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ABSTRACT

State-sanctioned death sentences are the final dismissal a society can impose. Literature offers limited information on the effect a death sentence and execution has on the condemned inmate's family. This study explores and describes the impact a sentence of death from society has on parents, grandparents, aunts, uncles, siblings, spouses, and children of condemned inmates. The inquiry orientation of this study will follow the post-positivist research paradigm. Data was gathered from interviews, organized and then analyzed by use of qualitative and quantitative methods. This study provides insight into the impact experienced by family members of condemned inmates. These insights present an enormous challenge to which individuals and groups must respond, and assist social service providers and public policy makers in serving families of condemned inmates.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Problem Statement

Capital punishment is a complex public policy in which a person is given a sentence of punishment by execution. In the United States, each of the fifty states had to decide whether to have a death penalty policy. Of the fifty states, thirteen states decided against a public policy of state-sanctioned executions, whereas thirty-seven of the U.S. states have made it a public policy to sentence human beings to death. Since 1976, when the Supreme Court overturned the ban on capital punishment, more than three thousand individuals have received the sentence of death with 282 being executed.

California has played an active part in this sentencing-executing process. Californians have delivered a total of 480 death sentences to men and women since the reinstatement of capital punishment. Since then, fifty sentences have been overturned, ten inmates committed suicide, eight inmates died while on death row and two individuals were executed. This leaves 410 men and women
waiting. During this period of waiting, the condemned inmate is affected by the uncertainty of his or her fate, his or her living environment, his or her emotions, the psychological and physical stresses and the legal process. Waiting with these condemned individuals are their families -- family members who are also affected in various ways because of the death sentence imposed on their relatives. Literature notes that families of condemned inmates experience feelings similar to families of inmates not condemned to death and more closely to families of terminally ill patients (Carlson, 1991, 1992; Morris, 1965; Radelet, 1983). These individuals and families need some type of support system as they experience the loss of a loved one through death or separation, according to psychiatrist Elizabeth Kubler-Ross (1969). As the number of imposed death sentences increases, so does the number of families who will be affected and who will need some type of support system.

However, there is limited literature that discusses the effects of the death sentence on family members. Much of the literature notes the effects of the death sentence on
the condemned inmate, prison guards, attorneys, public witnesses, and the victim's family.

The Focus of the Inquiry

With little research on the effects of a death sentence upon families, there remains many unanswered questions. However, some questions have been answered by Michael Radelet (1983), who noted the relationship between death row inmates and their families, the functions, as well as the sentencing process. He found that a major function of the family is to provide psychological support and a link to the outside world to the condemned inmate. This high stress of responsibility causes tension within the relationship, which eventually leads to strained or ended family ties. He also found that families of condemned inmates feel they are powerless onlookers in a gradual dying process. In this process an individual experiences a prolong period of anticipatory grief (Radelet, 1991; Kubler-Ross, 1969).

This study, however, will focus on how families of condemned inmates perceive the effect of this experience on their relationships with others and on their self-image.
This new information, coupled with previous condemned inmates' family studies, may assist social workers and social service professionals in understanding the effects of the death sentence, family experience and society's response. This study will specifically discuss the relationship of family members with other family members, fellow employees, neighbors, the relative-inmate, and support services in overcoming the pressures and difficulties they experience. Further discussion will explore how the family members view themselves concerning their situation.

This information may assist social workers who, through their work in agencies, non-profit organizations, and churches, come across the poor, the disenfranchised, and individuals who have been dismissed by society because of their relatives' sentences of death. After listening to the stories of family member's experience, the professional role moves to one of educating the society on the plight and impact of the death sentence on the condemned inmates' family. Social workers can also assist those effected by the death sentence through linkage with community
organizations that provide necessary services and contribute to social reform.

Literature Review

Social Service Provisions.

In California, there are laws that have established programs of assistance to meet the needs of victims of crime, such as Victim Witness, Families of Murdered Members, and Parents of Murdered Children. However, there are no laws to establish programs to assist the families of incarcerated perpetrators of crime. Therefore, these families seek assistance through non-state run agencies like Friends Outside. Bakker et al., (1978) states that Friends Outside is the only statewide agency, public or private, that deals exclusively with the problems that arise from being the family member of an inmate. As of May 1995, San Quentin State Prison had 403 of the 410 condemned inmates in California and according to Peter Breen, Director of Centerforce, San Quentin does not have a Friends Outside Program.

Support for the family of an inmate condemned to death is nearly non-existent. Michael Radelet (1983) notes that
there are no organizations that exist to provide service for families of condemned persons. Despite the lack of formal support there is some informal assistance provided to them by a handful of concerned citizens. Even though informal assistance is provided, it is most often limited to those who will experience an execution within weeks or days. Due to the limited informal assistance, the families who are still waiting through the appeal process do not receive the necessary support. For the most part, family members themselves develop support groups, such as Ken and Lois Robison in Texas who have created HOPE (Help Our Prisoners Exit), a chapter through CURE (Citizens United for the Rehabilitation of Errants).

Population on Death Row -- A Reflection?

Our prisons and jails are primarily filled with poor and minorities. This reflects a sketch on the families of condemned inmates. Analyst Carol Jansepar, Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy, reports that the State of California 1992 Census reflects 66.6% White, 7.5% Black, 19.2% Hispanic, and 6.7% Other residents. Of this break down of race in California, 50.07% are male and 49.93%
are females. The California Department of Corrections, Communication Office in Sacramento reports that in California's prisons and jails, the general inmate population is 29.4% White, 31.8% Black, 33.8% Hispanic, and 4.9% Other. There are 93.3% males and 6.6% females within this particular population. The California Department of Corrections Death Sentence Status notes that the population on California's death row consists of 45.8% White, 37.5% Black, 13.2% Hispanic, and 3.4% Other. This is with 98.6% males and 1.4% females in this population. Comparing percentages of imprisoned people to the general population in the State of California, the proportion of imprisoned people of color is higher than their ratio in the general population.

The California Department of Corrections records contains the sentencing county of each condemned inmate but this is not necessarily the individual's residential location at time of conviction. The California Department of Corrections (April 1995) reports that 28.2% or 117 are sentenced from Los Angeles County, 7.2% or 30 from Orange County, 5.3% or 22 from San Bernardino and 5.1% or 21 each
from San Diego and Riverside. The five southern counties in
California collectively represent more than half of the
condemned inmate population sentenced to California's death
row. This fact must have many repercussions for the family,
one to consider is financial implications.

**Financial Issues.**

In 1990, the median income for a family in California
was $42,700.00, with the annual minimum wage income being
$8,840.00 (Children Now, 1991). Many families lack
financial stability, particularly after a partner, commonly
the man, is incarcerated. This suggests that the other
partner, usually the woman, must secure some financial
support through employment, public assistance or relatives.
Many of the women, like their partners, have little or no
formal education. They must struggle until the inmate is
released from prison, rejoins the family and can provide for
them (Bakker et al., 1978; Carlson et al., 1991; Carlson et
al., 1992; Morris 1965; Schneller 1976). Concerning the
unstable financial status, many families of condemned
inmates find themselves in debt. There is an attempt to
pursue every avenue to keep their family members alive.
These pursuits cause economic difficulties for family members. This economic difficulty, many times, brings added stress and burdens that prevent the opportunity for time or energy to be available for maintaining the relationship (Radelet et al., 1983; Smykla 1987; Vandiver 1989). This most likely leading to an other tragic loss experienced by the family member of a condemned inmate.

