

SENTENCING AND
MODERN REFORM

SENTENCING AND MODERN REFORM

The Process of Punishment

Liz Marie Marciniak

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH AT GREENSBURG



CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS

Durham, North Carolina

Copyright © 2016
Liz Marie Marciniak
All Rights Reserved

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Marciniak, Liz Marie, author.

Title: Sentencing and modern reform : the process of punishment / Liz Marie Marciniak.

Description: Durham, North Carolina : Carolina Academic Press, [2016] | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2016033573 | ISBN 9781611637229 (alk. paper)

Subjects: LCSH: Sentences (Criminal procedure)--United States. | Law reform--United States. | Mandatory sentences--United States. | Sentences (Criminal procedure)--Philosophy. | Punishment--United States.

Classification: LCC KF9685 .M343 2016 | DDC 345.73/0772--dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2016033573>

Carolina Academic Press, LLC
700 Kent Street
Durham, North Carolina 27701
Telephone (919) 489-7486
Fax (919) 493-5668
www.cap-press.com

Printed in the United States of America

Dedication

To Ellie,
My sweet little girl who will live in my heart forever.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	xxiii
1 · An Overview of Sentencing in the United States	3
Sentencing: The Link between Courts and Corrections	3
A Comparison of Sentencing in Four States	4
The Crime	4
Texas	5
South Carolina	6
North Carolina	7
Ohio	8
Accounting for the Differences	9
Sentencing Approaches and Terms	10
Indeterminate Sentencing	10
Spotlight — Parole in Texas	11
Determinate Sentencing	12
Commission-Based Sentencing Guidelines	12
Mandatory Minimums	12
“Truth-in-Sentencing” Laws	13
Three Strikes Laws	14
The Essence of Three Strikes Laws	14
California’s Strikes Laws	14
The Population under Correctional Supervision in the United States	14
The Prison Population	15
Persons under the Sentence of Death	19
The Jail Population	20
The Probation and Parole Populations	20
Sentencing Goals of Corrections	22
The Non-Utilitarian/Backward-Looking Goal of Retribution	24
Utilitarian/Forward-Looking Goals	25
Deterrence	25
Specific Deterrence	25
General Deterrence	26
Incapacitation	28
Selective Incapacitation	29
Rehabilitation	31

The Compatibility or Incompatibility of Goals of Sentencing and Approaches to Sentencing	33
Summary	34
2 · Early Sentencing Practices for Serious Crimes —	
From the Fixed Sentence to Indeterminate Sentencing	39
Early Punishments in the Colonies	39
Corporal Punishments	39
The Death Penalty	40
Banishment	40
The Use of Jails in the Colonies	40
The Influence of Enlightenment Thinkers on American Penology	41
Incarceration as a Distinct Mode of Punishment in America	41
The Contributions of William Penn	41
The Contributions of Benjamin Rush	43
Early Prisons and the Fixed Sentence	44
The Pennsylvania System— Eastern State Penitentiary	44
The New York System— Auburn	45
Comparing the Pennsylvania and Auburn Systems	46
Early Efforts to Implement Indeterminate Sentencing in Other Countries	46
Captain Alexander Maconochie and the Mark System	47
Sir Walter Crofton and the Irish System	49
Zebulon Reed Brockway— Pioneer of Indeterminate Sentencing	
in the United States	50
Brockway and the Detroit House of Corrections	50
The Establishment of a Board of Guardians	50
National Prison Congress	51
Elmira Reformatory	51
Brockway and the Role of the Positivist School	52
The Increased Use of Indeterminate Sentencing and the Practice of Parole in the United States	54
The Progressive Movement	56
Description	56
The Progressive Approach to Criminal Offenders	57
Progressives and Indeterminate Sentencing	58
Industrial Era/The Big House	58
Spotlight— Ohio State Reformatory	59
Schooling	60
Vocational Training	61
Chaplain	61
Parole	61
Sentencing and Corrections	
Post Depression—Late 1960s	62
Summary	62

