



Sentencing Psychology in Criminal Justice Decision-Making

Sarah Lowenthal*

Department of Psychology, Pennsylvania State University, Pennsylvania, USA

DESCRIPTION

Sentencing psychology examines how judges, juries, and other legal decision-makers determine appropriate punishments for convicted offenders, integrating legal principles with insights from human cognition, emotion, and social influence. While sentencing frameworks are guided by statutory rules and judicial precedents, psychological factors inevitably shape how those rules are interpreted and applied. Understanding these influences is important for ensuring fairness, consistency, and proportionality in criminal justice outcomes.

At the core of sentencing decisions lies the assessment of blameworthiness and harm. Psychological research shows that individuals rely on cognitive shortcuts, or heuristics, when evaluating responsibility. For instance, the severity of harm often disproportionately influences sentencing judgments, even when legal standards emphasize intent. This tendency, known as outcome bias, can lead to harsher penalties when consequences are severe, regardless of whether the offender's intent differed significantly from less harmful cases. Similarly, the attribution of intent is shaped by narratives presented during trials, where vivid storytelling can intensify perceptions of culpability [1-3].

Emotional responses also play a central role in sentencing psychology. Feelings such as anger, disgust, or empathy can influence the perceived deservingness of punishment. Crimes involving vulnerable victims or moral violations tend to elicit stronger emotional reactions, often resulting in harsher sentences. Conversely, expressions of remorse by defendants may evoke empathy and lead to leniency. However, the interpretation of remorse is subjective and may be influenced by cultural expectations, communication styles, or even implicit biases, raising concerns about equity in sentencing practices.

Another significant factor is the role of individual differences among decision-makers. Judges and jurors bring their own experiences, beliefs, and values into the courtroom, which can shape sentencing outcomes. Research has demonstrated variability in sentencing based on factors such as political orientation, prior exposure to crime, and attitudes toward

punishment versus rehabilitation. Some decision-makers may prioritize deterrence and retribution, while others emphasize rehabilitation and restorative justice. This variability can lead to disparities, even within the same legal system, highlighting the importance of structured guidelines and training to mitigate subjective influences [4].

Social and contextual factors further complicate sentencing decisions. Media coverage, public opinion, and societal attitudes toward specific crimes can create external pressures that influence judicial behavior. High-profile cases, in particular, may result in harsher sentences due to perceived expectations of accountability. Additionally, stereotypes and implicit biases related to race, gender, or socioeconomic status can unconsciously affect judgments, contributing to systemic inequalities. Efforts to address these issues include bias-awareness training and the implementation of standardized sentencing frameworks [5-8].

The use of risk assessment tools represents a growing intersection between psychology and sentencing. These tools aim to predict the likelihood of reoffending by analyzing factors such as criminal history, age, and behavioral patterns. While they offer the potential for more objective decision-making, they are not without controversy. Critics argue that such tools may perpetuate existing biases if they rely on historical data reflecting unequal policing or prosecution practices. Therefore, careful validation and ethical oversight are essential when integrating these instruments into sentencing processes [9,10].

In conclusion, sentencing psychology reveals that legal decisions are not purely objective applications of law but are deeply influenced by cognitive, emotional, and social factors. Recognizing these influences is essential for improving fairness and consistency in sentencing. By incorporating psychological research into judicial training, refining sentencing guidelines, and critically evaluating decision-making tools, the legal system can move toward more equitable and evidence-based practices that balance accountability with an understanding of human behavior.

Correspondence to: Sarah Lowenthal, Department of Psychology, Pennsylvania State University, USA, E-mail: sarah@lowenthal.edu

Received: 28-Feb-2026, Manuscript No. JFPY-26-31459; **Editor Assigned:** 02-Mar-2026, Pre QC No. JFPY-26-31459 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 16-Mar-2025, QC No. JFPY-26-31459; **Revised:** 23-Mar-2026, Manuscript No. JFPY-26-31459 (R); **Published:** 30-Mar-2026, DOI: 10.35248/2475-319X.26.11.406

Citation: Lowenthal S. (2026). Sentencing Psychology in Criminal Justice Decision-Making. *J Foren Psy.* 11:406.

Copyright: © 2026 Lowenthal S. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

REFERENCES

1. Pinals DA, Fuller DA. The vital role of a full continuum of psychiatric care beyond beds. *Psychiatr Serv.* 2020;71(7):713-721.
2. Olmstead vs. LC, Pinals DA. Forensic services, public mental health policy, and financing: charting the course ahead. *J Am Acad Psychiatry Law.* 2014;42(1):7-19.
3. Gowensmith WN. Resolution or resignation: The role of forensic mental health professionals amidst the competency services crisis. *Psychol Pub Pol Law.* 2019;25(1):1.
Heilbrun K, Giallella C, Wright HJ, DeMatteo D, Griffin PA,
4. Gowensmith N, et al. Appraising Jackson-based unrestorability to competence to stand trial: The demonstration model. *Psychol Serv.* 2023;20(3):553-564.
5. Jackson vs. United States, 406 U.S. 715 (1972). JUSTIA. 1972.
6. Pirelli G, Gottdiener WH, Zapf PA. A meta-analytic review of competency to stand trial research. *Psychol Pub Pol Law.* 2011;17(1): 1.
7. Pirelli G, Zapf P. An attempted meta-analysis of the competency restoration research: Important findings for future directions. *J Foren Psychol Res Pract.* 2020;20(2):134-162. [Crossref] [Google Scholar]
8. Rogers R, Johansson-Love J. Evaluating competency to stand trial with evidence-based practice. *J Am Acad Psychiatry Law.* 2023.
9. Sell vs. United States, 539 U.S. 166 2003. JUSTIA. 2003.
10. Zapf PA, Beltrani A. Emerging issues in competence to stand trial evaluation. *The Oxf hand Psychol. law.* 2023;153-169.