2021

The Stratification of Justice: Evaluating the Relationship between Gender, Race, and Crime

Catherine Bain
Butler University

THE STRATIFICATION OF JUSTICE: EVALUATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GENDER, RACE, AND CRIME

CATHERINE BAIN, BUTLER UNIVERSITY
MENTOR: KRISTA CLINE

Abstract

Today, 2.3 million Americans are incarcerated; 1,564,000 of those people are not White. This illustrates a clear racial disparity within the U.S. justice system in terms of which individuals are sentenced to prison. Although previous research, examining mostly state justice systems, has found that racial bias leads to longer sentences and has noted differences in sentencing length for male and female defendants, a paucity of research examines the impact of race and gender on sentencing lengths within the federal justice system. This study seeks to fill that gap. Data from the years 2000 through 2016 were obtained via the U.S. Sentencing Commission's Monitoring of Federal Criminal Cases and were analyzed using multiple linear regression featuring control variables of education level, age, socioeconomic status, and criminal history. The data set included 1,011,988 defendants, of whom 87% were male, 71% were White, and 78% had a criminal history. Results found that, on average and across crimes, White individuals received shorter sentences than did people of color, and women received shorter sentences than did men. When comparing ethnicity, on average and across crimes, White men received shorter sentences than did men of color, and White women received longer sentences than did women of color. These findings suggest that a judge may base the length of sentence not only on the facts of the case but also on the defendant's race or gender. These results alert federal judges to possible biases of which they must be aware, and they highlight the need for a policy to control for demographic factors in determining sentences.

Keywords: criminology, race, gender, sentencing length, justice, justice system

Race and, subsequently, racism seem to be written into the DNA of America. Whether the topic is mass incarceration, police brutality, or political policies such as stop-and-frisk, race is always a factor. This conversation does not

stop as we cross over into the field of academia. Scholars argue that racial bias was a main motivator behind the war on drugs as well as behind laws such as stop-and-frisk and the three-strikes policy (Alexander, 2010). In addition, we know that the label of "criminal" is more likely to be assigned to a person of color than to a White or White-passing individual, and links have been made between the label of criminality and rates of recidivism (Chiricos et al., 2007). The field of research focusing on race as it pertains to criminality and criminal justice is not new. In fact, this type of research has a long and complicated history, ever more complicated by the many types of relationships that can be examined in any given court case. This study seeks to examine these relationships and to build upon them. Specifically, this study aims at examining the relationships between race and sentencing length, gender and sentencing length, and the intersection of race and gender with sentencing length. To examine these relationships, however, we must first examine previous findings about these relationships.

Literature Review

Race

Race has a long and complicated history with the U.S. justice system. The 13th Amendment, often credited with ending slavery in America, did not fully do so. In fact, it declares the enslavement of those incarcerated to be legal, a fact taken advantage of quite frequently during Jim Crow (Alexander, 2010). When looking at the influence of race within our justice system today, we see the literature convening on three major focuses of study: the race of the defendant, the race of the victim as it pertains to the race of the defendant, and the race of the victim.

The race of the defendant has been thought to influence various things within the justice system, including the likelihood of conviction (Gibson, 1978; Miller & Hewitt, 1978) and even the likelihood of sentencing with the death penalty (Radelet, 1981). In terms of conviction rates, research has shown that juries are more likely to recommend longer sentences for cases in which the defendant was of a race dissimilar to the racial makeup of the jury (Miller & Hewitt, 1978) and has shown geographical patterns of racial bias (Gibson, 1978). For example, Gibson (1978) found three major patterns of conviction throughout the United States—pro-Black, anti-Black, and nondiscriminatory—and that these patterns seem to correlate with geographical location: for example, anti-Black patterns of conviction tended to occur in the more southern area of the United States.

