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**Introduction**

Death penalty or capital punishment is defined as a practice of executing someone in the essence of punishment for committing a crime after a series of legal trials. It is significant to note that the death penalty is used by the state or government to punish someone for his actions. In the context of this research, another side of the picture is depicted where victim is the one who is being executed either due to some actual or a manipulated cause. (Chaemsaithong, et, al. 2019). The stance of death penalty can be traced from the beginning of eighteen century where King Hammurabi of Babylon was the first individual to codify death penalty to twenty-five crimes. The lineage of death penalty is still prevalent today. It is significant to note that death penalty is more like a controversy; within the last hundred years, several efforts are made to abolish the stance of death penalty. Williams, (2009) has highlighted there are fifty states in which there is great retention referring to the use of death penalty. In 2008, it was inferred that there are thirty-six states in which death penalty was legal, there were five states in which there was a relatively high rate of execution, i.e., 65% of execution by the reaffirmation of death penalty in the constitution. There are several paradigms associated with capital punishment

**Imperfect Justice and retribution**

In accordance with many moral arguments, it is inferred that death penalty is based on streamline procedural issues and the outcomes that are involved in this process. The stance of capital punishment is more like, “Person moves from the road of freedom to that of the electric chair or a gas chamber." The stance of imperfect justice gathers attention from various spectrums. It is asserted that the procedural imperfections are employed by those who are in opposition to capital punishment, there are seldom complete abolition on the logistic grounds of capricious and discriminatory instructions aimed at selecting the future, i.e. either an individual will live or die. It is highlighted that there are several imperfections in the system; each of it is referring to the procedural improvements that can reduce problematic outcomes. Problematic outcomes are also a stance to address because abolitionists tend to have zero tolerance in the stance of the criminal justice system. (Madeira, et, al. 2016). Many of the defenders argue that arbitrariness is much acceptable while others are against it. Capital cases are included in the potent category of capital punishment because arbitrariness is evident in the procedures such as selectivity of convicted killers among the merit of death sentence. There are several analogies dealing with substance and non-comparative considerations. Justice requires a clear stance that is void of all background information such as differentiation between a mistake and an issue when criminal is White but a sheer mistake when the criminal is Black. (Offit, et, al. 2019).

 The major stance of death penalty is to address the popular discourse of “economic backgrounds." It is significant to note that usually death penalty is imposed on a socialization base who is having a family or other member who can be termed as family. Retribution is treated as a stance that is inflicted on other for some non-major essence behind. In the context of criminal justice system, retribution refers to a stance that is meant for the catharsis of family of one has become a victim of a crime. (Maratea, et, al. 2019). Another side of picture questions the practical implication of retribution that questions the existence of family of the one who is executed under capital punishment. It would not be wrong to say that a number of crimes are a tribute to the unaddressed social and moral needs. Moreover, every punishment is equally effective taking into account that it is not appropriate to snatch the right of life. Death punishment never comforts the family of the one who had already died, it can become a serious death cause for a number of people, taking into account that their future can be compromised in all the aspects of life. (Bell, et, al. 2018).

**Overview**

Historical account asserts that Britain is one of the great precursors that influenced the case of death penalty in America taking into account the time when European settlers came to settle in the new world. Captain George was the first individual to infer the first execution. Taking into account the context of capital punishment, it has been brought into insight that there is a continuous conflict about capital punishment. The analysis of criminal justice theories put forth different views regarding punishment, affirming different schools of thought. The idea of capital punishment was presented by Beccaria, in the context of legalized revenge. It is more significant to note that great philosophers such as Hegel, Kant, and Plato agreed with the idea of capital punishment. “The Metaphysical Elements of Justice," is a treatise that addresses the historical background of death penalty. It has been brought into insight that death penalty is more like a stance that can be imposed on anyone who has committed a crime, referring to the fact that death penalty will be imposed on the strong basis of “crime commitment."

