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Abstract

Research has demonstrated that stigma may affect the re-entry experiences of individuals who are exonerated of crimes they did not commit. In this study, we examined exoneree stigmatization by examining participants’ perceptions of exonerated individuals compared to parolees and average individuals. In addition, we varied the target’s race to examine if race played a role in stigma levied upon exonerated individuals. Results indicated that people who are exonerated and people who are actually guilty are stigmatized more than those with no criminal history. Race did not affect the level of stigma encountered, but further research is needed prior to concluding that race does not affect stigma for exonerated individuals.
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After Exoneration: An Investigation of Stigma and Wrongfully Convicted Persons

In 1992, the Innocence Project was created to respond to miscarriages of justice. As of December 5, 2011, the Innocence Project has aided in exonerating 280 men and women who were serving sentences for crimes they did not commit (innocenceproject.org). These individuals spent an average of 13 years in prison and 17 served time on death row (innocenceproject.org). After being exonerated, these individuals face several obstacles that they must overcome for successful re-entry into society. From domestic and household issues to economic hardships, such hurdles are exemplified through the housing, employment, and relationship statuses of exonerees (Armbrust, 2004; Martin, 2006; Rattner, 1988; Schwartz & Skolnick, 1962). Thus, there is a dilemma regarding what can be done to aid the wrongfully convicted upon re-entry to society (Leo, 2005).

While some of the effects of wrongful conviction are physical, with many suffering from assault and abuse while in the prison system, there is evidence that wrongful conviction may also have negative psychological effects (Grounds, 2004; Grounds, 2005). As there has been some research dedicated to uncovering and analyzing the psychological effects of wrongful conviction (Grounds, 2004; Grounds, 2005), there are only two studies that have studied the stigma (a severe disapproval of a person on the grounds of superficial characteristics) these individuals encounter after being exonerated (Clow & Leach, 2009; Thompson & Levett, 2010). The purpose of this thesis is to build on previous literature and examine social consequences exonerees may experience upon re-entry to society through examining people’s perceptions of exonerated individuals. To do this, we first consulted literature on prisoner re-entry to assess how conviction affects re-entry for parolees and how that might be applied to those who were wrongfully convicted. We then continued by consulting literature examining exoneree stigma,
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couching our exploration of exoneree stigma and re-entry in the psychological literature on the correspondence bias.

Prisoner and Exoneree Re-entry

Though little research has examined the social consequences of wrongful conviction, a wide body of literature has investigated the social consequences of holding a criminal record (Buikhuisen & Dijksterhuis, 1971; Chunias & Aufgang, 2008; Martin, 2006; Pager, 2003; Pager, 2007; Petersilia, 2001; Schwartz & Skolnick, 1962). There has been evidence to suggest that parolees and ex-convicts are stigmatized and discriminated against in the areas of gaining employment and housing.

Parolees and difficulty in finding housing. The Bureau of Justice Statistics (2010) defines a parolee as one who is under a period of supervision within the community after release from prison. In 2009, there was a decrease of parole entries (down 1.2% from 2008), an increase of parolees completing the terms of their supervision (up to 51% in 2009 from 49% in 2008), and a decline in the rate of re-incarceration of all parolees (15% in 2006 to 14% in 2009) (Glaze & Bonczar, 2010). Due to the years they spent incarcerated, parolees are less likely than the average person to have education, life skills and solid family support needed to survive in the community, making the first 6 months after release the most common for re-arrests (Petersilia, 2001). Once released, parolees are assigned to a parole officer who enforces the rules of re-entry, helping the parolee refrain from drug use, find and maintain employment, and not associate with known criminals (Petersilia, 2001).

Unable to either live near or associate with others who have criminal records, parolees may find themselves restricted from interacting with their family and their friends who may be willing to provide them with housing (Bradley et al., 2001). Returning to the neighborhood
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where parolees lived before they were incarcerated may bring personalities and temptations that can impede upon a successful re-entry (Bradley et al., 2001). At other times, parolees may even have their potential guardian change their mind and refuse to grant them housing, primarily because the potential guardian may believe that the individual is a negative influence on the family (Bradley et al., 2001; Pettit & Lyons, 2007). If parolees are fortunate enough to have money saved, the parolees can seek to privately own a home. If their initial offer on a home is rejected due to their criminal record and lack of credit and work history, parolees can apply for subsidized housing in order to avoid living in a homeless shelter or on the streets (Bradley et al., 2001; Pettit & Lyons, 2007). Some ex-convicts can be barred from subsidized housing if they are involved in drug-related activities, if they are registered as sex offenders, or if they have been convicted of manufacturing or producing methamphetamine on the premises of federally assisted housing. In Boston, researchers surveyed 104 parolees within three pre-release facilities and prisoners about their housing experience and needs, and 68% cited their family as being the primary resource for shelter and 52% cited their family as a source for primary assistance and 62% feared being discriminated due to their criminal record when it came to securing housing (Bradley et al., 2001).

**Exonerees and difficulty finding housing.** Though the wrongfully convicted serve an average of 13 years before being exonerated and released from prison, the negative consequences they face do not disappear when the cell door opens. In fact, “The most damaging injury inflicted upon the wrongfully convicted is not necessarily the time lost behind bars, but the stigma that follows them for the rest of their lives” (Lopez, 2002, p.720). Those who were exonerated of an infamous crime or who were subjected to great amounts of publicity may face an even greater
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degree of stigma than those who were exonerated of less well known crimes or had less publicity associated with their wrongful convictions (Martin, 2006).

Though exonerees and parolees may experience similar levels of stigma, exonerated individuals do not receive as much assistance and support as parolees upon release, which may lead to difficulty finding housing and employment (Westervelt & Cook, 2007). In Massachusetts, for example, inmates that do not have housing upon their release are aided by the Re-entry Services Division of the Massachusetts Department of Correction six months prior to their scheduled release dates. However, exonerees are not often provided such a benefit (Chunias & Aufgang, 2008). Yet, upon release exonerees are subjected to hardship, given that their experiences may have deprived them of all their valuable possessions, from their car to their homes.

Upon their release, most exonerees rely on either moving in with their family or friends or perhaps even a private residence if they have monetary means (Martin, 2006). However, just like parolees, if exonerees seek private or subsidized housing, they will also be subject to background checks that can reveal a criminal record, lack of credit, and lack of work history. To improve their chances of obtaining housing, exoneerees can expunge their criminal record or obtain a pardon (Martin, 2006). However, a pardon may be beyond the realm of possibilities for exonerees; it is an incredibly high legal standard to achieve and a highly political process that is subject to an array of considerations (Martin, 2006).

If the offender (parolee or exoneree) was unable to take part in a work release program, he or she may not have funds saved for housing (Pettit & Lyons, 2007). On one hand, to improve chances of successful re-entry, parole officers encourage parolees to seek employment and check to make sure the parolee is taking steps toward this goal. Exonerees, on the other hand, must
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acquire the motivation and ability to do this on his/her own without the assistance of the
government. By securing employment, parolees and exonerees can obtain the funds necessary to
pay for housing, and build credit and work history that many landowners look for in a reliable
tenant. However, this may be a harder road for exonerees due to lack of government help. The
difficulties parolees and exonerees face do not end with housing, they also carry over into
employment.

**Parolees and difficulty securing gainful employment.** Many researchers have
investigated the difficulty parolees experience in gaining employment (Buikhuizen &
Dijksterhuis, 1971; Harding, 2003; Kling, 1999; Pettit & Lyons, 2007; Schwartz & Skolnick,
1962). Years of incarceration lead to gaps in work history, render job skills either rusty or non-
existent, and few employers are willing to hire an individual with a criminal record (Martin,
2006). Furthermore, few institutions have opportunities for inmates to earn degrees to bolster
their job prospects. According to a 2003 Bureau of Justice Statistics report, 13% of both prison
and jail inmates have any form of post-secondary education compared to 48% of the general
population (Harlow, 2003). For those who already hold degrees and seek to obtain employment
in licensed or professional occupations, such as in health care and skilled trades, a criminal
record has the potential to ban their chances of doing so (Petersilia, 2001).

