

Running Head: APPEARANCE, SOCIAL PERCEPTION, JUROR DECISION-
MAKING

The effects of appearance and crime-type on
determinations of culpability and sentence length

Jonathan Poitras

Algoma University College

Abstract

Physical appearance affects the way people perceive other. For example, people usually attribute positive qualities to attractive people, but in certain situations negative qualities are also attributed to attractive people. These attributions that people make unknowingly have an effect on judicial decisions. Depending on the nature of the crime, facial qualities can have very different effect, such as, attractive people are shown leniency when they commit crimes that do not involve exploitation, however, this effect is reversed when the crime does involve exploitation of appearance. Facial maturity is another aspect of appearance that can affect judicial decisions. Baby-faced people, who are perceived as warm, honest and weak, are shown leniency in crimes that are of an intentional nature, but are not shown leniency when the crime is of a negligent nature.

Physical appearance can have a powerful impact on how other people perceive and react to an individual. Numerous studies (e.g. Dion et al, 1972) demonstrated an attractiveness stereotype: attractive people are assumed to possess other favourable characteristics in addition to their appearance. In general, it has been shown that we attribute positive qualities (e.g. being well adjusted, leading happier lives.) to attractive people and negative qualities to unattractive people. However, it has also been shown in further studies, (Dermer & Thiel, 1975) that in some situations the opposite effect can be found.

A second aspect of appearance that can have an effect on how people perceive others is facial maturity. Adults that have babyish faces elicit very different social responses than do their more mature faced peers. Baby-faced individuals are often attributed more childlike traits, such as being naïve and honest (Zebrowitz-McArthur & Berry, 1987). These childlike traits can be either a benefit or a detriment, depending on the circumstance.

Perceiving people on the basis of their appearance could have serious repercussions in some situations, such as in court, where it is important that people be judged solely on facts and not appearance; so, it is imperative to know the effect that these perception have in real life situations.

Although there has been a great deal of research done on how physical attractiveness affects the decision making of prospective jurors, there has been a paucity of research conducted on the effect facial maturity could have on such decision making.

Dion, Berscheid, and Walster (1972) examined how the physical attractiveness of a person could potentially affect how other perceived this person. Their experiment was designed to investigate whether physically attractive stimulus persons, both male and female, are assumed to a) possess more socially desirable personality traits than unattractive individuals, and b) to lead better lives than unattractive individuals.

Participants in the study were given three photographs: one photograph of a physically attractive stimulus, one of a person of average physical attractiveness, and one of a relatively unattractive person. They were then asked to rate the photographs on 27 different personality traits and to estimate which of the stimulus person would be more likely, or least likely, to have a number of different life experiences.

Dion, Berscheid, and Walster found that strangers rated attractive people as possessing more socially desirable traits than unattractive people. In addition, they found that attractive people were also expected to lead better lives than unattractive people. For example, attractive individuals were thought to be able to achieve more prestigious occupations, be more competent spouses with happier marriages and to have better prospects for personal fulfillment. Therefore, they concluded that people assumed, “what is beautiful is good.”

Although other studies have found similar results to justify the “what is beautiful is good” stereotype, Dermer and Thiel (1975) set out to test this hypothesis. They wanted to include questions regarding negative personality traits. They conducted two similar studies, the first having only women as the raters of female only stimuli, the second study had male and female raters but only a female stimulus.

In the first study, the participants themselves were first rated as either attractive or unattractive on a 6 point scale. The following procedure was almost identical to that of Dion et al. (1972). Dermer and Thiel found that participants that were as attractive as or more attractive than the stimulus had similar results to that of Dion et al.'s. However, participants who were less attractive than the stimulus were more likely to judge the stimulus as being more vain and egotistical.

The second study corroborated previous research indicating that attractive women are expected to be more sociable, professionally successful, and personally happy in comparison to unattractive women. The second study also found that attractive women were expected to be more conceited and more likely to engage in adultery.

The reason this study is important is because it shows that a particular physical appearance can have very different effects on people, depending on the questions asked and the appearance of the rater.

In summary, it has been shown that physically attractive people are attributed socially desirable traits to a greater extent than unattractive people and that attractive people are also expected to lead better lives than unattractive people; however, there is a dark side to beauty, as some people perceive attractive people as vain and egotistical. This tends to occur when the rater is less attractive than the stimulus person of the same sex.

