Table A15. The Impact of Past Criminal Behavior on Perceived Certainty

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Perceived Certainty	Crime Type	Findings
Jensen (1969)	1,588 white boys grades 7-12, Richmond	Non Prob.	Gamma	1	No	Caught-Others	Multiple-Self	+, p = ?
Waldo & Chiricos (1972)	321 college students, Florida	Probability	Gamma	1	No	CBP-Self	Theft<$100-Self	-, p> .05
						CBP-Others		-, p> .05
						CBP-Self	Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .001**
						CBP-Others		**-, p< .01**
Burkett & Jensen (1975)	1,056 HS students, Washington	Non Prob.	Gamma	1	No	Caught-Self	Marijuana-Peers	+, p= ?
	546 male HS students, Washington						Marijuana-Self	-, p = ?
	510 female HS students, Washington							-, p = ?
Bailey & Lott (1976)	266 students, Midwestern Univ.	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Arrest-Self	Marijuana-Self	-, p = ?
						Arrest-Marijuana-Self	Marijuana Sale-Self	-, p = ?
						Arrest-Self	Theft<$60-Self	+, p = ?
							Theft>$60-Self	-, p = ?
							Shoplift-Self	+, p = ?
						Convicted-Self	Marijuana-Self	+, p = ?
							Marijuana Sale-Self	-, p = ?
							Theft<$60-Self	-, p = ?
							Theft>$60-Self	-, p = ?
							Shoplift-Self	+, p = ?
Grasmick & Milligan (1976)	187 adults, Midwest city	Probability	Correl.	1	No	CBP-Self	Speeding-Self	**-, p< .001**
	133 drivers ages 25 and over							**-, p< .05**
	54 drivers ages under 25							-, p> .05
Kraut (1976)	606 college students, Pennsylvania	Probability	Correl.	1	No	Caught-Self	Shoplift-Self	**-, p< .01**
						Caught-Others		+, p> .01
Silberman (1976)	174 students, small private univ.	Non Prob.	Correl.	4	No	CBP-Self	Assault-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Drug Use-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Theft≤$50-Self	**-, p< .001**
							Vandalism-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Shoplift-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Drunk-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .05**

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Perceived Certainty	Crime Type	Findings
							Alcohol Use-Self	-, p> .05
				1	No		Multiple-Self	**-, p< .001**
							Multiple-Others	+, p> .05
Teeven (1976a)	191 university students, Canada	Non Prob.	Gamma	1	No	CBP-Others	Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Shoplif-Self	-, p> .05
						CBP-Friends	Marijuana-Self	+, p< .001
							Shoplift-Self	+, p< .05
Teeven (1976b)	421 HS students, Canada	Non Prob.	Gamma	1	No	CBP-Self	Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .05**
						CBP-Others		**-, p< .05**
						CBP-Self	Shoplift-Self	**-, p< .05**
						CBP-Others		+, p> .10
						CBP-Friends	Marijuana-Self	+, p< .05
							Shoplift-Self	+, p> .10
Anderson et al (1977)	321 college students in the South	Probability	Yules Q	1	No	CBP-Others	Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .001**
	154 males							**-, p< .001**
	167 females							**-, p< .01**
Grasmick & Appleton (1977)	166 adults in Midwest city	Probability	Correl.	1	No	CBP-Other	Speeding- Self	**-, p< .001**
Minor (1977)	260 adults, Florida	Probability	Tau	1	No	CBP-Self	Speeding-Self	**-, p< .001**
							DUI-Self	**-, p< .001**
							Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .001**
							Shoplift-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Tax Fraud-Self	**-, p< .001**
							Multiple-Self	**-, p< .001**
Teeven (1977)	396 adolescents, Canada	Non Prob.	Gamma	1	No	CBP-Others	Shoplift-Self	+, p< .05
							Theft-Self	+, p>. 10
							Burglary-Self	+, p< .05
	Females						Shoplift-Self	+, p> .10
	Males							+, p> .10
	Delinquents							+, p> .10
	Male non-delinquents						Theft-Self	+, p> .10
							Burglary=Self	+, p< .05
	Male delinquents						Theft-Self	-, p> .10

