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We investigated effects of defendant race, victim race, and juror gender on public perceptions of a juvenile sex offense. We predicted that participants, particularly men, would support registering a juvenile defendant as a sex offender more when he was Black than White and that participants, particularly women, would support registering the defendant more when the female crime victim was portrayed as White than as Black. We also expected that support for registration would be higher when the defendant and victim were different races than when they were the same race. As expected, women (but not men) recommended registration more when the victim was White than Black. Furthermore, participants supported registration more when the defendant and the victim were different races than when they were the same race. These effects were mediated by retributive goals to punish the offender—not by utilitarian goals to protect society. Explanations and implications are discussed. Copyright © 2009 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

In 2006, the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (SORNA; 42 U.S.C. § 16911), also known as the Adam Walsh Act, mandated that all states extend sex offender registry laws to juvenile sex offenders (Caldwell, Ziemke, & Vitacco, 2008). Although these laws are presumed to protect society from dangerous sex offenders, social scientists highlight evidence that these laws are ineffective at reducing sex offenses, and instead harm the lives of offenders in ways that might contribute to future offenses (Levenson & Cotter, 2005; Levenson, D’Amora, & Hern, 2007; Salerno et al., in press; Tewksbury, 2005; Tewksbury & Lees, 2006, 2007; Trivits & Reppucci, 2002). Because the extension of registry laws to juveniles might be driven by politicians’ assumptions that the public supports these laws, it is important to examine public attitudes toward juvenile sex offenders. Although there is strong public support for registration laws applied to adult sex offenders (Levenson et al., 2007; Phillips, 1998), there is currently a paucity of research on perceptions of juvenile sex offenders. In the only study to examine this issue, Salerno and colleagues (manuscript in preparation) revealed strong public support for registering juvenile sex offenders, but cautioned that this may be an artifact of methodology. That is, when asked about support for registry
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laws in general, participants’ support was high for both adults and for juveniles (yet slightly lower for juveniles). When asked about specific juvenile sex offenses, however, such as harassment or non-forced sex (offenses for which juveniles are registered in some states), public support for registration was much lower.

Even less is known about specific defendant and victim-related factors that influence perceptions of juvenile sex offenders. Consider the case of Genarlow Wilson, a 17-year-old Black high school student who was videotaped receiving non-forced oral sex from a 15-year-old White girl during a New Years Eve Party. In adult court, he was convicted of aggravated sexual molestation, was placed on the sex offender registry, and received a 10-year mandatory prison sentence (*Wilson v. State of Georgia*, 2006). The forewoman announced this verdict with tears in her eyes—tears that suggest she might not have felt comfortable with the punitive verdict that she and her fellow jurors felt legally obligated to render (Thompson, 2007). Although Wilson was released after spending two years in prison, this case raises important issues regarding factors that affect perceptions of extending sex offender registration laws to juveniles in cases like these. Does the public support registering juveniles as sex offenders for acts alleged to have been consensual and between similarly aged juveniles? Further, what factors affect perceptions of the application of the registry in cases like these? For instance, might Wilson’s African American ethnicity and the victim’s Caucasian ethnicity have shaped jurors’ perceptions of this case? In the current study, we examined the influence of case-related factors, including defendant race and victim race (Black or White), on perceptions of a mock case in which two juveniles engaged in non-forced sexual relations. To increase ecological validity, our case was based on the real-world Genarlow Wilson case. Next we describe the psychological literature that led to the formulation of our theoretically derived hypotheses.

### Defendant and Victim Race

Although the literature is riddled with mixed findings, research reveals that Whites generally render more pro-prosecution case judgments when the defendant is Black than White and when the victim is White than Black (e.g., Sommers & Ellsworth, 2003). For example, Sweeney and Haney (1992) found compelling evidence of racial bias in their meta-analysis exploring effects of adult defendant race on sentencing in 14 mock juror studies involving adult defendants (see also Mitchel, Haw, Pfeifer, & Meisner, 2005). In addition, White mock jurors tend to be most punitive in reactions to mock rape cases when the defendant is described as Black and the victim as White than in any other defendant–victim racial combination (see, e.g., Feild, 1979; Foley & Chamblin, 1982; Klein & Creech, 1982; Ugwuegbu, 1979). It is likely that similar effects of racial bias will manifest in research examining perceptions of juvenile sex offenders. In support, there is substantial evidence of racial bias within the juvenile justice system: As compared with non-minority offenders, minority juvenile offenders are more likely to be arrested, detained, transferred to criminal court, and given longer sentences, even when controlling for factors such as offense severity and prior offenses (Bishop & Frazier, 1988; Engen, Steen, & Bridges, 2002; Wordes, Bynum, & Corley, 1994).

Several psychological theories offer ways to explain racial bias in the courtroom. One important theory specifies that well established biased attitudes and anti-Black
stereotypes (e.g., Blacks are more violent and aggressive than Whites; Blacks are not as intelligent as Whites; Devine, 1989) drive discriminatory treatment. In support, Bridges and Steen (1998) found that juvenile probation officers rated minority offenders as more criminal-like, dangerous, and likely to recidivate than comparable White counterparts. Stereotypes that Black men are more dangerous and criminal-like than White men likely influence the processing of case-related information, and in turn, cause Black defendants to be perceived as guilty more often than White defendants accused of the same crime (for a review, see Sweeney & Haney, 1992).

Perhaps the simplest explanation of racial bias in the courtroom is that of racism. According to the theory of aversive racism, it is no longer socially acceptable to appear outwardly racist in most social circles (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). Instead, aversive racists endorse egalitarian values (which have become societal norms), yet their behavior is still influenced by anti-Black sentiments. Aversive racism could explain why Black adult defendants are treated more harshly than White defendants, and why the highest conviction rates occur when the defendant is Black and the victim is White, whereas the lowest conviction rates occur when the defendant is White and the victim is Black (e.g., Landwehr et al., 2002; Pfeifer & Olgoff, 1991; Ugwuegbu, 1979).

