

Table A8. The Impact of Experienced Severity or Swiftness on Later Criminal Behavior

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	IV	INF	Prior Crime	Experienced Severity	Crime Type	Findings
Claster (1967)	42 delin. & 65 non-delin., E. South Central	Non Prob.	MWUT	1	No	No	Inmates vs Non-Inmates	Multiple	+, p= .003
Scarpitti & Stephenson (1968)	894 delinquent boys in New Jersey, 1962	Non Prob.	T-Test	1	No	No	Tougher Sent. v. Probation	Re-sentenced	+, p< .001
Babst et al (1972)	7,200 male parolees in 1968-69, U.S.	Non Prob.	T-Test	1	No	No	Time-Served	Parole Outcome	N.S.
	Drug abuse parolees								N.S.
	Alcohol abuse parolees								N.S.
Jaman et al. (1972)	240 burglars on parole in 1965, CA	Non Prob.	T-Test	1	No	No	Sentence Length	Parole Outcome	+, p< .05
	150 robbers on parole in 1965, CA								+, p< .05
Berecochea et al. (1973)	1,009 parolees, CA	Non Prob.	Chi-Square	1	No	No	Time-Served	Rearrest	+, p> .05
Kraus (1974)	446 juvenile offenders in Wales, 1962-63	Non Prob.	Chi-Square	1	No	No	Prison vs. Probation	Rearrest	+, p< .05
Babst et al. (1976)	929 offenders, 1968 & 894 offenders, 1969	Non Prob.	OLS	6	No	Yes	Time Served	Parole violations	-, p>.05
Beck & Hoffman (1976)	1,546 federal offenders, 1970	Non Prob.	Chi-Square	1	No	No	Time Served	Rearrest	-, p> .05
Erickson (1976)	95 conv. of cannabis poss., Toronto	Non Prob.	Gamma	1	No	No	Severity of Penalty	Marijuana	+, p= ?
Heinz et al (1976)	36 offenders, Minnesota, 1972-1974	Non Prob.	Diff. Means	1	No	No	Severity of Parole	Reconviction	+, p> .05
Hopkins (1976)	882 offenders, Connecticut, 1962-1969	CE	Diff. Means	1	No	No	Prison vs. Lesser Offense	Recharged- Felony	?, p> .05
Bartell & Winfree (1977)	100 burglary offenders in Albuquerque, 1971	Non Prob.	OLS	6	No	Yes	Prison vs. Lesser Penalty	Rearrest	-, p< .05
								Reconviction	-, p< .05
Gottfredson et al. (1977)	5,346 male offenders, Ohio	Probability	Chi-Square	1	No	No	Time Served	Parole Outcome	+, p> .05
Waldron & Angelino (1977)	187 male offenders, Ohio	Non Prob.	T-test	1	No	No	Sentence Length	Rearrest	N.S.
								Reconviction	N.S.
								Reincarceration	N.S.
	76 female offenders, Ohio							Rearrest	N.S.
								Reconviction	N.S.
								Reincarceration	N.S.
Kraus (1978)	180 juvenile offenders in Australia, 1973-74	Non Prob.	Chi-Square	1	No	No	Custody vs. Probation	Re-charged	+, p< .001
							Length of Custody		+, p> .05
Wheeler (1978)	94 juvenile female offenders, Midwest	Non Prob.	T-test	1	No	No	Time Served	Parole Violation	+, p>.05
	353 juvenile male offender, Midwest								+, p<.01
Horwitz & Wasserman (1979)	474 teen offenders, NJ	Probability	OLS	9	No	Yes	Severity of Disposition	Rearrest	+, p>.05
Myers (1980)	23,837 offenders, U.S.	Non Prob.	Logit	10	No	Yes	Time Served	Rearrest	-, p< .05
	White offenders								-, p> .05

