

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN PRISON PROGRAM INVOLVEMENT
AND INMATE MISCONDUCT

by

AMANDA RUDE

IDA JOHNSON, COMMITTEE CHAIR
JANE DAQUIN
WILLIAM HART

A THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science
in the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2019

Copyright Amanda Rude 2019
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

The majority of current literature surrounding prison program involvement and inmate behavior focuses on recidivism, this study adds to the current literature by exploring the impact that involvement in different types of programs have on inmate misconduct. The limited research on the relationship between types of programs (e.g. educational, parenting, and religious programs) and inmate misconduct has yielded inconsistent findings and a majority of them were conducted on samples of male inmates only. This study aims to fill the gap in the existing literature centered on prison program involvement and inmate misconduct by utilizing samples of both male and female inmates (housed in federal and state prisons) to assess the gender differences in relation to program involvement and inmate misconduct. The Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities 2004 data were used to generate a sample of approximately 13,000 male and 3,500 female inmates. The results of multiple logistic regressions indicate that prison programs do significantly impact inmate misconduct; however, the direction of impact differs according to specific programs and gender.

Keywords: prison programs, gender differences, misconduct, importation, deprivation

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my family and friends who have provided me with endless support throughout the writing of this manuscript and my time as a graduate student. In particular, I would like to dedicate this thesis to my parents who taught me that “I can do all things through Christ who strengthens me” and to never give up on my dreams.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank Dr. Ida Johnson for her continued support and mentorship as my thesis committee chair, graduate advisor, and professor for the past five years. Dr. Johnson significantly impacted my interest in corrections and has been very encouraging and patient with me throughout the duration of this project and my academic career. I would also like to thank Dr. Jane Daquin and Dr. William Hart for serving on my thesis committee. Dr. Daquin has extended a great amount of assistance with my statistical interpretations and has provided unwavering guidance throughout the writing of this thesis and my graduate career. Dr. Hart has also provided me with honest feedback and practical suggestions which ultimately led me to expand this thesis to explore gender differences and tackle this topic from a more complex perspective. I would also like to acknowledge and thank my parents and fiancé for providing me with endless support throughout my academic career.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW	5
Prison Misconduct	5
Factors Related to Prison Misconduct	8
Importation Theory	9
Deprivation Theory	15
Program Participation and Misconduct	20
Educational and Vocational Programs	21
Religious Programs	25
Parenting Programs	27
Substance Treatment Programs	29
Other Programs	31
Present Study	33

CHAPTER THREE METHODOLOGY	35
Research Design.....	35
Population and Sample	35
Variables	36
Dependent Variables.....	36
Independent Variables	38
Hypotheses.....	43
Instrument	44
Data Collection	44
CHAPTER FOUR RESULTS	46
Sample Description.....	46
Logistic Regression Results.....	50
CHAPTER FIVE DISCUSSION.....	58
CHAPTER SIX CONCLUSIONS.....	65
Limitations	65
Policy Implications	67
Conclusion	67
REFERENCES	69
APPENDIX A THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IRB LETTER	75

LIST OF TABLES

1. Descriptive Statistics.....	47
2. Logistic Regression Results on Any Rule Violation.....	49
3. Logistic Regression Results on Assault Violations.....	52
4. Logistic Regression Results on Institution Violations.....	55

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Over the past few decades, there has been a significant increase in prison populations throughout the United States. Research has shown that prison populations grew from approximately 909,000 prisoners (male and female inmates) in 1993 (Snell, 1995) to approximately 2,170,000 prisoners (male and female inmates) in 2016 (Kaeble & Cowhig, 2018). This massive influx of prisoners stems from a combination of the “Three Strikes” legislation of 1994, “War on Drugs” (Pfaff, 2012), and the truth-in-sentencing laws (Klein, Tolbert, Bugarin, Cataldi, & Tauschek, 2004). Consequently, the dramatic increase in prison population overtime has led to an array of problems including inmate misconduct, lack of resources needed for programming (Rose, 2004), deterioration of inmate’s quality of life (e.g., increased levels of frustration, cognitive strain, lack of privacy, etc.) (Haney, 2006). One of the most consistent issues that virtually every correctional facility face is inmate misconduct (Camp, Gaes, Langan & Saylor, 2003; French & Gendreau, 2006; Haney, 2006; Rocheleau, 2014; Schenk & Fremouw, 2012). As a result, many scholars have attempted to address and identify problems that may be associated with inmate misconduct in order to help create safer environments for both inmates and correctional staff members (Cihan, Davidson, & Sorensen, 2017; Gendreau, Goggin & Law, 1997; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2014). Research that has centered on prison misconduct has been able to identify a variety of individual (e.g. age, race, marital status, education level, etc.) and environmental (e.g. prison crowding, prison gangs,

visitation, etc.) factors that influence male and female inmate misconduct (Camp et al., 2003; Chamberlain, 2012; Hunte & Esmail, 2011; Kuanliang & Sorensen, 2008; Solinas-Saunders & Stacer, 2012; Welsh et al., 2007).

Another issue that has stemmed from prison overcrowding is the lack of resources needed to provide inmates with equal opportunity to engage in different types of prison programs (Donohue III & Siegelman, 1998; French & Gendreau, 2006; Haney, 2006; Klein et al., 2004). Prisons were not prepared to deal with the financial consequences of prison overcrowding, and as a result, many prison programs were not adequately staffed to treat every inmate (French & Gendreau, 2006; Haney, 2006; Klein et al., 2004; Rocheleau, 2014; Vacca, 2004). As prison populations continued to increase over the years, prisons had to make do on much less to accommodate every inmate (Haney, 2006), which ultimately lead to ineffective programs and an overall decrease in programs offered for both male and female inmates (Rose, 2003). These findings are notable because inmates who pose the greatest risk in prison (i.e., in terms of inmate misconduct) are oftentimes more likely to have the greatest treatment needs (i.e., mental health, addiction, anger management, education, etc.) (Andrews et al., 1990; Chamberlain, 2005; French & Gendreau, 2006; Hoffman, Byrd & Kightlinger, 2010). Prison programs often serve as a form of rehabilitation that either provides inmates with treatment for personal issues (i.e., drug treatment, anger management, mental health treatment, etc.) and/or teaches inmates skills needed for a successful reentry to society (i.e., education, employment counseling, vocational, life-skills and community adjustment, etc.). Scholars have argued that prison programs are associated with improvements in inmate behavior and also help to lower recidivism rates overtime (Pompoco, Wooldredge, Lugo, Sullivan & Latessa, 2017; Solinas-Saunders & Stacer, 2012; Tripodi et al., 2011). However, with prison populations at an all-time high and a lack of funding/resources,

inmates may not have equal access to prison programs and even if they do, it is hard to assume that every program is as effective as it is supposed to be.

While there has been a plethora of research that has examined a variety of factors associated with inmate misconduct, there has been a paucity of research that has investigated the potential impact that prison program involvement may have on inmate misconduct. Particularly, prison program involvement has been found to positively affect male inmate behavior upon their release from prison (Pompoco et al., 2017; Randol & Campbell, 2017; Solinas-Saunders & Stacer, 2012), but little is known about the effect program involvement has on inmate behavior throughout their time served in prison. Much of the existing research on program involvement and inmate misconduct has incorporated samples of male inmates housed at state correctional facilities (Steiner & Wooldredge, 2012; Wilson, Gallagher & MacKenzie, 2000) and has included only a few types of programs (e.g. drug, education, and religious program) (Pompoco et al., 2017; Randal & Campbell, 2017; Steiner, Butler & Ellison, 2014). The existing research is limited in representing female inmates, which is problematic because research has shown that male and female inmates experience prison differently (i.e., in terms of adaption, pains of imprisonment, and misconduct), and that misconduct tends to differ among state and federal correctional facilities (Benning & Lahm, 2016; Camp et al., 2003; Goetting & Howsen; Kuanliang & Sorensen, 2008; Lahm, 2016; Lahm, 2017). The current study builds on existing literature on prison program involvement and inmate misconduct by utilizing samples of both male and female inmates (housed in federal and state prisons) to assess if any gender differences exist in relation to program involvement and inmate misconduct. This study also includes new types of programs (e.g. ethnic, inmate assistance, self-help, etc.) that have yet to be explored in addition to more commonly explored programs (e.g. educational and religious programs).

Specifically, the study incorporates ten programs which include: (1) substance abuse, (2) vocational, (3) educational, (4) religious, (5) ethnic, (6) employment counseling, (7) parenting, (8) life skills and community adjustment, (9) inmate assistance, and (10) self-help programs. Overall, the purpose of the study is to determine whether there is an association between prison program involvement and inmate misconduct, and if so, which programs are most effective in reducing prison misconduct.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Prison Misconduct

Prison order and safety are often one of the highest concerns among prison administration and correctional officials (Cihan, Davidson, & Sorensen, 2017; Gendreau, Goggin, & Law, 1997; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2008). The order and safety of correctional facilities are often evaluated through official reports or self-reports of inmate misconduct (Steiner & Wooldredge; Schenk & Fremouw, 2012). Inmate misconduct is defined as behaviors that violate the rules enforced throughout a correctional facility (Camp, Gaes, Langan & Stacer, 2012; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2014). More specifically, inmate misconduct refers to a variety of behaviors that range from mild acts of disobedience (e.g. being out of place, talking back to staff, etc.) to haphazard acts of violence (e.g. riots, physical assault, sexual assault, etc.) (Schenk & Fremouw, 2012).

Prison misconduct is often a loose concept that tends to be measured differently across researchers. One of the most common definitions of inmate misconduct is a composite measure that captures whether an inmate has been written up or found guilty of any rule violation since their admission to prison (e.g., any minor, major, violent, non-violent act) (French & Gendreau, 2006; Wooldredge, Griffin & Pratt, 2001). Another common measurement of misconduct is categorized by either “violent” or “non-violent” misconduct (Lahm, 2017; Schenk & Fremouw, 2012; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2013). Violent misconduct is often defined/operationalized as threatening behaviors, physical or harmful assault (to either inmate or staff), attempting to cause harm (to either inmate or staff), rioting, possession of weapon, etc., whereas nonviolent

misconduct is often defined as acts of disobedience, drug use, possession of contraband, etc. (Lahm, 2017; Schenk & Fremouw, 2012). Many studies have also categorized different types of misconduct into more specific groups (Camp et al., 2003; Cihan, Davidson & Sorensen, 2017; Gover, Perez & Jennings, 2008; Kuanliang & Sorensen, 2008; Solinas-Saunders & Stacer, 2012). For instance, some studies have broken misconduct down into measures of assault violations (e.g., physical and verbal assault on inmates or guards) (Camp et al., 2003; Cihan et al., 2017; Kuanliang & Sorensen, 2008; Solinas-Saunders & Stacer, 2012), substance violations (e.g., possession of drugs or alcohol, being under the influence, etc.) (Camp et al., 2003; Kuanliang & Sorensen, 2008) property violations (e.g., vandalism, stolen property, accepting/giving money without authorization, etc.) (Camp et al., 2003; Cihan et al., 2017), security-related offenses (e.g., attempted escapes, rioting, food strikes, contraband etc.) (Camp et al., 2003; Gover et al., 2008; Kuanliang & Sorensen, 2008), and other violations (e.g., being unsanitary, lying, being disobedient, tattooing or self-mutilation) (Camp et al., 2003; Celinska & Sung, 2014; Kuanliang & Sorensen, 2008).

By using different measures of misconduct, research has been able to suggest patterns of misconduct behaviors among male and female inmates. In fact, research has suggested that male and female inmates often engage in different types of prison misconduct (Caddock, 1996; Camp et al., 2006; Gendreau et al., 1997; Gover et al., 2008; Harer & Langan, 2001; Solinas-Saunders & Stacer, 2012; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2013; Wright et al., 2007). Research has suggested that male inmates are more likely to engage in more serious and violent forms of prison misconduct (Gover et al., 2008; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2013), whereas female inmates are more likely to engage in minor and non-violent forms of prison misconduct (Thomposon & Loper, 2005; Wright et al., 2007). Overall, research has shown that male inmates engage in misconduct at

higher rates than female inmates (Camp et al., 2006; Solinas-Saunders & Stacer, 2012; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2013; Wright et al., 2007).

Prison misconduct is a concerning aspect of the prison environment that needs to be continually investigated in order to better understand the underlying causes that influence inmates to act out. There exists a considerable body of literature on predictors of inmate misconduct, however, the problem still occurs. Therefore, it is important for scholars to continue investigating new aspects of inmate's lifestyles (e.g. behaviors, involvement, social bonds, etc.) in order for correctional facilities to develop proactive policies to help prevent future misconduct. Previous studies have emphasized the consequences of high rates of institutional misconduct and have found inmates to have an increased risk of physical victimization (Kuanlian & Sorensen, 2008), sexual victimization (Kuanling & Sorensen, 2008), mental health deterioration (Cihan , Davidson, Sorensen, 2017; Haney, 2006), injuries (Haney, 2006), etc. when they are housed in overcrowded facilities that have high rates of institution misconduct. Additionally, prior research has shown that prison misconduct can have detrimental effects on both inmates and correctional staff workers (Randol & Campbell, 2017). In particular, facilities with high rates of prison misconduct may lead to unsafe and less secure environments, which can then increase both inmate's and correctional worker's risk of harm (Cihan et al., 2017; Schenk & Fremouw, 2012). In fact, research has suggested that correctional facilities with high rates of violence may impair both inmate's and correctional worker's physical and mental well-being over time (Camp, Gaes, Langan & Saylor, 2003; Cihan, Davidson & Sorensen, 2017; Randol & Campbell, 2017).

While prison misconduct may have detrimental effects on both inmates and correctional workers, other research has also been able to identify additional consequences of prison

misconduct for correctional workers solely (Camp et al., 2003; Schenk & Fremouw, 2012; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2014; Solinas-Saunders & Stacer, 2012). In particular, Randol and Campbell (2017) found that correctional workers who worked in facilities with high rates of misconduct were more likely to report higher levels of job dissatisfaction, higher turnover rates, and higher rates of absenteeism than correctional staff workers who worked in facilities with low rates of misconduct. Additionally, facilities with high rates of misconduct have been found to spend more money on administrative costs (e.g., security, placement of at-risk inmates in protective custody, medical treatment, additional staff recruitment and training, etc.) than facilities with lower rates of misconduct (Randol & Campbell, 2017).

Although there are many scholars who investigate the potential underlying causes and correlates of prison misconduct, the fiscal and social costs that are associated with prison misconduct could potentially be mitigated if the sources of inmate misconduct were more adequately associated with, or expounded by, institutional or administrative measures. In order for future research to develop more accurate measures of inmate misconduct, it is important to first examine the existing research that has held consistent over time. The following sections provide a brief review of the current literature that has centered on factors related to prison misconduct.

Factors Related to Prison Misconduct

In order to properly address gender differences in prison program involvement and inmate misconduct, it is important to first distinguish gender differences in predictors of prison misconduct among male and female inmates. Predictors of misconduct have been previously assessed only to a very limited extent because a majority of existing research has focused mainly on samples of male inmates and only a fraction of the existing literature has included samples of

female inmates (Celinska & Sung, 2014; Gover et al., 2008). The existing literature suggests that there are predictive factors of male inmate misconduct (Camp et al., 2003; Harer & Langan, 2001; Kuanliang & Sorensen, 2008; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2013); however, scholars often argue that such characteristics may not be salient for female prisoners (Craddock 1996; Chian et al., 2017; Kuanling & Sorensen, 2008; Reidy et al., 2012). In fact, many scholars attribute the potential differences in characteristics that may be predictive of misconduct among male and female inmates to the different lifestyles and experiences that occur prior to prison (Celinska & Sung, 2014; Chian et al., 2017; Gover et al., 2008; Zingraff, 1980).

