

VETERANS BEHIND BARS: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

OF A MASTER STATUS IN COUNTY JAIL

---

A Thesis

Presented

to the Faculty of

California State University, Chico

---

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

in

Political Science

---

by

© Lucas M. Alward

Spring 2016

VETERANS BEHIND BARS: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS  
OF A MASTER STATUS IN COUNTY JAIL

A Thesis

by

Lucas M. Alward

Spring 2016

APPROVED BY THE INTERIM DEAN OF GRADUATE STUDIES:

---

Sharon Barrios, Ph.D.

APPROVED BY THE GRADUATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

---

Matthew Thomas, Ph.D.  
Graduate Coordinator

---

Jonathan W. Caudill, Ph.D., Chair

---

Ryan Patten, Ph.D.

---

Matthew Thomas, Ph.D.

## PUBLICATION RIGHTS

No portion of this thesis may be reprinted or reproduced in any manner unacceptable to the usual copyright restrictions without the written permission of the author.

## DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this thesis to all the veterans who serve to defend our country, may we never forget the sacrifices they make on our behalf.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Jonathan Caudill for the invaluable guidance and mentorship he has provided me throughout my educational voyage. He has afforded me numerous opportunities to participate in rigorous academic research, continually challenged me, and helped me grow, contributing to my professional and personal development. I am forever grateful for Dr. Caudill's consistent commitment to my education and success. I would also like to thank both Dr. Ryan Patten and Dr. Mathew Thomas, who collectively introduced me to the world of academic scholarship, providing me numerous opportunities to develop professionally. Their continuous support and guidance were instrumental in my success.

Additionally, I would like to thank the faculty and staff at California State University, Chico, specifically the Political Science Department. The faculty in the department has continually nurtured my learning and helped cultivate my academic voice. Ultimately, the department has inspired me to choose higher education as a career of study. I want to especially acknowledge Eileen Morris, Ellie Ertle, and Kimberly Candela who opened their doors and offered me crucial support at a difficult time in my life. I cannot express how truly grateful I am for their continued support.

Throughout my time at CSU, Chico I have been surrounded by great friends, which I imagine will last a lifetime. They have continually challenged me, offered me their unconditional support, and allowed me to keep my sanity. To Georgia, Jay, Jeff, Brian

and the real Captain Saine, I owe a great deal of gratitude for our friendship and I look forward to see what the future brings.

Lastly, I would like to express the deepest of gratitude to my parents and grandparents who have supported me throughout everything. I am beyond fortunate to have such loving and caring parents whose unwavering support has kept me motivated throughout my educational career.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Publication Rights .....	iii
Dedication .....	iv
Acknowledgements .....	v
List of Tables .....	viii
Abstract .....	ix
 CHAPTER	
I. Introduction .....	1
Background .....	2
Theoretical Framework .....	3
Purpose of the Study .....	6
Implications.....	6
Overview of the thesis .....	7
II. Literature Review .....	8
Introduction .....	8
Veteran Criminality .....	9
History of PTSD .....	15
PTSD & Veteran Criminal Behavior .....	18
Institutional Socialization .....	25
Veterans and Prison Subculture .....	28
III. Data and Methodology .....	31
Introduction .....	31
Data .....	32
Methodology .....	33
IV. Results and Findings .....	37
Descriptive Statistics .....	39
Logistic Regression Results .....	41

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. Discussion and Limitations .....	45
Discussion .....	45
Policy Implications and Recommendations .....	50
Limitations .....	55
VI. Conclusions and Recommendations .....	58
Conclusion .....	58
Future Research .....	62
References .....	65

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Descriptive statistics by veteran status .....	39
2. Logistic regression model predicting the likelihood of gang membership .....	41
3. Logistic regression model predicting the likelihood of gang victimization .....	42

## ABSTRACT

### VETERANS BEHIND BARS: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

#### OF A MASTER STATUS IN COUNTY JAIL

by

© Lucas M. Alward 2016

Master of Arts in Political Science

California State University, Chico

Spring 2016

As the United States has officially withdrawn American troops from Iraq and Afghanistan, the number of military service personnel returning from combat operations continues to increase. Previous research finds that many veterans returning from tours of duty report psychological and neurological injuries, such as posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), traumatic brain injury (TBI), and other psychiatric disorders. Consequently, many veterans are impacting the criminal justice system. However, limited research has investigated the degree to which veteran status or inmates with prior military service effects the institutional subculture. This thesis empirically tests Hughes (1945) and Becker's (1963) master status concept hypothesizing that inmates with previous military service retain their veteran status, moderating the social hierarchy of the incarcerated environment. Using data collected from jail housing classification reports from 2012

through 2013, findings revealed veteran status was positively correlated with gang membership but not correlated with gang victimization.

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

David Carlson sat quietly at the Waukesha, Wisconsin county court as Judge Donald Hassin Jr. read aloud his criminal record: drunken driving, battery in prison, and stealing alcohol while on parole. Carlson, a former national guardsman who served two tours in Iraq, has struggled to readjust to civilian life and since returning from combat as Carlson has spent a majority of the previous five years incarcerated in jail or prison. The Department of Veteran Affairs attributes his criminal behavior to combat-related trauma, resulting in a diagnosis of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). However, as Carlson notes in a recent interview:

For my PTSD issues, jail is the least therapeutic atmosphere you could ever imagine. Same as when I'd been on patrol in Iraq ... Iraqis know, they know if you're [an] aggressive unit, or if you're a weak unit, if you're a soft target, if you're a hard target. It's the same in prison. I almost felt like I was delusional, but in my mind I was in combat with the jail, basically. I was at war, nonstop (Lawrence, 2015).

Regrettably, Carlson's story illustrates many of the struggles faced by military veterans after they return from combat operations abroad. In recent years, the number of American military service members returning home from theaters of war has increased, following troops withdrawals from Iraq and Afghanistan. Since the beginning of combat operations in Afghanistan in 2001 and Iraq in 2003, roughly 2.5 million American personnel served in theaters of or near combat (Sayer, Orazem, Noorbaloochi, Gravely, Frazier, Carlson, Schnurr, & Oleson, 2015). Somewhere between 25-40 percent of returning veterans report neurological and psychological injuries, such as post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), traumatic brain injury (TBI), and other psychiatric disorders (White, Mulvey,

Fox, & Choate, 2011). Consequently, many veterans are finding themselves in the criminal justice system.

### Background

Several studies have found it is common for soldiers returning from active duty to be susceptible to a series of anti-social behaviors (drug use, violent aggression), thus gaining attention of law enforcement and increasing the chance of arrest and incarceration (Sherman, Sautter, Jackson, Lyons, & Han, 2006; Lasko, Gurvits, Kuhne, Orr, & Pitman, 1994; Freeman & Roca, 2001). Furthermore, research has also found evidence that veterans who experience longer tours of duty, specifically exposure to combat, are more likely to retain violent behavior, increasing the likelihood of incarceration upon return to civilian life (Fontana & Rosenheck, 2005). While little research has explored the local county jail environment and the impact veteran status on institutional socialization, previous studies have examined the prison subculture and how the prison environment effects institutional socialization and inmate misconduct.

Sociologist Donald Clemmer (1940)) studied the ways in which the prison community can both influence and shape inmate behavior, positing that inmates undergo a process of “prisonization” upon entry into the jail (67). Central to Clemmer’s notion of prisonization was the belief that inmates enter the prison community in an inferior role, one that becomes reinforced by an inmate’s anonymous status. Sykes (1958) expanding on Clemmer studied the inmate social system of the New Jersey State Maximum Security Prison focusing on how the prison subculture impacts the mentality and self-identity of the inmate. Sykes ultimately found that the psychological pains of imprisonment can be just as damaging as or more damaging than physical pains of imprisonment. In response,

Irwin and Cressey (1962) purported that Sykes' deprivation model neglected the values and social capital inmates bring with them into prison community. Irwin and Cressey (1962) advanced an importation thesis by administering a typology of subcultures designed to identify inmate characteristics before their incarceration. As a result, this typology explained not only the origins of the prison subculture but expanded on the influences these subcultures have on rehabilitative practices administered by correctional facilities.

More recent research has reexamined the importation, deprivation, and situational theoretical models used to understand and explain inmate misconduct. Inquiries examining the importation model have steadily found younger male inmates, who lack any social structure or have previous violent criminal histories, are more likely to engage in prison misconduct (Camp Cunningham, Sorensen, & Reidy, 2005; Berg & DeLisi, 2006; Gaes, Langan, & Saylor, 2003). In contrast, empirical testing of the deprivation theoretical model has provided mixed results. For instance, some research has found inmates housed in high-security and those imprisoned for longer sentences are more likely to participate in prison misconduct (Jiang & Fisher-Giorlando, 2002; Camp, et al., 2003). However, additional studies dispute these findings, arguing that classification or placement in high security-level housing does not affect inmate misconduct (Bench & Allen, 2003; Camp & Gaes, 2005).

#### Theoretical Framework

Initially defined by Hughes (1945), the notion of "master status" suggests that some statuses in our society supplant all other statuses and carries a certain priority. In this context, "status" is a social position for which the individual has a set of defined

rights, limitations of rights, and duties. According to Hughes, the title of master status serves as the primary identification factor for an individual, which subsequently dictates how society treats them. Some individuals are ascribed master status at birth, either through inheritance or as a result of certain characteristics such as physical features, sex, or ethnicity. For others, master status can be an achieved social position attained through ability, occupational profession, or other personal involvement. In this context, marriage could be an achieved master status. Ultimately, Hughes claimed that master status evolves into the dominant way society classifies or categorizes certain individuals. Becker (1963) expanded on Hughes' definition of master status by applying this concept to deviant behavior. Becker proposed that certain criminals or law-breakers, depending on the kind of deviance, constitutes as a kind of master status.

Previous scholars have adopted Becker's (1963) "deviant" label concept to examine the extent to which gang affiliation constitutes as a master status. Initially, Miethe and McCorkle (1997) tested Becker's master status thesis examining whether gang membership among criminal defendants comprised a master status, subsequently influencing charging and sentencing outcomes. These researchers found gang affiliation significantly altered an individual's risk of having charges dismissed and the likelihood of imprisonment upon conviction. Miethe and McCorkle's study found support that gang membership constituted a master status with evidence demonstrating that certain extra-legal factors (race, previous criminal history, and seriousness of the offense) significantly predicted sentencing outcomes.

Brownfield, Sorensen and Thompson (2001) also tested Becker's master status theory, examining the degree to which gang membership, race, or social class effects the

probability of being arrested by law enforcement. Brownfield and colleagues found gang membership was not predictive of arrest risk despite these researchers controlling for the effects of self-reported delinquency. Although findings did show race and social class, as master statuses, significantly affected the risk of arrest.

Despite scholars employing Becker's (1963) master status concept, emphasizing various implications of gang affiliation, deviancies, and juvenile delinquency; little research has empirically examined veteran status or the degree to which veteran status influences the prison subculture. This research adopts Becker's master status proposal and applies the concept to military veterans who retain a master status as a result of their military service. In this context, veterans are afforded special accommodations attributed in part by the sacrifices made as a result of their service. Subsequently, veterans receive distinctive medical care, educational support and employment preferences their civilian counterparts are unable to access (Hawkins, 2009). The enactment of legislation, such as the G.I. Bill, aimed at improving the lives of veterans and has been met with great admiration and perceived by many as a substantial factor contributing to the attainment of veterans and their social status (Mettler, 2002).

Other events have also demonstrated military veterans achieve a master status as the Federal Sentencing Commission amended Sentencing Guidelines to single out military service as an important factor during sentencing determinations (Giardino, 2009). While the Supreme Court somewhat over exaggerated a long withstanding tradition of courts granting leniency to veterans, some jurisdictions require military service background consideration as a mitigating factor during sentencing phase while other jurisdictions merely permit it (Lee, 2013). Essentially, this special treatment toward

veterans is an essential component of the current study presented which helps support the thesis that veterans retain a master status in society.

#### Purpose of the Study

Despite these findings, a dearth of literature exists concerning military veterans incarcerated in county jails, with little empirical research examining the general characteristics, potential risk factors, and criminal acts of incarcerated veterans belonging to Operation Enduring Freedom and/or Operation Iraqi Freedom campaigns. The purpose of this research is to evaluate the extent to which previous military service experience serves as a “master status” for incarcerated individuals, where veteran status moderates the social hierarchy within the local jail environment. This research empirically tests Hughes (1945) and Becker’s (1963) master status concept applying it to military veterans incarcerated in a county jail setting. It remains essential to examine whether a relationship exists between incarcerated military service offenders and non-military service inmates to better understand the degree to which veteran status effects the prison subculture.

#### Implications

This study has the potential to help fill the void in the literature on master status as applied to individuals who supersede the deviant label and retain mastering status regardless of committing a criminal act. Moreover, this study will benefit the larger academic community by filling a void in the literature about understanding the consequences of individuals who inhabit the local jail population, especially concerning incarcerated veteran populations. Policy implications will explore the recent advent of veteran treatment courts as a diversion strategy for incarcerated veterans who might be at

increased risk of joining gangs or being victims of gang violence. If military veterans maintain a master status among other inmates, this study has the potential to redefine the process by which inmates are classified and housed in the county-level jail environment.

