DO LOOKS MATTER? EFFECTS OF SEX OFFENDER APPEARANCE ON SENTENCING

by

Jessica R. Peterson

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for Departmental Honors in
the Department of Criminal Justice
Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, Texas

May 3, 2013

DO LOOKS MATTER? EFFECTS OF SEX OFFENDER

APPEARANCE ON SENTENCING

Project Approved:

Bruce Carroll, Ph.D, J.D.
Department of Criminal Justice
(Supervising Professor)

Ronald Burns, Ph.D.
Department of Criminal Justice

Paul King, Ph.D
Department of Communication Studies

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

LITERATURE REVIEW 2
The Ugly Truth 2
Identifying Factors with Potential for Social Stigma 6

DATA 10
Variables 10
Methods 13

RESULTS 13

DISCUSSION 15
Analysis 15
Limitations 19
Further Research 20

CONCLUSION 20

APPENDIX A 22

REFERENCES 27

ABSTRACT 30

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deep gratitude to Dr. Bruce Carroll for his patient guidance, encouragement, and dedication to my success. He has been an integral part of my academic achievement at Texas Christian University. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Paul King and Dr. Ronald Burns, for their support, advice and assistance throughout this process.

Furthermore, I could not have accomplished this project without the intellectual stimulation provided by the many professors within the Criminal Justice Department and the university as a whole. The professors at TCU teach with unprecedented passion for their subjects.

Finally, I want to thank my parents and family for their continued support and encouragement throughout my studies and life.

> "Law and order exist for the purpose of establishing justice and [that] when they fail in this purpose they become the dangerously structured dams that block the flow of social progress."
>
> - Martin Luther King, Jr.

INTRODUCTION

Justice is a core value of our nation and the American criminal justice system seeks to serve it. Jails, prisons, and probation provide structure for punishment and deterrence. Both citizens and criminal justice personnel often agree that punishment should be based strictly on the crime and specific circumstances surrounding it. However, sentencing disparities among similar crimes do not reflect this (Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1996). In an attempt to reduce unwarranted disparity in sentencing, states have moved toward more structured sentencing, including mandatory minimums or presumptive sentencing guidelines (Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1996). Nevertheless, the incongruities in sentencing have not disappeared.

Many factors can cloud the allocation of justice and result in unfair discrepancies. External forces, such as politics and money, play a role in American justice that has become expected and socially acceptable to the general public. However, research seeking to uncover the underlying and less obvious elements in the justice system has emerged. Investigation into discrimination and the psychology behind it has yielded many interesting results that apply directly to the way justice is often served. Many studies in the criminal justice field relate to pre-sentencing discrimination. In order to identify factors that specifically influence the sentencing process, we turn to research in social psychology. An individual's appearance may heavily influences the perceptions of

others. These perceptions can easily translate into discriminatory behavior. When considering length and harshness of a sentence, appearance may account for some of the observed disparity and have greater influence on sentencing than has been thought to in the past.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Ugly Truth

Public opinion concerning crime historically fluctuates greatly (Saad, 2011). In recent years, violent criminals have been viewed progressively as a major threat to public safety. A greater emphasis on incapacitation of offenders has evolved and, according to the Council on Crime and Justice, the average sentence length has substantially increased as a result (Carruthers, 2007). New legislation contributing to this approach has emerged, supported by the entire political spectrum. Although sentencing guidelines may be designed to bring equality to the judicial process, disparities have not subsided. Carruthers (2007) suggests that the criminal justice system should be evaluated constantly to "identify and work to eliminate discrimination" in these sentencing disparities. Considerable attention is given to legislation and law enforcement practices to ease these differences, but internal factors are considered less often.

When one thinks of appearance factors in the criminal justice system, one often thinks of race. It is well-documented that racial inconsistencies are prevalent and this is a popular topic in the criminal justice field. When comparing percentages of incarcerated individuals in 2010 with the 2011 population census, the extent of minority disproportionality in prison becomes apparent. White individuals accounted for 78.1% of the population, but only 34.4% of the total incarcerated individuals (Carson, William, &

Sabol, 2012; U.S. Census Bureau, 2013). While only accounting for 13.1% of the population, blacks comprised 38.1% of incarcerated individuals (Carson, William, & Sabol, 2012; U.S. Census Bureau, 2013). Finally, Hispanic individuals made up 16.7% of the population, but 21.2% of the prison population (Carson, William, & Sabol, 2012; U.S. Census Bureau, 2013). This overrepresentation of minority groups in the prison system does not stop there. Using data collected by the Maryland Administrative Office of the Courts, Bushway and Piehl (2001) found that African Americans were not only more likely than white individuals to be sentenced to prison, but were also more likely to have longer sentences. They found that the average sentence for blacks was more than 35 months, as opposed to only 28 months for whites. This produced a gap of approximately 28% difference between average sentence lengths (Bushway & Piehl, 2001). Although these are considerable disparities, it is possible that there is more to it than merely race. Once these offenders make it through the criminal justice system to the point of sentencing, what accounts for differences in their punishment?

Beyond research on racial inequalities, there has not been a great deal of examination on other physical features that can affect sentencing. One study from 1978, aimed to determine whether or not attitudes and role orientations of judges affected the severity of sentences given to defendants. The researcher stated that characteristic differences among defendants could have an impact on sentencing beyond the judges' attitudes and role orientations. Interestingly, he found that attitudes are not indicative of sentence severity (Gibson, 1978). For example, a liberal judge was not necessarily more likely to impose a lenient sentence on a defendant than a conservative judge. However, a judge with broad role orientations, whether liberal or conservative, would allow extra-legal factors to

heavily influence his decisions. These extra-legal factors are not fully identified in the article and this does not provide an explanation of how a *broadly oriented* judge reaches a decision on sentence severity. It is possible that physical characteristics affect these judges' perceptions of the defendants and play a role in the resulting sentence.

Researchers in psychology have examined the effects of appearance on individuals' perceptions in the context of whether or not one seems able-bodied, resourceful, or having leadership and other desirable qualities. One article addresses perception formation as a result of the subliminal mind at work. Mlodinow suggests that our picture of others is "built largely on unconscious inferences that are made employing factors such as a person's body language, voice, clothing, appearance, and social category." He emphasizes facial appearance as a major factor; not based upon beauty, but upon "a look of competence," especially in regards to democratic elections (Mlodinow, 2012). Furthermore, Murray & Schmitz isolated a specific physical attribute that influences peoples' perceptions of leadership ability. They conducted two studies to assess the link between physical height and political leadership. In the first study, they had participants describe and draw a citizen and a leader in different situations. Sixty four percent of the participants drew a national leader who was physically taller than the citizen, suggesting that individuals prefer or expect leaders to be of tall stature (Murray & Schmitz, 2011). This study shows that a physical characteristic alone can have a significant impact in how others' perceive an individual.

MacLin and Herrera (2006) specifically address the relationship between physical characteristics and criminality, providing a good foundation for further research in this area. These scholars sought to identify criminal stereotypes across different ethnicities.

Using information gathered from an initial study, the researchers created a questionnaire about perceptions of crime and criminals. Participants answered questions in the second study, including open-ended questions, regarding demographic information, personality traits, and the appearance of typical criminals. They found that a typical criminal was perceived to have the following characteristics: tall stature, an aggressive personality, dirty or dark baggy clothing, long or shaggy dark hair, facial hair, beady eyes, tattoos, scars, and pock marks (MacLin & Herrera, 2006). Slight variations on height, eye color, hair color, and style of clothing were found between the different races, however. Furthermore, this study pointed to various environmental aspects of the stereotypical offender including profession, sociability, and childhood behavior. This study indicates that a large number of factors may influence perceptions of criminals. It also introduces the relationship between social stereotypes and criminality. The problem remains that these results cannot be easily generalized. They do, however, provide a great starting point for further research on how some of the factors studied may impact sentencing.

