

# Justice and Regulatory Policy: A Case Study of the African American President Barack Obama

©Isreal Mallard

The African Institution, Washington DC, USA



## Abstract

This quantitative and persuasive paper was inspired by Dr. Michael Frazier's interest in International Security. The name of the course titled Problems in International Security was offered in the Fall Semester of 2011 at Howard University, Washington, DC, United States of America. Dr. Frazier always prepared his students for senior positions, whether in academics or in the highest levels of the United States government or international organizations. He inspired me to strive to be among top scholars and never limited my goals and abilities. He was the example of academic zeal, stewardship, campus involvement and leadership. For this paper, he challenged me to act as policy advisor to the Barack Obama Administration, thereby placing me mentally in a position of responsibility and influence. His classes were incubators for grooming the brightest minds of our generation to serve in the public domain.

Keywords: Justice, Regulation, African American President, Barack Obama

## Introduction

The District of Columbia is the political capital of the United States of America, if not the world. Justice and regulatory policy plays an extremely important role in the daily lives of United States citizens. Oftentimes, justice and regulations can include or exclude an individual from the rights granted by the United States Constitution in his or her efforts to pursue happiness. Executive orders are regularly passed down from The White House to repeal or enforce civil liberties. One of the key responsibilities of President Barack Obama was to sign bills from Congress into laws as well as initiate orders to "correct" unfair legal practices and hold regulatory agencies accountable for enforcing them. In the Nation's Capital, residents are either very aware of the impacts of the President's decisions on justice and regulatory policies or uninformed of his governing rules. There is a limited amount of research on the connection between justice and regulatory policy and Washingtonians' perceptions on Obama's domestic policies. Therefore, I gathered empirical data concerning the opinions of Washingtonians on Obama's justice and regulatory policy. Henceforth, the purpose of this paper is to explore the residents' perceptions on justice and regulatory policy. In order to fully capture the essence of Obama's ideals on justice and regulatory policy, I also explore some of his past legislative initiatives, executive

orders, and repeals. But before I do this, I would first provide a definition of the word justice.

The Random House College Dictionary (1975) states that justice is the quality of conforming to principles of reason, to generally accepted standards of right and wrong, and to the stated terms of laws, rules, agreements, etc. Depending on the laws of a country and the regulatory policies that are enforced, justice for one person can be an injustice for another person. So how does a person in an authoritative position such as the presidency find fairness and equality in the law and regulate them accordingly? Do the residents of Washington, DC find the President's policy on justice and regulation to be sensible and balanced or unreasonable and prejudicial? Do Washingtonians believe that Obama's justice and regulatory policies hurt or help the American people? Given these questions, the position of this paper is that the perceptions of Obama's justice and regulatory policy among Washington, DC residents should be favorable. This is because, according to [Whitehouse.gov](http://Whitehouse.gov), one of the first pieces of legislation Obama signed into law was the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Restoration Act which empowers women to recover wages lost to discrimination by extending the time period in which an employee can file a claim. At the time, women were paid, on average 77 cents to every dollar paid to men. The gap was even worse for women of color; African American women earned only 64 cents and Latina women earned only 55 cents for each dollar earned by males. In order to address the injustice of pay discrimination, Obama signed this legislation to restore the protections against women regarding wage discrimination (National Women's Law Center, 2013).

In the 1980s, Washington, DC was the "drug hub" for narcotics, and many low-income substance abusers in the District were sentenced to or served longer sentences than many people who were high-income earners due to the powder cocaine vs. crack cocaine rationalization law (The Sentencing Project, 2010). On August 3, 2010, President Obama signed the Fair Sentencing Act, which reduces the disparity in the amounts of powder cocaine and crack cocaine required to trigger certain penalties in the federal system, including imposition of mandatory minimum sentences ([www.whitehouse.gov](http://www.whitehouse.gov), 2014).

