

Where Did All the Parents Go?: An Intergenerational Approach to Incarceration

By

PRESLEY HALEN POWERS

A Thesis Proposal Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Masters of Sociology

Middle Tennessee State University

May 2021

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Meredith Dye (chair)

Dr. Adelle Montebianco

Dr. Angela Mertig

DEDICATION

To my husband who provided me with endless support throughout this process, I am forever grateful.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Dr. Meredith Dye for her support, mentorship, and kindness throughout the development of my thesis. Dr. Dye has an amazing ability to both teach and inspire. It was only through her that I was able to realize my passion for advocacy and policy work. To simply know Dr. Dye is a gift and I consider myself very fortunate to have gotten to work with her so closely while a student at MTSU. I would also like to thank Dr. Adelle Montebelanco and Dr. Angela Mertig. Dr. Montebelanco taught me to speak confidently in support of the things I believe in. She showed me that sometimes I have to create my own opportunities, open doors, and start conversations because these are not things that just happen. Dr. Mertig showed me the power of research and the ability to conceptualize an idea. She showed me that once an idea was measurable, the possibilities are endless. I carried each of these lessons with me and applied them in the development of my thesis. Thank you all for being on my thesis committee.

ABSTRACT

The United States incarcerates more people than any other developed nation in the world. However, the effects of incarceration are not limited to those incarcerated. The friends, family, employers, and children of that person also realize the consequences. In fact, millions of children experience the effects of parental incarceration before the time they reach maturity. In addition, research suggests that children of incarcerated parents have an increased likelihood of imprisonment. Using the 2004 Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities, this study adds to the growing body of literature examining intergenerational incarceration. Specially, a series of binary logistic regression models examine how parent's incarceration (first-generation) predicts the likelihood an inmate having a child incarcerated as well (third generation). Attention is given to the sex of the parent for first and second generations (i.e., mothers or fathers), strains and stressors such as physical abuse by a parent and prior parental incarceration, and sociodemographic factors. Findings suggest that female inmates were over three times more likely to have an incarcerated child compared to male inmates. Key to the research, having had an incarcerated parent significantly increased the likelihood of children's incarceration by a factor of 2.758. This pattern holds across all models except mothers and incarcerated sons. Physical abuse by a parent and prior imprisonment both increased the odds of having an incarcerated child. Being married also resulted in higher odds of third-generation incarceration, but only for male inmates. These findings are discussed with reference to existing research and theory.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
INTRODUCTION.....	1
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	3
Pathways to Prison.....	5
Theoretical Framework.....	6
Current Study.....	10
METHODS.....	10
Measures.....	11
Analysis.....	13
Limitations.....	14
RESULTS.....	14
Description of the Sample.....	14
Bivariate Relationships Between First and Third Generation Incarceration...	16
Binary Logistic Regression.....	18
DISCUSSION.....	21
CONCLUSION.....	29
REFERENCES	30
APPENDICES	33
APPENDIX A: TABLES	34
APPENDIX B: IRB APPROVAL	41

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Demographic Profile of Second-Generation Incarcerated Persons by Inmate Sex (n=14499)	37
Table 2: Incarceration History of First-Generation Parents	38
Table 3: Profile for Third-Generation Children of Incarcerated Parents	39
Table 4: Bivariate Results of Third-Generation Incarceration by Select Variables	39
Table 5. Binary Logistic Regression Models Predicting 3rd Generation Incarceration (Full Model and Models Split by Sex) (n=8241)	40
Table 6. Binary Logistic Regression Models Predicting 3rd Generation Incarceration (Partial Models for 1st Generation Fathers versus Mothers) (n=5169)	41
Table 7. Binary Logistic Regression Models Predicting 3rd Generation Incarceration (Partial Models for 1st Generation Fathers versus Mothers Split by Sex) by (n=5169)	42

INTRODUCTION

The United States is the world leader of incarceration with over 2 million people behind bars at any given time. The incarceration of a single person affects a plethora of other individuals whether directly or indirectly. As it were, individuals under correctional supervision have also lived in the free world and in turn are parents, children, employees, friends, etc. In fact, as of 2007, there were 809,800 parents of minor children incarcerated (Glaze and Maruschak 2008). Previous research suggests that the number of children who will experience parental incarceration within their childhood may span from 1.7 to 2.7 million (Martin 2017). Therefore, approximately 11% of all children are at risk of experiencing parental incarceration before the time they reach maturity (Martin 2017).