**Family Tragedies.**

The death sentence is the ultimate removal from the community that society can impose. The taint of the death sentence destroys the condemned inmate and their family. There is, as Prejean (1994) describes it, "An ever-widening circle of tragedy." This circle includes: the victim, the victim's family, and all those involved in the legal process (jurists, judges, lawyers, court personnel), the inmate, the inmates' family, the prison (personnel, other inmates, witnesses), and the society. One of the tragedies is the stigmatization associated to this sentence. It creates a hostility towards, and lack of respect for, the inmate as well as the family. The family experiences silence from those around them as well as from each other. They are
ostracized from society (Vandiver, 1989; Smykla, 1987; Morris, 1965). Camus (1959) wrote that, families of condemned inmates “experience a misery that punishes them beyond the bounds of all justice.” They undergo many tortures that are not inflicted on the families of the victim. This is not a place to compare families of perpetrators and victims but this is a time to re-evaluate attitudes and recognize that everyone is effected by this public policy and everyone needs support. If one person in our society is in pain, it seems only right that societies respond to the person in pain.

Another tragedy many family members of incarcerated people carry with them is humiliation. It is embarrassing to admit that a member of their family has committed a crime. They do not know what others are saying about them. They worry that someone might find out and they are angry that there is an internal code of silence or an inability to defend the member of the family. Family members find themselves wishing for the end of the waiting and suffering and this leads to feelings of guilt and shame. These guilt feelings also arise out of self-accusation, "Where did I go
wrong? I could have done more!” (Smykla, 1987).

Support Systems.

Only a few studies have been done of inmates' families and these studies reveal there is little help for those affected by the criminal justice system (Bakker et al., 1978; Carlson et al., 1992; Schneller, 1976). The numbers of incarcerated persons increase daily and, therefore, so do the number of family members of incarcerated persons. Bonnie Carlson et al., (1991) and Margaret Vandiver (1989) state that incarceration and prolonged anticipation of the death of a loved one brings crisis to the family environment. This crisis rocks the lives of the family members and creates problems and situations that are responded to through hostility, anger and isolation. The family crisis is only survived by the stronger families who are able to react with enhanced support for one another (Radelet et al., 1983).

Individuals or families are capable of dealing with the emotional roller-coaster as long as there is a constant support system(s). However, the lack of support systems and coping skills within the individual or family would not
allow the person(s) to function as they had in the past. For example, a family could become socially isolated and powerless in the face of this humiliation, guilt and lack of support (Bakker et al., 1978; Carlson et al., 1991; Vandiver 1989). Many of the families of condemned inmates also experience prolonged grief. This grief weighs upon the family member as they anticipate the delayed death of their relative. Again this grief could cause emotional and physiological burdens, such as insomnia, inability to eat, and depression (Radelet et al., 1983; Smykla 1987).

Individuals have a variety of survival skills when a family member is a condemned to death inmate. These survival skills or supports include friends, family, personal positive attitudes, inmate-family visits, letters, religion or prayer (Carlson et al., 1991; Vandiver, 1989). Religion is seen as a common support throughout the literature; it is a means of coping with crisis.

In interviews with condemned persons and their families Radelet, Vandiver, and Berardo (1983) discovered two areas of stress experienced by families of condemned inmates. "First is the existence of objective barriers to maintaining
supportive relationships and second is a limited capacity to deal with these problems.” Objective barriers have been defined as location of prison, the process of visiting and the actual visit itself, child care and transportation to the facility. Support systems available to those who have incarcerated family members are limited or non-existent, and this leads to an oppression or burden that the family is unable to deal with alone over a time.

Given there is little available support to assist families of condemned inmates, the question ‘why?’ needs to be asked and answers sought. One answer is simple; there is little research that addresses the needs, difficulties, and effects upon individuals who are relatives of condemned inmates. John Smykla (1987) believes that “researchers are more interested in the political, legal and moral issues of capital punishment”, whereas Michael Radelet (1983) reasons that “the relevant persons, family members of the condemned, are shielded from the public and want to protect their privacy.” Margaret Vandiver (1989) believes that the number of individuals involved in the situation has a lot to do with the limited studies. For example, she notes are more
than 240 people have been executed since 1976, and approximately 3,000 persons presently have death sentences. However, there is a great deal more of research and writing of terminal illnesses where hundreds of thousands of people have died. The differences in group numbers may, therefore, account for the limited research on individuals with death sentences and their families. Very simply, it then follows if there is no information, there is 'no problem'; if no problem exists, then there is 'no need' for assistance.

**TABLE 1**

Previous Studies of Condemned Inmates' Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Researcher</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Place of Study</th>
<th>Type of Study</th>
<th>Number of Families Studied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radelet Vandiver Berardo</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Interviews Observations and Case Studies</td>
<td>Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smykla</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Interviews and Case Studies</td>
<td>Forty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion.**

Reviewing the limited but reliable literature the findings indicate that the families of inmates condemned to death have similarities with families of the general prison
population. Credit must be given to these authors who have noted that incarceration and the sentence of death have an effect upon innocent people, the families of the condemned persons. The general public, which repeatedly expresses strong feelings in support of capital punishment and whose views influence policy, may benefit from a description and understanding of the effects upon the other victims -- the families of condemned inmates. The family members, in sharing information concerning the impact of their experiences upon their lives and insights to their perceptions, may gain a new freedom themselves.

The Fit of the Paradigm to the Focus

The focus of the study is on families of condemned inmates, their perspective of the effect of the death sentence and their relationship with others and their image of self. To acquire this information the study's orientation follows the Post-Positivist research paradigm. An implication of this research paradigm is the discovery of theory rather than testing of theory. Therefore, the methodology used is grounded theory. According to Strauss and Corbin (1993), grounded theory is "an inductive process
of discovering theory from data”, meaning this approach is a qualitative research method that uses a systematic set of procedures to develop a theory about a phenomenon. It is through this process of exploration and analyzing that gained insight would identify avenues that need to be explored. This will assist social workers to implement a support system for those affected by the criminal justice system and for family members of condemned inmates.

The previous family of condemned inmate studies have used the Post-Positivist research paradigm. They explored the human impact of capital punishment on family members of condemned inmates. This study has also followed the same paradigm by exploring and describing the ‘what’ impact experienced by these family members. However, there will be a further exploration into ‘what’ impact on other relationships, including image of self, rather than with the condemned inmate.

It would be much easier to be removed from the topic and collect the necessary data; however, this study can not reduce the gathering of information to numbers and statistics. The topic of capital punishment or the death
penalty touches upon strong emotions that are unique to each person who has been affected by it. Literally, human lives are at stake. Therefore, in coming to some understanding of the impact family members of condemned inmates' experiences can benefit those who seek to support family members, provide knowledge to assist in educating on the impact and effects, and much more.

Even though a quantitative approach was used initially to gather information about the interviewee, it would be impossible to use this approach as the complete means of obtaining information. Rich explanations of experience would be missed. That is why a qualitative approach was also used in this study; to garnish deeper insights to what experiences the family members of condemned inmates have had with others and to self.

This study specifically investigated the past and present situations and experiences of the family members of condemned inmates. It is this process of exploring their perceptions of the impact of having family members condemned to death and the effects upon their lives and relationships that will provide professionals with an understanding and
insight into the effects of the criminal justice system on family members of condemned inmates. This issue of family members of condemned inmates are relatively unstudied. Therefore, this post-positive paradigm will explore "what is the impact of the death sentence on the family of the condemned inmates" and "what does the family member perceive happens to them as a result." It is through this sensitive process of qualitative data collection that valuable information for future studies, programs and/or public policy has been gained.

Since this is a very hot political and legal issue, the focus is mainly on the inmate condemned to death. The family members, usually, quietly step out of the picture to protect their own privacy. Therefore, there is generally an uncertainty how a family member will respond to a researcher who wants to enter and touch upon a very sensitive and private issue and associate him/her with a 'topic' that has been deemed threatening.

