한국심리학회지 : 법
*The Korean Journal of Forensic Psychology*
2020, Vol. 11, No. 1, 37-61

# Punitiveness Toward Defendants Accused of Same-Race Crimes Revisited: Replication in a Different Culture*

**Jungwon Lee[1)†] Mawia Khogali[2)] Nikoleta M. Despodova[3)] Steven D. Penrod[4)]**

[1)]Korean Institute of Criminology [2)]Center for Policing Equity
[3)]John Jay College of Criminal Justice and the Graduate Center, City University of New York
[4)]John Jay College of Criminal Justice, the City University of New York

Lee, Khogali, Despodova, and Penrod (2019) demonstrated that American participants whose races are different from a defendant and a victim rendered more punitive judgments against the defendant in a same-race crime (e.g., White observer-Black defendant-Black victim) compared to a cross-race crime (e.g., White observer-Black defendant-Hispanic victim). The aim of the current study was to test the replicability of their findings in a different country-South Korea. Study 1a failed to replicate the race-combination effect in South Korea with three new moderators-case strength, defendant's use of violence, and race salience. Study 1b was conducted with the same design of Study 1a in the United States to examine whether the failure of the replication in Study 1a was due to cultural differences between South Korea and the United States. However, Study 1b also failed to replicate the race-combination effect. Study 2 conducted a meta-analytic review of the data from Lee et al.'s (2019) study, along with the data from Study 1a and 1b and revealed that the race-salience manipulation in Study 1a and 1b might have caused the null results. We conclude that when people' races are different from both a defendant and a victim, they are likely to render more punitive judgments against the defendant in a same-race crime than a cross-race crime. However, the race-combination effect is only sustained when race-relevant issues are not salient in the crime.

*Key words : racial bias, judgment in criminal cases, race salience*

---

* Study 1b is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship awarded to the third author under Grant No. DGE 1646736. Any opinion, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

† 교신저자 : Jungwon Lee, Korean Institute of Criminology, 114 Taebong-ro, Umyeon-dong, Seocho-gu, Seoul
E-mail : jlee6@gradcenter.cuny.edu

Psychologists have accumulated a large body of research on jury decision-making to determine whether extralegal factors influence jurors' judgments. One finding produced from that endeavor is that the race of actors in a trial plays a crucial role in shaping legal outcomes (Mitchell, Haw, Pfeifer, & Meissner, 2005). To investigate race effects on jurors' judgments, most prior studies manipulated race combinations of juror-defendant-victim in terms of a juror's in-group and out-group (Adams, Bryden, & Griffith, 2011; ForsterLee, ForsterLee, Horowitz, & King, 2006; Sommers, & Ellsworth, 2000; Stevenson, & Bottoms, 2009; Wuensch, Campbell, Kesler, & Moore, 2002). The race combinations most frequently investigated in those studies involved White jurors rendering judgments in criminal cases involving a White/Black defendant and a White/Black victim. Those prior studies have demonstrated that White participants rendered more severe judgments against a defendant in cross-race crimes (e.g., White defendant-Black victim or Black defendant-White victim) than in same-race crimes (e.g., White defendant-White victim or Black defendant-Black victim; ForsterLee et al., 2006; Hymes, Leinart, Rowe, & Rogers, 1993; Rector & Bagby, 1995; Wuensch et al., 2002).

In the prior studies, the more punitive judgments against defendants in cross-race crimes compared to same-race crimes were explained by in-group/out-group biases (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) or perceived racial conflicts (Herzog, 2003; Saucier, Hockett, Zanotti, & Heffel, 2010). First, according to the in-group/out-group bias explanation, White participants render more punitive judgments in crimes where the defendant is Black and the victim is White, compared to same-race crimes (i.e., White defendant-White victim or Black defendant-Black victim), because White participants are likely to hold negative attitudes toward the Black defendant who is their racial out-group member and this effect is particularly pronounced when the defendant harms their racial in-group member. Thus, the unfavorable attitudes toward the Black defendant may lead to their punitive judgments against him. In addition, White participants may also render more punitive judgments in cases where the defendant is White and the victim is Black, compared to the same-race crimes, because they disapprove of the White defendant who may harm a positive evaluation of their racial in-group (i.e., the "black sheep effect"; see Marques, 1990). Second, some researchers have explained White participants' more punitive judgments in cross-race crimes in the context of racial conflicts. That is, White participants may render more punitive judgments against a defendant in cases with Black defendants and White victims or White defendants and Black victims (compared to cases with Black defendants and Black victims or White defendants and White victims) because the cross-race crimes can be

readily perceived as race conflicts between White and Black people, which may lead the crimes to be considered as more serious than the same-race crimes (the "cross-ethnicity" effect; see Herzog, 2003).

However, focusing on the race combinations of jurors' in-group and out-group membership, researchers have overlooked an important case, in which a juror's race is different from both the defendant and the victim. For example, White jurors may participate in criminal trials involved with a Black/Hispanic defendant and a Black/Hispanic victim. Given the growing racial diversity in the criminal justice system in the United States, those race combinations are plausible in a trial. Indeed, researchers have found that proportions accounted for by non-Black and non-White (e.g., Hispanic, Asian, and other races) defendants and victims has increased (Margan, 2017), and that the racial diversity among juries is also growing (Gau, 2016). In spite of the racial diversity in a trial, there has been very little attention paid to the race combinations of jurors, defendants, and victims outside of what the literature has typically examined.

Considering this limitation, Lee, Khogali, Despodova, and Penrod (2019) conducted two studies investigating judgments of participants whose races were different from a defendant and a victim in cross-race and same-race crimes with American participants. Their studies demonstrated that participants whose races were different from a defendant and a victim were more likely to render severe judgments to the defendant in same-race (e.g., White participant, Black defendant, and Black victim) crimes than in cross-race crimes (e.g., White participant, Black defendant, and Hispanic victim), and that the more punitive judgments against the defendant of same-race crimes became more evident when the defendant and victim were acquaintances (compared to when they were strangers). The authors accounted for the race biases in the legal judgments by the out-group homogeneity effect, which is the phenomenon that people perceive the homogeneity among out-group members more strongly than that among in-group members; and the more highly perceived homogeneity of out-group members is associated with more unfavorable attitudes toward the out-group members (Judd & Park, 1988; Judd, Ryan, & Park, 1991; Quattrone & Jones, 1980). When applying the homogeneity effect to the results in Lee et al. (2019), participants whose race was different from the defendant and victim in a crime might have tended to perceive the racial homogeneity between the defendant and victim more strongly in the same-race condition than the cross-race condition. This could lead to more punitive judgments against the defendant in the same-race conditi on.

## Study 1a

The purpose of Study 1a was to investigate if we could replicate the race-combination effect of Lee et al. (2019), which were conducted in the United States, in a different country-South Korea. South Korea and the United States have been frequently compared to each other in cross-cultural research as countries representative of different cultural characteristics, such as individualism and collectivism (Bresnahan, Levine, Shearman, Lee, Park, & Kiyomiya; 2005; Diener & Diener, 2009; Hofstede, 2001; Morling & Lamoreaux, 2008).