An alternative psychological theory that might explain discriminatory treatment against Blacks is described by the similarity-leniency hypothesis: Not only do people tend to like similar others more than non-similar others, but people also tend to administer preferential treatment to those they like (e.g., Davis, Bray, & Holt, 1977). Accordingly, jurors who perceive themselves as similar to defendants would treat defendants more leniently than those who perceive themselves as different from defendants. Though some research has not uncovered evidence of the similarity-leniency bias (e.g., Taylor & Hosch, 2004), a good deal of research has: A meta-analysis by Mitchel et al. (2005) revealed that White people tend to demonstrate preferential treatment toward White defendants, whereas Black people tend to administer preferential treatment toward Black defendants.

We expect that theories of stereotyping, racism, and the similarity-leniency bias can be applied to perceptions of juvenile sex offenders such that non-Black participants will recommend the sex offender registry more often when the juvenile defendant is portrayed as Black and the victim is White as compared with when the defendant is White and the victim is Black.

**Participant Gender and Defendant and Victim Race**

There is reason to expect that the effects of defendant and victim race will differ for men and women. In a mock case describing a juvenile defendant (portrayed as Black or White) tried in adult court for the murder of an elderly man (Black or White), Stevenson and Bottoms (2009) found interactions of juror gender and defendant and victim race such that men, but not women, convicted more often when a juvenile defendant was Black than when he was White and when the victim was White than Black. Manipulating defendant race in a mock capital case with an adult defendant, Dovidio, Smith, Donella, and Gaertner (1997) found a similar pattern of results: Men, but not women, recommended the death penalty more often for the Black adult defendant than for the White adult defendant. These results could be due to men’s tendency to score
higher than women on measures of explicit racism and ethnocentrism (Carter, 1990; Kim & Goldstein, 2005; for a review, see Ekehammar, Akrami, & Araya, 2003), men’s diminished likelihood to confront acts of racial discrimination (Byrnes & Kiger, 2001), and men’s lower acceptance of others, as compared with women (Mills, McGrath, Sobkoviak, Stupec, & Welsch, 1995b). Yet, Stevenson and Bottoms found these effects even when controlling for participants’ scores on the Modern Racism Scale, suggesting that racism might not drive men’s discriminatory actions.

An alternative explanation, thus, is that gender-related social categorization drove men to attend more to the male defendant than women. That is, women may have classified the male defendant as an out-group member due to his gender, and in turn have paid less attention to his racial characteristics. In other words, female participants might have been less affected by defendant and victim race because they did not perceive a male defendant or male victim (Black or White) to be part of their “in-group.” Why? Women demonstrate strong positive in-group associations toward women and negative associations toward men on measures assessing implicit gender associations (Rudman & Goodwin, 2004). That is, women identify much more with women than with men. Likewise, although the bias is less pronounced, men demonstrate positive in-group associations toward men over women (Rudman & Goodwin, 2004). Thus, in the studies described above, men were probably more likely than women to identify with and attend to the defendant and victim, both of whom were male. Because men likely attended more to the defendant and victim, they, in turn, were more susceptible to the influence of racial characteristics of the defendant and victim.

Indeed, social categorization greatly influences the extent to which one attends to characteristics and features of people. For instance, White participants can more accurately distinguish between different photos of White faces than Black faces, whereas Black participants more accurately distinguish between Black faces than White faces—a robust phenomenon called the cross-race effect (for a review, see Meissner & Brigham, 2001). Although some theorize that this effect is due to perceptual expertise (e.g., Meissner & Brigham, 2001), there is evidence that it may be due to social categorization (e.g., Bernstein, Young, & Hugenberg, 2007). For instance, this facial recognition phenomenon also occurs for social groups for which a perceptual expertise explanation is implausible, including university affiliations and minimal groups (Bernstein et al., 2007). Thus, because White participants categorized the White faces as part of their social group, they may have been more motivated to attend to those faces, causing them to be able to accurately identify them later. In contrast, because White participants categorized the Black faces as part of a different social group, they may have been less motivated to attend to those faces and, in turn, were less able to recall their characteristics.

In line with this research, because the defendant in the present study is portrayed as male, we expect women to categorize him as part of a different social group, and in turn attend less to the defendant’s characteristics (i.e., race) than men. Consequently, women might be less affected by the race of the defendant than men, just as they were in past studies (Dovidio et al., 1997; Stevenson & Bottoms, 2009). Men, on the other hand, will likely categorize the male defendant as part of their social group, and in turn attend more to the defendant’s characteristics (i.e., race) than women. Thus, we expect that the race of the defendant will influence men’s case judgments more than women, such that non-Black men (but not non-Black women) will be more punitive toward the
Black than the White defendant. Because, however, the victim is female, we expected that women would attend to the victim more than men. Thus, women might be more influenced by victim race than men, for whom the victim is less likely to be perceived as an in-group member. That is, we expect that non-Black women, but not non-Black men, will seek more retribution by punishing the defendant more when the victim is White than Black, thereby devaluing the worth of the Black victim, with whom they are less similar.

Perceptions of Interracial Relationships

Due to the uniqueness of the case involved in the present study, however, it is also possible that we might uncover a pattern of defendant and victim race effects that differs from typical main effects of racial bias found in research. Because the defendant and victim are close in age and were alleged to have engaged in consensual sexual activity, some participants may not view this as a crime, but rather as typical adolescent sexual exploration between two mutually consenting teenagers. Thus, we also consider research on attitudes toward interracial romantic relationships.

Although we have certainly come a long way from the 1960s, when marriage between a White and a Black couple was still illegal in some states (Porterfield, 1982), there is considerable research suggesting that lingering negative societal attitudes toward interracial relationships remain (e.g., Ross, 2005). For instance, interracial couples, as compared with same-race couples, are perceived more negatively, as less compatible, and as being less supported and accepted by family members (Carrasco, 2007; Lewandowski & Jackson, 2001; Harrison & Esqueda, 2000; Mills, Daly, Longmore, & Kilbride, 1995a; Ross, 2005). For instance, in an experiment in which a couple’s racial composition was varied between subjects, Lewandowski and Jackson (2001) found that, as compared with White women and White men in same-race relationships, White women married to Black men were perceived as less psychologically adjusted and less traditional, while White men married to Black women were thought to be less successful on a professional level and less competent (Lewandowski & Jackson, 2001). Similarly, compared with Black women and Black men in same-race relationships, those married to Whites were thought to be less traditional, and less compatible. Not surprisingly, these negative attitudes toward interracial couples are reflected in survey research illustrating societal general unwillingness to engage in interracial relationships: Only 32% of individuals without prior interracial dating experience expressed openness to such a relationship (Knox, Zusman, Buffington, & Hemphill, 2000).