 Certain principles are also employed that can determine the influence of punishment within a particular context. (Yost, et, al. 2019). Lex Talionis has proposed the principle of proportionality that expresses the constructing scales of crime, adhering to the subject that death penalty is a daunting challenge. Lex Talionis explores the stance of morality even for highly serious crimes. It is highlighted that there is no solid point to think about death penalty because many of the serious cases in past are dealt with prejudice. The point to address is, although capital punishment is a tool that can somehow satisfy the human desire of revenge but where does the actual stance of capital punishment stand. Taking into account the idea presented by Reformative school of thought, it is affirmed that no one is born criminal and the other side reveal that criminals are also humans. In a generalized form, it is important to think of the after effects that appear after giving someone a capital punishment. Moreover, it is also necessary to infer either capital punishment is doing any good for the families of the victim. (Yost, et, al. 2019).

**Retributive Justice**

Retributive justice refers to the stance of justice as a response to a crime. It would not be wrong to say that retribution is more like revenge. In order to understand "retribution" in the context of the family of murderer or criminal, it is significant to note that the family of the victim is firstly not treated equally or with respect. Even families believe that criminal justice system is not responsive to their needs because murder or any crime is treated as an offense for the state rather than a matter of existence and the future life of relatives of a victim. (Maratea, et, al. 2019). It is also assessed that many families view criminal justice system as a barrier to understand the aspects of the case because they are provided with limited information. Moreover, the family members of victim have to encounter a streamline of psychiatric, sociological and psychological issues because losing a family member is not an easy task. However, this aspect of understanding highlights that the underlying meaning is much efficient in addressing the crux of retribution. Apparently, it seems satisfaction and sigh of relief that can help to sort out the conflict in terms of human nature, affirming, "eye for an eye." (Maratea, et, al. 2019).  it is necessary to view the broader perspective that can deal with "other" roles of the criminal justice system in addressing brutality that has occurred on victims. How this revenge can have a long-term effect on the families of victim. In such a scenario, the arrow of retribution seems to turn towards the family of the one who is being executed because revenge is extracted by hampering their lifestyle and tinting family profile with someone who was criminal, no matter he was innocent or it was something psychological or manipulated?

**Retributes and right to life**

There are several forms of retributes, taking into account the reliance in Lex Talionis in favor of several other kinds of moral principles. Although these principles depart from Kant's philosophy of capital punishment, still it is presented regardless of any consequence. One of the approaches employ that society should be based on the principles of moral rights such as expression of values, social justice and the inclusion of basic moral rights adhering to defy capital punishment. Although John Lock, in his “Second Treatise” presented both a defense against death penalty for murderer and a natural right to life. Thomas Aquinas has defended capital punishment in the same row. Lock has inferred that a murderer violates another’s right to live, and it is a stance of depicting oneself as, “noxious creature, therefore may be destroyed as a tiger or a lion or any of any savage beast that deters others from doing the same action and to secure a person from such wild acts. (Davies, et, al. 2018). The retributivist approach highlights philosophical issues in accordance with capital punishment. Keeping empirical claims aside, it can be highlighted that death penalty is more like a way that incapacitates offenders. In a nutshell, the point of consideration is, right to life is one of the fundamental rights that should be maintained and with equal potential towards the other societal roles and rights. One’s actions should not have the underlying stance to alter the life status of another human entity, addressing the right to life is inalienable, and it cannot be forfeitable. killers have the right to live and live in accordance with correlative duties that are assigned to each individual, side by side death penalty is not a punishment. It is a violation of human rights. (Bessler, et, al. 2019).