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Perceived Certainty	Crime Type	Findings
							Burglary-Self	+, p< .05
							Vandalism-Self	-, p= .20
							Shoplift-Self	**-, p= .000**
Cohen (1978)	105 military residents in Southwest	Probability	Correl.	1	No	CBP-Other	Speeding-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Speeding-Other	-, p> .05
Jensen et al (1978)	3145 Tucson HS students	Non Prob.	Gamma	1	No	CBP- Other	Burglary-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Vandalism- Self	**-, p= .000**
							Shoplifting-Self	**-, p= .000**
						Arrest-Other	Burglary-Self	**-, p= .000**
							Vandalism-Self	**-, p= .000**
							Shoplifting-Self	**-, p= .000**
						Caught-Self	Burglary-Self	**-, p < .05**
							Vandalism-Self	-, p= .20
							Shoplifting-Self	**-, p= . 000**
Akers et al. (1979)	2,395 students grades 7-12, Midwest	Non Prob.	Zero Order	1	No	CBP-Self	Marijuana-Self	-, p = ?
Johnson (1979)	734 HS students, Seattle	Non Prob.	Path	5	No	Caught-Self	Multiple-Self	N.S.
Burkett & Carrithers (1980)	517 HS students, Northwest	Non Prob.	Yules Q	1	No	Caught-Self	Alcohol Use-Self	**-, p < .001**
Grasmick & Bryjak (1980)	390 residents, Polk City.	Probability	OLS	1	No	Arrest-Self	Multiple-Self	**-, p< .05**
Jacob (1980)	176 residents, Illinois	Probability	Chi-Square	1	No	Caught-Others	Shoplifting-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .05**
						Knowledge- Others	Speeding-Self	-, p> .05
							Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Theft<50-Self	**-, p< .05**
Grasmick & Green (1981)	390 adults, Polk City.	Probability	Correl.	1	No	Arrest-Self	Multiple-Self	**-, p < .001**
Richards & Tittle (1981)	1,993 people, NJ, IA & OR	Probability	OLS	6	No	Arrest-Self	$5 Theft-Self & Others	-, p= ?
							$10 Theft-Self & Others	+, p= ?
							Marijuana-Self & Others	+, p= ?
							Illegal Gambling-Self & Others	-, p= ?
							Assault-Self & Others	-, p= ?
							Tax Cheating-Self & Others	-, p= ?
Minor & Harry (1982)	488 students, large state university	Non Prob.	OLS	1	No	Caught-Self	Marijuana-Self	-, p > .05
							Cocaine-Self	**-, p < .001**
							Drunk-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Shoplift-Self	**-, p< .01**

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Perceived Certainty	Crime Type	Findings
Paternoster et al. (1982a)	300 college students	Probability	Gamma	1	No	Arrest-Self	Theft≤$10-Self	**-, p< .05**
						Arrest-Others	Theft≤$10-Self	**-, p< .01**
						Arrest-Self	Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .001**
						Arrest-Others	Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .001**
Paternoster et al. (1982b)	300 college students, Florida	Probability	Gamma	1	No	Arrest-Others	Theft<$10-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Bad Checks-Self	**-, p< .05**
						Arrest-Self	Theft<$10-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Bad Checks-Self	**-, p< .05**
Rankin & Wells (1982)	1395 people, 40 U.S. counties	Probability	Correl.	1	No	Arrest-Others	Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Burglary-Self	+, p> .05
							False I.D.-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Drug Use-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Trespass-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Vandalism-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Battery-Self	-, p> .05
							Theft-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Assault-Self	-, p> .05
							Car Theft-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Fraud-Self	-, p> .05
Richards & Tittle (1982)	1,993 people, NJ, IA & OR	Probability	OLS	1	No	Arrest-Self	$5 Theft-Others	**-, p < .01**
							$10 Theft-Others	**-, p < .01**
							Marijuana-Others	**-, p < .01**
							Illegal Gambling-Others	**-, p < .01**
							Assault-Others	**-, p < .01**
							Tax Cheating-Others	**-, p < .01**
Saltzman et al. (1982)	300 college students, Florida	Probability	Yule's Q	1	No	Arrest-Self	Theft<$10-Self	**-, p < .01**
							Marijuana-Self	**-, p < .001**
							Bad Checks-Self	**-, p < .001**
						Arrest-Others	Theft<$10-Self	**-, p < .05**
							Marijuana-Self	**-, p < .01**
							Bad Checks-Self	-, p> .05
Hollinger & Clark (1983)	9,175 employees, 3 Midwest states	Probability	Correl.	1	No	Caught-Self	Employee Theft-Self	-, p = ?
Paternoster et al. (1983a)	300 college students, Florida	Probability	Correl.	1	No	Arrest-Self	Theft <$10-Self	**-, p< .01**