Children affected by parental incarceration, face a heightened risk of antisocial behaviors and psychological problems (Martin 2017). This is due in large part to the traumatic separation from their caretakers coupled with the early exposure to criminal behaviors. The arrest and removal of a parent from a child's life forces the child to confront emotional, economic, and social consequences that may result in behavioral issues, problems in school, or severance of the relationship with the incarcerated parent even after release. (Hairston 2007). The terminated relationship between child and caretaker serves to increase the likelihood of recidivism for the parent as well as criminal behaviors for the child. In fact, statistics show that children of incarcerated parents are six times more likely to become incarcerated themselves (Martin 2017). As a result, children of parents under correctional supervision are often referred to as hidden victims as they lack a platform to express their experiences and do not receive support from the

community. Theories suggest that this results in a decrease in social bonds and an increase in deviant behaviors (Hirschi and Gottfredson 1990).

As of 2000, 73% of mothers in federal prisons and 58% in state facilities were living with their children prior to the arrest while only 47% of fathers in federal prisons and 36% state facilities reported living with their children. Furthermore, one third of mothers reported they were living alone as the primary caretaker of their minor children prior to entering correctional supervision (Mumola 2000). These are startling statistics when considering the rapidly increasing rate of women's incarceration coupled with lower socioeconomic statuses, less access to resources, and a justice system tailored to the needs of men. With regard to the custody of underage children following separation, incarcerated fathers cite that mothers are the primary caretakers of their minor children while incarcerated mothers cite grandparents as primary caretakers (Mumola 2000).

Despite the need for awareness for non-binary parents and their experiences, penal facilities remain segregated on the basis of an inmates' biological sex. While correctional facilities are still male dominated, the incarceration rates for women have increased astronomically since 1980. In fact, women's incarceration has outpaced that of men, two-fold in recent decades (Sawyer 2018). The United States' incarceration rate for females is higher than any other country in the world with a striking 646% increase between 1980 and 2012 with women now accounting for the fastest growing segment of the prison population (Halter 2018). In addition, while there has been particular attention paid to incarcerated mothers, their children, and their unique trails and challenges, we know less about previous and future generations of people currently under correctional supervision. This middle generation is the focus of my research. I will examine those who

have histories of parental incarceration; parents who are incarcerated; and those who have children who are incarcerated. Through the emerging cycle of intergenerational incarceration, I plan to uncover shared characteristics between the generations including cycles of imprisonment, prior victimization, and additional sociodemographic patterns.

Using the 2004 Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities (Bureau of Justice Statistics 2004), I conduct a series of binary logistic regression models to examine how parent's incarceration (first-generation) predicts the likelihood an inmate (second generation) having a child incarcerated as well (third generation). The study considers the following hypotheses:

H1: First-generation incarceration increases the likelihood of third-generation incarceration.

H2: Maternal incarceration has a greater effect on third generation incarceration than paternal incarceration.