**Policy Relevance**

Garofalo highlighted that the main objective of the state is to protect the rights and lives of the citizens, by adhering to a simple practice of social justice. It is inferred that there is always a place of hampering and destruction in the society, in order to overcome the stance of destruction and infer a parallel spectrum to repair the damage that society has suffered, a strict condemnation has been brought into practice that could compel criminals to feel sorry of their actions and let others abide by social rules. (Berger, et, al. 2019). It is significant to note the legal framework, UN Declaration of basic principles of justice for crime and abuse of power has set certain patterns and strategies. There are several approaches that are inferred in order to analyze the relevance of "death penalty." According to section 727 of US laws, the family members are not allowed to interfere in the investigation. (Yost, et, al. 2019). It opens an avenue of justification that questions whether there is any insurance of crystal care investigation at a place where there is no security of actual or basic human rights? (Kaplan, et, al. 2019). Moreover, there are several detailed contexts that can highlight and affirm that capital punishment is a tool to heal the injuries of the one who is affected as a result of crime but there is a gap that questions every human has the same amount of emotions, and there is a parallel line between the elements, what if the one who is executed is "not guilty" of any crime? Or if he is just treated as a road rock to achieve other personal aims? (Lin, et, al. 2019).

**Social Significance**

A general context of an individual who is being executed depicts a wide spectrum of questions where there is a huge question mark on the criminal justice system and the ever-formulated legal strategies. The first and foremost concern is the recognition of criminal, is it something that is recorded or is it something that is manipulated. In a broader perspective, it is questioned what happens after the family member is executed, what is the reputation of family member afterward and what will be the social, and moral consequences that an individual has to face being a family member of someone who has been executed for the sake of committing a crime. Although many of researches have been made to undergo an analysis of the facts and figures that can make an individual a criminal and strong justification for capital punishment none of the researches has highlighted the after effects that may tarnish a complete lifestyle. (Maratea, et, al. 2019). It has been observed that there are many people who prefer punishment over the threats of life, there are individuals who commit a crime not because of some personal ambition but actually because of some passive enforcement with dark ideas behind. In a nutshell, there is a detailed context required of retribution in terms of capital punishment either it is meant for healing or in-depth destruction, inferring no matter how long it takes to sort out actual criminal, human life is precious. (Morris, et, al. 2003).

**Literature Review**

The framework of criminal justice is filled with the stance of closure, taking into account emotional satisfaction and an end to the traumatic event of capital punishment. Taking into account a more specific context, Berns has highlighted that the controversy is the same as it was in history. All the appeals to the victim families adhering to the stance of revenge highlight a picture that is usually left undescribed. According to a psychologist, Dr. Robert, who has brought into insight that death penalties have an adverse impact on the friends and families of victims. A study at the University of Minnesota inferred that about 2.5% of the co-victims had achieved closure after the declaration of capital punishment; about 20.1% is of the view that execution is not an option to heal. (Williams, et, al. 2019). As per a quotation from an interview, "Healing is a technique, not an event." To understand the fact of "impact of the death penalty" on the victim, researchers are much successful in addressing the phenomenon, "capital punishment is retribution on the family of victims" taking into account the studies taken by psychologists. (Poppe, et, al. 2019).  According to a Florida therapist, it has been brought into insight that a large proportion of co-victim’s express sympathy for the family members of condemned but it is also important to consider that death penalty can polarize the families, creating an obstruction in the healing of both families. An article published at the University of Michigan, "Journal of law reform," describes the retributive effects of the death penalty, asserting "death penalty is an added punishment that falls on the family." This enhanced impact punishes just the family members of the victim other than the inmates". (Morris, et, al. 2003).