The current study incorporates two competing theories, importation theory and deprivation theory, to examine prison misconduct. While both theories attempt to pinpoint factors related to inmate misconduct, both theories postulate different underlying causes and factors that influence misconduct. Importation theory rests on the assumption that there are characteristics, traits, experiences, attitudes, and behaviors inmates carry into prison that influence their adaption to prison (Cihan et al., 2017; Lahm, 2016; Rocheleau, 2013). Deprivation theory presumes that the adverse conditions of the prison environment or pains of imprisonment influence inmates' behavior/adaption to prison (Lahm, 2016; Lahm, 2017; Thomas, 1977). By incorporating these two theories, the current study will be able to examine how both individual (e.g. age, race, education, marital status, mental health, etc.) and environmental/situational characteristics (i.e. influence of participation in prison programs) influence prison misconduct.

Importation Theory

Importation theorists postulate that prison misconduct occurs when inmates “import” behaviors and attitudes into prison that they previously adhered to outside of prison (Irwin &

Cressey, 1962; Lahm, 2016). Under this assumption, it is suggested that inmates adapt to prison based on their social background, personal experiences, and socialization that occurred prior to incarceration (Lahm, 2016; Welsh, McGrain, Salamatin & Zajac, 2007). Importation theorists argue that individuals who engaged in more crime and violent behaviors outside of prison will continue to act the same when they are incarcerated (Cihan et al., 2017; Griffin & Hepburn, 2012; Lahm, 2016; Welsh et al., 2007). Therefore, the importation model emphasizes individual characteristics over the institution (i.e. prison environment) or the conditions associated with incarceration (i.e. pains of imprisonment) as the cause of prison misconduct.

In order to examine individual (i.e. personal) characteristics related to prison misconduct, importation scholars often examine pre-prison conditions that may influence institutional behavior, such as demographics, criminal history, and current offense characteristics (Cihan et al., 2017; Lahm, 2016). Demographic characteristics are important to examine as they signify preexisting traits that represent individuals' differential environmental and social experiences that shape their behavior (Cihan et al., 2017; Griffin & Hepburn, 2012). Some of the most common demographic characteristics that prior studies have used to examine associations with misconduct include age, race, education, marital status, prior employment, prior substance abuse problems, and prior mental health. Criminal history characteristics are also equally important to examine as they may help predict the likelihood that an inmate will engage in prison misconduct (Lahm, 2008). For instance, importation theorists argue that individuals who have more extensive criminal history records may be more likely to engage in prison misconduct than individuals who do not have a criminal history (Cihan et al., 2017; Griffin & Hepburn, 2012; Welsh et al., 2007). Some of the common measures of criminal history include, but are not

limited to, the type of offense that inmates are convicted of (e.g., violent, drug, property, etc.), and prior prison experience (Lahm, 2008; Lahm, 2016).

Although importation theory has been applied to samples of male and female inmates, scholars often argue whether this theory is equally applicable to both male and female inmates (Gover et al., 2008; Lahm, 2017; Rocheleau, 2013; Zingraff, 1980). In particular, importation theorists have argued that males and females oftentimes have different experiences prior to prison, and as a result, they contend that males and females import different characteristics that are gender specific to prison (Cihan et al., 2017; Gover et al., 2008; Lahm, 2016; Lahm, 2017). Consequently, importation theorists suggest that these gender differences prior to prison may account for the differences in prison misconduct among male and female inmates (Faily & Roundtree, 1979; Gover et al., 2008; Thompson & Loper, 2005).

Research that has centered on predictors of prison misconduct has suggested that there are some similarities and differences in individual characteristics that are associated with inmate misconduct among male and female inmates (Casey-Acevedo & Bakken, 2001; Cihan et al., 2017; Solinas-Saunders & Stacer, 2012). Some of the characteristics that appear to influence misconduct in a similar manner for both male and female inmates include age, race, educational level and employment prior to incarceration (Casey-Acevedo & Bakken, 2001; Cihan et al., 2017; Gover et al., 2008; Solinas-Saunders & Stacer, 2012). In particular, prior research has suggested that male and female inmates are more likely to engage in misconduct if they are young (Chamberlain, 2012; Gendreau et al., 1997; Goetting & Howsen, 1986; Hunte & Esmail, 2011; Jiang, 2005; Kuanliang & Sorensen, 2008), non-white (Gover et al., 2008; Solinas-Saunders & Stacer, 2012), less educated (i.e., lack 12th education) (Berg & DeList, 2006; Cunningham, Sorensen & Reidy, 2005; DeList et al., 2004; Lahm, 2009; Schenk & Fremouw,

2012; Solinas-Saunders & Stacer, 2012), and are not employed prior to incarceration (Goetting & Howsen, 1986; Kuanliang & Sorensen, 2008).

While age, race, education level, and prior employment may influence misconduct in a similar manner for both male and female inmates, there are other individual characteristics that appear to have a different impact on misconduct among male and female inmates. Specifically, research has suggested that individual factors such as marital status, prior substance abuse, prior mental health issues, and type of offense convicted of may impact misconduct differently among male and female inmates.

For one, there have been numerous studies that have found marital status to be a significant predictor of inmate misconduct among male inmates only (Jiang & Winfree, 2006; Solinas-Saunders & Stacer, 2012; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2013). Research has suggested that male inmates who are married are significantly less likely to be written up or found guilty of rule violations in comparison to non-married male inmates (e.g. single, divorced, etc.). Scholars often suggest that male and female inmates who are married are more likely to abide by prison rules and regulations in order to keep their visitation rights (i.e., married inmates have more of an incentive to behave appropriately so they can see their spouse) (Jing & Winfree, 2006; Solinas-Saunders & Stacer, 2012; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2013). Jiang and Winfree (2006) focused specifically on the gender differences between marital status and misconduct and suggested that females (nonincarcerated) typically provide more social support for their incarcerated spouses than husbands do for their incarcerated spouses. Therefore, this discrepancy may account for the findings that incarcerated married males are more likely to benefit from visitation than incarcerated married females.

Research has found substance abuse issues prior to prison to increase the likelihood of prison misconduct for both male and females (Cihan, Davidson & Sorensen, 2017; DeLisi et al., 2011; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2009); however, some studies have found the prevalence rates to be significantly higher among female inmates than male inmates (Celinska & Sung, 2014; Houser & Welsh, 2014; Jiang, 2005). Scholars have noted that substance use is often one of the leading pathways of female criminality, and as a result, females tend to have a more extensive history of drug abuse prior to prison in comparison to males (Celinska & Sung, 2014; Reidy et al., 2017; Sailsbury et al., 2009; Wright et al., 2007). Females' extensive drug histories also place females at an increased risk to be written up for rule violations (Jiang, 2005; Reidy et al., 2017; Sailsbury et al., 2009; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2009; Wright et al., 2007). However, other scholars have argued that the overall effect of drug abuse in prison impacts male and female inmates differently. Male inmates who are addicted to drugs have been suggested to act out in more aggressive behaviors, whereas female inmates who are addicted to drugs have been suggested to develop more internalized problems (e.g., mental health issues, negative perceptions of self, etc.) (Solinas-Saunders & Stacer, 2012).

Similarly, research has also suggested that mental health issues prior to prison may increase the likelihood of rule violations for male and female inmates (Houser & Welsh, 2014; Moloney et al., 2009; Reidy & Sorensen, 2018; Solinas-Saunders & Stacer, 2012); however, the prevalence of mental health issues and diagnosis of mental disorders impact misconduct rates differently among male and female inmates (Steiner et al., 2014; Solinas-Saunders & Stacer, 2012). To illustrate, female inmates, in comparison to male inmates, are oftentimes more likely to enter prison with mental disorders (e.g., anxiety, depression, PTSD, etc.) that stem from pre-prison trauma (e.g., sexual assault, domestic violence, etc.) (Reidy et al., 2017; Reidy &

Sorensen, 2018) and substance abuse (Houser & Welsh, 2014). Consequently, scholars have argued that female's pre-prison victimization coupled with mental health issues cause females to have a harder time adapting to the prison environment and, thus, increase their chances of being written up for more rule violations (Reidy & Sorensen, 2018). Further research has also suggested mental health issues to impact females in a more aggressive manner than male inmates (Solinas-Saunders & Stacer, 2012).

The type of offense that inmates are convicted of have also been noted by many studies as telling predictor of prison misconduct for both male and female inmates; however, the specific types of offenses that may be predictive of misconduct often differ among male and female inmates (Cihan et al., 2017; Faily & Roundtree, 1979; Gover et al., 2008). For example, male inmates who are convicted of violent offenses are more likely engage in more violent forms of prison misconduct (Cihan et al., 2017; Faily & Roundtree, 1979), whereas female inmates who are convicted of drug and property offenses are more likely to engage in more minor and non-violent forms of prison misconduct (Gover, et al., 2008).

Lastly, male and female inmates have been noted to import different types of behaviors with them to prison that tend to be gender specific (Dyer, 2005; Hariston, 1991; Kazaura, 2001; Philips, 2001; Umamaheswar, 2013). According to Dyer (2005) and Philips (2001), males are more likely to import behaviors that uphold an image of masculinity than female. These images of masculinity are often fostered through aggressive behaviors and attitudes (Dyer, 2005; Philips, 2001). Contrarily, females are more likely to import behaviors that uphold an image of motherly and or caring figures (Hariston, 1991; Kazaura, 2001; Umamaheswar, 2013). These images of females are often facilitated through the creation of pseudo families which allow female inmates

to provide supportive roles to one another (Hariston, 1991; Kazaura, 2001; Umamaheswar, 2013).

Deprivation Theory

While importation theorists focus on pre-prison individual characteristics to explain and predict prison misconduct (Cihan et al., 2017; Thomas, 1977), deprivation theorists focus on the environmental (i.e. facility) characteristics to explain and predict prison misconduct (Gover, Perez & Jennings, 2008; Sykes, 1958; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2008; Lahm, 2016). Sykes (1958) was one of the first scholars to use the deprivation theory to suggest that inmates experience environmental deprivations and pains of imprisonment (i.e., loss of liberty, goods and services, heterosexual relationships, autonomy, and security.) as a result of their incarceration (Gover et al., 2008; Irwin & Cressey, 1962; Lahm, 2016; Sykes, 1958). These deprivations and pains that inmates experience is then argued to influence inmate behavior and adaption to prison life (Lahm, 2016; Steiner et al., 2014; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2008). Under this assumption, it is the degrading, stigmatizing, and oppressive conditions of prison that influence inmates to act out (Irwin & Cressey, 1962; Lahm, 2016; Lahm 2017; Thomas 1977). Deprivation theorists also argue that some inmates, when placed in an environment that denies access to the means of satisfying certain needs, may violate the prison rules by seeking illegitimate alternatives to obtain satisfaction (Sykes & Messinger, 1960; Steiner et al., 2014). Essentially, inmate behavior is a manifestation of how inmates cope and adapt to the pains of imprisonment, whether through individual choices that help facilitate satisfaction or participation in a social system that helps reduce such deprivations (Gover et al., 2008; Steiner et al., 2014; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2008).

In order to examine factors associated with misconduct under the deprivation theory, scholars incorporate factors related to the institution and the prison environment to measure

inmate adjustment and behavior (Gover et al., 2008; Irwin & Cressey, 1962; Lahm, 2016; Lahm 2017; Sykes, 1958). Some of the most common deprivation variables used for analysis include sentence length, time served, crowding, visitations, prison employment, and program participation (Lahm, 2017; Rocheleau, 2013). Similar to the findings associated with the importation variables (i.e. individual characteristics) and inmate misconduct, prior research has noted similarities and differences in the way deprivation variables impact prison misconduct among male and female inmates (Camp et al., 2003; Celinska & Sung, 2014; Jiang & Winfree, 2006).

Deprivation factors such as overcrowding, sentence length, and security level have been suggested to impact prison misconduct at a similar rate and manner among both male and female inmates. In particular, research suggests that male and female inmates who are housed in overcrowded facilities (Camp et al., 2003; Lahm, 2008; Steiner et al., 2014), are serving long prison sentences (Reidy & Soresen, 2018; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2009; Thompson & Loper, 2005), and are housed in high security levels (i.e. maximum and medium level) (Lahm, 2016; Reidy & Sorensen, 2018; Steiner et al., 2014) are more likely to engage in prison misconduct.

While overcrowding, sentence length, and security level have been suggested to impact prison misconduct in a similar manner for both male and female inmates, research has also suggested that there are other deprivation factors that impact misconduct differently for male and female inmates. Specifically, research suggests that factors related to social support (i.e. phone calls, mail, visitation, etc.), parenting, and prison involvement (i.e. participation in programs, work assignments, etc.) impact misconduct differently among male and female inmates (Celinska & Sung, 2014; Jiang & Winfree, 2006; Lahm, 2008; Reidy & Sorensen, 2018; Thompson & Loper, 2005).

Deprivation theorists have argued that social support, such as communication with friends or family outside of prison, can help alleviate the pains of prison (Berg & DeLisi, 2006; Ferraro & Moe, 2003; Snyder et al., 2001; Solinas-Saunders & Stacer, 2012). A majority of the research that has centered on social support and misconduct has measured social support as the amount of phone calls, mail, and visitation that inmates receive while incarcerated (Jiang & Winfree, 2006; Loper & Tuerk, 2011; McClure et al., 2015). In fact, many studies have found that when both male and female inmates make or receive phone calls from their friends or family outside of prison, they are significantly less likely to engage in prison misconduct in comparison to male and female inmates who do not make or receive any phone calls (Benning & Lahm, 2016; Loper & Tuerk, 2011; McClure et al., 2015). In contrast, there have been a few studies that have investigated the association between inmates sending and receiving mail and prison misconduct, and these findings have suggested that both male and female inmates who send or receive mail are more likely to be guilty of rule violations than male or female inmates who did not send or receive mail (Benning & Lahm, 2016; Cochran, 2012). Benning and Lahm (2016) attributed this increase in rule violations to the idea that inmates are more likely to receive bad news from friends and family through mail than any other form of communication (e.g., visitation and phone calls).

Similarly, research on visitation and prison misconduct has produced rather inconsistent and contradicting findings (Benning & Lahm., 2016; Harison, 1991; Kazura, 2001). On one hand, deprivation theorists have argued that visitation with friends and family should help alleviate feelings of isolation and should enable male and female inmates to become more optimistic about their future, and therefore, should help reduce misconduct (Cochran, 2012; Harison, 1991; Jiang & Winfree, 2006). To illustrate, Cochran (2012) and Jiang and Winfree

(2006) both found visitation to reduce the likelihood of inmate misconduct among male and female inmates; however, other research that has investigated this association further has suggested this effect to be stronger for female inmates (Ferrero & Moe, 2003; Owen, 1998). On the other hand, other scholars have argued that visitation may actually have the opposite effect on incarcerated parents (Benning & Lahm, 2016; Casey-Acevedo et al., 2004; Schenk & Fremouw, 2012). In fact, Benning and Lahm (2016) and Casey-Acevedo et al. (2004) found that incarcerated parents who received visits from their children were more likely to be written up for rule violations than incarcerated parents who did not receive any visits. Scholars have suggested that the impact of visitation with friends and family tends to differ among inmates and their perceptions of the event (Benning & Lahm, 2016; Casey-Acevedo et al., 2004; Jiang & Winfree, 2006; Owen, 1998). They argue that some inmates may perceive visitations with children as too traumatic and painful which later fosters feelings of guilt and despair after their friends or family leave (Benning & Lahm, 2016; Owen, 1998).

