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FELONY PUNISHMENTS: A FACTORIAL SURVEY OF PERCEIVED JUSTICE IN CRIMINAL SENTENCING

JOANN L. MILLER, PETER H. ROSSI, AND JON E. SIMPSON*

I. INTRODUCTION

The legally justified felony punishment in the contemporary United States supposedly reflects the harm principle—i.e., a penal sanction is justified when it prevents harm to individuals in the society.¹ The just or fair felony punishment supposedly reflects the severity of the offense, indicated in part by the injury, physical or financial, suffered by both the crime victim and the general population.² The just punishment is a social response to a criminal act, devised to prevent some unknown types and number of potential or future criminal acts.³

Law makers and policy makers strive to formulate sentencing procedures and felony punishments that are effective and responsive to the community’s plea for just punishments. Therefore, because public opinion about criminal punishments is politically consequential, it warrants systematic study. In this work we ask: In addition to the seriousness of the crime, what are the factors that influence judgments about felony sentencing?

This research was designed to measure perceptions of appropriate punishments for offenders convicted of various crimes com-
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mitted under differing circumstances. We examine empirically how offense characteristics, offender characteristics, victim characteristics, and survey respondent characteristics influence judgments of felony punishments.

In the following section we present the socio-legal perspective used to frame our research. In section III we summarize the research design and research methods used for the study. In section IV we present empirical findings. In the final section we discuss some of the felony sentencing implications that can be inferred from the research.

II. A SOCIO-LEGAL PERSPECTIVE

This study is guided by the socio-legal notion that "law cannot be understood without regard for the realities of social life." We contend that to explain or predict a legal phenomenon sufficiently, the social context surrounding that phenomenon must be examined. We subscribe to Black’s definitions of the law and criminal law. He states that law is governmental social control. Criminal law specifically is the style of law that “prohibits certain conduct, and it enforces its prohibition with punishment. In the case of violation, the group as a whole takes the initiative against an alleged offender, the question being . . . guilt or innocence.”

Criminal punishments vary quantitatively, ranging from one day in jail to life in prison. Criminal punishments also vary qualitatively, taking such diverse forms as the prison term, the probation term, and the monetary fine.

In this work we examine survey respondents’ recorded judgments of criminal punishments. Generally, we expect to find these judgments reflect dimensions of social life that affect or characterize respondents, criminal perpetrators, criminal acts, and crime victims. Specifically, we expect to find that the respective occupational statuses of the offender and victim, the relationship between the offender and victim, and respondent’s race, gender, and educational attainment are all related to personal judgments of felony punishments. Further we expect to find that survey respondents think corporate offenders deserve harsher criminal punishments than do individual offenders.

---

6 Id. at 4.
III. Research Design and Methods

We designed this study to measure perceptions of appropriate prison sentences for convicted felons. We used a factorial survey approach\(^7\) to elicit from a general population sample, criminal justice samples, and student samples judgments, regarding the punishments appearing in more than 61,000 vignettes describing criminal acts, offenders, and the harm resulting from the crimes. The punishments describe the type of sanction — prison or probation — and the amount of felony punishment meted out for a variety of conviction offenses.

A. Respondent Samples

A modified area probability sample of Boston SMSA households was drawn to represent the non-institutionalized, adult general population. Blocks or groups of blocks were selected with probabilities proportionate to population size. Interviewers from the Center for Survey Research at the University of Massachusetts, Boston, enlisted the cooperation of either four or six individuals age eighteen or older from each block, maintaining equal gender quotas within the blocks. Interviews were conducted during the evening as well as the daytime hours, with no more than two interviews per block conducted with respondents over age sixty-five. This reduced any bias associated with respondent availability. The blocks designated for four respondents are in geographic areas with substantial minority populations. Interviewers completed at least three of the four interviews from these blocks with black individuals.

The adverse design effects of block-quota sampling are well documented.\(^8\) The advantages of this sampling design are also well known and reflected by this research. A total of 741 respondents were interviewed within a one month time frame at a cost far below that which would be required for a sampling strategy requiring call backs to complete interviews.

Column A of Table 1 profiles the Boston general population sample. Respondents, on average, are forty-one years old, largely Catholic, typically maintaining a $26,000 annual net income for a 3.30 person household. Nearly one out of four respondents reports some form of criminal victimization experience within the past six

\(^7\) See Measuring Social Judgments: The Factorial Survey Approach (P.H. Rossi & S. Nock eds. 1982) [hereinafter Judgments].
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TABLE 1
STATISTICAL PROFILES OF RESPONDENT GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(A)</th>
<th>(B)</th>
<th>(C)</th>
<th>(D)</th>
<th>(E)</th>
<th>(F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>41.11</td>
<td>16.78</td>
<td>18.95</td>
<td>25.73</td>
<td>29.87</td>
<td>31.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17.18)</td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
<td>(1.82)</td>
<td>(5.43)</td>
<td>(5.43)</td>
<td>(8.94)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>13.69</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>11.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Years*</td>
<td>(2.70)</td>
<td>(.81)</td>
<td>(1.45)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(1.20)</td>
<td>(2.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>25.98</td>
<td>18.51</td>
<td>16.23</td>
<td>20.07</td>
<td>27.74</td>
<td>11.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Thousands</td>
<td>(15.90)</td>
<td>(11.94)</td>
<td>(11.16)</td>
<td>(13.30)</td>
<td>(14.45)</td>
<td>(17.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Size</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.63)</td>
<td>(2.36)</td>
<td>(3.15)</td>
<td>(2.04)</td>
<td>(1.90)</td>
<td>(2.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion White</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Male</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Catholic</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Protestant</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Victimized in Past Six Months</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N**</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Educational attainment is coded in years, through the code for “high school diploma” (code 12); and, is coded 14 for some college, 16 for college degree, and 18 for professional or graduate school.

