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Accomplishments

\* What are the major goals of the project?

This project collected data in one prison to reveal its network structure and correlate this with inmate health, safety, and rehabilitative outcomes. The investigators designed and fielded a network survey measuring ties of friendship, respect, and support for all inmates in one prison unit (205 inmates) of a Pennsylvania medium security men’s prison. Survey administration was conducted via face-to-face Computer-Assisted Personal Interviews (CAPI) repeated. Drawing on network and social influence theories, the study analyzed how the prison’s informal network structure related to the distribution of inmate demographic characteristics and behavioral outcomes—including race, mental and physical health, and recidivism.

***Stage 1 (Pre-Collection):*** During the first year, we finalized the survey instrument and submitted for IRB approval. The PSU Survey Research Center helped create the CAPI instrument and survey protocol. We identified and trained four research assistants to assist with prison interviews.

***Stage 2 (Baseline Survey):*** At the end of the first year, we fielded the baseline survey. Four interviewers worked each day for an average of 10 inmates surveyed per day. With this schedule, the surveys were completed in a three-week period. Upon completion of the baseline survey, we began cross-sectional network analyses and published four empirical papers (*Justice Quarterly, American Sociological Review, Journal of Health and Social Behavior,* and *Social Networks)*. Results of the cross-sectional (i.e., ERGM) analyses also informed required changes to the 2nd survey questionnaire.

***Stage 3 (Survey Revision and Re-Administration):*** In year two, we reviewed the survey protocol and made necessary adjustments. Three months following the baseline survey, we re-assessed the same prison unit with a follow-up survey. This was followed with a longitudinal network analyses. At the end of this year, we received funding for two additional prison network studies (i.e., in a prison-based drug treatment program and in women’s prisons) that are currently underway.

***Stage 4 (Qualitative Follow-Ups and Next Steps):*** An extension of the project began to follow parole-eligible respondents during their period of community re-entry. Using three semi-structured qualitative interviews (pre-release, 3 months post-release, and 9 months post-release) we followed 49 parolees through their re-entry experiences. This rich narrative data will inform a book that also includes the social network data.

\* What was accomplished under these goals (you must provide information for at least one of the 4 categories below)?

Major Activities:

We have accomplished the following activities within the period of this award:

1. Developed a 45-minute CAPI survey for administration in a prison unit housing 205 inmates.
2. Received IRB approval from PSU for survey administration and data collection.
3. Trained 8 graduate students, 1 research assistant, and 1 postdoctoral scholar to administer surveys.
4. In June, 2015, we administered Wave 1 CAPI surveys to 142 inmates (69%) of the sampled prison unit.
5. Coded survey data and merged it with official data from PA Department of Corrections (PADOC).
6. Based on preliminary results, we revised the survey instrument. A key difference in the Wave 2 survey was to include open-­ended general questions to establish inmate trust and interest.
7. In Nov, 2015, we administered Wave 2 CAPI surveys to 120 inmates (59%) of the studied prison unit.
8. In Nov, 2015, we presented three papers at the American Society of Criminology annual conference based on Wave 1 preliminary results. In the same month, we presented a paper at the annual Illicit Networks Workshop.
9. We coded survey data from Wave 2 and merged this with PADOC official data and Wave 1 data.
10. In Waves 1 and 2, we recruited approximately 75 parole-eligible inmates to participate in longitudinal interviews pre- and post-release. These interviews focus on expected and realized social networks and experiences upon prison release. To date, we have conducted 49 pre-release interviews, 32 interviews 3 months after prison release, and 11 interviews 9 months after prison release.
11. Interview audio files are currently being transcribed and qualitatively coded by undergraduate research assistants.
12. We have published six papers in top sociological and criminological journals (Justice Quarterly, Social Networks, Social Science and Medicine, Annual Review of Criminology, American Sociological Review, and Journal of Health and Social Behavior) along with two book chapters in edited volumes.
13. One graduate student completed his dissertation using the longitudinal network interviews and was placed at a top-5 Criminology program (University of Albany).
14. We presented two PINS papers at the 2016 and one PINS paper at the 2017 American Society of Criminology annual conferences.
15. We have three PINS papers accepted at the 2018 American Society of Criminology annual conference in Atlanta, GA.
16. A book is being planned for the re-entry study.
17. We received funding from the National Institute of Justice (2016-MU-MU-0011) to support replications of the PINS study in two PA women's prisons.
18. A paper summarizing the PINS prison network data collection has been accepted for publication in an edited volume on prisoner re-entry (NYU Press).
19. Analyses of the first women’s prison suggest that the inmate network structure looks very similar to that observed in the PINS prison. We are presenting these results and preparing a paper for publication.
20. Enough time has elapsed since the data collection that we can collect and analyze release and recidivism data for a large proportion of the original sample. We have collected data from the PA Department of Corrections that provides release and reincarceration data. As of the time of this report, 64% (N=176) were released from prison following our data collection. Of these, 16% (N=29) have been reincarcerated. Additionally, we have collected arrest data from the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts (AOPC) and are in the process of coding this data to examine arrest rates and time-to-arrest analyses.