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	IV	INF	Prior Crime	Experienced Severity	Crime Type	Findings
Phillpotts & Lancucki (1980)	Black offenders 4,425 male offenders, England, 1971 575 female offenders, England, 1971	Non Prob.	Descriptive	1	No	No	Severity of Penalty	Reconviction	-, p> .05 +, p= ? +, p= ?
Myers (1983)	2,127 released federal prisoners black prisoners white prisoners	Non Prob.	Logistic	18	No	Yes	Time Served	Rearrest	-, p<.05 -, p>.05 -, p>.05
Vito et al (1985)	310 probationers, Kentucky, 1980-1986	Probability	Chi-Square	1	No	No	Severity of Probation	Rearrest	+, p> .05
Petersilia et al (1986)	1022 offenders in corrections in CA	Non Prob.	OLS	26	No	Yes	Prison vs. Probation Time Served	Rearrest	+, p< .05 -, p> .05
Murray and Erickson (1987)	120 drug offenders in Ontario	Non Prob.	OLS	9	No	Yes	Severity of Penalty	Marijuana Use Forecast of Marij. Use	-, p<.05 -, p<.05
Orsagh & Chen (1988)	1,425 offenders, North Carolina	Non Prob.	Logit	9	No	Yes	Time Served	Rearrest	+, p< .01
Wheeler & Hissong (1988)	329 first time DWI offenders, TX 68 repeat DWI offenders, TX	Non Prob.	Chi-Square	1	No	No	Severity of Penalty	Reconviction-DUI	+, p> .05 +, p> .05
Wooldredge (1988)	2,038 delinquents, Illinois	Non Prob.	Chi-Square	1	No	No	Probation vs. Dismissed Length of Probation	Rearrest	-, p<.05 +, p> .05
Klepper and Nagin (1989c)	50,000 tax returns in the U.S.	Probability	OLS	7	No	No	Severity of Penalty	Tax Fraud	-, p<.01
Trumbull (1989)	1310 offenders, North Carolina	Non Prob.	Tobit	20	No	No	Sentence Length	Rearrest	+, p> .10
Barton & Butts (1990)	511 delinquent youths, Michigan, 1983-1985	Probability	T-Test	1	No	No	State Commitment vs. IS	Minor Crime Drug Use Property Crime Violent Crime Multiple Crime	+, p> .05 +, p> .05 +, p> .05 +, p < .05 -, p> .05
Petersilia & Turner (1990)	157 offenders, Los Angeles, 1987-1988	Non Prob.	Unclear	1	No	No	ISP vs. Probation	Technical Viol.- Any Technical Viol.- Drugs Rearrest- Any Rearrest- Drugs Rearrest- Property Rearrest- Violent Incarceration	+, p< .05 +, p< .05 +, p> .05 +, p> .05 +, p> .05 +, p > .05 +, p> .05
Schmidt & Garner (1990)	2,268 federal offenders released in 1978	CE	Descriptive	1	No	No	Time Served	Rearrest	+, p= ?

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	IV	INF	Prior Crime	Experienced Severity	Crime Type	Findings
Schneider & Ervin (1990)	876 delinquents, U.S.	Non Prob.	OLS	16	No	Yes	Severity: Last Crime	Reimprisonment	+, p= ?
	202 felony offenders, Israel	CE	Discriminant	7	No	Yes	Severity of Sentence	Theft ≥ \$20	+, p> .05
Cohen et al. (1991)	824 offenders in CA	Non Prob.	Logistic	14	No	Yes	Prison vs. Probation	Arrest	-, p< .001
							Jail vs. Lesser Sentence	Arrest	-, p> .05
Gordon & Glaser (1991)	13,978 offenders, California	Non Prob.	OLS	10	No	No	Amount of Fine	Rearrest	+, p> .05
							Time Served	Arrest-Felony	+, p< .01
Jones (1991)	1,414 felony offenders in Kansas, 1984	Non Prob.	Logit	7	No	No	Prison vs. Lesser Penalty	Arrest-Non-Felony	+, p< .05
	273 offenders, Louisiana, 1987-1989	Non Prob.	Survival	7	No	Yes	Prison vs. Lesser Penalty	Arrest-Property	+, p< .01
Mackenzie (1991)	2045 first time DUI offenders, Ontario, 1976-79	CE	OLS	13	No	No	Severity of Fine	Arrest-Non-Property	+, p< .01
							Sentence Length	Arrest-Felony	+, p< .01
Mann et al. (1991)	192 multiple DUI offenders, Ontario, 1976-79	CE	OLS	13	No	No	Sentence Length	Arrest-Felony	-, p> .05
	Probation Length						Arrest-Non-Felony	-, p> .05	
Mann et al. (1991)	2045 first time DUI offenders, Ontario, 1976-79	CE	OLS	13	No	No	Length of Susp. License	Arrest-Property	-, p> .05
	Severity of Fine						Arrest-Non-Property	-, p> .05	
Mann et al. (1991)	192 multiple DUI offenders, Ontario, 1976-79	CE	OLS	13	No	No	Sentence Length	Arrest-Property	-, p> .05
	Probation Length						Arrest-Non-Property	-, p> .05	
Mann et al. (1991)	2045 first time DUI offenders, Ontario, 1976-79	CE	OLS	13	No	No	Length of Susp. License	Reconviction- DUI	+, p< .05
	Severity of Fine						Reconviction- DUI	+, p< .05	
Mann et al. (1991)	192 multiple DUI offenders, Ontario, 1976-79	CE	OLS	13	No	No	Sentence Length	DUI Accidents	+, p> .05
	Probation Length						DUI Accidents	+, p> .05	
Mann et al. (1991)	2045 first time DUI offenders, Ontario, 1976-79	CE	OLS	13	No	No	Length of Susp. License	DUI Accidents	+, p> .05
	Severity of Fine						DUI Accidents	+, p> .05	
Mann et al. (1991)	192 multiple DUI offenders, Ontario, 1976-79	CE	OLS	13	No	No	Sentence Length	DUI Accidents	+, p> .05
	Probation Length						DUI Accidents	+, p> .05	