3 · Modern Sentencing Reform in the United States:	
Precipitating Factors and Early Approaches	65
The Move Toward Modern Sentencing Reform—Precipitating Factors	65
Disparity, Discretion, Discrimination, and Indeterminate Sentencing	66
Unbridled Discretion and Indeterminate Sentencing	66
The Critiques from Judge Marvin Frankel	66
Critiques from Criminologist Sheldon Glueck	68
California’s Adult Authority—An Example of Indeterminate Sentencing	69
Questioning the Efficacy of Rehabilitation	71
The Martinson Report	71
Other Philosophical Challenges to Rehabilitation	72
“Liberal” Critiques of Indeterminate Sentencing—	
A Concern for Prisoners’ Rights	73
The Practice of Parole	73
Prison Violence	75
Inmate-on-Inmate Violence	75
The Attica Prison Riot	76
Conservative Critiques of Indeterminate Sentencing	77
The Conservative View of Indeterminate Sentencing	77
The Courts and Landmark Supreme Court Decisions	77
The Role of Victims’ Rights Groups	78
Mounting Crime Rates and the	
Law and Order Movement	79
The Crime Wave of the 1960s and 1970s	79
Fear of Crime	80
Changes in the Dominant Philosophy about the Purposes of Punishment	80
The Economic Recession of the 1970s	81
The Move to Sentencing Reform	81
Commonalities of Sentencing Reforms	81
Changes in Parole Practices	82
Parole Guidelines	82
The Elimination of Parole Release	85
Voluntary/ “Descriptive” Guidelines	86
Statutory Determinate Sentencing Schemes	87
California’s Determinate Sentencing	87
Indeterminate Sentencing in California	87
Chairman’s Directive 75/20	88
Senate Bill 42, The Uniform Determinate Sentencing Law	89
Amendments to the Original Determinate Sentencing Law	90
Consequences of California’s Determinate Sentencing Law	91
Proposition 36—2000	92
Indiana’s Determinate Sentencing Law	92
North Carolina’s Fair Sentencing Act (FSA)	95

Sentencing Commissions and Presumptive Sentencing Guidelines	97
Summary	98
4 • Commission-Based Sentencing Guidelines in States	103
Variation in State Sentencing Reforms	103
The Development of State Sentencing Commissions and Sentencing Guidelines	103
Overview of Sentencing Commissions	103
A Sentencing Commission That Did Not Produce Guidelines—Texas	104
The Creation of States’ Commission-Based Sentencing Guidelines	105
Comparing and Contrasting Structure and Function of State Sentencing Commissions and Resulting Guidelines	106
Sentencing Commissions—Temporary or Permanent?	127
The Goals of State Sentencing Guidelines	128
Design—The Two Dimensional Grid, Sentencing Worksheets, and Other Approaches	129
Two Dimensional Sentencing Grid	129
Number of Grids	129
Calculation of Seriousness Levels of Current Offense and Prior Criminal History	131
Worksheets	131
Hybrid Approaches	134
Other Approaches	134
The Consideration of Juvenile Record	134
The Consideration of Aggravating and Mitigating Factors	137
Calculated within the Guidelines or Considered as Reasons for Departure?	137
Some Controversial Aggravating and Mitigating Factors	141
Off-Grid or Off-Worksheet Crimes	142
The Retention of Some Judicial Discretion within Sentencing Guidelines	143
The Relationship between the Sentencing Commission and Its Legislature	143
Sentencing Guidelines, Parole, and Good Time	143
Voluntary, Presumptive, or Somewhere in Between?	144
Appeals of Sentence	144
An In-Depth Look at Commission-Based Guidelines in Four States	145
The Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines	145
History/Background of the Guidelines	145
Structuring the Guidelines—A “Modified Just Deserts” Model	146
Offense Severity and Criminal History	146
The Dispositional Line	147

The Meaning behind Labeling the Guidelines “Modified Just Deserts”	148
The Establishment of Prescriptive Sentences	148
Revisions and Clarifications to the Original Minnesota Guidelines	148
The Pennsylvania Sentencing Guidelines	149
History/Background of the Guidelines	149
Structuring the Guidelines	150
The Basic Sentencing Matrix	150
Variation of Dominant Sentencing Goals by Sentencing Level	152
Aggravating and Mitigating Circumstances	154
Separate Matrices for Crimes Involving Weapons and Children	154
Other Duties of the Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing	155
The North Carolina Sentencing Guidelines	156
History/Background of the Guidelines	156
The North Carolina Commission on Sentencing—Description and Scope of Authority	157
Structuring the Guidelines	158
The Creation of the Felony Punishment Chart—The Work of Subcommittees	158
The North Carolina Sentencing Commission Today	163
The Ohio Sentencing Guidelines	163
History/Background of the Guidelines	163
Structuring the Guidelines	165
Summary	167
5 · Sentencing in the Federal System	173
Introduction	173
The Structure of Federal Courts	174
Early Efforts to Structure Judicial Decision Making	174
Sentencing Institutes	175
Sentencing Councils	175
The Formation of the United States Sentencing Commission	176
Authority	176
Background of the United States Sentencing Commission and the Federal Sentencing Guidelines	177
Sentencing Guidelines Are Now Advisory, Not Mandatory	178
The Complexity of Federal Sentencing Guidelines	180
The Creation of the Federal Sentencing Guidelines	180
Objectives of the Guidelines	180
Sentencing Goals of Corrections—The Federal System	181
The Use of Empirical Data from Past Sentencing Practices as a Point of Departure	182
Real Offense vs. Charge Offense Sentencing	182

