This is to certify that the

thesis entitled
The Effects of a Defendant's Physical Attractiveness and Experimental Procedures on Juridic Judgments

presented by

Michael J. Sunnafrank

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Master of Arts degree in **Communication**

Gerald R. Miller
Major professor

Date **May 8, 1978**

O-7639

THE EFFECTS OF A DEFENDANT'S PHYSICAL ATTRACTIVENESS AND EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES ON JURIDIC JUDGMENTS

By

Michael James Sunnafrank

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Communication

1978

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECTS OF A DEFENDANT'S PHYSICAL ATTRACTIVENESS AND EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES ON JURIDIC JUDGMENTS

By

Michael James Sunnafrank

The present study focused on identifying the possible effects of a defendant's physical attractiveness and sex on jurors' judgments under various experimental conditions. More specifically, four studies were conducted to examine whether a defendant's attractiveness influenced the decisions of role-playing jurors. In each of these studies, subjects were shown either a physically attractive or unattractive male or female defendant. In two further conditions, subjects were told that the defendant was male or female but the defendant was not shown.

A comparison of the four studies was conducted to determine if the amount of information presented, mode of presentation, or type of evidence presented influenced juridic decisions.

The results of these studies indicated that while the defendant's attractiveness did not influence juridic decisions, the mode of presentation and type of evidence presented did.

Dedicated

to

Mom and Dad

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to extend my sincere appreciation to the members of my committee, Dr. Gerald R. Miller, Dr. Norman E. Fontes, and Dr. Hal Hepler, for their constant help and guidance.

I would also like to thank Ed Kaminski for his much needed advise concerning the videotape equipment employed in these studies.

In addition, I would like to thank Donna, Shana, and Ryan for putting things in their proper perspective with their love, laughter, and understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Researchers have recently given increased attention to identifying extra-legal influences that may affect the perceptions of jurors and, ultimately, the decisions that jurors are required to render (Beran, Albert, Loiseaux, Mayfield & Wright, 1958; Fontes, Miller & Bender, 1977; Kaplan & Kemmerick, 1974; Lawson, 1969; Miller, Bender, Boster, Florence, Fontes, Hocking & Nicholson, 1975; Miller, Fontes, Bauchner, Brandt, Boster, Carman, Halbert, Haight, Kaminski, Sunnafrank & Werner, 1977; Mitchell & Byrne, 1973; Walster, 1966). These studies have shown that such diverse factors as the prestige of the jury foreperson, the credibility of contesting attorneys, the mode in which the testimony is presented, the frequency of the introduction of inadmissible testimony, perceived attitude similarity between jurors and defendants, and the severity of the crime may affect juridic judgments.

One potentially biasing courtroom influence lies in the relative physical attractiveness of the defendant. The possible effects of this variable have received little attention within the trial setting. This apparent lack of concern is surprising, since the positive value many persons attach to attractiveness (Byrne, London & Reeves, 1968) could lead to preferential treatment of attractive defendants by jurors.

Berscheid and Walster (1974) suggest that the lack of concerted research focusing on attractiveness may stem from the belief that "(a)

people of different attractiveness levels are not treated differentially; we do not typically judge books by their covers. (b) Even if we do, individual differences in physical attractiveness criteria are so vast that differential treatment could have no consistent effect upon any one individual" (p. 186). As far as legal treatment is concerned, this reasoning may be augmented by an awareness of the Constitutional "guarantee" that all persons, regardless of race, color, or creed, shall receive due process from our legal system (Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution).

Numerous studies (e.g., Berscheid & Walster, 1969; Byrne, London & Reeves, 1968; Dion, Berscheid & Walster, 1972; Miller, 1970) have demonstrated that people respond differently to individuals who vary in physical attractiveness. In general, these response differences fall into line with favorable stereotypes of attractive persons, although some of them appear to be sex-specific. Thus, Byrne et al. (1968) found that physically attractive males are judged less intelligent and moral than their unattractive counterparts, but physically attractive females are perceived as more intelligent and moral than less attractive women.

Various attribution formulations (Heider, 1958; Jones & Davis, 1965; Kelley, 1967) assume that individuals make inferences about others based on the information they possess about them. The physical attraction studies indicate that information about the physical attractiveness of others may influence the inferences made about them; specifically, people usually make favorable inferences regarding attractive others and unfavorable inferences about physically unattractive others.

Although no study has examined the effects of a defendant's physical attractiveness in the courtroom, some studies (Dion, 1972; Efran, 1974;

Sigall & Ostrove, 1975) report that people do render decisions favoring physically attractive individuals in experimental situations which are more or less analogous to the courtroom setting. While these studies suffer from questionable ecological validity, they do suggest that the physical attractiveness of defendants may bias juridic decisions (ecological validity refers to the likelihood that the results of an experiment are generalizable to the "real" world given the procedures employed.). Given that the extra-legal influence of a defendant's physical attractiveness may affect juridic judgments, the Constitutional guarantee of due process may be called into question. Further investigation into this socially significant problem area should be undertaken to determine if the physical attractiveness variable affects juridic decisions in more ecologically valid situations.

The purpose of this inquiry is to identify and circumvent problems of ecological validity in past studies to assess the effects of a defendant's physical attractiveness on juridic decisions. In addition, an examination of the attributions made by jurors across procedures with apparent varying degrees of ecological validity will be made. Since the procedural differences of interest concern the ways information is communicated to jurors, as well as the amount of information communicated, the study focuses on the trial situation as a communication system.

Statement of the Problem

Recent research evidence indicates that the physical attractiveness of a defendant may affect jurors' perceptions and decisions regarding the defendant. In a study dealing with the relationship between physical attractiveness and evaluation of people who commit socially undesirable

acts, Dion (1972) found that attractive children were generally evaluated more positively after committing a transgression than were less attractive children. However, an interaction was observed that suggested different stereotypes for male and female offenders. Specifically, attractive females and unattractive males were evaluated less negatively for a severe transgression than were attractive males. Moreover, unattractive females received more negative evaluations than unattractive males.

Two studies have dealt with the relationship of physical attraction and severity of punishment in simulated legal settings. Efran (1974) had participants read a 650 word description of an alleged cheating incident committed by a student during an examination. By attaching a photograph of either an attractive or unattractive male or female student to some of the statements, Efran generated three conditions: attractive defendant, unattractive defendant, and no photograph provided. Equal numbers of male and female participants in each condition were then asked to evaluate the defendant's guilt, to recommend punishment contingent upon the defendant's guilt or innocence, and to indicate their degree of attraction toward the defendant by completing Byrne's Interpersonal Judgment Scale.

Regardless of the sex of the defendant, participants were less certain about the guilt of attractive defendants than they were about the guilt of unattractive defendants. Finally, while there was no significant sex of participant by sex of defendant interaction, male participants were influenced to a greater degree by defendant's attractiveness than were females.

Sigall and Ostrove (1975) posited an interaction between the relative attractiveness of a defendant and the degree to which a crime

is attractiveness-related. Specifically, they reasoned that if a crime is attractiveness-related - i.e., if being attractive facilitates successful perpetration of the crime - jurors will judge attractive defendants more harshly than unattractive ones. If the crime is not attractiveness-related - i.e., if successful perpetration of the crime is perceived as independent of physical attraction - unattractive defendants will receive more severe sentences.

As predicted, a significant physical attractiveness by type of crime interaction was observed. Examination of the simple effects indicated, however, that the interaction was most pronounced for the attractiveness-unrelated crime (burglary). Specifically, the recommended punishment for the unattractive burglar was significantly harsher than for the attractive burglar. By contrast, there were no sigificant differences in the sentences recommended for the attractive and unattractive defendants accused of an attractiveness-related crime (swindle). While the analysis yielded no significant sex of simulated juror by sex of defendant interaction, this result must be interpreted cautiously since only photographs of a female defendant were used.

Although the preceding research has added to our understanding of the influence of physical attraction on jurors' judgments of defendants, the studies employed experimental techniques that may limit the generalizability of their findings. The fact that none of them closely simulates actual courtroom conditions creates several problems. The use of monochromatic photographs to vary physical attraction appears to result in a relatively weak manipulation, both because the photos themselves are relatively far removed from a real courtroom situation and because

this procedure eliminates cues such as color of hair and eyes which may themselves be salient in judging physical attraction.

In the Sigall and Ostrove study, which more closely approximates the courtroom environment than any of the other prior studies, the guilt of the defendants was not in question. Instead, guilt was taken as a given and the simulated jurors were asked to recommend a specific sentence. Both Efran's and Dion's studies indicate that when the guilt or innocence of a person is in question, evaluators are not as certain of an attractive person's guilt as they are of an unattractive person's. This fact suggests that generalization to actual trial situations can occur with greater confidence if researchers use situations where the guilt or innocence of the defendant is questionable.

Some of the studies did not manipulate the sex of the defendant, thus precluding evaluation of a possible sex of juror by sex of defendant interaction. Moreover, for those studies that did manipulate the defendant's sex, the findings are mixed: some did not find significant interactions while others did. Thus, these possible interactions need additional evaluation.

The amount of information conveyed in the short written descriptions of the antisocial acts used in these studies is problematic. The limited amount and type of information made available to participants may have been inadequate to make the judgments normally required of jurors. Individuals make retrodictive and predictive inferences about others based upon either cultural, sociological and/or psychological information available concerning the individuals being evaluated. Miller and Steinberg (1975) state that predictions concerning others' behavior based upon cultural information entail knowledge concerning cultural norms and

values. Predictions based upon sociological information require knowledge of the evaluated person's memberships in specific subgroups of society and predictions at the psychological level necessitate information which is idiosyncratic to the individual being judged.

These inferences are essentially attributions, the accuracy of which, is dependent upon the type of information available. Specifically, the probability that attributions concerning a given individual are accurate would increase as we moved from the cultural through the sociological to the psychological level. The accuracy of attributions made based upon psychological information should be greater than attributions based upon sociological information. Attributions based upon cultural information would be the least accurate. Psychological information reduces individuals' reliance upon sociological and cultural stereotypes, including the physical attractiveness stereotype, when making judgments of others.

The information provided to participants in these studies was sociological at best, identifying the group memberships of the accused. In the Dion study, subjects were informed that the transgressor was either a male or female second-grade school child. The accused in the Efran study was either a female or male college student and the defendant in the Sigall and Ostrove study was either an attractive or unattractive female.

Given the effects of cultural and sociological physical attractiveness stereotypes and the absence of psychological information, it is not surprising that the effects of the physical attractiveness variable were significant. No psychological information was presented concerning the intent and motive of the accused or the degree of remorse felt by them, if any. Presentation of this type of information would more closely

approximate what generally transpires in the courtroom environment and might diminish the effects of the physical attractiveness variable. It should be noted that the introduction of this type of information would not necessitate the accused testifying in his or her own behalf. It is sometimes introduced by witnesses to the alleged antisocial behavior.

The use of short written descriptions and photographs may also produce what Orne (1962) has labeled demand characteristics. Student subjects such as those participating in these studies are generally better educated than the general populace and are usually more knowledgeable about experimental research techniques. Consequently, when using student subjects it is imperative that the experimental manipulation be as unobtrusive as possible. If subjects are able to identify the nature of the experimental manipulation, it is possible that the subjects' responses to the dependent measures included in the study will be contaminated by their understanding of the manipulation.

There were a number of cues in the studies reviewed which could have been used by subjects to identify the physical attraction manipulation. Perhaps the most salient cue was the attached picture of the accused. A reasonably inquisitive subject might be expected to question the purpose of the inclusion of the picture. Once such cognitions are activated, it does not require much creative thought from subjects to conclude that the study has something to do with the effects of the accused's appearance on their judgments. Given this possibility, vexing doubts about experimental artifacts are difficult to ignore.

One final limitation of these studies merits discussion. As indicated, the information concerning the transgressions was presented in written form. The absence of verbal presentations by the transgressors

or witnesses to the transgressions denied subjects nonverbal and paralinguistic cues that may have significantly affected subjects' judgments of the accused individuals.

It is not the intent of this paper to be unduly critical of the studies discussed. Rather, an attempt has been made to identify procedural factors that may limit the generalizability of findings of studies employing these or similar experimental techniques. Given a specific interest in the effects of a defendant's physical attractiveness on juror information processing and decision-making activities, the significant departure of the Efran and Sigall and Ostrove studies from normal courtroom procedures raises serious questions about the generalizability of their findings to the courtroom environment. For this reason, this paper will report a study which examines the effects of the relative physical attractiveness of a defendant in a more ecologically valid trial simulation. In addition, three further studies will be reported to empirically assess the ecological validity of past research.

Theoretic Perspective

Various attribution perspectives assume that man strives to stabilize, predict, and control his environment. One of the main elements in man's environment is other men. Given that man seeks an ordered view of his surroundings, he must attempt to view other men as stable in order to predict and control their actions. Attribution perspectives assume that man achieves this goal by attributing enduring dispositions to actors based on information about them.

In a recent review of the attribution literature, Seibold (1975) indicates that most research in this area focuses on attributions about

the enduring dispositions of strangers based wholly on information about actions taken by them. While information concerning the actions taken by strangers may be highly salient to attributions made about them, it would be unrealistic to assume that this is the only information perceivers use in making attributions about others. As the physical attraction literature suggests, people may use information conveyed by the attractiveness and sex of strangers in attributing enduring dispositions to them. Since the physical attractiveness and sex of strangers are readily accessible to perceivers in face-to-face situations, it would appear that any theoretic perspective addressing attributions about strangers should account for information conveyed by these characteristics. The current analysis deals with attributions made by jurors about defendants who are strangers to them. Thus, this paper will extend attribution theory to include the physical attractiveness and sex variables. An attempt will be made to show that information conveyed by the physical attractiveness and sex of strangers contributes to man's goal of a stable, predictable, and controlled environment.

Individuals come into contact with many strangers in their day-to-day interactions. If these individuals seek a stable, predictable, and controlled environment, coming into contact with unpredictable strangers would disrupt their goal. They must, therefore, establish some means of predicting how strangers will act.

Miller and Steinberg posit that perceivers use information from the cultural, sociological, and psychological levels of analysis when attempting to make predictions or attributions about others. If people are to be successful in attaining a stable environment, they must base their

attributions on information at the level of analysis with the best predictive potential available to them.

When individuals make attributions about strangers, no psychological information is generally available. Thus, the information with the best predictive potential is based on the sociological level of analysis. This paper suggests that when people have sociological information about strangers, they will employ stereotypes based on this information to make attributions.

The findings in the physical attraction literature suggest that individuals have sociological stereotypes about the behavior and enduring dispositions of others based on the physical attractiveness and sex variables. If this is the case, then sociological information conveyed by these stereotypes may differentially affect the attributions made about strangers.

If individuals base their attributions about strangers on the sociological information conveyed by the attractiveness and sex of strangers in everyday life, it is likely that this propensity will be activated in the courtroom regarding decisions made by jurors about defendants. If the courtroom environment and the information presented to the jurors during the case do not overcome these attributions, it is likely that the verdict jurors arrive at will be affected by the physical attractiveness and sex of the defendant. The research on the physical attractiveness of transgressors would indicate that this may be the case. While these studies do not closely approximate the courtroom environment or the information presented in the court, they do indicate that the relative attractiveness and sex of a defendant may affect decisions made regarding him/her.

