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**Chapter 1**

**Introduction**

**Introduction to the Death Penalty**

Death Penalty is the punishment that involves the killing of the culprit. It is given by state law authorities for conduct of any offense that is very severe and impairing in the nature. Hence, the capital punishment is provided to ensure that the law and order is restored to the society. It creates a deterrence and a fear of the committing a crime. Many countries (China, USA, Australia) practice it while many countries have left the capital punishment. Many crimes such as rape, murder and burglary is given justice by the severe punishment. The word “capital” is Latin by origin, meaning “pertaining to head”. In ancient times, the beheading involved the giving of the capital punishment. The medieval ages was age of cruel torture and punishment provided to the criminal. Presently, it is much humane in nature and many countries have decided to reduce the number of offenses punishable by death in nature. Hence, the capital punishment has been a part of the criminal procedures around the globe (Randa, 1997).

The document will circle the death penalty in context of New Mexico, and Texas. It will look into laws of states related death penalty, compare and contrast the statistics of crime and the effect of death penalty on the crime rate and seek the Brutalization versus Deterrence effect.

**History of Death Penalty**

The history of the death penalty dates as far as back to Eighteenth Century B.C, in the codes developed by the King Hammurabi of Babylon. He arranged the death penalty for 25 kinds of infringements and each was a brutal method for ordinary crimes. The Hittite Code of the Fourteenth Century B. C., the Seventh Century B. C. Athen’s Code of Draconian Laws (which made passing the principle discipline for all infringement), and in the Fifth Century B.C., the enactment if the Roman Law of the Twelve Tablets are all an initial form of the death statements in which there was a strict punishment was developed for the minor crimes. Capital punishment used to be very strict and punishing in nature. The methods such as harmful and pain injecting and slaughtering, reducing the breathing capacity, beating the criminal to death, cutting the body parts, quartering (cutting of body into four parts), burning alive, skinning or impalement were used in the medieval ages in order to carry out the disciplinary charges. In the 10th Century B.C., there were around 200 criminals in one year who were being tried for treason and murdered by royal decree. Due to harshness of the punishment, there were special requests and efforts to reduce the amount of torture and harshness in the royal decree for criminals of treason. Some kings were more leinenit in their rulings of the bad behaviors as compared to the others. William the Conqueror would not empower individuals to be hanged or allowed them to be executed by any method for their bad behaviors, except for during the war. This situation will not last, as there were upwards to 72000 people as assessed to be executed under the reign of the of standard of Henry VIII. The unique methods for execution were employed. Foaming, expending at the stake, hanging, beheading, quartering and drawing were the methods used in general in UK and Europe. The executions were provided by the situation of offences of high magnitude such as marrying a Jew, not admitting a crime, any malicious attempt on the crown or king/queen, and so on. By the 1700s, two hundred and twenty-two offences were meriting passing as punishable by death. Many of them included the minor misdemeanors such as entrapturing, slashing down a tree, and misleading a rabbit warren. In light of the severity of the death penalty, many juries did not convict the defendants if the offense was not veritable. Thus, the death penalty was reformed in the UK. During the years of 1823 to 1837, the death penalty was cleared out for around hundered out of two twenty two bad behaviors that merited the demise (Randa, 1997)