Perhaps most relevant to the current research is a study conducted by Harrison and Esqueda (2000) in which participants rated their perceptions of a vignette describing a case of domestic violence. The male batterer’s race and the female victim’s race (i.e., Black or White) were experimentally manipulated in a fully crossed between-subjects design. The batterer was attributed more guilt when he was in an interracial relationship than when he was in a same-race relationship. It is possible that this effect was driven by societal lack of acceptance of interracial relationships, causing the interracial couple to be perceived as less compatible and more dysfunctional, and in turn the domestic violence was perceived as more plausible.
Thus, in the present study, we hypothesize that, due to negative perceptions of interracial relationships, participants will perceive a juvenile sex offender as more deserving of sex offender registration when the sexual interaction is interracial than same race.

RETRIBUTIVE VERSUS UTILITARIAN GOALS OF PUNISHMENT

Finally, it is important to consider competing goals of punishment that may drive effects of race on support for the sex offender registry, including retributive and utilitarian goals of punishment. Although the existence of sex offender registration laws is legally justified only by the utilitarian claim that they protect society, we actually expect that retributive goals to punish the defendant will emerge as a stronger mediator of the effects of race on support for the registry. Why? On the one hand, most people believe that registry laws protect the community and that most sex offenders recidivate (Levenson et al., 2007; Redlich, 2002), indicating that public support for registry laws might be motivated by utilitarian concerns for society. On the other hand, most people (73%) will still support registry laws even if there is no evidence that they reduce sex offenses (Levenson et al., 2007), suggesting that utilitarian goals alone do not explain public support. Further, Redlich (2002) found that support for registration is driven not only by fear for society, but also by anger toward sex offenders. Together, these findings suggest that the public may support registration as a means to satisfy retributive desires to punish sex offenders for their wrong-doings. Further, research reveals that participants’ case-related judgments are primarily driven by retributive desires to punish, not by utilitarian desires to protect society (Carlsmith, Darley, & Robinson, 2002; Darley, Carlsmith, & Robinson, 2000). For example, Carlsmith et al. found that people are more sensitive to factors associated with a retributive approach to punishment when rendering sentences and are less sensitive to factors associated with a utilitarian approach. In addition, Darley et al. found that sentence lengths were more influenced by the offense severity (a retributive perspective) than by the likelihood for future offenses (a utilitarian perspective).

OVERVIEW AND DESIGN

Our study conformed to a 2 (defendant race: Black or White) × 2 (victim race: Black or White) × 2 (participant gender) between-subjects design. Non-Black participants were given a questionnaire that contained a vignette describing a 15-year-old boy (depicted as White or Black) who received “consensual,” videotaped oral sex from a similarly aged girl (depicted as White or Black). Case materials and questions were originally developed by Salerno and colleagues (manuscript in preparation). After reading the vignette, participants rendered case-related judgments, including (a) support for registering the juvenile as a sex offender, ranging from 1 (never register) to 4 (register publicly on the internet), (b) retributive goals to punish the defendant (i.e., supporting the registry even if there is no evidence that it reduces sex offenses), and (c) utilitarian goals to protect society (e.g., belief that the juvenile offender is likely to re-offend).
METHOD

Participants
We approached 220 participants from a Midwestern city and 72% agreed to participate, for a total sample size of 158 participants. We did not recruit Black participants because we were interested in anti-Black biases. Twenty-five participants incorrectly reported the defendant’s or the victim’s race in the manipulation checks, and 13 participants suspected that the study was about racial bias. These participants were excluded from analyses. This resulted in a sample of 120 representative community members (57% men, 94% White, 3% Hispanic, 1% Asian, 2% other (non-Black), M age = 41, SD age = 13.26, age ranged from 18 to 79). Sixty percent of participants had at most some college experience, and 40% had at least a Bachelors degree.

Materials

Vignette of Case
A short vignette, modified from the vignette used by Salerno and colleagues (2009), presents a case describing a 15-year-old boy who was convicted of aggravated child molestation. We portrayed the juvenile offender as a boy because the majority of juvenile crime is committed by boy, rather than girl, offenders (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006) and because 92% of all juvenile sex offenses are committed by boys (Uniform Crime Report, 2007). Our case was ecologically valid, as it was based on the real-world Genarlow Wilson case (Wilson v. State of Georgia, 2006). Specifically, participants were told that the defendant attended a party where he participated in videotaped consensual oral sex with the victim. Participants were told that, although the girl victim stated that the act was consensual, because she was a legal minor, she could not legally provide consent.1

To manipulate race, we embedded racial demographic information within the vignette. For example, the defendant was described as either “Tyrone (a 15-year-old African American male)” or as “Jacob (a 15-year-old Caucasian male).” Race specified as “African American” or “Caucasian,” along with race-consistent names of the defendant (Tyrone or Jacob) and victim (Shaniqua or Elizabeth), constituted the race manipulation. Sommers and Ellsworth (2001) showed that manipulating race in this manner enables participants to recognize race, without making race overly salient. Thus, there were four versions of the vignette to accommodate the factorial manipulation of defendant and victim race.

1 There were two victim age conditions such that the victim was portrayed as either 12 or 15 years old. Because we were not interested in effects of victim age for the purposes of this study, we conducted all analyses collapsed across victim age. Although there were no main effects or interactions involving victim age on any case judgments, we nonetheless replicated all analyses including victim age as a covariate. There were no differences in the results. Thus, we present analyses without including victim age as a covariate.

Case Judgments

To assess support for registering the juvenile as a sex offender, we used an item developed by Salerno and colleagues (2009). Specifically, participants were asked to indicate the most appropriate outcome for the defendant in the vignette. The four choices were 1 (should not be required to register), 2 (should be required to register, but his information should never be posted on the Internet), 3 (should be required to register, but his information should not be posted on the Internet until he turns 18, at which time his information should be publicly posted on the Internet), and 4 (should be required to register and his information should be publicly posted on the Internet immediately). Thus, higher numbers indicate greater support for the full application of the registry.