The results of the physical attraction studies suggest various stereotypes based on the physical attractiveness and sex of a transgressor. These observed stereotypes were employed to generate the following hypotheses:

H_1: Physically unattractive defendants will be perceived as less moral by jurors than attractive defendants.

H_2: Physically attractive female defendants will be perceived by jurors as more moral than unattractive female defendants.

H_3: Physically attractive male defendants will be perceived as less moral than attractive female defendants.

H_4: The morality of physically attractive female defendants will be evaluated higher by male jurors than by female jurors (given the research by Byrne which suggests that male and female perceivers may hold different stereotypes for females).

H_5: Physically attractive male defendants will be perceived as less intelligent by jurors than unattractive male defendants.

H_6: Physically attractive female defendants will be perceived as more intelligent than unattractive female defendants.

H_7: Physically attractive male defendants will be perceived as less intelligent by jurors than attractive female defendants.

H_8: The intelligence of physically attractive female defendants will be evaluated higher by male jurors than by female jurors.

H_9: The defendant's locus of control will be perceived by jurors as external for unattractive defendants and internal for attractive defendants.

H_{10}: Male jurors will perceive a male defendant's locus of control as internal and a female defendant's locus of control as external.

H_{11}: Physically attractive defendants will be perceived by jurors as less likely to commit future crimes than unattractive defendants.

H_{12}: Physically attractive defendants will be found guilty less often by jurors than physically unattractive defendants accused of committing the same crime.

H_{13}: Physically attractive defendants who receive guilty verdicts will be found guilty of a less severe crime than unattractive defendants who receive guilty verdicts.

H_{14}: The punishment recommended by jurors for physically unattractive defendants found guilty of a crime will be more severe than the punishment recommended for attractive defendants found guilty of the same crime.

An additional hypothesis concerns the relationship between the absence or presence of a defendant and the amount of trial related information retained by jurors. If the defendant's physical attractiveness does influence jurors' evaluations, they may conceivably formulate a judgment about the defendant's guilt or innocence early in the trial. If this is the case, jurors may attend less carefully to the subsequent trial proceedings, thus causing a decrease in the amount of trial related information they retain. This reasoning leads to the following hypothesis:

H_{15}: Jurors who do not see a defendant during a trial will retain more trial related information than jurors who see a defendant.

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURES

Definitions

This section presents conceptual and operational definitions for the following variables: perceived physical attractiveness; perceived morality; perceived intelligence; perceived locus of control; perceived likelihood of future crime; verdict; severity of sentence; and juror information retention.

Physical Attractiveness

Physical attractiveness is conceptualized as a perceived variable. It is assumed members of a culture learn that certain physical characteristics are differentially valued in their culture. When individuals evaluate the physical attractiveness of others, they are likely to base their judgments on these culturally learned values. Thus, physical attractiveness is conceptualized as the perceivers' aesthetic evaluation of the physical characteristics of others, a judgment which is usually heavily influenced by these culturally learned values.

Physical attractiveness was operationalized in the following manner. Seventeen drama majors at Michigan State University, who classified themselves as either physically attractive or unattractive, were videotaped for three minutes each. Nine of these individuals were females and eight were males. These videotape shots were taken of the stimulus persons'

head and shoulders. These videotaped individuals were to be used as stimulus persons in an attractiveness pretest.

Twenty subjects were solicited from beginning communication classes at Michigan State University to rate the physical attractiveness of the videotaped stimulus persons. These subjects rated the physical attractiveness of the stimulus persons on the following seven-point scale:

In comparison to people in general this person is:

Very Physically Attractive							Very Physically Unattractive
____	____	____	____	____	____	____	

The male and female stimulus persons who were ranked the most physically attractive and least physically attractive on this pretest by the subjects were selected as the stimulus persons for the studies to be reported here. The physically attractive male had a mean score of 5.35, while the unattractive male had a mean score of 2.65. The physically attractive female's score was 5.35, while the unattractive female obtained a 2.4. The physically attractive male was rated as significantly more attractive than the unattractive male ($t=12.34$, $df=19$, $p<.001$). In addition, the physically attractive female was judged as more attractive than her unattractive counterpart ($t=12.58$, $df=19$, $p<.001$). No significant difference was found between the attractive male and female or the unattractive male and female.

One of the videotapes of the selected stimulus persons was presented to role-playing jurors in each of the experimental conditions reported in this paper. These presentations represent the manipulation of the physical attractiveness variable.

Perceived Morality

This analysis assumes that there are culturally learned normative criteria that individuals employ to evaluate whether the actions of others are morally appropriate. When individuals are asked to evaluate another's morality, it is likely they will employ these normative criteria to arrive at their judgments. Thus, perceived morality is conceptualized as a perceiver's evaluation of the degree to which another's actions conform to or deviate from the normative actions subscribed to by the perceiver.

This conceptualization was operationalized by asking each role-playing juror to respond to the following item from Byrne's Interpersonal Judgment Scale (1968):

> Please check the response which best describes your feelings about the defendant.
>
> ____ This defendant impresses me as being extremely moral.
>
> ____ This defendant impresses me as being moral.
>
> ____ This defendant impresses me as being moral to a slight degree.
>
> ____ This defendant impresses me as being neither particularly moral or immoral.
>
> ____ This defendant impresses me as being immoral to a slight degree.
>
> ____ This defendant impresses me as being immoral.
>
> ____ This defendant impresses me as being extremely immoral.

Perceived Intelligence

This paper assumes that individuals evaluate the actions of others in assessing the intellectual ability reflected by those actions. Moreover, it is assumed that individuals employ these evaluations to assess how intelligent others are. Thus, perceived intelligence is conceptually

defined as a perceiver's evaluation of the intellectual ability reflected in another's actions. The more rational the actions of another is perceived to be, the higher the perceived intelligence of the other.

This conceptualization was operationalized by asking each role-playing juror to respond to the following item from Byrne's Interpersonal Judgment Scale:

> Please check the response that best describes your feelings about the defendant.
>
> ____ I believe the defendant is very much above average in intelligence.
>
> ____ I believe the defendant is above average in intelligence.
>
> ____ I believe the defendant is slightly above average in intelligence.
>
> ____ I believe the defendant is average in intelligence.
>
> ____ I believe the defendant is slightly below average in intelligence.
>
> ____ I believe the defendant is below average in intelligence.
>
> ____ I believe the defendant is very much below average in intelligence.

Perceived Locus of Control

Rotter (1966) posits that individuals perceive that their actions and the outcomes of their actions are either externally or internally controlled. Externally controlled individuals perceive that the environment is responsible for their actions and outcomes. Internally controlled individuals perceive that their actions and outcomes are contingent on their own behavior and/or own permanent characteristics. Moreover, Rotter specifies that this is not an all or none trait. Rather, individuals' perception of their locus of control can vary in degree. That is, in

some situations individuals may perceive that the environment is in control, while in other situations they may feel that they are in control. Thus, locus of control is conceptualized as the degree to which an individual perceives that him/herself or the environment is in control of his/her actions and outcomes. The present analysis focuses on the perceived locus of control of others. Perceived locus of control is conceptualized as a perceiver's evaluation of the degree to which another or the environment is in control of the other's actions and outcomes.

The locus of control conceptualization was operationalized by asking each juror to respond to a modified version of the 29 item Scale to Measure Internal and External Control (Rotter, 1966). The original version attempts to measure an individual's own locus of control. The modified version asked role-playing jurors to respond to the Scale to Measure Internal and External Control as they believed the defendant would. The instructions to the role-playing jurors and an example item follow:

> The next set of statements concern how you believe the defendant personally feels about a number of topics. Two statements appear together for each item. Please check the statement that you believe the defendant would most agree with.
>
> The defendant feels that:
>
> ____ Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
>
> ____ People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.

The statement "the defendant feels that" preceded each of the 29 items to remind subjects that they were to respond for the defendant.

If subjects checked an external response (as with the first alternative for the example item), they were assigned a score of one for that item.

Internal responses (such as the second alternative in the example) were assigned a score of zero. 23 of the items measure internal-external control and six of the items are fillers. The perceived locus of control score for each subject was the sum of the scores for the 23 locus of control items. The higher the score, the more external the perceived locus of control. Thus, if the defendant was perceived to be completely external in locus of control, he/she would have received a score of 23 from that subject. If the defendant was perceived as completely internal, the score would be 0. Any score from 0 to 23 was possible.

Likelihood of Future Crime

This analysis assumes that individuals evaluate another's past actions to predict his/her future actions. When individuals are asked to predict specific future behaviors, it is likely that the past behavior of others which is similar to the future behavior would be most salient. Thus, the perceived likelihood to commit future crime is conceptualized as the juror's perception of the degree to which crime related actions taken by the defendant in the past indicate a tendency to engage in criminal behavior.

This conceptualization was operationalized by asking role-playing jurors to respond to the following item:

> How probable is it that the defendant will commit a crime in the future?
>
> ____ very probable
>
> ____ somewhat probable
>
> ____ not very probable
>
> ____ not very probable at all

Verdict

Verdict is conceptualized as the jurors' evaluation of whether or not the evidence indicates beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant engaged in the action(s) he/she is charged with.

This conceptualization was operationalized by asking each role-playing juror to respond to the following item:

I find the defendant:

____ guilty

____ innocent

In addition, jurors who found the defendant guilty were asked to find the defendant guilty of a misdemeanor or a felony:

> If you have found the defendant guilty, you must decide if the defendant is guilty of a misdemeanor or a felony. Please check the appropriate response.
>
> I have found the defendant guilty of a:
>
> ____ felony
>
> ____ misdemeanor

Severity of Sentence

Severity of sentence is conceptualized as the jurors' recommended period of incarceration for defendants found guilty of committing a crime.

The operationalization of the severity of sentence variable consists of two separate items. First, subjects who found the defendant guilty of a felony were asked to recommend a sentence in the following item:

> Since you have found the defendant guilty of a felony, you must now recommend the number of years the defendant is going to spend in prison. Please assume that the defendant will serve the number of years you recommend.
>
> ____ 0 years
>
> ____ 1 year

____ 2 years

____ 3 years

____ 4 years

____ 5 years

____ 6 years

____ 7 years

____ 8 years

____ 9 years

____ 10 years

____ 11 years

____ 12 years

Second, subjects who found the defendant guilty of a misdemeanor recommended punishment in response to the following item:

> Since you have found the defendant guilty of a misdemeanor, you must now recommend the number of months the defendant is going to spend in the county jail. Please assume that the defendant will serve the total number of months you recommend.

____ 0 months (defendant is put on probation)

____ 1 month

____ 2 months

____ 3 months

____ 4 months

____ 5 months

____ 6 months

____ 7 months

____ 8 months

____ 9 months

____ 10 months

____ 11 months

____ 12 months

The recommended punishment items represent operationalizations of the severity of sentence variable. Each of these items was analyzed separately.

Information Retention

Information retention is conceptualized as the jurors' ability to remember trial testimony and instructions from the judge at the conclusion of the trial.

This conceptualization was operationalized in the following manner for the first study to be reported in the results chapter. Subjects were asked to respond to 51 true-false items concerning the trial that they had just witnessed. Fifteen items focused on the instructions the judge had given to them concerning the responsibilities of jurors. The remaining 36 items pertained to the testimony of the witnesses in the trial. When the subjects' responses were correct, they were assigned one point. If the responses were incorrect, no points were assigned. The subject's information retention score was the sum of the points given for all 51 items. The higher the score, the greater the information retention.

Design

Chapter I identified the limitations of previous studies dealing with the physical attractiveness of transgressors. This section will present the procedures employed in a study which attempted to circumvent these limitations. In addition, the procedures used in three further studies will be reported. These further studies were undertaken to assess if the

hypothesized relationships are constant across procedures. An examination of the results of the four studies could indicate that procedural differences (e.g., amount of information provided, type of information provided) lead to different patterns of relationships.

There were some differences between the design employed in the present set of studies and the designs employed in the Efron and Sigall and Ostrove studies. First, since jurors are never told whether a defendant is guilty or innocent, but make that decision after hearing the trial testimony, the participants in the studies reported here decided upon the verdict. Second, in all but the final study the evidence presented in the trial stimulus was inconclusive, i.e., the guilt or innocence of the defendant was open to question. Finally, the sex of the defendant was manipulated to facilitate investigation of possible sex of juror by sex of defendant interaction.

The same 3 x 2 factorial design was used in all four of the studies in which both the physical attractiveness (attractive, unattractive) and sex (male, female) of the defendant were manipulated. The remaining two cells were "no visual conditions" in which no visual information was provided concerning the defendant although participants assigned to these conditions were made aware of the sex of the defendant.

Selecting a Trial Transcript

A transcript of an actual vehicular manslaughter trial was obtained from the California State Law Library, Sacramento, California. This particular trial was selected with the assistance of legal experts because it was felt that the potential for committing this crime is independent of an individual's sex and physical attractiveness.

The transcript was edited, again with the assistance of legal experts, so that the entire trial including the judge's instructions could be presented to jurors in one and a half hours. During this editing process, all references to the names of actual trial participants were deleted and the amount and type of trial evidence supporting the innocence of the accused was balanced with that evidence which supported a guilty verdict. Although the defendant in the original trial testified in his behalf, his testimony was edited from the transcript because of a desire to replicate in part the procedures used by Efran and Sigall and Ostrove. It should be noted, however, that witnesses who talked with the accused immediately subsequent to the crime provided testimony concerning what the accused had told them. This consisted of psychological information concerning the accused's intent and motive.

Finally, three ninety second intervals were edited into the transcript at the beginning, middle and end of the trial during which no information concerning the defendant or the crime was presented. This facilitated editing in a sixty second video shot of the defendant during a portion of the judge's opening remarks to the jurors; during a conference at the judge's bench between the attorneys and the judge; and during a segment of the judge's deliberation instructions to the jury.

Preparing the Stimuli

Three different stimuli were prepared, one for each of the studies to be executed. The first stimulus consisted of a videotaped reenactment of the trial. A courtroom set was constructed at California State University, Sacramento and participants to play the roles of various trial participants were recruited from among the faculty and students in the Department of Communication Studies. Everyone was required to memorize

their parts verbatim from the trial transcript. The reenactment was videotaped in color and served as the stimulus for the full trial (FT) simulation experiment. The trial was one and one-half hours long.

The second study entailed the use of a twenty minute long video synopsis (VS) of the trial. The synopsis obviously contained less information. The information that was edited out was primarily cultural and sociological. The salient psychological information relevant to the intent and motive of the accused presented by three different witnesses who spoke with the defendant subsequent to the accident was presented in this synopsis. The judge's opening remarks to the jurors and his deliberation instructions were included in abbreviated form.

The relevant segments of testimony selected for presentation were copied onto another tape. A fifteen second break between presentations of trial participants were edited in facilitating the use of a voice-over technique in which information was provided concerning who would be testifying next. The synopsis included the three intervals discussed earlier during which no information concerning the defendant or the crime was presented which enabled us to edit in three sixty second shots of the defendant. The only significant differences between this video presentation and the one used in the full trial simulation were the amount of information presented and the length of the presentation.