### Overview of the Thesis

Chapter two provides a review of the scholarly literature discussing previous inquiries assessing the potential link between military service and criminality. Chapter two also incorporates a comprehensive examination of the psychological traumas war imposes on veterans by discussing various studies stipulating that post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and traumatic brain injury (TBI) perpetuate criminal behavior. Furthermore, chapter two concludes by analyzing more recent research concerning institutional misconduct and jail socialization.

In chapter three, the specific research methods by which this research data was collected and used to test the hypotheses are discussed. In particular, this chapter explains the process by which jail housing classification reports were used to identify veterans and non-veterans in a local county-jail. Chapter three also discusses how the variables were operationalized and conclude by describing how logistical regression models were used to examine the influence of veteran status on jail violence. In chapter four, results and findings of the logistical regression models are presented. Chapter five details the interpretation of these findings with results indicating that veteran status is significantly correlated with predicting gang affiliation.

Lastly, the final chapter reviews the major findings concerning the relationship between veteran status and jail violence. In particular, it discusses how these findings impact public policy and veterans in the criminal justice system. Finally, the conclusion

makes suggestions for future research for those who may want to build upon this analysis.

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### Introduction

Developmentally, scholars have identified service in the military as a turning point in an individual's life with the propensity to impart fundamental change (Elder, 1999; Caspi & Moffitt, 1993; Wright, Carter, & Cullen, 2005; Laub & Sampson, 2003; Bouffard, 2003, 2005). Previous research investigating the notion of military service as a turning point in the life course contends that upon entry into the military new recruits undergo a process of resocialization from civilian life and instilled with a new set of military values and norms (Hollingshed, 1946). As recruits are removed from their previous civilian lifestyles and environments, they become exposed to a wide range of new perspectives and experiences, engendering social independence (Elder, 1999; Laub & Sampson, 2003). Furthermore, the military provides educational opportunities and job training permitting some individuals to escape disadvantaged environments (Browning, Lopreato, & Poston).

During World War II, military service provided some young men who had previously been arrested in their teens with a positive change in their life course trajectories (Elder & Shanahan, 2006). Sampson and Laub (1996) expanded on this research and found that some juvenile delinquents were less likely to continue their criminality as adults if they served in the military during World War II. Sampson and Laub (1996, p. 364) reasoned that military service, particularly overseas service,

represented a “knifing off” of social disadvantages (poverty, deviant peers) serving as a crucial life experience.

Although military service can have positive impacts on the life course, other research suggests that military service disrupts existing social roles (Sampson & Laub, 1996) preparing individuals to solve conflicts combatively and with weapons (Hakeem, 1946). Despite research stipulating that service in World War II provided some men a positive turning point in their live course, service in the Vietnam War did not result in a similar positive effect. Wright, Cater, and Cullen (2005) studied the influence of military service in Vietnam and its impact on altering an individual’s trajectory of development by examining drug use and criminal arrests across the life-course. Results indicated that service in Vietnam significantly increased individual drug use and offending rates (Wright et al., 2005).

Other research examining military service and life course has identified combat training and combat experiences can impose psychological traumas on military servicemen further exacerbating dysfunctional behavior (Bohannon, Drosser, & Lindley, 1995; Bryant, 1979). Bohannon and colleagues (1995) stressed that military service can negatively affect an individual’s marital status, employment opportunities, and increase continual aggression. Despite various research findings that military service can positively and negatively impact an individual’s life-course trajectory and development, it remains difficult to validate with any certainty a causal relationship exists between military service and criminal behavior.

## Veteran Criminality

Considerable credence has been given to the notion that a relationship exists between military service, army training, and combat experience that fosters criminalistic behavior; its first appearance entrenched in the early writing of Erasmus, Sir Thomas More, and Machiavelli whom collectively observed violent crimes increased in post-war eras (Archer & Gartner, 1976). However, despite anecdotal evidence suggesting war promotes violence and criminal activity (Abbott, 1918; 1927; Hamon, 1918), only recently – since the conclusion of World War II – did researchers demonstrate renewed interest towards investigating whether prior military experience impacted veteran behavior, resulting in future criminal behavior.

Before the end of the war, Wagley (1944) was the first researcher to express concern over the vital problems confronting the American public as soldiers returned from the battlefield with a new set of values speculating a propensity towards criminal behavior. Hakeem (1946) was one of the first researchers to examine whether a causal relationship existed between military training and criminality by comparing ex-servicemen and non-veterans who were admitted to the same penitentiary during a two-year period. Hakeem (1946) collected prison records of 510 incarcerated persons finding 125 inmates (25 percent) had been in the armed forces: 80 having served in the Navy, seven in the Marine Corps, and three in the Coast Guard. Furthermore, results indicated that 85 ex-servicemen (68 percent) had previous criminal histories, preceding their enlistment in the armed forces. However, compared to arrestees with no military service, 235 (61 percent) also had previous criminal records thus indicating there were no significant differences between ex-military servicemen and nonservice men.

Following the end of World War II, observing an increase in civilian population, Willbach (1948) provided an analysis of New York City crime trends finding the arrest rate rose 89 percent during a three-year period in the mid-1940s. Willbach's report led some researchers to suggest that military service personnel were responsible for this increase. Willbach reasoned that wartime exposure to an environment of extreme chaos and violence might re-socialize some soldiers to return home with a new set of morals along with a desire to continue their wartime adventure by committing criminal acts against others. Although Willbach found an increase in the number of arrestees, he ultimately concluded that veterans were not responsible for the increased criminal behavior.

Lunden (1952) further investigated the claim military service and prolonged exposure to combat operations will lead to veteran criminality. Lunden, a former prison official with the U.S. Army in Europe and eventually Professor of Sociology at Iowa State College, examined 11 penal and correctional institutions in eight Mid-Western states of the upper Mississippi Valley. During a three-year period (1947-1949), 5,599 or roughly one-third of 16,895 men sentenced and confined in these institutions served in the armed forces in either World War I or II (Lunden, 1952). Lunden further assessed whether a relationship existed between military service and criminality by evaluating if military personnel had a criminal record prior to entering the armed forces. Based on data available from two states, 70 percent of the committed service members had previous encounters and conflicts with the criminal justice system, preceding military service.

As a result of the number of veterans who previously held criminal records before military experience, Lunden could not determine with any degree of certainty that

military service leads to criminal behavior. Lunden's findings speak to the fact that following their discharge from the Army, these individuals returned to their criminal behaviors. Lunden concluded that it could not be substantiated that military service will lead to criminal behavior once soldiers return to civilian life.

James Bennett, former Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, noted World War II veterans were less criminal than non-veterans. Furthermore, more notably, Bennett (1954) concluded that veterans were able to adjust to prison life better than non-veteran offenders and reported lower levels of recidivism rates, suggesting veterans were also able to readjust better to civilian life than non-veteran violent offenders. Although only a limited number of studies explored the relationship between military service and criminal behavior throughout the aftermath of World War II, the Vietnam War sparked renewed interest among scholars proclaiming that military service and prolonged combat experiences increase subsequent violent behavior among Vietnam veterans (Moskos, 1976).

In contrast to World War II veterans, who were met with joyous celebrations and parades upon their return from service, Vietnam veterans experienced a crude and hostile American public as they returned from combat often suffering various forms of stigmatization (Sparr, Reaves, & Atkinson, 1987). Archer and Gartner (1976, p. 943) empirically examined postwar homicide rates positing the violent veteran model, which hypothesized some soldiers exposed to wartime violence and lawlessness might be re-socialized "to be more accepting of violence and more proficient at it." In their study, Archer and Gartner analyzed crime data from 110 countries between 1900 and 1970 finding no direct link between military service and the commission of homicide or violent

crimes. Furthermore, results indicated that homicide arrests increased among groups who could not have been combat veterans.

Several other studies exploring the criminal behavior of Vietnam veterans found soldiers with combat experience were more likely to commit violent crimes as compared to non-veterans (Resnick, Foy, Donahoe, & Miller, 1989). Landolfi and LeClair (1976) investigated the degree to which Vietnam era veterans constituted a substantial proportion of the incarcerated population of the Massachusetts Correctional Institutions (MCI). Upon further inspection of their data, Landolfi and LeClair found 222 veterans or approximately 11 percent of the total MCI population (N=2,000) were former Vietnam veterans. Moreover, results revealed Vietnam veterans were more likely to have completed high school or gone beyond the 12th grade, less likely to have prior juvenile, county or state incarcerations, and more likely to be classified as first-time offenders than the non-veteran sample. Although, it is important to note the results did find veterans reported higher rates of narcotics use compared to non-veterans. Nonetheless, Landolfi and LeClair concluded that Vietnam veterans incarcerated in the Massachusetts Correctional Institution experienced less criminal behavior than non-veterans prior to their current imprisonment.

In a separate study, Yesavage (1983) compared differential effects of Vietnam veterans combat experiences between dangerous criminal behavior of Vietnam veterans diagnosed with schizophrenia. Yesavage analyzed data from a group of 70 Vietnam-era veterans and all met the criteria of Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) for schizophrenia. Of the 70 veterans included in Yesavger's study, 27 individuals had served in Vietnam with 19 of these veterans having experienced combat, leaving 43

veterans who neither served in Vietnam nor served in combat. Yesavage found a significant correlation between Vietnam combat experience and post service criminal behavior. Based on these results, Yesavage determined that certain violent tendencies of schizophrenic Vietnam era veterans were better explained by the subject's war experiences than their premorbid criminal behavior.

Yager and colleagues (1984) expanded on previous research concerning Vietnam era veterans by assessing the behavior and emotional problems associated with exposure to combat. Researchers found that veterans who experienced combat or participated in atrocities reported higher rates of behavior problems compared to other young males with similar backgrounds. Findings also showed combat experience increased alcohol consumption, marijuana, and heroin usage, and was more prevalent among veterans who partook in atrocities.

Expanding on this research, Card (1983) found that Vietnam veterans also faced higher conviction rates as compared to non-veterans. However, later on, Rand (1987) disputed these results finding no difference existed between those who served in the military and those who did not for committing serious crimes. Nonetheless, a large majority of men who served during Vietnam War-era did not have criminal records until after they joined the armed forces suggesting a potential criminogenic effect (Bouffard, 2003). More recent research has reexamined the potential link between military service and veteran criminality. Bouffard (2003) expanded on previous research examining the relationship between military service and criminality among Vietnam veterans. In this study, Bouffard reanalyzed and compared data between a 1945 Philadelphia birth cohort (N=565) and the 1949 Racine birth cohort (N=243) finding no empirical relationship

between military service and violent criminal behavior. This study also revealed that veterans were just as likely as non-veterans to have post-service contacts with law enforcement. Ultimately, Boufford's analysis suggested that military service reduces post-service veteran offending.

Greenberg, Rosenheck, and Desai (2007) used national survey data to examine and compare the relative risk of incarceration among veterans to non-veterans. In their analysis, Greenberg and colleagues (2007) found incarceration peaked for white veterans between the age of 35 to 44 with the youngest and oldest aged veterans facing lower incarceration rates. When controlling for race/ethnicity, results revealed black veterans were more likely to be incarcerated than any other racial group. Results also demonstrated that Hispanic veterans were incarcerated less than half the rate of black veterans whereas white veteran incarceration rates ranged from one-fourth to one-third of black veterans. Greenberg et al. speculated the difference in risk of incarceration among race/ethnicity could be attributed to the difference in recruitment processes for veterans who entered the military during the early period of the All-Volunteer Force military.

In a similar study, Tsai and colleagues (2013) investigated the risk of incarceration among different groups of minority veterans, comparing sociodemographic and clinical characteristics between incarcerated white veterans. These researchers found black veterans were 5.6 times and Hispanic veterans 4.3 times more likely than white veterans to be incarcerated. However, in the general population, black veterans faced lower risk of being incarcerated than Whites (6.7 times), suggesting that veteran status is a protective factor against incarceration for black veterans. In contrast to black veterans, Hispanic veterans demonstrated a higher risk of incarceration (4.3 times more likely than

Whites) than non-veteran Hispanics in the general population (2.6 times more likely than Whites). Tasi and colleagues (2013) conceive the increased incarceration rates could be attributed to acculturation among Hispanic veterans, which are associated with higher substance abuse and psychiatric disorders. Nonetheless, these findings are consistent with previous studies concerning the risk of veteran incarceration (Greenberg, Rosenheck, & Desai, 2007; Greenberg & Rosenheck, 2012).

### The History of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder

Although the official recognition of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) is a relatively new occurrence, stories of combat-related stresses have been well documented throughout the history of armed conflict. Many scholars credit Homer's *Iliad* as the first depiction of military veterans experiencing combat-related traumas. Homer's *Iliad* – a rendering of the decade-long war between the Greeks and Trojans – offered the first analysis of how exposure to combat and war can manifest in psychological trauma. For example, Homer describes how Achilles became so grief stricken following the death of his friend and battle-companion Patroclus that he renounced all hope of ever returning from war alive (McCormick-Goodhart, 2013). Subsequently, many scholars have commented on how Achilles's behaviors resemble those of contemporary veterans, warranting a modern day diagnosis of PTSD (Coleman, 2006).