Empirical research supports the notion that ex-convicts have difficulty finding jobs. One
study found that ex-convicts had employment rates 5% to 21% lower than the general population
(Waldfogel, 1994). In addition, Waldfogel (1994) also found that ex-convicts will make 16% to
28% less money during their lifetime than those who were convicted but did not go to prison.
Kling (1999) also established that ex-convicts have the ability to find some kind of work that is
similar to what they had prior to being incarcerated though they are likely to work for fewer
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hours or for lower wages. Ex-convicts who were employed as white-collar workers before incarceration risk suffering the most earning loss because such positions require high levels of responsibility, which they may have lost in the eyes of employers (Kling, 1999).

Other research has investigated the extent to which ex-convicts are offered jobs. For example, one experiment analyzed the effects of incarceration and conviction on employment opportunities and found that individuals who were accused but acquitted of assault had almost as much trouble finding unskilled jobs as individuals who were convicted of assault (Schwartz & Skolnick, 1962). In their experiment, four employment folders were prepared detailing a “32 year old single male of unspecified race, high school training in mechanical trades, and a record of successive short term jobs” for unskilled hotel worker positions in New York (Schwartz & Skolnick, 1962, p. 134). The only difference within the four applications was that the applicant was either convicted of assault, tried and acquitted of assault, tried and acquitted of assault with a letter from a judge certifying the acquittal, or had no criminal history. Applicants without criminal records had a 36% success rate of obtaining employment, and those who had been convicted had a 4% success rate of obtaining employment. For those who were acquitted, there was a 24% success rate of obtaining employment if they had a letter, and a 12% success rate of obtaining employment if they did not have a letter (differences between all proportions were significant).

So, even if an applicant is acquitted on all charges, with or without a letter from a judge supporting their statements, the applicant still faced some degree of stigmatization. Thus, it is possible that a person who was acquitted could be denied employment because of the association between the person and criminal charges. These results suggest that being suspected of a crime can have detrimental effects on employment opportunities, and even if one is later acquitted of a
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crime, the fact that one was suspected and charged with a crime can have detrimental effects on one’s employment opportunities. Thus, exonerees, who were convicted of a crime though later found innocent, may have difficulty in obtaining employment once they are released.

In another study which investigated a similar research question, the researchers varied the types of crimes for which the applicant was originally convicted (Buikhuysen & Dijksterhuis, 1971). One applicant was convicted of theft, one applicant was convicted of drunk driving, and one applicant had no criminal record. The response choices were dichotomized as either a positive reaction or a negative reaction. Letters from someone who had no criminal record had a positive reaction 52% of the time, the letters from someone convicted of theft had a positive reaction 32% of the time, and the letters from someone convicted for drunk driving had a positive reaction 26% of the time (again, all significant differences). Thus, combining results of these two studies, it is possible that employers may have a less positive reaction towards exonerees who were originally convicted of a serious crime such as murder compared to exonerees who were convicted of a less serious crime such as vandalism.

Next, I will discuss some of the obstacles exonerees must overcome once they are released from prison. Research has suggested that exonerees are at risk for housing, employment, government assistance and other social difficulties (Armbrust, 2004; Burnett, 2005; Campbell & Denov, 2004; Chunias & Aufgang, 2008; Goffman, 1961; Lonergan, 2008; Martin, 2006; Scheck, Neufeld, & Dwyer, 2000; Westervelt & Cook, 2007). Thus exonerees may be subject to similar difficulties that ex-convicts also face upon re-entry into society.

Exonerees: Post-Release

Unlike parolees, exonerees have been convicted (and subsequently exonerated) of crimes they did not commit. Goffman (1961) introduced the idea of a mortification process that
AN INVESTIGATION OF STIGMA describes how mortifying it is for exonerees to have been stripped of their former identity both literally and figuratively and forced to take on a new identity given to him or her by the prison. The process of exoneration provides an opportunity for exonerees to regain their identities as they prove their actual innocence beyond the scope of just legal innocence (Lonergan, 2008). For the 280 individuals exonerated with the help of the Innocence Project, all waited years to garner their actual innocence and upon their release faced several obstacles that impeded successful re-entry. Years of incarceration have not only led to a “criminal” record, but with the inability to obtain life skills, employment and housing, and the growing mental and medical issues upon release (Martin, 2006). With only 37% of exonerees receiving compensation (Scheck, Neufeld, & Dwyer, 2000) upon release, exonerees have been forced to find ways to meet their needs and survive within society.

Upon release from prison, exonerees differ from other long-term prisoners as they have an increased intolerance of injustice and a desire for the government to acknowledge the error they have committed and compensate them for the harm they endured (Campbell & Denov, 2004). They also differ from other long-term prisoners because there are few re-entry services available for exonerees, and exonerees generally do not want to be associated with parolees (Westervelt & Cook, 2007). Martin (2006) stated that without the assistance of a pre-release program to aid them through the re-entry process, exonerees are likely to seek two types of compensation: restorative and monetary.

Restorative compensation is necessary due to the outcomes of a wrongful conviction. Its main purpose is to restore exonerees to a functional and satisfying life, instead of just compensating them for their economic losses (Martin, 2006). The goals behind restorative
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compensation are to address any barriers to re-entry, address any immediate needs that exonerees may have, and to address any long-term needs they may have as well.

Monetary compensation is compensation given to exonerees for any form of economic loss they endured whereas restorative compensation instead focuses on returning the exonerees to a state in which they are able to function and live a satisfying life (Martin, 2006). Currently there are three paths to obtain monetary compensation for wrongful conviction: lawsuit, special legislation, and statutory compensation (Armbrust, 2004).

If an exoneree files a lawsuit against the police, prosecutor, judge, or defense attorney it would be difficult for the exoneree to win because they must prove serious fault and the doctrine of qualified immunity grants government officials protection from liability for civil damages (Armbrust, 2004; Burnett, 2005). Special legislation occurs when the claimant seeks to have private bills passed by a legislator as a means of direct compensation (monetary benefits). This strategy is hardly, if ever, successful because it is difficult to find a legislator who will care about the situation and because private legislation is viewed as a discretionary action (a decision to make changes to a program in order to produce more efficient results) (Armbrust, 2004; Burnett, 2005). Statutory compensation is gaining compensation through a federal and/or state statute that provides money for those who have been wrongfully convicted. This seems to be the most successful of the three types of solutions. In 2004, Massachusetts became the first state to create a compensation statute that provides post-incarceration services along with monetary compensation. This statute provides monetary compensation up to $500,000, while allowing the court to be able to grant exonerees state services to address any deficiencies caused by the wrongful conviction (Chunias & Aufgang, 2008). Though there are researchers who urge the government to compensate exonerees, currently there are only 27 states who offer some form of
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compensation to exonerees (innocenceproject.org). Thus, it is difficult for exonerees to receive compensation post-release, increasing the likelihood they will experience difficulty upon re-entry.

These difficulties are heightened by the criminal status (guilty, exonerated, no criminal history) of an individual as well as the stigma they face upon re-entry into society. Exonerees can fall victim to this stigma due to the notoriety of the crime for which they were convicted or because of the publicity surrounding their release from prison (Martin, 2006). The next section in this literature review will examine literature regarding the stigma that exonerees encounter.

Previous Research: Exonerees and Stigma

As difficult as exonerees’ re-entry to society is already due to the lack of assistance from the government, exonerees also face possible stigmatization from society. Only two studies have examined the social consequences of wrongful conviction for exonerees from the perspective of society (Clow & Leach, 2009; Thompson & Levett, 2010). In both of these studies, participants read a newspaper article about an exoneree, and the researchers measured participant’s perceptions of the exoneree (compared to other conditions). Clow & Leach (2009) found that exonerees are perceived as having low levels of competency and warmth while also being undesirable friends, neighbors, business partners, or spouses. However, the stigma against exonerees varied in relation to the evidence that contributed to the wrongful conviction.

