

Data Resources Program of the
National Institute of Justice

Data Set JU.65

REGISTRY OF RANDOMIZED CRIMINAL JUSTICE EXPERIMENTS IN SANCTIONS

David Weisburd
Lawrence Sherman
Anthony Petrosino

A User's Guide To the Machine-Readable Files and Documentation

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

146242
Pgs. 1 & 2

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been granted by

Public Domain/NIJ
U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the ~~copyright~~ owner.

146242
P.1

December 1990

Sociometrics Corporation
170 State Street, Suite 260
Los Altos, CA 94022-2812
(415) 949-3282

CONTENTS OF THE DATA SET

Machine-Readable

- (1) Sanctions Experiment Data File (304 records; 76 cases; 99 variables)
- (2) Sanctions Experiment SPSSX Export File (395 records; 76 cases; 99 variables)

Paper

User's Guide to the Machine-Readable Files and Documentation (this document; 13 pages)

Original Codebook (48 pages)

Ordering Information

Machine-readable files and paper documentation can be ordered from the Data Resources Program of the National Institute of Justice, Sociometrics Corporation, 170 State Street, Suite 260, Los Altos, California 94022-2812.

Suggested Bibliographic Citation for the Data Set (All Machine-Readable Files and Paper Documentation)

Weisburd, D., Sherman, L., Petrosino, A. J. (1990). *Registry of randomized criminal justice experiments in sanctions* (Data Set JU.65, Eisner, S. L., & Peterson, J. L., Archivists) [machine-readable data file and documentation]. Rutgers University and Crime Control Institute (Producer). Los Altos, CA: Sociometrics Corporation, Data Resources Program of the National Institute of Justice (Distributor).

Suggested Bibliographic Citation for the User's Guide Alone

Eisner, S. L., & Peterson, J. L. (1990). *Registry of randomized criminal justice experiments in sanctions: A user's guide to the machine-readable files and documentation* (Data Set JU.65) Los Altos, CA: Sociometrics Corporation, Data Resources Program of the National Institute of Justice.

146242

PK1

Data Set JU.65

Registry of Randomized Criminal Justice Experiments in Sanctions

Award No. 88-IJ-CX-0007

Original Investigators:

David Weisburd
Lawrence Sherman
Anthony Petrosino

Rutgers University and Crime Control Institute
15 Washington Street
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Documentation Produced by

Sara L. Eisner
James L. Peterson

Sociometrics Corporation

1st ed., 1990

Distributed by

Data Resources Program of the
National Institute of Justice

Sociometrics Corporation
170 State Street, Suite 260
Los Altos, California 94022-2812
(415) 949-3282

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Registry of Randomized Criminal Justice Experiments in Sanctions has been deposited at the Data Resources Program of the National Institute of Justice, Sociometrics Corporation, for public distribution, by David Weisburd, Lawrence Sherman, and Anthony J. Petrosino, Rutgers University and Crime Control Institute. Data collection was funded by the National Institute of Justice under Award No. 88-IJ-CX-0007. Funding for the work done by the Data Resources Program to prepare the data for public use was provided by the U. S. Office of Justice Programs under Contract No. OJP-89-C-008 to Sociometrics Corporation.

Users of the data are strongly urged to inform the Data Resources Program of any errors or discrepancies. They are further urged to bring to the attention of the Data Resources Program all problems and difficulties encountered, particularly those that may prevent effective and convenient use of the data.

All manuscripts based on data made available through the Data Resources Program should acknowledge that fact as well as cite the data set (see suggested citation format, inside front cover). Users of these data are urged to follow some adaptation of the following statement.

The data used in this publication were made available by the Data Resources Program of the National Institute of Justice, Sociometrics Corporation, 170 State Street, Suite 260, Los Altos, CA 94022-2812. The study entitled *Registry of Randomized Criminal Justice Experiments in Sanctions* was conducted by David Weisburd, Lawrence Sherman, and Anthony J. Petrosino, Rutgers University and Crime Control Institute, Newark, New Jersey. Data collection was funded by the National Institute of Justice (Award No. 88-IJ-CX-0007). Funding support for preparing the revised documentation for public distribution was provided by a contract (OJP-89-C-008) between the U. S. Office of Justice Programs and Sociometrics Corporation. The original investigators, funding agency, and the Data Resources Program are not responsible for the analyses or interpretations presented here.

In order to provide funding agencies with essential information about use of archival resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about Data Resources Program participants' research activities, each user of these resources is requested to send a copy of each completed manuscript, thesis abstract, or reprint to the Data Resources Program of the National Institute of Justice, Sociometrics Corporation, 170 State Street, Suite 260, Los Altos, CA 94022-2812.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Summary	1
General Study Overview	
Study Identification	2
Key Words	2
Purpose of the Study	2
Methods	3
Summary of Contents	4
Geographic Coverage	4
Evaluation	4
Reports and Publications	5
Specifications for Machine-Readable Files	
Available Formats	6
File Structure	6
Mainframe Orders	6
Microcomputer Orders	6
Data Completeness and Consistency Report	7

SUMMARY

In this study, the investigators collected information on 76 randomized experiments that involved criminal justice sanctions. The investigators classified the experiments into three categories: (A) experiments that compare a sanction with no sanction or a more severe sanction with a less severe sanction; (B) experiments that measure the effects of alternative sanctions that are difficult to arrange in terms of severity; and (C) experiments that examine the effects of coercive treatments that supplement traditional sanctions.

These studies were drawn from a range of publications, took place in several states and countries, and used a variety of experimental methods. The data file contains a total of 99 variables. Topics include descriptions of the subjects (such as the mean age of subjects); the nature of the offense and its accompanying sanction; the racial and sex composition of the samples; and the procedures, outcomes, and results of a reanalysis of each study.

GENERAL STUDY OVERVIEW

Source: Weisburd D., Sherman L., Petrosino, A. J. (1990). *Registry of randomized criminal justice experiments in sanctions*.

Study Identification

Registry of Randomized Criminal Justice Experiments in Sanctions

David Weisburd, Lawrence Sherman, and Anthony J. Petrosino

Rutgers University and Crime Control Institute

Award No. 88-IJ-CX-0007

Key Words

Criminal sanctions, punishment, randomized experiments, recidivism.

Purpose of the Study

This study emanated from an interest in randomized experiments conducted in the field of criminal justice research. In developing a registry of such experiments, the investigators sought to present a comprehensive view of the methods used and problems encountered in experimental criminal justice research. To narrow the scope of criminal justice topics, the investigators included only those studies that used criminal justice sanctions as treatments and individual recidivism as an outcome variable. The data address the following questions:

1. What randomized experiments that use sanctions have been conducted?
2. Where and when were these studies carried out?
3. To what sanctions were subjects exposed? For how long?
4. Based on the sanction conditions being imposed, how can these studies be classified into types?
5. How were subjects for each study selected? How old were they? What type of offenses did they commit? What was the racial and sex composition of the sample?
6. How, when, and by whom was random assignment achieved? Were exceptions in randomization permitted?
7. What were the outcomes of the studies? What outcome measures were employed? When the original data were reanalyzed, did these findings change?