To assess participants’ retributive desire to punish the defendant, participants were asked the following question developed by Levenson et al. (2007) on a five-point scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree): “I would support the sex offender registry for juveniles like Tyrone/Jacob, even if there is no scientific evidence showing that it reduces sexual abuse.” To assess participants’ utilitarian desire to protect society, participants were asked the following questions on the same five-point scale: “Registry laws make the community safer by allowing people to keep track of juvenile sex offenders like Tyrone/Jacob in their community,” “Tyrone/Jacob is at a high risk for re-offending,” and “Tyrone/Jacob poses a danger to society.” These items were developed by Bumby and Maddox (1999), Malesky and Keim (2001), Proeve and Howells (2006), and Salerno and colleagues (2009).

Manipulation and Suspicion Checks

As a manipulation check, participants were asked to state the race of the defendant and victim, as well as the age of the defendant and the victim. To determine whether participants were suspicious of our hypotheses or manipulations (particularly regarding race), participants were asked “As you were completing this study, what did you think the study was about? Explain.”

Demographics

We assessed participants’ gender, age, U.S. citizenship, race, political orientation, and education level. To assess political orientation, participants rated themselves on a scale ranging from 1 (extremely liberal) to 7 (extremely conservative) in response to the question “When it comes to politics, how liberal or conservative are you?” To assess education level, participants were asked to indicate “Which of the following degrees do you have” by responding on a scale including options ranging from 1 (some high school) to 8 (doctorate).

Procedure

Community members in public places were approached and invited to participate in the present study. We approached people in locations where they were likely to have spare time, including, for example, the mall, public libraries, and gas stations. To ensure there
were no biases in participant recruitment, we recruited everyone who was visible in the vicinity of our data collection site and recorded response rates. Only participants who were having conversations or eating were not recruited for this study. Participants were offered a candy bar as compensation for their participation. If they agreed to participate, each participant was randomly assigned to one of the four race conditions. To ensure that participants remembered the race of the defendant and victim, but did not become suspicious that the study was about racism, participants were told the following before reading the vignette:

We ask you to please take this study seriously, and read the vignette very carefully so that you do not miss important information about the case, which may affect your judgments. To prevent this, please create a mental image of the characters described in the case, which should help make it more realistic and life-like.

After participants read the vignette describing the case, they then completed the case judgments, demographic questions, the suspicion check question, and the race and age manipulation check questions. After all measures were completed, participants were thanked for their participation. Individual participation lasted approximately 5 minutes, and data collection lasted approximately 6 months. All procedures and materials were approved by our university’s Institutional Review Board.

RESULTS

We conducted 2 (defendant race: Black, White) × 2 (victim race: Black, White) × 2 (participant gender) between-subjects analyses of covariance (ANCOVAs) on all dependent measures.2 Because participant level of education, age, and political orientation correlated with some case judgments, we included these variables as covariates in these analyses.3 To preview, there were no main effects of participant gender. As predicted, however, there were several interesting interactions of participant gender and defendant and victim race. See Table 1 for means and standard deviations for all case judgments.

Support For The Registry

There were no significant main effects of any independent variables on support for the registry, all F<sub>s</sub> < .31, ns. There was, however, a marginally significant interaction of defendant race by victim race, F(1, 95) = 2.74, p = .10, \eta^2 = 0.03. Although the follow-up interactions did not reach significance, a clear cross-over trend emerged such that

---

2 We recognize that support for the registry is technically an ordinal variable and that treating it as a continuous variable in ANCOVAs violates statistical assumptions. We believe, however, that support for the registry can also function sufficiently as a continuous variable because, as this variable increases numerically, so too does one’s support for registering the defendant. Nonetheless, we conducted ordinal logistic regressions, thereby treating this variable as ordinal. There were no differences in results. Thus, for simplicity and consistency, we present only the results of the ANCOVAs.