Facial Maturity

One factor of appearance that affects the perception of a person is facial maturity. Research has established the configuration of facial qualities that make someone look either mature or baby-faced (Zebrowitz, 1997). People are judged as more baby-faced

than their peers if they have facial features that are similar to that of a child. Compared to others, baby-faced individuals have rounder and less angular faces, larger and round eyes, higher eyebrows, smaller noses, and lower vertical placement of features, which creates a higher forehead and a shorter chin (Montepare and Zebrowitz, 1992).

Zebrowitz-McArthur and Berry (1987) conducted a study to find out how people perceive others as a function of their facial maturity. They gave people pictures of either a mature-faced person, or a baby-faced person and asked them to rate people in the pictures on different personality traits. They found that people perceive baby-faced people to be more dependent, submissive, naïve, honest and physically weak than mature-faced people. People perceived mature-faced people to be more competent, dominant, and more likely to deceive than their baby-faced counterparts.

Keating and Bai (1986) examined whether children shared similar judgments about facial maturity as adults. They showed a pair of faces, one mature faced and one baby faced, to children and had them listen to a story that described a social interaction in which one person dominates another. The children were then asked to point out which of the faces was the dominant person in the story. These children showed a strong tendency to pick the mature-faced picture as the dominant character. This study shows that differential responses to baby-faced people develop at an early age, and they may even be innate.

Advertising has picked up on these facts about facial maturity, Solomon, Ashmore and Longo (1992) studied how advertising uses these facts to their advantage. They found that in commercials that used baby-faced actors or actresses as their product spokesperson, the persuasive appeals relied less on expertise and more on

trustworthiness, than in commercials using mature-faced actors or actresses. Baby-faced actors are more likely to give personal testimonials. Baby-faced people are perceived as more persuasive by advertiser when the essence of the appeal is trust, and less persuasive when the appeal emphasizes expertise.

The fact that baby-faced adults are perceived as weaker, warmer, more naïve, honest and submissive than mature-faced adults may affect the types of jobs they get. Zebrowitz, Tenenbaum and Goldstein (1991) examined this idea and found it to be true. They had business management students evaluate eight job applicants on the basis of a brief resume that contained a black and white photograph of the applicant and some background information. The resumes depicted equal numbers of mature-faced and baby-faced male and female applicants. All applicants were approximately the same age, and baby-faced and mature-faced applicants were equally attractive. Students were asked to rate the suitability of the applicants for two job openings: loan counselor (which stressed attributes that were associated with baby-faced type qualities), and loan officer (which stressed attributes that were associated with mature-faced type qualities). Students rated baby-faced applicants higher than mature-faced applicants for the loan counselor, and the opposite was found for the loan officer.

Therefore, it has been shown that people have a tendency to use facial maturity as a tool to make judgments instead of just the facts presented about a person. The fact that people make these decisions based on facial feature shows that this could have serious repercussions in court, where people are guaranteed a fair trial based solely on the facts.

Physical appearance and nature of the crime

One important aspect of appearance that affects the decision of a juror is attractiveness. Generally, research has shown that attractive defendants are shown leniency. Efran (1974) reported that physically attractive defendants are less likely than physically unattractive defendants to be convicted, Zebrowitz and McDonald (1991) were able to replicate this finding. Kulka and Kessler (1978) were able to demonstrate the same attractive leniency effect, but, in addition, they were able to show that if attractive defendants are convicted, they receive more lenient sentences. Downs and Lyons (1991) found that judges gave lower bail amounts to attractive defendants than to unattractive defendants.

It is important to note that a leniency toward attractive defendants is not always found. If an attractive person exploits his or her appearance to commit a crime, then jurors perceive that person as more blameworthy. Zebrowitz (1997) reported that attractive defendants were given stiffer sentences than less attractive defendants when their actions exploited their appearance. For example, when a woman exploits her attractive appearance to con a man, she is seen as more culpable and thus worthy of a stiffer sentence than an unattractive woman who commits the same action.

To examine whether this attractive leniency effect is seen cross-culturally, Wuensch et al. (1993) had Chinese college students read a description of either a crime, exploiting appearance or not exploiting appearance, where the defendant was either male or female, physically attractive or unattractive. Participants were asked to indicate the length of sentence appropriate for the crime, and rate the seriousness of the crime. Wuensch et al. found that attractiveness was associated with lenient sentencing for a

crime not exploiting appearance, but with stringent sentencing for a crime exploiting appearance. Chinese women gave more lenient sentences to female defendants than to male defendants.

