

ABSTRACT

Title of Thesis: DELINEATING DEMOGRAPHIC PATTERNS:
ANALYZING PARTICIPATION IN PRISON
MISCONDUCT AND EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS
Gwynne L Shepherd, Master of Arts, 2024

Thesis Directed By: Dr. Robert Stewart,
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
Dr. Sarah Tahamont
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice

While it is acclaimed that participation in educational programming reduces the likelihood of an individual engaging in misconduct, the body of literature describing prison misconduct and educational programming participation largely treats the two as isolated processes. However, the contexts of how prison education and misconduct intersect are obscured in the limited scholarship. Using the Bureau of Justice Statistics' Survey of Prison Inmates collected in 2016, individuals were categorized into four groups (1) "Rule Breakers" who only participated in misconduct, (2) "Students" who participated in only educational programming, (3) "None" who participated in neither, and (4) "Both" for those who participated in both. Weighted cross-tabulations of each group were conducted across multiple demographic characteristics to determine the demographic distribution within each group. The findings of this analysis demonstrate that the characteristics of race, level of prior educational attainment, and age all show disproportional distributions depending on group participation. Additionally, this analysis could inform prison policy, emphasizing the importance of providing educational opportunities even for those who engage in misconduct. Such policies could offer broader societal benefits, reducing recidivism and aiding reintegration.

DELINEATING DEMOGRAPHIC PATTERNS: ANALYZING PARTICIPATION IN
PRISON MISCONDUCT AND EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

by

Gwynne L. Shepherd

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
2024

Advisory Committee:
Rob Stewart, Co-Chair
Sarah Tahamont, Co-Chair
Rachel Ellis

©Copyright by
Gwynne L. Shepherd
2024

Acknowledgments

There are many people I want to thank for their role in this thesis.

To my co-chair Sarah Tahamont, for the years of guidance and support, all leading to this thesis.

To my co-chair Robert Stewart, for his enthusiastic involvement and crucial support in the completion of this paper

To my committee member Rachel Ellis, for her ongoing support and engagement

To my family and friends, for their constant encouragement and support during all the ups and downs that came with writing this paper. I am truly grateful, and I do not know where I would be without them

Most of all, to my cat Ripper, who earned his Master's in Arts ten times over with the amount of emotional support given in this process. And without whom, this paper would not exist.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
List of Tables	iv
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Prior Literature	5
Misconduct.....	5
Misconduct in Prison	5
History of Misconduct Research.....	7
Trends in Misconduct Research.....	10
Limitations of Misconduct Research	13
Education	14
Education in Prison	14
Trends in Prison Education Research	18
Limitations of Prison Education Research.....	22
Studying Misconduct and Education Together.....	23
Studying Prison Misconduct and Prison Education as Isolated Processes	23
Limitations of Misconduct and Educational Programming Research	25
Comparing Characteristics of Misconduct and Educational Programming.....	26
Implications of Joint Analysis	27
Chapter 3: Research Questions and Hypotheses.....	29
Research Questions	29
Hypotheses.....	29
Racial Expectations.....	29
Gender Expectations	30
Prior Education Attainment Level Expectations.....	31
Age Expectations	32
Chapter 4: Data and Methods	33
Data and Sample Statistics.....	33
Analysis.....	38
Chapter 5: Findings.....	42
Race.....	43
Gender.....	46
Prior Educational Attainment	47
Age.....	49
Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusion	51
Discussion of Findings.....	51
Conclusion	55
Limitations of Study	56
Future Avenues of Research	58
Broader Implications of Research.....	60
Appendices.....	62
Citations	64

List of Tables

Table 1: Demographic Statistics.....	37-38
Table 2: Racial Distribution within Groups.....	45
Table 3: Gender Distribution Within Groups.....	47
Table 5: Prior Educational Attainment Distribution within Groups.....	49
Table 6: Prior Educational Attainment Distribution within Groups With No Educational Programming Requirement.....	49
Table 7: Age Distribution within Groups.....	50
<i>Appendix</i>	
Table A-1: Distribution of Prior Educational Attainment within Racial Category....	62
Table A-2: Distribution of Sentence Length within Groups.....	62
Table A-3: Group Distribution Within Each Racial Category.....	62

Chapter 1: Introduction

In my analysis, I will focus on the intersection of engaging in misconduct and participating in educational programming in prison. I am specifically interested in this intersection because education is claimed to be one of the most promising forms of intervention available to prisons to reduce the rates of misconduct (L. Davis et al., 2014; Federal Bureau of Prisons, 2016). Education and misconduct are often seen as opposing forces. Researchers assume that engaging in institutional misconduct indicates future defiance and misconduct (Cochran & Mears, 2017; Pompoco et al., 2017). Across these studies, participating in education is expected to improve an individual's critical thinking skills in a way that will reduce their likelihood of future misconduct (Courtney, 2018; L. Davis et al., 2014; Lahm, 2009; Pompoco et al., 2017).

Misconduct poses significant financial and operational challenges for prison facilities, which further impacts security. Researchers have conducted numerous analyses to look at the demographic characteristics of people who engage in prison misconduct, what events or situations change the frequency of misconduct for those who participate, and what potential interventions can reduce the frequency of misconduct (Berg & DeLisi, 2006; Celinzska & Sung, 2014; Goetting & Howsen, 1986; Innes, 1997; Steiner et al., 2014a; Tahamont, Pheasant, et al., 2022; J. Wooldredge & Steiner, 2009; Worrall & Morris, 2011). However, despite the assumed benefits in reducing misconduct, research on prison education has faced numerous challenges. After a large-scale sociopolitical shift, prison practitioners and

the general public held an overwhelmingly negative opinion on rehabilitative programs in prisons (L. Davis et al., 2014). Therefore, much of the research on prison education aims to renew a sense of interest by providing evidence on how effective these programs are (Bozick et al., 2018; Courtney, 2018; L. Davis et al., 2014; Lahm, 2009; Pompoco et al., 2017; Wilson et al., 2000). Contemporary efforts by researchers and prison administrators have made progress in restoring the image and reputation of prison rehabilitation programs (Bozick et al., 2018). However, there are still institutional barriers that block wide-scale access to accessible and reliable data (Ellis, 2023b), especially data that contains adequate measures of educational programming.

Despite their theoretical connection, little attention is paid to how prison education intersects with engagement in misconduct within the prison context. The limited literature that examines educational participation's effect on the likelihood of future misconduct typically considers only a one-way relationship. However, these phenomena do not occur in isolation, prison education and misconduct overlap and affect chances of participation in the other. The decision to engage in misconduct or participate in educational programming is not isolated social, structural, and environmental factors influence it. Thus, to truly understand how misconduct overlaps with educational participation it is important to conduct analyses looking at their intersection within the prison experience.

The primary goal of my analysis is to determine how incarcerated individuals distribute demographically based on their participation in either, both, or neither misconduct and educational programming. In the current prison system, individuals

who commit misconduct often receive sanctions that remove or disallow them from voluntary programming. The individuals engaging in misconduct who are not going to be participating in voluntary programming at any time would face different consequences because of these policies than the incarcerated individuals who are likely to participate in programming at some point. Yet, there is little to no information on the predictive demographic characteristics of these individuals. Because of the antithetical differences in engaging in misconduct and participating in educational programming, the group of incarcerated individuals engaging in both conflicting concepts might be categorically different from the individuals who participate in either one or neither. Therefore, studying the predictive characteristics of these individuals could provide more information on how this group differs and what could be done differently to account for their needs.

By conducting a joint analysis I will be able to explore the relationship between misconduct and educational programming with a higher level of complexity than what was able to be ascertained from prior analyses. Examining both concepts in the same study allows me to detect meaningful relationships and uncover deeper insights that would have been obscured when examined in isolation. By studying the people who participate in both, it is possible to understand more about specific manifestations of engagement in misconduct within the prison context. This study will be among the first to suggest these phenomena have a multi-directional association and to conduct a joint examination of the relationship between misconduct and educational programming. Studying the overlap in education and

misconduct in prison will also inform researchers about disproportional trends relating to punishment for misconduct.

In this analysis, I will use the 2016 Survey of Prison Inmates produced by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. I conducted crosstabs with a categorical variable expressing all possible groups of participation in misconduct and educational programming against the demographic variables of interest. I used Chi-square hypothesis tests to determine if the observed sample was significantly different than what would be expected if there was no significant association between the two variables. In this analysis, I found that the demographic characteristics of race, prior education level, and age had substantive disproportionate representation across the four possible groups of participation. Specifically, Black people were over-represented in the group that only participated in education. Conversely, White people were over-represented in the groups that did not participate in educational programming. I found that individuals with lower levels of prior educational attainment were over-represented in the group of individuals who participated in misconduct, while individuals with higher levels of prior educational attainment were over-represented in the group of individuals who participated in neither misconduct nor educational programming. Lastly, I found that younger people are over-represented in the groups of individuals who engage in misconduct, while older individuals are over-represented in the groups that do not engage in misconduct.

Chapter 2: Prior Literature

Misconduct

Misconduct in Prison

Prison Misconduct is an event defined as when an incarcerated individual engages in actions that violate the rules within the institution (Campbell et al., 2020; Glazener, 2021; Steiner et al., 2014a; J. D. Wooldredge, 1994). This can include mundane actions like stepping out of line at roll call to actions like assault (Federal Bureau of Prisons, 2011; Glazener, 2021; Steiner et al., 2014a). The first level of the disciplinary process is write-ups. These are administrative reports where correctional officers draft the details of how an individual committed a rule violation (Rocheleau, 2014). Very little evidence is needed for an individual to receive a write-up from a correctional officer. Additionally, write-ups are issued before any investigation takes place into the validity of these claims (Rocheleau, 2014; *The Prison Disciplinary Process*, 2023). Following a write-up an individual will be put through a disciplinary hearing to determine guilt and the appropriate punishment. The punishments in prison can vary widely, some include confiscation of private property, removal from voluntary programming, solitary confinement, and transfer to a different facility (Federal Bureau of Prisons, 2011; Rocheleau, 2014; Sample & Zoukis, n.d.; *The Prison Disciplinary Process*, 2023). These punishments used by the prison administration can lead to disruptive and stress-inducing events for incarcerated individuals. For instance, if an individual is ordered to transfer to a different cell block as their punishment for misconduct, it could disrupt their social life, their sense of security, and could result in damage or loss of their possessions (Liebling, 2011;

Marquart, 1986; Rocheleau, 2015). All these effects can decrease one's sense of control over their life and environment.

Despite the efforts at the facility level to manage misconduct, it still occurs frequently at prison facilities. Tewksbury et al. (2014) found that at the institutional level, prisons deal with thousands of disciplinary infractions annually and these high rates of prison misconduct incur significant costs for the prison facility. Misconduct presents significant threats to facility security and operations. Prisons are in charge of ensuring the safety of all incarcerated individuals and staff, thus, maintaining and optimizing security is often prioritized over other aspects of prison life (Linning et al., 2022). Misconduct that is violent or intimidating can have lasting physical and/or emotional tolls on the individuals involved (Bosma et al., 2020; Randol & Campbell, 2017). Additionally, smooth daily operations are imperative for prisons to effectively manage the needs of incarcerated individuals (Steiner, 2008). To that end, public instances of misconduct could act as an event that de-legitimizes the authority of the staff who are trying to facilitate routine daily operations (Campbell et al., 2020; Steiner, 2008; J. Wooldredge & Steiner, 2016). For example, a large-scale fight during lunch may be a distraction and unwanted use of resources because altercations divert correctional officers' attention from ensuring proper food distribution to focusing on de-escalating the conflict.

High rates of misconduct can have serious financial implications for prison facilities. Prisons are responsible for addressing any immediate damage or injuries that are caused by misconduct (Linning et al., 2022; Lovell & Jemelka, 1996). Moreover, prisons also oversee distributing sanctions as punishment. Many of the

sanctions result in increasing an individual's sense of isolation or amount of authoritative control (Rocheleau, 2014). This ultimately increases the cost the prison spends on providing lodging or staffing for that individual. Proactive methods employed by prison facilities to achieve goals of controlling the frequency and onset of misconduct: like hiring more staff or adding new security measures can be strenuous on the financial resources allotted to prison facilities (Bosma et al., 2020; Clark & Rydberg, 2016; Goetting & Howsen, 1986; Olson, 2016; Rocheleau, 2015; Tewksbury et al., 2014). For administrators, the threat to prison security, operation, and finances establishes some of the incentives to try and maximize the effect of any potential interventions while minimizing the cost needed to enforce.