Other accounts of military personnel experiencing PTSD-like symptoms can be traced to the American Revolutionary War. It was common for troops in the Continental Army to suffer from “melancholia,” a disease that included symptoms of invasive flashbacks and bouts of severe depression (McCormick-Goodhart, 2013). At this time, researchers associated cases of melancholia with prolonged exposure to scenes of combat

and violence, however, little empirical evidence was ever collected or examined (McCormick-Goodhart, 2013).

Historical evidence collected during the American Civil War suggests soldiers were identified with “nervous disease” and other anxiety disorders similar to PTSD were commonplace among Union and Confederate soldiers (White et al., 2012). In a study of archival records assessing health outcomes of Civil War veterans, Pizarro and colleagues (2006) found that direct exposure to death in a soldier’s unit was highly correlated with later co-morbid psychological and nervous problems. In a similar study, Hendin and Haas (1984) documented several examples of veterans who experienced significant bouts of anxiety and antisocial and violent behaviors, attributed to prolonged combat. Although similar to PTSD-like symptoms, physicians and doctors throughout the American Civil War recognized these cases merely as “irritable heart syndrome” (McCormick-Goodhart, 2013).

In spite of changes in the terminology and diagnosis of combat-related stresses, little was known about the degree to which issues of PTSD plagued military veterans. Furthermore, attitudes toward the treatment and evaluation of such disorders were not well received, as commanders showed little empathy towards veterans experiencing PTSD-like symptoms. In some extreme cases, soldiers were shot by firing squad if they were unable to resume their military duties (Coleman, 2006). During this period many commanders reasoned that such executions would impart obedience among the ranks and eliminate any “contagion of weakness” (Coleman, 2006).

However, by the early twentieth century, language used to describe symptoms of PTSD continued to evolve. Physicians and army doctors throughout World War I

witnessed an increase of soldiers suffering from psychological wounds, subsequently diagnosing these soldiers with the evocative label, “shell shock” (McCormick-Goodhart, 2013). Many scholars have acknowledged advancements in the technology of modern warfare, such as the use of artillery, mustard gas, and trench warfare as responsible for imposing a series of new traumas disrupting the physiology of the brain (Bentley, 2005). Contrary to popular belief, casualties suffering from shell shock were not a result of physiological damage to the brain, rather emotional and psychological in nature (Bentley, 2005). By the end of the war, Coleman (2006) found that of the 300,000 disabled World War I veterans, roughly 50,000 remained hospitalized some 20 years later citing psychiatric disorders.

By the time the United States entered World War II, the military sought to avoid combat-stress or PTSD cases by screening draftees for predispositions to mental illness (Finley, 2011). After screening 20 million American draftees, roughly 1.6 million were disqualified from active service for a diagnosed mental illness. However, despite the military’s attempt to reduce the number of soldiers who experience combat stress, a total of 1.3 million World War II soldiers developed a mental illness (McCormick-Goodhart, 2013). Upon further examination of combat stress, the medical community began to recognize any individual could develop combat stress. As a result, physicians replaced the diagnosis of “war neurosis” with “combat fatigue” (Wanke, 1999).

Although combat-related traumas received increased attention from military physicians throughout the first half of the twentieth century, it was the Vietnam War that redefined the condition. Dr. Matthew Friedman, Executive Director of the National Center for PTSD, noted the severity of the issue saying: “Veterans were flooding clinics,

demanding that we do something for their distress. We had no clinical terminology for what we were seeing. Their suffering was so raw” (McCormick-Goodhart 2013, p. 902). Subsequently, some clinics attempted to advocate for the official recognition of Vietnam Syndrome by influencing the American Psychiatric Association (APA) to formally adopt Vietnam Syndrome into the DSM. Although many psychiatrists were in favor of such recognition, some members of the APA were reluctant to accept Vietnam Syndrome into the DSM, citing a lack of research distinguishing Vietnam Syndrome from other mental illnesses (McCormick-Goodhart, 2013). Nonetheless, by 1980, the APA officially added Vietnam Syndrome to the DSM as a psychological illness, later renaming it PTSD (McCormick-Goodhart, 2013).

#### PTSD & Veteran Criminal Behavior

As the number of Vietnam War veterans returning from combat with severe mental disorders continued and society began more aware of PTSD and combat-related traumas, such attention provoked major research efforts to understand the psychological traumas of war (McCormick-Goodhart, 2013). Previous research found PTSD affected nearly one in three Vietnam veterans returning from deployment after one year in combat (Kulka et al., 1990). Some years later, Schlender and colleagues (1997) found rates of PTSD among military veterans persisted, remaining at approximately 15 percent. Wilson and Zigelbaum (1983) examining potential connections between PTSD and veteran criminality, studied 114 former Vietnam combat veterans finding a significant relationship between PTSD and criminal behaviors. Furthermore, their results showed PTSD was correlated with specific criminal offenses: disorderly conduct, DUI, assault, and weapon charges.

In response to the work of Wilson and Zigelbaum, Congress mandated an extensive study evaluating the severity of PTSD among Vietnam veterans. By 1988, following a four yearlong study, the National Vietnam Veterans Readjustment Survey (NVVRS) found 46 percent of male Vietnam combat veterans had been arrested at least once since returning from combat (McCormick-Goodhart, 2013). The report also found that 12 percent of male Vietnam veterans who were not diagnosed with PTSD had been arrested. In an effort to explain the prevalence of PTSD among Vietnam veterans, scholars theorized the unique challenges of the Vietnam War aggravated the prevalence of psychological disorders. Specifically, the use of guerilla war tactics combined with an often unclear fighting objective increased rates of PTSD among Vietnam military combat veterans (White et al., 2012).

Highly publicized media accounts of the criminal behaviors of Vietnam veterans, attributed to symptoms of PTSD, led to the tracking of the number of veterans in federal and state prisons beginning in the early 1980s. Since this time, the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) has released three reports examining the prevalence of military veterans in federal prisons and jails. In its initial report, BJS found that, following the Vietnam War, the number of incarcerated inmates with previous military service rose steadily, spiking in 1985, when roughly 20 percent of U.S. adult prisoners were former veterans. By 1988, more than half of all Vietnam War veterans, diagnosed with PTSD, reported they had previously been arrested.

A 2004 report on veterans incarcerated in prison or jail found the proportion of incarcerated veterans has been declining over the previous two decades (Noonan & Mumola, 2007). However, as some scholars have suggested, the decline of incarcerated

veterans might be tied to long-term decreases in the veteran population, a decrease of more than 3.5 million veterans during this period (White et al., 2012). Other scholars have noted similar distinction between Vietnam veterans and contemporary soldiers fighting in the War on Terror. Culp and colleagues (2013) identified with the end of conscription in 1973 and the transition to an “All-Volunteer Force”, the modern day military is vastly different than its predecessor. For example, many of the previously low-skilled military jobs (e.g. clerical, transportation, and food service) have now been contracted out to civilian workers in the post-Cold War era (Culp, 2007). Additionally, today’s military service members are much more likely to be high school graduates than their civilian counterparts, which could play a major factor in avoiding the criminal justice system (Berryman, 1988).

Although recent data has found limited evidence supporting the notion that the prevalence of military veterans incarcerated in prison or jail continues to decline, a recent article in the New York Times found 121 cases of former U.S Iraq and Afghanistan veterans charged with committing a homicide (Sontag and Alvarez, 2008). Burchett, Ferreira, and Sullivan (2008) more closely examined these homicide cases to better ascertain the linkage between combat exposure and violence. Upon their analysis, Burchett and associates found the vast majority of the perpetrators were male with 90 percent having served in the Iraq campaign and two of those veterans serving in both Iraq and Afghanistan. Most of these offenders were charged with first-degree murder (56 percent) with the second most common vehicular manslaughter (21 percent). These researchers also identified that 70 percent of the cases had some significant forms of psychiatric symptoms. For example, 34 percent showed signs of PTSD, 19 percent had

comorbid substance abuse, and an additional 17 percent showed a combination of PTSD and other substance abuse disorders.

Scholars and medical professionals have realized that in contemporary warfare mortality rates have substantially declined. It is believed that advancements in technology and body armor worn by soldiers have improved an individual's chance of surviving serious wounds. Although these advancements have curbed mortality rates among military service members, another more "silent killer" lurks in the backdrop of American society. A 2008 study conducted by the RAND Center for Military Health Policy Research found that of the (then) 1.64 million soldiers deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan, one in five veterans returning home, or roughly 300,000 soldiers, will suffer from some form of mental illness (Tanielian & Jaycox, 2008). Moreover, the Veterans Administration had diagnosed some 90,000 American combat veterans who served in either Iraq or Afghanistan with PTSD (Giardino, 2009).

More recent scholarship finds that the changing nature of warfare has exposed military service members to a series of new and unique challenges, namely among them guerilla warfare and terrorist tactics. Greenburg and Roy (2007) noted that Iraq has subsequently become an incubator for PTSD among American military personnel as the embattled combat soldier is often left with little warning to when or where the next improvised explosive device will be detonated. Litz (2008) also depicts the high-stress environment contemporary soldiers experience including a constant of fear of hyper arousal.

In another study, Hoge, Castro, Messer, McGurk, Cotting, and Koffman (2004) surveyed both pre and/or post-deployment OEF/OIF service members examining mental

health problems among Army veterans stationed in Afghanistan. In their study, these researchers supported many of the combat experiences that were initially described by Litz (2008), with veterans reporting a variety of experiences that personify the unique challenges of service members manifesting trauma diagnoses. Some of these reported experiences included: seeing dead bodies, receiving small-arms fire, incoming artillery, and being ambushed (Hoge, Castro, Messer, McGurk, Cotting, & Koffman, 2004).

In addition to the high rates of PTSD, somewhat overlooked are the growing number of veterans suffering from Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI). According to the Defense and Veterans Brain Injury Center (2007), TBI is categorized as trauma to the head that typically results in concussion either from closed or penetrating injuries. Blast injuries from improvised explosive devices (IEDs) – the preferred weapon used by insurgents against American forces – are the most frequent cause of TBI (Levin, 2008). Taber, Warden, and Hurley (2006) identified the main consequences of IED blasts that result in TBI: primary secondary, and tertiary. Primary injuries manifest from the effects of wave-induced changes in atmospheric pressure an explosion, which can cause damage with air-fluid interfaces. Secondary injuries refer to damage caused by the blast in which flying debris wound people. Lastly, tertiary injuries can happen when an individual hits an object or the ground following the blast. Consequently, many soldiers suffering from TBI experience a variety of symptoms: lack of concentration, severe anxiety, headaches, sleep apnea, and depression (Degeneffe, 2001).

Early studies of veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan estimate that 20 percent of troops had TBI (Tanielian & Jaycox, 2008). However, a more recent report by the National Center on Posttraumatic Stress Disorder finds that roughly 60-80 percent of

all soldiers who experience an IED blast will acquire TBI (Summerall, 2008). Although these statistics have yet to be corroborated, the implications of PTSD and TBI are far reaching. Research continues to find veterans diagnosed with PTSD and TBI face increased risk of incarceration (Wilson & Zigelbaum, 1983) Despite these findings, little is known about the degree to which former military service members affect the incarcerated environment.

### Institutional Socialization

While little research has explored the local county-jail environment and the notion of veteran status on institutional socialization, previous studies have examined the prison subculture and how the prison environment affects institutional socialization. Sociologist Donald Clemmer (1940) studied the ways in which the prison community can both influence and shape inmate behavior. Clemmer (1940) found that upon entrance into the prison environment inmates undergo “prisonization” meaning inmates are assimilated to the constructs of the prison environment. Central to Clemmer’s notion of prisonization was the belief that inmates enter the prison community in an inferior role, one that becomes reinforced by an inmate’s anonymous status. For instance, a prisoner’s identity is replaced by nothing more than a prison identification number and handed standardized uniforms to further impose anonymity and prevent any individual expression. However, it is important to stress that Clemmer ultimately concluded that not all inmates are indoctrinated to the same degree or at the same speed. Furthermore, some inmates possess certain pre-prison personalities or “statuses” that can delay or even prevent prisonization from transpiring.

Expanding on Clemmer's study of the prison community, Sykes (1958) studied the inmate social system of the New Jersey State Maximum Security Prison. In contrast to Clemmer, Sykes' study focused upon the prison environment and how the prison subculture impacts the mentality and self-identity of the inmate. Sykes found that psychological pains of prison could be just as damaging or more damaging than physical pains. Furthermore, Sykes found that five deprivations constituted some of the greatest pains inmates endure during imprisonment. According to Sykes, deprivations included: an inmate's loss of liberty, inability to interact freely with outsiders, the deprivation of goods and services, loss of heterosexual relationships or conjugal visits, and deprivation of security. Subsequently, Sykes cautioned that extended exposure to such an environment can lead to and further perpetuate an inmate's helplessness and dependency. Interestingly, when examining inmate characteristics, Sykes found that the general labels inmates gave one another serves as an effective function of a classification system. As a result, the classifications or perceived "status" of certain prisoners helps inmates maneuver the prison environment by identifying inmates who might pose a certain threat.