Facial maturity is another aspect of appearance that has been found to affect how a juror determines culpability. Zebrowitz and McDonald (1991) demonstrated an interaction between the effects of facial maturity and type of crime committed on sentencing. They studied 506 cases heard in small claims court. For cases involving intentional actions, almost all mature-faced defendants were found guilty, whereas less than half of the baby-faced defendants were found guilty. The opposite effect was found for cases that involved negligence. Baby-faced people were more likely to be found guilty in cases involving negligence than mature-faced defendants. These outcomes are consistent with assumptions about likely behaviors of baby-faced people. They are perceived as more honest than mature-faced people and thus less likely to cause harm intentionally, and they are also perceived as more naïve and thus less likely to be able to plan intentional harm (Berry & Zebrowitz, 1988).

Gender of the Juror

Another factor that can influence a jurors' decision of defendant culpability and sentence-length is the gender of the juror. Steffensmeier and Hebert (1999) have shown that women judges show less leniency than men judges. This is seen in levels of culpability and sentence length.

An interaction of gender of the juror and the appearance of the defendant is another factor that affects determinations of culpability and sentence length. Abwender and Hough (2001) have shown an interaction between sex of the defendant and sex of the

juror as a function of physical attractiveness. Abwender and Hough showed that when an attractive defendant was judged by a member of the same sex, they were shown less leniency in comparison to a juror of the opposite sex. However the opposite was shown for unattractive defendants. Unattractive defendants were shown less leniency by jurors of the opposite sex than by jurors of the same sex.

Conclusion

The research that has been presented here suggests that people do perceive and judge others on the basis of their appearance. One aspect of appearance that affects a person's perception of others is attractiveness. Generally attractive people are attributed positive personality traits, and are also shown leniency in a judicial setting. However, this is not always the case; attractive people can also be attributed with negative personality traits such as, being conceited. Attractive people are shown less leniency in a juridical setting when they are accused of a crime, in which they exploited their appearance.

A second aspect of appearance that can affect a person's perception of others is facial maturity. Compared to people with a mature face, baby-faced people are perceived to have different traits, such as, honesty, naivety, and weakness. These perceptions are also displayed in judicial decision making. Baby-faced defendants are shown leniency for crimes that are of an intentional nature, but are shown less leniency than mature-faced defendants for crimes of a negligent nature.

Research should be done to determine whether exploiting the traits ascribed to one's facial maturity has similar effects as exploiting one's attractive appearance. Gender of the juror should also be investigated to look for interaction as well.

References

- Abwender, D. & Hough, K. (2001). Interactive effects of characteristics of defendant and mock juror on U.S. participants' judgment and sentencing recommendation. *Journal of Social Psychology*. 141, 603-615.
- Berry, D., & Zebrowitz, L. (1988). What's in a face?: Facial maturity and the attribution of legal responsibility. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 14, 23-33
- Dermer, M., & Thiel, D.L. (1975). When beauty may fail. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 31, 1168-1176
- Dion, K., Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. (1972). What is beautiful is good. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 24, 285-290
- Downs, C., & Lyons, P. (1991). Natural observations of the links between attractiveness and initial legal judgments. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17, 541-547
- Efran, G. (1974). The effect of physical appearance on the judgment of guilt, interpersonal attraction, and severity of recommended punishment in a simulated jury task. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 8, 45-54
- Keating C. F. & Bai D. L. (1986). Children's attributions of social dominance from facial cues. *Child Development*. 57, 1269-1276
- Kulka, R., & Kessler, J. (1978). Is justice really blind: The influence of litigant physical attractiveness on judicial judgment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 8, 366-381.
- Montepare, J. M., Zebrowitz, L. (1992). Impression of babyfaced individuals across the life span. *Developmental Psychology*. 6, 1143-1152

- Solomon, M., Ashmore, R., & Longo, L., (1992). The beauty match-up hypothesis: Congruence between types of beauty and product images in advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, XXI, 23-34
- Steffensmeier, D. & Hebert, C. (1999). Women and men policymakers: Does the judge's gender affect the sentencing of criminal defendants? *Social Forces*, 77, 1163-1196
- Wuench, K. Chia, R. Castellow, W. Chuang, C. & Cheng, B. (1993). Effects of physical attractiveness, sex and type of crime on mock juror decisions: A replication with chinese students. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 24, 414
- Zebrowitz-McArthur, L. & Berry, D. (1987). Cross-cultural agreement in perceptions of babyfaced adults. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 18, 165-192
- Zebrowitz, L. A., (1997). *Reading faces: Window to the soul?* Westview Press. Boulder, Colorado
- Zebrowitz, L. & McDonald, S. (1991). The impact of litigants' baby-facedness and attractiveness on adjudications in small claims courts. *Law and Human Behavior*, 15, 6, 603-623
- Zebrowitz, L., Tenenbaum, D., & Goldstein, L. (1991). The impact of job applicants' facial maturity, sex, and academic achievement on hiring recommendations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 21, 525-548