History of Misconduct Research

Historically there have been three general phases in misconduct research (J. Wooldredge, 2020). The first phase of prison research (1930's to mid-1960's) was focused on identifying the formation of culture within the prison, as well as how the prison culture what specifically about this culture encouraged individuals to participate in misconduct (Ellis, 2023b; J. Wooldredge, 2020). Prior to this, little to no interest was given to the internal operations of prisons, especially in what incarcerated individuals were doing while serving their sentences (Mears, 2008). Articulated by Sykes' *A Society of Captives* (1958), deprivation theory was a major conception during the early time of prison literature. Deprivation theory posits that the prison environment deprives incarcerated individuals which creates the five pains of imprisonment: deprivation of autonomy, goods and services, heterosexual

relationships, liberty, and security (Crewe et al., 2017; Rocheleau, 2013). Committing misconduct is a way for incarcerated individuals to regain access to these 5 categories of liberties (Sykes, 1958). For example, incarcerated individuals who lack or are deprived of certain material goods through facility restrictions may try to bring those goods into prison as contraband. This is a way they could regain some control and independence by satisfying their needs.

The second phase of prison research (mid 1960's to mid-1970's) happened during a volatile time in prison history coupled with increased riots that brought attention to the prisoner rights movement. Additionally, there was a rising heterogeneity within the prison population that facilitated the evolution of prison racial gangs. Research at this time tends to look past the culture of prison and instead focus on individual-level differences that would lead to increased violence and rates of misconduct in prisons. The leading critical theory spearheading this change of focus in prison research was importation theory, established by Irwin & Cressey (1962), which states that all people in prison import personal characteristics or knowledge that determine how they act around others in prison. With importation theory in mind, an incarcerated individual will commit misconduct because it matches a personal trait, goal, value, or culture that they acquired outside of prison (i.e., easy to aggression, confrontational tendencies, group loyalty, ideologies of sacrificing self for group[leader]). To put it another way, engaging in misconduct is how an individual would import personal traits or values with them into prison.

The third phase of prison research (mid-1970s to late-2010's), identified by Wooldredge (2020) has various shifts in carceral politics and philosophies. At the end

of the 1970's there was a shift towards a more managerial carceral state. This aligned with the War on Drugs and the "Tough on Crime" movement that affected the larger criminal-legal system. The crime control model is one of the main models of the criminal justice system, it emphasizes reducing the rights of the offenders for the sake of public safety. (Findley, 2008). Feeley & Simon, (1992) acclaimed that this shift presented itself in prison as the "New Penology". At this time Prison practitioners and researchers moved away from medical and rehabilitation models towards higher control and aggregate risk analysis. Incarceration rates began to dramatically increase, and prison facilities started to get overcrowded with heightened levels of heterogeneity during this period of prison research. Furthermore, researchers around this time not only shifted their focus toward an analysis of management styles and their effect on violence in prison (Blomberg & Cohen, 2003; Feeley & Simon, 1992) but also on how the changing makeup of the prison population increases aggregate rates of prison violence, through increased street gang presence and changes in prison population size (Gaes et al., 2002; Skarbek, 2014; Tostlebe & Pyrooz, 2022; J. Wooldredge & Steiner, 2009).

While there is still a faction of prison research that follows a managerial and risk analysis lens, by contrast, a divergence arose in a more contemporary collaborative movement calling to bring back humanistic and rehabilitative frameworks to prison research (Celinzka & Sung, 2014; Owen & Bloom, 1995; Pollock, 2002; Reidy et al., 2017; Toman, 2017). To give an illustration, some research connected misconduct trends to feminist and intersectional frameworks (Celinzka & Sung, 2014; Reidy et al., 2017), and other research studied longitudinal

patterns in misconduct (Linning et al., 2022). Importantly, rehabilitative research has sometimes been met by administrative barriers to accessing adequate information on incarcerated individuals. This is because the data that is collected at facilities is limited by the prison's data-collecting quality and scope. However, if the researcher is interested in getting self-report data, there are still a lot of steps and potential roadblocks that need to be completed before a researcher can start getting access to that (Ellis, 2023b).

Trends in Misconduct Research

A large portion of misconduct scholarship tried to identify characteristics of the individuals, the environment, or the situations that could be connected back to differing rates of misconduct. This style of research structure is designed for risk analysis so that prisons will be able to establish a framework of who and when incarcerated individuals are most likely to engage in misconduct. This allows the prison to identify where to administer interventions in hopes of preventing most offending behavior or to classify individuals by their risk level.

Some studies identify characteristics that lead to higher chances of engaging in misconduct. This information could inform correctional risk analysis programs or managerial practices (Celinzka & Sung, 2014; Jiang & Fisher-Giorlando, 2002; Quick et al., 2023). That said, there is a consensus on the general characteristics related to misconduct. Specifically, characteristics such as age, ethnicity, gender, and criminal history are some of the most common measures that are included in studies on individuals who engage in misconduct (Bosma et al., 2020; Bottoms, 1999; Cihan

& Sorensen, 2019; Rocheleau, 2013, 2014; Steiner et al., 2014a; J. Wooldredge, 1991). Based on the results of these characteristic studies, a young black man with low levels of educational attainment would match the profile of the individual most likely to engage in misconduct (Cihan & Sorensen, 2019; Quick et al., 2023; Rocheleau, 2013; Steiner et al., 2014a; Tewksbury et al., 2014). In many of the empirical analyses that identify the characteristics of individuals participating in misconduct, there is not much time dedicated to explaining why these trends are present, just that is what is seen with the data. However, misconduct is often considered to be theoretically similar to criminal activity (Blevins et al., 2010). Therefore, some of the explanations for the trends that are seen within misconduct participation would also exist outside of prison.

Research has found significant and consistent patterns in misconduct engagement: On average, certain minority groups, namely individuals who are Black, Hispanic, and Native American, show disproportionate engagement in overall rates of misconduct as well as rates of violent misconduct (Bell, 2017; Berg & DeLisi, 2006; Gaes et al., 2002; Harer & Steffensmeier, 1996; Steiner et al., 2014a). Gender is another significant predictor of engagement in misconduct. Studies show that there are gender-based differences in the patterns of engagement in misconduct (Berg & DeLisi, 2006; Celinzska & Sung, 2014; Craddock, 1996; Gover et al., 2008; Reidy et al., 2017; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2009). Provided that, males are more likely to commit misconduct in general compared to females (Celinzska & Sung, 2014; Reidy et al., 2017). Nonetheless, when females do engage in misconduct, they do not have as many violent or serious infractions compared to their male counterparts (Berg &

DeLisi, 2006; Celinzska & Sung, 2014; Craddock, 1996; Reidy et al., 2017). Notably, age has been a leading predictive characteristic seen to have a consistent positive relationship with misconduct engagement across numerous studies (Steiner et al., 2014). Prior literature has found that younger people are considerably more likely to commit misconduct (Cihan & Sorensen, 2019; Linning et al., 2022; Steiner et al., 2014). With that in mind, the age crime curve (Sampson & Laub, 1992) that visualizes offending behavior peaking for younger adults with a gradual decline with age would also apply to trends in misconduct.

Some research on prison misconduct focuses exclusively on identifying individual motivations for such behavior, while other studies seek to understand the underlying reasons for misconduct regardless of personal characteristics. Known reasons for engagement in misconduct often come from qualitative research exploring individual adjustment and coping mechanisms within the prison (Leban et al., 2016; Rocheleau, 2015). This information also could impact correctional policy by providing information about what incarcerated individuals are attributing their misconduct behavior to. Therefore, the prisons would be able to identify what areas of their facilities contribute directly to that and could begin to establish informed improvements.

Significantly, misconduct can have benefits that can help individuals adapt to the harsh conditions in prison. Engaging in misconduct could be a way to advance an individual's status and power in prison. For example, someone might want to showcase their physical dominance to gain respect in prison. Therefore, they would

start a fight to showcase their physical abilities (Rocheleau, 2015). Additionally, an incarcerated individual could leverage access to goods or services in prison to receive some sort of payment or trade that benefits them (Rocheleau, 2013). Nonetheless, there are other reasons to engage in misconduct rather than the benefits that one could get. Individuals may engage in misconduct due to a lack of understanding of the complex social system and power dynamics within a prison environment or if they are unable to avoid a problematic interaction with another incarcerated individual or a staff member. Above all, misconduct could be a sign of emotional distress, and one could be lashing out because they are feeling out of control or as a way of expressing their emotions (Blevins et al., 2010; Morris et al., 2012).

However, these study results do not get much attention because many prisons still operate within a risk analysis framework designed to manage the incarcerated population (Feeley & Simon, 1992). Therefore, prisons with risk management perspectives would be more interested in research that identifies individuals and circumstances that increase the likelihood of misconduct. Prison facilities are not only in charge of the operation of prison facilities but also in which researchers are allowed access to their facilities (Ellis, 2023b). Given this, researchers who proposed studies that could pinpoint the reasoning for misconduct would be prioritized due to the alignment with the prison administration's research and system of operation, resulting in the dominating research framework of risk analysis research discourse.

Limitations of Misconduct Research

A significant limitation of misconduct literature is that it is really difficult to identify the true rates of misconduct. Like with crime, most of what is known about

the rates of misconduct is only the misconduct that is caught and also being reported. Furthermore, with write-ups as one of the most common ways for researchers to evaluate misconduct, this speaks not only to the rate of known misconduct, but to the misconduct someone is getting caught/blamed for. Correctional officers are in charge of the day to day operation of prison, and therefore are given a lot of discretion with how they choose to be an authority. Researchers have posed ethical concerns and questions about this in the past (Campbell et al., 2020; McCorkle et al., 1995; Olson, 2016). However, this undoubtedly could introduce some bias in the information that can be gathered with this type of data. Moreover, most of the research on misconduct is very segmented, focusing on one or two more aspects of what could cause misconduct at a time. Furthermore, a lot of the analyses studying misconduct prioritize the methods and findings of their paper and therefore have very small, general comments for the front end of their papers where they would discuss prior literature and theories (Berg & DeLisi, 2006; Harer & Steffensmeier, 1996; J. Wooldredge & Steiner, 2009; Worrall & Morris, 2011). While there has been extensive amounts of research analyzing misconduct in prison, there have only been a few theories generated specifically about prison misconduct.

Education

Education in Prison

Education fosters personal growth, enhances individual well-being, and benefits society. Researchers laud education as having the ability to assist individuals with personal development, enhancing critical thinking skills, and gain a sense of

cultural awareness (Baranger et al., 2018; Clark & Rydberg, 2016; L. Davis et al., 2014; Kaiser et al., 2024; Messemer, 2011). To that end, education has been speculated to provide the cognitive and moral development that is central to changing offending behavior (Bozick et al., 2018). Furthermore, higher levels of educational attainment are strongly associated with increased employment prospects (L. Davis et al., 2014; Pompoco et al., 2017; Rothes et al., 2017). Increased employment prospects are important for an individual's socioeconomic standing and ability to support themselves. Education level and low socioeconomic standing are both predictors of offending behaviors (Courtney, 2018; Curtis, 2013). Therefore, it is speculated that education could be a significant intervention in reducing an individual's future offending behavior (Bosma et al., 2020). Prison is one place where offending behavior and access to education could intersect. Incarcerated individuals are impacted by the benefits of education just as much as an individual who is not incarcerated. However, there are additional benefits to educational programming that are more specific to the prison context. Certain educational programs could be a place of gathering for like-minded individuals and education could be seen as an environment that removes an individual away from troubling social situations (Manger et al., 2013; Szifris et al., 2018). Educational programming takes up time and could be a relief to boredom and the monotony of the prison routine (Crittenden & Koons-Witt, 2017; Manger et al., 2013; C. Rose, 2004; Szifris et al., 2018). Furthermore, there are certain incentives that the prison administration offers incarcerated individuals to encourage pro-social behavior like participation in

educational programming (i.e. good time credits, access to goods and services) (Austin, 2017; L. Davis, 2019; Manger et al., 2013).