Thompson & Levett (2010) sought to further these findings by investigating if stigma is applied to both the guilty and the exonerated in a similar manner and if the type of crime in question affects the levels of stigma. Thompson & Levett (2010) found that a guilty individual is perceived more negatively than the exonerated individual. They also found that the type of crime the guilty individual was convicted of did matter on measures of personal and housing closeness.
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yet it never mattered for the exonerated individual. That is, participants perceived the exoneree the same regardless of the type of crime for which he was originally convicted. Thompson & Levett (2010) also replicated some of Clow & Leach’s (2009) findings by demonstrating that participants did not desire personal relationships with exonerees. Most importantly, however, was the fact that wrongful conviction does not affect desired closeness in housing, work, and business relationships (Thompson & Levett, 2010). Though these findings suggest that exonerees might not be stigmatized similarly to parolees, it is still possible that they experience some level of stigma in our society. That is, this research compared exonerees to parolees (a guilty party). It is possible that if we compare exonerees to average individuals who have no history of interaction with the criminal justice system, we may see that exonerees are stigmatized more than average individuals. In addition, other factors may affect stigma. It is possible that other variables typically associated with stigma (i.e., race) may play a role in the amount of stigma levied upon exonerated individuals.

This literature review will continue to examine this issue by focusing on the effects of race in stigmatization, exoneree stigmatization and the correspondence bias. Examining race is essential as it may lead to a better understanding of other factors that can affect the level of stigmatization experienced by exonerees. Understanding the correspondence bias is essential as it will provide a theoretical background for why exonerees may be stigmatized (Clow & Leach, 2009; Thompson & Levett, 2010).

Why Race May Matter in Stigmatization

The Bureau of Justice Statistics reports that in 2000, the incarceration rate for young black men was nearly 10%, whereas the incarceration rate for white men in the same age group was just over 1% (Beck & Harrison, 2002). Young black men have a 28% chance of being
incarcerated at some point during their lifetime (Bonczar & Beck, 1997). After their incarceration, this large African American population will eventually return back to society in hopes of finding a home and employment. However, these ex-offenders inevitably face several barriers to re-entry due to their minority status and criminal record.

In a study that examined the effect of race on employment and how the effects of a criminal record on employment differ for black and white applications, Pager (2003) found that race plays a major role in employment for ex-convicts. In examining the effects of race on employment, only 14% of blacks without a criminal record received a callback from employers after applying for a job opening, compared to 34% of white non-criminals (Pager, 2003). Pager (2003) also found that whites with criminal records received more favorable treatment (17%) than blacks without criminal records (14%). When examining the effects of a criminal record on employment for black and white applicants, the ratio of callbacks for non-offenders relative to ex-offenders for whites is 2:1, compared to 3:1 for blacks (Pager, 2003). This of course means that the presence of a criminal record has a 40% larger effect on black applicants compared to white applicants.

Pager (2003) showed that one’s race and having a criminal record can have detrimental effects on one’s chances for employment. Therefore, it is possible that even being accused of a crime could have a more detrimental effect for a black applicant versus a white applicant. In addition, Pager (2003) examined a limited number of races (employment opportunities between African American and Caucasian ex-offenders and non-offenders). To examine if race and a criminal record lead to the stigmatization of individuals, another race should be added as a condition – it is possible that Latinos may experience stigmatization similarly to African
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Americans. Thus, in the present study, we had three racial groups for the exoneree, parolee, and average target: African American, Latino, and Caucasian.

Stigmatization and the Correspondence Bias

Through the course of my literature review, I have emphasized the difficulties that exonerees and ex-convicts experience in successfully re-entering into society. After being incarcerated for several years, many exonerees have been unable to garner life skills, and in consequence have problems securing employment and housing upon release (Martin, 2006). The presence of the exoneree’s criminal record may cause observers to attribute the exoneree’s situation to dispositional factors more so than situational factors. Specifically, correspondence bias (Ross, 1977) may play a role in peoples’ perceptions of exonerated individuals. Correspondence bias posits that although observers attribute other peoples’ behaviors to dispositional characteristics, they attribute their own behaviors to situational factors. In the case of exonerated individuals, observers may attribute the initial conviction to the exoneree’s inherent criminality rather than to a flaw in the criminal justice system (Clow & Leach, 2009). Jones, Riggs, & Quattrone (1979) believed that most observers of behavior will draw dispositional conclusions about the actor and develop a “perceptual anchor” that they fail to adjust in response to receiving information about situational factors.

Gilbert & Malone (1995) stated that there is a three step process involved in attributing behaviors: First, the observer must recognize the situation in which the actor is functioning; second, the observer must perceive the behavior exhibited by the actor; third, the observer must decide upon if the actor’s behavior is in violation of the observer’s knowledge of the situation.

In the first step, the observer determines what caused the wrongful conviction. They may ask a series of questions: Was the exoneree actively involved in the crime? Did he provide a
false confession? Was he a victim of police misconduct? Was he simply at the wrong place at the wrong time? During this step, the observer is trying to determine if the exoneree was legally responsible for his actions and thus properly tried and convicted, or if he was wrongfully convicted. If the observer believes the exoneree has criminal tendencies or if he did contribute someway to his wrongful conviction, the observer will proceed to the second step. In this step the observer determines if the exoneree contributed to his wrongful conviction due to inherit criminality, or if it was caused by situational factors such as an incompetent attorney, police misconduct, or eyewitness misidentification. This step is crucial as the observer may have the tendency to commit the correspondence bias by ignoring the situational factors and believing that the exoneree caused his own conviction due to his personal attributes. If the observer believes that the exoneree brought upon his own conviction due to his personal attributes, the observer enters the third phase with two misjudgments of the exoneree. The observer will first perceive the exoneree as being at fault for his conviction thus believing the exoneree to be deviant in nature and then continue by believing that the exoneree will commit future crimes. This process highlights a scenario in which situational factors that were ignored in the second step led to the development of correspondence bias and explains why an exoneree is likely to be stigmatized.

Schwartz & Skolnick (1962) and Buikhuisen & Dijksterhuis (1971) demonstrated that employers may stigmatize one who has been acquitted for a crime more so than one who has never committed a crime because that the person was accused of committing a crime. Employers may have viewed the applicant as having criminal tendencies because they have a criminal record or even just because they had been accused of a crime (Clow & Leach, 2009). Similarly, employers and members of society may not realize that an exoneree’s conviction may be due to situational factors and may mistakenly believe that there is something inherently criminal about
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the exoneree. As explained by Gilbert & Malone (1995), people who have a difficult time putting themselves in someone else’s shoes are unable to understand the effects of a situational factor and if they were just able to acknowledge the presence of these situational factors, then the correspondence bias would cease to exist.

Overview of the Current Work

Throughout my literature review I have demonstrated empirical evidence of the hardships parolees and exonerees experience in employment and housing upon being released from prison (Buikhuizen & Dijksterhuis, 1971; Harding, 2003; Schwartz & Skolnick, 1962; Waldfogel, 1994; Western & Beckett, 1999) as well as being stigmatized by the public (Armbrust, 2004; Burnett, 2005; Campbell & Denov, 2004; Clow & Leach, 2009; Martin, 2006; Scheck, Neufeld, & Dwyer, 2000; Schwartz & Skolnick, 1962; Westervelt & Cook, 2007). However, there are gaps in the literature on whether the public stigmatizes exonerees more than the average individual.

Previous research has shown that parolees and exonerees are not stigmatized equally (Thompson & Levett, 2010), and this makes sense. Both of these populations have been convicted through the criminal justice system, garnering a criminal record, though exonerees were later found to be proven innocent. However, we still do not know whether exonerees are stigmatized more than average individuals.

Though innocent, the correspondence bias prevents exonerees to be freed from the stigmatization that a criminal record causes (Gilbert & Malone, 1995; Jones & Harris, 1967; Jones et al., 1979; Ross, 1977). The prevalence of the correspondence bias leads to the following hypotheses regarding public perception of the exoneree:
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H1. Both people who are exonerated and people who are guilty will be stigmatized in the areas of employment, housing, and personal relationships more so than people who have never been involved with the justice system.