**Death Penalty and USA**

Since the beginning of the renaissance movement, there has been a focus on the abolition of the capital punishment in the USA and across the world. Cesare Beccaria’s 1767 essay “On Crimes and Punishment” that made a huge impact on the world, promoted the abolishing of the capital punishment. It argued that there has been no substantial reasoning that capital punishment has any specific impact in reducing the crime rate around the world.Hence, the capital punishment should not be given for the wrong doings. The essay influenced policies related to the capital punishment around the globe. In Austria and Tuscany (Schabas, 2002, pp. 35–47), the death penalty was abolished by 1950s under the influence of senators who believed in the philosophy of abolishment present by Beccaria. The abolishment movement presented by Beccaria also influenced American intellectuals. When Thomas Jefferson introduced the bill to revise the Virginia’s death penalty laws, it was considered as the first serious effort in reducing the cruelty of death penalty and reforming it. The revised law enacted that capital punishment be used only for the crimes of murder and treason, by the court. It was defeated by a single vote. Those influenced by the abolishment movement included Dr. Benjamin Rush. He was an influencer of law reforms. He was signer of the declaration of Independence and also one of the key founders of Pennsylvania Prison Society. Rush challenged the idea that death penalty is a reductionist approach and that it acts as a deterrant and helps in reduction of the crime. In reality, Rush was an staunch supporter of the brutalization effect (King, 1978). By using the simple statistics of the execution rate and murder rate, he made a point with the masses. He proposed that the rate of the crimes and criminality had spiked, since the rate of execution were increased. According to brutalization effect, the execution only reduces the sensitivity of the people towards the sacredness of human life. Hence it should not be idealized or promulgated. Thus, he pointed out that death penalty served to add in the criminal behaviors. Rush ended up gaining support of many notable politicians and civil society members. Under their efforts, Pennsylvania became the first state to consider the degrees of murder based on the accountability. Pennsylvania repealed the death penalty for all felonies except for the first degree murders (Riedel, 2000).

The abolitionist movement gained momentum in the northeast America in the early 19th Century. Moreover, many states reduced the number of their capital crimes and built state penitentiaries in early Nineteenth Century B.C. Pennsylvania became the first state to move executions away from the public eye and carrying them out in correctional facilities in 1834. Michigan became the first state that abolished the capital punishment for all crimes in 1846, except for disloyalty from state. The Rhode Island and Wisconsin abolished the death penalty for all crimes further on. By the end of the century, Wisconsin and Rhode Island abolished the death penalty for all felonies. By the end of the century, the countries like Portugal, Venezuela, Portugal, Costa Rica, Netherlands, Ecuador and Brazil followed the path (Schabas, 2002).

**Dimensions of Abolishment and Anti-abolishment Movements**

Research by Reidel (2000) showed that amongst the twenty-five states with the highest murder rate, twenty have the death penalty. In the other twenty-five states, eleven states have the death penalty and the other 14 states without the death penalty have a low crime rate. Some reason that the high crime rate is a predictor of the presence of capital punishment. Moreover, the crime rate can also increase due to presence of non-availability of the crime prevention. Factors such as socioeconomic status, society and neighborhood, biological influences and multiple other factors contribute to the rate of crime. Merely the capital punishment cannot be blamed. There are currently 1834 inmates on death row around the USA. The death row has been lowest in 2017 with only 612 deaths by capital punishment. Capital punishment is still a way and a procedure of providing the death to the inmates. Although some states in USA abolished the death penalty, most states still hold steadfast to the capital punishment. Some states more crimes capital punishment crimes and it especially focused on the crimes done by the slaves and African Americans. In 1838, some states started passing the more flexible death penalty statues to ensure that there is a more acceptable stance of the public towards acceptance of the capital punishment
(King, 1978).

The 1838 enactment of the flexible death penalty statues in Tennessee and Alabama was considered a great reform. The introduction of the clauses and conditions that were flexible in nature, more situation oriented and considerate of the situation in which the crime was oriented, was seen as a prominent achievement of the abolitionists. Before it, most of the times, the capital punishment was given right away and there was no consideration of the situation, causal factors or other relevant situations to be considered by the jury. Considering the meager number of occasionally committed crimes in a few places as an excluded case, remaining mandatory capital punishment laws had been abolished in multiple states by 1963. During the era of the Civil War, the movement of death penalty abolishment reduced as it involved the larger focus on the development of the anti-slavery movement. However, in the developments after the war, there was newer focus on the abolishment and deterrence movements. They both emerged with equally strong force and hence it provided the momentum to the law-related discussions and criminal procedures. The development of providing the death penalty were re-invented. In New York City, the first electric chair was built in 1888. The first person executed by the electric chair was William Kemmler. The drugs such as sodium pentobarbital was started to be used for the death penalty. Many states adopted this execution method in the coming years. As the few states removed the death penalty, in the mid of the 19th Century B.C., it was really the ending years of the fore-mentioned century that marked the dynamic period of the change in the USA (Yost 2011).