There is strong evidence that incarcerated individuals are disproportionately likely to have lower levels of educational attainment compared to the general population (Chlup, 2005; L. Davis et al., 2014; Harlow, 2003). Additionally, the incarcerated population has a large number of individuals who are considered functionally illiterate compared to the counterpart population outside of prison (Chlup, 2005; Dunwoody, 2017; Harlow, 2003; Kaiser et al., 2024; Messemer, 2011; Robinson, 2018; Western, 2006). Thus, the prison population is composed of individuals who have expressed previous offending behavior as well as a large concentration of individuals with low levels of educational attainment. Therefore, the resource of studying correctional education presents a valuable opportunity for researchers to test the effect of increasing education on offending behavior directly. Misconduct is often seen as a useful proxy for offending behavior outside of prison (Clark & Rydberg, 2016; Trulson et al., 2011) as misconduct presents empirical similarities to criminal behavior. Studying how prison education impacts the institutional level of misconduct could have empirically valuable results. If education is found to alleviate misconduct's strain on institutional resources, it would also endorse education as being a significant intervention available for prisons.

Prisons have been offering educational courses in America since the late 1700s (Flores, 2021; Messemer, 2011). During this time, education offered in prison was focused solely on improving literacy for religious reasons. By increasing the literacy of the incarcerated population, they could read the Bible and repent for their

sins (L. Davis et al., 2014; Messemer, 2011). After prison factories became more prominent, vocational education replaced literacy programs incarcerated individuals could learn practical trade skills for their eventual release. Moreover, the prison could also exploit the incarcerated population for cheap labor while they are incarcerated if they had the skills to produce goods and work for the prison (L. Davis et al., 2014; Lahm, 2009; Messemer, 2011). Prison education has continued to shift with the ideologies of the prison administration. When the prison administration focuses more on rehabilitation, education gets more funding and attention. On the other hand, when the prison administration focuses more on retribution and punishment, education is de-funded in favor of measures of security and control (Bozick et al., 2018; L. Davis et al., 2014; Messemer, 2011). In 1974, a report evaluating rehabilitative initiatives in prisons claimed that “Nothing Works” (Lipton et al., 1975). This report almost single-handedly changed the entire public opinion on rehabilitation efforts within the prison. Despite this not being the intended purpose of the report, it ushered in a new carceral era with a focus on crime control and risk management. Prison administrators and staff started to become highly skeptical of education and other rehabilitation efforts (L. Davis et al., 2014). The continued efforts of scholars calling for improved rehabilitation initiatives in prison struggled to directly affect prison policies despite significant results with improved methodological rigor (Wilson et al., 2000)

More current analyses of prison educational capabilities estimate that just under 90 percent of correctional facilities offer some sort of educational programming (Coley & Barton, 2006; L. Davis et al., 2014; Staphan, 2008). There are three types of programming commonly considered to be educational in prisons; adult basic

education, secondary education, and post-secondary education (Bozick et al., 2018; Clark & Rydberg, 2016; Courtney, 2018; L. M. Davis et al., 2013; Pompoco et al., 2017). That said, prison facilities operate on different budgets and resources concerning staffing or materials that can be utilized in programs (Ewert & Wildhagen, 2011; Klein et al., 2004). Things like funding, instructors, and capacity all play a major function in educational programs. Notably, correctional educational courses are often not standardized. Thus, there is no way to ensure that all education programs across different facilities are providing equal opportunities or course quality (Coley & Barton, 2006; L. M. Davis et al., 2013; Kaiser et al., 2024; Pompoco et al., 2017; C. Rose, 2004). Even within the three main types of educational programming, there can be significant variations in quality or accessibility between different prison facilities (Coley & Barton, 2006; L. M. Davis et al., 2013; Kaiser et al., 2024; Pompoco et al., 2017; C. Rose, 2004).

Trends in Prison Education Research

A significant portion of scholarship on prison education assesses how educational participation changes individuals' involvement in offending behaviors, specifically with post-release recidivism. However, a significant limitation of this body of research is that a majority of studies that directly analyze evaluating educational programming on post-release behavior lack methodological rigor. Moreover, studies often have issues with generalizability with their analysis because of small sample sizes and restrictions of program permeability across facility locations (Bozick et al., 2018). Comprehensive meta-analyses were conducted using

the Maryland Scientific Methods Scale to organize the multitude of analyses into more comprehensible results by ensuring that the research with the highest levels of methodological rigor is prioritized (Bozick et al., 2018; L. M. Davis et al., 2013; Wilson et al., 2000). Most notably, Davis et al. (2014) conclude that in the most rigorous studies, individuals who participated in educational programming have 43% lower odds of recidivating than individuals who did not participate.

A majority of the extant literature has focused solely on how education affects post-incarceration factors. However, there is an extensive gap between what is understood about the empirical value of correctional education and the effect of education on individual behavior within prison. There is a small but growing scholarship dedicated to evaluating educational programming for in-prison conditions like misconduct (Clark & Rydberg, 2016; Courtney, 2018; Lahm, 2009; Pompoco et al., 2017). Most of these analyses show that education does have a negative relationship with future engagement in misconduct. However, since there are so few studies included in this scholarship inconsistent findings cannot be ignored. It was also seen that educational level leads to varying effects on misconduct. Most of these studies highlight the need for prison educational research to become more comprehensive and to be able to expand the understanding of how education interacts with the prison context.

Most empirical data that has been collected on education in prison focuses on the effectiveness of educational programming, mostly concerning recidivism or other post-release outcomes (Bozick et al., 2018; Clark & Rydberg, 2016; L. Davis et al., 2014; L. M. Davis et al., 2013; Duwe, 2017; Duwe & Clark, 2014; Esperian, 2010;

Knepper, 1990; K. Rose & Rose, 2014). While these results do provide valuable information that could be used to establish more informed prison policy, these empirical analyses often are not designed to provide information on predictors of educational programming participation in the first place (Kaiser et al., 2024; C. Rose, 2004). Empirical analyses assessing educational programming often have access to the demographic information of the individuals in their study, but very few of the studies mention the demographic characteristics of the participants in their analysis (Courtney, 2018; Lahm, 2009). Instead, they are utilized only to construct matching controls for the treatment and control groups (Clark & Rydberg, 2016; Pompoco et al., 2017).

The simplest reason for this lack of discussion about the individuals who participate in educational programming is that this information would not assist in the evaluation process. Educational programming participation is most often voluntary act within the prison, in addition has long wait times, limited occupancy, and often require individuals to meet certain qualifications. Therefore, the subsection of the population attending educational courses has a selection bias (Bozick et al., 2018; L. M. Davis et al., 2013; Pompoco et al., 2017). With that in mind, some researchers might disregard further exploration into this group of individuals because the population is not random. However, being able to contribute to identifying valuable predictive characteristics of this group would still provide valuable empirical information for future prison research. What can be gleaned from the extant literature on the population of people who participate in prison education is extremely limited. Knepper (1990) showed that age, race, gender, and prior conviction were all

significant predictors of participation in prison educational programming. Additionally, this analysis identified different patterns of participation at the different levels of educational programming. White, male, slightly older incarcerated individuals with no prior convictions were most likely to be in post-secondary educational programs. In contrast, Black people and females made up larger portions of secondary and primary educational programs.

Limited additional contextual information on educational participation trends of incarcerated individuals can be derived from population statistics on educational attainment (Coley & Barton, 2006; L. M. Davis et al., 2013; Haigler et al., 1994; Lawrence et al., 2002). Prior literature has found Black individuals are most likely to have the lowest levels of educational attainment upon admission to prison (Coley & Barton, 2006; L. M. Davis et al., 2013; Haigler et al., 1994; Lawrence et al., 2002). Prison demographics show that young Black men without a high school degree are incarcerated at disproportionately high rates (Haigler et al., 1994; Lawrence et al., 2002; Pompoco et al., 2017). One out of every three Black men without a high school education is incarcerated (Lerman, 2013; Olson, 2016). Furthermore, gender is also a significant predictor of educational participation outside of prison. Women make up larger proportions of the population of higher educational institutions (Fry, 2023). However, incarcerated women often face high rates of mental illness, drug addiction disorder, and histories of victimization and exploitation. Therefore, they are disproportionately likely to have very low levels of educational attainment (Celinzska & Sung, 2014; C. Rose, 2004; K. Rose & Rose, 2014). This information suggests that incarcerated women are likely to have conflicting programming that may interfere

with their ability to participate in educational programming. Age does not appear to have a consistent effect on educational participation in the available discourse (Chisholm, 2004; Tuijnman & Boudard, 2001).

Limitations of Prison Education Research

Although education in prison has existed for over a century, there is limited information on who is participating in educational programming, and the evolution of prison. Gathering predictive characteristics relies on compiling different sources of proxy information that are supposed to inform on the characteristics of participants. Studies evaluating education had access to the demographic characteristics of their samples but often did not discuss this in their analysis (Bozick et al., 2018; L. Davis et al., 2014; Pompoco et al., 2017). Furthermore, prison education research often looks at one program in one prison at a time and is therefore highly segmented. Researchers often have small, localized samples of incarcerated individuals in their data that limit the size and scope of their results. This specifically impacts the effort to piece together information on predictors of educational programming participation. Connecting patterns in national trends in educational participation can be difficult when most of the studies are segmented and only focus on certain populations at one time.

Another limitation of this research is that researchers collecting data can only acquire contracts or licenses to conduct research with one specific prison facility or prison system, further limiting the scope of their studies (Berg & DeLisi, 2006; Ellis, 2023a; Harer & Steffensmeier, 1996; Pompoco et al., 2017; Worrall & Morris, 2011). If researchers are not able to access certain prison data needed for research, there are

only a few studies that collect nationally representative prison data that are made publicly available. Moreover, by the time these studies are published and available for use in independent research, they are often outdated and not designed to provide comprehensive information about educational programming in prison (Ewert & Wildhagen, 2011). This also affects the quality and breadth of the data that researchers can use to learn more about the lives and needs of incarcerated individuals. This limitation significantly hampers the ability of researchers to gather current, comprehensive data necessary for understanding and addressing the educational needs of incarcerated individuals effectively.

Studying Misconduct and Education Together

Studying Prison Misconduct and Prison Education as Isolated Processes

How misconduct and educational programming research is conducted is fundamentally different. They have different theoretical framing schemes as well as differences in the critical lens. Misconduct is most often studied under a risk analysis framework the majority of the studies are concerned with identifying patterns of misconduct engagement that can be used to manage the prison population more efficiently. On the other hand, educational programming research is conducted under a rehabilitation framework has at some points aimed to show prison practitioners the value of improving rehabilitative efforts. Furthermore, within educational programming, most of the research is dedicated to assessing post-release outcomes

and does not consider behavior modification during the incarceration period at all (Bozick et al., 2018; L. Davis et al., 2014).

Researches on both misconduct and educational programming are designed to demonstrate the likelihood that educational programming participation alters the likelihood of engaging in misconduct (Clark & Rydberg, 2016; Courtney, 2019; Kiszewski, 2020; Lahm, 2009; Linning et al., 2022; Pompoco et al., 2017). Most studies use a research design that compares the misconduct rates of program educational participants against matching individuals who are not program participants. Often these studies do show a negative relationship between participation in educational programming and engagement in misconduct (Bozick et al., 2018; Courtney, 2019; Kiszewski, 2020; Lahm, 2009; Linning et al., 2022; Pompoco et al., 2017). On the other hand, other studies found a positive relationship between educational programming and engagement in misconduct (Clark & Rydberg, 2016; Jiang & Fisher-Giorlando, 2002). This could be a result of individuals participating in educational programming being held to a higher standard of behavior. Furthermore, they could be given fewer allowances than individuals who are not participating in educational programming (Clark & Rydberg, 2016; Coley & Barton, 2006). Therefore, prison staff would be more likely to report active students for incidents of misconduct when non-students would have been let off with a warning. Even though studies show inconsistencies in behavior-modifying effects across different levels of education, college-level courses do show consistent and the most positive results in reducing rates of misconduct. That said, GED or high school

courses have more inconsistent and/or more modest results for reducing the likelihood of misconduct (Duwe & Clark, 2014; Lahm, 2009; Rothes et al., 2017).

The main purpose of these studies is to assess the ability of educational programs to reduce the rates of future misconduct. There is little to no consideration of the broader context of prison which both education and misconduct exist. Engagement in misconduct and participation in educational programming can and do, interact with each other in ways that could hinder an incarcerated individual's tendency to do the other. This limitation to address the interaction of misconduct and education conceals the complexities of the prison experience and further hides valuable information that cannot be obtained when examining misconduct and education in prison as joint processes.

