

Behind Bars and Beyond: Investigating Socioeconomic Drivers of Incarceration Rates in the United States*

A comparative analysis of global trends and America's mass incarceration crisis.

Abbass Sleiman

April 18, 2024

Abstract

Over the last 2 decades, the United States has found itself struggling with an issue of mass incarceration, leading the world in number of individuals incarcerated. This paper investigates the possible causes of this by conducting a comparative analysis of global trends in education, unemployment, crime, and poverty rates, and their respective impacts on incarceration. Utilizing data from the World Population Review, and employing a Bayesian multiple linear regression model, this paper finds evidence that poverty and unemployment negatively correlate with incarceration rates, whereas violent crime rates positively correlate. The paper also identifies nuances in the relationship between educational attainment and incarceration rates. These insights may offer valuable considerations for policy-making aimed at addressing mass incarceration in the United States.

Table of contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Data	3
2.1	Incarceration Rate Dataset	4
2.2	Poverty Rate Dataset	4
2.3	Violent Crime Rate Dataset	5
2.4	Unemployment Rate Dataset	5
2.5	Education Ranking Dataset	6
2.6	Cleaned Dataset	6
3	Model	10
3.1	Model set-up	10
3.1.1	Model justification	11

*Code and data are available at: https://github.com/AbbassSleiman/US_Incarceration. Shiny webapp can be accessed at https://wklzec-abbass-sleiman.shinyapps.io/incarceration_rate/

4	Results	11
4.1	Model Coefficients	11
4.2	Actual vs. Predicted Incarceration Rates	12
5	Discussion	14
5.1	Nations with extreme incarceration rates necessitate the need to consider additional factors beyond the model’s scope	14
5.2	Economic hardships and corruption at the national level may prevent nations from incarcerating when necessary	14
5.3	Educational attainment as a nuanced metric of incarceration rates	14
5.4	Insights for addressing the mass incarceration challenge in the United States drawn from the data and results	15
6	Limitations and Next Steps	15
6.1	Limitations	15
6.2	Next Steps	16
	Appendix	17
A	Model details	17
A.1	Posterior Predictive Check	17
A.2	Comparison of the Posterior and Prior	17
A.3	Markov Chain Monte Carlo Convergence	18
A.4	Credibility Intervals	20
	References	21

1 Introduction

In recent decades, the United States has grappled with a consistent rise in its prison population, becoming infamous for having one of the highest incarceration rates in the world. Leading the world with nearly 2 million individuals in prisons and jails in 2022, the US is faced with what, at first glance, appears to be a “uniquely American problem” (Galea 2022). This phenomenon has sparked widespread concern and debate over how best to address this issue. Central to these discussions is the question of what underlying factors have contributed to this circumstance, in turn necessitating an exploration of the socioeconomic drivers of incarceration rates in the United States.

Incarceration refers to the state of being confined in prison as punishment for criminal offences (*Incarceration Rates by Country 2024* 2024), and in examining the United States’ prison dilemma, it becomes clear that the crux of the problem is not easily reducible to simple explanations. Instead, it is a complex issue influenced by a multitude of factors including cultural dynamics and socioeconomic conditions. Thus, in an attempt to unravel the intricacies of these factors, this paper seeks to conduct a comparative analysis of global trends in education, unemployment, crime, and poverty

rates as independent factors influencing a nation’s incarceration. However, recognizing that the total number of incarcerations is heavily dependent on population size, this paper focuses on nations’ incarceration rates as the estimand, defined to be the number of incarcerated individuals per 100,000 in a given population (*Incarceration Rates by Country 2024* 2024), which serves as a better metric for measuring the extent of imprisonment within a society. By exploring the impact of these factors on incarceration rates, we aim to better understand the primary forces behind the United States’ high incarceration rate and overall number of individuals incarcerated. This understanding will help inform policy-making decisions aimed at addressing the issue effectively.

This paper utilizes various datasets from the World Population Review, in particular it utilizes their datasets on “Incarceration Rates by Country 2024”, “Poverty Rate by Country 2024”, “Education Rankings by Country 2024”, “Unemployment by Country 2024”, and “Violent Crime Rates by Country 2024”. By conducting statistical analyses with the aforementioned data, this paper finds evidence to suggest that poverty and unemployment negatively correlate with incarceration rates, and violent crime rates correlate positively. Education, on the other hand, appears to have a more nuanced relationship with incarceration rates as the relationship does not appear to be consistent across all levels of education.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 discusses the raw data, cleaning process, variables of interest, and offers visual representations of the data through tabular and graphical representations of the observations. Section 3 introduces and justifies the Bayesian linear regression model used in the analysis of the data in predicting the relationship between the aforementioned independent variables and a nation’s incarceration rate. Section 4 deals with analyzing the trends and correlations showcased by the model in more detail. Section 5 discusses the real-world implications of the results uncovered in the prior sections, and finally Section 6 discusses the limitations and weaknesses of the analysis conducted, as well as the next steps that could be taken to improve the overall reliability of the paper.