Unconscious psychological factors, underlying some of the previously discussed literature, are numerous and difficult to measure. Following more closely with MacLin and Herrera's (2006) study, it seems appropriate to turn attention toward research on appearance factors associated with social stigma and stereotypes. Arboleda-Florez (2002) describes stigma as "a social construction whereby a distinguishing mark of social disgrace is attached to others in order to identify and devalue them" (p. 25). He asserts that the process of stigmatization consists of first recognizing the differentiating mark and then devaluing an individual exhibiting such a mark (Arboleda-Florez, 2002). Factors linked to social stigma say more about society in its entirety as opposed to the individual

human mind. Accordingly, the following research aims to describe how people perceive certain aspects of appearance based on stigma.

Identifying Factors with Potential for Social Stigma

As previously mentioned, race is often cited as a single cause for disparity in the criminal justice system. Research shows that skin color, rather than race alone, may be an underlying culprit of this epidemic. One study looked at 12,000 black women incarcerated in North Carolina between 1995 and 2009. Sentencing outcomes, including maximum consecutive sentence length and actual time served, were assessed along with skin tone. The researchers found that the women deemed to have a lighter skin tone were not only given more lenient incarceration sentences, but they also served less actual time in prison (Viglione, Hannon, & DeFina, 2011). According to this study, race may not be the primary element affecting sentence outcomes. Instead, a social stigma attached to darker skin may be at play.

Beyond skin tone, the "level of blackness" may be contributing to varying sentence outcomes. In another study, subjects where given photographs that unknowingly depicted convicted murderers. Each photograph was rated on a likert scale from 1 (not at all stereotypical) to 11 (extremely stereotypical). The raters were prompted to use multiple features of their choice including lips, nose, hair texture, skin tone, etc. Results indicate that defendants seen as more stereotypically black were more likely to be sentenced to death (57.5% receiving death penalty) than defendants viewed as less stereotypically black (24.4% receiving death penalty). However, this was only true when the victim was white (Eberhard, Davies, Purdie-Vaughns, & Johnson, 2006). This limitation makes is easy to jump to conclusions involving racial discrimination. Nevertheless, crimes

committed by one race on another are often easily seen as the result of intergroup conflict and this belief about the circumstance may allow stereotypes to play a larger role in the sentencing process.

Weight issues are widespread in the U.S., as obesity, diabetes, and hypertension rates are incredibly high (Healy, 2012). Obesity has become a sensitive topic with hints of biological explanations. In regard to criminality however, the media often portrays scary and violent criminals as all-around physically large. This would suggest that a high body mass index may hold a negative social stigma. In the study by MacLin and Herrera, 48% of the subjects' responses stated that weight was an aspect of the typical criminal stereotype. However, the terms used in the open-ended questions to indicate weight's relevance included "lean," "thin," and "fat." Additionally, height was also found to be a factor, but it was dependent upon different racial stereotypes. For example, black male criminals were viewed as "tall" (between 5'6" and 6'7") whereas white and Latino criminals were perceived to be of average height (MacLin & Herrera, 2006). These findings suggest no clear-cut height or weight stigmatization for criminals, but the ratio between weight and height may paint a different picture.

Although MacLin and Herrera (2006) found that facial hair was considered a feature of a criminal, the following two studies expose a positive bias towards men who have some form of facial air. In the first study, business interviewers were given photos of six male job applicants and asked to evaluate each one on a social/physical attractiveness dimension, a personality dimension, a competency dimension, and a composure dimension. Two of the photos depicted clean-shaven applicants, two depicted applicants with moustaches, and two depicted applicants with beards. The researchers found that the

men with facial hair (beard or moustache group) were rated as more attractive and as having more favorable personalities. The bearded men were rated as having greater composure than the clean-shaven men or men with moustaches. Women, specifically, rated men with beards as more competent than the other groups (Reed & Blunk, 1990). This study shows that there were consistently more positive perceptions along the four dimensions for men having facial hair.

Another study on facial hair incorporated glasses and hair into the photos that were being evaluated. Subjects received 32 photos of men organized into eight categories. The categories included combinations of glasses/no glasses, hair/no hair, and beard with moustache/no beard with no moustache. Subjects finished sentences about each man regarding personal quality or occupation. Overall, the glasses and/or beard categories received positive evaluations. Beards were noted as significant factors in an individual's judgment of a man (Hellstrom & Tekle, 1994). Although more variables were included, the general finding was that beards, at least, tend to positively affect one's perception formation and carry a positive social stigma.

Intentional markings on the body will unquestionably be noticed. The act of tattooing one's body would not exist if it were not meant to elicit some kind of attention. However, the type of attention has evolved into one of stigmatization. One study used virtual characters to assess the effect of body modification on people's perceptions. Each participant rated two tattooed or non-tattooed characters, one of which was female and one of which was male, on attributes listed on Zuckerman's Sensation Seeking Scale and the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory. Results showed that the characters with tattoos were perceived as more experience-seeking, more thrill and adventure seeking, more

susceptible to boredom, less inhibited, and more likely to have a greater number of past sexual partners (Wohlrab, Fink, Kappeler & Brewer, 2009). In other words, having tattoos is associated with risk-taking personality characteristics and more sexual promiscuity. This assumption could easily lead to discrimination against individuals with tattoos.

Similar to body modifications, blemishes and scars can elicit much attention. However, they typically differ in a fundamental way from tattoos in that they are innate or unintentional. Regardless, society often associates visible scars with a negative perception. In fact, scars were specifically identified in MacLin and Herrera's (2006) study as a typical indicator of a criminal. There is not a large body of research on how scars influence perception, but they are generally seen in the media on hard or violent characters, suggesting the underlying notion that scars speak negatively about a person.

Research on social psychological effects on sentencing is not prevalent within the criminal justice field. The goal of this study is to uncover discrimination in giving out punishment once an individual has been convicted, rather than pointing out discrimination involved with the process leading up to it. The conclusions drawn from the socio-psychological research previously reviewed in this manuscript will be used as independent variables to examine their effect on sentencing of sex offenders. Information regarding sex offenders is more readily available than that of other criminal offenders due to the existence of sex offender registries. Furthermore, sex offenders are often considered to be among some of the more violent offenders, increasing the likelihood of observed differences in sentencing.

I hypothesize that appearance factors associated with social stigmas will have a significant effect on sex offender sentencing. For my purposes, factors associated with social stigmas will be defined as those employing cultural assumptions of social disgrace (Arboleda-Florez, 2002). I expect that race, facial hair, visible tattoos, visible scars, body mass index, and whether the crime was a misdemeanor or felony will affect sentencing.

DATA

Variables

The data used in this analysis were collected from multiple databases. In total, there are 222 observations compiled from sex offender registries and corresponding supplemental criminal record databases across six major metropolitan areas in the U.S. This sample is a convenience selection in which information about sex offenders within the most heavily populated zip code areas of Milwaukee, New York City, Charlotte (NC), Indianapolis, Houston, and Chicago are included for the analysis (see *appendix A)*. Eleven physical and social characteristics are coded for each offender including age at time of offense, race, gender, facial hair, visible scars, visible tattoos, body mass index, prior record, victim age, crime (charge), and sentence. Any missing information is coded as a 9.

The dependent variable in this study is sentencing. Each offender's sentence is categorized as probation (0), jail (1), or prison (2). The codes are set in an ordinal scale so that distinctions can be made between levels of sentencing harshness.

For the offender's gender, 0 represents a female and 1 represents a male. It was not expected that gender would be significant as most sex offenders are men. In fact

95.5% are male, leaving very little variance. This makes any conclusion about the effect of this variable spurious.

If an offender had any prior criminal record, whether for a sexual crime or other crime, he or she is coded with a 1in the prior record category. A 0 denotes no prior record. A large portion of my observations are missing information on prior records.

As crimes and charges vary state to state, type of crime had to be condensed and simplified for this study. Type of crime is divided into misdemeanor, denoted with a 0, or felony, denoted with a 1. Overall, misdemeanors are typically less violent and invasive than felony charges. Although different crimes can incur varying degrees of felonies, no further charge distinctions could be made that generalized across different state laws.

Race is categorized as white or non-white. White subjects are denoted with a 0 and non-white subjects are denoted with a 1. Subjects listed as "white" include Caucasian, Hispanic, and Asian offenders. Non-white subjects include only black offenders. This coding was chosen, as most sex offender registries utilize this binary categorization of race.