Although Sykes' study provided much insight into the social strains the prison environment imposes on inmates, Sykes did not take into account inmate behavior or experiences that occur outside the prison environment. Irwin and Cressey (1962) purported that Sykes' deprivation model neglected the values and social capital inmates bring with them into prison community. Irwin and Cressey's importation model was grounded in the belief that inmate behavior and attitudes developed outside of prison can similarly govern group interaction inside the prison environment. Irwin and Cressey (1962) advanced their importation proposition by administering a typology of subcultures

designed to identify inmate characteristics prior to their incarceration. This typology explained not only the origins of the prison subculture but expanded on the influences these subcultures have on rehabilitative practices administered by correctional facilities. While research of institutional socialization can be grounded in the studies of Clemmer (1940), Sykes (1958), Irwin & Cressey (1962), the retesting of these hypotheses have yielded mixed results.

Recent studies have reexamined the importation, deprivation, and situational theoretical models used to understand and explain inmate misconduct. Inquires examining the importation model have steadily found younger male inmates, who lack any social structure or have previous violent criminal histories, are more likely to engage in prison misconduct (Cunningham, Sorensen, & Reidy, 2005; Berg & DeLisi, 2006; Camp, Gaes, Langan, & Saylor, 2003). In contrast, empirical testing of the deprivation theoretical model has provided mixed results. For example, some scholars have found inmates housed in high-security facilities and those imprisoned for longer sentences are more likely to participate in prison misconduct (Jiang & Fisher-Giorlando, 2002; Camp, et al., 2003). However, other additional studies dispute these findings, arguing instead that classification or placement of inmates in high security-level housing does not affect inmate misconduct (Bench & Allen, 2003; Camp & Gaes, 2005). Furthermore, Cao, Zhao, and Van Dine (1997) found that prison misconduct declines as inmates learn to adjust and adapt to the prison subculture. As a result, Cao et al. (1997) concluded that inmate misconduct was most prevalent during the early stages of imprisonment.

Other recent studies testing the situational model begin with Steinke (1991), who examined violent misconduct among male inmates. In this study, Steinke found certain

situational factors such as temperature, location, and types of staff were predictors of hostile and aggressive noncompliance among inmates. In a separate study, Camp and colleagues (2003) analyzed 121,051 federal inmates finding prison crowding or security level of the facility were not predictors of prisoner misconduct. Interestingly, these researchers did note that institutions with high levels of female inmates, generally had higher frequencies of inmate misconduct.

#### Veterans and Prison Subculture

Although considerable research has investigated institutional effects imposed on incarcerated inmates, a dearth of literature has empirically examined the experience of incarcerated veterans and the degree to which veteran status protects inmates from institutional misconduct or jail violence. Goetting and Howsen (1986) examined the correlates of prison misconduct by assessing pre-incarceration and institutional characteristics of inmates. These researchers conducted a nationwide sample of 5,586 (men and women) state-prison inmates with results revealing no relationship existed between institutional misconduct and military service. Maguire, Flanagan, and Thornberry (1988) investigated the extent to which inmate participation in prison industry programs reduced recidivism and demonstrated similar findings that pre-prison military service did not reduce the hazard of re-arrest.

More recently and central to this study, Stacer and Solinas-Saunders (2015) studied serious interpersonal violations and prison misconduct by examining whether incarcerated veterans were better able to adapt the prison environment. Based on data collected from the Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities, researchers found no distinction in the likelihood of being written-up or found guilty of

physical or verbal abuse between veterans and non-veteran inmates. While no major distinctions or correlations were present, veterans were slightly less likely to participate in prison misconduct than non-veteran inmates. Other important findings showed that on average, veteran inmates represented an older incarcerated population than non-veterans. This raises important questions as to whether veteran commit crimes late in life and the degree to which these crimes could be associated with mental health conditions. Nonetheless, these researchers found no evidence to support their hypothesis that veteran inmates would be less likely to commit verbal and physical assault.

More recently, however, Logan and Pare (2016) empirically examined the relationship between previous military service and inmate misconduct, theorizing that individuals with military backgrounds will be better able to adjust to the pains of imprisonment than non-veterans. Using data from the Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities (2004) 18,185 respondents from 326 prisons participated in this study. Binary regression models yielded interesting results that demonstrated moderate support that military service is a protective factor for experiencing negative prison outcomes.

Logan and Pare also found veteran inmates were less likely to physically assault other inmates, be written up for verbal abuse, and drug violations. However, results found no evidence to support the notion that inmates with prior military service were either weak or more vulnerable inmates, but it did appear that inmates with higher rates of PTSD were linked to an increased risk of violent victimization. While little research has examined the likelihood of veteran inmates to engage in prison misconduct, the fact that older and more educated veteran inmates were less likely to engage in misconduct

indicates that veteran inmates enter the incarcerated environment with greater levels of social capital. Collectively, (Stacer & Solinas-Saunders, 2015; Logan & Pare, 2016) findings support an importation model that veteran inmates retain many of their pre-characteristics in the incarcerated environment. Inmates prior experiences in the military, which affords individuals educational opportunities and enhanced training, may shape how veteran inmates adapt the institutional environment. Although, more research is needed to uncover the particular nature of veteran experiences especially as it relates to combat exposure and violence.

## CHAPTER III

### DATA AND METHODOLOGY

#### Introduction

This chapter explains the methodology used to test the hypotheses, and provide a brief description of the booking and classification process of inmates to explain how the data was collected. This chapter also explores and describes the independent and dependent variables and how these variables were operationalized to perform logistical regression analyses.

#### Clark County

Research for this study occurred in Clark County Jail in which Clark County is a pseudonym for a Northern California County. Although official definitions of rural and urban vary, Clark County can be considered rural as it is a member of the Rural County Representatives of California. As of the 2010 census, the county in which this study was conducted, had a population over 200,000 people. The county is fairly racially homogenous with approximately 75 percent of Clark County residents identifying themselves as White; the next largest group is Hispanic, and Asians making up 4 percent. African Americans and Native Americans both accounted for less than five percent of the county population.

During the time the data was collected, crime rates in Clark County, CA witnessed a slight increase in violent crimes from 2013-2014, attributed to an 11 percent increase in aggravated assaults. Although violent crime rates increased, murder rates decreased by 16 percent and rape by five percent. Property crimes increased by six

percent with larceny theft accounting for a 14 percent increase from 2013-2014. As compared to statewide averages, a decrease in violent crimes by nearly one percent and eight percent decrease in property crimes, Clark County experienced increased in both violent crimes and property crimes.

The Clark County Jail is a medium-security jail with the correctional division responsible for supervising more than 600 bed county jail inmates, averaging a daily populating (ADP) of almost 600 inmates. In the Clark County Jail, inmates are housed into three different security classifications: maximum, medium, and minimum. Following an arrest, inmates in Clark County Jail are assigned to housing units through a series of objective evaluation standards according to sex, age, criminal sophistication, seriousness of criminal charges (felon vs. misdemeanor), and assault/non-assaultive behavior designed to ensure the safety and security of inmates and staff in the facility. It is also important to note that certain high-risk inmates (protective custody, mentally disabled) may be placed in administrative segregation which potential could alter the odds of inmate's risk of becoming victimized.

### Sample

The primary data source for this research was jail housing classification reports gathered by/at Clark County Jail. A data set was created using stratified random sample technique from differing quarters between the years 2012 and 2013. This current project was partially funded by the local university as part of a larger strategy to facilitate public safety research. In addition to access to classification reports, official arrest records detailing an individual's criminal offenses, biographical information, and deviance were used to explore correlations between incarcerated veterans and non-veterans. For

instance, do veteran and non-veteran offenders who commit similar types of crime experience the same levels of gang victimization. In addition to the predictor and outcome variables (i.e., military discharge and veteran status, and gang violence victimization) this study included: gang affiliation, mental health, criminal histories, community supervision, and education level.

## Measures

### Independent Variable

The independent variable in this study was a binary indicator of veteran status where veteran status refers to incarcerated inmates with prior service in any branch of the United States Armed Forces. Inmate's military service record was identified through the collection of jail housing classification reports where arrestees are processed through a series of objective evaluation standards. For example, inmates reported their veteran status by answering "yes" to the question "have you ever served in the United States military?" Inmates who answered "yes" were coded as 1 and inmates who answered "no" were coded as 0. It is important to note this study measures military service in general and does not differentiate among the various branches (Navy, Marines, Coast Guard, Army, Air Force) of the armed forces nor identifies veterans who experience combat or served in conflict operations.

### Dependent Variables

This study examined the effects of prior military service in a local jail environment using multiple dependent variables, including gang membership and victim of gang violence. The measure of the first dependent variable gang membership was based on the answer to the housing classification question "Are you or have you ever

been in a gang?” Inmates who answered “yes” were coded as 1, identifying gang membership, and inmates who answered “no” were coded as 0. Similarly, the variable victim of gang violence was identified based on the answer to the following questions: “Have you ever been a victim of gang violence?” Respondents who answered “yes” were also coded as 1, victim of gang violence, and inmates who answered “no” were coded as 0.

### Control Variables

This study used control variables which allow the evaluator to control for extraneous influences and protect against spurious relationships to better specify the influence of the independent variable on the dependent outcome. Control variables included measures of individual characteristics such as education, previous criminal history, prior criminal charges, previous or continuing correctional supervision (probation or parole), mental disabilities, and medical ailments. Other control variables included severity of offense type (felony vs misdemeanor; 1/2), correctional history (recorded as the number of days incarcerated), number of times booked into the Clark County Jail, protective custody, and escaped.

Education refers to the individual’s highest grade of school that a subject had completed (high school diploma, some college, college degree) in which three separate variables were used to measure the variation in an individual’s education. “Graduate high school” was measured as a dichotomous variable in which inmates who answered “yes” to the question: “Have you graduated high school?” were coded as 1, and those who answered “no” were coded as 0. Similarly, “College” was measured as a dichotomous variable where college educated inmates were coded as 1 with 0 corresponding to

inmates who were not college educated. “Military Discharge” was measured as a categorical variable of a veteran’s release from his or her obligation of service that was grouped into five categories: (a) honorable, (b) general, (c) medical, (d) dishonorable, and (e) other than honorable. In order to control for serious criminality a crime index was created where misdemeanants were given a weight of 1, felonious criminals a weight of 2. Thus, if an arrestee was booked and charged with both a misdemeanor and felony charge, that individual would receive a serious criminal index of 1.5.

### Logistic Regression

In this study, logistic regression analyses were performed to investigate the relationship between veteran inmates and jail gang victimization. Hosmer and Lemeshow (2013) note that regression models have developed into an essential component of data analysis concerned with explaining relationships between response and explanatory variables. Moreover, logistic regression is among the most frequently used methods in applied statistics as logistic regression allow researchers to predict outcome variables among one or multiple predictor variables (von Eye & Mun, 2013). While general regression analyses aim at predicting the likelihood of certain phenomena or events happening, logistic regression analysis examines binary outcomes in which dependent variables take on a value of 0 or 1 (Pollock, 2012).

Logistic regression models are used to analyze the average of the variables to determine the probability the independent variable will fall into either two cases of the dependent variables (Menard, 2002). In using logistic regression analysis, this researcher will be able to present the strength of the relationship between each independent variable on the various dependent variables. This will identify the correlation between gang

membership and veteran status. The regression analyses report the coefficient estimate and the intercept of each variable. Positive coefficients demonstrate a positive relationship between the dependent variables being tested, indicating that as the independent variables increase in value, so will dependent variables (Pollock, 2012). Asterisks were placed next to the coefficients if the relationship was statistically significant; one asterisk represented a significance level of 0.05, two asterisk for significance levels of 0.01, and three asterisks for the highest level of statistical significance less than 0.01. In addition to reporting statistical significance of coefficient estimates, the standard error of each variable is also recorded. Pollock (2012) notes that recording standard error permits the researcher to assess how much the sample varies by chance.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS AND FINDINGS

#### Introduction

In this chapter, descriptive statistics are presented along with two separate logistic regression analyses that test this study's hypothesis. Logistic regression tables presented in this chapter examine whether veteran status was positively correlated with gang membership or becoming a victim of gang violence.

Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1 by veteran status. Results show that five percent of the total sample population or 86 inmates were former members of the U.S. military. Comparatively, the vast majority, or 95 percent ( $n = 1,687$ ) of the full sample included in this study were non-veterans having never served in the U.S. military. When breaking down the descriptive statistic by veteran and non-veteran status, Table 1 also reveals that roughly seven percent of veterans identified gang membership with roughly three percent of non-veterans acknowledging gang affiliation. Furthermore, veteran status and gang membership indicated there was a statistically significant relationship between serving in the military and be a member in a gang ( $p < .01$ ). Approximately 21 percent of veterans ( $n=18$ ) reported having been placed in protected custody whereas non-veterans recorded low frequency of protected custody with a total of 223 non-veteran inmates or 13 percent.

Interestingly, approximately four veterans or five percent of veteran sample were victims of gang violence as compared to three percent ( $n =56$ ) of non-veterans. Regarding the descriptive statistics for the continuous control variables (serious criminality, the

number of days incarcerated, number of times booked in jail) the mean, standard deviation, and t-test results were provided. For non-veterans, the mean of serious criminality was 1.75 with a standard deviation of .58 indicating that non-veterans criminal index is clustered closely around the mean. These results indicate non-veterans inmates could be characterized as more violent or retained a greater proportion of felony charges. The mean of serious criminality for veteran inmates was 1.69 also revealing a higher proportion of felony convictions which would increase this crime index. Veteran inmates reported an average of 181 days previously incarcerated as compared to non-veteran who recorded a greater average of days incarcerated at 219. However, both non-veterans and veterans accounted for a mean of eight times previously booked into Clark County Jail.

