Table A4. The Impact of Perceived Severity or Swiftness on Forecasts of Criminal Behavior

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Perceived Severity	Crime Type	Findings
Carroll (1978)	79 offenders & Non-offenders	Non Prob.	ANOVA	1	No	Assigned Severity-Self	Multiple	N.S.
Grasmick & Green (1981)	390 adults, Polk City	Probability	OLS	7	Yes	Problem?-Self	Multiple	+, p> .05
Miller & Anderson (1986)	347 white males age 15-35, Baltimore	Non Prob.	OLS	10	No	Assigned Severity-Self	Multiple	**-, p< .01**
	173 white females age 15-35, Balt.							**-, p< .01**
	154 black males age 15-35, Baltimore							**-, p< .01**
	77 black females age 15-35, Balt.							**-, p< .01**
Green (1989a)	241 adults, Minneapolis	Probability	Logit	5	Yes	Problem?-Self	DUI	-, p> .05
Thurman (1989)	319 adults, Oklahoma City	Probability	OLS	6	No	Assigned Severity-Self	Tax Cheating	**-, p< .01**
Grasmick & Bursik (1990)	360 adults, Southwestern City	Probability	Logistic	1	No	Problem?-Self	Tax Cheating	**-, p< .01**
							Theft< $20	**-, p< .01**
							DUI	**-, p< .01**
Schneider & Ervin (1990)	876 delinquents, U.S.	Non Prob.	OLS	16	No	Estimate-Self	Theft≥ $20	?, p> .10
Kinsey (1992)	1,202 taxpayers, Minnesota, 1988	Probability	OLS	17	Yes	Problem-Self	Tax Cheating	+, p> .05
Decker, et al (1993)	88 burglars & non-burglars, Missouri	Non Prob.	ANOVA	1	No	Assigned Penalty-Self	Burglary	?, p>.10
Carnes & Englebrecht (1995)	126 college students, Unknown area	Non Prob.	ANOVA	1	No	Assigned Penalty-Sef	Tax Cheating	**-, p< .01**
Ellis & Simpson (1995)	96 college students, unknown area	Non Prob.	GLS	18	Yes	Problem?-Self	Corporate	+, p> .05
McCarthy (1995)	1,993 residents, 3 U.S. states	Probability	Logit	13	Yes	Problem?-Self	$5 Theft	-, p> .05
							$50 Theft	-, p> .05
Piquero & Rengert (1999)	15 residential burglars, Northeast	Non Prob.	OLS	4	No	Assigned Penalty-Self	Burglary	**-, p< .05**
Nagin & Pogarsky (2001)	251 college students, Arizona	Non Prob.	Tobit	10	No	Assigned Penalty-Self	DUI	**-, p< .05**
Bouffard (2002a)	129 college students in the east	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Problem- Self	Rape	-, p> .05
Bouffard (2002b)	129 college students in the east	Non Prob.	OLS	10	No	Problem-Self	Sex Coercion	+, p > 05
Piquero & Pogarsky (2002)	250 students, Southwestern Univ.	Non Prob.	Tobit	14	No	Assigned Penalty-Self	DUI	**-, p < .05**
Pogarsky (2002)	412 college students, Unkown Area	Non Prob.	Tobit	11	Yes	Assigned Penalty-Self	DUI	**-, p< .01**
Simpson & Piquero (2002)	84 students and 12 executives	Non. Prob.	GLS	36	Yes	Problem-Firm	Corporate	**-, p< .05**
Gul, Ng & Tong (2003)	53 auditors, China	Non Prob.	OLS	7	No	Estimate-Other	Corruption	**-, p< .001**
Barratt et al. (2005)	100 Cannibis users in Australia	Non Prob.	OLS	1	No	Problem- Self	Cannibis Use	-, p = ?
Higgins et al. (2005)	382 College students in the Southeast	Non Prob.	OLS	13	Yes	Estimate-Self	Software Piracy	+, p> .05
Freeman & Watson (2006)	166 drunk drivers, Australia	Non Prob.	Ordinal	6	No	Severe- Self	DUI	**-, p< .05**
Sitren & Applegate (2006)	634 undergraduate students, Southeast	Non Prob.	OLS	21	Yes	Assigned Penalty-Self	DUI	**-, p= .00**
Yu et al (2006)	433 people in New York	Non Prob.	OLS	13	No	Sever-Other	DUI	-, p> .05

