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Abstract

Ten groups of six participant-jurors each viewed a videotape of a trial in which either an attractive or unattractive female defendant was convicted of vehicular manslaughter. Before any group discussion about the case, each participant-juror recommended a sentence for the defendant (from 1 to 25 years). After group discussion, each participant-juror again recommended a sentence. Prior to group discussion, the unattractive defendant received a longer sentence than the attractive defendant, but after group discussion, attractive and unattractive defendants were sentenced equally. These results support problem-solving theory, but contradicted information-integration theory.
Effects of Defendant Attractiveness and Jury Discussion on Length of Sentence

Forensic Psychology deals with the application of psychology to legal issues and court cases (Deitz, 2000). One area in forensic psychology is the investigation of factors other than the evidence and testimony presented during a trial that can influence jury decisions. These “extra legal” factors include the defendant’s race, gender, and socioeconomic status (Saks & Hastie, 1978). Another one of these factors is the attractiveness of the defendant: more attractive defendants generally receive more lenient sentence recommendations. Landy and Aronson (1969) had subject-jurors read a case of an alcohol-related driving accident prior to their recommending a sentence length for the defendant (from 1 to 25 years). The attractive defendant was presented as an insurance assessor with a stable employment record. He was known as a good worker with no criminal record and was a widower intending to spend Christmas Eve with his daughter and son-in-law. The unattractive defendant was a recently hired janitor with a criminal record. He was not known by his fellow employees, he was a divorcée with three children, and he intended to spend Christmas Eve with his girlfriend. Even though the same evidence was presented to convict both defendants, the subject-jurors recommended a shorter sentence for the more attractive defendant.
Effects of Defendant

In another study of an auto-accident case, jurors recommended a shorter sentence for the more attractive defendant than for the less attractive one (Kaplan & Kemerick, 1974). Moreover, in studies in which attractiveness is defined in terms of physical characteristics alone, results have been similar. For example, Efran (1974) attached a photograph of a physically attractive or unattractive male or female college student to a booklet describing a case of student cheating. Participant-juror ratings of the defendant on a 6-point scale indicated a desire to punish the unattractive defendant more severely than the attractive defendant.

Gerbasi, Zuckerman, and Hess (1977) pointed out that these, as well as other participant-juror studies (e.g., Nemeth & Sosis, 1973; Sigall & Ostrove, 1975), are lacking in one critical respect: participant-jurors were presented with a case and were asked to render sentence without discussing the case with fellow jurors, which is always the case following a real trial. The purpose of the present experiment was to determine if attractiveness of the defendant influences the length of sentence recommendations when group discussion precedes a sentencing decision. It was hypothesized that before group discussion participant-jurors would recommend a more lenient sentence for an attractive defendant than for an unattractive defendant, but that after group discussion the attractive and unattractive defendants would receive equally harsh sentence recommendations. This prediction was based on research that
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Effects of Defendant

has shown that group discussion leads to problem solutions that are superior to the solutions of individual participant’s (e.g., Shaw, 1932). So, if the extralegal variable of defendant attractiveness does indeed result in jurors’ making inappropriate sentence recommendations when they act as individuals, group discussion should result in rejection of attractiveness (a superior solution) as a sentencing criterion. In other words, attractiveness of the defendant should be less likely to influence the length of a juror’s sentence recommendation if the recommendation follows group discussion.

Method

Participants

A total of 60 students (30 male and 30 female) who were enrolled in an introductory psychology course at a northeastern university participated in this experiment for course credit. They were ethnically diverse freshman or sophomores who ranged in age from 18 to 24 years ($M = 19.70$, $SD = 1.90$).

Materials

The questionnaire, a two-page typed booklet, contained a cover page with the title of the case, and a second page labeled “Years of Sentence” on which were listed numbers 1 to 25. A rectangular table with six chairs and a large screen (1 x 1 m) were set up in the experimental room for viewing the videotape of the trial. The two videotaped versions of the trial (each 12-min long) were
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identical except for the high versus low attractiveness of the defendant. The attractive and unattractive defendants were both acted by the same 25-year old professional actress and model. In the highly attractive condition, she was physically appealing, well-groomed, and neatly dressed. In the unattractive condition, she was unkempt and sloppily attired. She was also made to look physically unappealing (stained teeth, poor complexion, etc.) through the assistance of the theatrical make-up staff. The defendant was charged with vehicular manslaughter because, while intoxicated, she ran a red light and killed a man who was crossing the street. For a complete description of the case, see Landy and Aronson (1969).

Procedure

Six participants were randomly assigned to each jury group, with the restriction that there be three males and three females in each. Of the 10 jury groups included in the experiment, five were randomly assigned to see the videotape depicting the high attractive defendant (Group HI-A), and five were randomly assigned to see the low attractive defendant (Group LO-A). The groups were run on 10 consecutive days at 9:00 a.m.

Upon entering the experimental room, the female experimenter asked the six participants to seat themselves at a table. She informed them that after watching a videotape of a trial, they would be asked to recommend a
after watching a videotape of a trial, they would be asked to recommend a sentence for the defendant. The experimenter then played the appropriate videotape. One-half of the participants were shown the tape with the attractive defendant, whereas the other half were shown the tape with the unattractive defendant. Immediately after the presentation, the questionnaire booklet was given to each participant. The experimenter instructed them to circle a number (from 1 to 25) on the second page of the booklet to indicate the sentence length they thought was appropriate for the defendant. Participants were given as much time as they needed, but were instructed not say anything to the other participants. The booklets were then collected, and the experimenter asked the six participants to discuss the case freely as if they were a real jury. They were told to notify the experimenter (who was waiting in the next room) when, as a group, they felt they had fully discussed the case. Once the experimenter was notified, she re-entered the room and handed all participant-jurors another copy of the questionnaire. She again asked them to fill it out individually, after considering all aspects of the case brought out in the group discussion. The experimenter specifically told participants not to feel bound by the response they gave to the questionnaire prior to the opportunity for group discussion.
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At the end of the experiment participants were thanked for their participation and were instructed not to discuss the case with anyone else. They were also informed that within two weeks they could contact the experimenter to receive a detailed explanation of the research project. An additional group of six participants was excused partway through the experiment due to a malfunction of the videotape monitor.