Unlike the Unites States, South Korea is a single-race nation. The foreign population accounts for only 2.8% of the total population in South Korea (Korean Statistical Information Service, 2016). The top 5 ethnicities are Chinese (48.9%), Vietnamese (8.0%), Thai (5.8%), American (3.7%), and Philippines (3.7%) among the foreign population. Given that most of the foreigners in South Korea are Asians, Koreans' attitudes and perceptions of ethnicities, rather than races, would be a better parallel to American's attitudes and perceptions of different races. Therefore, we investigated the race-combination effect of Lee et al. (2019) in terms of ethnicity in Study 1a. We tested whether Korean participants would render more punitive judgments toward the defendant in the same-ethnicity condition than in the cross-ethnicity condition, like the American participants of Lee et al.'s study (2019). We manipulated the ethnicity combinations with Chinese and Vietnamese, who account for the largest proportion of the foreign population in South Korea.

In addition, we sought to find other moderators (besides the relationship between a defendant and a victim examined in Lee et al. (2019)) that may affect the ethnicity combination effect on participants' judgments in criminal cases. We selected three potential moderators-case strength, the extent of a defendant's use of physical violence, and race-salience. We expected that the ethnicity combination effect would be stronger when the case strength was ambiguous (vs. strong); when the defendant used low (vs. severe) violence on the victim; or when ethnicity of the defendant and victim was salient (vs. non-salient).

More specifically, we expected that when there was not conclusive evidence supporting the defendant's guilt or innocence, the case would be difficult and ambiguous for participants to render a verdict. The participants' lack of information may reduce their motivation or ability to scrutinize and deliberate the criminal cases. Thus, they would be more likely to depend on peripheral cues (e.g., the defendant's or victim's characteristics such as ethnicity, profession, or reputation), rather than central cues (e.g., the defense's and the attorney's arguments, or expert testimony). This assumption

is based on the elaboration likelihood model (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). According to the model, the lack of ability or motivation to process information leads people to rely on issue-irrelevant cues (i.e., the peripheral route) for their decision-making or attitude changes; but when people have the ability or motivation to process information, they are likely to focus on issue-relevant cues (i.e., the central route). Therefore, we anticipated that when the case strength was ambiguous (vs. strong), participants' judgments would be more likely to be affected by the ethnicity combination of a defendant and a victim, which will intensify the more punitive judgments against the defendant in a same-race crime compared to a cross-race crime.

With respect to the level of the defendant's physical violence during a crime, we anticipated that direct physical violence against the victim during a crime would increase the perceived seriousness of the crime; and the perceived seriousness would lead to punitive judgments against the defendant regardless of the ethnicity combination of the defendant and victim, and consequently nullify the ethnicity combination effect. A recent modelling study demonstrated that as a crime was perceived as more serious, juries' belief in guilt of the defendant in the crime also increased, and that jurors' guilt assessment was more related to the perceived seriousness of the crime than the type of evidence (Pearson, Law, Skene, Beskind, Vidmar, Ball, Malekpour, Carter, & Skene, 2018). Therefore, we expected that when a defendant uses violence during a crime, participants would render severe judgments against the defendant regardless of the ethnicity combination of the defendant and victim, which may decrease differences in participants' judgments between the cross-ethnicity and same-ethnicity conditions.

Finally, we included a race-salience (Sommers & Ellsworth, 2000, 2009) variable as a potential moderator. Sommers and Ellsworth's study (2000) demonstrated that, in a trial with a Black defendant and a White victim, White jurors rendered less punitive judgments against the Black defendant when the trial involved a racially charged incident than when race remained a salient background issue in the trial. The authors referred to this phenomenon that explicit reference to racial issues reduces White juror's racial biases in their legal judgment as race salience. Given that the race of either the defendant or the victim was the same of the participants in Sommers and Ellsworth (2000), we could not expect the same effect of race salience in our study. Instead, we expected that ethnicity-salient crimes would be associated with a stronger ethnicity-combination effect because the ethnicity salience may highlight different ethnicity combinations between the cross- and same-ethnicity conditions.

## Method

### Participants

One hundred and seven Korean community members participated in Study 1a in South Korea. Eighteen participants did not complete the experiment. Another 18 participants showed 66% or below accuracy rates on the manipulation check including questions that asked them to identify the ethnicity of the defendants and victims. Therefore, responses of the remaining 70 participants (33 males; *M* age = 33.88, *SD* = 11.11) were included for further analyses.

### Design

Study 1a involved a 3 (Ethnicity combination of defendant-victim: cross ethnicity, same ethnicity, & control) × 2 (Case strength: ambiguous & strong) × 2 (Defendant's use of violence: low & severe) × 2 (Ethnicity-salience: low & high) × 6 (Crime type: arson, battery 1, battery 2, burglary, robbery, & murder) within-subject design. Participants read all the six types of criminal cases which were randomly matched to 6 of the 24 conditions produced by the 3 (Ethnicity combination) × 2 (Case strength) × 2 (Defendant's violence) × 2 (Ethnicity-salience). The ethnicity of the defendant and victim was manipulated to create five combinations (Chinese defendant-Chinese victim, Chinese defendant-Vietnamese victim, Vietnamese defendant-Chinese victim, Vietnamese defendant-Vietnamese victim, and a control condition where the defendant and victim's race was not mentioned). When participants were assigned to the same-ethnicity condition, they randomly read either a case with a Chinese defendant-Chinese victim or Vietnamese defendant-Vietnamese victim. When participants were assigned to the cross-ethnicity condition, they randomly read either a case with a Chinese defendant-Chinese victim or Vietnamese defendant-Chinese victim. In the control condition, information regarding the ethnicity of the defendant and victim was not provided.

### Materials

We used six case scenarios-the battery case from Lee et al. (2019) and additional five case scenarios we created. We manipulated the three moderators-case strength, defendant's use of violence, and race salience-directly in the case scenarios. The summary of the case scenarios is available at goo.gl/yorJGg. We presented head-and-shoulder photos of the defendant and victim with their brief information (e.g., age, sex, ethnicity, etc.) to manipulate the ethnicity combinations. We selected 12 neutral faces for each of the ethnicities from the Chicago Face Database (Ma, Correll, & Wittenbrink, 2015). In the control condition of the ethnicity-combination variable, we presented pictures of a black

silhouette instead of the face photos and removed ethnicity from the brief information of the defendant and victim.

### Dependent Measures

We measured participants' judgments toward the defendants with four items; a dichotomous guilty verdict (*Do you find the defendant guilty of this offense; 0: not guilty, 1: guilty*), a continuous guilty verdict (*Please indicate to what extent you believe the defendant is guilty; 1: not at all, 7: very much*), perceived seriousness of crime (*How serious is this offense; 1: not at all serious, 7: very much serious*), and sentence (*Please indicate what sentence you would recommend; 1: no punishment, 7: varied across crime types*). We also measured participants' judgments toward a victim with victim blaming (*To what extent is the victim to blame for the case; 1: not at all, 7: To a very great extent*).

### Procedures

We posted an advertisement on local websites and Facebook to recruit Korean participants who lived in South Korea. People who were interested in this study were directed to an online webpage. Participants read six case summaries. After reading each case summary, participants responded to questions about their judgments in the case. Once participants completed the experiment, we asked them to forward the online study link to their acquaintances.