Methods

Study Design

The investigators collected information from written sources on 76 randomized experiments that included criminal justice sanctions. The investigators used several selection criteria. To begin with, the studies must have employed criminal justice sanctions as an intervention or treatment. Acceptable sanctions met three conditions: they were governmentally imposed by a public criminal justice agent; they were a coercive condition or experience; and they were imposed either in response to an act defined by the government as a crime, or in anticipation of a possible future crime. Second, each study must have measured individual recidivism as an outcome. Examples include measures such as police field interrogation, field arrest or citation, stationhouse arrest, charging, conviction, or violation of probation or parole. Third, the experiments must have had a minimum sample of fifteen cases for at least two of the groups studied. Finally, the unit of analysis had to be the individual. All individuals had to be randomly assigned to treatment conditions, or at least randomly assigned within pairs or blocks. The researchers classify these experiments into three categories: (A) experiments that compare a sanction with no sanction or a more severe sanction with a less severe sanction; (B) experiments that measure the effects of alternative sanctions that are difficult to arrange in terms of severity; and (C) experiments examine the effects of coercive treatments that supplement traditional sanctions.

Sources of Information

Studies to include in the registry were chosen from a range of publications, including academic journals or books, government publications, unpublished manuscripts, and non-government research evaluation reports. Data were collected from the written reports of the experiments found in the publications and manuscripts.

The search for studies to include in the data base began with a review of two works -- Farrington, D. (1983). "Randomized experiments in crime and justice." Pp. 257-308 in M. Tonry and N. Morris (eds.) *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; and Farrington, D., L. Ohlin, and J. Wilson (1986). *Understanding and Controlling Crime*. New York: Springer-Verlag. From the references and studies included there, additional references and studies were reviewed, including bibliographies, qualitative works on the topic of randomized field experiments, and elaborations of studies already included in the sample. A search of the *Criminal Justice Abstracts* data base was also conducted. At the same time, additional narrative review articles on experimentation, deterrence, rehabilitation, sentencing, and corrections were examined. In addition, a search of the National Criminal Justice Reference System (NCJRS) was completed in June 1989 for 1973-1988 using the following keywords: *randomization; controlled study; random assignment; randomly assigned; random allocation; field experiment; randomized experiment; and controlled trial*. Although no exact figures on the number of references checked was kept, it is estimated that approximately 200,000 citations were reviewed, including 100,000 documents covered by the NCJRS search.

Sample

From the sources the investigators consulted, a total of 76 experiments were found to meet these criteria. These experiments are the universe of studies meeting the investigators' criteria. Thus no sampling was involved.

Response Rates

Not applicable.

Dates of Data Collection

The experiments included in the registry were conducted between 1951 and 1983.

Summary of Contents

Description of Variables

The data file contains 99 variables. The data include background information on the studies, such as the year the experiment began, its geographic location and scope, the position of the investigators, and the location of the data used for the registry. Each study was classified into one of three categories (as described above) according to the type of sanction(s) used. A number of variables describe the sample, the experimental design, and the procedure. Among these are variables that indicate restrictions to subjects' eligibility for participation in each study as well as the results of pre-experimental group comparisons. Other information includes the mean or median age of subjects in each experiment; the nature of the offense or the type of offender sanctioned in the experiment; the percentage of male subjects; the percentage of white subjects; the rate of attrition or differential attrition; and whether their informed consent had been obtained.

Rather than designate a control and an experimental condition, the investigators recorded up to four different sanctioning conditions for each experiment, based on the harshness of that sanction (the least harsh sanction was the control condition). For each sanction, the exposure period was given in days, and the total number of subjects in the final analysis of the recidivism variables was given. In addition, the nature of randomization, its success, and whether exceptions to randomization were permitted are also included. The remainder of the data is concerned with the experimental findings: the outcomes, the attrition rates, the follow-up periods, and the investigators' statistical reanalyses of the results. The data base allows for three outcome measures, given in terms of percentage differences and mean differences between experimental and control groups. The data base also allows up to three follow-up periods.

Presence of Common Scales

None.

Unit of Observation

The sanction experiment.

Geographic Coverage

The studies reported were conducted in Denmark, England, Canada and the United States. In the United States, experiments took place in New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Maryland, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Minnesota, Idaho, Georgia, Oklahoma, North Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, Washington, California, Colorado, Utah, and Florida. Two of the studies were national in scope. The remaining 74 studies focused either on a state (17 studies), county (17), city (21), or a particular institution (19).

Evaluation

Data Quality

There were no out-of-range values in the data and no variables failed checks for internal consistency. Only three variables were missing over 5% of their values.

Data Limitations

The data base is restricted to studies that satisfied the investigators' criteria, as discussed above. Thus, related studies of interest might not be included. The data base is intended primarily as a registry that permits a user to locate information about experimental studies meeting criteria the user specifies. However, it could also be

used for meta-analysis, because standardized variables are included in each of the studies in the data base. Two cautions are in order regarding the analytic use of these data: (1) Many variables have a high percentage of "not applicable" cases, as would be expected given the variety of methods and designs employed. (2) The selected cases are intended to cover the universe of studies meeting the selection criteria. However, as these selection criteria are fairly narrowly defined, generalizations from the data base to the field of experimental criminal justice research as a whole would be inappropriate without further justification.

Reports and Publications

Weisburd D., Sherman L., Petrosino, A. J. (1990). *Registry of randomized criminal justice experiments in sanctions.*

SPECIFICATIONS FOR MACHINE-READABLE FILES

Contents of Machine-Readable Files

Machine-readable Archive files are available in both mainframe and microcomputer formats. Unless otherwise requested, files formatted for a mainframe computer are provided on a 9-track tape at a density of 6250 bpi, in EBCDIC recording mode with IBM Standard Labels. Files formatted for a microcomputer are provided in ASCII format on low- or high-density, 5¼" or 3½" diskettes, at the user's request.

File Structure

Data Files (1):	(1)	Sanctions experiments.
Unit:		The experiment.
Variables:		99
Cases:		76

Mainframe Orders

	Contents	LRECL	BLKSIZE	Feet of tape at 6250 bpi
File 1	Raw data file	80	32720	1.3
File 2	SPSSX export file	80	32720	1.4

Microcomputer Orders

Low- and High-Density 3½" and 5¼" Diskettes

	Contents	Diskette	File Name	Bytes
File 1	Raw data	1	JU65W.DAT	24,928
File 2	SPSSX export file	1	JU65W.EXP	32,390

DATA COMPLETENESS AND CONSISTENCY REPORT

This section presents information regarding the quality of the data in this Data Set. Tables 1 and 2 indicate the extent and location of out-of-range values, and Tables 3 and 4 summarize the incidence of missing data. Table 5 provides information regarding the adherence to the skip pattern of the questionnaire and consistency of the data as reflected in the logical relations between particular items. The checks in Table 5 are meant to be illustrative, and are not necessarily exhaustive.