** Total number of respondents in a sample.

+ $\bar{X}$ is the mean; (s) is the standard deviation.

months. All told, the general population respondent sample reflects the socio-demographic profile of the Boston SMSA.

For the purpose of representing young persons in the overall sample (especially those who are disproportionately likely to be crime victims), a sample of 226 Roxbury, Massachusetts, high school students and a sample of 135 Chicopee, Massachusetts, Job Corps recruits were approached. (The school-aged respondents as well as the criminal justice respondents discussed below are nonprobability samples and are especially valuable when treated as supplements to our general population sample.)

Three criminal justice samples — police officers, law students, and state prison inmates — were also enlisted. A criminal justice
program at Northeastern University enrolling police, students aspiring to a career in law enforcement, and security guards provided a sample of 128 respondents. A total of 165 law students from Indiana University, Bloomington, also participated in the survey. One-third of the law students surveyed were first-year students while the remaining two-thirds were third-year students. The final criminal justice sample surveyed consisted of thirty-five Norfolk (Massachusetts) State Prison inmates.9

As Table 1 shows, the surveyed law students tended to be young, white men. The police officer sample was slightly older than the law student sample but younger than the prison inmate sample. Compared to the high school students, the Job Corps recruits tended to be somewhat older although less educated. Members of the high school as well as the Job Corps samples tended to be black and Catholic.

The prison inmates who participated in the study were serving time for murder, rape, aggravated assault, robbery, burglary, or weapons' offenses. Thirty-three percent report they were unemployed at the time they committed the crime for which they were imprisoned. Fifty-one percent had not earned the high school diploma.10 This profile did not depart substantially from a nationwide profile of state prison inmates regarding background characteristics or conviction offense.11

B. RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

A factorial survey measurement technique was used to collect data from the Boston general population sample and the supplemental samples of student and criminal justice respondents. This measurement technique was developed by Rossi12 for the purpose of observing how individuals and segments of populations integrate various dimensions of information when forming judgments about complex social phenomema.

The factorial survey technique combines the benefits of traditional survey research with those associated with the experimental

---

9 These inmates were participants in a nationwide survey on illegal weapons ownership and use. See J.D. Wright & P.H. Rossi, Armed and Considered Dangerous: A Survey of Armed Felons (1986). The Massachusetts Commissioner of Corrections approved our administration of survey instruments to these individuals.

10 The nationwide state prison population is young (most are under age thirty-five), relatively uneducated (61.6% do not have the high school diploma), unemployed at the time the conviction offense was committed, and typically in prison for a violent offense.


12 See Judgments, supra note 7.
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design. Factorial survey research instruments are administered to samples of respondents, selected by using conventional sampling designs, to represent the population(s) under investigation. The factorial objects judged by respondents are computer generated "vignettes" consisting of randomly assigned values for selected variables. The random assignment method for constructing vignettes generates approximately asymptotically orthogonal independent variables, making multiple regression techniques ideal for estimating the unbiased net effect of each variable appearing in the vignettes on the respondents' judgments.

To conduct this particular factorial survey, we used two types of survey instruments. First, we developed a traditional survey questionnaire to obtain personal background information and information about attitudes regarding crime and other social problems. Second, a booklet of "vignettes" describing various illegal incidents and the punishments given out for them was computer-generated for each individual survey respondent.

To create the vignettes for this study, we rotated twenty distinct dimensions of information (i.e., independent variables), describing the type and amount of punishment hypothetically meted out for several different crimes, committed by various offenders under differing circumstances. Some of the independent variables are nominal (offender and victim race and gender, for example), while other independent variables are ordinal or interval (such as amount of money stolen or number of prior felony convictions). Each vignette set is a unique random subset drawn from the universe of all possible combinations of the different levels of the twenty vignette dimensions. (See Appendix A for the vignette variables and their levels.)

The vignette booklets generated for the high school student sample and the first-year law student sample each contained twenty-five different vignettes. The booklets generated for the remaining respondents each contained fifty different vignettes. Regardless of the number of vignettes contained in a booklet, all respondents judged four different types of crimes; for the sake of convenience, these have been categorized as violent crimes, property crimes, public disorder crimes, and corporate crimes.

13 Some applications of the factorial survey design "restrict" possible combinations to what is plausible in the empirical world. Restrictions can result in correlated independent variables. In this application of the design we only restricted one variable, i.e., gender of rape offenders and victims. That is, all rape offenders are described in the vignettes as men and all rape victims are women. As a result, we can claim our independent variables, by design, are unrelated.
Figure 1 shows an example of a violent crime vignette and an example of a corporate crime vignette. After reading each vignette, the respondent places an “X” on its rating line to indicate the degree to which the criminal sanction meted out for the incident described in the vignette is too lenient, about right, or too harsh.