The stimulus for the third study consisted of a 1,161 word written synopsis (BW) which contained the same testimony that was included in the video synopsis. Therefore, a significant difference between the video synopsis and the written synopsis was the mode of presentation which provided none of the witnesses' paralinguistic and nonverbal behavior. Another

difference concerns the length of time required by subjects to process the information which was considerably less in this study as compared to the video synopsis study. The final difference resulted from the procedure used to visually present the defendant to the subjects in this study. A thirty second color videotaped shot of the defendant sitting at the defense table in the courtroom was shown to the participants in this study. This shorter presentation was used because of the reduced amount of time it would take participants in the study to process the trial information presented.

The stimulus for the final study consisted of a 1,080 word written synopsis which eliminated a piece of testimony from the BW study that supported the innocence of the defendant. This testimony contained cultural and sociological information. Thus, in this study subjects were presented with a guilty written synopsis (GW) which presented more information supporting guilt than innocence. Therefore, one difference between this study and the BW study was the type of evidence presented (primarily guilty versus equal amounts of guilty and innocent evidence). The only other difference was the length of the transcript. Eighty one fewer words were presented in the GW study.

Instructions to the Subjects

In the full trial study subjects were told that Dr. Gerald R. Miller and Dr. Norman E. Fontes, Professors in the Department of Communication at Michigan State University, were conducting research on juror information processing. They were informed that the research in which they were participating was part of this ongoing project. The experimenter told the subjects that they were going to see an actual trial that had been

conducted in California. They were instructed to role-play jurors and not to speak to one another about the trial. The experimenter then told them that either Mr. Mark Johnson (male conditions) or Ms. May Johnson (female conditions) had been charged with the vehicular manslaughter of one Martha Bell. They were further instructed that the defendant had exercised his/her legal right not to testify.

The experimenter then said that the trial would be one and one-half hours in length and that there would be a short break during the middle of the trial. Subjects were told that they would see the defendant at the beginning, the middle, and the end of the trial (in the control conditions this statement was not made). The experimenter then ascertained if the subjects understood the instructions.

The videotape was then played for the subjects. The experimenter monitored all the subjects to make certain that the trial was not discussed. The subjects appeared to be interested in the trial and conscientiously played the role of jurors. The subjects filled out questionnaires at the end of the trial and were debriefed.

The experimental procedures in the video synopsis study were identical to the full trial study with a single exception. Subjects were told that they would see a twenty minute synopsis of an actual trial which had taken place in California. They were informed that all of the facts of the case would be presented in the synopsis and that procedural matters had been edited out.

The experimenter gave the same instructions in the balanced written study with the following deviations. The subjects were told that they would be reading a synopsis of an actual trial which had occurred in

California. The experimenter informed them that California law does not allow the videotaping of trials. In the conditions where the subjects were to see the defendant, they were told that the court had given permission to videotape the defendant and that they would be shown that videotape. In these conditions, the videotape of the defendant was played for 30 seconds immediately after the instructions were completed. The subjects were then asked to read the synopsis and fill out the attached questionnaire. In the control conditions, subjects read the synopsis and filled out the questionnaires immediately after the instructions were completed.

The experimental procedures in the guilty written study were identical to those employed in the balance written study.

Description of Subjects

Subjects for all four studies were solicited from undergraduate communication classes at Michigan State University to participate in exchange for extra-credit. 168 students participated in the FT study of which 99 were males and 69 were females. Their average age was 19.08 years and they had completed an average of 13.2 years of education. 149 students participated in the VS study of which 78 were male and 71 were female. Their average age was 20.33 years and they had completed an average of 13.7 years of education. 140 subjects participated in the BW study of which 79 were male and 61 were female. Their average age was 20.85 years and they had completed an average of 14.6 years of education. 156 students participated in the GW study of which 85 were male and 71 were female. Their average age was 20.0 years and they had completed an average of 13.9 years of education.

Overview

Each of the hypotheses presented earlier was tested in all four studies. In addition, the results of the four studies were compared to assess differences due to the procedures employed.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

This chapter reports the results of each of the four studies and of comparisons between the studies. The first section reports the results of a manipulation check on the attractiveness variable for each study. The following section reports the results of the tests of the hypotheses. In the final section a comparison of the studies is reported which focuses on the guilt and severity of sentence variables. For all statistical tests the .05 significance level is used.

Before presenting these results, it should be noted that a number of demographic variables were measured in each of the studies. These demographic variables included the subjects' locus of control, age, sex, marital status, education, jury experience, television usage, likelihood to drink, likelihood to get drunk, and likelihood to drive and drink. Analysis of variance, t-tests, and chi-square tests were performed, where appropriate, to determine if there were differences between the experimental conditions in each of the studies or between experiments on each of these demographic variables. Where significant differences were observed, correlations between the demographic variables and the dependent variables were obtained to determine if these demographic variables might be confounding the experimental results. These analyses revealed that none of the demographic variables were significantly affecting the experimental results.

Manipulation Check

In the process of filling out the questionnaires, subjects were asked to respond to the seven-point attractiveness measure as a check on the attractiveness manipulation. One-tailed t-tests for uncorrelated means were performed for each study to ascertain if the perceived physical attractiveness of the attractive and unattractive stimulus persons was significantly different.

The results of these manipulation checks are reported in Table 1. These results indicated that the physical attractiveness manipulation was successful in the full trial (FT) study (for the male defendant: $t=3.81$; $df=54$, $p<.05$; for the female defendant: $t=7.25$; $df=52$; $p<.05$), the videotaped synopsis (VS) study (for the male: $t=3.78$; $df=50$; $p<.05$; for the female: $t=6.25$; $df=49$; $p<.05$), and the guilty written (GW) synopsis study (for the male: $t=4.40$; $df=47$; $p<.05$; for the female: $t=3.79$; $df=48$; $p<.05$). However, in the balanced written (BW) synopsis study, the physical attractiveness manipulation was successful for the female defendant ($t=5.69$; $df=45$; $p<.05$), while the manipulation was unsuccessful for the male defendant ($t=1.14$; $df=42$; $p>.05$). This would indicate that tests of the hypothesis involving the male defendant in the BW study may be problematic.

The first four hypotheses focus on the defendant's perceived morality as the dependant variable. A 3x2 analysis of variance with attractiveness and sex of the defendant as the independent variables and perceived morality as the dependent variable was performed on the results of each study. Tables 2 through 5 present the results of these analyses for each of the studies.

Table 1

Manipulation Check of the Physical Attractiveness Variable

Sex and Attractiveness of Defendant	Experimental Procedure			
	FT	VS	BW	GW
Attractive Male	$\bar{\chi}$=4.63 SD=1.28 N=24	$\bar{\chi}$=4.39 SD=.96 N=31	$\bar{\chi}$=4.33 SD=1.02 N=21	$\bar{\chi}$=4.63 SD=.88 N=24
Unattractive Male	$\bar{\chi}$=3.50 SD=1.12 N=32	$\bar{\chi}$=3.38 SD=.92 N=21	$\bar{\chi}$=4.04 SD=.64 N=33	$\bar{\chi}$=3.44 SD=1.00 N=25
Attractive Female	$\bar{\chi}$=5.17 SD=.96 N=24	$\bar{\chi}$=4.52 SD=.99 N=23	$\bar{\chi}$=4.96 SD=.98 N=27	$\bar{\chi}$=4.40 SD=1.08 N=25
Unattractive Female	$\bar{\chi}$=2.96 SD=.99 N=28	$\bar{\chi}$=2.82 SD=.95 N=28	$\bar{\chi}$=3.35 SD=1.04 N=20	$\bar{\chi}$=3.20 SD=1.08 N=25

Table 2

The Effects of the Defendant's Attractiveness and Sex on the Jurors' Perception of the Defendant's Morality in the FT Study

Attractiveness	Sex of Defendant	
	Male	Female
Attractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=4.08 SD=1.02 N=24	$\bar{\chi}$=4.48 SD=1.08 N=23
No Presentation of Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=4.16 SD=1.00 N=31	$\bar{\chi}$=4.41 SD=.69 N=27
Unattractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=4.06 SD=1.11 N=32	$\bar{\chi}$=4.43 SD=.879 N=27

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Attractiveness	2	0.024	0.026
Sex	1	4.411	4.668*
Interaction	2	0.105	0.112
Residual	160	0.945	

*p<.05

Table 3

The Effects of the Defendant's Attractiveness and Sex on the Jurors' Perception of the Defendant's Morality in the VS Study

Attractiveness	Sex of Defendant	
	Male	Female
Attractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=4.26 SD=.82 N=31	$\bar{\chi}$=4.57 SD=.95 N=23
No Presentation of Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=4.41 SD=.91 N=22	$\bar{\chi}$=4.14 SD=.73 N=21
Unattractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=4.33 SD=.97 N=21	$\bar{\chi}$=4.07 SD=1.14 N=27

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Attractiveness	2	0.538	0.624
Sex	1	0.039	0.046
Interaction	2	2.000	2.319
Residual	140	0.863	

*p<.05

Table 4

The Effects of the Defendant's Attractiveness and Sex on the Jurors' Perception of the Defendant's Morality in the BW Study

Attractiveness	Sex of Defendant	
	Male	Female
Attractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=4.38 SD=.87 N=21	$\bar{\chi}$=4.31 SD=.79 N=26
No Presentation of Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=4.26 SD=.81 N=23	$\bar{\chi}$=4.46 SD=.72 N=24
Unattractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=4.50 SD=.98 N=24	$\bar{\chi}$=4.32 SD=.75 N=19

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Attractiveness	2	0.069	0.102
Sex	1	0.007	0.010
Interaction	2	0.437	0.643
Residual	131	0.679	

*p<.05

Table 5

The Effects of the Defendant's Attractiveness and Sex on the Jurors' Perception of the Defendant's Morality in the GW Study

Attractiveness	Sex of Defendant	
	Male	Female
Attractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=4.29 SD=1.27 N=24	$\bar{\chi}$=4.25 SD=1.29 N=24
No Presentation of Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=4.07 SD=1.09 N=28	$\bar{\chi}$=4.45 SD=1.12 N=29
Unattractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=4.20 SD=1.12 N=25	$\bar{\chi}$=3.88 SD=1.13 N=25

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Attractiveness	2	0.870	0.638
Sex	1	0.019	0.014
Interaction	2	1.652	1.212
Residual	149	1.363	

*p<.05

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 predicted that physically attractive defendants would be perceived as less moral than unattractive defendants. No significant results were obtained for the attractiveness variable in any of the analyses of variance. Thus, this hypothesis was not supported and no further tests of the hypothesis were called for.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 predicted that the attractive female defendant would be perceived as more moral than the unattractive female. No significant main effects for attractiveness and no significant interaction effects were observed in any of the studies. This would indicate that the attractiveness variable did not affect the perceived morality and that this is the case for both male and female defendants. Therefore, none of the studies support Hypothesis 2 and no further tests were called for.

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 predicted that physically attractive male defendants would be judged as less moral than attractive female defendants. Given that no sex of defendant or interaction effects were observed in the VS, BW, or GW studies, no further tests of this hypothesis were called for in these studies. However, there was a significant main effect for sex of defendant in the full trial study ($F=4.668$; $df=1,160$; $p<.05$). Thus, a further test of Hypothesis 3 was called for in this study. A one-tailed t-test for independent means comparing the evaluations of the attractive male and female defendant's morality revealed no significant difference between these groups ($t=1.29$; $df=45$; $p>.05$), although the observed value of t approached significance with the relationship in the hypothesized

direction. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 was not supported in any of the studies.

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 predicted that the morality of the attractive female defendant would be evaluated higher by male jurors than by female jurors. One-tailed t-tests for independent samples were employed to test this hypothesis for each of the studies. Table 6 presents the mean morality ratings of the attractive female defendant for male and female jurors in each of the studies. No significant differences between male and female jurors' evaluations were found in the FT ($t<1.0$; $df=21$; $p>.05$), VS ($t<1.0$; $df=21$; $p>.05$), or the BW studies ($t<1.0$; $df=24$; $p>.05$). Thus, Hypothesis 4 was not supported in these studies. However, this hypothesis was supported in the guilty written synopsis study. In this study, male jurors did assign higher morality to the attractive female defendant than did female jurors ($t=1.92$; $df=22$; $p>.05$).

Table 6

Means and Standard Deviations of Male and Female Jurors' Evaluations of the Attractive Female Defendant's Morality in Each of the Studies

Sex of Subject	Experimental Procedure			
	FT	VS	BW	GW
Male	$\bar{X}$=4.39 SD=1.26 N=13	$\bar{X}$=4.40 SD=.97 N=10	$\bar{X}$=4.46 SD=.82 N=11	$\bar{X}$=4.70 SD=1.03 N=13
Female	$\bar{X}$=4.60 SD=.84 N=10	$\bar{X}$=4.70 SD=.95 N=13	$\bar{X}$=4.20 SD=.78 N=15	$\bar{X}$=3.73 SD=1.42 N=11

Hypotheses 5 through 8 focused on the defendant's perceived intelligence as the dependent variable. A 3x2 analysis of variance with attractiveness and sex of the defendant as the independent variables was performed on the data for each study. Tables 7 through 10 present the results of this analysis for each of the studies.

Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 predicted that the physically attractive male defendant would be judged to be less intelligent than the unattractive male defendant. Given that no attractiveness or interaction effects were observed in the VS, BW, or GW studies, no further tests of this hypothesis were called for in these studies. However, there was a significant main effect for attractiveness in the full trial study ($F=5.090$; $df=2,160$; $p<.05$). Thus, a further test of Hypothesis 5 was carried out. A one-tailed t-test for independent means comparing the attractive and unattractive male defendant's perceived intelligence revealed that the attractive male was perceived to be more intelligent than the unattractive male in the FT study ($t=2.15$; $df=54$; $p<.05$). Since this effect was not in the predicted direction, Hypothesis 5 was not supported.

