Demographic Predictors of Attitudes Toward Capital Punishment: A Critical Multiple Regression Analysis

Dr. Kenneth Okocha

Professor of Political Science, Hillcity University, Benin Republic, Benin

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.10200124

Received: 10 February 2026; Accepted: 17 February 2026; Published: 26 February 2026

ABSTRACT

The question of attitudes to capital punishment has continued to be central to the criminal justice policy and mass opinion research. The research paper explores the stability and predictability of three demographic variables, which are core variables age, gender, and education, on the support of the death penalty. The analysis of interest was based on a predictive model using multiple regression analysis on secondary data of two independent samples (N 1 = 132 and N 2 = 150). Those findings showed that there was a significant paradox in the first sample, the overall model showed statistical significance (F(3,128)=9.209, *p=.001, R 2=.178), and age (404) and gender (0.404) turned out to be significant predictors, and education did not. The same model used on the second sample was, on the other hand, non-significant (F(3,146) =1.010, 3.90, R 2=0.20) and none of the predictors had any statistical significance. Such an extreme discrepancy evidences that the correlation between these fundamental demographics and attitudes towards the death penalty is not strong and constant in all situations. It is hypothesized in the interpretive conclusion that the divergence is probably because of sample-specific differences in compositional changes and that simplistic demographic models are subject to certain constraints. Such results are critical to the dependence of independent demographic variables and emphasize the need to develop more sophisticated and combined theoretical models that include psychosocial and contextual mediators, which are effective in explaining punitive attitudes.

Keywords: Capital, Punishment, Criminal Justice. Multivariate Analysis, Demographics

INTRODUCTION

The feelings of people on capital punishment have taken a permanent centre stage in sociological research and political discussions. Being a litmus test of societal values to issues of justice, retribution, and the powers of the state, the attitudes to the death penalty can affect the legislative discussions, court verdicts, and the international positions on human rights (Thinley & Ziegler Jr, 2020). As a result, a significant amount of research has already been carried out in order to establish the factors that define such attitudes, often hinging on such fundamental demographic factors as age, gender, or educational attainment. The supposition that the variables are consistent and predicting roots of punitive opinions and provide a roadmap to the masses is the assumption behind a lot of this research (Samara et al., 2025).

Nevertheless, a critical analysis of the literature shows that there is one issue still, and it is the lack of consistency of the findings of the empirical research on these demographic predictors. Although other research findings confirm the existence of a strong gender gap and generational differences, a null effect (or even a negative one) is observed in other studies, especially in education (McCarthy & Brunton-Smith, 2024; Anderson, Chao, and Schwadel, 2019). Such inconsistency implies that the studies of demographic variables and the support of the death penalty can be a more conditional and complicated relationship than people assume. Most of the available studies work at the tier of bivariate correlations or at examining the general tendencies of nations, which might hide the delicate interaction of variables in particular population groups (Liang et al., 2025). The number of studies that use controlled multivariate analysis on different samples to critically evaluate the ability of these demographic variables to maintain their predictive power- and more importantly- their stability when analyzed simultaneously is fewer. The possibility of such a misinterpretation of demographic impacts is caused by this gap, and the observed correlations in one context are mistakenly generalized to be universal truths (McCarthy & Brunton-Smith, 2024).

The theoretical generalization behind the given study is as follows: maybe the use of simplistic and standalone demographic models may not be quite enough to be used in explaining a phenomenon which has such a deep psychological and cultural root as the support of capital punishment. Demographics are, probably, a proxy variable of the underlying psychosocial constructs, including authoritarianism, racial resentment, or moral traditionalism, and the mediators between these constructs and outcome are context and intersectional identity (Trahan, Dixon, and Nodeland, 2019). Thus, it is a crucial exercise in criticizing and improving our theoretical models by testing the consistency of these predictors in the same way that we would test the consistency of a historical variable such as national security (Liang et al., 2025).

