Table A2. The "Impact" of Perceived Severity on Past Criminal Behavior

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Perceived Risk	Crime Type	Findings
Silberman (1976)	174 students, small private university	Non Prob.	OLS	4	No	Estimate-Self	Multiple	**-, p< .05**
							Assault	-, p> .05
							Hard Drug Use	+, p> .05
							Theft < $50	+, p> .05
							Vandalism	+, p> .05
							Shoplifting	+, p> .05
							Public Drunk	+, p> .05
							Marijuana Use	+, p> .05
							Underage Drink	+, p> .05
Meier & Johnson (1977)	632 adults, Chicago	Non Prob.	OLS	16	Yes	Severe-Others	Marijuana	+, p= ?
Jacob (1980)	176 residents, Illinois	Probability	OLS	6	Yes	Problem?-Self	Traffic Crime	-, p= .27
							Marijuana	+, p= .69
Grasmick & Green (1981)	390 adults, Polk City	Probability	OLS	7	Yes	Problem?-Self	Multiple	+, p> .05
Pestello (1984)	271 HS students, Midwest	Non Prob.	Path	15	No	Estimate-Self	Multiple	-, p> .05
						Estimate-Others		+, p> .05
Williams (1985)	899 drivers, Texas	Non Prob.	OLS	14	No	Severe-Others	Marijuana	+, p> .05
Blewitt, et al. (1987)	344 fishermen, Canada	Non Prob.	OLS	12	No	Estimate-Self	Fishing Violations	-, p> .05
Braithwaite & Makkai (1991)	277 nursing home execs., Australia	Probability	OLS	24	No	Estimate-Self	Corporate	-, p> .05
Kinsey (1992)	1,202 taxpayers, Minnesota, 1988	Probability	OLS	17	Yes	Problem-Self	Tax Cheating	-, p> .05
Baron & Kennedy (1998)	125 males, Edmonton	Non Prob.	OLS	13	Yes	Problem?-Self	Building Burglary	-, p> .05
							Car Burglary	**-, p< .05**
							Battery	+, p> .10
Hatcher et al (2000)	68 fishing captains, UK, 1997-98	Probability	Probit	15	Yes	Severe-Self	Illegal Fishing	-, p > .05
Wenzel (2004)	1,406 taxpayers in Australia	Probability	OLS	17	No	Problem?- Self	Tax Fraud	**-, p< .05**
Freeman & Watson (2006)	166 drunk drivers, Australia	Non Prob.	Ordinal	6	No	Severe- Self	DUI	+, p> .05
Yu et al (2006)	433 people in New York	Non Prob.	OLS	13	No	Severe-Other	DUI	+, p> .05
								+, p> .05
Young & Zhang (2007)	127 adult hackers, U.S.	Non. Prob.	Logistic	6	Yes	Problem?-Self	Hacking	+, p< .05
Freeman & Watson (2009)	5,525 adults in Australia, 2002	Probability	Logistic	9	No	Severe Caught-Self	DUI	**-, p< .05**
						Severe Fine-Self		+, p> .05

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Perceived Risk	Crime Type	Findings
						Severe License Loss-self		-, p> .05
						Severe Jail- Self		+, p> .05
Gunter (2009)	513 college students in Mid Atlantic	Non. Prob.	Ordinal	14	No	Estimate-Other	Music Piracy	+, p> .05
	513 college students in Mid Atlantic	Non. Prob.	Ordinal	14	No	Estimate-Other	Software Piracy	+, p> .05
	513 college students in Mid Atlantic	Non. Prob.	Ordinal	14	No	Estimate-Other	Movie Piracy	+, p> .05
Zhang et al (2009)	207 college students, Southern U.S.	Non Prob.	OLS	9	No	Severe-Self	Digital Piracy	-, p= .36
Verboon & Dijke (2011)	469 Dutch Employees	Non Prob.	OLS	6	No	Severe-Self	Tax Fraud	**-, p< .01**

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Swiftness	Crime Type	Findings
Pestello (1984)	271 HS students, Midwest	Non Prob.	Path	15	No	Swiftness-Self	Multiple	+, p> .05
Freeman & Watson (2006)	166 drunk drivers, Australia	Non Prob.	Ordinal	6	No	Time Caught to Ad-Self	DUI	+, p> .05
Yu et al (2006)	433 people in New York	Non Prob.	OLS	13	No	Length of Case-Other	DUI	-, p> .05
							Drugged Driving	-, p> .05

Clarification of Commonly Used Abbreviations in Table 2

Column Headings

#IV- Number of Independent Variables in the Analysis
INF- Did the Study Control For Informal Sanctions?
Severity- All measures represent respondents' perceived severity of the penalty for a particular crime. The most commonly used abbreviations in Table 2 are listed below. The "self" or "other" feature denotes whether the perceived severity was for the respondents themselves or others. Some researchers asked respondents the severity 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.
Swiftness- All measures represent respondents' perceived swiftness of the penalty for a particular crime. The "self" or "other" feature denotes whether the perceived swiftness was for the respondents themselves or others. Some researchers asked respondents the 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

Ad- Adjudication
Drink- Drinking
Estimate- Respondents' Estimates of the Penalty Administered for the Crime
Execs- Executives
HS- High School Students

Multiple- Multiple Crimes Combined into one Measure
OLS- Ordinary Least Squares Regression
Ordinal- Ordinal Regression
Non Prob.- Non Probability Sample
Path- Path Analysis
Problem- How big of a Problem Would Getting Caught/arrested, etc., Present in Your life?
Severe- Respondents' Perceptions of the Level of Severity that would result for the Crime
UK- United Kingdom