Six states promulgated laws against the capital punishment and the three restricted it to the occasionally perpetrated violations of treason and first degree murder of a law requirement official, during the years of 1907 to 1917. During any situation, the change was inevitable. There was a climate of ferocity in the USA, as the inhabitants began to freeze for the risk of insurgency in the wake of the USSR revolution. In addition to this, the USA had recently entered the World War 1. Moreover, there were exceptional class clashes as communists mounted the basic law as genuine tests to free enterprise. The efforts by abolitionists were revoked and five amongst the six abolitionist states restored their capital punishment until the year of 1920 (Rosen & Rise, 1998). The use of cyanide gas was presented in 1924. As Nevada looked for a more sympathetic method of execution of inmates, many other options were introduced. The most renowned criminal executed by the deadly gas was Well Jon. The state endeavored to uitilize the cyanide gas to be siphoned into Jon’s cell while he was asleep. It was not very humane and hence the gas chamber was developed later on (Lowe, 2012). There was a strong resurgence in the utilization of capital punishment from years of 1920 to 1940. This was expected, to some extent, a contribution of the works of the criminologists. They believed and worked for the idea that the capital punishment was an important aspect of the social justice. While in the same years, Americans were enduring the Prohibition and the Great Depression. There were a huge number of executions during the era of 1910 to 1930, as compared to normal average of 167 every year (Reidel,2000). Open assumptions started to get some distance from the death penalty by 1950s. Many countries in the united front either annulled or constrained the capital punishment. The amount of executions in the USA dropped drastically since 1950s. In the USA, the quantity of had a sharp decline, with 1,289 executions, during the 1940s. There were 715 during the 1950s, and it fell down further to just 191, during years of 1960 to 1976. The bolster for the death penalty touched an all time low in 1966. The gallup survey demonstrated the help for capital punishment at mere 42% in 1966 (Yost, 2011).

**Death Penalty and State of Texas**

The death penalty in Texas was developed in the same era as the other states in USA. In 1784, the first death penalty has was enacted in the Texas. It included felonies of murder, rape and other major crimes to be punished by the death penalty. With time, there had been different developments in the death penalty laws. From tough executions to more humane methods, the history of the death penalty has surpassed a long time and era. Presently, the penal codes 12.31, 19.31, 8.07 and CCrP 37.071, 43.14 are being used for the capital punishment allowance. The state uses the lethal injection as the source of capital punishment. Those under the age of 17 years and those who have a lacking or deficit in mental capacity, those who are legally insane are the ones who are considered to be exempted from the capital punishment. The situation of the capital punishment includes some specified situations. State of Texas explains the capital homicide as a murder, utilizing the different situations. Situations such as the victim is a peace officer or fireman killed while doing the duty;the occurrence of the murder when defendant was committing (or trying to commit) a kidnapping/burglary/robbery/aggravated sexual assault or arson; occurrence of a murder when a murderer was hired (both the killer and hirer will be responsible); the occurrence of murder during the course of an actual or attempted prison break; occurrence of multiple murders as a result of the defendant’s act; and if the victim was less than 10 years old.All the fore-mentioned situation are considered punishable by the death penalty. The minimum age by which the criminal is rendered an exemption from the death penalty is 17 years. The present laws of the death penalty were introduced by the state senate in 2014 by 7th amendment. (Phillips & Simon, 2014).