Running Head: FACIAL MATURITY AND JUROR DECISION-MAKING

The effects of facial maturity and crime-type on determinations
of culpability and sentence length

Jonathan Poitras

Algoma University College, Laurentian University

Abstract

Perceived culpability and sentencing of a defendant is affected by several variables, including the defendant's appearance, and whether the juror is the same or opposite gender. For example, generally attractive defendants are shown leniency but not by same sex jurors, or if they appear to have used their appearance to aid in the commission of an offense. Another example is facial maturity, baby-faced people are shown more leniency for crimes that are perceived as intentional, whereas mature-faced people are shown more leniency for crimes that are perceived as negligent. The purpose of this study was to determine whether different levels of facial maturity of a male defendant affect culpability and the sentence length imposed by a juror, and, if so, whether this effect is affected by a defendant exploiting his appearance to aid in the commission of the crime, or the gender of the juror.

Rationale

Appearance is a factor that has been shown to affect the decision of a juror. However, this is not the only factor that affects the decision making process of jurors. Other variables include gender of the juror and the nature of the crime. These relationships will be discussed below.

Appearance and Nature of the Crime

One important aspect of appearance that affects the decision of a juror is attractiveness. Generally, research has shown that attractive defendants are shown leniency. Efran (1974) reported that physically attractive defendants are less likely than physically unattractive defendants to be convicted, Zebrowitz and McDonald (1991) were able to replicate this finding. Kulka and Kessler (1978) were able to demonstrate the same attractive leniency effect, but, in addition, they were able to show that if attractive defendants are convicted, they receive more lenient sentences. Downs and Lyons (1991) found that judges gave lower bail amounts to attractive defendants than to unattractive defendants.

It is important to note that a leniency toward attractive defendants is not always found. If an attractive person exploits his or her appearance to commit a crime, then jurors perceive that person as more blameworthy. Zebrowitz (1997) reported that attractive defendants were given stiffer sentences than less attractive defendants when their actions exploited their appearance. For example, when a woman exploits her attractive appearance to con a man, she is seen as more culpable and thus worthy of a stiffer sentence than an unattractive woman who commits the same action.

Facial maturity is another aspect of appearance that has been found to affect how a juror determines culpability. Zebrowitz and McDonald (1991) demonstrated an interaction between the effects of facial maturity and type of crime committed on sentencing. They studied 506 cases heard in small claims court. For cases involving intentional actions, almost all mature-faced defendants were found guilty, whereas less than half of the baby-faced defendants were found guilty. The opposite effect was found for cases that involved negligence. Baby-faced people were more likely to be found guilty in cases involving negligence than mature-faced defendants. These outcomes are consistent with assumptions about likely behaviors of baby-faced people. They are perceived as more honest than mature-faced people and thus less likely to cause harm intentionally, and they are also perceived as more naïve and thus less likely to be able to plan intentional harm (Berry & Zebrowitz, 1988). Given that facial maturity and attractiveness are two aspects of appearance, and exploiting the positive traits attributed with attractiveness is seen as more blameworthy. This raises the question: Will baby-faced people receive stiffer sentences for exploiting their honest appearance the same way attractive people receive stiffer sentences for exploiting their appearance? It should if baby-face people are perceived as exploiting their appearance.

Gender of the Juror

Another factor that can influence a jurors' decision of defendant culpability and sentence-length is the gender of the juror. Steffensmeier and Hebert (1999) have shown that women judges show less leniency than male judges. This is seen in levels of perceived culpability and assigned sentence length.

An interaction of gender of the juror and the appearance of the defendant is another factor that affects determinations of culpability and sentence length. Abwender and Hough (2001) have shown an interaction between sex of the defendant and sex of the juror as a function of physical attractiveness. Abwender and Hough showed that when an attractive defendant was judged by a member of the same sex, they were shown less leniency in comparison to a juror of the opposite sex. However the opposite was shown for unattractive defendants. Unattractive defendants were shown less leniency by jurors of the opposite sex than by jurors of the same sex. perhaps a similar interaction of gender of the juror and facial maturity exists?