Height and weight, as listed in the sex offender registries, were recorded for each offender. Body mass index was then calculated using instruction from the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute under the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. After determining each offender's BMI, a 0 was used to represent "normal weight" (BMI between 18.5-24.9) and a 1 was used to represent "overweight or obese" (BMI of 25 or greater).

Facial hair is simply categorized as present or absent for male offenders. Subjects without facial hair were given a 0 and subjects with facial hair were given a 1 for this

category. An offender considered to have facial hair could have anything from a small goatee to a full beard and sideburns. If the offender was not completely clean-shaven, he was listed as having facial hair, regardless of the extent.

Tattoos are coded based on whether or not they are visible. Subjects listed as having tattoos may have one or more tattoos that may be any size or color. An offender with no visible tattoos has a 0 in this category and an offender with one or more visible tattoos has a 1.

Scars are recorded similarly to tattoos. This variable is based on whether or not the scar(s) are visible. This does not include birthmarks. A defendant having one or more scars, regardless of size and severity, is represented with a 1. A defendant with no scars has a 0 in this category.

The final independent variable recorded pertains to age. The offender's age at the time of the offense was classified as 40 years of age or younger, denoted by a 0, or over 40 years of age, denoted by a 1. The victim's age was also recorded for each offender and categorized as either under 18 years of age (0) or 18 years of age or older (1). This shows whether the victim was a minor or an adult. With this information, I created an age-ratio category that was used as an independent variable. If the offender was over the age of 40 when the crime was committed and his or her victim was under the age of 18, the offender was given a 1 in this group. This ratio was the only distinction made and all other observations regarding age were given a 0 in this category. This category was created on the assumption that society views a large age gap, in regards to sex offenses, as more detestable. Abuse and discrimination against children has a long history. Individuals often hold heightened disgust for one who preys on the weak or helpless and

child molesters carry a hefty negative social stigma. It was my prediction that older offenders who prey on minors would be viewed as more deserving of extreme punishment due to this social ideology.

Methods

In order to produce an initial overview of the variables, I ran a cross-tabulation. This was beneficial in illustrating the number of observations and frequencies under each variable. Following this, I ran an ordinal regression to determine the significance with which each variable affected sentencing. An ordinal regression is a technique used when predicting the effects of multiple independent variables on one ordinal dependent variable. The first category in the dependent variable is considered the lowest category and the last category is considered the highest. Accordingly, sentencing is coded in this study as 0, 1, and 2. These numbers do not hold numerical value, but they do represent a rank within sentencing. Probation is coded as 0 because it is the least punitive sentence, jail is coded as 1 because it is the second most punitive, and prison is coded as 2 because it is the most punitive.

RESULTS

Gender was not specifically included in the statistical analysis as only 4.5% of the offenders were female. The percentage of males was so high at 95.5% that gender was practically irrelevant. Prior record was also excluded because many observations were missing this information. Table 1 provides the overview of each of the other 8 variables. There were 196 valid cases and 26 missing cases. From this sample, 70.4% of the offenders received a prison sentence, 27.6% were placed on probation, and only 2% received jail time. It appears that sentencing hinges mostly on probation or prison,

skipping the jail sentence in between. When examining the independent variables, race was relatively equally represented. There was a slightly greater number of white offenders (54.6%) compared to non-white offenders (45.4%). This sample demonstrations even more overrepresentation of black offenders in comparison with the 2010 black incarceration rates (38.1%). Although 2010 incarceration percentages for white offenders was only 34.4%, this does not necessarily point to a discrepancy with the current study because the incarceration rates do not include Hispanic offenders in the white category. The majority of offenders (71.9%) had facial hair. The 28.1% who did not have facial hair include a small percentage of males and the female offenders. Only 28.1% of the offenders had visible scars and 37.8% had visible tattoos. The majority of those used in the sample did not have visible scars (71.9%) or visible tattoos (62.2%). It is shocking that these rates were this low; however, the numbers may be different if non-visible scars and tattoos were included. Almost all of the offenses were felony offenses (95.9%), with only 4.1% accounting for misdemeanors. This is not surprising because most sex crimes are felonies. The BMI percentages indicate that 65.3% of the offenders were overweight or obese. Only 34.7% fell into the "normal weight" category. Finally, only 16.3% of the offenders in this sample were over the age of 40 when they victimized a minor.

Table 1

Category		N	Marginal Percentage
Sentence	0=probation	54	27.6%
	1=jail	4	2.0%
	2=prison	138	70.4%
Race	0=white	107	54.6%
	1=non-white	89	45.4%

Facial Hair	0=no	55	28.1%
	1=yes	141	71.9%
Visible Scars	0=no	141	71.9%
	1=yes	55	28.1%
Visible Tattoos	0=no	122	62.2%
	1=yes	74	37.8%
Type of Crime	0=misdemeanor	8	4.1%
	1=felony	188	95.9%
BMI	0=normal weight	68	34.7%
	1=overweight/obese	128	65.3%
Age Ratio	0	164	83.7%
	1	32	16.3%
Valid		196	100.00%
Missing		26	
Total		222	

The ordinal regression produced three factors that were significant at the 95% level. Visible scars, visible tattoos, and type of crime all significantly affected the sentence received. Visible scars had a p value of .031, visible tattoos had a p value of .022, and type of crime had a p value of .037. Interestingly and not as predicted, race, facial hair, BMI, and age racial were not significant factors in determining sentence length.

Table 2

	Race	Facial Hair	Visible Scars	Visible Tattoos	Type of Crime	BMI	Age Ratio
Significance	.650	.107	.031*	.022*	.037*	.477	.291

* p.<.05

DISCUSSION

Analysis

My findings on visible scars, visible tattoos, and type of crime were consistent with prior research. My hypothesis that appearance factors associated with social stigma would have a significant effect on sex offender sentencing was supported overall, but

four of these factors had inconclusive results. It is just as likely that race, facial hair, BMI, and age ratio do support the hypotheses as it is likely that they do not. More research is necessary to further address these attributes.

The major conclusion from this study is that type of crime, visible scars, and visible tattoos do matter when sentencing an offender. Social psychological research indicates that scars and tattoos matter because they evoke a negative perception. Scars and tattoos infer a hard and dangerous life. They are common images conjured by the public when prompted to describe a criminal (MacLin, Herrera, 2006). It is a rational assumption that the belief that a tattooed individual is more sexually adventurous and thrill-seeking would lead one to also believe that person is more likely to be a criminal deserving punishment (Wohlrab, Fink, Kappeler & Brewer, 2009). The presence of scars and tattoos may stigmatize an individual and I am 95% confident that these factors do lead to harsher sentencing.

The seriousness of a crime as a major factor in sentencing is heavily supported in literature (Gibson, 1978; Ahola, Hellstrom & Christianson, 2010). White found that when assessed with offender and victim occupational status, it was the only significant influence on deciding sentence severity (White, 1975). It was accurately predicted that whether the offender committed a misdemeanor or felony offense would have great bearing on the sentence. This is not a socially linked factor, but it is comforting that it is a major contributor to sentence severity. In theory, crime type in combination with the mitigating or aggravating case circumstances should be the only determinants of sentence. It is refreshing to see that this factor has not been outweighed by social or psychological factors.

As noted, race was not a significant factor in the current study. The accepted general opinion, as well as most research, challenges this finding. One possible explanation for this finding is that we are beginning to see a change in our society's historical core beliefs about race. Miscegenation is becoming more common and discrimination based on race may be slowly decreasing. Simple awareness and social liberalization of society has contributed to this and may be taking hold in our criminal justice system. Recognition of prejudice, such as bias outlooks on skin lightness (Viglione, Hannon, & Defina, 2011), may be causing increased tolerance and decreased reliance on predispositions. On the other hand, even if its effects are not currently harmful, it is possible that such increased awareness has led to overcompensation for past discrimination. A third explanation, however, is that race may simply be mitigated in this case due to the nature of sex offenses. If the general consensus is that sexual offenses are particularly detestable, all sexual offenders may be viewed as equally "bad" at ground level before characteristics like scars and tattoos are taken into account.

