

Appendix A: Closely Related Deterrence Studies Omitted from the Meta Analysis

Micro Studies

Study Type

All qualitative analyses and all theoretical analyses

Studies testing judged deterrence values - i.e. - which does penalty does respondent consider the most severe of a list of penalties provided?

Studies using simulated models or formulas where no data were collected

Studies using traffic accidents, traffic deaths, or near misses as a proxy for DUI activity or reckless driving.

Rationale for Omitting

Our study only examines the impact of quantitative deterrence analysis. No qualitative or theoretical analyses were included.

Our analysis is more concerned with experienced penalties or perceptions of the level of penalties, not opinion about which penalties are the worst or how penalties impact judged deterrence.

We considered these studies theoretical in nature even though formulas were used and calculations were undertaken. If the study was based on hypothetical data then we did not include it in our analysis.

Since our analysis attempted to avoid assumptions based on the contents of studies that were reviewed, we did not include studies that made assumptions about crime. In these studies, there were too many other factors that could have contributed to traffic deaths or accidents besides unlawful activity.

Examples of Omitted Studies

Aitken, Moore, Higgs, Kelsall & Kerger (2002)
Gilbert (2009)
O'Connell, Visher, Martin, Parker & Brent (2011)
Jacobs & Cherbonneau (2012)

Howe & Brandau (1988)
Howe & Loftus (1996)
Gill, Bilby & Turbin (1999)

Bebchuk & Kaplow (1992)
Andreoni, Harbaugh & Vesterlund (2003)
Imai & Krishna (2004)

Ross (1975)
Ross (1984)
Snortum (1984)

Study Type

Studies testing academic dishonesty or other school misbehavior as the dependent variable or its impact on perceptions of punishment

Studies testing policy Interventions on perceptions of punishment. For example, the impact of drug laws on perceptions of drug laws. Also not included were studies testing the impact of policies on micro level crime where the punishment level is unknown. An example would be the impact of foot patrol, mandatory drunk driving laws, boot camp, mandatory jail laws, etc. on crime.

Rationale for Omitting

Although academic dishonesty and school misbehavior is considered deviant behavior, we only included studies that tested actual crime.

Although these studies provide an interesting addition to the literature on perceptions and knowledge of crime, we focused only on the impact of actual penalties or crime experience on perceptions of crime, not the impact of general policies. These studies contain too many extraneous variables that may impact perceptions of punishment that may be completely independent of these policies. With regard to studies testing policies such as foot Patrol and its impact on crime, we only included studies that had a punishment aspect. Studies testing the impact of mandatory jail laws, drunk driving laws, etc., on perceptions of punishment or crime were not included because these laws were too far removed from the actual punishment received by the respondents tested. Similarly, while policies such as foot patrol may increase the number of arrests, we only included policy studies if they tested the impact of actual punishments or penalties on crimes or perceptions. For this reason, studies testing the impact of arrest experiments in Milwaukee, Kansas City, etc., were included in the analysis because they test the impact of arrests against crime, not simply general policy.

Examples of Omitted Studies

Salem & Bowers (1970)
Tibbets (1997)
Tibbets (1999)

Mackenzie, Brame, McDowall
& Souryal (1995)
Wheeler & Hisson (1998)
Bell, Jaitman & Machin (2014)
Suo (2015)

Study Type

Studies testing aggressive policing against individual level crime or perceptions of crime.

Studies that test perceptions of punishment over time or across different regions, areas, etc.

Studies testing the impact of intensive rehabilitation or mandatory rehabilitation against crime or perceptions.

Studies testing “what if” scenarios.

Rationale for Omitting

Although aggressive policing studies do test a form of experienced punishment, these studies do not directly test the impact of experienced arrest or an actual punishment level on crime. It could be that many citizens enjoy having aggressive police in their community and do not view this as a level of experienced punishment. Also, aggressive policing may not necessarily lead to more overall arrests.

Although relevant to our research, these studies will not be included in our meta-analysis because they do not test a punishment or crime variable against perceptions.

Although many offenders may perceive these types of rehabilitation as punishment, being sentenced to rehabilitation / treatment is not considered a traditional form of punishment. Studies testing rehabilitation of offenders were only included if rehabilitation was being compared to a punishment level such as traditional probation or prison.

These studies are different from “vignette” studies because they examine what would have happened had a certain situation occurred. For instance, had a certain group of offenders received 10 years of prison instead of being released in 5 Years, what would have occurred? Typically, these studies use formulas to estimate the amount of crime that a group would have committed in five years had they had been released from prison- and not been in

Examples of Omitted Studies

Snortum (199)
Braga (2008)

Williams, Gibbs, &
Erickson (1980)
Snortum & Berger (1989)

Raush (1983)
Han & Redlich (2015)

Van Dine, Dintz, &
Conrad (1977)
Duwe (2014)

Study Type

Rationale for Omitting

Examples of Omitted Studies

prison that entire time. Such studies veer too far from actual penalties experienced to be included In our analysis.

Psychology studies testing the impact of corporal punishment on juvenile behavior

These studies do not test the direct effect of legal punishments on juvenile behavior. Rather, they examine The impact of parental punishment, school discipline, etc. on juvenile behavior.

Aronfreed & Reber (1965)
Evan, Simons, & Simons (2012)

Studies testing the impact of workplace punishment on workplace compliance

These studies do not test legal punishments or actual crime. Our analysis does not include studies of violation of norms, morality or workplace deviance.