Regarding descriptive statistics for medical alignments, results demonstrated that non-veteran inmates incurred a greater frequency than veterans or 31 percent versus 21 percent of veterans. However, veterans reported a greater percentage of mental illness and physical injuries. For veterans, the majority of inmates reported honorable discharges accounting for nearly 75 percent of the total veteran population. The remaining majority of veteran inmates reported other than dishonorable discharge or 23 percent of the entire veteran sample. Lastly, only two veterans reported either general or medical discharge.

Descriptive characteristics concerning inmate's previous educational achievement reveal the majority of veteran and non-veteran sustained education levels greater than high school equivalent. Included in educational background characteristics, inmates identified whether or not they participated in special education courses during high school. Results showed that non-veteran inmates were more likely to have participated in

special education courses during their high school education. Similarly, veteran and non-veterans inmates attained noteworthy level of college achievement with more than 50 percent of veteran inmates indicating previous college completion.

**Table 1:** Descriptive Statistics by Veteran Status

Variables	Non-Veteran		Veteran		Significance Test (X <sup>2</sup> or t-test)
	n= 1687		n=86		
	<i>F</i>	%	<i>F</i>	%	
Gang Membership	43	3	6	7	5.97**
Victim of Gang Viol.	56	3	4	5	0.44
Protective Custody	223	13	18	21	4.14*
Serious Criminality <sup>1</sup>	1.75	.58	1.69	.53	0.96
Days Incarcerated <sup>1</sup>	219	289	181	221	1.19
Number of Times Booked <sup>1</sup>	8	12	8	7	0.08
Medical	528	31	25	29	0.19
Mental Illness	326	19	22	26	2.03
Injuries	401	24	25	29	1.22
Discharge					
Honorable	----	----	64	74	
General Dis.	----	----	1	1	
Medical Dis.	----	----	1	1	
Other Dis.	----	----	20	23	
Education					
Graduate HS	873	52	65	76	19.8***
Special Education	238	14	7	8	2.39
College	662	39	49	57	11.3***

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$

<sup>1</sup> Mean average and standard deviations reported for continuous variables.

Table 2 provides results from a multivariate logistic regression model that predicts the likelihood of gang membership. Veteran status or previous military service has a significant effect in predicting gang membership. Holding inmate's serious

criminality, previous incarceration, and the number of time previously booked into Clark County Jail constant, veteran inmates are significantly more likely to report gang membership ( $b=1.12$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). Subsequently, veteran status inmates were more likely to be gang members as compared to non-veteran inmates. However, Model 1 of Tables 2 also shows no significant correlation existed between predicting gang membership for inmate's with more serious criminal charges, increased length of incarceration, or prior incarcerations. Furthermore, these results displayed in Table 2 also confirm that majority of inmates included in this study were not gang members (y-axis  $b= -4.58$ ) with the overall model showing to be statistically significant relationship.

**Table 2:** Logistic regression models predicting the likelihood of gang membership

Variables	Model 1		Model 2	
	n=1,773		n=1,768	
	<i>b</i>	Std. Error	<i>b</i>	Std. Error
Veteran Status	1.12**	0.45	1.10**	0.47
Serious Criminality	0.43	0.26	0.33	0.27
Days Incarcerated	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Number of Times Booked	-0.00	0.02	-0.01	0.02
Victim of Gang Viol.	-----	-----	0.63	0.58
Protective Custody	-----	-----	1.14***	0.34
Escape	-----	-----	2.78***	0.87
Graduated High School	-----	-----	-0.34	0.34
College Education	-----	-----	-0.11	0.35
Medical Ailment	-----	-----	-0.37	0.34
Mental Illness	-----	-----	-0.25	0.39
Y- Axis	-4.58***	0.54	-4.63***	0.60
X <sup>2</sup>	10.62*		30.17***	
LL	-218.85		-208.93	

\**p*<.05; \*\**p*<.01; \*\*\**p*<.001

Model 2 of Table 2 provides an additional regression model that predict the likelihood of gang membership with additional control variables. This model controls for inmates had been in protective custody, escaped from custody, graduate high school, or sustained medical injuries or mental disorders. Despite incorporating additional control variables into this model, veteran status remained statistically correlated with predicting

of gang membership ( $b = 1.10$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). Table 3 also revealed that inmates who had previously been in protective custody was statistically predictor of gang membership ( $b = 1.14$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Similarly, inmates who escaped from custody or incarceration was a statistically significant predictor of gang membership ( $b = 2.78$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). However, no relationship existed for inmate's medical alignments nor mental disabilities.

**Table 3:** Logistic regression models predicting the likelihood of being victim of gang violence

Variables	Model 1		Model 2	
	<i>b</i>	Std. Error	<i>b</i>	Std. Error
	n=1,773		n=1,753	
Veteran Status	0.32	0.54	0.23	0.57
Gang Membership	0.91	0.55	0.72	0.57
Serious Criminality	-0.15	0.26	-0.27	0.27
Days Incarcerated	0.00*	0.00	0.00	0.00
Number of Times Booked	0.003	0.01	0.00	0.01
Protective Custody	-----	-----	1.64***	0.30
Mental Illness	-----	-----	0.28	0.33
Medical Ailment	-----	-----	0.78**	0.30
Injuries	-----	-----	0.69**	0.30
Graduate High School	-----	-----	-0.68**	0.32
College Education	-----	-----	0.57	0.31
Y- Axis	-3.37***	0.47	-3.90***	0.54
X <sup>2</sup>	6.91		64.27***	
LL	-258.68		-222.59	

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$

Next, to further test the hypothesis that veteran status moderates the social hierarchy of the jail environment, additional logistic regression models were conducted predicting the likelihood of being a victim of gang violence. Table 3 displays these results finding veteran status was not significantly correlated with gang violence despite a slight positive relationship existing between military service and being a victim of gang violence was present ( $b = 0.32$ ). Interestingly, no correlation was found when controlling for gang membership nor inmate's serious criminality when testing to predict the likelihood of being victimized by gang violence. However, the number of days incarcerated in Clark County was a predictor of gang violence ( $b = 0.0008$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) indicating that inmates who are incarcerated for longer sentences have an increased risk of becoming a victim of gang violence. Lastly, Model 1 displayed in Table 3 confirmed that majority of inmates included in this study were not victims of gang violence (constant  $b = -3.37$ ) with the overall model showing to be statistically significant relationship ( $p < 0.001$ ).

Model 2 presented in Table 3 provides another logistic regression model predicting the likelihood of gang victimization with additional control variables. This model added controls for inmates had been in protective custody, escaped from custody, graduate high school, were college educated, retained medical alignments, sustained injuries or mental disorders. Similar to previous regression models, results displayed in Table 5 found veteran status was not a predictor of gang victimization despite incorporating additional control variables. Although, protective custody again demonstrated a significant correlation between predicting gang victimization ( $b = 1.64$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). These findings reveal a potential temporal time order indicating inmates were

first victimized by gang members then subsequently placed in protective custody for their safety.

Other important results presented in Table 3 show inmates with increased medical ailments ( $b = 0.78$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) or personal injuries ( $b = 0.69$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) was correlated with the likelihood of gang victimization. However, inmates with mental illnesses or disorders did not predicted the likelihood of gang victimization. Although, this could be attributed to Clark County's jail housing classification system in which inmates with diagnosed mental disabilities are placed in segregation housing for safety and security concerns. Nonetheless, this cannot be validated given the possibility that inmates could have been incarcerated elsewhere, and that facility might not segregate mentally ill inmates. Inmates who graduated high school disclosed a negative relationship for predicting gang victimization ( $b = -0.68$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) possibly indicating that educated inmates were better able to maneuver the incarcerated environment. Although, contrary to previous findings, inmates that were college education showed a slight positive relationship for predicting the likelihood of gang victimization ( $b = 0.57$ ), yet these results were not statistically significant. Finally, Table 3 confirmed that majority of inmates included in this study were not victims of gang violence (constant  $b = -3.90$ ) with the overall model showing the highest level of statistical significance ( $p < 0.001$ ).

## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION AND LIMITATIONS

#### Discussion

The logistic regression findings show many of the independent variables yielded positive effects predicting inmate gang membership and gang victimization. The initial logistic regression model examining the likelihood of gang membership found veteran status inmates were significantly more likely to be gang members than non-veteran inmates. This indicates that other pre-characteristics, such as veteran status, carry greater weight in predicting gang membership. Alternatively, no predictive relationship was found for inmates who spent longer periods of time incarcerated in the jail environment which is consistent with previous research that institutional misconduct and violence typically wain as inmates acclimate themselves to the confines of incarcerated life (Flanagan, 1980). Nonetheless, these results prove to be a rather interesting granted that inmate serious criminality was not a predictor of gang membership, suggesting that an inmate's previous criminal offenses did not influence inmate's decision to join a gang.

In a separate logistic regression model, when additional dependent variables were included in the regression analysis, veteran status remained positively correlated with gang membership. Moreover, inmates placed in protective custody along with inmates who escaped from correctional supervision were both positively correlated with gang membership. These results could potentially denote that inmates placed in protective custody were either current gang members fearing retaliation from a rival gang or former gang members segregated from general population for security reasons. Previous research

has found that when gang members attempt to leave the group, it jeopardizes group security, or the “blood in, blood out” doctrine (Fong & Vogel, 1995).

Research has found that inmates with previous escapes from custody might have a proneness to institutional misconduct, increasing the likelihood of eventual gang membership. Previous research has found that inmates who escape from custody are more likely to have a history of previous escapes (Holt, 1974). While little empirical research has specifically examined the link between escape of custody and gang membership, DeLisi, Berg, & Hochstetler (2004) found inmates with escape history was one of the strongest predictors of institutional violence.

Further analyses were performed predicting the likelihood of gang victimization. Veteran status was not positively correlated despite previous results showing veteran inmates were more likely to be gang members. These results give some credence to Logan and Pare (2016) “army strong” hypothesis that veteran inmates demonstrate an ability to fare better in the incarcerated environment. This research found that higher levels of education reduced an inmates chance of gang victimization. These findings are consistent with previous research that inmates with higher levels of education cope better to the confines of the incarcerated environment. Several scholars have found highly educated inmates are less likely to participate in criminal behavior (Lochner, 2004; Lochner & Moretti, 2001). Educated inmates typically have more to lose making them more likely to conform to incarcerated rules, as inmates who engage in rule violations may be less likely to be paroled or released. Additionally, more educated inmates can adapt to the institutional environment as they are more likely to possess social skills. Educated inmates might hold negotiation skills, be less impulsive, and more prosocial in

the general population, which collectively have proven to reduce the pains of imprisonment (Porporino & Zamble, 1984; Sappington, 1996; Sykes, 1958; Wooldredge, 1999; Wright, 1985).

Other significant results found medical ailments and physical injuries were both predictors of gang victimization meaning inmates with certain medical or injury-related characteristics were more likely to be victims of gang violence. Although this study found no relationship between inmates with mental disorders predicting the likelihood of gang victimization, this could be a result of Clark County's classification system that places confirmed cases of mentally ill inmates in segregated modules. Such results validate Clark County's policy of isolating high risk inmates with mental deficiencies as research finds mentally disordered inmates are more likely to be disruptive and participate in violent conduct (Toch, 1982; Toch & Adams, 1986). Further, other research finds that mentally handicapped inmates are at greater risk of physical and sexual victimization than their counterparts without mental illness (Wolff, Blitz, & Shi, 2007; Blitz, Wolff, & Shi, 2008). Thus, it would be in the interest of Clark County administrators to continue to isolate certain high risk inmates that could pose great security concerns to the overall population.

One potential explanation as to why veteran inmates were more likely to be gang members could be attributed to the shared similarities between military culture and gang organizational structures and used as a recruitment tool. Decker, Bynum, and Weisel (1998) identify that most gangs incur a rank and file form of social hierarchy including a constitution defining group behavior. Other scholars also note extreme loyalty, obedience (Marquart & Sorensen, 1997), and secrecy are fundamental and required components of

group dynamics (Fong & Buentello, 1991). Similarly, upon entrance into the United States military, recruits undergo a resocialization process that instill the same values of discipline, obedience, and loyalty typically found in gang organizations. Gangs might attempt to recruit veteran inmates who possess these skills as previous research has found that gang affiliated inmates were more likely to engage in violent and serious misconduct than nongang members (Fischer, 2001).

Other scholars have found that correctional facilities with increased gang members reported significantly higher rates of inmate homicide (Reisig, 2002). Consequently, veteran inmates with hand to hand combat training could be effective in protecting fellow members from rival gangs or keeping lesser members in check as violent behavior is customary and typically used to climb the prison hierarchy (Decker et al., 1998). As gang organization continue dominate the drug business, motivated by monetary gains, it is expected “turf wars” will persist requiring gangs to recruit inmates with special skills and devotion to group culture with veteran inmates fulfilling many of these requirements.