H3: Exposure to parental violence increases the likelihood of third-generation incarceration.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Intergenerationality, for the purpose of this research, refers to whether an incarcerated person is the first, second, or third generation of their family to be under correctional supervision. This includes individuals who have no other family members incarcerated, those who have children incarcerated, parents incarcerated, and those with both children and parents incarcerated. Previous studies have linked intergenerational incarceration to the trauma of separation, a lack of programming, and the severance of a

bond between parent and child (Martin 2017; Hairston 2007; Scotti 2020). In fact, research suggests that the effects of childhood adversities can be transmitted generationally (Geller et al. 2009). Research has also found that losing a parent due to incarceration is more detrimental than any other form of parental separation (Murray and Farrington 2005). This may be explained by the increased risk of damaging childhood experiences such as an early exposure to crime, victimization, neglect, economic instability, and/or social isolation (Wildeman and Wakefield 2014; Martin 2017). The removal of an incarcerated parent also serves to negatively affect the secure attachment between parent and child resulting in a strain on the normal psychological development which may in turn lead to deviant behaviors (Makariev and Shaver, 2010). Such a traumatic strain on healthy psychological development works to increase the likelihood of substance abuse, poor social development, and home instability (Arditti 2012).

In terms of the gender of the parent and child, prior research suggests that the removal of the mother has a more immediate physical and emotional effect on the child. This may be explained by the fact that when a father is incarcerated, the child commonly remains in the care of the mother while when the mother is incarcerated the child will either be placed in the care of a relative or foster care (Mumalo 2000). This would therefore result in weak or unstable social bonds (Hirschi and Gottfredson 1900). Furthermore, there are fewer female correctional facilities which may serve to increase the likelihood of a severed bond between mother and child due to the parent being away from the child. In addition to a lower self-esteem and lower levels of empathy, children of incarcerated parents display an increased likelihood of having a history of arrest, conviction, and incarceration (Thomson, Kuay, et al., 2018). Despite the prevalence of

parental incarceration, there is limited knowledge of the differences in maternal versus paternal separation and even less information on whether these effects are stronger on male or female children. Prior research almost solely focuses on paternal incarceration and its effects on male children. Interestingly existing research suggests that girls may be more strongly affected by parental incarceration than boys. In fact, girls who are exposed to parental incarceration exhibit earlier onsets of risky sexual behaviors and an increased risk of criminal offending (Murray et al. 2007). This, therefore, leads us to assume that a gendered approach may be necessary in examining intergenerational incarceration.

Pathways to Prison

In contrast with male offenders, the majority of females under correctional supervision are convicted of non-violent offenses (Greenfeld and Snell 2000). Notably, one-third of the women in state prisons have committed property crimes while a quarter of these women have drug related convictions (McConnell 2017). Such property and drug crimes committed by women are often deemed crimes of survival due to the dominating patriarchal norms of modern society. Women are more commonly subjected to sexual victimization, a lower socioeconomic status, and gender stereotypes. While this terminology of survival is not often associated with violent crimes, women who do commit such crimes, typically do so in self-defense. A striking 42.3% of women convicted of homicide, acted in self-defense against an intimate partner (McConnell 2017). Moreover, females with a history of drug abuse most commonly cite self-medication for prior victimizations as their reasoning for illicit substance use. While men are also affected by lower socioeconomic statuses, their social position typically does not constitute crimes of survival. To further elaborate, the US Census Bureau (2015) found

that one in seven women live in poverty, a rate substantially exceeding that of men. Moreover, eight out of ten women have full custody of their minor children, which increases the likelihood of their having a lower socioeconomic status (compared to men) by two-fold (Cawthorne 2008).

In general, there is a lack of resources for incarcerated women and their children. There are fewer female facilities which typically results in mothers being housed farther away from their children. This, therefore, works to increase the likelihood of recidivism for the female offender as their social bonds weaken over time, and increase the likelihood that their children will engage in criminal behavior.

For incarcerated fathers, the environment of correctional facilities has become overwhelmed by a counterculture of violent norms, cultures, and taboos that serve to resocialize their inhabitants. Along this same line of thought, the deprivation perspective explains that inmates act in accordance with their environments (Worrall and Morris 2012). Many correctional facilities are fraught with violence, misconduct, and a lack of resources which serves to promote deviant and criminal ideals. Therefore, incarcerated fathers also face a heightened risk of recidivism upon release due to the resocializing effects of their environment which may produce strain, further weaken bonds with their children, and influence intergenerational incarceration.

