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Recent research has provided considerable evidence that when facial appearance is the only information provided about a stimulus person, babyfaced adults are perceived to have more childlike qualities than mature-faced adults who are equal in perceived age and attractiveness. The present study utilized a simulated trial format to assess the impact of facial maturity on social perceptions in a more complex situation in which other meaningful information about the stimulus person was available. The fact that babyfaced adults are perceived to be more naive than those with mature features led to the prediction that a babyfaced defendant would be more often found guilty of an offense resulting from negligent actions than would a mature-faced defendant. The fact that babyfaced adults are perceived to be more honest than those with mature features yielded the prediction that babyfaced defendants would less often be perceived as guilty of charges involving intentional criminal behavior. Finally, when defendants were known to be guilty of a negligent crime, it was predicted that subjects would recommend less severe punishment for babyfaced defendants than for mature-faced ones. The pattern of results supported the predictions.

Recent research has provided considerable evidence that "babyfaced" adults are perceived to have childlike psychological qualities. For example, McArthur and Apatow (1983-1984) found that adult male and female schematic faces characterized by immature features including large eyes, low feature placement or short noses were rated as physically weaker, more submissive, more honest, and more naive than faces exhibiting more mature features. Keating (1985) also found that immature features increased the judged submissiveness of schematic faces. Berry and McArthur (1985) reported analogous results in their analysis of the relationship between perceptions of photographed adult males faces and measurements of their facial features. Large, round eyes, high eyebrows, and a

AUTHORS' NOTE: We would like to thank Mike Berbaum, Rebecca Eder, and Margie Lachman for their helpful comments on earlier versions of this article. Correspondence should be addressed to Diane S. Berry, Department of Psychology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas 75275.

© 1988 by the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Inc.
small chin each yielded the perception of a babyish facial appearance, and these features increased perceivers' impressions of the stimulus persons' naiveté, kindness, warmth, and honesty. Research conducted with Korean subjects (McArthur & Berry, 1987) has further revealed that there is cross-cultural agreement in impressions of babyfaced adults. Finally, it should be noted that in all of the foregoing studies, the documented impact on impressions of babyish features has been independent of the perceived age and attractiveness of the stimulus persons. (See Berry & McArthur, 1986, for a review of additional research on this topic.)

Research investigating the impact of babyish facial features on impressions has been motivated by McArthur and Baron's (1983) ecological theory of social perception. Within this perspective, a person's directly detectable attributes are assumed to provide useful knowledge about that person's needs and capabilities. Although the ecological approach thus assumes that social perceptions will typically be accurate, it does consider the issue of error. One reason for erroneous perceptions, according to this theory, is impoverished stimulus information: It is assumed that configurational, dynamic, and multimodal stimulus information is often necessary for accurate social perceptions and that errors may occur when such information is not available. Another source of error proposed within this approach is the overgeneralization of perceptions that are usually adaptive. In particular, because it is so important to perceive the psychological qualities that are communicated by an infant's facial appearance, it is predicted that these qualities may be overdetected in adults who physically resemble the young.

A limitation of past studies on reactions to babyfaced adults is that they have utilized a paradigm in which facial appearance was the only source of information on which perceivers could base their judgments. The question thus remains as to the impact of facial maturity on social perceptions in real-world contexts when perceivers have access to multiple sources of information. The present study represents an initial attempt to address the question of whether or not the documented reactions to babyfaced adults persist in more complex situations in which additional information about a stimulus is made available. More specifically, it assessed the impact of a person's facial maturity on perceptions of guilt or innocence in a simulated trial.

Research conducted in the area of facial stereotyping has revealed that there is consensus among perceivers as to which persons look as if they are guilty of a crime. It has also been found that there is agreement as to what particular crime a person "looks" like he or she has committed (e.g., Shoemaker, South, & Lowe, 1973). Although it has been thus shown that certain faces connote particular crimes, these studies have not determined exactly what facial characteristics are responsible for these impressions. However, other research has demonstrated that physical attractiveness may be an important determinant of a "criminal appearance." Studies investigating the impact of defendants' attractiveness on the outcome of mock trials have revealed that attractive defendants are less likely to be convicted than are their less attractive counterparts (e.g., Kulka &
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Kessler, 1978: Leventhal & Krato, 1977; Stephan & Tulley, 1977). Furthermore, given a conviction in simulated as well as in real criminal trials, attractive people tend to receive lighter punishments (Leventhal & Krato, 1977; Stewart, 1980).