Although this study did not examine why veteran inmates are more likely to be gang affiliated, additional explanations warrant discussion. Recent scholarship investigating gang activity has found military communities are not immune from gang activity, despite the relative stable and secure environment (Eyler, 2009). Data collected from the National Gang Intelligence Center (NGIC), and the Criminal Investigation Command (CID) found an increase of gang-related criminal behavior involving military personnel. Between 2003-2007, the CID reported a total of 183 suspected gang-related incidents and felony investigation that were identified by military police. Among

individuals who were identified as official gang offenders, the majority were junior enlisted men (Eyler, 2009).

A separate report conducted by the NGIC found nearly all major street gangs were present in most branches of the military. For example, the FBI has identified some 40 military-affiliated gang members at Fort Bliss Army Base and roughly 130 at Fort Lewis since 2005. These same CID and NGIC reports also note the serious criminal acts committed by gang-affiliated military personnel. These reports find that gang involved military delinquency encompasses a vast array of criminal activity, ranging from lesser known money laundering to more sophisticated drug-trafficking operations. In one extreme incident, a gang member smuggled home assault weapons used in Iraq that were used in multiple bank robberies.

The increased presence of gang-affiliated members in the military can be attributed to alternations in recruitment policies throughout the different military branches. Although the United States Supreme Court has previously held that voluntariness and capacity are the only two requirements prescribed for military enlistment, this ruling has afforded much discretion in the hands of the national government prescribe additional recruitment requirements (physical, mental, age, and moral). Subsequently, different branches of the armed forces set their standards in excluding certain individuals from enlistment. The military automatically excludes recruits with prior felony convictions for drug trafficking, violent sexual assaults, and individuals convicted of multiple felonies (Alvarez, 2007).

However, the same law that disqualifies certain felons from military enlistment also permits the Secretary of Defense to make exceptions in meritorious cases. These

exceptions, commonly referred to as “moral waivers”, are used to recruit individuals with prior criminal records (Alvarez, 2007). Moral waivers have been used throughout the history of the armed forces (Boucai, 2007). In the past decade, as the U.S. Military struggled to meet demands of fighting a two front war on terror, the military has steadily increased the number of moral waivers, increasing the number of felons into the military (Tyson, 2008). The Army, in particular, between 2007 to 2008 has accepted more than double the number of moral waivers for individuals with prior felony convictions for crimes of burglary, aggregated assault, and grand larceny (Tyson, 2008). The screening of potential recruits remains an important function of the U.S. military; the recent rise in use moral waivers for ex-felony offenders coinciding with increased gang activity in the military could explain the reason as to why former veteran inmates were more likely to be gang members.

#### Policy Implications and Recommendations

Based upon logistic regression models showing veteran status was a significant predictor of gang membership, these results carry potential criminal justice policy implications. As previous research has demonstrated, former military service veterans who impact the criminal justice system experience high levels of PTSD, TBI, drug and substance abuse, and mental health disorders. A potential remedy to prevent veterans from becoming gang members or potential victims of gang violence would be diversion programs out of the general incarcerated environment.

One possible solution to divert veterans out of the incarcerated environment would be veteran treatment courts. Over the previous two decades, courts have faced a variety of new challenges, many of which are psychological in nature (Frederick, 2013).

Consequently, courts have transitioned attention from focusing on factual issues towards accommodating the special needs traditional courts have failed to adequately address. This paradigm shift led to the creation of problem-solving courts, later resulting in drug-treatment courts (Frederick, 2013). As drug courts gained more attention for their success, many of the techniques used have now been applied to various areas of the judicial system.

In response to the growing number of veterans returning from home from deployment and increasing veteran incarceration rates (an increase of 46 percent from 1985 to 1998), two judges, former veterans themselves, established the first known veterans court in Anchorage, Alaska in 2004 (Hawkins, 2010). The Anchorage Veterans Court was, by and large, a specialty court designed to handle misdemeanor cases overseen by a court administrator (Hawkins, 2010). Once defendants were arraigned and charges presented against them were amenable to veteran court, the defendant may be referred to veteran court either in pretrial detention or out of custody.

Veteran courts differ from the traditional drug treatment courts in the sense that they were designed to accommodate the special needs military veterans experience returning home from combat operations. For example, veteran treatment courts main goal is to attend to the defendant's psychological needs, rather than focus on factual issues. To a large extent, this shift in ideological treatment for veteran courts can be associated with the significant increase of veteran's returning from combat with serious physical and psychological needs.

More notably, in 2008, Buffalo City Court Judge Robert Russell founded one of the most successful veteran treatment courts (Frederick, 2013). By the end of 2008, less

than one year after the Buffalo Veteran Treatment Court opened, three veterans had graduated from the program and seventy-five were still participating. By the summer of 2009, Frederick (2013) found the Buffalo court had a zero percent recidivism rate for the veteran graduates of the program. Furthermore, in 2013, the VA released a report detailing the early success of veteran treatment courts. This report indicated there were some 168 formal veteran treatment courts nationwide, with roughly 7,724 veterans having participated in some form of a veteran treatment court since the inception of such programs began in 2008.

According to the VA report, there was an average of 24 veterans assigned to each court, despite the fact that each court caseload varies depending on the particular court. There are instances in which veteran participants could be released from programming. Exits from veteran treatment courts are categorized two ways, terminations and program completions. Veterans who become terminated from the program could result from serious illness warranting a release, noncompliance with program requirements, voluntary exits, or transfers. In the same 2013 Veteran Affairs report, roughly one-third (31 percent) of program participants were terminated from their respective veteran court program. However, the majority of veteran court participants successfully complete the court program with over two-thirds (69 percent) graduating their respective court program.

Additional data from two previous studies also support the adoption of veteran treatment courts. A two-yearlong assessment of the Anchorage, Alaska Veteran Treatment Court conducted from 2004-2006 found only one of the thirty-four graduates were rearrested within this two-year period (Frederick, 2013). Other studies have also

shown promising results highlighting many of the successes of veteran treatment courts. A 2011 study of graduates from eleven different treatments of the (then) fourteen veteran courts showed recidivism rates were less than 2 percent, as compared to nearly 70 percent recidivism rates for state prisoners.

Another possible solution to divert veterans out of the general incarcerated population would be to develop singular veteran housing pods. Recently, various California counties and a handful of other states have launched programs to incarcerate veteran inmates in veteran pods. Among the most noteworthy, the Community of Veterans Engaged in Restoration (COVER) program at San Francisco Jail in San Bruno program, established by the Sheriff's Office, was designed to assist veterans once they become released from custody. COVER, which recognizes the tumultuous transition many veterans face upon returning from combat, designed a program that offers veteran inmates a variety of in-jail counseling programs and educational opportunities (Brunker & Kaufman, 2012).

The San Diego, CA Vista Detention Facility has adopted a similar program, opening doors to a new module for its veteran as part of their "Veterans Moving Forward" program. The theory behind incorporating an all veterans housing module is to use the veteran inmate's shared experiences to help with rehabilitation and reentry. Additionally, all correctional officers and counselors assigned to the veteran's unit are former military veterans. According to a California Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC, 2014) article, as of August of 2014, 85 veterans have participated in the program with 44 released and only three veterans returning to jail. One of the central components to the success of the program are the roughly 20 to 30 community-based

organizations and volunteers that deliver vocational mentoring, financial planning and life skills. Furthermore, a veteran's justice outreach representative associated with Veteran Affairs assists veterans who are about to be released custody by ensuring inmates are signed up for healthcare and other military benefits.

Criminal justice agencies that are interested in investigating incarcerated veterans would be able to draw on local representatives from the Department of Veteran Affairs. It is common for many local VA offices to have experience assisting veterans with combat-related problems. Moreover, VA offices have access to federal-level funding to develop programs for treatment or other services (White et al., 2011). Veteran Affairs offices also offer a broad range of information and resources that deal with PTSD related issues as they operate the National Center for PTSD. Essentially, VA offices offer critical resources that local criminal justice systems might be able to draw on for supporting incarcerated veterans.

These programs highlight another significant policy implication concerning incarcerated veterans as these counties employ improved classification system that both identify and divert veterans upon their entrance into the jail system. Subsequently, this can potentially reduce veteran inmates risk of victimization or participation in jail misconduct if diversion takes place before being housed in the general incarcerated population. This is especially important concerning that controlling gang members is a critical concern of jail administrators. For instance, Fischer (2001) found that prison gang members were significantly more likely to commit serious disciplinary violations as compared to non-gang members. These justifiable policy recommendations would not only increase the likelihood that veterans are identified in the jail environment but would

also increase the chances that veterans do not recidivate upon release from correctional supervision.

### Limitations

Although the inquiry into the relationship between prior military service and the jail subculture yielded important findings, several limitations of the current study do exist and need to be acknowledged. Foremost, the low frequency of veteran status offenders included in this study is a potential cause for concern as the small sample size could affect the validity of these analyses. Moreover, this study relies on the honesty of jail housing classification reports and whether inmates are truthful in identifying veteran status or gang membership. This could impact the representation of veterans included in the sample size. Although, the total veteran sample listed in this study (5 percent) is within the target population of the total number of veterans incarcerated in jail or prison (8 percent).

It is also important to address the variance between the jail and prison incarcerated environments. Although considerable scholarship has examined the prison subculture and inmate's adherence to institutional norms, it remains difficult to assess whether inmates in the jail environment undergo prisonization to the same degree (Clemmer, 1940). Jails can be characterized by having a rapid turnover, as the majority of those imprisoned in jail serve shorter periods of confinement – potentially preventing an inmate subculture to form or develop (Garofalo & Clark, 1985).

Although this remains a potential limitation to the current study, it is important to note the depopulation of California prisons has transformed the role of county jails in considerable ways. For instance, California's *Criminal Justice Realignment Act* (AB 109)

transferred non-violent, non-serious, and non-sexual felony offenders to local jail custody where some of these offenders serve longer sentences than the pre-realignment maximum of one year in county jail. Consequently, jail populations have now accepted responsibility for housing more sophisticated criminals as they serve out their sentences under county correctional supervision.

Recently, Caudill and colleagues (Caudill, Trulson, Marquart, Patten, Thomas, & Anderson, 2014) examined the effects of prison depopulation on local jail violence finding a significant increase in inmate-on-staff assaults. In this study, researchers found an increase from an average of four assaults per quarter to fewer than six assaults on staff per quarter. Furthermore, a significant increase from 234 sentenced felons per quarter to 327 sentenced felons per quarter from the pre-AB 109 to post-AB 109 periods. Ultimately, Caudill and associates attributed the escalation of jail violence to the influx in the number of sentenced felons in county jails with the enactment of *Criminal Justice Realignment* legislation. As California counties jails have witnessed an increases in jail violence, the possibility of an institutional subculture manifesting seems more likely.

Another limitation of this research concerns the type of data used to examine serious criminality of inmates. For example, previous criminal histories were collected on a trajectory of an individual's life-course, meaning certain individual included in this study's sample could have potentially committed a criminal offense several years ago. More importantly, this could impact inmates standing in the incarcerated environment if they committed a crime a decade ago for a felony but were only recently booked for a misdemeanor. Ultimately, this could alter their adaptability or perception in the jail environment.

Lastly, generalizability is limited, as this study incorporated data from only one rural county jail population. Consequently, it remains difficult to proclaim that veteran inmates in other jails would demonstrate a similar relationship between military service and participation in gang organizations. More comparison is needed that would include both rural and urban county jail populations to better identify and validate the correlation between veteran status and gang membership in jail incarcerated environments

## CHAPTER VI

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

##### Conclusion

This thesis sought to investigate former military veterans incarcerated in county jail and whether veteran status moderates the social hierarchy of the incarcerated environment. Logistic regression models empirically tested Hughes (1945) and Becker's (1963) master status concept using gang membership and gang victimization as proxies to examine the relationship veteran status effects the jail subculture. The question of military veterans in the criminal justice system continues to remain a major concern among policy-makers and criminal justice practitioners. As more and more veterans return from war theaters, it remains essential to explore the nature and extent to which veterans impact the criminal justice system and prison subculture.

Military veterans and the criminal justice system have been tenuously linked throughout the history of U.S. military conflicts, as veterans returning from tours of duty sustain psychological and physical traumas, which have found to be associated with negative outcomes and the potential for incarceration (Accordion, Porter, & Morse, 2001; National Drug Court Institute, 2012). In addition, incarcerated veterans have a tendency to come from different social and demographic backgrounds from other inmates (Dabbs & Morris, 1990). More recently, Noonan and Mumola (2007) identified that incarcerated veterans in state prison were, on average, older and more educated than non-veteran counterparts. These pre-characteristics are important as such traits have been linked to

both reduce the pains of imprisonment (Benson & Cullen, 1988; Clemmer, 1958; Wooldredge, 1999).