Hypothesis 6

Hypothesis 6 predicted that the physically attractive female defendant would be perceived to be more intelligent than the unattractive female defendant. Given that no attractiveness or interaction effects were observed in the VS, BW, or GW studies, no further tests of this hypothesis were called for in these studies. However, the significant main effect for attractiveness in the full trial study indicated that a further test of Hypothesis 6 was called for. A one-tailed t-test for independent means

Table 7

The Effects of the Defendant's Attractiveness and Sex on the Jurors' Perception of the Defendant's Intelligence in the FT Study

Attractiveness	Sex of Defendant	
	Male	Female
Attractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=4.63 SD=1.25 N=24	$\bar{\chi}$=4.48 SD=.90 N=23
No Presentation of Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=4.16 SD=.97 N=31	$\bar{\chi}$=4.15 SD=.95 N=27
Unattractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=4.03 SD=.82 N=32	$\bar{\chi}$=3.89 SD=.53 N=28

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Attractiveness	2	4.665	5.090*
Sex	1	0.398	0.435
Interaction	2	0.073	0.079
Residual	160	0.916	

*p<.05

Table 8

The Effects of the Defendant's Attractiveness and Sex on the Jurors' Perception of the Defendant's Intelligence in the VS Study

Attractiveness	Sex of Defendant	
	Male	Female
Attractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=4.39 SD=.84 N=31	$\bar{\chi}$=4.35 SD=.89 N=23
No Presentation of Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=4.17 SD=.89 N=23	$\bar{\chi}$=4.76 SD=1.09 N=21
Unattractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=4.38 SD=1.02 N=21	$\bar{\chi}$=3.89 SD=1.28 N=27

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Attractiveness	2	2.140	2.051
Sex	1	1.602	1.536
Interaction	2	1.278	1.225
Residual	141	1.043	

*p<.05

Table 9

The Effects of the Defendant's Attractiveness and Sex on the Jurors' Perception of the Defendant's Intelligence in the BW Study

Attractiveness	Sex of Defendant	
	Male	Female
Attractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=4.43 SD=1.08 N=21	$\bar{\chi}$=4.48 SD=.85 N=27
No Presentation of Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=4.33 SD=1.24 N=24	$\bar{\chi}$=4.25 SD=.90 N=24
Unattractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=4.38 SD=.88 N=24	$\bar{\chi}$=4.16 SD=.50 N=19

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Attractiveness	2	0.506	0.571
Sex	1	0.208	0.235
Interaction	2	0.204	0.230
Residual	133	0.886	

*p<.05

Table 10

The Effects of the Defendant's Attractiveness and Sex on the Jurors' Perception of the Defendant's Intelligence in the GW Study

Attractiveness	Sex of Defendant	
	Male	Female
Attractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=4.67 SD=.82 N=24	$\bar{\chi}$=4.08 SD=1.32 N=24
No Presentation of Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=4.21 SD=1.20 N=28	$\bar{\chi}$=4.31 SD=1.07 N=29
Unattractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=4.00 SD=.96 N=25	$\bar{\chi}$=4.00 SD=1.08 N=25

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Attractiveness	2	1.839	1.556
Sex	1	0.819	0.693
Interaction	2	1.698	1.437
Residual	149	1.182	

*p<.05

comparing the attractive and unattractive female defendants' perceived intelligence revealed that the attractive female was perceived to be more intelligent than the unattractive female in the FT study ($t=2.35$; $df=49$; $p<.05$). Thus, Hypothesis 6 was supported in the FT study only.

Hypothesis 7

Hypothesis 7 predicted that the physically attractive male defendant would be perceived to be less intelligent than the attractive female defendant. No significant main effect for sex and no interaction effects were observed in any of the studies. This would indicate that the sex variable did not affect the perceived intelligence variable and that this is the case for attractive male and female defendants. Thus, Hypothesis 7 was not supported in any of the studies.

Hypothesis 8

Hypothesis 8 predicted that the intelligence of the physically attractive female defendant would be evaluated higher by male jurors than by female jurors. One-tailed t-tests for independent samples were employed to test this hypothesis for each of the studies. Table 11 presents the mean intelligence ratings of the attractive female defendant by male and female jurors. No significant differences between male and female jurors' evaluations were found in the FT ($t<1.0$; $df=21$; $p>.05$), VS ($t<1.0$; $df=21$; $p>.05$), BW ($t=1.01$; $df=25$; $p>.05$), or the GW studies ($t=1.58$; $df=22$; $p>.05$). Thus, Hypothesis 8 was not supported in any of the studies.

Hypothesis 9

Hypothesis 9 predicted that the unattractive defendants would be perceived to be external in locus of control, while the attractive defendants would be perceived as internally controlled. A 3x2 analysis

Table 11

Means and Standard Deviations of the Male and Female Jurors' Evaluations of the Attractive Female Defendant's Intelligence in Each of the Studies

Sex of Subject	Experimental Procedures			
	FT	VS	BW	GW
Male	$\bar{X}$=4.54 SD=.97 N=13	$\bar{X}$=4.10 SD=.74 N=10	$\bar{X}$=4.67 SD=.65 N=12	$\bar{X}$=4.46 SD=.88 N=13
Female	$\bar{X}$=4.40 SD=.84 N=10	$\bar{X}$=4.54 SD=.97 N=13	$\bar{X}$=4.33 SD=.97 N=15	$\bar{X}$=3.64 SD=1.63 N=11

of variance with attractiveness and sex of the defendant as the independent variables was performed on the data for each study. Tables 12 through 15 present the results of this analysis for each of the studies. No significant results were obtained for the attractiveness variable on the locus of control variable in any of the studies. Thus, this hypothesis was not supported and no further tests were called for.

Hypothesis 10

Hypothesis 10 predicted that male jurors would perceive a male defendant's locus of control to be internal and a female defendant's locus of control to be external. One-tailed t-tests for independent samples were employed to test this hypothesis for each of the studies. Table 16 presents the mean locus of control ratings of the male and female defendants by male jurors in each of the studies. No significant differences between the male jurors' evaluations of the male and female defendant's

Table 12

The Effects of the Defendant's Attractiveness and Sex on the Jurors' Perception of the Defendant's Locus of Control in the FT Study

Attractiveness	Sex of Defendant	
	Male	Female
Attractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=17.00 SD=5.30 N=23	$\bar{\chi}$=17.67 SD=3.76 N=21
No Presentation of Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=18.62 SD=4.17 N=29	$\bar{\chi}$=17.28 SD=5.42 N=26
Unattractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=18.55 SD=4.30 N=29	$\bar{\chi}$=16.82 SD=4.32 N=27

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Attractiveness	2	5.337	0.253
Sex	1	34.674	1.644
Interaction	2	19.899	.944
Residual	154	21.085	

*p<.05

Table 13

The Effects of the Defendant's Attractiveness and Sex on the Jurors' Perception of the Defendant's Locus of Control in the VS Study

Attractiveness	Sex of Defendant	
	Male	Female
Attractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=14.87 SD=5.17 N=30	$\bar{\chi}$=15.96 SD=5.83 N=23
No Presentation of Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=15.68 SD=6.01 N=22	$\bar{\chi}$=17.20 SD=4.90 N=20
Unattractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=17.95 SD=3.85 N=20	$\bar{\chi}$=16.74 SD=5.68 N=27

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Attractiveness	2	44.737	1.579
Sex	1	0.004	0.000
Interaction	2	32.261	1.139
Residual	137	28.326	

*p<.05

Table 14

The Effects of the Defendant's Attractiveness and Sex on the Jurors' Perception of the Defendant's Locus of Control in the BW Study

Attractiveness	Sex of Defendant	
	Male	Female
Attractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=17.30 SD=3.87 N=20	$\bar{\chi}$=14.83 SD=3.62 N=24
No Presentation of Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=16.87 SD=5.11 N=23	$\bar{\chi}$=17.43 SD=5.85 N=21
Unattractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=16.92 SD=5.58 N=24	$\bar{\chi}$=18.05 SD=4.83 N=20

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Attractiveness	2	25.904	1.087
Sex	1	2.156	0.090
Interaction	2	40.831	1.713
Residual	126	23.842	

*p<.05

Table 15

The Effects of the Defendant's Attractiveness and Sex on the Jurors' Perception of the Defendant's Locus of Control in the GW Study

Attractiveness	Sex of Defendant	
	Male	Female
Attractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=16.58 SD=4.56 N=24	$\bar{\chi}$=16.05 SD=5.36 N=22
No Presentation of Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=14.96 SD=5.41 N=28	$\bar{\chi}$=15.93 SD=5.33 N=29
Unattractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=14.82 SD=5.11 N=22	$\bar{\chi}$=18.36 SD=4.14 N=22

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Attractiveness	2	18.948	0.748
Sex	1	59.127	2.335
Interaction	2	47.890	1.891
Residual	141	25.319	

*p<.05

Table 16

Means and Standard Deviations of the Male Jurors' Evaluations of the Male and Female Defendants' Locus of Control in Each Study

Sex of Defendant	Experimental Procedure			
	FT	VS	BW	GW
Male	$\bar{X}$=18.44 SD=4.09 N=41	$\bar{X}$=16.47 SD=4.57 N=32	$\bar{X}$=15.54 SD=5.34 N=37	$\bar{X}$=14.43 SD=5.27 N=42
Female	$\bar{X}$=17.24 SD=4.71 N=54	$\bar{X}$=14.93 SD=6.29 N=42	$\bar{X}$=16.54 SD=5.22 N=37	$\bar{X}$=16.18 SD=4.84 N=39

locus of control were found in the FT ($t=1.30$; $df=93$; $p>.05$), VS ($t=1.17$; $df=72$; $p>.05$), BW ($t<1.0$; $df=72$; $p>.05$) or the GW studies ($t=1.55$; $df=79$; $p>.05$). Thus, Hypothesis 10 was not supported in any of the studies.

Hypothesis 11

Hypothesis 11 predicted that physically attractive defendants would be perceived as less likely to commit future crimes than unattractive defendants. A 3x2 analysis of variance with attractiveness and sex of the defendant as the independent variables was performed on the results of the likelihood to commit future crimes variable for each of the studies. Tables 17 through 20 present the results of these analyses. No significant results were observed in any of the studies. Thus, Hypothesis 11 was not supported and no further tests were called for.

Table 17

The Effects of the Defendant's Attractiveness and Sex on the Jurors' Perception of the Likelihood of Future Crimes in the FT Study

Attractiveness	Sex of Defendant	
	Male	Female
Attractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=2.00 SD=.66 N=15	$\bar{\chi}$=1.69 SD=.75 N=13
No Presentation of Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=2.16 SD=.83 N=19	$\bar{\chi}$=2.06 SD=.85 N=16
Unattractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=1.90 SD=.64 N=20	$\bar{\chi}$=1.77 SD=.66 N=17

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Attractiveness	2	0.816	1.502
Sex	1	0.715	1.316
Interaction	2	0.096	0.176
Residual	94	0.544	

*p<.05

Table 18

The Effects of the Defendant's Attractiveness and Sex on the Jurors' Perception of the Likelihood of Future Crimes in the VS Study

Attractiveness	Sex of Defendant	
	Male	Female
Attractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=1.88 SD=.70 N=33	$\bar{\chi}$=2.09 SD=.67 N=23
No Presentation of Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=2.05 SD=.65 N=22	$\bar{\chi}$=2.24 SD=.77 N=21
Unattractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=1.91 SD=.63 N=21	$\bar{\chi}$=2.04 SD=.84 N=28

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Attractiveness	2	0.078	0.152
Sex	1	0.755	1.474
Interaction	2	0.038	0.074
Residual	143	0.512	

*p<.05

Table 19

The Effects of the Defendant's Attractiveness and Sex on the Jurors' Perception of the Likelihood of Future Crimes in the BW Study

Attractiveness	Sex of Defendant	
	Male	Female
Attractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=2.00 SD=.89 N=21	$\bar{\chi}$=1.93 SD=.62 N=27
No Presentation of Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=1.92 SD=.72 N=24	$\bar{\chi}$=2.00 SD=.52 N=23
Unattractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=2.04 SD=.75 N=24	$\bar{\chi}$=2.30 SD=.66 N=20

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Attractiveness	2	0.643	1.320
Sex	1	0.248	0.508
Interaction	2	0.313	0.643
Residual	133	0.488	

*p<.05

Table 20

The Effects of the Defendant's Attractiveness and Sex on the Jurors' Perception of the Likelihood of Future Crimes in the GW Study

Attractiveness	Sex of Defendant	
	Male	Female
Attractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=1.83 SD=.65 N=23	$\bar{\chi}$=1.87 SD=.76 N=23
No Presentation of Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=2.04 SD=.84 N=28	$\bar{\chi}$=1.93 SD=.65 N=29
Unattractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=2.12 SD=.67 N=25	$\bar{\chi}$=2.13 SD=.85 N=24

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Attractiveness	2	0.894	1.631
Sex	1	0.023	0.042
Interaction	2	0.078	0.142
Residual	146	0.548	

*p<.05

Hypothesis 12

Hypothesis 12 predicted that attractive defendants would be found guilty less often than unattractive defendants. Given that verdict was operationalized as a dichotomous variable, the appropriate method of analysis was deemed to be the chi-square statistic. One-tailed chi-square tests were performed on 3x2 contingency tables with attractiveness and sex of defendant as the independent variables and with innocent and guilty verdicts as the dependent variables. Table 21 presents the frequency of innocent verdicts in each study, while Table 22 presents the frequency of guilty verdicts. No significant differences between the frequency of innocent verdicts for the attractiveness and sex variables were observed in the FT (x^2=1.21; df=2; p>.05), VS (x^2=1.97; df=2; p>.05), BW (x^2<1.0; df=2; p>.05), or the GW studies (x^2=1.77; df=2; p>.05). Moreover, no significant differences between the frequency of guilty verdicts for the attractiveness and sex variables were observed in the FT (x^2<1.0; df=2; p>.05), VS (x^2=1.58; df=2; p>.05), BW (x^2<1.0; df=2; p>.05) or the GW studies (x^2<1.0; df=2; p>.05). Thus, Hypothesis 12 was not supported in any of the studies and no further tests of the hypothesis were called for.

Hypothesis 13

Hypothesis 13 predicted that jurors who found the defendant guilty would find the attractive defendants' guilty of a less severe crime than unattractive defendants. This was operationalized by asking jurors to find the defendant guilty of a misdemeanor or a felony. Given that this was a dichotomous measure, the chi-square statistic was deemed the appropriate method of analysis.

Table 21

The Obtained Frequencies for Innocent Verdicts in Each Study
M=Male Defendant, F=Female Defendant

Attractiveness	Experimental Procedure							
	FT		VS		BW		GW	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Attractive	7	11	21	7	12	17	8	6
No Presentation	15	12	9	6	16	15	12	4
Unattractive	11	12	12	9	13	12	8	2

Table 22

The Obtained Frequencies for Guilty Verdicts in Each Study
M=Male Defendant, F=Female Defendant

Attractiveness	Experimental Procedure							
	FT		VS		BW		GW	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Attractive	17	13	12	16	9	10	16	19
No Presentation	16	17	14	15	8	9	16	25
Unattractive	21	16	9	19	11	8	17	22

Table 23 presents the frequency of misdemeanor verdicts by attractiveness and sex for each study and Table 24 presents the felony verdicts. Chi-square analysis was used to evaluate the results of the frequency of misdemeanor and felony sentences in the FT and VS studies. In addition, chi-square analysis was applied to the results of the GW study for felony sentences. However, in the BW study and in the case of misdemeanors in the GW study the expected cell frequencies were too small to allow an appropriate test of the attractiveness by sex contingency tables for the chi-square statistic. Thus, the sex variable was collapsed to examine the effects of the attractiveness variable and the attractiveness variable was collapsed to examine the effects of the sex variable in these studies. The chi-square statistic was employed to examine these collapsed contingency tables which are presented in Tables 25 through 28.