Based on the literature, facial hair should have an effect on perceptions that could affect sentencing outcomes. Individuals with facial hair were viewed favorably (Hellstrom & Tekle, 1994), especially in regards to personality and composure (Reed & Blunk, 1990), yet facial hair was also found to be a feature of a typical criminal (MacLin & Herrera, 2006). Even though the consensus was mixed, I predicted that facial hair would have an effect on sentencing. However, this study found facial hair to have no significance in the sentencing process. One possible explanation is that individual's perceptions of facial hair are similar to the literature; mixed. Perhaps facial hair is important when identifying criminals in public, but unimportant once they have been

found guilty. On the other hand, individuals may become confused when they see a violent criminal with facial hair that they typically view in a positive light, causing a level of cognitive dissonance (McLeod, 2008).

Tall stature was linked to perceptions of leadership ability in one study (Murray & Schmitz, 2011), but had was not clearly defined as a necessary characteristic of a criminal (MacLin & Herrera, 2006). Weight was considered an aspect of a typical offender, but the specific weight varied from thin to overweight (MacLin & Herrera, 2006). It was my understanding that the overall size of an offender would matter in sentencing. I expected a difference in perception of someone who is 5'5" and 130 pounds, versus someone who is 5'5" and 230 pounds. Using BMI to capture this difference did not produce a significant effect on sentence outcome. This ratio between size and weight may be insignificant if weight and height do have independent effects on perception. For example, as power comes with leadership, tall stature may also lead to perceptions of power. Therefore, a tall convicted sex offender might appear powerful and consequently frightening. It is no surprise that individuals would want to lock up a person with such a dangerous combination. If height alone were to have this type of effect on perceptions, the BMI calculation would not necessarily indicate it.

A second theory is that weight may be insignificant when evaluating offenders for sentencing due to the increase in obese Americans (Healy, 2012). If more people have mothers, fathers, children, and close loved-ones that are overweight, they will be much less likely to hold negative stigmas towards others who are large. With obesity becoming so common, it may not be a factor in negative impression formation.

The final characteristic that did not have a significant effect on sentencing was age ratio. Crime shows flood TV programming and sensationalized cases often depict children victimized by older adults (e.g. *Law and Order: Special Victims Unit).* Society seems to thrive on the morbid and grotesque. Based on this public perception, it is baffling that offenders over the age of 40 who victimized minors were no more likely to receive a harsh sentence than younger offenders.

Limitations

The major limitation in the current study stems from the fact that sex offender registries are not uniformed across the nation. Each state has its own registry and each registry is organized in a completely different manner. Some provide an abundance of information such as detailed traits of the offender, crime details, the victim's gender, or the predatory style (modus operandi) and sexual tendencies of the offender. Others provide only basic information such as birth year, race, gender, and address. This greatly restricted my data collection abilities and limited my scope to only a few states and a few characteristics. Prior record was one factor that was highly inconsistent and widely unavailable to the point that I could not make a hypothesis regarding it. Additionally, type of crime was restricted to only two distinctions; misdemeanor or felony. I intended to divide this factor further into misdemeanor, felony without penetration, and felony with penetration. I imagined that the difference in severity involved with those two types of felonies may impact the results of the study. However, upon researching the various charges within each state, this distinction was not able to be made. In some states, penetration is a distinguishing element between charges. In others, one single charge could involve only fondling or penetration.

Based on these limitations and the difficulty involved in this study, it is my suggestion that the sex offender registry databases be reformed and standardized. The differences between them are drastic. Not only would a truly national database (the current national database only provides links to each states' registry) benefit the public in terms of awareness and safety, but a national database would also greatly benefit researchers. Consistency in available information would allow for better data collection and analysis. This would also ensure that all registries were held to a single standard, rather than having some that are well-kept and others that are not.

Further Research

Based on the current findings, I would like to see further research into the factors that were insignificant. Furthermore, future research should include a larger sample. My original intentions were to gather 400 observations, but database limitations resulted in a reduced usable sample. Mixed results regarding race, facial hair, and BMI prompt further research, but the factor of most fascination appears to be age ratio. As noted earlier, this insignificance of this factor was unexpected. It seems there is an incongruity between the current finding on age ratio and the public perception of age ratio. More research addressing age gaps in sexual victimization would benefit the criminal justice field and possibly reveal unaccredited disparities.

CONCLUSION

This study was not perceptual, hypothetical, or survey-based. It utilized real-world data from actual criminal cases. While not all of the factors tested were found to play a significant role in sentencing, the findings make a statement about stigmatization in our society. People are likely to hold negative views of tattoos and scars, and

furthermore, allow those perceptions to affect decisions on criminal sentencing. Being founded on equality, this greatly compromises the goals of the criminal justice system. An individual with tattoos or scars is not necessarily more deserving of punishment than an individual without those markings. Tattoos can be expressions of self, art, religion, passed loved ones, etc. Furthermore, scars may be the result of innocent explanations or accidents. The mere presence of either should not affect punishment-worthiness.

The fact that crime severity has a significant impact on punishment is an element of this study that instills hope about the criminal justice system. This is the factor that should matter and decreasing the significance of all others involved would be ideal. For justice to be rightfully served, equal treatment of all must be practiced. If enough awareness to these discrimination-based factors is raised, the disparities may subside and justice may flourish in a better society.