The most recent available data investigating inmates with former military backgrounds incarcerated in prison or jail finds the number of incarcerated veterans has declined for the third straight decade (Bronson, Carson, Noonan, & Berzofsky, 2015). Conducted by BJS, this study found an estimated 181,500 veterans were serving in some correctional facility, making up about 8 percent of all veteran inmates in state and federal prisons and local jails. Consistent with prior research, these veteran inmates reported higher levels of mental illness, specifically PTSD than non-veteran inmates. Other significant findings reveal that a greater percentage of veterans were incarcerated for more serious and violent crimes than non-veterans. Further, roughly 43 percent of veteran population in prison reported having at least four or more prior arrests, revealing incarcerated veterans might be habitual offenders. Although, given that 77 percent of veterans incarcerated in state and federal prison and jail received honorable discharges. These findings are rather interesting given previous reports that the military has increased the number of moral waivers, accepting more ex-felons into the ranks.

The analyses presented in this thesis found veteran status was a strong predictor of gang membership (see Table 2). Additionally, protective custody and escape from correctional supervision were strong predictors of gang membership. However, the same analyses controlling for gang victimization, length of incarceration, education, medical, and mental disorders were not correlated with gang membership. It is worth considering that Clark County Jail isolates inmates with serious mental disorders which would influence inmate's likelihood of joining gang organizations. Furthermore, it would seem

highly unlikely that gangs would look to recruit individuals who would offer the organization little in return or demonstrate the capacity to abide by organization norms and rules.

Other logistic regression analyses conducted predicting the likelihood of gang victimization found veteran status was not a strong predictor (see Table 3). Although inmates with previous military service were more likely to be gang members, no positive relationship was found predicting gang victimization. Potentially, veteran inmates who are gang members might be better equipped to avoid such victimization as a result of their military training. Furthermore, if veteran inmates experienced combat, other inmates might perceive veteran inmates to be strong targets and avoid confronting them altogether. Although, the data available in this study did not assess the degree to which the veteran inmates experienced tours of combat.

However, regression analyses did find that the length of incarceration was a slight positive predictor of gang victimization meaning that longer sentences increased an inmates risk of gang victimization (see Table 3). Furthermore, results found that protective custody, medical illness, and physical injury were all predictors of gang victimization (see Table 3). This either points to the fact that inmates placed in protective custody were separated from the general incarcerate population because they had previously been a victim of gang violence or were at greater risk of becoming a victim. Similarly, inmates with reported medical ailments and physical injuries were significantly more likely to be victims of gang violence revealing that gangs tend to prey on weaker targets who might have difficulty fending for themselves. Interestingly, results found an inverse relationship between inmates who graduate high school, meaning inmates who

achieved a high school diploma were less likely to be victims of gang violence. However, no relationship was found for inmates with college experience.

The vast majority of the findings presented throughout this thesis were supported by prior research. However, two conflicting theories are evident as to why veteran status was positively correlated with gang membership but not gang victimization. The military has increased the number of moral waivers by accepting more ex-felony offenders in the armed forces, recent reports from the BJS finds that the number of veterans in state and federal prison and county jail continues to decline. It is difficult to ascertain that the veteran sample included in this study previously served in the military, were subsequently arrested, and then joined a gang upon entrance in the jail environment.

Furthermore, as limited research notes that veterans are better able to adjust to the confines of institutional life (Logan & Pare, 2016) it would seem paradoxical that veterans feel obligated to join a gang if they have the skills to fare better than non-veterans in the incarcerated environment. Thus, it would seem possible, given their military training, that veteran inmates who were gang members in this study were recruited into gang organizations. However, based on previous reports that current gang members are infiltrating the military, it is possible that veteran gang members included in this study were gang members prior to their service or incarceration.

The notion that veteran inmates retain a master status in the incarcerated environment has some validity given that veteran inmates were more likely to be gang members but not victims of gang violence. Furthermore, this could mean that veteran status carries a certain priority that overshadows gang membership. As it has been demonstrated throughout this thesis, veteran inmates typically enter the institutional

community with greater social capital and other pre-characteristics (education, social skills, military training) that allow inmates with prior military service to adapt to the confine of institutional life.

More importantly, these findings demonstrate partial support that veteran inmates do retain a master status, moderating the social hierarchy of the incarcerated environment. While veteran inmates were more likely to be gang members, the finding that veteran status was not correlated with gang victimization supports this theoretical framework. This potentially indicates that veteran gang members possess a certain set of skills that make them less likely to be targets of gang violence, further supporting an importation model.

#### Future Research

As more and more veterans return from theaters of war, it remains essential to investigate the nature and extent to which veterans impact the criminal justice system, specifically the incarcerated environment. Despite previous research examining the potential link between military service and criminal behavior (Bouffard, 2003, 2005; White et al., 2012) future research should attempt to better assess the problems and prior experiences of military veterans that might impact their status in the jail or prison community. As various research has documented the serious physical and psychological ailments many veterans experience upon their return from service, little research has empirically investigated veterans returning from Iraq or Afghanistan. Consequently, this lack of research has made it difficult to identify potential risks factors of more recent military veterans. Thus, future researchers might consider including more recent veterans

who served in OEF/OIF to better understanding the changing dynamics of the war and how this impacts veterans returning from combat.

Subsequently, future research should be concerned with assessing more data to better examine how veteran status impacts inmate behavior increasing prison misconduct or jail violence. Criminal justice administrators and practitioners have a vested interest in advancing this scholarship as one of the primary roles of correctional supervision is the safety and security of the facility. It would be in the interest of future scholars to investigate veteran status and more serious institutional misconduct as a way for jail administrators to provide more security or divert dangerous inmates out of the general population. Another important recommendation for future research should include more comprehensive comparison between both rural and urban county jail populations to better identify and validate the correlation between veteran inmates and gang members in jail incarcerated environments.

Additionally, future research is needed to continue to examine the dynamics military service affects gang violence and prison misconduct. More federal funding is needed to better identify the serious physical and psychological ailments associated with combat to ensure returning veterans receive the attention they deserve. Although the review of the literature revealed some available data about veterans incarcerated in jails or prisons exist, little is known about the problems and prior experiences of military veterans that might impact their status in the prisons environment.

More research is needed to discern whether veteran status impacts inmate behavior increasing prison misconduct or jail violence. Many policy related questions still persist considering given the vast majority California criminal justice agencies do not

collect data concerning the number of incarcerated veterans in their courts or jails. Based on the lack of awareness concerning veterans incarcerated in local county jurisdictions, it is highly recommended that future scholarship attempt to build bridges between counties that collect data on former military veterans to ensure individuals who sacrifice for their country are not forgotten.

## REFERENCES

## REFERENCES

- Abbott, E. (1918). Crime and the war. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 9(1), 32-45.
- Abbott, E. (1927). The Civil War and the crime wave of 1865-70. *Social Service Review*, 51(1), 71-93.
- Accordino, M. P., Porter, D. F., & Morse, T. (2001). Deinstitutionalization of persons with severe mental illness: Context and consequences. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 67(2), 16-21.
- Alvarez, L. (2007, February 14). Army giving more waivers in recruiting. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/02/14/us/14military.html>
- Archer, D., & Gartner, R. (1976). Violent acts and violent times: A comparative approach to postwar homicide rates. *American Sociological Review*, 41(6), 937-963.
- Becker, Howard. (1963). *The outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bench, L. L., & Allen, T. D. (2003). Investigating the stigma of prison classification: An experimental design. *The Prison Journal*, 83(4), 367-382.
- Bennett, J. V. (1954). Criminality of veterans, The. *Federal Probation*, 18(2), 40-42.
- Benson, M. L., & Cullen, F. T. (1988). The special sensitivity of white-collar offenders to prison: A critique and research agenda. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 16, 207-215.
- Bentley, S. (2005). A short history of PTSD: from Thermopylae to Hue soldiers have always had a disturbing reaction to war. *The VVA Veteran*.
- Berg, M. T., & DeLisi, M. (2006). The correctional melting pot: Race, ethnicity, citizenship, and prison violence. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34(6), 631-642.

- Berryman, S. E. (1988). *Who serves? The persistent myth of the underclass army*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Blitz, C. L., Wolff, N., & Shi, J. (2008). Physical victimization in prison: The role of mental illness. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 31(5), 385-393.
- Board of State and Community Corrections. (2014). *Military vets find support in jail*. Sacramento, CA: Author.
- Bohannon, J. R., Dosser, D. A., & Lindley, S. E. (1995). Using couple data to determine domestic violence rates: An attempt to replicate previous work. *Violence and Victims*, 10(2), 133-141.
- Boivin, Michael. (1987). Forgotten warriors: An evaluation of the emotional well-being of presently incarcerated Vietnam veterans. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 113(1), 109-125.
- Bronson, J., Carson, A., Noonan, M., & Berzofsky, M. (2015). *Veterans in prison and jail, 2011-12*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Brownfield, D., Sorenson, A. M., & Thompson, K. M. (2001). Gang membership, race, and social class: A test of the group hazard and master status hypotheses. *Deviant Behavior*, 22(1), 73-89.
- Browning, H. L., Lopreato, S. C., & Poston Jr, D. L. (1973). Income and veteran status: variations among Mexican Americans, blacks and anglos. *American Sociological Review*, 38(1), 74-85.
- Bryant, C. D. (1979). *Khaki-collar crime: Deviant behavior in the military context*. New York: Free Press.

- Brunker, M., & Kaufman, L. (2012, July 18). S.F. Sheriff's Dept. aims to heal veterans' wounded spirits behind bars. *NBC NEWS*. Retrieved from [http://usnews.nbcnews.com/\\_news/2012/07/18/12773651-sf-sheriffs-dept-aims-to-heal-veterans-wounded-spirits-behind-bars](http://usnews.nbcnews.com/_news/2012/07/18/12773651-sf-sheriffs-dept-aims-to-heal-veterans-wounded-spirits-behind-bars)
- Boucai, M. (2007). Balancing your strengths against your felonies: Considerations for military recruitment of ex-offenders. *University of Miami Law Review*, 61(4), 997.
- Bouffard, L. A. (2003). Examining the relationship between military service and criminal behavior during the Vietnam era: A research note. *Criminology*, 41(2), 491-510.
- Bouffard, L. A. (2005). The military as a bridging environment in criminal careers: differential outcomes of the military experience. *Armed Forces & Society*, 31(2), 273-295.
- Burchett K., Fereira D., & Sullivan, G. "Post-deployment homicide." Newsletter of Section VII of the *American Psychological Association*. Spring/Summer 2008, pp 13–14.
- Camp, S. D., & Gaes, G. G. (2005). Criminogenic effects of the prison environment on inmate behavior: Some experimental evidence. *Crime and Delinquency*, 51(3), 425-442.
- Camp, S. D., Gaes, G. G., Langan, N. P., & Saylor, W. G. (2003). The influence of prisons on inmate misconduct: A multilevel investigation. *Justice Quarterly*, 20(3), 501-533.
- Card, J. J. (1983). *Lives after Vietnam: The personal impact of military service*. Free Press.

- Cao, L., Zhao, J., & Van Dine, S. (1997). Prison disciplinary tickets: A test of the deprivation and importation models. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 25(2), 103-111.
- Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. E. (1993). When do individual differences matter? A paradoxical theory of personality coherence. *Psychological Inquiry*, 4(4), 247-271.
- Caudill, J. W., Trulson, C. R., Marquart, J. W., Patten, R., Thomas, M. O., & Anderson, S. (2014). Correctional destabilization and jail violence: The consequences of prison depopulation legislation. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 42(6), 500-506.
- Clemmer, D. (1958). Observations on imprisonment as a source of criminality. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 41(3), 311-319.
- Clemmer, P. (1940). *The prison community*. Boston: The Christopher Publishing Company.
- Coleman, P. (2006). *Flashback: Posttraumatic stress disorder, suicide, and the lessons of war*. Beacon Press.
- Culp, R., Youstin, T. J., Englander, K., & Lynch, J. (2013). From war to prison: Examining the relationship between military service and criminal activity. *JQ: Justice Quarterly*, 30(4), 651-680.
- Culp, R. (2007, March 13-17). *Where have all the young men gone? Research on the relationship between military personnel levels and prison population*. Paper presented at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Settle, WA.
- Cunningham, M. D., Sorensen, J. R., & Reidy, T. J. (2005). An actuarial model for assessment of prison violence risk among maximum security inmates. *Assessment*, 12(1), 40-49.

- Dabbs, J. M., & Morris, R. (1990). Testosterone, social class, and antisocial behavior in a sample of 4,462 men. *Psychological Science, 1*(3), 209-211.
- Decker, S.H., Bynum, T.S., & Weisel, D.L. (1998). Gangs as organized crime groups: A tale of two cities. *Justice Quarterly, 15*(3), 395–423.
- Degeneffe, C. E. (2001). Family caregiving and traumatic brain injury. *Health and Social Work, 26*(4), 257-268.
- DeLisi, M., Berg, M. T., & Hochstetler, A. (2004). Gang members, career criminals and prison violence: Further specification of the importation model of inmate behavior. *Criminal Justice Studies, 17*(4), 369-383.
- Elder Jr, G. H. (1999). The life course and aging: Some reflections. Distinguished Scholar Lecture, 10.
- Eyler, G. (2009). Gangs in the military. *The Yale Law Journal, 118*(4), 696-742.
- Finley, E. P. (2011). *Fields of combat: Understanding PTSD among veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan*. Cornell University Press.
- Fischer, D. R. (2001). *Arizona Department of Corrections: Security Threat Group (STG) program evaluation, final report*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.
- Flanagan, T. J. (1980). Time served and institutional misconduct: Patterns of involvement in disciplinary infractions among long-term and short-term inmates. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 8*(6), 357-367.
- Fong, R.S., & Buentello, S. (1991). The detection of prison gang development: An empirical assessment. *Federal Probation, 55*(1), 66–69.