## Results

### Manipulation Checks

Before the main experiment, we conducted a pilot test to examine whether the three moderators were effectively manipulated. Six Koreans living in South Korea participated in the pilot test (2 males; $M_{age}$ = 25.20, $SD$ = 16.34). The participants read six case summaries and rated case strength (*To what extent do you believe you have enough evidence about the offense to say that the defendant is guilty/not guilty; 1: very insufficient, 7: very sufficient*), the defendant's use of violence (*How serious do you find the defendant's physical violence toward the victim during the crime; 1: very minor, 7: very serious*), and race salience (*How clearly were the ethnicities of the defendant and victim expressed in the crime scenario, 1: not at all, 7: to a very great extent*) with 7-point Likert scales.

We conducted an ANCOVA on each of the three dependent measures with the corresponding moderator as an independent variable, controlling for participants' sex, crime type, defendant's and victim's ethnicity, ethnicity combination of the defendant and victim, and the other two moderators which were not the independent variable. The ANCOVAs demonstrated that the

three moderators were properly manipulated in the case summaries. Participants in the strong case condition ($M$ = 4.89, $SD$ = 1.76) believed more strongly that they had sufficient evidence to render their verdict than did those in the ambiguous case condition ($M$ = 3.00, $SD$ = 1.32), $F$ (1, 9) = 8.08, $p$ = .02, $d$ = 1.21, 95% CI [0.21, 2.22]; participants in the severe violence condition ($M$ = 6.75, $SD$ = 0.46) perceived the defendant's violence toward the victim more seriously than did those in the low violence condition ($M$ = 4.90, $SD$ = 1.79), $F$ (1, 8) = 8.63, $p$ = .02, $d$ = 1.34, 95% CI [0.32, 2.37]; and participants in the high salience condition ($M$ = 5.09, $SD$ = 1.87) rated that the ethnicity of the defendant and victim was expressed more clearly than did those in the low salience condition ($M$ = 2.43, $SD$ = 2.30), $F$ (1, 8) = 6.68, $p$ = .03, $d$ = 1.30, 95% CI [0.26, 2.34]. The same manipulation checks with participants of Study 1a also confirmed that the manipulations of case strength, the defendant's use of violence, and ethnicity salience were successful.

## Preliminary Analyses

Table 1 presents the summary of descriptive statistics as a function of the ethnicity combination. We conducted a principal component analysis (PCA) using oblimin rotation with the four continuous measures. As a result, two components were extracted. The first component explained 45.60% of the variance

Table 1 Descriptive statistics as a function of the ethnicity/race combination between a defendant and a victim

| | Dichotomous Verdict | Continuous Verdict | Seriousness of Crime | Sentence | Victim Blaming |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Study 1a | | |
| Same-ethnicity (N=130) | 58.2% | 4.44 (1.93) | 5.13 (1.69) | 3.46 (2.05) | 2.94 (2.08) |
| Cross-ethnicity (N=134) | 58.5% | 4.36 (1.96) | 5.10 (1.58) | 3.30 (1.90) | 3.02 (1.97) |
| Control (N=127) | 48.0% | 4.09 (1.99) | 5.04 (1.82) | 3.18 (2.12) | 2.54 (1.93) |
| | | | Study 1b | | |
| Same-race (N=298) | 60.4% | 4.91 (1.95) | 5.63 (1.65) | 4.24 (2.28) | 2.48 (1.79) |
| Cross-race (N=317) | 62.5% | 4.86 (1.97) | 5.75 (1.58) | 4.37 (2.27) | 2.62 (1.82) |

and contained a continuous guilty verdict and sentence. The Cronbach's alpha of the two dependent variables was .71. We combined the two into one variable-total judgment against the defendant. The second component explained 28.97% of the variance and contained victim blaming and perceived seriousness of the crime. However, we did not combine them into one variable because of their low internal reliability (*Cronbach's alpha* = .29). Therefore, we conducted the main analyses with the four dependent variables: the dichotomous guilty verdict, total judgments against the defendant, perceived seriousness of the crime, and victim blaming.

## Main Analyses

We conducted a hierarchical binary logistic regression analysis on the dichotomous guilty verdict to test the interaction effect of ethnicity combination × each of the moderators. We entered all covariates (participant's sex, crime type, and ethnicity of the defendant and victim) at the first step; and the ethnicity combination and three moderators at the second step; and the 2-way interaction terms of ethnicity combination × each of the moderators at the final step. However, none of the moderators produced the significant interaction effect with ethnicity combination on the dichotomous guilty verdict. The main effect of ethnicity combination was also not significant.

We conducted a MANCOVA on the total judgment against the defendant, the perceived seriousness of the crime, and victim blaming to test the interaction effect of ethnicity combination × each of the moderators; controlling for participants' sex, crime type, ethnicity of the defendant and victim. As shown in Table 2, none of the moderators produced the significant interaction effect with ethnicity combination on the dependent variables in the multivariate test. The main effect of ethnicity combination was also not significant in the multivariate test. However, the multivariate main effects of case strength, $F$ (3, 373) = 70.24, $p$ < .001, Wilks' $\Lambda$ = 0.64, $\eta_p^2$ = .36, and defendant's use of violence, $F$ (3, 373) = 22.69, $p$ < .001, Wilks' $\Lambda$ = 0.85, $\eta_p^2$ = .15 were significant. Univariate testing demonstrated that participants in the strong case condition (vs. the ambiguous case condition) rendered more punitive judgments against the defendant, $F$ (1, 375) = 204.88, $p$ < .001, $\eta_p^2$ = .35, perceived the case as being more serious, $F$ (1, 375) = 6.68, $p$ < .01, $\eta_p^2$ = .02, and were less likely to blame the victim, $F$ (1, 375) = 49.82, $p$ < .001, $\eta_p^2$ = .03. Participants in the severe violence condition (vs. the low violence condition) also rendered more punitive judgments against the defendant, $F$ (1, 375) = 26.31, $p$ < .001, $\eta_p^2$= .07, and perceived the case as being more serious, $F$ (1, 375) = 59.97, $p$ < .001, $\eta_p^2$ = .14.

Table 2 MANCOVA results for the interaction effect of ethnicity combination × each of the moderators on punitive judgments against a defendant (Study 1a)

| Source | Wilks' Lambda | *df* | *F* | $\eta_p^2$ | *p* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Covariates | | | | | |
| Participant Gender | 0.03 | 3 | 3.49* | .027 | .016 |
| Defendant Ethnicity | < 0.01 | 3 | 0.52 | .004 | .672 |
| Victim Ethnicity | 0.01 | 3 | 1.63 | .013 | .183 |
| Crime Type | 0.07 | 3 | 8.66*** | .065 | < .001 |
| Main Effects | | | | | |
| Ethnicity-Combo | 0.01 | 6 | 0.91 | .007 | .488 |
| Case Strength | 0.36 | 3 | 70.24*** | .361 | < .001 |
| Violence | 0.15 | 3 | 22.69*** | .154 | < .001 |
| Ethnicity Salience | 0.01 | 3 | 1.68 | .013 | .171 |
| Interaction Effects | | | | | |
| Ethnicity-Combo × Case Strength | 0.01 | 6 | 0.32 | .003 | .925 |
| Ethnicity-Combo × Violence | 0.01 | 6 | 0.71 | .006 | .644 |
| Ethnicity-Combo × Race Salience | 0.01 | 6 | 0.68 | .005 | .666 |
| Intercept | 0.45 | 3 | 100.73*** | .448 | < .001 |

*Note.* $^{***}p < 0.001$, $^{*}p < 0.05$

## Discussion

In Study 1a, we failed to replicate the race-combination effect in Lee et al. (2019) with Korean participants. Lee et al. (2019) consistently showed more punitive judgments toward the defendant of same-race crimes than that of the cross-race crimes, whereas there were no significant main effects of ethnicity-combination on participants' judgments in Study 1a.

