Crime-prone individuals are more likely to choose theft and violence regardless of motivators and deterrence.

Background
- That individuals first perceive and then choose an action alternative is, according to Situational Action Theory (SAT), the fundamental process explaining a criminal act.
- Prior work has generally found support for the process but has mainly focused on violence at one (1) time point.
- The aim of this study is to test the “perception-choice process” also for theft, as well as for two time points within the same sample.

Additional finding, and conclusion
- Adolescents appear to be more sensitive to monitoring (deterrence) when it comes to theft, but more sensitive to motivation when it comes to violence.
- The ‘perception-choice process’ works according to expectations, also across time.

Method
- Data from the longitudinal project “Malmö Individual and Neighbourhood Development Study” (MINDS). Time1, n = 504; Time2, n=516.
- Four randomized scenarios manipulating motivation (temptation/provocation) and monitoring (presence or no presence). Not the same wording across time points.
- Crime propensity = morality + self-control.
- “How likely are you to…?”:
  0 = (Very) unlikely; 1 = (very) likely.
- Generalized Linear Model with a logit link in a Bayesian framework (Hamiltonian Monte Carlo) using the R-package “rethinking”. Priors for intercepts and slopes: ~dnorm(0, 1.5).

"Testing the Situational Action Theory’s perception-choice process using randomized scenarios." 
Alberto Chrysoulakis, Malmö university.
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