1a. People who are guilty will be stigmatized more than people who are exonerated and people who have never been involved with the justice system.

1b. Exonerated people will be stigmatized less than people who are guilty but more than people who have never been involved with the justice system.

1c. People who have never been involved with the justice system will be stigmatized less than exonerated people and guilty people.

H2. The target’s race will affect the level of stigma encountered.

2a. An African American individual will face higher levels of stigma than a Latino or Caucasian individual.

2b. A Latino individual will face lower levels of stigma than an African American individual but more stigma than a Caucasian individual.

2c. A Caucasian individual will face lower levels of stigma than an African American individual and a Latino individual.
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Method

Participants

Participants were 253 undergraduate students drawn from the department of Sociology and Criminology & Law participant pool and from undergraduate criminology classes at the University of Florida. A total of 67 cases were dropped, nine due to experimenter error (for example running subsequent participants under the same condition) and participant error (for example verbally asking questions that tainted other participants’ data during collection) and 58 from failing manipulation checks, leaving a sample size of 186 cases. Of the 67 cases that were dropped, six participants were in the exonerated Caucasian condition; eight participants were in the guilty Caucasian condition; one participant was in the average Caucasian condition; eight participants were in the exonerated Latino condition; 17 participants were in the guilty Latino condition; five participants were in the average Latino condition; two participants were in the exonerated African American condition; 10 participants were in the guilty African American condition; one participant was in the average African American condition.

The final sample of 186 participants contained 20 participants in the exonerated Caucasian condition; 12 participants in the guilty Caucasian condition; 31 participants in the average Caucasian condition; 20 participants in the exonerated Latino condition; 15 participants in the guilty Latino condition; 28 participants in the exonerated Latino condition; 22 participants in the exonerated African American condition; 21 participants in the guilty African American condition; and 17 participants in the average African American condition.

After performing the manipulation checks, participants ranged in age from 18-29 years old with a mean age of 19.8 years. The majority of participants were female (64.5%), white (61.3%), and never married (95.1%). The majority classified themselves as criminology majors or double-majoring in criminology and a second subject (79.6%). The largest proportions of
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participants were juniors or third year students (37.6%), followed by freshman or first year students (22.0%), senior or fourth year students (21.0%), sophomores or second year students follow (18.28%) and undergraduates with more than four years (0.005%). Roughly a quarter (25.8%) of the participants indicated they had been victims of crime in the past, and out of that sample, 10 victims (20.8%) indicated that the perpetrator had been apprehended. Six participants (3.2%) indicated they themselves had committed a felony in the past, and 30 participants (16.1%) indicated they had committed a misdemeanor. Nine participants (4.8%) indicated they had been arrested for misdemeanors, and two participants indicated they had been arrested for felonies (1.1%). Of those who were arrested, seven were convicted and four were incarcerated in a jail or prison.

Design

This study used a 3 (target’s race: African American vs. Caucasian vs. Latino) X 3 (target status: guilty individual vs. exonerated individual vs. “average individual”) fully crossed between subjects factorial design.

Stimulus

Participants were randomly assigned to receive one of nine simulated news articles that described a male individual who was starting his first day at the University of Florida as a transfer student. Stimuli were written by investigator and were based on stimulus articles in previous research (Thompson & Levett, 2010). A full sample stimulus (including all pertinent manipulations) is included in Appendix A.

Target Status

Three of the articles indicated that the target was released from prison because he had completed his sentence and had been paroled. Three articles indicated that the target was
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released because his conviction was overturned when DNA evidence was examined and he was exonerated. The final three articles indicated that the target was a man living in the Gainesville area, and made no reference to CJ history.

Target Race

Three of the articles indicated that the target’s name was Brett Philips, a name that represents the Caucasian condition in the study. Three articles indicated the target’s name was Raul Perez, a name that represents the Latino condition in the study. The final three articles indicated that the target’s name was Deshawn Johnson, a name that represents the African American condition in the study. These names were decided upon after research was done examining common first names and common last names of African Americans, Latinos, and Caucasians over the past three decades.

Dependent Measures

After reading the news article, participants were asked to fill out a survey (see Appendix B). Items were factor analyzed according to hypothesized scales, and some items were deleted because they did not load cleanly on to a factor or made the scale obtain less reliability. To allow a full test of our hypotheses and comparisons across the exoneree, parolee, and average individual groups, only items that could pertain to any target were included in this study. Items in this questionnaire were adapted for use in this study from previous research (Thompson & Levett, 2010).

Future dangerousness measures. Participants were asked questions used in previous research (Thompson & Levett, 2010) about the target’s probability of future dangerousness. Participants then responded to statements on a 7-point Likert-type scale, where 1 was strongly disagree and 7 was strongly agree, and reverse coded items are indicated by (R). These items
were recoded so that higher numbers were indicative of a more negative evaluation of the target. Participants responded to the following statements to measure their perceptions of future dangerousness (α = .70): (a) [The target] will not commit a crime in the future (R); (b) [The target] will be arrested in the future (R); (c) [The target] is no more dangerous than the average person (R); (d) I am suspicious of [The target]; (e) [The target] deserves to have the same rights and privileges that I have (R).

**Intelligence measures.** Participants were asked questions about the target’s intelligence. These questions were used in previous research (Thompson & Levett, 2010) and were previously adapted from Fiske et al.’s (2002) competency scale. Participants responded to the following statements on a 7-point Likert-type scale, where 1 indicated strongly disagree and 7 indicated strongly agree, and reverse coded items are indicated by (R). All items were recoded so that higher numbers indicate a more negative evaluation of the target (i.e., more stigma). Participants responded to the following statements (α = .69): (a) [The target] is incompetent (R); (b) [The target] is competitive; (c) [The target] is confident; (d) [The target] is not intelligent (R); (e) [The target] is intolerant.

**Warmth measures.** Participants were also asked questions about the target’s warmth. These questions were used in previous research (Thompson & Levett, 2010) and were previously adapted from Fiske et al.’s (2002) warmth scale. Participants responded to these items on a 7-point Likert-type scale, where 1 indicated strongly disagree and 7 indicated strongly agree, and reverse coded items are indicated by (R). All items were recoded so that higher numbers indicate a more negative evaluation of the target (α = .82): (a) [The target] is warm (R); (b) [The target] is good-natured (R); (c) [The target] is dishonest.
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**Friend closeness measures.** Participants were asked questions about whether they would want to be friends with the target. The closeness measures were used in previous research (Thompson & Levett, 2010) and were previously adapted from the Bogardus Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1933). Participants responded on a 7-point Likert-type scale, where 1 indicated strongly disagree and 7 indicated strongly agree, and reverse coded items are indicated by (R). All items were recoded so that a higher number indicated a more negative evaluation of the target (i.e., more stigma; $\alpha = .92$): (a) I would be willing to be friends with [the target] (R); (b) I would be willing invite [the target] over to my house for dinner (R); (c) I would be willing to share a cab with [the target] (R); (d) I would be willing to let my sister or daughter go on a date with [the target] (R); (e) I would be willing to let my kids play with [the target]’ kids (R); (f) I would not be willing to let [the target] babysit my little brother; (g) I would not be willing to let [the target] be my child’s schoolteacher; (h) I would be willing to be roommates with [the target] (R); (i) I would be willing to live next door to [the target]; (j) I would be willing to lend money to [the target] (R); (k) I would be willing to be business partners with [the target] (R).