We coded the vignette ratings in the direction of harshness on a 125 point scale. The midpoint on the scale (62.5) reflects the perception that the type and the amount of punishment is “about right” for the incident. When respondents judge the sentence to be “too lenient” they are calling for more sanction than what appears in the vignette. When they think the sentence is “too harsh” they are calling for less sanction than what is given out to the offender.

**FIGURE 1**

(A) **VIOLENT CRIME VIGNETTE**

Victor J., a white, employed sewing machine operator, was convicted of intentionally shooting his friend, Laura L., a housewife. The victim required two weeks hospitalization.

In the last five years, the offender has not been arrested or convicted. The offender claims to have been taking drugs at the time.

Victor J. was sentenced to 10 years in prison.

The sentence given was . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Must</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Too</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>About Right</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) **CORPORATE CRIME VIGNETTE**

A very large nationwide company was convicted of cheating on its federal income tax to avoid the payment of $1,000.

Over the past five years, this company has been in court many times on charges like this. The company claims that such practices are the only way to survive in a very competitive industry.

The officials responsible for the crime were sentenced to five years in prison. The sentence was suspended with probation for the duration of the original sentence.

The sentence given was . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Must</th>
<th>Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Too</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>About Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A total of 61,025 cases of information appear in the data files resulting from this application of the factorial survey design. Each vignette constitutes a separate case of information containing values for the vignette variables, the vignette rating, and values corresponding to the respondent information obtained from the background questionnaire.

As reported elsewhere,\textsuperscript{14} multiple regression was used to explain harshness ratings as a function of vignette variables and personal background characteristics. (Independent variables in the equation are treated appropriately as nominal, ordinal, or interval data in the multiple regression analyses.) The dependent variable, i.e., the harshness rating, is the respondent's perception of the type (prison versus probation) and the amount (ranging from "3 months in jail" to "more than 10 years in prison") of court imposed punishment meted out in response to various felony convictions. For the purposes of this research, we use mean vignette ratings\textsuperscript{15} and partial regression coefficients taken from the results of multiple regression analyses. The coefficients are estimates of the net, unbiased effects of social factors on felony punishment judgments, controlling for: crime seriousness, the injury or financial loss resulting from the offense, offender's prior criminal history, and the mitigating (or aggravating) circumstances surrounding the criminal act.

We present empirical findings that correspond to two different levels of analysis: the respondent characteristic, and the vignette level.\textsuperscript{16} Figure 2 shows how data at various levels of analysis are produced by the factorial survey method of measurement. Column A shows that six distinctive respondent groups participated in this particular study. Column B shows that respondent characteristics vary, and they are related somewhat to the respondent groups. Column C shows that vignette parameters describe four different types of criminal offenses. Factorial object parameters (Column C), by design, are unrelated to either respondent group (Column A) or respondent characteristics (Column B). Thus, controlling for vignette


\textsuperscript{15} In a factorial survey all the values appearing in the vignettes are assigned and combined randomly. This method results in an overall mean vignette rating (a harshness rating) that can be interpreted as a global judgment tendency, one reflecting respondents' considerations of all the dimensions of information rotated in the vignettes. Likewise the intercept resulting from an OLS analysis can also be interpreted as a rating tendency in that the intercept is the predicted value of the dependent variable when all the independent variables in the equation are set to zero.

\textsuperscript{16} Contact the paper's first author for respondent group level of analysis findings that are based on this research.
FIGURE 2
LEVELS OF ANALYSIS

Respondent Group | Respondent Characteristics | Vignette Parameters | Vignette Ratings
--- | --- | --- | ---
4. Law Students | 4. Education | 
5. Police | 5. Occupation | 
6. Prisoners | 6. Income | 
7. Victimization
8. Attitudinal Measures

C is unrelated to A or B.
A to D = structural (group) level effects
B to D = respondent level effects
C to D = vignette level effects

parameters, it is possible to estimate the respondent group effects and the respondent characteristic effects on vignette ratings. Further, one can estimate, independently of the respondent group or characteristic level effects, the vignette parameter effects.

IV. FINDINGS

A. SOCIAL STATUS

Researchers have made numerous attempts to establish the relationship (or lack thereof) between some indicator of offender or victim social status and disparity or discrimination in the distribu-
tion of criminal sanctions. This inconclusive research literature persuaded us to explore the association between social status and vignette harshness judgments at two levels of analysis.

First, at the vignette level of analysis, we use occupational status, a proxy for social status in the contemporary United States society, to examine how the relationship between the victim's and the offender's status influences the vignette harshness judgments. Second, at the respondent group level of analysis, we examine differences in harshness ratings across the gender and race segments of the general population. Our premise is that the race and gender segments are differentially positioned in the contemporary U.S. society, and their felony punishment judgments correspond to their vertical ranks or positions.

1. Vignette level of analysis

The violent crime vignettes created for this study varied the occupation of both the offender and the victim. We used Duncan occupational prestige scores adapted for use with the current census to code numerically offender and victim occupational prestige. We classified the vignettes by whether the offender had either a lower or a higher social status than the victim of the crime.