In many cases, such as the geographical connections seen in Gibson's (1978) work, culture can play a part in influencing our opinions of others. For example, we typically are drawn to those individuals who look like us and avoid those who do not. This fear of "the outsider," commonly referred to as xenophobia, is believed to be an evolutionary trait (Cook et al., 2018), for we think that those who look like us will not harm us but those who look different may cause us harm. This pattern of thinking led to the second major relationship of focus in this study: race of the victim as it pertains to the race of the defendant. Previous research has shown that cases with defendants of color and White victims are the most likely to end with the defendant being sentenced to jail (Radelet, 1981) but that cases with White defendants and victims of color did not see the same likelihood. This indicates that not only the dissimilarity of race of victim versus race of defendant but also which individual is of which race is important to sentencing outcome (Radelet, 1981).

These findings therefore lead to the last relationship studied: the race of the victim. Would the race of the victim still matter when the race of the defendant was controlled for? Pierce et al. (2017) found evidence that cases with White victims were more likely to result in death sentences than cases with victims of color even after controlling for the racial makeup of the jury and the race of the defendant.

Gender

When it comes to the role that gender plays within our justice system, we know four main things. First, research shows that men and women tend to commit different types of crimes (Butcher et al., 2017; Lauritsen et al., 2009). Specifically, men are more likely to commit violent crimes than are women (Butcher et al., 2017), although that difference in likelihood seems to be decreasing (Lauritsen et al., 2009).

Second, men, in general, are more likely to be sent to prison than are women (Butcher et al., 2017). This difference is seen even if the type of crime committed is controlled for, meaning that a man who committed first-degree murder would be more likely to go to prison than a woman who committed first-degree murder (Butcher et al., 2017). We also know that men are more likely than women to commit crimes in general (Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996).

Third, we tend to associate men and women with violence differently. To better understand this difference, we must first understand the social phenomena that are gender roles. *Dainty*, *kind*, *shy*, *generous*, *sensitive*, and *quiet* are all

adjectives typically associated with women; that is how we expect women to be. *Strong*, *aggressive*, *loud*, *unbothered*, *greedy*, *insensitive*; these are the words we use to describe men. We have a belief that, to be considered "manly," one must fit this mold and that to be a valuable member of society as a man, one must be manly. This is taught over and over through sports, video games, movies, and other forms of media. We teach men to be aggressive, and we all too often equate aggression with violence (Baugher & Gazmararian, 2015; Connell, 1996; Cornwall, 1997; Santana et al., 2006). It should therefore be no surprise that we associate men and women differently with crime.

Finally, we see that the gender of the victim is relevant. Pierce et al. (2017) found that cases with female victims were far more likely to result in death sentences than were cases in which the victims were male. Additionally, in the past, it was seen that females were more likely to have violent acts committed against them, although more recently, no statistically significant difference across gender has been found in terms of who is being victimized (Morgan & Truman, 2017).

Other Extralegal Factors

An extralegal factor is a factor pertaining to the case that is outside the scope of the law, such as race, gender, socioeconomic status, and the like. Research has shown that those who are of a lower socioeconomic status receive inadequate defense as a result of relying on federally funded defense attorneys who are often overworked and are therefore unable to designate adequate time to a defendant's case (Gould & Leon, 2017).

Another extralegal factor that may contribute to sentencing is that of stereotypes. Welch (2007) argues that there has been continual discrimination of people of color throughout America's history via our use of stereotyping. The study links this idea with the caricatures of people of color portrayed during the blackface era as well as with current policies such as stop-and-frisk that allow for racial profiling. Welch argues that by imposing these policies, we are reinforcing the false idea that people of color are somehow criminal in their biology. To support this theory, the study cites the disproportionate prison population and how it skews public perceptions of crime to be unrealistically correlated with race, and the impact this perception has on the way law enforcement officers and public officials do their jobs. In addition, Welch's research reaffirms the theory that a problematic relationship exists between false public perception and the way that perception influences policy making, as was previously found in the work of Baldus (2004).