2 Data

This paper utilizes 5 datasets, all provided by the World Population Review and each providing information on one of the 5 factors involved in this study. The incarceration rate dataset (*Incarceration Rates by Country 2024* 2024), Section 2.1, features the most recently available information on incarcerations and incarceration rates of 219 countries and territories as of 2024. The poverty rate dataset (*Poverty Rate by Country 2024* 2024), Section 2.2, features the data on the poverty rates of 164 nations. The violent crime rate dataset (*Violent Crime Rates by Country 2024* 2024), Section 2.3, features data on the number of various types of violent crimes in each of 200 nations and territories per 100k members of the population. The unemployment rate dataset (*Unemployment by Country 2024* 2024), Section 2.4, features data on the unemployment rate in each of 226 countries and territories. Finally, the education ranking dataset (*Education Rankings by Country 2024* 2024), Section 2.5, contains data on the literacy rate and education rank of each of 207 countries and territories, accurate as of 2024.

All data analysis was done through R (R Core Team 2023) with the aid of the following packages: `tidyverse` (Wickham et al. 2019), `here` (Müller 2020), `ggplot2` (Wickham 2016), `knitr` (Xie 2014), `modelsummary` (Arel-Bundock 2022), `rstanarm` (Brilleman et al. 2018), `kableExtra` (Zhu 2021), `dplyr` (Wickham et al. 2023), and `janitor` (Firke 2023). Moreover, the shiny web app associated with this paper was made with the aid of the `shiny` package (Chang et al. 2024).

2.1 Incarceration Rate Dataset

The raw incarceration rate dataset contains information on the incarceration rate (per 100k population), total incarcerated, percentage of incarcerated that are female, and percentage of incarcerated that are male for 219 countries and territories. A snippet of the top 10 countries ordered by incarceration rate can be seen in Table 1, showcasing their rates of incarceration and total number of individuals incarcerated. It is important to note that, whilst the data provided is the most recent available for each nation, the data for each nation need not be accurate as of 2024 as varying nations may have data from different years.

Table 1: Top 10 countries by incarceration rate

Country	Incarceration Rate per 100k Population	Total Incarcerated
El Salvador	1086	71000
Cuba	794	90000
Rwanda	637	89034
Turkmenistan	576	35000
American Samoa	538	301
United States	531	1767200
Panama	499	22239
Guam	475	820
Palau	428	77
Uruguay	424	14965

2.2 Poverty Rate Dataset

The poverty rate dataset contains information on the poverty rates in 164 nations. In particular, it provides information on the percentage of the population living on less than 10 USD per day, less than 3.65 USD per day, the poverty rate, and the year the data was collected. Here, poverty rate is measured as the percentage of a given population living below that particular nation’s respective poverty line which is estimated based on population-weighted subgroup estimates from household surveys (*Poverty Rate by Country 2024* 2024). This is an important clarification to make as it ensures that a nation’s poverty rate is relative to the living costs in that particular nation, in turn reducing biases that could arise as a result of the vastly differing costs of living across various nations. This ensures that, in the analysis that shall follow, we are able to more accurately take into account income inequality relative to each particular nation. The top 5 countries ordered by poverty rate are showcased in Table 2, showcasing information on the poverty rate and year of data collection for each of the 5 countries.

Table 2: Top 5 countries by poverty rate

Country	Poverty Rate	Year Data was Collected
South Sudan	82.3	2016
Equatorial Guinea	76.8	2006
Madagascar	70.7	2012
Central African Republic	68.8	2021
Burundi	64.9	2013

2.3 Violent Crime Rate Dataset

The violent crime rate dataset contains violent crime statistics for 200 nations and territories across the globe. In particular, it contains data on the homicide rate, serious assault rate, sexual violence rate, kidnapping rate, and robbery rate for each of the nations, each of which is measured to be the number of incidents per 100k population. It also features information on the year each of the data points was collected. As with the other datasets, the year of data collection for each nation varies by nation, and thus some information is more recent than others.