This premise leads to the following question that the present research is going to answer: To what extent are age, gender, and education are consistent and significant predictors of attitudes towards the death penalty among diverse samples, and what does the unstable nature of these predictors tell us about the shortcomings of demography explanations? In order to empirically test this, we have a testable hypothesis: H1 Age, gender, and education will statistically significantly predict attitudes toward the death penalty. The null hypothesis (H 0) that predictive effects will not exist will be statistically significant. (Liang et al., 2025)

The presentation in this paper shall go as follows. To begin with, the literature review will systematize the already available information on demographic predictors and make a case to be more critical and complex. In the section on method, two independent samples are analyzed through multiple regression in terms of secondary data analysis. The final results and the analysis will show diametrically opposite results. The discussion which follows will be a critical interpretation of this paradox and will discuss both theoretical and methodological implications, which culminate in the conclusion that states the need to go beyond the mere demographic determinism in studying punitive attitudes. (Jiang et al., 2018)

LITERATURE REVIEW

The way people think about capital punishment is a labyrinth of attitudes that could be discussed through the historical and cultural context and in the course of the uniqueness of inward psychology. Such studies have long made a number of demographic scorings as correlates listings, but a synthesis indicates that these variables are not universally stable or habitable as isolated clarifications. The review will first have a general setting of death penalty attitudes, and empirical evidence of three fundamental demographic predictors, namely age, gender, and education, followed by a concluding critical argument that the three variables are rather best described as proxies needed to see deeper, and often overlapping, psychosocial constructs. (Fox et al., 2024)

The Landscape of Death Penalty Attitudes

The death penalty is not an absolute and unchanging phenomenon. In history, the attitude in the United States has changed considerably depending on the crime rate, high-profile cases, and the changing standards of the law (Samara, Mata, and Moffitt, 2025). The difference between some countries in terms of cross-national differences is even more drastic, as some countries have gone appallingly far toward abolition, and others show no signs of change in this regard (Boch, Tran, and Voracek, 2019). Such an inconsistency is an emphasis of the fact that punitive attitudes are firmly fixed in certain socio-political situations.

Moreover, even the notion of support is a complex one, which is not always consistently quantified. The reason is that research draws a distinction between an abstract and specific support (a general principle and an execution, respectively, in a case), which might produce radically different outcomes (Fox, Cochran, and Escue, 2024). In the same manner, support is based on the reason, which can be retributive justice, deterrence, incapacitation, or cost, which also differ among individuals and can be associated with various predictor profiles. Such complexity implies that a single demographic correlate could be an amalgam of specific psychological standpoints, making the process of study, which measures a single, generalized attitude, more complicated (Fox et al., 2024).

Empirical Findings on Core Demographic Predictors

Among the complex terrain, the demographic variables have worked the horses in the research of public opinion. Their impacts are hardly homogeneous.

The issue of age is often analyzed in terms of a so-called generational shift hypothesis whereby it is suggested that younger generations, growing up in an environment where violent crime rates have fallen, and people have increasingly doubted authority and institutional favoritism, tend to be less likely to support the death penalty, as compared to older generations (Anderson, Chao, and Schwadel, 2019). Although there are longitudinal and cohort analyses that promote this trend, mixed findings provide evidence for the same. There are studies that found a weak or non-linear association, and there are those studies that propose that the effects of the lifecycle (when people are often more conservative as they age) may transpire as counteractions to the trends in generations (Martinez, 2025). Such discrepancy refers to a possible change in societal values or experience as the cause of aging, and not a direct cause. (Davey et al., 2025)

In many cultural environments, gender is one of the most attractive demographic indicators, with men indicating much more support of the death penalty than women, although this is commonly known as the gender gap (Vito, Vito, and Higgins, 2025; Liang et al., 2025). This dissonance is exceptionally strong and has been argued to have been caused by the difference in socialization. According to the theories, masculinity can be thought of as related to more support of the punitive justice and toughness, whereas femininity is correlated with more empathy, compassion, and care-related concerns (Tuncer et al., 2018). In other terms, risk perception views hold that men tend to have a lower perceived risk and trust of state institutions and are thus more at ease with end state punishment. The gender gap, despite its power, can be regulated, although by other means, which implies its conditionality (Cohen-Louck et al., 2025).

Of the three predictors, education is probably the most disputed. A negative result is common in Western countries, i.e., the higher the educational levels, the less the support for capital punishment. This has been attributed in most settings to the exposure to the liberalizing university setting, the ability to think critically, and increased levels of awareness about systemic problems such as false convictions (Anderson and Schwadel, 2025; Boateng et al., 2025). This relation is, however, not universal. The correlation may be weak, non-existent, or even positive with respect to some subgroups of people in certain cultural and political settings and where the death penalty is justified in terms of national strength or popular justice (Jiang, Hu, and Lambert, 2018). The influence of education seems extremely dependent on the political and ideological aspects of the education and how they relate to other identities (Boch et al., 2019).

Moving Beyond Demographics: The Critique and Call for Complexity

The unreliability and even unpredictable results in terms of age and education, the necessity to explain the tight gender gap, indicate the inherent drawback of the use of demographics. There is a developing literature that criticizes this simplistic nature and argues in favor of more complicated, combined models.