One other important piece of background information to know is how crimes are processed in the United States. When an individual commits a crime in this country, the crime can be processed in either one of two systems: the state justice system or the federal justice system. Each of these systems processes different types of crimes. The state system deals with things such as murder, arson, robbery, rape, theft, and burglary. The federal system deals with fewer classes of crimes because the crimes must involve a national or federal interest. This is not to say that the federal system does not deal with things such as murder or rape; in some cases, they do. Provisions for such cases come from the federal criminal code (18 U.S.C., 1970). This covers both violent and nonviolent crimes. In addition to these crimes, any crime committed on federal property, such as national parks or federal courthouses, is deemed a federal crime.

The current, quantitative, study fills two gaps in the literature by exploring the impact of race and gender on the specific length of sentencing and by looking specifically in our federal system. In addition, given previous knowledge on the impact of socioeconomic status (Brown & Males, 2011) and age (Farrington, 1986) on criminality, this study controls for these variables. Given the previously established racial bias seen in our justice system in terms of what defendants are sentenced to prison, as well as our knowledge about the relationship between gender and criminality, I expected three things: (1) longer sentences are given to individuals of color than to White individuals, (2) women are given shorter sentences than men, and (3) with regard to the interaction between race and gender, men of color are given the longest sentences and White women are given the shortest sentences.

Given the importance of our justice system in America, a study looking at possible further bias has the potential to enhance our understanding of the complex relationship that America has with both race and gender. In addition, this research has the potential to influence future policy implications working against this type of bias. Finally, by demonstrating who is most vulnerable to bias in our justice system, this study could help to identify those who are most likely to benefit from policies working against it.

Methodology

Research Design

This study involved a quantitative research design that utilized a secondary data set. This design was chosen to eliminate bias caused by obtaining the data and

because of restrictions in feasibility in collecting original data. Overall, doing a secondary data analysis provided the most reliable use of measurement. The universe of data contains all cases received by the United States Sentencing Commission (USSC) with sentencing dates between October 1, 2000, and September 30, 2016.

Participants

Participants included 1,011,988 individuals (29% White) aged 16–97 ($M =$ 35.42, $SD = 10.94$) from a variety of educational backgrounds. The sample included a greater proportion of men (87%) than women. Additionally, more cases with a defendant with a criminal history (78%) were obtained than for a defendant without a criminal history. To ensure that age and criminal history did not influence the results of the primary analyses, it was included as a covariate. In addition, highest level of education was used as a covariate to control for socioeconomic status because the two variables are known to be positively correlated.

Measures

Data were obtained from the USSC's Monitoring of Federal Criminal Cases data sets for the years 2000 through 2016. The USSC obtained these data through a repeated cross-sectional design. This data set has a universe containing all cases received by the USSC that had sentencing dates between October 1, 2000, and September 30, 2016. Cases were reported to the USSC only if they were sentenced according to the Sentencing Reform Act (SRA) of 1984. All sentences recorded in this data set were deemed to be constitutional. The SRA of 1984 simply put forth a range of sentencing lengths that are allowed based on a given crime. It is important to note that all the data used in this study were from after the act was put in place. The original study obtained this data from judgments of conviction, guideline worksheets, statements of reason, the Federal Probation Sentence and Supervision Information System, plea agreements, and presentence reports.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable in this study is sentencing length. Sentencing length was operationalized as the number of months the defendant was sentenced to at the time of original sentencing.

Independent Variables

The independent variables of interest are race and gender. This study operationalized gender as male and female, for this is how gender is defined in the federal justice system. Race was operationalized in terms of White individuals and people of color, resulting from previous literature's findings that policies determined to be discriminatory toward one minority group, such as stop-and-frisk, are discriminatory toward most, if not all, other minority groups (Gelman et al., 2012).