APPENDIX A

City	Offender	Prior Record	Gender	Race	Age	Facial Hair	Victim	Scars	Tattoos	BMI	Sentence	Sentence	Type of Crime	Type of Crime Adva	Type of Crime	Age Ratio	BMI Code	BMI Code Simplified
New York	Marcus Auerbach	9	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	22.3	2	3 yrs state prison	1	2	sex (contact) abuse 1st degree	1	0	0
New York	Ulysses Brown	9	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	27.3	2	18 mo-3yr	1	1	Sex (intercourse) abuse 1st deg	0	1	1
New York	Angel Echevarria	9	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	43.4	0	probation 5 yrs, jail 6 mo	1	1	rape 2nd degree (sex contact, d	1	2	1
New York	Orlando Feliciano	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	36	2	36 mo-6yr state prison	1	1	Sexual Abuse 1st: Sexual Contac	0	2	1
New York	Baron Franklin	9	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	37.9	2	24 yr state prison	1	1	Non NYS felony sex offense (s	0	2	1
New York	Ken Fuller	9	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	24.4	0	probation 5 yrs	1	2	Sex Abuse 2nd Degree (cutting	0	0	0
New York	Ruben Gonzalez	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	26.6	2	probation 1.5 yrs, 4 yrs su	1	2	Non NYS felony sex offense (s	0	1	1
New York	Anthony Jones	9	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	27.4	2	2-4 yrs state prison	1	2	Attempted Sex Abuse 1st degre	0	1	1
New York	Joseph Klein	9	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	25.1	0	Probation 10 yrs	1	2	Non NYS felony sex offense (s	1	1	1
New York	Irving Lansboy	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	24.3	0	probation 2 yrs	1	9	Non NYS felony sex offense	0	0	0
New York	Ruben Lasalle	9	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	23.5	2	6-18 yrs state prison	1	1	Sodomy 1st degree	0	0	0
New York	Juan Marte	9	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	23.5	2	1-3 yrs state prison	1	1	Rape 1st degree	0	0	0
New York	John McCray	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	32.1	2	16 mo-4 yrs state prison	1	1	Incest	0	2	1
New York	Allen Parker	9	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	28.4	2	18 mo-3 yr state prison	1	2	Attempted Rape 2nd Degree	0	1	1
New York	Roderick Philbert	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	32.5	2	1 day-4 yr state prison	1	2	Sex Abuse 1st Degree	0	2	1
New York	Perez Esequail	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	23.8	2	6-18 yrs state prison	1	1	Rape 1st degree (blunt object)	0	0	0
New York	Perez Rashmaei	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	33.9	0	Probation 10 yrs	1	2	Promotes sex performance by ch	0	2	1
New York	Shaun Perkins	9	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	23	1	1 yr local jail	1	1	Sex Misconduct: engage in oral	0	0	0
New York	George Rivera	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	24.9	2	5-15 yrs state prison (cons	1	1	Sodomy 1st degree	0	0	0
New York	Gladys Miller	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	33.3	2	5-15 yrs state prison (cons	1	1	sodomy 1st degree and rape 1s	0	2	1
New York	Luis Rodriguez	9	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	25.8	2	18-54 months state (cons	1	2	attempted rape 1st degree	0	1	1
New York	John Smith	9	1	1	0	1	9	1	0	22.1	2	18-54 months state (cons	1	2	attempted rape 1st degree	0	0	0
New York	Jose Torres	9	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	18.9	2	28 months-7 years state	1	2	Sex Abuse 2nd Degree :sex con	1	0	0
New York	Herbert Webby	9	1	1	1	1	9	0	0	31	0	5 years probation	1	2	sexual abuse 1st degree	0	2	1
New York	Daryll White	9	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	27.5	2	3 yrs state prison	1	2	Sex Abuse 1st Degree (cutting	0	1	1
New York	Kenneth Archbold	9	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	24.4	2	42 months state prison	1	2	sex abuse 1st degree:contact b	0	0	0
New York	Noel Arreagalista	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	2	18 mo-3 yrs state prison	1	1	rape 3rd victim <17, perp>21;s	0	0	0
New York	Sal Babiloma	9	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	36.5	2	10-20 yrs state prison (co	1	1	rape 1st degree (cutting instrum	0	2	1
New York	Kevin Burton	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	25.1	2	3-6 yrs state prison	1	1	rape 2nd degree	0	1	1
New York	Rigoberto Cruz	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	23.9	2	1-3 yrs state prison (cons	1	1	sodomy 2nd degree	0	0	0
New York	Jeffrey Enger	9	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	29	0	10 yrs probation, 6 mo ja	1	2	sex abuse 1st: sex contact <11	1	1	1
New York	Marcus Gardner	9	1	1	0	1	9	1	0	31.1	2	2-6 yrs state prison	1	1	Rape 1st degree (blunt object)	0	2	1
New York	Monroe Grosfield	9	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	29	2	100 mo-25 years state pr	1	1	sex abuse 1st degree; sodomy 1	1	1	1
New York	Johnny Hogans	9	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	22.3	1	1 yr local jail	1	1	rape 3rd victim <17, perp>21	0	0	0
New York	Melquis Lawson	9	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	31.4	2	2-6 yrs state prison (cons	1	1	rape 1st degree	0	2	1
New York	Ismael Lopez	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	29.8	2	5-15 yrs state prison	1	1	sodomy 1st degree	0	1	1
New York	Luther Marshall	9	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	22.8	2	1 day-5 yrs state prison	1	9	Non-NYS felony sex offense	0	0	0
New York	Carlos Ortiz	9	1	0	0	0	9	0	1	23	2	6-18 yrs state prison	1	1	rape 1st degree	0	0	0
New York	Johannes Rafeih	9	1	0	1	0	9	0	1	24.3	0	probation 5 yrs	1	2	sex abuse 1st degree	0	0	0
New York	Philip Ribeck	9	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	27.9	0	Probation 10 yrs	1	2	sex abuse 1st: sex contact <11	1	1	1
New York	Raymond Augustus	9	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	25.8	0	Probation 5 yrs	1	1	sodomy 1st; rape 1st; sex abus	0	1	1
New York	Rodney Baccus	9	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	25.8	2	40 mo-10 yrs state prison	1	1	rape 1st degree	0	1	1
New York	Keith Banks	9	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	30.5	2	3 yrs state prison	1	9	course of sex conduct against c	1	2	1
New York	Samuel Priestley	9	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	25.1	1	45 days local jail	1	2	sex abuse 3rd degree:subject as	0	1	1
New York	Samuel Cormack	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	Probation 10 yrs	1	1	rape 2nd:person <15 has intere	0	0	0
New York	Jerry Correa	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	24.5	1	1 yr local jail	1	1	rape 3rd degree	0	0	0
New York	Anthony Edwards	9	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	24.4	2	12 yrs state prison	1	2	attempted rape 1st degree (cont	0	0	0
New York	Dashawn Johnson	9	1	1	0	0	0	1		19.9	2	1-3 yrs state prison	1	2	sex abuse 1st: sex contact <11	0	0	0
New York	Jared Fisher	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	26.3	2	18 mo-3 yrs state prison	1	2	attempted disseminate indecent	0	1	1
Indianapolis	Tahir Abdullah	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	25.8	0	probation	1	9	child seduction	0	1	1
Indianapolis	Terra Abel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	48.4	2	4 yrs	1	9	child molesting	0	2	1
Indianapolis	Neal Abner	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	19.5	2	4 yrs; 4 yrs; 5 yrs; 10 yrs	1	9	4 counts child molesting	0	0	0
Indianapolis	Daniel Abshire	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	24.4	0	5 yrs probation	1	2	child solicitation	0	0	0
Indianapolis	Muhammed Abshair	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	27.3	2	4 yrs	1	9	child molesting	0	1	1