3 Although it is possible that minority jurors might perceive themselves to be more similar to African Americans, past research has shown that non-Black minorities and Whites have similar racial biases toward African Americans (Stevenson & Bottoms, 2009). Even so, we re-conducted all analyses excluding these participants. We found no differences in the results. Therefore, we have presented the results of analyses including these participants.
Table 1. Case Judgments as a Function of Juror Gender, Victim Race, and Defendant Race (Standard Deviations Noted Parenthetically)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent measure</th>
<th>Juror gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for registry&lt;sup&gt;a,b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black defendant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White victim</td>
<td>2.00 (.82)</td>
<td>1.71 (.63)</td>
<td>1.83 (.76)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black victim</td>
<td>1.50 (.76)</td>
<td>1.75 (.22)</td>
<td>1.65 (1.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>1.78 (.81)</td>
<td>1.73 (.96)</td>
<td>1.75 (.89)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White defendant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White victim</td>
<td>2.00 (1.05)</td>
<td>1.40 (.68)</td>
<td>1.60 (.86)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black victim</td>
<td>1.87 (.99)</td>
<td>2.12 (1.11)</td>
<td>2.00 (1.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>1.92 (1.00)</td>
<td>1.73 (.96)</td>
<td>1.81 (.97)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White defendant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White victim</td>
<td>3.10 (1.20)</td>
<td>2.64 (1.34)</td>
<td>2.83 (1.27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black victim</td>
<td>2.13 (1.64)</td>
<td>2.27 (1.27)</td>
<td>2.21 (1.40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>2.67 (1.46)</td>
<td>2.48 (1.30)</td>
<td>2.56 (1.35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White defendant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White victim</td>
<td>2.80 (1.14)</td>
<td>2.25 (1.12)</td>
<td>2.43 (1.34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black victim</td>
<td>2.33 (1.05)</td>
<td>1.71 (1.16)</td>
<td>2.53 (1.11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>2.52 (1.09)</td>
<td>2.46 (1.15)</td>
<td>2.48 (1.11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief that juvenile will re-offend&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black defendant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White victim</td>
<td>3.10 (.99)</td>
<td>2.64 (1.22)</td>
<td>2.83 (1.13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black victim</td>
<td>2.50 (1.20)</td>
<td>3.00 (1.28)</td>
<td>2.80 (1.24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>2.83 (1.10)</td>
<td>2.81 (1.23)</td>
<td>2.82 (1.17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White defendant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White victim</td>
<td>3.00 (1.10)</td>
<td>2.95 (1.00)</td>
<td>2.97 (1.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black victim</td>
<td>2.60 (91)</td>
<td>3.00 (1.23)</td>
<td>2.81 (1.09)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>2.77 (.99)</td>
<td>2.97 (1.09)</td>
<td>2.89 (1.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief that juvenile is dangerous&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black defendant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White victim</td>
<td>2.10 (.74)</td>
<td>2.71 (1.33)</td>
<td>2.46 (1.14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black victim</td>
<td>2.13 (.99)</td>
<td>3.17 (1.19)</td>
<td>2.75 (1.21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>2.11 (.83)</td>
<td>2.92 (1.26)</td>
<td>2.59 (1.17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White defendant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White victim</td>
<td>2.55 (1.23)</td>
<td>2.16 (.96)</td>
<td>2.30 (1.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black victim</td>
<td>2.13 (0.92)</td>
<td>2.24 (1.09)</td>
<td>2.19 (1.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>2.31 (1.01)</td>
<td>2.19 (1.01)</td>
<td>2.24 (1.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief that registering the juvenile makes the community safer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black defendant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White victim</td>
<td>3.00 (1.41)</td>
<td>2.92 (1.32)</td>
<td>2.96 (1.33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black victim</td>
<td>3.12 (1.55)</td>
<td>3.45 (1.04)</td>
<td>3.32 (1.25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>3.06 (1.43)</td>
<td>3.17 (2.20)</td>
<td>3.12 (1.29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White defendant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White victim</td>
<td>2.82 (1.33)</td>
<td>2.95 (1.40)</td>
<td>2.90 (1.35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black victim</td>
<td>3.40 (1.06)</td>
<td>2.88 (1.27)</td>
<td>3.13 (1.89)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>3.15 (1.19)</td>
<td>2.92 (1.32)</td>
<td>3.02 (1.26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
<sup>a</sup>Marginally significant interaction of defendant race and victim race, all $F_i \geq 2.66$, $p < .10$.
<sup>b</sup>Marginally significant interaction of victim race and participant gender, all $F_i \geq 3.50$, $p < .10$.
<sup>c</sup>Marginally significant main effect of victim race, $F(1, 94) = 2.67, p < .10$.
<sup>d</sup>Statistically significant interaction of victim race and participant gender, $F(1, 96) = 4.32, p < .05$.
<sup>e</sup>Statistically significant interaction of defendant race and participant gender, $F(1, 95) = 4.57, p < .05$. 
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participants were more likely to recommend the registry when the victim and defendant were different races ($M = 2.00$, $SD = 1.05$; $M = 1.83$, $SD = 0.76$) than when they were the same race ($M = 1.40$, $SD = 0.68$; $M = 1.65$, $SD = 1.04$) (see Figure 1). In addition, there was a marginally significant victim race by participant gender interaction, $F(1, 95) = 3.50, p < .10, \eta^2 = 0.04$ (see Figure 2). Follow-up analyses revealed that when the victim was White, women supported the registry more ($M = 2.00$, $SD = 0.92$) than men ($M = 1.53$, $SD = 0.71$), $F(1, 49) = 4.68, p < .05, \eta^2 = 0.09$. When the victim was Black, however, participant gender did not influence support for the registry, $F(1, 47) = .59$, ns. No other interactions reached significance, all $F$s $< .82$, ns.

Support for the Registry Even if it Does Not Reduce Abuse

In support of our hypotheses, participants were marginally more likely to support the registry even if there is no scientific evidence that it reduces sexual abuse when the victim was White ($M = 2.61$, $SD = 1.20$) than when Black ($M = 2.41$, $SD = 1.22$), $F(1, 94) = 2.67, p = .10, \eta^2 = 0.03$. There was also a marginally significant interaction of defendant race by victim race, $F(1, 94) = 2.66, p = .10, \eta^2 = 0.03$. Again, although the follow-up interactions did not reach significance, the same cross-over trend emerged such that participants were more likely to support the registry even without evidence that it is effective when the victim and defendant were different races ($M = 2.53$,...
Belief that the Juvenile Defendant is at High Risk for Re-offending

There was a statistically significant victim race by participant gender interaction for belief that the defendant is at high risk for re-offending, $F(1, 96) = 4.23, p < .05, \eta^2 = 0.04$. Again, follow-up analyses revealed that women believed the defendant was at a higher risk for re-offending when the victim was White ($M = 3.05, SD = 1.03$) than when she was Black ($M = 2.57, SD = .99$), $F(1, 39) = 5.21, p < .05, \eta^2 = 0.12$. Men, however, were not influenced by victim race, $F(1, 58) = .21, ns$. No other main effects or interactions were significant, all $Fs < .83, ns$.

Belief that the Juvenile Defendant is a Danger to Society

There was a statistically significant defendant race by participant gender interaction for the belief that the defendant is a danger to society, $F(1, 95) = 4.57, p < .05, \eta^2 = 0.05$. Follow-up analyses revealed that men believed the Black defendant ($M = 2.92, SD = 1.26$) was significantly more dangerous than the White defendant ($M = 2.19, SD = 1.01$), $F(1, 57) = 4.22, p < .05, \eta^2 = 0.07$. Women, however, were not influenced by defendant race, $F(1, 39) = .51, ns$. No other main effects or interactions reached significance, all $Fs < .83, ns$.

Belief that Registering the Juvenile Defendant Makes the Community Safer

There were no main effects or interactions for any independent variables on the belief that registering the defendant makes the community safer by allowing people to keep track of sex offenders in their community, all $Fs < .97, ns$.

