

**Table A11. The Impact of Experienced Certainty and Severity on Perceived Certainty**

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Perceived Certainty	Experienced Punishment	Crime Type for Perception	Findings
<b>Parker &amp; Grasmick (1979)</b>	360 adults, Midwest	Probability	Correl.	1	No	% Crime Arrested-Others	Arrests/Crimes – Self & Others	Burglary	-, p<.01
<b>Bridges &amp; Stone (1986)</b>	550 incarcerated fed. offenders	Non Prob.	OLS	11	No	Arrest-Others	Conviction / Offense-Self	Multiple	+, p> .05
			Correl.	1			Time Served-Self		+, p> .05
							Conviction / Offense-Self	Robbery	-, p= ?
							Conviction / Offense-Self	Fraud	-, p= ?
								Embezzle	-, p= ?
<b>Schneider &amp; Ervin (1990)</b>	876 delinquents in 6 U.S. cities	Non Prob.	OLS	16	No	Caught-Self	Time Served-Self	Theft≥\$20	-, p< .05
							Swiftiness-Self		?, p> .10
<b>Horney &amp; Marshall (1992)</b>	1046 male offenders, Nebraska	Non Prob.	OLS	6	No	Arrest-Self	Arrest to crime ratio-Self	Burglary	<b>+ p &lt; .01</b>
								Rob Person	+, p > .05
								Rob Business	+, p > .05
								Theft	<b>+, p &lt; .01</b>
								Car Theft	<b>+, p &lt; .01</b>
								Bad Checks	+, p > .05
								Fraud	+, p > .05
								Drug Dealing	<b>+, p &lt; .01</b>
								Assault	+, p > .05
<b>Paternoster &amp; Piquero (1995)</b>	1422 HS students, Southeast	Non Prob.	MLR	9	No	Arrest-Self	# Crimes without capture-Self	Mult. Drugs	N.S.
						Arrest-Others			N.S.
<b>Piquero &amp; Paternoster (1998)</b>	1,686 drivers ages 16 and over	Probability	MLR	11	Yes	CBP-Self	DUI without capture?-Self	DUI	<b>+, p&lt; .05</b>
	826 male drivers					CBP-Others			-, p> .05
						CBP-Self			<b>+, p&lt; .05</b>
						CBP-Others			-, p> .05
	860 female drivers					CBP-Self			+, p> .05
						CBP-Others			-, p> .05
<b>Piquero &amp; Pogarsky (2002)</b>	250 students, Southwestern Univ.	Non Prob.	OLS	12	No	Caught-Self	# DUI without capture-Self	DUI	+, p> .10
							% of peers charged	DUI	-, p> .10
			Tobit				Peers DUI minus Peer Caught		<b>+, p&lt; .05</b>

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Perceived Certainty	Experienced Punishment	Crime Type for Perception	Findings
Lochner (2005)	4,621 males age 12-16, 1997-2000	Unclear	OLS	9	No	Arrest-Self	County Arrest Ratio	Auto Theft	-, p > .05
Matsueda et al (2006)	1459 juveniles, 7-15, Denver, CO.	Probability	Tobit	18	No	CBP-Self	Low arrests to crime ratio-Self Medium arrests to crime ratio-Self High arrests to crime ratio-Self Low arrests to crime ratio-Self Medium arrests to crime ratio-Self High arrests to crime ratio-Self	Multiple-Theft  Multiple Assault	+ , p < .001 + , p < .05 + , p > .05 + , p < .001 + , p < .001 + , p > .05
Sitren & Applegate (2006)	634 undergraduate students, Southeast	Non Prob.	OLS	21	Yes	Caught- Self	# of DUIs without being caught-Self % of peers avoided DUI capture	DUI	+ , p = .00 + , p = .02
Bouffard (2007)	212 college students in Midwest	Non Prob.	Logistic	6	Yes	Arrest-Self	CxS-Self	DIU Battery Shoplifting	-, p > .10 +, p > .10 +, p > .05
Walker et al (2007)	1,081 fishermen in Canada, 2001-02	Non Prob.	ANCOVA	1	No	C+S-Self	% of Anglers Checked by Wardens	Illegal Fishing	+ , p < .01
Wood (2007)	726 inmates, Southeast	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Arrest- Self	Time Served-Self	All Crime	+, p > .05
MacCoun et al (2009)	25,015 Marijuana users, U.S., 2001-03	Probability	Logistic	42	No	Knowledge-Others	State Arrests / Crimes	Marijuana	+, p > .05
Watling et al (2010)	899 drivers in Australia, 2007	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Caught-Others	Caught / DUI-self Peer Caught DUIs	DUI	+ , p < .05 ++ p < .01
Anware & Loughran (2011)	1,354 juvenile offenders in AZ & PA	Non Prob.	OLS	10	No	Arrest-Self	Arrest to Crime Ratio	Multiple Violent Property	+ , p < .01 + , p < .01 + , p < .05
Lapham & Todd (2012)	544 DUI off, New Mex, 1989-2004	Non Prob.	Path	8	Yes	Composite-Self	Time Served-Self	DUI	+ , p < .01
Thomas et al (2013)	1,354 juvenile offenders in AZ and PA	Non Prob.	RCM	10	No	Arrest-Self	Arrests / Crime-Self	Multiple	+ , p < .001
Shultz (2014)	1,279 people, Eng. & Wales, 2003+06	Non Prob.	FER	9	No	CBP-Other	Caught / Crime-Self	Multiple	+, p > .05

---

#### Clarification on Commonly Used Abbreviations in Table 11

##### Column Headings

#IV- Number of Independent Variables in the Analysis

INF- Did the Study Control For Informal Sanctions?

Experienced Certainty- All measures represent respondents' experienced certainty of punishment when committing crime. When certainty of punishment is experienced vicariously it is listed within the measure. For instance, experienced certainty is only through one's peers, it is noted in the measure.

Perceived Certainty- All measures represent respondents' perceived likelihood that a type criminal justice contact will occur. The most commonly used abbreviations in Table 1 are listed below. Thus, CBP represents the respondent's perceived likelihood that they would be caught by police if they committed a crime. The "self" or "other" feature denotes whether the perceived certainty was for the respondents themselves or others. Some researchers asked respondents the chances that they themselves would be caught (self) if committing the crime, while others asked respondents the chances that others would be caught if they committed the crime.

*Abbreviations Located Under Column Headings*

ANCOVA- Analysis of Covariance

AZ- Arizona

CA- California

CBP- Caught By Police

CO- Colorado

Correl.- Correlation Coefficient

CxS- Certainty Multiplied with Severity

Composite- Measure made up of several Certainty Measures

DUI Off- DUI Offenders

Eng. & Wales- England and Wales

Fed off. – Federal Offender

FER- Fixed Effects Regression

MLR- Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis

Mult. Drugs = Multiple Crimes Combined into One Drugs Use Measure

Multiple- Multiple Crimes Combined into one Measure

New Mex. – New Mexico

OLS- Ordinary Least Squares Regression

Path- Path Analysis

RCM- Random Coefficient Model

Southwestern Univ.- Southwestern University