To begin with, the intersectionality theory postulates that demographic classifications do not exist separately and there are overlaps between them to create distinct social positions and experiences. Gender influence on the attitude towards the death penalty, such as, is not tested across the board but rather by race, class, and political ideology (Boateng et al., 2025). The attitudes of White men are thus very different compared to those of Black men or White women, as shown by Trahan, Dixon, and Nodeland (2019). Likewise, education can have a positive impact on conservatives (it is equivalent to becoming an elite) and a negative impact on liberals (it is equivalent to enlightenment). Raising variables in a regression model may overlook these key interactive realities.

Second, demographics may be considered distal variables, which act as a form of influence on the contextual and psychological proximities. As an example, the gender disparity can be mediated in various ways through variations in empathy or risk aversion. The fluctuating influence of age could be translated into the difference in the generational interests in political affiliation or racial perceptions. In fact, studies indicate that political ideology and partisan identity are characterized as powerful predictors in most instances compared to demographics alone (Anderson and Schwadel, 2025). The racial attitudes and those based on racial resentment or even symbolic racism are strongly related to advocates of punitive policies such as the death penalty, sometimes more than the factor of race does (Trahan and Laird, 2018). The presence of the specific fear of crime as a powerful predictor (Cohen-Louck, Levy, and Herzog, 2025), the moral intuitions based on moral foundations, or even the unconscious motivation based on the lack of resources that may make preferences for

harsh punishment as the manifestation of intergroup competition rise high are other potent predictors (Anderson & Schwadel, 2025).

Synthesis Argument

According to the literature, there is also some commonality of the age, gender, and education not being direct causative factors of death penalty attitudes, and more as proxy variables of alternative psychosocial construction, life experience, and social standpoints. Their ability to predict is not intrinsic, but it depends on the composition of the sample (e.g., its racial, political, and regional makeup) and on the moment of history (Boateng et al., 2025). The main-effects model of demographics—isolated and main-effects, thus, is likely to provide an unstable and sample-dependent instance. One critical gap in the literature is a systematic exploitation of this instability, specifically, what is the level of consistency in such core predictors when there is similarity between applying the same model to distinct and unique groups of people? This gap is specifically discussed in this paper. Taking two different samples and using the same multiple regression framework, it goes beyond mere correlation reporting held down to the issue of stability of demographic paradigm proper, therefore, challenging the hasty generalizations of how simple explanations critically relate to the challenge that the more complex, theory-driven studies are in point of need.

METHOD

Research Design

This research used a quantitative research design that was non-experimental using secondary data. Multiple linear regression was the main method of analysis because it was selected to provide an estimate of the simultaneous and distinct effects of a few predictors on a continuous dependent variable. This style is suitable in predictive hypothesis testing in a complex social context in which it is neither unethical nor unfeasible to manipulate variables experimentally (Knapp, 2023).

Data Source and Sample

Two different surveys (03A and 03B) delivered in the Knapp textbook were the sources of the data used in this analysis, as they represent different samples of survey participants. The sample size in the first sample (03A) was 132 participants (N=132), and the second sample (03B) had a sample size of 150 participants (N=150). The existence of two independent samples, which have the same measured variables, is one of the main methodological strengths of the study because it will make the possibility to perform a direct test of the consistency and replicability of the predictive model across different populations. The original data collection does not include any specific sampling frames and recruitment procedures, which is a known weakness of the second approach to information analysis (Boch et al., 2019).

Measures

Dependent Variable: Death penalty was the outcome variable, which was operationalized as a continuous scale that entailed attitudes towards capital punishment. Using the descriptive statistics, it is possible to postulate that the scale has a lower limit to a higher limit (e.g., 0 to 10, with the higher the scores, the more the support).

- Independent Variables: 3 predictor variables were used:
- Age: This is a continuous variable that is in years.
- Gender: The variable is dichotomous (e.g. 1 = Male and 0 = Female).
- Education: A continuous measuring variable? The number of years that a person has received a formal education.

Analytical Technique

Each sample was analyzed by multiple linear regression with the Enter (or Simultaneous) method and statistical software (apparently SPSS, because of format of results). The rationale behind the choice of this method is that it is an effort to determine the contribution of each predictor when the rest of all predictors are

controlled statistically, thus they are able to measure the unique explanatory power of each variable (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2019). The analysis measured overall model significance (F-test and R^2) and other significant (F-test), positive or negative, and strong regression coefficients (unstandardized (B) and standardized (Beta)).