One might question the legitimacy of drawing conclusions about the role of appearance in real courtroom situations from research using simulated trial paradigms. However, such studies have extended our understanding of the scope of the physical attractiveness stereotype by demonstrating that this factor exerted a strong influence on person perception even when perceivers had access to additional information about a stimulus person. The intent of the present research is to use a similar paradigm to extend our knowledge about stereotyping based on babyish facial characteristics.

The fact that babyfaced adults are perceived to be more naive than those with more mature features (Berry & McArthur, 1985; McArthur & Apatow, 1983-1984; McArthur & Berry, 1987) led to the prediction that a babyfaced "defendant" would more often be found guilty of an offense resulting from negligent actions than would a mature-faced defendant. On the other hand, the fact that babyfaced adults are perceived to be more honest than those with mature features yielded the prediction that babyfaced defendants would less often be perceived as guilty of charges involving intentional criminal behavior. A different pattern of results was expected when defendants had pled guilty to an offense. In the case of the negligent crime, it was expected that a less severe punishment would be recommended for a babyfaced defendant than a mature-faced one, presumably because the babyfaced individual "couldn't help it." No differences were predicted in the punishment recommended for babyfaced and mature-faced defendants in the case of an intentional crime.

**METHOD**

**Subjects**

Sixty-four female and 64 male undergraduates enrolled in introductory psychology received course credit for their participation in the study.

**Design and Stimulus Materials**

The experiment employed a 2 (criminal case) × 2 (defendant intent) × 2 (plea) × 2 (facial maturity of defendant) between-subject factorial design. Sex of subject was originally included as a factor in the design. Neither the main effect of sex nor any interaction incorporating sex approached significance. Therefore, the reported analyses are collapsed across subject gender.

Subjects were provided with a copy of a Pretrial Intake Report used by the Boston District Court System (Form DC/BMC). These were filled out in a manner resembling an authentic report. Each described a young male college student who had been charged with some offense.

Two different scenarios were used in order to assess the generalizability of the predicted effects across different contexts. Defendant intent was varied in each. In one case, the defendant was accused of underreporting to the Internal
Revenue Service tip income that was earned during summer employment as a waiter. It was charged that the alleged underreporting of income was the result of either the negligent maintenance of records (negligent crime) or the deliberate falsification of records (intentional crime). The second case described a civil suit brought against the defendant in which a plaintiff claimed that she had developed an allergic reaction to a home-cleaning product that the defendant had sold to her during his summer employment as a door-to-door salesman. The plaintiff claimed either that the defendant had failed to warn her about the potential hazards of the product (negligent crime) or that he had actively misinformed her about such hazards (intentional crime). Plea was varied by stating that the defendant had pled "guilty" or "not guilty" to the charge in question.

Defendant appearance was manipulated by attaching one of four black-and-white photographs to the Pretrial Intake Report. Two babyish and two mature stimulus faces were selected from a sample of 20 faces that had previously been measured on a number of physiognomic characteristics, as well as rated on perceived age, physical attractiveness, perceived facial maturity, and several trait scales (Berry & McArthur, 1985). The faces selected from the original sample were chosen on the basis of their judged facial maturity and their measurements on four physiognomic characteristics that had been found to correlate significantly with perceived babyfacedness (eye size, eye shape, eyebrow height, and chin width). The four faces, which did not differ in physical attractiveness, were all white males in their early 20s without facial hair or glasses. Table 1 contains details of the characteristics of the faces. Half of the subjects in a given face condition saw one stimulus face, and the remaining subjects viewed the second face.