**A History of the Death Penalty in Texas**

In 2000, a couple of factors influenced the death penalty to go under examination outstanding since the late 1960's to mid 1970's.In expansion to the long-standing charges that death penalty is relentless, uncalled for to minorities, and a crude, coldblooded instrument unfit for an acculturated society, adversaries of capital punishment began crushing their conviction that innocent people were being executed in the United States. In January 2000, after a couple of particularly declared exonerations of death row prisoners in Illinois, Governor George Ryan broadcasted a prohibition on executions in his state until the point that an examination could be endeavored to evaluate the demonstration of capital punishment. Texas went under especially strong national examination in 2000 for two reasons: one is in light of the fact that it drove the nation in executions - more than all other 37 the death penalty states merged. The other reason is in light of the fact that Texas Governor George W. Shrub was running for President, and by March, he had effectively won the Republican Party choice for the president-ship(Weisbuch, 1984).

One of the essential weapons the death penalty rivals weilded in the strike on capital punishment was the openness of DNA testing. DNA testing systems were impressively more refined in 2000 than when most death-row prisoners around then were prosecuted, so the conflict was that DNA confirmation should be retested in circumstances where the respondent's fault was in vulnerability. On 1 June, Gov. Shrubbery issued a 30-day stay of execution to condemned executioner Ricky McGinn, for DNA testing. McGinnwas arraigned for striking and murdering his 12-year-old stepdaughter in 1993. McGinnwas executed in September after the tests returned positive. The get together passed a law in 2001 guaranteeing DNA testing to any decried prisoner whose genuineness might be tied down thus(MacDonald, 2005).The other key issue of the mid 2000's was whether prisoners who are reasonably upset should be executed. A couple of states passed laws restricting the execution of the judiciously obstructed. The Texas lawmaking body passed such a law in 2001, anyway Governor Rick Perry vetoed it, observing that Texas law authoritatively protected the judiciously unbalanced from execution, and that juries should be allowed to pick whether a condemned killer merits the death penalty. On 20 June 2002, by the by, the U.S. Overwhelming Court found in Atkins v. Virginia that a "national accord" had developed that executing soundly hindered prisoners is primitive and phenomenal control, and subsequently the Court ruled it illicit. The Court left it to the states to choose how mental deterrent would be resolved(Harding, 2000)

Some place in the scope of 2000 and 2005, the typical number of executions consistently in Texas declined from the high 30's to the low 20's. As of this structure, no Texas death row prisoner has been pardoned by DNA confirmation, and the amount of prisoners who have had their sentences toppled dependent on mental obstruction has been nearly nothing. One doable elucidation for the decently stepped drop in the pace of executions after 2000 is that laws and court decisions in the 1990's that were proposed to diminish a building abundance of the death penalty cases accomplished just that, and after that excess was cleared, the amount of executions consistently proceeded at an inexorably moderate pace. The Supreme Court furthermore restricted the usage of the death penalty in 2005, when it chose that prisoners who submitted their capital offenses when they were under age 18 couldn't be executed. Following this choice, 29 prisoners who were 17 at the period of their offenses were ousted from death row(Morteze, 2011). In 2005, Texas changed the law with the objective that capital executioners sentenced to life in prison as opposed to given the death penalty would be ineligible for parole. Sponsor of this law believed that individuals from the jury would will undoubtedly sentence a miscreant to life, understanding that he couldn't be paroled later on, and that the amount of capital disciplines constrained would be reduced. Up until this point, this emits an impression of being the circumstance. Prior to 2005, orderlies were frequently sending 30 or prisoners for every year to death row, anyway starting now and into the foreseeable future, the most lifted number of capital disciplines constrained in a year has been 15. In reliably since 2005, the amount of prisoners removed from death row by execution, typical downfall, or resentencing has been greater than the amount of new capital disciplines constrained. Consequently, the quantity of occupants in death row has dropped from 446 prisoners toward the beginning of 2005 to 235 prisoners toward the beginning of 2018. The amount of prisoners at present hanging tight for the death penalty is the most diminished it has been since 1987(Williams, 2005).In 2011, Texas and distinctive states using dangerous imbuement changed the manufactured beauty care products of the lethal mixture, due to a general absence of one of the prescriptions that had been used since 1982. The implantation by and by includes a single segment of pentobarbital, a brisk acting barbituate moreover used in creature required elimination. Prescription associations that create pentobarbital for business bargain don't permit its usage for execution of wrongdoers (yet they do allow it for specialist helped suicide), so state confinement offices get their arrangements from increasing medication stores (Harding, 2000). Furthermore in 2011, the Texas Department of Criminal Justice quit giving remarkable last dinners to reproved prisoners. This long-standing methodology was changed in accordance with state delegate John Whitmore after detainee Lawrence Brewer declined to take an eat of the rich eat up he had asked. Blamed prisoners are presently given a last supper from a comparative menu open to whatever is left of the correctional facility unit (Philips& Simons, 2014).