Number of Cases: 76
Number of Variables: 99

Table 1. Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Out-of-Range Values

Percentage of Cases With Out-of-Range Values	Corresponding Number of Cases	Number of Variables	Percentage of Variables
0%	0	99	100.0%
>0%	1 to 76	0	0.0%
Total		99	100.0%

Table 2. List of Variables With Out-of-Range Values

None

Table 3. Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values

Percentage of Cases With Missing Values	Corresponding Number of Cases	Number of Variables	Percentage of Variables
0%	0	71	71.7%
> 0% 3%	1 to 2	21	21.2%
> 3% 5%	3	4	4.0%
> 5% to 10%	4 to 7	3	3.0%
> 10% to 100%	8 to 76	0	0.0%
Total		99	100.0%

Table 4. List of Variables With Over 5% Missing Values (4 Missing Values or More)

Variable Name and Label	Number of Cases
OVERRIDE Were overrides permitted?	5
PIGROUP What condition was the investigator's experimental group?	6
FOLLWA1 First follow-up period (in months)	6

Note. The variable names referred to in this and subsequent tables are identified in the codebook.

Table 5. Report on Consistency Checks

Comparisons Examined	Number of Cases Passing Consistency Check	Number of Cases Failing Consistency Check	Number of Cases Not Applicable
----------------------	---	---	--------------------------------

Example of a Relational Edit Check

1. DATTRIT	"Was differential attrition noted by the experimenter?"	76	0	0
	<i>compared with</i>			
WHYDATT	"Was there any attempt to analyze the reasons subjects left?"			

Note. To pass this check, the number of yes and no responses for DATTRIT should have logically corresponded to the number of yes and no responses for WHYDATT.

Relational edit checks were also performed by comparing the following pairs of variables.

2. MEANA1	<i>compared with</i>	EFFCTA1	76	0	0
3. MEANA2	<i>compared with</i>	EFFCTA2	76	0	0
4. MEANA3	<i>compared with</i>	EFFCTA3	76	0	0
5. MEANB1	<i>compared with</i>	EFFCTB1	76	0	0
6. MEANB2	<i>compared with</i>	EFFCTB2	76	0	0
7. MEANB3	<i>compared with</i>	EFFCTB3	76	0	0
8. MEANC1	<i>compared with</i>	EFFCTC1	76	0	0
9. OVERRIDE	<i>compared with</i>	ODOC	76	0	0

Data Resources Program of the
National Institute of Justice

146242
p.2
Data Set JU.65

**REGISTRY OF RANDOMIZED CRIMINAL JUSTICE
EXPERIMENTS IN SANCTIONS**

**David Weisburd
Lawrence Sherman
Anthony Petrosino**

Original Codebook

December 1990

**Sociometrics Corporation
170 State Street, Suite 260
Los Altos, CA 94022-2812
(415) 949-3282**

CODEBOOK
FOR
SPSS DATASET -

EXPERIMENTS IN SANCTIONS

David Weisburd
Rutgers University
and Crime Control Institute

Lawrence W. Sherman
University of Maryland
and Crime Control Institute

and

Anthony J. Petrosino
Rutgers University

VI. ID Numbers ID

- 01 California Special Intensive Parole Experiment Phase I
- 02 California Special Intensive Parole Experiment Phase II
- 03 Utah Provo Experiment
- 04 California Juvenile CTP Phase I Experiment -
Sacramento/Stockton
- 05 California Juvenile CTP Phase I Experiment -
San Francisco
- 06 English Police Cautioning Experiment
- 07 Los Angeles Silverlake Experiment
- 08 Florida Inmate Work Release Experiment
- 09 California Unofficial Probation Experiment
- 10 California Reduced Prison Sentence Experiment
- 11 Sacramento (CA) Juvenile 601 Diversion Experiment
- 12 Sacramento (CA) Juvenile 602 Diversion Experiment
- 13 California Ellsworth House Experiment
- 14 English Intensive Probation Experiment - Sheffield
- 15 English Intensive Probation Experiment - Dorset
- 16 English Intensive Probation Experiment - London
- 17 English Intensive Probation Experiment - Staffordshire
- 18 Juvenile Diversion and Labeling Paradigm Experiment
- 19 Pinellas County (FL) Juvenile Services Program
Experiment
- 20 Memphis Drunk Driving Sanctioning Experiments - Social
Drinkers
- 21 Memphis Drunk Driving Sanctioning Experiments - Problem
Drinkers
- 22 Memphis Juvenile Diversion Experiment
- 23 Vera Institute (NY) Pretrial Adult Felony Offender
Diversion Experiment
- 24 Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment
- 25 Police Foundation Shoplifting Arrest Experiment
- 26 Hamilton (Canada) Juvenile Services Project
Experiment
- 27 Leeds (UK) Truancy Experiment
- 28 Wayne County (MI) Project Start Experiment
- 29 English Psychopathic Delinquent Experiment
- 30 California Fremont Program Experiment
- 31 English Borstal Allocation Experiment
- 32 English Juvenile Therapeutic Community Experiment
- 33 California Preston School Typology Experiment
- 34 California Juvenile Behavior Modification and
Transactional Analysis Experiment
- 35 Ramsey County (MN) Community Assistance Program
Experiment
- 36 Copenhagen Short-Term Offender Experiment
- 37 California Pico Experiment
- 38 California Group Counseling Prison Experiment
- 39 San Diego (CA) Chronic Drunk Offender Experiment
- 40 Kentucky Village Psychotherapy Experiment
- 41 English Prison Intensive Social Work Experiment
- 42 Tacoma Juvenile Inmate Modeling and Group
Discussion Experiment

- 43 English Intensive Welfare Experiment
- 44 Michigan Juvenile Offenders Learn Truth (JOLT) Experiment
- 45 New Jersey Juvenile Awareness Program (Scared Straight) Experiment
- 46 San Quentin (CA) Squires Program Experiment
- 47 Florida Project Crest Experiment
- 48 California Paso Robles Experiment
- 49 California Youth Training Center Experiment
- 50 Los Angeles Community Delinquency Control Project Experiment
- 51 Minneapolis Informal Parole Experiment
- 52 California Early Parole Discharge Experiment
- 53 Illinois Volunteer Lawyer Parole Supervision Experiment
- 54 Illinois Juvenile Tours Experiment
- 55 Fricot Ranch Delinquent Dormitory Experiment
- 56 North Carolina Butner Correctional Facility Experiment
- 57 Denver Drunk Driving Sentencing Experiment
- 58 National Restitution Experiment - Boise
- 59 National Restitution Experiment - Washington, D.C.
- 60 National Restitution Experiment - Clayton County, Georgia
- 61 National Restitution Experiment - Oklahoma County, Oklahoma
- 62 California Juvenile Probation and Group Counseling Experiment
- 63 Canadian I-Level Maturity Probation Experiment
- 64 San Fernando Juvenile Crisis Intervention Experiment
- 65 Clark County (WA) Status Offender Deinstitutionalization Experiment
- 66 California Summary Parole Experiment
- 67 California Parole Research Project Experiment
- 68 California Short-Term Psychiatric Treatment Experiment - Preston
- 69 California Short-Term Psychiatric Treatment Experiment - Nelles
- 70 Washington, D.C., Pretrial Supervision Experiment
- 71 California Crofton House Experiment
- 72 San Pablo (CA) Adult Diversion Experiment
- 73 Fairfield School for Boys Experiment
- 74 Ohio Juvenile Probationer Behavior Modification Experiment
- 75 California Parole Work Unit Experiment
- 76 Ontario (Canada) Social Interaction Training Experiment