Limitations of Misconduct and Educational Programming Research

The primary limitation of research examining both educational participation and misconduct is the limited amount of existing scholarship on the topic (Clark & Rydberg, 2016; Courtney, 2019; Lahm, 2009; Pompoco et al., 2017). There are very few analytical studies that have examined misconduct and educational programming together. Therefore, this is still a burgeoning area of analysis and a lot about education and misconduct has not been explored.

Another limitation of this area of research and this analysis is the lack of information about the individuals who were included in these analyses. Some studies include information on the demographic statistics of their sample (Courtney, 2018; Lahm, 2009). However, the limitations of these studies call into question whether this information can be used to generate preliminary predictive characteristics of

educational programming for the overarching prison population. Courtney (2018) only studied males from Arizona and (Lahm, 2009) only looked at 1,054 males from prisons in 3 states in the Midwest. This lack of comprehensive demographic data limits the generalizability of findings and impedes the development of predictive characteristics for educational programming across the broader prison population.

Comparing Characteristics of Misconduct and Educational Programming

There are few studies on any type of prison education that observe the demographic characteristics of participating individuals in educational programming in prison. Due to the lack of demographic information on the participants in educational programming, it is difficult to adequately compare the subpopulation of education seekers to the subpopulation of people who engage in misconduct. Then again, some general trends in educational attainment can be used as supplemental support for what is known about how different characteristics engage in education. Firstly, research has found that lower levels of educational attainment are correlational to a higher likelihood of engaging in misconduct (Steiner et al., 2014). Yet, there is little to no information on how the level of educational attainment affects an individual's likelihood of being in educational programming while they are incarcerated. Within prison, some states require mandatory participation in programming if an individual has less than a certain grade level (Pompoco et al., 2017). This means that in those states, educational programs may consist of predominantly lower-level educated individuals, some against their wishes. However, including the data on mandatory attendance would not provide accurate information

about the predictive characteristics of the true population of incarcerated individuals who voluntarily participate in educational programming. Notably, research on both misconduct and education indicates that race is a significant explanatory variable. According to some studies, Black people and other minorities, specifically Hispanic and Native Americans were shown to be more likely to engage in misconduct (Berg & DeLisi, 2006; Steiner et al., 2014b). These racial and ethnic groups are also more likely to have low levels of educational attainment at both societal and prison levels (US Census Bureau, 2021).

Implications of Joint Analysis

If prisons only focus on measuring and monitoring recidivism, they will not be able to address the needs/characteristics of educational programs that would make them more desirable or accessible. Prison punishment policies have intentionally, or as a latent effect, discouraged individuals' participation in educational programming. For instance, violations of institutional rules can result in an individual losing their place or eligibility in voluntary and complementary programs in prison, including educational programming (Federal Bureau of Prisons, 2011). Prison administrators with a focus on security may disrupt education participation if the individual is posing a threat to facility safety or operation (Sample & Zoukis, n.d.; *The Prison Disciplinary Process*, 2023). Disruptions in the ability to participate in educational programming and/or changes in facility location could be devastating for an individual's ongoing educational progress. Because most prisons have a strong focus on security management, even minor infractions can have dire consequences for an

individual's program participation. Moreover, individuals who participate in both education and misconduct are a valuable target population for analyses due to their ability to provide further information about how incarcerated individuals distribute into misconduct and educational programming. With that in mind, both engaging in misconduct and participating in educational programming have a theoretical similarity with behaviors outside of prison. Thus, furthering the knowledge and understanding of how education and misconduct interact might provide insight into further analyses looking at the big-picture intersection of education and crime.

Chapter 3: Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Questions

To direct the scope of this study and explore the primary concerns, I have developed the following research questions.

- a. How does the distribution of demographic characteristics change across the different groups of participation in misconduct and educational programming?
- b. How do individuals of each demographic characteristic distribute across the groups of participation in misconduct and educational programming?

Hypotheses

Racial Expectations

Prior literature on prison misconduct shows that Black and Hispanic people are disproportionately more likely to engage in misconduct (Bell, 2017; Berg & DeLisi, 2006; Gaes et al., 2002; Harer & Steffensmeier, 1996; Steiner et al., 2014b). Additionally, education literature states that White people are more likely to obtain higher levels of education than Black and Hispanic people (US Census Bureau, 2021). This results in Black people and Hispanic people being disproportionately more likely to have lower levels of educational attainment. This data supports the argument that Black and Hispanic individuals are more likely to participate in educational programming in prison because there are more programs available for

lower levels of education (L. Davis, 2019). Because of this information, I expect that these racial groups will be disproportionately represented in the groups that engage in misconduct (i.e. the Rule Breakers and the Both groups).

H1₀: White, Black, and Hispanic people are proportionally represented across the four groups

H1_A: Black and Hispanic people will be over-represented in the group of individuals who participate in only misconduct.

H1_B: Black and Hispanic people will be over-represented in the group of individuals who participate only in educational programming

H1_C: Black and Hispanic people will be over-represented in the group of individuals who participate in both misconduct and educational programming.

Gender Expectations

Literature suggests that incarcerated males are more likely to engage in misconduct (Berg & DeLisi, 2006; Celinzska & Sung, 2014; Craddock, 1996; Gover et al., 2008; Reidy et al., 2017; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2009). What's more, general educational literature suggests that women would be more likely to participate in educational programming (Fry, 2023). However, incarcerated women face a lot of social disadvantages that could impede their ability to participate in educational programming (Celinzska & Sung, 2014; Reidy et al., 2017; C. Rose, 2004).

Therefore, I assume that males will make up a disproportionately larger portion of the group of individuals who participate in just misconduct and that females will make up

a disproportionately larger proportion of the group of individuals who participate in both misconduct and educational programming.

H2o: Incarcerated males and females will be proportionally represented across the four groups

H2A: Males will be over-represented in the group of individuals that participate in misconduct

H2B: Females will be over-represented in the group of individuals who participate in both misconduct and educational programming.

Prior Education Attainment Level Expectations

Prior literature on misconduct argues that having a lower level of education is highly likely to increase an individual's risk of engaging in misconduct during incarceration (Celinzka & Sung, 2014; Steiner et al., 2014). The literature on participation in educational programming does not directly establish a connection between educational attainment levels and education. Still, it suggests that individuals who graduated High School are more likely to pursue education in the form of post-secondary education (Markle, 2015). However, there are mitigating and extenuating circumstances that are specific to prison that would change this prediction. As discussed earlier some states have mandatory participation in educational programming (Pompoco et al., 2017) this would change the proportion of individuals with lower levels of education in the group of individuals participating in educational programming. Furthermore, prison administrators prioritize including certain prison

programs due to the urgency and need, therefore, lower-level educational courses are more available in prisons than higher-level educational courses (L. Davis, 2019).

H3₀: Incarcerated individuals with prior education levels of Less Than High School, High School Graduate, Some College, and College Degree or More will be proportionally represented across all four groups.

H3_A: Incarcerated individuals with lower levels of prior educational attainment will be over-represented in the group of individuals who participate in both misconduct and educational programming.

H3_B: Incarcerated individuals with higher levels of prior educational attainment will be over-represented in the group of individuals who participate in neither misconduct nor educational programming.

Age Expectations

Prior literature concludes that age is a significant predictor for engaging in misconduct. younger individuals are more likely to engage in this behavior than older individuals (Cihan & Sorensen, 2019; Linning et al., 2022; Steiner et al., 2014a). That said, there is little to no literature exploring the connection of age for returning to education, for the general or prison population. There is limited evidence that suggests that younger individuals would be more likely to participate in educational programming than older individuals (Markle, 2015).

H4₀: Incarcerated individuals of all age groups will be proportionally represented across all four groups

H4A: Incarcerated individuals in younger age groups will be over-represented in the groups of individuals who participate in misconduct.

H4B: Incarcerated individuals in older age groups will be over-represented in the groups of individuals who participate in neither misconduct nor educational programming.

Chapter 4: Data and Methods

Data and Sample Statistics

The data being examined in this study is the Survey of Prison Inmates (SPI) collected by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) in 2016. The data collection method was a cross-sectional two-stage selection survey conducted by RTI International on behalf of the United States Department of Justice.

The target population for the 2016 SPI was all male and female incarcerated individuals age 18 or older who were held in a state prison or were serving a sentence in federal prison in the United States during 2016. The universe of prison used for the 2016 SPI was based on BJS's 2012 Census of State and Federal Adult Correctional Facilities, which enumerated correctional facilities that held persons sentenced as an adult, including those 17 or younger who were sentenced as an adult. The Census included both confinement and community-based facilities, but it excluded special facilities such as those operated by or holding exclusively for the U.S. military.,

Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the U.S. Marshall Service, and correctional authorities in Indian Country. (Glaze, 2016)

The initial sample size consists of 24,848 individuals. First, I applied the jackknife application to weigh the data to be nationally representative as indicated by BJS in the ICPSR codebook. Individuals who provided missing or incomplete data on the key outcome variables were removed from the sample. Individuals who had not been incarcerated for at least 12 months¹ at the time of their survey being administered were also dropped from my sample. This decision is due to the conditional outcome variable of receiving write-ups in the last 12 months. Therefore, my sample needs to include individuals who have been incarcerated for that length of time to make sure that the respondents had similar levels of exposure to receiving a write-up. Due to the small number of respondents who self-identified as nonbinary or transgender individuals, they were also dropped from the sample². This small population would not provide enough data on predictors for educational programming or misconduct for non-binary and transgender individuals who are incarcerated, and they could not be categorized as male or female within this research. Similarly, the small number of respondents who identified as American Indian and Native Alaskan

¹ I anticipate that people who have been incarcerated for longer than a year at the time of completing their survey will provide significantly more information for my analysis. This is because if they have been incarcerated for longer than a year, they have more of a chance to start behavioral adaptations like education programming which may require a waiting period or take time to affect behavior-making decisions.

² While it could be argued that these populations would also face different and unique structural barriers and personal needs than either cis men or women, the data limitations preclude them from inclusion in this analysis.

or identified as Asian American or Pacific Islander were dropped from the sample.³ The first binary outcome variable of my analysis was if the respondent indicated that they had or had not received a write-up in the 12 months before the administration of the survey. Receiving a write-up will be a proxy variable to understand if an individual has participated in misconduct or not.⁴ Receiving a write-up is commonly used as a proxy variable for misconduct in the prior literature (Steiner et al., 2014b) as it is accessible administrative information. My other binary outcome variable in my analysis was if the respondents indicated that they had or had not participated in a prison-sponsored educational program since admission to their current term of incarceration. For my analysis, I did not look at levels of educational attainment, instead focused on general participation in educational programming within prison.

I created a new categorical outcome variable to indicate all possible participation options based on the two binary outcome variables. If an individual did not engage in misconduct or participate in educational programming, they were placed in the “None” group. If an individual did engage in misconduct but did not participate in educational programming, they were placed in the “Rule Breakers” group. If an individual did not engage in misconduct but did participate in educational programming, they were placed in the “Students” group. If an individual did engage

³ While it is the opinion of this author that research should be conducting analyses on racially diverse samples as to ascertain true population differences, the limitations of the size of these racial categories preclude them from being able to provide valuable information on trends of these individuals.

⁴ The survey does not ask a question determining if an individual has received a write-up since their admission to prison if they had been incarcerated for longer than 12 months at the time of the survey being administered. This will be a limitation of the data because this could lead to miscategorizing individuals who had received a write-up longer than 12 months ago but not in the 12 months leading up to the survey.

in misconduct and participate in educational programming, they were placed in the “Both” groups. These group titles will be used for the remainder of this paper to be clearer about which group of individuals is being discussed. The final analytic sample for this study after initial cleaning and applying the weighting system is 23,317 incarcerated individuals. The estimated population size after applying the weights is 1,329,156 individuals. Furthermore, my desired sample consists of individuals included in the survey who are over the age of 18 and who had a response to both outcome variables in my analysis.

Table 1 outlines the demographic statistics of the final analytic sample: first by the proportion of the sample when it is weighted to be nationally representative, then by the frequency and percent of the raw sample without the weight system applied. The sample distribution of the two outcome variables shows that expectedly, engagement in misconduct is more prevalent than participation in educational programming. By looking at the sample distribution of the joint participation groups; “None”, “Rule Breakers”, “Students”, and “Both”, make up different proportions of the total sample. Those in the “Rule Breaker” group make up the largest proportion of the total sample and those in the “None group” make up the smallest proportion of the total sample. As support for the premise of this analysis, the “Both” group makes up the second largest portion of the total sample. This means that individuals do experience an intersection of misconduct and educational programming to some degree. Moreover, White people make up the largest racial category in the non-weighted sample, but after applying the weights, the largest portion switches to Black people. While it fits in with the extant scholarship that Black people would make up a

substantial portion of this sample, it shows how certain racial groups are disproportionately incarcerated. Furthermore, Black people make up 34.7% of the weighted sample, but according to the 2020 Census, Black people only make up 12.1% of the American population (US Census Bureau, 2021). That said, Hispanic individuals are also over-represented in this sample, with 28.8% compared to 18.7% if the total population.

