

**Table A16. The Impact of Past Criminal Behavior on Perceived Severity**

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Severity	Crime Type	Findings
Waldo & Chiricos (1972)	321 college students, Florida	Probability	Gamma	1	No	Estimate-Others	Theft<\$100-Self	-, p> .05
							Marijuana-Self	-, p> .05
Bailey & Lott (1976)	266 students, Midwestern university	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Estimate-Self	Marijuana-Self	+, p= ?
							Marijuana Sale-Self	-, p= ?
							Theft<\$60-Self	-, p= ?
							Theft>\$60-Self	-, p= ?
							Shoplift-Self	-, p= ?
Kraut (1976)	606 college students, Pennsylvania	Probability	Gamma	1	No	How serious?-Self	Multiple-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .001</b>
Silberman (1976)	174 students, small private university	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Estimate-Self	Multiple-Self	+, p> .05
							Multiple-Others	+, p< .05
Teeven (1976a)	191 university students, Canada	Non Prob.	Gamma	1	No	Estimate-Self	Shoplift-Self	+, p> .05
							Marijuana-Self	+, p> .05
						Estimate-Others	Shoplift-Self	+, p> .05
							Marijuana-Self	+, p< .01
Teeven (1976b)	421 high school students, Canada	Non Prob.	Gamma	1	No	Estimate-Self	Marijuana-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .05</b>
							Shoplift-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .05</b>
						Estimate-Others	Marijuana-Self	-, p> .10
							Shoplift-Self	-, p> .10
						Estimate-Friends	Marijuana-Self	+, p< .05
							Shoplift-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .05</b>
Anderson, et al (1977)	321 college students in the South	Probability	Gamma	1	No	Estimate-Others	Marijuana-Self	-, p> .05
	154 males						Marijuana-Other	-, p> .05
	167 females						Marijuana-Self	-, p> .05
								+, p> .05
Meier & Johnson (1977)	632 adults, Chicago	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Severe-Others	Marijuana-Self	+, p= ?
							Marijuana-Peers	+, p= ?
Teeven (1977)	396 adolescents, Canada	Non Prob.	Gamma	1	No	Estimate-Others	Shoplift-Self	+, p> .10
							Theft-Self	+, p> .10

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Severity	Crime Type	Findings
	females						Burglary-Self	+, p> .10
	males						Shoplift-Self	-, p> .05
	delinquents							-, p> .10
	male non delinquents						Theft-Self	+, p> .10
	male delinquents						Burglary-Self	+, p> .10
							Theft-Self	-, p> .10
							Burglary-Self	-, p> .10
							Battery-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .05</b>
							Vandalism-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .05</b>
							Drug Use-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .05</b>
							Alcohol Use-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .05</b>
							Multiple-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .05</b>
<b>Cohen (1978)</b>	105 military residents in Southwest	Probability	Correl.	1	No	Estimate-Others	Speeding-Self	+, p> .05
<b>Minor (1978)</b>	274 adults, Florida	Probability	Tau-b	1	No	Swiftiness-Unclear	DUI-Self	-, p> .05
							Marijuana-Self	-, p> .05
							Shoplift-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .05</b>
							Tax Cheating-Self	+, p> .05
							Multiple-Self	-, p> .05
						Severe-Unclear	DUI-Self	-, p> .05
							Marijuana-Self	+, p< .05
							Shoplift-Self	+, p> .05
							Tax Cheating-Self	-, p> .05
							Speeding-Self	+, p< .05
							Multiple-Self	-, p> .05
<b>Grasmick &amp; Bryjak (1980)</b>	390 residents, Polk City	Probability	Correl.	1	No	Problem?-Self	Multiple-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .001</b>
<b>Grasmick &amp; Green (1981)</b>	390 adults, Polk City.	Probability	Correl.	1	No	Problem?-Self	Multiple-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .001</b>
<b>Hollinger &amp; Clark (1983)</b>	9,175 employees, 3 Midwest states	Probability	Correl.	1	No	Estimate-Self	Employee Theft-Self	-, p= ?
<b>Paternoster et al (1983a)</b>	300 college students, Florida	Probability	Correl.	1	No	Estimate-Self	Theft<\$10-Self	-, p> .05
							\$10-\$100 Theft-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .05</b>
							Marijuana-Self	-, p> .05
							Bad Checks-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .001</b>