Determination of Type of Sentence	183
The Development of Sentencing Ranges	183
Application of the Guidelines	184
The Sentencing Table	184
The Steps to Calculating a Sentence	185
Sentencing Departures	196
Sentencing Variances	198
Violations of Probation and Supervised Release	199
How Much Do Judges Adhere to the Federal Sentencing Guidelines?	199
The Reputation of Federal Sentencing Guidelines	201
Have the Goals of Federal Sentencing Reform Been Realized?	202
Lingering Avenues to Sentencing Disparity	202
Current Issues of Interest to the United States Sentencing Commission	203
The Federal Response to Drug Offenses	204
Spotlight — Basketball Star Len Bias Dies of a Cocaine Overdose	204
Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986	206
Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988	207
Revisions to Penalties for Crack Cocaine Offenses	208
Amendments 706 and 713	208
The Fair Sentencing Act of 2010 and Amendments 748, 750, and 759	210
Retroactivity of the Fair Sentencing Act	211
Research on the Fair Sentencing Act	212
Summary	213
6 • Mandatory Minimum Sentencing and Three Strikes Laws	217
What Are Mandatory Minimum Sentencing Laws?	218
Federal Mandatory Minimum Sentences for Drug Offenders	218
Round One of Mandatory Minimum Sentencing for	
Federal Drug Offenders	218
The 1951 Boggs Act	218
The Narcotics Control Act of 1956	219
The Movement Away from Federal Mandatory Minimums—	
Re-establishment of Judicial Discretion in Federal Drug Cases	219
Presidential Commissions Study Drug Abuse, Drug Crimes, and	
Mandatory Minimums	219
The Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and	
Control Act of 1970	220
Round Two of Mandatory Minimum Sentencing for	
Federal Drug Offenders	221
The Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 and the Anti-Drug Abuse	
Act of 1988	221
Sentencing below a Mandatory Minimum—Two Strategies	221
Substantial Assistance	221
The Creation of Safety Valves	221

Congress to Focus on Mandatory Minimum Sentencing Issues	222
Former Attorney General Eric Holder and the USSC Call for Reduction in Mandatory Minimum Drug Sentences	223
Eric Holder's August 2013 Speech	223
2014 United States Sentencing Commission Votes to Reduce Some Drug Sentences	224
Patterns in the Federal Response to Drug Offenders	224
State Sentencing Laws Targeting Drug Offenders	224
North Carolina's Current Mandatory Minimum Sentences for Drug Trafficking Offenders	225
Rockefeller Drug Laws	226
Background	226
Nixon's War on Drugs	226
Rockefeller's Approach	227
Criticisms of Rockefeller Drug Laws	231
Reforms to the Rockefeller Drug Laws	231
Michigan's 650 Lifer Law	232
Spotlight — JeDonna Young Sentenced under Michigan's 650 Lifer Law	232
Federal and State Drug Laws —	
Complementary or Contradictory?	234
Overlapping Jurisdiction	234
Spotlight — Medical Marijuana — A Look at the Differences between California State Law and Federal Law	234
Federal Mandatory Minimum Sentencing for Firearms Offenders	235
State Mandatory Minimum Sentencing for Firearms Offenses	236
Massachusetts' Bartley-Fox Amendment	236
Michigan Felony Firearms Statute	238
Federal Mandatory Minimum Sentencing for	
Child Pornography Crimes	239
History of Statutes and Sentencing Guidelines Covering Child Pornography Offenses	239
The 2003 Protect Act	239
Current Federal Child Pornography Statutes and Guidelines	240
Prison Lengths for Child Pornography Offenders	242
United States Sentencing Commission Undertakes Study of Sentencing Practices for Child Pornography Offense	243
A Broad Mandatory Minimum Sentencing Law — Oregon's Measure 11	245
The Status of Mandatory Sentencing in the United States	246
State Mandatory Minimum Sentencing Provisions	246
State Safety Valve Provisions	260
Pennsylvania's Moratorium on Mandatory Minimums	261
Three Strikes Laws	262
Background	262