**Acquaintance closeness scale.** Participants were asked question about whether they would want to be acquaintances with the target. The closeness scales were also used in previous research (Thompson & Levett, 2010) and were previously adapted from the Bogardus Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1933). Participants responded on a 7-point Likert-type scale, where 1 indicated strongly disagree and 7 indicated strongly agree, and reverse coded items are indicated by (R). All items were recoded so that a higher number indicated a more negative evaluation of the target (i.e., more stigma; $\alpha = .83$): (a) I would not be willing to spend time alone with [the target]; (b) I would not be willing to live in the same apartment complex as [the target]; (c) I would not be willing to live in the same neighborhood as [the target]; (d) I would not be willing
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to share a cubicle with [the target]; (e) I would not be willing to let [the target] be my boss; (f) I would not be willing to rent an apartment to [the target]; (g) I would not be willing to hire [the target] for a job.

**Government assistance measures.** Participants were also asked questions about whether the target should receive government-sponsored assistance ($\alpha = .74$). Participants responded on a 7-point Likert-type scale, where 1 indicated strongly disagree and 7 indicated strongly agree, and reverse coded items are indicated by (R). All items were recoded so that a higher number indicates a more negative evaluation of the target (i.e., less government assistance or more stigma; $\alpha = .74$). Participants answered the following questions: (a) The government should not help [the target] find a job; (b) [The target] should not get government-subsidized mental health treatment; (c) The government should help [the target] find a place to live (R); (d) [The target] should get government-sponsored family counseling (R); (e) [The target] should not receive legal assistance from the government.

**Demographic questions.** Participants were asked a series of demographic questions. Participants responded to the following questions: (a) How old are you; (b) What is your gender; (c) What racial group do you identify with; (d) Do you consider yourself Hispanic or Latino/Latina; (e) What is your current marital status; (f) What is your class standing; (g) What is your major; (h) Have you ever been the victim of a crime; (i) Was the perpetrator of the crime against you apprehended; (j) Have you ever committed a felony; (k) Have you ever committed a misdemeanor; (l) Have you ever been arrested for a crime; (m) Have you ever been convicted of a crime; (n) Have you ever been incarcerated in a prison, jail, or other correctional institution.

**Manipulation Check questions.** Participants were asked manipulation check questions to ensure people noticed whether the target was an average individual, exonerated individual, or
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paroled individual and whether they noticed the other material presented in the stimulus article. The first question asked participants to rate, on a scale of 1-10, how serious a crime of sexual battery (rape) was, with one being not at all serious and ten being the most serious. Participants were then asked to rate DNA evidence on a scale of one to ten, with one being not at all conclusive and ten being the most conclusive. Participants were also asked a series of true or false questions to test whether they paid attention to the material in the article. (a) According to the article, [the target] was originally convicted of robbery; (b) According to the article, [the target] was originally convicted of assault; (c) According to the article, [the target] was originally convicted of sexual battery; (d) According to the article, [the target] was originally convicted of murder; (e) According to the article, [the target] was being praised for his restaurant’s success.

Finally, participants were asked a series of true or false questions related to the stimulus article to ensure they noticed the manipulations of the independent variables: (a) According to the article, [The target] was released from prison because he served his entire sentence; (b) According to the article, [The target] was release from prison because new evidence proved his innocence; (c) According to the article, DNA evidence confirmed [The target]’s guilt; (d) According to the article, DNA evidence proved [The target]’s innocence. Participants in the average condition were asked these series of true or false questions. We did not ask manipulation check questions to assess whether participants accurately perceived the race of the target. Thus, it is unclear whether the manipulation of race was strong enough (or whether participants noticed the manipulation).

Procedure

Participants were recruited from the Sociology and Criminology & Law participant pool. In return for their participation, they received class credit. Upon arriving at the laboratory,
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participants were asked to read and sign an informed consent form that indicated their willingness to participate in the study. The participants were told that their participation was anonymous and that they could withdraw from participating in the study both during and after the experiment. Once the participants signed the consent form, a random number generator was used to assign participants to one of nine conditions. Participants were told they would be reading an article written by a journalism student about a transfer student’s first day at the University of Florida. Each participant was provided with a news article and was asked to read the article critically and carefully.

Once the participants finished reading their assigned articles, the experimenter collected the articles. The experimenter then gave the participants the survey. Participants were asked to complete the surveys to the best of their abilities. Once all participants completed their surveys, the experimenter collected the surveys and distributed a debriefing form. The form contained the goal of the study along with the relevant hypotheses. Participants were told they could have a copy of the form to keep for their records, and were instructed to contact the principle investigator with any questions or to learn about the study results. Participants were also asked not to share information about the experiment with any classmates, as discussing the experiment could affect the results. The experimenter then asked if the participants had any questions, answered any questions that were asked, and then thanked the participants for their time. Participants were then asked to exit the lab and were reminded not to discuss the experiment with their classmates.
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Results

Analysis

Data for 253 participants was entered into SPSS twice to cross-check and ensure accuracy. Participants’ responses to manipulation check questions were analyzed. Participants who failed one or more manipulation check questions were dropped from the analysis in order to obtain the most conservative test of our hypotheses. For all items, a Likert-scale was used to indicate the attitudes participants had toward the target. Higher Likert-scale scores indicated more negative attitudes toward the target. Factor analyses were conducted for each scale in the data to ensure adequate single-factor loading for scales, and ANOVAs were conducted with target status and race as the independent variables. If the results of the ANOVAs revealed a statistically significant main effect of an independent variable, post hoc least-squares difference (LSD) tests were conducted to examine the nature of these main effects.

Does target race or target status affect participants’ perception of targets’ future dangerousness?

To analyze the effect of our independent variables and the interaction between them on participants’ perceptions of future dangerousness, the data were analyzed by running a 3 (target’s race: African American vs. Caucasian vs. Latino) X 3 (defendant status: guilty vs. exonerated vs. “average”) ANOVA with future dangerousness as the dependent measure. Only the target’s status was found to be significant in this measure (future dangerousness: \( F(2,155) =14.79, \ p<.01, \ \text{eta-squared} =.16 \)). The guilty target (\(M=3.69 (3.44\text{-}3.94)\)) was always regarded more negatively than the exonerated (\(M=2.87 (2.65\text{-}3.08)\)) and average targets (\(M= 2.90 (2.67\text{-}3.13)\)). There was not a main effect of race or the interaction between target status and race on this measure. Data are presented in Table 1.

Does target race or target status affect participants’ perception of targets’ intelligence?
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The data was analyzed by running a 3 (target’s race: African American vs. Caucasian vs. Latino) X 3 (defendant status: guilty vs. exonerated vs. average) ANOVA with intelligence as the dependent measure. There was a main effect of target status on intelligence: \( F(2,172) = 5.84, p < .01, \text{eta-squared} = .06 \). The exonerated target (\( M=3.01 (2.81-3.20) \)) was regarded more negatively than the guilty target (\( M=2.75 (2.52-2.98) \)) and the average target (\( M=2.55 (2.36-2.73) \)). There was no effect of the interaction between race and status and or main effect of race on this measure. Data are presented in Table 1.

**Does target race or target status affect participants’ perception of targets’ warmth?**

The data was analyzed by running a 3 (target’s race: African American vs. Caucasian vs. Latino) X 3 (defendant status: guilty vs. exonerated vs. average) ANOVA with warmth as the dependent measure. Once again the target’s status was found to be significant in this measure (warmth: \( F(2,174) = 20.42, p < .01, \text{eta-squared} = .19 \)). The guilty target (\( M=4.01 (3.77-4.26) \)) was regarded more negatively than the exonerated (\( M=3.43 (3.22-3.63) \)) and average target (\( M=3.00 (2.80-3.19) \)), and the exonerated target was regarded more negatively than the average target. There was no effect of the interaction between race and status and or main effect of race on this measure. Data are presented in Table 1.

**Does target race or target status affect participants’ perception of how close of a friend they would want to be with the target?**

The data was analyzed by running a 3 (target’s race: African American vs. Caucasian vs. Latino) X 3 (defendant status: guilty vs. exonerated vs. average) ANOVA with friend closeness as the dependent measure. The target’s status was found to be significant in this measure (friend closeness: \( F(2,170) = 14.74, p < .01, \text{eta-squared} = .15 \)). The guilty target (\( M=4.29 (4.00-4.59) \)) was regarded more negatively than the exonerated (\( M=3.25 (2.99-3.52) \)) and average target
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There was no effect of the interaction between race and status and or main effect of race on this measure. Data are presented in Table 1.

