, Liberal, National or what?</td>
<td>1=Liberal/national 0=other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial TV</td>
<td>Which of the following sources of information would you say you rely on MOST for your news and information?</td>
<td>1=Commercial tv 0=other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in courts</td>
<td>How much confidence do you have in the following organisations? d. The courts and the legal system</td>
<td>1=quite a lot/great deal 0=none/not very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate crime Perceptions</td>
<td>Over the last TWO YEARS, do you think the following have increased or decreased or stayed the same? f. Crime</td>
<td>1=crime decreased /stable 0=crime increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police not corrupt</td>
<td>Here are some statements about law enforcement. Please tell us how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. b. There is a lot of corruption in the police force in my State (or Territory)</td>
<td>1= disagree 0=other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in police</td>
<td>How much confidence do you have in the following organisations? j. The police in my state (or Territory)</td>
<td>1=quite a lot/great deal 0=none/not very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants don't increase crime</td>
<td>Here are some statements about crime and the law in our society. Please tell us how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. d. Immigrants increase crime rates</td>
<td>1=disagree 0=other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 1. Steps in Regression Model Predicting Punitive Attitudes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardised Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.009*</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (male)</td>
<td>.382**</td>
<td>.245*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of education</td>
<td>-.209***</td>
<td>-.182***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>.706***</td>
<td>.993***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion and Politics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends religious services</td>
<td>-.810***</td>
<td>-.778***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right political spectrum</td>
<td>.391***</td>
<td>.366***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal/National supporter</td>
<td>.447**</td>
<td>.410**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Source of News</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial TV</td>
<td>.974***</td>
<td>.626***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate crime perceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police not corrupt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants don’t increase crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R Square                          | .128   | .227   | .251   | .382***|
R Square Change                   | .100***| .023***| .131***|

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001.