Purposes	262
The Popularity of Three Strikes Laws	263
Habitual Offender Laws	263
The Federal “Three Strikes” Law	264
Washington’s Three Strikes Law	264
Washington’s Prior Habitual Offender Statutes	264
Passage of the Nation’s First Three Strikes Law	265
Spotlight—Washington Governor Grants Clemency for Three Strikes Offender	266
California’s Strikes Laws	267
Spotlight—The Murder of Polly Klass	267
Elements of California’s Original Strikes Laws	267
Changes to California’s 1994 “Three Strikes” Law	269
Proposition 36—2012	269
Precipitating Factors	269
Summary	270
7 · Legal Scrutiny of Sentencing Practices	277
Introduction	277
Court Cases Involving Proportionality Review in Sentencing	278
Proportionality Review—Federal System	
<i>Weems v. United States</i> (1910)	278
Proportionality Review—States	279
<i>Robinson v. California</i> (1962)	279
Proportionality Issues Involving Sentencing Enhancements for Habitual Offenders	280
<i>Graham v. West Virginia</i> (1912)	280
<i>Rummel v. Estelle</i> (1980)	280
<i>Hutto v. Davis</i> (1982)	281
Proportionality and the Death Penalty	282
<i>Furman v. Georgia</i> (1972)	282
<i>Gregg v. Georgia</i> (1976)	283
<i>Coker v. Georgia</i> (1977)	284
<i>Enmund v. Florida</i> (1982)	284
<i>Kennedy v. Louisiana</i> (2008)	285
<i>Roper v. Simmons</i> (2005)	286
Summary of Supreme Court Decisions Involving Proportionality and the Death Penalty	287
The Development of a Three-Factor Proportionality Test— <i>Solem v. Helm</i> (1983)	288
Mandatory Minimum Sentence Laws and the Issue of Proportionality	289
<i>Harmelin v. Michigan</i> (1991)	289
Arguments Concerning Proportionality Review in Non-capital Cases	290

Three Strikes Laws and the Issue of Proportionality	291
<i>Ewing v. California</i> (2003)	291
<i>Lockyer v. Andrade</i> (2003)	293
Proportionality and Sentencing Juvenile Offenders	
to Life Imprisonment	294
<i>Graham v. Florida</i> (2010)	294
<i>Miller v. Alabama</i> (2012)	296
Making Sense of Supreme Court Decisions Concerning Proportionality	
Review of Sentences for Non-Capital Offenses	297
Takeaways — What We Can (and Can't) Conclude	
about the Supreme Court's Opinion on the	
Appropriateness of Proportionality Review	299
The Constitutionality of Federal Sentencing Guidelines	301
Court Cases Involving the Sixth Amendment Right to Trial by Jury	302
Legal Scrutiny of Constitutional Protections	302
Sentencing Factors, Offense Factors, and the Sixth Amendment	303
<i>McMillan v. Pennsylvania</i> (1986)	303
<i>Apprendi v. New Jersey</i> (2000)	304
<i>Harris v. United States</i> (2002)	305
Court Cases Involving Presumptive Sentencing, Sentencing Guidelines,	
and the Sixth Amendment Right to Trial by Jury	306
<i>Blakely v. Washington</i> (2004)	307
The Case	307
The Decision	307
The Supreme Court Rules on the Federal Sentencing Guidelines	308
<i>United States v. Booker</i> (2005)	308
<i>Rita v. United States</i> (2007)	311
<i>Gall v. United States</i> (2007)	312
<i>Kimbrough v. United States</i> (2007)	314
Goals of Sentencing—Can Rehabilitation Impact Sentence Length?	314
<i>Tapia v. United States</i> (2011)	314
The Sixth Amendment Right to a Jury Trial and California's Determinate	
Sentencing Law — <i>Cunningham v. California</i> (2007)	314
The Sixth Amendment Right to Trial by Jury and	
Mandatory Minimums — <i>Alleyne v. United States</i> (2013)	315
Summary	316
8 · Philosophical Issues and Ethical Challenges of Sentencing Reforms	321
Sentencing Goals of Corrections and Sentencing Reform	321
Stated Goals of Sentencing Reforms — A Mix	321
The Compatibility and Incompatibility of Sentencing Goals	
of Corrections — Can Reforms Serve Multiple Purposes?	322
Retribution and Incapacitation	322
Retribution and Rehabilitation	324