To expand further on the social support variables, some deprivation scholars have examined parenting behind bars and how it may impact inmate adjustment and behavior differently for incarcerated mothers and fathers (Benning & Lahm, 2016; Kazura, 2001; McClure et al., 2015; Thomas & Foster, 1976). More specifically, scholars have examined parent-child relationships and have found the strength of the parent-child relationship to be a predictor of inmate misconduct (Benning & Lahm, 2016; Harison, 1991; McClure et al., 2015; Umamaheswar, 2013). For instance, research has suggested that inmates (male and female) who have stronger relationships with their children throughout their time in prison may be less likely to engage in prison misconduct than inmates who have weaker relationships with their children (Loper et al., 2009; Wright et al., 2007). Some studies have also noted that these relationships

tend to be stronger among female inmates and weaker among male inmates (McClure et al., 2015; Umamaheswar, 2013). These relationships often stem from the idea that mothers are more likely than fathers to be the primary care provider prior to prison and therefore it is easier for mothers to maintain a relationship that was already existent prior to prison (Benning & Lahm, 2016).

Lastly, deprivation theorists argue that involvement in prison programs could serve as a rehabilitative factor and could help reduce inmate misconduct (Gendreau, Goggin & Law, 1997; Hoffman & Kightlinger, 2010; Hunte & Esmail, 2011; Johnson, 2004; Lahm, 2009; Pompoco et al., 2017; Randol & Campbell, 2017; Wilson, Gallagher & Mackenzie, 2000). However, research that has examined prison program involvement and misconduct has produced conflicting findings, specifically among samples of male and female inmates (Camp et al., 2006; Chamberlain, 2012; Gendreau et al., 1997; Goetting & Howsen, 1986, Pompoco et al., 2017; Steiner, Butler & Ellison, 2014). On one hand, some studies have found that male inmates who were involved in religious and substance abuse programs had lower rates of rule violations in comparison to male inmates who were not involved in such programs (Hoffman et al., 2010; Loper et al., 2009). On the other hand, other research has found that males who were involved in parenting, vocational, and work assignment programs had higher rates of prison misconduct than male inmates who were not involved in parenting, vocational, and work assignment programs (Conerly, 1997; Lahm, 2016; Lahm 2017; Parkinson & Steurer, 2004). Additionally, other research has found that female inmates who participated in parenting and substance abuse programs were less likely to be written up for rule violations in comparison to female inmates who were not involved in such programs (Glaze & Maruschak, 2008; Loper et al., 2009). The

following section will provide a more extensive review of the existing literature that has examined prison program involvement and inmate behavior.

Program Participation and Misconduct

As a majority of the prison misconduct research has examined individual and institutional factors, there is very little research that has centered on prison program involvement and misconduct rates. Scholars have argued that prison programs should help reduce or prevent misconduct in prison, under the assumption that programs can provide inmates who have needs with means of different treatment opportunities (Andrews et al., 1990; Chamberlain, 2012; Fox, 1954; French & Gendreau, 2006). For instance, inmates who often pose the greatest risk in prison are likely to have the greatest treatment needs; therefore, inmates with unmet treatment needs may pose a significant security threat within the prison environment (Andrews et al., 1990; Chamberlain, 2005; French & Gendreau, 2006; Hoffman, Byrd & Kightlinger, 2010).

However, research on program involvement and misconduct rates have produced conflicting findings (Chamberlain, 2012; Lahm, 2009; Pompoco et al., 2017; Randol & Campbell, 2017) For instance, one of the first studies conducted by McCain and McNally (1982) hypothesized that prison programs would provide inmates with incentives to behave better, and as a result, participation in programs would lower rates of misconduct; however, their findings did not support their claim. Another study by Steiner and Wooldredge (2008) examined the effectiveness of facility programming on inmate behavior among a sample of male inmates housed in state correctional facilities and found that inmates who participated in prison programs were more likely to engage in both violent and nonviolent forms of misconduct. Conversely, French and Gendreau (2006) conducted a meta-analysis on inmates housed in state facilities (sample included male and female inmates but did not control for gender) and found that inmates

who were involved in prison programs engaged in significantly less prison misconduct than inmates who were not involved in prison programs.

While there have been a few studies that have examined prison program involvement and misconduct, the findings are not generalizable. For one, a majority of the research has solely analyzed samples of male inmates, and as mentioned earlier, research has suggested that males and females experience prison differently. That said, it cannot be assumed that involvement in prison programs would have the same effect on misconduct for female inmates as it does for male inmates. Second, a majority of the existing research has examined program involvement among state correctional facilities and has not compared any potential differences that may exist between program involvement and inmate misconduct on samples from state and federal correctional facilities. Third, much of the existing research has measured program involvement in terms of whether an inmate has participated in any type of program and many studies have failed to identify which programs were included in their research. Finally, some studies have examined one specific type of program (e.g. educational programs) and the impact it had on inmate behavior. However, studies that have focused on one specific program and the effects it has on inmate misconduct are limited since they do not compare the effectiveness of different types of programs on inmate misconduct. The following five sections provide a brief overview of the current literature on different types of prison programs and the potential impact that program participation has on inmate behavior (i.e., inmate misconduct and recidivism).

Educational and Vocational Programs

Educational and vocational programs are combined into one category since a majority of the existing literature that has evaluated educational programs in prison has included measures of vocational programs in a majority of their assessments. These programs are often evaluated

together because they both aim to teach inmates new skill sets and they also address the glaring educational deficits that inmates enter prison with (Adams et al., 1994; Solinas-Saunders & Stacer, 2012; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2014; Wilson et al., 2000). Educational and vocational programs can be beneficial to inmates since a disproportionate number of inmates have difficulties reading and writing and are economically poor or disadvantaged (Berg & DeLisi, 2006; Chamberlain, 2012). Therefore, participation in these types of programs may provide inmates with opportunities to improve their education and work skills and later increase their odds of employment after prison. While there have been a couple of studies that have found involvement in educational and vocational programs to greatly reduce recidivism rates (Bracey, 2006; DeLisi et al., 2004), scholars have also suggested that the participation in these programs may also positively impact inmate behavior while in prison (Steiner & Wooldredge, 2014; Wilson et al., 2000). In fact, many scholars have argued that factors such as exposure to civilian role models and engagement in productive activity may reduce the odds of inmate misbehavior by improving inmates' sense of self and outlook on life (Adams et al., 1994; Tewksbury & Stengel, 2006). However, there is very little research that backs up that assertion.

One of the first studies conducted by Adams et al. (1994) explored inmate behavior and recidivism among 14,000 male inmates housed in Texas state prisons. They found that participation in vocational and educational programs was associated with an increase in rule violations. Specifically, they looked at monthly participation in these programs by hours involved (e.g., 0 to 40 or more hours of involvement) and found the percentage of minor disciplinary involvement to increase as hours involved in the programs increased. However, they also found a significant reduction in recidivism rates among some of the most educationally disadvantaged inmates who participated in these programs. Adams et al. (1994) inferred that

educational and vocational programs are most effective when inmates are matched with programs that adequately meet offenders needs and are delivered in a concerted manner.

Following Adams et al. (1994), Lahm (2009) conducted a study on a sample of male inmates and looked directly at educational program involvement and inmate misconduct. Misconduct was a self-report measure that captured the number of times in the past year that an inmate received a disciplinary ticket, with disciplinary ticket covering an array of institutional behaviors that were not specified. Lahm (2009) found that inmates who were involved in educational programs, specifically college programs, had significantly fewer disciplinary tickets than inmates who were not involved in educational programs. Lahm suggested that completion of college programs increased inmates' perception of self-worth and, therefore, motivated them to behave better. One major limitation of the study was the exclusion of female inmates; therefore, these findings cannot be generalized to all inmates.

A recent study conducted by Pompoco et al. (2017) compared the likelihood of being written up for seven different types of misconduct between male inmates who were involved in GED, vocational training, and college classes and male inmates who were not involved in any of the programs. They found that male inmates who completed college courses were significantly less likely to be involved in violent misconduct rates. However, vocational and GED programs were found to have no effect on inmate violence or any of the other six types of misconduct included in their analysis. This recent study is noticeably significant because it identified specific types of educational programs and the impact that each program may have on inmate behavior independently. However, it is unknown if these results would be replicated for females.

A closer look to the literature on educational program involvement and inmate misconduct, however, reveals a major gap. One major limitation with the existing literature on

educational program involvement is the lack of research that has explored female inmate involvement in educational programs. Rose (2004) conducted an in-depth analysis on female inmate involvement in educational programs and found females to engage in educational programs at a significant lower rate than male inmates for a few reasons. Rose (2004) attributed females' lower rates of participation in educational programs to the removal of Pell grants, sudden increase in female prison populations, and the idea that prisons are more suited to meet the needs of male inmates. Essentially, Rose (2004) argued that educational programs in female prisons may not be as successful as the educational programs in male prisons, therefore, involvement in educational programs may not have the same impact on female behavior as it does for male inmates.

Consequently, many scholars have pointed out problems that are associated with combining educational and vocational programs as one measure. The main difference between these two programs is that educational programs focus on improving inmate's literacy and helping them attain a higher level of education, whereas vocational programs on teaching inmates a new trade skill (e.g., carpentry, manufacturing, etc.) that can potentially help them find a job after release. Some research has actually been able to identify differences in types of personalities and motivations that are associated with vocational and educational program involvement. Scholars have noted that inmates who engage in educational programs tend to be more motivated and have lower recidivism rates in comparison to inmates who engage in vocational programs (Gerber & Fritsch, 2004; Vacca, 2004). Therefore, much of the existing literature has suggested for future research to examine these programs separately (Solinas-Saunders & Stacer, 2012; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2014; Wilson et al., 2000).

Religious Programs

Religious programs in prison often differ from other types of programs offered since they do not typically follow formal curriculums and do not require program steps (i.e., completion/graduation), but rather they focus on bringing salvation or transformation to inmates. Consequently, scholars argue that when inmates adopt a new outlook on life and eternity, they often undergo a change in their sense of self and are inspired to live a life without crime (Camp et al., 2006; Camp et al., 2008; Johnson, 1984; Kwon et al., 2010). While there is a lack of research that examined the impact that religious programs may have on inmate behavior, specifically misconduct, there have been a few studies that have examined the impact that religious involvement has on criminal behavior in the public (Camp et al., 2006; Camp et al., 2008; Solinas-Saunders & Stacer, 2012). Many scholars argue that individuals who are involved in religious practices are less likely to engage in deviant behavior, since religion can provide individuals with different types of social networks that promote a crime-free lifestyle (Camp et al., 2006; Camp et al., 2008; Solinas-Saunders & Stacer, 2012).

One of the first studies that examined the impact of religion in prison was by Johnson (1984). Specifically, Johnson (1984) examined the impact that religion had on inmate adjustment to prison and later found that male inmates who identified with a religion had an easier psychological and emotional adjustment to prison than inmates who were not religious (Johnson et al., 1997). Following these studies, Sumter (1999) began to investigate the impact that religion had on recidivism rates and found that religious inmates were less likely to recidivate than inmate nonreligious inmates. While these programs were able to depict positive outcomes among religious inmates in comparison to nonreligious inmates, there is still a significant lack of

research that has investigated religious programming and inmate behavior, specifically inmate misconduct.

Camp et al. (2008) was one of the first studies that actually examined the impact that involvement in faith-based programs had on male and female inmate behavior. Specifically, they evaluated inmate involvement in the Life Connections Program (LCP), which is a relatively new faith-based program that also works to decrease the propensity of criminal behavior and has been offered among federal prisons. The results of the study indicated a significant decrease in serious forms of misconduct among inmates who were involved in LCP in comparison to inmates who were not involved in LCP; however, involvement in LCP had no significant impact on less serious forms of misconduct. While these findings support the idea that involvement in religious programs improve inmate behavior (i.e., reduce misconduct), the findings are limited to serious rule violations. Camp et al. (2008) suggested that involvement in religious programs may have a perverse effect that increases the odds of less serious rule violations (e.g., being in an unauthorized area, being unsanitary, disobedience, etc.) due to increased surveillance from program staff workers.

Similar to the findings by Camp et al. (2008), Steiner, Butler, and Ellison (2014) conducted a systematic review on the correlates of prison misconduct and found involvement in religious programs to have the lowest rates of misconduct. Specifically, they included measures of involvement in religious-based programs, educational/vocational programs and work assignments. When they compared involvement in these three categories, religious-based program involvement was the only measure associated with a reduction in misconduct. However, these findings should be taken with caution since the study was a systematic review. For

instance, it is difficult to generalize these findings across gender, especially because the findings were based on different sample sizes and subpopulations of inmates.

Parenting Programs

Parenting programs have also been suggested to greatly impact inmates' adjustment to prison and their relationship with their child(ren) both during and after incarceration (Glaze & Maruschak, 2008; Loper, Carlson, Levitt & Scheffel, 2009). Oftentimes, when incarcerated parents enter the prison system it becomes harder for them to remain in constant contact with their children (Hoffman, Byrd & Kightlinger, 2010; Loper et al., 2009). Scholars have noted that incarceration can pose negative effects on both the inmate and the child (Benning & Lahm, 2016; Hoffman et al., 2010). Many correctional facilities have developed services to combat the negative effects of incarceration for both the incarcerated parent and his/her children (Hairston, 1991; Kazura, 2001; Umamaheswar, 2013). Some of the most common services that are offered by correctional facilities include parenting programs, child centers, and family visits. Research has suggested that family services can greatly impact the level of social support for both male and female inmates, and in turn, positively influence their behavior both during and after release from prison (Benning & Lahm, 2016; Hairston, 1991; Kazura, 2001; Umamaheswar, 2013). However, while there are family services offered for parents in prison, there tends to be gender differences in the types of services offered (e.g. different types of parenting programs offered for males and females) and the in ways male and female inmates participate in the services (i.e. differences in frequency of participation, communication, etc.). These gendered based differences in programs offered appear to be most present among parenting programs in comparison to a variety of other types of programs (e.g., education, religious, etc.). Therefore, it

is important to note how parenting programs may differ among male and female facilities before diving into the current literature on parenting programs and inmate misconduct.

Research has noted gender differences in the types/goals of parenting programs offered for incarcerated mothers and fathers (Armstrong et al., 2018; Kazura, 2001; Loper & Tuerk, 2011; Umamaheswar, 2013). Programs in female prisons have been associated with the social and emotional roles that mothers are expected to maintain with their children (Armstrong et al., 2018; Thompson & Harm, 2000). For instance, women's parenting programs usually focus on improving their relationships with their children through parental support groups, family counseling, and sometimes through prison nurseries. Contrarily, parenting programs in male prisons often ignore practices used to strengthen the parent-child relationship (i.e., less focused on emotional and social bonds to child) and tend to focus more on fulfilling their duty as a father figure (i.e., financial provider, masculine, etc.) (Umamaheswar, 2013). For instance, parenting programs in male prisons focus on teaching fathers' skills that would be useful for financially providing for the family (i.e. their programs underline the idea that fathers need to be committed to their children via monetary support). These differences in parenting programs can be attributed to the way that society often defines the roles of mothers and fathers and, as a result, involvement in parenting programs may impact incarcerated mothers' and fathers' behavior while in prison differently.