Assumptions and Diagnostics

The important assumptions of a multiple regression were evaluated based on the given statistical results. Both samples were checked on the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) and Tolerance statistics to diagnose multicollinearity, and the results showed that the statistic was within acceptable limits (VIF less than 10, Tolerance greater than 0.1), which does not overlook that the predictors were not surprisingly related. The review of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was done to determine the normality of the variable distributions. Also, to test the assumptions of homoscedasticity and independence of errors, respectively, the residual scatterplots (implied by the analysis) and the Durbin-Watson value were taken into account. These diagnostic tests can be used to corroborate the strength of the inferences made on the regression models.

ANALYSIS & RESULTS

As the multiple regression analysis was run on the two independent samples separately, the results were quite different. The results are as follows, with a summary comparison made in Table 1.

03A Results

In the case of the first sample (N=132), the regression model of the general result was found to be significant F(3, 128) = 9.209, *p* < .001. The model described a variance of about 17.8 in the attitudes of the death penalty (R 2 =.178, Adjusted R 2 =.158). A study on the individual predictors showed a varied pattern. The negative predictor, which was essentially a significant variable as well, was age (B = -0.033, 8 = -0.173, p =.034): the higher the age, the lower the score on the death penalty support. A positive predictor was gender (B = 1.695, 0404 = 0.404, and the p-value of 0.001). Since the variable is coded over where 1 will denote Male, the value at 1.7 means that the male group was found to have a death penalty score almost 1.7 higher than the female group, keeping age and education levels at par. Education, on the contrary, did not forecast significantly in this model (B = 0.047, *p* = .481).

03B Results

The outcomes of the second sample (N=150) were very different. The regression equation as a whole did not show statistical significance, F(3, 146) = 1.010, *p* =.390. The model explained an insignificant 2.0 percent of variance (R 2 =.020, Adjusted R 2 =.000). More importantly, none of the predictors on a case-by-case basis were statistically significant. The Age (B = -0.018, p =.245), Gender (B = -0.502, p =.237), and Education (B = -0.106, p =.273) coefficients were not significant at all. The direction of the relationship between the two genders changed to negative in Sample 03B, but this coefficient was not significant.

Direct Comparison of Models

The contradictory nature of the findings is synthesized in Table 1 below.

Predictor	Sample 03A (N=132)	Sample 03B (N=150)
Model Fit	F*F*(3,128) = 9.209, *p* < .001	F*F*(3,146) = 1.010, *p* = .390
R^2	.178	.020
Age (B, *p*)	-0.033, *p* = .034	-0.018, *p* = .245
Gender (B, *p*)	1.695, *p* < .001	-0.502, *p* = .237
Education (B, *p*)	0.047, *p* = .481	-0.106, *p* = .273
Constant	5.358	8.296

DISCUSSION

The current discussion provides a strong empirical example of one of the pivotal theoretical issues of the research concerning the opinion expressed by people on capital punishment. The clear difference in the results between Sample 03A and Sample 03B, in which a similar multiple regression model produces a significant

result that could be explained in one sample and a null result in the other, is not just a contradiction but a critical case of study. It compels a re-evaluation of perceived stability and explanatory primacy of the fundamental demographic predictors and emphasizes the necessity of theoretically more advanced constructs.

Interpreting the Paradox

Sample 03A results will give a literature-supported picture. The large and significant coefficient on Gender supports decades of studies that have documented the ongoing and established gender gap in punitive attitudes, where men report more support of severe sanctions than women (Vito, Vito, and Higgins, 2025; Tuncer et al., 2018). The substantial negative coefficient of Age is in line with a part of the generational analyses, indicating that older people in the given sample were less supportive, which might be based on a particular cohort experience or lifecycle influence (Martinez, 2025). The insignificance of Education, although remarkable, is not the first time in the literature. By itself, Sample 03A would easily lend some truth to a story that gender and, to a smaller degree, age are useful demographic predictors of death penalty attitudes.

The findings of Sample 03B, however, contradict this story directly. Here, the entire model fails. The individual predictors are not only non-significant, but the entire model does not explain (R 2 =. 020). This result essentially questions the stability of these demographic impacts. The important question becomes then not What do demographics predict? to What conditions do demographics predict and why do they not work in other settings? The inability of the model in 03B is not a statistical accident, but rather a significant observation revealing the weaknesses of the demographics-only strategy.

Critical Explanations for Divergent Findings

This divergence can be attributed to a number of interrelated causes, and they are inclined toward the conditionality of demographic effects.