**Death Penalty in New Mexico**

The state of New Mexico abolished the capital punishment in 2009. The then Governor of New Mexico, Bill Richardson, signed the 25th amendment bill of senate, on 24th March, that abolished the capital punishment. New Mexico has executed only one inmate since the 1960s. The death penalty was discontinued after there was a referendum held to take the public opinion via phone call method. The majority voted to remove the death penalty and thus it was assured that death penalty is no more a part of law procedures. The death penalty abolishment is unique in perspective and thus it is related to the crime system of the state by which there has been the development of the preventive procedures, which is a new shift of paradigm (Marcar, 2015).

**Chapter II**

**Literature Review**

 This research will cater to the question that whether the deterrence is the follow-up process or the process of brutalization is the real phenomenon. Houghtalin and Mays (1991) saw the crime rates in the New Mexico during years of 2006, 2007 and 2008. It was observed that the rate of homicides was reduced by the ‌28%, 24% and 25% in the three years. The other felonies also showed a sharp decrease. The rate of theft decreased by 14.7 %, 14.1% and 13.5%. Moreover, the rate of reported sexual assault cases decreased by 23.1%, 22.6% and 25.4%. However, the rate of property crime has increased by a sharp 32% in New Mexico. By the years of 2006, 2007 and 2008, the reported property crimes were 24%, 27% and 28% increase in the rate of property crime. The white-collar crimes also increased in New Mexico by 24%. By the years 2006, 2007 and 2008, the white-collar crimes increased by the 21%, 22.4%, and 27.1%. There has also been a decrease in the crimes related to the drug dealing and substance abuse. During the years 2006, 2007 and 2008, the crime rate has reduced from 31%, 30% and 25%. Moreover, the similar trends were seen in the reported crimes of New Mexico by years of the years of 2010, 2011 and 2012. The crime rate dropped by 14% in state by 22% reduction in homicides, 24% reduction in in the kidnapping, 30% reduction in the burglary, 25% decrease in the burglary since the years of 2010, 2011 and 2012.



Figure 1: The Rate of the Property Crime in New Mexico: A Comparative View (Houghtalin and Mays, 1991)

In another research by Koeninger(2017), the crime rate in the state of the Texas were observed. It was found out that the rate of the crime has been consistent over the years of 2006, 2007 and 2008. The rate of homicidal crimes sustained a rate of 2% increase in its occurrence. The rate of reported assault cases was increased by 1.2%. Moreover, the rate of kidnapping increased by 2.3%. The burglary cases increased by 2.4%. There has been slight developments in the reported cases of the crime by years of 2010, 2011 and year 2012. The research shows that there has been an overall 12% increase in overall crime rate in the years of 2012.