### TABLE 2

**SOCIAL STATUS OF OFFENDER AND VICTIM VERSUS HARSHNESS RATING OF CRIMINAL INCIDENTS WITH ALL RESPONDENT SAMPLES POOLED**

*Vignette Level of Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Status</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Shoot</th>
<th>Stab</th>
<th>Beat-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>93.83</td>
<td>85.28</td>
<td>82.90</td>
<td>65.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s)</td>
<td>(29.38)</td>
<td>(29.49)</td>
<td>(30.92)</td>
<td>(35.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Lower&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>92.39</td>
<td>84.56</td>
<td>83.07&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>69.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s)</td>
<td>(30.32)</td>
<td>(30.19)</td>
<td>(30.71)</td>
<td>(34.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Higher&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>99.03</td>
<td>88.33</td>
<td>84.13</td>
<td>63.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s)</td>
<td>(24.64)</td>
<td>(27.09)</td>
<td>(30.77)</td>
<td>(35.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Includes vignettes showing no difference in offender and victim occupation and vignettes in which the offender and victim occupation did not appear.

<sup>b</sup> Offender occupational prestige is less than victim occupational prestige.

<sup>c</sup> The difference between the means in this category is not statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

<sup>d</sup> Offender occupational prestige is greater than victim occupational prestige.

<sup>e</sup> The t-value concerns the difference in means for offender “lower” and “higher” mean ratings.

Table 2 shows the mean vignette ratings characterizing all the respondent samples discussed above (i.e., general population, student, and criminal justice samples) for four specific violent crimes appearing in the vignettes. They are described in the vignettes as “rape,” “intentional shooting,” “intentional stabbing,” and “beating up with fists” (assault and battery). Additional incidents of violence appeared in the vignettes but they are not similar in nature to the offenses examined here. For example, “planting a bomb,” “causing an accident while recklessly driving,” and “threatening to injure” are qualitatively different than such behaviors traditionally defined as battery or rape. The ratings for these additional forms of violence are not reported in this paper.
An inspection of the mean vignette ratings shows that offenders with higher social status than their victims, controlling for the severity of the offense and the outcome of the crime, elicit harsher felony punishment judgments when a "rape," "shooting," or "stabbing" offense is committed. Offenders with a lower social status than their victims elicit harsher felony punishment judgments when their victims are injured from assault and battery offenses.

The vignettes generated for this application of the factorial survey varied the injury sustained by victims, for all acts of violence, ranging from "no physical injury" to "death." Whether the violent act is an assault or a stabbing, the variation in injury is identical. This design effect impels us to argue an interaction exists between the vignette offense and the relationship between offender and victim occupational prestige, i.e., social status. If the criminal offense is a rape or a shooting, and the offense is committed by a person enjoying a higher social status than the victim, respondents call for punishments that are more severe than those that would be meted out to lower status offenders committing similar offenses.

2. Respondent characteristic level of analysis

In Table 3 we show mean vignette ratings for the four types of crimes. The ratings are aggregated across the race and gender segments of the general population. We use race and gender designations to indicate vertical distances among segments of society, arguably a structural indicator of social stratification. Men and whites, relative to women and blacks, maintain higher ranks in society as measured by income, educational attainment, or political power. At this respondent characteristic level of analysis, we see

---

19 The differences in mean ratings are statistically significant for all offenses except stabbing.
that women make harsher vignette judgments than men, regardless of crime type. We see also that when judging sanctions for property offenses, disorder offenses, and corporate offenses, blacks make harsher judgments than whites. Finally, we see that punishments given out for crimes of violence are judged most harshly by white women and least harshly by black women.22

**TABLE 3**

**SOCIAL STATUS: RACE AND GENDER DIFFERENCES**

*Respondent Group Level of Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Type</th>
<th>Violence</th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Disorder</th>
<th>Corporate Crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>75.63</td>
<td>59.63</td>
<td>46.60</td>
<td>66.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s)</td>
<td>(35.60)</td>
<td>(33.44)</td>
<td>(33.95)</td>
<td>(33.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,298</td>
<td>6,998</td>
<td>5,082</td>
<td>3,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>78.12</td>
<td>61.93</td>
<td>50.73</td>
<td>69.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s)</td>
<td>(33.55)</td>
<td>(32.22)</td>
<td>(32.45)</td>
<td>(31.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,182</td>
<td>7,001</td>
<td>4,983</td>
<td>3,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>75.27*</td>
<td>61.68</td>
<td>51.91</td>
<td>71.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s)</td>
<td>(37.04)</td>
<td>(34.92)</td>
<td>(34.72)</td>
<td>(32.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>1,472</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>74.83</td>
<td>68.28</td>
<td>55.73</td>
<td>75.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s)</td>
<td>(35.38)</td>
<td>(34.21)</td>
<td>(33.75)</td>
<td>(31.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The difference between the black men’s and the black women’s mean rating is not statistically significant at the .05 level.

*Significance of Race, 15 Society 56 (1978); W.J. Wilson, THE TRULY DISADVANTAGED: THE INNER CITY, THE UNDERCLASS, AND PUBLIC POLICY (1987).*

22 Although not reported here, we also examined the intercepts resulting from multiple regression analyses of the vignette ratings for the four distinctive types of crime scenarios. The multiple regression analysis explains variance in vignette ratings as a function of all of the dimensions of information rotated in the vignettes. Thus, the intercepts should be interpreted as the expected vignette ratings characterizing a segment of the general population when the values for all the dimensions rotated in this application of the factorial survey design are set to zero. Said differently, the intercepts, as well as the mean vignette ratings, should be interpreted as indicators of the judgment tendency representing the race and gender segments of the general population.