For many years, this arbitrary discrepancy had an unfair and a disproportionate impact on racial minorities. According to the United States Sentencing Commission figures, no class of drug was as racially skewed as crack in terms of numbers of offenses. According to the commission, 79 percent of 5,669 sentenced crack offenders in 2009 were Black versus ten percent who were White and ten percent who were Hispanic. The figures for the 6,020 powder cocaine cases are far less skewed: 17 percent of these offenders were White, 28 percent were Black, and 53 percent were Hispanic. Combined with a 115-month average imprisonment for crack offenses versus an average of 87 months for cocaine offenses, this made for more African Americans spending more time in the prison system (U. S. News & World Report, 2010). Also, the President continued to support funding for drug courts, which give first-time, non-violent offenders a chance to serve their sentence, if appropriate, in drug rehabilitation programs that had proven to work better than prison terms in changing behavior ([www.whitehouse.gov](http://www.whitehouse.gov), 2014). Furthermore, the President signed executive actions in November of 2014 to help secure the border, hold nearly five million undocumented immigrants accountable, and ensure that everyone plays by the same rules. Acting within his legal authority, Obama took an important step to fix the United States broken immigration system. This executive order offered a legal acquittal to the undocumented parents of United States citizens and permanent residents who

have resided in the country for at least five years. This would remove the constant threat of deportation and many could also receive work permits. Also, it expanded the 2012 Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program that allowed young immigrants, under 30 years old, who arrived as children to apply for a deportation deferral and who were now here legally (The Washington Post, 2014).

The aforementioned examples of Obama's legislative initiative, repeal, and executive actions all signify his ideology of fairness under the law. This paper is therefore important because it examines his legislation regarding equality and how Obama interpreted fairness. In a boarder sense, one can put into prospective his ideas of justice and fairness in the United States and around the globe from these three examples by simply analyzing them and drawing conclusions from the findings. The reason I chose the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Restoration Act, The Fair Sentencing Act, and the President's Executive Orders on Immigration was due to the nature that women, Africans Americans, and immigrants from Central and South America have historically been discriminated in United States society. These groups have played an important role in the development of the United States; yet, they have suffered the most injustice. This paper thus seeks to understand how Washingtonians view the President's justice and regulatory policies regarding fairness to all Americans under the two Acts and Executive Order. Therefore, in order to answer these questions and grasp a real understanding of Obama's justice and regulatory policy, I conducted a survey of a randomly selected group of residents in Washington, DC to gather empirical evidence to measure his fairness as well as to understand Washingtonians' perceptions on Obama's justice and regulatory policy.

### **Review of Existing Perspectives**

Historically, in the United States, minorities groups such as African Americans and women have been marginalized from mainstream society. In the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Century, the U.S. welcomed most immigrants from across the world; however, today, many immigrants arriving on America's soil, mostly from Central and South America, have been met with resistance. In an attempt to discuss the extensive perspectives of a wide body of professional arguments and reviews from Internet and newspaper articles, I take a diachronic approach at looking into President Obama's justice and regulatory policy regarding the aforementioned issues. The data gathered for this review were derived from Internet and newspaper articles due to the lack of books and journal articles on the subjects.

Women's rights and African Americans' access to civil liberties have been political issues in the U.S. since the late 19th Century and tougher immigration laws have been the focus of national debate in the 21st Century. Many advocates for justice believe that President Obama is upholding his oath to defend the Constitution of the United States of America while many other people object. Respectfully, justice for one person might appear to be injustice for another person. Therefore, in the sake of fairness, I review the perspectives on three subjects as examples to illustrate justice.

Originally, in most cultures, not only in the U.S. but around the world, men have traditionally been considered the sole financial contributors to their households. During the first decades of the 20th Century, women made up less 24% of the U.S. workforce. During World

War II, however, labor shortages brought large numbers of women into the workplace and by 1945, women made up 37% of the civilian workforce. In general, while contributing the same labor, women were typically paid less than men (National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior).

Throughout the 1950's, several bills seeking equal pay for women were introduced in Congress, but all failed to move forward. According to the National Park Service on Civil Rights, by 1960, there were approximately 25 million women working outside the home. While women accounted for 37% of the total workforce, they only earned an average of 59 cents on the dollar compared to men.

On June 10, 1963, President John F. Kennedy signed into law the Equal Pay Act of 1963, which was one of the first federal anti-discrimination laws that addressed wage differences based on gender. The Act made it illegal to pay men and women working in the same place different salaries for similar work.

The National Women's Law Center reported that women today have experienced progression in the labor force by reaching managerial, executive, and other equal roles as their male colleagues; however, most women are still paid on average, only 77 cents for every dollar paid to men. The report also stated that the gap is even worse for women of color considering African American women earn only 64 cents and Latina women earn only 55 cents for each dollar earned by males (National Women's Law Center, 2013). On January 29, 2009, President Obama signed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act to help address the unfair wage gap between men and women and to protect against pay discrimination that was stripped away by the Supreme Court's decision in *Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co* ([www.whitehouse.gov](http://www.whitehouse.gov)). According to Obama, the intent of the Act is to restore longstanding laws and help to ensure that individuals subjected to unlawful pay discrimination are able to effectively assert their rights under the federal anti-discrimination laws. The Employers will have a strong incentive to eliminate any discriminatory compensation practices because they will continue to be accountable for discriminatory pay practices.