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	IV	INF	Prior Crime	Experienced Severity	Crime Type	Findings
Clarke & Harrison (1992)	4,919 offenders, North Carolina	CE	Logistic	28	No	Yes	Length of Susp. License		-, p > .05
							Time Served	Rearrest	+, p < .05
								Rearrest-Violent	-, p > .05
								Rearrest-Property	+, p < .01
Jolin & Stipak (1992)	221 offenders in Oregon,	Probability	Logistic	14	No	Yes	Work Rel. vs. Treatment.	Rearrest-Drug	+, p < .01
								Rearrest	-, p > .05
Simpson & Koper (1992)	38 corporations in U.S.9, 1928-81 (n=1415)	Non Prob.	Logit	16	No	No	Severity of Penalty	Antitrust Violations	-, p > .10
Turner & Petersilia (1992)	221 offenders in Dallas	Non. Prob.	Chi-Square	1	No	No	I.S. vs. Parole	Arrest	+, p > .05
								Arrest-Drugs	+, p > .05
								Arrest-Property	+, p > .05
								Arrest- Violent	+, p > .05
								Arrest	+, p > .05
								Arrest-Drugs	+, p > .05
								Arrest-Property	+, p > .05
Arrest- Violent	+, p > .05								
Van Ness (1992)	70 offenders, Indiana, 1991-1993	Non Prob.	Diff. Means	1	No	No	Prison vs. ISP	Reconviction- Violent	+, p < .05
								Reconvict-Non Viol.	+, p < .05
								Reconviction- Prop.	+, p > .05
								Rearrest-Property	-, p < .05
Gottfredson and Barton (1993)	927 delinquents in U.S.	Non Prob.	OLS	9	No	Yes	Institutionalized vs. not	Rearrest- Violent	-, p > .05
								Rearrest- Drugs	-, p > .05
								Recidivism	+, p > .05
Kim et al. (1993)	3,534 drug offenders, Florida	Non Prob.	Weibull	20	No	Yes	Time Served	Arrests- Technical	-, p > .05
Mackenzie & Shaw (1993)	353 offenders, Louisiana, 1987-1990	Non Prob.	Survival	6	No	Yes	Incar. vs. Lesser Offense	Arrests- Any Crime	-, p > .05
								Prob. Viol. – Tech.	-, p > .05
								Prob. Viol.- Any	-, p > .05
								Reconviction- Any	-, p < .05
								Reconviction- DUI	+, p > .05
Martin et al (1993)	383 DUI offenders in Minnesota, 1983-84	Non Prob.	2SLS	10	No	Yes	Jail vs. Lesser Sentence	Rearrest	-, p = .352
Smith & Akers (1993)	494 males in corrections in Florida	Non Prob.	Logit	3	No	Yes	Prison vs. Com. Control	Reimprisonment	-, p = .006

