

**Table A14. The Impact of Arrest / “Being Caught” on Perceived Risk**

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Perceived Risk	Sanction	Crime Type	Findings
<b>Jensen (1969)</b>	1588 white boys 7-12 grade, Richmond	Non Prob.	Gamma	1	No	Punished-Others	Arrest or Pol. Cont.-Any-Self	Multiple	-, p> .05
<b>Kraut (1976)</b>	606 college students, PA	Probability	Diff. Means	1	No	CBP-Self	Caught-Self	Shoplift	+, p< .001
<b>Silberman (1976)</b>	174 students, small private univ.	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	CBP-Self	#Crimes Peers Arrested	Multiple	+, p> .05
						Severity-Self			+, p< .05
<b>Richards &amp; Tittle (1981)</b>	1,993 people, NJ, IA & OR	Probability	OLS	6	No	Arrest-Self	Arrest-Self & Others	\$5 Theft	-, p= ?
								\$20 Theft	-, p= ?
								Marijuana	+, p= ?
								Illegal Gambling	+, p= ?
								Assault	+, p= ?
								Tax Cheating	+, p= ?
<b>Thomas &amp; Bishop (1984)</b>	2,147 HS students, Virginia	Probability	OLS	4	Yes	Caught-Others	Caught or Arrest-Self	Any Crime	-, p> .05
<b>Piliavin et al. (1986)</b>	3,300 adult & youth offenders, U.S.	Non Prob.	OLS	21	No	Police Contacts-Self	Arrested?-Self	\$1,000 Prop.	-, p> .05
	974 adult offenders, U.S.								+, p> .05
	861 HS dropouts ages 17-20								+, p< .05
<b>Snortum et al. (1988)</b>	1,102 drivers, Norway	Probability	Correl.	1	No	Knowledge-Others	Friend Arrested for DUI?	DUI	+, p< .05
	848 drivers, U.S., 1983								+, p< .001
	1,539 drivers, U.S., 1986								+, p< .001
<b>Dutton et al. (1992)</b>	1409 men, Canada	Non Prob.	Diff. Means	1	No	Arrest-Self	Arrested? Self	Dom. Violence	+, p< .05
						Severity-Self			+, p< .05
<b>Horney &amp; Marshall (1992)</b>	1046 male offenders, Nebraska	Non Prob.	OLS	8	No	Arrest-Self	#Past Arrests-Any Crime-Self	Burglary	-, p> .05
								Rob Business	-, p< .01
								Rob Person	-, p> .05
								Theft	-, p< .01
								Car Theft	-, p< .01
								Bad Checks	-, p> .05
								Fraud	-, p> .05
								Drug Dealing	-, p> .05
								Assault	-, p> .05
<b>Kinsey (1992)</b>	1202 taxpayers, Minnesota	Non Prob.	OLS	12	No	Caught-Self	Caught-Self	Tax Cheating	+, p< .01

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Perceived Risk	Sanction	Crime Type	Findings
Piquero & Paternoster (1998)	1,686 drivers ages 16 and over 826 male drivers 860 female drivers	Probability	MLR	11	Yes	CBP-Self	Caught-Other	DUI	+, p> .05
							Problem-Self		-, p< .05
							Caught-Self		+, p> .05
							Arrested?-Self		-, p> .05
							CBP?-Self		-, p> .05
	1,686 drivers ages 16 and over 826 male drivers 860 female drivers	Probability	MLR	11	Yes	CBP-Self	Arrested?-Self	DUI	+, p> .05
							CBP?-Self		+, p> .05
							Arrested?-Self		+, p> .05
							CBP?-Self		+, p> .05
							Arrested?-Peers		+, p> .05
1,686 drivers ages 16 and over 826 male drivers 860 female drivers	Probability	MLR	11	Yes	CBP-Others	Arrested?-Self	DUI	+, p> .05	
						CBP?-Self		+, p> .05	
						Arrested?-Self		+, p> .05	
						CBP?-Self		+, p> .05	
						Arrested?-Peers		+, p> .05	
Heckert & Gondolf (2000)	463 batterers, 4 U.S. Cities	Non Prob.	Logistic	11	No	Jail-Self	Arrested?-Self (Non-Assault)	Assault	+, p< .01
Piquero & Pogarsky (2002)	250 students, Southwestern Univ.	Non Prob.	OLS	12	No	Caught-Self	Times caught for DUI -Self	DUI	+, p> .10
Pogarsky & Piquero (2003)	253 college students, Southwest	Non Prob.	OLS	10	No	CBP-Self	Friends caught for DUI?	DUI	-, p>.05
Pogarsky et al (2004)	194 H.S. offenders in S.E., 1981-82	Non Prob.	OLS	7	No	CBP-Self	Arrested?-Self	Shoplifting	+, p> .05
	298 H.S. offenders in S.E., 1981-82							Vandalism	+, p< .05
	418 H.S. offenders in S.E., 1981-82							Marijuana Use	+, p< .01
	927 H.S. non-offenders, SE, 1981-82							Shoplifting	-, p> .05
	940 H.S. non-offenders, SE, 1981-82							Vandalism	+, p> .05
	780 H.S. non-offenders, SE, 1981-82							Marijuana Use	-, p> .05
Kleck et al. (2005)	1,142 – 1330 adults in 54 U.S. counties	Probability	MLR	21	No	Arrest-Others	Arrested?- Self	Homicide	-, p> .05
								Robbery	-, p< .01
								Assault	-, p< .01
								Burglary	-, p< .05
								Conviction- Others	Homicide
						Robbery		-, p< .05	
						Assault		-, p> .05	
						Burglary		-, p> .05	
						Prison-Others		Homicide	+, p> .05