While there is a significant amount of research that has examined the impact of parenting on incarcerated parents' attitudes (Hochstetler et al., 2010), self-esteem (Cochran, 2012), and relationships with their children (Booker-Loper et al., 2009; Ferraro & Moe, 2003; Owen, 1998), there appears to be a lack of research that has further examined the impact that parenting programs may have on inmate behavior (i.e., misconduct) while in prison. This lack of research

is apparent for both male and female inmates. However, it can be inferred from the existing literature that participation in parenting programs should improve inmate behavior for a couple of reasons. For one, there have been many studies that have found visitation with children to greatly reduce the odds of rule violations (Cochran, 2012; Ferraro & Moe, 2003; Goetting & Howsen, 1986; Snyder et al., 2001). This finding implies that inmates who see their children on a regular basis are more likely to uphold and value their role as a mother or father and are more likely to behave properly in prison to ensure that their visitation rights will not be revoked (Loper et al., 2009). Additionally, there has also been a great deal of research that has suggested that incarcerated parents who maintain strong bonds with their children are less likely to engage in prison misconduct (Loper et al., 2009; Rocheleau, 2014). This assumption stems from the idea that incarcerated parents who maintain relationships with their children are more likely to develop a positive sense of self and are less likely to get caught up in the prison environment (Loper et al., 2009; Snyder et al., 2001).

Substance Treatment Programs

Since the development of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 (i.e., the beginning of the war on drugs), prisons throughout the United States have experienced a significant increase in the number of inmates who are serving time for drug offenses (Cihan et al., 2017; Jiang, 2005; Klein et al., 2004). Scholars have argued that many of these inmates who enter prison with a history of drug use or abuse problems will continue to have problems while incarcerated (i.e., problems related to rule violations, specifically drug violations while incarcerated) (Cihan et al., 2017; DeLisi et al., 2011; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2009; Wright et al., 2007). In fact, Jiang (2007) examined the impact of drug use inmate misconduct among male and female inmates (housed at state and federal facilities) and found that inmates who entered prison with a history of drug use

had significantly higher rates of both substance rule violations and non-substance rule violations. These results infer that drug use history may be a predictor of rule violations for both male and female inmates and, as a result, the findings highlight a need for better screening of inmates who enter prison with a history of drug use problems. Scholars have responded to these findings by emphasizing the importance of drug education and treatment programs for reducing prison misconduct, especially among inmates who enter prison with drug use problems (French & Gendreau, 2006; Innes 1997; Langan & Pelissier, 2002).

Substance treatment programs are often suggested to be effective at improving inmate behavior throughout incarceration and after release from prison (French & Gendreau, 2006; Innes, 1997; Welsh et al., 2007). In fact, an early study by Lagan and Pelisser (2001) examined the effect of drug treatment on inmate misconduct among a sample of male and female inmates (housed at federal prisons) who admitted to a history of substance abuse. Specifically, they compared the rates of disciplinary infraction among inmates who graduated from the Federal Bureau of Prisons' Drug and Alcohol Treatment Program (DAP) and inmates who did not participate or graduate from DAP. In short, Lagan and Pelisser (2001) found a 74 percent decline in disciplinary infraction rates over a 14-month period for male and female inmates who graduated from DAP. These findings infer that involvement in substance and alcohol treatment programs serve as a rehabilitative factor and foster a safer prison environment (Lagan and Pelisser, 2001).

Nevertheless, a study conducted by Welsh, McGrain, and Zajac (2007) examined the effects of prison drug treatment on inmate misconduct over an extensive period of time and found contrasting evidence in comparison to Langan and Pelisser (2001). In particular, Welsh et al. (2007) found the positive effects of substance treatment programs on inmate behavior (i.e.,

misconduct) to deteriorate after a substantial period of time following completion of the treatment program. Welsh et al. (2007) suggested that future research include a multitude of individual, environmental, and situational variables to further analyze why these findings occurred.

In sum, there is a substantial lack of research that has investigated the direct association between involvement in substance treatment programs and inmate misconduct, specifically among inmates housed in state facilities. While there is limited research that has found involvement in substance treatment programs to greatly reduce recidivism rates (French & Gendreau, 2006; Welsh et al., 2007), there is a lack of consistent research that has found involvement in substance treatment programs to have the similar impact on inmate behavior (Innes 1997; Welsh et al., 2007).

Other Programs

Since the purpose of this study is to explore the impact that involvement in a variety of different programs has on inmate misconduct, it is important to examine the literature surrounding every type of program that is included in the analysis of this thesis. The previous sections provided brief descriptions and evaluations of educational, vocational, religious, parenting, and substance treatment programs; however, those five programs only account for half of the programs that are included in this study's analysis on program involvement. The remaining five programs that are included in this study are: (1) life skills and community adjustment, (2) ethnic, (3) employment counseling, (4) assistance, and (5) self-help programs. The following paragraphs provide information on the current literature surrounding prison programs that can be applied to some of the remaining programs that have yet to be discussed;

however, no prior studies have examined ethnic and employment counseling program involvement.

Fox (1953) conducted one of the first studies that examined the effect of counseling programs on male inmate adjustment to prison. Specifically, this study examined counseling programs that integrated the use of professionals (e.g., psychologists, sociologists, and social workers) to work as a counselor. Fox (1953) found that the counseling services helped inmates with their frustration, aggression, transference, and also enhanced the inmates' meaning of life. This study was significant as it illustrated the positive benefits of integrating professional personnel into the prison system to help inmates. The findings produced by Fox (1953) can be applied to explain and predict the impact that involvement in life skills (e.g., anger management, conflict resolution) and assistance (e.g., inmate liaison) programs have on inmate behavior since they both aim to provide inmates with services to improve themselves at the individual level.

Another early study conducted by Baro (1999) focused on the effect of self-help programs, specifically cognitive restructuring programs, and institutional behavior. One of the major findings that came out of this study was the association between participation in the cognitive restructuring program and misconduct. Specifically, inmates who participated in this program were associated with a significant decrease in the likelihood of disobeying a direct order and committing an assault. Baro (1999) noted that these findings are consistent with the goals of the program; and that emphasizing cooperation, open communication, and understanding the consequences of one's own behavior and attitudes are effective methods that impact inmates' willingness to obey orders and settle matters peacefully. From here, it can be inferred that participation in self-help programs should positively impact inmate behavior and reduce the likelihood of prison misconduct.

In sum, it can be inferred from the studies mentioned in this section that involvement in life-skills, assistance, and self-help programs should reduce the likelihood of misconduct. However, this inference should be taken with caution since the studies focused on male inmates only and were also conducted almost over 20 years ago. Unfortunately, the literature on employment counseling and ethnic programs and inmate behavior appear to be nonexistent so no prediction (backed by research) can be made on involvement in these types of programs.

Present Study

The current study explores factors that may be associated with inmate misconduct. More specifically, the study examines the association between involvement in different types of prison programs and inmate misconduct. The study incorporates samples of male and female inmates to explore gender differences in program involvement and prison misconduct.

While a majority of the current literature surrounding prison program involvement and inmate behavior focuses on recidivism, this proposed study differs from previous research by exploring the impact that involvement in such programs may have on inmate misconduct. Although there has been a limited amount of research that has examined a few types of programs (e.g. educational, parenting, and religious programs) and inmate misconduct, many have produced inconsistent findings and a majority of them were conducted on male inmates only. This study aims to fill the gap in the existing literature on prison program involvement and inmate misconduct by utilizing samples of both male and female inmates (housed in federal and state prisons) to assess if any gender differences exist in relation to program involvement and inmate misconduct. This study also plans to include new types of programs (e.g. ethnic, inmate assistance, self-help, etc.) that have yet to be explored in addition to more commonly explored programs (e.g. educational and parenting programs). The ten programs that will be examined in

the study are: (1) substance related, (2) vocational, (3) educational, (4) religious, (5) ethnic, (6) employment counseling, (7) parenting, (8) life skills and community adjustment, (9) inmate assistance, and (10) self-help programs. Overall, the purpose of the study is to determine whether there is an association between prison program involvement and inmate misconduct, and if so, which programs are most effective in reducing prison misconduct.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The current study examines the relationship between program involvement and prison misconduct among male and female inmates. The study addresses three research questions that measure inmate involvement in prison programs and the impact it has on inmate misconduct. First, do prison programs reduce the likelihood that inmates will engage in misconduct? Second, are there specific categories of prison programs (e.g., educational, religious, self-help, etc.) that are more effective at reducing different types of inmate misconduct (e.g., any rule violation, assault violations, institution violations)? Third, does the association between program involvement and inmate misconduct differ by gender?

To answer these questions, an exploratory study was designed to investigate factors associated with prison misconduct. The Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities (SISFCF) (2004) data was used for the study and samples of male and female inmates that were collected by the SISFCF were incorporated into the study. The SISFCF dataset will be used for secondary analyses. The SISFCF collected data from inmates at one point in time, so the nature of the current study is cross-sectional and quantitative.

Population and Sample

The sample used for the present study was collected from the Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 2004 (SISFCF) dataset. The SISFCF collected their sample

through a multistage sampling process. The first stage of sampling used universe files to select and stratify correctional facilities. State facilities were stratified by eight geographical regions, and federal prisons were stratified by security level. A total of 225 male state prisons, 62 female state prisons, 31 federal male prisons, and 8 female federal prisons were selected for the study. During the second stage of the sampling process, a total of 11,569 state male inmates, 2,930 state female inmates, 2,728 federal male inmates, 958 federal female inmates were selected and interviewed.

The current study uses a majority of the entire population of state and federal inmates in the SISFCF. The study combines all male inmates (state and federal) into one sample and all female inmates (state and federal) into a separate sample. Inmates who were missing from any of the measures included in the study were excluded from the sample. A total of 1,003 males and 282 females were dropped from the entire population (via listwise delete). The final sample consisted of 13,294 male inmates and 3,606 female inmates.

Variables

Dependent Variables

The outcome measure of interest for the current study is misconduct. The SISFCF originally measured five different types of rule violations which included (1) any rule violations; (2) substance abuse violations; (3) contraband-related violations; (4) assault violations; and (5) institution violations. However, only any rule violations, assault violations, and institution violations will be used as the dependent variables of analysis. These three measures of misconduct were selected to explore gender differences that are associated with specific types of rule violations. Prior research has suggested that male inmates are more likely to engage in more physical and violent forms of misconduct (Gover et al., 2008), whereas female inmates are more

likely to engage in more petty and non-violent forms of misconduct (Gendreau et al., 1997). Therefore, this study will include the assault and institution related violations to measure potential gender differences in different types of misconduct.

The first dependent variable is any rule violation. Any rule violation was measured as whether the inmate had been written up or found guilty of breaking any of the prison rules since his/her admission to prison. The responses were coded as “yes” and “no”.

The second dependent variable is institution violations. This variable was created by combining five different rule violations that were related to institution violations since admission to prison: (1) escape or attempted escape; (2) being out of place; (3) disobeying orders; (4) major violations (i.e. work slowdowns, food strikes, setting fires, rioting, etc.); and (5) minor violations (i.e. abusive language, horseplay, failing to follow sanitary regulations, etc.). Responses to all five of these measures were combined to create a scale that ranged from 0-5, with numerical scores corresponding to the number of categorical incidents that they have been written up for (e.g. “0” meaning never been written up for any of the institution related violations, and “5” meaning the inmate has been written up for all five types of institution related violations).

The third dependent variable is assault violations. This variable was created by combining four different variables: (1) physical assault against a correctional officer; (2) verbal assault against a correctional officer; (3) physical assault against another inmate; and (4) verbal assault against another inmate. The responses to each of the measures were recorded as “yes” and “no”. The responses to all four of these measures were then combined to create a scale that ranged from 0-4 (“0” meaning the respondent was not written up or found guilty of any of the four assault related violations, and “4” meaning the respondent was written up or found guilty for all four of the assault related violations).

Independent Variables

The current study has organized the independent variables into three categories: prison programs, deprivation, and importation. The prison program variables are the main independent variables of interest for the current. Program involvement will be measured by ten types of programs, which include: substance related, vocational, educational, religious, ethnic, employment counseling, parenting, life skills and community adjustment, inmate assistance, and self-help programs. The second category is deprivation, these variables include eight measures that stem from the deprivation theoretical framework. The third category is importation, these variables include thirteen measures that stem from the importation theoretical model. The deprivation and importation variables are included to determine if they impact the association between program involvement and inmate misconduct among male and female inmates.

Program variables. Ten different types of prison programs were included to examine the association between prison program involvement and inmate misconduct. The ten programs include substance related, vocational, educational, religious, ethnic, employment counseling, parenting, life skills and community adjustment, inmate assistance, and self-help programs.

The first program variable, substance related program involvement, was created by combining four different drug and alcohol program variables into one. The four variables were combined to create substance related program involvement were whether the inmate ever attended inpatient alcohol or drug programs, outpatient counseling, self-help groups or peer counseling, and drug and alcohol educational or awareness programs since admission to prison. Substance program involvement was dichotomized as “participation in at least one of the four substance programs” and “no participation in any substance program”.

The second program variable captured involvement in vocational programs. Vocational program involvement was measured by asking the inmates whether they have ever been in any vocational or job-training program, excluding prison work assignments since their admission to prison. The responses were dichotomized as “yes” and “no.”

The third program variable captured involvement in educational programs. Educational program involvement was measured by asking the inmates whether they have been in any type of educational program, excluding vocational training. The responses were dichotomized as “yes” and “no”.

The fourth program variable captured involvement in religious programs. Religious program involvement was measured by asking the inmates whether they have joined or participated in a bible club or other religious study group (including Muslims) since their admission to prison. The responses were dichotomized as “yes” and “no”.

The fifth program variable captured involvement in ethnic programs. Ethnic program involvement was measured by asking the inmates whether they have joined or participated in an ethnic/racial organization (for example, NAACP, African American or Black Culture Group, Hispanic Committee, Aztlan, or Lakota) since their admission to prison. The responses were dichotomized as “yes” and “no”.

The sixth program variable captured involvement in employment counseling programs. Employment counseling involvement was measured by asking the inmates whether they have joined or participated in employment counseling (e.g., how to find a job, interviewing skills) since their admission to prison. The responses were coded as either “yes” or “no”.

The seventh program variable captured involvement in parenting programs. Parenting program involvement was measured by asking the inmates whether they have joined or

participated in classes in parenting or child rearing skills since their admission to prison. The responses were dichotomized as “yes” or “no”.

The eighth program variable captured involvement in life skills and community adjustment programs. Life skills and community adjustment involvement was measured by asking the inmates whether they have joined or participated in life skills and community adjustment (including anger management, conflict resolution, personal finance, etc.) since their admission to prison. The responses were coded as “yes” or “no”.