Mediation Analyses Explaining Victim Race by Gender Interaction on Registry Support

Next, we conducted mediation analyses to understand the underlying psychological processes that drove women to support the registry more than men, but only when the victim was White (not when she was Black). Because juror gender predicted support for the registry for the White, but not the Black victim, we conducted mediation analyses on participants in the White victim condition only. All mediation analyses were conducted controlling for participant age, level of education, and political orientation, as these variables predicted some case judgments.
According to Baron and Kenny (1986), the first step of a mediational model is to show that the independent variable (i.e., juror gender, for the White victim only) predicts the dependent variable (i.e., support for the registry), as illustrated by the ANCOVAs reported previously. The second step is to show that the independent variable (i.e., juror gender, for the White victim only) predicts the proposed mediator, which our previously conducted ANCOVAs revealed for one variable: support for the registry even without evidence that it reduces abuse. Although there was a significant victim race by participant gender interaction for the belief that the juvenile defendant is at high risk for re-offending, the simple effect of participant gender for the White victim did not reach statistical significance, $F(1, 50) = .77, ns$. Thus, belief that the juvenile is at high risk for re-offending logically cannot mediate the effect of participant gender on support for the registry for the White victim. This variable is thus not explored as a potential mediator. The simple effect of participant gender for the White victim did, however, reach marginal significance for support for the registry even without evidence that it reduces abuse, $F(1, 55) = 3.15, p < .10$. Thus, we conducted meditational analyses to test whether support for the registry even without evidence that it is effective emerges as a significant mediator. This potential mediator serves as a proxy variable for retributive goals to punish the offender. That is, supporting the registry even if it does not reduce abuse indicates that participants are likely using the registry to punish the offender (not to protect society). Thus, to the extent that this variable mediates the effect of juror gender on support for the registry, then it can be said that gender differences in support for the registry are driven by women’s greater desire to punish juvenile sex offenders, as compared with men, but only when the victim is White (not Black).

The third step is to show that the proposed mediator (i.e., support for the registry even without evidence that it reduces abuse) is significantly related to the dependent variable (i.e., support for the registry), and correlations indicate that they are related ($r = .57, p < .001$). The final step is to show that when both the independent variable and the proposed mediator are entered into a regression equation simultaneously, (a) the mediator beta coefficient is significant, and (b) the independent variable (i.e., juror gender) beta coefficient is no longer significant (full mediation) or is reduced significantly (partial mediation). This would illustrate that the mediator ultimately accounts for the same variance in case judgments as the independent variable (i.e., participant gender).

Mediation: Support for the Registry Even if it Does Not Reduce Abuse

Mediation analyses revealed that the support for the registry even without evidence that it reduces abuse mediated the effect of juror gender for support for the registry, for the White victim only (see Table 2). Figure 3 illustrates these analyses. Specifically, in the first step of the mediation analyses, women supported the registry more than men (for the White victim only). Second, a separate regression showed that women were significantly more likely than men to support registering the defendant even if there is no scientific evidence that it reduces abuse (but only when the victim was White). Third, we entered juror gender simultaneously with the support for the registry even without evidence that it reduces abuse. Consistent with mediation, after entering the mediator into the regression equation with juror gender, the effect of juror gender on support for
the registry was no longer significant. A Sobel test confirmed that the change in beta weights provides evidence of statistically significant mediation. This illustrates that women supported the registry more than men because their retributive (i.e., punitive) goals to support the registry even without evidence that it is effective were triggered more than men, but only when the victim was White and not when she was Black.

Mediation Analyses Explaining the Victim Race by Defendant Race Interaction for Registry Support

Next, we conducted mediation analyses to understand the underlying psychological processes that drove participants to support the registry more when the defendant and
victim were different races than when they were the same race. In line with the recommendations of Baron and Kenny (1986), the only potential mediator we tested was support for the registry even without evidence that it reduces abuse because this was the only variable in which there was the same interaction of defendant and victim race, as illustrated in the previous ANCOVAs. That is, because both support for the registry and support for the registry even without evidence that it reduces abuse revealed crossover interactions such that support was higher when the defendant and victim were different races than when they were the same race, we created a new variable labeled as “racial composition.” In this variable, “0” applied when the defendant and victim were the same race and “1” applied when the defendant and victim were different races. We allowed our newly created racial composition variable to predict support for the registry and support for the registry even without evidence that it reduces abuse in a series of regressions, as recommended by Baron and Kenny, to test for possible mediation.

Mediation: Support for the Registry Even if it Does Not Reduce Abuse

Mediation analyses revealed that support for the registry even without evidence that it reduces abuse mediated the effect of racial composition on support for the registry (see Table 2). Figure 4 illustrates these analyses for support for the registry. Specifically, in the first step of the mediation analyses, participants supported the registry marginally more when the victim and defendant were different races than when they were the same race. Second, a separate regression showed no significant effect of racial composition on support for registering the defendant even if there is no scientific evidence that it reduces abuse. Even so, because it did account for some variance in judgments, we entered racial composition simultaneously with support for the registry even without evidence that it reduces abuse. Consistent with mediation, after entering the mediator into the regression equation with racial composition, the marginal effect of racial composition
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Racial composition was coded as 0 (defendant and victim were the same race) and 1 (defendant and victim were different races). Support for the registry even if it does not reduce abuse ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Support for the registry ranged from 1 (do not register the defendant) to 4 (register the defendant and post the information on-line immediately).

\[ \beta = .32 \]  
\[ \beta = .18^{*} \]  
\[ \beta = .30 \]

Figure 4. Support for the registry even if it does not reduce abuse as a mediator of the effect of racial composition on support for the registry.
on support for the registry became no longer significant. A Sobel test reached marginal significance, thus suggesting evidence of partial mediation. This illustrates that participants supported the registry more when the victim and defendant were different races than when they were the same race because their retributive goals to support the registry (even without evidence that it is effective) were triggered more for interracial crimes than same-race crimes.

**DISCUSSION**

This study represents the first examination of the influence of a juvenile defendant’s race, a victim’s race, and juror gender on perceptions of a juvenile sex offender. We found a number of interesting effects that contribute to the limited literature on perceptions of juvenile sex offenders.

**Participant Gender and Victim Race**

Drawing on theories of stereotyping, racism, and the similarity-leniency bias, we predicted that participants, especially women, would render harsher case judgments when the victim was White than when she was Black. Further, we predicted that these effects would be driven by retributive desires to punish the offender more than by utilitarian desires to protect society. In support of these hypotheses, we found a marginally significant interaction of gender and victim race on support for registration and retributive goals to punish sex offenders, and a statistically significant gender by victim race interaction on perceived likelihood for recidivism. Follow-up analyses revealed that women were significantly more supportive of registering the juvenile as a sex offender than men, but only if the victim was White, and not when she was Black. In addition, women (but not men) expressed significantly more retributive desires to punish the defendant when the victim was White than Black by indicating that they would register the defendant even if registration does not reduce abuse more often when the victim was White than Black. Women were also significantly more likely to express utilitarian concerns when the victim was White than Black, believing that the juvenile defendant is at high risk for re-offending more when the victim was White than Black.