Previous studies on appearance have shown that exploiting ones' attractiveness to aid in committing an offence reverses the leniency effect, but research has not yet shown whether a similar effect is found when another aspect of appearance (facial maturity) is exploited. Other research has shown an interaction between sex of the defendant and sex of the juror as a function of physical attractiveness, but again research has not shown whether a similar effect is found when facial maturity is manipulated instead of attractiveness. This study investigated whether or not there is a difference in determining culpability and sentence length when different levels of facial maturity are presented with a crime that exploits appearance, and a crime that does not exploit appearance. The effects of same versus opposite sex jurors were also investigated to look for interactions between these three variables (facial maturity, exploitation of appearance, and juror gender).

This study is a 2 (Sex: Male/Female) X 2 (Facial Type: Mature/Baby-face) X 2 (Crime Type: Exploiting/ Not Exploiting Appearance) independent groups design with

one subject variable (i.e., Sex), and two independent variables (i.e., Facial Type and Crime Type).

Hypothesis

It was expected from the research by Zebrowitz and McDonald (1991) that in all cases that the mature-faced defendant will be found more culpable because both crime types are of an intentional nature (Fraud and Theft). There will not be a main effect found between nature of the crimes. There will not be a main effect found between same sex and opposite sex jurors.

It was expected that an interaction would be found between facial maturity and nature of the crime. The baby-faced defendant will receive a stiffer sentence in the appearance exploiting crime condition. The reason for this is because it will look as if the baby-faced defendant will have exploited their honest appearance.

It was expected that an interaction will also be found between gender of the juror and facial maturity. Specifically, it was predicted that opposite sex jurors will be more lenient toward the baby-faced defendants than same sex jurors when determining culpability, because in this case the defendant is male, and women tend to find baby-faced individuals more attractive (Penton-Voak et al, 2002). In contrast, the male jurors will be more lenient on mature-faced defendants than female jurors and less lenient on baby-faced defendants than female jurors.

Method

Participants

Ninety-six participants took part in the study. Participants were enrolled in an introductory course in psychology at Algoma University College. Each student had agreed to participate in return for participation points to be added to their final grade. All male students were randomly assigned to one of four possible conditions; mature-faced exploiting/ mature-faced not exploiting/ baby-faced exploiting/ baby-faced not exploiting. And all female students were randomly assigned to one of four possible conditions.

Materials

The target photographs were adopted from Penton-Voak et al. (2002). To create two levels of maturity a photograph of a male face from the shoulder up was morphed to give two facial appearances: Mature and Immature. The immature face was created by raising the eyebrows and making the eyes bigger, the lips thicker, the nose smaller, and rounding the jaw line. To create the mature face the eyebrows were lowered, the eyes were made smaller, the lips were thinned out, the nose was enlarged, and the jaw was squared off.

Procedure

The participants in this experiment were tested individually. After being given a brief description of the study the participants were provided with an informed consent form [see Appendix A]. The participants were then provided with (a) a photograph of a male face, and asked to answer three questions about appearance, specifically about the, degree of attractiveness, degree of facial maturity, and degree of masculinity. These were to evaluate whether the manipulation of maturity was successful. After these were completed the participants were provided with (b) a criminal case. Participants received

one of two cases [see Appendices B & C]: one described a crime exploiting appearance (fraud) and the other described a crime not exploiting appearance (theft) committed by the person in the photograph. Participants were asked to use a 7 point Likert scale to evaluate: (a) the degree of culpability of the perpetrator, (b) degree of sentence-length, (from 1 (90 days) to 7 (730 days)), (c) degree of credibility, (d) degree of honesty, (e) degree of trustworthiness. After these were completed they were asked to answer a question about the degree of exploitation of appearance. (See Appendix D). This was to evaluate whether participants believed using one's appearance would influence their evaluation.

Following completion of the questionnaire, all subjects were administered debriefing instructions [see Appendix E], as well as a post-experimental interview to discuss any questions they had about the procedure.

Results

Manipulation check

Facial Maturity.

The test for whether the two faces differed in maturity was statistically significant. The mature-face ($M = 4.729$, $SD = 1.105$) was perceived as more mature than the baby-face ($M = 3.75$, $SD = 1.15$), $t(95) = 4.237$, $p = .000$ (two-tailed).

Masculinity

The test for whether the two faces differed in masculinity or femininity was not statistically significant.

Attractiveness

The test for whether the two faces differed in attractiveness was not statistically significant.

Perceived Age

The test for whether the two faces differed in perceived age was statistically significant. The mature-face (M = 22.35, SD = 2.64) was perceived as older than the baby-face (M = 20.7, SD = 2.11), $t(95) = 3.374, p = .001$ (two-tailed).