Significant Results:

Our published and ongoing analyses produced the following broad patterns:

1. Inmate Status: Unit residents most likely to be nominated as "powerful and influential" were older and had spent more time on the sampled unit. These "old heads" often led unit treatment programs, mentored younger inmates, and arbitrated conflicts or racial tensions. In general, the informal social organization demonstrated a fairly conventional normative climate focused on reducing conflicts and maintaining peace and order. These results will be published in American Sociological Review.
2. Inmate Friendship: Unit residents were connected to one another in a dense friendship network that is comparable to friendship networks in other settings, such as schools. Although friendships tended to be within the same race/ethnicity, central inmates also had ties outside their demographic group. This reduces group partitioning and maintains unit network integrity, creating a core­-periphery structure. These results have been published in Social Networks.
3. Unit Social Integration and Health: Unit residents at the center of the friendship network (i.e., with more incoming friendship ties) demonstrated improved health as measured by self-­reported depression, BMI, smoking, and exercise. More marginal members to the unit (who were also generally younger and in prison for shorter sentences) reported the greatest number of health risks. A paper on this topic was published in Social Science and Medicine and another has been accepted for publication at Journal of Health and Social Behavior.
4. Visitation and Race: African American inmates are visited less often than whites and Hispanics, and these racial differences are primarily explained by the distance that the families of African Americans are required to travel to the prison and their limited financial resources. We are drafting these results for publication.
5. New Inmate Integration: In our first longitudinal analysis, we explore the process by which new inmates enter the unit's friendship network. We find that new inmates typically enter at the periphery of the unit's network structure and in the group most associated with their race/ethnicity. However, there are some new inmates with prior exposure to the unit or with extensive prison experience that are able to enter at the core of the prison network structure. These findings are being prepared for publication.
6. Qualitative Interviews: Our parolee data are producing strong disjunctures between perceived and realized re-entry experiences. We are currently analyzing egocentric network data resulting from these surveys and qualitatively coding interview data for analyses. We are also writing a qualitative paper on prison data collection.
7. Reincarceration Rate: Of the inmates who were released from our “good behavior” unit (N=176), 16% (N=29) have returned to prison.

Key outcomes or Other achievements:

Our primary products are:

1. Six published journal articles
2. Two published or forthcoming book chapters
3. More than 15 conference presentations to Criminology, Sociology, and Network audiences
4. One graduate student dissertation
5. One presentation to the Department of Corrections

Our primary achievements are:

1. Administration of two waves of network surveys to inmates in a sampled prison unit
2. Coding survey and network data for Waves 1 and 2
3. Merging survey data with PADOC official data
4. Network graphs and analyses (e.g., ERGM) of a prison unit
5. Follow-up interviews of approximately 50 paroled inmates
6. Collection of re-arrest and re-incarceration data for all surveyed respondents

\* What opportunities for training and professional development has the project provided?

This project has provided an excellent opportunity for graduate students and post-doctoral research associates to be engaged with primary data collection and research production. We now have 8 graduate students, 1 research assistant, and 1 postdoctoral associate who have been trained and experienced in CAPI administration to inmates. Two graduate students are conducting qualitative interviews of parole­-eligible inmates that form the bases for their dissertations. These two students also applied their experiences to develop and submit funding proposals (NSF and NIJ) to support their research.

All of the graduate students remain involved with the data analysis and manuscript writing phases. There are four manuscripts currently under production, and each has at least one involved graduate student.

A postdoctoral research associate (Dr. Soyer) led the prison data collection team and has since assumed a tenure-track faculty position at Hunter College.

Four undergraduate students have participated on the project to code qualitative interview data and assist in interview data collection. One of these students accepted a graduate program offer from Temple University.

\* How have the results been disseminated to communities of interest?