Control Variables

The current study included three control variables: age, criminal history, and educational status. Age was defined by the number of years the defendant had been alive at the time of sentencing. Criminal history was coded 0 for *no criminal history* and 1 for *criminal history*. Educational status included four categories originally coded as 1 for *did not finish high school*, 2 for *high school diploma/GED*, 3 for *pursued higher education*, and 4 for *earned a trade school degree*. Because educational status was the only control variable coded categorically, educational status was recoded into dummy variables upon analysis, making the value for each either 0 or 1.

Data Analysis

Data from a total of 1,011,988 defendants sentenced between September 1, 2000, and September 30, 2016, were analyzed using SPSS. Descriptive statistics were run on both the dependent variables and independent variables as well as on the control variables. Data analysis was then conducted using multiple linear regression, looking for a significant p value of less than .05. For the data set containing all 1,011.988 defendants, four models of regression were run.

The first model included the control variables of age, education level, and criminal history as well as an independent variable of the year the sentencing took place, on the dependent variable, sentence length. The second model included these variables as well as the independent variable of race on the dependent variable. The third model included the control variables and the independent variables of gender and year of sentencing on the dependent variable. The fourth model included the control variables and the independent variables of year of sentencing, as well as the intersection of gender and race on the dependent variable. The models were run in this order to see the base effects of the control variables when dealing only with the

year of sentencing first, and then looking at the influence that the independent variable of interest had on the prior results. After the overall analysis was complete, an additional two models of analysis were run examining the variables of race while controlling for gender. In the original analysis, it was seen that gender had a larger effect on length of sentencing than did race, so an additional model was needed to compare women of color to White women and men of color to White men most accurately.

Models were run on individual years. No significant differences were seen between years, however, so in terms of analysis, the overall data set was the major point of focus.

Results

Descriptive statistics are provided in Tables 1–4. Four models were run on the overall data set. The first model contained the control variables and the year of sentencing, and the remaining three models contained the independent variables of race and gender, and the interaction of race and gender, respectively.

Relationships Among Key Variables

Standard correlation analysis was run in IBM SPSS Statistics to explore the relationships between all variables of interest within the study.

Unsurprisingly, defendants with a criminal history were given longer sentences than those without ($r = .129$, $p < .01$). In accordance with prior literature, younger defendants were given longer sentences ($r = -.014$, $p < .01$). Finally, educational status had a negative relationship with length of sentence if the defendant had either not finished high school, ($r = -.036$, $p < .01$), pursued a level of education past high school, ($r = -.041$, $p < .01$), or obtained some other form of degree, such as one from a trade school ($r = -.010$, $p < .01$), yet a positive relationship was found between graduation from high school and length of sentence ($r = .079$, $p < .01$). Consistent with my first hypothesis, White defendants were given lesser sentences than were defendants of color ($r = -.016$, $p < .01$). Consistent with my second hypothesis, female defendants received lesser sentences than did male defendants, ($r = -.130$, $p < .01$). Inconsistent with my third hypothesis, a negative relationship was seen between race and gender intersection and length of sentence ($r = -.071$, $p < .01$).

Mediating Effects of Race, Gender, and Interaction

To test the strength of influence of each independent variable on sentence length, I ran a series of regression analyses to test the potential mediating effects of race, gender, and race-gender interaction (Tables 3 and 4). For the variable of education level, pursuit of higher education served as the comparison variable in the analysis.

All control variables were found to be significant ($p < .01$) in all four models except Model 2, in which age and the educational level of *other degree* were not found to be significant at this level (*other degree* was significant at the .05 level, $p = .013$), as shown in Tables 3 and 4. Year was also found to be a significant predictor of length of sentence. The first model found a significance with a small effect size (B = –0.464, *SE* = 0.017, $p < .001$), as did the second, third, and fourth models (Model 2: B = –0.494, *SE* = 0.017, $p < .001$; Model 3: B = –0.447, *SE* = 0.016, $p < .001$; Model 4: B = –0.474, *SE* = 0.017, $p < .001$).