Theoretical Framework

Strain, control, and learning theories are commonly associated with the understanding of intergenerational incarceration (Light 2018). Social strain theory explains that individuals may act out defiantly in response to a stressful event in their life. The sudden removal of a parent would certainly constitute such a strain. Following

separation from the parent, the child must be subjected to the stress of being placed into the care of a new custodian who may or may not be known to the child. Additionally, there may be media attention, court proceedings, and social damnation following the actions of the parent. There are three types of circumstances that constitute strain; strain as a result of anticipated or actual failure to achieve positively valued goals, strain from the loss of positively valued stimuli, and strain resulting from the anticipation or actual presence of negatively valued stimuli (Agnew 1992). Parental incarceration would be a prime example of losing positively valued stimuli. The loss of a parent due to incarceration works to remove positively valued stimuli from the home, resulting in strain on the child. Additionally, parental incarceration may also be an example of strain due to the presence of negatively valued stimuli. Children of incarcerated parents are more likely to be exposed to crime, engage in delinquency, and face home insecurity (Martin 2017). The strain placed on the child due to the parent may serve to increase the likelihood of cyclical offending. Thus, children who experience strain due to parental incarceration are at an increased likelihood of engaging in crime during their lifetime (Martin 2017).

Furthermore, a great deal of economic strain is associated with the incarceration of a parent. In fact, approximately half of all incarcerated parents in state facilities report providing financial support for their minor children (Glaze and Maruschak 2008). The removal of the parent coupled with the sudden loss of financial support leads to a significant amount of strain placed on a minor child. As a result, the child may begin to engage in deviant or criminal behaviors as a means of coping with the sudden changes in their life. Children in families with incarcerated or previously incarcerated parents

demonstrate a great deal of unmet need which may manifest itself in the way of psychological strain, antisocial behavior, suspension or expulsion from school, economic hardship, and criminal activity (Martin 2017). This is perpetuated by the hardships experienced by previously incarcerated people upon reentry. Hardships may include the lack of job opportunities, pro-social community ties, or a lack of resources.

Regarding social control theory, Hirschi and Gottfredson (1990) have further developed Hirschi's previous ideas (1969). They have further developed the views of social bonds to include low self-control and its effects on future crime and deviance. Moreover, Hirschi and Gottfredson have posited that self-control is a behavior that is learned through socialization which occurs in the family, school, and through peers. In terms of the parents, factors that develop self-control include a secure attachment, supervision, and the recognition and correction of deviant behaviors. For children of incarcerated parents, there is a removal of an assistant in the socialization process, resulting in a weakened social bond. Additionally, Hirschi and Gottfredson argue that parents must monitor their child's behavior in order to correct deviance and encourage self-control. They go on to argue that if the child is unable to develop self-control by the age of eight to ten then it is unlikely to ever develop (Hirschi and Gottfredson 1990). This, therefore, creates a pathway to incarceration for children with weakened or severed social bonds.

Previous research also supports how the absence of a parent can result in an intergenerational repetition of deviant behaviors through the process of socialization, strains, and weakened social bonds (Haggan 1996) . To further elaborate, an incarcerated parent is one less person available to provide prosocial behaviors and may in fact, serve

to promote deviance. When a parent is incarcerated, they are not only unable to provide a strong bond for their children but the exposure to criminality brought by their actions may work to increase the likelihood of a child repeating these behaviors (Haggan 1996). Given that normative behaviors are taught through socialization, it is understood that deviant and criminal behaviors are also adopted this way.