Results

A preliminary analysis comparing sentences given by male ($M = 7.40, SD = 1.30$) versus female ($M = 7.05, SD = 1.15$) participant-jurors indicated no significant difference, $t(58) = 1.73, p > .10$. Therefore, the gender variable was not included in the main analysis. Results of a 2 x 2 mixed design analysis of variance (high versus low attractive defendant x no discussion versus discussion) showed a significant main effect for attractiveness, $F(1, 58) = 10.88, p < .01$. Sentence recommendations for the low-attractive defendant ($M = 9.35, SD = 1.27$) were longer than for the high-attractive defendant ($M = 5.05, SD = 1.35$). Results also indicated a main effect for group discussion versus no group discussion, such that sentence length prior to group discussion ($M = 8.40, SD = 1.56$) was higher than sentence length after group discussion ($M = 6.00, SD = 1.32$), $F(1, 58) = 12.22, p < .001$.
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These main effects were qualified by a significant interaction effect, $F(1, 58) = 7.46, p < .01$; therefore, tests of simple main effects were done. As shown in Figure 1, sentence recommendations for the low-attractive defendant were longer than for the high-attractive defendant only when they were made prior to group discussion, $F(1, 58) = 17.54, p < .001$. After group discussion, however, defendant attractiveness had no effect on sentence-length recommendations, $F < 1$.

Discussion

The finding that, before group discussion, participant-jurors sentenced the unattractive defendant more harshly than the attractive defendant replicates the findings of earlier research (e.g., Efran, 1974; Kaplan & Kemerick, 1974; Landy & Aronson, 1969; Sigall & Ostrove, 1975). After group discussion, however, high versus low defendant attractiveness no longer influenced the length of the participant-jurors’ sentence decisions. These results support the experimental hypothesis that group discussion of the case would tend to eliminate the influence of defendant attractiveness on individual sentence decisions. Since no data were collected that reflect the content of the group discussions, future research should either monitor group discussion to determine attractiveness was discussed, or should assess the impact of directing deliberations toward or away from a discussion of defendant attractiveness.
One prediction was not completely verified: that after group discussion the attractive defendant would receive a sentence as *harsh* as that received by the unattractive defendant. The results show that sentence values assigned to the attractive and unattractive defendant were equally *lenient* after group discussion. Apparently, the unattractive defendant had received unduly harsh sentence recommendations when there was no group discussion.

The effect group discussion had on the sentencing of attractive and unattractive defendants may not generalize to other types of defendant characterizations. For example, Myers and Kaplan (1976) found that for defendants involved in a high- versus low-guilt case, group discussion increased rather than decreased the length of the sentence decisions. Perhaps group discussion influences the effect the high- versus low-guilt variable had on sentencing differently from the way it influences the effects of the high- versus low-attraction variable. Alternatively, procedural differences may have caused the difference in results. Myers and Kaplan had participants read booklets containing the summary of the case, whereas in the present experiment participants saw a videotape of the trial. Research reported by Williams, Farmer, Lee, Cundick, Howel, and Rooker (1975), however, indicates that mode of trial presentation may not be an important variable. Williams et al. found no difference in punishment (dollar amounts

- Authors frequently indicate if they believe the results can be generalized.

- Reminder: Use et al if the citation has been previously given and there are three or more authors.
assigned in a land condemnation case) among groups seeing the trial live versus in color video, black and white video, audio only, or transcript only. Another procedural difference was that participant-jurors in the Myers and Kaplan study read both high- and low-guilt cases (a within-subject design), whereas in the present experiment participant-jurors saw either the high- or low-attractive defendant tape (a between-subject design). Additional research must be conducted to determine if the type of design used can account for the opposite effects group discussion had in the two sentencing experiments.

The opposite effects of group discussion obtained in the present study and Myers and Kaplan’s (1976) study also raised an interesting theoretical question. Myers and Kaplan explained their results in terms of Anderson’s (1974) information-integration theory, which predicts that group discussion should increase the difference in the length of the sentence between high- and low-guilt cases as compared with the sentence length prior to group discussion. Since information-integration theory does not differentiate between the guilt and attractiveness variables, it makes predictions opposite to the results obtained in the present experiment. It may be that this theory needs to be modified.

- Discuss problems you encountered when carrying out the research and suggestions for improving the research effort.

- Elaborate on contradictory results.
The practical implication of the results of the present experiment is that those who were concerned that attraction of the defendant may influence jury decisions should question the validity of the conclusions of earlier research. The current study supports the idea that defendant attractiveness only has an effect on juror sentence recommendations in the absence of jury discussions of the case. Because real juries always discuss cases presented to them, the extralegal attractiveness variable may not influence jury decisions about a defendant. Future investigations of the effects of attractiveness on jury decisions should allow for case discussions. Otherwise the research setting will not be representative of the real legal environment.
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Table 1

Mean Sentence in Years for Low and High-attractive Defendant With and Without Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attractiveness</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Discussion</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure Caption

*Figure 1.* Mean sentence in years as a function of defendant’s attractiveness (low vs. high) and amount of discussion (“no discussion” denoted by the filled bar; “with discussion” denoted by the open bar).
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