First, it is paramount with sample composition. The two samples, although similar in the demographic variables used in measurement (Age, Gender, Education), were certainly different in terms of other, powerful covariates that had not been measured. The most significant factors identified to have a strong effect on attitudes toward the death penalty, including political ideology, racial identity and attitudes, religious fundamentalism, and geographic location, were not controlled (Cao, Lai, and Huang, 2020; Davey, Mulrooney, and Watt, 2025). Unless Sample 03B is more politically homogenous, more racially diverse, or more representative of a specific historical relationship with capital punishment, these strong contextual processes might have drowned the smaller variance presented by simple demographics. Demographics in itself is not that powerful in predicting behaviour as compared to, say, racial resentment or partisan identity (Trahan and Laird, 2018).

Second, Education, being a predictor, is the most educationally unstable. To demonstrate that it is a poor predictor on its own, the fact that it was not significant in 03A and 03B, and that it had the opposite sign on its coefficient, is informative. Education is not a unitary psychological construct; the meaning and the impact of investigating education depend on what is being learned and its intersection with other identities. According to the argument made by Anderson and Schwadel (2025), the impact of college education on the perception of the death penalty is highly mediated by the political worldview that is also strengthened or put to the test. More education could be associated with exposure to liberal-arts criticisms of the justice system in one sample, with professional education that stresses societal law and order in another. It has an indirect influence rather than a direct one.

Third, there are measurement and context problems that cannot be eliminated. In spite of the fact that the name of the scale (Death penalty) is exactly the same, minor differences in the way the two original surveys worded questions, framed, or gave some response choices may cause the respondents to think differently about the dimensions of support (e.g., abstract principle vs. specific application). Additionally, social and political conditions in each survey (e.g., closeness to a high-profile execution or exoneration) may also have established temporary changes in the correlates of support, which a cross-sectional demographic model would fail to account.

Lastly, some interesting results in Sample 03B are a significant value of negative correlation between Gender and Education (r = -.592). This poses a possible problem of multicollinearity, which is going to blow up standard errors and hide important effects. More to the point, such a high correlation is not a statistical nuisance, but rather the reflection of intersectionality itself (Trahan, Dixon, and Nodeland, 2019). It implies that gender and the level of education are profoundly connected socializations in this sample, perhaps women were much more educated than men, or vice versa. This interrelation implies that their effects are not simple to disaggregate and it might be theoretically simplistic to consider them as interacting in an independent manner as the main effect of social location on attitudes.

Theoretical Implications

The overall theoretical implication of the findings is that age, gender, and education are only at best, distal predictors. They are a few steps distant from the quotiential, psychological mechanisms that immediately form attitudes. More proximate variables probably mediate their effects, which are frequently fully moderated by them. As an example, the gender gap could be intervened by dissimilarities in empathy, risk perception, or social dominance direction (Tuncer et al., 2018). The creating turbulent impact of age can be mediated by generational variations in political confidence or media use. As Cohen-Louck, Levy, and Herzog (2025) illustrate, other factors, such as fear of crime and perceived offender responsibility, are also potent direct predictions that might be the reason why demographics predict attitudes in certain cases.

Thus, the critique of simplistic models as presented in this analysis has much empirical evidence to support it and recommends combining frameworks into a multi-level one. The future studies should not focus on whether the demographics are predictors of attitudes, but on how and when. This would demand model designs which place demographics as peripheral variables, strong attitudinal intermediary variables (e.g., racial resentment, moral foundations, perceived fairness), and control macro-level contextual variables (e.g., crime rates, political rhetoric).

Practical Implications

There are significant practical implications of the unpredictability of these demographic predictors. To the policy makers and advocacy groups, the results warn against the creation of messages based fundamentally on general demographic descriptions. The campaign approach based on the assumption that the entire world is ruled by older men as the most ardent advocates can be inefficient or even negating in certain communities where the local history, economic factors, or racial relations reshape those relations.

This study is a critical methodological guide to researchers. It highlights the extreme significance of the description of the sample and the risks of extrapolating the results of a study, however consequence-inducing they are. They do not replicate them in different samples, and science would be a luxury except for determining the stability of social patterns. Moreover, it suggests that even standard survey design should necessarily include theoretical intermediaries in order to transition away from describing correlations to elaborating the process that produces them. Finally, the perception of the population about the death penalty can only be realized by observing not only those people, but also what they think, fear, and care about in the particular social world.