The independent variable of race was calculated only through Model 2, where it was shown to be significant (B = –3.868, *SE* = 0.185, $p < .001$). The independent variable of gender was calculated only in Model 3, where it was shown to be significant (B = –26.876, *SE* = 0.231, $p < .001$). The independent variable of the interaction between race and gender was calculated only in Model 4, where it was shown to be significant (B = –23.762, *SE* = 0.356, $p < .001$). Although all models remained significant, the effect sizes in Models 1 ($R^2 = .023$), 2 ($R^2 = .023$), 3 ($R^2 = .036$), and 4 ($R^2 = .027$) were small.

After the overall analysis was complete, an additional two models of analysis were run to examine the variables of race while controlling for gender. The first additional model examined only females and showed race to be significant (B = 2.879, *SE* = 0.387, $p < .001$). The second additional model examined only males and also showed race to be significant (B = –3.920, *SE* = 0.206, $p < .001$). The effect size was small in both of the additional models ($R^2 = .009$ for the first, $R^2 = .023$ for the second).

Discussion

This study strongly supports the previously documented reports of both racial and gender bias in the justice system in the United States, but it also augments prior research through an exploration of the impact of race and gender on the specific length of sentence. The negative relationship between a defendant's race

and length of sentencing seen in this study is consistent with prior findings that suggest a racial bias in the justice system (Gibson, 1978). More importantly, the current study expands on prior literature that has documented instances of bias within the justice system by illustrating relationships between race, gender, and sentencing length. Consistent with my first hypothesis, defendants of color were seen to be given longer sentences than were White defendants. Additionally, in support of my second hypothesis, it was found that female defendants were given shorter sentences than male defendants. When looking directly at the interaction of gender and race, a negative relationship was seen, although this may be due to the higher strength of the effect of gender as compared to race on sentencing length.

Despite the established relationships that race and gender have with sentencing length, results of this study do not support all of the anticipated mediating effects among these three variables. I hypothesized that racial influence would be the same across genders. Specifically, I anticipated that both women and men of color would be given longer sentences than were White men and women, but this was not supported. In examining race with the control of gender, analysis showed that White women were given longer sentences than were women of color, and White men were given shorter sentences than were men of color. Although race did not have the same effect on both genders, it did significantly affect sentencing length in both cases. This suggests that an outside variable may affect this given sentencing length. Previous research indicates that a difference exists in types of crimes committed by men as compared to women (Lauritsen et al., 2009), and this difference could be contributing to the difference in effect of race across genders. Another reason this difference is seen may be the sample of cases used in this study. The sample contained a much higher percentage of men (87%) than women, which may have produced skewed results.

Interestingly, age did not always prove to be significant. This finding is contrary to the results of Farrington (1986), which illustrate a strong relationship between age and likelihood to commit crimes. This finding is also surprising in its irregularity, for significance not only varied across years but also across models within a single year. The irregularity and the opposing results suggest that although age may be a significant predictor of likelihood to commit crimes, it is not as reliable in its ability to predict length of sentence.

Another result to note is that of the significance of year. This is interesting because it illustrates that the influence of racial and gender bias when looking at sentencing length is not static across years. Overall, looking at the cumulative data from 2000 through 2016, year was seen to have a negative relationship with

sentencing length, which indicates that we may be seeing a decrease in the amount of influence that race and gender have on sentencing length in recent years as compared to the early 2000s.

Despite this study's promising findings about race, gender, and sentencing length, its results should be interpreted within the context of its limitations. First, the cases used in this study were reported to the USSC, and although the cases span the United States, they may be skewed to one geographic location over another. Most defendants are individuals of color with some criminal history. Given these demographic characteristics, these defendants may not be representative of the average defendant in the federal system. For example, defendants with criminal histories are likely given longer sentences than those without (Bushway & Piehl, 2007); thus, the majority of sentences within this data set may be longer than they would be on average in the federal system as a whole.

Additionally, the data set chosen to complete this survey did not contain a variable pertaining to type of crime committed. According to U.S. federal law, crimes are given different mandatory minimums and, as a result, different average sentences. As previously mentioned, men and women tend to commit different crimes; the inability to control for type of crime committed may therefore have influenced the results.