Revisiting the Sentencing Goals of Corrections—	
How Are Various Sentencing Goals of Corrections Reflected in Sentencing Reforms?	325
Retribution and Sentencing Reforms	325
The Key Elements of Retribution	325
The Issues of Proportionality and Determining Offense Seriousness	326
Ways to Measure Offense Seriousness	326
Spotlight—Measuring the Seriousness of Crime	326
A Consideration of the Seriousness of White Collar Crimes	328
Public Ratings of Crime Seriousness and Sentencing Schemes	329
Changing Perceptions of Offense Seriousness over Time	330
Are Sentencing Guidelines Compatible with the Goal of Retribution?	331
Are Mandatory Minimums Compatible with the Goal of Retribution?	331
North Carolina Mandatory Minimums for Drug Trafficking Offenses	333
Federal Child Pornography Laws	335
Are Three Strikes Laws Compatible with the Goal of Retribution?	335
Deterrence and Sentencing Reforms	336
The Key Elements of Deterrence	336
A Note about Swiftiness	337
Are Sentencing Guidelines Compatible with the Goal of General Deterrence?	339
Are Sentencing Guidelines Crafted to Promote Certainty of Punishment?	339
Are Sentencing Guidelines Crafted to Minimize Severity?	340
Is the General Public Aware of Sentencing Guidelines?	340
Are Mandatory Minimums Compatible with the Goal of General Deterrence?	340
Are Mandatory Minimums Crafted to Promote Certainty of Punishment?	340
Are Mandatory Minimums Crafted to Minimize Severity?	341
Is the General Public Aware of Mandatory Minimums?	341
Are Three Strikes Laws Compatible with the Goal of General Deterrence?	341
Are Three Strikes Laws Crafted to Promote Certainty of Punishment?	341
Are Three Strikes Laws Crafted to Minimize Severity?	342
Is the General Public Aware of Three Strikes Laws?	342
Specific Deterrence and Sentencing Reforms	342
Are Sentencing Guidelines Compatible with the Goal of Specific Deterrence?	342

Are Sentencing Guidelines Crafted to Promote Certainty of Punishment?	342
Are Sentencing Guidelines Crafted to Minimize Severity?	343
Are Mandatory Minimums Compatible with the Goal of Specific Deterrence?	343
Are Mandatory Minimums Crafted to Promote Certainty of Punishment?	343
Are Mandatory Minimums Crafted to Minimize Severity?	343
Are Three Strikes Laws Compatible with the Goal of Specific Deterrence?	344
Are Three Strikes Laws Crafted to Promote Certainty of Punishment?	344
Are Three Strikes Laws Crafted to Minimize Severity?	344
Incapacitation and Sentencing Reforms	344
Are Sentencing Guidelines Compatible with the Goal of Incapacitation?	344
Are Mandatory Minimums Compatible with the Goal of Incapacitation?	345
Are Three Strikes Laws Compatible with the Goal of Incapacitation?	345
Rehabilitation and Sentencing Reforms	345
Are Sentencing Guidelines Compatible with the Goal of Rehabilitation?	346
Are Mandatory Minimum Sentencing Laws Compatible with the Goal of Rehabilitation?	346
Are Three Strikes Laws Compatible with the Goal of Rehabilitation?	347
Beyond Conventional Goals—Another Perspective of What’s Behind Sentencing Laws	347
Spotlight—Jeff Berryhill Sentenced under Iowa Mandatory Minimum Sentencing Law	348
The Case	348
What (If Any) Sentencing Goals Were Served?	349
Organizations Aim to Challenge and Change	
Harsh Sentencing Practices	350
Families Against Mandatory Minimums (FAMM)	350
The Sentencing Project	351
Stanford Three Strikes Project	352
How Do People Working in the Criminal Justice System View Various Reforms?	352
Summary	353
Interview	354