With the exception of a single intercept pertaining to black men judging crimes of
B. VICTIM-OFFENDER INTIMACY

Controlling for the nature of the offense and the harm resulting from the crime, the socio-legal perspective that guides our research leads us to expect that respondents would form vignette judgments that are the most harsh when a stranger offends a victim. We anticipate the least harsh judgments to be in response to vignettes describing punishments for a spouse harming a spouse in a criminal act of violence. These expectations, although problematic to those who seek justice in punishing the criminally liable, are derived from the research literature regarding criminal justice and family violence.23

Table 4 shows the partial regression coefficients taken from a single equation model specified to account for variance in violent crime vignette ratings as a function of all dimensions of information rotated in the vignettes. We show unstandardized dummy variable coefficients; “No relationship between the victim and the offender” in the vignette is the omitted category in the block of dummy variables. One can interpret these coefficients as the net increase or decrease in harshness ratings estimated for the relationship type specified, controlling for the nature of the act, the harm resulting from the act, the mitigating or aggravating circumstances surrounding the act, and various characteristics describing crime victims and criminal offenders.

The coefficients displayed in Table 4 are from analyses of white male and white female harshness ratings. (The black analyses show no pattern that is relevant to the problem explored here.) For white respondents, injuring a spouse — compared to injuring an individual whose relationship to the offender is not specified — has an average net effect of decreasing harshness by six units on a 125 unit rating scale. White men call for more punishment as relational distance increases from “spouse” to “friend.” White women call for

---

### Table 4
Victim-Offender Intimacy

**Vignette Level of Analysis**

Partial Regression Coefficients Taken From Analysis of Crimes of Violence Vignettes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation Between Offender &amp; Victim</th>
<th>General Population White Male Regression Coefficients</th>
<th>General Population White Female Regression Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b(^+) \hspace{1em} (S.E.)</td>
<td>b \hspace{1em} (S.E.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>-5.350(***) \hspace{1em} (1.822)</td>
<td>-6.338(***) \hspace{1em} (1.763)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>-4.026(*)\hspace{1em} (1.606)</td>
<td>6.085(***) \hspace{1em} (1.547)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>-2.964 \hspace{1em} (1.637)</td>
<td>-4.255(**) \hspace{1em} (1.575)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>-.768 \hspace{1em} (1.626)</td>
<td>1.043 \hspace{1em} (1.591)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>47.815(***) \hspace{1em} (2.262)</td>
<td>56.172(***) \hspace{1em} (2.245)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R\(^2\) Value from full equation: .468\(***\) \hspace{1em} .456\(***\)

N: 3,298 \hspace{1em} 3,182

* p < 0.05 \hspace{1em} \(+ b\) is regression coefficient; (S.E.) is standard error.

** p < 0.01

*** p < 0.001

More punishment when relational distance increases from “spouse” to “acquaintance.” When the offender and the victim are “strangers” to each other, the vignette harshness ratings are not significantly different from the ratings for vignettes that do not describe any victim-offender relationship. We believe this indicates that respondents generally think “stranger” crimes deserve more punishment than crimes committed by offenders who are at least acquainted with their victims.

C. Respondent’s Educational Attainment

We anticipate that a respondent’s educational attainment, also a
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structural indicator of social status in American society, is associated with harshness in judgments of felony punishments. To probe that possibility, we array the mean vignette ratings by five traditional thresholds of educational attainment. Table 5 shows the results of this respondent characteristic level of analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment Level</th>
<th>Mean Vignette Rating</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school diploma</td>
<td>64.13</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma</td>
<td>63.25</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>61.55</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree</td>
<td>60.79</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or Professional degree</td>
<td>56.93</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We find that differences in mean harshness ratings for adjacent educational attainment levels are not statistically significant. However, respondents without a high school diploma make vignette judgments that are the most harsh, whereas those having graduate or professional degrees make judgments that are the least harsh. No educational group rating departs whatsoever from the overall pattern: as educational attainment increases, average vignette ratings decrease in harshness.

D. CORPORATE CRIME VICTIMS AND CORPORATE OFFENDERS

1. A victim perspective

Contemporary and conventional research on perceptions of corporate crime generally tries to establish the notion that corporate criminals are treated (or judged) more or less harshly than indi-

---


25 This analysis is based on the ratings made by the general population respondent sample only.

26 We used ANOVA to examine the association between education and vignette ratings overall (F=7.58, 4 d.f., ≤ 0.0001) and find at least provisional statistical confirmation for our claim regarding education and harshness ratings.
individual offenders. In this research we also examine whether respondents' perceptions of appropriate felony punishments are influenced by the crime victim being an organization, rather than an individual. We compare mean vignette ratings for two "trespassing" offenses as shown in Table 6. The vignettes generated for this application of the factorial survey design rotated the dollar loss amounts for all relevant crimes (see Appendix A, dimension E). Regardless of the particular crime descriptor appearing in the vignette, the range of dollar loss is identical. This design effect permits us to argue that it is the corporate crime victim that elicits an increase in harshness ratings.

**TABLE 6**

**CORPORATE CRIME VICTIM**

**Vignette Level of Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harshness Ratings for Trespassing Offenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backyard Trespass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Trespass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t = 2.25, p ≤ 0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. An offender perspective

Do corporate offenders enjoy an immunity from the law that some theorists predict? The data presented in Table 7 indicate no empirical support for a corporate immunity hypothesis. Panel A shows that respondents rate the corporate tax evasion offense to warrant more punishment than the individual tax evasion offense. As remarked above, the range or amounts evaded are identical for the corporate and the individual offense, permitting us to conclude that the corporate offender, and not the amount of income tax evaded, explains our finding.

