

**Table A3. The Impact of Perceived Certainty on Forecasts of Criminal Behavior**

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Certainty	Crime Type	Findings
<b>Erickson (1976)</b>	95 Canadians conv. of cannabis poss., Toronto	Non Prob.	Gamma	1	No	Arrest-Self	Marijuana	+, p= ?
<b>Tittle (1977)</b>	1,993 people, NJ, Iowa & Oregon	Probability	MCA Beta	8	Yes	Arrest-Self	Theft of \$5	N.S.
							Theft of \$50	N.S.
							Marijuana	N.S.
							Illegal Gambling	N.S.
							Assault	N.S.
							Tax Cheating	N.S.
						Jail-Self	Theft of \$5	N.S.
							Theft of \$50	N.S.
							Marijuana	N.S.
							Illegal Gambling	N.S.
							Assault	N.S.
							Tax Cheating	N.S.
<b>Carroll (1978)</b>	79 juvenile & adult offenders & non-offenders	Non Prob.	ANOVA	1	No	Assigned Certainty-Self	Multiple	N.S.
<b>Grasmick &amp; Green (1980)</b>	390 adults, Southwest city	Probability	OLS	3	Yes	CxS-Self	Multiple	<b>-, p&lt; .05</b>
<b>Grasmick &amp; Green (1981)</b>	390 adults, Polk City	Probability	OLS	7	Yes	Arrest-Self	Multiple	<b>-, p&gt; .05</b>
						CxS-Self		<b>-, p&gt; .05</b>
<b>Grasmick &amp; Scott (1982)</b>	401 adults, Polk City	Probability	Logistic	3	No	Caught-Self	Tax Evasion	<b>-, p&lt; .05</b>
<b>Jensen &amp; Stitt (1982)</b>	3,000 HS students, Arizona	Non Prob.	OLS	3	No	Caught-Self	Vandalism	<b>-, p&lt; .01</b>
							Shoplift	<b>-, p&lt; .01</b>
							Burglary	<b>-, p&gt; .05</b>
<b>Grasmick et al (1983)</b>	353 adults, Polk directory	Probability	OLS	5	Yes	Caught-Self	Multiple	<b>-, p&lt; .001</b>
<b>Miller &amp; Anderson (1986)</b>	347 white males 15-35 years old in Baltimore	Non Prob.	OLS	10	No	Assigned Certainty-Self	Multiple	<b>-, p&lt; .01</b>
	173 white females 15-35 years old in Baltimore							<b>-, p&lt; .01</b>
	154 black males 15-35 years old in Baltimore							<b>-, p&lt; .01</b>
	77 black females 15-35 years old in Baltimore							<b>-, p&lt; .01</b>
<b>Green (1989a)</b>	245 adults, Minneapolis	Probability	Gamma	1	No	Arrest-Self	DUI	<b>-, p&gt; .05</b>
<b>Kleppler &amp; Nagin (1989a)</b>	163 college students, Northeast	Non Prob.	OLS	12	No	Caught-Self	Tax Cheating	<b>-, p&lt; .01</b>
<b>Kleppler &amp; Nagin (1989b)</b>	163 college students, Northeast					Prosecuted-Self		<b>-, p&gt; .05</b>