As expected, women’s greater support for registering the defendant when the victim was White was significantly mediated by retributive desires to punish the offender, but not by utilitarian goals to protect society—a finding supported by previous research illustrating that justice decision-making is primarily motivated by retributive desires to punish, rather than utilitarian desires to protect society (Carlsmith et al., 2002; Darley et al., 2000). We find this to be particularly interesting in the context of support for registry laws, which are legally justifiable only because they are presumed to have been motivated by a desire to protect society. The results of our research reveal, however, that women’s greater support for registration was not motivated by utilitarian concerns about sex offender recidivism. Instead, women’s support for the registry (when the victim was White) was driven by their desire to register the juvenile even if registration does not reduce recidivism. In other words, women’s support for registration appears to be retributive in nature, not utilitarian.
Thus, women, as compared with men, felt more need for retribution (i.e., punishment) when the victim was White, which in turn drove them to be more supportive of registering a juvenile as a sex offender. Women also believed that the juvenile was more likely to re-offend when the victim was White than when she was Black. These effects partially support theories of aversive racism, suggesting that participants are more likely to devalue the worth of Black victims than of White victims and, in turn, are less punitive when victims are Black than White (e.g., Landwehr et al., 2002; Pfeifer & Olgoff, 1991; Ugwuegbu, 1979). Why, however, did these effects manifest for women, but not for men? As we theorized, perhaps gender-related social categorization caused women to attend to characteristics of the female victim more than men. That is, women’s positive in-group associations toward women (Rudman & Goodwin, 2004), as well as their sympathetic attitudes toward victims of child sexual abuse (see Bottoms, Golding, Stevenson, Wiley, & Yowziak, 2007, for a review), might have driven them to pay attention to the female victim in this case more than men. In turn, women’s heightened awareness of the female victim may have caused them to be more susceptible to her characteristics, namely race. Men, in contrast, likely categorized the female victim as an out-group member and paid less attention to her than did women, and in turn were less influenced by her racial characteristics.

Note that this pattern of results is inconsistent with past research conducted by Stevenson and Bottoms (2009), in which men, but not women, were more punitive when a victim was White than Black. In that study, however, the victim in the case was a man, not a woman. Thus, perhaps, men in that study were more likely than women to identify with and pay attention to the male victim, and in turn men were more influenced by the victim’s race than women.

Also note, however, that the victim race by participant gender interactions did not manifest for two dependent variables: the belief that the defendant is dangerous, and the belief that registering the defendant makes the community safer. Perhaps women’s preferential treatment of a White victim over a Black victim only manifests in case judgments that are most directly relevant to punishing the defendant (i.e., support for the registry). In support, retributive goals of punishment, not utilitarian goals, significantly mediated women’s greater support for registration when the victim was White. Thus, it is possible that the effects of victim race for women did not manifest for the belief that the defendant is dangerous and that registration makes the community safer because these variables are less directly tied to actual consequences for the juvenile defendant. We did, however, find an effect of victim race for women for the utilitarian case judgment regarding recidivism. Perhaps, however, non-Black women believed the juvenile would re-offend more when the victim was White than Black because women labeled the sex act as a “sexual offense” more often when the victim was White than Black. Instead, women perceived the sex act as more consensual when the victim was Black than White. That is, women may have perceived the White victim as sexually innocent and the Black victim as sexually experienced, or even promiscuous. In fact, negative stereotypes about Black people include that they are more sexually experienced, promiscuous, and perverse than White people (Devine, 1989; Powell, Wyatt, & Bass, 1983; Weinberg & Williams, 1988; Wyatt, 1982). To the extent that non-Black women were more likely to label the sex act as a sexual offense for the White victim than the Black victim, it follows that they, in turn, would perceive re-offense as more plausible when the victim was White than Black.
Participant Gender and Defendant Race

We also predicted that participants, especially men, would render more anti-defendant case judgments for a Black offender than a White offender. Contrary to our hypotheses, pervasive effects of defendant race did not emerge for either men or women. Yet there was some support for racial bias against the Black defendant such that men, but not women, believed that the Black juvenile defendant was a marginally greater danger to society than the White juvenile defendant. This finding is consistent with the research by Stevenson and Bottoms (2009) in which they explored the effects of juror gender and defendant race on perceptions of a juvenile defendant tried in adult court for murder. They found that men, but not women, were more likely to vote guilty for a Black juvenile defendant than a White juvenile defendant. Dovidio et al. (1997) found a similar pattern of results in a study exploring the effects of juror gender and defendant race on death-penalty recommendations. Again, men, but not women, were more likely to recommend a death sentence for a Black defendant than a White defendant. Perhaps as before, in-group social categorization caused men to attend to the male defendant more than women, which in turn, caused them to be more influenced by the defendant’s racial characteristics.

Yet, defendant race had no effect on any remaining case judgments, including the primary case judgment of interest—support for the registry. Thus, the overall lack of defendant race effects on central case judgments must be duly noted. One possibility is that, although there are negative stereotypes about Black men regarding violence and sexuality (see, e.g., Devine, 1989), Black men might not fit the stereotype of a typical child sex offender. Instead, White men might better fit this stereotype. In support, in a vignette study conducted by Jackson and Nuttall (1993), clinicians perceived a White defendant as more likely to be a child sex offender than a Black or Hispanic defendant. Another possibility is that participants are truly not affected by defendant race in cases involving juvenile sex offenders. Yet, given an established body of psychological research showing bias against Black defendants (for a review see Sommers & Ellsworth, 2003), we believe more research is warranted before we draw that conclusion. For instance, Foley and Chamblin (1982) found that White mock jurors were most punitive in their reactions to a vignette describing the sexual abuse of an 11-year-old girl when the adult defendant was described as Black and the victim as White than any other victim-defendant racial combination. In the study by Foley and Chamblin, however, the sexual act (i.e., the sexual battery of an 11-year-old) certainly could not have been construed by participants as consensual. Thus, perhaps we found no effects of defendant race on support for the registry because the sexual offense in our study was unique: a non-violent sexual act described by the victim as consensual. Consider a similar case described earlier in which Genarlow Wilson, a 17-year-old Black high school student, received a 10-year prison sentence and was placed on the sex offender registry for receiving “consensual” oral sex from a 15-year-old White girl. Would a White 17-year-old boy have received the same 10-year prison sentence? Would it have made a difference if the victim had also been Black? We describe these possibilities next.