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Perceived Certainty	Crime Type	Findings
							$10-$100 Theft-Self	**-, p< .001**
							Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Bad Checks-Self	**-, p< .001**
							Vandalism-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Multiple-Self	**-, p< .001**
						Caught-Others	Theft<$10-Self	-, p> .05
							$10-$100 Theft-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Bad Checks-Self	+, p> .05
							Vandalism-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Multiple-Self	**-, p< .01**
						CBP-Others	Theft<$10-Self	**-, p< .05**
							$10-$100 Theft-Self	-, p> .05
							Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Bad Checks-Self	**-, p< .001**
							Vandalism-Self	-, p> .05
							Multiple-Self	**-, p< .001**
						Arrest-Others	Theft<$10-Self	**-, p< .05**
							$10-$100 Theft-Self	-, p> .05
							Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Bad Checks-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Vandalism-Self	-, p> .05
						Arrest-Self	Multiple-Self	**-, p< .001**
						Convicted-Others	Theft<$10-Self	**-, p< .05**
							$10-$100 Theft-Self	-, p> .05
							Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Bad Checks-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Vandalism-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Multiple-Self	**-, p< .001**
	262 HS students, Florida					Caught-Others	Theft<$10-Self	**-, p< .001**
							$10-$100 Theft-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Alcohol Use-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Vandalism-Self	**-, p< .05**

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Perceived Certainty	Crime Type	Findings
						Caught-Self	Multiple-Self	**-, p< .001**
						Convicted-Others	Theft<$10-Self	**-, p< .01**
							$10-$100 Theft-Self	-, p> .05
							Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .001**
							Alcohol Use-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Vandalism-Self	-, p> .05
							Multiple-Self	**-, p< .001**
Paternoster et al. (1983b)	300 college students, Florida	Probability	Path	9	Yes	Arrest-Self	Multiple-Self	**-, p< .05**
Bishop (1984a)	2147 students, Virginia	Probability	Correl.	1	No	Caught-Others	Multiple-Self	-, p= ?
	8th & 9th graders		OLS					**-, p< .001**
	10th -12th graders							-, p= ?
	males							**-, p< .05**
	females							**-, p< .001**
	blacks							-, p= ?
	whites							-, p= ?
Meier et al. (1984)	265 HS students, Pacific NW City	Non Prob.	Path	2	No	Caught-Self	Drug Use-Self	N.S.
Pestello (1984)	271 HS students, Midwest	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Caught-Self	Multiple-Self	-, p> .05
						Caught-Others.		-, p> .05
Thomas & Bishop (1984)	2,147 HS students, Virginia	Probability	OLS	4	Yes	Caught-Others	Multiple-Self	**-, p< .05**
Montmarquette et al (1985)	3,000 students ages 11-17, Montreal	Non Prob.	Gamma	1	No	CBP-Self	Theft > $50 -Self	**-, p< .05**
							Shoplift-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .05**
Paternoster et al. (1985)	300 college students, South	Probability	OLS	12	Yes	Arrest-Self	Theft-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Marijuana-Self	+, p> .05
							Bad Checks-Self	**-, p< .001**
		Probability	Yules Q	1	No	Arrest-Others	Theft-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .001**
							Bad Checks-Self	**-, p< .01**
						CBP-Others	Theft-Self	**-, p< .001**
							Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .001**
							Bad Checks-Self	**-, p< .01**
						Caught-Others	Theft-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .001**
							Bad Checks-Self	**-, p< .01**