In Panel B of Table 7 we show the overall mean vignette rating for crimes committed by individuals that are financially motivated (called "property crimes"), and crimes committed by corporations (called "corporate crimes") that are financially motivated. We find that sample survey respondents call for more punishment against corporations that engage in illegal acts for profit than for individuals

---


28 See D. BLACK, supra note 17, at 42-44.
TABLE 7
CORPORATE CRIMINAL OFFENDER

Vignette Level of Analysis

(A) AVERAGE HARSHNESS RATING FOR INCOME TAX EVASION OFFENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminal Act</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>(s)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Tax Evasion</td>
<td>41.23</td>
<td>31.07</td>
<td>1,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Tax Evasion</td>
<td>53.16</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>1,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( t = 7.06, p &lt; 0.001 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) OVERALL HARSHNESS FOR INDIVIDUAL PROPERTY AND CORPORATE CRIMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminal Act</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>(s)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Crimes</td>
<td>60.01</td>
<td>33.34</td>
<td>23,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Crimes</td>
<td>66.18</td>
<td>32.92</td>
<td>11,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( t = 16.38, p &lt; 0.001 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

whose criminal acts are at least apparently motivated by financial gain. Based on these findings, we conclude that theoretical propositions concerning corporate immunity are not tenable when predicting or explaining how members of society perceive appropriate felony punishments. We argue that, from society's point of view, corporate offenders deserve more punishment than individual criminal offenders.

We recognize that the felony punishment deemed appropriate for offenders does not necessarily correspond to what is actually meted out by trial courts. Many researchers find, using qualitative as well as quantitative indicators, that corporations are (or have been, historically) the recipients of less severe criminal punishment than individual criminal offenders.\(^{29}\) An examination of the punishments meted out to corporations may indeed provide support for a corporate immunity proposition. Respondents in this study, however, appear to reject the notion that corporations should enjoy immunity from the law.

The socio-legal orientation that framed this study, combined with the factorial survey research design, produced an uncommon understanding of felony punishment judgments. The study validates the notion that legalistic features of crime are not the sole determinants of perceived justice in criminal sentencing. It highlights the need to account for the social factors that prejudice opinions.

We believe this study shows that perceptions of justice in criminal sanctions reflect complex social judgments. The factorial survey design we used enabled us to examine the net and unbiased effects of numerous social factors on the judgment-making process. We contend that the factorial survey design is an important tool for understanding felony punishment judgments and other socio-legal phenomena.

Our investigation demonstrates that the relationship between the criminal perpetrator and the victim, and between the offender's social status and that of the victim's social status, influences attitudes of appropriate sanctions. Conventional research fails to examine the relationship between victim and offender characteristics — a social factor, which interacts with legal factors, such as statutorily defined crime severity — in effecting judgments of felony punishments.

We find that socio-demographic characteristics, i.e., race, gender and education, influence respondents' judgments about what constitutes suitable criminal sanctions. We conclude that survey respondents' judgments simultaneously reflect their own social structural positions and the social structural positions of perpetrators and victims of criminal incidents.

We also find that the respondents call for an increase in punishment severity when either the crime victim, or the criminal offender is a corporation, and not an individual. We believe events, such as criminal political misconduct and corporate misconduct that have headlined the U.S. news over the past decade may explain this finding. The moral indignation expressed toward the corporate offender intimates that organizations engaging in criminal conduct, according to survey respondents representing the general population and several elements the criminal justice system, deserve felony punishments that are more severe than those given out to individual offenders.

We quite clearly see that thoughts of justice are filtered through the social context in which criminal behavior occurs. Our research implies that perceptions of justice, inferred from evaluations of felony sanctions, reflect discretionary judgments and considerations of
structural aspects of society. Perceptions of justice parallel Roscoe Pound's classic portrait regarding the actual administration of justice:

[I]n no legal system, however minute and detailed its body of rules, is justice administered wholly by rule and without any recourse to the will of the judge and his personal sense of what should be done to achieve a just result in the case before him. Both elements are to be found in all administration of justice.30

We invite legal and sociological researchers to bring the *socio-legal* perspective — with appropriate research design — to bear on future inquiries of justice perceptions.

APPENDIX A

VIGNETTE DIMENSIONS

(A) Crime
A = aggregate (corporate) offender
I = injury crime (violence)
L = financial loss crime
P = person (individual) crime
R = offender-victim relationship specified