The ninth program variable captured involvement in inmate assistance programs. Inmate assistance program involvement was measured by asking the inmates whether they have joined or participated in inmate assistance groups (e.g. inmate liaison, advisory or worker’s councils) or inmate counseling groups since admission to prison. The responses were dichotomized as “yes” and “no”.

The tenth program variable captured involvement in self-help programs. Self-help involvement was measured by asking the inmates whether they have joined or participated in other inmate self-help/personal improvement groups (e.g. Toastmakers, Jaycees, Gavel club, veterans club, or parent’s awareness groups) since admission to prison. The responses were dichotomized as “yes” and “no”.

Deprivation variables. Deprivation will be measured in terms of program involvement. According to the deprivation model, prison programs may provide inmates with means to reduce feelings of deprivation and help ease their adjustment to prison. Eight descriptive variables were created to measure deprivation: (1) distance from home; (2) hours in cell (3) prison victimization, (4) children under the age of 18, (5) communication with child, (6) child living

with close family member, (7) child living with other relative, and (8) child living with non-family member.

Distance from home was measured by asking the respondents to report in miles how far away the prison (that they are currently serving time at) is from the place where they were living at the time of arrest. Responses were dichotomized as under 500 miles from the facility and over 501 miles from the facility. Time in cell is a continuous variable that measured the number of hours the inmate spent in their cell within the past 24 hours. Prison victimization measured whether the inmate had been injured in a fight, assault, or incident in which someone tried to harm them since their admission to prison. The any children variable was measured as whether the inmate had a child or stepchild under the age of 18 years old. Communication with children was measured as whether the inmate made or received calls, sent or received mail, or was personally visited by her children under the age of 18 since admission to prison. Who the inmate's child lives with while incarcerated was measured as three separate variables : (1) close relative (meaning the child lived with child's mother or father, child's grandmother, or child's grandfather; (2) other relative (meaning the child lived with inmate's boyfriend or girlfriend, inmate's friends, or friends of the inmate's child); and (3) non-family guardians (meaning that the child lived in a foster home, agency, correction institution, religious institution, alone, or with someone else).

Importation variables. Thirteen variables were created to measure importation. According to the importation model, factors related to individuals' attitudes, values, and experiences prior to incarceration oftentimes influence individual inmate behavior in prison. The variables used to measure importation include: age, race, marital status, education, citizenship, employment prior to incarceration, offense convicted of, prior physical victimization, prior

sexual victimization, primary caregiver for child, lifetime mental illness, mental health problems prior to prison, and substance abuse problems prior to prison.

Age was recorded as a continuous variable. Race was categorized as white, African American, and other. Marital status was dichotomized as “currently married” and “not currently married”. Education was dichotomized as “attended 12th grade or higher before admission to prison” and “did not attend 12th grade or higher before admission to prison”. Citizenship was dichotomized as “U.S. citizen” and “non-U.S. citizen”. Employment prior to incarceration was dichotomized as “employed during the month before arrest” and “not employed during the month before arrest”. Prior physical victimization was dichotomized as whether the inmate had been physically abused (prior to incarceration). Prior sexual victimization was dichotomized as whether the inmate had been pressured or forced to have sexual contact against their will (prior to incarceration). Offense convicted of was dichotomized as non-violent and violent. Primary care provider was measured by asking the respondents whether their child/children under the age of 18 were living with them prior to incarceration, whether they were the primary source of financial support, or whether they provided the most daily care for their child/children.

Three variables were created to capture a range of mental health issues: lifetime mental illness, mental health problems prior to incarceration, and substance abuse problems. Lifetime mental illness was measured by asking the inmates to report if they had ever been diagnosed by a mental health professional (i.e. psychologist or psychiatrist) with at least one of seven different types of mental disorders. The seven types of mental disorders included in the measure were: (1) depressive disorder; (2) manic-depression, bipolar disorder, or mania; (3) schizophrenia or another psychotic disorder; (4) post-traumatic stress disorder; (5) another anxiety disorder, such as a panic disorder; (6) personality disorder (such as an antisocial or borderline personality

disorder); and (7) any other mental or emotional condition. Mental health issues prior to incarceration was measured as whether the inmate was taking medication for a mental or emotional problem or was receiving any mental health treatment at any time during the year before their arrest. Substance abuse problems prior to incarceration was measured as whether the inmate ever lost a job due to drug use, had any school troubles due to drug use, had used a drug in larger amounts or longer periods of time than they meant to, or had used drugs to get over the bad after-effects of other drugs all within the year prior to their admission to prison. The responses for the mental health related variables mentioned above were all recorded as “yes” and “no”.

Hypotheses

The study aims to identify any relationship between prison program involvement and misconduct. Four directional hypotheses were created to explore any potential impact that program participation may have on inmate misconduct. Each directional hypothesis compares overall program participation and misconduct between female and male inmates.

Hypothesis 1: Inmates who participate in prison programs will be less likely to engage in prison misconduct than inmates who do not participate in prison programs.

Hypotheses 2: Female inmates who participate in prison programs will be less likely to be written up or found guilty of any rule violations than male inmates who participate in prison programs.

Hypothesis 3: Female inmates who participate in prison programs will be less likely to be written up or found guilty of any assault related violations than male inmates who participate in prison programs.

Hypothesis 4: Female inmates who participate in prison programs will be less likely to be written up or found guilty of any institutional related violations than male inmates who participate in prison programs.

Instrument

The 2004 SISFCF was collected by the Bureau of Census for the Bureau of Justice Statistics. The original researchers of the SISFCF collected the data through personal interviews that began in October 2003 and ended in May 2004. The interviews were conducted with the use of computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI), which took about an hour to complete. CAPI provided the interviewer with computer generated questions along with follow-up questions that were tailored to preceding answers. The 2004 SISFCF covered a wide range of information on the state and federal inmates and was categorized into ten sections. The ten sections include: (1) individual characteristics; (2) current offenses; (3) pretrial release and trial; (4) current sentence; (5) incident characteristics; (6) criminal history; (7) socioeconomic characteristics; (8) alcohol and drug use and treatment; (9) medical conditions, mental health, and disabilities; and (10) prison programs and disabilities.

Data Collection

Data for this study were gathered from the 2004 Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities (SISFCF). The SISFCF is a public data set that is available to the public through the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research website. The 2004 SISFCF is a combination of the 2004 Survey of Inmates in State Correctional Facilities (SISCF) and the 2004 Survey of Inmates in Federal Correctional Facilities (SIFCF). The 2004 SISCF and SIFCF were both collected for the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), and together provide nationally representative data on inmates housed in both State and Federal prisons. The Bureau

of Prisons research staff collected the data. The data collection took seven months to complete, which began in October 2003 and ended in May 2004.

Since inmates are considered a vulnerable population, many precautionary measures were taken to ensure every inmate was protected. Prior to the interviews, inmates were informed in person and in writing that their participation was voluntary and any information that they provided would be confidential. The researchers assured the participants that the information they provided would be used for statistical purposes only and the participants would not be identified in the results. The researchers also restricted potential identifying information from general dissemination to protect the participants' privacy.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Sample Description

All of the measures included in the study are presented and described in Table 1. The overall sample consisted of 16,900 male and female inmates (housed in federal and state facilities). All of the analyses examined male and female inmates separately. A total of 13,294 males and a total of 3,606 females were included in the study. The variable descriptions are organized by misconduct, program participation, deprivation, and importation.

Three misconduct variables were included as dependent variables. Approximately, 48% of male inmates and 39% of female inmates had been written up or found guilty of any rule violation since their admission to prison. 18% of male inmates and 12% of female inmates had been written up or found guilty of assault violations since their admission to prison. 32% of male inmates and 27% of female inmates had been written up or found guilty of institution violations since their admission to prison.

The percentage of male and female inmates who participated in prison programs appeared to be relatively similar across all ten programs. Approximately, 33% of males and 35% of females participated in substance programs; 29% of males and 27% of females participated in vocational programs; 34% of males and 35% of females participated in educational programs; 30% of males and 37% of females participated in religious programs; 4% of males and 3.9% of females participated in ethnic programs; 9% of males and 12% of females participated in

employment counseling programs; 9% of males and 21% of females participated in parenting programs; 24% of males and 31% of females participated in life skills and community

Table 1. Description of Variables (N = 16,900)

Variables	Males (N= 13,294)			Females (N= 3,606)		
	N	(%)	M (SD)	N	(%)	M (SD)
Dependent Variables						
General Misconduct	6424	(48.32)		1409	(39.07)	
Assault Violations	2396	(18.02)		431	(11.95)	
Institutional Violations	4286	(32.24)		982	(27.23)	
Program Participation						
Substance Abuse	4417	(33.23)		1262	(35.00)	
Vocational	3799	(28.58)		975	(27.04)	
Educational	4535	(34.11)		1260	(34.94)	
Religious	4046	(30.44)		1346	(37.33)	
Ethnic	570	(4.29)		140	(3.88)	
Employment Counseling	1248	(9.39)		445	(12.34)	
Parenting	1261	(9.49)		763	(21.16)	
Life Skills	3245	(24.41)		1101	(30.53)	
Assistance	806	(6.06)		289	(8.01)	
Self Help	1132	(8.52)		476	(13.20)	
Deprivation variables						
Over 500 miles from home	2130	(16.02)		602	(16.69)	
Prison victimization	1963	(14.77)		255	(7.07)	
Communication with child	7101	(53.42)		2504	(69.44)	
Parent	5632	(42.36)		1300	(36.05)	
Child lives with nonfamily member	144	(1.08)		202	(5.60)	
Child lives with other family member	308	(2.32)		489	(13.56)	
Child lives with close family member	6672	(50.19)		1635	(45.34)	
Importation Variables						
Age			35.66 (10.68)			36.28 (9.91)
Race (White)	6063	(45.61)		1942	(53.85)	
Married	2393	(18.00)		752	(20.85)	
US Citizen	11927	(89.72)		3310	(91.79)	
Education (12th grade or higher)	6085	(45.78)		1737	(48.18)	
Employment prior incarceration	9809	(73.79)		2170	(60.18)	
Prior physical victimization	1647	(12.39)		1664	(46.15)	
Prior sexual victimization	739	(5.57)		1365	(37.85)	
Primary care provider prior to prison	2286	(17.20)		1225	(33.97)	
Drug abuse problems prior to prison	5834	(43.88)		1736	(48.14)	
Lifetime mental illness	2898	(21.80)		1602	(44.43)	
Mental health issues prior to prison	1311	(9.87)		938	(26.01)	
Violent Offense	6086	(45.78)		953	(26.43)	

adjustment programs; 6% of males and 8% of females participated in assistance programs; 8.5% of males and 13% of females participated in self-help programs.

Eight variables were included to measure deprivation and many gender differences are present among the proportion of males and female inmates. Of the males included in the study, approximately 16% were located at a prison that was over 500 miles away from their home, 15% experienced victimization in prison, 53% engaged in some form of communication with their children since their admission to prison, 42% had a child under the age of 18 years old, 1% had a child who lived with a nonfamily member (while incarcerated), 2% had a child who lived with other family member (while incarcerated), and 50% had a child who lived with a close family member (while incarcerated). Of the females included in the study, approximately 17% were located at a prison that was over 500 miles away from their home, 7% experienced victimization in prison, 69% engaged in some form of communication with their children since their admission to prison, 36% had a child under the age of 18 years old, 6% had a child who lived with a nonfamily member (while incarcerated), 14% had a child who lived with other family member (while incarcerated), and 45% had a child who lived with a close family member (while incarcerated).

Many gender differences were also apparent among the importation variable characteristics. Of the males included in the study, approximately 46% were white, 18% were married, 90% were a US citizen, 74% were employed prior to prison, 12% were physically victimized prior to prison, 6% were sexually victimized prior to prison, 17% were a primary care provider prior to prison, 44% had drug use problems prior to prison, 22% have received an official mental health diagnosis over their lifetime, 10% entered prison with mental health issues, 45% were convicted of a violent offense. Of the females included in the study, approximately

Table 2. Logistic Regression Models on General Misconduct (Yes/No).

Variables	Model 1				Model 2				Model 3			
	Males		Females		Males		Females		Males		Females	
	<i>B (SE)</i>	Exp(<i>b</i>)	<i>B (SE)</i>	Exp(<i>b</i>)	<i>B (SE)</i>	Exp(<i>b</i>)	<i>B (SE)</i>	Exp(<i>b</i>)	<i>B (SE)</i>	Exp(<i>b</i>)	<i>B (SE)</i>	Exp(<i>b</i>)
Program Participation												
Substance Abuse	0.301 (0.038)***	1.351	0.309 (0.073)***	1.363	0.359 (0.041)***	1.432	0.359 (0.079)***	1.431	0.261 (0.045)***	1.298	0.184 (0.087)*	1.201
Vocational	0.707 (0.041)***	2.029	0.585 (0.08)***	1.795	0.631 (0.044)***	1.880	0.536 (0.087)***	1.709	0.622 (0.045)***	1.863	0.532 (0.091)***	1.702
Educational	0.462 (0.038)***	1.588	0.484 (0.073)***	1.623	0.434 (0.041)***	1.543	0.488 (0.08)***	1.630	0.401 (0.043)***	1.493	0.457 (0.085)***	1.579
Religious	-0.131 (0.04)**	0.877	0.058 (0.075)	1.060	-0.197 (0.043)***	0.821	0.053 (0.081)	1.054	-0.177 (0.045)***	0.838	0.116 (0.085)	1.123
Ethnic	0.439 (0.093)***	1.551	-0.406 (0.185)*	0.667	0.335 (0.1)**	1.398	-0.412 (0.204)*	0.663	0.323 (0.104)**	1.381	-0.441 (0.216)*	0.644
Employment Counseling	-0.039 (0.068)	0.962	-0.209 (0.113)	0.812	0.018 (0.072)	1.019	-0.088 (0.123)	0.916	-0.009 (0.075)	0.991	-0.124 (0.129)	0.883
Parenting	-0.161 (0.067)*	0.851	0.055 (0.093)	1.057	0.04 (0.072)	1.040	0.177 (0.105)	1.193	0.021 (0.075)	1.021	0.129 (0.11)	1.138
Life Skills	0.133 (0.049)**	1.143	0.372 (0.087)***	1.450	0.085 (0.052)	1.088	0.293 (0.094)**	1.340	0.056 (0.053)	1.057	0.291 (0.099)**	1.337
Assistance	0.206 (0.083)*	1.229	0.352 (0.134)**	1.421	0.103 (0.089)	1.109	0.211 (0.145)	1.234	0.177 (0.093)	1.194	0.279 (0.152)	1.322
Self Help	0.351 (0.072)***	1.420	0.131 (0.11)	1.140	0.264 (0.076)**	1.303	0.073 (0.119)	1.076	0.283 (0.079)***	1.327	0.112 (0.125)	1.118
Deprivation variables												
Over 500 miles from home					-0.081 (0.052)	0.922	-0.595 (0.107)***	0.552	0.038 (0.054)	1.038	-0.473 (0.113)***	0.623
Hours in cell					0.153 (0.018)***	1.165	0.091 (0.036)*	1.095	0.701 (0.040)***	2.016	0.937 (0.09)***	2.553
Prison victimization					1.564 (0.063)***	4.778	1.989 (0.173)***	7.307	1.512 (0.066)***	4.536	1.933 (0.182)***	6.907
Communication with child					-0.119 (0.047)*	0.888	-0.252 (0.093)**	0.777	0.110 (0.053)*	1.116	0.032 (0.108)	1.033
Parent					0.088 (0.042)*	1.092	0.115 (0.079)	1.121	0.097 (0.045)	1.102	0.104 (0.09)	1.109
Child with nonfamily member					0.058 (0.181)	1.060	0.187 (0.158)	1.206	0.057 (0.187)	1.058	-0.036 (0.168)	0.965
Child with other family member					-0.173 (0.126)	0.841	0.164 (0.11)	1.178	-0.185 (0.132)	0.831	-0.065 (0.122)	0.937
Child with close family member					-0.143 (0.047)**	0.867	0.091 (0.085)	1.095	-0.263 (0.055)***	0.769	-0.22 (0.104)*	0.803
Importation Variables												
Age									-0.017 (0.002)***	0.983	-0.023 (0.005)***	0.977
Race (White)									-0.212 (0.041)***	0.809	-0.317 (0.081)***	0.728
Married									-0.217 (0.054)***	0.805	-0.336 (0.102)**	0.715
US Citizen									0.605 (0.07)***	1.831	0.564 (0.174)**	1.759
Education (12th grade or higher)									-0.201 (0.041)***	0.818	-0.23 (0.083)**	0.794
Employment prior incarceration									-0.102 (0.045)*	0.903	-0.203 (0.081)*	0.817
Prior physical victimization									0.315 (0.064)***	1.370	0.144 (0.086)	1.155
Prior sexual victimization									0.006 (0.092)	1.006	0.061 (0.088)	1.063
Primary care provider prior									-0.171 (0.057)**	0.843	0.167 (0.105)	1.182
Drug abuse problems prior									0.16 (0.041)**	1.173	0.343 (0.087)***	1.409
Lifetime mental illness									0.252 (0.056)***	1.287	0.292 (0.095)**	1.340
Mental health issues prior									-0.183 (0.075)*	0.833	0.019 (0.104)	1.019
Violent Offense									0.120 (0.019)***	1.128	0.07 (0.038)	1.073
Model chi-square	895.53		258.14		2357.88		661.3		2644.04		809.96	