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Perceived Certainty	Crime Type	Findings
						Convicted-Others	Theft-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .001**
							Bad Checks-Self	**-, p< .01**
Bridges & Stone (1986)	550 incarcerated federal offenders	Non Prob.	OLS	11	No	Arrest-Others	Multiple-Self	-, p > .05
			Correl.	1	No	Arrest-Robbery-Others		-, p= ?
						Arrest-Fraud-Others		-, p = ?
						Arrest-Embezzle-Others		-, p= ?
Paternoster (1986)	1463 HS students, Southeast city	Non Prob.	OLS	3	No	CBP-Self	Multiple-Peers	N.S.
							Multiple-Self	N.S.
		Non Prob.	OLS	1	No	CBP-Self	Marijuana-Peers	-, p= ?
							Marijuana-Self	-, p= ?
							Theft-Peers	-, p= ?
							Theft-Self	-, p= ?
							Vandalism-Peers	-, p= ?
							Vandalism-Self	-, p= ?
							Alcohol Use-Peers	-, p= ?
							Alcohol Use-Self	-, p= ?
Paternoster & Iovanni (1986)	1173 HS students, Southeast	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	CBP-Self	Multiple-Self	-, p= ?
		.						-, p= ?
Piliavin et al. (1986)	1,497 adult & juvenile offenders, U.S.	Non Prob.	OLS	15	No	Combo of Risks-Self	Multiple-Self	**-, p< .001**
	974 adult offenders, U.S.							**-, p< .05**
	861 HS dropouts ages 17-20							**-, p< .05**
Demers & Lundman (1987)	710 college students, Ohio	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	CBP-Self	Marijuana-Self	**+, p< .01**
								+, p< .01
Lanza-Kaduce (1988)	139 students, Southeast Univ.	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Arrest-Self	DUI-Self	-, p= ?
Paternoster (1988)	1,178 HS students, Southeast	Non Prob.	Path	6	No	CBP-Self	Theft-Self	-, p> .05
							Marijuana-Self	-, p> .05
							Theft-Peers	-, p> .05
							Marijuana-Peers	**-, p < .05**
Paternoster & Triplett (1988)	1,544 HS students, Southeast	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Caught-Self	Marijuana-Self	-, p= ?
							Marijuana-Peers	-, p= ?
							Theft<$10-Self	-, p= ?
							Theft<$10-Peers	-, p= ?
							Alcohol Use-Self	-, p= ?