Also, the Act eliminates the incentive created by the Ledbetter decision for employers to hide discrimination. The Act enables individuals to challenge continuing pay discrimination, ensuring both that employees are not penalized if they are initially unaware of the discrimination and that they remain able to challenge pay discrimination that is compounded by raises, pensions, and other contributions over time (National Women's Law Center, 2013).

According to the official White House blog, President Obama has long championed this Bill and Lilly Ledbetter's cause, and by signing it into law, he will ensure that women like Ms. Ledbetter and other victims of pay discrimination can effectively challenge unequal pay. As the law seeks to address workplace rights for women, it was later criticized as being "[nothing] more than a trial-lawyer payout as the legislation was thought to provide greater assist to trial lawyers collecting their fees than promote equal pay in the workplace" (Strassel, 2014). The law has been compared to Wisconsin's Equal Pay Enforcement Act which was repealed by Governor Scott Walker because it allegedly made sex discrimination lawsuits financially attractive to female employees (National Review, 2014). However, is the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act conducive in helping women earn equal pay for the same work they contribute in the workforce? Is this law helping to achieve fairness among women in the workplace? And how do Washingtonians

perceive this law in regards to justice?

Next, in today's society, the distribution of illegal drugs and drug addiction appears to have been on the decline since the 1980's. However, during the 1980s, relative to the number of African American drug offenders in this country, black Americans were disproportionately arrested, convicted, and incarcerated on drug charges compared to any other racial group according to the (U.S. News & World Report, 2010). The report also concluded that African-Americans had unfairly received longer prison sentences than their white counterparts and that "no class of drug is as racially skewed as crack in terms of numbers of offenses". A study released in 1997 examined the addictive nature of both crack and powder cocaine and concluded that one was no more addictive than the other. The study explored other reasons why crack was viewed as more addictive and theorized, "a more accurate interpretation of existing evidence is that already abuse-prone cocaine users are most likely to move toward a more efficient mode of ingestion as they escalate their use (University of California Press, 1997). While theories were formed from scientists and academic scholars to explain the "powder vs. crack" cocaine high ratio, Congress gave many reasons for the high ratio, concluding that crack cocaine was more addictive than powder cocaine and that crack cocaine was associated with violent crime. Also, Congress concluded that youth were more likely to be drawn to crack cocaine considering crack cocaine was inexpensive and more likely to be consumed in large quantities. Furthermore, Congress found that the use of crack cocaine by pregnant mothers were extremely dangerous for their unborn children (Beaver, 2010).

Nonetheless, a study released in 1997 examined the addictive nature of both crack and powder cocaine and concluded that one was no more addictive than the other. The Los Angeles Times reported, "There was never any scientific basis for the disparity, just panic as the crack epidemic swept the nation's cities." The sentencing disparity between these two drug offenses was perceived by a number of commentators as racially biased. And in 1995, the U.S. Sentencing Commission concluded that the disparity created a "racial imbalance in federal prisons and led to more severe sentences for low-level crack dealers than for wholesale suppliers of powder cocaine and as a result thousands of people whom were mostly African Americans had received disproportionately harsh prison sentences" (Los Angeles Times, 2010).

In 2002 the United States Sentencing Commission "found that the ratio was created based upon a misperception of the dangers of crack cocaine, which had since been proven to have a less drastic effect than previously thought". In 2009, the U.S. Sentencing Commission introduced figures stating that no class of drug is as racially skewed as crack in terms of numbers of offenses. According to the data, 79% of 5,669 sentenced crack offenders were black, while only 10% were white and 10% were Hispanic.

The figures for the 6,020 powder cocaine convictions, in contrast, were as follows: 17% of these offenders were white, 28% were black, and 53% were Hispanic combined with a 115-month average imprisonment for crack offenses, compared with an average of 87 months for cocaine offenses, the sentencing disparity results in more African-Americans spending more time in the prison system. The United States Sentencing Commission also released a statement saying that "perceived improper racial disparity fosters disrespect for and lack of confidence in the criminal justice system." And according to U.S. Senator Dick Durbin, "The sentencing disparity between crack and powder cocaine has contributed to the imprisonment of African Americans at

six times the rate of whites and to the United States' position as the world's leader in incarcerations" (The Washington Post, 2009).