A vast majority of the respondents in the sample identify as male, this does fit with what was expected from the prior literature. Individuals with less than a high school education make up over half of the entire sample and make up over 60% of the sample that is weighted to be representative of the national prison population. With that in mind, about 8.9% of adults in the United States aged 25 and older have less than a high school education. This indicates that the vast majority of the adult population has attained at least a high school diploma or equivalent (US Census Bureau, 2021). This result provides further support for the claim that individuals who are incarcerated are likely to have lower levels of educational attainment upon admission to prison. When it comes to age, the largest age group within this sample is individuals who are 25-34 years old. Age appears to have more of a gradual distribution within this sample, as compared to the distribution of gender and prior educational attainment. These characteristics all have one dominating type making up a substantially larger portion of the sample than the others.

Table 1: Demographic Statistics			
Variable	Weighted Proportion	Frequency (n) = 23,317	Percent (%)
<i>Misconduct Participation</i>			
No	0.229	4,899	21.01

Yes	0.772	18,418	78.99
Education Participation			
No	0.557	12,882	55.21
Yes	0.443	10,435	44.75
Joint Participation Group			
None	0.097	1,995	8.56
Rule Breakers	0.460	10,887	46.69
Students	0.132	2,904	12.45
Both	0.311	7,531	32.30
Race Category			
White	0.316	8,265	35.45
Black	0.346	7,275	31.20
Hispanic	0.229	5,136	22.03
2+ Races	0.110	2,641	11.33
Gender			
Male	0.930	17,364	74.47
Female	0.071	5,953	25.53
Prior Education Level			
Less than High School	0.617	13,518	57.98
High School Graduate	0.228	5,432	23.30
Some College	0.115	3,130	13.42
College Degree or More	0.040	1,237	5.31
Age [Categorical]			
18 - 24	0.096	2,211	9.48
25 - 34	0.318	7,360	31.56
35 - 44	0.273	6,509	27.92
45 - 54	0.187	4,521	19.39
55 - 64	0.095	2,098	9.00
65+	0.03	618	2.65

Analysis

In this analysis, weighted crosstabs of the categorical outcome variable against all of the categorical demographic variables of interest were utilized. This will allow me to visualize the demographic composition of each joint participation group. Furthermore, I will be able to see information on how each demographic characteristic is distributed by group participation. I also conducted weighted crosstabs of the demographic characteristics against the categorical outcome variable

which would allow me to determine how each characteristic internally distributes across the groups. The Chi-square test is a statistical method used to determine if there is a significant association between two categorical variables. In the statistical software package Stata, the Chi-square test is automatically included as part of the function when conducting a weighted crosstab analysis. With each weighted crosstab, Stata returns the uncorrected Pearson Chi-square statistic, which includes the degrees of freedom, the Chi-square value, and the p-value. The p-value indicates the probability of observing the test statistic (or one more extreme) if the null hypothesis were true, meaning there is no association between the categorical variables.

The results of this analysis should speak to the proportional differences in participation compared to the total sample but also what might be prompting the disparities. Moreover, the inclusion of the “None” group and the “Both” group helps to narrow down the direction of the association. This is because it is possible to see if the trend of over-representation continues into the “Both” group or “None” group and what that says about the direction of the intersection with the other concept. For example, a disproportional over-representation in the “Students” and “Both groups would suggest a stronger positive association with educational programming, that is because of the over-representation of “Both” group, where individuals are also engaging in misconduct, rather than the “Rule Breaker” group. Conversely, a disproportional over-representation in the “Rule Breakers” and “None” groups would indicate that there is a negative association with education. This is because the two groups including educational participation are under-represented. To understand when there would a positive or negative association with misconduct the logic of

these arguments would be mirrored but fit to explain misconduct. The results of the Chi-square tests were interpreted to determine if there were statistically significant associations between the categorical variables. A p-value less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant. Any significant associations were further explored and discussed in the Results and Discussion sections.

The purpose of this analysis is to demonstrate the demographic characteristics that can be predictors of joint participation in misconduct and educational programming in prison. This analysis will add to the understanding of the complexity of the prison experience that much of the prior literature is unable to explore. Notably, the descriptive statistics show that over 30% of my sample, as well as the estimated nationally representative prison population, participate in both misconduct and educational programming. Yet there is little to no information about who makes up this third of the prison population. Furthermore, analyzing this considerably sized group of individuals separately from those who participate in just misconduct or just educational programming could reveal true trends that have been obscured because of their inclusion in prior analyses. This analysis will contribute to the large gap in understanding about who are the individuals who are likely to participate in the different possible combinations of misconduct and educational programming. This will establish a foundation for future research to explore more about this significant portion of the prison population. Moreover, individuals participating in both misconduct and educational programming might be a valuable target population for interventions as they are the people engaging in both behaviors. With the limited information, the prison administration might not consider alternative options of

policies that would address this subgroup within the prison population. I hope to use this analysis to contribute to the gap in the literature about what is known about incarcerated individuals who participate in educational programming. Furthermore, my analysis will be one of the first to provide a current nationally representative understanding of what predictive characteristics exist for educational participation.

Chapter 5: Findings

In this analysis I look at the distribution of each category of the explanatory variables of: race, gender, Prior Educational Attainment, and Age within the four different possible participation groups. This will provide information on the demographic breakdown within each group. By using this analysis framework, it is possible to determine if a group has a disproportionate number of individuals with a certain demographic characteristic. It is expected that the proportion of individuals in the joint participation group who possess a certain characteristic should be representative of the proportion of individuals who have that characteristic in the whole sample. For example, the proportion of incarcerated females in the “Rule Breaker” group should be representative of the proportion of females in the entire sample. If the group proportion is substantively different from the expected sample proportion that means that there is a disproportionate number of individuals with that characteristic in that group. Within this analysis, I also look at how respondents who have a certain demographic characteristic are distributed among the different joint participation groups. This will provide information on the group breakdown within each characteristic. It is then possible to determine if individuals with certain characteristics are disproportionally distributed into certain groups. Similarly, I will compare group proportions within each characteristic to the proportion of individuals in that group of the entire sample.

Race

My first hypothesis was focused on racial representation within the joint analysis of misconduct and education participation. Based on the available literature, H1_A, H1_B, and H1_C predicted that Black and Hispanic people would be overrepresented in the “Rule breaker”, “Both”, and “Student” groups respectively. Thus, if Black and Hispanic people are expected to be over-represented in three of the four possible groups of participation, White people would inherently be over-represented in the “None” group. Table 2 shows the racial distribution across the different groups. Black people are seen to be substantively under-represented in the “Rule Breaker” group, which is directly contrary to what was predicted in H1_A. Furthermore, Black people are substantively over-represented in the “Student” group and moderately over-represented in the “Both” group. These findings are direct evidence supporting part of H1_B and the H1_C estimating that Black and Hispanic people will be over-represented in the “Student” and “Both” groups. However, as seen in Table 2, there are no substantive changes in representation for Hispanic people throughout all groups of participation. Table 2 is evidence that Black people are disproportionately represented in educational programming. Furthermore, Black people who engage in misconduct also are more likely to be participating in educational programming, thus, the over-representation of Black individuals in the “Both” group rather than the “Rule Breaker” group. This could be due to incarcerated Black people being likely to have lower levels of educational attainment compared to the general population (Coley & Barton, 2006; Ewert & Wildhagen, 2011; US Census Bureau, 2021). This is supported by Table A-1 showing the distribution of prior

educational attainment by racial category. Black people make up the largest proportion of people in the sample who have Less than a High School Education, but for people with prior education in High School and Some College Black People do not make up the largest proportion. Therefore, in prison where available educational programming is concentrated in the lower-level courses, Black people would be able to access more educational programming fitting their level of education. However, this would not explain how there are no changes in representation for Hispanic individuals, who are also more likely to have lower levels of education according to the literature (Coley & Barton, 2006; Ewert & Wildhagen, 2011; US Census Bureau, 2021).

In contrast, White people are substantively over-represented in the “Rule Breaker” group. This result is counter to H1_A which predicts that Black and Hispanic people will be the racial groups that are over-represented in the “Rule Breaker” group. The shape of the distribution also shows that White people are less likely to participate in educational programming, as White people are under-represented in the “Student” and “Both” groups. This could explain why White people make up such a large proportion of the “Rule Breaker” group compared to the other high misconduct races. White people are disproportionately less likely to be in groups with educational programming which forces more White people to be in the “Rule Breaker” group because it does not include educational programming. This seems to be the result of broader population education trends. White people are more likely to have higher

prior educational attainment than people in other racial categories⁵ (US Census Bureau, 2021). Therefore, when White people are incarcerated, fewer educational programs can accommodate White individuals with higher levels of education because most of the funding and resources go toward providing basic education as that is more requisite.

While this analysis shows unexpected results, the chi-square value that was produced was 427.967 the corresponding p-value is 0.000. The p-value shows that there is a very low probability of observing this chi-square value (or one more extreme) if the null hypothesis were true. This indicates that there is a statistically significant association between the categorical variables of race and joint participation in misconduct and educational programming. The results of the chi-square analysis and the substantive differences that can be seen in Table 2 are efficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis that individuals of different races will be proportionally represented across all joint participation groups.

Table 2: Racial Distribution within Groups

	White	Black	Hispanic	2+ Races	Total
None	0.355	0.354	0.177	0.114	1.000
Rule Breaker	0.366	0.298	0.226	0.110	1.000
Students	0.243	0.432	0.216	0.109	1.000
Both	0.260	0.377	0.254	0.109	1.000
Sample	0.316	0.346	0.229	0.110	1.000

⁵ This is supported in Table A-1, which shows that White people do have larger proportions of individuals that were incarcerated with some college or a college or more as prior education than other racial groups

Gender

Hypothesis 2 focuses on gender representation within misconduct and educational participation. It is expected that males will be over-represented in the “Rule Breaker” group (H2_A), and that females will be over-represented in the “Both” group (H2_B). Table 3 shows the gender distribution within groups. There appear to be no substantive changes in representation for males throughout all groups of participation. Since males make up over 90% of the sample, it makes sense that the group proportions of the total sample and the males of the sample are similar. With females in the sample, there are some more moderate differences in the distribution across the groups, but nothing is substantively different from the proportion women make up of the total population. Table 3 shows that females are slightly under-represented in the “Students” and “None” groups. This indicates that women are disproportionately less likely to be participating in nothing during incarceration.

The chi-square value that was produced was 74.781 the corresponding p-value is 0.000. The p-value shows a very low probability of observing this chi-square value (or one more extreme) if the null hypothesis were true. This indicates a statistically significant association between the categorical variables of gender and joint participation in misconduct and educational programming. The results of the chi-square analysis are evidence to reject the null hypothesis that individuals of different genders will be proportionally represented across all joint participation groups. However, Table 3 shows no indication of a substantive difference between the group proportions and the sample proportions. Because my analysis has a very large sample size, even small differences between categories can be determined to be statistically

significant. The chi-square test could determine these small differences to be significant, but they may not be substantively meaningful. Therefore, this analysis does not show efficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis that individuals of different genders will be proportionally represented across all joint participation groups.

Table 3: Gender Distribution within Groups

	Male	Female	Total
None	0.966	0.034	1.000
Rule Breakers	0.922	0.078	1.000
Students	0.946	0.054	1.000
Both	0.923	0.077	1.000
Sample	0.930	0.071	1.000

Prior Educational Attainment

Hypothesis 3 focused on prior educational attainment level representation within misconduct and educational participation. With the limited available literature, individuals with lower levels of prior educational attainment will be over-represented in the “Both” group (H4_A), and individuals with higher levels of prior educational attainment will be over-represented in the “None” group (H4_B). Table 4 shows how the sample is distributed by prior educational attainment level within the groups. Based on the distribution within groups, it appears that people who were incarcerated with “less than a High School Education” are over-represented in the “Student” and “Both” groups, this does support H4_A. What’s more, Table 5 shows that all levels of prior educational attainment above Less than High School are slightly to substantively over-represented in the “None” group. With individuals at the High School Graduate level being the most over-represented, each prior educational

attainment level higher shows exponentially more modest representation. This does show evidence in support of H4_B.