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	IV	INF	Prior Crime	Experienced Severity	Crime Type	Findings
Wiebush (1993)	244 juvenile delinquents in Ohio, 1987-90	Non Prob.	T-Test	1	No	No	Prison vs. Int. Supervision	Felonies Misdemeanors	+, p> .05 +, p> .05
Belenko et al. (1994)	3,561 offenders, NYC, 1989	Non Prob.	Logistic	12	No	Yes	Time Served	Rearrest	-, p< .05
Brennan & Mednick (1994)	28,879 males born in Denmark	C.E.	Logistic	3	No	Yes	Severity of Fine Time Served Prison vs. Lesser Offense Severity of Fine Time Served Prison vs. Lesser Offense	Rearrest	N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S.
Fagan (1994)	6,800 drug offenders, NYC	Non Prob.	ANOVA	1	No	No	Time Served	Rearrest-Drug Sale Rearrest-Drug Poss Rearrest-Violence Rearrest-Property Rearrest	+, p> .05 +, p< .001 +, p< .001 +, p< .001 +, p< .001
Kim (1994)	4,398 drug offenders, Florida	Non Prob.	OLS	12	No	Yes	Time Served	Recidivism	+, p> .05
Morgan (1994)	266 probationers in Tennessee, 1980-89	Non Prob.	Logit	12	No	Yes	Probation Sentence Length	Rearrest	+, p> .05
Roeger (1994)	442 male offenders, Australia, 1986-1990	Non Prob.	Logistic	16	No	Yes	Prison vs. C.C.	Reimprisonment	?, p> .05
Fagin (1995)	800 15-16 yrs old, NY & NJ	Non Prob.	Logistic	7	No	Yes	Sentence Length	Time to Rearrest	-, p= .076
Harer (1995)	865 released federal prisoners, 1987	Non Prob.	Logistic	28	No	Yes	Time Served	Rearrest	+, p> .10
Weisburd et al. (1995)	742 white collar offenders, U.S.	Non Prob.	Chi-Square	1	No	No	Prison vs. Probation	Recidivism	+, p> .05
Yu & Williford (1995)	13,058 DUI offenders, NY, 1990-94	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	No	Severity of Fine	# of Re-tickets-DUI	-, p> .05
Baumer (1997)	1,230 offenders, Island of Bauma	Non Prob.	Logistic	9	No	Yes	Prison Length % Sentence Served	Reconviction Reimprisonment Reconviction Reimprisonment	-, p< .05 -, p< .05 -, p> .05 +, p> .05
Courtright et al. (1997)	114 DUI offenders, PA	Non Prob.	T Tests	1	No	No	Jail vs. lesser Penalty	Rearrest	+, p= .028
Dejong (1997)	4,847 male offenders, NY	Non Prob.	Logistic	19	No	Yes	# of days sentenced	Rearrest	-, p= ?
DeYoung (1997)	88,552 first time DUI offenders in CA, 1990/91	CE	Ancova	6	No	No	Jail vs. Lesser Penalty	Reconviction- DUI	+, p< .01
Jones & Ross (1997)	649 offenders, age 16-25 in North Carolina	Non Prob.	Logistic	34	No	Yes	Prison vs. House Arrest	Rearrest- Any Rearrest- Property Rearrest- Drugs	-, p< .001 -, p< .001 -, p< .001

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	IV	INF	Prior Crime	Experienced Severity	Crime Type	Findings
Nirel et al (1997)	1,357 offenders in Israel, 1991-1993	CE	Logistic	5	No	No	Prison vs. Work Release	Recharged	+ p< .001
Davis et al. (1998)	464 dom. violence cases, Wisconsin	Non Prob.	Logistic	12	No	Yes	Jail vs. Lesser Penalty	Rearrest	+, p= .000
Myner et al. (1998)	138 male offenders, CA	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	No	Time Served	Future Convictions	+, p< .05
Odegard & Amundsen (1998)	1,905 Nowegian offenders, 1980-1984	Non Prob.	Tobit	6	No	Yes	Time Served	Reconviction	+, p< .01
Thistlethwaite et al. (1998)	683 domestic violence offenders	Non Prob.	Logit	14	No	Yes	Severity of Penalty	Rearrest	-, p< .05
							Time served- probation		+, p> .10
							Time Served- jail		-, p> .10
Wright & Mays (1998)	1,937 offenders, Oklahoma, 1989-1991	CE	Logistic	6	No	No	Prison vs. Probation	Parole Violation	?, p> .05
Gottfredson (1999)	962 felony offenders in New Jersey	Non Prob.	Descriptive	1	No	No	Time Served	Rearrest	-, p> .05
							Jail vs. Lesser Sentence		-, p> .05
Bonta et al (2000)	532 male offenders, Canada, 1995-1998	Non Prob.	OLS	8	No	No	Prison vs. Lesser Sentence	Rearrest	?, p> .05
Gainey et al. (2000)	276 offenders on electronic monitoring	Non Prob.	Logistic	13	No	Yes	Time Served	Rearrest	+, p> .05
Gross et al. (2000)	177 male offenders, VA	Non Prob.	Logistic	8	No	Yes	Jail vs Lesser Penalty	Rearrest- DV	+, p= .75
								Reconviction-DV	+, p= .75
Killias et al. (2000)	123 offenders in Switzerland	Probability	Gamma	1	No	No	Prison vs. Lesser Penalty	Reconvict	+, p< .02
Olson & Lurigio (2000)	2438 adult probationers in Illinois, 1997	Non Prob.	Logistic	11	No	Yes	Sentence Length	Probation Revocation	+, p< .01
								Rearrest	+, p> .05
Yu (2000)	878 DUI offenders, NY	Non Prob.	Logistic	9	No	No	Jail vs. Lesser Penalty?	Rearrest	-, p> .05
							length of license susp?		-, p> .05
Muiluvuori (2001)	605 offenders in Finland , 1998	Non Prob.	T-Test	1	No	No	Prison vs. Lesser Penalty	Reimprisonment	+, p> .05
Ulmer (2001)	516 offenders, Indiana	Non Prob.	Logistic	26	No	Yes	Incarc. vs. lesser Penalty?	Rearrest	+, p> .05
Weinrath & Garthrell (2001)	514 drunk drivers, Alberta, CA, 1989-91	Non Prob.	Logistic	5	No	No	Timer Served	Reconviction-DUI	+, p< .05
Finn & Muirhead-Steves (2002)	286 violent parolees in Georgia	Non Prob.	Logistic	13	No	Yes	Time Served	Recommitted to Prison	-, p> .05
								Time to Recommit	-, p> .05
Savolainen (2002)	3,720 offenders, NYC, 1998-2000	Non Prob.	Cox Reg.	62	No	Yes	Prison vs. Probation	Rearrest	+, p> .05
			Cox Reg.				Jail vs. Probation		+, p< .05
			Unclear	1		No	Jail vs. ATI		+, p> .05
			Unclear	1			Prison vs. ATI		+, p> .05
Spohn & Holleran (2002)	1,530 offenders, Missouri	Non Prob.	Logistic	9	No	Yes	Severity of Sentence	Any Crime	+, p< .05
Fagin et al. (2003)	2,382 15-16 yrs old, NY & NJ	Non. Prob.	Logistic	22	No	Yes	Time Served	Rearrest	+, p< .001
								Rearrest-violence	+, p> .05
								Rearrest-property	+, p> .05