9 · Have the Goals of Sentencing Reform Been Met?	
Answers from Social Science Research	363
Evaluating the Impacts of Sentencing Reforms	363
Four Approaches to Studying Sentencing Reforms	364
Descriptive Research	364
Explanatory Research	364
Evaluation Research	366
Exploratory Research	366
Types of Effects	367
Bivariate and Multivariate Research	369
Two Important Research Issues in	
Sentencing Research	369
Sample Selection Bias	369
The “Hydraulic Effect” and Sentencing Reforms	370
Understanding the “Hydraulic Effect”	370
Research on the Hydraulic Effect and Sentencing Guidelines	372
Evidence of the Hydraulic Effect in Minnesota	
Sentencing Guidelines	372
Evidence of the Hydraulic Effect in Ohio	
Sentencing Guidelines	372
Evidence of the Hydraulic Effect in	
District of Columbia Guidelines	373
Evidence of the Hydraulic Effect in	
Federal Sentencing Guidelines	374
Research on the Hydraulic Effect and Mandatory Minimums	375
Federal Mandatory Minimum Statutes	375
The Impact of Oregon’s Measure 11 on Prosecutors’	
Charging Decisions	376
Takeaways from Research on the Hydraulic Effect	377
Have Sentencing Guidelines Increased Sentencing Uniformity and	
Decreased Disparity and Discrimination?	378
The Goal of Sentencing Uniformity	378
The Extent of Sentencing Departures	379
Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines Departures	379
Federal Guidelines Departures	381
The Effect of Legally Irrelevant Factors on Sentence Outcomes	
in Jurisdictions with Sentencing Guidelines	382
Legally Relevant Variables	382
Race — Legally Irrelevant	382
Theoretical Perspectives	382
Study Findings	383
Interpreting Studies of Race and Sentencing and the	
Use of Meta-Analysis	384
Gender — Legally Irrelevant	385

History and Hypotheses	385
Study Findings	386
Interpreting Studies of Gender and Sentencing	388
Other Legally Irrelevant Characteristics	388
Age	388
Mode of Conviction	389
Individual Level Interactions	389
Contextual Level Sources of Disparity	389
Takeaways from Research on the Impact of Legally Irrelevant Variables on Sentencing under Commission-Based Sentencing Guidelines	391
The Effects of Recent Supreme Court Decisions on Sentencing Disparity in the Federal Guidelines	391
Have Mandatory Minimum Sentencing and Three Strikes Laws Increased Sentencing Uniformity and Decreased Disparity and Discrimination?	392
Race/Ethnicity and California’s Three Strikes Law	393
Disparities in the Application of Federal Mandatory Minimum Sentencing Laws	393
Summary	397
10 · The Impact of Sentencing Reforms on Crime, the Offender, and Society	405
Have Mandatory Minimums and Three Strikes Laws Led to a Reduction in Crime?	405
Evaluation of the Rockefeller Drug Laws	405
Evaluation of Bartley-Fox	406
Evaluation of Michigan Felony Firearms Statute	407
Three Strikes Laws and Crime	407
Takeaways of the Research Examining the Effect of Mandatory Minimums and Three Strikes Laws on Crime	408
Serving Time and Serving the General Public—Is the Public Made Safer by Imprisoning More Offenders?	409
The Complex Relationship between Imprisonment Rates and Crime Rates	410
How May Imprisonment Lead to Less Crime?	410
What National Descriptive Statistics Show	410
What State Descriptive Statistics Show	411
What Multivariate Analyses Show	413
Does Imprisonment Deter Crime? A Look at Recidivism Rates	414
Bureau of Justice Statistics Study	414
The Pew Center on the States Study	414
Can Incarceration “Backfire” and Increase the Crime Rate?	415
Does Prison Help Control Crime through the Incapacitative Effect?	416

What Social Science Research Has Found	416
What (Other Than Increased Imprisonment) Can Lower Crime Rates?	417
Increasing Employment	417
Increasing Educational Opportunities	417
Social Consequences of Punitive Sentencing Reforms	418
The Attenuation of Informal Social Controls	418
Children of Incarcerated Persons	418
Indirect Ways Three Strikes Laws Negatively Impact Women	420
Mental Health Concerns of Incarcerated Persons	421
How Do Offenders View Sentencing Reforms and Criminal Sanctions?	421
Inmates' Views on Determinate Versus	
Indeterminate Sentencing	421
Inmates' Perceptions on the Punitiveness of Imprisonment Versus	
Alternative Sanctions	422
How Do People Working in the Criminal Justice System	
View Various Reforms?	425
Summary	425
Interview	426
11 • The Future of Sentencing in the United States	435
Recent Calls to Scale Back Harsh Sentencing Practices	435
Sentencing Commission Votes to Reduce Sentences for	
Drug Offenders	435
Justice Department Releases 6,000 Federal Inmates	436
Scaling Back Mandatory Minimums	437
President Obama Commutes Sentences	437
Bipartisan Calls to Scale Back Federal Mandatory Minimums	437
Proposed Federal Legislation	438
To What Extent Are the Reforms Being Reformed?	
Sentencing Reform in Context	441
The Cost of Incarceration	441
Estimating the Cost of Imprisonment	442
Strategies to Cut Corrections Costs	443
The Cost of Incarcerating Older Offenders	443
Public Opinion about Sentencing and Corrections	444
The Media's Influence on Public Perceptions of Crime and Justice	445
The Media's Portrayal of the Crime Problem	445
The Media and the Passage of Three Strikes Laws	446
Public Sentiments on Sentencing and Punishment in the United States	447
How Punitive Is the General Public?	447
Public Attitudes toward Alternative Sanctions	448
Public Attitudes toward Rehabilitation	449
Public Attitudes about Sentencing in Different Countries	450
Should Public Opinion Impact Policymakers and Policies?	451