An important note to make regarding this information is that the definitions for each of these crimes can vary significantly from nation to nation. What one nation may deem to be a serious offence can be nothing more than a misdemeanor in another. As a result, though the data provided is based on each nation’s own definition of a serious offence, the fact that we are still provided with a fairly well-rounded subset of violent crimes ranging from theft to murder will enable us to better understand what the overall rate of violent crimes per nation is comprised of. One should note that some countries have missing values for certain crime rates, indicated by an “NA”. Table 3 showcases a sample of 5 countries including information regarding the aforementioned crime rates for each.

Table 3: Sample of 5 countries and their respective rates of various violent crimes (per 100k population)

Country	Homicide Rate	Serious Assault Rate	Sexual Violence Rate	Kidnapping Rate	Robbery Rate
India	3.08	26.13	9.1	5.111	2.847
China	0.53	NA	NA	NA	NA
United States	4.96	246.84	NA	NA	86.244
Indonesia	0.43	4.18	2.1	0.083	3.147
Pakistan	3.88	12.51	1.8	9.452	7.027

2.4 Unemployment Rate Dataset

The unemployment rate dataset provides data on the unemployment rates of 226 countries and territories across the globe according to 3 various sources: the World Bank, the International Labour Organization, and the CIA, as well as the respective years that each of these organizations collected the data. Here, unemployment is defined as the percentage of unemployed workers in the labour force, which includes those who do not currently work but are able to do so (*Unemployment by Country 2024* 2024). It is important to note that, as with the other datasets, information on the nations’ unemployment rates is not necessarily accurate as of 2024 and the date of collection varies from country to country. As the World Bank has information on every one of the countries and territories, this paper will utilize only data from that one source regarding unemployment rates. Table 4 showcases the top 5 countries by highest unemployment rates, according to the World Bank, as well as the year the data was collected.

Table 4: Top 5 countries by highest unemployment rate (as per the World Bank)

Country	Unemployment Rate	Year Data was Collected
South Africa	28.8	2022
Tuvalu	26.6	2017
Djibouti	26.1	2017
Equatorial Guinea	25.0	1983
Palestine	24.4	2022

2.5 Education Ranking Dataset

The education ranking dataset provides information on the literacy rate and education rank of 207 countries and territories. The dataset contains ranks assigned by various organizations, however the most recent ranking data is by the nonprofit World Top 20, who determine a nation’s rank according to a number of factors including early childhood enrollment rates, high school graduation rates, primary test scores, and various other factors (*2024 World Best Education Systems – 1st Quarter Rankings Predictions* 2024). The top 5 countries according to the World Top 20 in 2024 are showcased in Table 5.

Table 5: Top 5 countries by education (World Top 20 (2024))

Country	Education Rank
South Korea	1
Denmark	2
Netherlands	3
Belgium	4
Slovenia	5

2.6 Cleaned Dataset

The finalized cleaned dataset used in the analysis that will follow was created by merging the aforementioned 5 datasets into one. In particular, only countries that were present in all 5 datasets are present in the cleaned dataset, bringing the total number of nations included in this study to 134. Further, the cleaned analysis dataset was filtered to only contain the following information from the 5 datasets: a country’s name, its incarceration rate (per 100k population), its national poverty rate, its unemployment rate, its violent crime rate, and its educational ranking category. Note that a nation’s violent crime rate and educational ranking category were not explicit data that were provided as part of the 5 raw datasets. Instead, these were manually constructed and appended to the final dataset during the cleaning process.

In this study, a nation’s violent crime rate is defined to be the sum of all the crime rates (per 100k population) available through the violent crime dataset in order to have one final value that represents the extent of violent crime in a nation. It is important to note, however, that various nations had missing values for some of the violent crime statistics, and as a result, these values were simply treated as 0 for the sake of the summation. As for the educational ranking category, as opposed to treating educational ranking as a continuous variable in the analysis that will follow, we instead decided to create 10 categories representing the 10 deciles of educational ranks present in the final dataset, based on the ranks of the 134 countries present, essentially splitting the countries into 10 equally sized categories by educational ranking. This was done in order to have a categorical variable whose

coefficient will be more easily interpreted in the model present in Section 3, as interpreting a 1 unit increase in educational ranking can be quite arbitrary, as moving up or down one rank educationally may be more subjective. Table 6 showcases the top 5 countries by incarceration rate in the cleaned dataset.