The non-significant differences in Korean participant's judgments between the cross-ethnicity and same-ethnicity conditions might have been due to the Korean participants' failure to differentiate across ethnicity types. As mentioned earlier, Koreans have a weak experience dealing with different ethnicities because Korea is still a single-race nation. Therefore, Korean participants might have perceived the defendant and victim as a group (i.e., foreigners), rather than as individuals (i.e., Chinese and Vietnamese), in both cross-ethnicity and same-ethnicity conditions. This categorization

might have made it difficult for participants to differentiate between the cross-ethnicity and same-ethnicity conditions. Indeed, although the guilty verdict % was similar between the cross-ethnicity condition (58.5%) and the same-ethnicity condition (58.2%), the guilty verdict % for the two conditions was considerably higher than that for the control condition (48.0%). Therefore, the more unfavorable judgments against the defendant in both cross-ethnicity and same-ethnicity conditions, compared to the control condition, might be due to the Korean participants' negative attitudes toward different ethnicities.

## Study 1b

Considering that cultural characteristics of Korean participants might have caused the null results in Study 1a, we conducted Study 1b which was a replication study of Study 1a with American participants in the United States. If we find the expected race-combination effect (i.e., more punitive judgments in same-race crimes than cross-race crimes) with American participants in Study 1b, we could attribute the null results in Study 1a to the cultural characteristic.

### Method

#### Participants

One hundred twenty-one Amazon Mechanical Turk users participated in Study 1b. Five participants showed 66% or below accuracy on the manipulation check including questions that asked them to identify the ethnicity of the defendants and victims. We excluded their responses from our dataset, and conducted further analyses with the remaining 116 participants (34 males; $M$ age = 45.44, $SD$ = 12.27; 101 Whites, 4 Blacks, 5 Hispanics, 4 Asians, and 2 other races).

#### Design

Study 1b used the same design as Study 1a, except the control condition in the defendant-victim race combinations. We excluded the control condition because our major interest was the comparison of the cross-race and same-race conditions. Therefore, the race combination of a defendant and a victim was manipulated to create four race combinations using White, Black, and Hispanic (same-race condition: Race1 defendant-Race1 victim or Race2 defendant-Race2 victim; and cross-race condition: Race1 defendant-Race2 victim or Race2 defendant-Race1 victim). For Black participants, Race1 was Hispanic and Race2 was White. For Hispanic participants, Race1 was Black and Race2 was White. For White participants, Race1 was Black and Race2 was

Hispanic. For Asian and other race participants, Race1 and Race2 were randomly assigned to Black and Hispanic, Black and White, or Hispanic and White.

### Materials, Dependent Measures, and Procedures

We used the same materials, dependent measures, and procedures as in Study 1a.

## Results

### Manipulation Checks

To examine the effectiveness of the manipulations, we conducted a pilot test with 30 Amazon Mechanical Turk users (8 males; *M* age = 21.50, *SD* = 13.66). The participants read six case summaries and rated the case strength, defendant's use of violence, and race-salience on 7-point Likert scales. We conducted an ANCOVA on each of the three dependent measures with the corresponding moderator as an independent variable, controlling for participants' sex and race, crime type, defendant's and victim's race, race combination of the defendant and victim, and other two moderators which were not the independent variable. The ANCOVAs demonstrated that case strength, defendant's use of violence, and race salience were successfully manipulated. Participants in the strong case condition ($M$ = 4.46, $SD$ = 2.00) believed more strongly that they had sufficient evidence to render a verdict than did those in the ambiguous case condition ($M$ = 3.02, $SD$ = 1.96), $F$ (1, 160) = 23.76, $p$ < .001, $d$ = 0.73, 95% CI [0.42, 1.04]; participants in the severe violence condition ($M$ = 6.10, $SD$ = 1.16) perceived the defendant's violence on the victim to be more serious than did those in the low violence condition ($M$ = 4.86, $SD$ = 1.89), $F$ (1, 158) = 36.23, $p$ < .001, $d$ = 0.80, 95% CI [0.48, 1.11]; and participants in the high salience condition ($M$ = 5.92, $SD$ = 1.56) rated that the race of the defendant and victim was expressed more clearly than did those in the low salience condition ($M$ = 5.47, $SD$ = 2.02), $F$ (1, 160) = 3.06, $p$ = .08, $d$ = 0.25, 95% CI [-0.05, 0.55]. The same manipulation checks were conducted with participants of Study 1b. The results also confirmed that the manipulation of the three moderators was successful.

### Preliminary Analyses

Table 1 presents the summary of descriptive statistics as a function of the race combination. We conducted a PCA using oblimin rotation with the four continuous measures. The analysis extracted one component that explained 46.95% of the variance. The internal reliability of the four dependent variables was only .38. Once we excluded victim blaming from the component,

Cronbach's alpha increased by .65. Thus, we combined the three variables into one variable called total judgment against the defendant. We conducted the main analyses with the three dependent variables-the dichotomous guilty verdict, total judgment against the defendant, and victim blaming.

## Main Analyses

We conducted a hierarchical binary logistic regression on the dichotomous guilty verdict to test the interaction effect of race combination × each of the moderators. We entered all covariates (participant's sex, and race, crime type, and races of the defendant and victim) at the first step; the race combination and moderators at the second step; and 2-way interaction terms of the race combination × each of the moderators at the final step.

As a result, although race salience and defendant's use of violence did not yield a significant interaction effect with race combination, the race combination × case

Table 3 MANCOVA results for the interaction effect of ethnicity combination × each of the moderators on punitive judgments against a defendant (Study1b)

| Source | Wilks' Lambda | *df* | *F* | $\eta_p^2$ | *p* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Covariates | | | | | |
| Participant Gender | 0.01 | 2 | 1.51 | .005 | .221 |
| Participant Race | 0.01 | 2 | 2.48$^{\dagger}$ | .008 | .085 |
| Defendant Race | < 0.01 | 2 | 0.10 | < .001 | .907 |
| Victim Race | < 0.01 | 2 | 0.15 | < .001 | .862 |
| Crime Type | 0.03 | 2 | 7.96$^{***}$ | .026 | < .001 |
| Main Effects | | | | | |
| Race-Combo | < 0.01 | 2 | 0.45 | .002 | .636 |
| Case Strength | 0.16 | 2 | 58.14$^{***}$ | .163 | < .001 |
| Violence | 0.09 | 2 | 29.97$^{***}$ | .091 | < .001 |
| Race Salience | 0.01 | 2 | 2.14 | .007 | .118 |
| Interaction Effects | | | | | |
| Race-Combo × Case Strength | < 0.01 | 2 | 1.33 | .004 | .265 |
| Race -Combo × Violence | < 0.01 | 2 | 0.11 | < .001 | .899 |
| Race -Combo × Race Salience | < 0.01 | 2 | < 0.01 | < .001 | .998 |
| Intercept | 0.17 | 2 | 61.63$^{***}$ | .171 | < .001 |

*Note.* $^{***}p < 0.001$, $^{*}p < 0.05$

strength interaction was marginally significant, GFI of overall model ($df$ = 22) = 295.80, $p$ < .001; Wald's $\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 615) = 3.54, $p$ = .06. Participants in the same-race condition (33.8%) were more likely to find the defendant guilty than those in the cross-race (31.6%) when the case was ambiguous; meanwhile, participants in the same-race condition (85.6%) were less likely to render a guilty verdict than those in the cross-race condition (92.0%) when the case was strong.