1. Criminologists: We presented more than one project­-related paper at each of the past three American Society of Criminology annual conferences. We published theory pieces related to the project in Justice Quarterly, Annual Review of Criminology, and an edited volume. We published empirical papers in American Sociological Review, Social Science and Medicine, and Journal of Health and Social Behavior. Finally, we published a methodological piece in an edited volume on prisoner reentry.
2. Correctional Practitioners: We presented project preliminary results and planned activities to PADOC staff and PA Secretary of Corrections John Wetzel in Harrisburg, PA. We plan another presentation to these stake holders by the end of Summer, 2018.
3. Network Methodologists: Our team has completed four presentations at network conferences. We also published a paper at Social Networks, the flagship journal for the area.

\* What do you plan to do during the next reporting period to accomplish the goals?

This is the final report for the funded project, although we intend to continue related work (particularly in the qualitative portion of the project and recidivism analyses of the full sample) in the coming year.
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Products

Books

Book Chapters

* Kreager, Derek A., Martin Bouchard, George De Leon, David R. Schaefer, Michaela Soyer, Jacob T. N. Young, and Gary Zajac (2018). A Life Course and Networks Approach to Prison Therapeutic Communities. *Social Networks and the Life Course 1.* 1.  Duane F. Alwin, Diane H. Felmlee, and Derek A. Kreager.  Springer International.  New York.  433. Status = PUBLISHED; Acknowledgement of Federal Support = Yes ; Peer Reviewed = Yes
* Whichard, Corey, Sara Wakefield, and Derek A. Kreager (2018). Collecting Social Network Data in Prison and During Re-Entry: A Field Guide. *Moving Beyond Recidivism: Expanding Approaches to Research on Prisoner Reentry and Reintegration* Andrea Leverentz, Elsa Chen, and Johnna Christian.  NYU Press.  New York.  . Status = ACCEPTED; Acknowledgement of Federal Support = Yes ; Peer Reviewed = Yes

Inventions

Journals or Juried Conference Papers

* Haynie, Dana L., Corey Whichard, Derek A. Kreager, David R. Schaefer, and Sara Wakefield (2018). Social Networks and Health in a Prison Unit.  *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*.   . Status = ACCEPTED; Acknowledgment of Federal Support = Yes ; Peer Reviewed = Yes
* Kreager, Derek A. and Candace Kruttschnitt (2017). Inmate Society in the Era of Mass Incarceration.  *Annual Review of Criminology*. 1  261. Status = PUBLISHED; Acknowledgment of Federal Support = Yes ; Peer Reviewed = Yes ; DOI: 10.1146
* Kreager, Derek A., David R. Schaefer, Martin Bouchard, Dana L. Haynie, Sara Wakefield, Jacob Young, and Gary Zajac (2016). Toward a Criminology of Inmate Networks.  *Justice Quarterly*. 33 (6),  1000. Status = PUBLISHED; Acknowledgment of Federal Support = Yes ; Peer Reviewed = Yes
* Kreager, Derek A., Hanneke Palmen, Anja Dirkzwager, and Paul Nieuwbeerta (2016). Doing Your Own Time: Peer Integration, Aggression and Mental Health in Dutch Male Detainment Facilities.  *Social Science and Medicine*. 151  92. Status = PUBLISHED; Acknowledgment of Federal Support = Yes ; Peer Reviewed = Yes
* Kreager, Derek A., Jacob T.N. Young, Dana L. Haynie, Martin Bouchard, David R. Schaefer, and Gary Zajac (2017). Where ‘Old Heads’ Prevail: Inmate Hierarchy in a Men’s Prison Unit. *American Sociological Review*. 82 (4),  685. Status = PUBLISHED; Acknowledgment of Federal Support = Yes ; Peer Reviewed = Yes
* Schaefer, David R., Martin Bouchard, Jacob T.N. Young, and Derek A. Kreager (2017). Friends in Locked Places: An Investigation of Prison Inmate Network Structure.  *Social Networks*. 51  88. Status = PUBLISHED; Acknowledgment of Federal Support = Yes ; Peer Reviewed = Yes ; DOI: 10.1016/j.socnet.2016.12.006