Table 6: Top 5 countries by incarceration rate in the finalized cleaned dataset

Country	Incarceration Rate	Poverty Rate	Unemployment Rate	Educational Ranking Category	Violent Crime Rate
El Salvador	1086	26.6	3.0	111-125	238.813
Rwanda	637	38.2	15.1	126-147	74.923
United States	531	18.0	3.6	20-34	338.044
Panama	499	21.5	8.3	111-125	468.830
Palau	428	24.9	0.8	148-175	11.170

To gain a better understanding of the distribution of incarceration rates as a function of the independent variables, the figures below each showcase all observations, placing incarceration rates on the y-axis and independent variable on the x-axis. Moreover, we have chosen to highlight 5 particular nations in each of the figures, representing nations across the entire range of incarceration rates present in the dataset. In particular, we highlight El Salvador who has the highest incarceration rate of 1086, the United States with the 3rd highest incarceration rate of 531, Mexico with the 51st highest incarceration rate of 174, Iceland with the 5th lowest incarceration rate of 36, and Guinea-Bissau with the lowest incarceration rate of 31. Do note that these rankings are relative to the finalized dataset as opposed to the entire list of countries and territories found in the raw incarceration rate dataset.

Figure 1 showcases all observations by poverty rate, unemployment rate, and violent crime rates, highlighting the aforementioned countries as well. On the other hand, Figure 2 showcases the mean incarceration rate for each of the 10 educational ranking categories. Note that Iceland is in the “1-19” category, the United States is in the “20-34” category, Mexico is in the “35-52” category, El Salvador is in the “111-125” category, and Guinea-Bissau is in the “176-198” category.




Figure 1: Scatter plot of incarceration rates against each of the independent variables of interest.




Figure 2: Bar chart showcasing mean incarceration rate for each educational ranking category

To gain a better understanding of the underlying data, Table 7 provides information on the overall mean, median, and standard deviation of each of the variables present in the cleaned dataset.

Table 7: Mean, median, and standard deviation for each variable

Variable	Mean	Median	SD
Incarceration Rate	167.61	128.50	133.68
Poverty Rate	25.26	21.90	15.04
Unemployment Rate	7.23	5.60	5.42
Violent Crime Rate	187.26	58.13	308.32

As it stands, by adhering to the figures above, there does not appear to be a strong correlation between any one of the variables and incarceration rates. In particular, poverty rates and unemployment rates do not showcase any particular trend in any direction. Violent crime on the other hand, does appear to show a somewhat positive correlation with incarceration rates. However what is interesting to note is that the 5 highlighted nations spanning the entire range of incarceration rates do not have a significant range of violent crime rates, at least relative to the overall range of violent crime rates in the entire dataset. The educational ranking category appears to have a negative relationship with incarceration rates, where a higher rank, i.e. a better education, seems to correspond with a lower average incarceration rate. However, somewhat interesting to note is the drop in mean incarceration rates for categories past the peak in the “111-125” ranking category. As such, given the fairly minimal information provided by the graphical and tabular figures above regarding the relationship between the variables of interest and a nation’s incarceration rate, we employ a model in Section 3 to come to a more conclusive result.

3 Model

As the purpose of this paper is the investigation of various socioeconomic factors and their impact on a nation’s incarceration rate as a means of better understanding the United States’ mass incarceration problem, we will employ a model that will better enable us to infer the relationship between these various factors and incarceration rates. Then using this information, I will attempt to predict what the United States’ incarceration rate should be given its own individual data for each of the determinants of incarceration rate, and subsequently uncover whether they are a good estimator of incarceration rate, or whether the problem stems from a different facet.

3.1 Model set-up

The particular model that this paper will utilize is a Bayesian multiple linear regression model of incarceration rate as a function of the independent variables present in our analysis. In particular, the model is as follows:

$$y_i | \mu_i, \sigma \sim \text{Normal}(\mu_i, \sigma) \quad (1)$$

$$\mu_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{poverty}_i + \beta_2 \text{crime}_i + \beta_3 \text{unemployment}_i + \gamma_1 \text{educ}_i + \dots + \gamma_9 \text{educ}_i \quad (2)$$

$$\beta_0 \sim \text{Normal}(0, 2.5) \quad (3)$$

$$\beta_1 \sim \text{Normal}(0, 2.5) \quad (4)$$

$$\beta_2 \sim \text{Normal}(0, 2.5) \quad (5)$$

$$\beta_3 \sim \text{Normal}(0, 2.5) \quad (6)$$

$$\gamma_i \sim \text{Normal}(0, 2.5) \quad (7)$$

$$\sigma \sim \text{Exponential}(1) \quad (8)$$

In the above model:

- μ_i is the predicted incarceration rate for a nation given a nation’s poverty rate, violent crime rate, unemployment rate, and educational ranking category.
- β_0 is the coefficient for the intercept.
- β_1 is the coefficient for the predicted change in the incarceration rate of a nation given a one unit, i.e. one percentage point, increase in the nation’s poverty rate.
- β_2 is the coefficient for the predicted change in the incarceration rate of a nation given a one unit increase in the nation’s violent crime rate.
- β_3 is the coefficient for the predicted change in the incarceration rate of a nation given a one unit, i.e. one percentage point, increase in the nation’s unemployment rate.
- γ_i , for $i = 1, \dots, 9$, represents the coefficient for the predicted change in the incarceration rate of a nation given that it is in one of the educational ranking categories, “20-34”, ..., “176-198”, respectively for each i . Notice, this implies that the base intercept assumes that a nation is in the “1-19” educational ranking category.