### Procedure

Subjects were tested in mixed-sex groups varying in size from 2 to 10. Upon entering the room, subjects were seated and read the following instructions:

This research addresses the problem of potential biases that may affect the decisions reached by our court system. Our laws dictate that an accused individual has a right to judgment by his or her peers. However, it seems questionable as to whether such decisions are always rendered by peers. How likely is it that a college student will encounter a jury composed of peers? More important, will this affect such decisions? Do differences in age, gender, level of education, or occupation really influence such judgments? These are some of the questions that we would like to address in this research.

Subjects were then instructed to open a folder placed in front of them and read through a copy of a Pretrial Intake Report. After examining the report, they were asked to indicate on an attached questionnaire whether or not they considered the defendant to be guilty of the alleged offense. For guilty defendants, subjects were also asked to indicate how severe a punishment they

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Characteristics of Stimulus Faces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye shape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyebrow height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiognomic composite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- Measured Dimensions
- Rated Dimensions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Babyish Face A</th>
<th>Babyish Face B</th>
<th>Mature Face A</th>
<th>Mature Face B</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measured Dimensions^a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye size</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.76-1.32</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye shape</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.57-1.00</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyebrow height</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.03-1.36</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin width</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>4.13-9.36</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiognomic composite</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.64-9.58</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated Dimensions^b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye size (large)</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.25-5.74</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye shape (round)</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.17-5.75</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyebrow height (high)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.76-5.28</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin width (broad)</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>2.45-5.83</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facial maturity (babyish)</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.55-5.71</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical attractiveness (attractive)</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.74-5.20</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Indices represent actual measurements of the faces on these dimensions. Higher values represent larger eyes, rounder eyes, higher eyebrows, and broader chins. The physiognomic composite is a weighted linear index of facial measurements that predict judgments of feature maturity. Higher composite scores represent more babyish feature configurations. See Berry and McArthur (1985) for details on the derivations of these measures.

^b Ratings were obtained on 7-point bipolar scales. The high end of each scale is listed in parentheses. Values represent the mean rating for each stimulus face collapsed across 80 subjects. Twenty faces were included in the original sample.
felt was appropriate for the described offense on a 6-point scale with endpoints minimum and maximum.

After completing these judgments, the subjects were asked to look again at the photograph and rate the defendant on two appearance dimensions. Perceptions of the targets' physical attractiveness were obtained through ratings on a 7-point scale with endpoints not at all attractive and very attractive. The perceived maturity of the defendant's facial appearance was also assessed through subjects' ratings on a 7-point scale with endpoints baby face and mature face. Although subjects were given unlimited time in which to make their judgments, all completed the task within 15 minutes.

RESULTS

Perceptions of Facial Maturity and Attractiveness

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to ascertain whether the individual stimulus faces were indeed perceived to differ in facial maturity. The effect of face on these ratings was highly significant, $F(3, 124) = 45.36, p < .0001$, thus replicating the findings reported by Berry and McArthur (1985). Scheffe multiple comparison tests further revealed that although there were no differences in the perceived facial maturity of the two faces in the babyish condition, or the two faces constituting the mature condition, each of the faces in the babyish condition was rated as significantly less mature than either of the faces in the mature condition (see Table 2). A one-way analysis of variance revealed no effect of stimulus face on ratings of physical attractiveness, $F(3, 124) = .57$, n.s. (see Table 2).

Conviction Rate

Log-linear modeling techniques were utilized to analyze data pertaining to the decision to recommend conviction or acquittal of the defendant. Log-linear modeling is an appropriate alternative to analysis of variance for multiple factor designs that feature categorical response variables (Fingleton, 1984). Data obtained from the 64 subjects in the not guilty plea condition were included in these analyses. Defendant facial appearance, criminal case, and defendant intent were incorporated as factors yielding a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ contingency table. This was subjected to a backward deletion procedure in order to isolate those factors that best predicted conviction decisions. This analysis revealed that a model retaining two factors, criminal case and the predicted interaction of facial maturity and defendant intent, provided a highly accurate fit of the data, lack of fit, $G^2 = 1.59$, n.s. As predicted, babyfaced defendants were more likely than maturefaced defendants to be found guilty of crimes of negligence, $z = 2.09, p < .05$, and less likely than mature-faced defendants to be found guilty of intentional crimes, although the latter difference did not reach significance, $z < 1$, n.s. (see Figure 1). In addition, the main effect for criminal case revealed that subjects in the tax case condition were more likely to recommend the defendant than were those in the civil case condition,