Licenses

Other Conference Presentations / Papers

* Schaefer, David R., and Derek Kreager (2016). *A Longitudinal Analysis of a Prison Inmate Network*. Advanced SIENA User’s Meeting. Zurich, Switzerland. Status = PUBLISHED;  Acknowledgement of Federal Support = Yes
* Schaefer, David R., Martin Bouchard, Derek Kreager and Jacob Young (2016). *An Investigation of Prison Inmate Network Structure*. Sunbelt International Social Networks Conference. Newport Beach, CA. Status = PUBLISHED;  Acknowledgement of Federal Support = Yes
* Kreager, Derek A., Dana L. Haynie, David R. Schaefer, Martin Bouchard, Jacob T.N. Young, and Gary Zajac (2018). *Comparing Inmate Social Networks in Male and Female Prison Units*. American Society of Criminology. Atlanta, GA. Status = ACCEPTED;  Acknowledgement of Federal Support = Yes
* Young, Jacob T.N., Derek Kreager, David Schaefer, Gary Zajac, Martin Bouchard, and Dana Haynie (2016). *Findings from the Prison Inmate Network Study*. Department of Sociology Colloquium at the University of New Mexico. Albuquerque, NM. Status = PUBLISHED;  Acknowledgement of Federal Support = Yes
* Bouchard, Martin, Jacob Young, Derek Kreager, David Schaefer, Dana Haynie, and Gary Zajac (2015). *Friends in Locked Places: The Antecedents of Friendship in a Prison Unit Network*. 7th Annual Illicit Networks Workshop. Montreal, CA. Status = PUBLISHED;  Acknowledgement of Federal Support = Yes
* Whichard, Corey (2016). *From Cellblock to Community: Inmate Social Capital and Re-Entry*. American Society of Criminology Annual Conference. New Orleans, LA. Status = PUBLISHED;  Acknowledgement of Federal Support = Yes
* Whichard, Corey (2017). *Inmate Expectations of Future Support and the Reality of Re-Entry: A Network Approach*. American Society of Criminology Annual Conference. Philadelphia, PA. Status = PUBLISHED;  Acknowledgement of Federal Support = Yes
* Whichard, Corey (2017). *Inmate Expectations of Future Support and the Reality of Re-Entry: A Network Approach*. American Society of Criminology. Philadelphia, PA. Status = PUBLISHED;  Acknowledgement of Federal Support = Yes
* Wakefield, Sara, Derek Kreager, Wade C. Jacobsen and David R. Schaefer (2015). *Prison Inmate Networks: An Examination of Supportive Relationships Inside and Outside the Institution*. American Society of Criminology Annual Conference. Washington, D.C.. Status = PUBLISHED;  Acknowledgement of Federal Support = Yes
* Wakefield, Sara (2016). *Reentry Among the Prison Inmate Network Study Participants*. Criminology Symposium, PSU Department of Sociology and Criminology. University Park, PA. Status = PUBLISHED;  Acknowledgement of Federal Support = Yes
* Haynie, Dana L., Sara Wakefield, Derek Kreager, and Corey Whichard (2015). *Social Networks and Health Among the Incarcerated*. American Society of Criminology Annual Conference. Washington, D.C.. Status = PUBLISHED;  Acknowledgement of Federal Support = Yes
* Whichard, Corey and Sara Wakefield (2018). *Sources of Support during Re-Entry: Gender, Kinship, and Social Network Position*. American Society of Criminology. Atlanta, GA. Status = ACCEPTED;  Acknowledgement of Federal Support = Yes
* Young, Jacob T.N., Derek Kreager, David Schaefer, Gary Zajac, Martin Bouchard, and Dana Haynie (2015). *The Antecedents of Respect in an Inmate Network*. American Society of Criminology Annual Conference. Washington, D.C.. Status = PUBLISHED;  Acknowledgement of Federal Support = Yes
* Hashimi, Sadaf and David R. Schaefer (2018). *The Coevolution of Friendship and Power Networks in a Men's Prison Unit*. American Society of Criminology. Atlanta, GA. Status = ACCEPTED;  Acknowledgement of Federal Support = Yes
* Kreager, Derek A. and Sara Wakefield (2016). *The Prison Inmate Networks Study (PINS): Using Social Network Analysis to Understand the Incarceration and Reentry Experience*. NSF Prisoner Reentry and Reintegration Workshop. Rutgers University. Status = PUBLISHED;  Acknowledgement of Federal Support = Yes
* Young, Jacob T.N., David R. Schaefer, and Derek Kreager (2016). *Trust in Prison: An Exponential Random Graph Analysis of Binary and Weighted Networks*. Sunbelt International Social Networks Conference. Newport Beach, CA. Status = PUBLISHED;  Acknowledgement of Federal Support = Yes