We also conducted a MANCOVA on the total judgment against the defendant and victim blaming to test the interaction effect of race combination × each of the moderators; controlling for participants' sex, and race, crime type, race of the defendant and victim (see Table 3). None of the moderators produced a significant interaction effect with race combination on the dependent variables in the multivariate test. The main effect of the race combination was also not significant. The multivariate main effects of case strength and defendant's use of violence, however, were significant, $F$ (2, 598) = 58.14, $p$ < .001, Wilks' $\Lambda$ = 0.84, $\eta_p^2$ = .16 for case strength; $F$ (2, 598) = 29.97, $p$ < .001, Wilks' $\Lambda$ = 0.91, $\eta_p^2$ = .10 for defendant's use of violence. Univariate testing demonstrated that participants in the strong case condition (vs. the ambiguous case condition) and participants in the severe violence condition (vs. the low violence condition), rendered more punitive judgments against the defendant, $F$ (1, 599) = 115.87, $p$ < .001, $\eta_p^2$ = .16 for case strength, $F$ (1, 599) = 60.02, $p$ < .001, $\eta_p^2$= .09 for defendant's use of violence.

## Discussion

Study 1b demonstrated the marginally significant interaction effect of race-combination × case strength on the dichotomous guilty verdict. However, given that the race-combination × case strength interaction was not significant on the continuous dependent variables, we should cautiously interpret the significance of the interaction effect on the dichotomous guilty verdict.

Inconsistent with our expectations, we failed to replicate the main effect of race combination of Lee et al. (2019) in Study 1b as well as Study 1a. We supposed that we might have failed to find the ethnicity-combination effects with Korean participants in Study 1a because of their cultural characteristics (i.e., undifferentiated attitudes or perceptions across ethnicity types). Because we also failed the replication with American participants in Study 1b, we cannot explain the null results of Study 1a with differences in cultural characteristics.

To find potential reasons for the failed replication in both Study 1a and 1b, we should look at any differences between Lee et al. 's study (2019) and the current Study. One of

differences was that Lee et al. (2019) did not manipulate race salience (or ethnicity salience) in their crime scenarios, whereas Study 1a and 1b manipulated it as a within-subject variable. Participants in Study 1a and 1b read six case summaries, which were randomly matched to six conditions from the 2 case strength × 2 violence × 2 ethnicity/race salience × 3 or 2 ethnicity/race-combination design. Thus, once participants were exposed to the high ethnicity/race-salience scenarios, ethnicity/race could have become salient even in the following low salience scenarios (i.e., the "priming" effect, see Meyer & Schvaneveldt (1971)). Therefore, unlike participants in Lee et al.'s study (2019), those in Study 1a and 1b might have been primed with ethnicity/race salience.

We originally hypothesized that, when an ethnic/racial issue was salient (vs. not salient) in a trial, the effect of defendant-victim ethnicity/race combination would be stronger because it might highlight differences between the same- and cross-combinations. However, unlike our expectation, ethnicity/race salience might have reduced the ethnicity/race combination effect in the current study. For example, as demonstrated in Lee et al. (2019), participants whose races are different from a defendant and a victim render more punitive judgments in same-ethnicity/race crimes than cross-ethnicity/race crimes. However, when an ethnic/racial issue becomes salient in a trial, participants may perceive cross-ethnicity/race crimes as ethnic/racial conflicts between the defendant and victim. The perception of ethnic/racial conflicts could intensify punitive judgments toward the defendant in cross-ethnicity/race crimes (i.e., the cross-ethnicity effect; Herzog, 2003) and consequently reduce the differences in judgments between the same- and cross-ethnicity/race crimes.

If the within-subject manipulation of the race salience nullified the race combination effect in Study 1a and Study 1b, the effect should be found in the same studies when analyzing data from only participants who were not exposed to the high ethnicity/race-salience condition. Thus, we compared participants ' judgments of same-ethnicity/race crimes versus cross-ethnicity/race crimes in Study 1a and Study 1b, with a sub-dataset including only responses to a crime scenario which was firstly presented among the six scenarios and manipulated as low ethnicity/race salience. As expected, the additional examination demonstrated the tendency of more punitive judgments in same-race/ethnicity crimes compared to cross-race/ethnicity crimes. The participants, who were not exposed to the high salience condition, rendered a guilty verdict more frequently in same-ethnicity/race crimes (53.3% for Study 1a; 63.6% for Study 1b) than in cross-ethnicity/race crimes (33.3% for Study 1a; 57.5% for Study 1b).

Finally, if participants in Study 1a and 1b perceived cross-ethnicity/race crimes as ethnic/racial conflicts and intensified punitive

judgments against the defendant in the cross-combination condition, we may anticipate that participants of the cross-ethnicity/race condition in Study 1a and 1b would render more punitive judgments than those of the cross-race condition in Lee et al. (2019). Because of the low race salience in Lee et al. (2019), the participants might not interpret cross-race crimes in the context of racial conflicts; thus, the judgments in cross-race crimes of Lee et al. (2019) would be less punitive than those in the cross-ethnicity/race crimes of Study 1a and 1b. If we find more severe judgments against the defendant in cross ethnicity/race crimes for Study 1a and 1b than for Lee et al.'s study (2019), we may indirectly account for the null results in Study 1a and 1b by the influence of the race-salience manipulation. We conducted Study 2 to test this hypothesis with a meta-analytic approach.

## Study 2

In Study 2, we integrated the data of the four studies-the pilot and main studies in Lee et al. (2019), along with the data from Study 1a and Study 1b in the current study-and tested whether participants of Study 1a and 1b, compared to those of Lee et al. (2019), would render more punitive judgments against the defendant in cross ethnicity/race crimes.

### Method

First, we created study type variable (0 = the pilot and main studies in Lee et al. (2019); 1 = Study 1a and 1b in the current study) and country variable (0 = the United States; 1 = Korea). Then, we recoded several variables-the relationship between defendant-victim, which was manipulated in the main study of Lee et al.(2019), and the three moderators manipulated in Study 1a and 1b of the current study. Because those variables were exclusively manipulated in the studies, we had to create the variables in other studies that did not manipulate the variables. In that case, we coded the variables in accordance with the contents of each criminal case. For example, we coded the robbery case of a taxi driver in the pilot study of Lee et al. (2019) as following; the relationship between defendant-victim as stranger; case strength as ambiguous, violence as low, and race-salience as low.

We also created a major dependent variable-total judgment against the defendant-by combining continuous guilty verdict, sentence, and perceived seriousness. The three dependent measures were used in all the four studies, along with the dichotomous verdict. Therefore, we used the combined continuous measure and dichotomous verdict for further analyses.