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Perceived Severity	Crime Type	Findings
Levin et al (2007)	388 college students in Southeast	Non Prob.	ANOVA	1	No	Assigned Penalty-Self	Music Piracy	**-, p< .01**
Bouffard et al (2008)	212 college students in Midwest	Non. Prob.	OLS	8	No	Estimate- Self	Shoplifting	-, p> .10
	93 juvenile offenders in Midwest							-, p> .10
D'Arcy et al (2008)	269 employees in 8 companies, U.S.	Non Prob.	Path	9	No	Severe-Other	Comp. Crime	**-, p< .01**
Morton & Koufteros (2008)	216 university students, Southeast	Non Prob.	Path	8	Yes	Problem- Self	Music Piracy	+, 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
Urban (2009)	118 juvenile offenders, area unknown	Non Prob.	OLS	8	No	Problem- Self	Any Crime	+, p> .05
Ali and Abdullah (2010)	284 fishermen in Malaysia, 2001-2002	Non Prob.	Logit	16	No	Severe-Self	Illegal Fishing	-, p> .05
Watling et al (2010)	899 drivers in Australia, 2007	Non Prob.	Logistic	8	Yes	Severe-Other	DUI	+, p> .05
Maxson et al (2011)	744 Delinquent Youth, CA, 2000-01	Non Prob.	OLS	14	Yes	Composite-Self	Theft	**-, p< .01**
							Mar. Dealing	-, p> .05
							Car Theft	**-, p< .05**
Title et al (2011)	1,400 adults in Eastern Europe, 2006	Probability	OLS	6	Yes	Problem- Self	Theft	**-, p< .05**
	400 adults in Greece							+, p> .05
	500 adults in Russia							**-, p< .05**
	500 adults in the Ukraine							**-, p< .05**
	1,400 adults in Eastern Europe, 2006						Violent Crime	-, p> .05
	400 adults in Greece							+, p> .05
	500 adults in Russia							-, p> .05
	500 adults in the Ukraine							+, p< .05
Watling & Freeman (2011)	922people in Unknown Area	Non Prob.	Logistic	13	Yes	Severe-Other	Drug Driving	-, p> .05
Jacobs & Piquero (2012)	171 college students, Southeast, 2010	Non Prob.	OLS	2	No	Problem-Self	DUI	**-, p< .05**
Sitren & Applegate (2012)	326 inmates in Southeast, 2006	Non Prob.	OLS	25	Yes	Assigned Severity-Self	DUI	+, p> .05
							Drug Purchase	-, p> .05
							Shoplifting	-, p> 05
Baron (2013)	300 homeless teens, Toronto, 2005-06	Non Prob.	OLS	17	Yes	Problem-Self	Battery	+, p> .05
Bouffard & Exum (2013)	760 students in Southwest, 2011	Non Prob.	Neg. Binomial	10	No	Problem-Self	DUI	-, p> .05
	1,013 offenders in Southwest, 2011							-, p> .05
Harbaugh et al (2013)	82 H.S & 34 College students, Oregon	Non prob.	OLS	12	No	Assigned Severity-Self	Theft	**-., p< .01**
	Sample of College Students							**-, p< .01**
	Sample of High School Students							**-, p< .01**

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Perceived Severity	Crime Type	Findings
Piquero et al (2013)	1,013 inmates, unknown area, 2011	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Problem-Self	DUI	-, p> .05
Worrall et al (2014)	306 college students, Southeast, 2011	Non Prob.	OLS	9	Yes	Problem-Self	DUI	**-, p< .05**
Yao et al (2014)	123 college students, Maryland	Non Prob.	Logistic	27	No	Assigned Severity-Self	DUI	**-, p< .001**

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Perceived Swiftness	Crime Type	Findings
Thurman (1989)	319 adults, Oklahoma City	Probability	OLS	6	No	Assigned Swiftness-Self	Tax Cheating	**-, p< .01**
Nagin & Pogarsky (2001)	251 college students, Arizona	Non Prob.	Tobit	10	No	Assigned Swiftness-Self	DUI	-, 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**
Watling & Freeman (2011)	922 people in Unknown Area	Non Prob.	Logistic	13	Yes	Time until Caught-Self	Drug Driving	-, p> .05
Loughran et al (2012b)	478 coll. stud., unknown area, 2010	Non Prob.	OLS	5	No	Assigned Swiftness-Self	DUI	**-, p< .001**
Yao et al (2014)	123 college students, Maryland	Non Prob.	Logistic	27	No	Assigned Swiftness-Self	DUI	+, p> .05

Clarification of Commonly Used Abbreviations in Table 4

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
ANOVA- Analysis of Variance
Assigned Penalty- Penalty level was assigned to the respondent by the researcher
Balt. - Baltimore
CA- California
Coll. Students- College Students

Comp. Crime- Computer Crime
Correl.-Correlation Coefficient
Drug Driving- Drugged Driving
Estimate- Respondents' Estimates of the Penalty Administered for the Crime
GLS- Generalized Least Squares Regression
H.S.- High School
Mar. Dealing- Marijuana Dealing
Neg. Binomial- Negative Binomial Analysis
Non Prob. – Non Probability
OLS- Ordinary Least Squares Regression
Path- Path Analysis
Problem- How big of a Problem Would Getting Caught/arrested, etc., Present in Your life?
Pun. - Punishment
Time Caught to Ad- Time Caught to Adjudication
Time Caught to Pun. – Time Caught to Punishment
Univ.-University

Citation

Loughran et al 2012b in this table refers to the study: Loughran, Thomas, Raymond Paternoster and Douglass Weiss. 2012. "Hyperbolic Time Discounting, Offender Time Preferences and Deterrence. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 28 (1): 607-628.