CONCLUSION

This paper aimed to critically assess the consistency of the most often mentioned demographic forecasts of age, gender, and education in explaining notions about capital punishment. The analysis of two independent samples by using the same multiple regression model showed that there was some basic lack of consistency because the regression model was significant in one of the samples and nonexistent in the other one, indicating the importance of gender and age factors. Such a direct empirical comparison creates a very straightforward answer to the research question: age, gender, and education are not weak predictors of death penalty attitudes. Their importance is proven to be dependent on the compositional factors of the samples and the effects of the unmeasured variables.

The main contribution that is in the paper is the fact that this instability in itself is an important finding. It is an effective empirical rebuttal of simple, demographic-deterministic models, which may be generalized. The study succeeds in refocusing the academic research activity, not on whether demographics can predict

attitudes, but on the conceptually more interesting questions of how, when, and how they may do so. Demographics can be defined as estranged indicators of social location that have to be related to proximal psychological and contextual motivators.

This finding is marred by a number of constraints, mainly the fact that this is a secondary data analysis, which means that unknown sampling frames, missing important variables (e.g., political ideology, race), and unknown specifications of the death penalty measure limit deeper causal inference. These gaps need to be filled with direct research in the future that employs integrated models that draw demographics as the background variable and models of important mediators that include political opinions and perceptions, racial attitudes, and the foundations of morality. In a methodological sense, using methods such as the latent class analysis to determine specific typologies of supporters (Fox, Cochran, and Escue, 2024) and historical comparative tests utilizing standardized measures (Boateng, Dzordzormenyoh, and Wallace, 2025) would also shed more light on contextual limits of demographic influences. Conclusively, a mature science of popular opinion about punishment should be one that goes beyond the listing of correlations to indicate the complicated channels through which social structures convert to individual attitudes.

REFERENCES

1. Anderson, A. L., Chao, W.-F., & Schwadel, P. (2019). Evolving attitudes toward capital punishment. In Handbook on sentencing policies and practices in the 21st century (pp. 237–253). Routledge. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9780429027765-12/evolving-attitudes-toward-capital-punishment-amy-anderson-weng-fong-chao-philip-schwadel
2. Anderson, A. L., & Schwadel, P. (2025). College Education, Politics, and Attitudes Towards Capital Punishment. American Journal of Criminal Justice, 50(1), 119–141. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-024-09782-8
3. Boateng, F. D., Dzordzormenyoh, M. K., & Wallace, W. C. (2025). Predictors of public support for the death penalty in the Americas: A comparative analysis. Criminology & Criminal Justice, 25(4), 1201–1223. https://doi.org/10.1177/17488958231166564
4. Boch, M., Tran, U. S., & Voracek, M. (2019). Does really one in ten believe capital punishment exists in a contemporary European community country? An endorsed, prereviewed, preregistered replication study and meta-analysis. Frontiers in Psychology, 10, 1601. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01601/full
5. Cao, L., Lai, Y.-L., & Huang, C.-C. (2020). Exploring sources of public attitudes toward capital punishment in Taiwan. Crime, Law and Social Change, 74(5), 571–588. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10611-020-09913-2
6. Cohen-Louck, K., Levy, I., & Herzog, S. (2025). Predicting Israeli Public Support for Capital Punishment: Crime Type and Severity, Offender, Observer, and Victim Characteristics. Crime & Delinquency, 71(8), 2820–2844. https://doi.org/10.1177/00111287211029859
7. Davey, C. B., Mulrooney, K. J. D., & Watt, S. E. (2025). Exploring individual-level predictors of punitive attitudes in Australia. Psychology, Crime & Law, 31(9), 1121–1141. https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2024.2338200
8. Fox, B., Cochran, J. K., & Escue, M. (2024). Profiles of Death Penalty Attitudes: A Latent Class Approach. Deviant Behavior, 45(11), 1499–1520. https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2024.2307962
9. Jiang, S., Hu, M., & Lambert, E. G. (2018). Predictors of Death Penalty Views in China: An Empirical Comparison Between College Students and Citizens. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 62(14), 4714–4735. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X18767573
10. Liang, B., Liu, J., Lu, H., & Tuo, Z. (2025). A Study of Gender Differences on Chinese Criminal Justice Practitioners' Death Penalty Opinions. Women & Criminal Justice, 35(2), 136–156. https://doi.org/10.1080/08974454.2024.2358814
11. Martínez, A. Y. (2025). What Shapes Attitudes Toward Capital Punishment? A Study of Generational Differences and Intersectional Identities [Master's Thesis, Arizona State University].

https://search.proquest.com/openview/a54c60e8a44d36f20c8f13811e70d3b3/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y

