Contemporary Issues in Social Sciences and Management Practices (CISSMP)
ISSN: 2959-1023
Volume 3, Issue 1, March 2024, Pages 82-91
Journal DOI: 10.61503
Journal Homepage: https://www.cissmp.com

Predicting Prison Misconduct: Role of Criminogenic Cognitions of Adult Convicted Prisoners

Javed Iqbal[1], Farhan Navid Yousaf[2] & Khalil Ahmad[3]
[1]PhD Scholar, Institute of Social and Cultural Studies, University of Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan
[2] Professor, Institute of Social and Cultural Studies, University of Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan.
[3] Professor, Institute of Social and Cultural Studies, University of Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan

ABSTRACT

Article History:
Received: Dec 28, 2023
Revised: Jan 22, 2024
Accepted: Feb 15, 2024
Available Online: March 25, 2024

Keywords:
Criminogenic Cognitions, Prison Misconduct, Adult Convicted Prisoners

Funding:
This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Prison misconduct is violation of prison rules through which prisoners are governed to regulate their behavior by the prison authorities. The aim of present study was to examine relationship between criminogenic cognitions of prisoners and prison misconduct in the Punjab, Pakistan. Conducting a survey of 363 adult convicted prisoners from the Punjab prisons, data were collected by using structured questionnaires and analyzed in SPSS-26. The study concluded that the relationship between criminogenic cognitions of prisoners and prison misconduct was found strong and positive. On the basis of these findings, criminogenic cognitions—dynamic risk factors of the prisoners may be assessed by the prison authorities at the time of prisoners' entry into custody which would help them in an appropriate and scientifically based classification. This classification would clearly distinguish the high, medium, and low risk offenders and their probability in engaging in future criminal activities inside the prisons and after their transition into society. Policies based on these conclusions derived from the classification would reduce prison misconduct as well as enhance the chances of institutional adjustment which would provide a conducive environment for prison management to run rehabilitation programs for prisoners. Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that prison authorities in the Punjab, Pakistan may incorporate the assessments of criminogenic cognitions during the admission process of offenders in prisons.

Corresponding Author's Email: jikhokhar_soc@yahoo.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.61503/cissmp.v3i1.116
Citation: Iqbal, J., Yousaf, F. N., & Ahmad, K. (2024). Predicting prison misconduct: Role of criminogenic cognitions of adult convicted prisoners. Contemporary Issues in Social Sciences and Management Practices, 3(1), 82-91.

1.0 Introduction

Prison misconduct is behavior which violates prison rules (Steiner & Wooldredge, 2014). The formal regulations governing inmate behavior in prisons are crucial for maintaining order and safety within correctional facilities. Instances of rule violations, or "misconducts," are indicative of problematic behavior among inmates and are associated with continued criminal behavior both during and after incarceration (Trulson et al., 2011). Understanding the factors contributing to inmate misconduct can provide insights into the roots of criminality among high-risk individuals and help to assess the effectiveness of imprisonment and related interventions, such as vocational programs, in promoting rehabilitation and deterring future offenses. Additionally, identifying the sources of inmate misconduct is essential for correctional administrators to develop more effective strategies for managing and reducing such behavior, including the use of classification tools, structured routines, and intervention programs aimed at promoting positive change and maintaining institutional order and safety (Steiner et al., 2014).

Research has discovered that elimination of prison misconduct and prediction of institutional adjustment is important because it plays three primary roles. Firstly, this can assist in classifying prison inmate. Most of the prisons classify the prisoners focusing on only static risk factors such as criminal history. The identification and validation of additional factors enhances the efficacy of existing classification system in the prisons. Secondly, accurate prediction leads to prevention. Occurrence of less disciplinary actions in the prison reflects the environment is safe for both the staff and the inmates. Thirdly, accurate prediction benefits post-prison adjustment (Walters, 2015). As prisons have criminogenic effects on inmates and it is well documented, the inmates who live in safe environment, they participate in rehabilitation programs available in correctional facility which helps them in a positive transition back into society (Bales & Piquero, 2012).