V2

The year the experiment started was coded here (instead of the publication date) because many of the experiments began over five years before results concerning them were published. If the report did not state when the experiment started, the date of publication minus the presumed length of the study was coded for this variable.

V3

"Region" refers to the geographic location of the experiment(s).

V4

"Geographic Scope" is an variable taken from M.L. Dennis (1988), Implementing Randomized Field Experiments: An Analysis of Criminal and Civil Justice Research. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Northwestern University. It refers to the jurisdictional spread of the experiment. For example, the California Special Intensive Parole Experiments involved the entire state parole system and, therefore, were assigned "3" ("state") for this variable.

V5

"Relation of Investigator to Research" records the position of the principal investigators at the time of the experiment.

V6

The place where the data used in this analysis were found.

V2. Year Experiment Started YEAR

V3. Region where the Experiment Took Place REGION

- | | |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| 1. California | 13. Denmark |
| 2. Utah | 14. Kentucky |
| 3. England | 15. New Jersey |
| 4. Colorado | 16. Illinois |
| 5. Florida | 17. North Carolina |
| 6. Washington State | 18. Idaho |
| 7. Tennessee | 19. Washington, D.C. |
| 8. New York | 20. Georgia |
| 9. Not Given | 21. Oklahoma |
| 10. Minnesota | 22. Ohio |
| 11. Canada | 23. Connecticut |
| 12. Michigan | |

V4. Geographic Scope of the Experiment SCOPE

1. Country
2. State
3. County
4. City
5. Institution

V5. Relation of Investigator to Research RELATION

1. Internal government
2. Outside academic
3. Outside private research
4. Collaborative effort between practitioners and researchers

V6. Where were Data Found? JOURNAL

1. Academic journal or book
2. Government publication
3. Both academic journal and government publication
4. Unpublished manuscript
5. Non-government research evaluation report

V7

"Type of Experiment" groups the experiments in terms of the disparity between the sanction conditions imposed in each experiment. The groupings are:

"A" - Experiments that compare a sanction with no sanction or a more severe sanction with a less severe sanction;

"B" - Experiments that measure the effects of various sanctions which are difficult to order in terms of severity; and

"C" - Experiments that measure the effects of coercive "treatments" which are added onto traditional sanctions.

V8

"Eligibility Restrictions - Exclusion Criteria" are the criteria which exclude otherwise eligible subjects from participation in the experiment - taken exactly as written in the principal investigators' reports.

V7. Type of Experiment TYPE

1. A
2. B
3. C

V8. Eligibility Restrictions - Exclusion Criteria RESTRCT

1. Narcotics users, psychopaths, out-of-staters, non-English speaking, physically incapacitated
2. Psychopaths, out-of-staters, non-English speaking, physically incapacitated
3. Mentally disturbed, psychotics
4. Parole opposed by local law enforcement
5. Serious offenses
6. Age > 17, previous offense, no admittance of guilt, no family cooperation, complainant refusal to drop prosecution
7. Psychotics, mentally retarded, addicts, serious sex offenders
8. 1st degree murderers, special cases, out-of-staters
9. Severe escape risks, heavy drug use, uncontrollable physical violence
10. Offenders < 17, fewer than 2 previous convictions or probation orders
11. Non-residents, servicemen, serious health problems, prior DWI conviction
12. Drug-alcohol involvement, lack of court or attorney approval
13. 2 or more prior store arrests, no ID, suspect victimized other store chain, caused physical violence, in possession of contraband
14. Age > 14, not living with own family, less than two prior police occurrence reports
15. Already on supervision order, sibling in sample
16. Hard drug use, age < 17 or > 30
17. IQ < 59, age < 13 or > 26, over-aggressives
18. IQ in lower 30 % of population, sex or violent offenders, criminally experienced
19. IQ < 90, mentally ill, destructive aggressives, inability to form meaningful relationships

V9

This variable records whether there were any comparisons made between the groups on demographic factors (age, sex, race, prior offense, etc.).

V10

If there were any "pre-experimental" differences reported for the groups and coded in V9, they are set out specifically here. "E" signifies subjects who were in the experimental group while "C" signifies those in the control group.

20. Assignment to outside work or psychiatric unit
21. Boys < 15 or > 17, out-of-staters
22. Severe reading difficulty, out-of-staters, non-English speaking, gross mental defect, psychotic, commitment < 6 months, juvenile court case
23. Age > 65, special prison cases
24. Age < 21, prisoners serving < 2 month or > 12 month sentence
25. Females, status offenders, no legal guardian
26. Transfers between wards or prisons
27. Out-of-staters, parole opposed by local law enforcement, recent violent offense
28. Arson, rape, severe emotional disturbance, no family home, consistently assaultive
29. Transfers, not enough time committed before experiment is to end, serious offenders, potentially dangerous, already on violation status, out-of-staters, no file available
30. Severe mental or physical cases, release to Southeastern U.S., militant or notorious criminals, age > 35
31. Those in pretrial detention
32. Those not meeting emotional disturbance criteria, and, later, older wards
33. Those with extensive prior criminal histories, alcoholics, and those already on probation
34. Assurance by the administration that the subject would remain at the institution for the duration of the experiment
35. Sexual, violent, or drug offenders
999. No restrictions stated

V9. Pre-Experimental Group Comparisons Reported? PREGROUP

1. Yes
2. No

V10. Any Significant Differences Found Between the Groups in their Demographic Characteristics Before the Experiment?
GROUPDIF

1. No
2. Yes, more first parolees in E group
3. Yes, C group > X age than E group
4. Yes, E group fewer prior incarceration or probation sentences
5. E group with more subjects having 3 or more police occurrence reports and from high crime area of city; C group had more subjects who committed serious offenses
6. Differences found for E and C groups in both prisons in study
7. E group more prison experience
8. E > age than C

V11 - V14

These variables allow the coder to record up to four different sanctioning conditions for each experiment. Rather than accept the designation of "experimental" and "control" used by the principal investigators in their reports, a hierarchical system based upon the harshness of the sanction was set up.