No significant differences on the frequency of misdemeanor verdicts were observed in the FT ($x^2<1.0$; df=2; $p>.05$), VS ($x^2<1.0$; df=2; $p>.05$), BW (for attractiveness: $x^2<1.0$; df=2; $p>.05$; for sex: $x^2<1.0$; df=1; p.>05) or the GW studies (for attractiveness: $x^2<1.0$; df=2; $p>.05$; for sex: $x^2=3.1$; df=1; $p>.05$). Moreover, no significant differences on the frequency of felony verdicts were observed in the FT ($x^2<1.0$; df=2; $p>.05$), VS ($x^2=3.39$; df=2; $p>.05$), BW (for attractiveness: $x^2=1.18$; df=2; $p>.05$; for sex: $x^2<1.0$; df=1; $p>.05$), or the GW studies ($x^2=1.81$; df=2; $p>.05$). Thus, no support was found for Hypothesis 13.

Hypothesis 14

Hypothesis 14 predicted that jurors would recommend more severe punishment for unattractive defendants than for attractive defendants. The punishment operationalization focused on the number of months or

Table 23

The Obtained Verdicts for Misdemeanors in Each Study
M=Male Defendant, F=Female Defendant

Attractiveness	Experimental Procedure							
	FT		VS		BW		GW	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Attractive	7	8	8	10	5	5	5	9
No Presentation	8	13	6	8	6	5	6	7
Unattractive	14	13	7	10	5	5	3	9

Table 24

The Obtained Frequencies for Felonies in Each Study
M=Male Defendant, F=Female Defendant

Attractiveness	Experimental Procedure							
	FT		VS		BW		GW	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Attractive	10	5	4	6	3	5	11	9
No Presentation	9	4	9	8	2	3	9	16
Unattractive	7	3	2	9	6	3	14	14

Table 25

The Obtained Frequency of Misdemeanor Verdicts in the BW and GW Studies After Collapsing Attractiveness

Sex of Defendant	Experimental Procedure	
	BW	GW
Male	16	14
Female	15	25

Table 26

The Obtained Frequency of Misdemeanor Verdicts in the BW and GW Studies After Collapsing Sex

Attractiveness	Experimental Procedure	
	BW	GW
Attractive	10	14
No Presentation	11	13
Unattractive	10	12

Table 27

The Obtained Frequency of Felony Findings in the BW Study for Sex After Collapsing Attractiveness

Sex of Defendant	Felony Verdicts in BW Study
Male	11
Female	11

Table 28

The Obtained Frequency of Felony Findings in the BW Study for Attractiveness After Collapsing Sex

Attractiveness	Felony Verdicts in BW Study
Attractive	8
No Presentation	5
Unattractive	9

years that the jurors recommended the defendant be incarcerated. These results were to be subjected to analysis of variance. However, examination of the obtained cell sizes indicated that they were too small to be appropriate for analysis of variance. Therefore, these length of sentence variables were collapsed into dichotomous measures. Specifically, a misdemeanor sentence was dichotomized as probation versus jail sentence, while a felony sentence was dichotomized as probation versus prison sentence. One-tailed chi-square tests were then performed on these collapsed severity of punishment variables.

While it was desirable to use 3x2 contingency tables to examine the effect of the attractiveness and sex variables on severity of punishment, the expected cell frequencies were too small in all studies to allow an appropriate test by the chi-square statistic. Consequently, the data were collapsed to facilitate assessments of the independent effects of a defendant's physical attractiveness and sex upon the severity of punishment. The collapsed contingency tables are presented in Tables 29 through 36. Unfortunately, after collapsing the data, the frequencies in some of the cells, including felony probation sentences for the full video trial, video synopsis, and balanced written synopsis and felony incarceration results for the balanced written synopsis, were still too small for chi-square analysis. In these cases, no statistical tests were performed. In all other cases, chi-square tests for significance were performed.

No significant differences for misdemeanor probation were observed in the FT (for attractiveness: $x^2=1.0$; df=2; $p>.05$; for sex: $x^2<1.0$; df=1; $p>.05$), VS (for attractiveness: $x^2<1.0$; df=2; $p>.05$; for sex:

Table 29

The Obtained Frequency of Misdemeanor Probation Findings in Each Study for Sex After Collapsing Attractiveness

Sex of Defendant	Experimental Procedure			
	FT	VS	BW	GW
Male	12	11	8	5
Female	14	15	7	12

Table 30

The Obtained Frequency of Misdemeanor Probation Findings in Each Study for Attractiveness After Collapsing Sex

Attractiveness	Experimental Procedure			
	FT	VS	BW	GW
Attractive	8	11	3	8
No Presentation	7	8	5	5
Unattractive	11	7	7	4

Table 31

The Obtained Frequency of Misdemeanor Incarceration Findings in Each Study for Sex After Collapsing Attractiveness

Sex of Defendant	Experimental Procedure			
	FT	VS	BW	GW
Male	16	10	8	9
Female	20	13	8	13

Table 32

The Obtained Frequency of Misdemeanor Incarceration Findings in Each Study for Attractiveness After Collapsing Sex

Attractiveness	Experimental Procedure			
	FT	VS	BW	GW
Attractive	7	7	7	6
No Presentation	13	6	6	8
Unattractive	16	10	3	8

Table 33

The Obtained Frequency of Felony Probation Findings in Each Study for Sex After Collapsing Attractiveness

Sex of Defendant	Experimental Procedure			
	FT	VS	BW	GW
Male	3	3	5	16
Female	3	7	7	15

Table 34

The Obtained Frequency of Felony Probation Findings in Each Study for Attractiveness After Collapsing Sex

Attractiveness	Experimental Procedure			
	FT	VS	BW	GW
Attractive	3	2	5	12
No Presentation	1	3	3	5
Unattractive	2	5	4	14

Table 35

The Obtained Frequency for Felony Incarceration in Each Study for Sex After Collapsing Attractiveness

Sex of Defendant	Experimental Procedure			
	FT	VS	BW	GW
Male	21	12	6	18
Female	9	17	4	24

Table 36

The Obtained Frequency for Felony Incarceration in Each Study for Attractiveness After Collapsing Sex

Attractiveness	Experimental Procedure			
	FT	VS	BW	GW
Attractive	10	9	3	8
No Presentation	12	14	2	20
Unattractive	8	6	5	14

$x^2<1.0$; df=1; p>.05), BW (for attractiveness: $x^2=1.62$; df=2; p>.05; for sex: $x^2<1.0$; df=1; p.>05), or the GW studies (for attractiveness: $x^2=1.53$; df=2; p>.05; for sex: $x^2=2.88$; df=1; p>.05). In addition, no significant differences for misdemeanor incarceration were observed in the FT (for attractiveness: $x^2=3.49$; df=2; p>.05; for sex: $x^2<1.0$; df=1; p>.05), VS (for attractiveness: $x^2=1.13$; df=2; p>.05; for sex: $x^2<1.0$; df=1; p>.05), BW (for attractiveness: $x^2=1.62$; df=2; p>.05; for sex: $x^2<1.0$; df=1; p>.05), or the GW studies (for attractiveness: $x^2<1.0$; df=2; p>.05; for sex: $x^2<1.0$; df=1; p>.05). For the relationships that could be tested, no significant differences for felony probation were observed in the VS (for sex: $x^2=1.60$; df=1; p>.05), BW (for sex: $x^2<1.0$; df=1; p>.05), or GW studies (for attractiveness: $x^2=4.32$; df=2; p>.05; for sex: $x^2<1.0$; df=1; p>.05).

In the full trial study, male defendants who were found guilty of committing a felony were more likely to be sentenced to a period of incarceration than female defendants found guilty of committing a felony ($x^2=4.80$; df=1; p<.05). However, no significant differences on felony incarceration for the attractiveness variable were observed in the full trial study ($x^2<1.0$; df=2; p>.05). For the relationships that could be tested in the remaining studies, no significant differences for felony incarceration were observed in the VS (for attractiveness: $x^2=3.38$; df=2; p>.05; for sex: $x^2<1.0$; df=1; p>.05), BW (for sex: $x^2<1.0$; df=1; p>.05), or the GW studies (for attractiveness: $x^2=5.14$; df=2; p>.05; for sex: $x^2<1.0$; df=1; p>.05).

The results of these analyses indicate that no differences attributable to the attractiveness of the defendant were observed for either

operationalization of the severity of punishment variable in any of the studies. Thus, Hypothesis 14 was not supported in any of the four studies.

Hypothesis 15

Hypothesis 15 predicted that jurors in the FT study who did not see the defendant would retain more trial-related information than jurors who did see the defendant. A 3x2 analysis of variance with attractiveness and sex of the defendant as the independent variables and information retention as the dependent variable was performed on the results of the FT study. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 37.

No significant differences were observed for the attractiveness variable or for interactions of the attractiveness and sex variables. This would indicate that Hypothesis 15 was not supported and no further tests were called for.

Summary of Significant Results

This section provides a summary of the hypotheses which received support and a brief report of significant results which were not hypothesized. Hypothesis 4, which predicted that male jurors would evaluate the attractive female defendant's morality more positively than female jurors would, was supported in the guilty written synopsis study. Hypothesis 6, which predicted that the attractive female defendant would be perceived by jurors as more intelligent than the unattractive female defendant, was supported in the full trial study. Neither of these hypotheses was supported in the remaining studies and none of the other 13 hypotheses received support in any of the studies.

Three unhypothesized significant results were observed in the full trial study. Specifically, jurors in this study perceived female

Table 37

The Effects of the Defendant's Attractiveness and Sex on the Jurors' Information Retention in the FT Study

Attractiveness	Sex of Defendant	
	Male	Female
Attractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=38.74 SD=4.53 N=23	$\bar{\chi}$=38.81 SD=3.72 N=21
No Presentation of Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=39.21 SD=5.33 N=28	$\bar{\chi}$=40.42 SD=5.03 N=26
Unattractive Defendant	$\bar{\chi}$=39.38 SD=4.62 N=29	$\bar{\chi}$=37.25 SD=5.02 N=24

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
Attractiveness	2	27.574	1.210
Sex	1	3.157	0.139
Interaction	2	38.068	1.671
Residual	145	22.787	

*p<.05

defendants as more moral than male defendants and attractive defendants as more intelligent than unattractive defendants. In addition, jurors in the full trial study were more likely to recommend a period of incarceration for male defendants found guilty of a felony than for female defendants found guilty of a felony.

No other significant results were observed in any of the studies on the dependent variables.

Comparison of the Experimental Procedures

This paper has argued that the results of previous studies may be an artifact of the procedures used and that these simulations may lack ecological validity. This section of the paper makes an attempt to ascertain if this is the case.

In actual criminal trials, jurors may be asked to make two decisions: (1) They must decide whether the defendant is innocent or guilty and (2) if the defendant is found guilty, the jurors may be asked to determine if the defendant is guilty of a misdemeanor or a felony. Given that these are the only decisions that the jurors are asked to make, this paper will report comparisons of the results of the verdict variable on guilty versus innocent and misdemeanor versus felony verdicts across procedures.

It was noted earlier that the Sigall and Ostrove study may be the most ecologically valid of the past studies in this area. Given that their only measure of severity of sentence was the length of incarceration, this paper will compare the results of the recommended punishment severity of sentence operationalizations across studies.

Comparisons of the results for these variables were made between the full trial and video synopsis studies to ascertain if the amount of information presented to role-playing jurors had an independent effect on their decisions. In addition, comparisons of the results of the video synopsis and balanced written synopsis were made to ascertain if the mode of presenting information independently affected jurors' decisions. Moreover, comparisons of the results of the balanced written synopsis and the guilty written synopsis were made to assess the independent effect of the type of evidence presented.

Comparisons of the results of the full trial and balanced written synopsis were also made. If there were no differences attributable to the amount of information observed in the FT versus VS comparison and no differences attributable to the mode of presentation in the VS versus BW comparison, then any differences in the FT versus BW comparison would be attributable to the conjoint effects of amount of information and mode of presentation. If differences were observed for both amount of information and mode of presentation in the FT versus VS and VS versus BW comparisons, then any differences in the FT versus BW comparison would again be attributable to the conjoint effect of amount of information and mode of presentation. However, if differences were observed for amount of information but not for mode of presentation in the FT versus VS and the VS versus BW comparisons, then any differences in the FT versus BW comparison would be attributable to amount of information. Finally, if differences were observed for mode of presentation but not for amount of information in the preliminary analysis, then any differences in the FT versus BW comparison would be attributable to the mode of presentation.

Verdict (Guilty Versus Innocent)

Given that the verdict variable was operationalized as a dichotomous variable, the appropriate form of analysis for comparing the results of the studies was deemed to be the chi-square statistic. Since none of the studies found significant differences attributable to the sex or attractiveness of the defendant, the attractiveness and sex variables were collapsed to examine differences across simulations on verdicts rendered. 2x2 contingency tables of verdict by methodology were then analyzed by the chi-square statistic. Table 38 presents the results on the verdict variable for each of the studies.

Table 38

The Observed Frequency of Guilty and Innocent Verdicts in Each Study

Verdict	Experimental Procedure			
	FT	VS	BW	GW
Guilty	97	85	55	115
Innocent	70	64	85	40

No significant differences on the verdict variable were observed between the FT and VS studies ($x^2<1.0$; df=1; $p<.05$) indicating that the amount of information presented had no effect on the verdict rendered.

A comparison of the video synopsis and balanced written synopsis studies revealed that the subjects in the VS study were more likely to find the defendant guilty than subjects in the BW study ($x^2=8.42$; df=1;

$p<.05$). This finding indicated that the mode of presenting the testimony had an effect on the verdicts rendered. The comparison of the full trial and balanced written studies revealed that the subjects in the full trial study were more likely to find the defendant guilty than the subjects in the balanced written synopsis study ($x^2=10.03$; $df=1$; $p<.05$). This finding reinforces the conclusion that the mode of presenting the information affected the verdicts rendered.

The comparison of the BW and GW studies showed that subjects in the guilty written synopsis study were more likely to find the defendant guilty than subjects in the balanced written synopsis study ($x^2=35.29$; $df=1$; $p<.05$). This finding indicates that, as expected, the type of evidence presented differentially affected the verdicts rendered.

Verdict (Misdemeanor Versus Felony)

Given that this variable was operationalized as dichotomous, the appropriate form of analysis was deemed to be the chi-square statistic. Since none of the studies found differences on this operationalization attributable to the attractiveness or sex of the defendant, the attractiveness and sex variables were collapsed to examine differences across procedures. 2x2 contingency tables of verdict by procedures were then analyzed with the chi-square statistic. Table 39 presents the results on this variable for each of the studies.

No significant differences were observed in the FT and VS ($x^2<1.0$; $df=1$; $p>.05$), VS and BW ($x^2<1.0$; $df=1$; $p>.05$), or the FT and BW comparisons ($x^2<1.0$; $df=1$; $p>.05$).

Subjects in the guilty written synopsis study were more likely to find the defendant guilty of a felony than subjects in the balanced

Table 39

The Observed Frequencies of Misdemeanor and Felony Verdicts in Each of the Studies

Severity of Verdict	Experimental Procedure			
	FT	VS	BW	GW
Felony	38	38	22	73
Misdemeanor	63	49	31	39

written synopsis study (x^2=7.31; df=1; p<.05) indicating that the type of evidence presented affected the type of crime defendants were found guilty of.