Defendant and Victim Racial Composition

We expected that negative perceptions of interracial relationships would cause participants to label an interracial sex act as more deviant, and in turn recommend the
registry more often if the defendant and victim were different races than if they were the same race. Further, we predicted that these effects would be explained by retributive desires to punish the offender more than by utilitarian desires to protect society. In line with these hypotheses, we found that participants were marginally more supportive of the registry when the defendant and victim were different races than when they were the same race. As expected, this effect of racial composition was marginally mediated by a retributive desire to support the registry even if it does not reduce abuse (i.e., to punish the offender) and not by a utilitarian desire to protect society. Again, this supports research illustrating that people are primarily motivated by retributive desires to punish than by utilitarian desires to protect society during justice decision-making (Carlsmith et al., 2002; Darley et al., 2000).

These findings are consistent with research conducted by Harrison and Esqueda (2000), who found that participants treated a defendant accused of domestic violence more punitively when he was in an interracial relationship (i.e., Black and White) than when he and his partner were the same race. Why? Compared with same-race relationships, participants perceive interracial partners as less compatible, less stable, and less psychologically adjusted (Lewandowski & Jackson, 2001; Mills et al., 1995; Ross, 2005). Because interracial couples are perceived as more dysfunctional than same-race couples, it follows that participants are more likely to expect dysfunctional behavior within those relationships than within same-race relationships. The sexual crime in the present study was unique because, although the victim was a legal minor (thereby constituting child sexual abuse), the victim alleged that the sexual activity was consensual. Therefore, some participants likely labeled the activity as a sexual crime, whereas other participants likely labeled the activity as normative sexual exploration between two consenting teens. Thus, participants were probably more likely to label the sexual act as normative and to not recommend the registry when the two teenagers were the same race than when they were different races. In contrast, participants were probably more likely to label the crime as a deviant sexual act and to recommend the registry when the two teenagers were different races than when they were the same race.

It is interesting to note, however, that our defendant by victim race interactions differ from those uncovered by Bottoms, Davis, and Epstein (2004). They asked mock jurors to consider a vignette in which an adult man (Black or White) was accused of sexually molesting a 12-year-old girl (Black or White). In their study, participants convicted more often when the defendant and victim were the same race than when they were different races. Bottoms and colleagues theorized that participants perceived the same-race crime to be more plausible than the different-race crime, and therefore more likely to have happened. In our study, however, participants were not asked to determine guilt. Instead, they were told that the juvenile defendant had already been convicted. Thus, the plausibility of the crime was not at stake. Instead, just as Bottoms and colleagues found that participants perceived interracial sex acts as less normal than same-race sex acts, so too did participants in our study. Because the interracial sex act in our study was perceived as less likely to have resulted from a mutually consenting romantic relationship, it was in turn perceived as a more serious offense, and therefore treated more punitively.

**Limitations**

Future research should further explore the psychological processes underlying effects of racial composition on perceptions of juvenile sex offenses in other types of juvenile
sex offenses, including, for instance, more severe sex crimes, and using materials that are even more ecologically valid (i.e., lengthy written or videotaped trial transcripts). Future research should also explore the underlying psychological constructs that drive interactions of gender and victim race by further examining social categorization as a potential moderator of race effects. Additional research should also include Black participants to provide a more complete test of the similarity-leniency bias. In our study, we did not examine the judgments of Black participants because our goal was to study majority prejudice against Blacks—an issue that has historically been more problematic than prejudice against Whites (Sommers & Ellsworth, 2001). We did, however, examine White participants’ judgments toward defendants and victims who are Black versus White, which provides a partial test of the similarity-leniency bias.

Finally, it is possible that some of our effects reached only marginal significance due to a lack of sufficient power ($N = 120$). Recall that some of the victim race by gender interactions reached only marginal significance (though the follow-up analyses reached statistical significance). Testing this possibility, post hoc power analyses examining our power to detect significant effects ($p < .05$) of participant gender on support for registration for the White victim only ($N = 60$) revealed an observed power of .73. Post hoc power analyses examining power to detect significant interactions ($p < .05$) of defendant race and participant gender, as well as defendant race and victim race, revealed similar levels of observed power (.70 and .67, respectively). Although not far from the standard of acceptable power (.80), some of these marginal or non-significant effects might have been a result of insufficient power. Thus, it is possible that the results of this research provide a conservative estimate of actual racial biases.

CONCLUSION

We have extended the limited field of research on public perceptions of juvenile sex offenses by examining the influence of extralegal factors, including defendant and victim race, on support for registering juveniles as sex offenders. We feel that this topic is particularly important and timely in light of the government’s recent extension of sex offender registration laws to juveniles (Caldwell et al., 2008). We found that participants were more supportive of registering a juvenile as a sex offender when the defendant and victim were different races than when they were the same race. In addition, women were more supportive of registration when the victim was White than Black. Thus, we have revealed evidence of racial bias in the application of sex offender registration to juveniles—biases that attorneys and judges should recognize. Furthermore, although in some states judges have little discretion in the application of registration to juvenile sex offenders, in other states they do have some discretion and are thus susceptible to the influence of extra-legal factors in decision-making (Salerno et al., in press). Thus, understanding how defendant and victim race influence a juvenile’s likelihood to be registered is important, given that registering juveniles is not only ineffective at reducing sex offenses, but also negatively impacts the lives of those registered in ways that could contribute to future recidivism (Levenson & Cotter, 2005; Levenson et al., 2007; Salerno et al., in press; Tewksbury, 2005; Tewksbury & Lees, 2006, 2007; Trivits & Reppucci, 2002). In conclusion, our study provides an important first step in understanding racial biases that influence the application of sex offender registration laws to juveniles. Uncovering racial biases that negatively affect young and
vulnerable offenders has the potential to help facilitate justice and fairness, thus strengthening the core of our legal system.
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