Other Products

Other Publications

Patents

Technologies or Techniques

Thesis/Dissertations

* Whichard, Corey. *Social Ties During Incarceration and Community Re-Entry: A Network Approach to Prison Life, Re-Entry Preparation, and the Return Home*. (2018).  Pennsylvania State University. Acknowledgement of Federal Support = Yes

Websites
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Participants/Organizations

What individuals have worked on the project?

| **Name** | **Most Senior Project Role** | **Nearest Person Month Worked** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [Kreager, Derek](https://reporting.research.gov/rppr-web/rppr?execution=e1s4#participant_0) | PD/PI | 2 |
| [Zajac, Gary](https://reporting.research.gov/rppr-web/rppr?execution=e1s4#participant_1) | Co PD/PI | 2 |
| [Haynie, Dana](https://reporting.research.gov/rppr-web/rppr?execution=e1s4#participant_2) | Co-Investigator | 2 |
| [Schaefer, David](https://reporting.research.gov/rppr-web/rppr?execution=e1s4#participant_3) | Co-Investigator | 2 |
| [Wakefield, Sara](https://reporting.research.gov/rppr-web/rppr?execution=e1s4#participant_4) | Co-Investigator | 2 |
| [Young, Jacob](https://reporting.research.gov/rppr-web/rppr?execution=e1s4#participant_5) | Co-Investigator | 2 |
| [Soyer, Michaela](https://reporting.research.gov/rppr-web/rppr?execution=e1s4#participant_6) | Faculty | 2 |
| [Wenger, Marin](https://reporting.research.gov/rppr-web/rppr?execution=e1s4#participant_7) | Faculty | 2 |
| [Bucklen, Kristofer](https://reporting.research.gov/rppr-web/rppr?execution=e1s4#participant_8) | Other Professional | 2 |
| [Davidson, Kim](https://reporting.research.gov/rppr-web/rppr?execution=e1s4#participant_9) | Graduate Student (research assistant) | 2 |
| [Greenfelder, Theodore](https://reporting.research.gov/rppr-web/rppr?execution=e1s4#participant_10) | Graduate Student (research assistant) | 4 |
| [Hashimi, Sadaf](https://reporting.research.gov/rppr-web/rppr?execution=e1s4#participant_11) | Graduate Student (research assistant) | 1 |
| [Jacobsen, Wade](https://reporting.research.gov/rppr-web/rppr?execution=e1s4#participant_12) | Graduate Student (research assistant) | 2 |
| [Whichard, Corey](https://reporting.research.gov/rppr-web/rppr?execution=e1s4#participant_13) | Graduate Student (research assistant) | 3 |
| [Phillips, Samantha](https://reporting.research.gov/rppr-web/rppr?execution=e1s4#participant_14) | Undergraduate Student | 4 |
| [Wade, Miriam](https://reporting.research.gov/rppr-web/rppr?execution=e1s4#participant_15) | Undergraduate Student | 4 |
| [Woodward, Peyton](https://reporting.research.gov/rppr-web/rppr?execution=e1s4#participant_16) | Undergraduate Student | 4 |
| [Wu, Yue](https://reporting.research.gov/rppr-web/rppr?execution=e1s4#participant_17) | Undergraduate Student | 4 |
| [Bouchard, Martin](https://reporting.research.gov/rppr-web/rppr?execution=e1s4#participant_18) | Consultant | 2 |

Full details of individuals who have worked on the project:

|  |
| --- |
| **Derek Kreager** **Email:** dak27@psu.edu **Most Senior Project Role:** PD/PI **Nearest Person Month Worked:** 2  **Contribution to the Project:** Principal Investigator. Supervised survey construction and administration, interviewer training, and data management and coding. Presented results to research partners. Contributed to written products.  **Funding Support:** Principal Investigator, “Network Mechanisms in a Prison¬Based Therapeutic Community,” National Institutes of Health (NIAAA). Co-Investigator, “Friendship Networks and the Emergence of Substance Use,” National Institutes of Health (NIDA).  **International Collaboration:**  No  **International Travel:**  No |
| **Gary Zajac** **Email:** gxz3@psu.edu **Most Senior Project Role:** Co PD/PI **Nearest Person Month Worked:** 2  **Contribution to the Project:** Coordinated project activities with PADOC, to include prison official data collection, prison superintendent liaison, and the dissemination of findings. He grounded the project in research based practice and theories of inmate rehabilitation. He coordinated Justice Center resources and research staff in support of the project.  **Funding Support:** Principal Investigator, “Network Mechanisms in a Prison Based Therapeutic Community,” National Institutes of Health (NIAAA).  **International Collaboration:**  No  **International Travel:**  No |
| **Dana Haynie** **Email:** haynie.7@sociology.osu.edu **Most Senior Project Role:** Co-Investigator **Nearest Person Month Worked:** 2  **Contribution to the Project:** Dr. Haynie helped finalize survey preparation and planned and analyzed cross-sectional network data. She was involved in writing up results for journal publication.  **Funding Support:** Co-Investigator, “Network Mechanisms in a Prison-Based Therapeutic Community,” National Institutes of Health (NIAAA).  **International Collaboration:**  No  **International Travel:**  No |
| **David Schaefer** **Email:** David.Schaefer@asu.edu **Most Senior Project Role:** Co-Investigator **Nearest Person Month Worked:** 2  **Contribution to the Project:** Dr. Schaefer contributed scientific leadership with respect to conducting longitudinal social network analyses, including the collection of such data. In particular, Dr. Schaefer 1) designed the egocentric and global network survey questionnaires, 2) evaluated network pretest data, 3) led the analysis of Wave 1 data (e.g., estimating ERGMs), and 4) contributed to manuscript writing and presenting results.  **Funding Support:** Co-Investigator, “Network Mechanisms in a Prison-Based Therapeutic Community,” National Institutes of Health (NIAAA).  **International Collaboration:**  No  **International Travel:**  No |
| **Sara Wakefield** **Email:** sara.wakefield@rutgers.edu **Most Senior Project Role:** Co-Investigator **Nearest Person Month Worked:** 2  **Contribution to the Project:** Dr. Wakefield developed the longitudinal interview and trained interviewers. She analyzed visitation and family data. She presented results and is writing a manuscript draft.  **Funding Support:** n/a  **International Collaboration:**  No  **International Travel:**  No |
| **Jacob Young** **Email:** jacob.young.1@asu.edu **Most Senior Project Role:** Co-Investigator **Nearest Person Month Worked:** 2  **Contribution to the Project:** Dr. Young’s responsibilities included 1) designing the egocentric and global network survey questionnaires, 2) evaluating network pretest data, 3) assisting in the analysis of Wave 1 data (e.g., estimating ERGMs), and 4) contributing to manuscript writing and presenting results.  **Funding Support:** Co-Investigator, “Network Mechanisms in a Prison-Based Therapeutic Community,” National Institutes of Health (NIAAA).  **International Collaboration:**  No  **International Travel:**  No |
| **Michaela Soyer** **Email:** ms3831@hunter.cuny.edu **Most Senior Project Role:** Faculty **Nearest Person Month Worked:** 2  **Contribution to the Project:** She led the project’s survey administration procedures and trained the graduate research assistants in assistants in prison interview techniques. She conducted interviews of paroled respondents.  **Funding Support:** Co-Investigator, “Network Mechanisms in a Prison-Based Therapeutic Community,” National Institutes of Health (NIAAA).  **International Collaboration:**  No  **International Travel:**  No |