Currently federal sentencing law punishes offenses involving crack cocaine more severely than drug offenses. Crack cocaine is the only drug for which possession and trafficking can lead to the same sentence. If an individual is caught possessing or dealing 5 grams of crack cocaine, there is a mandatory five year minimum sentence as dealing in 500 grams of powder cocaine.

More than 80% percent of the people sentenced under the federal crack cocaine laws are African Americans and they serve more prison time than their white counterparts for drug offenses. In 2003, whites constituted 7.8% and African Americans constituted more than 80% of the defendants sentenced under the federal crack cocaine laws, despite the fact that more than 66% of crack cocaine users in the United States are white or Hispanic (*U.S. Sentencing Commission*, 2003). In 2003, the average sentence for a crack cocaine offense was three and a half years longer than for an offense involving the powder form of the drug. The average sentences for crack cocaine were also 27 months longer than for methamphetamine and 60 months longer than for heroin (USSC, 2003 Sourcebook of Federal Sentencing Statistics).

From 1994 to 2003, the average time served by African Americans for a drug offense increased by 77% compared to an increase of 28% for white drug offenders (*Bureau of Justice Statistics*, 1994). And according to the Fifteen Years of Guidelines Sentencing, African American drug offenders have a 20% greater chance of being sentenced to prison than white drug offenders (United States Sentencing Commission, 2004). The significantly higher rates of blacks who are arrested and incarcerated on drug charges relative to the rates of whites raise strong implications of discrimination that could be countered only if the disproportion were defensible.

However, in 2010, Congress passed the Fair Sentencing Act (FSA), the law reduced the disparity between the amount of crack cocaine and powder cocaine needed to trigger certain United States federal criminal penalties from a 100:1 weight ratio to an 18:1 weight ratio and eliminated the five-year mandatory minimum sentence for simple possession of crack cocaine, among other provisions (famm.org, 2010). According to Obama, the FSA represents a decade-long effort to reduce the racial disparities caused by the crack vs. cocaine sentencing laws and to restore confidence in the criminal justice system. However, is the signing of the President's Fair Sentencing Act (FSA) really helping minority groups, particularly African Americans get justice?

Finally, immigration reform in the US is widely used to describe proposals to maintain or increase legal immigration while decreasing illegal immigration, such as the guest worker proposal supported by President George W. Bush and the "Gang of Eight" bill which passed the U.S. Senate in June 2013. Illegal immigration is a controversial issue in the United States with roughly 11 million undocumented immigrants that are "hiding in the shadows". Congress has scrambled with ideas to fix the broken US immigration system, yet due to the lack of sponsorship or support amongst both political parties and civil rights groups, most actions have failed to bring about comprehensive change. However, in President Obama's November 2014 speech on immigration, he summarized the need to revise the immigration laws stating that: "Today, our immigration system is broken, and everybody knows it. Families who enter our country the right way and play by the rules watch others flout the rules. Business owners who

offer their wages good wages benefits see the competition exploit undocumented immigrants by paying them far less. All of us take offense to anyone who reaps the rewards of living in America without taking on the responsibilities of living in America. And undocumented immigrants who desperately want to embrace those responsibilities see little option but to remain in the shadows, or risk their families being torn apart” (Keeling, 2014).

Obama stated that he would use his executive authority to “will help secure the border, hold nearly 5 million undocumented immigrants accountable, and ensure that everyone plays by the same rules” in order to fix the US broken immigration system. He stated that his executive actions on immigration will crack down on illegal immigration at the border, prioritize deporting felons not families, and require certain undocumented immigrants to pass a criminal background check and pay their fair share of taxes as they register to temporarily stay in the U.S. without fear of deportation (www.whitehouse.gov). Critics of the President’s executive action stated that many of the beneficiaries of all the legalization programs would be eligible for legal status through more than one program, creating significant overlap and making it difficult to predict exactly how many people would be eligible for the program. And that an estimated 1.7 million unlawful immigrants will be eligible for this program but only 675,000 will have been granted Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals status which is about 40 percent of the total (Nowrasteh, 2014). But is Obama’s executive action on immigration considered Justice?