As a general rule, the condition with the strongest deprivation of liberty or the most contact with the criminal justice system is coded as the harshest sanction (V11). The least harsh sanction is coded as the control condition (V14).

This coding scheme can be applied without modification to those experiments designated as "A" experiments, because they, by definition, involve comparisons between sanction and no sanction conditions or sanctions of clearly distinguishable degrees of severity. For example, the following rank-order classification was used for the Juvenile Diversion and Labeling Paradigm Experiment: harshest sanction (V11) = criminal justice system; second sanction (V12) = diversion to services; third sanction (V13) = diversion with a subsidy to cover costs; and control condition (V14) = counsel and release.

"B" experiments present the most difficult coding dilemma for these variables since there is no clear ordering of sanction conditions. To solve for this, the control condition (V14) is a "sanction of similar severity" rather than a true control.

For "C" experiments, the control condition (V14) is the deprivation of treatment condition, the least harsh sanction. With the treatment experiments, all the subjects received the traditional sanction. Although the state's decision to add a "positive treatment" to the incarceration might be considered helpful, if it cannot be refused, it is considered to be a harsher sanction for the purposes of this analysis.

Values for these variables were added as the coding was done. The intention was to specify clearly the sanctions involved. Categories can be combined later for analysis.

V11 - V14 ("a" variables only)

Exposure period is given in days. If the exposure period was the hour it took for the arrest to be made, it was coded here as 1 day.

V11 - V14 ("b" variables only)

The "N of Cases" is the number of subjects in the final analysis of the recidivism (or outcome) variables.

9. E had more females and lower mean age than C
10. "Fine" group had more lawyer representation
11. E had more blacks than C
12. C had more blacks than E
998. Not applicable

V11. What was the Harshesht Sanction (in "A Experiments), the Positive Treatment (in "C" Experiments) or Treatment 1 Condition (in "B" Experiments)? SNCTION1

1. Police caution and supervision
2. Intensive parole supervision
3. Community residential day center
4. Institutionalization or institutionalization followed by regular parole
5. "Unofficial" probation
6. Handled by "criminal justice system"
7. Positive treatment added onto traditional sanction
8. Intensive probation
9. Regular probation or regular probation and treatment services
10. Arrest
11. Adjournment
12. Authoritarian ward
13. Therapeutic community
14. Casework regime
15. I-Level classification and treatment
16. Institution with transactional analysis emphasis
17. "Scared straight" prison tour
18. Regular parole supervision
19. Probation and restitution or probation and restitution with mediation or counseling
20. I-Level classification and treatment on probation
21. Intensive supervision (pretrial)
22. Probation and incarceration on weekends
23. Regular custodial care

11a. Exposure Period (in Days) EXPOSE1

11b. N of Cases N1

V12. What was the Secondary Sanction (or Treatment 2) Condition? SNCTION2

1. Police caution and supervision
2. Intensive parole supervision
3. Community residential day center
4. Institutionalization followed by regular parole
5. "Unofficial" probation
6. Handled by "criminal justice system"
7. Positive treatment added onto traditional sanction
8. Community based parole emphasizing Guided Group Interaction techniques
9. Diversion services

10. Regular probation or social services supervision
11. Separation of suspect and victim for 8 hours
12. Group counseling regime
13. Regular classification and treatment
14. Institution with behavior modification emphasis
15. Probation and restitution
16. Probation and treatment
17. Moderate pretrial supervision

12a. Exposure Period (in Days) EXPOSE2

12b. N of Cases N2

V13. What was the Third Sanction Condition? SNCTION3

1. Police caution and supervision
2. Intensive parole supervision
3. Community residential day center
4. Institutionalization followed by regular parole
5. "Unofficial" probation
6. Handled by "criminal justice system".
7. Positive treatment added onto traditional sanction
8. Diversion services with subsidy
9. Education classes for DWI
10. Fine
11. Regular probation

13a. Exposure Period (in Days) EXPOSE3

13b. N of Cases N3

V14. Control Group Received CONTROL

1. Withholding of positive treatment
2. Diversion from criminal justice system to receive services
3. Counsel or caution and release, release, or discharge
4. Intensive parole supervision
5. Parole supervision utilizing Guided Group Interaction
6. Regular probation or social service supervision
7. Regular parole supervision
8. Community residential day center
9. Work release during institutionalization
10. Self-governing ward
11. Regular custodial care
12. Little or no coercive parole supervision
13. Less coercive internal prison environment
14. Probation with restitution
15. Restitution
16. 20-bed dormitory
17. Institutionalization followed by regular parole
18. Regular classification and treatment

V15

"Total N" is the total number of subjects in the final analysis from all of the groups combined.

V16

Often the principal investigators were interested in the effect of some type of intervention (e.g., diversion) which is considered as a less severe sanction condition in this analysis. This variable allows the coder to specify the condition which appears to have been the intervention or experimental condition in the principal investigators' analysis.

V17

If the program, policy, or intervention had an effect which was reported - regardless of how that condition was ranked in severity for this analysis - that is noted here.

V18

"Timing of Randomization" refers to the stage of processing through the criminal justice system when the subjects were randomly assigned to one of the sanction conditions.

V19

The random assignment method was generally explained very briefly in these reports. The values for this variable were taken from the actual wording in the reports about how randomization was accomplished.

19. Institution with behavior modification emphasis
20. Passive pretrial supervision
21. Fine

14a. Control Group Exposure Period (in Days) EXPOSEC

14b. Control N of Cases NC

V15. Total N TOTALN

V16. What Condition was the Investigator's Experimental Group?
PIGROUP

1. Harshesht sanction
2. Secondary sanction
3. Third sanction
4. Control
5. Treatment 1 in "B" experiment
6. Positive treatment(s) in "C" experiment
997. No particular group specified

V17. Was there a Program Effect Noted by the Investigators?
PROGEFF

1. Yes
2. No

V18. Timing of Randomization RTIMING

1. At time of parole
2. At sentencing
3. At time of police or security intervention
4. During institutionalization
5. At the charging or juvenile adjudication
6. After court-referral or sentencing, upon intake into the probation unit
7. After referral from school, family or police, upon intake into the unit (pre-adjudication)
8. After referral from probation, upon intake into the institution
9. After arrest, prior to adjudication
999. Unstated

V19. How was randomization done? RHOW

1. Coin toss
2. Random time quota
3. Random numbers table
4. Toss of die
5. Random slips of paper
6. Stratified random procedure (not further specified)

V20

This variable will frequently be coded as "missing" since the experimental reports did not usually provide many details about the randomization process.

V21

If the principal investigators stated anywhere that the randomization process broke down, this variable was coded "1" (yes). Because researchers may have been hesitant to report completely about randomization failure, this variable may undercount the extent of such failure within this group of experiments.