## Results and Discussion

We conducted a hierarchical binary logistic regression analysis on the dichotomous guilty verdict with data from only the cross-ethnicity/race conditions. We entered all covariates (participants' sex and race, race/ethnicity of the defendant and victim, country, scenario type, relationship between defendant-victim, case strength, defendant's violence, and race/ethnicity salience) at the first step, and study type at the second step (see Table 4). The analysis demonstrated that study type significantly improved the model fit, GFI of overall model ($df$ = 29) = 354.88, $p$ < .001; GFI of the second step ($df$ = 1) = 8.29, $p$ = .004. In cross-ethnicity/race crimes, participants of Study 1a and 1b (61.5%) were more likely to render a guilty verdict than those of Lee et al. (2019) (52.8%), $B$ = 1.71, $SE$ = 0.58, Wald's $\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 753) = 8.56, $p$ = .003, exp ($B$) = 5.50, 95% CI [1.76, 17.25].

We also conducted an ANCOVA to test the study-type effect on the total judgment against the defendant controlling for the same covariates used in the logistic regression analysis (see Table 5). As expected, the results demonstrated that participants in Study 1a and 1b ($M$ = 14.05, $SD$ = 4.61) rendered more punitive judgments toward the defendant than those in Lee et al. (2019) ($M$ = 13.56, $SD$ = 3.93), $F$ (1, 737) = 5.94, $p$ = 0.015, $\eta_p^2$ = .008.

Additionally, when the same analyses were conducted with data from only the same-ethnicity/race conditions, the study-type effect was not significant. In same-ethnicity/race crimes, there was not significant difference in the proportion of a guilty verdict (59.9% for Study 1a and 1b; and 63.2% for Lee et al., 2019), GFI of overall model ($df$ = -26) = 339.87, $p$ < .001; GFI of the second step ($df$ = 1) = 0.36, $p$ = .55, $B$ = -0.50, $SE$ = 0.86, Wald's $\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 741) = 0.33, $p$ = .56, exp ($B$) = 0.61, 95% CI [0.11, 3.29], and scores of the total judgment against the defendant ($M$ = 14.25, $SD$ = 4.56 for Study 1a and 1b; and $M$ = 13.84, $SD$ = 3.83 for Lee et al., 2019), $F$ (1, 730) = 0.94, $p$ = 0.33, $\eta_p^2$ = .001, between participants in Study 1a and 1b and those in Lee et al.(2019)

The analyses indirectly supported our supposition that the race-salience manipulation in Study 1a and 1b might have increased punitive judgments toward the defendant in cross-ethnicity/race crimes and consequently nullified the race-combination effect found in Lee et al.'s study (2019). Therefore, it appears that the race-combination effect (i.e., more punitive judgments toward the defendant for same-race crimes than cross-race crimes, when observers' race is different from the defendant and victim) may be sustained only when the race of the defendant and victim does not become salient.

Table 4 Summary of hierarchical binary logistic regression analysis for the study type predicting a dichotomous verdict in the second step, controlling for case characteristics (cross-ethnicity/race crimes)

| Source | B | SE B | Wald | p | Exp(B) | 95% CI UL | 95% CI LL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Country (the US = 0; Korea = 1) | 0.44 | 1.31 | 0.11 | .738 | 1.55 | 0.12 | 20.24 |
| Participant Gender (female = 0; male = 1) | -0.55 | 0.22 | 6.28* | .012 | 0.58 | 0.38 | 0.89 |
| Participant Race (White = 0) | | | 2.65 | .618 | | | |
| race 1 (Black = 1) | -0.37 | 0.92 | 0.16 | .688 | 0.69 | 0.11 | 4.22 |
| race 2 (Hispanic = 1) | 0.04 | 0.95 | 0.00 | .970 | 1.04 | 0.16 | 6.68 |
| race 3 (Asian = 1) | -0.75 | 0.70 | 1.12 | .289 | 0.47 | 0.12 | 1.88 |
| race 4 (Others = 1) | 0.56 | 0.85 | 0.44 | .506 | 1.76 | 0.33 | 9.24 |
| Defendant Race (control = 0) | | | 1.27 | .866 | | | |
| race 1 (White = 1) | -0.34 | 0.88 | 0.15 | .697 | 0.71 | 0.13 | 3.95 |
| race 2 (Black = 1) | 0.04 | 0.93 | 0.00 | .962 | 1.05 | 0.17 | 6.50 |
| race 3 (Hispanic = 1) | 0.41 | 1.04 | 0.15 | .697 | 1.50 | 0.19 | 11.64 |
| race 4 (Vietnamese = 1) | 0.23 | 0.48 | 0.22 | .640 | 1.25 | 0.49 | 3.22 |
| Victim Race (control = 0) | | | 0.90 | .826 | | | |
| race 1 (White = 1) | -0.02 | 0.84 | 0.00 | .978 | 0.98 | 0.19 | 5.11 |
| race 2 (Black = 1) | 0.43 | 0.91 | 0.22 | .637 | 1.54 | 0.26 | 9.13 |
| race 3 (Hispanic = 1) | 0.53 | 1.00 | 0.27 | .600 | 1.69 | 0.24 | 12.08 |
| Scenario Type (robbery of tourist = 0) | | | 98.93*** | < .001 | | | |
| type 1 (taxi driver robbery = 1) | 3.08 | 0.75 | 16.83*** | < .001 | 21.72 | 4.99 | 94.54 |
| type 2 (battery on girlfriend = 1) | 2.20 | 0.70 | 9.81** | .002 | 9.04 | 2.28 | 35.87 |
| type 3 (arson at church = 1) | -1.19 | 0.95 | 1.57 | .210 | 0.31 | 0.05 | 1.95 |
| type 4 (murder b/w gang = 1) | 4.00 | 0.98 | 16.80*** | < .001 | 54.56 | 8.06 | 369.47 |
| type 5 (car theft = 1) | 2.03 | 0.88 | 5.36* | .021 | 7.58 | 1.36 | 42.12 |
| type 6 (sabotage = 1) | 2.59 | 1.31 | 3.90* | .048 | 13.31 | 1.02 | 173.57 |
| type 7 (sexual assault = 1) | 1.16 | 0.90 | 1.66 | .198 | 3.18 | 0.55 | 18.42 |
| type 8 (arson at restaurant= 1) | -0.55 | 0.46 | 1.41 | .236 | 0.58 | 0.23 | 1.43 |
| type 9 (battery on a street= 1) | -0.81 | 0.44 | 3.28† | .070 | 0.45 | 0.19 | 1.07 |
| type 10 (burglary = 1) | 1.03 | 0.70 | 2.16 | .142 | 2.80 | 0.71 | 11.03 |
| type 11 (murder of coworker = 1) | 0.92 | 0.70 | 1.71 | .191 | 2.50 | 0.63 | 9.91 |
| Relationship (acquaintance = 0; stranger =1) | 0.81 | 0.54 | 2.22 | .136 | 2.24 | 0.77 | 6.49 |