In this paper, I study the Washington, DC resident’s perception of Obama’s domestic policies regarding justice and regulatory policy. To determine this information, three survey questions were asked of each respondent; (1) Do you think President Obama laws to promote fairness are helping the American people? This question seeks to assess the degree to which a respondent is in favor of or opposed to his idea of *Justice*. (2) Are minority groups benefiting from Obama’s laws? This question is asked to determine the degree of positive and negative perception pertaining to Obama laws on *Justice*. (3) Are President Obama’s laws promoting fairness in Washington, D.C.? The last question is used to explore whether residents of the District of Columbia believe Obama’s laws are justly impacting their community directly.

Lastly, this paper will enlighten the reader’s perception of how Washingtonians, in general, believe in the President’s idea of *justice*. It is my goal to show the relationship between President Obama’s justice and regulatory policy and how the residents of the District of Columbia perception of them.

### **Data Analysis**

To contribute to the literature, a telephone survey was conducted in March and April of 2015 to better understand Washington, DC residents’ views on justice and regulatory policy. In addition, the differences in terms of gender, race, and religion in regards to Obama’s justice and regulatory policy and how it would impact justice were examined. According to Daniel (2011), surveying by telephone is the most popular survey technique utilized by researchers in the United States and is very cost-effective. The downside is that telephone surveys are one of the most time-consuming methods and may underrepresent residents who do not have a home telephone, particularly university students and economically challenged residents.

Furthermore, a systematic random sampling technique was used, which Daniel (2011)

confirms is a method that provides more generalizability to a group in comparison to nonrandom methods. For this study, I wished to generalize the findings on residents of Washington, DC. The following questions were asked based on the literature: (a) Do you think President Obama laws to promote fairness are helping the American people? (b) Are minority groups benefiting from Obama’s laws? (c) Are President Obama’s laws promoting fairness in the Washington, D.C.? The questions were open-ended to encourage the participants to provide meaningful responses. The answers were coded by looking for trends and patterns in responses. And through those patterns, the following categories were delineated for the responses:

(a) Do you think President Obama laws to promote fairness are helping the American people?

1. Yes
2. No

(b) Are minority groups benefiting from Obama’s laws?

1. Yes
2. No

(c) Are President Obama’s laws promoting fairness in the Washington, D.C.?

1. Yes
2. No

To determine the distribution of my dependent variables, frequency analysis was conducted. Table 1 shows that the responses to the question, Do you think President Obama laws to promote fairness are helping the American people?, were in support of Obama’s justice and regulatory policy, as 79% answered yes and 21% answered no. They did not support the President’s stance on justice and regulatory policy believing that it was not helping to promote fairness to help the American people.

Table 1: Do you think President Obama’s laws to promote fairness are helping the American people?

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	79	79.0
No	21	21.1
Total	100	100.0

Self-generated by the Author

Table 2 reveals that 80% of the individuals in this sample responded yes to the question, Are minority groups benefiting from Obama’s laws? Among those that responded, 20% said they did not believe that minority groups were benefiting from the policy.

Table 2: Are minority groups benefiting from Obama’s laws?

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	80	80.0
No	20	20.0
Total	100	100.0

Self-generated by the Author

Table 3 shows that the majority of the respondents, 70% in this sample, answered yes to the question, Are President Obama’s laws promoting fairness in the Washington, D.C.? A total of 30% indicated no to the question that they did not believe Obama’s policy was promoting fairness in Washington, DC.

Table 3: Are President Obama’s laws promoting fairness in Washington, DC?

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	70	70.0
No	30	30.0
Total	100	100.0

Self-generated by the Author

To facilitate the analysis of the differences among gender, race, and religion, cross-tabulations were performed for each question in terms of their perceptions of Obama’s justice and regulatory policy. The findings are presented in Tables 4-8. Table 4 indicates that 34% of the respondents who agreed that Obama laws promoted fairness and helping the American people were men and 46% of these respondents were women, whereas 12% of male respondents and 8% of female respondents did not support the policy.

Table 4: Do you think President Obama laws to promote fairness are helping the American people? (Gender Cross-tabulation)

<b>Response</b>	<b>Male (%)</b>	<b>Female (%)</b>	<b>Total</b>
Yes	34	46	80
No	12	8	20
Total	100	100	100

Self-generated by the Author

Table 5 shows that of the respondents who agreed that minority groups benefited from Obama’s laws, 46% were African American respondents, while 21% were European Americans and the remainder 7% were of other nationalities. Nonetheless, of the sample that responded that they did not agree that minority groups were benefiting from Obama’s laws, 12% of the respondents were African American, 10% European Americans and 4% were of other nationalities.