Note, we employ `rstanarm` (Brilleman et al. 2018) in order to run the regression. Moreover, we make use of the default priors offered by `rstanarm`, however we allow for auto scaling.

3.1.1 Model justification

The above factors were each chosen due to the literature present regarding each of their impacts on incarceration. In particular, there is data to suggest that more impoverished individuals are more susceptible to being arrested, at least in the United States (Tara O'Neill Hayes 2020). Moreover, there is research to suggest that unemployment rates seem to correlate with incarceration rates, at least over extended periods of time in the United States (R J Waldron 1979). There is also literature that suggests that education significantly reduces the likelihood of incarceration, with claims that incarceration rates monotonically decline with education (Lance Lochner 2004). As for the impact of violent crime rates on incarceration rates, most research generally tends to focus on the reverse, focusing on incarceration rates' impact on violent crime. As such, this paper seeks to explore the converse in order to gain a more well-rounded understanding of how both factors influence one another on the whole.

A priori, we expect a linear relationship between each of these variables and a nation's incarceration rate. More specifically, we would expect that as the the level of violent crime, poverty, and unemployment rises, so too does the incarceration rate, as individuals may find themselves more likely to commit crimes as a means of survival, in turn increasing the amount of individuals that become imprisoned. On the contrary, we expect that more educated nations will generally see lower incarceration rates as better education is likely to be correlated with better standards of living and lower crime rates.

4 Results

4.1 Model Coefficients

After running the regression based on the above model, we receive the following coefficient values as showcased in Table 8.

Table 8: Model summary of the predicted impact of crime, education, unemployment, and poverty on incarceration rates.

	(1)
(Intercept)	85.287
poverty_rate	-2.408
violent_crime_rate	0.128
unemployment_rate	-1.525
education_category111-125	214.817
education_category126-147	148.628
education_category148-175	121.137
education_category176-198	132.218
education_category20-34	137.093
education_category35-52	134.324
education_category53-71	119.923
education_category72-92	128.736
education_category93-110	162.022
Num.Obs.	134
R2	0.258
R2 Adj.	0.105
Log.Lik.	-831.347
ELPD	-848.6
ELPD s.e.	31.4
LOOIC	1697.3
LOOIC s.e.	62.7
WAIC	1697.3
RMSE	117.04

We can see that, somewhat unexpectedly, increases in the poverty rate negatively correlate with incarceration rates, as do increases in unemployment, assuming all else held constant. On the contrary, as predicted, violent crime rates correlate positively with incarceration rates, all else held constant. As for a nation’s educational ranking, it appears that there is no clear relationship between education and incarceration rates as nations in the highest category of education, “1-19”, would see a much larger increase in predicted incarceration rates as they enter categories near the median educational ranking, before then seeing smaller increase near the lowest ranked nations.

4.2 Actual vs. Predicted Incarceration Rates

In order to get a better grasp of the predictive power of our model, we compare every nation’s predicted incarceration rate, given their respective qualities, to their actual incarceration rate as showcased in Figure 3 below.




Figure 3

In the above figure, each point represents a given nation’s actual incarceration rate (on the y-axis), against their predicted incarceration rate (on the x-axis) based on our employed model. We include a dotted $y = x$ line for reference to showcase all the theoretical points where the actual incarceration rate of a nation equals the predicted incarceration rate. Note that any points below the dotted $y = x$ line signify nations whose predicted incarceration rates exceeds their actual incarceration rates, whereas points above the line signify nations whose actual exceeds their predicted.

Examining the results on the whole, it appears that the model is able to somewhat accurately predict a nation’s incarceration rate, whenever that nation’s actual incarceration rate is between 100 and 300. As a nation’s actual incarceration rises above 300, the model loses its predictive power as it appears to significantly underestimate the nation’s incarceration rate. On the other hand, with nations whose actual incarceration rates are below 100, it appears that model generally tends to overestimate the nation’s incarceration rate.