Table 4 Summary of hierarchical binary logistic regression analysis for the study type predicting a dichotomous verdict in the second step, controlling for case characteristics (cross-ethnicity/race crimes) (continue)

| Source | B | SE B | Wald | p | Exp(B) | 95% CI UL | 95% CI LL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Case Strength (strong = 0; weak = 1) | -3.46 | 0.30 | 132.00*** | < .001 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.06 |
| Violence (severe = 0; weak =1) | -0.54 | 0.26 | 4.19* | .041 | 0.58 | 0.35 | 0.98 |
| Race Salience (salient = 0; not salient = 1) | -0.18 | 0.26 | 0.48 | .488 | 0.83 | 0.50 | 1.39 |
| **Study Type (Lee et al. (2019) = 0; current study = 1)** | 1.71 | 0.58 | 8.56** | .003 | 5.50 | 1.76 | 17.25 |
| Constant | 0.48 | 1.89 | 0.07 | .799 | 1.62 | | |
| $\chi^2$ statistics (Step) | $\chi^2$ ($df$ = 1, $N$ = 753) = 8.29, $p$ = .004 | | | | | | |
| $\chi^2$ statistics (Model) | $\chi^2$ ($df$ = 29, $N$ = 753) = 354.88, $p$ < .001 | | | | | | |

*Note.* $^{***}p < 0.001$, $^{**}p < 0.01$, $^{*}p < 0.05$, $^{\dagger}p < 0.10$. The contrasts of Asian vs. control, and Chinese vs. control in Defendant Race and Victim Race, and Vietnamese vs. control in Victim Race were automatically removed from the regression equation due to redundancies.

Table 5 ANCOVA results for the study-type effect on punitive judgments against a defendant (cross-ethnicity/race crimes)

| Source | $df$ | $F$ | $\eta_p^2$ | $p$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Covariates | | | | |
| Participant Gender | 1 | 6.11* | .008 | .014 |
| Participant Race | 1 | 0.76 | .001 | .384 |
| Defendant Race | 1 | 8.83** | .012 | .003 |
| Victim Race | 1 | 0.50 | .001 | .479 |
| Scenario Type | 1 | 2.15 | .003 | .143 |
| Relationship | 1 | 5.10* | .007 | .024 |
| Case Strength | 1 | 99.41*** | .119 | < .001 |
| Violence | 1 | 78.63*** | .096 | < .001 |
| Race Salience | 1 | 5.88* | .008 | .016 |
| **Study Type** | 1 | 5.94* | .008 | .015 |
| Intercept | 1 | 285.93*** | .280 | < .001 |

*Note.* $^{***}p < 0.001$, $^{**}p < 0.01$, $^{*}p < 0.05$, $^{\dagger}p < 0.10$

## General Discussion

The purpose of the current studies was to test the replicability of the race-combination effect in Lee et al. (2019) in South Korea, and to find other potential moderators. Lee et al. (2019) demonstrated that people whose races were different from the defendant and victim in a crime rendered more punitive judgments against the defendant in the same-race condition than in the cross-race condition. However, contrary to our expectation, we failed to replicate the race-combination effect with Korean participants in Study 1a. It was possible that we failed to replicate the effect due to cultural differences between South Korea and the United States. Therefore, we conducted Study 1b using the same research design but with an American sample. The main effect of the race combination was still not replicated. We concluded that it was possible that the race-combination effect was not found because the participants in Studies 1a and 1b might have been primed with the high ethnicity/race salience. The primed participants might have perceived cross-ethnicity/race crimes as ethnic/racial conflicts between the defendant and victim, and consequently rendered judgments to the defendant in the crimes as punitive as they did in same-ethnicity/race crimes. To test this possibility in Study 2, we conducted a meta-analysis of the data from Lee et al. (2019) and Study 1a and 1b. We found that participants rendered more punitive judgments toward the defendant in Study 1a and 1b, compared to Lee et al. 's study (2019), in cross-ethnicity/race crimes, but not in same-ethnicity/race crimes. The result indirectly supported our hypothesis that participants in Study 1a and 1b might regard the cross-ethnicity/race crimes as ethnic/racial conflicts; and that the race-salience manipulation could have caused the null results in Studies 1a and 1b.

Taken all findings together in Lee et al.'s study (2019) and the current study, it appears that participants are more likely to render more punitive judgments toward defendants in same-race crimes than cross-race crimes, when the participants' race is different from the defendant and victim. However, the race-combination effect disappeared when race-relevant issues were salient in the crimes, because the race salience in the cases may have led participants to perceive cross-race crimes as racial conflicts between the defendant and victim and to intensify the punitive judgments against the defendant.

However, the current study has limitations with regard to the research design. First, the race-salience effect on the null results in Study 1a and 1b was indirectly tested with a meta-analytic approach. Thus, follow-up studies should test the race-salience effect directly by manipulating the race salience in crime scenarios as a between-subject variable. Second, the current study focused on the potential factors moderating the race-combination effect in Lee et

al. (2019), while not paying much attention to mediation paths between the race-combination of a defendant and a victim and participants' judgments in criminal cases. Lee et al. (2019) suggested a potential mediation path using the homogeneity effect-participants whose races are different from a defendant and a victim may perceive the homogeneity between the defendant and victim in a same-race crime more strongly than in a cross-race crime, which may lead to more punitive judgments against the defendant in the same-race crime. Future research should examine mediation paths between the race combination of a defendant and a victim and participants' judgments.

It is notable that the current study found the race-salience effect of Sommers and Ellsworth (2000) with different types of race-combinations. Sommers and Ellsworth's findings (2000) were consistent with aversive racism in modern society-White participants' unfavorable judgments toward the Black defendant (i.e., outgroup) disappeared when race-relevant issues were salient in the crime. However, the results of the current studies suggest that participants' punitive judgments toward an outgroup defendant may increase in race-salience conditions when the victim is also of a different race from the participants. For example, we may anticipate a situation where, in high race-salience, White participants render more punitive judgment to a Black defendant when the victim is Hispanic, compared to when the victim is White. This anticipation is worth investigating in future research.

It would be desirable to test the race-combination effect (i.e., a third party's more punitive judgments in same-race crimes than cross-race crimes) in various contexts, such as across regions. For example, studies could test the effects of having participants render more punitive judgments against defendants in same-regional or cross-regional crimes (e.g., both the defendant and victim from the same city or the defendant and victim are from different cities). Considering the strong regionalism in Korea, the replication of the race-combination effect in the regional context may have practical implications for Korean society.

Finally, although Study 1a tested the replicability of the race-combination effect found in Lee et al. (2019) in the context of ethnicity with Korean participants, it would also be worth testing the effect in a racial context for future policy making, given that Korea is transforming into a multiracial society rapidly.

## References

Adams, L. T., Bryden, M. W., & Griffith, J. D. (2011). Middle Eastern racial bias and the impact of jury deliberation. *American Journal of Forensic Psychology, 29*, 41-59.

Bresnahan, M. J., Levine, T. R., Shearman, S. M., Lee, S. Y., Park, C. Y., & Kiyomiya, T.

(2005). A Multimethod Multitrait Validity Assessment of Self-Construal in Japan, Korea, and the United States. *Human Communication Research, 31*, 33-59. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2005.tb00864.x.