Severity of Recommended Punishment

Data pertaining to recommended severity of punishment subjects in the guilty plea condition. Six of the 64 subjects believed the defendant to be innocent despite the fact that these subjects were not clustered in any particular cell excluded from this analysis. A 2 (crime scenario) $\times$ 2 (defendant facial maturity) analysis of variance revealed no effect of facial maturity and defendant intent to be significant (see Figure 2). Although the pattern of means suggested a tendency for babyfaced defendants to be less severely punished than maturefaced defendants, this comparison did not reach significance, $t(26) = .2$, n.s. However, subjects did recommend longer punishment for babyfaced defendants who were guilty of negligent acts than for defendants convicted of intentional offenses, $t(26) = 2.7$, n.s. (see Table 2). The defendant intent had no significant effect on sentence severity.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study are consistent with previous research that stimulus persons exhibiting immature craniofacial features were perceived to be more honest and more naive than those perceived to be more mature (Berry & McArthur, 1985; McArthur & McArthur & Berry, 1987). Specifically, subjects were more likely to believe information that implicated a young adult male from negligence if he was babyfaced than if he displayed equally attractive, facial appearance. Conversely, the
TABLE 2 Ratings of Physical Attractiveness and Facial Maturity of Stimulus Faces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Stimulus Face</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Babyish Face A</td>
<td>Babyish Face B</td>
<td>Mature Face A</td>
<td>Mature Face B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facial maturity</td>
<td>2.59 a</td>
<td>2.66 b</td>
<td>4.81 b</td>
<td>5.28 b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>4.44 a</td>
<td>4.78 a</td>
<td>4.44 a</td>
<td>4.59 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attractiveness</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( N = 32 \) in each cell. Within each row, means without common subscripts differ significantly at \( p < .05 \).

Subjects in the tax case condition were more likely to recommend conviction of the defendant than were those in the civil case condition, \( z = 4.36, p < .05 \).

Severity of Recommended Punishment

Data pertaining to recommended severity of punishment were analyzed for subjects in the guilty plea condition. Six of the 64 subjects indicated that they believed the defendant to be innocent despite the fact that he had admitted guilt. These subjects were not clustered in any particular cell and were therefore excluded from this analysis. A 2 (crime scenario) \( \times \) 2 (defendant intent) \( \times \) 2 (defendant facial maturity) analysis of variance revealed the predicted interaction of facial maturity and defendant intent to be significant, \( F(1, 57) = 4.04, p = .05 \) (see Figure 2). Although the pattern of means revealed the predicted tendency for babyfaced defendants to be less severely punished for a negligent crime than mature-faced defendants, this comparison did not reach significance, \( t(28) < 1 \), n.s. However, subjects did recommend lighter punishments for babyfaced defendants who were guilty of negligent acts than for babyfaced defendants convicted of intentional offenses, \( t(26) = 2.44, p < .05 \), whereas defendant intent had no significant effect on sentence severity for mature-faced defendants, \( t(26) < 1 \), n.s.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study are consistent with previous work that has revealed that stimulus persons exhibiting immature craniofacial characteristics are perceived to be more honest and more naïve than those with a more mature appearance (Berry & McArthur, 1985; McArthur & Apatow, 1983-1984; McArthur & Berry, 1987). Specifically, subjects were significantly more likely to believe information that implicated a young adult male in an offense resulting from negligence if he was babyfaced than if he displayed a more mature, but equally attractive, facial appearance. Conversely, there was a tendency for
subjects to find deliberately dishonest behavior to be more believable when the defendant was mature-faced than when he was baby-faced. The lack of significance for this effect was due to a relatively low conviction rate for mature-faced defendants, which may reflect a general reluctance to convict people of crimes involving alleged premeditated intent.