Severity of Sentence (Recommended Punishment for Misdemeanor)

Given that the misdemeanor sentence operationalization was collapsed to a dichotomous variable, the appropriate form of analysis was deemed to be the chi-square statistic. Since none of the studies found differences on this variable attributable to the attractiveness or sex of the defendant, the attractiveness and sex variables were collapsed to examine differences across simulations on this variable. 2x2 contingency tables of recommended punishment by simulation were then analyzed with the chi-square statistic. Table 40 presents the results of this punishment variable for each of the studies.

No significant differences on the misdemeanor sentence variable were observed in the FT and VS (x^2=1.84; df=1; p>.05), VS and BW (x^2<1.0; df=1; p>.05), FT and BW (x^2<1.0; df=1; p>.05), or the BW and GW comparisons (x^2<1.0; df=1; p>.05).

Table 40

The Observed Frequencies of Incarceration and Probation Recommendations for Defendants Found Guilty of a Misdemeanor in Each Study

Misdemeanor Sentence	Experimental Procedure			
	FT	VS	BW	GW
Incarceration	36	23	16	17
Probation	26	26	15	22

Severity of Sentence (Recommended Punishment for Felony)

Given that the felony sentence operationalization was collapsed to a dichotomous variable, the appropriate method of analysis was deemed to be the chi-square statistic. The results of the full trial study indicated that the sex of the defendant differentially affected the recommended punishment for defendants found guilty of a felony. No significant relationship between sex of defendant and recommended punishment for a felony was observed in any of the remaining studies. In addition, none of the studies found differences on felony punishment attributable to the attractiveness of the defendant. Given the significant sex of defendant results in the FT study, the most appropriate comparisons involving the FT study should include the sex variable. However, an inspection of these comparisons revealed that the expected cell frequencies were too small to allow an appropriate test by the chi-square statistic. Thus, the attractiveness and sex variables were collapsed to examine differences across simulations on felony punishment. 2x2 contingency tables of recommended punishment by simulation were then analyzed with the chi-square

statistic. Table 41 presents the results for this punishment variable for each of the studies.

Table 41

The Observed Frequencies of Incarceration and Probation Recommendations for Defendants Found Guilty of a Felony in Each Study

Felony Sentence	Experimental Procedure			
	FT	VS	BW	GW
Incarceration	30	29	10	43
Probation	6	10	12	31

No significant differences on the felony sentence variable were observed in the FT and VS ($x^2<1.0$; df=1; $p>.05$), or the BW and GW comparisons ($x^2=1.54$; df=1; $p>.05$).

A comparison of the VS and BW studies revealed that the subjects in the video synopsis study were more likely to recommend incarceration than subjects in the balanced written synopsis study ($x^2=3.92$; df=1; $p<.05$) indicating that the mode of presenting the information had an effect on the felony sentence variable. A comparison of the FT and BW studies revealed that subjects in the full trial study were more likely to recommend incarceration than subjects in the balanced written synopsis study ($x^2=7.47$; df=1; $p<.05$). This finding reinforces the conclusion that the mode of presenting the information affected the felony sentences.

Summary of Significant Findings for Comparisons

Role-playing jurors in both the full trial and video synopsis studies were more likely to find the defendant guilty and recommend incarceration for a felony than jurors in the balanced written synopsis study. These findings indicate that the mode of presentation significantly affected jurors' verdicts and recommendations for punishment of felonies. In addition, role-playing jurors in the guilty written synopsis study were more likely to find the defendant guilty and guilty of a felony than jurors in the balanced written synopsis study, indicating that the type of evidence affected jurors' verdicts.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

This chapter will first address the findings for the attractiveness and sex variables. The results for the comparison of the experimental procedures will then be discussed.

Effects of the Defendant's Attractiveness and Sex

Fourteen hypotheses were tested in each of the four studies reported in this paper. One further hypothesis was tested in the full trial study. A total of 57 hypothesis tests were carried out. Only Hypothesis 4 in the guilty written study and Hypothesis 6 in the full trial study were supported. Given the .05 significance level used, these are probably chance findings. Although this possibility is likely, it seems useful to examine other possible reasons for these findings.

In Chapter III it was reported that a number of demographic variables were measured in each of the studies. Analysis of these data revealed no differences between conditions within studies or across studies which were affecting the experimental results. However, this does not rule out the possibility that the observed differences were due to sampling error.

While the significant results for both Hypothesis 4 and Hypothesis 6 may be attributable to either chance or sampling error, these findings could reflect differences due to the independent variables. The following discussion focuses on this possibility and suggests reasons for discovering significant relationships in one study while not in others.

Hypothesis 4, which was supported in the guilty written study, predicted that the morality of the attractive female defendant would be evaluated higher by male jurors than by female jurors. Possible reasons for the discrepancy between the results of the guilty written study and the remaining studies can be assessed by comparing the experimental procedures employed in these studies. Specifically, differences in the amount of information presented, the mode of presentation, and/or the type of evidence presented may account for the discrepant findings. However, if the amount of information presented produced the significant results in the guilty written study, then similar results should have been observed in the balanced written study and the video synopsis study. Moreover, if the mode of presentation produced the significant finding, a significant result should have been observed in the balanced written study. Therefore, neither the amount of information presented nor the mode of presentation readily accounts for the observed results.

The possibility remains that the type of evidence presented produced the discrepant results. In the guilty written study jurors were presented with more evidence concerning the defendant's guilt than his/her innocence. In all other studies equal amounts of evidence supporting guilt and innocence were presented. Thus, the sole difference between the guilty written study and all of the remaining studies was the type of evidence presented. The results for the morality variable indicate that when male and female jurors are presented with primarily evidence supporting the guilt of an attractive female defendant, male jurors attribute greater morality to her than do female jurors.

One possible explanation for this observed relationship concerns the similarity of the defendant and the jurors. A number of studies

have shown that socially stigmatized others who possess personalities or attitudes similar to an individual's own personality or attitudes are evaluated more negatively than socially stigmatized others who possess dissimilar personalities or attitudes (e.g., Novack & Lerner, 1968; Mettee, 1971). The female jurors in the guilty written study probably perceived the attractive female defendant to be more similar to them than did the male jurors. In addition, since subjects in the guilty written study were given primarily evidence supporting the guilt of the defendant, the defendant likely would be perceived as more socially stigmatized in this study. The results for the verdict variable support this contention: The defendant was found guilty more often in the guilty written study than in the other studies. Thus, the attractive female defendant in the guilty written study may have been perceived as a socially stigmatized similar other by female jurors and a socially stigmatized dissimilar other by male jurors. If socially stigmatized similar others are evaluated more negatively than socially stigmatized dissimilar others, then female jurors would be likely to evaluate the morality of the attractive female defendant lower than would the male jurors. This would not have occurred in the other studies reported here where equal amounts of evidence supporting the defendant's guilt and innocence were presented, thus lessening the amount of social stigma attached to the defendant.

If this reasoning is valid, then female jurors should have evaluated the attractive female defendant more negatively than male jurors on dimensions other than morality. Hypothesis 8 predicted that male jurors would perceive the attractive female defendant to be more intelligent than would the female jurors. While this hypothesis was not supported in any of the studies, the relationship did approach significance in the

guilty written study ($t=1.58$; $df=22$; $p\simeq.06$). Thus, some support for the stigmatized similar-dissimilar other argument may be inferred.

Hypothesis 6 predicted that the attractive female defendant would be perceived as more intelligent than the unattractive female defendant. This hypothesis was supported in the full trial study only. Moreover, in the full trial study the attractive defendant's intelligence was evaluated higher than the unattractive defendant's regardless of the sex variable, while this was not the case in the remaining studies. Again, differences in the amount of information presented, the mode of presentation, and/or the type of evidence presented may conceivably account for the discrepant findings. However, if the mode of presentation produced the significant results in the full trial study, significant results should also have been observed in the video synopsis study. In addition, if the type of evidence presented produced the full trial results, the same results should have been observed in the video synopsis and balanced written studies. Therefore, neither the mode of presentation nor the type of evidence presented could account for the discrepant results.

The possibility remains that the amount of information presented could account for the discrepant results. More specifically, either the sheer amount of information presented or some bit(s) of information which was deleted from the full trial stimulus to produce the remaining trial stimuli may account for these findings.

Although it would be impossible to evaluate the effect of each piece of deleted information, there is one intriguing argument concerning the effect of the sheer amount of information presented. During the execution of the synoptic studies, a number of subjects found it difficult to make attributions concerning the defendant's intelligence based on the

information available to them. When this occurred, the subjects were told to do the best they could. Given that the subjects felt they did not have information on which intelligence attributions could be based, they may have decided to attribute what they considered to be average intelligence for individuals in this culture; i.e., when subjects in the synoptic studies, who felt they did not possess sufficient information to make intelligence attributions, were forced to make attributions, they may have resorted to employing cultural information to evaluate the defendant's intelligence.

In the full trial study no subject in either the attractive or unattractive conditions expressed an inability to make attributions concerning the defendant's intelligence. Given the sheer amount of available information, these subjects may have felt they should be able to evaluate the defendant's intelligence. Therefore, they may have used all of the information available to them, including sociological information conveyed by the defendant's attractiveness, in making intelligence attributions. Thus, the findings of the full trial study suggest that when individuals perceive they possess sufficient information to make attributions concerning another's intelligence, attractive others will be perceived as more intelligent than unattractive others. Although psychological information was presented to the jurors concerning the defendant, none of this information concerned the defendant's intelligence. If psychological information concerning the defendant's intelligence had been presented to the jurors, perhaps the effect of sociological information conveyed by the defendant's attractiveness would not have been observed.

Two further significant findings not hypothesized were observed in the full trial study. Specifically, jurors in this study perceived the female defendant as more moral than the male defendant and were less likely to recommend incarceration for the female defendant than for the male defendant. These findings were not observed in the remaining studies, indicating that the amount of information presented could account for the discrepant results.

Before presenting an analysis of why amount of information presented could account for these results, it should be noted that the argument presented for the findings on the intelligence variable is not applicable here. In none of the studies did jurors express inability to make attributions concerning the defendant's morality or to recommend punishment. In all four studies jurors were given information concerning an alleged crime committed by the defendant and the defendant's reactions to what had occurred. This information would likely be used by the jurors to evaluate the defendant's morality and to recommend the defendant's punishment. Thus, subjects in all of the studies may have perceived that they possessed sufficient information on which to base morality attributions and recommend punishment.

At least one possible explanation concerning the amount of information presented can account for the female defendant being perceived as more moral than the male defendant in the full trial study but not in the remaining studies. Jurors presented with the synoptic versions of the trial received primarily salient information concerning the alleged criminal activities engaged in by the defendant and psychological information about the defendant's reaction to these activities. However, in the full trial study this information was embedded in great amounts of other information

concerning such issues as witness qualifications and courtroom procedures. This additional information may have distracted jurors from the information concerning the defendant's actions upon which morality attributions and punishment recommendations could be based. If so, jurors in the full trial study may have based their decisions on information other than the defendant's actions. One other source of information available to the jurors concerned the defendant's sex. Specifically, jurors may have employed sociological stereotypes based on the defendant's sex in arriving at morality attributions. These sex-related sociological stereotypes may convey information which leads to higher morality attributions for females than for males. Thus, under the conditions of the full trial study higher morality ratings for the female defendant would be expected.

The preceding discussion may, in part, explain why jurors recommended less severe punishment for the female defendant in the full trial study. When making punishment recommendations, jurors probably consider their perceptions of the defendant's morality. Thus, it would not be unreasonable to assume that the greater the perceived morality of the defendant, the less the punishment recommended for the defendant. Since the female defendant was perceived as more moral in the full trial study, she would receive less severe punishment recommendations.

Another possible explanation for the discrepant findings concerning punishment recommendations has to do with the seriousness with which the role-playing jurors approached their tasks. Subjects in the synoptic studies had much less time to assume their roles as jurors than their full trial counterparts. Moreover, subjects in the full trial study were in a situation which more closely approximated an actual trial situation. Both of these factors may have led the subjects in the full

trial study to take their roles as jurors more seriously than subjects in the synoptic studies. In turn, subjects in the full trial study would have considered their decisions regarding punishment recommendations to be more important than subjects in the synoptic studies. This possibility is even more likely when information obtained in the debriefing periods is considered. Though numerous subjects in the full trial study inquired about the actual outcome of the trial, no subjects in the written synopsis studies and only a few in the video synopsis studies made this inquiry. This difference in curiosity supports the contention that role-playing jurors in the full trial study took their roles more seriously than role-playing jurors in the synoptic studies.

If the subjects in the full trial study were more seriously involved in their trial-related decisions, it is not difficult to fathom why the female defendant received fewer incarceration recommendations than the male defendant. It would not be unreasonable to assume that individuals in this society consider incarceration more appropriate for males than for females. Thus, incarceration may be perceived as a more severe punishment for female defendants than for male defendants. It is likely that jurors who consider their decisions to be important would consider this when making these decisions. However, subjects in the synoptic studies, who did not consider their decisions as important, may not have considered the sex of the defendant when making their decisions concerning incarceration. If so, it is not surprising that the female defendant received incarceration recommendations less often than the male defendant in the full trial study while not in the other studies.

None of the remaining 55 hypotheses received support. These results may appear surprising given past studies which have found support for the

predicted differences. However, the present set of studies differed systematically in a number of ways from past studies in this area. The following discussion focuses on these differences.

In the four studies reported here, psychological information was provided about the defendant. Past studies which have found differences attributable to the attractiveness variable provided no psychological information about the stimulus person. Chapter I pointed out that when individuals do not have psychological information concerning others, their attributions are likely to be based on sociological information such as information conveyed by the others' attractiveness. When psychological information is available for arriving at attributions, as with the current set of studies, individuals may base their attributions on this information rather than on sociological data. The numerous failures to reject the null hypothesis in the present studies indicate that this is likely. Since actual jurors normally receive psychological information about defendants, the current findings suggest that the results of research which fails to provide role-playing jurors with psychological information concerning the defendant may not be generalizable to actual trial situations.

Another difference between prior research and the studies reported here concerns the demand characteristics of past studies. Previous studies have typically attached a photograph of an attractive or unattractive stimulus person to a written description of some offense purportedly committed by that person. Chapter I suggested that this mode of manipulating attractiveness may serve as a highly salient cue to subjects for assessing the purpose of the study. Thus, the results of past studies may be due to demand characteristics.

In the current studies, a cover story concerning the appearance of the defendant on videotape was provided in an attempt to overcome this problem. During the debriefing it was ascertained that none of the subjects had discerned the independent variables or had questioned the cover story. In addition, the subjects appeared surprised when the purpose of the study was revealed to them. Apparently, demand characteristics were not transparently present in these studies. Thus, the discrepancy between the results of the present studies and previous research may be attributable to the elimination of demand characteristics.

A further difference concerns the crime involved. Chapter I pointed out that Sigall and Ostrove found when a defendant committed an attractiveness-related crime (swindle), recommendations for punishment were the same for an attractive and an unattractive defendant. However, when the crime was attractiveness-unrelated (burglary), jurors recommended more severe punishment for the unattractive defendant. These authors considered an attractiveness-related crime to be one whose commission could be facilitated by the attractiveness of the perpetrator, while an attractiveness-unrelated crime would not be. The crime of vehicular manslaughter appears to be an attractiveness-unrelated crime. Thus, the attractiveness relatedness of the crime would not account for the discrepancy between the findings of the current studies and past studies.