V22

This is another variable taken from Dennis (1988). Were overrides of the random assignment process permitted by the principal investigators? An override occurs if a subject who would have been assigned to one condition is placed in another condition. For example, in the Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment, police could override the random assignment scheme in special circumstances. Again, the reports used here may undercount the extent to which overrides were permitted. Dennis gathered this information more directly - by calling the principal investigators.

V23

This variable records whether the overrides which did occur were documented.

V24 & V24b

These variables note whether the raw number (or the percentage) of overrides to the randomization process was reported; and if it was, whether the source of this information was a principal investigator or a reviewer.

7. Random days, alternating monthly
8. First two subjects assigned to E, every 3rd person to C group
9. Computer-generated randomized disposition log
10. Lottery
11. Alternate assignment, not further specified
12. Odd and even assignment
13. Alternating months
14. Matching, then randomization
999. Unstated

V20. Who Controlled the Randomization? RWHO

1. Practitioners
2. Researchers
999. Unstated

V21. Did the Investigator Note Randomization Failure? RFAIL

1. Yes
2. No

V22. Were Overrides Permitted? OVERRIDE

1. Yes
2. No
999. Unstated

V23. Were Overrides Documented by Investigator? ODOC

1. Yes
2. No
998. Not applicable

V24. Was the Percentage of Cases where Randomization was Overridden Reported by Investigators or Reviewers?
OREPORT

1. Yes
2. No
998. Not applicable

24a. Investigator States OPI

24b. Reviews State OREVIEW

V25

The definition of sanction used in this analysis demands at least one involuntary condition. However, in some experiments, the less severe sanction condition could be refused. When that was possible, it is noted here.

V26

If the informed consent of the subject - or subject's guardian - was needed before involvement with the study, it is recorded here.

V27

This variable applies primarily to those experiments (such as the positive prison treatment or "C" experiments) where the treatment sessions might not have been well attended by the subjects, even though the sanctioning condition was not a voluntary one. If the investigator or the staff had no way to insure compliance and it was mentioned in the report, it is noted here.

V28

Observation, as it is used here, does not mean actual participant observation. Rather, it merely seeks to record whether the investigators followed the harshest condition after subjects were assigned to it. For instance, the investigators may have tried to assess whether the condition was imposed or delivered in the manner or to the degree intended - e.g., the intensive supervision experiments usually recorded the number of contacts between subjects and supervisors for both the experimental and the control groups.

V29 & V29a

If the harshest sanction condition failed (i.e., subjects assigned to a particular condition did not get what they were supposed to get), then that is recorded here. For V29a, the reason given in the report for that failure is noted.

V25. What Conditions were Voluntary? VOLUNTRY

0. None
1. Harshhest sanction
2. Secondary sanction
3. Third sanction
4. Control
5. Secondary sanction and control

V26. Was it Reported that Informed Consent of Subjects (or Subjects' Guardians) had been Obtained? CONSENT

1. Yes
2. No

V27. If Harshhest Sanction Condition was Involuntary, were Coercive Controls Lacking? COERCIVE

1. Yes
2. No
3. "B" experiment - not applicable

V28. Was Harshhest Sanction or Positive Treatment Condition Observed? OBSERVED

1. Yes
2. No
3. "B" experiment - not applicable

V29. Was there Documented Failure in Harshhest Sanction or Positive Treatment Condition? TFAIL

1. Yes
2. No
3. "B" experiment - not applicable
998. Not applicable

V29a

See note for V29 & V29a.

V30 & V31

Caseflow problems occur frequently in experiments (i.e., number of actual cases is far below the number anticipated and programmatic problems follow), and that is recorded here if the principal investigators made note of it. V31 refers to the type of adjustment which was made for an inadequate caseflow.

V32

Were subjects all juveniles (under 18), all adults, or did the experiment include both juveniles and adults (e.g., Police Foundation Shoplifting Experiment)?

V33

This variable records the mean or median age of all the subjects included in the experiment.

29a. Investigators or Reviewers State **TWHY**

1. Originally designed conditions not disparate enough
2. Harshesst sanction or positive treatment condition not delivered as planned
3. One condition began to simulate another condition
4. High rate of runaways and in-program failures
5. Some subjects in E received same or less harsh treatment as subjects in C
6. Absenteeism
998. Not applicable

V30. Were Caseflow Problems Noted? **CASEFLOW**

1. Yes
2. No

V31. How did PIs adjust? **ADJUST**

1. Deviated from original randomization plan and sent everyone into experimental group
2. Stopped the experiment
3. Accepted lower N of cases than originally planned
4. Abandoned another simultaneous experiment and set up quasi-experimental comparison study
5. Abandoned randomization and changed caseflow requirements
6. Relaxed eligibility criteria
7. Accepted lower N of cases and deviated from randomization
8. Extended the experiment
9. Increased proportion of assignments to E
10. Extended experiment, abandoned randomization, modified selection criteria
11. Deviated from randomization and sent all subjects to C
12. Eligibility relaxed, proportion of assignments to E continuously adjusted
13. Randomization relaxed, proportions fluctuated
998. Not applicable

V32. Subjects Were **SUBJECTS**

1. Adults
2. Juveniles
3. Experiment included adults and juveniles

V33. Mean or Median Age for Subjects **AGE**

V34

The categories in this variable use the descriptive statements about the subjects which appeared in the principal investigators' reports.

V34. Classification Best Describes the Nature of the Offense
or the Type of Offender Sanctioned in the Experiment
OFFENDER

1. First-time property, incorrigibility
2. Non-serious property, vagrants
3. Serious person and property
4. Habitual person and property
5. First-time minor
6. Repetitive property, status
7. Robbery, theft, narcotics, forgery
8. Status
9. Narcotics, property
10. Theft, burglary, forgery
11. Delinquents, those in need of supervision or
problem kids referred from agencies
12. First-time DWI
13. First-time felonious property
14. Minor domestic violence
15. First-time shoplifting
16. Person, property, status
17. Truancy
18. First-time and repetitive felonious property
19. Misdemeanants
20. Chronic public drunkenness
21. Repetitive property
22. Assault, theft, burglary
23. Non-serious person, property, status
24. Mixed felony and misdemeanor
25. 100% felony
26. Minor delinquent offenders, status
27. Repetitive felony
28. Typical offenses were auto theft and breaking
and entering, average # of offenses = 4,
average total time incarcerated = 11 months
29. Emotionally disturbed, serious
30. Pretrial defendants, first offending felons
31. Repetitive misdemeanor
32. Predominantly misdemeanor, traffic offenses
33. Delinquents
999. Unstated

V35

"Percent Male" refers to the percentage of subjects in the experiment who were male. If this figure was not given or could not be calculated from information provided in the report, then this value is "999" (missing).

V36

"Percent White" refers to the percentage of subjects in the experiment who were white. If this figure was not given or could not be calculated from information provided in the report, then this value is "999" (missing).