Despite these limitations, two of my three original hypotheses were supported: longer sentences for individuals of color as compared to those for White individuals, and longer sentences for male defendants than for female defendants. Although my third hypothesis was not entirely supported, study findings did support the hypothesis that men of color are given longer sentences than are White men. This conflicting result indicates that another variable may be at play, influencing sentencing length outside of the independent variables tested. Furthermore, the current study significantly contributes to the existing body of research by being one of the first to look directly at the influence of the interaction of race and gender on sentencing length, as well as by being one of the first to look specifically at the federal justice system. As such, this study provides valuable information that begins to elucidate the complex interplay among race, gender, and length of sentence, not only providing a foundation for new avenues of research but also identifying new information that politicians can utilize to promote policy change and reduce bias within the federal court system.

References

Alexander, M. (2010). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. New York Press.

Baugher, A. R., & Gazmararian, J. A. (2015). Masculine gender role stress and violence: A literature review and future directions. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 24*, 107–112.

Brown, E., & Males, M. (2011). Does age or poverty level best predict criminal arrest and homicide rates? A preliminary investigation. *Justice Policy Journal,* 8(1), 1–30.

Bushway, S. D., & Piehl, A. M. (2007). The inextricable link between age and criminal history in sentencing. *Crime & Delinquency, 53*(1), 156–183.

Butcher, K. F., Park, K. H., & Piehl, A. M. (2017). Comparing apples to oranges: Differences in women's and men's incarceration and sentencing outcomes. *Journal of Labor Economics, 35*(51), S201–S234.

Chiricos, T., Barrick, K., Bales, W., & Bontrager, S. (2007). The labeling of convicted felons and its consequences for recidivism. *Criminology, 45*(3), 547–581.

Cook, C. L., Li, Y. L., Newell, S. M., Cottrell, C. A., & Neel, R. (2018). The world is a scary place: Individual differences in belief in a dangerous world predict specific intergroup prejudices. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 21*(4), 584–596.

Crimes and Criminal Procedure, 18 U.S.C. (1971).

Farrington, D. P. (1986). Age and crime. *Crime and Justice, 7*, 189–250.

Gelman, A, Fagan, J., & Kiss, A. (2012). An analysis of the New York City police department's "stop-and-frisk" policy in the context of claims of racial bias. *Journal of the American Statistical Assosication, 102*(479), 813–823. doi:10.1190/016214506000001040

Gibson, J. L. (1978). Race as a determinant of criminal sentences: A methodological critique and a case study. *Law & Society Review, 12*(3), 455–478.

Gould, J. B., & Leon, K. S. (2017). A culture that is hard to defend: Extralegal factors in federal death penalty cases. *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology, 107*(4), 643–687.

Lauritsen, J. L., Heimer, K., & Lynch, J. P. (2009). Trends in the gender gap in violent offending: New evidence from the National Crime Victimization Survey. *Criminology, 47*(2), 361–399.

Miller, M., & Hewitt, J. (1978). Conviction of a defendant as a function of juror-victim racial similarity. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 105*(1), 159–160.

Morgan, R. E., & Truman, J. L. (2018). *Criminal victimization, 2017* (NCJ No. 252472). U.S. Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Pierce, G. L., Radelet, M. L., & Sharp, S. (2017). Race and death sentencing for Oklahoma homicides committed between 1990 and 2012. *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology, 107*(4), 733–756.

Radelet, M. L. (1981). Racial characteristics and the imposition of the death penalty. *American Sociological Review, 46*(6), 918–927.

Santana, M. C., Raj, A., Decker, M. R., La Marche, A., & Silverman, J. G. (2006). Masculine gender roles associated with increased sexual risk and intimate partner violence perpetration among young adult men. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, *83*(4), 575–585. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-006-9061-6

Steffensmeier, D., & Allan, E. (1996). Gender and crime: Toward a gendered theory of female offending. *Annual Review of Sociology, 22,* 459–487. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.22.1.459

U.S. Const. amend. XIII.