To better serve the people and society as a whole, through social services and professional assistance, it is vital to understand the impact and meaning of the experience
for the family members. To use only a quantitative approach would not allow for the opportunity to touch the deeper impact this experience has on their lives. A qualitative approach provided an opportunity for a family member to discuss how this experience has affected him/her and what it has meant to him/her personally and with others. The following were topics for the interview process: background information on family member; problems and difficulties that have had an impact on his/her life, assistance or support presently or in the future; information regarding the interviewee’s relationship with the condemned inmate; relationship with friends and other family members. For the complete interview guide and demographic questionnaire, see Appendix III and Appendix IV.
CHAPTER TWO

Methods

Where and From Whom Data Was Collected

The population of interest is family members of condemned inmates. There is no formal or informal list of such families, so a convenience sampling technique was used to gather a study sample among the families of condemned inmates. This technique is discussed further in the data collection section. The study population selection consisted of individuals and house-holds of family members of condemned inmates who were aware that a member of the family is on death row. The interviewees are in the age range of 18 years and older. A family member is defined as: (step)mother, (step)father, (step)sister, (step)brother, (step)son, (step)daughter, spouse, in-law, cousin, aunt, uncle, grandmother/father and significant other (a non-blood or legally recognized married relationship).

The actual number of family members of condemned inmates to participate was difficult to determine before the study was initiated. There was no list, or formal network group of family member of condemned inmates to be obtained.
There was a possibility that through the convenience sampling technique, at least 10 -- 20 individuals would be contacted. This study population is very important, for it is from these family members that information regarding the impact of the death sentence and their perceptions of the experience would be shared with those of us who have not experienced this situation.

**Instrumentation**

A questionnaire was used to gather background information on the interviewee. Demographics gathered included income level, location of residence, age, sex, and blood relationship to the condemned inmate. A slightly structured conversational interview approach was used to gather data regarding the impact of this experience and how they perceived themselves due to this situation. This interview provided information concerning the problems and needs of the family, how they coped with the difficulties and the types of support system they deem essential as they faced their situation.

Considering the sensitivity of the topic and themes, the open-ended questions asked allowed for the interviewee
to share freely and feel safe. Apart from the demographic sheet, the family member was asked four general questions. The questions were: 1) How has this experience had an impact on your life? 2) How have you changed? How do you see or think of yourself considering this experience? 3) Would you talk about the impact this experience has had on your relationships (family, friends, employees, neighbors, church members)? 4) What were/are your experiences of support systems? The researcher-interviewer had a responsibility to use the guided interview structure so that the focus remained on the topic.

This approach has a limitation because the unknown location of the study population made it necessary to rely on one member of the study to introduce another member who was willing to participate. Those who participated in the study are in an active relationship with the condemned inmate. In addition, those family members who have completely disappeared and want no part of the condemned inmate's life are excluded from the study. Both Rubin and Babbie (1993) support this notion that convenient sampling technique "can produce results in samples that have
questionable representation such as the sex distribution of the respondents or their age, ethnicity, education, or income.” It must be remembered that this is an exploratory study to generate a hypothesis for later research.

The primary data collection instrument was the interviewer-researcher, who was to follow a guide: introductions, put the family member at ease (non-judgmental prompts, encouraging gestures, sensitivity to differences in cultures and or ethnicity, convey empathy and warmth), explain purpose of interview, and receive written and spoken permission for interview.

Planning, Data Collection and Recording Modes

As noted earlier, a convenience sampling was used; a non-probability sampling technique called snowball sampling. Snowball sampling, according to Rubin and Babbie (1993), is appropriate for this special non-structured study population who are scattered throughout California. To locate members of the study population, attorneys, prison chaplains, prison warden, prisoners' rights groups, and social service agencies were solicited. They provided names of or made initial contact with family members of condemned inmates for
the study. Posters announcing the study was also posted in two social service agencies that assist families of prisoners, attached to the posters were pre-stamped post card so families of condemned inmate would respond. Relatives of condemned inmates who were interviewed provided names of other families who were considered for participation.

When the name of a condemned inmate's family member was received, the first step was to make initial contact through a language-appropriate letter introducing the study and the interviewer-researcher. The ideal initial introduction was through the source of contact. Either way, the potential participant received a letter. The letter explained how the researcher got the name of the family member, the purpose and importance of the interview, the importance of anonymity and discreteness, possible dates and length of the interview. Finally, the letter assured the family member that they were free not to participate. The second step was a phone call following the introductory letter to answer any questions and to confirm the interview date. If the family member did not have a phone, a letter with a pre-stamped
post card was sent, asking them to check the appropriate response box and return to the post card to the research-interviewer. The third step was the interview using the demographic questionnaire and open-ended face-to-face interview. The interviewer used both note-taking and tape recording to collect the data. Translators were obtained in case there was a need for translation during the interview. In the end, letters were sent to the participants, thanking them for their time. Information on support and networking groups was provided as well as updates on the research. They were again solicited for other names of friends or family members who had a relative on death row.

This study used an interview guide approach. Used properly, this structured interview reduces biases from the interviewer and provided consistencies in the interview format. This was achieved by providing an outline of questions that needed to be covered in the interview. Again, during the interview, both note taking and tape recording was used to provide a greater opportunity for gathering the data. The lengths of the interviews were approximately one hour.
Analysis Procedure Overview

Quantitative and qualitative procedures were applied to examine the responses to the research questions. A computer was used to assist in organizing, coding, storing and summarizing all data collected during this study. Each interviewee received an identification number on the form. During this process, a code-book was constructed to indicate which code represents the data item and to assist in reading the matrixes. A quantitative procedure, a numerical examination, analyzed the data to describe and explain the results. A qualitative procedure, a non-numerical examination, is a process which Glaser and Strauss (1967) refer to as “the constant comparative method of analysis.” This procedure helps to reach the goal of categorizing data to create a hypothesis.

Quantitative Procedure.

A method of descriptive statistics was used to organize and summarize the information obtained from the demographic sheet to present it clearly. This method helped describe the overall characteristics of the interviewees. The first step was to gather the raw data from the face sheet and
reduce them to numeral values. These numeral values are the coding scheme for the variable. For example, questions that require a yes or no response will code the yes as "1" and no as "2". Missing or unavailable information was also assigned codes. Each coded variable was entered onto a form created within a computer software program. The program used to create this data form was the EPI Program.

Once this information had been entered into the computer, the next process was to calculate a statistic that summarized one variable at a time. This univariate analysis provided information on frequencies, percentages, measures of central tendency and summaries of the dispersion of responses, either by range or standard deviation. For this the researcher used the SPSS computer program to generate the frequency tables on each variable giving the number and percentage of the people who gave each response. In this study the variables analyzed were the interviewee and condemned inmates': age, sex, race, the location of their residences. Other variables included: family income, marital status, employment status, number of children, relationship to condemned inmate, number of years they have
known the condemned inmate, and number of contacts with the condemned inmate.

The computer automatically provided the standard summary statistic on a frequency table for each of the categories requested. Through this process, a description of the overall characteristics of the interviewees began to emerge as a result of this part of the data analysis.

Qualitative Procedure.

Using the qualitative procedure, a more meaningful insight was drawn by using the data gathered through the open-ended question interviews conducted by the researcher-interviewer. This interview allowed the participants to use their own words to express how they felt and thought about their experience of having a family member on death row and as well as talk about the impact this situation had on them. As with the quantitative method, a coding operation was carried out in this section to help "break down, conceptualize and put the information back together in a new way" (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). This is called open coding.

The process of open-coding begins with the data collected from the interviews. The researcher takes the
interviewee's statement sentence by sentence to give a name to the phenomena. This conceptualizing of data becomes the first step of analysis. Ongoing comparison with the other sentence-data was done so that similar phenomena were given the same name. This next step was to discover categories. Categorizing is the process of grouping the named concepts that seem to pertain to the same phenomena. This was done to summarize the number of concept-names with which the researcher had to work.