Does target race or target status affect participants’ perceptions about how close of an acquaintance they would want to be with the target?

The data was analyzed by running a 3 (target’s race: African American vs. Caucasian vs. Latino) X 3 (defendant status: guilty vs. exonerated vs. “average Joe”) ANOVA with acquaintance closeness as the dependent measure. The target’s status was found to be significant in this measure (acquaintance: $F(2,174) =5.18, p<.01, \eta^2=.06$). The guilty target ($M=3.70 (3.38-4.02)$) was regarded more negatively than the exonerated target ($M=3.15 (2.88-3.42)$) and the average target ($M=3.07 (2.82-3.32)$). There was no effect of the interaction between race and status and or main effect of race on this measure. Data are presented in Table 1.

Does target race or target status affect participants’ perceptions of the targets’ need for government assistance?

The data was analyzed by running a 3 (target’s race: African American vs. Caucasian vs. Latino) X 3 (defendant status: guilty vs. exonerated vs. average) ANOVA with government assistance as the dependent measure. Target status was predictive of participant’s ratings of government re-entry assistance ($F(2,161)=18.13, p<.01, \eta^2=.18$). The participants believed the average target ($M=3.55 (3.30-3.80)$) should receive less financial assistance than the exonerated ($M=2.54 (2.30-2.76)$) and guilty target ($M=3.27(3.00-3.55)$) and that the guilty target should receive less financial assistance than the exonerated target. There was no effect of the interaction between race and status and or main effect of race on this measure. Data are presented in Table 1.
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Discussion

As of December 5, 2011, the Innocence Project has exonerated 280 men and women all while exposing the flaws in the justice system (innocenceproject.org). In response to the Innocence Project’s actions, scholars have conducted several studies that have examined the causes of wrongful convictions (Kassin, 2005; Kassin & Gudjonsson, 2004; Leo, 2005; Wells & Olson, 2002), yet very few have examined the social consequences of wrongful conviction (see Clow & Leach, 2009; Thompson & Levett, 2010 for exceptions to this).

This study was designed to further explore stigma levied upon exonerated individuals by investigating if an individual’s criminal status (guilty, exonerated, average) and race (Caucasian, African American, Latino) would affect participant perceptions of the target (and therefore the level of stigma that an exonerated person may encounter). The addition of an average individual condition allowed us to compare and better understand the severity of stigma between individuals who have been affected by the justice system (guilty and exonerated) to those who have never been affected by the justice system. The addition of race as a condition allowed us to examine if race affected participant perceptions of the target.

Are exonerees stigmatized similarly to average individuals?

It was hypothesized that both people who were exonerated and people who were guilty would be more stigmatized than people who have never been involved with the justice system. We also hypothesized that exonerated people would be stigmatized less than people who were guilty but more than people who were never involved with the criminal justice system and that people who have never been involved with the justice system would be stigmatized less than exonerated and guilty people.
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Though exonerees were found innocent of the crime they were originally convicted of, participants still stigmatized them more on some measures (intelligence and warmth) than the average target. Participants may have felt inclined to favor the average target, who has not spent any form of time behind bars, compared to the exonerated target who has spent time behind bars. This translates to the fact that stigma against exonerees may not be due to their status, but rather to the time they spent behind bars.

We found some support that exonerated and guilty targets would be stigmatized more than people who have never been involved with the justice system on some measures. Though the exonerated target, guilty target and the average targets were all rated below the midpoint (neither agree nor disagree) of the Likert scale on several measures (with the exclusion of the guilty target in the warmth scale and friend closeness scale), the most important differences were the differences between groups. Participants viewed the exonerated target more negatively than the average target on measures of intelligence and warmth but less negatively than the guilty target on all measures except for the intelligence measure. Participants viewed the guilty target more negatively than the exonerated target and the average target in all measures of future dangerousness, warmth and closeness (friend, acquaintance) except for the intelligence measure in which the exonerated target was viewed more negatively. In the intelligence measure, it is possible that this may reflect an internal attribution in that participant’s may have believed that the target was responsible in some way for his own wrongful conviction because of his intelligence. This study replicated those findings demonstrating that convicted individuals were stigmatized more than exonerees, especially in the measures of future dangerousness, warmth, closeness (friend, acquaintance), and government assistance.
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This, of course, is relevant in literature regarding the causes of wrongful conviction and correspondence bias. As stated earlier in the literature review, the most crucial step in the correspondence bias is when the observer must determine if the exoneree contributed to his wrongful conviction due to his personal attributes, or if it was caused by situational factors such as an incompetent attorney, police misconduct, or eyewitness misidentification. The exonerees personal attributes can be a lack of intelligence and thus if the observer ignores the situational factors, they will believe the exoneree caused his own conviction due to his lack of intelligence.

**Governmental support for exonerees**

Participants suggested that the guilty target should receive less governmental assistance compared to the exonerated individuals. Thus, there seems to be popular support for the notion that the government should compensate and provide assistance for exonerated individuals. This finding is inconsistent with the re-entry services available for exonerees. As previously stated in the literature review, there are few re-entry services available for exonerees (Westervelt & Cook, 2007). If exonerees desire to obtain compensation for their wrongful conviction through lawsuits, special legislation, and statutory compensation, it is still extremely difficult to achieve any compensation through these methods (Armbrust, 2004). However, it appears that the public would be in favor of compensating these individuals.

**Limitations**

This study has several limitations. The homogeneous sample, ecological validity, and lack of making race salient (and lack of manipulation checks to ensure participants properly noticed the race manipulation) all could have had detrimental effects on our study.

**Sampling.** It is possible that the sample in this study may have produced these types of results. That is, participants were drawn from the participant pool which is composed of students
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taking undergraduate criminology classes. Due to this sampling method, the majority of students were criminology majors. As a result of their educational background, many of the students could have been aware of causes and issues regarding wrongful conviction. This of course could result in a better understanding of exonerees and the obstacles they face upon release. Therefore, these students may have been less likely than community members to stigmatize exonerated targets.

**Ecological Validity.** Low ecological validity is another limitation of this study. In this study, participants were exposed to one news article as the stimulus. In the real world, the same person would be exposed to a greater depth of media coverage regarding the crime that took place and the suspect, or would likely read such a news article along with several other articles. That is, the process by which the participant was exposed to the news was not very similar to how it would occur in the real world. To combat this limitation, this study should be replicated by using multiple stimuli about crime, suspect and perpetrator, and perhaps should be in the context of reading an entire newspaper (or watching news on television).

The fact that participants participated in this study to receive class credit is another ecological validity issue. As many participants failed to pass the manipulation checks regarding the stimulus they just read, it is possible that the participants simply did not take the study seriously. In the real world, it is likely that people would make decisions about whether to be friends with a target, whether the target is likely to be dangerous in the future, etc., with a great deal of care. To address this limitation, this study should be replicated by making the study a more serious task. For example, instead of featuring a crime and suspect through a news article, participants could evaluate a candidate for a position in their local government or interview a
possible job candidate. In turn, the participant might perceive the task as more important and therefore take the task more seriously.

**Race Salience.** There was not a manipulation check asking if the participant noticed the race of the suspect. Though the stimulus did present common names for an African American, Latino, or Caucasian individual, the stimulus never clearly stated the race of the suspect. In addition, because there was no manipulation check asking participants whether they perceived the race of the target correctly, we cannot assess whether participants noticed the differences between conditions. In the real world, a news article would state the race of the suspect, may include a picture, and may have more information that would make it easier for the observer to note the race of the suspect. By not asking the participant if they had noticed the race of the suspect in the news article as a manipulation check, it is impossible to know if the participant clearly knew what the race of the suspect was. Future research should make the race of the suspect more evident in the news article and should test if the participant noticed the race as a manipulation check.