We highlight the same 5 nations as done in Section 2 as they span the entire range of incarceration rates. We can see that, as observed, Iceland and Guinea-Bissau, who have the 5th lowest and lowest incarceration rates of 31 and 36, respectively, feature predicted incarceration rates that exceed their actual. El Salvador and the United States, who have the highest and 3rd highest incarceration rates of 1086 and 531, respectively, featured predicted incarceration rates far below their actual. On the other hand, Mexico, with an actual incarceration rate of 174, had a predicted incarceration rate almost exactly equal to its actual rate. Thus, these 5 nations effectively showcase where the model’s predictive power is strongest - near the middle - and where it is weakest - on either extreme.

We discuss the implications of these results in Section 5, and in particular, how this helps in understanding the United States’ issue of mass incarceration.

5 Discussion

5.1 Nations with extreme incarceration rates necessitate the need to consider additional factors beyond the model’s scope

As the results in Section 4.2 have shown, nations with excessively high and excessively low incarceration rates have various qualities about them, outside the scope of our model, that may better explain how and why they may find themselves with the incarceration rates that they do have. In particular, various cultural differences across nations such as differences in how nations view the idea of incarceration could significantly impact how various countries choose to deal with crime.

Countries such as Norway prioritize rehabilitation over punitive measures, leading to recidivism rates as low as 20%. On the contrary, the United States - who focus much more heavily on punishment than rehabilitation - finds over two-thirds of released prisoners returning back to the criminal justice system within 2 years (Beaumont 2023). Such stark differences in how nations choose to deal with crime can vastly impact how likely they are to incarcerate an individual, as well as how likely incarcerated individuals are to return to crime. In essence, prioritizing punishment as a deterrent can create a vicious cycle of high incarceration rates subsequently leading to high crime rates, in turn necessitating the need for more punishment, continuing the cycle.

Thus, it could appear that countries who suffer from mass incarceration, such as the United States, may find themselves in these positions by their own volition, as they choose to focus on harming their prisoners than helping.

5.2 Economic hardships and corruption at the national level may prevent nations from incarcerating when necessary

The results in Table 8 indicated a negative relationship between poverty rates and incarceration rates, suggesting that nations with a generally poorer population, relative to that particular nation’s cost of living, and higher income inequality may find themselves with lower incarceration rates. Though this may seem counter-intuitive at first glance, a potential explanation could be that poorer nations are simply less capable of handling crime. In particular, nations may not have the funding necessary to house criminals or hire a sufficient number of individuals to police the nation. For instance Kenya, who feature a poverty rate of 36.1% well above the median but an incarceration rate of 107 fairly below the median, also happen to have a jail occupancy level of 173.2% as of 2022 (*Kenya* 2022). This could help explain Kenya’s relatively low incarceration rate as being the result of an inability to house more inmates.

Another important point to raise is the effect of national poverty on the extent of corruption within a nation. Studies generally show that the levels of corruption in developing nations outweigh those of developed nations (Mirzayev 2023). As a result, it may be the case that poorer nations find themselves with lower incarceration rates as individuals are more easily capable of avoiding imprisonment through means such as bribery. In turn, extreme poverty can in turn lead to a lack of incarceration both due to financial concerns as well as higher rates of corruption.

5.3 Educational attainment as a nuanced metric of incarceration rates

As was explored in Section 4.1, we found that there was no consistent relationship between educational ranking and incarceration rates. In particular, though the highest educationally ranked nations found themselves with lower incarceration rates than those with poorer education, the extent to which incarceration rates were predicted to rise with a decrease in education varied depending on how much

the educational ranking would fall. Somewhat counter intuitively, a nation falling from the highest educational category to that of the ranks “111-125” would find themselves with the highest increase in incarceration rates compared to a further worsening of education to even the lowest category of “176-198”.

The possible explanations for this are twofold: Firstly, as was previously examined in Section 5.1, incarceration rates can be heavily dependent on cultural aspects that were not taken into account via the model. As such, certain nations with exceedingly low or exceedingly high incarceration rates may be disproportionately affecting the mean incarceration rates of their respective educational ranking categories, in turn leading to inaccurate conclusions regarding the impact of education on incarceration rates. To illustrate this point further, El Salvador who feature the highest incarceration rate of 1086, also happen to be in the educational ranking category of “111-125”, which may explain why the model predicts that this particular category is likely to raise a nation’s incarceration rate by the greatest margin.

The second possible explanation could be that nations with poorer levels of education are likely to also be poorer economically, which, as explored in Section 5.2, could lead to lower incarceration rates, in turn providing a possible explanation for why nations with the lowest levels of education also happen to feature lower incarceration rates than some nations with better education.