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Perceived Risk	Sanction	Crime Type	Findings
Lochner (2005)	4,621 males age 12-16, 1997-2000	Unclear	OLS	9	No	Arrest- Self	# of previous arrests-Self # of previous arrests-Other	Robbery	-, p> .05
								Assault	-, p> .05
	918 males age 11-17 in 1976	Burglary	-, p> .05						
		Auto Theft	-, p< .05						
		Theft < \$5	-, p> .05						
		Theft > \$50	-, p> .05						
Pogarsky et al (2005)	1,295 adults, U.S., 1983, 87	Probability	OLS	13	No	Arrest-Self	# of Arrests-Self	Burglary	-, p< .05
								Battery	-, p> .05
	645 adults inexperienced in crime	Theft > \$50	+, p> .05						
		Violence	+, p> .05						
	585 adults experienced in crime	Theft > \$50	+, p> .05						
		Violence	+, p> .05						
Yu et al (2006)	433 people in New York	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Caught-Other	# of Previous Arrests-Self	Drugs	-, p> .05
						Severe-Other		-, p> .05	
						Length of Case-Other		-, p> .05	
Lochner (2007)	4,621 males age 12-16, 1997-2000	Unclear	OLS	9	No	Arrest-Self	County arrest rate	Auto Theft	+, p > .05
Hjalmarsson (2009a)	4588 males age 12-16, 1996-2001	Non Prob.	OLS	18	No	Jail-Self	# of previous arrests-Self	Auto Theft	+, p> .05
MacCoun et al (2009)	135,338 adults in U.S., 2001-2003	Probability	Logit	42	No	Knowledge-Other	State Arrest Rate	Marijuana	-, p> .05
Baron (2013)	300 homeless teens, Toronto, 2005-06	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Caught-Self	# of previous arrests-Self # of peers arrested	Battery	-, p> .05
						Problem-Self		+, p> .05	
						# of previous arrests-Self # of peers arrested		+, p> .05	
Erickson et al (2013)	122 Cannabis users, Toronto, 2004-05	Non Prob.	Chi-Square	1	No	Arrest-Self	Arrested-Self	Cannabis	+, p= .039
Saridakis (2013)	1,686 youths and adults, Eng. & Wales	Non Prob.	Probit	36	Yes	Caught-Self	Arrested?-Self CBP-Self CBP-Sibling CBP-Parent	Shoplifting	-, p> .05
						+, p> .05			
						+, p> .05			
Saridakis & Sookram (2014)	10,079 people in Eng. & Wales, 2003	Non Prob.	OLS	50	Yes	Arrest-Self	CBP-Parent	Battery	+, p> .05
						+, p< .05			

## **Clarification on Commonly Used Abbreviations in Table 14**

### *Column Headings*

#IV- Number of Independent Variables in the Analysis

INF- Did the Study Control For Informal Sanctions?

Sanction- All sanction measures represent respondents' arrests or apprehensions experienced for a crime or crimes they committed. When an arrest or apprehension is experienced vicariously it is listed within the measure. For instance, when an arrest or apprehension is experienced only through one's peers the measure is listed specifically for the respondents' peers.

Perceived Certainty- All measures represent respondents' perceived likelihood that a type criminal justice contact will occur. 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*

AZ- Arizona

CBP- Caught By Police

Correl.- Correlation Coefficient

Eng.- England

Diff. Means- Difference in Means Test

Dom. Violence- Domestic Violence

IA- Iowa

Knowledge - How well respondent predicted the actual amount of certainty for crime.

P.A.- Pennsylvania

Police Contacts - Composite of Police Contacts

Punished- Likelihood of Being Punished for Crime

Multiple= Multiple Crimes Combined

Rob Business = Robbery of business

Rob Person = Robbery of person

H.S.= High School

MLR- Maximum Likelihood Estimates

NJ- New Jersey

Non Prob.- Non Probability

OLS- Ordinary Least Squares Regression

OR- Oregon

Pol. Cont. – Police Contact

Prop.- Property

Rob.- Robbery

S.E.= Southeast

Univ.- University