Through open-coding, the researcher developed categories to classify concepts found in the data. Characteristics and the dimensional range of the category were named. The characteristics or the properties are the attributes of a category whereas the dimensions represent positions of a property along a continuum. Strauss and Corbin (1990) stress the importance of understanding the nature of properties and dimensions and their relationship. Understanding this analytic procedure will assist the researcher in developing a grounded theory.

Therefore, in open-coding, the researcher-interviewer can identify general properties of a category, allowing for
information to fall within a full range of dimensions. A separate dimensional profile was developed from each occurrence of a category. These profiles were grouped to give a pattern, which under a given set of conditions would eventually provide a specific property of a phenomenon. Open coding allowed the researcher to develop categories, and name its properties and dimensions.

Protection of Human Subjects

This study used human subjects; family members of condemned inmates. Participants in the study were informed both orally and in writing and in the appropriate language of the purpose of the study and that they would remain anonymous. The participants were asked to sign an informed consent form. Due to the sensitivity of the issue and the privacy of the participants all data and information collected during the interview was confidential. At the conclusion of the study all names and addresses were destroyed unless the interviewee signed a waiver for his or her name to be added to a list for on-going support. None of the questionnaires or recordings contained the name of the interviewee.
CHAPTER THREE

Results

Introduction

The data analyzed in this chapter was obtained during individual face to face interviews with family members of condemned inmates. The following presentation of the interview data describes the interviewees' demographic characteristics, contact between family members and the condemned inmate relative, perception of self in this situation and relationships with others concerning this situation. The individual interview sessions were with eight family members who have a relative on death row in California. Two participants interviewed had relatives on death row in another state.

Characteristics of the Study Population

Gender, Age, Ethnicity and Income.

The individual interviews were with three parents, one daughter, one son and five spouses who have a condemned relative on death row. Participants in this study ranged from nineteen years to seventy-four years of age, with the median age of 46 years old. Table 2 provides a summary of
of the study population.

TABLE 2

Characteristics of Family Members Interviewed and Condemned Inmates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Member</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Employ</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Ethnic</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>5,000--5,999</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Male-36</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>22,500--24,999</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male-44</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sales Rep</td>
<td>15,000--17,499</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male-37</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nurse Aid</td>
<td>50,000--over</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male-46</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>10,000--12,499</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male-44</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do not Know</td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male-44</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female-</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>17,500--19,999</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Male-34</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000--5,999</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Male-27</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>15,000--17,499</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Male-45</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ethnicity of the interviewed family members was 10% Hispanic, 20% Black and 70% White. It is noted that the ethnicity of the family members' condemned inmate is 10% Hispanic, 20% Black, 50% White and 20% Other. The Other represents person of Filipino and Mulatto descent. Of the family members interviewed, 7 or 70% are employed and 3 or 30% are unemployed. It was found that the job status of the majority of interviewed family members was semi skilled and hourly employment. The average yearly incomes of the
interviewed condemn inmate’s family is $17,500.00 – $19,999.00. Two participates either did not know or refused to answer the question. Therefore, six out of the eight who answered the question made no more than $19,999.00 a year. Sixty percent of the interviewed family members are married, 20% are either divorced or widowed and 20% never married.

Location of Residence.

Findings revealed that before the sentence of death was imposed on the inmate five of the ten family members interviewed lived in Southern California (see Table 3). After the sentence of death was delivered, all the condemned inmates were transferred to the Northern California, and two family members relocated to Northern California shortly after to be closer to their relative. Therefore, five out of ten family members who were interviewed lived in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Family Before</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Family After</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Inmate Before</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Inmate After</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of CA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
North after the sentencing and relocation of the condemned inmate.

The study also revealed that in the pre-sentencing phase 20% of the condemned inmates lived in Northern California, 20% in Central California, 40% lived in Southern California and 20% lived in out of state. The post-sentencing phase had 80% living in Northern California and 20% out of State. The location of family home greatly affects the contact they have with the condemned inmate.

**Family Contacts with Condemned Inmate.**

The longest amount of time on death row among those condemned inmates whose family members participated in the study is sixteen years; the shortest amount of time is seven years. The average time for all those condemned inmates whose family members participated in the study is 12.4 years.

Over these years the interviewed family members stayed in contact with relatives who have been condemned to death by the state. This contact was possible through one of three ways -- telephone calls in which the condemned inmate made a collect call to the family member, letter writing, or
face to face visitation by the family member with the
condemned relative. As the years increased, the means of
communication changed. Many family members made similar
statements such as the following: "In the beginning, we
would make many trips up north to visit." Or, "At first, I
would travel...12 hours by bus ride...till I started
developing double ear infections. I couldn't do it any
more."

During 1994, the study found 66% of family members
wrote weekly, averaging forty-six letters per year. All
family members stated they accepted collect calls from the
condemned relative; the collect calls averaged seven times a
month or 92 per year. It seemed that family members were
conscious of the cost of collect phone calls however, the
condemned inmate was not denied the opportunity to call.
The study found that visitations varied, four family members
visited weekly or more, one visited 12 times a year and four
were unable to visit this past year due to financial
constraints, transportation, health or other family
commitments.

Transportation and available funds were key factors for
family visitations. Between Los Angeles County and San
Marin County, where San Quentin State Prison is located, it
is approximately 410 miles. To visit a woman who is on
death row, one would travel approximately 275 miles to
Chowchilla State Prison. Other issues associated with their
travel were housing and food costs. However, participants
presently living in Southern Californian would mention a
friend, a relative or an acquaintance with a relative on
death row who would provide a place to stay while they
visited.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years Condemned Inmate on Death Row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Family Contacts Per Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condemned Inmates</th>
<th>Present Age</th>
<th>Time on Death Row</th>
<th>Contact Phone</th>
<th>Contact Mail</th>
<th>Contact Face to Face</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age at Sentencing</td>
<td>Condemned Inmate</td>
<td>(year)</td>
<td>(year)</td>
<td>(year)</td>
<td>(year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As discussed earlier in this report, the approach of
this study was one of qualitative analysis. In interviewing
the family members of condemned inmates word patterns would
originate from the collected data. This resulted in the
development of initial concepts and a working hypothesis. The process continued until all nine interviews were consolidate. This was achieved by examining the participant’s interview sentence by sentence until categories began to emerge. Both similarities and differences were looked at during this analysis.

According to Strauss and Corbin (1990), conceptualizing the data was the first step in analysis. In breaking down the data and conceptualizing it the process of taking a sentence apart and each idea, thought, observation, and phenomenon were given a name. Data was compared, idea with idea, so that similar phenomena were given the same name. Once particular phenomena in the data were identified, concepts were grouped around them.

The processes of open coding not only identify categories but also their properties and dimensions. Properties are the characteristics or attributes of a category and the dimensions represented positions of a property along a continuum. Each time an instance of a category appeared in the data, it was possible to place it somewhere along the dimensional continua (Strauss and
Corbin, 1990). For further explanations of open coding see Chapter Two.

Through this process of open coding, the data revealed several concepts related to the impact of the death sentence on family members of condemned inmates and their perception of self. These concepts were used as the framework for developing categories that explained the impact experienced by family members.

Impact of the Death Sentence

General Experiences of the Impact.

The family members' responses on the impact they experienced concerning the death sentence of a relative were fairly consistent. However, even with the consistency there were some contradictions, e.g., "It totally changed my life" to "My life is not changed." Even so, there was a shared expressed experience of socio-economic change in their life, particularly for the spouses of the condemned inmate. They had to obtain some means of income, others had to re-located for a job or to be closer to their spouse; bringing with this move all the emotional issues of housing, job, and friends. One family member, a spouse, was fired from her.
place of employment because of her marriage to a condemned inmate. Table 5 provides a summary of the study's findings. The table presents the various categories, properties and dimensional ranges of the impact experienced by family members of condemned inmates.