| **Marin Wenger** **Email:** myw5133@psu.edu **Most Senior Project Role:** Faculty **Nearest Person Month Worked:** 2  **Contribution to the Project:** Marin assisted with survey design for Waves 1 and 2. She continues to work on a manuscript covering race and prison relationships  **Funding Support:** n/a  **International Collaboration:**  No  **International Travel:**  No |
| **Kristofer Bret Bucklen** **Email:** kbucklen@pa.gov **Most Senior Project Role:** Other Professional **Nearest Person Month Worked:** 2  **Contribution to the Project:** Dr. Bucklen is the PADOC director of research and assisted us with data access, prison logistics, and idea development.  **Funding Support:** n/a  **International Collaboration:**  No  **International Travel:**  No |
| **Kim Davidson** **Email:** kbd5175@psu.edu **Most Senior Project Role:** Graduate Student (research assistant) **Nearest Person Month Worked:** 2  **Contribution to the Project:** Kim was an interviewer and data analyst for Wave 2. She assists in longitudinal interviews of paroled respondents  **Funding Support:** n/a  **International Collaboration:**  No  **International Travel:**  No |
| **Theodore Greenfelder** **Email:** tjg24@psu.edu **Most Senior Project Role:** Graduate Student (research assistant) **Nearest Person Month Worked:** 4  **Contribution to the Project:** Data management, cleaning, and coding  **Funding Support:** None  **International Collaboration:**  No  **International Travel:**  No |
| **Sadaf Hashimi** **Email:** sadaf.hashimi@rutgers.edu **Most Senior Project Role:** Graduate Student (research assistant) **Nearest Person Month Worked:** 1  **Contribution to the Project:** Network analyses of friendship and respect co-evolution data.  **Funding Support:** none  **International Collaboration:**  No  **International Travel:**  No |
| **Wade Jacobsen** **Email:** wcj106@psu.edu **Most Senior Project Role:** Graduate Student (research assistant) **Nearest Person Month Worked:** 2  **Contribution to the Project:** Wade assisted with survey design was a data analyst for both waves. He is contributing to working papers on visitation  **Funding Support:** n/a  **International Collaboration:**  No  **International Travel:**  No |
| **Corey Whichard** **Email:** clw332@psu.edu **Most Senior Project Role:** Graduate Student (research assistant) **Nearest Person Month Worked:** 3  **Contribution to the Project:** Corey assisted with survey design and was an interviewer for Wave 1 and lead interviewer for Wave 2. He was also a data analyst. He leads the pre-prison and parolee interviews.  **Funding Support:** n/a  **International Collaboration:**  No  **International Travel:**  No |
| **Samantha Phillips** **Email:** sip5351@psu.edu **Most Senior Project Role:** Undergraduate Student **Nearest Person Month Worked:** 4  **Contribution to the Project:** Cleaned and Coded interview transcripts  **Funding Support:** PSU Justice Center for Research  **International Collaboration:**  No  **International Travel:**  No |
| **Miriam Wade** **Email:** Miriam.a.wade@gmail.com **Most Senior Project Role:** Undergraduate Student **Nearest Person Month Worked:** 4  **Contribution to the Project:** Cleaned and coded interview transcripts  **Funding Support:** PSU Justice Center for Research  **International Collaboration:**  No  **International Travel:**  No |
| **Peyton Woodward** **Email:** pwood16@germantownacademy.org **Most Senior Project Role:** Undergraduate Student **Nearest Person Month Worked:** 4  **Contribution to the Project:** Cleaning and coding interview transcripts  **Funding Support:** PSU Justice Center for Research  **International Collaboration:**  No  **International Travel:**  No |
| **Yue Wu** **Email:** yzw5315@psu.edu **Most Senior Project Role:** Undergraduate Student **Nearest Person Month Worked:** 4  **Contribution to the Project:** Cleaned and coded interview transcripts  **Funding Support:** PSU Justice Center for Research  **International Collaboration:**  No  **International Travel:**  No |
| **Martin Bouchard** **Email:** mbouchard@sfu.ca **Most Senior Project Role:** Consultant **Nearest Person Month Worked:** 2  **Contribution to the Project:** Dr. Bouchard assisted with survey design, network analysis, and manuscript preparation.  **Funding Support:** Consultant, “Network Mechanisms in a Prison-Based Therapeutic Community,” National Institutes of Health (NIAAA).  **International Collaboration:**  Yes, Canada  **International Travel:**  No |