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Perceived Certainty	Crime Type	Findings
							Alcohol Use-Peers	-, p= ?
							Vandalism-Self	-, p= ?
							Vandalism-Peers	-, p= ?
Snortum et al. (1988)	1,102 drivers, Norway	Probability	Correl.	1	No	Knowledge-Others	DUI-Self	+, p> .05
	848 drivers, U.S., 1983							+, p> .05
	1,539 drivers, U.S., 1986							+, p< .001
Schneider & Ervin (1990)	876 delinquents, U.S.	Non Prob.	Path	12	No	Caught-Self	Theft ≥$20-Self	N.S.
Tyler (1990)	1,575 adults, Chicago	Probability	MLE	11	Yes	Arrest-Self	Multiple-Self	**-, p< .05**
Braithwaite & Makkai (1991)	410 nursing home execs., Australia	Probability	OLS	24	No	Caught-Self	Corporate-Self	-, p> .05
						Prosecuted-Self		+, p> .05
Miller & Simpson (1991)	552 university students	Non Prob.	OLS	10	No	Arrest-Self	Dom. Violence of Parents	-, p> .05
							Serious Dom. Violence-Self	-, p> .05
							Mild Dom. Violence-Self	**-, p< .01**
	males						Dom. Violence of Parents	+, p> .05
							Serious Dom. Violence-Self	-, p> .05
							Mild Dom. Violence-Self	**-, p< .01**
	females						Dom. Violence of Parents	**-, p< .05**
							Serious Dom. Violence-Self	+, p> .05
							Mild Dom. Violence-Self	+, p> .05
Apospori et al. (1992)	157 adult offenders, Midwest	Non Prob.	OLS	9	No	Arrest-Self	All Crime-Self	**-, p< .001**
Horney & Marshall (1992)	1046 male offenders, Nebraska	Non Prob.	OLS	8	No	Arrest-Self	Burglary-Self	-, p > .05
							Rob Business-Self	-, p > .05
							Rob Person-Self	-, p > .05
							Theft-Self	-, p > .05
							Car Theft-Self	-, p > .05
							Bad Checks-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Fraud-Self	-, p > .05
							Drug Dealing-Self	-, p > .05
						Arrest-Assault-Self	Drug Use-Self	**-, p< .01**
						Arrest-Burglary-Self		-, p > .05
						Arrest-Robbery-Self		-, p > .05

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Perceived Certainty	Crime Type	Findings
						Arrest-Robbery-Self		-, p > .05
						Arrest-Theft-Self		**-, p< .01**
						Arrest-Car Theft-Self		**-, p< .01**
						Arrest-Bad Checks-Self		-, p > .05
						Arrest-Fraud-Self		-, p > .05
						Arrest-Drug D.-Self		**-, p< .01**
						Arrest-Assault-Self		**-, p< .01**
Kinsey (1992)	1202 taxpayers, Minnesota	Non Prob.	OLS	16	No	Caught-Self	Tax Cheating-Self	**-, p< .05**
Guppy (1993)	937 male drivers, UK	Non Prob.	ANOVA	1	No	CBP-Self	DUI-Self	**-, p= .019**
Miller & Iovanni (1994)	372 students, state university	Non Prob.	OLS	15	Yes	Caught-Self	Dom. Violence-Self	**-, p< .05**
	201 males							**-, p< .05**
	163 females							-, p> .05
	372 students, state university					Arrest-Self		**-, p< .001**
	201 males							**-, p< .01**
	163 females							-, p> .05
	365 students, state university	.				Caught-Self	Dom. Violence of Peers	-, p> .05
							Dom. Violence of Parents	-, p> .05
	201 males						Dom. Violence of Peers	-, p> .05
							Dom. Violence of Parents	-, p> .05
	164 females						Dom. Violence of Peers	+, p> .05
							Dom. Violence of Parents	-, p> .05
	366 students, state university					Arrest-Self	Dom. Violence of Peers	-, p> .05
							Dom. Violence of Parents	-, p> .05
	202 males						Dom. Violence of Peers	-, p> .05
							Dom. Violence of Parents	-, p> .05
	164 females						Dom. Violence of Peers	+, p< .05
							Dom. Violence of Parents	-, p> .05
Wieczorek et al. (1994)	453 drivers, New York	Probability	Chi-Square	12	No	Arrest-Self	DUI-Self	-, p>..05
Albery & Guppy (1995)	1011 drivers, UK	Non Prob.	Diff. Menas	12	No	CBP-Self	DUI-Self	**-, p< .05**
Gertz & Gould (1995)	535-611 university students, Florida	Probability	Kendall's Tau-b	12	No	Arrest-Self	Battery-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Bad Checks-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Cocaine-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Burglary-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Theft-Self	**-, p< .01**

