
Index

- Advisory Council on the Penal System,
guidelines of 22–23
- aims of current study 1–3, 5, 8, 15, 20
see also overview of current study; scope of
current study
- alternative decision model
evidence for 160, 162–163, 169–170
see also hypothesized decision model
limitations of 163–164, 164–165, 252–253
models of Ashworth and Thomas compared
to 164
principles of 160–162, 169, 222
quantification (algebraic model) of
237–246
testing, method for *see* fictitious cases
validity of
 component sentences 216–222
 effective sentences 222–236
- armature
formulation of 252–260
multiple offenders, as a solution to the
theoretical problem of 252–260
nature of 3, 262, 263
numerical guideline, in role as 260–262
- Canadian Sentencing Commission, guidelines
of 23
- decision model
armature, as the *see* armature
decision strategy, in the form of a *see*
decision strategy
development of *see* modelling, general
principles of
ideal 1, 3, 30, 79, 172–173, 206, 245–246
multiple counts, for *see* alternative decision
model; hypothesized decision model
numerical guideline, in the form of a *see*
numerical guidelines
prescriptive 3, 172–173, 206, 245–246
psychology, in *see* psychology
requisite 4–5, 205–207
see also modelling, general principles of
single counts and multiple counts (same
kind), for *see* single counts and
multiple counts (same kind), sentencing
of
- decision strategy
Ashworth's account of *see* multiple counts,
sentencing of
multiple counts, for 160–162, 169, 222
nature of in current study 1–2, 245–246
single counts and multiple counts (same
kind), for 39–40, 47–48
Thomas's account of *see* multiple counts,
sentencing of; single counts and
multiple counts (same kind), sentencing
of
- fictitious cases
alternative decision model, as tests of
administration 196–201, 201–202
data analysis
 administration of cases 213, 215–216
 general considerations 169–170, 176,
 204, 212, 216–217
 judges' comments on exercise
 213–214
formulation 170–171, 176–196
relevance 170
sample of judges 198, 214–215
validity 171–175
hypothesized decision model, as tests of *see*
sentencing problems

- hypothesized decision model
 - formulation of 7, 30–35, 52–56, 60–61
 - principles of 56–60
 - propositions, testable 62–65
 - testing, method for *see* fictitious cases; verbal protocols; sentencing problems
 - validity of
 - Proposition 1 138
 - Proposition 2 100–104
 - Proposition 3 104–107
 - Proposition 4 107–112
 - Proposition 5 138–139
 - Proposition 6 112–113
 - Proposition 7 139–142
 - Proposition 8 113–118
 - Proposition 9 142–145
 - Proposition 10 118–128
 - Proposition 11 145–146
 - Proposition 12 128–131
 - Proposition 13 131–137
 - Proposition 14 146–149
 - summary 150–154
- intuition
 - guidance, in association with 20–21, 260–262
 - nature of
 - general 18
 - judicial
 - actual 165–168
 - predicted 8, 18–20
 - actual 165
 - predicted 8, 15–18
 - sentencing of, place in
 - studying, method for *see* verbal protocols
 - Judicial Commission of New South Wales, guidelines of 23–25
 - modelling, general principles of
 - judicial thought, relevance of 5–7
 - past research, comparison with 5–7, 8–9, 21–22, 23–30
 - request 4–5, 6, 7, 30, 56, 60–61, 160, 163, 204–212, 243, 244–245
 - strategy 3–4, 7
 - unit of analysis 4, 4–5
 - verbal protocols 4, 4–5, 8
 - see also* fictitious cases; decision model; sentencing problems; verbal protocols
 - multiple counts, sentencing of
 - disparity in, inter-judge 236
 - guidelines systems for 22–30
 - judicial approach to
 - Ashworth's account of 33, 34
 - validity 164
 - decision model of *see* alternative decision model; hypothesized decision model
 - decision strategy for *see* decision strategy
 - numerical guidelines for *see* numerical guidelines
 - Thomas's account of 31, 32–34
 - validity 164
 - law, relevant *see* sentencing law and policy
 - theoretical problem of, Ashworth's statement of 2
 - solution 252–260
 - numerical guidelines
 - multiple counts, for 241–244, 246
 - nature of in current study 2, 7, 20–21, 212, 245–246, 260–262
 - single counts, for 39–47
 - see also* sentencing guidelines
 - overview of current study 9–11
 - see also* aims of current study; scope of current study
 - psychology
 - decision making of, contribution to 8–9, 21–22, 246–249
 - see also* intuition; modelling, general principles of
 - scope of current study 5, 11–14, 30, 33, 207, 262–263
 - see also* aims of current study; overview of current study
 - sentencing guidelines
 - development of, modelling for *see* modelling, general principles of
 - multiple offenders, for 22–30
 - nature of in current study 2, 13–14, 15, 245–246, 260–262
 - see also* decision strategy; numerical guidelines
 - sentencing law and policy
 - nature of 1, 14–15, 16–18
 - proportionality in
 - principle 12
 - application 45, 66–67
 - multiple offenders, for 30–32, 33, 262
 - prior record, elements of 195
 - statutory changes to, relevant 201–203
 - sentencing problems
 - administration of 91–98
 - data analysis for
 - administration of problems 154–156
 - general considerations 72–75, 76–77, 99–100, 137, 158–159
 - judges' comments on exercise 157
 - formulation of 65–72
 - hypothesized decision model, relationship to 72–77, 137

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-03256-8 - The Framework of Judicial Sentencing: A Study in Legal Decision Making

Austin Lovegrove

Index

[More information](#)**280** INDEX

- sentencing problems (*cont.*)
 - relevance of 78–80
 - sample of judges for 90–91, 159–160
 - validity of 80–81
- single counts and multiple counts (same kind),
 - sentencing of
 - judicial approach to
 - decision model of 39–48
 - armature, as a basis for development of 2–3, 254–259
 - multiple counts (different kind), as a basis for understanding sentencing of 47–51, 52–56
 - decision strategy for 39–40, 47–48
 - Lovegrove’s study of 36–48
 - numerical guidelines for 39–47
 - Thomas’s account of 37–39, 44
 - theoretical problem of, Ashworth’s statement of 36
 - solution 48–51
 - United States Sentencing Commission, guidelines of 25–30
- verbal protocols
 - hypothesized decision model, in testing the
 - administration 84, 89, 91–98
 - relevance 4, 4–5, 8, 81–84, 88–89
 - theory 84
 - validity 84–88, 88–89
 - see also* sentencing problems
 - intuition, as a method for studying 8, 18