12. McCarthy, D., & Brunton-Smith, I. (2024). Attitudes towards the death penalty: An assessment of individual and country-level differences. European Journal of Criminology, 21(1), 116–139. https://doi.org/10.1177/14773708221097670
13. Samara, K., Mata, C., & Moffitt, B. (2025). Capital Punishment: Analyzing Trends in the United States (1976–2016). In V. Bhateja, M. Dey, & R. Senkerik (Eds.), Innovations in Information and Decision Sciences (Vol. 422, pp. 151–162). Springer Nature Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-96-0147-9_13
14. Thinley, T., & Ziegler Jr, A. H. (2020). Attitudes toward capital punishment in America: An analysis of survey data. Center for Research and Creativity. https://www.methodist.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/crc9_paper_thinley.pdf
15. Trahan, A., Dixon, A., & Nodeland, B. (2019). Public Opinion of Capital Punishment: An Intersectional Analysis of Race, Gender, and Class Effects. Criminal Justice Review, 44(4), 452–469. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734016818818687
16. Trahan, A., & Laird, K. (2018). The nexus between attribution theory and racial attitudes: A test of racial attribution and public opinion of capital punishment. Criminal Justice Studies, 31(4), 352–367. https://doi.org/10.1080/1478601X.2018.1509859
17. Tuncer, A. E., Broers, N. J., Ergin, M., & de Ruiter, C. (2018). The association of gender role attitudes and offense type with public punitiveness toward male and female offenders. International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice, 55, 70–79. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1756061617303762
18. Vito, A. G., Vito, G. F., & Higgins, G. E. (2025). The Gender Gap in Attitudes toward Capital Punishment and Life without Parole (LWOP) in Kentucky. Women & Criminal Justice, 35(2), 108–118. https://doi.org/10.1080/08974454.2022.2126745
19. Vito, G. F., Higgins, G. E., & Vito, A. G. (2018). Kentuckians' Attitudes on Capital Punishment, 1989–2016. American Journal of Criminal Justice, 43(4), 861–870. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-017-9429-z
20. Williams, K. E., Votruba, A. M., Neuberg, S. L., & Saks, M. J. (2019). Capital and punishment: Resource scarcity increases endorsement of the death penalty. Evolution and Human Behavior, 40(1), 65–73. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1090513818300175

Appendix

Pretest Checklist

Descriptive Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Death_penalty	5.61	2.085	132
Age	44.13	10.912	132
Gender	.57	.497	132
Education	15.96	2.542	132

Correlations					
		Death_penalty	Age	Gender	Education
Pearson Correlation	Death_penalty	1.000	-.133	.383	-.004
	Age	-.133	1.000	.086	.085
	Gender	.383	.086	1.000	-.116
	Education	-.004	.085	-.116	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Death_penalty	.	.064	.000	.481
	Age	.064	.	.163	.166
	Gender	.000	.163	.	.093
	Education	.481	.166	.093	.
N	Death_penalty	132	132	132	132
	Age	132	132	132	132
	Gender	132	132	132	132

	Education	132	132	132	132

Variables Entered/Removed[a]			
Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Education, Age, Gender[b]	.	Enter
a. Dependent Variable: Death_penalty			
b. All requested variables entered.			

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.421[a]	.178	.158	1.913
a. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age, Gender				

ANOVA[a]						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	101.063	3	33.688	9.209	.000[b]
	Residual	468.233	128	3.658		
	Total	569.295	131			
a. Dependent Variable: Death_penalty						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age, Gender						

Coefficients[a]								
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	5.358	1.242		4.315	.000		
	Age	-.033	.015	-.173	-2.138	.034	.983	1.017
	Gender	1.695	.340	.404	4.987	.000	.977	1.023
	Education	.047	.066	.057	.706	.481	.977	1.023
a. Dependent Variable: Death_penalty								

Collinearity Diagnostics[a]							
Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	Variance Proportions			
				(Constant)	Age	Gender	Education
1	1	3.589	1.000	.00	.00	.02	.00
	2	.359	3.161	.00	.01	.94	.01
	3	.041	9.341	.03	.90	.00	.15
	4	.011	17.976	.96	.08	.03	.84
a. Dependent Variable: Death_penalty							

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test					
		Death_penalty	Age	Gender	Education
N		132	132	132	132
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	5.61	44.13	.57	15.96
	Std. Deviation	2.085	10.912	.497	2.542
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.149	.067	.376	.123
	Positive	.084	.067	.305	.123
	Negative	-.149	-.044	-.376	-.120
Test Statistic		.149	.067	.376	.123

Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000[c]	.200[c,d]	.000[c]	.000[c]
a. Test distribution is Normal.				
b. Calculated from data.				
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.				
d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.				