The chi-square value that was produced was 1293.403 the corresponding p-value is 0.000. The p-value shows that there is a very low probability of observing this chi-square value (or one more extreme) if the null hypothesis were true. This indicates that there is a statistically significant association between the categorical variables of prior educational attainment and joint participation in misconduct and educational programming. The results of the chi-square analysis and the substantive differences that can be seen in Table 4 are efficient evidence to reject the Null hypothesis that individuals with different prior educational attainment levels will be proportionally represented across all joint participation groups.

These results could be impacted by the prison policies that mandate enrollment in educational programming for individuals who do not have certain levels of educational attainment. To account for this potentiality, I ran an individual cross tab for group participation based on education level with just individuals who indicated that they were not required to participate in educational programming as a stipulation in their sentence, as seen in Table 6. Of my sample, 4,367 individuals were required to participate in educational programming and were removed for this ancillary analysis. When compared to the distribution with required educational participation, Table 6 shows that individuals with less than a high school education still are substantially overrepresented in the Students and Both groups. So regardless of mandatory participation individuals with less than a high school education will still be disproportionately more likely to be participating in educational programming.

Table 4: Prior Educational Attainment Distribution within Groups

	Less Than High School	High School Graduate	Some College	College Degree or More	Total
None	0.493	0.325	0.137	0.045	1.000
Rule Breakers	0.520	0.279	0.148	0.053	1.000
Students	0.744	0.156	0.076	0.025	1.000
Both	0.744	0.152	0.076	0.028	1.000
Sample	0.617	0.228	0.115	0.040	1.000

Table 5: Prior Educational Attainment Distribution within Groups With no Educational Programming Requirement

	Less Than High School	High School Graduate	Some College	College Degree or More	Total
None	0.493	0.325	0.137	0.045	1.000
Rule Breakers	0.520	0.279	0.148	0.053	1.000
Students	0.701	0.183	0.088	0.027	1.000
Both	0.686	0.179	0.100	0.036	1.000
Sample	0.577	0.250	0.129	0.045	1.000

Note: The None and the Rule Breakers groups have not changed when individuals with required educational programming are removed from the sample. This is because these groups do not have any educational programming participation in the first place and therefore their numbers and proportions within groups would not change

Age

Hypothesis 4 focused on age representation within misconduct and educational participation. Taking the limited available literature into consideration it is expected that younger individuals will be over-represented in the “Rule Breaker” group (H5A). Additionally, older individuals will be over-represented in the “None” group (H5B). Table 6 shows the distribution of age across the groups. The shape of the distribution of the outcome groups shows that younger individuals are more likely to participate in educational programming and misconduct, which is consistent with both my H5A and H5B hypotheses. The age categories of [18 – 24] and [25 – 34] appear to be similarly distributed across the participation groups. Furthermore, older categories present a different trend, where the individuals are moderately over-represented in the “Student” and “None” groups.

The chi-square value that was produced was 775.679 the corresponding p-value is 0.000. The p-value shows that there is a very low probability of observing this chi-square value (or one more extreme) if the null hypothesis were true. This indicates that there is a statistically significant association between the categorical variables of age and joint participation in misconduct and educational programming. The results of the chi-square analysis and the substantive differences that can be seen in Table 6 are efficient evidence to reject the Null hypothesis that individuals with different prior educational attainment levels will be proportionally represented across all joint participation groups.

Table 6: Age Distribution within Groups

	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Total
None	0.032	0.214	0.272	0.271	0.160	0.052	1.000
Rule Breakers	0.104	0.335	0.266	0.174	0.092	0.029	1.000
Students	0.048	0.258	0.309	0.232	0.116	0.038	1.000
Both	0.126	0.353	0.268	0.161	0.072	0.021	1.000
Sample	0.096	0.318	0.273	0.187	0.095	0.030	1.000

Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusion

Discussion of Findings

Misconduct undoubtedly causes many problems within prison facilities. Therefore, a significant portion of prison research turned toward investigating the characteristics indicative of and the interventions available to use against misconduct. Participation in educational programming in prison has been theorized to have a negative effect on engagement in misconduct. However, the limited available literature on prison educational programming was centered on evaluating the ability of a prison-offered educational program to reduce future instances of misconduct. Rarely does research consider that engaging in misconduct and participation in educational programming are not independent phenomena in prison. Participating in either misconduct or education can change how an individual interacts within the prison environment. Furthermore, participation in one phenomenon can alter an individual's ability to participate in the other. For example, participating in misconduct might result in an individual being banned from attending educational programming as they might pose a risk to the educational environment. Therefore, the resulting lack of educational programming was a decision made by the administration, not the individual. This administrative barrier could have prevented many incarcerated individuals, who would have benefited from education as an intervention, from returning to education.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to utilize a joint analysis framework to expand what is known about the predictive characteristics of individuals who

participate in either, both, or neither misconduct or educational programming. This analysis will provide valuable information about the predictive characteristics of participation. Furthermore, my hope for this analysis was to establish the routine use of joint analyses for research in prison. I utilized the data from the BJS Survey of Prison Inmates from 2016. This analysis yielded several key findings that shed light on what is being obscured when misconduct and education are analyzed as independent events in prison.

My findings, in part, did support the prior literature that based on race and ethnicity there is differential involvement in misconduct and education (Bell, 2017; Berg & DeLisi, 2006; Harer & Steffensmeier, 1996; Steiner et al., 2014b; US Census Bureau, 2021). I did find sufficient evidence to reject the null because substantive differences exist between the group's demographic distribution and the expected proportion of the sample. However, my analysis looked at the intersection of education and misconduct, while others did not. That being said, my analysis did produce some conflicting results compared to the prior literature. I found that Black people are disproportionally distributed into groups that include participation in educational programming and are substantively under-represented in the “Rule Breaker” group. Conversely, White people are seen to be over-represented in the “Rule Breaker” and “None” groups and substantively under-represented in the “Students” group. This is a prime example of why conducting joint analyses and looking deeper into the intersection of misconduct and educational programming is valuable. While it is true that most Black people in my sample still engage in

misconduct.⁶ The incarcerated Black people are seen to be much less likely to be only engaging in misconduct compared to individuals of other racial categories. Instead, Black people make up a larger proportion of people in the “Both” group indicating that a disproportionate amount of Black people engaging in misconduct are also participating in educational programming. In other analyses, these individuals would just be counted as individuals who engaged in misconduct, this subtle difference in misconduct participation would not be visible in analyses that study misconduct as an isolated event.

Similarly, my findings also agree with the prior literature that the characteristics of prior educational attainment and age also lead to differential involvement in misconduct and educational attainment. I did find sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis for both because there were substantive differences in participation in misconduct and educational programming. My findings for prior education matched up with what was expected from the prior literature. I found that individuals who were incarcerated with less than a high school level education make up a disproportionate amount of the individuals in groups that have/are participating in educational programming. Furthermore, every other level of educational attainment in my data was disproportionately under-represented in groups with educational programming. This was the case even when individuals who reported being required to participate in educational programming were not included in the analysis. This aligns with what is known about availability of different educational programs in

⁶ See table Table A-3, which looks at the how individuals within each racial category are distributed by group

prison. My findings for age also did match up with what was expected from prior literature. Younger age groups comprised a larger proportion of individuals involved in misconduct compared to older age groups.

In this analysis, I did not show sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis that males and females will have proportional differences in their group distribution. Males and Females do not show substantive differences in group participation from the expected proportion. However, females make up a considerably small proportion of individuals in the “None” group. Thus, it indicates women are more likely to be involved in prison experiences, even if what they are doing is not always socially accepted; as seen with the high distribution in the “Rule Breaker” group.

By looking at the characteristics that are most overrepresented in each group this could generate a profile of who is most likely to make up that group. These profiles can help visualize which characteristics make up most of each group. From this analysis, I found that Black people, people who have less than a high school education level, younger people, and females are over-represented in “Both”. I chose to include gender in this profile because even though I failed to reject the null hypothesis for not seeing substantive differences from what was expected, the chi-square test did show that gender had a significant association with the categorical participation variable. The significance of this profile lies in its over-representation of groups that are highly likely to experience extreme societal marginalization.

To determine if the individuals of the “Both” group are characteristically different than those in the other groups, which characteristics are over-represented in each group can be compared. Like the “Both” group, the “Students” group is over-

represented with Black people, people with less than a high school education.

Uniquely the “Students” are more likely to be 35 and older as well as male. The over-represented characteristics in the “Rule Breakers” were White people, people with a high school education or more, younger people, and females. With these profiles in mind, we see that there are some characteristic differences for individuals in “Both” compared to the individuals that make up “Students” or “Rule Breakers”. This is further evidence that these distinct groups need to be accounted for in future research so that real trends in participation are not obscured because the analysis tool is not precise.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it is crucial to investigate the intersection of misconduct and educational programming in prison. Misconduct and education are theorized to be antithetical processes, specifically that education reduces the likelihood of future misconduct. Yet, there has been very little research delving deeply into the intersection of misconduct and education. Previous analyses that did not fully account for this intersection have been unable to achieve the depth of understanding required. This study aimed to rectify this crucial flaw in prior literature, by not only establishing a foundation for what is known about the predictive characteristics of misconduct and educational programming but also to encourage further exploration into the interaction between misconduct and educational programming within the prison context.

The individuals in the “Both” group present significant opportunities for prison researchers and practitioners to learn more about participation in prison. The

distribution of individual characteristics across different participation groups may have significant implications in certain discussions. With the identified trends in this analysis, it is important to consider the punishment structure might negatively impact certain groups more than others. As seen with the profiles, the people over-represented in the “Both” possess one or many characteristics likely to experience additional societal marginalization. Therefore, being barred from education, commonly assumed to be a tool for individuals to improve their lives, could keep these individuals in a deeper marginalized identity. The incarcerated population in general already has a heavy concentration of marginalized individuals. Therefore, there should be more careful consideration about what latent discriminatory effects come from prison policies in attempting to manage misconduct how prisons operate now is reducing the chances of a highly supported intervention from being able to reach populations that might need it most. One possible avenue to address this policy issue would be to establish safeguards against disruptions from educational programming. Versions of remote learning could be routinely utilized so that individuals who are physically removed from classroom environments for administrative security reasons could still be able to continue their studies.

Limitations of Study

The data provided by the SPI contributed to the methodological and empirical limitations of this analysis. For example, this survey was not designed with my analysis in mind and therefore lacks some nuance for analysis of this topic. Variables that could provide empirical value to this study were not included in the publicly available version of the data. Variables such as security level and geographic

indicators were not available in this version of the data. Measures of security level speak to an individual's initial ability to participate in misconduct or educational programming. Individuals in higher security levels could be misclassified in their group participation because their housing restrictions could obscure their true behavior patterns. Geographic indicators could provide information on regional differences in prison policies or aggregate rates of misconduct and educational attainment.

Similarly, this data did not allow analysis with a temporal element. There is no information provided about the temporal ordering of events concerning engagement in misconduct and participation in educational programming. This missing element would have suggested changes in behavioral approaches overlapping and interacting. Moreover, the key variables within the data were measured across different time frames. The measure that was used to indicate involvement with misconduct only asked the respondents about the last 12 months. On the other hand, involvement in prison educational programming was recorded since admission for all respondents regardless of how long they had been incarcerated. Because of this crucial difference in the data entry, some individuals in my analysis could have been misclassified as individuals in either the "None" or "Students" Groups if their engagement in misconduct happened over a year ago.

Write-ups may be a common proxy variable to measure rates of misconduct but it is imperfect. Difference between what receiving a write-up indicates and what we are using it to say. Rates of who gets caught, correctional officer bias, little to no establishment of proof because the investigation is followed.

This survey almost exclusively uses self-report data. While this can provide information on how respondents identify themselves, there are plenty of opportunities for error. Respondents are not always the most reliable sources of information, and they may not always provide accurate responses. Error in responses could be intentional, such as lying, or it could be unintentional, such as misremembering events. The Survey of Prison Inmates is a national reoccurring survey that at the time of beginning this paper in 2022 had recently released its most recent rendition of survey data, collected in 2016. There are some concerns with the ability of analyses to speak to current trends when the most recent rendition of the data was administered 8 years prior to the time of this analysis being completed.