Primary Dependant Variables

Sentence Length

For a comparing the assigned sentence lengths an analysis of variance was performed and a main effect of gender of the juror was found to be statistically significant, $F(1, 88) = 10.57, p = .002$. Opposite sex jurors (M = 9.79, SD = 6.44) assigned longer sentences than same sex jurors (M = 6.166, SD = 4.63).

While it did not meet statistical significance a trend was shown to support the hypothesis that baby-face defendants who committed fraud would receive the lengthiest sentence. $F(1,88) = 1.912, p = .17$ (see Table 1).

TABLE 1 Assigned Sentence Length

	Baby-Face	Mature-Face
Fraud	M = 10.083 SD = 6.46	M = 7.2 SD = 5.36
Theft	M = 7.2 SD = 4.42	M = 7.41 SD = 6.788

Note: N = 24 in each cell

Culpability

For comparing perceived levels of culpability an analysis of variance was performed and a main effect of gender of the juror was found to be statistically significant, $F(1,88) = 5.067$, $p = .027$. Opposite sex jurors ($M = 4.958$, $SD = 1.18$) perceived the defendant to be more culpable than same sex jurors ($M = 4.375$, $SD = 1.39$).

Auxiliary Variables

Honesty

For comparing perceived levels of honesty an analysis of variance was performed and a main effect of gender of the juror was found to be statistically significant, $F(1,88) = 5.763$, $p = .018$. Opposite sex jurors ($M = 3.063$, $SD = 1.24$) perceived the defendant as less honest than same sex jurors ($M = 3.6875$, $SD = 1.323$).

There was also a 3 way interaction found for honesty that was statistically significant, $F(1,88) = 4.382$, $p = .04$ (see Table 2). Holding Gender constant, this was broken down to find simple effects. For same sex jurors a two-way interaction simple effect was found for crime-type and facial maturity, $F(1,44) = 6.806$, $p = .012$. Breaking this down further, while holding crime-type constant, a trend was shown for the crime of theft, $F(1,22) = 3.96$, $p = .059$. Same sex jurors perceived a baby-face defendant, who has committed a theft, ($M = 4.1667$, $SD = 1.03$) as more honest than a mature face defendant who has committed a theft, ($M = 3.1667$, $SD = 1.4$). There were no significant results for opposite sex jurors.

TABLE 2 Perceived Level of Honesty

	Same Sex		Opposite Sex	
	Baby-Face	Mature-Face	Baby-Face	Mature-face
Fraud	M = 3.25 SD = 1.35	M = 4.167 SD = 1.267	M = 3.167 SD = 1.586	M = 2.83 SD = 1.337
Theft	M = 4.167 SD = 1.029	M = 3.167 SD = 1.4	M = 3.167 SD = 1.02	M = 3.08 SD = 1.08

Note: N = 12 in each cell

Credibility

For comparing perceived levels of credibility, an analysis of variance was performed and a main effect of crime type was found to be statistically significant, $F(1,88) = 5.463$, $p = .022$. The defendant who committed the theft ($M = 4.375$, $SD = 1.299$) was perceived as more credible than the defendant who committed that fraud ($M = 3.7$, $SD = 1.51$)

Trustworthiness

For comparing perceived levels of trustworthiness, an analysis of variance was performed and there were no significant results.

Exploitation of appearance

An analysis of variance was performed to determine if people perceived the defendant of exploiting his appearance. A two-way interaction was found to be statistically significant for facial maturity and gender of the juror, $F(1,88) = 7.201$, $p = .009$ (see Table 3). The interaction was broken down by holding gender constant to determine the simple effects. Opposite sex jurors demonstrated a simple effect for facial

maturity, $F(1,46) = 5.05$, $p = .029$. Opposite sex jurors perceived the mature-face defendant ($M = 4.375$, $SD = 1.689$) as exploiting his appearance more than the baby-face defendant ($M = 3.375$, $SD = 1.377$). There were no significant results for same sex jurors.

TABLE 3 Perceived Level of Exploitation of Appearance

	Same Sex	Opposite Sex
Baby-Face	M = 4.25 SD = 1.96	M = 3.375 SD = 1.377
Mature-Face	M = 3.58 SD = 1.61	M = 4.375 SD = 1.689

Note: N = 24 in each cell

Exploited Yes or No

Half the participants in the study answered that it would affect their judgment if a person exploited his appearance to help him commit a crime, and the other half answered that it would not affect their judgment if a person exploited his appearance to help him commit a crime.