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	IV	INF	Prior Crime	Experienced Severity	Crime Type	Findings
								Rearrest-weapons	-, p> .05
								Rearrest-drugs	+, p< .05
Sung (2003)	263 drug offenders, NY	Non Prob.	Logistic	10	No	Yes	Time Served	Rearrest	+, p> .05
Meloy (2005)	917 sex offenders in 17 states, 1986-89	Non Prob.	Logistic	12	No	Yes	Jail vs. No Jail	Rearrest	+, p> .05
								Rearrest-non sex crime	-, p> .05
								Rearrest- sex crime	+, p< .05
Deschense et al (2006)	23,562 female prisoners, U.S., 1994-1997	Non Prob.	Logistic	12	No	Yes	Sentence Length	Rearrest- Any Crime	-, p=.000
								Rearrest- Drug Crime	-, p=.000
Freeman, et al. (2006)	166 drunk drivers in Australia	Probability	Ordinal	3	No	Yes	Actual Problem	Forecast of DIU	-, p< .05
Chen & Shapiro (2007)	1205 Federal prisoners released in 1987	Non Prob.	Probit	7	No	Yes	Prison Security Level	Rearrest	+, p> .05
Holland et al (2007)	3,352 prisoners, Australia, 2002-2005	Non Prob.	Logistic	6	No	No	Time Served	Reimprisonment	+, p= .004
Nunes et al. (2007)	627 male sexual offenders in Ottawa, 1983-95	Non Prob.	Logistic	3	No	Yes	Prison vs. Lesser Penalty	Recharged	+, p> .05
							Prison Length		+, p> .05
Spohn (2007)	1,077 felony offenders in Missouri, 1993	CE	OLS	18	Yes	Yes	Prison vs. Lesser Penalty	Any Crime	+, p< .05
Wood (2007)	726 inmates, Southeast	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	No	Time Served	Forecast-Any Crime	+, p> .05
Cid (2009)	483 offenders in Barcelona, Spain, 1998-2005	Non Prob.	Logistic	3	No	Yes	Prison vs. Lesser Penalty	Reimprisonment	+, p=.015
DeBeck et al (2009)	1,603 drug offenders in Vancouver, 1996-05	Non Prob.	GEE	10	No	Yes	Prison vs. Lesser Penalty	Heroin Use	?, p> .05
								Cocaine Use	?, p> .05
								Crack Cocaine Use	?, p> .05
								Injection Drug Use	?, p> .05
Drago et al (2009)	20,950 offenders in Italy	Non Prob.	Logit	18	No	Yes	Sentence Length	Reimprisonment	-, p< .05
Loughran et al (2009)	1354 adolescents in PA & AZ	Non Prob.	OLS	5	No	No	Time Served	Any Crime	-, p> .05
McGrath (2009)	193 adolescents in Wales	Non Prob.	Survival	1	No	No	Sentence Length	Any Crime	+, p> .05
Nieuwbeerta et al (2009)	2,970 offenders in the Netherlands	Non Prob.	OLS	14	No	Yes	Prison vs. Lesser Penalty	Reconviction	+, p< .05
								Reconviction- Violent	+, p< .05
								Reconviction- Prop.	+, p< .05
Patrick & Marsh (2009)	447 Offenders in Idaho	Probability	Correl.	1	No	No	Prison vs. Probation	Reconviction	+, p> .05
Bahr et al (2010)	51 parolees in two large U.S. cities	Non Prob.	Logistic	7	No	Yes	Sentence Length	Parole Violation	-, p> .05
Green & Winik (2010)	1,003 drug defendants, D.C., 2002-03	Non Prob.	2SLS	23	No	Yes	Sentence Length	Rearrest	+, p> .05
							Probation Length		+, p> .05
Wermink et al (2010)	4,257 Offenders, Netherlands, 1997-05	Non Prob.	Diff. Means	1	No	No	Sentence Length	Reconviction	+, p< .001