Future Avenues of Research

Despite the significant findings of this study, some of the limitations of this analysis established further questions. There are several methodological and empirical limitations in this paper, stemming directly from the data source utilized in the analysis. Thus, further analysis should obtain data that allows for a more robust analysis of the distribution of characteristics across participation trends that do not have the same limitations.

Moreover, future researchers can expand this joint analysis model to explore how other components within the prison affect and interact with misconduct and/or educational programming. To start, it is important to consider that access to education in prison is not equal at all levels. Prisons prioritize putting the most resources into general education courses, where higher-level courses might be offered less regularly and have smaller occupancy sizes. Furthermore, college-level courses often also had a

financial component, unlike other educational programming, that could prevent individuals from participating. Although the Second Chance Pell (SCP) pilot program reinstated Pell Grants for the use of incarcerated individuals in 2015 (Tahamont, Hyatt, et al., 2022), at the time the survey was administered in 2016 there might not have been enough time for this to alter my results. Therefore, further analysis could not only look more into the interaction between misconduct and the different levels of educational attainment. Additionally, how this has changed since the reintroduction of Pell Grants. Subsequently, this analysis does not account for the different levels of exposure that incarcerated individuals would have to engage in misconduct compared to educational programming. Incarcerated individuals experience numerous instances of misconduct over short periods; however, prison educational programs would not have that degree of representation in day-to-day life. Therefore, future analyses could conduct robustness checks controlling for different lengths of time being incarcerated to see how the results might change when levels of exposure are considered.

Given the broader implications of these findings, future research could also explore more aspects of the intersection of misconduct and educational programming beyond individual characteristics. This could include exploring how the temporal order of events changes how and when individuals participate in misconduct or educational programming. In addition, future research could also look at the intersection of other aspects of prison. Misconduct and educational programming are not the only phenomena in prison that have been categorized as independent processes by prior literature when more information could be learned about how they intersect. Prisons are complex environments where incarcerated individuals must

navigate new social interactions and institutional rules. It is time for research to try and understand all the complexities of prison. In that way, incarcerated individuals' existences will not be simplified down to a single behavior.

Broader Implications of Research

The broader implications of this analysis will expand what is known about individuals who engage in misconduct and educational programming in ways that could inform prison policy and practice. This segment of the prison population has been misunderstood and overlooked in previous studies despite its empirical significance. Namely, these individuals could provide more insight into what leads individuals to participate in theoretically opposite behaviors. Additionally, as these individuals participate in both, they might be able to provide more information about why the interventions used are or aren't working. With that in mind, if more prison research were to adopt research methods that incorporate joint analyses that would mean that prison research would get more comprehensive. If prison research established a framework of comprehensive knowledge, then prison policy could be molded to fit it. Prison policies should be able to take into consideration the reality of prison life, and that incarcerated individuals may be engaging in misconduct but can still receive some of the benefits of educational programming. Without considering the frequency of misconduct committed in the facility, providing adequate access to education can have plenty of other societal benefits at the individual and community levels. In that way, policies like the one to remove access to voluntary programming when an individual engages in misconduct could be reworked to still provide the

security needed by the prison administration but not interfere as hard with an incarcerated individual's ability to receive the intervention.

Appendices

Table A-1: Distribution of Prior Educational Attainment within Racial Category

	Less Than High School	High School Graduate	Some College	College Degree or More	Total
White	0.159	0.082	0.053	0.022	0.316
Black	0.234	0.072	0.032	0.008	0.346
Hispanic	0.159	0.046	0.018	0.007	0.229
2+ Races	0.065	0.027	0.013	0.004	0.110
Total	0.617	0.228	0.115	0.040	1.000

Note: The "Total" row indicates the proportions of the racial categories for the total sample. The "Total" column indicates the proportions of the levels of prior educational attainment for the total sample.

Table A-2: Distribution of Sentence Length within the Groups (years)

	0	1 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	80+	Total
None	0.000	0.177	0.149	0.188	0.089	0.030	0.009	0.005	0.001	0.001	0.3516	1
Rule Breakers	0.070	0.409	0.121	0.072	0.024	0.009	0.004	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.2896	1
Students	0.000	0.113	0.149	0.231	0.114	0.032	0.014	0.005	0.003	0.004	0.336	1
Both	0.028	0.326	0.167	0.133	0.048	0.013	0.006	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.2763	1
Sample	0.041	0.322	0.141	0.123	0.049	0.015	0.006	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.2976	1

Note: This Sentence Length variable is derived from two self-report variables. 1.) how long the individual has been incarcerated before the administration of the survey and 2.) the estimated time that the individual has left in their sentence. This introduces errors in the data. This can be seen because I controlled for individuals who were not incarcerated for longer than a year at the beginning of my analysis and yet some individuals on this list have a sentence length of 0 years. Additionally there was a lot of missingness that changed the total sample size.

Table A-3: Group Distribution Within Each Racial Category

	None	Rule Breakers	Students	Both	Total
White	0.109	0.534	0.101	0.257	1.000
Black	0.099	0.397	0.166	0.340	1.000
Hispanic	0.075	0.455	0.124	0.345	1.000
2+ Races	0.100	0.460	0.131	0.308	1.000
Sample	0.097	0.460	0.132	0.311	1.000

Citations

- Austin, J. (2017). Limits of Prison Education Programs: Policy Essays. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 16(2), 563–570.
- Baranger, J., Rousseau, D., Mastroianni, M. E., & Matesanz, J. (2018). Doing Time Wisely: The Social and Personal Benefits of Higher Education in Prison. *The Prison Journal*, 98(4), 490–513. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885518776380>
- Bell, K. E. (2017). Prison Violence and the Intersectionality of Race/Ethnicity and Gender. *Criminology, Criminal Justice, Law & Society*, 18(1), i–121.
- Berg, M., & DeLisi, M. (2006). The Correctional Melting Pot: Race, Ethnicity, Citizenship, and Prison Violence. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34, 631–642. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2006.09.016>
- Blevins, K. R., Johnson Listwan, S., Cullen, F. T., & Lero Jonson, C. (2010). A General Strain Theory of Prison Violence and Misconduct: An Integrated Model of Inmate Behavior. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 26(2), 148–166. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986209359369>
- Blomberg, T. G., & Cohen, S. (2003). *Punishment and Social Control*. Transaction Publishers.
- Bosma, A. Q., C. van Ginneken, E. F. J., Sentse, M., & Palmen, H. (2020). Examining Prisoner Misconduct: A Multilevel Test Using Personal Characteristics, Prison Climate, and Prison Environment. *Crime & Delinquency*, 66(4), 451–484. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128719877347>
- Bottoms, A. E. (1999). Interpersonal Violence and Social Order in Prisons. *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, 26, 205–282.

- Bozick, R., Steele, J. L., Davis, L. M., & Turner, S. (2018). Does Providing Inmates with Education Improve Postrelease Outcomes?: A Meta-Analysis of Correctional Education Programs in the United States. *Journal of Experimental Criminology* [Epub May 2018]. Doi:10.1007/S11292-018-9334-6. https://www.rand.org/pubs/external_publications/EP67650.html
- Campbell, C. M., Labrecque, R. M., Schaefer, R. L., Harvis, M., Zavita, K. R., Reddy, L., & Labranche, K. (2020). Do Perceptions of Legitimacy and Fairness Matter in Prison? Examining How Procedural and Distributive Justice Relate to Misconduct. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 47(12), 1630–1653. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854820916901>
- Celinzka, K., & Sung, H.-E. (2014). Gender Differences in the Determinants of Prison Rule Violation. *The Prison Journal*, 94(2), 220–241. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885514524882>
- Chisholm, L. (2004). *Lifelong learning: Citizens' views in close-up: findings from a dedicated Eurobarometer survey*. <https://www.voced.edu.au/content/ngv%3A23905>
- Chlup, D. (2005). Prison Education. In *The Handbook of Adult and Continuing Education*. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781003447849-27/prison-education-dominique-chlup>
- Cihan, A., & Sorensen, J. R. (2019). Examining Developmental Patterns of Prison Misconduct: An Integrated Model Approach. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 63(14), 2406–2421.

- Clark, K., & Rydberg, J. (2016). The Effect of Institutional educational Programming on Prisoner Misconduct. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 29(4), 325–344.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1478601X.2016.1229770>
- Cochran, J., & Mears, D. (2017). The path of least desistance: Inmate compliance and recidivism. *Justice Quarterly*, 34(3), 431–458.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2016.1168476>
- Coley, R. J., & Barton, P. E. (2006). *Locked Up and Locked Out: An Educational Perspective on the U.S. Prison Population* [Policy Information Report]. Educational testing Service.
- Courtney, J. A. (2018). *The Relationship between Participating in Education Programs and In-Prison Misconduct* [Ph.D., Grand Canyon University].
<https://www.proquest.com/docview/2164836343/abstract/64D15129BDE64C89PQ/1>
- Courtney, J. A. (2019). The Relationship Between Prison Education Programs and Misconduct. *Journal of Correctional Education* (1974-), 70(3), 43–59.
- Craddock, A. (1996). A Comparative Study of Male and Female Prison Misconduct Careers. *The Prison Journal*, 76(1), 60–80.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0032855596076001004>
- Crewe, B., Hulley, S., & Wright, S. (2017). The Gendered Pains of Life Imprisonment. *British Journal of Criminology*, azw088.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azw088>
- Crittenden, C. A., & Koons-Witt, B. A. (2017). Gender and Programming: A Comparison of Program Availability and Participation in U.S. Prisons.

- International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 61(6), 611–644. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X15601432>
- Curtis, A. J. (2013). Tracing the School-to-Prison Pipeline from Zero-Tolerance Policies to Juvenile Justice Dispositions Note. *Georgetown Law Journal*, 102(4), 1251–1278.
- Davis, L. (2019). *Higher Education Programs in Prison: What We Know Now and What We Should Focus On Going Forward*. RAND Corporation. <https://doi.org/10.7249/PE342>
- Davis, L. M., Bozick, R., Steele, J., Saunders, J., & Miles, J. (2013). *Evaluating the Effectiveness of Correctional Education: A Meta-Analysis of Programs That Provide Education to Incarcerated Adults*. Rand Corporation.
- Davis, L., Steele, J., Bozick, R., Williams, M., Turner, S., Miles, J., Saunders, J., & Steinberg, P. (2014). *How Effective Is Correctional Education, and Where Do We Go from Here? The Results of a Comprehensive Evaluation*. RAND Corporation. <https://doi.org/10.7249/RR564>
- Dunwoody, J. (2017). The Adult Literacy Crisis. *Journal of Online Higer Education*, 1(1).
- Duwe, G. (2017). Effectivness of Prison-Based education Programming and the Implications for correctional policy and practice. *Crimnology and Public Policy*, 16(2), 511–514.
- Duwe, G., & Clark, V. (2014). The Effects of Prison-Based Educational Programming on Recidivism and Employment. *The Prison Journal*, 94(4), 454–478. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885514548009>

- Ellis, R. (2023a). In This Place Called Prison: Women's Religious Life in the Shadow of Punishment. In *In This Place Called Prison*. University of California Press. <https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520384552>
- Ellis, R. (2023b). What Do We Mean By a "Hard-to-reach" Population? Legitimacy Versus Precarity as Barriers to Access. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 52(3), 1556–1586. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124121995536>
- Esperian, J. H. (2010). The Effect of Prison Education Programs on Recidivism. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 61(4), 316–334.
- Ewert, S., & Wildhagen, T. (2011). *Educational Characteristics of Prisoners: Data from the ACS* (SEHSD Working Paper 2011–8; pp. 1–32). U.S. Census Bureau. <https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/working-papers/2011/demo/ewert-wildhagen-prisoner-education-4-6-11.pdf>
- Federal Bureau of Prisons. (2011). *Inmate Discipline Program*. https://www.bop.gov/policy/progstat/5270_009.pdf
- Federal Bureau of Prisons. (2016). *Directory of National Programs*.
- Feeley, M. M., & Simon, J. (1992). The New Penology: Notes on the Emerging Strategy of Corrections and Its Implications*. *Criminology*, 30(4), 449–474. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1992.tb01112.x>
- Findley, K. A. (2008). Toward a New Paradigm of Criminal Justice: How the Innocence Movement Merges Crime Control and Due Process Can We Reduce the Amount of Wrongfully Convicted People without Acquitting Too Many Guilty. *Texas Tech Law Review*, 41(1), 133–174.