5.4 Insights for addressing the mass incarceration challenge in the United States drawn from the data and results

By incorporating all insights derived from Section 4.2, Section 5.2, and Section 5.3, we arrive to the following conclusions for how the United States can best address their issue of mass incarceration:

- (1) The United States should stray from punitive measures as the primary means of dealing with crime as this can perpetuate a cycle of high incarceration rates, recidivism, and crime. Instead, shifting towards rehabilitation-oriented policies, such as those endorsed by nations like Norway, can be more effective in reducing the need for incarceration, and reduce the likelihood of repeat-offenders.
- (2) The United States should dedicate more resources towards enhancing their educational prowess. As it stands, the United States has an education ranked between “20-34”, and as a result, given the overwhelming evidence that nations with the highest educational strength also happen to have the lowest incarceration rates, an increase in investment in education can aid the United States in decreasing both their violent crime rate, as well as the need for mass incarceration. Though we have uncovered that education can be closely linked to other factors of a nation including economic strength and standards of living, the United States is one of the most economically powerful nations, and as a result, we may come to the justified conclusion that improvements in their education are likely to yield positive results akin to that of similar nations.

6 Limitations and Next Steps

6.1 Limitations

There are a number of limitations to be addressed with regards to the analysis conducted and subsequent conclusions drawn. A significant limitation pertaining to this study is the lack of up-to-date

data across all nations. As was discussed in Section 2, all raw datasets contained information on nations that may not be accurate as of 2024. In particular, many nations had data that was collected years, and in some cases decades, ago, in turn potentially rendering much of the analysis inaccurate as significant changes could have risen over the years. Moreover, not all datasets included information on all nations, and in many cases, countries that were included in some datasets featured missing data points for various qualities of differing nations. As a result, the subset of countries that were included in this study may not accurately reflect the overarching global trends as only 134 out of the 193 countries recognized by the UN (*About Us* 2024) were taken into account during the analysis. Thus, the subsequent conclusions drawn may be biased as the remaining countries left in the study could be skewed towards more developed nations as these may be more likely to have data readily available. Moreover, due to the missing data points for countries that were included in the study, values such as the violent crime rate statistic that was calculated for each nation is inaccurate as it only included whatever information was available on that particular nation. As a result, nations which may have reported more crime rates than others would in turn bias the results to inaccurately portray such nations as having relatively more crime than they should when compared with nations that had missing data points for certain crime statistics.

A potentially significant limitation also exists with regards to the model used. In particular, the model does not take into account any interaction terms between the various independent variables when it likely should have, given the complex and intricate dynamics between the many variables at play. Though this was done to simplify the complexity of the model to allow for easier interpretations of the results, the caveat was an overall less realistic, and possibly less accurate, model. Another limitation with the model lies in its omission of cultural variations and associated factors across nations. By not grouping countries with similar cultural values or political and judicial policies, the model fails to account for factors that could greatly influence the derived results. As we have already explored in Section 5.1, varying cultural and societal norms with regards to how nations deal with crime can significantly impact their incarceration rates, a fact not taken into account by the model.

6.2 Next Steps

Future analysis in the context of this study can be better improved by incorporating more up-to-date data. In particular, web-scraping and compiling the raw data manually as opposed to using the raw datasets used in this study could net an overall more recent, and complete, set of data points. Moreover, incorporating time series data spanning multiple years across all nations would allow us to account for time and country fixed-effects, in turn providing more conclusive data that takes into account the various cultural and societal disparities across nations, and years. Another improvement that could be made is a better analysis of the model itself in order to fine-tune aspects such as the locations of the various priors, as well as exploring the possibility of adding additional factors and interaction terms to more accurately model incarceration rates.

Appendix

A Model details

A.1 Posterior Predictive Check

We employ the use a posterior predictive check in Figure 4 to evaluate how well the model fits the data. By examining the figure, it appears as though the model does not accurately fit the data, and thus amendments likely should be made as a result (Alexander 2024).




Figure 4: Examining how the model fits, and is affected by, the data through a posterior predictive check

A.2 Comparison of the Posterior and Prior

We compare the posterior and prior in Figure 5 to examine how the estimates change once data is taken into account (Alexander 2024).






Figure 5: Examining how the model fits, and is affected by, the data through a posterior-prior comparison

A.3 Markov Chain Monte Carlo Convergence

As `rstanarm` makes use of the sampling algorithm MCMC (Alexander 2024), we examine whether the algorithm ran into issues through the use of an Rhat plot and trace plot, both showcased in Figure 6. The Rhat plot does not indicate any issues, evidenced by the values all remaining close to 1 (Alexander 2024). Moreover, the trace plot suggests nothing out of the ordinary given that lines remain horizontal and fluctuate in an expected manner (Alexander 2024).