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	IV	INF	Prior Crime	Experienced Severity	Crime Type	Findings	
Snodgrass et al (2011)	4,683 Dutch Offenders, 1997	Non Prob.	OLS	5	No	No	Prison vs. Lesser Penalty		+, p< .001	
			Diff. Means	1			Sentence Length	Reconviction	-, p< .001	
Weatherburn & Moffat (2011)	12,657 DUI offenders, Australia, 2003-04	CE	2SLS	13	No	Yes	Severity of Fine	DUI	-, p> .05	
Bales & Piquero (2012)	144,416 offenders in Florida, 1994-2002	CE	Logistic	19	No	Yes	Prison vs ISP	Reconviction	+, p< .001	
Entorf (2012)	159 inmates in Germany, 15-22 years old	Non Prob.	Probit	14	No	Yes	Sentence Length	Forecast of Crime	-, p> .05	
Lapham & Todd (2012)	544 DUI offenders, New Mex, 1989-2004	Non Prob.	Path	8	Yes	Yes	Time Served	DUI	-, p> .05	
Lund et al (2012)	318 male offenders in Sweden	Non Prob.	Logistic	6	No	Yes	Prison vs. Lesser Penalty	Reconviction-Any	-, p< .01,	
Meade et al (2012)	2,052 offenders in Ohio, 2003-2005	Non Prob.	Logistic	21	No	Yes	Time Served	Rearrest-Felony	-, p< .01	
								Reconviction- Violent	-, p< .01	
Mears et al (2012)	513,268 male offenders, Florida, 1994-2002	Probability	Diff Means	1	No	No	Prison vs. Probation	Reconviction-Violent	+, p< .05	
								Reconviction-Property	+, p< .05	
								Reconviction-Drug	+, p< .05	
								Reconviction-Other	+, p< .05	
								Prison vs. Intensive Prob.	Reconviction-Violent	+, p< .05
								Reconviction-Property	+, p< .05	
								Reconviction-Drug	+, p< .05	
								Reconviction-Other	+, p< .05	
								Prison vs. Jail	Reconviction-Violent	-, p> .05
								Reconviction-Property	+, p< .05	
								Reconviction-Drug	+, p< .05	
								Reconviction-Other	+, p< .05	
								Prison vs. Probation	Reconviction-Violent	+, p> .05
								Reconviction-Property	+, p< .05	
Reconviction-Drug	+, p< .05									
Reconviction-Other	+, p> .05									
Prison vs. Intensive Prob.	Reconviction-Violent	+, p> .05								
Reconviction-Property	+, p< .05									
Reconviction-Drug	+, p< .05									
Reconviction-Other	+, p> .05									
Prison vs. Jail	Reconviction-Violent	-, p> .05								