- Flores, J. (2021). Fromm, Foucault, Garland, and prison education. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 41(2), 231–236. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41297-021-00146-4>
- Fry, R. (2023, December 18). Fewer young men are in college, especially at 4-year schools. *Pew Research Center*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2023/12/18/fewer-young-men-are-in-college-especially-at-4-year-schools/>
- Gaes, G. G., Wallace, S., Gilman, E., Klein-Saffran, J., & Suppa, S. (2002). The Influence of Prison Gang Affiliation on Violence and Other Prison Misconduct. *The Prison Journal*, 82(3), 359–385. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003288550208200304>
- Glaze, L. (2016). *Methodology: Survey of Prison Inmates*, 2016.
- Glazener, E. M. (2021). *Exploring Heterogeneity in Disciplinary Custody Sanctioning and Subsequent Inmate Misconduct*. <http://hdl.handle.net/1903/28404>
- Goetting, A., & Howsen, M. (1986). Correlates of Prisoner Misconduct. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 2(1), 49–65.
- Gover, A., Perez, D., & Jennings, W. (2008). Gender Differences in Factors Contributing to Institutional Misconduct. *The Prison Journal*, 88(3), 378–403. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885508322453>
- Haigler, K., Educational Testing Service, & National Center for Education Statistics (Eds.). (1994). *Literacy behind prison walls: Profiles of the prison population from the National Adult Literacy Survey*. The Center : For sale by the U.S. G.P.O., Supt. of Docs.

- Harer, M., & Steffensmeier, D. (1996). Race and Prison Violence. *Criminology*, 34(3), 323–345.
- Harlow, C. W. (2003). *Education and Correctional Populations* (Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report NCJ-195670). U.S. Department of Justice.
- Innes, C. (1997). Patterns of Misconduct in the Federal Prison System. *Criminal Justice Review*, 22(2), 157–174.
- Irwin, J., & Cressey, D. R. (1962). Thieves, Convicts and the Inmate Culture. *Social Problems*, 10(2), 142–155.
- Jiang, S., & Fisher-Giorlando, M. (2002). Inmate Misconduct: A Test of the Deprivation, Importation, and Situational Models. *The Prison Journal*, 82(3), 335–358. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003288550208200303>
- Kaiser, K., Piquero, A. R., Keena, L., & Howley, C. (2024). Assessing the Institutional Barriers and Individual Motivational Factors to Participation in Prison-Based Programs. *Crime & Delinquency*, 70(3), 870–893. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00111287221114804>
- Kiszewski, D. C. (2020). *Prison Programming and Misconduct: Examining Variations Across Programs and Race/Ethnicity* [M.A., University of Maryland, College Park]. <https://www.proquest.com/pqdtglobal/docview/2496386780/abstract/6DF98D4BC5964D90PQ/1>
- Klein, S., Tolbert, M., Bugarin, R., Cataldi, E. F., & Tauschek, G. (2004). *Assessing the Status of Prison Programs and Information Needs* (ED-99-CO-0160). The U.S. Department of Education. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED543577.pdf>

- Knepper, P. (1990). Selective Participation, Effectiveness, and Prison College Programs. *Journal of Offender Counseling Services Rehabilitation*, 14(2).
https://doi.org/10.1300/J264v14n02_08
- Lahm, K. (2009). Educational Participation and Inmate Misconduct. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 48, 37–52.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10509670802572235>
- Lawrence, S., Mears, D., Dubin, G., & Travis, J. (2002). *The Practice and Promise of Prison Programming* (pp. 1–28). Urban Institute.
- Leban, L., Cardwell, S. M., Copes, H., & Brezina, T. (2016). Adapting to Prison Life: A Qualitative Examination of the Coping Process among Incarcerated Offenders. *Justice Quarterly*, 33(6), 943–969.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2015.1012096>
- Lerman, A. E. (2013). *The Modern Prison Paradox: Politics, Punishment, and Social Community*. Cambridge University Press.
- Liebling, A. (2011). Moral performance, inhuman and degrading treatment and prison pain. *Punishment & Society*, 13(5), 530–550.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474511422159>
- Linning, S., Silver, I., & Papp, J. (2022). Exploring the Correspondence Between General Correctional Programming and Inmate Misconduct Using a Time-Course Framework. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 66(2–3), 209–226.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X21990811>

- Lipton, D., Martinson, R., & Wilks, J. (1975). *The effectiveness of correctional treatment: A survey of treatment evaluation studies*.
<https://cir.nii.ac.jp/crid/1130000797024231296>
- Lovell, D., & Jemelka, R. (1996). When Inmates Misbehave: The Costs of Discipline. *The Prison Journal*, 76(2), 165–179.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0032855596076002004>
- Manger, T., Eikland, O.-J., & Asbjørnsen, A. (2013). Effects of Educational Motives on Prisoners' Participation in Education and Educational Desires. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 19, 245–257.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10610-012-9187-x>
- Markle, G. (2015). Factors Influencing Persistence Among Nontraditional University Students. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 65(3), 267–285.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0741713615583085>
- Marquart, J. W. (1986). Prison Guards and the Use of Physical Coercion as a Mechanism of Prisoner Control. *Criminology*, 24(2), 347–366.
- McCorkle, R., Miethe, T., & Drass, K. (1995). The Roots of Prison Violence: A Test of the Deprivation, Management, and “Not-So-Total” Institution Models. *Crime & Delinquency*, 41(3), 317–331.
- Mears, D. (2008). Accountability, Efficiency, and Effectiveness in Corrections: Shining a Light on the Black Box of Prison Systems. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 7(1), 143–152.

- Messemer, J. E. (2011). The historical practice of correctional education in the united states: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1(17).
- Morris, R. G., Carriaga, M. L., Diamond, B., Piquero, N. L., & Piquero, A. R. (2012). Does prison strain lead to prison misbehavior? An application of general strain theory to inmate misconduct. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 40(3), 194–201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2011.12.001>
- Olson, J. (2016). Race and Punishment in American Prisons. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 758–768. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1093/jopart/muw026>
- Owen, B., & Bloom, B. (1995). Profiling Women Prisoners: Findings from National Surveys and a California Sample. *The Prison Journal*, 75(2), 165–185. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032855595075002003>
- Pollock, J. M. (2002). Women, crime, and prison. *Belmont, CA: Wadsworth*.
- Pompoco, A., Wooldredge, J., Lugo, M., Sullivan, C., & Latessa, E. (2017). Reducing Inmate Misconduct and Prison Returns with Facility education Programs. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 16(2), 515–543. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12290>
- Quick, E., Iselin, A.-M., DeCoster, J., & Fasone, H. (2023). Pre-Prison and Indigenous Predictors of Institutional Misconduct. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 67(1), 105–125. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X221102831>

- Randol, B., & Campbell, C. (2017). Macro-Correlates of Inmate Violence: The Importance of Programming in Prison Order. *The Prison Journal*, 97(4), 451–474. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885517711975>
- Reidy, T., Cihan, A., & Sorenson, J. (2017). Women in prison: Investigating trajectories of institutional female misconduct. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 52, 49–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2017.07.013>
- Robinson, S. A. (2018). A study designed to Increase the literacy skills of Incarcerated Adults. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 69(1), 60–72.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734016813494764>
- Rocheleau, A. M. (2014). An Exploratory Examination of a Prison Disciplinary Process: Assessing Staff and Prisoner’ Perceptions of Fairness. *Journal of Qualitative Criminal Justice & Criminology*, 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.21428/88de04a1.037cb4c4>
- Rocheleau, A. M. (2015). Ways of Coping and Involvement in Prison Violence. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 59(4), 359–383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X13510275>
- Rose, C. (2004). Women’s Participation in Prison Education: What We Know and What We Don’t Know. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 55(1), 78–100.
- Rose, K., & Rose, C. (2014). Enrolling in College While in Prison: Factors That Promote Male and Female Prisoners to Participate. *Journal of Correctional Education* (1974-), 65(2), 20–39.

- Roths, A., Lemos, M., & Goncalves, T. (2017). Motivational Profiles of Adult Learners. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 67(1), 3–29.
- Sample, B., & Zoukis. (n.d.). *Prison Disciplinary Infraction | Inmate Discipline Proceedings*. Zoukis Consulting Group. Retrieved August 3, 2024, from <https://federalcriminaldefenseattorney.com/prison-life/inmate-discipline-program/>
- Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1992). Crime and Deviance in the Life Course. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 18, 63–84.
- Skarbek, D. (2014). *The Social Order of the Underworld: How Prison Gangs Govern the American Penal System*. Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199328499.001.0001>
- Staphan, J. (2008). *Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 2005*. Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Steiner, B. (2008). *Maintaining Prison Order: Understanding Causes of Inmate Misconduct Within and Across Ohio Correctional Institutions*. University of Cincinnati.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2014.08.001>
- Steiner, B., & Wooldredge, J. (2009). Individual and Environmental Effects on Assaults and Nonviolent Rule Breaking by Women in Prison. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 46(4), 437–467.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427809341936>

- Sykes, G. M. (1958). *The Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum Security Prison*. Princeton University Press.
- Szifris, K., Fox, C., & Bradbury, A. (2018). *A Realist Model of Prison Education, Growth, and Desistance: A New Theory*. <https://doi.org/10.25771/QAC7-9W77>
- Tahamont, S., Hyatt, J., Pheasant, M., Lafferty, J., Bell, N., & Sheets, M. (2022). Ineligible Anyway: Evidence on the Barriers to Pell Eligibility for Prisoners in the Second Chance Pell Pilot Program in Pennsylvania Prisons. *Justice Quarterly*, 39(2), 402–426. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2020.1853798>
- Tahamont, S., Pheasant, M., Jaw, H. S., & Midgette, G. (2022). *The Intersection of Visitation and Misconduct Before Release from Prison: Using Joint Prevalence to Understand Contemporaneous Outcomes*. 1–20.
- Tewksbury, R., Connor, D. P., & Denney, A. S. (2014). Disciplinary Infractions Behind Bars: An Exploration of Importation and Deprivation Theories. *Criminal Justice Review*, 39(2), 201–218. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734016814529965>
- The Prison Disciplinary Process*. (2023). Prisoners Legal Services.
- Toman, E. L. (2017). *Female Incarceration and Prison Social Order: An Examination of Gender Differences in Prison Misconduct and In-Prison Punishments* [Ph.D., University of South Florida]. <https://www.proquest.com/docview/1946182988/abstract/2BDD9AF3261C40B2PQ/1>

- Tostlebe, J. J., & Pyrooz, D. C. (2022). Procedural justice, legal orientations, and gang membership: Testing an alternative explanation to understand the gang–misconduct link. *Criminology*, 60(4), 700–739. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9125.12316>
- Trulson, C. R., DeLisi, M., & Marquart, J. W. (2011). Institutional Misconduct, Delinquent Background, and Rearrest Frequency Among Serious and Violent Delinquent Offenders. *Crime & Delinquency*, 57(5), 709–731. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128709340224>
- Tuijnman, A., & Boudard, E. (2001). *Adult education participation in North America: International perspectives*. <https://www.voced.edu.au/content/ngv%3A40975>
- US Census Bureau. (2021). *The Chance That Two People Chosen at Random Are of Different Race or Ethnicity Groups Has Increased Since 2010*. Census.Gov. <https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2021/08/2020-united-states-population-more-racially-ethnically-diverse-than-2010.html>
- Western, B. (2006). *Punishment and inequality in America*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427800037004001>
- Wooldredge, J. (1991). Correlates of Deviant Behavior Among Inmates of U.s. Correctional Facilities. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 14(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0735648X.1991.9721424>

- Wooldredge, J. (2020). Prison Culture, Management, and In-Prison Violence. *Annual Review of Criminology*, 3(1), 165–188. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-criminol-011419-041359>
- Wooldredge, J. D. (1994). Inmate crime and victimization in a southwestern correctional facility. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 22(4), 367–381. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2352\(94\)90083-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2352(94)90083-3)
- Wooldredge, J., & Steiner, B. (2009). Comparing Methods for Examining Relationships Between Prison Crowding and Inmate Violence. *Justice Quarterly*, 26(4), 795–826. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418820802427841>
- Wooldredge, J., & Steiner, B. (2016). The Exercise of Power in Prison Organizations and Implications for Legitimacy Criminology. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 106(1), i–166.
- Worrall, J., & Morris, R. G. (2011). Inmate Custody Levels and Prison Rule Violations. *The Prison Journal*, 91(2), 131–157. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885511404380>