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Certainty	Crime Type	Findings
Thurman (1989)	319 adults, Oklahoma City	Probability	OLS	6	No	Assigned Certainty-Self	Tax Cheating	-, p< .001
Grasmick & Bursik (1990)	353 adults, Southwestern City	Probability	Logistic	7	Yes	CxS-Self	Tax Cheating	-, p= .03
							Theft<\$20	-, p= .03
							DUI	-, p= .02
Schneider & Ervin (1990)	876 delinquents, U.S.	Probability	OLS	14	No	Caught-Self	Theft≥\$20	-, p< .01
Bachman et al. (1992)	94 male college students, New England	Non Prob.	Logistic	10	Yes	Arrest-Others	Rape	-, p< .01
Kinsey (1992)	1,202 taxpayers, Minnesota, 1988	Probability	OLS	17	Yes	Caught-Self	Tax Cheating	-, p< .05
Decker et al (1993)	48 burglars & 40 non-burglars, Missouri	Non Prob.	Logit	1	No	Assigned Certainty-Self	Burglary	?, p> .10
Grasmick et al (1993)	636 adults, Southwestern city, 1982/1990	Probability	OLS	8	Yes	CxS-Self	DUI	-, p< .001
Carnes & Englebrecht (1995)	126 college students in unknown area	Non Prob.	ANOVA	1	No	Caught-Self	Tax Cheating	-, p= .01
Ellis & Simpson (1995)	96 college students, unknown Area.	Non Prob.	GLS	18	Yes	Arrest-Self	Corporate	-, p> .05
						Prosecuted-Others		-, p> .05
Gertz & Gould (1995)	535-611 university students, Florida	Probability	OLS	11	Yes	Arrest-Self	Battery	-, p> .05
							Bad Checks	-, p> .05
							Cocaine	-, p> .05
							Burglary	-, p> .05
							Theft	+, p> .05
							Sex Crime	-, p> .05
							Shoplift	-, p> .05
			Tau-b				Car Theft	-, p> .05
			OLS				DUI	-, p> .05
							Minors	-, p< .01
			Tau-b			Incarcerate-Self	Battery	-, p> .05
			OLS				Bad Checks	-, p> .05
							Cocaine	-, p> .05
			Tau-b				Burglary	-, p> .05
			OLS				Theft	-, p> .05
			Tau-b				Sex Crime	-, p> .05
							Shoplift	-, p> .05
							Car Theft	-, p> .05
							DUI	-, p> .05
			OLS			Incarcerate-Self	Minors	-, p> .05

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Certainty	Crime Type	Findings
McCarthy (1995)	1,993 residents, 3 U.S. states	Probability	Logit	13	Yes	Caught-Self	Theft of \$5 Theft of \$50	-, p>.05 +, p>.05
Paternoster & Simpson (1996)	84 bus. students & 12 bus. executives	Non Prob.	GLS	20	Yes	CxS-Self CxS-Others	Corporate	-, p<.10 +, p<.05
Piquero & Tibbetts (1996)	604 students, East Coast university	Non Prob.	Path	6	Yes	CxS-Self	Shoplift DUI	N.S. -, p<.05
Tibbetts & Herz (1996)	324 college male undergrads, MD	Non Prob.	OLS	6	Yes	CxS-Self	Shoplift DUI	+, p>.05 -, p<.05
	280 female college undergrads, MD	Non Prob.	OLS			CxS-Self	Shoplift DUI	+, p>.05 -, p<.01
Gopal & Sanders (1997)	61 MBA students	Non Prob.	OLS	4	No	Information on Penalties-Self	Software Piracy	-, p<.05
Piquero & Paternoster (1998)	1,686 drivers ages 16 and over	Probability	Path	10	Yes	CBP-Self	DUI	-, p<.05
Piquero & Rengert (1999)	15 residential burglars, Northeast	Non Prob.	OLS	4	No	Assigned Certainty-Self	Burglary	-, p<.05
Blackwell (2000)	211 residents, Oklahoma City	Probability	OLS	7	Yes	CBP-Self	Multiple	-, p<.001
Nagin & Pogarsky (2001)	251 college students, Arizona	Non Prob.	Tobit	12	No	Caught-Self	DUI	-, p<.05
Bouffard (2002a)	129 college students in the east	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Punished- Self	Rape	-, p>.05
Bouffard (2002b)	129 college students in the east	Non Prob.	OLS	10	No	Punished-Self	Sexual Coercion	-, p < .05
Piquero & Pogarsky (2002)	250 students, Southwestern univ.	Non Prob.	Tobit	14	No	CBP-Self	DUI	-, p<.05
Pogarsky (2002)	412 college students, unknown area.	Probability	Tobit	11	Yes	Caught-Self	DUI	-, p<.01
Simpson & Piquero (2002)	84 grad students, 12 executives in unknown area	Non. Prob.	GLS	36	Yes	Prosecuted-Firm	Corporate	-, p>.10
Gul, Ng & Tong (2003)	53 auditors, China	Non Prob.	OLS	7	No	CBP-Others	Corruption	-, p<.001
Pogarsky & Piquero (2003)	253 college students, Southwest	Non Prob.	Tobit	7	No	CBP-Self	DUI	-, p<.01
Carmichael & Piquero (2004)	414 college students in the West, 1997	Probability	Tobit	7	Yes	Composite-Self	Battery	+, p>.05
Barratt et al. (2005)	100 Cannabis users in Australia, 2002,2003	Non Prob.	Descr.	1	No	Caught-Self	Cannabis	-, p = ?
Higgins et al. (2005)	382 College students in the Southeast	Non Prob.	OLS	13	Yes	Caught-Self	Software Piracy	-, p<.05
Freeman et al (2006)	166 drunk drivers, Australia	Non Prob.	Ordinal	3	No	Caught-Self	DUI	+, p>.05
Freeman & Watson (2006)	166 drunk drivers, Australia	Non Prob.	Ordinal	6	No	Caught-Self &Others	DUI	+, p>.05
Sitren & Applegate (2006)	634 undergraduate students in Southeast	Non Prob.	OLS	21	Yes	Caught-Self	DUI	+, p=.60
Yu et al (2006)	433 people in New York	Non Prob.	OLS	13	No	Caught-Other	DUI	-, p>.05
Levin et al (2007)	384 undergraduate students in Southeast	Non Prob.	ANCOVA	2	No	CxS-Self	Music Piracy	-, p<.01