Table 5: Are minority groups benefiting from Obama’s laws?  
(Race/Ethnicity Cross-tabulation)

<b>Response</b>	<b>African American (%)</b>	<b>European American (%)</b>	<b>Others (%)</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
Yes	46	21	7	74
No	12	10	4	26
Total	76	100	100	100.0

Self-generated by the Author

Table 6 indicates that 46% of the respondents who believed that Obama’s laws were promoting fairness in the Washington, DC were Christians. Only 1% of Muslims supported the laws, and 17% of other nationalities were also in favor of the policy. While 19% of Christians were not in favor of the policy, 3% of Muslims did not believe that the laws were working, and 14% of respondents of other religious affiliated groups did not support the policy.

Table 6: Are President Obama’s laws promoting fairness in Washington, DC? (Religion Cross-tabulation)

<b>Response</b>	<b>Christian (%)</b>	<b>Muslim (%)</b>	<b>Others (%)</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
Yes	46	1	17	64
No	19	3	14	36
Total	100	100	31	100.0

Self-generated by the Author

Table 7 displays that the persons who agreed that minority groups were benefiting from Obama’s laws were mostly females at 44%, and 30% of males believed the policy was benefiting minority groups. While 16% of the female respondents believed that Obama’s justice and regulatory policy was not helping minority groups, 10% of males also believed that the policy was not working.

Table 7: Are minority groups benefiting from Obama’s laws? (Gender Cross-tabulation)

<b>Response</b>	<b>Male (%)</b>	<b>Female (%)</b>	<b>Total %</b>
Yes	30	44	74
No	16	10	26
Total	46	54	100

Self-generated by the Author

Table 8 reveals that 46% of the respondents who believed that minority groups were benefiting from Obama’s laws were African American, with. About 21% of European American agreed with the policy and 7% of other nationalities believed that the laws were helping minority groups.

Table 8: Are minority groups benefiting from Obama’s laws?  
(Race/Ethnicity Cross-tabulation)

<b>Response</b>	<b>African American (%)</b>	<b>European American (%)</b>	<b>Others (%)</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
Yes	46	21	7	74
No	12	10	4	26
Total	58	31	11	100

Self-generated by the Author

Table 9 shows that the 50% of Christians believed that minority groups were benefiting from Obama’s laws, while 3% of Muslims believed that the policy was benefiting minority groups, and 21% other religious affiliated groups believed that the President’s policy was helping minority groups. While 15% of Christians were not in favor of the laws, 1% of Muslims did not believe that the policy was working, and 10% of respondents of other religious affiliated groups did not support the policy.

Table 9: Are minority groups benefiting from Obama’s laws?  
(Religion Cross-tabulation)

<b>Response</b>	<b>Christian (%)</b>	<b>Muslim (%)</b>	<b>Others (%)</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
Yes	50	3	21	74
No	15	1	10	26
Total	65	4	31	100

Self-generated by the Author

In Table 10, it is shown that 37% of the persons who agreed that Obama’s laws were promoting fairness in Washington, D were women and 27% were males. Whereas 19% of the males believed that Obama’s law was not promoting fairness in Washington, DC, 17% of the females were also in disagreement that the policy was promoting fairness.

Table 10: Are President Obama’s laws promoting fairness in Washington, D.C.? (Gender Cross-tabulation )

<b>Response</b>	<b>Male (%)</b>	<b>Female (%)</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
Yes	27	37	64
No	19	17	36
Total	46	54	100

Self-generated by the Author

As Table 11 shows, 43% of the persons who agreed that Obama’s laws promoted fairness in Washington, DC were African Americans, with 15% of European Americans agreeing with the policy, and 6% of other nationalities believing that Obama’s policy promoted fairness in Washington, DC. In contrast, the African American respondents made up 15% of those that were not in favor of the policy, with 16% of European Americans in disagreement of the laws, and 5% of other nationalities believing that the laws were not promoting fairness in Washington, DC.