United States Sentencing Commission. (2000–2017). *Monitoring of Federal Criminal Sentences*. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor]. https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR22623.v2

Welch, K. (2007). Black criminal stereotypes and racial profiling. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 23*(3), 276–288.

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations for Study Variables

Variables	*M* (*SD*)
White (1 = White, 0 = person of color)	0.29 (.451)
Female (1 = female, 0 = male)	0.13 (.341)
Race and gender interaction	0.0510 (.22008)
Age	35.42 (10.941)
Length of sentence (months)	50.6850 (79.14561)
Criminal history (1 = yes, 0 = no)	0.78 (.411)
Did not graduate high school	0.4806 (.49962)
Graduated high school	0.2939 (.45553)
Pursued higher education	0.1973 (.39796)
Attained other degree	0.0282 (.16560)

Table 2. Correlations of Race, Gender, and Control Variables

	White	Female	Race and gender interaction	Age	Length of sentence	Criminal history	Did not complete high school	Graduated high school	Pursued higher education	Attained other degree
White	1									
Female	.082**	1								
Race and gender interaction	.367**	.588**	1							
Age	.228**	.025**	.055**	1						
Length of sentence	−.016**	−.130**	−.071**	−.014**	1					
Criminal history	−.073**	−.163**	−.084**	−.060**	.129**	1				
Education Level										
Did not complete high school	−.302**	−.109**	−.119**	−.170**	−.036**	.110**	1			
Graduated high school	.126**	.025**	.046**	0.001	.079**	.049**	−.621**	1		
Pursued higher education	.209**	.087**	.079**	.187**	−.041**	−.177**	−.477**	−.320**	1	
Attained other degree	.064**	.053**	.043**	.060**	−.010**	−.041**	−.164**	−.110**	−.084**	1

Table 3. Estimated Effects of Race, Gender, and Control Variables on Sentencing Lengths.

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
R-squared	.023			.023			.036			.027		
	B	SE	Sig.	B	SE	Sig.	B	SE	Sig.	B	SE	Sig.
Year	−0.464	0.017	0.000	−0.494	0.017	0.000	−0.447	0.016	0.000	−0.474	0.017	0.000
Age	−0.040	0.007	0.000	−0.011	0.007	0.157	−0.043	0.007	0.000	−0.025	0.007	0.001
Criminal history	25.030	0.194	0.000	24.964	0.194	0.000	21.702	0.195	0.000	24.188	0.194	0.000
Education												
Did not graduate high school	−1.467	0.216	0.000	−2.557	0.222	0.000	−3.503	0.215	0.000	−2.696	0.216	0.000
Graduated high school	11.720	0.231	0.000	11.458	0.231	0.000	11.031	0.229	0.000	11.469	0.230	0.000
Attained other degree	1.278	0.495	0.010	1.234	0.495	0.013	2.649	0.492	0.000	1.818	0.494	0.000
White				−3.868	0.185	0.000						
Female							−26.876	0.231	0.000			
Race and gender interaction										−23.762	0.356	0.000

65

Table 4. Estimated Effects of Race when Gender Is Controlled.

	Model 1			Model 2		
R-squared	.009			.023		
	B	SE	Sig.	B	SE	Sig.
Year	0.197	0.039	0.000	–0.577	0.018	0.000
Age	0.015	0.017	0.000	–0.027	0.008	0.001
Criminal history	12.061	0.385	0.000	23.774	0.221	0.000
White	2.879	0.390	0.000	–3.920	0.206	0.000
Education						
Did not graduate high school	3.729	0.478	0.000	–5.471	0.247	0.000
Graduated high school	3.083	0.475	0.000	11.943	0.258	0.000
Attained other degree	–0.081	0.889	0.928	3.181	0.572	0.000