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Severity	Crime Type	Findings
							Vandalism-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .05</b>
							Multiple-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .05</b>
	262 HS students, Florida						Theft<\$10-Self	-, p> .05
							\$10-\$100 Theft-Self	-, p> .05
							Marijuana-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .01</b>
							Alcohol Use-Self	-, p> .05
							Vandalism-Self	-, p> .05
							Multiple-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .01</b>
<b>Pestello (1984)</b>	271 HS students, Midwest	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Estimate-Self	Multiple-Self	-, p> .05
						Estimate-Others		-, p> .05
						Swiftiness-Self		+, p> .05
<b>Paternoster &amp; Iovanni (1986)</b>	1173 HS students, Southeast	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Problem?-Self	Multiple-Self	-, p> .05
							Multiple-Others	-, p= ?
<b>Carmody &amp; Williams (1987)</b>	1,626 males, U.S.	Probability	Diff. Means	1	No	Problem?-Self	Dom. Violence-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .05</b>
<b>Demers &amp; Lundman (1987)</b>	710 college students, Ohio	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Estimate-Others	Marijuana-Self	+, p> .05
				1	No		Marijuana-Others	+, p> .05
<b>Braithwaite &amp; Makkai (1991)</b>	410 nursing home execs., Australia	Probability	Correl.	1	No	Cost of Conviction-Self	Corporate-Self	-, p> .05
<b>Miller &amp; Simpson (1991)</b>	640 university students	Non Prob.	OLS	10	No	Problem?-Self	Dom. Violence-Parents	+, p > .05
							Mild Dom. Violence-Self	+, p > .05
	males						Serious Dom. Violence-Self	-, p> .05
							Dom. Violence-Parents	+, p > .05
							Mild Dom. Violence-Self	-, p> .05
							Serious Dom. Violence-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .05</b>
	females						Dom. Violence-Parents	+, p > .05
							Mild Dom. Violence-Self	+, p > .05
							Serious Dom. Violence-Self	+, p > .05
<b>Kinsey (1992)</b>	1202 taxpayers, Minnesota	Non Prob.	OLS	16	No	Problem-Self	Tax Cheating-Self	-, p> .05
<b>Miller &amp; Iovanni (1994)</b>	367 students, state university	Non Prob.	OLS	15	Yes	Problem?-Self	Dom. Violence-Self	+, p> .05
	294 males							-, p> .05
	163 females							-, p> .05
<b>Baron &amp; Kennedy (1998)</b>	125 males, Edmonton	Non Prob.	OLS	10	Yes	Problem? Vio. Composite-Self	Composite of Crime-Peers	-, p> .10
						Problem? Prop. Composite-Self		+, p> .10

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Severity	Crime Type	Findings
						Problem? Vio. Composite-Self	Marijuana-Self	+, p> .10
						Problem? Prop. Composite		+, p>.10
<b>Varma &amp; Doob (1998)</b>	1908 people, Ontario	Probability	Chi- Square	1	No	Estimate-Others	\$500 Tax Cheating-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .01</b>
							\$5,000 Tax Cheating-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .01</b>
							\$100,000 Tax Cheating-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .01</b>
<b>Pogarsky (2002)</b>	412 college students, unknown area	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Estimate-Self	DUI-Self	-, p= ?
							DUI-Others	+, p= ?
<b>Yu et al (2006)</b>	433 people in New York	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Severe-Other	DUI-Self	+, p> .05
						Swiftiness-Other		<b>-, p&lt; .01</b>
						Caught-Other	Drugged Driving-Self	+, p> .05
						Swiftiness-Other		<b>-, p&lt; .01</b>
<b>Freeman &amp; Watson (2009)</b>	5,525 adults in Australia, 2002	Probability	Correl.	1	No	Severe Caught-Self	DUI-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .01</b>
						Severe Fine-Self		-, p> .05
						Severe License Loss-Self		<b>-, p&lt; .01</b>
						Severe Jail- Self		+, p> .05
<b>Urban (2009)</b>	118 juvenile offenders, area unknown	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Problem-Self	Any-Self	-, p> .05
<b>Title et al (2011)</b>	1,400 adults in Eastern Europe, 2006	Probability	Correl.	1	No	Problem- Self	Theft-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .01</b>
							Violence-Self	<b>-, p&lt; .01</b>
<b>Watling &amp; Freeman (2011)</b>	922people in Unknown Area	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Severe-Other	Drug Use-Self	+, p< .001
						Swiftiness-Self		<b>-, p&lt; ,001</b>
<b>Baron (2013)</b>	300 homeless teens, Toronto, 2005-06	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Problem-Self	Battery-Self	-, p> .05

---

#### Clarification of Commonly Used Abbreviations in Table 16

##### Column Headings

#IV- Number of Independent Variables in the Analysis

INF- Did the Study Control For Informal Sanctions?

Perceived Severity- All measures represent respondents' perceived severity and swiftness of the penalty for a particular crime. The "self" or "other" feature denotes whether the perceived severity or swiftness measures were for the respondents themselves or others. Some researchers asked respondents the severity or swiftness of the crime if they themselves were punished (self) for the crime, while others asked respondents how people in general (others) would be punished for the crime.

*Abbreviations Located Under Column Headings*

Correl.-Correlation Coefficient  
Diff. Means- Difference in Means Test  
Dom. Violence = Domestic violence  
Estimate- Respondents' Estimates of the Penalty Administered for the Crime  
Multiple- Multiple Crimes Combined into one Measure  
Mild Dom. Violence- Mild Domestic Violence  
Non Prob. – Non Probability  
OLS- Ordinary Least Squares Regression  
Problem- How big of a Problem Would Getting Caught/arrested, etc., Present in Your life?  
Prop. Composite- Composite of Property Crimes  
Ser. Domestic Violence= Serious Domestic Violence  
Severe- Respondents' Perceptions of the Level of Severity that would Result for the Crime  
Vio. Composite- Composite of Property Crimes