**Future Research**

This study furthered findings made by Thompson & Levett (2010) and in previous literature. However, to better understand other factors that could affect exoneree stigma, future studies could investigate if the time spent in prison affects the level of stigma exonerees encounter. In addition, this study should be replicated with a non-student population.

The Innocence Project has exonerated men and women through the use of DNA evidence. Thus, this study used DNA evidence as the source of exoneration in its stimulus. Though DNA evidence is the most common source of exonerations, there are other forms of evidence that can be used to exonerate an individual. To investigate the stigma encountered by
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those exonerated by other forms of evidence, future research could investigate the stigma of DNA exonerees compared to exonerees who were released through other forms of evidence.

Conclusion

As of November 20, 2011 the Innocence Project has exonerated 280 men and women through DNA evidence (innocenceproject.org). As these individual struggle to re-enter society, there has been little research done that has investigated the consequences of their incarceration. The present study furthered previous research on wrongful conviction by examining the differences in stigma between guilty, exonerated and average individuals. It also provided insight into how the race of the exoneree can affect the severity of stigma an exoneree encounters. This study determined that average individuals are the least stigmatized compared to guilty individuals and exonerated individuals in future dangerousness, warmth, closeness (friend, acquaintance) and intelligence. Guilty individuals however are more stigmatized than exonerated individuals in future dangerousness, warmth and closeness (friend, acquaintance).Finally, exonerated individuals are stigmatized more than guilty individuals in intelligence and more than average people in future dangerousness, warmth, closeness (friend, acquaintance) and intelligence. However, this study failed to prove race affects the level of stigma exonerees encounter. Future research is needed to investigate if the time spent in prison affects the level of stigma exonerees encounter. Future research should also attempt to analyze stigma from a community sample as opposed to a student sample.
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Appendix A: Sample Stimulus

Welcome, to the Gator Nation

By Brittany Thomas, Gainesville Sun

GAINESVILLE, FL— [[The target] OR Deshawn Johnson OR Raul Perez], 28, woke up this morning not knowing what to expect going into his first day as a transfer student in the University of Florida. Having graduated in the top 1% of his college class, he enrolled in UF in hopes of majoring in Political Science.

“Words cannot describe how I feel right now. I’m excited about being a Gator but I also miss my family,” [[The target] OR Deshawn Johnson OR Raul Perez] said as he walked out of his apartment early this morning.

[[The target] OR Deshawn Johnson OR Raul Perez] grew up in a Caucasian household where his mother and father raised him to count his blessings and to thank God before he goes to bed every day for the life he has been given. [Insert criminal history stimulus]

AVERAGE INDIVIDUAL: Before enrolling in UF, [[The target] OR Deshawn Johnson OR Raul Perez] was enrolled in a local community college while at the same time actively participating in the community through programs such as Teach for America and the Peace Corps.

AVERAGE INDIVIDUAL: After many years of providing great service and assistance to those around him, [[The target] OR Deshawn Johnson OR Raul Perez] feels that now would be the best time for him to finally pursue his dreams of becoming a U.S. Senator.

GUILTY: Though his future is bright, there was once a time in which his future lied behind bars. In 2008, then 21, [[The target] OR Deshawn Johnson OR Raul Perez] was released on good behavior from Union Correctional Institution after serving 7 years in prison for sexual battery.

EXONEREE: Though his future is bright, there was once a time in which his future lied behind bars. In 2001, then 21, [[The target] OR Deshawn Johnson OR Raul Perez] was released from Union Correctional Institution after serving 7 years in prison for a crime he did not commit.

GUILTY AND EXONEREE: Police reports show that at around 9:30 P.M. on March 13, 2001, the victim returned home after her nightly run to find that a man had forcibly entered her home. As she attempted to fend off the intruder by slapping and scratching him, the man then proceeded to tie her arms and legs together using a belt that was on top of her dresser as he raped her repeatedly.

GUILTY AND EXONEREE: A security guard patrolling the community heard screaming coming from the victim’s residence and proceeded to call 911. Upon hanging up with the operator, the security guard decided to investigate the scene and saw a man run...
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into the kitchen and jump out of a window as he fled through the backyard. [Insert criminal history stimulus (Guilty or Exoneree)]

GUILTY: Three hours later, [[The target] OR Deshawn Johnson OR Raul Perez], was arrested by Citrus County sheriff’s office deputies for the sexual battery of the 22-year-old victim.

OR

EXONEREE: Last May, DNA test conducted by the Innocence Project, a national litigation public policy organization dedicated to exonerate wrongfully convicted individuals through DNA testing, found DNA evidence that [[The target] OR Deshawn Johnson OR Raul Perez] could not have been the perpetrator.

EXONEREE: Evidence collected from a swab of the victim’s fingernails yielded skin cells from a male with O-positive blood type, the same blood type as [[The target] OR Deshawn Johnson OR Raul Perez]. However, a DNA test was never conducted during the original trial. [Insert criminal history stimulus]

GUILTY AND EXONEREE: “The prosecution relied on the eyewitness identification by the victim’s security guard as a key piece of evidence that lead to [[The target]’ OR Deshawn Johnson’s OR Raul Perez’s] conviction,” said James Peterson, a Citrus County sheriff’s deputy.

GUILTY AND EXONEREE: Upon his release, [[The target] OR Deshawn Johnson OR Raul Perez] enrolled in a local community college to earn the credentials necessary to transfer to UF. [The real perpetrator has not yet been apprehended.]
## Part I

**Instructions:** Please circle only one answer for the question below.

1. Do you believe that [The target] is guilty or not guilty of the crime he was in prison for? (circle one answer):

   - Guilty (1)
   - Not Guilty (2)

**Instructions:** Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements. Please circle only one answer for each question. If you do not know or would rather not answer, leave the question blank and continue on to the next question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. [The target] is not guilty of the crime he went to prison for:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. [The target] did not deserve to be in prison:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. [The target] will not commit a crime in the future:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. [The target] will be arrested in the future:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. [The target] will return to prison:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. [The target] is no more dangerous than the average person:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am suspicious of [The target]:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. [The target] deserves to have the same rights and privileges that I have:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It is [The target]’ fault that he went to prison:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. [The target] was convicted because he has criminal tendencies:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. [The target] is a victim of a flawed criminal justice system:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part II

Instructions: Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements. Please circle only one answer for each question. If you do not know or would rather not answer, leave the question blank and continue on to the next question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. [The target] is incompetent:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. [The target] is competitive:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. [The target] is dependent:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. [The target] is confident:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. [The target] is not intelligent:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part III

Instructions: Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements. Please circle only one answer for each question. If you do not know or would rather not answer, leave the question blank and continue on to the next question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. [The target] is intolerant:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. [The target] is warm:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. [The target] is good-natured:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. [The target] is dishonest:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Part IV**

Instructions: Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements. Please circle only one answer for each question. If you do not know or would rather not answer, leave the question blank and continue on to the next question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. I would be willing to be friends with [The target]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I would be willing to invite [The target] over to my house for dinner:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I would not be willing to spend time alone with [The target]:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I would be willing to share a cab with [The target]:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I would be willing to let my sister or daughter go on a date with [The target]:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I would be willing to let my kids play with [The target]' kids</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I would not be willing to let [The target] babysit my little brother:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I would not be willing to let [The target] be my child’s schoolteacher:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I would be willing to be roommates with [The target]:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I would be willing to live next door to [The target]:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I would not be willing to live in the same apartment complex as [The target]:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Part V

Instructions: Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements. Please circle only one answer for each question. If you do not know or would rather not answer, leave the question blank and continue on to the next question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. I would not be willing to live in the same neighborhood as [The target]:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I would be willing to work in the same office as [The target]:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I would not be willing to share a cubicle with [The target]:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I would be willing to collaborate on a project with [The target]:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I would not be willing to let [The target] be my boss:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I would not be willing to rent an apartment to [The target]:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. I would not be willing to hire [The target] for a job:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. I would be willing to lend money to [The target]:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. I would be willing to be business partners with [The target]:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. The government should not help [The target] find a job:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. The government should help [The target] get his criminal record expunged:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. [The target] should not get government-subsidized mental health treatment:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AN INVESTIGATION OF STIGMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47. The government should help [The target] find a place to live:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. [The target] should get government-sponsored family counseling:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. [The target] should not receive legal assistance from the government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. [The target] should receive monetary compensation for the years he spent in prison:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. [The target] deserves restitution for the years he spend behind bars:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. The government does not owe [The target] anything for the years he spend in prison:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. [The target] should not get money to start his life outside of prison:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructions:** Please circle only one answer for the question below.