Given that a defendant was guilty of the charges against him, facial maturity continued to exert a predictable impact on subjects' perceptions of the amount of punishment appropriate for the offense in question. In particular, the significant interaction between facial appearance and defendant intent reflected, in part, the predicted tendency to recommend less severe punishments for baby-faced than for mature-faced men who pled guilty to a negligent offense. The relative reluctance of subjects to censure the baby-faced individual for a negligent act would seem to derive from the belief that people should not be held culpable for an action resulting from naïveté. If a person is not perceived as being knowledgeable enough to avoid getting into trouble, it was for others to be reluctant to punish him.

Although it had been expected that pleading guilty to a negligent offense would yield strong and equal sentencing for the two types of crime, the interaction between facial appearance and defendant intent to recommend more severe punishments for baby-faced men. The unanticipated punitiveness of subjects toward defendants for an intentional offense may reflect the defendant had used his innocent appearance to dupe others, which is analogous to Sigall and Ostrove's (1975) explanation of attraction and type of crime on reconviction. The defendant was accused of a crime unrelated to apparent attractiveness. Defendants received more lenient sentence for attractive counterparts. However, when the crime described was attractive appearance may have been an asset (e.g., defendants were punished more severely than were unattractive).
knowledgeable enough to avoid getting into trouble, it would seem reasonable for others to be reluctant to punish him.

Although it had been expected that pleading guilty to an intentional offense would yield strong and equal sentencing for the two types of defendants, the interaction between facial appearance and defendant intent revealed a tendency to recommend more severe punishments for babyfaced than for mature-faced men. The unanticipated punitiveness of subjects sentencing a babyfaced defendant for an intentional offense may reflect their perception that the defendant had used his innocent appearance to dupe others. This interpretation is analogous to Sigall and Ostrove’s (1975) explanation for the interaction of physical attractiveness and type of crime on recommended sentence. When a defendant was accused of a crime unrelated to appearance (e.g., a burglary), attractive defendants received more lenient sentences than did their less attractive counterparts. However, when the crime described was one in which an attractive appearance may have been an asset (e.g., a swindle), attractive defendants were punished more severely than were unattractive defendants. A
similar mechanism may account for the severe punishment recommended for a babyfaced defendant guilty of an intentional offense. This interpretation would lead one to expect that the effect would not be obtained in the tax case, which involved no face-to-face interaction. However, the effect did not vary with the case described to subjects. It may be that it was not salient to subjects that the tax case did not allow the defendant to use his appearance to carry out the offense.

The finding that an adult male's facial maturity continues to exert an impact on others' evaluations of him when information in addition to facial appearance is provided may seem to contradict the ecological theory's prediction that perceptions will become more accurate with increased information. In fact, the present study did not directly address this hypothesis as much as there was no comparison of perceptions based on facial appearance alone with perceptions based on appearance plus behavior. However, a comparison of the strength of the facial appearance effects for conviction rate versus sentence severity reveals a pattern of results that is consistent with the ecological prediction. In particular, the analysis of conviction rate included only data from subjects in the not guilty plea condition. For these subjects, the behavioral information provided was ambiguous. Did the defendant commit the offense or didn't he? Under such conditions, one would predict an effect of facial appearance, and the conviction rate for mature-faced and babyfaced defendants was, in fact, significantly different. On the other hand, analyses of sentence severity included only data obtained from subjects in the guilty plea condition, who received unambiguous behavioral information. As one would expect, the sentences recommended by these subjects for the babyfaced versus mature-faced defendants did not differ significantly.

Finally, it should be noted that although the attribution of childlike qualities to babyfaced adults is often assumed to constitute an error in social perception, this proposition has yet to be empirically tested. Perceivers do develop reliable expectations of adults who exhibit babyish features. The communication of these assumptions to babyfaced persons may actually elicit behaviors consistent with the original expectations. Such a self-fulfilling prophecy has been documented to occur as a function of differential expectations based on physical attractiveness (Snyder, Tanke, & Berscheid, 1977), and there is evidence that behavioral differences between attractive and unattractive persons may result (e.g., Erwin & Caley, 1984; Goldman & Lewis, 1977). Additional research is warranted to assess whether honest and naive behaviors are indeed elicited from babyfaced adults through such consistent expectations.
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