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Perceived Certainty	Crime Type	Findings
							Sex Crime-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Shoplift-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Car Theft-Self	-, p> .05
							DUI-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Contrib. To Del. of minors-Self	**-, p< .01**
						Incarcerate-Self	Battery-Self	-, p> .05
							Bad Checks-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Cocaine-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Burglary-Self	-, p> .05
							Theft-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Sexual Crime-Self	-, p> .05
							Shoplift-Self	-, p> .05
							Car Theft-Self	-, p> .05
							DUI-Self	-, p> .05
							Contrib. To Del. of minors-Self	**-, p< .01**
Paternoster & Piquero (1995)	1422 HS students, Southeast	Non Prob.	MLR	9	No	CBP-Self	Mult. Drugs-Peers	**-, p< .05**
						CBP-Others		N.S.
Foglia (1997)	298 HS students, Northeast	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Arrest-Marijuana-Self	Multiple-Self	-, p> .05
						Arrest-Alcohol Use-Self		-, p> .05
						Arrest-Theft-Self		-, p> .05
						Arrest Assault-Self		-, p> .05
						Arrest-Self		-, p> .05
Baron & Kennedy (1998)	125 males, Edmonton	Non Prob.	OLS	10	Yes	CBP-Theft-Self	Multiple-Peers	-, p> .10
						CBP-Battery		-, p> .10
						CBP-Theft-Self	Marijuana-Self	**-, p< .05**
						CBP-Battery-Self		-, p> .10
Varma & Doob (1998)	1908 people, Ontario	Probability	Chi- Square	1	No	CBP-Others	Tax Cheating-Self	**-, p < .00**
Hatcher et al (2000)	68 fishing captains, UK, 1997-98	Probability	Probit	5	No	Caught-Self	Illegal Fishing-Self	+, p> .05
Scheider (2001)	104-126 college students, U.S.	Probability	OLS	11	No	Arrest-Self	Theft >$100-Self	+, p> .05
							DUI-Self	-, p> .05
							Battery-Self	-, p> .05
							Cocaine-Self	-, p> .05
							Theft >$100-Others	-, p> .05

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Perceived Certainty	Crime Type	Findings
							DUI-Others	+, p> .05
							Battery-Others	-, p> .05
							Cocaine-Others	-, p> .05
						Arrest-Others	Theft >$100-Others	-, p> .05
							DUI-Self	-, p> .05
							Battery-Self	-, p> .05
							Cocaine-Self	+, p> .05
							Theft >$100-Others	-, p> .05
							DUI-Others	+, p> .05
							Battery-Others	-, p> .05
							Cocaine-Others	-, p> .05
McDonough et al. (2002)	228 HS students, Australia	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Caught-Self	Joyriding-Self	**-, p< .01**
Piquero & Pogarsky (2002)	250 students, Southwestern Univ.	Non Prob.	OLS	12	No	Caught- DUI-Self	Multiple-Self	-, p > .10
Pogarsky (2002)	412 college students, Unknown Area	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Caught-Convicted-Self	DUI-Self	-, p= ?
							DUI-Others	-, p= ?
Pogarsky et al (2004)	194 H.S. offenders in S.E., 1981-82	Non Prob.	OLS	7	No	CBP-Self	Shoplifting-Peers	-, p> .05
	298 H.S. offenders in S.E., 1981-82						Vandalism-Peers	**-, p< .01**
	418 H.S. offenders in S.E., 1981-82						Marijuana Use-Peers	**-, p< .01**
	927 H.S. non-offenders, SE, 1981-82						Shoplifting-Peers	**-, p< .01**
	940 H.S. non-offenders, SE, 1981-82						Vandalism- Peers	**-, p> .01**
	780 H.S. non-offenders, SE, 1981-82						Marijuana Use-Peers	**-, p> .01**
	194 H.S. offenders in S.E., 1981-82						Shoplifting-Self	-, p> .05
	298 H.S. offenders in S.E., 1981-82						Vandalism-Self	-, p> .05
	418 H.S. offenders in S.E., 1981-82						Marijuana Use-Self	+, p> .05
Carmichael et al. (2005)	2,700 10th graders, Southeast	Non Prob.	OLS	5	No	Caught-Self	Drinking-Self	-, p> .05
							Marijuana-Self	+, p> .05
							Theft-Self	-, p> .05
							Vandalism-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Drinking-Friends	**-, p< .05**
							Marijuana-Friends	**-, p< .05**
							Vandalism-Friends	**-, p< .05**
	males						Drinking-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Marijuana-Self	-, p> .05
							Theft-Self	-, p> .05
							Vandalism-Self	**-, p< .05**