On the other hand, the findings reveal that the three mothers who participated recognized 'little to no change' in their lives as a result of this experience but responded with similar statements such as "I just continue to pray" and "My life is not changed; just go on day to day, there is nothing you can really do."

Overall, the family members' emotions and feelings varied in affect. In the beginning, their feelings of "anger", being "scared" or an "awful sickening gut" sensation was the strongest and over time these feelings eventually gave way for the family member to become involved in an issue they never thought about -- the death penalty. This experience has made many of them stronger and more confident. However, there was a time when a few became physically or emotionally paralyzed even with one family member attempting to kill herself.
### TABLE 5
Impact of the Death Sentence on Condemned Inmate Family Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PROPERTIES</th>
<th>DIMENSIONAL RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic</td>
<td>Moved residence</td>
<td>Often &lt; &gt; Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Chosen &lt; &gt; Not chosen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Stable &lt; &gt; Unstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fired from job</td>
<td>Yes &lt; &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>Sent away</td>
<td>Physical &lt; &gt; Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From relatives</td>
<td>Lost contact &lt; &gt; Never had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grew up without parents-role model</td>
<td>Some &lt; &gt; None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Facets</td>
<td>Involved with death penalty grps</td>
<td>A great deal &lt; &gt; Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Injure Self</td>
<td>Thought it &lt; &gt; Did it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Share with others</td>
<td>Different &lt; &gt; Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paralyzed</td>
<td>Physically &lt; &gt; Emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Lost &lt; &gt; ?? ??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grew-up personally</td>
<td>A lot &lt; &gt; Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling-Emotions</td>
<td>Awful</td>
<td>Always &lt; &gt; Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Always &lt; &gt; Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>A lot &lt; &gt; Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scared</td>
<td>More &lt; &gt; Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jealousy in family</td>
<td>Sometimes &lt; &gt; ?? ??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tension in family</td>
<td>A lot &lt; &gt; Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought Process</td>
<td>Thoughts are with you</td>
<td>Healthy &lt; &gt; Unhealthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block it out</td>
<td>All the time &lt; &gt; Some times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficult to deal with</td>
<td>Often &lt; &gt; Not often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Truthful</td>
<td>All the time &lt; &gt; Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>When to be &lt; &gt; When not to be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The children of condemned inmates spoke how not growing up with a "role model", "missing out or not growing up with them" were very disturbing and painful. Due to the
instability of their lives they would lose contact with other members of the family. They felt isolated or alone and at time did not know what to think. The study revealed comments such as, "Where do you belong?" "Whom do they love?" "Was I really bad?" "Will I grow up like him or her?" The children of condemned inmates also expressed responsibility for the tension and jealousy within their families. It seems that individuals' relatives argued over the care of the child, and over where and with whom they will live. This on-going struggle affects a person's outlook on life and on oneself.

The Family Member's Perception of Self.

Many of the family members experienced behavioral changes as a result of having a family member sentenced to death. They spoke of having difficulty sleeping. Some sought professional help from the medical or psychological field, while other family members self-medicated to "overcome something unimaginable." There was a common theme from the interviewed family members as seeing themselves unintentionally forgetting or intentionally blocking things out of the mind. They believed it was normal not to
think about the situation because discussing that a family member was going to be killed was very difficult. The recollection of their experience “brought back a lot of memories” that were just too painful.

The feelings and emotions family members have felt or noticed within themselves ranged from anger and loneliness to hope and a sense of value. For the family members to talk “with ease” they found they used an approach that was upbeat, idealistic, such as story telling because it was just too difficult to feel the reality of their experience. The findings reveal several common statements: “I don’t talk about it”, “it’s hard to even discuss it”, “you kept it to yourself” as more of a reflection of their reality.

The family members all shared that they see or think of themselves differently because of this experience. There are statements such as, “I have become a stronger person”, “I definitely feel stronger”, “stronger not weaker.” Some family members had felt “worthless”, “like trash” or “thought poorly” about themselves. They spoke how they might of “run away and weep over it” but now realize they have gone through a “metamorphosis”, a “transformation”, a “hundred and
ninety degree change" in life and in oneself.

The study found that the family members believed more in God and thought of themselves as being valuable not only to themselves but also to others and to God. As one interviewed family member reflected “God has helped me; He has been a part of the enlightening process.” Table 6 provides a profile of the perception of self as seen by the family member.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PROPERTIES</th>
<th>DIMENSIONAL RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Change</td>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>Forget (\ldots) Never Forget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sleep</td>
<td>Never (\ldots) All the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talk about / Discuss</td>
<td>At time (\ldots) Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health care Activities</td>
<td>Professional (\ldots) Self medicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More (\ldots) Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings-Emotion</td>
<td>stressed</td>
<td>More (\ldots)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stronger</td>
<td>More (\ldots)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>depressed</td>
<td>High (\ldots) Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>angry</td>
<td>Sometimes (\ldots) A lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>alone</td>
<td>Many times (\ldots) Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hopeful</td>
<td>Always (\ldots)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>worthless</td>
<td>Sometimes (\ldots) Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rejected</td>
<td>Always (\ldots) Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>compassionate</td>
<td>Sometimes (\ldots) Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>Always (\ldots) Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Facets</td>
<td>Thought Process</td>
<td>Negative (\ldots)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td>Always (\ldots) Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stronger/Empower</td>
<td>More (\ldots)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idealistic</td>
<td>More (\ldots)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faith / God</td>
<td>Belief in (\ldots)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stronger (\ldots)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relationships with Other Family Members.

The responses varied from the expected to the unexpected. Those who are married to a person on death row found very little support from their immediate family. They stated that their blood-relatives encouraged them to get out of the relationship. As one wife quoted her parents: "If the State is going to kill him, you might as well let him go, too." The wives found more encouragement and support from their in-laws to stay in relationship with their husbands. Those who were children of condemned inmates heard similar responses of discouragement and non-support regarding their connection with their relative.

Some behavioral impacts experienced by a few family members included not being invited to interact with other blood relatives because of their relationship with the condemned inmate (Table 7). The study revealed that many of the interviewees stated that because of the fear and lack of understanding of other, they were rejected or ostracized from family groups. When they were invited to a family event, they were strongly encouraged not to discuss the condemned person.
TABLE 7

Relationships with Other Family Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PROPERTIES</th>
<th>DIMENSIONAL RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Facet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Distance</td>
<td>Moving away &lt;..&gt; Moving closer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitation</td>
<td>Invited &lt;.......&gt; Not invited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial/Rejected</td>
<td>Strong &lt;.........&gt; Some what</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostracized/Disown</td>
<td>Sometimes &lt;.........&gt; ???????</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>None &lt;.........&gt; Very little</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged pre-maturely</td>
<td>A lot &lt;...............&gt; ???????</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>Many times &lt;.......&gt; Few Times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Distance</td>
<td>Moving away &lt;..&gt; Moving closer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>A lot &lt;...............&gt; None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strained</td>
<td>Somewhat &lt;.........&gt; A little</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>Non-acknowledgment &lt;..&gt; ???????</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling-Emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ached for</td>
<td>A lot &lt;...............&gt; ???????</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>Strong &lt;...............&gt; ????</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negativity</td>
<td>A lot &lt;...............&gt; ???????</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>A lot &lt;...............&gt; Some</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These experiences caused great emotional strain and anger for many of the family members as well as a strong desire to discuss the issues at hand rather than continue the silence and secrecy. The mothers mentioned that this experience has “aged them tremendously.”

Relationship with Friends.