Note. All model chi-squares are significant at $p < .001$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

54%% were white, 21% were married, 92% were a US citizen, 61% were employed prior to prison, 46% were physically victimized prior to prison, 38% were sexually victimized prior to prison, 34% were a primary care provider prior to prison, 48% had drug use problems prior to prison, 44% have received an official mental health diagnosis over their lifetime, 26% entered prison with mental health issues, and 26% were convicted of a violent offense.

Logistic Regression Results

The statistical test used to analyze the relationship between program participation and misconduct (i.e., any rule violations, assault violations, and institution violations) was logistic regression. A logistic regression is an appropriate statistical analysis for this study as it allows for the researcher to evaluate whether the independent variables (continuous or discrete) predict a dichotomous dependent variable. The results of the logistic regression are presented in three tables: Table 2 presents the logistic regressions on any rule violations, Table 3 presents the logistic regressions on assault violations, and Table 4 presents the logistic regressions on institution violations. Tables 2, 3, and 4 include three models of logistic regressions. Model 1 presents the logistic regression results from examining the relationship between program variables and misconduct without controlling for any additional descriptive variables. Model 2 examines the relationship between program participation and misconduct, controlling for deprivation variables. Model 3 examines the relationship between program participation and misconduct, controlling for both deprivation and importation variables.

Table 2 presents the findings for models examining the relationship between program participation and any rule violation for males and females. In model 1, male participation in substance, vocational, educational, religious, ethnic, life skills and community adjustment, assistance, and self-help programs were all found to be significant; however, when controlling

for deprivation and importation variables of male participation in parenting, life skills and community adjustment, and assistance programs lost significance. In model 3, male participation in substance, vocational, educational, ethnic, and self-help programs were all associated with a significant increase in the odds of being written up or found guilty of any rule violation.

Religious program involvement was the only program variable that significantly reduced the odds of being written up or found guilty of any rule violation for male inmates (across all three models).

Table 2 also presents the findings for models examining program involvement and any rule violation. In model 1, female participation in substance, vocational, educational, ethnic, life skills and community adjustment, and assistance programs were all found to be significant; however, when controlling for deprivation and importation variables, female participation in assistance programs lost significance (all other program variables mentioned remained significant). In model 3, female participation in substance, vocational, educational, and life skills and community adjustment programs were all associated with a significant increase in the odds of being written up or found guilty of any rule violation. Ethnic program involvement was the only program variable that significantly reduced the odds of being written up or found guilty of any rule violation for female inmates (across all 3 models).

Table 2 also shows many significant associations among the importation and deprivation variables and any rule violation for both male and female inmates. Males who spend an increased amount of time in their cell, are victimized, communicate with their children, are US citizens, were physically victimized prior to prison, had a history of drug use problems prior to prison, have a lifetime history of mental health issues, and are serving time for a violent offense were all associated with a significant increase in the odds of being written up or found guilty of any rule

Table 3. Logistic Regression Models on Assault Violations (Yes/No).

Variables	Model 1				Model 2				Model 3			
	Males		Females		Males		Females		Males		Females	
	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>Exp(b)</i>	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>Exp(b)</i>	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>Exp(b)</i>	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>Exp(b)</i>	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>Exp(b)</i>	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>Exp(b)</i>
Program Participation												
Substance Abuse	0.216 (0.047)***	1.241	-0.047 (0.108)	0.954	0.257 (0.052)***	1.293	-0.008 (0.119)	0.992	0.194 (0.056)**	1.214	-0.124 (0.134)	0.883
Vocational	0.51 (0.049)***	1.665	0.639 (0.11)***	1.895	0.367 (0.054)***	1.443	0.554 (0.124)***	1.740	0.371 (0.057)***	1.448	0.637 (0.132)***	1.892
Educational	0.337 (0.047)***	1.400	0.514 (0.105)***	1.672	0.257 (0.052)***	1.292	0.541 (0.117)***	1.717	0.17 (0.055)**	1.186	0.467 (0.126)***	1.596
Religious	-0.055 (0.05)	0.947	-0.241 (0.111)*	0.786	-0.142 (0.055)*	0.867	-0.296 (0.123)*	0.744	-0.09 (0.058)	0.914	-0.198 (0.131)	0.820
Ethnic	0.448 (0.097)***	1.565	0.02 (0.248)	1.020	0.3 (0.108)**	1.349	0.145 (0.275)	1.156	0.167 (0.115)	1.182	-0.112 (0.301)	0.894
Employment Counseling	-0.055 (0.079)	0.947	0.015 (0.152)	1.015	-0.021 (0.088)	0.979	0.201 (0.171)	1.223	-0.058 (0.091)	0.944	0.07 (0.185)	1.072
Parenting	-0.325 (0.082)***	0.722	-0.021 (0.131)	0.979	-0.183 (0.092)*	0.833	0.023 (0.153)	1.023	-0.179 (0.096)	0.836	-0.064 (0.164)	0.938
Life Skills	0.177 (0.058)**	1.194	0.323 (0.125)*	1.381	0.161 (0.064)*	1.175	0.215 (0.139)	1.240	0.145 (0.067)*	1.156	0.245 (0.149)	1.277
Assistance	0.377 (0.089)***	1.457	-0.012 (0.186)	0.988	0.253 (0.099)*	1.288	-0.138 (0.209)	0.871	0.315 (0.104)**	1.370	0.134 (0.222)	1.143
Self Help	0.18 (0.08)*	1.197	-0.032 (0.155)	0.969	0.088 (0.088)	1.092	-0.103 (0.174)	0.902	0.159 (0.093)	1.172	-0.013 (0.186)	0.987
Deprivation variables												
Hours in cell					0.187 (0.022)***	1.206	0.203 (0.052)***	1.225	0.721 (0.053)***	2.056	0.759 (0.127)***	2.137
Prison victimization					1.817 (0.055)***	6.150	2.316 (0.147)***	10.132	1.803 (0.058)***	6.068	2.359 (0.161)***	10.577
Communication with child					-0.148 (0.063)*	0.863	-0.235 (0.138)	0.790	0.102 (0.073)	1.107	0.222 (0.171)	1.248
Parent					-0.146 (0.056)**	0.864	0.109 (0.119)	1.115	-0.137 (0.061)*	0.872	0.127 (0.14)	1.135
Child with nonfamily member					-0.014 (0.23)	0.986	0.602 (0.205)**	1.826	0.062 (0.239)	1.064	0.583 (0.222)**	1.791
Child with other family member					-0.282 (0.174)	0.754	0.204 (0.163)	1.226	-0.362 (0.183)*	0.696	-0.18 (0.188)	0.835
Child with close family member					0.026 (0.063)	1.027	0.185 (0.129)	1.203	-0.162 (0.076)*	0.851	-0.184 (0.162)	0.832
Importation Variables												
Age									-0.022 (0.003)***	0.978	-0.042 (0.008)***	0.959
Race (White)									-0.388 (0.055)***	0.678	-0.898 (0.127)***	0.408
Married									-0.184 (0.077)*	0.832	-0.383 (0.177)*	0.682
US Citizen									0.369 (0.101)***	1.447	0.038 (0.274)	1.039
Education (12 th grade)									-0.333 (0.055)***	0.717	-0.309 (0.129)*	0.734
Employment Prior Incarceration									-0.209 (0.057)***	0.812	-0.546 (0.122)***	0.579
Prior physical victimization									0.133 (0.076)	1.143	-0.081 (0.131)	0.922
Prior sexual victimization									-0.071 (0.107)	0.932	-0.101 (0.132)	0.904
Primary care provider prior									-0.047 (0.078)	0.954	0.068 (0.159)	1.071
Drug abuse problems prior									0.146 (0.054)**	1.157	0.34 (0.132)*	1.405
Lifetime mental illness									0.264 (0.067)***	1.302	0.43 (0.141)**	1.537
Mental health issues prior									-0.127 (0.092)	0.881	0.016 (0.15)	1.017
Violent Offense									0.168 (0.023)***	1.183	0.2 (0.055)***	1.221
Model chi-square	398.53		94.35		2078.05		451.92		2265.06		661.71	

Note. All model chi-squares are significant at $p < .001$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

violations. Model 3 also shows that males who have a child that lives with a close family member (while they are incarcerated), are older, white, married, have a 12th grade or higher education level, were employed prior to prison, and had a mental health issue prior to prison were all significantly associated with a decrease in the odds of any rule violations. Female inmates who spend an increased number of hours in their prison cell, are victimized (while in prison), are US citizens, and enter prison with drug abuse and lifetime mental health illnesses have an increased odd of being written up or found guilty of any rule violations. Model 3 also presents numerous variables that are associated with a decrease in rule violations for females. Females who are serving time at a facility that is over 500 miles from their home, older, white, married, have a 12th grade education or higher, and were employed prior to prison are significantly less likely to be written up or found guilty of any rule violations.

Table 3 shows the results of the logistic regression on assault violations across three models. In model 1, male involvement in substance, vocational, educational, ethnic, parenting, life skills and community adjustment, assistance, self-help were all found to be significantly associated with assault violations. Male involvement in ethnic, parenting, and self-help programs lost significance when controlling for deprivation and importation variables (model 3). In model 3, male participation in substance, vocational, educational, life skills and community adjustment and assistance programs were all found to increase the odds of assault violations. No programs were found to significantly reduce the odds of assault violations for male inmates when controlling for deprivation and importation variables.

When looking at female inmates in Table 3, there are many gender differences in program participation and assault violations in comparison to male inmates. In model 1, vocational, educational, religious, and life skills and community adjustment were significantly

associated with assault violations. However, when controlling for deprivation and importation variables, life skills and community adjustment lost significance for females. Model 3 shows that female participation in educational and vocational programs were both associated with a significant increase in the odds of assault violations. Religious program participation was the only program that was associated with a decrease in the odds of assault violations for female inmates across all three models.

The importation and deprivation variables were also found to significantly impact assault violations for both male and female inmates (Table 3). Males who were located over 500 miles from their home spent an increased number of hours in their cell, communicated with their children, are US citizens, had drug problems prior to prison, entered prison with a lifetime mental illness, and are serving time for a violent offense had a significant increase in the odds of assault violations. However, males who are older, white, married, have a 12th education or higher and were employed prior to prison significantly decreased the odds of assault violations. Females who spent an increased amount of time in their cell, experienced prison victimization, had a child who lived with a nonfamily member (while incarcerated), entered prison with drug problems and a life time mental illness, are serving time for a violent offense significantly increased their odds assault violations. However, females who are located over 500 miles from their home, older, white, married, have a 12th grade or higher education and were employed prior to prison significantly decreased the odds of assault violations.

Table 4 presents the logistic regression results on institution violations across three models for males and females. For males in model 1, substance, vocational, educational, religious, ethnic, parenting, life skills and community adjustment, assistance, and self-help programs were all significantly associated with institution violations. Parenting and life skills

Table 4. Logistic Regression Models on Intitution Violations (Yes/No).