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Perceived Certainty	Crime Type	Findings
	females						Drinking-Self	-, p> .05
							Marijuana-Self	+, p> .05
							Theft-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Vandalism-Self	-, p> .05
	males						Drinking-Friends	**-, p< .05**
							Marijuana-Friends	**-, p< .05**
							Theft-Friends	**-, p< .05**
							Vandalism-Friends	**-, p< .05**
	females						Drinking-Friends	**-, p< .05**
							Marijuana-Friends	**-, p< .05**
							Theft-Friends	**-, p< .05**
Pogarsky et al (2005)	1,295 adults, U.S., 1983,87	Probability	OLS	13	No	Arrest-Self	Theft > $50-Peers	**-, p< .01**
							Violence- Peers	-, p> .05
							Theft> $50-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Violence-Self	**-, p< .01**
	645 adults inexperienced in crime			11			Theft > $50-Peers	-, p> .05
							Violence- Peers	-, p> .05
							Theft> $50-Self	-, p> .05
							Violence-Self	**-, p< .05**
	585 adults experienced in crime						Theft > $50-Peers	**-, p< .01**
							Violence- Peers	-, p> .05
							Theft> $50-Self	**-, p< .05**
							Violence-Self	**-, p< .01**
Matsueda et al (2006)	1,459 juveniles, 7-15, Denver, CO.	Probability	Tobit	18	No	CBP-Self	Multiple-Theft-Self	**-, p< .001**
							Multiple-Theft-Peers	**-, p< .001**
							Multiple-Assault-Self	**-, p< .001**
							Multiple-Assault-Peers	**-, p< .01**
Yu et al (2006)	433 people in New York	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Caught-Other	DUI	**-, p< .01**
							Drugged Driving	**-, p< .01**
Hjarlmarrson (2009a)	4,588 males age 12-16, 1996-2001	Non Prob	OLS	18	No	Jail-Self	Auto-Theft-Self	-, p> .05
							Theft< $50-Self	-, p> .05
							Theft> $50-Self	-, p> .05
							Assault-Self	-, p> .05

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Perceived Certainty	Crime Type	Findings
							Drug Dealing-Self	-, p> .05
							Vandalism- Friends	**-, p< .05**
Li & Nergadze (2009)	306 college students in the South.	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Caught&Punished-Self	Illegal File Sharing-Self	**-, p< .01**
Loughran et al (2009)	1,100 serious juv. Delinquents, AZ & PA	Non Prob.	OLS	3	No	Arrest-Self	Multiple-Self	**-, p<.05**
							Multiple-Violent-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Multiple Property-Self	**-, p< .05**
MacCoun et a (2009)	25,015 marijuana users, U.S. 2001-03	Probability	Logistic	42	No	Knowledge-Others	Marijuana Use-Self	+, p< .05
Urban (2009)	118 juvenile offenders, area unknown	Non-Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Caught-self	Any Crime-Self	**-, p< .05**
Title et al (2011)	1,400 adults in Eastern Europe, 2006	Probability	Correl.	1	No	Punished-Self	Theft-Self	**-, p< ,05**
							Violence-Self	**-, p< .05**
Watling & Freeman (2011)	922people in Unknown Area	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Caught-Other	Drug Driving-Self	**-, p< .001**
Wikstrom et al (2011)	716 Youth in England	Probability	Correl.	1	No	Caught-Self	Shoplifting-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Theft-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Vandalism-Self	**-, p< .01**
							Assault-Self	**-, p< .01**
Loughran et al (2012c)	1,100 juvenile offenders, AZ and PA	Non Prob.	Diff, Means	1	No	Arrest- Self	Multiple- Self	**-, p< .001**
Piquero et al (2012)	420 adults, U.S.	Probability	OLS	9	No	Arrest- other	DUI-Self	+, p> .05
			Logistic			Knowledge-Other		-, p> .05
Baron (2013)	300 homeless teens, Toronto, 2005-06	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Caught-Self	Battery-Self	-, p> .05
Erickson et al (2013)	122 Cannabis users, Toronto, 2004-05	Non Prob.	Chi-square	1	No	Arrest-Self	Cannabis-Self	+, p=.001
Saridakis (2013)	1,686 youths and adults, Eng. & Wales	Non Prob.	Probit	36	Yes	Caught-Self	Shoplifting-Self	-, p> .05
Goodfellow & Kilgore (2014)	60 DUI offenders, Pennsylvania,2008-09	Probability	Diff. Means	1	No	CBP-Other	DUI-Self	?, p> .05
						Arrest-Self		**-, p< .05**
						Convicted-Self		**-, p< .05**
Saridakis & Sookram (2014)	10,079 people in Eng. & Wales, 2003	Non Prob.	OLS	50	Yes	Arrest-Self	Battery-Self	-, p> .05
Shultz (2014)	1,279 people, Eng. & Wales, 2003+06	Non Prob.	FER	50	No	Arrest-Other	Multiple-Self	**-, p> .05**