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Prior Crime	Experienced Severity	Crime Type	Findings
								Reconviction-Property	+, p< .05
								Reconviction-Drug	-, p> .05
								Reconviction-Other	+, p> .05
Sitren & Applegate (2012)	326 inmates in Southeast, 2006	Non Prob.	OLS	25	Yes	Yes	Sentence Length	Forecast of DUI	-, p> .05
								Forecast, Buy Drugs	-, p> .05
								Forecast of Shoplifting	+, p> .05
Steiner et al (2012)	1,244 parole violators, Ohio, 2003-05	Probability	MLR	5	No	No	Severity of Penalty	Rearrest- Felony	-, p< .01
Bell et al (2013)	104 domestic violence victims in Mid Atlantic	Non Prob.	MLM	3	No	Yes	Prison vs. Lesser Penalty	Domestic Violence	-, p> .05
Loeffler (2013)	20,297 felony cases in Illinois, 2000-2008	Non Prob.	2LSL	11	No	Yes	Prison vs. Lesser Penalty	Rearrest-Felony	-, p> .05
Siren & Savolainen (2013)	1,054 offenders in Finland, 1996+2000	Non Prob.	Cox Model	27	No	Yes	Prison vs. Lesser Penalty	Any Crime	+, p< .05
							Sentence Length		+, p>.05
							Time Served		-, p> .05
Wermink, et al (2013)	6,260 Dutch Offenders, 1997-2005	Non Prob.	Diff. Means	1	No	No	Prison vs. Lesser Penalty	Reconviction	-, p= ?
Aarten et al (2014)	2,115 offenders in Amsterdam, 2006	Non Prob.	Cox Model	6	No	Yes	Prison vs. Lesser Penalty	Reconviction	+, p= .97
	Sample of first offenders								-, p= .001
	Sample of recidivists								+, p= .000
Dooley et al (2014)	1,124 released inmates in Illinois, 2000-02	CE	CEM	5	No	No	Time Served	Rearrest	-, p< .01
								Reimprisonment	-, p> .05
Georgiou (2014)	47,154 offenders in Washington, 2000-2004	Non Prob.	OLS	15	No	No	Level of Supervision	Reconviction	+, p> .05
Tollenaar et al (2014)	6,652 Dutch Offenders, 2004-2008	Non Prob.	Diff. Means	1	No	No	Sentence Length	Reconviction	-, p< .001
Klement (2015)	1,602 offenders in Denmark, 2005-2009	Non Prob.	Logistic	24	No	Yes	Prison vs. C.S.	Reconviction	+, p< .01
							Sentence Length		+, p> .05
Lee & Teske (2015)	370 Probationers in Texas, 2002-10	Non Prob.	History	13	No	Yes	Composite	Probation Violation	-, p< .05
Wodahl et al (2015)	859 Offenders, Wyoming, 2000-03	Probability	Logistic	12	No	Yes	Jail vs. Lesser Penalty	Probation Violation	-, p> .05

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Prior Crime	Experienced Swiftess	Crime Type	Findings
Phillips et al. (1983)	210 Youth offenders, Ohio	Non Prob.	Descriptive	1	No	No	Time- first arrest to prison	# of Rearrests	-, p= ?
Schneider & Ervin (1990)	876 delinquents, U.S.	Non Prob.	OLS	16	No	Yes	Time: offense to disp.	Theft ≥ \$20	+, p> .05
Mann et al. (1991)	2045 first time DUI offenders, Ontario, 1976-79	CE	OLS	13	No	No	Time: offense to court	Reconviction--DUI	+, p> .05
	192 multiple DUI offenders, Ontario, 1976-79								-, p> .05

Study	Sample	Sample Type	Analysis	#IV	INF	Prior Crime	Experienced Swiftness	Crime Type	Findings
	2045 first time DUI offenders, Ontario, 1976-79							DUI Accidents	+, p< .05
	192 multiple DUI offenders, Ontario, 1976-79								-, p>.05
Simpson & Koper (1992)	38 corporations, 1928-81 (n=1415)	Non Prob.	Logit	16	No	Yes	Time: Offense to Charge	Antitrust Violations	-, p> .05
Belenko et al. (1994)	3,561 offenders, NYC, 1989	Non Prob.	Logistic	12	No	Yes	Case Processing Time	Recidivism	-, p> .05
Yu (1994)	878 DUI offenders, NY	Probability	Logistic	8	No	No	Time- arrest to conviction	Rearrest	+, p> .05
Fagin (1995)	800 15-16 yrs old, NY & NJ	Non Prob.	Logistic	7	No	Yes	Case Processing Time	Time to Rearrest	+, p= .010
Yu & Williford (1995)	13,058 DUI offenders, NY, 1990-94	Non Prob.	Correl.	1	No	No	Time: DUI to Disposition	# of Re-tickets-DUI	-, p< .01
Fagin et al. (2003)	2,382 15-16 yrs old, NY & NJ	Non. Prob.	Logistic	22	No	Yes	Time-Arrest to Disposition	Rearrest	+, p< .01
								Rearrest-violence	+, p< .01
								Rearrest-property	+, p> .05
								Rearrest-weapons	+, p< .001
								Rearrest-drugs	+, p> .05
Freeman, et al. (2006)	166 drunk drivers in Australia	Probability	Ordinal	3	No	Yes	Actual Swiftness	DUI Forecast	-, p> .05
Whiteacre (2008)	324 federal work release offenders, 2006	Non Prob.	Chi Square	1	No	No	Time-charge to hearing	Rearrest	-, p< .001
Steiner et al (2012)	1,244 parole violators, Ohio, 2003-05	Probability	MLR	5	No	No	Time-Crime to Sanction	Rearrest- Felony	-, p< .01
Lee & Teske (2015)	370 Probationers in Texas, 2002-10	Non prob.	Cox Reg.	13	No	Yes	Time from Filing to Conv.	Probation Violation	+, p< .05
Zettler et al (2015)	20,369 offenders, Texas, 2008-2011	CE	Logistic	42	No	Yes	Tune from crime to arrest	Rearrest	-, p< .05