Intergenerational transmission of violence theory examines the way in which behaviors, specifically violent behaviors, are transmitted between generations (Besemer 2017). This perspective argues that children with parents who engage in violent behaviors are more likely to adopt those behaviors as they perceive them to be normal. This social learning perspective explains that behaviors can be learned through observation, imitation, and attitude. Children learn to adopt attitudes through socialization and choose to engage in crime when they have absorbed more motivation for deviance than normative behaviors. Violent behaviors are more easily transmitted intergenerationally than other types of offenses. Like many types of offenses, violence is visible through arrest, conviction, and incarceration. However, violent offenses differ in that they typically receive more media attention and remain stable in the sense that violent offenders tend to display more aggressive behaviors. Thus, the child of a violent offender may learn and adopt these behaviors through a process of observation, imitation, and attitude. However, the experience with violence may also serve as important sources of strain for children of incarcerated parents.

Current Study

In a recent study of intergenerational incarceration, Zhao et al. (2021) examined a sample of mothers from the Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Facilities, 2004, and their children's risk of imprisonment. The study paid in-depth attention to mother's trajectories to prison and the relationship to child incarceration. However, the study did not include the effects father's incarceration on their children, and they did not consider how previous generations (i.e., respondents' parents) may also influence subsequent generations. The current study builds upon the existing research and theories on intergenerational incarceration but adds missing information on the effects of multiple generations of incarceration. Using the same data, the current study seeks to understand how first-generation parents of incarcerated inmates, including mothers and fathers in both generations, help explain the risk of third-generation incarceration.

METHODS

This study examines the intergenerational effects of incarceration using an existing dataset of adult inmates in US prisons, the 2004 Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2004). This nationally representative sample of inmates was selected using a two- stage sampling procedure in which prisons were selected in the first stage and inmates were selected in the second stage. Computer-assisted personal interviews were conducted with selected inmates. The survey demonstrated a high response rate (89.1%) and large sample size (n=14,499 state prisons). There was also a low rate of missing data (<5% for included variables). (For more information on the data collection see Bureau of Justice Statistics 2004).

Measures

This study only examined inmates in state prisons and focuses on a small selection of variables from this much larger dataset (over 6,748 variables) that focused broadly on an inmate's background, incarceration experiences, and expectations for getting out of prison. Specifically, this study included measures of first and third-generation incarceration, and background characteristics of the second-generation inmate respondents. Each are outlined in detail below.

Dependent Variable

Intergenerational, specifically third-generation, incarceration served as the dependent variable. Third-generation incarceration was measured using a dichotomous, binary variable (0/1) indicating whether the inmate's child(ren) has ever been incarcerated (1) or not—an inmate whose child was never incarcerated was coded 0.

Independent Variables

The key independent variable for the analysis was first-generation incarceration, or if the currently incarcerated inmates (second-generation) ever experienced parental incarceration. Three related variables were examined. The first measure was also a dichotomous, binary coded variable (0/1) which indicated any parental incarceration (first-generation). The other two variables were measured in the same way (coded 0/1) and indicated whether the incarcerated parent was their mother or their father.

The analysis also examined several other independent/control variables. Biological sex was coded (1) male and (2) female and enabled the analysis to focus separately on the effects of males/females and mothers/fathers. Whether the inmate was a parent was coded as has children (1) and (2) does not have children. The age of the child

would affect the likelihood of incarcerated, as adult children would be more likely to be incarcerated than minors (especially very young children). Thus, whether their children were minors (<18) or adults (coded as adult children (1)) was another important control variable. In order to flesh out the relationship between minor children and generational incarceration, access to resources by the guardian of the child coded (0) no or (1) yes in which yes meant financial aid was received and no accounted for those who did not receive aid. A measure of social bonds, whether children visited parents at the correctional facility was coded (1) daily or almost daily, (2) at least once a week, (3) at least once a month, (4) less than once a month, (5) never, or (7) don't know in which more visitation constituted a stronger social bond. In order to identify the effect of correctional supervision over a period of time, criminal history examined if the parent (second-generation) has previously been incarcerated (coded (1) no prior imprisonment history and (2) prior prison history).