Discussion

The results in this study did not support the hypotheses; however there were unexpected significant results. Opposite sex jurors assigned lengthier sentences to defendants in all conditions than same sex jurors. The reason for this is that opposite sex jurors perceived the defendant as more culpable and less honest than did same sex jurors. This finding is consistent with the work by Steffensmeier and Hebert (1999) that revealed that women are more likely to find blame and assign longer sentences than men.

The hypothesis stating that baby-face defendants, whom commit a fraud, would receive the lengthiest sentence was not supported. However, an examination of the means demonstrated that a trend was shown to assign the longest sentence to the baby-face defendant whom had committed a fraud. This is consistent with the idea that defendants who exploit their appearance to commit a crime should be shown less leniency when being sentenced.

The hypothesis stating that the mature-face defendant would be perceived as more culpable in both crime types was not supported. This finding is inconsistent with the work by Zebrowitz and McDonald (1991). The reason that these findings are inconsistent could be due to the method of data collection. Zebrowitz and McDonald used naturalistic observation, wherein they had two people rate the defendants on facial maturity. This method of data collection leaves room for confounding variables, for example, the defendants' hair colour or clothing, could also have been a factor not taken into consideration for their findings. This study used the same face which was morphed to factor out these kinds of confounding variables. Therefore there is no difference in determinations of culpability for intentional crimes when the defendants vary in facial maturity.

The hypothesis stating that opposite sex jurors would show leniency to baby-face defendants, because women view baby-face people as more attractive, was not supported. Following the manipulation check, it was determined that the faces did not vary in attractiveness, and thus no leniency was shown.

For same sex jurors, a simple effect was found that demonstrated that a baby-face defendant who has committed theft, is perceived as more honest than a mature-face

defendant who has committed theft. This is consistent with the honest perception of baby-face people. The reason this effect was not found in the fraud cases, could be due to the high level of deception used. When such blatant deception is used, this may negate the honesty trait attributed to baby-face people.

The main effect of credibility for type of crime committed was an unexpected result. Both men and women perceived the defendant who committed the theft as more credible than the defendant who committed the fraud. However, this finding has no effect on determinations of culpability or sentence length, which shows that in the case of a fraud and a theft, jurors' determination of culpability and sentence length is not affected by people's perception of credibility.

There was a simple effect for opposite sex jurors which demonstrated that they perceived mature-face defendants as exploiting their appearance more often than baby-face defendants. There is no evidence that is consistent with this finding. However, due to this finding only being shown in women, it would be interesting to know what stage of their menses they were in because research has shown that preference for varying levels of facial maturity changes across their cycle (Penton-Voak et al, 2002). Perhaps it is also the case that perceived levels of exploitation also changes across this cycle

Finally, additional research is warranted to assess whether there would be similar findings for a female defendant that varied in facial maturity.

References

- Abwender, D. & Hough, K. (2001). Interactive effects of characteristics of defendant and mock juror on U.S. participants' judgment and sentencing recommendation. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 141, 603-615.
- Berry, D., & Zebrowitz, L. (1988). What's in a face?: Facial maturity and the attribution of legal responsibility. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 14, 23-33
- Downs, C., & Lyons, P. (1991). Natural observations of the links between attractiveness and initial legal judgments. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17, 541-547
- Efran, G. (1974). The effect of physical appearance on the judgment of guilt, interpersonal attraction, and severity of recommended punishment in a simulated jury task. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 8, 45-54
- Kulka, R., & Kessler, J. (1978). Is justice really blind: The influence of litigant physical attractiveness on judicial judgment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 8, 366-381.
- Penton-Voak, S. Little, A. Jones, B. Burt, D. & Perrett, D. (2002). Partnership status and the temporal context of relationships influence human female preferences for sexual dimorphism in male face shape. *The Royal Society*, 269, 1095-1100.
- Steffensmeier, D. & Hebert, C. (1999). Women and men policymakers: Does the judge's gender affect the sentencing of criminal defendants? *Social Forces*, 77, 1163-1196
- Zebrowitz, L. (1997). *Reading Faces: Window to the Soul?* Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 153-154

Zebrowitz, L. & McDonald, S. (1991). The impact of litigants' baby-facedness and attractiveness on adjudications in small claims courts. *Law and Human Behavior*, 15, 6, 603-623

Appendix A
Informed Consent Form

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Department of Psychology Committee on Research with Human Subjects, on behalf of the Institutional Research Ethics Board, to be in compliance with the Tri-Council Policy Statement, as preserving the safeguards of subjects' privacy, welfare and civil liberties. The Chairperson of the committee may be reached through the Department of Psychology, Algoma University.