V37 & 37a

Attrition - as used here - refers to the loss of subjects at some point during the experiment. This attrition can occur from one of the groups (due to drop-outs) or from inadequate follow-up data (lost cases). If attrition rates are given - or can be easily calculated - the overall rate is recorded here.

V38 & V38a

"Differential attrition" - the loss of more subjects from one group than from another - is a seldom-noted problem in experimental reports. If differential attrition was noted by the principal investigators, then it is recorded here. If attempts to analyze why subjects left particular groups were made, then this is noted in V38a.

V35. Percent Male MALE

V36. Percent White WHITE

V37. Was Attrition Noted By the Investigators? ATTRIT

1. Yes
2. No

37a. Percentage Given ATTPERC

V38. Was Differential Attrition Noted by Investigators? DATTRIT

1. Yes
2. No

38a. Was there any Attempt to Analyze the Reasons Subjects
Left? WHYDAT

1. Yes
2. No
998. Not applicable

V39 & V43 & V47

The coding scheme allows for three separate types of outcome measures to be recorded. The outcome measures were coded in detail, as stated by the principal investigators, and can be grouped into various categories for later analysis. (Only outcome measures indicating recidivism were recorded.)

V39. First Outcome Measure OUTCOME A

1. % violating parole
2. % rearrested
3. % major arrests
4. Mean arrests during program only
5. Mean arrests - program graduates only
6. % incarcerated
7. % failing parole
8. % receiving re-referrals
9. Mean days to referral
10. # of petitions filed
11. % rebooked (all offenses)
12. % rebooked (criminal offenses only)
13. % arrested, during program only
14. % arrested, post-program only
15. % convicted
16. % recidivating as defined by investigators
17. % with police contacts from caution & beginning of the supervision period
18. % with police contacts from the end of supervision & six months after caution
19. % with police contacts from the end of supervision & the end of caution
20. % receiving jail or probation revocation
21. % DWI rearrested
22. % domestic violence arrests
23. % shoplifting arrests
24. % police occurrence or contact reports
25. Mean days truant
26. % charged and convicted
27. % charged
28. % of time group spent locked up
29. % of group receiving petitions
30. Mean misconduct reports
31. % driving violation
32. # driving violation points
33. Months to first arrest
34. Time to first arrest
35. Months to first conviction
36. % convicted - program graduates only
37. Mean number of offenses
38. % with other than shoplifting arrests
39. Mean number arrests from day assigned to program
40. % with other than DWI arrests
41. % rearrested - program graduates only
42. Time to first parole violation
43. Mean proportion of time incarcerated
44. % failing to appear
45. % with a felony commitment
46. # reinstitutionalized

V40 & V44 & V48

Each of these variables records the first follow-up period in months for each of the corresponding outcome measures. V44 and V48 are coded "998" (not applicable) if there is no corresponding outcome measure recorded.

V40a & V44a & V48a

Each of these variables records the difference between groups for the first follow-up period, where this figure was reported as a percentage difference. If it was reported as a mean difference, these variables are coded "998" (not applicable). V44a and V48a are coded "998" (not applicable) if there is no corresponding outcome measure recorded.

V40b & V44b & V48b

Each of these variables records the difference between groups for the first follow-up period, where this figure was reported as a mean difference. If it was reported as a percentage difference, these variables are coded "998" (not applicable). V44b and V48b are coded "998" (not applicable) if there is no corresponding outcome measure recorded.

V40c & V44c & V48c

Each of these variables records whether the principal investigators reported that the difference between the harshest sanction and the control sanction (under this analysis) was significant. V44c and V48c are coded "998" (not applicable) if there is no corresponding outcome measure recorded.

V40d & V44d & V48d

When the raw effect size differences were reported, the experimental findings were reanalyzed, using a difference of means or a difference of proportions test. The results of that reanalysis are reported here. Bornstein and Cohen's (1989) Statistical Power Analysis software was also used to reanalyze some of these findings, using a two-tailed test with $p < .05$.

V40. First Follow-Up Period (in Months) . FOLLWA1

40a. Raw Effect Size - % Difference EFFCTA1

40b. Raw Effect Size - \bar{X} (Mean) Difference MEANA1

40c. Is this Difference between Harshesht Sanction Condition and the Control Condition Significant (as Reported by the Investigator)? SIGA1

1. Yes
2. No
999. Unstated

40d. Does our Reanalysis Change these Findings? REANA1

1. Yes
2. No

V41 & V45 & V49

These variables for the second follow-up period are coded in the same manner as V40, V44 and V48 above. If there was no second follow-up period for the corresponding outcome measure, they are coded "998" (not applicable).

V41a & V45a & V49a

These variables for the second follow-up period are coded in the same manner as V40a, V44a and V48a above. If there was no second follow-up period for the corresponding outcome measure, they are coded "998" (not applicable).

V41b & V45b & V49b

These variables for the second follow-up period are coded in the same manner as V40b, V44b and V48b above. If there was no second follow-up period for the corresponding outcome measure, they are coded "998" (not applicable).

V41c & V45c & V49c

These variables for the second follow-up period are coded in the same manner as V40c, V44c and V48c above. If there was no second follow-up period for the corresponding outcome measure, they are coded "998" (not applicable).

V41d & V45d & V49d

These variables for the second follow-up period are coded in the same manner as V40d, V44d and V48d above. If there was no second follow-up period for the corresponding outcome measure, they are coded "998" (not applicable).

V41. Second Follow-Up Period (in Months) FOLLWA2

41a. Raw Effect Size - % Difference EFFCTA2

41b. Raw Effect Size - \bar{X} (Mean) Difference MEANA2

41c. Is this Difference between Harshesht Sanction Condition and the Control Condition Significant (as Reported by the Investigator)? SIGA2

1. Yes
2. No
999. Unstated

41d. Does our Reanalysis Change these Findings? REANA2

1. Yes
2. No

V42 & V46 & V50

These variables for the third follow-up period are coded in the same manner as V40, V44 and V48 above. If there was no third follow-up period for the corresponding outcome measure, they are coded "998" (not applicable).

V42a & V46a & V50a

These variables for the third follow-up period are coded in the same manner as V40a, V44a and V48a above. If there was no third follow-up period for the corresponding outcome measure, they are coded "998" (not applicable).

V42b & V46b & V50b

These variables for the third follow-up period are coded in the same manner as V40b, V44b and V48b above. If there was no third follow-up period for the corresponding outcome measure, they are coded "998" (not applicable).

V42c & V46c & V50c

These variables for the third follow-up period are coded in the same manner as V40c, V44c and V48c above. If there was no third follow-up period for the corresponding outcome measure, they are coded "998" (not applicable).

V42d & V46d & V50d

These variables for the third follow-up period are coded in the same manner as V40d, V44d and V48d above. If there was no third follow-up period for the corresponding outcome measure, they are coded "998" (not applicable).