1.1 Rationale of the Study

Empirical evidence suggests that while static risk factors among prison inmates are important in predicting institutional adjustment, they may not reliably predict subsequent offending and recidivism. Therefore, this is necessary to supplement them with dynamic risk factors such as criminogenic cognitions to achieve optimal predictability, as highlighted by Abbiati et al. (2019) and Walters (2015). By combining static and dynamic factors, a more comprehensive risk profile of an individual can be obtained, and dynamic factors allow for tracking changes in an individual over time. As criminogenic cognitions are crime-promoting thought patterns and are well-established dynamic risk factors (Kroner & Morgan, 2013). These cognitions involve distorted ways of thinking and cognitive patterns that support criminal behavior by rationalizing deviant actions in the eyes of the individual engaging in criminal behavior (Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Walters, 1990). Offenders may disregard the negative impact and consequences of their actions due to these negative attitudes (Tangney et al., 2012).

Criminogenic cognitions are considered one of the "big four" dynamic criminogenic needs (Duriez et al., 2018; Smith et al., 2009), yet they are not commonly used to predict institutional violence or general misconduct (Kroner & Morgan, 2013). Only a limited number of studies

conducted by Soyer et al. (2017), Walters (2015), Walters and Schlauch (2008), and Kroner and Mills (2001) have measured criminal thinking, which is often used interchangeably with criminogenic cognitions, to predict institutional misconduct. The present study intends to determine the nature of relationship between criminogenic cognitions of prisoners and misconduct within Pakistani prisons.

1.2 Research Objective

The objective of this research is to investigate the correlation between criminogenic cognitions among adult convicted prisoners and prison misconduct in the Punjab, Pakistan.

2.0 Literature Review

Correctional systems often utilize algorithms incorporating reliable static indicators or actuarial assessments to predict misconduct within prison environments, as noted by Austin and Hardyman (2004). Previous research has consistently indicated that men exhibit a higher propensity for misconduct compared to women, while younger inmates are more prone to facing disciplinary actions than their older counterparts. These demographic variables, namely gender and age, are among the static factors integrated into such predictive models, as demonstrated in studies by Bench and Allen (2003), Gendreau et al. (1997), Steiner et al. (2014), and Steiner and Wooldredge (2008).

Earlier research, such as the work by Drury and DeLisi (2010), has highlighted a notable trend that individuals who have previously been involved in disciplinary incidents during past periods of incarceration demonstrate a heightened likelihood of engaging in similar behaviors during subsequent periods of imprisonment. This underscores a pattern wherein past behaviors serve as strong indicators for future conduct within institutional settings. In the realm of predictive research concerning institutional adjustment, there has been a noteworthy emphasis on fixed or unchanging risk factors. Among these factors, age emerges as a particularly robust and consistent predictor of potential misconduct within prison environments. Specifically, studies focusing on male populations, such as those conducted by Bench and Allen (2003) and Steiner and Wooldredge (2008), have indicated that younger prisoners tend to accumulate a significantly greater number of disciplinary reports compared to the older prisoners.

Prior institutional adjustment stands out as a significant indicator of misconduct within prison settings (Drury & DeLisi, 2010). Furthermore, DeLisi (2003) identified the criminal history of inmates as a robust and consistent predictor of prison misconduct. In particular, inmates with extensive criminal records tend to accumulate more disciplinary infractions compared to those with fewer prior offenses. Various other factors have also been identified as predictors of disciplinary infractions in correctional facilities. These include ethnicity, gang affiliation, shorter prison sentences, non-violent offenses, history of mental illness, and substance misuse, as noted in studies by Austin (2003), Cunningham and Sorensen (2007), Drury and DeLisi (2011), Flanagan (1980), Harer and Steffensmeier (1996), Jiang (2005), and Trulson et al. (2012). However, while these factors contribute to the prediction of misconduct, they do not reach the same level of significance as age, criminal history, and prior institutional adjustment.