Indianapolis	George Acevedo	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	24.1	2	3 yrs; 3yrs	1	9	child molesting; sexual battery	0	0	0
Indianapolis	Jerry Acheson	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	22.5	2	8 yrs	1	9	child molesting 2 counts	0	0	0
Indianapolis	Jack Adams	0	1	0	0	0	9	1	0	22.3	2	6 yrs	1	1	rape	0	0	0
Indianapolis	John Adams	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	24.8	2	2 yrs	1	1	sex misconduct w/ a minor	0	0	0
Indianapolis	Michael Adams	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	34.4	2	2 yrs	1	9	child molesting	0	2	1
Indianapolis	Quincy Adams	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	27.7	0	1 1/2 yr probation	1	9	child seduction	0	1	1
Indianapolis	Robert Adams	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	20.5	2	9 yrs	1	9	child molesting	0	0	0
Indianapolis	Elvis Adamson	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	28.8	2	3 yrs; 8 yrs	1	1	sex misconduct w/ a minor; chi	0	1	1
Indianapolis	Jack Addison	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	27.2	0	2 yrs probation	1	9	child molesting	1	1	1
Indianapolis	Arthur Ahlfeldt	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	24.4	2	8 yrs	1	9	child molesting	1	0	0
Indianapolis	David Alexander	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	24.4	2	10 yrs	1	9	child molesting	0	0	0
Indianapolis	Danielle Allen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	27.5	2	4 yrs	1	1	sex misconduct w/ a minor	0	1	1
Indianapolis	Richard Allen	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	32.7	2	4 yrs, 4 yrs	1	9	child molesting; child molesting	1	2	1
Indianapolis	Thomas Allen	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	24.4	2	4 yrs; 3 yrs	1	9	child molesting; child molesting	0	0	0
Indianapolis	David Allison	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	30.5	2	5 YEARS SUSPENDED	1	9	child molesting	1	2	1
Indianapolis	Bruce Alte	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	29.3	2	3 yrs	1	9	child molesting	0	1	1
Indianapolis	Dallas Alte	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	39.6	2	2 YEARS, DO 1, 5 YEA	1	9	child molesting	0	2	1
Indianapolis	William Altman	0	1	0	1	1	9	1	1	25.8	2	1.5-3 yrs	1	1	incest	0	1	1
Indianapolis	Kevin Altum	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	23.7	2	14 yrs	1	9	child molesting	0	0	0
Indianapolis	Billy Anderson	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	35.7	2	15 yrs	1	1	incest; child molesting	0	2	1
Indianapolis	Billy R Anderson	0	1	0	0	1	9	0	0	43.6	2	1 yr 9 mo	1	2	sexual battery	0	2	1
Indianapolis	Brandon Anderson	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	26.6	2	4 yrs	1	9	child molesting	0	1	1
Indianapolis	John Anderson	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	40.9	2	8 yrs	1	9	child molesting	0	2	1
Indianapolis	Karen Anderson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	46.9	0	2 yrs community control	1	2	lewd/lascivious conduct victim	0	2	1
Indianapolis	Larry Anderson	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	26.1	2	8 yrs	1	9	child molesting	1	1	1
Indianapolis	Randy Anderson	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	27.8	2	6 yrs	1	1	sex misconduct w/ a minor	0	1	1
Indianapolis	Robert Anderson	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	29.8	2	9 yrs	1	1	sex misconduct w/ a minor	0	1	1
Indianapolis	Ron Anderson	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	46.2	2	4 yrs	1	9	child solicitation	0	2	1
Indianapolis	Ronald Anderson	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	24.5	2	772 days	1	9	child molesting	1	0	0
Indianapolis	David Andrews	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	25.8	2	10 yrs	1	9	child molesting	0	1	1
Indianapolis	Leon Anwuy	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	33	2	5-10 yrs	1	2	attempted sex assault of child 1	1	2	1
Indianapolis	Emilio Anzaldua	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	24.4	2	3 yrs	1	9	child molesting	0	0	0
Indianapolis	Andrew Armstrong	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	38.4	2	25 yrs	1	9	child molesting	0	2	1
Indianapolis	Michelle Armstrong	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29.3	0	Probation	1	9	child molesting	0	1	1
Indianapolis	Kevin Arnold	0	1	1	1	1	9	0	1	24.3	2	6 yrs	1	1	rape	0	0	0
Indianapolis	Michael Ashburn	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	35.3	0	2 yrs home detention	1	9	child solicitation	1	2	1
Indianapolis	Danny Asher	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	29.9	2	8 yrs	1	1	sex misconduct w/ a minor	1	1	1
Indianapolis	Kevin Austin	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	33.3	0	2 yrs house arrest	1	1	sex misconduct (attempted law	0	2	1
Indianapolis	Richard Austin	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	26.5	0	2.5 yrs probation	1	2	performing sex conduct in pres	0	1	1
Indianapolis	Hector Avila	0	1	0	0	1	9	0	0	28.1	0	3 yrs probation	0	0	indecent exposure	0	1	1
Indianapolis	Joh Ayers	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	26.7	2	7 yrs	1	1	sex misconduct w/ a minor; cri	0	1	1
Indianapolis	Anwar Baboul	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	26.4	0	3 yrs probation	1	9	child solicitation	1	1	1
Indianapolis	Tommie Bacon	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	22.4	2	3 yrs	1	2	Attempted sex misconduct w/ a	0	0	0
Indianapolis	David Badger	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	24.2	2	3 yrs	1	9	child molesting	1	0	0
Indianapolis	Marvin Baggett	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	25.1	2	2 yrs	1	9	child molesting	1	1	1
Charlotte, NC	Phillip Barryman	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	19.4	0	60 mo probation	1	2	indecent liberty minor	0	0	0
Charlotte, NC	Gonzie Burns	0	1	1	0	1	9	1	0	23.4	2	100-129 mo state prison	1	1	rape 2nd degree	0	0	0
Charlotte, NC	Jacaris Burris	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	33	2	63 days state prison	0	0	sexual battery	0	2	1
Charlotte, NC	Joseph Burris	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	29.5	2	150 mo-225 mo state pri	1	2	attempted rape 1st degree - w/	0	1	1
Charlotte, NC	John Carter	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	24.4	2	5 yrs probation; 10 yrs st	1	2	indecent liberty minor	0	0	0
Charlotte, NC	William Carter	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	20.9	2	19-23 mo state prison	1	2	indecent liberty minor	0	0	0
Charlotte, NC	Robert Fuller	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	30	2	18-22 mo state prison	1	1	incest w/ near relatives	0	2	1
Charlotte, NC	Phillip Gaddy	0	1	1	1	9	0	1	0	34.7	2	8 yr state prison	1	1	indecent liberty minor; rape 2n	1	2	1
Charlotte, NC	Andre Gary	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	39.3	2	37-54 mo state prison	1	1	kidnapping against minor	1	2	1
Charlotte, NC	John Geter	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	30	0	36 mo probation	1	2	indecent liberty minor	0	2	1

Charlotte, NC	Kenneth Gorham	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	26.3	0	30 mo probation	1	1	incest w/ near relatives	0	1	1
Charlotte, NC	Anthony Hall	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	25.8	0	36 mo probation; 14-17 r	1	2	indecent liberty minor	0	1	1
Charlotte, NC	Kenneth Hall	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	23.7	0	60 mo probation; 21-26 r	1	2	indecent liberty minor	1	0	0
Charlotte, NC	Shawn Hall	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	22.5	0	24 mo probation	0	0	sexual battery	0	0	0
Charlotte, NC	Neil Huey	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	26.9	0	36 mo probation	1	2	indecent liberty minor	0	1	1
Charlotte, NC	Early Jackson	0	1	1	0	1	9	0	1	36.1	2	8 yrs, 6 mo state prison	1	2	attempted sex offense 2nd degr	0	2	1
Charlotte, NC	Timothy Marshall	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	28.8	0	36 mo probation	0	0	sexual battery	0	1	1
Charlotte, NC	Randall Mauldin	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	38.7	2	36 mo probation; 15-18 r	1	2	indecent liberty minor	0	2	1
Charlotte, NC	Ricky McCall	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	29	2	5 yrs probation; 13 yrs st	1	2	indecent liberty minor	0	1	1
Charlotte, NC	Kimberly McLaughlir	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	24.4	2	64-86 mo state prison	1	2	attempted sex offense 2nd degr	0	0	0
Charlotte, NC	David McLendon	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	21.6	0	48 mo probation	1	1	sex offense w/ certain victims; i	0	0	0
Charlotte, NC	Ronald Moore	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	24.8	2	36 mo probation;76-101 r	1	1	sex offense 2nd degree & rape	1	0	0
Charlotte, NC	Vincent Morings	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	22.1	2	15-18 mo prison	1	2	indecent liberty minor	0	0	0
Charlotte, NC	Ramy Mostafa	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	29.8	0	60 mo probation	1	2	indecent liberty minor	0	1	1
Charlotte, NC	Harold Pass	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	27.7	2	150 days prison	0	0	sexual battery	0	1	1
Charlotte, NC	Jeffrey Pulley	0	1	1	0	1	9	1	0	37.3	2	25-39 mo prison	1	1	sex offense w/ certain victims	0	2	1
Charlotte, NC	James Roberson	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	31.3	2	51-71 mo prison; 58-79 r	1	1	attempted rape or sex offense (	0	2	1
Charlotte, NC	Windel Rouse	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	24.1	2	19-23 mo prison; 15-18 r	1	2	indecent liberty minor 2 counts	0	0	0
Charlotte, NC	Christian Salazar	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	25.1	0	30 mo probation	0	0	sexual battery	0	1	1
Charlotte, NC	Joshua Wilkerson	0	1	0	0	0	9	0	0	30.6	0	36 mo probation	1	2	indecent liberty minor	0	2	1
Charlotte, NC	David Williams	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	23.3	2	40 yrs prison	1	1	attempted sex offense 2nd degr	0	0	0
Charlotte, NC	Travis Williams	0	1	1	0	1	9	1	1	21.1	2	2 yrs, 8 mo prison	1	1	attempted sex offense w/ certai	0	0	0
Charlotte, NC	David Wilson	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	22.8	0	30 mo probation	1	1	attempted sex offense w/ certai	0	0	0
Charlotte, NC	Dominique Wilson	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	22.1	0	36 mo probation	1	2	indecent liberty minor 3 counts	0	0	0
Charlotte, NC	Raymond Wilson	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	26.3	0	36 mo probation	1	2	indecent liberty minor	0	1	1
Charlotte, NC	Willie Wright	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	28.8	2	1 yr, 2 mo prison	1	2	indecent liberty minor	0	1	1
Charlotte, NC	Joel Zandrowicz	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	21.9	0	60 mo probation	1	2	indecent liberty minor	0	0	0
Charlotte, NC	William Goldstein	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	29.5	2	36 mo probation, 16-20 r	1	2	indecent liberty minor	0	1	1
Charlotte, NC	David McCauley	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	29	0	36 mo. Probation	0	0	sexual battery	1	1	1
Charlotte, NC	Richard Moore	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	25.8	2	2 yr prison	1	2	indecent liberty minor	0	1	1
Charlotte, NC	Carl Nixon	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	34.4	2	48 mo; 60 mo; 60 mo pro	1	2	indecent liberty minor 3 counts	1	2	1
Charlotte, NC	Kyle Sobodash	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	25.8	0	30 mo probation; 30 mo ;	1	2	indecent liberty minor 2 counts	0	1	1
Charlotte, NC	Jeremy Alford	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	24.3	2	2 yrs, 9 mo; 60 mo proba	1	1	kidnapping against minor 1st, 2	0	0	0
Charlotte, NC	Byron Allison	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	23.2	2	36 mo probation, 16-20 r	1	2	indecent liberty minor (3 count	0	0	0
Charlotte, NC	Adam Bagley	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	29.8	0	36 mo probation	1		attempted indecent liberty minc	0	1	1
Charlotte, NC	Rauben Belmonds	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	20.1	0	60 mo probation (x2)	1	2	indecent liberty minor 2 counts	0	0	0
Charlotte, NC	Michael Blount	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	23	0	48 mo probation (x4)	1	2	indecent liberty minor 4 counts	0	0	0
Charlotte, NC	Kelvin Brown	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	24.1	2	100-129 mo prison; 19-2	1	1	rape 2nd degree; indecent liber	0	0	0
Charlotte, NC	Joshua Ancrue	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	47.5	0	48 mo probation	1	2	indecent liberty minor	0	2	1
Charlotte, NC	Ricardo Aristizabal	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	22.8	0	36 mo probation	1	2	indecent liberty minor	0	0	0
Milwaukee	William Bass	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	25.1	2	7 yrs state prison	1	9	2nd degree sex assault child (fe	1	1	1
Milwaukee	Mark Bailey	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	29.4	2	3 years	1	9	2nd degree sex assault child (fe	1	1	1
Milwaukee	John Behnke	0	1	0	0	1	9	0	0	31.6 .		7 (converted case)	1	9	sex assault	0	2	1
Milwaukee	Jason Berglas	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	25.8	2	2 yrs state prison	1	9	2nd degree sex assault child (fe	0	1	1
Milwaukee	Malcolm Broadnax	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	21.1	2	5 yrs prison	1	9	1st degree sex assault child (fel	0	0	0
Milwaukee	Michael Bruening	0	1	0	0	1	N/A	0	0	27.4	2	3 yrs prison, 5 yrs probat	1	2	possession of child pornograph	0	1	1
Milwaukee	Shawn Castellano	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	40.3	2	3 yrs prison	1	9	2nd degree sex assault child (fe	0	2	1
Milwaukee	Bernard Chojnacki	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	17 .		7 (converted case)	1	9	1st degree sex assault child (fel	1		
Milwaukee	Jessie Agosto	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	28.1	2	2 yrs prison	1	9	2nd degree sex assault child (fe	0	1	1
Milwaukee	Andis Aiello	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	34.5	2	3 yrs probation, 2 yrs priv	1	1	3rd degree sex assault (felony)	0	2	1
Milwaukee	Jordan Alexander	0	1	1	0	1	9	0	0	24.4	2	30 mo. Probation, 1 1/2 y	1	1	3rd degree sex assault (felony)	0	0	0
Milwaukee	Edgard Almodovar	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	30	2	4 yrs, 6 mo prison	1	9	2nd degree sex assault child (fe	1	2	1
Milwaukee	Brian Ambers	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	26.8	2	42 mo probation, 3 yrs pr	1	9	2nd degree sex assault child (fe	0	1	1
Milwaukee	David Anastasi	0	1	0	0	0	N/A	0	0	39.2	2	7 yrs probation, 2 yrs priv	1	2	use computer to facilitate child	0	2	1
Milwaukee	Adam Anderson	0	1	0	0	1	N/A	0	0	23.4	0	10 yrs probation	1	2	use computer to facilitate child	0	0	0