What other organizations have been involved as partners?

| **Name** | **Type of Partner Organization** | **Location** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [Arizona State University](https://reporting.research.gov/rppr-web/rppr?execution=e1s23#organization_0) | Academic Institution | Phoenix, AZ |
| [Ohio State University](https://reporting.research.gov/rppr-web/rppr?execution=e1s23#organization_1) | Academic Institution | Columbus, OH |
| [Pennsylvania Department of Corrections](https://reporting.research.gov/rppr-web/rppr?execution=e1s23#organization_2) | State or Local Government | Harrisburg, PA |
| [Rutgers University](https://reporting.research.gov/rppr-web/rppr?execution=e1s23#organization_3) | Academic Institution | New Brunswick, NJ |

Full details of organizations that have been involved as partners:

|  |
| --- |
| **Arizona State University**  **Organization Type:** Academic Institution **Organization Location:** Phoenix, AZ  **Partner's Contribution to the Project:** Collaborative Research  **More Detail on Partner and Contribution:** Co-Investigators' (Drs. Jacob Young and David Schaefer) home institution. |
| **Ohio State University**  **Organization Type:** Academic Institution **Organization Location:** Columbus, OH  **Partner's Contribution to the Project:** Collaborative Research  **More Detail on Partner and Contribution:** Co-investigator's (Dr. Dana Haynie) home institution. |
| **Pennsylvania Department of Corrections**  **Organization Type:** State or Local Government **Organization Location:** Harrisburg, PA  **Partner's Contribution to the Project:** Facilities  Collaborative Research  **More Detail on Partner and Contribution:** PADOC assists the project staff with survey administration, official data access, and prison logistics. |
| **Rutgers University**  **Organization Type:** Academic Institution **Organization Location:** New Brunswick, NJ  **Partner's Contribution to the Project:** Collaborative Research  **More Detail on Partner and Contribution:** Co-investigator's (Dr. Sara Wakefield) home institution. |

What other collaborators or contacts have been involved?

Nothing to report
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Impacts

What is the impact on the development of the principal discipline(s) of the project?

This project represents the first extensive assessment of inmate network structure and dynamics. It creates a baseline from which to understand how inmate social ties (friendship, trust, power, and visitation) relate to health, recidivism, family, and community re­entry outcomes. Results have already had a substantial impact on research in network science, criminal justice, and life course criminology. In particular, tremendous effort has been focused on understanding the consequences of incarceration for ex-­inmates and their families and communities. This study contributes to this body of knowledge with data from the inmate social experience and adds qualitative data collected directly from respondents before and after prison release. International researchers are currently preparing similar projects in other countries, to include Canada and the Netherlands.

What is the impact on other disciplines?

Findings from this project have implications for multiple disciplines, including sociology, criminology, criminal justice, and network methodology. Toward the latter, project investigators have presented results at annual meetings of the International Social Network Association and published in social network outlets.

What is the impact on the development of human resources?

This project has created substantial opportunities for graduate and undergraduate student research and mentoring. Eight graduate students have been involved in the project in varying capacities. These include one Hispanic and two female students. Two of the students have written external funding proposals (NSF and NIJ) to extend their involvement in the project. Additionally, graduate students have been involved in all stages of the research process, including survey design, CAPI interviewing (of an inmate population), data coding and management, statistical analysis, and manuscript writing. The PI, Co­-PI, and Co-­Investigators have mentored these students through all phases either through face­-to­-face meetings, conference calls, or project workshops. Also, four undergraduate students have participated in the project as qualitative coders and interview assistants. For one of these, the experience was so transformative that she applied to criminal justice graduate programs and was selected to begin at Temple University in Fall, 2018.

What is the impact on physical resources that form infrastructure?

The project has designed and implemented a network survey instrument for a prison population that can be applied to future sites and projects. Investigators have shared the survey instrument with outside researchers and similar surveys are being designed and implemented in multiple sites, to include two international settings.

What is the impact on institutional resources that form infrastructure?

Results from the project will have direct bearing on prison management and rehabilitation programming. Specifically, our results describe a prison unit that is working well and the mechanisms behind that success, in addition to the ways policies might be improved to increase positive health, safety, and re­entry outcomes. Project findings have been communicated directly to agency representatives.

What is the impact on information resources that form infrastructure?

Nothing to report.

What is the impact on technology transfer?

Project results are being communicated to the PA Department of Corrections in the hopes of furthering the academic-practitioner partnership and influencing prison policy.

What is the impact on society beyond science and technology?

By understanding inmate social ties and their associations with health and community re­entry, this project has the potential to inform policies that reduce incarceration's collateral consequences on families, communities, and racial stratification.
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Changes/Problems

Changes in approach and reason for change

Due to expected attrition and burden on prison staff, we requested replacing a third wave of prison data collection with individual interviews of inmates who were parole-­eligible within the year after Wave data collection. This change benefits the project by providing detailed information on the re­entry process and its impacts on inmate social networks over time. We have collected 49 pre-release interviews and almost half of these respondents have already completed their first community interviews. Qualitative patterns we observe from these interviews will be the basis for a book on social networks and community re-entry.

Actual or Anticipated problems or delays and actions or plans to resolve them

Nothing to report.

Changes that have a significant impact on expenditures

The individual interviews to inmates prior to prison release and again after they are paroled extended the timeline of data collection by approximately one year. We thus requested a no-cost extension to follow these inmates beyond the two­-year project period.

Significant changes in use or care of human subjects

Nothing to report.

Significant changes in use or care of vertebrate animals

Nothing to report.

Significant changes in use or care of biohazards

Nothing to report.