Clarification of Commonly Used Abbreviations in Table 15

Column Headings

#IV- Number of Independent Variables in the Analysis
INF- Did the Study Control For Informal Sanctions?
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. Where the perceived crime type is different from the measure of crime in the independent variable, it is included in the measure of the perceived certainty.

Abbreviations Located Under Column Headings

Sample

AZ- Arizona
Bus.- Business
CA- California
CO- Colorado
Conv. – Conviction
Eng.- England
Execs- Executives
HS- High School
IA- Iowa
M.D.- Maryland
N.J.- New Jersey
OR- Oregon
P.A.- Pennsylvania
Poss- Possession
SE- Southeast
UK- United Kindom
Univ- University

Sample Type

Non-Prob. – Non Probability

Analysis

ANOVA- Analysis of Variance
Correl.- Correlation Coefficient
Diff. Means- Difference in Means Test
FER- Fixed Estimates Regression
GLS- Generalized Least Squares Regression
MCA Beta- Multiple Classification Analysis- Beta
MLE- Maximum Likelihood Estimate
MLR = Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis
MWUT- Mann Whitney U Test
NW- Northwest
Neg. Binomial- Negative Binomial Regression
OLS- Ordinary Least Squares Regression
Path- Path Analysis

Certainty

CBP- Caught By Police
Knowledge - How well respondent predicted the actual amount of certainty for crime.

Crime Type

Dom. Violence = Domestic violence
Drug D.- Drug Dealing
Drug Driving- Drugged Driving
Mar. Dealing- Marijuana Dealing
Multiple- Multiple Crimes Combined into one Measure
Mult. Drugs = Multiple Drug Crimes Combined into One Drugs Use Measure

Citation

Paternoster et al. 1982a in this table refers to the study: Paternoster, Raymond, Linda Saltzman, Theodore Chiricos and Gordon Waldo. 1982. "Perceived Risk and Deterrence: Methodological Artifacts in Perceptual Deterrence Research." The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 73 (3): 1238-1259

Paternoster et al 1982b in this table refers to the study: Paternoster, Raymond, Linda Saltzman, Gordon Waldo and Theodore Chiricos. 1982b. Causal Ordering in Deterrence Research: An Examination of the Perceptions-Behavior Relationship. In John Hagan (Ed.), *Deterrence Reconsidered: Methodological Innovations* (pp. 55-70). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage

Loughran et al 2012c in this study refers to the study: Loughran, Thomas, Alex Piquero, Jeffrey Fagan and Edward Mulvey. 2012. "Differential Deterrence: Studying Heterogeneity and Changes in Perceptual Deterrence Among Serious Youthful Offenders. *Crime and Delinquency* 58 (1): 3-27.