Table 11: Are President Obama’s laws promoting fairness in Washington, D.C.? (Race/Ethnicity Cross-tabulation)

<b>Response</b>	<b>African American (%)</b>	<b>European American (%)</b>	<b>Others (%)</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
Yes	43	15	6	64
No	15	16	5	36
Total	58	31	11	100

Self-generated by the Author

The results in Table 12 indicate that the respondents who agreed that Obama’s laws were promoting fairness in Washington, DC constituted 46% Christians, with 1% of Muslims supporting the policy, and 17% of other religious affiliated groups believing that Obama’s laws did promote fairness in the Washington, DC. While 19% of Christians believed that Obama’s policy was not working, 3% of Muslims did not support the law and 14% of those of other religious affiliated groups were not in agreement that the President’s laws were promoting fairness in Washington, DC.

Table 12: Are President Obama’s laws promoting fairness in Washington, D.C.? (Religion Cross-tabulation)

<b>Response</b>	<b>Christian (%)</b>	<b>Muslim (%)</b>	<b>Others (%)</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
Yes	46	1	17	64
No	19	3	14	36
Total	65	4	31	100

Self-generated by the Author

Presented in Tables 13 through 15 are results for linear regression analysis. As the reader can see, the three questions posed in the survey are the independent variables and their relationships with the dependent variables: race/ethnicity, religion, and gender. This is the conclusive test of whether the overall percentages for DC residents who aligned themselves with the notion of Obama’s justice and regulatory policy in an effort to make not only Washington, DC a fair city, but the entire United States as well. The results, however, revealed no significant statistical relationship between any of the independent variables and any of the dependent variables at the 0.05 level.

In summary, this section, explored the effects of the independent variables (gender, race, and religion) on the dependent variables about Obama’s justice and regulatory policy, whether the policy would increase justice, and whether the policy will benefit all Americans and, more specially, Washingtonians. The use of univariate analysis (frequencies and percentages) produced results indicating that the majority of the respondents did support the President’s justice and regulatory policy. In exploring the effects of the independent variables on the dependent variables, the results consistently indicated that African Americans, Christians, and females were more likely to support Obama’s justice and regulatory policy and have a positive outlook on the results of the legislation than their counterparts. Nonetheless, overall, there are no significant statistical relationships between the independent and dependent variables.

Table 13: Do you think President Obama laws to promote fairness are helping the American people? Are minority groups benefiting from Obama's laws? Are President Obama's laws promoting fairness in Washington, D.C.? (Regression Analysis Race/Ethnicity)

<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>Std. Error</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>Sig</b>
(Constant)	1.075	.264		4.064	.000
FairAmerica	.159	.199	.095	.802	.425
Benefiting	.063	.183	.038	.341	.734
FairDC	.153	.166	.106	.921	.359

Self-generated by the Author

Table 14: Do you think President Obama laws to promote fairness are helping the American people? Are minority groups benefiting from Obama's laws? Are President Obama's laws promoting fairness in Washington, D.C.? (Regression Analysis Religion)

<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>Std. Error</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>Sig</b>
(Constant)	1.022	.342		2.990	.004
FairAmerica	.426	.257	.195	1.658	.100
Benefiting	-.094	.237	-.044	-.395	.694
FairDC	.155	.215	.082	.721	.473

Self-generated by the Author

Table 15: Do you think President Obama laws to promote fairness are helping the American people? Are minority groups benefiting from Obama's laws? Are President Obama's laws promoting fairness in Washington, D.C.? *Regression Analysis (Gender)*

<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>Std. Error</b>	<b>Beta</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>Sig</b>
(Constant)	1.852	.193		9.619	.000
FairAmerica	-.165	.145	-.135	-1.143	.256
Benefiting	-.147	.133	-.124	-1.104	.273
FairDC	.052	.121	.049	.427	.670

Self-generated by the Author

### **Conclusion**

Overall, the goal of this study was to determine whether or not DC residents supported President Barak Obama's justice and regulatory policy. A related goal was to evaluate whether DC residents believed that his policy would increase fairness. Finally, this study sought to assess whether or not there were any differences vis-à-vis race/ethnicity, religiosity, and gender and their influence on one's perception about Obama's justice and regulatory policy. Accordingly, it was hypothesized that all three variables were a measure of community views to be used in the

development, execution, and administration of social policy at the local, state, and federal levels.

The findings tell us that the majority of District of Columbia residents did support Obama's justice and regulatory policy. The results also supported the notion that Washington, DC had always been overwhelmingly Democratic Party and liberal; it is therefore not surprising that, DC residents shared similar viewpoints with Obama regarding justice and regulatory policy. To expand upon this research, future studies should ask the question of whether more legislation is needed, or just better enforcement of current legislation. There seems to be multiple layers to solving the problem of justice and regulatory policy at the federal, state and local levels. Therefore, a deeper look into current laws that promote unfair practices that cause hardship on individuals in part because of their race/ethnicity, religion, and/or gender will provide another avenue for promoting fairness in the United States in general and Washington DC in particular. The repeal of current laws that are not promoting fairness in justice and regulatory policy must be measured.

