

Assessing for Racial Disparity in the Use and Effects of Disciplinary Segregation: A Propensity Score Matching Analysis

Ryan M. Labrecque, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor, Portland State University

Presented at the 72nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology
on November 17, 2016 in New Orleans, LA



Portland State
UNIVERSITY

Competing Views of Restrictive Housing

- **Prison system view**

- Targets the “worst of the worst”
- Effective deterrent

- **Critics’ view**

- Placement influenced by ascriptive characteristics (e.g., mental illness, race, age)
- Increases criminal behavior, especially among vulnerable populations

Review of the Research

- Little is known about the uses of restrictive housing.
 - Effects may vary based on who is placed in the setting, why they are placed there, the conditions of confinement, and how long they spend there.
- Few studies assess the impact of restrictive housing on behavioral indicators:
 - Some find a benefit (e.g., Ralph & Marquart, 1991)
 - Some point to a detriment (e.g., Lovell et al., 2007; Mears & Bales, 2009)
 - Some suggest no effect (e.g., Butler et al., 2016; Morris, 2016)
- Virtually no information available on the influence of moderators.

Race and Restrictive Housing

- Descriptive studies find a greater proportion of minority inmates in restrictive housing settings compared to the general prisoner population (e.g., Beck, 2015).
- Multivariate investigations reveal race is not a significant predictor when other factors are included (Butler & Steiner, 2016; Mears & Bales, 2010).
- The disproportionate presence of minorities in restrictive settings may cause a greater distrust of authority, which may lower their likelihood for complying with institutional rules (Olson, 2016; Schlanger, 2013).

Current Study

- Sample includes inmates admitted into ODRC between 2007 and 2011 who served 365 consecutive days in prison ($N = 40,981$).
- Restrictive housing is defined here as the experience of disciplinary segregation (DS) within 3 months of ODRC admission.
- Institutional misconduct is defined as a finding of guilt for any violation of an ODRC rule of conduct:
 - Violent/serious offenses (e.g., assault)
 - Non-violent/less serious offenses (e.g., damage to property, theft, drug use)

Method

- Logistic regression is used to predict placement in DS within 3 months.
- Propensity score matching (PSM) is used to match black and white inmates on a variety of theoretically relevant variables, including placement in DS.
- One-to-one nearest neighbor matching with a .05 tolerance level.
- PSM is useful because it reduces potential biases due to confounding variables (Rosenbaum & Rubin, 1983).
- Once matched, the group differences in misconduct measures are examined.

Comparison of Characteristics (Full Sample)

	Black (<i>N</i> = 18,980)	White (<i>N</i> = 22,001)	%STD Diff
% DS within first 3 months*	15.11	11.25	11.4
% male*	94.52	88.05	23.1
% gang affiliation*	23.36	15.46	20.1
% serious mental illness*	20.67	39.56	42.1
% recidivist*	53.33	42.00	22.8
Mean age at admission (<i>SD</i>)*	30.51 (10.38)	33.36 (10.91)	22.0
Mean total violent convictions (<i>SD</i>)*	0.78 (1.13)	0.44 (0.85)	26.6
Mean total nonviolent convictions (<i>SD</i>)*	0.78 (1.34)	0.86 (1.51)	4.7
Mean pre-violent misconduct (<i>SD</i>)*	0.07 (0.27)	0.04 (0.21)	9.7
Mean pre-nonviolent misconduct (<i>SD</i>)*	0.16 (0.56)	0.10 (0.42)	9.5

Note. **p* < .01.

Logistic Regression Predicting DS Within 3 Months

	Model 1	Model 2
Black	1.22*	1.05
Male	1.20*	1.19
Gang affiliation	1.32*	1.12
Serious mental illness	1.81*	1.45*
Age at admission	0.95*	0.97*
Recidivist	0.96	0.95
Violent convictions	1.41*	1.35*
Nonviolent convictions	1.20*	1.20*
Pre-violent misconduct	—	23.71*
Pre-nonviolent misconduct	—	5.08*
Nagelkerke R-square	.134	.410

Note. * $p < .01$.

Odds ratios are reported.

Effect of Race on Misconduct (Full Sample)

	Mean (Black)	Mean (White)	Difference	Cohen's d
Violent				
Prevalence*	.18	.12	.06	.17
Incidence*	.25	.15	.10	.18
Nonviolent				
Prevalence*	.31	.25	.06	.13
Incidence*	.95	.67	.27	.14

Note. * $p < .01$.

Comparison of Characteristics (Matched Sample)

	Black (N = 16,092)	White (N = 16,092)	%STD Diff
% DS within first 3 months*	13.48	15.18	4.9
% male*	93.64	92.82	3.2
% gang affiliation	20.08	19.92	0.5
% serious mental illness*	23.70	32.64	19.9
% recidivist*	51.19	48.76	4.8
Mean age at admission (<i>SD</i>)	31.35 (10.68)	31.08 (9.64)	2.1
Mean total violent convictions (<i>SD</i>)	0.60 (.93)	0.60 (.95)	0.0
Mean total nonviolent convictions (<i>SD</i>)*	0.80 (1.38)	1.14 (1.63)	18.9
Mean pre-violent misconduct (<i>SD</i>)	.06 (.24)	.06 (.25)	0.0
Mean pre-nonviolent misconduct (<i>SD</i>)	.13 (.49)	.13 (.49)	0.0

Note. * $p < .01$.

Effect of Race on Misconduct (Matched Sample)

	Mean (Black)	Mean (White)	Difference	Cohen's d
Violent				
Prevalence	.17	.17	.00	.00
Incidence*	.23	.21	.02	.04
Nonviolent				
Prevalence*	.29	.34	-.05	-.10
Incidence	.89	.91	-.02	-.01

Note. * $p < .01$.

Summary of Results

- Black inmates are more likely to experience DS; however, this difference appears due to objective risk factors, most notably, violent institutional behavior.
- Supplemental analyses produce similar results when predicting number of days spent in DS, % of time spent in DS, and number of placements in DS within first 3 months.
- Black inmates are more likely to be written up for institutional misconduct; however, the magnitude of the differences is largely diminished when matched:
 - Once matched, there is little difference found between race categories in subsequent violent behavior and whites appear to have more subsequent nonviolent misconduct.

Limitations

- Findings may not be applicable to all restrictive housing settings and inmates.
- The current study is limited to adult inmates from Ohio who were placed in restrictive housing for disciplinary purposes.
- This study also relied on the use of official data.
- It is possible that differences exist in officers treat inmates by race:
 - Officers may be more likely to write up black inmates for misbehavior, and rule infractions boards may be more likely to place black inmates in DS for misbehavior.

Conclusion

- Restrictive housing might create benefits; however, it may also create harms.
- These possibilities clearly warrant further investigation (see Frost & Monteiro, 2016).
- In addition, there is a need for more studies to assess for the influence of potential moderators (e.g., age, gender, race, mental health, risk level).
- Such an endeavor will inevitably lead to more informed policy decisions regarding the use of restrictive housing.

Contact Information

Ryan M. Labrecque, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Criminology and Criminal Justice Department
Portland State University

Phone: 503-725-5164

Email: rml@pdx.edu

Web: www.ryanmlabrecque.com

Supplemental Analyses

	Mean (Black)	Mean (White)	Difference	Cohen's d
Violent				
Prevalence	.30	.30	.00	.02
Incidence	.44	.42	.02	.03
Nonviolent				
Prevalence	.53	.54	-.01	-.02
Incidence	2.01	1.92	.09	.03

Note. * $p < .01$.