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Certainty	Crime Type	Findings
<b>Botchkovar &amp; Tittle (2008)</b>	224 Russian adults	Non Prob.	OLS	7	Yes	Caught-Self	Predatory Crime	-, p> .05
							Violent Crime	+, p> .05
<b>Bouffard et al (2008)</b>	212 college students in Midwest	Non. Prob.	OLS	8	No	Punished- Self	Shoplifting	-, p> .05
	93 juvenile offenders in Midwest							+, p> .10
<b>D'Arcy et al (2008)</b>	269 employees across 8 companies in U.S.	Non Prob.	Path	9	No	Caught-Other	Computer Crime	-, p> .05
<b>Morton &amp; Koufteros (2008)</b>	216 university students in Southeast	Non Prob.	Path	8	Yes	Caught- Self	Music Piracy	+, p> .05
<b>Sinha and Mandel (2008)</b>	386 college students, unknown area	Non Prob.	OLS	11	Yes	Assigned Certainty-Self	Digital Piracy	-, p< .001
	513 college students in Mid Atlantic	Non. Prob.	Ordinal	14	No	Punished-Other	Software Piracy	-, p> .05
	513 college students in Mid Atlantic	Non. Prob.	Ordinal	14	No	Punished-Other	Movie Piracy	-, p> .05
<b>Gunter (2009)</b>	513 college students in Mid Atlantic	Non. Prob.	Ordinal	14	No	Punished-Other	Music Piracy	-, p< .001
							Software Piracy	-, p> .05
							Movie Piracy	-, p> .05
<b>Li &amp; Nergadze (2009)</b>	306 college students in the South	Non Prob.	OLS	4	Yes	Caught&Punished-Self	Illeg. File Sharing	-, p< .01
<b>Rebellion, et al (2009)</b>	435 college students, 2004, unknown area	Non Prob.	Path	6	Yes	Caught- Self	Theft of \$100	-, p< .05
<b>Urban (2009)</b>	118 juvenile offenders, area unknown	Non Prob.	OLS	8	No	Caught-Self	Any Crime	+, p> .05
<b>Ali and Abdullah (2010)</b>	284 fishermen in Malaysia, 2001-2002	Non Prob.	Logit	16	No	Caught-Self	Illegal Fishing	-, p< .05
<b>Watling et al (2010)</b>	899 drivers in Australia, 2007	Non Prob.	Logistic	8	Yes	Caught-Other	DUI	-, p> .05
<b>Hu et al (2011)</b>	207 employees in China	Non. Prob.	Path	10	Yes	CxS- Self	Computer Crime	-, p> .05
<b>Maxson et al (2011)</b>	744 Delinquent Youth, CA, 2000-01	Non Prob.	OLS	14	Yes	Arrest-Self	Theft	+, p> .05
							Drug Dealing	-, p> .05
							Car Theft	-, p> .05
<b>Title et al (2011)</b>	1,400 adults in Athens, Greece, Ukraine, 2006	Probability	OLS	6	Yes	Punished-Self	Theft	+, p>.05
	400 adults in Greece							+, p> .05
	500 adults in Russia							+, p> .05
	500 adults in the Ukraine							+, p> .05
	1,400 adults in Athens, Greece, Ukraine, 2006						Violent Crime	-, p< .05
	400 adults in Greece							+, p> .05
	500 adults in Russia							-, p> .05
	500 adults in the Ukraine							-, p> .05
	1,400 adults in Athens, Greece, Ukraine, 2006					CxS-Self	Theft	+, p> .05
	400 adults in Greece							+, p> .05
	500 adults in Russia							+, p> .05
	500 adults in the Ukraine							-, p> .05
	1,400 adults in Athens, Greece, Ukraine, 2006						Violent Crime	+, p> .05