Research conducted by Campbell et al. (2009), DeLisi (2003), Gendreau et al. (1997) has

consistently highlighted certain factors associated with disciplinary infractions among prison inmates. These factors include the type of offense committed, length of sentence, and history of mental health issues or involvement with security threat groups. For instance, individuals convicted of sexual offenses are less likely to engage in misconduct, while those serving shorter sentences, typically less than five years, and tend to exhibit higher rates of misconduct. Additionally, a history of mental health problems or affiliation with security threat groups increases the likelihood of engaging in misconduct. Collectively, these factors offer valuable insights for understanding and predicting disciplinary infractions within correctional facilities (Steiner et al., 2014).

2.1 Research Hypothesis

Criminogenic cognitions of adult convicted prisoners and prison misconduct has positive relationship. The increase in the level of criminogenic cognitions of adult convicted prisoners increases the chances prison misconduct.

3.0 Methodology

3.1 Data and Method

The target population for this study comprised adult convicted prisoners incarcerated in Punjab, Pakistan. As per the Pakistan Prison Rules of 1978, adult convicted prisoners are defined as individuals aged 22 years and older. A sample of 363 adult prisoners from Central Jail Rawalpindi commonly known as Adiala Jail of the Punjab, Pakistan. For the purpose of data collection regarding criminogenic cognitions of prisoners, criminogenic cognitions scale (CCS) developed by Tangney et al. (2012) was used. For collecting data regarding dependent variable of the research—prison misconduct, Reisig and Mesko's (2009) instrument was used which taped self-reported responses of the prisoners. The data collected from the respondents were entered into Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS-26) and employed correlation test for analyzing the directional relationship among variables.

4.0 Results and Discussion

Data were analyzed in SPSS-26. To check the normality of data, descriptive statistics: mean, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis were measured. Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents were interpreted by making simple frequency table and correlation was used to examine relationship between two variables of the study: criminogenic cognitions and prison misconduct.

Table 1: Data Normality

Predictors	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Gender	1.1129	.31697	2.456	.128	4.053	.255
Age	1.9284	1.00295	1.284	.128	1.628	.255
Education	3.0496	1.11631	.393	.128	-.706	.255
Marital Status	1.4490	.58007	.883	.128	-.211	.255

Family Type	1.6970	.46020	-.861	.128	-1.266	.255
Nature of Crime	1.2755	.44737	1.009	.128	-.987	.255
PCC_1	3.6446	1.11390	-.265	.128	-1.278	.255
PCC_2	3.2920	.98195	.021	.128	-1.145	.255
PCC_3	3.4187	1.09286	-.200	.128	-.956	.255
PCC_4	3.6006	1.01791	-.417	.128	-.410	.255
PCC_5	3.8457	.88161	-.569	.128	-.259	.255
PCC_6	3.0909	1.33999	-.236	.128	-1.186	.255
PCC_7	3.6006	1.27998	-.221	.128	-1.419	.255
PCC_8	3.5124	1.12320	-.049	.128	-1.369	.255
PCC_9	3.8182	1.09997	-.449	.128	-1.133	.255
PCC_10_R	3.2810	1.05031	-.050	.128	-.902	.255
PCC_11	3.6446	1.08627	-.324	.128	-1.179	.255
PCC_12_R	3.4022	1.15782	-.238	.128	-.884	.255
PCC_13	3.6529	1.08514	-.332	.128	-1.169	.255
PCC_14	3.6804	.98459	-.424	.128	-.817	.255
PCC_15	3.2782	1.04709	-.054	.128	-.896	.255
PCC_16	3.4766	1.05190	-.002	.128	-1.198	.255
PCC_17_R	3.6749	.95715	-.678	.128	.178	.255
PCC_18	3.6281	.85849	-.152	.128	-.599	.255
PCC_19	3.8760	.84327	-.512	.128	-.202	.255
PCC_20_R	3.7521	.80001	-.402	.128	-.161	.255
PCC_21	3.7796	.90787	-.152	.128	-.891	.255
PCC_22_R	3.4518	.99710	-.547	.128	.064	.255
PCC_23	3.3223	1.01002	-.243	.128	-.787	.255
PCC_24	3.7521	1.01873	-.339	.128	-.996	.255
PCC_25	3.4242	1.15948	-.205	.128	-1.188	.255
PM_1	4.1791	.77131	-.319	.128	-1.255	.255
PM_2	4.3223	.75672	-.613	.128	-1.011	.255
PM_3	4.1763	.70263	-.693	.128	.724	.255
PM_4	4.0275	.93685	-.785	.128	.585	.255
PM_5	4.2755	.77326	-.844	.128	.166	.255
PM_6	4.2011	.71356	-.727	.128	.639	.255
PM_7	4.1983	.84048	-1.399	.128	3.134	.255
PM_8	4.2231	.79175	-.419	.128	-1.287	.255
PM_9	4.1983	.84376	-.639	.128	-.652	.255
PM_10	3.9972	.77424	.005	.128	-1.329	.255