A group of demographic measures included inmate's (second-generation) education, age, marital status, income prior to incarceration, and race. Education was originally measured as highest year of school completed (e.g., 1 year, 2 years, etc.). Given the distribution of cases, education was recoded to include high school education or some college (0) or less than high school/dropout (1). Two measures of age were included: a continuous variable (years) and a categorical measure coded (1) <25 years, (2) 25-34, (3) 35-44, (4) 45-54, (5) 55-64, (6) 65-96. Both were used in the descriptive statistics while continuous measure was used in the regression models. Income was measured with a single item, did the inmate receive income from a job in the month prior to their incarceration. Lawful occupation in which income was received one month prior

to incarceration and was coded (0) no or (1) yes. A typical measure of marital status was included in the original data collection and included never married, married, divorced/separated, and widowed. These categories were collapsed and recoded as (0) not married or (1) married. Similarly, race was recoded as (0) nonwhite or (1) white, non-Hispanic.

Last, a group of variables measured a variety of adverse life experiences. Physical abuse by a parent was coded (0) not abused by a parent or (1) abused by a parent and was used gauge the effects of violent actions generationally. Lifetime measure of substance abuse was coded as (1) alcohol, (2) drugs, or (3) both alcohol and drugs. Another indicator of adverse life experiences was homelessness which was measured as ever homeless while growing up (coded (0) no or (1) yes). Similarly, ever being in foster care was coded (0) no or (1) yes.

Analysis

In addition to descriptive and bivariate analyses, a series of binary logistic regression models were used to predict/explain the likelihood of third generation incarceration (i.e, whether they have incarcerated child(ren) or not). As such, the models only included those inmates who are parents. Mothers and fathers were compared using three basic regression models: 1) full model 2) mothers only 3) fathers only. Gendered differences in intergenerational incarceration were also examined in separate models: 1) any incarcerated parent, 2) their mother was incarcerated, and 3) their father was incarcerated. In total, nine binary logistic regression models are examined. Selected independent/control variables were included in the regression models while some were only used for descriptive purposes (see Tables 1-7).

Limitations

The data set was incredibly large and problematic to recode due to skip patterns and inconsistencies in coding. Due to the sheer size of the data file it was hard to properly flesh out every single relationship that may yield significant results. Additionally, the age of the data is problematic, given the changes in social trends over time. Moreover, even though this was a large sample, a relatively small percentage were parents and an even smaller percentage had incarcerated children. So, the actual sample size analyzed was reduced. This was especially important when comparing males/females and fathers/mothers. The data is also cross-sectional so even though I can compare first, second, and third-generation incarceration I cannot compare these patterns over time without a longitudinal design.

RESULTS

Description of the Sample

The total sample included in the analysis consisted of 14,499 inmate respondents (referred to as second generation). Of these inmates, 79.8% were males and 20.1% were females. (It is important to note that female prisons and female inmates were oversampled in the primary data collection.) Over half of the respondents were nonwhite males (65.4%), in the 25-34 year age range (33.4%). Most second-generation offenders had a criminal history (70% were repeat offenders) and reported alcohol/drug abuse. Over 10% (10.7%) reported having been physically abused by a parent and similar percentages reported experiences with homelessness or foster care while growing up. Well over half of the sample (65.6%) reported having received income from a lawful occupation once month prior to incarceration (see Table 1).

Nearly 80% of the incarcerated females were mothers and 65% of the males were fathers (n=5196). Additionally, 14.6% of individuals reported having an adult child. For minor children, the majority lived with the nonincarcerated parent (39.6%) or grandparents, typically the grandmother (9.8%). A little over a quarter of the minor children's guardians received some form of financial aid to care for the children. Nearly a quarter of males (23.7%) and even fewer of females (19.8%) reported having visits from their children less than once a month (see Table 3).