Figure 2: Crime Rate Developments in Texas (Koeninger, 2017)

Cochran et al. (1994) give a critical commitment to a long queue of research analyzing the impact of the death penalty on homicide. They call attention to that with few special cases, capital punishment examiners have discovered no steady proof that death penalty is related with either lower (prevention) or higher (brutalization) manslaughter rates. Or maybe, the mind-boggling design is bolster for the invalid theory that death penalty neither debilitates nor supports murder. Notwithstanding this proof, Cochran et al. contend that both prevention and brutalization may work some degree for various kinds of murder. In any case, in light of the fact that most specialists inspect the general crime rate, this vital variety is conceal. That is, if the death penalty disheartens a few kinds of crime however energizes different sorts, it isn't astonishing that most examinations find basically a “zero” connection between the death penalty and the general manslaughter rate. Prevention specialists are aware of the need to look at death-eligible murders. Unexpectedly, they long have perceived the significance of doing as such; however have been hampered by the powerlessness to disaggregate official murder information. A few investigations have beaten this deterrent and have inspected a few sorts of capital killings: planned homicide and lawful offense murder. Seeing all the facts, similar to general murder considers, these endeavors have given no sign of discouragement. Scientists analyzing the brutalization contention have not given deliberate thoughtfulness regarding which kinds of homicide are quite supported by the death penalty. Many researchers have foughtthat executions degrade human life and authentic deadly retribution, however they don't demonstrate how brutalization works for murders happening under various conditions. In light of the restricted comprehension of whether brutalization/discouragement applies for distinctive kinds of murdering, the Cochran et al. (1994) makes an imperative commitment by analyzing the impact of executions for various sorts of executing (Cochran et al., 1994).

Even more explicitly, Cochran et al. (1994) place that killing including outsiders may be impelled by the death penalty. They battle that, when all is said and done, if restraints against the utilization of deadly savagery to take care of issues made by “dishonorable” others are decreased by executions, “such a brutalization impact is destined to happen in arranged exchanges’ where hindrances against the utilization of viciousness are as of now missing or impressively loose”.Insults by outsiders include such a setting because of the reality that social ties, and thus social controls, are a lot more fragile for people not known to each other. Cochran et al. (1994) affirm observationally that for one locale, Oklahoma for 1989-1991, an arrival to the death penalty after a 25-year ban on executions was trailed by a quick and perpetual increment in killings among outsiders. A week after week time-arrangement ARIMA investigation demonstrated that the execution of Charles Troy Coleman on September 10, 1990, was trailed by a huge increment in by and large more complicated killings. In any case, not a wide range of crime including outsiders expanded essentially following the Coleman execution. Or maybe, noteworthy increments were watched just for non-felony and contention related more complicated killings. Lawful offense murders and burglary related killings including outsiders did not increment essentially following the inconvenience of the capital punishment on Coleman. Week after week killings neither expanded nor diminished essentially for (1) all out killings, (2) complete crime murders, (3) all out burglary related killings, and (4) all out death-qualified homicides. Cochran et al. (1994) see their discoveries as primer, and they call for further inquire about “to explain the connections between the execution of the passing punishment and changes in the dimensions of both aggregate and disaggregated measures of more odd manslaughters" (Cochran et al. 1994, p. 130).

The examination broadens the Cochran et al. (1994) investigation of Oklahoma murders by (1) considering critical capital punishment factors not considered in the before investigation the dimensions of execution and media inclusion dedicated to executions amid the 1989-1991 period (2) inspecting the quick (inside the week) and conceivable postponed deterrent/brutalization impacts of capital punishment for the distinctive sorts of homicide. This is done to keep away from conceivable false outcomes recommending obstruction or brutalization impacts for the Coleman intercession factor and the execution attention factors that may be because of changes in statistic or monetary conditions in Oklahoma amid the period. Cochran et al. (1994) have encouraged enormously this investigation by giving both the murder record that they got from the Supplementary Homicide Reports (SHR) ofthe Oklahoma Uniform Crime Reports, and their week-by-week code sheets for various kinds of murdering. The rate of crime comparison shows that there has been a substantial effect of the deterrence and brutalization in the lives of the people. Moreover, it also observed that the effect of deterrence is not supportedby the trends of crime record. The research points out that there has been no substantial evidence that the severity of punishment leads to a reduction in the crime rate. In fact, the opposite is true. The severity of the crime rate leads to the lack of regard for the human life and hence it is the source of the further increase in the crime rate. Moreover,it is also the situation that the trend of the crime kept increasing in the state with the death penalty on, and rate of crime kept decreasing for the state in which the death penalty is off. Hence, it is important to have more preventive measures that can reduce the rate of occurrence of the crime. The preventive measures are the source of reduction and it is observed that the youth that is more involved in the crime preventive activities are prone to be more law abiding and shows reduced recidivism (Rebbi, 2011).