PCC is prisoners' criminogenic cognitions

PM is prison misconduct

R is reverse question

Table 1 illustrates the assessment of data normality. The results of the normality test indicate that the skewness values for both prisoners' criminogenic cognitions (PCC) and prisoners' misconduct (PM) items are within the range of -2 to +2, suggesting a reasonable level of symmetry. Furthermore, the kurtosis values for PCC and PM items fall within the acceptable range of -7 to +7, indicating an appropriate level of peakedness or flatness in the distribution. The skewness and kurtosis values for Gender, Age, Education, Marital Status, Family Type, and Nature of Crime also meet acceptable criteria, implying relatively symmetrical and appropriately peaked distributions. Additionally, the mean scores and standard deviations are in line with expectations. Therefore, based on the favorable normality values observed, it is inferred that the data related to both PCC and PM items demonstrate characteristics of normal distribution (Hair et al., 2010).

Table 2: Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents

Predictors		**Frequency**	**Percent (%)**
	Male	351	96.69
Gender	Female	12	3.31
	Total	363	100.0
	22 - 30	142	39.1
	31 - 40	144	39.7
	41 - 50	53	14.6
Age	51 - 60	9	2.5
	61+	15	4.1
	Total	363	100.0
	Below Primary	16	4.4
	Primary	112	30.9
Education	Middle	130	35.8
	Matric	48	13.2
	FA and above	57	15.7
	Total	363	100.0
	Unmarried	216	59.5
Marital Status	Married	131	36.1
	Widowed	16	4.4
	Total	363	100.0
	Nuclear	110	30.3
Family Type	Joint	253	69.7
	Total	363	100.0
	Violent Crime	263	72.5
Nature of Crime	Nonviolent Crime	100	27.5
	Total	363	100.0

Table 2 reveals demographic determinants adult convicted prisoners. Descriptive results depict that sample contained 351 (96 %) male respondents and 12 (4%) are female prisoners the information of respondents regarding their gender, age, marital status, family type, and nature of

crime. Among all 263 respondents 351 (96.7%) are male and 12 (3.31%) are female respondents out of total 363 respondents. More than one-third (142, 39%) prisoners were of the age 22-30 years, and more than one-third (144, 40%) were of the age 31-40 years, while 53 (15%) prisoners were of the age 41-50 years, and only 9 (3%) and 15 (4%) prisoners of the age of 51-60 years and 61 and above respectively.

Findings reveal that most of the respondents 130 (36%) had the education of middle level. 128 (35%) respondents had the education of primary and below. Among all 363 respondents, only 48 (13%) had matric level education, and 57 (16%) had Intermediate and above. More than of the respondents 216 (60%) were unmarried, and 131 (34%) were married, and 16 (4%) were widowed. Majority of the respondent 253 (70%) belonged to joint family system whereas 110 (30%) were residing in nuclear family system. In total sample of 363, 263 (72%) of the respondents were incarcerated in violent crime, and 100 (28%) had committed nonviolent crime before their incarceration.