Despite enduring and unimaginable grief of the families, extended efforts to let the family members speak out against the penalty has become a trend, but it has failed to resolve the controversy of the death penalty. Information from "Voices from California Crime Victims for Alternative to Death penalty" has highlighted that organizations are working to reframe the debate in the subject of death penalty. It has been highlighted that death penalty does not resolve anything. It perpetuates the sufferings of the children, parents and the siblings who are left behind. In 2005, the Los Angeles Times reported that California is spending about $57.5 million every year to house the people in death penalty other than the stance spent if all those people were sentenced to death without parole. (Bessler, et, al. 2019). The empirical investigations reveal that capital punishment and closure prompt is more like a redefinition of closure through the families of the victim that learned to cope with the story of murder and its impacts. (Morris, et, al. 2003). The context of political involvement has just attempted to reduce the crowd of execution, taking into account that the family members of criminal and victim are allowed to attend the execution. In past, there was a trend of ceremony in which society members were also engaged to make execution an emblem of threat for the general public. Otherwise, none of the efforts are made by the lawmaking bodies to address the stance of death penalty. (Lin, et, al. 2019).

 An analysis of literature infers that there are certain issues that are unaddressed. One of the major issues is the lack of "adherence" to the family of victim. It is important to note that there is a great ratio of people who are granted capital punishment, but there is no certified stance that can address the impacts on the family of victims. (Madeira, et, al. 2016). Moreover, one of the major issues to address is the "criminal lineage" that would stay long with the family. It is important to consider the "acceptance” of death penalty after a crystal-clear jurisdiction procedure. (Offit, et, al. 2019).

After the completion of the evaluation program, there would be a question mark on the stakeholders in terms of families of victims and death penalty because all that the family member would have been, “a long row of problems." (Madeira, et, al. 2016). Moreover, the concept of “closure” would also be brought into bright light, taking into account that closure is not imparting the expected and assumed aims. If families are not satisfied and they are not approaching catharsis, then there is no significance to bring an inhuman act into practice that is doing more harm than good. In accordance with the psychological framework, it is important to infer that death penalty is more like an unknown symbol where neither the family of executed is lead to a positive end nor the family of another victim. (Poppe, et, al. 2019).  Side by side there are certain positive expectations associated with program evaluation such as there would be heed to the analysis of death penalty in terms of after effects. It is expected that one of the major unexpected outcomes would be a change in the code of conduct that can address both families equally. It is also important to note that there could be major importance given to the legal proceeding in order to mitigate the impact any hampering can have on the criminal and his family. (Offit, et, al. 2019).

**Terms**

**Death Penalty**

It refers to capital punishment. In this research death penalty refers to capital punishment directed by the government as a result of a crime or a practice that is against the legal or normative framework.

**Retribution**

Retribution refers to "punishment inflicted on anyone as a result of wrong or criminal act." In this research, retribution refers to the penalty that is imposed on the family of the victim. The context of retribution resembles "revenge."

**Victim**

Victim refers to an individual who is affected as a result of some action. In this research, the victim is the one who is affected by capital punishment.

**Policy description**

**Aim of research**

The aim of the research is to evaluate a dilemma that is usually negated in the framework of criminal justice system. In a nutshell, the aim of research is to justify that death penalty or capital punishment is usually treated as a tool to get revenge and to satisfy the family of the one who is being affected by the other entity. In another aspect, it would not be wrong to say that death penalty is not revenging for the family of the one who is affected by the victim; in fact, it is more like revenge from the family of the victim as well. (Berger, et, al. 2019). It is evident that if, "eye for an eye" stands sound then what is the certification and justification of rights and lives of the family whose family member is doomed to capital punishment, knowing that there are several other types of punishments. In order to evaluate the stance that I want to measure, I will be making use of research methodology.

As criminology is a social science, it would be adequate to opt for quantitative research methodology. Survey research is a type of quantitative research that is best suited for the evaluation of my research stance. I will be conducting survey research in order to justify that death penalty is retribution on the families of the victim. The survey will include questionnaires that would be filled by my selected population through different means. I would prefer to approach my selected population by myself; however, I am going to approach people who are living out of my approach as well. In order to access the population, I will email them the survey and the response will be sent by the same email. (Davies, et, al. 2018). It is significant to note that not all the age groups are well aware of the email, in order to approach that population, I will use telephonic surveys. After the collection of information, I will analyze the information. In order to maintain the credibility of the information collected, I will conduct some close-ended interviews. The reason for conducting close ended interviews is to collect some “centered” information that will be highly specific in its context.