Evidence-Based Sentencing	451
The NCSC Sentencing Reform Project	451
The Role of Sentencing Commissions	453
How May Reviving Rehabilitation Impact Sentencing Policies?	453
Penal Harm	453
Modern Reforms Have Devalued Rehabilitation	454
A Revived Interest in Rehabilitation	454
Another Look at <i>The Martinson Report</i>	455
Recent Evidence of the Effectiveness of Some Rehabilitation Programs	456
How Can a Renewed Interest in Rehabilitation Affect Sentencing Practices?	457
The Growing Interest in Reentry Programs in the United States	458
What Is Offender Reentry?	458
How Imprisonment Impedes Reentry	459
Sentencing Approaches and Reentry	459
An International Comparison	460
Spotlight—Sentencing and Incarceration in Germany and the Netherlands: A Cross National Study”	460
Background	460
Findings	461
Takeaways	462
The Advice of Scholars	463
What Is the Future of Sentencing Practices in the United States?	467
Calls to Reform the Reforms	467
The Continuum of Judicial Discretion in Sentencing Practices	467
Variation in Sentencing in the United States Will Likely Persist	468
Trends in Sentencing in the United States	469
Summary	469
Interview	470
Index	479

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As I finish writing my first book, I feel humbled by the support I have received from the wonderful staff at Carolina Academic Press, my family, my friends, and my colleagues. When I began work on this project years ago, I really didn't know how much work it would require. I also didn't realize how important so many people would be to providing me with guidance, encouragement, and love. Words can't do justice to how much I appreciate the support of so many people in my life.

I first thank the great people at Carolina Academic Press. I met Beth Hall a few years ago when she came to my campus to share with me new and exciting titles. I discussed my book idea with her and wrote up a proposal. From the day I met Beth until today, she has been so encouraging, professional, and pleasant to work with. I am indebted to her for offering me a contract and working with me for many months. Thanks to Tasha Gervais for answering all my questions during the writing process. I thank Ryland Bowman for his editorial work and extreme attention to detail. Special thanks go to Grace Pledger and Sara Hjelt for their work on my page proofs. I also thank Meredith Jones for working with me on the Instructor's Manual. Her insights and guidance are much appreciated. Thanks to Rae Meade and Davis Alderson for assisting with my Powerpoint slides. I would also like to thank anonymous reviewers for providing feedback throughout the process.

My parents gave me the opportunity to go to college and instilled the importance of perseverance and hard work. I would never have been able to attend graduate school with an assistantship and earn a doctorate at the University of Maryland without those values. My parents have also been extremely patient throughout the time I have been writing. I look forward to spending much more quality time with them now!

I also thank Uncle Raymond and Aunt Debbie for their encouragement and support and I am so blessed to have such a cool aunt and uncle.

The professors I had while attending the University of Maryland were simply the best. And without the superb education I received from my graduate school professors, I wouldn't have the tools needed to write this book. Thanks to Colin Loftin, Larry Sherman, Ray Paternoster, Denise Gottfredson, Charles Wellford, and David McDowall for being such amazing professors, scholars and role models.

Then there are my former colleagues, who I consider friends who gave me their professional expertise while I researched and wrote this book. Tim Kinlock, my dear friend from University of Maryland (who now teaches at the University of Baltimore) shared with me his expertise in substance abuse research and pointed to some good resources.

Randy LaGrange from University of North Carolina at Wilmington gave me some great pointers on writing a textbook ... and balancing that with life.