Table 3: Reliability and Correlation

	Criminogenic Cognitions	**Prison Misconduct**
Criminogenic Cognitions	(0.817)	
Prison Misconduct	.643**	(0.746)

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
Reliabilities are in parenthesis

Table 3 shows the values of reliability of both data collection instruments for independent variable and dependent variable; values of Cronbach's alpha are 0.817 and 0.746 respectively. Proving the reliability of instruments this study revealed the correlation regarding relationship between criminogenic cognitions of prisoners and prison misconduct. The value of correlation (0.643) shows that the relationship between criminogenic cognitions of prisoners and prison misconduct is strong and in positive direction; increase in the level of criminogenic cognitions of adult convicted prisoners increases misconduct in prisons. These results align with prior research findings, such as those by Tangney and her colleagues (2012), who established a connection between criminogenic cognitions and inmate misconduct. Similarly, Walters (2015) demonstrated in his study that criminal thinking, which is interchangeably used term with criminogenic cognitions, serves as a robust predictor of inmate misconduct. He concluded that the presence of criminal thinking—criminogenic cognitions—among prison inmates correlates positively with their misconduct. In line with these findings, the current study corroborates that criminogenic cognitions play a predictive role in prison misconduct. More recently, Duwe and colleagues (2023) determined that the overall Criminal Thinking Style (CTS) score significantly forecasts misconduct, although the strength of this relationship was relatively moderate (AUC = 0.62)

5.0 Conclusion

On the basis of all these results, it is concluded that those prisoners who are younger have more criminogenic cognitions and those prisoners who have less income also have more

criminogenic cognitions. Furthermore, it has been observed that those prisoners who live in nuclear families also have higher level of criminogenic cognitions and those prisoners who have committed violent crimes also have higher level of criminogenic cognitions. Along with all these, this research has also proved that there is a strong and positive relationship between criminogenic cognitions and prison misconduct, as criminogenic cognitions of prisoners increase, prison misconduct also increases. The conclusion of this quantitative study has both implications—theoretical and practical. Theoretically, this is the addition in literature produced regarding the understanding of prison misconduct and the role of criminogenic cognitions of adult convicted prisoners in the Punjab, Pakistan. These findings and conclusions may be used for academic purpose in subfields of sociology especially prison sociology, criminology, penology, and social psychology. Practically, this may be used in making the policy for improvement of prison system especially prison management for better classification of prisoners during incarceration.

5.1 Recommendations

1. Prison management should make a mechanism for assessment of criminogenic cognitions—dynamic risk factors of the prisoners at the time of admission and subsequently at the time of their release from the prisons.
2. Interventions should be made focusing on reformation—attitudinal change of prisoners aligned with rehabilitation programs.
3. Prison staff should be trained professionally for managing the prison population by using appropriate and evidence-based classification considering dynamic risk factors of prison misconduct and recidivism.

Javed Iqbal: Problem Identification and Literature Research,
Farhan Navid Yousaf: Data Analysis and Supervision
Khalil Ahmad: Methodology

Conflict of Interests/Disclosures

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest in this article's research, authorship,and publication.

References

Abbiati, M., Palix, J., Gasser, J., & Moulin, V. (2019). Predicting physically violent misconduct in prison: A comparison of four risk assessment instruments. *Behavioral sciences & the law*, *37*(1), 61-77.

Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct*. Routledge

Austin, J. (2003). *Findings in prison classification and risk assessment*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Prisons.

Austin, J., & Hardyman, P. L. (2004). *Objective prison classification: A guide for correctional agencies*. US Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections.

Bales, W. D., & Piquero, A. R. (2012). Assessing the impact of imprisonment on recidivism. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, *8*, 71-101.

Bench, L. L., & Allen, T. D. (2003). Investigating the stigma of prison classification: An experimental design. *The Prison Journal*, *83*(4), 367-382.

Campbell, M. A., French, S., & Gendreau, P. (2009). The prediction of violence in adult offenders:

A meta-analytic comparison of instruments and methods of assessment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 36*(6), 567-590.

Cunningham, M. D., & Sorensen, J. R. (2007). Predictive factors for violent misconduct in close custody. *The Prison Journal, 87*(2), 241-253.

DeLisi, M. (2003). Criminal careers behind bars. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 21*(5), 653–669.