### References

- American Civil Liberties Union. Fair Sentencing Act. <https://www.aclu.org/fair-sentencing-act>
- Beaver L. A., (2010). Getting a fix on cocaine sentencing policy: Reforming the sentencing scheme of the anti-Drug abuse act of 1986. *Fordham Law Review*. [http://www.law.fordham.edu/assets/LawReview/Beaver\\_April\\_2010](http://www.law.fordham.edu/assets/LawReview/Beaver_April_2010)
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (2004). Compendium of federal justice statistics. *Washington DC BJS*). <https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/cfjs0401.pdf>
- Daniels, J. (2011). *Sampling Essentials: Practical guidelines for making sampling choices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- Ehrenfreund, M. (2014). Your complete guide to Obama's immigration executive action. *The Washington Post*. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2014/11/19/your-complete-guide-to-obamas-immigration-order/>
- Fair Sentencing Act of 2010. Families against mandatory minimums. <https://famm.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/FAQ-Fair-Sentencing-Act-4.13.pdf>
- Johnson, C., (2009). Bill targets sentencing rules for crack and powder cocaine. *The Washington Post*. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/national/2009/10/16/bill-targets-sentencing-rules-for-crack-and-powder-cocaine/7ac6ad08-9dfa-4a2f-8226-de89f49580d0/>
- Keeling, D., (2014). Transcript of Obama's November 20, 2014 speech. [https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/transcript-obamas-immigration-speech/2014/11/20/14ba8042-7117-11e4-893f-86bd390a3340\\_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/transcript-obamas-immigration-speech/2014/11/20/14ba8042-7117-11e4-893f-86bd390a3340_story.html)
- Kurtzleben, D. (2010). Data show racial disparity in crack sentencing. *U.S. News & World Report*. <http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2010/08/03/data-show-racial-disparity-in-crack-sentencing>
- Los Angeles Times. (July 31, 2010). The fair sentencing act of 2010: It's about time. <http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/31/opinion/la-ed-sentencing-20100731>
- National Park Service. Equal pay act of 1963. <https://www.nps.gov/articles/equal-pay-act.htm>
- National Review. (March 28, 2014). There is no war on Wisconsin women.

- <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/295623/there-no-war-women-wisconsin-editors>  
National Women's Law Center. (January 29, 2013). Lilly Ledbetter fair pay act.  
<http://www.nwlc.org/resource/lilly-ledbetter-fair-pay-act-0>
- Nowrasteh, A., (November 19, 2014). Obama's immigration executive order-policy implications. <http://www.cato.org/blog/obamas-immigration-executive-order-policy-implications>
- Phillips, M., (January 25, 2009). The White House Blog. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/now-comes-lilly-ledbetter>
- Random House College Dictionary. (1975). Justice.  
[https://archive.org/details/randomhousecolle00dict\\_1](https://archive.org/details/randomhousecolle00dict_1)
- Reinarman, C., Waldorf, D., Murphy, S. B., Levine, H. G. (1997). The contingent call of the pipe: Bingeing and addiction among heavy cocaine smokers. In Reinarman, C., Levine, H. G. (eds.). *Crack in America: Demon Drugs and Social Justice*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Strassel, A. K., (March 27, 2014). Obama's inequality pitch falls flat. *The Wall Street Journal*.  
<https://www.wsj.com/news/author/kimberley-a-strassel?page=3>
- The Sentencing Project. (2010). (Crack cocaine sentencing key to racial disparity in federal prisons. [www.sentencingproject.org](http://www.sentencingproject.org)
- The White House. (2014). Immigration accountability executive action. *Office of the Press Secretary*. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/11/20/fact-sheet-immigration-accountability-executive-action>
- United States Sentencing Commission. (2003). Sourcebooks of federal sentencing statistics.  
<http://www.ussc.gov/research-and-publications/annual-reports-sourcebooks/2003/sourcebook-2003>
- United States Sentencing Commission. (November 2004). Fifteen years of guidelines sentencing.  
<http://www.ussc.gov/research-and-publications/research-projects-and-survey/miscellaneous/fifteen-years-guidelines-sentencing>