 In a nutshell, it can be inferred that research is a tool that can help to analyze the impact of death penalty by addressing the personal lives of people who are included in near and far family of the victim. It is significant to note that death penalty is termed as the most controversial issue of the present time, especially in areas where there is great cultural diversity such as the United States of America. In such a country, death penalty is an extension of the “after effects to the family of the victim." It would not be wrong to say that “Others” have a highly disturbed and narrow spectrum of life and literature results that, death penalty stance infers any productive function” is a stance that should be brought into consideration. (Poppe, et, al. 2019).

**Relevant issues**

There are several issues that are associated with research such as, an attack on political attire. Usually addressing policy within exegetical analysis leads to a serious deterioration, taking into account that there is a set of logistics behind the foundation basis of any policies.

**Stakeholders**

 A question to the conduct of “jury” and “criminal justice system” is an approach that can highlight the framework of criticism because many of the people assume death penalty as a fault in the judicial procedures and intervention of social paradigms such as race and ethnicity, accompanied no economic and social background. Stakeholders can be identified into three major categories

**Lawyers**

Lawyers are the first stair of stakeholder in criminal justice system, because they know all about laws and practical implication of lawyers can make more surplus lucrative if they are involved in the case of death penalty.

**Politicians**

Politicians are at the third stair of criminal justice because it is an asset that has the potential to manipulate the entire issue by involving death penalty. it would not be wrong to say that death penalty is playing God for politicians.

**Social groups**

Social groups involve moral approach towards death penalty such as religion and interference of religiously affiliated groups that can validate or reject the stance of implementation of any policy.

**Limitations**

There are several limitations that I may face while carrying out the research, detail as follows

**Confidentiality**

One of the limitations in carrying out the research is confidentiality. People usually avoid participation because they don’t believe that the record or information is kept confidential. People are more towards fake information because of certain underlying fears. It is significant to note that the families are already at a threat to social and moral deterioration. The fear of exposure of their personal life can impact a lot attribute of life. (Rossi, et, al. 2004).

**Biased decisions**

It is evident that the participant may be an enemy of the victim. (Rossi, et, al. 2004). The response of such an individual would be biased, taking into account that there are several other reasons for biased information. Sometimes it is the loss of individual that makes someone biased or other assumptions.

**Informed Consent**

Informed consent is another limitation that can hamper the adequacy of information. It is significant to note that a researcher cannot go everywhere. Usually, there is a lack of informed consent, and people don't take research seriously. (Berger, et, al. 2019). Some of the participants may take research as a formality and answer questions without any critical thinking and belief. It is associated with the person who will be collecting surveys from far off people.

**Inadequate information**

One of the basic threats is the "lack of adequate information." It refers to the fact that usually participant trick evaluator or a researcher by giving false information. Lack of information also refers to illogical or half twisted information; it is one of the basic dilemmas that deal with the limitation that I may face in research.

**Political interference**

One of the prominent limitations in research is political interference. A majority of the criminal justice decisions are hampered by political interference, and there are several cases in which unfair politics has changed the actual direction of the case. In case, any of the participants has a background with political interference; it is obvious that the conveyed information will not be true and there would be a lack of credibility in the information. (Rossi, et, al. 2004). Another important aspect to note is, it is hard to trace a participant that has some politically hampered background. (Poppe, et, al. 2019).

**Entity limitations**

It refers to the gaps that are associated at the end of a researcher. If a researcher is a male entity and the participant is female, there may be less comfortable. The same stance of uncertainty can be found in the researcher, or the participant believes in racial discrimination. However, racial discrimination can be addressed, whereas, gender gaps are hard to trace because it is totally uncertain either a participant is comfortable in an interview or not.