In a research by Cochran &Chamlin (2000), the deterrence and brutalization, with its dual effects was observed. On April 21, 1992, California got wide national consideration when Robert Alton Harris was executed in the gas chamber at San Quentin. Harris' execution denoted a reintroduction of capital punishment in California following a 25-year ban. Week after week time-arrangement informationwas utilized on the dimension and kind of criminal murder episodes in the state from 1989 through 1995 to abuse the semi test characteristics of this normally happening “test” and the effect of Harris' execution on the frequency of manslaughter was evaluated. As in a few ongoing investigations, we disaggregate criminal manslaughters into types of homicide almost certain to be influenced by the death penalty: lawful offense murders of non-strangers, for which it was foreseen an obstruction impact, and contention murders of outsiders, for which we anticipate a brutalization impact. Based on an autoregressive incorporated way to deal with time-arrangement investigation, It was found as anticipated that a huge decrease in the dimension of non-stranger lawful offense murders and a noteworthy increment in the dimension of contention based killings of outsiders in the period following the execution. Additionally, the expansion in contention based more complicated homicides related with the Harris execution persisted over an ensuing execution period, while the decrease in non-stranger lawful offense murders moved to the consequent execution.

In a research by Thomson (1997), the deterrence versus the brutalization and it’s impact on the situation of Arizona were seen. For a very long while, the discussions and research with respect to capital punishment and discouragement have concentrated on whether the accepted impediment impacts were genuine. The ascent of brutalization hypothesis, and the developing proof in help of the hypothesis, represents a difficulty with an alternate essentialness: It gives the idea that executions cause a greater number of murders than they counteract and consequently increment manslaughter rates. This investigation of impediment and brutalization impacts of an Arizona execution mostly duplicates and broadens an examination that utilized a normally happening semi trial circumstance to survey the effect of an Oklahoma execution on various (i.e., disaggregated) kinds of manslaughters in Oklahoma. The discoveries are steady with those of the Oklahoma think about, and demonstrate that Arizona's first execution in over 29 years had no impediment impact on Arizona murders, yet rather, prompted increments in a few sorts of crimes reliable with the forecasts of brutalization hypothesis.

In another research by Bailey (1998), the effect of deterrence versus the brutalization were observed in sense of Oklahoma’s returning stance to the capital sentence. There has been a return towards the capital punishment. A replication and augmentation of a week-by-week ARZMA investigation (1989– 1991) affirms that Oklahoma's arrival to the death penalty in 1990, after a 25‐year ban, was trailed by a noteworthy increment in killings including outsiders. Additionally, a multivariate autoregressive investigation, which incorporates proportions of the recurrence of executions, the dimension of print media consideration gave to executions, and chose socio-demographic factors, delivered results predictable with the brutalization theory for complete manslaughters, just as a wide range of kinds of murdering including the two outsiders and non-strangers. No earlier investigation has appeared solid help for the cause of death penalty and brutalization contention. Nevertheless, there is likewise a recommendation of a conceivable slacked obstacle impact for the dimension of media inclusion of executions for non-felony murders including outsiders. The examination demonstrates that the effect of the death penalty in Oklahoma amid the 1989– 1991 period was substantially more broad than proposed by the before study. The researches point out the specified directions in which the research is to be maintained and followed.