54. How much money should [The target] receive from the government for each year he spent in prison?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No money</th>
<th>$4,999 or less per year</th>
<th>$5,000-$14,999 per year</th>
<th>$15,000-$29,999 per year</th>
<th>$30,000-$59,999 per year</th>
<th>$60,000-$99,999 per year</th>
<th>$100,000 or more per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part VI**

**Instructions:** Please answer the following demographic questions. Please circle only one answer for each question. If you do not know or would rather not answer, leave the question blank and continue on to the next question.

55. How old are you? (Write your age in years) ___________ (enter age)

56. What is your gender? (Please circle one answer): Female Male
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57. What racial group do you identify with? (Please circle one answer)
   A. White/ Caucasian
   B. Black/African-America
   C. Asian/Pacific Islander
   D. Native American/American Indian
   E. Mixed-race
   F. Other (please indicate)_____________________

58. Do you consider yourself Hispanic or Latino/Latina? (Please circle one answer)
   Yes  No

Instructions: Please answer the following demographic questions. Please circle only one answer for each question. If you do not know or would rather not answer, leave the question blank and continue on to the next question.

59. What is your current marital status? (Please circle one answer)
   A. Married
   B. Domestic partnership
   C. Divorced
   D. Widowed
   E. Single and never married

60. What is your class standing? (Please circle one answer)
   A. Freshman/First Year
   B. Sophomore/Second Year
   C. Junior/ Third Year
   D. Senior/Fourth Year
   E. Undergraduate more than 4 years
   F. Graduate student

61. What is your major? (Please write on the line below)
   _______________________________________________________

62. Have you ever been the victim of a crime? (Please circle yes or no. If NO, skip to question 65)
   Yes  No

63. Was the perpetrator of the crime against you apprehended? (Please circle)
   A. Yes
   B. No
   C. I don’t know

64. Was the perpetrator of the crime against you tried in a court of law? (Please circle)
   A. Yes
   B. No
   C. I don’t know

65. Have you ever committed a felony (a crime punishable by a year or more in prison)? (Please circle yes or no)
   Yes  No
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66. Have you ever committed a misdemeanor (a crime punishable by less than a year in jail)? (Please circle yes or no)
   Yes
   No

67. Have you ever been arrested for a crime? (Please circle one answer)
   A. Yes, a felony
   B. Yes, a misdemeanor
   C. Yes, both a felony and a misdemeanor
   C. No

68. Have you ever been convicted of a crime? (Please circle one answer)
   A. Yes, a felony
   B. Yes, a misdemeanor
   C. Yes, both a felony and a misdemeanor
   C. No

69. Have you even been incarcerated in a prison, jail, or other correctional institution? (Please circle yes or no)
   Yes
   No

---

Part VII

Instructions: Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1-10. Circle only one answer for each question. If you do not know or would rather not answer, leave the question blank and continue on to the next question.

70. In your opinion, on a scale of 1-10, how serious is a crime of sexual battery (rape)?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   Not at all serious
   The most serious

71. In your opinion, on a scale of 1-10 how conclusive is DNA evidence that is being used to match a crime to a perpetrator?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   Not at all conclusive
   The most conclusive
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Instructions: Please answer the following questions by circling either 1 for true or 0 for false. Circle only one answer for each question. If you do not know or would rather not answer, leave the question blank and continue on to the next question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>True (1)</th>
<th>False (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75. According to the article, [The target] was originally convicted of robbery:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. According to the article, [The target] was originally convicted of assault:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. According to the article, [The target] was originally convicted of sexual battery (rape):</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. According to the article, [The target] was originally convicted of murder:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. According to the article, [The target] was released from prison because he served his entire sentence:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. According to the article, [The target] was release from prison because new evidence proved his innocence:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. According to the article, [The target] was being praised for his restaurants success:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. According to the article, DNA evidence confirmed [The target]’ guilt:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. According to the article, DNA evidence proved [The target]’ innocence:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Have you ever participated in “An Investigation of Attitudes Towards Persons Released from Prison”?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Have you ever taken Psychology &amp; Law?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is the end of the survey. Please raise your hand to indicate to the experimenter that you are done
Appendix C

Informed Consent

Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study.

**Protocol Title:** An investigation of attitudes toward persons released from prison (Part II).

**Purpose of the research study:** The purpose of this study is to examine the public’s perception on persons released from prison in regards to their race.

**What you will be asked to do in the study:** Should you agree to participate, you will be asked to read a news article about an individual who was recently released from prison. You will then be asked to complete a survey about your feelings toward the subject of the article.

**Time required:** 45 minutes

**Risks and Benefits:** We do not anticipate that you will benefit directly by participating in this experiment, nor will you be exposed to any risk.

**Compensation:** You will receive course credit for participating in this study.

**Confidentiality:** Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law. Your information will be assigned a code number, and your survey answers will not be connected to your name or to this consent form. Thus, your participation is completely anonymous.

**Voluntary participation:** Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating.

**Right to withdraw from the study:** You have the right to withdraw from the study at anytime without consequence.

**Whom to contact if you have questions about the study:**

**Whom to contact about your rights as a research participant in the study:**

IRB02 Office, Box 112250, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-2250; phone 392-0433.

**Agreement:**

I have read the procedure described above. I voluntarily agree to participate in the procedure and I have received a copy of this description.

Participant: ___________________________ Date: _______________

Principal Investigator: ______________________ Date: _______________
## Table 1

**Effects of Target Status on Mean Participant Ratings (Confidence Intervals) of Future**

**Dangerousness, Intelligence, Warmth, Closeness (Friend and Acquaintance), and Governmental Assistance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average target</th>
<th>Exoneree target</th>
<th>Guilty target</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>( \eta^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future</strong></td>
<td>2.90&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2.87&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>3.69&lt;sub&gt;ab&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dangerousness</strong></td>
<td>(2.67-3.13)</td>
<td>(2.65-3.08)</td>
<td>(3.44-3.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intelligence</strong></td>
<td>2.55&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>3.01&lt;sub&gt;cd*&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2.75&lt;sub&gt;d*&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.36-2.73)</td>
<td>(2.52-2.98)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warmth</strong></td>
<td>3.00&lt;sub&gt;ef&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>3.43&lt;sub&gt;eg&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4.01&lt;sub&gt;fg&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>20.42</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.8-3.19)</td>
<td>(3.22-3.63)</td>
<td>(3.77-4.26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friend</strong></td>
<td>3.46&lt;sub&gt;h&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>3.25&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4.29&lt;sub&gt;hi&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closeness</strong></td>
<td>(3.23-3.70)</td>
<td>(2.99-3.52)</td>
<td>(4.00-4.59)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acquaintance</strong></td>
<td>3.07&lt;sub&gt;j&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>3.15&lt;sub&gt;k*&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>3.70&lt;sub&gt;jk*&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.82-3.32)</td>
<td>(2.88-3.42)</td>
<td>(3.38-4.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government</strong></td>
<td>3.55&lt;sub&gt;ln*&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2.54&lt;sub&gt;lm&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>3.27&lt;sub&gt;mn*&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>18.13</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistance</strong></td>
<td>(3.30-3.80)</td>
<td>(2.30-2.76)</td>
<td>(3.00-3.55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: shared subscripts are used to show significant difference between targets*

*Note: (p<.05 except for d*= p<.09; k*= p<.02; n*= p<.08)*