Although the attractiveness-relatedness of the crime cannot explain these findings, another aspect of the crime may. Perhaps individuals possess stereotypes concerning the physical characteristics of individuals likely to commit a certain type of crime. Such stereotypes would likely affect their attributions concerning a defendant. Since most persons are not personally acquainted with criminals, these stereotypes are probably

acquired through the media; e.g., the media characterizes most burglars as relatively unattractive. If individuals possess this stereotype of burglars, then it is not surprising that Sigall and Ostrove discovered an unattractive burglar was more severely punished than an attractive burglar in their attractiveness-unrelated condition. Simply put, the unattractive defendant looked like a burglar while the attractive defendant did not.

Applying the above reasoning to the crime of vehicular manslaughter could explain why this attractiveness-unrelated crime did not produce differences due to the attractiveness variable. The media does not portray persons who commit vehicular manslaughter as consistently attractive or unattractive. Indeed, persons who commit vehicular manslaughter are seldom portrayed by the media. Therefore, individuals probably do not possess stereotypes concerning the attractiveness of people who commit vehicular manslaughter. Given this possibility, the results of the present studies may stem from lack of a stereotype concerning the attractiveness of persons who commit vehicular manslaughter.

The crime employed in the present set of studies differs from crimes employed in past studies on yet another dimension. Previous studies have employed crimes such as burglary and swindling which are intentionally committed; i.e., the goal of the individual is to commit the crime to achieve rewards for him/herself. However, the crime of vehicular manslaughter is defined by California law as the unintentional but unlawful killing of a human being while driving a vehicle. Legal experts might argue that from their perspective vehicular manslaughter could be considered intentional. It is unlikely, however, that jurors would consider this offense an intentional criminal act. Attribution perspectives suggest

that information concerning an intentional action taken by an individual to secure rewards would be more likely to be employed when making attributions than information concerning an unintentional action which was not motivated by rewards (e.g., Heider, 1958; Jones & Davis, 1965). This fact suggests that the conflict between the current findings and past findings could be due to the intentionality of the crimes involved.

Information about an intentional crime committed by an individual to obtain rewards would be more likely to lead to negative evaluations concerning the defendant than information about an unintentional crime not motivated by rewards. In the case of intentional crimes, information conveyed by the attractiveness variable may overcome these negative evaluations for attractive defendants but not for unattractive ones. In the case of unintentional crimes, there would be fewer negative evaluations to overcome, thus confounding the effects of the attractiveness variable.

The preceding discussion has focused on numerous possible reasons for the discrepancies between findings of the present studies and previous research. It should be noted that the present studies were conducted, in part, to examine the ecological validity of past findings. Most of the reasons advanced for the discrepant findings indicate that the results of past studies may not be generalizable to actual trial settings. The following section will focus on the results for comparing the experimental procedures which are directly relevant to the ecological validity argument.

Comparison of Experimental Procedures

Despite the lack of evidence for effects attributable to the attractiveness variable, the results do indicate that the mode of presentation

and the type of evidence presented did influence juridic judgments. In both the full trial and video synopsis studies, subjects returned significantly more guilty verdicts than subjects in the balanced written study. Moreover, subjects in these two video studies were more likely to recommend incarceration than subjects in the balanced written study. These findings support the contention that the mode of presentation affected juridic decisions.

Subjects in the guilty written study returned significantly more guilty verdicts and felony verdicts than subjects in the balanced written study. These findings indicate that the type of evidence presented also influenced juridic decisions.

The findings concerning the mode of presentation variable demonstrate that the nonverbal and paralinguistic cues presented to jurors in the videotaped versions of the trial systematically affected their decisional behavior in ways which caused them to be more punitive than jurors who read the balanced written synopsis. Obviously, more research is needed if the precise nonverbal and paralinguistic cues influencing juror behavior are to be specified. Nevertheless, these findings do indicate that if the goal of legal researchers is to produce generalizable findings then studies should be conducted under presentational conditions which closely approximate actual trial situations.

The findings concerning the type of evidence presented indicate that jurors presented with primarily guilty evidence are more likely to find the defendant guilty and to recommend more severe sentences than jurors presented with equal amounts of evidence concerning the guilt and innocence of the defendant. Although hardly surprising, these results do

suggest that the findings of research which does not leave the guilt of the defendant open to question may not be generalizable to actual trials.

The results of the comparison of the full trial and video synopsis studies provide no support for the contention that the amount of information presented to jurors has a significant impact on their trial related decisions. It could be argued that the full trial and video synopsis presentations differed systematically on variables other than the amount of information presented, thus confounding the effect of the amount of information variable. Although an attempt was made to present all the highly relevant information in the video synopsis, there is no guarantee that some unnoticed systematic difference did not influence outcomes. Therefore, further research focusing on the amount of information variable is needed.

Taken together, the results of the present studies carry a clear message for legal researchers: if the goal of the researcher is to produce findings which are generalizable to actual trials, studies should be conducted under informational, presentational, and evidential conditions that closely approximate the trial situation.

APPENDIX

Drs. Gerald R. Miller and Norman E. Fontes have been investigating communication problems that exist within the legal system for the past three years. Today you are participating in a study that is part of their programmatic research into this socially significant problem area. You have just been presented with a trial involving a defendant charged with vehicular manslaughter. We are asking you to continue to role-play jurors while you complete the attached questionnaire. The research executed by Drs. Miller and Fontes and other members of their research team has received national attention and is being used by legal experts to introduce change into the legal system. The research findings are very important, and we hope you will conscientiously play the role of a juror when completing the questionnaire. Thank you very much for your kind cooperation.

You are now going to be asked to make a decision concerning the defendant's guilt or innocence. Please check the appropriate response.

1. I find the defendant

_____ guilty
_____ innocent

If you have found the defendant innocent, please skip to question 6. If you found the defendant guilty, you must decide if she/he is guilty of a misdemeanor or a felony. Please check the appropriate response.

2. I find the defendant guilty of a

_____ felony
_____ misdemeanor

If you found the defendant guilty of a felony, please skip question 3 and move to question 4. If you found the defendant guilty of a misdemeanor, please answer question 3 and skip question 4.

3. Since you have found the defendant guilty of a misdemeanor, you must now recommend the number of months the defendant is going to spend in the county jail. Please assume that the defendant will serve the total number of months you recommend.

_____ 0 months (defendant is put on probation)
_____ 1 month
_____ 2 months
_____ 3 months
_____ 4 months
_____ 5 months
_____ 6 months
_____ 7 months
_____ 8 months
_____ 9 months
_____ 10 months
_____ 11 months
_____ 12 months

4. Since you have found the defendant guilty of a felony, you must now recommend the number of years the defendant is going to spend in prison. Please assume that the defendant will serve the total number of years you recommend.

_____ 0 years (defendant is put on probation)
_____ 1 year
_____ 2 years
_____ 3 years
_____ 4 years
_____ 5 years

_____ 6 years
_____ 7 years
_____ 8 years
_____ 9 years
_____ 10 years
_____ 11 years
_____ 12 years

5. How certain are you that the defendant is guilty? (After responding to this question, please skip to question 7.)

_____ very certain
_____ somewhat certain
_____ somewhat uncertain
_____ not very certain at all

6. How certain are you that the defendant is innocent?

_____ not very certain at all
_____ somewhat uncertain
_____ somewhat certain
_____ very certain

7. How probable is it that the defendant will commit a crime in the future?

_____ very probable
_____ somewhat probable
_____ not very probable
_____ not very probable at all

The next set of statements concern how you believe the defendant personally feels about a number of topics. Two statements appear together for each item. Please check the statement that you believe the defendant would most agree with.

8. The defendant feels that

_____ Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
_____ The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.

9. The defendant feels that

_____ Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
_____ People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.

10. The defendant feels that

_____ One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
_____ There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

11. The defendant feels that

_____ In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
_____ Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he/she tries.

12. The defendant feels that

_____ The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
_____ Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.

13. The defendant feels that

_____ Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
_____ Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.

14. The defendant feels that

_____ No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
_____ People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.

15. The defendant feels that

_____ Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
_____ It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like.

16. The defendant feels that

_____ What is going to happen will happen.
_____ Trusting to fate doesn't turn out as well as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

17. The defendant feels that

_____ In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely, if ever, such a thing as an unfair test.
_____ Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.

18. The defendant feels that

_____ Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
_____ Getting a good job depends mainly in being in the right place at the right time.

19. The defendant feels that

_____ The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
_____ This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

20. The defendant feels that

_____ When you make plans, you can be almost certain that you can make them work.
_____ It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.

21. The defendant feels that

_____ There are certain people who are just no good.
_____ There is some good in everybody.

22. The defendant feels that

_____ Getting what you want has nothing to do with luck.
_____ Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

23. The defendant feels that

_____ Who gets to be boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
_____ Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

24. The defendant feels that

_____ As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand nor control.
_____ By taking an active part in political and social affairs, the people can control world events.

25. The defendant feels that

_____ Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
_____ There really is no such thing as luck.

26. The defendant feels that

_____ One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
_____ It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.

27. The defendant feels that

_____ It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
_____ How many friends you have depends on how nice a person you are.

28. The defendant feels that

_____ In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
_____ Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.

29. The defendant feels that

_____ With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
_____ It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.

30. The defendant feels that

_____ Sometimes you can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
_____ There is a direct connection between how hard you study and the grades you get.

31. The defendant feels that

_____ A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
_____ A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.

32. The defendant feels that

_____ Many times we have little influence over the things that happen to us.
_____ It is impossible that chance or luck plays an important role in our lives.

33. The defendant feels that

_____ People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
_____ There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.

34. The defendant feels that

_____ There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
_____ Team sports are an excellent way to build character.

35. The defendant feels that

_____ What happens to us is our own doing.
_____ Sometimes we don't have enough control over the direction our lives are taking.

36. The defendant feels that

_____ Most of the time you can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
_____ In the long run, the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as a local level.

The next item concerns how you feel about the defendant.

37. I feel that

_____ The defendant exerts more control over the environment than the environment exerts over the defendant.
_____ The environment exerts more control over the defendant than the defendant exerts over the environment.

38. Please check the statement that you think best describes the defendant's drinking habits.

_____ The defendant drinks heavily.
_____ The defendant drinks moderately.
_____ The defendant drinks only on social occasions.
_____ The defendant does not drink at all.

39. How often do you think the defendant gets drunk?

_____ very frequently
_____ frequently
_____ seldom
_____ never

40. How likely do you think the defendant is to drive when drunk?

_____ very likely
_____ somewhat likely
_____ somewhat unlikely
_____ very unlikely

Please check one of the responses that best describes your feelings concerning the defendant.

41. _____ I believe that this defendant is very much above average in intelligence.
_____ I believe that this defendant is above average in intelligence.
_____ I believe that this defendant is slightly above average in intelligence.
_____ I believe that this defendant is average in intelligence.
_____ I believe that this defendant is slightly below average in intelligence.
_____ I believe that this defendant is below average in intelligence.
_____ I believe that this defendant is very much below average in intelligence.

42. _____ I believe that this defendant is very much below average in his/her knowledge of current events.
_____ I believe that this defendant is below average in his/her knowledge of current events.
_____ I believe that this defendant is slightly below average in his/her knowledge of current events.
_____ I believe that this defendant is average in his/her knowledge of current events.
_____ I believe that this defendant is slightly average in his/her knowledge of current events.
_____ I believe that this defendant is above average in his/her knowledge of current events.
_____ I believe that this defendant is very much above average in his/her knowledge of current events.

43. _____ This defendant impresses me as being extremely moral.
_____ This defendant impresses me as being moral.
_____ This defendant impresses me as being moral to a slight degree.
_____ This defendant impresses me as being neither particularly moral or particularly immoral.
_____ This defendant impresses me as being immoral to a slight degree.
_____ This defendant impresses me as being immoral.
_____ This defendant impresses me as being extremely immoral.

44. _____ I believe that this defendant is extremely maladjusted.
_____ I believe that this defendant is maladjusted.
_____ I believe that this defendant is maladjusted to a slight degree.
_____ I believe that this defendant is neither particularly maladjusted nor particularly well adjusted.
_____ I believe that this defendant is well adjusted to a slight degree.
_____ I believe that this defendant is well adjusted.
_____ I believe that this defendant is extremely well adjusted.

45. _____ I feel that I would probably like this defendant very much.
_____ I feel that I would probably like this defendant.
_____ I feel that I would probably like this defendant to a slight degree.
_____ I feel that I would probably neither particularly like nor particularly dislike this defendant.
_____ I feel that I would probably dislike this defendant to a slight degree.
_____ I feel that I would probably dislike this defendant.
_____ I feel that I would probably dislike this defendant very much.

46. _____ I believe that I would very much dislike working with this defendant.
_____ I believe that I would dislike working with this defendant.
_____ I believe that I would dislike working with this defendant to a slight degree.
_____ I believe that I would neither particularly dislike nor particularly enjoy working with this defendant.
_____ I believe that I would enjoy working with this defendant to a slight degree.
_____ I believe that I would enjoy working with this defendant.
_____ I believe that I would very much enjoy working with this defendant.

The following statements concern the Judge's jury instructions to you. Some of the statements accurately reflect what the Judge told you while others do not. Please mark the statement "True" if it accurately reflects what the Judge said and "False" if the statement is inaccurate.

47. If the attorneys for the parties involved in this case stipulated to any fact, you were instructed by the Judge to regard that fact as conclusively proved.

_____ True
_____ False

48. It is necessary that facts be proved by direct evidence. They cannot be proved by circumstantial evidence or by a combination of direct evidence and circumstantial evidence.

_____ False
_____ True

49. There is no distinction between direct evidence and circumstantial evidence as a means of proof.

_____ False
_____ True

50. Direct evidence means evidence that directly proves a fact, conclusively establishes that fact.

_____ True
_____ False

51. Circumstantial evidence means evidence that proves a fact from which an inference of the existence of another fact may be drawn.

_____ True
_____ False

52. A witness false in one part is not to be distrusted in others; that is to say, you may not reject the whole testimony of a witness who willfully has testified falsely as to a material point.

_____ True
_____ False

53. Testimony given by one witness who you believe is sufficient for the proof of any fact.

_____ False
_____ True

54. Reasonable doubt is defined as follows: It is a mere possible doubt; because everything relating to human affairs, and depending on moral evidence, is open to some possible or imaginary doubt. It is not that state of the case which, after the entire comparison and consideration of all the evidence, leaves the minds of the jurors in that condition that they can say they feel an abiding conviction, to a moral certainty, of the truth charge.

_____ True
_____ False

55. Vehicle manslaughter is the unintentional but unlawful killing of a human being in the driving of a vehicle.

_____ True
_____ False

56. Vehicle manslaughter is a felony when a person commits, with gross negligence, an act inherently dangerous to human life or safety, or commits, with gross negligence, an act ordinarily lawful which might produce death.

_____ False
_____ True

57. To constitute manslaughter in this case, the act so committed by the defendant need not have been the proximate cause of the death of the person killed.

_____ False
_____ True

58. The term "gross negligence," as used in the definition of manslaughter given by the Judge, means the failure to exercise any care, or the exercise of so little care that you are justified in believing that the person whose conduct is involved was wholly indifferent to the consequences of his or her conduct to the welfare of others.