Before you agree to participate in this experiment, we would like you to be aware of the procedures involved. You will be presented with a photograph and a questionnaire. Part of the procedures involve evaluating a behavioural scenario, in terms the target's role in that scenario.

It is important to the success of the study that you are honest and genuine in your responses. We have found in previous studies that participants are able to do this. However, if at any time you should find any part of the procedures objectionable and wish to withdraw from the study, you are free to do so, at that point, without loss of experimental credit.

I, the undersigned, have read the above and am willing to participate in the study therein. I understand that I have the freedom to withdraw from the study at any time.

Signature of Research Participant _____

Signature of Research Investigator _____

Date: _____

If you are receiving course credit for participating in this study please fill out below

Course: _____

Professor: _____

Appendix B

Fraud Case

Stephen Hunt was a 23 year old male who had just recently lost his job at a telemarketing company in Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario. He is a single father of a 15 month old baby girl. At the time of the alleged incident he had no money and had been unable to put any food on the table at home. Stephen has been accused of defrauding a 51 year old man, Joe Benoit, of 1 000 dollars.

Stephen Hunt's criminal record shows that he was convicted of two other petty theft crimes when he was a juvenile 6 years ago.

Joe Benoit told the court that he was walking along Queen Street when Stephen Hunt walked up to him and pleaded with him to cash a cheque for him. He claimed that he had lost his bank card and needed to buy groceries. It was 7:00 pm at night and the bank was closed. Joe Benoit agreed to help the young man out and walked into the CIBC, deposited the cheque into the bank machine, withdrew 1 000 dollars and gave it to Stephen. Joe said the accused thanked him and walked away.

One week later Joe got a call from the bank telling him that he had deposited a forged cheque for 1 000 dollars. Joe called the police and gave them a description of the man, and the police picked up Stephen the same day.

Stephen pleaded not guilty claiming that he had not committed this act.

Appendix C

Theft Case

Stephen Hunt was a 23 year old male who had just recently lost his job at a telemarketing company in Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario. He is a single father of a 15 month old baby girl. At the time of the alleged incident he had no money and had been unable to put any food on the table at home. Stephen has been accused of stealing 1 000 dollars from the car of a 51 year old man, Joe Benoit.

Stephen Hunt's criminal record shows that he was convicted of two other petty theft crimes when he was a juvenile 6 years ago.

Joe Benoit told the court that when he was walking back to his car he saw Stephen Hunt rummaging around in his car. He yelled at the accused to get out of his car and the accused ran. Joe Benoit walked up to his car and found the window had been broken and his bank book with 1 000 dollars in it had been taken. Joe Benoit called the police and gave them a description of the man. The police picked up Stephen Hunt one week later.

Stephen pleaded not guilty, claiming that he had not committed this act.

Instructions for Rating of Target Photos

You have read a case wherein the defendant has been charged with a crime that he has pleaded not guilty to. The defendant is the man who appeared in the photograph presented to you. Imagine this case was tried by a jury of which you are a member. Your task here is to evaluate the defendant on each of the following traits. Each of the traits range from 1 to 7, with 4 representing a moderate amount of that trait. Please complete each rating with respect to your perception of that particular trait in the man in the photograph.

Please rate the extent to which the accused is credible/not credible

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 credible not credible

Please rate the extent to which the accused is trustworthy/untrustworthy

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 untrustworthy trustworthy

Please rate the extent to which the accused is honest/dishonest

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 honest dishonest

Please rate the extent to which the accused is blameworthy/not blameworthy

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 not blameworthy blameworthy

Sentencing for this type of crime ranges between three months and 24 months. In the event that this defendant was found guilty, using the range above, how many months of imprisonment would you recommend as a fair sentence?

Number of Months: _____

Please rate the extent to which the accused exploited his appearance

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Exploited

Did not exploit

If he had, would this have affected your judgment? Yes No

Appendix E

Debriefing Procedure

This study sought to test the effects of facial characteristics on how we respond to others. I was interested in evaluating how we perceive intent in others when they engage in an action considered to be criminal. You were only exposed to a single photograph; Some other participants were exposed to a different photograph.

Are there any questions about the study?

As the study is ongoing and requires natural responses of our participants, I would request that you not disclose the procedures of this study with others who might be participating in this project; otherwise, their responses will not be natural and I will not be able to consider their responses. To avoid that bias, I would appreciate your not disclosing the purpose or procedures of this study.

Thank-you very much for your cooperation.