P L 1 Snatching a handbag on the street, stealing
P L 2 Threatening someone with a weapon and demanding
P L 3 Breaking into a home and stealing property worth
P L 4 Breaking into a home carrying a gun and stealing
P L 5 Breaking into a government building and stealing
P L 6 Breaking into a neighborhood store and stealing
P L 7 Breaking into a department store and stealing
P L 8 Intentionally setting fire to a building causing damages worth
P L 9 Knowingly trespassing on the property of a business and
stealing property worth
P L 10 Trespass in backyard and steal property worth
P L 11 Stealing from a locked car property worth
P L 12 Using stolen credit card to charge purchases worth
P L 13 Stealing merchandise from a department store amounting to
P L 14 Cheating on federal income tax return to avoid the payment of
P L 15 Robbing a bank with a gun and stealing
P L 16 Passing worthless checks and stealing
P L 17 Forging a fake name to a check and stealing
P L 18 Stealing a car, causing damages amounting to
P L 19 Stealing property from place of employment worth
P L 20 Embezzling money amounting to
P L 21 As a public official, taking bribes amounting to
PI L 22 Using a gun to rob someone, stealing
PI 23 Planting a bomb in a public building that explodes while
someone is in the building
PI 24 Causing an accident while recklessly driving
PI R 25 Intentionally stabbing
PI R 26 Forcibly raping
PI R 27 Intentionally shooting
PI R 28 Intentionally pushing or shoving
PI R 29 Intentionally injuring
PI R 30 Beating up with fists
P R 31 Threatening to injure seriously
P 32 Being drunk in a public place
P 33 Loitering in a public place
P 34 Repeated refusal to pay a number of parking fines
P 35 Resisting lawful arrest
P 36 Selling heroin
P 37 Selling marijuana
P 38 Carrying a firearm without a proper license
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P 39 Smoking marijuana
P 40 Deliberately making a false arrest while on duty as a police officer
P 41 Making an obscene phone call
P 42 Driving a car while drunk
P 43 Joining a prohibited demonstration
P 44 Lying under oath during a court trial
P 45 Stealing a car to resell it
P 46 Using cocaine
A 47 Knowingly selling contaminated food to a customer
A 48 Operating a store knowingly selling stolen property
A 49 Deliberately mislabelling lower quality goods to sell at higher prices
A 50 Conspiring with several companies to fix illegally the retail prices of their products
A 51 Threatening to fire workers if they join a union
A 52 Making and selling pharmaceutical products known to be harmful to users
A 53 Selling cars known to be dangerously defective to buyers
A 54 Overcharging on repairs to an appliance
A 55 Refusing to make essential repairs to rentals
A 56 Overcharging for credit in selling goods
A L 57 Cheating on its federal income tax return avoiding the payment of

(B) Length of Prison Sentence

3 months in jail
6 months in jail
1 year in prison
2 years in prison
3 years in prison
5 years in prison
7 years in prison
10 years in prison
More than 10 years in prison

(C) Suspended Sentence Given

Sentence was suspended
Sentence was suspended with probation for the duration of the original sentence

Blank text

(D) Injury

No injury specified
Victim was not injured
Victim was hurt but did not require medical attention
Victim required medical attention
Victim required 2 weeks hospitalization
Victim received permanent physical injury
Victim died

(E) Dollar Amount for Theft Crimes
No amount specified
Under $20
$20
$50
$100
$500
$1,000

(F) Offender Name (sex)
None specified
Male names
Female names
(If Crime is rape, the offender name is restricted to a male name)

(G) Offender Age
Not applicable
18
20
22
24
25
26
30
40
Blank text

(H) Offender Race
Not applicable
White
Black
Hispanic
Blank text

(I) Offender Employment Status
Not applicable
Unemployed
Employed
Blank text
Houseperson

(J) Offender Occupation
Not applicable
Car washer
Construction laborer
Cook
Parking lot attendant
Store clerk
Assembly line worker
Car salesperson
Bus driver
Cleaning person
Restaurant worker
Telephone operator
Office clerk
Office manager
Business manager
Bookkeeper
Drill press operator
Sewing machine operator
Teacher
Business owner
Blank text

(K) Prior Record of Individual Offender
Not applicable
Not arrested or convicted
Arrested once but not convicted
Convicted once but not sent to prison
Convicted twice and sent to prison once
Convicted and sent to prison more than twice
Blank text

(L) Mitigating Circumstances for Individual Offender Crime
Not applicable
Taking drugs
Very drunk
Worried over money to support family
Very sorry for the crime
Committed the crime for the sake of the family
Currently seeking a counselor for help in solving personal problems
Offered to make up for the crime by paying damages
Blank text

(M) Offender - Victim Relationship
Not applicable
Spouse
Friend
Acquaintance
Stranger
Blank text

(N) Victim Name
Not applicable
Female name
Male name
(If Crime is rape, victim name is restricted to a female name)

(O) Victim Age
Same as Offender age (G)

(P) Victim Employment Status
Same as Offender employment status (I)

(Q) Victim Occupation
Same as Offender occupation (J)

(R) Size of Company
Not applicable
Very large nationwide
Large
Small
A company

(S) Prior Record for Corporate Crime
Not applicable
Has never been in court on charges like this
Many complaints, first time found guilty
Been in court many times on charges like this
Blank text

(T) Mitigating Circumstances for Corporate Crime
Not applicable
All competitors do the same
Such practices are the only way to survive
Trying to save jobs for workers
Would have gone bankrupt
Law violated was unconstitutional
## APPENDIX B