The family members always had one or two very dear and close friends. However, the findings reveal that over time friends “faded out”, “slipped away”, or “didn’t keep in touch” with the family member.
It was the family member's belief that emotionally 'it was too difficult'. The hurt, the constant reminder of what had happened or what will happen was too great for the friends to handle. There was a strong belief that friends wanted to be supportive and sensitive to them and their needs but did not know how to respond. In Table 8, a summary is provided of the categories, properties and dimensional range of the impact on relationship with friends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PROPERTIES</th>
<th>DIMENSIONAL RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Facet</td>
<td>Associated with</td>
<td>A lot &lt;.........&gt; Not much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fade away</td>
<td>Never &lt;...........&gt; Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judged</td>
<td>Never &lt;...........&gt; Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Action</td>
<td>accepted</td>
<td>Always &lt;.........&gt; Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>avoid</td>
<td>Sometimes &lt;........&gt; A lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shared</td>
<td>A lot &lt;...........&gt; Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling-Emotions</td>
<td>hurt</td>
<td>Deep &lt;.............&gt; A little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>A lot &lt;...........&gt; A little</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationship with Employees.

Another area of concern family members dealt with was the possibility of repercussion or harassment from those with whom they worked and from their employer. The study
found that these concerns involved being isolated or separated from the group or possibly being fired. As a result, they were slow to present the facts of their life. Spouses even denied the fact they were married. "I feel bad, I denied his existence... but I had to protect myself and my children."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with Employer and Fellow Employees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PROPERTIES</th>
<th>DIMENSIONAL RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioral Facet</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Yes &lt;.................&gt; No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>Constant &lt;.............&gt; Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Very Little &lt;.............&gt; None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>Often &lt;.............&gt; Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional Action</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Strong &lt;.............&gt; None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid</td>
<td>All the time &lt;...&gt; Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feeling-Emotions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afraid</td>
<td>A lot &lt;.............&gt; None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caution</td>
<td>All the time &lt;...&gt; Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judgment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassed</td>
<td>Fear of &lt;.............&gt; Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judged</td>
<td>All the time &lt;......&gt; Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-percussion</td>
<td>Fear of &lt;.............&gt; Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family members struggled continuously to avoid and protect themselves from what they feared within others. This can be seen in Table 9 by the categories and the properties of the impact experienced by family members. When a few family members did share with their employer and
or fellow employees about their relative, they found them to be supportive and concerned for them. A family member reflected in her interview: "The girls at work are always asking me how my son is doing; they are concerned when I'll see him again." This was a pleasant surprise to find support where you least expect it.

Relationship with Church.

Many of the family members grew up in some formal mainline religion, however, apart from two interviewees no one was participating in their religion/church when their relative was sentenced to death. They found themselves returning to their church for support and strength. The family members found little or no support from the church (Table 10). This was a surprised to them.

Many believed that the church would stand by them. A couple of interviewees reflected "church is a place you should be able to go and get strength from" and "there they [would] try to lift you up and encourage you to hold on." The findings reveal many family members experienced finger pointing, being put down and a [lack] of forgiveness and love. Therefore, many of them followed the rule of 'doesn't
ask, do not tell' until they found a place or an understanding person to comfortably share with. One interviewed family member stated she connected with others at church who had someone in prison, "That helped ease the fear and burden."

TABLE 10
Relationship with Church

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PROPERTIES</th>
<th>DIMENSIONAL RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Facet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Not at all &lt;......&gt; Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved</td>
<td>A lot &lt;.............&gt; Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>A lot &lt;.............&gt; Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacked</td>
<td>Not at all &lt;......&gt; Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>Some &lt;.............&gt; A lot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>Often &lt;.............&gt; ???</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling-Emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understood</td>
<td>Not at all &lt;......&gt; Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belong</td>
<td>A lot &lt;.............&gt; Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>Not at all &lt;......&gt; Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>Always &lt;.............&gt; Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>A lot &lt;.............&gt; ???</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationship with Neighbors.

The study found that the participating family members moved to new neighborhoods after the delivery of the death sentence. Therefore, the present neighbors were unaware of the family situation. The family members consciously chose
not to tell people; “Everyone pretty much keeps to themselves” (Table 11). The two family members who continued to live in the ‘old’ neighborhood stated “It never affected me with neighbors” because they “do not blame me or judge me.” One interviewed family member believes that some neighbors did stop interacting with her because they hurt so badly “I am a reminder.” Otherwise, the ‘old’ neighbors were supportive and helpful (Table 11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PROPERTIES</th>
<th>DIMENSIONAL RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Facet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>Ignore &lt;......&gt; Acknowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation</td>
<td>Very little &lt;.........&gt; None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware</td>
<td>Fully &lt;.............&gt; Unaware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Action</td>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>Very &lt;.............&gt; ????</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support Groups or Systems.

The findings reveal that family members’ experiences of formal support groups or systems during the process of the trial, and sentencing was clearly expressed by statements such as, “I didn’t have any support”, “No support”, “No, no one reached out. There are no support systems” and so on. It was a clear response of “No”. The study found that after
the sentencing phase, many family members continued to feel there was no outside support group (Table 12). However, many family members found an informal support system among death row inmates and their families. "We socialize when we are together; we developed friendships; everyone hugs." The family members who visited regularly "really depended on those people to help them pull through some of the hard times."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Source and Type of Support Family Members of Condemned Inmates Experienced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PROPERTIES</th>
<th>DIMENSIONAL RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Support</td>
<td>Religious anti-death penalty grps</td>
<td>A lot ...........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Support</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>A lot ...........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• inside facility</td>
<td>Some ...........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• outside of facility</td>
<td>A lot ...........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Support</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Great. ...........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal prayer</td>
<td>Great relief ..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings exhibit that there was appreciation of those who spiritually ministered and provided services to those who visited death row inmates such as The HOUSE at San
Quentin State Prison. The study also showed that many of the family members relied on gaining support from their inner journey, and spirituality through prayer, journal writing, and bible reading. On rare occasions some would have the opportunity to sincerely share with a friend or family member how they were feeling and to feel supported in some special way.

In view of the above information, family members had highly emotional responses to the lack of support they experienced (Table 12). The findings reveal that family members expressed having moments of isolation and loneliness and feeling deep bitter resentment that there was no one who could be with them during their time of pain and sorrow (Table 12). However, amid all the struggle and difficulty, many of them did expressed hope, such as one interviewee who stated, “I have a mind and know that there is hope.”

The study also found that, due to the limited support systems available, some of the family members find themselves continuously guarding their privacy and painfully denying the existence of their relative on death row. Family members make this conscious act due to the belief
that one could not be open and truthful with everybody (Table 13).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PROPERTIES</th>
<th>DIMENSIONAL RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feeling-Emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressed</td>
<td>A lot &lt;......&gt; Some</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>Many times &lt;.&gt; Few times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>Often &lt;......&gt; Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resentment</td>
<td>High &lt;............&gt; Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>A lot &lt;............&gt; ????</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarded</td>
<td>Constantly &lt;...&gt; ????</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>Always ....&gt; Few times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

The results of this study indicate that there are many points of impact experienced by family members whose relatives have received a sentence of death by the State. The conclusion that there is pain, anger, isolation and humiliation are fairly consistent with previous literature on families of condemned inmates (Radelet et. al., 1983; Smykla, 1987; Vandiver, 1989; and Bakker et al., 1978). Also, the determination that the function of the family is to provide psychological support and a link to the outside world to the condemned inmate is harmonious with a previous study (Radelet et al., 1983).