Kobayashi & Kerbo (2012)
Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara (2012)

Studies testing the impact of demographics on perceptions of punishment.

These studies typically compare perceptions of punishment across gender, race, income, education, etc. Although it is Important to know how these demographics compare in their perceptions of punishment, we only included these demographics when a study broke down findings of deterrence by these demographics. For example, we included findings where the impact of punishment on crime was broken down by gender, race, income, etc.

Blackwell, Grasmick & Cochran (1994)

Studies testing the impact of DNA databases on crime

These studies are not included because although DNA databases may increase the certainty that offenders will be caught for crime, these studies do not measure certainty of punishment specifically.

Bhati & Roman (2014)

Studies testing the impact of cameras on crime

Cameras may increase the certainty of punishment for crime in certain areas, but we cannot be sure that all

Welsh & Farrington (2003)

Study Type

Rationale for Omitting

Examples of Omitted Studies

	areas with increased cameras have greater certainty	Musheno, Levine, & Palumbo (1978)
Studies of the impact prisoner deaths on prisoner recidivism.	Although it can be argued that the rate of violent prisoner deaths in prison is a form of severity of punishment, it is too far removed from the measure of sanction severity because areas with harsher sentences could also have the same rate or even fewer prisoner deaths than areas with less severe sentences.	Drago, Galbiati & Vertova (2011)
Studies where the proxy for forecast off crime is too far removed from a statement that one would actually commit crime in the future	We encountered a few studies where researchers measured the subjects' likelihood to commit crime in the future, but, did so in a way that did not measure crime. An example would be asking the responded if, under the scenario provided, "would it be a good idea for a person in the scenario to commit crime or not?" We felt that this measure does not determine whether a respondent would actually commit crime because respondents may see it as a good idea for another person- but, not say that they themselves would actually commit the crime due to of morality, social response, etc. In other words, simply stating that crime is a good idea for a person in a scenario does not translate to the respondent actually suggesting he or she would commit the crime.	Ugrin & Odom (2010)
Studies testing the impact of informal sanctions on crime or perceptions of crime.	These studies test the impact of non-legal sanctions on crime and perceptions of punishment. These non-legal sanctions include religion, morality, shaming, etc., and represent informal rather than formal social control devices.	Workman (2001) Kelley, Fukushima, Spivak & Payne (2009) Spivak, Fukushima, Kelley & Jenson (2011)

Macro Studies

Study Type

Studies testing policy interventions on crime such as three, strikes laws, sentencing laws, minimum, mandatory policies, seat belt laws, foot patrol, etc. and their impact on macro level crime rates

Studies testing the impact of police force strength on macro level crime rates

Studies that test the impact of police crackdowns and / or pulling levers on crime rates

Studies using proxies that are not crime to substitute for crime.

Studies testing the impact of inspections on environmental compliance

Rationale for Omitting

These studies do not directly test the impact of penalties on crime rates and such policies may run contrary to penalty levels. For instance, some states with three states laws may have shorter average sentences than states without such Laws.

These studies test the size of the police force (all police employees, sworn officers, etc.) across cities, police force zones, counties, etc. on crime rates. Another version of this study type tests the impact of the police budget or spending on crime rates

These studies are similar to tests of police force strength on crime rates except that they focus on specific police interventions (such as gang units, drug task forces, etc.) and their impact on crime rates.

These studies typically test difficult to measure crime types such as white collar crime, pollution, etc. They substitute a legal activity that is often related to this type of crime.

Although environmental compliance, or lack thereof, is white collar crime, inspections of plants do not fit our category of certainty of punishment. Inspections are not analogous to being “caught” for a crime because they

Examples of Omitted Studies

Schwartz (1968)
Mackenzie, Brame, McDowwall & Souryal (1995)
Kessler & Levitt (1999)
Elvik & Christensen (2007)
LaFree, Dugan, & Korte (2009)

Phillips & Votey (1973)
Wilson & Boland (1978)
Friedman, Hakim,
& Spiegel (1989)

Braga (2008)
Crank, Koski, Johnson,
Ramirez, Sheldon &
Peterson (2010)
Ratcliffe, Taniguchi, Groff
& Wood (2011)

Block, Nold & Sidak (1981)
Deily & Gray (1991)

Magat & Viscusi (1990)
Stafford (2002)
Earnhart & Fieson (2013)

Study Type

Rationale for Omitting

Examples of Omitted Studies

are standard procedures which all law abiding plants receive.

Studies testing the impact of traffic policies on traffic fatalities or accidents

These studies are not included because they test policies instead of penalties. They are also not included because they test traffic fatalities or accidents instead of actual driving violations such as DUI or speeding.

Legge & Park (1994)
Ritchey & Nicholson-Crotty (2011)
Tavares, Mendes & Costa (2008)

Studies using a formula rather than data to create certainty, severity or swiftness

These studies use mathematical formulas to calculate or estimate punishment variables and do not use actual data in the calculation.

Combe & Monnier (2011)

Studies that test international data and test dependent variables that are difficult to compare and measure across countries.

An example of this type of study would be a test of the deterrence impact of prosecutions or punishments on human rights violations across the world. What is labeled a crime for human rights violations in one country may not be a crime in another country. Due to the methodological problems surrounding these studies and the small number of these studies, they were omitted from our review.

Kim & Sikkink (2010)