V42. Third Follow-Up Period (in Months) FOLLWA3

42a. Raw Effect Size - % Difference EFFCTA3

42b. Raw Effect Size - \bar{X} (Mean) Difference MEANA3

42c. Is this Difference between Harshesht Sanction Condition and the Control Condition Significant (as Reported by the Investigator)? SIGA3

1. Yes
2. No
999. Unstated

42d. Does our Reanalysis Change these Findings? REANA3

1. Yes
2. No

V43

See note for V39 above.

V43. Second Outcome Measure OUTCOMEB

1. % violating parole
2. % rearrested
3. % major arrests
4. Mean arrests during program only
5. Mean arrests - program graduates only
6. % incarcerated
7. % failing parole
8. % receiving re-referrals
9. Mean days to referral
10. # of petitions filed
11. % rebooked (all offenses)
12. % rebooked (criminal offenses only)
13. % arrested, during program only
14. % arrested, post-program only
15. % convicted
16. % recidivating as defined by investigators
17. % with police contacts from caution & beginning of the supervision period
18. % with police contacts from the end of supervision & six months after caution
19. % with police contacts from the end of supervision & the end caution
20. % receiving jail or probation revocation
21. % DWI rearrested
22. % domestic violence arrests
23. % shoplifting arrests
24. % police occurrence or contact reports
25. Mean days truant
26. % charged and convicted
27. % charged
28. % of time group spent locked up
29. % of group receiving petitions
30. Mean misconduct reports
31. % driving violation
32. # driving violation points
33. Months to first arrest
34. Time to first arrest
35. Months to first conviction
36. % convicted - program graduates only
37. Mean number of offenses
38. % with other than shoplifting arrests
39. Mean number arrests from day assigned to program
40. % with other than DWI arrests
41. % rearrested - program graduates only
42. Time to first parole violation
43. Mean proportion of time incarcerated
44. % failing to appear
45. % with a felony commitment
46. # reinstitutionalized

V44

See note for V40 above.

V44a

See note for V40a above.

V44b

See note for V40b above.

V44c

See note for V40c above.

V44d

See note for V40d above.

V44. First Follow-Up Period (in Months) FOLLWB1

44a. Raw Effect Size - % Difference EFFCTB1

44b. Raw Effect Size - \bar{X} (Mean) Difference MEANB1

44c. Is this Difference between Harshesht Sanction Condition and the Control Condition Significant (as Reported by the Investigator)? SIGB1

1. Yes
2. No
999. Unstated

44d. Does our Reanalysis Change these Findings? REANB1

1. Yes
2. No

V45

See note for V41 above.

V45a

See note for V41a above.

V45b

See note for V41b above.

V45c

See note for V41c above.

V45d

See note for V41d above.

V45. Second Follow-Up Period (in Months) FOLLWB2

45a. Raw Effect Size - % Difference EFFCTB2

45b. Raw Effect Size - \bar{X} (Mean) Difference MEANB2

45c. Is this Difference between Harshesht Sanction Condition and the Control Condition Significant (as Reported by the Investigator)? SIGB2

1. Yes
2. No
999. Unstated

45d. Does our Reanalysis Change these Findings? REANB2

1. Yes
2. No

V46

See note for V42 above.

V46a

See note for V42a above.

V46b

See note for V42b above.

V46c

See note for V42c above.

V46d

See note for V42d above.

V46. Third Follow-Up Period (in Months) . FOLLWB3

46a. Raw Effect Size - % Difference EFFCTB3

46b. Raw Effect Size - \bar{X} (Mean) Difference MEANB3

46c. Is this Difference between Harshesht Sanction Condition and the Control Condition Significant (as Reported by the Investigator)? SIGB3

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 999. Unstated

46d. Does our Reanalysis Change these Findings? REANB3

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

V47

See note for V39 above.

V47. Third Outcome Measure OUTCOME C

1. % violating parole
2. % rearrested
3. % major arrests
4. Mean arrests during program only
5. Mean arrests - program graduates only
6. % incarcerated
7. % failing parole
8. % receiving re-referrals
9. Mean days to referral
10. # of petitions filed
11. % rebooked (all offenses)
12. % rebooked (criminal offenses only)
13. % arrested, during program only
14. % arrested, post-program only
15. % convicted
16. % recidivating as defined by investigators
17. % with police contacts from caution & beginning of the supervision period
18. % with police contacts from the end of supervision & six months after caution
19. % with police contacts from the end of supervision & the end caution
20. % receiving jail or probation revocation
21. % DWI rearrested
22. % domestic violence arrests
23. % shoplifting arrests
24. % police occurrence or contact reports
25. Mean days truant
26. % charged and convicted
27. % charged
28. % of time group spent locked up
29. % of group receiving petitions
30. Mean misconduct reports
31. % driving violation
32. # driving violation points
33. Months to first arrest
34. Time to first arrest
35. Months to first conviction
36. % convicted - program graduates only
37. Mean number of offenses
38. % with other than shoplifting arrests
39. Mean number arrests from day assigned to program
40. % with other than DWI arrests
41. % rearrested - program graduates only
42. Time to first parole violation
43. Mean proportion of time incarcerated
44. % failing to appear
45. % with a felony commitment
46. # reinstitutionalized

V48

See note for V40 above.

V48a

See note for V40a above.

V48b

See note for V40b above.

V48c

See note for V40c above.

V48d

See note for V40d above.

V48. First Follow-Up Period (in Months) FOLLWC1

48a. Raw Effect Size - % Difference EFFCTC1

48b. Raw Effect Size - \bar{X} (Mean) Difference MEANC1

48c. Is this Difference between Harshesht Sanction Condition and the Control Condition Significant (as Reported by the Investigator)? SIGC1

1. Yes
2. No
999. Unstated

48d. Does our Reanalysis Change these Findings? REANC1

1. Yes
2. No

V49

See note for V41 above.

V49a

See note for V41a above.

V49b

See note for V41b above.

V49c

See note for V41c above.

V49d

See note for V41d above.

V49. Second Follow-Up Period (in Months) FOLLWC2

49a. Raw Effect Size - % Difference EFFCTC2

49b. Raw Effect Size - \bar{X} (Mean) Difference MEANC2

49c. Is this Difference between Harshesht Sanction Condition and the Control Condition Significant (as Reported by the Investigator)? SIGC2

1. Yes
2. No
999. Unstated

49d. Does our Reanalysis Change these Findings? REANC2

1. Yes
2. No

V50

See note for V42 above.

V50a

See note for V42a above.

V50b

See note for V42b above.

V50c

See note for V42c above.

V50d

See note for V42d above.

V50. Third Follow-Up Period (in Months) FOLLWC3

50a. Raw Effect Size - % Difference EFFCTC3

50b. Raw Effect Size - \bar{X} (Mean) Difference MEANC3

50c. Is this Difference between Harshesht Sanction Condition and the Control Condition Significant (as Reported by the Investigator)? SIGC3

1. Yes
2. No
999. Unstated

50d. Does our Reanalysis Change these Findings? REANC3

1. Yes
2. No