_____ True
_____ False

59. The rate of speed at which a person travels, considered as an isolated fact and simply in terms of so many miles per hour, is alone proof of a violation of the basic speed law.

_____ False
_____ True

60. If the evidence establishes beyond a reasonable doubt that the amount, by weight, of alcohol in the defendant's blood was one-fifteenth of one percent (0.15%) or more at the time of the test as shown by a chemical analysis of his or her blood, breath, or urine, you should find that the defendant was under the influence of intoxicating liquor at the time of the alleged offense, unless from all evidence you have a reasonable doubt that he or she was in fact under the influence of intoxicating liquor at the time of the alleged offense.

_____ True
_____ False

61. If you find the defendant guilty of vehicle manslaughter, then the defendant has committed a felony.

_____ False
_____ True

Below are some statements concerning information provided by witnesses during the course of the trial. Some of the statements accurately reflect what the witnesses said when they testified while others do not. Please mark the statement "True" if it accurately reflects what the witness said and "False" if the statement is inaccurate.

62. Officer Ross' total length of service as a Highway Patrol Officer was slightly over three years.

_____ True
_____ False

63. The accident occurred shortly after midnight, according to Officer Ross.

_____ False
_____ True

64. The defendant was driving a Corvair at the time of the accident.

_____ True
_____ False

65. Officer Ross spent approximately one hour and fifteen minutes with the defendant the morning of the accident.

_____ True
_____ False

66. Officer Ross testified that he had administered the MOBAT Test to approximately 100 people.

_____ True
_____ False

67. Officer Ross did not think the defendant was intoxicated at the time of the accident.

_____ False
_____ True

68. The defendant told Officer Ross that the defendant had drunk a total of six drinks the day of the accident.

_____ True
_____ False

69. The defendant told Officer Ross that the defendant had not seen Martha Bell prior to the accident.

_____ True
_____ False

70. According to Officer Ross, the road where the accident occurred had eleven foot wide lanes and no shoulder.

_____ False
_____ True

71. Officer Ross testified that the last six-tenths of a mile of the road traveled by the defendant prior to the accident was hilly.

_____ False
_____ True

72. Officer Ross testified that the light switch was pulled out in Martha Bell's vehicle indicating that the lights had been on.

_____ False
_____ True

73. Officer Ross testified that the battery in the victim's car had been shorted out as a result of the accident.

_____ True
_____ False

74. Officer Ross testified that the left rear tire from the victim's vehicle had a long cut in it.

_____ False
_____ True

75. The defendant told Officer Ross that the defendant had been driving 49 M.P.H. prior to the accident.

_____ True
_____ False

76. Officer Ross stated that he did not administer the ROMBERG Test to the defendant because the defendant was too intoxicated to complete it.

_____ True
_____ False

77. Daniel F. Meek was a clinical laboratory bioanalyst who owned and operated a clinical laboratory.

_____ False
_____ True

78. Dr. Meek testified that a person with .10% blood-alcohol level shouldn't be driving.

_____ True
_____ False

79. When questioned about the accuracy of the MOBAT Test, Dr. Meek said that it was accurate to within plus or minus 10% of the reading obtained when it is administered.

_____ False
_____ True

80. When asked if he was familiar with the scientific work of Glenn C. Forrester, Dr. Meek testified that he had not read anything written by Mr. Forrester.

_____ False
_____ True

81. Dr. Meek stated that the defendant's blood-alcohol level would have registered .02% higher if the MOBAT Test had been administered at the scene of the accident immediately following the mishap instead of at the hospital like it was.

_____ True
_____ False

82. Dr. Talley, the second physician to testify, was a Captain in the United States Army.

_____ True
_____ False

83. Dr. Talley was a specialist in internal medicine.

_____ False
_____ True

84. The defendant suffered about an inch and a half to two inch laceration on the inside of the mouth as a result of the accident.

_____ False
_____ True

85. The defendant did not break or fracture any bones as a result of the accident.

_____ False
_____ True

86. Dr. Talley testified that the defendant was intoxicated when examined at the hospital.

_____ False
_____ True

87. Dr. Talley testified that the defendant may have appeared intoxicated as a result of the codeine the defendant took to relieve pain from the injuries suffered during the accident.

_____ True
_____ False

88. When questioned about the effects the suturing of the laceration in the mouth may have had upon the defendant's speech, Dr. Talley stated that it could have affected the defendant's speech.

_____ True
_____ False

89. Dr. Talley stated that the medication given the defendant affected the alcohol-level reading on the MOBAT Test administered by Officer Ross.

_____ False
_____ True

90. The first person to arrive at the scene of the accident was Mr. Mark Stevens, a Fire Fighter.

_____ True
_____ False

91. Mr. Stevens found the defendant lying by the roadside.

_____ False
_____ True

92. Mr. Stevens testified that when he talked to the defendant at the scene of the accident, he could smell alcohol on the defendant's breath.

_____ False
_____ True

93. Mr. Stevens reported that he determined Martha Bell was dead by checking the pupils of her eyes; the pulse at her wrist and neck; and by squeezing her fingernails.

_____ True
_____ False

94. Mr. Stevens testified that Martha Bell was wearing all dark colored clothing at the time of the accident.

_____ True
_____ False

95. Mark Stevens indicated that both of Martha Bell's legs were severely fractured below the knees.

_____ False
_____ True

96. Stevens testified that the front of the defendant's vehicle and the left side of Martha Bell's vehicle were damaged.

_____ False
_____ True

97. Mark Stevens testified that he witnessed Officer Ross administer the MOBAT Test to the defendant and did not detect any odor of alcohol on the defendant's breath at that time.

_____ True
_____ False

(CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE)

Now we would like to get some idea of your evaluations of the two attorneys. Please complete the following scales for each attorney. Here is how to use these scales:

Attorney A

Example: bad___:___:___:___:___:___:___:good
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

If you felt that attorney was in general extremely bad, you would place a check mark in space #1; if quite bad (but not extremely bad), in #2; if slightly bad, in #3; if neither good nor bad, in #4; if slightly good, in #5; if quite good, in #6; and if extremely good, in #7.

The "4" or neutral space on the scale may also be used for "I don't know," or "I don't think this scale applies," answers.

Please note that the "good" or "favorable" words are not all on the same side. Put your check within the spaces (: X :), not on the lines separating scales. Please place one mark on each of the 30 scales.

Prosecution Attorney, Mr. Wilson

98. trustworthy:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:untrustworthy

99. just:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:unjust

100. dishonest:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:honest

101. bad:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:good

102. safe:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:dangerous

103. expert:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:ignorant

104. incapable:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:capable

105. trained:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:untrained

106. unknowledgeable:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:knowledgeable

107. incompetent:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:competent

108. energetic:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:tired

109. meek:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:aggressive

110. indecisive:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:decisive

111. bold:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:timid

112. passive:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:active

Defense Attorney, Mr. Manning

113. trustworthy:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:untrustworthy

114. just:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:unjust

115. dishonest:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:honest

116. good:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:bad

117. dangerous:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:safe

118. expert:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:ignorant

119. incapable:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:capable

120. untrained:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:trained

121. knowledgeable:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:unknowledgeable

122. competent:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:incompetent

123. energetic:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:tired

124. meek:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:aggressive

125. indecisive:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:decisive

126. bold:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:timid

127. passive:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:active

We would like to get some idea of your evaluation of the defendant's physical attractiveness. Use the seven scales on the following page for these evaluations. Here is how to use the scales:

Example:

In comparison to people in general, I think the defendant was:

physically attractive:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:physically unattractive
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

If you felt the defendant was extremely attractive, you would place a check in space #1; if quite attractive (but not extremely so), in #2; if slightly attractive, in #3; if average; in #4; if slightly unattractive, in #5; if quite unattractive, in #6; if extremely unattractive, in #7.

The "4" or neutral space on the scale may also be used for "I don't know," or "I don't think this scale applies," answers.

Please note that the attractive ratings are not all on the same side. Put your check within the spaces (: X :), not on the lines separating spaces. Please place one mark on each of the seven scales.

128. In comparison to people in general, I think the defendant was:

very physically attractive:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:very physically unattractive
Ave.

129. I think the defendant's hair was:

very attractive:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:very unattractive
Ave.

130. I think the defendant's eyes were:

very unattractive:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:very attractive
Ave.

131. I think the defendant's nose was:

very unattractive:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:very attractive
Ave.

132. I think the defendant's mouth was:

very attractive:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:very unattractive
Ave.

133. I think the defendant's complexion was:

very unattractive:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:very attractive
Ave.

The next set of statements concern how you personally feel about a number of topics. Two statements appear together for each item. Please check the statement that you most agree with.

134. _____ Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
_____ The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.

135. _____ Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
_____ People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.

136. _____ One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
_____ There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

137. _____ In the long run, people get the respect they deserve in this world.
_____ Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he/she tries.

138. _____ The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
_____ Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.

139. _____ Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
_____ Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.

140. _____ No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
_____ People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.

141. _____ Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
_____ It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like.

142. _____ I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
_____ Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

143. _____ In the case of the well prepared student, there is rarely, if ever, such a thing as an unfair test.
_____ Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.

144. _____ Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
_____ Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

145. _____ The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
_____ This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

146. _____ When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
_____ It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.

147. _____ There are certain people who are just no good.
_____ There is some good in everybody.

148. _____ In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
_____ Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

149. _____ Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
_____ Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

150. _____ As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.
_____ By taking an active part in political and social affairs, the people can control world events.

151. _____ Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
_____ There really is no such thing as "luck."

152. _____ One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
_____ It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.

153. _____ It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
_____ How many friends you have depends on how nice a person you are.

154. _____ In the long run, the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
_____ Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.

155. _____ With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
_____ It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.

156. _____ Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
_____ There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.

157. _____ A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
_____ A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.

158. _____ Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
_____ It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

159. _____ People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
_____ There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.

160. _____ There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
_____ Team sports are an excellent way to build character.

161. _____ What happens to me is my own doing.
_____ Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

162. _____ Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
_____ In the long run, the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.

And now we would like to ask you some questions about yourself. Please complete all of the following items.

163. Age: _____

164. Sex: _____ Female _____ Male

165. Marital Status: _____ Single _____ Married _____ Divorced
_____ Separated _____ Widowed

166. How many years of school have you completed? _____ years

167. Occupation: _____
(We are interested in what you do for a living and not who you work for.)

168. Have you ever served as a juror before?

_____ yes
_____ no

169. How many hours per week on the average do you spend watching television?

_____ hours

170. Do you own an automobile?

_____ no
_____ yes

171. Do you have a driver's license?

_____ yes
_____ no

172. Please check the statement that best describes your drinking habits.

_____ I drink heavily
_____ I drink moderately
_____ I drink only on social occasions
_____ I do not drink

173. How often do you get drunk?

_____ very frequently
_____ frequently
_____ seldom
_____ never

174. How likely are you to drink when driving?

_____ very likely
_____ somewhat likely
_____ somewhat unlikely
_____ very unlikely

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beran, W., R.S. Albert, P.R. Lioseaux, P.M. Mayfield, and G. Wright. "Jury Behavior as a Function of the Prestige of the Foreman and the Nature of Leadership." Journal of Public Law, 7 (1958), 419-449.

Berscheid, E., and E. Walster. "Physical Attractiveness." Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 8 (1974).

Berscheid, E., and E. Walster. "Physical Attractiveness and Dating Choice: A Test of the Matching Hypothesis." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, (1969).

Blunk, R.A., and B.D. Sales. "Persuasion During the Voir Dire." Psychology in the Legal Process, Sales, B.D. (Ed.). New York: Spectrum, 1976.

Brislin, R., and S. Lewis. "Dating and Physical Attractiveness." Psychological Reports, 1968.

Byrne, D., O. London, and K. Reeves. "The Effects of Physical Attractiveness, Sex, and Attitude Similarity on Interpersonal Attraction." Journal of Personality, 36 (1968), 259-271.

Dion, K. "Physical Attractiveness and the Evaluation of Children's Transgressions." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 24 (1972), 207-213.

Dion, K., E. Berscheid, and E. Walster. "What is Beautiful is Good." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 24 (1972), 285-290.

Efran, M.G. "The Effect of Physical Appearance on Judgment of Guilt, Interpersonal Attraction, and Severity of Recommended Punishment in a Simulated Jury Task." Journal of Research in Personality, 8 (1974), 45-54.

Fontes, N.E., G.R. Miller, and D.C. Bender. "Deletion of Inadmissible Materials from Courtroom Trials: Merit or Myth?" Detroit College of Law Review, 1 (1977), 67-81.

Heider, F. The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1958.

Hocking, J.E., J.E. Bauchner, E.P. Kaminski, G.R. Miller. "Detecting Deceptive Communication from Verbal, Visual, and Paralinguistic Cues." Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention. Portland, Oregon, 1976.

Jones, E.E., and K.E. Davis. "From Acts to Dispositions: The Attribution Process in Person Perception." Advances in Experimental and Social Psychology, Berkowitz, L. (Ed.). Vol. 2. New York: Academic Press, 1965.

Kaplan, M.F., and G.D. Kemmerick. "Juror Judgment as Information Integration: Combining Evidential and Nonevidential Information." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30 (1974), 493-499.

Kelley, H.H. "Attribution Theory in Social Psychology." Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 15 (1967), 192-238.

Lawson, R.G. "The Law of Primacy in the Criminal Courtroom." The Journal of Social Psychology, 77 (1969), 121-131.

Mettee, D.R. "Changes in Liking as a Function of Magnitude and Affect of Sequential Evaluations." Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 7 (1971), 157-172.

Miller, A.G. "Social Perception of Internal-External Control." Perception and Motor Skills, 30 (1970), 103-109.

Miller, G.R., and M. Steinberg. Between People. Science Research Associates, (1975).

Miller, G.R., D.C. Bender, F. Boster, B.T. Florence, N.E. Fontes, J. Hocking, and H. Nicholson. "The Effects of Videotape Testimony in Jury Trials." Brigham Young University Law Review, 2 (1975), 331-373.

Miller, G.R., N.E. Fontes, J. Bauchner, D. Brandt, F. Boster, S. Carmen, R. Halbert, L. Haight, E. Kaminski, M. Sunnafrank, E. Werner. "The Effects of Videotaped Court Materials on Juror Response: Preliminary Report." Unpublished Monograph. Michigan State University, (1977).

Mitchell, H.E., and D. Byrne. "The Defendant's Dilemma: Effects of Jurors' Attitudes and Authoritarianism on Judicial Decisions." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 25 (1973), 123-129.

Novak, D.W., and M.J. Lerner. "Rejection as a Consequence of Perceived Similarity." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8 (1968), 147-152.

Orne, M.T. "On the Social Psychology of the Experiment: With Particular Reference to Demand Characteristics and Their Implications." American Psychologist, 17 (1962), 776-783.

Sigall, H., and N. Ostrove. "Beautiful but Dangerous: Effects of Offender Attractiveness and Nature of the Crime on Juridic Judgment." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31 (1975), 410-414.

Waller, W. "The Rating and Dating Complex." American Sociological Review, 1937.

Walster, E. "Assignment of Responsibility for an Accident." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3 (1966), 73-79.