My past and present criminal justice colleagues from the University of Pittsburgh at Greensburg are simply the best. Their friendship and encouragement mean the world to me. Thanks to Tom Horan, Greg Kerpchar, Nick Hall, and Tim Holler for being the coolest colleagues a girl could ask for. And a special thanks to Neil Guzy, who offered me his legal expertise for the book and offered me time and friendship, even when he really didn't have the time.

Special thanks to Tony Boldurian and Martha Koehler for reading reviewers' remarks and giving me great advice on writing a book. Thanks to my former co-division chairs, Mark Stauffer and Bill Rued for being supportive of my writing and understanding why I had to step down to write my book. And thanks to some very special people at Pitt-Greensburg—Lori Jakiela, Melissa Marks, Steve Murabito, and Judy Vollmer. Their scholarly accomplishments are truly inspirational and their support for me during this project is much appreciated.

My friends have been amazing and so encouraging. One really realizes who is truly a friend when writing a book. Thanks to Mylene Samek, Kelly Myers, Suzanne Weightman, Jameson Bowden, and Jennifer Dunlap for being there for me and celebrating the good things in life and being there for the not so good things. True friendship is a true blessing.

And special thanks to people who have been both my friends and colleagues at University of Pittsburgh. Thanks to Mike Lucci, the truest friend a girl could ask for. He has always offered me sweet support and love. Mike is the one of the most caring, giving people I've ever met. I treasure our friendship.

And thanks to Steve Dworkin, my friend and former colleague at UNCW. I'm so glad we kept in touch. Steve is an amazing researcher, a supportive friend, and cool guy!

My student research assistants were incredibly dedicated and a joy to work with. Two students made a difference. Steve Reddy worked on tables for the book and performed legal research. He was always enthusiastic and extremely hard working and always went the extra mile. I just know he is going to have an amazing career as a lawyer. I was also blessed to have had Michelle Duffy work very hard on performing literature searches, checking references, and obtaining permissions. Michelle also got me into country music along the way!!! I totally appreciate that (I'm now a super Dan + Shay fan!!) and her sweet disposition.

The people I interviewed for my book were so gracious to give me their time. Thanks to the Honorable Judge Debra Pezze and Mr. Wayne McGrew for giving me their perspectives on sentencing in Pennsylvania. Their time is so precious which makes their contributions to my book even more special. They both also served on a panel discussion at Pitt—Greensburg on Pennsylvania's sentencing guidelines. They, along with the Honorable Judge Christopher Feliciani, Assistant District Attorney Jim De Floria, and Dr. Eric Kocian gave their time in providing Pitt students with their perspectives on sentencing. I also thank Dr. Sharon Smith, President of the University of Pittsburgh at Greensburg for attending this event and encouraging me throughout my writing.

Special thanks to “Serena,” a formerly incarcerated person. I so admire her willingness to talk to me and admire her courage and fortitude in life.

The librarians, past and present, at the University of Pittsburgh at Greensburg helped me so much and I am indebted to them. Thanks to Anna Mary Willford, Pat Duck, and Amanda Folk.

I must also thank the New Hanover County Criminal Justice Advisory Board for accepting me as a member back in 1994. I first became interested in sentencing when I served on this board. My position on the board helped me secure a grant to evaluate the day sentencing center that was established by the board. I don’t think I’d ever have thought of writing a book on sentencing if I didn’t have this opportunity. Special thanks to Andy Atkinson, who served as chair.

And before I began writing, I needed a home office. Thanks to Bob and Joella, who helped me put together a beautiful office in my home. None of this would be possible without a computer desk, carpeting, and painting!

I also thank my puppies, past and present for showing me unconditional love. I dedicated my book to Ellie, who passed shortly after I finished writing my book. She must have known how important the book was to me and she was the sweetest girl ever. I thank Bumper and Rebel, who are also at the rainbow bridge and were amazing companions. And my current pups, Jackson and my wild child puppy Jessa for being sweet.

And last but not least, I must give a very special thank you to Shawn. He was there for me from the time I signed my contract and to the day I signed off on the last page proof. He was always there for me for the time in between, even when I didn’t make it so easy to be! His kindness and love are unmatched.

These acknowledgements only scratch the surface as to how many people (and dogs) helped me writing this book. I am so appreciative of so many people in my life. Now that the book is done, I can start thanking them in person and playing more with Jackson and Jessa. I have a lot of thanking (and playing) to do!