Duriez, S. A., Sullivan, C., Latessa, E. J., & Lovins, L. B. (2018). The evolution of correctional program assessment in the age of evidence-based practices. *Corrections, 3*(2), 119-136.

Drury, A. J., & DeLisi, M. (2010). The past is prologue: Prior adjustment to prison and institutional misconduct. *The Prison Journal, 90*(3), 331-352.

Drury, A. J., & DeLisi, M. (2011). Gangkill: An exploratory empirical assessment of gang membership, homicide offending, and prison misconduct. *Crime & Delinquency, 57*(1), 130-146.

Duwe, G., Clark, V., & McNeeley, S. (2023). Does Criminal Thinking Predict Prison Misconduct? An Evaluation of TCU's Criminal Thinking Scales. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 50*(6), 830-848.

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.

Gendreau, P., Goggin, C. E., & Law, M. A. (1997). Predicting prison misconducts. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 24*(4), 414-431.

Hair, J., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J. & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis (7th ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Educational International.

Harer, M. D., & Steffensmeier, D. J. (1996). Race and prison violence. *Criminology, 34*, 323-351.

Jiang, S. (2005). Impact of drug use on inmate misconduct: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 33*(2), 153-163.

Kroner, D. G., & Mills, J. F. (2001). The accuracy of five risk appraisal instruments in predicting institutional misconduct and new convictions. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 28*(4), 471-489.

Kroner, D. G., & Morgan, R. D. (2013). An overview of strategies for the assessment and treatment of criminal thinking. *Forensic CBT: A handbook for clinical practice*, 85-103.

Smith, P., Gendreau, P., & Swartz, K. (2009). Validating the principles of effective intervention: A systematic review of the contributions of meta-analysis in the field of corrections. *Victims and Offenders, 4*(2), 148-169.

Soyer, M., McNeeley, S., Zajac, G., & Bucklen, K. B. (2017). Measuring the criminal mind: The relationship between intelligence and CSS-M results among a sample of Pennsylvania prison inmates. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 44*(11), 1444-1461.

Steiner, B., & Wooldredge, J. (2008). Inmate versus environmental effects on prison rule violations. *Criminal justice and behavior, 35*(4), 438-456.

Steiner, B., & Wooldredge, J. (2014). Comparing self-report to official measures of inmate misconduct.

Justice Quarterly, *31*(6), 1074–1101.

Steiner, B., Butler, H. D., & Ellison, J. M. (2014). Causes and correlates of prison inmate misconduct: A systematic review of the evidence. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *42*(6), 462-470.

Tangney, J. P., Stuewig, J., Furukawa, E., Kopelovich, S., Meyer, P. J., & Cosby, B. (2012). Reliability, validity, and predictive utility of the 25-item Criminogenic Cognitions Scale (CCS). *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *39*(10), 1340-1360.

Trulson, C. R., DeLisi, M., & Marquart, J. W. (2011). Institutional misconduct, delinquent background, and rearrest frequency among serious and violent delinquent offenders. *Crime & Delinquency, 57*(5), 709–731.

Trulson, C. R., Caudill, J. W., Haerle, D. R., & DeLisi, M. (2012). Cliqued up: The postincarceration recidivism of young gang-related homicide offenders. *Criminal Justice Review*, *37*(2), 174-190.

Walters, G. D. (1990). *The criminal lifestyle: Patterns of serious criminal conduct*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Walters, G. D. (2005). Predicting institutional adjustment with the lifestyle criminality screening form and psychological inventory of criminal thinking styles. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, *4*(1), 63-70.

Walters, G. D. (2007). Predicting institutional adjustment with the Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form and the Antisocial Features and Aggression scales of the PAI. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *88*(1), 99-105.

Walters, G.D. (2015). Criminal thinking as a predictor of prison misconduct and mediator of the static risk–infractions relationship. *The Prison Journal*, *95*(3), 353-369.

Walters, G. D., & Schlauch, C. (2008). The psychological inventory of criminal thinking styles and level of service inventory-revised: Screening version as predictors of official and self-reported disciplinary infractions. *Law and Human behavior*, *32*(5), 454.