Milwaukee	Antonio Anderson	1	1	1	0	1	9	0	0	32.1	2	4 yrs probation, 2 yrs pris		1	1	3rd degree sex assault (felony)	0	2	1
Milwaukee	Angela-Marie Andrist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32.5	0	10 yrs probation		1	9	2nd degree sex assault child (fe	0	2	1
Milwaukee	Jose Aranzamendi	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	24.4	2	5 yrs prison		1	9	repeated sex assault of same ch	0	0	0
Milwaukee	Gregory Arndt	1	1	0	0	0	9	0	1	28	2	3 yrs prison		1	1	3rd degree sex assault (felony)	0	1	1
Milwaukee	Alvin Atkins	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	25.8	2	2 yrs prison		1	9	2nd degree sex assault child (fe	0	1	1
Milwaukee	Sammie Atkins Jr.	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	29	2	6 yrs prison		1	9	1st degree sex assault child (fel	0	1	1
Milwaukee	John Aussem	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	28.5	0	probation		1	2	2 counts child enticement (felo	0	1	1
Milwaukee	Darren Austad	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	27.5	2	2 yrs prison		1	2	child enticement - sexual conta	0	1	1
Milwaukee	Johnny Austin	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	47.3	2	4 yrs prison		1	1	incest (felony-intercourse)	0	2	1
Milwaukee	Donald Avery	1	1	1	0	1	9	1	1	23.6	2	3 yrs prison		1	1	3rd degree sex assault (felony)	0	0	0
Milwaukee	Mark Aviles	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	39.2	2	5 yrs prison		1	9	1st degree sex assault child (fel	0	2	1
Milwaukee	Darryl Badzinski	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	27.7	2	5 yrs probation; 8 1/2 yrs		1	9	1st degree sex assault child (fel	1	1	1
Milwaukee	Joseph Bagley	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	35.9	2	5 yrs probation; 5 yrs pris		1	9	1st degree sex assault child (fel	0	2	1
Milwaukee	Elbert Barker	1	1	0	0	1	9	1	1	34.3	2	3 yrs prison		1	1	2nd degree sex assault child (fe	0	2	1
Milwaukee	Lavell Baker	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	32.5	0	3 yrs probation		1	9	2nd degree sex assault child (fe	0	2	1
Milwaukee	Patrick Barnhardt	0	1	0	1	1	N/A	0	0	31	2	4 yrs prison		1	2	3 counts possession child porn	0	2	1
Milwaukee	Jose Barraza	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	30.4	2	5 yrs probation; 3 yrs pris		1	9	2nd degree sex assault child (fe	1	2	1
Milwaukee	Janice Barrett	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	21	2	3 yrs prison		1	9	repeated sex assault of same ch	1	0	0
Milwaukee	Ladale Barron	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	34.9	2	3 yrs prison		1	2	child enticement - sexual conta	0	2	1
Milwaukee	Mario Bates	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	25.5	0	6 yrs probation		0	0	sex w/ child >16 (misd); 4th de	0	1	1
Milwaukee	Orlando Bates	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	34.3	0	3 yrs probation		1	9	1st degree sex assault child (fel	0	2	1
Milwaukee	Michael Baumann	0	1	0	0	1	N/A	0	0	28.9	2	3 yrs probation; 3 yrs pris		1	2	possession of child pornograph	0	1	1
Milwaukee	Anthony Beard	1	1	1	0	1	9	0	1	34.5	2	4 yrs probation, 2 yrs pris		1	1	3rd degree sex assault (felony)	0	2	1
Milwaukee	Jeffery Bedford	1	1	1	1	1	N/A	0	0	29.3	2	5 yrs probation; 3 yrs pris		1	2	4 counts possession child porn	0	1	1
Milwaukee	Quincy Belk	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	22.3	0	6 yrs probation		1	9	2nd degree sex assault of child	0	0	0
Milwaukee	Jarel Bell	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	23.1	2	3 yrs probation; 3 yrs pris		1	2	child enticement - sexual conta	0	0	0
Milwaukee	Joshua Berry	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	26.5	2	4 yrs probation; 3 yrs pris		1	9	2nd degree sex assault of child	0	1	1
Milwaukee	Brian Bisa-Hartman	0	1	0	0	1	N/A	1	0	26.6	2	5 yrs probation; 3 yrs pris		1	2	use computer to facilitate child	0	1	1
Milwaukee	Sean Blair	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	26.5	2	2 yrs prison		1	9	2 counts 2nd degree sex assaul	0	1	1
Milwaukee	Joseph Bogan	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	26.9	2	12 yrs prison		1	9	1st degree sex assault child (fel	0	1	1
Milwaukee	Michael Brackett	1	1	1	0	1	9	0	0	34.4	2	3 yrs probation; 5 yrs pris		1	1	3rd degree sex assault (felony)	0	2	1
Milwaukee	Donald Breimon	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	25.1	2	3 yrs prison		1	9	1st degree sex assault child - se	0	1	1
Milwaukee	Darius Brewer	0	1	1	0	1	9	0	0	25.8	0	5 yrs probation		1	1	3rd degree sex assault (felony)	0	1	1
Milwaukee	Richard Brizre	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	23.7	0	5 yrs probation		1	1	3rd degree sex assault (felony)	0	0	0
Milwaukee	Freddie Bridges	0	1	1	0	1	9	0	0	25.1	2	3 yrs probation; 30 mo pr		1	1	3rd degree sex assault (felony)	0	1	1
Chicago	Jimmy Alexander	0	1	1	0	0	0	9	9	32.3	9		9	9	9	agg unlawful restraint	0	2	1
Chicago	Dwayne Anfield	0	1	1	0	1	0	9	9	29	9		9	9	9	Agg Criminal Sex Assault (2 co	0	1	1
Chicago	Michael Booker	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	26.5	2	35 yrs		1	1	Agg crim sex assault (2 counts	0	1	1
Chicago	Michael Boone	0	1	1	0	1	0	9	9	28.1	9		9	9	9	Crim sex assault victim 13-17	0	1	1
Chicago	Edward Butler	0	1	1	0	1	0	9	9	23.7	9		9	9	9	Crm Sex abuse victim 13-17	0	0	0
Chicago	Sean Dawson	0	1	1	0	1	0	9	9	23.5	9		9	9	9	Agg crim sex abuse victim 13-1	0	0	0
Chicago	David Dewost	0	1	1	0	1	0	9	9	24	9		9	9	9	crim sex abuse/force/2nd	0	0	0
Chicago	Corey Dorsey	0	1	1	0	0	0	9	9	31.3	9		9	9	9	Crim sex assault	0	2	1
Chicago	Thoeun Ducng	0	1	0	1	0	0	9	9	22.5	9		9	9	9	Agg crim sex abuse/bodily harm	1	0	0
Chicago	Luis Gonzalez	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	9	24.1	9		9	9	9	child abduction/lure child <16 i	0	0	0
Chicago	Troy Grow	0	1	0	0	1	0	9	9	32.1	9		9	9	9	Child porn/Elm/photos	0	2	1
Chicago	James Harper	0	1	1	0	1	0	9	9	28.5	9		9	9	9	Agg crim sex abuse victim 13-1	0	1	1
Chicago	Hector Herrera	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	9	24.1	9		9	9	9	Crim sex abuse victim 13-17	0	0	0
Chicago	Darryl Hicks	1	1	1	1	1	0	9	9	21.5	9		9	9	9	Agg crim sex abuse victim <13	1	0	0
Chicago	James Hodges	1	1	0	0	1	0	9	9	23.7	9		9	9	9	predatory crim sex assault; agg	0	0	0
Chicago	Marvin Johnson	0	1	1	0	1	0	9	9	19.9	9		9	9	9	Agg crim sex abuse victim 13-1	0	0	0
Chicago	Darryl Kinney	0	1	1	0	1	0	9	9	27.3	9		9	1	9	crim sex abuse/force; agg crim	0	1	1
Chicago	James Lozins	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	24.5	2	11 yrs		1	1	predatory crim sex assault (2 co	1	0	0
Chicago	Andrew Lozada	0	1	0	0	1	0	9	1	20.7	9		9	9	9	Agg crim sex abuse victim 13-1	0	0	0
Chicago	Timothy McCarty	0	1	1	0	1	0	9	9	46.2	9		9	9	9	Agg crim sex assault	0	2	1