Table 8- Clarification of Commonly Used Abbreviations in Table

Column Headings

#IV- Number of Independent Variables in the Analysis

INF- Did the Study Control For Informal Sanctions?

Experienced Severity- All measures represent respondents' experienced severity of punishment for a crime or crimes they committed. When severity of punishment is experienced vicariously it is listed within the measure. For instance, when experienced severity is only through one's peers, then the measure is listed specifically for the respondents' peers. When "vs." is used in a severity level, it is comparing the more serious punishment versus the less serious punishment. A negative relationship would signify that those who received the more serious punishment were less likely to commit crime, whereas a positive sign meant that they were more likely to commit crime.

Experienced Swiftness- All measures represent respondents' experienced swiftness of punishment for a crime or crimes that they committed. When swiftness of punishment is experienced vicariously it is listed within the measure. For instance, when experienced swiftness is only through one's peers, then the measure is listed specifically for the respondents' peers. A negative finding signifies that cases that are more swift in processing or penalties are significantly more likely to be related to lower crime rates.

Abbreviations Located Under Column Headings

Sample

AZ- Arizona
Bus.- Business
CA- California
Conv. – Conviction
D.C.- District of Columbia
M.D.- Maryland
MI- Michigan
New Mex- New Mexico
N.J.- New Jersey
NY- New York
NYC- New York City
P.A. - Pennsylvania
Poss- Possession
Univ- University
Va- Virginia
Yrs- Years

Sample Type

Non-Prob. – Non Probability

Analysis

ANOVA- Analysis of Variance
Correl.- Correlation Coefficient
Cox Model- Cox Proportional Hazzard Model Test of a Dichotomous Dependent Variable
Diff. Means- Difference in Means Test
GEE- Generalized Estimating equations
GLS- Generalized Least Squares Regression
MCA Beta- Multiple Classification Analysis- Beta
MLM- Multilevel Modeling
MLR- Maximum Likelihood Estimates
Neg. Binomial- Negative Binomial Regression
OLS- Ordinary Least Squares Regression
Path Analysis

Experienced Severity

Actual Problem= How Much of a Problem the Punishment Caused to Respondent's Life
Com. Control- Community Control
Conv.- Conviction
C.S.- Community Service
Incarc. - Incarceration
Int. Supervision- Intensive Supervision
Intensive Prob.- Intensive Probation
IP= Intensive Probation
I.S. vs. Parole- Intensive Supervision vs. Parole
ISP- Intensive Supervision

Length of Susp. License- Length of Suspended License
Level of Punishment- Respondents' Level of Punishment Received
Prob. vs. Lesser Penalty- Probation versus a lesser penalty
Prison vs. Comm. Control- Prison vs. Community Control
Sent.- Sentence
State Commitment vs. I.S.- State Commitment vs. Intensive Supervision

Experienced Swiftness

Conv.- Conviction
Time: Offense to Disp.- Time from Offense to Disposition

Crime Type

Drug Driving- Drugged Driving
Drug Poss.- Drug Possession
Forecast Any Crime- Respondent's prediction of future crime involvement
Forecast Marij Use- Forecast of Marijuana Use
Mult. Nonviolent- Multiple Crimes Combined into One Non-Violent Measure
Illeg. File Sharing- Illegal File Sharing
Mar. Dealing- Marijuana Dealing
Prop.- Property
Rearrest- Unless it is specified in the measure, rearrest is for any crime
Reconviction- Unless it is specified in the measure, reconviction is for any crime
Tech.- Technical
Viol.- Violent