The research found that many of the interviewees struggled with talking about themselves. The study revealed that family members began their interview talking about the condemned relative and when re-directed to talk about their experience, they did so. However, before the end of the interview the family member would return to some theme regarding the person on death row. This behavior indicates
a possible link to "living the life of the other" themselves. There seemed to be some inability to consider oneself an individual from the condemned inmate. In contrast, the study found that the children and mothers of condemned inmates reflected a different message, a stronger identity as individuals. They believed that people did not look at them or treat them as though they were the condemned inmate, they knew they were separate and so did others.

The study's findings also indicated that the family members were conscious of the reality of having a family member on death row. However, throughout the interviews there were comments such as, "They [the condemned inmate and the family member] have not discussed this [execution]." "I have prepared a home, a place for him to come home to." Therefore, family members presented some form of denial or distortion of reality or possibly a hopefulness about their lives. While interviewing family members in Northern California, a death row inmate received a reversal of his death sentence. The effect this had on the study population was of emotions, ranging from great joy to hopefulness.

Another finding that was clearly telling was that
family members saw themselves as being stronger, more in touch with themselves -- personal inner growth, and an ability to control their thinking more than the situation. Family members began to examine their actions toward others and self, recognizing the power of good and evil and the use of violence and non-violence. This process allowed many of them to keep going even though their outside relationships were limited, or non-existent. This experience had an intense impact on the family member’s relationships.

The findings show that many family members in this study chose to be silent in unfamiliar and or non-supportive environments to avoid the stigma of having a relative on death row. To the public, they acted and responded as though the person was already dead or there was no association; it was only in their heart that they were happy to have their loved one alive. This relationship even extended to situations in which many believed they would find support.

Another finding reveals that those who participated in the study experienced a lack of understanding and support from their church of choice. The sentence of death caused
many family members to turn to their church for support, however they found that there was misunderstanding, judgment, isolation and non-forgiveness. This behavior from the church truly surprised the participants themselves.

A finding that surprised the researcher is in the area in which previous literature discusses financial issues as a major concern. However, the study found that financial comments were limited. It did not seem to be a point of contention; it was more a matter of fact, such as, “I must have a job to live and get things ready for him.” “I accept all collect calls, I need it and I would not deny him this.” The implications of this limited discussion regarding financial concerns presented by the interviewees may be that they never relied on the condemned inmate in the past as a source of financial stability.

The study reveals that the median income for the participates was between $17,500.00 -- $19,999.00. In 1990, the median income for a family in California was $42,700.00, with the annual minimum wage income being $8,840.00 (Children Now, 1991). Therefore, the participants fall 50% below the median income of 1990.
A final comment, the literature and this study's findings attest that more than half of the death row population is sentenced from Southern California. Because of this fact, the impact experienced by some family members led to the choice to re-locate to be closer to their relative on death row. This shift in geographic location moved family members away from the neighborhoods, friends, family and, for some, employment.

Strengths and Weaknesses of this Study

A strength of this post-positivist research paradigm is that it allowed family members of condemned inmates to describe the impact and effect that a death sentence has on their lives. However, there are some drawbacks. One such weakness is that the results of this study are limited by the very nature of the number and sample. The study population was of ten family members who were actively involved with the condemned inmates and in relationship with the families of other condemned inmates. As noted in the literature review, it may be quite possible that the death sentence within a family is survived by the stronger families who are able to react with enhanced support from
outside and from within themselves. Therefore, it seems there is a gap surrounding those family members who have dis-connected, dis-associated, or divorced from their 'former' significant other. How do they feel? What impact did they experience from this type of situation? An other finding concerning family members is that the interviewees would mention other family members greatly effected by the death sentence. They would go as far as providing in great detail the emotional and behaviorally effects on the other person but would stop short of introducing or forwarding the person's address or phone number. This may be due to a sense of protection for the other and for oneself.

Possible future studies may consider initiating random contact with the person on death row first, introducing the study to them and then asking them to be the link to their family. There is a possibility that a random selection of more family members would be involved. However, according to Smykla (1987), a future researcher must be aware of the limited time and funding that are available for the above mentioned approach. This method may prevent interviewing all the relatives solicited from the persons on death row.
It is hoped that further in-depth study would be pursued. A word of warning -- this is a highly emotional study and study population. It was found that one hour interviews were sufficient; however, the pre-interview time was intense and time consuming, as was the post-interview time. Approximately one and half to two hours more were spent before and after the interview. Even though the participants were willing to be interviewed, they had many questions to ask themselves and they needed to create a safe environment before the actual interview could begin. The role of the interviewer is to provide this safe place in which the person will feel respected, heard and secure. In producing a comfortable environment, the professional boundaries may become blurred. Many family members have been in untrusting and oppressive environments. Therefore, they are very cautious. In the process of bringing about a safe place for them to tell their story they will recognize there is sincere interest and respect for them. In time the interviewer would achieve his or her goal...but where are the boundaries drawn? Family members are people who are, in one sense, desperate to save a life and they will invite
those they trust to help them.

**Opportunities for Social Work Involvement**

Clinical services such as individual counseling and family therapy as well as case management offer the greatest opportunity for social workers to focus on the special issues family members of condemned inmates face in dealing with the physical, emotional and spiritual impact of the death sentence. The use of a team-oriented approach and a feminist social work practice would work from the viewpoint that all human beings have intrinsic worth and dignity, that there is a need to remove obstacles to self realization and active participation in society and that the prevention and elimination of discrimination is necessary when dealing with the sentence of death and its effects on the community and family members. Collaboration among various groups such as social workers, church officials, prison officials, criminal justice officials and representatives of family members of condemned inmates could further explore the emotional, physical and spiritual impact on the family and the necessary support. However, it must be recognized that this approach to empower, collaborate and to respect the human
person works against the patriarchal, law and order criminal justice system. This does not to mean that this is a fruitless approach.

This approach may also include the community practice level by involving support networks among the professionals and families affected by this issue of the death sentence. They may take up social action to deal with the various issues that affect their lives concerning the sentence of death upon a family member. The researcher recommends a 'think-tank' gathering to determine the possibility of forming a network-supportive phone tree among attorneys, families, court system, social service agencies, religious leaders, and social workers that provide assistance to those family members affected by the death sentence. This concept is similar to “sponsors” at support groups or victim witness programs. On-going research is necessary to fully understand the impact of the state sanctioned death sentence on society particularly their family members. Social workers, along with family members of condemned inmates, can also lobby for change of capital punishment policies and legislation in any setting and at any government level.
Of the various roles of social workers, the position of assisting an individual or family through the fear, pain and anger they may have as a result of a family member receiving a death sentence may stir an area of inner conflict for the social worker. If a social worker assists family members through the various emotions experienced by the impact of a death sentence and these feelings are eliminated, suppressed, or dealt with in a healthy manner, there is concern that this may make executions easier for the state to perform and for the public to accept. As agents of change, the social worker’s role is not to “tidy up” this reality, but in some way assist the family member(s) in their needs, pain, positive and negative feelings and whatever they may bring with them. However, when providing support to the family members of condemned inmates the social worker must remember to replace with equal or greater value that which is taken away.

Conclusion

It is the hope of this researcher that the insights presented here would open doors for further discussion and be a challenge to which individuals and groups respond.
Social workers will assist, if not take leadership, in serving families of condemned inmates and policy makers and lobbyists will deal with the public policy of state-sanctioned death sentences. When social work as a profession recognizes the domino affect of the death sentence on the people within the community, particularly family members of condemned inmates, we can then move toward a healthy and non-violent society.
APPENDIX I

Definitions

Ethnicity

Black:
African, Jamaican, Trinidadian and West Indian

Hispanic:
Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Latin American or Spanish

White:
Indo-European, Pakistani, East Indian

Native American or Alaskan Native:
Persons who identify themselves or are known as such by virtue of tribal association.