Houston	Robert Ardrey	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	9	31.2	2	10-15 yrs prison	1	1	Rape 1st degree w/instrumentn	0	2	1
Houston	James Arnold	0	1	0	1	0	0	9	9	27.6	2	10 yrs prison	1	1	Agg Sex assault of a child	1	1	1
Houston	Robert Baggett	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	9	38.5	2	7 yrs prison	1	9	Agg Sex assault of a child	0	2	1

REFERENCES

Ahola, A., Hellstrom, A., & Christianson, S. (2010). Is justice really blind? Effects of crime descriptions, defendant gender and appearance, and legal practitioner gender on sentences and defendant evaluations in a mock trial. *Psychiatry Psychology and Law,* 17(2), 304-324.

Arboleda-Florez, J. (2002). What causes stigma? *World Psychiatry Journal,* 1(1), 25-26.

Bushway, S., & Piehl, A. (2001). Judging judicial discretion: Legal factors and racial discrimination in sentencing. *Law & Society Review,* 35(4), 733-764.

Carruthers, P. (2007). Sentencing trends: Analysis and recommendations. *Council on Crime and Justice.* Retrieved from http://www.crimeandjustice.org/councilinfo.cfm?pID=51

Eberhardt, J., Davies, P., Purdie-Vaughns, V., & Johnson, S. (2006). Looking deathworthy: Perceived stereotypicality of black defendants predicts capital-sentencing outcomes. *Psychological Science,* 17(5), 383-386.

Gibson, J. (1978). Judges' role orientations, attitudes, and decisions: An interactive model. *The American Political Science Review,* 72(3), 911-924.

Healy, M. (2012,). Health rankings: USA is living longer, but sicker. *USA Today.* Retrieved from http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2012/12/10/health-rankings-states/1759299/

Hellstrom, A., & Tekle, J. (1994). Person perception through facial photographs: Effects of glasses, hair, and beard on judgments of occupation and personal qualities. *European Journal of Social Psychology,* 24(6), 693-705.

MacLin, K., & Herrera, V. (2006). The criminal stereotype. *North American Journal of Psychology,* 8(2), 197-207.

McLeod, S. (2008). Cognitive dissonance. *Simply Psychology.* Retrieved from http://www.simplypsychology.org/cognitive-dissonance.html#sthash.iVmP8C1I.Tr0GlL4a.dpbs

Mlodinow, L. (2012). How we are judged by our appearance. *Psychology Today.* Retrieved from http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/subliminal/201206/how-we-are-judged-our-appearance

Murray, G., & Schmitz, J. (2011). Caveman politics: Evolutionary leadership preferences and physical stature. *Social Science Quarterly,* 92(5), 1215-1235.

Reed, J., & Blunk, E. (1990). The influence of facial hair on impression-formation. *Social Behavior and Personality,* 18(1), 169-176.

Saad, L. (2011). Most Americans believe crime in U.S. is worsening. *Gallup Wellbeing.* Retrieved from http://www.gallup.com/home.aspx

United States Department of Commerce: United States Census Bureau. (2013). *State and County QuickFacts* [Data File]. Retrieved from http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/11000.html

United States Department of Justice: Bureau of Justice Assistance. (1996). *National Assessment of Structured Sentencing.* Retrieved from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/strsent.pdf

United States Department of Justice: Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2012). *Prisoners in 2011.* Retrieved from http://bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/p11.pdf

Viglione, J., Hannon, L., & DeFina, R. (2011). The impact of light skin on prison ime for black female offenders. *The Social Science Journal,* 48(1), 250-258.

Wohlrab, S., Fink, B., Kappeler, P.M., & Brewer, G. (2009). Differences in personality attributions toward tattooed and nontattooed virtual human characters. *Journal of Individual Differences,* 30(1), 1-5.

White, G. (1975). Public responses to hypothetical crimes: Effect of offender and victim status and seriousness of the offense on punitive reactions. *Social Forces,* 53(3), 411-419

ABSTRACT

Researchers have conducted numerous studies and assessments regarding racial disparities in the criminal justice system. However, there is not much literature concerning the effects of physical appearance on sentencing. In the current study, the effects of race, facial hair, visible tattoos, visible scars, body mass index, and crime type on the sentencing of sex offenders was examined. The results indicate that crime type and physical factors such as visible tattoos and scars, do affect sentence severity. Limitations and further research possibilities are discussed.