**Honesty**

 Honesty is something that cannot be traced by measuring or tracing. It is significant that there is no way to justify if the families are speaking truth or not. Other implications that are associated with program evaluation include the gap between facts and figures that address the intentions of the participants. (Lin, et, al. 2019).

**Proposal Narrative**

**Measures**

In order to evaluate the policy, quantitative research will be used. Quantitative research is concerned with the quantification of the collected data by analysis. The aim of quantitative research is to determine the relationship that exists between independent and dependent variables. Quantitate study deals with objective stances, such as logic and numbers. There is a prominent focus on the numeric and other data to be collected through various methods. There are several methods of inferring quantitative research such as surveys, experimental techniques, and correlational studies. In order to evaluate the research question, surveys will be used. It is significant to note that there is no way out to gather "maximum quality" information. However, attempts can be made to achieve the desired results. In order to adhere to the quality maximum, some close-ended interviews will be used in order to collect centered information. The aim of interviews is to achieve some physical survey response in order to gather some psychological facts that can help evaluate the research question.

In order to carry out survey, questionnaires would be prepared. Each of the questionnaires would be provided to the participant via different means. (Yost, et, al. 2019).

**Questionnaires**

 The questionnaire will comprise of different questions. There would be both open-ended and close-ended questions. For closed-ended questions, the participants have to answer in either yes/no. While in open-ended questions, the answer would be "response based," in which a participant can share his/her views. (Rossi, et, al. 2004).

**Interviews**

 interview would be close-ended and open ended; the participants have to answer in either yes/ no, few of the questions will require a view. The participants would be interviewed within the research setting, taking into account that the same conditions would be applied to all the participants.

**Methodology**

**Participants**

 The participants for the survey would be several families of the victim who had been given capital punishment. It is important to note that the family circle will not be confined to "immediate family," many of the far relatives would be involved. In total there would be 100 participants. One of the points of consideration is, all of the participants were given free will to participate; none of the participants was enforced to participate. It is important to note that there were many families that were out of reach, i.e., they were not able to enter the realms of research floor. Such participants were provided with questionnaires through emails and post, taking into account that they will send back a responded questionnaire. (Rossi, et, al. 2004).

 Both, white and black families were involved so it was significant to practice categorized research as well. The black families were given a binary code 0 while white families were given binary code 1. In the same way, economic background is also a major point to consider, so rich families were given binary code 1 and families with middle background were given binary code 0. Political background also plays an equally important role, so all the participants were asked to select one of the four political affiliations such as 1 for Democrat, 2 for Republican, 3 for independent and 4 for any other affiliation. Gender is also equally important in research so, females were given binary code 0 while males were given binary code 1. Participants were also required to quote their age because it is also one of the factors that can have an impact on the results.

 Out of 100 participants, 30 participants would be given research surveys through emails while 25 participants would be presented with research questions through the postal address. Remaining participants would be made to reach the research center on a specified day. In order to collect data from an interview, ten random people would be interviewed where five would belong to criminal justice system studies, and the other five would be the general population.

**Dependent Variables**

Dependent variables would be the degrees of statement that would either acknowledge or negate the stance of capital punishment as retribution for the families of victims. These are the variables that are to be measured in the research.

**Independent Variables**

Independent variables are those that measure attitude towards death penalties such as gender, relationship with the victim, age and the attention given to the survey. It is the variable that can be manipulated or changed in order to create an impact on the dependent variables.

**Moderating Variables**

A moderating variable is known as the third variable that is denoted by M. It is a variable that hampers or build the strengths of the relationship between an independent and dependent variable. The moderating variables in my research could be racism, political interference, stance of grudges, attitude, and interest. It would not be wrong to say that the interference of such variables can deviate the actual pattern of research. As each intervention matters, a single biased and generalized response can act as a tool to hamper the desired results.