Diener, E., & Diener, M. (2009). Culture and Well-Being. *Social Indicators Research Series, 38,* 71-91. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-2352-0

ForsterLee, R., ForsterLee, L., Horowitz, I. A., & King, E. (2006). The effects of defendant race, victim race, and juror gender on evidence processing in a murder trial. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, *24*, 179-198. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/bsl.675

Gau, J. M. (2016). A jury of whose peers? The impact of selection procedures on racial composition and the prevalence of majority white juries. *Journal of Crime and Justice, 39,* 75-87. https://doi.org/10.1080/0735648X.2015.1087149.

Herzog, S. (2003). Does the ethnicity of offenders in crime scenarios affect public perceptions of crime seriousness? A randomized survey experiment in Israel. *Social Forces*, *82*, 757-781. https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2004.0011

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*. 2nd Edition, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hymes, R. W., Leinart, M., Rowe, S., & Rogers, W. (1993). Acquaintance rape: The effect of race of defendant and race of victim on white juror decisions. The Journal of Social Psychology, 133, 627-634. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224 545.1993.9713917.

Judd, C. M., & Park, B. (1988). Out-group homogeneity: Judgments of variability at the individual and group levels. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 778-788. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.5.778.

Judd, C. M., Ryan, C. S., & Park, B. (1991). Accuracy in the judgment of in-group and out-group variability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*, 366-379. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.61.3.366.

Korean Statistical Information Service. (2016). International Migration Statistics. Retrieved from http://kosis.kr/eng/statisticsList/statisticsList_01List.jsp?vwcd=MT_ETITLE&parentId=A

Lee, J., Khogali, M., Despodova, N. M., & Penrod, S. (2019). A third party's judgment in same-race and cross-race crimes. *Race and Social Problems, 11,* 253 - 267. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12552-019-09266-z

Ma, Correll, & Wittenbrink (2015). The Chicago Face Database: A Free Stimulus Set of Faces and Norming Data. *Behavior Research Methods, 47*, 1122-1135.

Margan, R. E. (2017, October). Race and Hispanic origin of victims and offenders, 2012-15 (NCJ Publication No. 250747). Retrieved from Bureau of Justice Statistics: https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/rhovo1215.pdf

Marques, J. M. (1990). The black sheep effect:

Outgroup homogeneity as a social comparison process. In D. Abrams & M. A. Hogg (Eds.), *Social identity theory: Constructive and critical advances* (pp. 131-151). Nova Iorque: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Meyer, D. E., & Schvaneveldt, R. W. (1971). Facilitation in recognizing pairs of words: Evidence of a dependent between retrieval operations. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 90*, 227-234. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0031564

Mitchell, T. L., Haw, R. M., Pfeifer, J. E., & Meissner, C. A. (2005). Racial bias in mock juror decision-making: a meta-analytic review of defendant treatment. *Law and Human Behavior, 29*, 621-637. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10979-005-8122-9

Morling, B., & Lamoreaux, M. (2008). Measuring Culture Outside the Head: A Meta-Analysis of Individualism-Collectivism in Cultural Products. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 12*, 199-221. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1088868308318260

Pearson, J. M., Law, J. R., Skene, J., Beskind, D. H., Vidmar, N., Ball, D. A., Malekpour, A., Carter, R. M., & Skene, J. H. (2018). Modelling the effects of crime type and evidence on judgments about guilt. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *2*, 856-866. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0451-z

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). The Elaboration Likelihood Model of Persuasion. Communication and Persuasion, (pp. 1-24). New York, NY: Springer New York doi:10.1007/978-1-4612-4964-1_1

Quattrone, G. A., & Jones, E. E. (1980). The perception of variability within in-groups and out-groups: Implications for the law of small numbers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*, 141-152. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.38.1.141.

Rector, N. A., & Bagby, R. M. (1995). Criminal sentence recommendations in a simulated rape trial: Examining juror prejudice in Canada. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, *13*, 113-121. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/bsl.2370130108

Saucier, D. A., Hockett, J. M., Zanotti, D. C., & Heffel, S. (2010). Effects of racism on perceptions and punishment of intra-and interracial crimes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *25*, 1767-1784. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0886260509358386

Sommers, S. R., & Ellsworth, P. C. (2000). Race in the courtroom: Perceptions of guilt and dispositional attributions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *26*, 1367-1379. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167200263005

Sommers, S. R., & Ellsworth, P. C. (2009). "Race salience" in juror decision-making: misconceptions, clarifications, and unanswered questions. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 27*, 599-609. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/bsl.877

Stevenson, M. C., & Bottoms, B. L. (2009), Race Shapes Perceptions of Juvenile Offenders in Criminal Court1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39*, 1660-1689. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2009.00499.x

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S.

Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson Hall.

Wuensch, K. L., Campbell, M. W., Kesler, F. C., & Moore, C. H. (2002). Racial bias in decisions made by mock jurors evaluating a case of sexual harassment. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *142*, 587-600. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00224540209603920

1 차원고접수 : 2019. 12. 20.
심사통과접수 : 2020. 03. 11.
최종원고접수 : 2020. 03. 20.

한국심리학회지 : 법
*The Korean Journal of Forensic Psychology*
2020, Vol. 11, No. 1, 37-61

# 동인종 범죄로 기소된 피고인에 대한 엄벌주의적 판단의 재고찰: 다른 문화에서의 적용

**Jungwon Lee[1)†] Mawia Khogali[2)] Nikoleta M. Despodova[3)] Steven D. Penrod[4)]**

[1)]Korean Institute of Criminology [2)]Center for Policing Equity
[3)]John Jay College of Criminal Justice and the Graduate Center, City University of New York
[4)]John Jay College of Criminal Justice, the City University of New York

Lee, Khogali, Despodova, 와 Penrod의 연구(2019)에서는 관찰자가 피고인과 피해자의 인종과 다른 경우, 타인종 범죄(예: 백인 관찰자, 흑인 피고인, 히스패닉 피해자)보다 동인종 범죄(예: 백인 관찰자, 흑인 피고인, 흑인 피해자)에서 더 가혹한 판결이 내려지는 것을 밝혀내었다. Lee 등의 연구(2019)는 미국 피험자들을 대상으로 실시되었다는 점을 고려하여, 본 연구는 그러한 인종조합효과가 한국 피험자에게서도 나타나는지를 검증하였다. 연구1a는 한국에서 3개의 조절 변인(증거 강도, 피고인의 폭력사용 정도, 인종 특출성)과 함께 인종조합효과를 살펴보았으나, 그 효과의 재현에 실패하였다. 연구1b는 연구1a의 재현실패가 한국과 미국의 문화 차이 때문인지를 검증하기 위하여, 연구 1a와 동일한 실험설계를 사용하여 미국에서 시행되었다. 그러나 연구 1b 역시 인종조합효과를 재현하는 데 실패하였다. 연구2는 연구1a와 연구1b의 데이터와 함께 Lee 등(2019)의 데이터도 통합하여 메타분석적 검토를 시행하였다. 그 결과, 연구1a와 연구1b의 인종 특출성 조작이 그 재현실패의 원인일 수도 있음을 보여주었다. 따라서 본 연구는 피고인과 피해자의 인종과 다른 사람들은 타인종 범죄보다 동인종 범죄에서 더 가혹한 판결을 내리지만, 이러한 인종조합효과는 그 범죄사건에서 인종 관련 사안이 특출해지지 않을 때만 나타나는 것으로 결론지었다.

주요어 : 인종편향, 범죄사건 판단, 인종 특출성