Variables	Model 1				Model 2				Model 3			
	Males		Females		Males		Females		Males		Females	
	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>Exp(b)</i>	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>Exp(b)</i>	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>Exp(b)</i>	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>Exp(b)</i>	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>Exp(b)</i>	<i>B (SE)</i>	<i>Exp(b)</i>
Program Participation												
Substance Abuse	0.249 (0.04)***	1.283	0.246 (0.079)**	1.279	0.288 (0.042)***	1.334	0.300 (0.084)***	1.349	0.208 (0.045)***	1.231	0.126 (0.092)	1.134
Vocational	0.595 (0.042)***	1.813	0.579 (0.084)***	1.784	0.515 (0.044)***	1.674	0.516 (0.091)***	1.676	0.503 (0.046)***	1.654	0.507 (0.095)***	1.660
Educational	0.469 (0.04)***	1.599	0.441 (0.079)***	1.555	0.438 (0.042)***	1.549	0.422 (0.084)***	1.525	0.393 (0.044)***	1.481	0.359 (0.09)***	1.432
Religious	-0.121 (0.042)**	0.886	0.102 (0.08)	1.107	-0.174 (0.045)***	0.841	0.099 (0.086)	1.104	-0.166 (0.047)***	0.847	0.18 (0.09)*	1.197
Ethnic	0.522 (0.089)***	1.685	-0.203 (0.195)	0.816	0.428 (0.094)***	1.535	-0.208 (0.215)	0.813	0.396 (0.099)***	1.485	-0.287 (0.227)	0.751
Employment Counseling	0.013 (0.068)	1.013	-0.331 (0.122)**	0.718	0.069 (0.071)	1.072	-0.226 (0.131)	0.797	0.062(0.074)	1.064	-0.24 (0.137)	0.786
Parenting	-0.226 (0.069)**	0.798	0.031 (0.099)	1.031	-0.043 (0.074)	0.958	0.159 (0.111)	1.172	-0.034 (0.076)	0.967	0.081 (0.116)	1.085
Life Skills	0.113 (0.05)*	1.120	0.257 (0.093)**	1.293	0.071 (0.052)	1.074	0.178 (0.1)	1.195	0.024 (0.055)	1.024	0.166 (0.105)	1.181
Assistance	0.139 (0.081)	1.150	0.102 (0.14)	1.107	0.022 (0.086)	1.022	-0.093 (0.151)	0.911	0.083 (0.09)	1.087	-0.001 (0.159)	0.999
Self Help	0.208 (0.07)**	1.231	0.048 (0.116)	1.050	0.135 (0.074)	1.145	-0.004 (0.125)	0.996	0.17 (0.077)*	1.186	0.046 (0.131)	1.047
Deprivation variables												
Hours in cell					0.124 (0.018)***	1.132	0.087 (0.038)*	1.090	0.633 (0.042)***	1.884	0.878 (0.092)***	2.406
Prison victimization					1.04 (0.052)***	2.830	1.188 (0.14)***	3.281	0.954 (0.055)***	2.595	1.073 (0.147)***	2.924
Communication with child					-0.21 (0.049)***	0.811	-0.44 (0.099)***	0.644	0.037 (0.056)	1.038	-0.153 (0.115)	0.858
Parent					0.054 (0.044)	1.055	0.05 (0.085)	1.051	0.086 (0.048)	1.090	0.035 (0.097)	1.036
Child with nonfamily member					-0.044 (0.186)	0.957	0.073 (0.167)	1.076	-0.041 (0.194)	0.960	-0.122 (0.177)	0.885
Child with other family member					-0.03 (0.131)	0.971	0.156 (0.119)	1.169	-0.063 (0.137)	0.939	-0.057 (0.131)	0.945
Child with close family member					-0.053 (0.05)	0.949	0.185 (0.093)*	1.203	-0.207 (0.059)***	0.813	-0.127 (0.112)	0.881
Importation Variables												
Age									-0.021 (0.002)***	0.979	-0.028 (0.005)***	0.973
Race (White)									-0.255 (0.043)***	0.775	-0.288 (0.086)**	0.749
Married									-0.251 (0.06)***	0.778	-0.458 (0.116)***	0.633
US Citizen									0.588 (0.08)***	1.799	0.642 (0.208)**	1.900
Education (12th grade or higher)									-0.171 (0.043)***	0.843	-0.201 (0.089)*	0.818
Employment prior incarceration									-0.124 (0.046)**	0.883	-0.187 (0.086)*	0.830
Prior physical victimization									0.268 (0.063)***	1.307	0.087 (0.092)	1.091
Prior sexual victimization									0.059 (0.089)	1.061	0.11 (0.093)	1.116
Primary care provider prior									-0.183 (0.061)**	0.833	0.148 (0.113)	1.160
Drug abuse problems prior									0.188 (0.043)***	1.207	0.304 (0.093)**	1.356
Lifetime mental illness									0.227 (0.056)***	1.255	0.382 (0.1)***	1.465
Mental health issues prior									-0.108 (0.076)	0.898	-0.074 (0.108)	0.928
Violent Offense									0.099 (0.019)***	1.104	0.055 (0.04)	1.056
Model chi-square	672.74		158.15		1621.51		465.98		1935.35		599.43	

Note. All model chi-squares are significant at $p < .001$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

and community adjustment program involvement lost significance when the deprivation and importation variables were added. In model 3, substance, vocational, educational, ethnic, and self-help programs were associated with a significant increase in institution violations for male inmates. Religious program involvement was the only program variable that significantly reduced the odds of institution violations across all three models for male inmates.

When looking at female inmates in Table 4, there are many gender differences in program participation and institution violations in comparison to male inmates. For females in model 1, substance, vocational, educational, employment counseling, and life skills and community adjustment programs were all significantly associated with institutional misconduct. Interestingly, when controlling for deprivation and importation variables, substance, employment counseling, and life skills and community adjustment program involvement lost significance; however, religious program involvement gained significance. Vocational, educational, and religious program involvement were all found to significantly increase the odds of institution violations for female inmates in model 3. No programs were found to significantly decrease the odds of institution violations for female inmates in both models 2 and 3.

Lastly, many of the importation and deprivation variables in Table 4 were significantly associated with institutional violations for male and female inmates. Male inmates who spent an increased number of hours in their cell, are US citizens, experienced physical victimization prior to prison, had drug problems prior to prison, entered prison with a lifetime mental illness, and are serving time for a violent offense significantly increased the odds of institution violations. However, males who are located over 500 miles away from home, have a child living with a close family member, are older, white, married, have a 12th grade or higher education, were employed prior to prison, and had mental health issues prior to prison significantly decreased the

odds of institution violations. Female inmates who spent an increase number of hours in their cell, communicated with their children, are US citizens, entered prison with drug abuse problems and life time mental illnesses significantly increased the odds of institution violations. However, female inmates who are located over 500 miles from their home, older, white, married, have a 12th grade education or higher, and were employed prior to prison significantly reduced the odds of institution violations.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to determine whether involvement in prison programs reduced the likelihood of inmate misconduct, and if this association was more significant for female inmates in comparison to male inmates. Research on prison program involvement has focused on specific types of programs (e.g., educational programs), and a majority of the research has found program involvement to improve inmate behavior overtime (Camp et al., 2006; French & Gendreau, 2006; Messina et al., 2009; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2008). Since a majority of the existing research has focused only on one type of program, it was important to examine a variety of programs in order to determine if specific programs impact inmate behavior differently, specifically among male and female inmates. As expected, the current study found many gender differences in program involvement and misconduct. However, the results of the current study challenge a great deal of the existing literature that has examined prison program involvement.

The findings counter predictions that prison program participation will reduce inmate misconduct. Prison programs may provide inmates with a variety of goods and services that are needed, but they may not all have the same impact on inmate misconduct, especially across gender. If involvement in prison programs increases the risk of inmate misconduct differently for males and females, then it can be inferred that either the programs are more effective among a specific gender or that the programs were not created with intentions of treating gender specific

criminogenic needs. These findings contradict the idea that prison programs serve as a rehabilitative factor and improve inmate behavior, but they also support the notion that gender differences do exist among prison programs and their impact on inmate misconduct.

One of the most surprising and consistent findings from the study is the association between vocational and education program involvement and misconduct. Specifically, male and female inmate involvement in vocational and educational programs was found to significantly increase the likelihood of all three types of misconduct across all three models. These findings challenge the results presented in Lahm (2009) and Pomoco et al. (2017) and their in-depth analysis on educational and vocational programs and inmate misconduct. While both studies suggest that educational and vocational programs should improve inmate behavior and reduce inmate misconduct, Pomoco et al. (2017) only attributed this association to inmates who participated in college courses. From here, it can be inferred that the educational program variable used in the current study may have been too inclusive of courses that fall under the “educational program” category. In fact, Klein et al. (2004) evaluated many federal and state educational programs across the United States and found that there is often a major discrepancy in the definition/measure of educational programs among every prison. For instance, facilities often use different criteria to classify courses as educational programs, and as a result, some prisons overestimate the number of inmates involved in educational programs when they include programs that do not fit the criteria (Klein et al., 2004). This implies that the association between involvement in educational programs and inmate misconduct may not be adequately represented across many evaluations. Therefore, when comparing the present study’s results to those of older studies, it must be pointed out that the present study may have used a measure of educational programs that was overly inclusive.

Although educational and vocational program involvement impacted males and females in a similar manner, there were many gender differences among the other eight programs (i.e., substance, religious, ethnic, employment counseling, parenting, life skills and community adjustment, assistance, and self-help) and misconduct. Overall, religious, ethnic, and employment counseling programs appeared to be the only programs to decrease misconduct for female inmates, whereas parenting and religious programs appeared to be the only programs to decrease misconduct for male inmates. One surprising finding from these results is the impact that parenting programs had on male inmates in comparison to female inmates. Specifically, parenting program participation appeared to reduce all three measures of misconduct for male inmates but had no effect on female inmates. This finding is interesting because there is a plethora of research that has emphasized the importance of parenting programs for incarcerated mothers (Ferroaro & Moe, 2003; Goetting & Howsen, 1986; Loper et al., 2009; Rocheleau, 2014). On one hand, research has suggested that incarcerated mothers should benefit from parenting programs more than incarcerated fathers, because mothers generally have stronger bonds to their children prior to incarceration in comparison to incarcerated fathers (Goetting & Howsen, 1986; Jiang & Winfree, 2006; Loper et al., 2009). On the other hand, Tremblay and Sutherland (2017) noted that a majority of parenting programs in women's prisons focus more broadly on parenting issues as a way to expand their services to a larger number of participants in comparison to men's prisons; however, this has been found to contribute to higher dropout rates for female inmates. Interestingly, a larger percentage of female inmates participated in parenting programs than male inmates in the current study. Therefore, it can be assumed that the parenting programs offered in female prisons may not be providing effective services that are tailored to meet the individual needs of incarcerated mothers.

Another interesting finding is the inverse relationship between male and female inmates who were involved in ethnic programs and the association with any rule violation. Specifically, involvement in ethnic programs was found to increase rule violations for male inmates and decrease rule violations for female inmates. These results cast a new light on the impact that ethnic programs may have on inmate behavior. It is important to highlight the fact that there were many significant associations with ethnic program participation because there is no current literature that has explored involvement in ethnic programs and the impact they have on inmate behavior. It is difficult to explain such results within the context of this study because the current study used the original ethnic program variable that was generated by the SISFCF which included NAACP, Black Culture Group, Hispanic Committee, Aztlan, and Lakota in their measure of ethnic programs. It is notable that the SISFCF listed these programs as examples of what was included in the measure and that the programs included in the measure could have differed by prisons. Future research is needed to delimitate each of these programs in more detail and see why these programs were found to have such a significant impact across all three misconduct measures.

Similar to the relationship between ethnic programs and misconduct, there was also an inverse relationship between religious program involvement and institution violations among male and female inmates. Specifically, involvement in religious programs reduced institution violations for male inmates and increased institution violations for female inmates. This finding is surprising because female involvement in religious programs is associated with a decrease in assault violations. In particular, religious program involvement is the only program variable that changes significantly across the misconduct measures. Similarly, Camp et al. (2008) found participation in faith-based programs to reduce serious forms of misconduct but have no impact

on less serious forms of misconduct. Camp et al. (2008) argued that their measure of less-serious misconduct included behaviors that are often considered to be nuisance (e.g., being in an unauthorized area, being unsanitary, failing to follow a work order, etc.) and as a result, program participation had a perverse effect that increased inmates odds of receiving a ticket for these minor offenses due to increased surveillance from program staff. Therefore, we can infer that religious program involvement had a similar impact on female assault and institution violations because our measure of institution violations captured a wide range of behaviors that can be considered to be nuisance (e.g., disobedience, being out of place, etc.).

The current study also included sets of deprivation and importation variables to the logistic regression models that served as control variables. A majority of these variables impacted male and female inmates in a similar manner and the findings are consistent with the current literature on deprivation and importation (Celinska & Sung, 2014; Cihan et al., 2017; Lahm, 2013, 2016; Welsh et al., 2007). Two deprivation (e.g., hours in cell, prison victimization) and seven importation variables (e.g., age, race, marital status, education, prior employment, prior drug abuse, and lifetime mental illness) consistently predicted all three types of misconduct (e.g., any rule violations, assault violations, and institution violations) for both male and female inmates. In fact, male and female inmates who spent longer hours in their cell, were victimized in prison, had drug abuse problems prior to prison, and had a lifetime of mental illness problems had an increased likelihood of being written up or found guilty of any rule violations, assault violations and institution violations. These findings support the claims that importation and deprivation impact males and females similarly (Cihan et al., 2017; Gover et al., 2008; Solinas-Saunders & Stracer, 2012). Additionally, the findings from the current study also suggest that male and female inmates who are younger, white, married, have an education of 12th grade or

higher, and were employed prior to incarceration are less likely to be written up or found guilty of any rule violation, assault violation, and institution violation.

Although a majority of the deprivation and importation findings are consistent with the current literature, there were a few surprising results that differed by gender. The first interesting finding is the inverse association between distance from home and assault violations among male and female inmates. Male inmates who were housed over 500 miles away from their home had an increase in assault violations, whereas female inmates who were housed over 500 miles away from their home had a decrease in assault violations. These findings may be explained through the literature on social support in male and female prisons. Scholars have suggested that the environment in female prisons tends to be more socially supportive than male prisons. For instance, females tend to form social groups/networks (i.e., pseudo families) with other female inmates that uphold positive elements of social support (e.g., emotional support, friendship, etc.) (Thomas & Foster, 1976), whereas males are more likely to form pseudo political groups as means of survival (Thomas & Foster, 1976). Therefore, it can be inferred that female inmates are more likely to join pseudo families as means to eliminate any feelings of deprivation from friends and family, especially when they are located further away from their home, and thus these supportive relationships reduce their likelihood of misconduct.

Another interesting finding from the deprivation measures is the association between who the inmate's child lived with (while the inmate was incarcerated) and the impact it had on misconduct among males and females. Specifically, incarcerated fathers experienced a significant reduction in misconduct (consistent across all three measures of misconduct) when their child lived with a family member (both close family members and other family members); however, incarcerated mothers experienced a significant increase in assault violations when their

child lived with a nonfamily member. These findings support deprivation research that suggests that inmates experience parental stress while incarcerated, and that who the inmate's child lives with while they are incarcerated has significant impact on their behavior (Benning & Lahm, 2016; Casey-Acevedo & Bakken, 2002; Kazura, 2001). Inmates whose children live with a family member (while they are incarcerated) are less likely to feel deprived and act out in prison because they may have less to worry about (in terms of quality of care that their child is receiving while they are incarcerated). Close family members may also help facilitate and maintain parent-child relationships while the parent is incarcerated because the family members may provide the inmate and child with more opportunities to communicate with each other (e.g., family members can drive the inmate's children to visitations, help children write letters and make phone calls to their incarcerated parents) (Benning & Lahm, 2016; Casey-Acevedo & Bakken, 2002; Kazura, 2001). A few studies suggest this to be more prevalent for male inmates because their children continue to live with their mother and continue to receive either the same or similar level of care (Benning & Lahm, 2016; Casey-Acevedo & Bakken, 2002; Kazura, 2001). However, inmates with children who live with nonfamily members may experience increased parental stress while they are incarcerated in regard to the quality of care their child is receiving, especially if their child was sent to live somewhere new such as a foster home (Benning & Lahm, 2016; Kazura, 2001). Some scholars have also suggested that these findings are often more prevalent among female inmates because females are generally the primary care provider prior to prison and when the mother is incarcerated there is a major disruption in both the mother and child's life (Benning & Lahm, 2016; Casey-Acevedo & Bakken, 2002).

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSIONS

Limitations

Although the findings of this study add to the current literature on program involvement and inmate behavior, there were a few limitations that need to be addressed. For one, the current study used self-reported data that was collected in 2004. Self-report measures of misconduct may not accurately identify inmate misconduct. For instance, inmates may either overexaggerate or underreport their involvement in misconduct, and as a result, this might either inflate or deflate the projected analyses of program involvement and inmate misconduct. Scholars have noted that these problems may stem from vulnerabilities with recall and social desirability bias (Celinska & Sung, 2014). Additionally, the data was collected in 2004 and the results presented in this current study may be outdated.

Other limitations of this current study stem from problems with the variables that were included in the study. For one, the study did not include any specific time ordered variables to measure program involvement and inmate misconduct. For example, program involvement and misconduct captured program involvement and misconduct at any time since their admission to prison. This is problematic because the inmates who were included in the study could have been written up or found guilty of any rule violation prior to their involvement in any program. While it is difficult to infer whether program involvement impacted inmate behavior in a positive or negative manner, it can also be suggested that inmates who had a history of misconduct were

more likely to seek help from prison programs than inmates who did not have a history of misconduct. Therefore, the programs that were associated with an increase in misconduct could be explained by inmates seeking help. Future research should include time ordered measures that capture inmate misconduct prior to their involvement in any program and after their completion of any program.