**Handling Data**

After the participants will send a solved survey paper, data would be analyzed. There are certain steps involved in the analysis of data. The first step is the preparation data; it will be achieved by opting data validation. There are four major steps in data validation such as eradication of fraud in attempting survey, screening of the respondent, rechecking if the procedure was followed or not and then ensuring that interviewer has asked all the questions to be asked or not. After data validation, all the data would be edited. It is not about changing the data collected in fact it is the eradication of errors such as, basic check of data, revising outliners and ensuring none of the question is left unaddressed. After that, codification would be employed, taking into account that the already mentioned codes, i.e., 0 and 1 would be applied to the surveys and interviews. After codification, a descriptive analysis of data would be made. It involved a few steps such as finding median, mean, mode, percentage, range and frequency.

**Budget**

The expected budget of the overall research would be 150 dollars including, transport, stationery, accommodation, eatables, translation of questionnaire, evaluation expense and interviewer salary.

**Proposed Schedule**

The schedule of evaluation would be systematic, taking into account that evaluation would be made step by step. The first step is to gather the survey reports from, the far-off clients. After that, the local clients would be contacted in order to get the questionnaires solved. Side by side, interviews will be carried out to collect the data. After that all the data should be validated, taking into account that there would be no chance of errors. After that statistical evaluation would be, made that can convey the desired results. It is more important to note that statistical evaluation would also proceed in terms of binary analysis.

**Summary**

**Expected Outcomes**

 As the aim of the research is to assert that death penalty is a retribution for the families of the victim. In accordance with the research, it could be inferred that the assumption will be proved evaluation brought into insight a variety of paradigms that can be accessed from different angles. These paradigms address gender, race and the measure of relationship with the victim. The inclusion of general public that could comment on the stance of research will also be highlighted to cater to the concern by adhering to the facts and figures. It is expected that the analysis would be highly centered accompanied by compact information that could clarify the stance of the death penalty in term of its application.

**Questions to be answered**

1. What is your Name?
2. What is your Race?
3. What is your Political Association?
4. What is your Age?
5. What is your gender?
6. What is your Relation with victim?
7. Is Death penalty is justified?

Yes, No Not Sure

1. Death penalty has a relation with race?

Yes No Not Sure

1. The death penalty has a relationship with religion?

Yes, No Not Sure

1. Does death penalty involve any political background?

Yes No Not Sure

1. Does death penalty hamper the stance of family life?

Yes No Not Sure

1. Does the death penalty highlight you in society?

Yes No Not Sure

1. Death penalty is a tag on the rapport of family?

Yes No Not Sure

1. Death penalty creates a barrier on the social status?

Yes No Not Sure

1. Does death penalty create a barrier to the academic framework?

Yes No Not Sure

1. Has Death penalty affected your life in any long-term goal?

Yes No Not Sure

1. Does death penalty pay the price of crime?

Yes No Not Sure

1. Is Death penalty a battle between justice and injustice?

Yes No Not Sure

1. How does death penalty infer life?
2. What is your understanding of “death penalty is unfair”?
3. Have you observed any significant stance with the negation of death penalty?
4. What are your views regarding life imprisonment or any other punishment?
5. Does death penalty stop crime?
6. Should there be any association with death penalty and type of crime?

**Expected Results**

It is expected that out of 100 participants, about 90% of the people will provide expected answers because they are the immediate relatives of the victim. One third of the population would fail to address the survey as expected, taking into account several factors that can mitigate the entire spectrum of results. Taking into account an assumed stance, it can be inferred that about 60% of the participants would be white while the rest would be black. In the same way, 53% of the population would be female while rest would be males. An exegetical analysis infers that the "Regression" method would be used to evaluate the results, taking into account that there would be varied reasons in favor and against the question because there are several dimensions incorporated. Moreover, the view of general public would be much effective, adhering to the analysis of the death penalty because emotions would be the greatest factor in the answers of “immediate family" of the victim. The response of the far family members and general public would have much ambiguous response, taking into account that intimacy and type of relationship would be a major factor in the realization of actual response.
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