- Fong, R. S., Vogel, R. E., & Buentello, S. (1995). Blood-in, blood-out: The rationale behind defecting from prison gangs. *Journal of Gang Research*, 2(4), 45-51.
- Fontana, A., & Rosenheck, R., (2005). The role of war zone trauma and PTSD in the etiology of antisocial behavior. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 193(3), 203–209.
- Frederick, A. (2013). Veterans treatment courts: Analysis and recommendations. *Law and Psychology Review*, 38, 211-230.
- Freeman, T. W., & Roca, V. (2001). Gun use, attitudes toward violence, and aggression among combat veterans with chronic posttraumatic stress disorder. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 189(5), 317-320.
- Garofalo, J., & Clark, R. D. (1985). The inmate subculture in jails. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 12(4), 415-434.
- Giardino, A. E. (2009). Combat veterans, mental health issues, and the death penalty: addressing the impact of post-traumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury. *Fordham Law Review*, 77(6), 2955-2996.
- Goetting, A., & Howsen, R. M. (1986). Correlates of prisoner misconduct. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 2(1), 49-67.
- Greenberg, G. A., & Rosenheck, R. A. (2011). Incarceration among male veterans: Relative risk of imprisonment and differences between veteran and nonveteran inmates. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*.
- Greenburg, D.L., Roy, M.J., (2007). In the shadow of Iraq: posttraumatic stress disorder. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 22(6), 888–889.

- Greenberg, G. A., Rosenheck, R. A., & Desai, R. A. (2007). Risk of incarceration among male veterans and nonveterans are veterans of the all volunteer force at greater risk? *Armed Forces & Society*, 33(3), 337-350.
- Hakeem, M. (1946). Service in the armed forces and criminality. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology (1931-1951)*, 37(2), 120-131.
- Hamon, A. (1918). *Lessons of the World War*. Tr. B. Mall. London: Fisher Unwin.
- Hawkins, M. (2009). Coming home: Accommodating the special needs of military veterans to the criminal justice system. *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law*, 7(2), 563-574.
- Hendin, H., & Haas, A. P. (1984). Post traumatic stress disorders in veterans of early American wars. *Psychohistory Review*, 12, 25-30.
- Hoge, C. W., Castro, C. A., Messer, S. C., McGurk, D., Cotting, D. I., & Koffman, R. L. (2004). Combat duty in Iraq and Afghanistan, mental health problems, and barriers to care. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 351(1), 13-22.
- Hollingshead, R. A. (1946). Adjustment to military life. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 51, 439-447.
- Holt, N., (1974). *Escape from Custody*. California Department of Corrections, Research Report No. 52.
- Hosmer, D. W., Lemeshow, S. (2013). *Applied logistic regression*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Hughes, E. C. (1945). Dilemmas and Contradictions of Status. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 50(5), 353-359.

- Irwin, J., & Cressey, D. (1962). Thieves, convicts and the inmate culture. *Social Problems, 10*, 142.
- Jiang, S., & Fisher-Giorlando, M. (2002). Inmate misconduct: A test of the deprivation, importation, and situational models. *The Prison Journal, 82*, 335-358.
- Kulka, R. A., Schlenger, W. E., Fairbank, J. A., Hough, R. L., Jordan, B. K., Marmar, C. R., et al. (1990). *The national Vietnam veterans readjustment study, tables of findings and technical appendices*. New York, NY: Brunner/Mazel.
- Landolfi, J., & LeClair, D. P. (1976). *A Profile of Vietnam era veterans incarcerated in Massachusetts correctional institutions*. Massachusetts Department of Correction.
- Lasko, N. B., Gurvits, T. V., Kuhne, A. A., Orr, S. P., & Pitman, R. K. (1994). Aggression and its correlates in Vietnam veterans with and without chronic posttraumatic stress disorder. *Comprehensive Psychiatry, 35*(5), 373-381.
- Laub, J. H., & Sampson, R. J. (2003). *Shared beginnings, divergent lives*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Shanahan, M. J., & Elder Jr, G. H. (2006). History, human agency and the life course. In *Nebraska symposium on motivation*.
- Lawrence, Q. (2015, November 5). Behind bars, vets with PTSD face a new war zone, with little support. *National Public Radio*. Retrieved from <http://www.npr.org/2015/11/05/454292031/behind-bars-vets-with-ptsd-face-a-new-war-zone-with-little-support>
- Lee, Y. (2013). Military veterans, culpability, and blame. *Criminal Law and Philosophy, 7*(2), 285-307.
- Levin, A. (2008). Blast injury sequelae linked to PTSD. *Psychiatric News, 43*(6), 23-30.

- Litz, B. (n.d.) *The unique circumstances and mental health impact of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq*. Retrieved March 19, 2008 from [http://www.ncptsd.va.gov/ncmain/ncdocs/fact\\_shts/fs\\_iraqafghanistan\\_wars.htm](http://www.ncptsd.va.gov/ncmain/ncdocs/fact_shts/fs_iraqafghanistan_wars.htm)
- Lochner, L. (2004). Education, work, and crime: A human capital approach. *International Economic Review*, 45, 811-843.
- Lochner, L., & Moretti, E. (2001). *The effect of education on crime: Evidence from prison inmates, arrests, and self-reports*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Logan, M. W., & Pare, P. P. (2016). Are inmates with military backgrounds “army strong?” *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 1-28.
- Lunden, W. A. (1952). Military service and criminality. *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Political Science*, 42, 766-773.
- Maguire, K. E., Flanagan, T. J., & Thornberry, T. P. (1988). Prison labor and recidivism. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 4(1), 3-18.
- Marquart, J.W. & Sorensen, J.R. eds., (1997). *Correctional contexts: Contemporary and classical readings*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Pub.
- McCormick-Goodhart, M. A. (2012). Leaving no veteran behind: Policies and perspectives on combat trauma, veterans courts, and the rehabilitative approach to criminal behavior. *Penn State Law Review*, 117(3), 895-926.
- Menard, S. (2002). *Applied logistic regression analysis*. London: Sage.
- Mettler, S. (2002). Bringing the state back in to civic engagement: Policy feedback effects of the GI bill for World War II veterans. *American Political Science Review*, 96(02), 351-365.

- Miethe, T. D., & McCorkle, R. C. (1997). Gang membership and criminal processing: A test of the “master status” concept. *Justice Quarterly*, 14(3), 407-427.
- Moskos, C. C. (1976). The military. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 55-77
- Mumola, C. J. (2000, January 18). Veterans in prison or jails, Stat. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.  
Retrieved from <http://www.bjs.gov>
- National Drug Court Institute. (2012). *Justice for vets*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Noonan, M. E., & Mumola, C. J. (2007). *Veterans in state and federal prison, 2004*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Pentland, B., & Dwyer, J. (1985). Incarcerated Viet Nam veterans. In, *Trauma of war: stress and recovery in Viet Nam veterans / edited by Stephen M. Sonnenberg, Arthur S. Blank, Jr., John A. Talbott* (pp. 403-416). Washington, D.C. American Psychiatric Press.
- Pizarro, J., Silver, R. C., & Prause, J. (2006). Physical and mental health costs of traumatic war experiences among Civil War veterans. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 63(2), 193-200.
- Pollock III, P., H. (2012). *The essentials of political analysis*. Washington DC: CQ Press.
- Porporino, F. J., & Zamble, E. (1984). Coping with imprisonment. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 26, 403-421.
- Rand, A. (1987). Transitional life events and desistance from delinquency and crime. *From boy to man, from delinquency to crime*, 134-162.

- Reisig, M. D. (2002). Administrative control and inmate homicide. *Homicide Studies*, 6, 84-103.
- Resnick, H. S., Foy, D. W., Donahoe, C. P., & Miller, E. N. (1989). Antisocial behavior and post-traumatic stress disorder in Vietnam veterans. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 45(6), 860-866.
- Russell, R. T. (2009). Veterans treatment court: A proactive approach. *New England Journal on Crime and Civil Confinement*, 35, 357.
- Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1996). Socioeconomic achievement in the life course of disadvantaged men: Military service as a turning point, circa 1940-1965. *American Sociological Review*, 61(3), 347-367.
- Sappington, A. A. (1996). Relationships among prison adjustment, beliefs, and cognitive coping style. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 40, 54-62.
- Sayer, N. A., Orazem, R. J., Noorbaloochi, S., Gravely, A., Frazier, P., Carlson, K. F., & Oleson, H. (2015). Iraq and Afghanistan War Veterans with reintegration problems: differences by Veterans Affairs healthcare user status. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 42(4), 493-503.
- Schlenger, W. E., Kulka, R. A., Fairbank, J. A., Hough, R. L., Jordan, K., Marmar, C. R., & Weiss, D. S. (1992). The prevalence of post-traumatic stress disorder in the Vietnam generation: A multimethod, multisource assessment of psychiatric disorder. *Journal of traumatic Stress*, 5, 533-536.

- Shaw, D. (1987). Criminal behavior and post-traumatic stress disorder in Vietnam veterans. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 28, 403–411.
- Sherman, M. D., Sautter, F., Jackson, M. H., Lyons, J. A., & Han, X. (2006). Domestic violence in veterans with posttraumatic stress disorder who seek couples therapy. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 32(4), 479-490.
- Sontag, D., & Alvarez, L. (2008, January 13). War torn, part I: Across America, deadly echoes of foreign battles. Retrieved from <http://www.newyorktimes.com>.
- Sparr, L. F., Reaves, M. E., & Atkinson, R. M. (1987). Military combat, posttraumatic stress disorder, and criminal behavior in Vietnam veterans. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law Online*, 15(2), 141-162.
- Sreenivasan, S., Garrick, T., McGuire, J., Smee, D. E., Dow, D., & Woehl, D. (2013). Critical concerns in Iraq/Afghanistan war veteran-forensic interface: combat-related postdeployment criminal violence. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law Online*, 41(2), 263-273.
- Stacer, M. J., & Solinas-Saunders, M. (2015). Physical and verbal assaults behind bars does military experience matter? *The Prison Journal*, 95(2), 199-222.
- Steinke, P. (1991). Using situational factors to predict types of prison violence. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 17, 119-132.
- Summerall, E. L. (2008). *Traumatic brain injury and PTSD fact sheet*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncptsd.va.gov>
- Sykes, G. (1958). *The society of captives: A study of a maximum security prison* NJ: Princeton University.

- Tanielian, T., & Jaycox, L. H. (2008). Invisible Wounds of War. *Rand Corporation*, 1-66.
- Toch, H. 1982. The disturbed disruptive inmate: Where does the bus stop? *Journal of Psychiatry and Law*, 10, 327-349.
- Toch, H., & Adams, K. G. (1986). Pathology and disruptiveness among prison inmates. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 23, 7-21.
- Tsai, J., Rosenheck, R. A., Kaspro, W. J., & McGuire, J. F. (2013). Risk of incarceration and other characteristics of Iraq and Afghanistan era veterans in state and federal prisons. *Psychiatric Services*, 64(1), 36-43.
- Tyson, A. S. (2008, April 22). Military waivers for ex-convicts increase. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/04/21/AR2008042103295.html>
- von Eye, A. and Mun, E.-Y. (2012). *Log-Linear Models of Rater Agreement*, in *Log-Linear Modeling: Concepts, Interpretation, and Application*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA.
- Wagley, P. V. (1944). Army rehabilitates military offenders, *The Fed. Probation*, 8, 14.
- Wanke, P. (1999). American military psychiatry and its role among ground forces in World War II. *The Journal of Military History*, 63(1), 127.
- Willbach, H. (1948). Recent crimes and the veterans. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* (1931-1951), 38(5), 501-508.
- Wilson, J. P., & Zigelbaum, S. D. (1983). The Vietnam veteran on wal: The relation of post-traumatic stress disorder to criminal behavior. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 1(3), 69-83.

- White, M. D., Mulvey, P., Fox, A. M., & Choate, D. (2012). A hero's welcome? Exploring the prevalence and problems of military veterans in the arrestee population. *Justice Quarterly*, 29(2), 258-286.
- Wolff, N., Blitz, C. L., & Shi, J. (2007). Rates of sexual victimization in prison for inmates with and without mental disorders. *Psychiatric Services*, 58(8), 1087-1094.
- Wooldredge, J. D. (1999). Inmate experiences and psychological well-being. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26, 235-250.
- Wright, K. N. (1985). The violent and victimized in the male prison. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 16(4), 1-26.
- Wright, J. P., Carter, D. E., & Cullen, F. T. (2005). A life-course analysis of military service in Vietnam. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 42(1), 55-83.
- Yager, T., Laufer, R., & Gallops, M. (1984). Some problems associated with war experience in men of the Vietnam generation. *Archives of general psychiatry*, 41(4), 327-333.
- Yesavage, J. A. (1983). Differential effects of Vietnam combat experiences vs. criminality on dangerous behavior by Vietnam veterans with schizophrenia. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 171(6), 382-384.