(a) Rhat plot



(b) Trace plot

Figure 6: Checking the convergence of the MCMC algorithm

A.4 Credibility Intervals

Lastly, we employ a 95% credibility interval as showcased in Figure 7, to gain a better understanding of the probability distribution of our coefficients.




Figure 7: Credible intervals

References

- 2024 World Best Education Systems – 1st Quarter Rankings Predictions. 2024. The World Top 20 Project. <https://worldtop20.org/worldbesteducationsystem/>.
- About Us. 2024. United Nations. <https://un.org/en/about-us>.
- Alexander, Rohan. 2024. *Telling Stories with Data*. "University of Toronto". <https://www.tellingstorieswithdata.com>.
- Arel-Bundock, Vincent. 2022. "modelssummary: Data and Model Summaries in R." *Journal of Statistical Software* 103 (1): 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v103.i01>.
- Beaumont, Leland R. 2023. *A Case for Norway's Rehabilitation Oriented Prison System*. <https://thefulcrum.us/a-case-for-norways-rehabilitation-oriented-prison-system>.
- Brilleman, SL, MJ Crowther, M Moreno-Betancur, J Bueros Novik, and R Wolfe. 2018. "Joint Longitudinal and Time-to-Event Models via Stan." https://github.com/stan-dev/stancon_talks/.
- Chang, Winston, Joe Cheng, JJ Allaire, Carson Sievert, Barret Schloerke, Yihui Xie, Jeff Allen, Jonathan McPherson, Alan Dipert, and Barbara Borges. 2024. *Shiny: Web Application Framework for r*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=shiny>.
- Education Rankings by Country 2024. 2024. World Population Review. <https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/education-rankings-by-country>.
- Firke, Sam. 2023. *Janitor: Simple Tools for Examining and Cleaning Dirty Data*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=janitor>.
- Galea, Sandro. 2022. *Addressing the Horrors of Mass Incarceration*. BU School of Public Health. <https://www.bu.edu/sph/news/articles/2022/addressing-the-horrors-of-mass-incarceration/>.
- Incarceration Rates by Country 2024. 2024. World Population Review. <https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/incarceration-rates-by-country>.
- Kenya. 2022. World Prison Brief. <https://www.prisonstudies.org/country/kenya>.
- Lance Lochner, Enrico Moretti. 2004. *The Effect of Education on Crime: Evidence from Prison Inmates, Arrests, and Self-Reports*. <https://eml.berkeley.edu/~moretti/lm46.pdf>.
- Mirzayev, Elvin. 2023. *How Corruption Affects Emerging Economies*. Investopedia. <https://www.investopedia.com/articles/investing/012215/how-corruption-affects-emerging-economies.asp>.
- Müller, Kirill. 2020. *Here: A Simpler Way to Find Your Files*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=here>.
- Poverty Rate by Country 2024. 2024. World Population Review. <https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/poverty-rate-by-country>.
- R Core Team. 2023. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- R J Waldron, T J Pospichal. 1979. *Relationship Between Unemployment Rates and Prison Incarceration Rates*. <https://www.ojp.gov/ncjrs/virtual-library/abstracts/relationship-between-unemployment-rates-and-prison-incarceration>.
- Tara O'Neill Hayes, Margaret Barnhorst. 2020. *Incarceration and Poverty in the United States*. <https://www.americanactionforum.org/research/incarceration-and-poverty-in-the-united-states/>.
- Unemployment by Country 2024. 2024. World Population Review. <https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/unemployment-by-country>.
- Violent Crime Rates by Country 2024. 2024. World Population Review. <https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/violent-crime-rates-by-country>.
- Wickham, Hadley. 2016. *Ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*. Springer-Verlag New York. <https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org>.
- Wickham, Hadley, Mara Averick, Jennifer Bryan, Winston Chang, Lucy D'Agostino McGowan, Romain François, Garrett Golemund, et al. 2019. "Welcome to the tidyverse." *Journal of Open Source Software* 4 (43): 1686. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686>.
- Wickham, Hadley, Romain François, Lionel Henry, Kirill Müller, and Davis Vaughan. 2023. *Dplyr: A Grammar of Data Manipulation*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dplyr>.

- Xie, Yihui. 2014. “Knitr: A Comprehensive Tool for Reproducible Research in R.” In *Implementing Reproducible Computational Research*, edited by Victoria Stodden, Friedrich Leisch, and Roger D. Peng. Chapman; Hall/CRC.
- Zhu, Hao. 2021. *kableExtra: Construct Complex Table with 'Kable' and Pipe Syntax*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=kableExtra>.