Asian or Pacific Islander:
Japanese, Chinese, Korean or Vietnamese
APPENDIX II

Informed Consent for Interview

The study you are being asked to participate in is designed to investigate the impact on family members of person condemned to death in California experience. The study is being conducted by Catherine Vallejo, a graduate student in Social Work at California State University, San Bernardino. The study will be supervised by Dr. Marjorie Hunt, Ph.D., professor of Social Work.

In this study, Catherine Vallejo will be asking you about the impact of the experience of having a relative condemned to death by the State of California. This question will require that you answer in your words about your feelings and thoughts. What you say will be written down and recorded on audio tape. This interview will not take more than one hour. You will also be asked a series of general questions to obtain collective characteristics of those interviewed for this study.

There are minimal risks to you in answering these questions. However, if at any time during or after the interview, you feel uncomfortable or an issue was stirred within you please, feel free to contact Catherine Vallejo at (714) 828-0316. If you have any questions about the study itself, you may contact Dr. Marjorie Hunt at (909) 880-5501.

This study is concerned with learning about your experiences in having a family member condemned to death. For example, how did you feel when you realized that he or she received the death sentence; What type of impact did this have on you; how did people at your work, in your neighborhood, in your family treat you; how and when did other realized you were related; what happened after people realized; and what type of assistance did you receive. From your perceptive how do you see your self, considering all this, is there any difference before and after the event. It is believed that this information will be helpful to others who are now or may experience this impact upon their lives. It is also hoped this information will be useful to
counselors and therapists in helping others deal with the reality that a family member is condemned to death.

Please be assured that any information you provide will be held in strict confidence. Your name will not be reported along with your responses and only Catherine Vallejo will be aware of your name. The audio tapes will be used only by Catherine Vallejo to insure that what was written down was correct. All data will be reported in group form only. At the conclusion of this study, you may receive a report of the results from Catherine Vallejo. Your participation in this research is totally voluntary. You are free to withdraw at any time during this study and to have any data about you removed at any time during this study.

I acknowledge that I have been informed of and understand the nature and purpose of this study, and I freely consent to participate.

_________________________________________ Date
Participant’s Signature

If you are under 18 years of age, you must also have the signature of your parent or legal guardian. Their signature acknowledges that they also understand the nature and purpose of this study and consent to your participation.

_________________________________________ Date
Parent or Legal Guardian's Signature

_________________________________________ Date
Researcher’s Signature
APPENDIX III

Interview Instrument

Interview Guide with Families of Condemned Inmates

1. Beginning of interview & observations by interviewer

- Introductions: Meet and greet all family members. Verbal and non-verbal gestures and or actions
- Put family member(s) at ease.
  - Non judgmental prompts
  - Encourage family members to talk
- Sensitivity to differences in culture & or ethnicity & or situation
  - Convey empathy and warmth
- Explain purpose of interview.
- Receive oral and written permission for interview.
- Obtain family member’s reason(s) for being interviewed.

2. How has this experience affected you?

- Relationship with friends, family members, society (neighborhood), employment
  - How do people treat you?
  - Do friends know? Do they ask you how you were/are? Did your friendships grow stronger or have they weakened?
  - How has this had an impact on your life?
  - Pre-trial, Present and future (anticipate execution)
- Assistance or support experienced by the family
  - Assistance or support offered to the family after the sentencing. By whom?
  - How did you cope with the feelings associated to the situation?
- Support systems
  - Support that could have been given to make the situation easier?
• Type of support system that would help solve or alleviate the problems you and or your family faced?
• What do you anticipate needing or wanting when the actual execution date is set and delivered.

3. What is the legal status of your relative on death row?

• Is he or she:
  • In appeal process? What stage?
  • Refusing to appeal?
APPENDIX IV

Questionnaire -- Demographic Sheet

Face Sheet of Information

1. What is your age?: ________

2. What is your sex?: Female (01) Male (02)

3. What is your race?:

   Black: Includes African, Jamaican, Trinidadian and West Indian (01)
   Hispanic: Includes Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Latin American or Spanish (02)
   White: Includes Indo-European, Pakistani, East Indian (03)
   Native American or Alaskan Native: Include persons who identify themselves or are known as such because of tribal association (04)
   Asian or Pacific Islander: Includes Japanese, Chinese, Korean or Vietnamese (05) Other: (06)

4. Where do you live?:
   Northern CA (1) Central CA (2) Southern CA (3)

5. Which of these groups represents your total family income from all resources for 1994?

   Under $1,000 (01) $15,000 - 17,499 (11)
   $1,000 -- 2,999 (02) $17,500 - 19,999 (12)
   $3,000 -- 3,999 (03) $20,000 - 22,499 (13)
   $4,000 -- 4,999 (04) $22,500 - 24,999 (14)
   $5,000 -- 5,999 (05) $25,000 - 34,999 (15)
   $6,000 -- 6,999 (06) $35,000 - 49,999 (16)
   $7,000 -- 7,999 (07) $50,000 or over (17)
   $8,000 -- 9,999 (08) Refused (18)
   $10,000 -- 12,499 (09) Don't Know (19)
6. Are you currently: --
   Married (01)  Widowed (02)  Divorced (03)
   Separated (04)  Never Married (05)

7. How many children do you have?: ________

8. Relationship to Condemned Inmate:
   (step)Mother (01/02)  (step)Father (03/04),
   (step)Brother (05/06)  (step)Sister (07/08),
   in-law (09)  Wife (10)  Husband (11),
   (step)Son (12/13)  (step)Daughter (14/15)  Aunt (16),
   Uncle (17)  Grandparent (18)  Significant Other (19)

9. Years Interviewee Has Known Condemned Inmate: _____

10. # of Contacts within a Year
    Telephone _____  Face to Face _____  Mailing _____

11. Condemned Inmate’s Sex:
    Female (01)  Male (02)

12. What is the age of the relative on death row?: ______

13. How many years have your relative been on death row?:

14. What is the race of the relative on death row?:

   Black: (01)
   Hispanic: (02)
   White: (03)
   Native American or Alaskan Native: (04)
   Asian or Pacific Islander: (05)
   Other: (06)

15. Housing Location:
    Northern CA (01)  Central CA (02)  Southern CA (03)
APPENDIX VI

Debriefing Statement

The study you have participated in is designed to investigate the impact family members of person condemned to death in California experience. This interview conducted by Catherine Vallejo, a graduate student in Social Work at California State University, San Bernardino. The supervision of this study is by Dr. Marjorie Hunt, Ph.D., professor of Social Work.

In this study, you have been asked questions about the impact of the experience of having a relative condemned to death by the State of California. The questions you have answered have been written down and recorded on audio tape. This information will be helpful to others who are now or may experience this impact upon their lives. This information will also be useful to counselors and therapists in helping others deal with the reality that a family member is condemned to death.

There are no risks to you in participating in this study. However, if at any time after this interview you feel uncomfortable or an issue has been stirred within you please feel free to contact Catherine Vallejo at 714 828-0316. If you have any questions about the study itself you may contact Dr. Marjorie Hunt at 909 880-5496.

Below is a list of contacts if you need to talk to someone or connect with a group regarding issues around the interview's topic.

- **Friends Outside** -- Call the State Office of Friends Outside at 408-985-8807 for information on the local chapter in your area. Friends Outside is a non-profit organization that works with family members of incarcerated people.

- **Death Penalty Focus** -- Call the State Office of Death Penalty Focus at 510-452-9505 for information on the local chapter in your area. DPF is a non-
profit organization committed to abolish capital punishment in the State of California.

- **Professionals:**
  Chris Ponnet 213-225-4461.
  Roman Catholic priest and member of Death Penalty Focus.

  Mike Niemeyer: 714-836-8100.
  Coordinator of the Victim Offender Reconciliation Program in Orange County

Thank you for participating in this study.  

Sincerely,

Catherine Vallejo
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