**Chapter III**

**Methodology**

**Operational Definitions**

 The research will use the variables of crime, crime rate, deterrence and brutalization in it’s use. The crime can be defined as the wrong-doing of a person. The crime will be the source by which the convict will be observed and taken into account. The crime rate will be seen as the ratio of the crimes that occur per twenty thousand people in the community. The deterrence will be defined as the reduction in rate of crime per twenty thousand people in the area. The brutalization will be considered as the increase in the crime rate per twenty thousand people.

**Instrumentation and Data Analysis**

The data will be taken from the staterecords.org and crime catalogs of data.gov of USA based record of criminals. From the census.gov, the data will be obtained relevant to the county data by which the data will be taken from the archives that will serve to be used as the analysis for the variables. The data will be obtained and utilized for the mixed-model approach. A public perception survey will be generated in which there will be twenty questions, of five questions related to four categories. Category 1 is the influence of crime perception i.e. the effect of crime and its relevant perception. Category 2 is the perception of deterrence i.e. how the deterrence is seen in relation to crime and punishment. Category 3 is the perception of brutalization i.e. how the brutalization is seen in relation to crime and punishment. Category 4 is the opinion related to the abolishment or continuation of death penalty. The questions will be closed ended interview type and it will have two options (A,B) for the response categories (favor/against). The data analysis will use both quantitative and qualitative data for establishing the connection between public perceptions and the generic development in the variables.

**Research Questions**

The research will cater to three main questions.

1. What is public perception of death penalty, deterrence, brutalization and crime
2. What are the demographic trends in perception of death penalty, deterrence, brutalization and crime
3. What is link of census data, crime rate, deterrence and with the perception of death penalty, deterrence, brutalization and crime.

**Sampling and Population**

The population of the city (Name of your city here) will be utilized. The random sampling will be done from the university (Name of university here). The data will be utilized from the sampled population of students in undergraduate course of the study. The data will be taken from both quantitative and qualitative sources.

**Procedure**

The study will be divided into three phases. First phase will becatering the developments of the public opinions survey. The questions will be refined and prepared and the categorical responses will be generated. There will be the phasic developments of the questionnaire. The reliability and validity of the questionnaire will be observed. The demographic sheet will be developed and it will use the variables such as age, gender, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, locality, language, and parenting style will be settled. In the next phase, the questionnaire will be administered for the pilot study in which the questionnaire will be administered to the understudy graduate to the population. The procedure will include the faculty members. They will be briefed about the research process. The forms of confidentiality will be administered to the faculty. The confidentiality will assure that the information being taken will be obtained only for the research purpose and it will not be disclosed to any other third party. The classes will be arranged for the research process. The questionnaires will be printed along with the demographic sheet. The demographic data, will be taken from students. After it, a questionnaire will be administered. The instructor will first read aloud the instruction of responding to the questionnaire and the key responses. Later on, the instructor (which will be a faculty member) will further take account of the trust building that the research data will be solely used for the research and high level of confidentiality will be maintained. After it, the questionnaire will be distributed in the classroom. A time of 30 minutes will be given for the questions to be administered. After the completion of the questionnaire, they will be collected and submitted to the researcher and a note of gratitude will be distributed amongst the responders. In the third phase, the data will be collected from online sources and its trends will be observed in relation to data obtained from questionnaires.

The research will generate the analysis of the policies of the death penalty and it will suggest the impact and changes in policy framework.

**Conclusion**

The research is very general and using a focused sample, hence the results will not be very generalizable in nature. Moreover, the policy detailing will be a lesser focus of the research thus refraining it from fully predicting the trends of crime, crime rate, deterrence versus the brutalization. Meta-analytical approach is required to cater to the given issue.
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