Multiple regression analysis

Variables Entered/Removed[a]			
Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Education, Age, Gender[b]	.	Enter
a. Dependent Variable: Death_penalty			
b. All requested variables entered.			

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.421[a]	.178	.158	1.913	.178	9.209	3	128	.000
a. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age, Gender									

ANOVA[a]						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	101.063	3	33.688	9.209	.000[b]
	Residual	468.233	128	3.658		
	Total	569.295	131			
a. Dependent Variable: Death_penalty						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age, Gender						

Coefficients[a]											
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B		Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	5.358	1.242		4.315	.000	2.901	7.814			
	Age	-.033	.015	-.173	-2.138	.034	-.064	-.002	-.133	-.186	-.171
	Gender	1.695	.340	.404	4.987	.000	1.023	2.368	.383	.403	.400
	Education	.047	.066	.057	.706	.481	-.085	.179	-.004	.062	.057
a. Dependent Variable: Death_penalty											

Pretest Checklist

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test					
		Death_penalty	Age	Gender	Education
N		150	150	150	150
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	5.56	42.92	.61	15.61
	Std. Deviation	2.038	10.842	.490	2.148
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.102	.053	.396	.098
	Positive	.102	.050	.285	.087
	Negative	-.092	-.053	-.396	-.098

Test Statistic	.102	.053	.396	.098
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.001[c]	.200[c,d]	.000[c]	.001[c]
a. Test distribution is Normal.				
b. Calculated from data.				
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.				
d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.				

Variables Entered/Removed[a]			
Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Education, Age, Gender[b]	.	Enter
a. Dependent Variable: Death_penalty			
b. All requested variables entered.			

Coefficients[a]								
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	8.296	1.821		4.557	.000		
	Age	-.018	.015	-.096	-1.168	.245	.995	1.005
	Gender	-.502	.423	-.121	-1.187	.237	.649	1.540
	Education	-.106	.096	-.112	-1.101	.273	.649	1.540
a. Dependent Variable: Death_penalty								

Collinearity Diagnostics[a]							
Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	Variance Proportions			
				(Constant)	Age	Gender	Education
1	1	3.603	1.000	.00	.00	.01	.00
	2	.348	3.219	.00	.01	.58	.00
	3	.044	9.019	.02	.92	.02	.06
	4	.005	26.724	.98	.07	.39	.94
a. Dependent Variable: Death_penalty							

Multiple Regression

Descriptive Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Death_penalty	5.56	2.038	150
Age	42.92	10.842	150
Gender	.61	.490	150
Education	15.61	2.148	150

Correlations					
		Death_penalty	Age	Gender	Education
Pearson Correlation	Death_penalty	1.000	-.096	-.060	-.035

	Age	-.096	1.000	.060	-.063
	Gender	-.060	.060	1.000	-.592
	Education	-.035	-.063	-.592	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Death_penalty	.	.121	.232	.337
	Age	.121	.	.234	.223
	Gender	.232	.234	.	.000
	Education	.337	.223	.000	.
N	Death_penalty	150	150	150	150
	Age	150	150	150	150
	Gender	150	150	150	150
	Education	150	150	150	150

Variables Entered/Removed[a]

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Education, Age, Gender[b]	.	Enter

a. Dependent Variable: Death_penalty

b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	S C
1	.143[a]	.020	.000	2.038	.020	1.010	3	146	.3

a. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age, Gender

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	12.589	3	4.196	1.010	.390[b]
	Residual	606.371	146	4.153		
	Total	618.960	149			

a. Dependent Variable: Death_penalty

b. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age, Gender

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	8.296	1.821		4.557	.000
	Age	-.018	.015	-.096	-1.168	.245
	Gender	-.502	.423	-.121	-1.187	.237
	Education	-.106	.096	-.112	-1.101	.273

a. Dependent Variable: Death_penalty

Dr. Kenneth Okocha is a Professor of Political Science at Hill City University, Benin Republic. He holds a B. A., M.Sc. (Ibadan), D.Sc. (Hawaii). CADC (New Jersey). Former Acting Dean Faculty of the Social Sciences at Hill City University. Current member, Governing Council, Hillcity University of Science and Technology, Liberia. Areas of research interest include International Relations, Strategic Studies, Military and Defense, Nuclear Deterrence and Arms Control, Law and Public Policy. He is an accomplished scholar and publisher.