**GENDER BY RACE GROUP ANALYSIS**

**HARSHNESS RATINGS OF CRIMES OF VIOLENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White Men</th>
<th>White Women</th>
<th>Black Men</th>
<th>Black Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b (S.E.)</td>
<td>b (S.E.)</td>
<td>b (S.E.)</td>
<td>b (S.E.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime seriousness</td>
<td>.045***</td>
<td>.035***</td>
<td>.036***</td>
<td>.033***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.002)</td>
<td>(.002)</td>
<td>(.005)</td>
<td>(.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.346)</td>
<td>(.343)</td>
<td>(.906)</td>
<td>(.910)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended Sentence (dummy)</td>
<td>14.442***</td>
<td>20.702***</td>
<td>6.478</td>
<td>11.825**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.365)</td>
<td>(1.355)</td>
<td>(3.666)</td>
<td>(4.154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation (dummy)</td>
<td>13.678***</td>
<td>15.955***</td>
<td>12.404***</td>
<td>17.089***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.414)</td>
<td>(1.354)</td>
<td>(3.754)</td>
<td>(3.611)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical treatment</td>
<td>9.111***</td>
<td>10.156***</td>
<td>7.039**</td>
<td>12.532***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.109)</td>
<td>(1.067)</td>
<td>(2.957)</td>
<td>(2.951)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.375)</td>
<td>(1.340)</td>
<td>(3.590)</td>
<td>(3.557)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim died</td>
<td>36.845***</td>
<td>36.880***</td>
<td>28.717***</td>
<td>33.438***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.385)</td>
<td>(1.359)</td>
<td>(3.964)</td>
<td>(3.797)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender attributes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>−.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.042)</td>
<td>(.041)</td>
<td>(.108)</td>
<td>(.113)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (dummy)</td>
<td>1.486</td>
<td>−.959</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>−2.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.054)</td>
<td>(1.105)</td>
<td>(2.802)</td>
<td>(2.905)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (dummy)</td>
<td>−1.573</td>
<td>−6.997***</td>
<td>−1.220</td>
<td>−16.196***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.874)</td>
<td>(1.756)</td>
<td>(5.581)</td>
<td>(4.335)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houseperson (dummy)</td>
<td>−5.266</td>
<td>4.092</td>
<td>−10.008</td>
<td>2.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.971)</td>
<td>(3.287)</td>
<td>(8.913)</td>
<td>(9.815)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>−.110</td>
<td>1.389</td>
<td>1.806</td>
<td>−.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.985)</td>
<td>(1.065)</td>
<td>(2.830)</td>
<td>(2.816)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td>−.010</td>
<td>−.013</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>−.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.019)</td>
<td>(.018)</td>
<td>(.048)</td>
<td>(.048)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal history:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No arrests</td>
<td>−6.336***</td>
<td>−7.764***</td>
<td>−6.449</td>
<td>−9.609**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.384)</td>
<td>(1.350)</td>
<td>(3.789)</td>
<td>(3.619)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One arrest</td>
<td>−.797</td>
<td>−.451</td>
<td>−4.106</td>
<td>−6.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.375)</td>
<td>(1.332)</td>
<td>(3.617)</td>
<td>(3.630)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior prison</td>
<td>7.375***</td>
<td>5.982***</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>8.320*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.365)</td>
<td>(1.318)</td>
<td>(3.670)</td>
<td>(3.640)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivist</td>
<td>9.667***</td>
<td>7.957***</td>
<td>6.836</td>
<td>4.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.356)</td>
<td>(1.323)</td>
<td>(3.737)</td>
<td>(3.557)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigating circumstances:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay damages</td>
<td>−.712</td>
<td>−3.015</td>
<td>−4.038</td>
<td>−3.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.842)</td>
<td>(1.751)</td>
<td>(4.977)</td>
<td>(4.694)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial worries</td>
<td>−4.464*</td>
<td>−3.001</td>
<td>−2.052</td>
<td>−6.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.830)</td>
<td>(1.799)</td>
<td>(4.791)</td>
<td>(4.654)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>−6.252***</td>
<td>−3.924*</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>−7.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.817)</td>
<td>(1.804)</td>
<td>(4.760)</td>
<td>(4.948)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intoxicated</td>
<td>−.583</td>
<td>−1.978</td>
<td>−.525</td>
<td>−2.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.819)</td>
<td>(1.778)</td>
<td>(4.716)</td>
<td>(4.800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>3.038</td>
<td>−.642</td>
<td>8.039</td>
<td>−7.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.794)</td>
<td>(1.823)</td>
<td>(5.031)</td>
<td>(4.765)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family sake</td>
<td>−.353</td>
<td>−1.473</td>
<td>−.088</td>
<td>−8.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.805)</td>
<td>(1.814)</td>
<td>(4.697)</td>
<td>(4.748)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Victim attributes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>(.041)</td>
<td>1.621</td>
<td>3.180*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (dummy)</td>
<td>5.128***</td>
<td>(.039)</td>
<td>2.070</td>
<td>5.128***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houseperson (dummy)</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>(.110)</td>
<td>1.973</td>
<td>5.128***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed (dummy)</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>(.105)</td>
<td>1.915</td>
<td>5.128***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status</td>
<td>-.078*</td>
<td>(.043)</td>
<td>1.973</td>
<td>5.128***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Victim-Offender Relationship:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>-5.350***</td>
<td>(1.822)</td>
<td>1.591</td>
<td>5.128***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>-4.026*</td>
<td>(1.606)</td>
<td>1.547</td>
<td>5.128***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>-2.682</td>
<td>(4.992)</td>
<td>4.421</td>
<td>5.128***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>47.815***</td>
<td>(2.262)</td>
<td>4.357</td>
<td>5.128***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R²            | .468***     | .456***        | .323***| .458***   |

Mean          | 75.630      | 78.117         | 75.269| 74.829     |

Standard Deviation | 33.602 | 33.554 | 37.038 | 35.383

N             | 3,298       | 3,182          | 685   | 527        |

* p < .05,  
** p < .01,  
*** p < .001