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Certainty	Crime Type	Findings
	400 adults in Greece							-, p> .05
	500 adults in Russia							-, p> .05
	500 adults in the Ukraine							+, p< .05
<b>Watling &amp; Freeman (2011)</b>	922 people in Unknown Area	Non Prob.	Logistic	13	Yes	Caught-Other	Drug Driving	-, p> .05
<b>Wingrove et al (2011)</b>	172 College Students, Midwest, 2003-04	Non Prob.	OLS	8	Yes	CxS-Self	Illegal Download	-, p< .01
<b>Jacobs &amp; Piquero (2012)</b>	171 college students in Southeast, 2010	Non Prob.	OLS	2	No	Caught-Self	DUI	-, p< .05
<b>Loughran et al (2012a)</b>	1354 juvenile offenders in PA and AZ	Non Prob.	OLS	2	No	Caught-Self	Multiple	-, p= .001
						Caught-Other		-, p= .004
<b>Loughran et al (2012b)</b>	478 college Students, unknown area, 2010	Non Prob.	OLS	5	No	Assigned Certainty-Self	DUI	-, p< .001
<b>Sitren &amp; Applegate (2012)</b>	326 inmates in Southeast, 2006	Non Prob.	OLS	25	Yes	Caught-Self	DUI	+, p> .05
							Drug Purchase	-, p> .05
							Shoplifting	+, p> .05
<b>Baron (2013)</b>	300 homeless teens, Toronto, 2005-06	Non Prob.	OLS	17	Yes	Caught-Self	Battery	+, p> .05
<b>Bouffard &amp; Exum (2013)</b>	760 college students in Southwest, 2011	Non Prob.	Neg. Binomial	10	No	CBP-Other	DUI	-, p< .01
	1,013 offenders in Southwest, 2011							-, p< .01
<b>Crank &amp; Brezina (2013)</b>	895 inmates in Colorado, 1998-99	Non Prob.	Logistic	11	No	Arrest-Other	Any Crime	-, p< .05
<b>Harbaugh et al (2013)</b>	82 High School and 34 College students, Oregon	Non Prob.	OLS	12	No	Assigned Certainty-Self	Theft	-, p< .01
	Sample of College Students							-, p< .01
	Sample of High School Students							-, p< .01
	82 High School and 34 College students, Oregon					CxS-Self		-, p< .01
	Sample of College Students							-, p< .01
	Sample of High School Students							-, p< .01
<b>Piquero et al (2013)</b>	1,013 felony inmates, unknown area, 2011	Non Prob.	OLS	10	Yes	C+S-Self	DUI	-, p< .01
			Correl.	1	No	Composite-Self		-, p< .01
<b>Bouffard &amp; Petkovsek (2014)</b>	1,013 offenders in Southwest, 2011	Non Prob.	Path	9	Yes	CxS-Self	DUI	-, p< .01
<b>Loughran et al (2014)</b>	137 students in Mid Atlantic State, 2012	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	Arrest-Self	DUI-Self	-, p< .001
							Marijuana-Self	-, p< .01
							Text Driving-Self	-, p< .001
<b>Worrall et al (2014)</b>	306 college students, Southeast, 2011	Non Prob.	OLS	9	Yes	Caught-Self	DUI	-, p< .01
<b>Yao et al (2014)</b>	123 college students, Maryland	Non Prob.	Logistic	27	No	Assigned Certainty-Self	DUI	-, p< .001
						Jail-Self		-, p= .03
						CxS-Self		-, p< .05