Additionally, there were limitations with the measure of misconduct, specifically institution violations. Institution violations captured a wide range of behavior that included measures of both minor and major rule violations. Consequently, the measure of institution violations may have been too inclusive and may not have adequately predicted rule violations that are specific to gender and the prison environment. For instance, the behaviors captured by major rule violations are more likely to be committed by male inmates, whereas the behaviors captured by minor rule violations are more likely to be committed by female inmates. Future research that uses the SISFCF should examine minor and major rule violations separately to determine if further gender differences exist.

Lastly, this study could be improved by using more specific measures to capture the depth of program involvement. The current study failed to include measures that captured the inmate's involvement overtime, specifically the duration and frequency of involvement. Future research should consider including measures of duration and frequency to further gauge how involved and devoted an inmate is to a program. The current study also failed to include measures that captured motivation to participate in the programs. Motivation to participate in prison programs could have included a simple measure of whether the inmate was required to participate in a program or if they chose to participate voluntarily. Future research should

explore motivation to participate in programs as a way to further measure effectiveness of prison programs.

Policy Implications

The findings of the study add to the literature by establishing that prison program involvement does have some impact on inmate misconduct. The finding that some programs were associated with a decrease in misconduct indicate that these programs serve as a rehabilitative factor and aid their adjustment to prison. However, the other finding that some programs were associated with an increase in misconduct suggest that these programs may not have the resources needed to provide effective services to all inmates. Correctional facilities need to look further into program characteristics such as staff characteristics (i.e., qualifications of program staff), inmate motivation to participate, availability of programs offered, effectiveness of programs offered, etc. to determine a clearer understanding of program outcomes. After a clearer distinction is made regarding the impact that program characteristics have on program outcomes, practitioners will be able to develop more effective correctional programs that will serve to rehabilitate inmates and thus facilitate a safer prison environment.

Conclusion

The current study aimed to explore the impact that involvement in prison programs has on inmate misconduct and if this impact differs among male and female inmates. The findings of this study imply that there are gender differences among prison program involvement and misconduct. However, these findings also challenge much of the existing literature on prison programs and inmate behavior since many programs were found to increase inmate misconduct. While there were some programs associated with an increase in misconduct and other programs associated with a decrease in misconduct, it is difficult to determine if program involvement is a

predictor of inmate behavior. For the programs associated with an increase in misconduct, it can be inferred that those programs lacked the resources (e.g., teachers, funding, psychologists, social workers, etc.) that were needed to provide adequate services and treatment to inmates. Future research should incorporate more detailed measures of program involvement such as, frequency of involvement, duration of program involvement, motivation to participate, and perception of effectiveness. These measures would help to better understand this association on a larger scale.

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, E., Eggins, E., Reid, N., Harnett, P., & Dawe, S. (2018). Parenting interventions for incarcerated parents to improve parenting knowledge and skills, parent well-being, and quality of the parent-child relationship: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 14(3), 279-317.
- Benning, C. L., & Lahm, K. F. (2016). Effects of parent-child relationships on inmate behavior: A comparison of male and female inmates. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 60(2), 189-207.
- Berg, M. T., & DeLisi, M. (2006). The correctional melting pot: Race, ethnicity, citizenship, and prison violence. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34(6), 631-642.
- Bracey, G. W. (2006). Locked up, locked out. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 88(3), 253.
- Camp, S. D., Gaes, G. G., Langan, N. P., & Saylor, W. G. (2003) The influence of prison inmate misconduct: A multilevel investigation. *Justice Quarterly*, 20(3), 501-533.
- Camp, S. D., Klein-Saffran, J., Kwon, O., Daggett, D. M., & Joseph, V. (2006). An exploration into participation in a faith-based prison program. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 5(3), 529-550.
- Casey-Acevedo, K., & Bakken, T. (2002). Visiting women in prison: Who visits and who cares?. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 34(3), 67-83.
- Celinska, K., & Sung, H. E. (2014). Gender differences in the determinants of prison rule violations. *The Prison Journal*, 94(2), 220-241.
- Chamberlain, A. W. (2012). Offender rehabilitation: Examining changes in inmate treatment characteristics, program participation, and institutional behavior. *Justice Quarterly*, 29(2), 183-228.
- Cihan, A., Davidson, M., & Sorensen, J. (2017). Analyzing the heterogeneous nature of inmate behavior: Trajectories of prison misconduct. *The Prison Journal*, 97(4), 431-450.
- Cochran, J. C. (2012). The ties that bind or the ties that break: Examining the relationship between visitation and prisoner misconduct. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 40(5), 433-440.

- Conerly, A. M. (1997). The effect of life skills instruction on locus of control in adult male inmates. ProQuest Digital Dissertation.
- Cunningham, M. D., Sorensen, J. R., & Reidy, T. J. (2005). An actuarial model for assessment of prison violence risk among maximum security inmates. *Assessment*, *12*(1), 40–49.
- DeLisi, M. (2003). Criminal careers behind bars. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, *21*(5), 653-669.
- DeLisi, M., Trulson, C. R., Marquart, J. W., Drury, A. J., & Kosloski, A. E. (2011). Inside the prison black box: Toward a life course importation model of inmate behavior. *International journal of offender therapy and comparative criminology*, *55*(8), 1186-1207.
- Donohue III, J. J., & Siegelman, P. (1998). Allocating resources among prisons and social programs in the battle against crime. *The Journal of Legal Studies*, *27*(1), 1-43.
- Faily, A., & Roundtree, G. A. (1980). A study of aggressions and rule violations in a female prison population. *Journal of Offender Counseling Services Rehabilitation*, *4*(1), 81-87.
- Ferraro, K. J., & Moe, A. M. (2003). Mothering, crime, and incarceration. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *32*(1), 9-40.
- Fox, V. (1954). The effect of counseling on adjustment in prison. *Social Forces*, *32*(3), 285-289.
- French, S. A., & Gendreau, P. (2006). Reducing prison misconducts: What works! *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *33*(2), 185-218.
- Gendreau, P., Goggin, C. E., & Law, M. A. (1997). Predicting prison misconducts. *Criminal Justice and behavior*, *24*(4), 414-431.
- Glaze, L. & Maruschak, L. (2011). Parents in Prison and Their Minor Children. Bureau of Justice Statistics Washington, D.C.
- Goetting, A., & Howsen, R. M. (1986). Correlates of prisoner misconduct. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *2*(1), 49-67.
- Gover, A. R., Pérez, D. M., & Jennings, W. G. (2008). Gender differences in factors contributing to institutional misconduct. *The Prison Journal*, *88*(3), 378-403.
- Griffin, M. L., & Hepburn, J. R. (2013). Inmate misconduct and the institutional capacity for control. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *40*(3), 270-288.
- Hairston, C. F. (1991). Family ties during imprisonment: Important to whom and for what. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, *18*, 87-104.

- Haney, C. (2006). The wages of prison overcrowding: Harmful psychological consequences and dysfunctional correctional reactions. *Washington University Journal of Law & Policy*, 22, 265-193.
- Hoffmann, H. C., Byrd, A. L., & Kightlinger, A. M. (2010). Prison programs and services for incarcerated parents and their underage children: Results from a national survey of correctional facilities. *The Prison Journal*, 90(4), 397-416.
- Hunte, R. S., & Esmail, A. (2011). Learning to change: Does life skills training lead to reduced incident reports among inmates in a medium/minimum correctional facility? *Race, Gender & Class*, 18(3/4), 291-315.
- Irwin, J., & Cressey, D. R. (1962). Thieves, convicts and the inmate culture. *Social problems*, 10(2), 142-155.
- Jiang, S. (2005). Impact of drug use on inmate misconduct: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33(2), 153-163.
- Johnson, B. R. (2002). Assessing the impact of religious programs and prison industry on recidivism: An exploratory study. *Texas Journal of Corrections*, 28, 7-11.
- Johnson, B. R., Larson, D. B., & Pitts, T. G. (1997). Religious programming, institutional adjustment and recidivism among former inmates in Prison Fellowship programs. *Justice Quarterly*, 14, 145-166.
- Kazura, K. (2001). Family programming for incarcerated parents: A needs assessment among inmates. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 32(4), 67-83.
- Klein, S., Tolbert, M., Bugarin, R., Cataldi, E. F., & Tauschek, G. (2004). Correctional Education: Assessing the Status of Prison Programs and Information Needs. *Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, U.S Department of Education*.
- Kuanliang, A., & Sorensen, J. (2008). Predictors of self-reported prison misconduct. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 21(1), 27-35.
- Kwon, O., Camp, S. D., Daggett, D. M., & Klein-Saffran, J. (2010). Reasons for faith-based correctional program participation: An examination of motive types. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 49(6), 377-397.
- Lahm, K. F. (2008). Inmate-on-inmate assault: A multilevel examination of prison violence. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35(1), 120-137.
- Lahm, K. F. (2009). Educational participation and inmate misconduct. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 48(1), 37-52.

- Lahm, K. (2016). Official incidents of inmate-on-inmate misconduct at a women's prison: Using importation and deprivation theories to compare perpetrators to victims. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 29(3), 214-231.
- Lahm, K. F. (2017). Violent and nonviolent misconduct among female inmates: An exploration of competing theories. *Victims & Offenders*, 12(2), 175-204.
- Langan, N. & Pelissier, B. (2001). The effect of drug treatment on inmate misconduct in federal prisons. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 34(2), 21-30.
- Loper, A. B., Carlson, L. W., Levitt, L., & Scheffel, K. (2009). Parenting stress, alliance, child contact and adjustment of imprisoned mothers and fathers. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 48, 483-503.
- Loper, A. B., & Tuerk, E. H. (2011). Improving the emotional adjustment and communication patterns of incarcerated mothers: Effectiveness of a prison parenting intervention. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 20(1), 89-101.
- McClure, H. H., Shortt, J. W., Eddy, J. M., Holmes, A., Van Uum, S., Russell, E., ... Martinez Jr., C. R. (2015). Associations among mother-child contact, parenting stress, and mother and child adjustment related to incarceration. *Children's Contact with Incarcerated Parents*, 59-82.
- Owen, B. A. (1998). *In the mix: Struggle and survival in a women's prison*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Pompoco, A., Wooldredge, J., Lugo, M., Sullivan, C., & Latessa, E. J. (2017). Reducing inmate misconduct and prison returns with facility education programs. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 16(2), 515-547.
- Randol, B. M., & Campbell, C. M. (2017). Macro-correlates of inmate violence: The importance of programming in prison order. *The Prison Journal*, 97(4), 451-474.
- Reidy, T. J., Cihan, A., & Sorensen, J. R. (2017). Women in prison: Investigating trajectories of institutional misconduct. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 52, 49-56.
- Rocheleau, A. M. (2013). An empirical exploration of the "pains of imprisonment" and the level of prison misconduct and violence. *Criminal Justice Review*, 38(3), 354-374.
- Roundtree, G. A., & Faily, A. (1980). The impact of educational programs on acts of aggression and rule violations in a female prison population. *Corrective & Social Psychiatry & Journal of Behavior Technology, Methods & Therapy*, 26(3), 144-145.
- Salisbury, E. J., Van Voorhis, P., & Spiropoulos, G. V. (2009). The predictive validity of a gender-responsive needs assessment: An exploratory study. *Crime & Delinquency*, 55(4), 550-585.

- Schenk, A. M., & Fremouw, W. J. (2012). Individual characteristics related to prison violence: A critical review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 17*(5), 430-442.
- Snyder, Z. K., Carlo, T. A., & Mullins, M. M. C. (2002). Parenting from prison: An examination of a children's visitation program at a women's correctional facility. *Marriage & Family Review, 32*(3-4), 33-61.
- Solinas-Saunders, M., & Stacer, M. J. (2012). Prison resources and physical/verbal assault in prison: A comparison of male and female inmates. *Victims & Offenders, 7*(3), 279-311.
- Steiner, B., Butler, H. D., & Ellison, J. M. (2014). Causes and correlates of prison inmate misconduct: A systematic review of the evidence. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 42*(6), 462-470.
- Steiner, B., & Wooldredge, J. (2008). Inmate versus environmental effects on prison rule violations. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 35*(4), 438-456.
- Steiner, B., & Wooldredge, J. (2014). Sex differences in the predictors of prisoner misconduct. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 41*(4), 433-452.
- Steiner, B., & Wooldredge, J. (2014). Comparing self-report to official measures of inmate misconduct. *Justice Quarterly, 31*(6), 1074-1101.
- Tewksbury, R. Stengel, K. M. (2006). Assessing correctional education programs: The student's perspective. *The Journal of Correctional Education, 57*(1), 13-25
- Thomas, C. W. (1977). Theoretical perspectives on prisonization: A comparison of the importation and deprivation models. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology, 68*, 135.
- Thomas, C. W., & Foster, S. C. (1976). On the Measurement of Social Roles Adaptations in the Prison Community. *Criminal Justice Review, 1*(1), 11-21.
- Thompson, P. J., & Harm, N. J. (2000). Parenting from prison: Helping children and mothers. *Issues in Comprehensive Pediatric Nursing, 23*(2), 61-81.
- Umamaheswar, J. (2013). Gendered representations of parents behind bars: An analysis of newspaper reports. *Punishment & Society, 15*(3), 274-303.
- Walters, G. D., & Crawford, G. (2013). In and out of prison: Do importation factors predict all forms of misconduct or just the more serious ones? *Journal of Criminal Justice, 41*(6), 407-413.
- Welsh, W. N. (2007). A multisite evaluation of prison-based therapeutic community drug treatment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 34*(11), 1481-1498.

Welsh, W. N., McGrain, P., Salamatin, N., & Zajac, G. (2007). Effects of prison drug treatment on inmate misconduct: A repeated measures analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 34*(5), 600-615.

Wilson, D. B., Gallagher, C. A., & Mackenzie, D. L. (2000). A meta-analysis of corrections-based education, vocation, and work programs for adult offenders. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 37*(4), 347-368.

Wright, E. M., Salisbury, E. J., & Van Voorhis, P. (2007). Predicting the prison misconducts of women offenders: The importance of gender-responsive needs. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 23*(4), 310-340.

Zingraff, M. T., & Zingraff, R. M. (1980). Adaptation patterns of incarcerated female delinquents. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal, 31*(2), 35-47.

APPENDIX A

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IRB LETTER



January 7, 2019

Amanda Rude
Criminal Justice
The University of Alabama
Box 870320

Re: IRB # EX-19-CM-001: "Gender Differences in Program Participation and Misconduct among Federal and State Inmates"

Dear Ms. Rude,

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for your proposed research. Your application has been given exempt approval per 45 CFR part 46.101(b)(4) as outlined below:

(4) Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

Your approval will expire on January 6, 2020. If the study will continue beyond that date, please submit the Continuing Review Form within e-Protocol. If you need to modify the study, please submit an Amendment form. *Changes to this study cannot be initiated without IRB approval, except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants.* When the study closes, please submit the Final Report Form.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this application, please include the assigned IRB approval number.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,

Carpantato T. Myles, MSM, CIM, CIP
Director & Research Compliance Officer
Office for Research Compliance

cc: Dr. Ida Johnson