<b>Study</b>	<b>Sample</b>	<b>Sample Type</b>	<b>Analysis</b>	<b>#IV</b>	<b>INF</b>	<b>Certainty</b>	<b>Crime Type</b>	<b>Findings</b>
Nguyen et al (2015)	338 cannabis growers in U.S.,2012	Non Prob.	Neg. Binomial	15	No	Arrest-Self	Cannabis Farm	+, p> .05

---

**Clarification of Commonly Used Abbreviations in Table 3**

*Column Headings*

#IV- Number of Independent Variables in the Analysis

INF- Did the Study Control For Informal Sanctions?

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*

*Sample*

- AZ- Arizona
- Bus.- Business
- CA- California
- Conv. – Conviction
- M.D.- Maryland
- N.J.- New Jersey
- P.A.- Pennsylvania
- Poss- Possession
- Univ- University

*Sample Type*

Non-Prob. – Non Probability

*Analysis*

- ANOVA- Analysis of Variance
- Correl.- Correlation Coefficient
- GLS- Generalized Least Squares Regression
- MCA Beta- Multiple Classification Analysis- Beta
- Diff. Means- Difference in Means Test

Neg. Binomial- Negative Binomial Regression  
OLS- Ordinary Least Squares Regression  
Ordinal – Ordinal Regression  
Path Analysis

*Certainty*

CBP- Caught By Police  
CxS- Certainty Multiplied with Severity  
C+S- Certainty added to Severity

*Crime Type*

Drug Driving- Drugged Driving  
Multiple- Multiple Crimes Combined into one Measure  
Illeg. File Sharing- Illegal File Sharing  
Mar. Dealing- Marijuana Dealing  
Cannabis Farm- Size of Cannabis Farm

*Citation*

Grasmick et al 1993 in this table refers to the study: Grasmick, Harold, Robert Bursik, and Bruce Arneklev. 1993. "Reduction in Drunk Driving as a Response to Increased Threats of Shame, Embarrassment and Legal Sanctions." *Criminology* 31 (1): 41-67

Loughran et al 2012a in this table refers to the study: Loughran, Thomas, Raymond Paternoster, Alex Piquero and Jeffrey Fagan 2012. "A Good Man Always Knows His Limitations." The Role of Overconfidence in Criminal Offending. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 50 (3): 327-358.

Loughran et al 2012b in this table refers to the study: Loughran, Thomas, Raymond Paternoster and Douglass Weiss. 2012. "Hyperbolic Time Discounting, Offender Time Preferences and Deterrence." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 28 (1): 607-628.