Differences in Sex

As shown in Table 1, there were some key differences in the overall sample of incarcerated males and females. While males were more likely to have a history of incarceration, females reported more adverse childhood experiences. For instance, females were significantly more likely (15%) to have a history of physical abuse by a parent. Additionally, females were more likely to have a history of homelessness and substance abuse. Females were also more likely to have a higher level of education while males were more likely to receive income from a lawful occupation. Nonwhite males were overrepresented compared to nonwhite females; males were also more likely to be never married and have no children. Males and females, on average, were similar in age (35 years).

Generational Incarceration

The dependent variable was a measure of whether the inmate's (second-generation) child(ren) (referred to as third-generation) had ever been incarcerated. Slightly less than five percent of parents in the inmate sample reported that they had at least one child who had also been incarcerated (n=431). There were also statistically

significant gender differences in third generation incarceration: 10.1% of females and 3.5% of males reported incarcerated child(ren). (see Table 3)

The key independent variable used in the analysis of third-generation incarceration (i.e., that of an inmate's child(ren)) was a measure of parental incarceration. Of the total inmate sample, approximately 21% indicated at least one of their parents had also been incarcerated (referred to as first-generation). Most of the cases involved the inmate's father. For example, 18.1% of respondents reported their father had been incarcerated while 7.3% reported their mother had been incarcerated. There were statistically significant gender differences in first generation incarceration. Overall, females were slightly more likely than males to have an incarcerated parent (23.2% versus 20.3%). Although having an incarcerated father was more common (17.7% of males and 19.5% of females), gender differences were more pronounced when the parent was their mother. Over 10% of females reported having an incarcerated mother compared to 6.5% of males (See Table 2).

Bivariate Relationships between First and Third Generation Incarceration

Cross tabulations and chi square tests were performed to determine any relationship between first and third generation incarceration: 1st - 2nd - 3rd generation incarceration. As shown in Table 3, having had an incarcerated parent (first-generation) was significantly associated with having an incarcerated child(ren). For those who had an incarcerated parent, 6.9% had an incarcerated child(ren) (third-generation). In comparison, among those who did not have an incarcerated parent, only 4.7% had incarcerated child(ren). While there was no significant association for first-generation incarcerated mothers and third-generation incarceration, having an incarcerated father

was significantly associated with their child(ren)'s incarceration. Inmates who had incarcerated child(ren) were over-represented among those with incarcerated fathers compared to those whose fathers were not incarcerated (7.2% versus 4.3%). The patterns of first to third generation incarceration were only slightly different for males and females. A smaller percentage of males reported parental incarceration compared to females but the relative percentages and Chi square tests for significance were similar and consistent with the overall patterns of intergenerational incarceration. For example, for inmates with a history of any first-generation incarceration, 5.1% of males and 13.8% of females reported having a child incarcerated in the third generation. This compares to 3.2% of males and 9.1% of females who did not experience first-generation parental incarceration. Once again, this pattern was significant only for inmates with incarcerated fathers (for males and females), but not incarcerated mothers.

In addition to first-generation incarceration, patterns of association for several other independent/control variables and child(ren)'s incarceration were identified. As shown in Table 4, the percentage of the parents with incarcerated children were overrepresented among those who reported physical abuse by a parent (7.9%) and those who were married (7.9%). In terms of income, only 4.7% of second-generation offenders had incarcerated children when they received income one month prior to incarceration. Being homeless, in foster care, and substance abuse were all associated with third-generation risk of incarceration. Additionally, the age of the second-generation offender and adult children were overrepresented in the expected direction: older inmates and those with adult children were more likely to have incarcerated children. Second-

generation inmates with adult children resulted represented 17.1% of those with incarcerated children.

Binary Logistic Regression Models

In order to examine intergenerational incarceration, nine binary logistic regression models were used in which variables were used to predict third generation incarceration. In the full model (See Table 5), just under 24% of the variance was explained (Nagelkerke r²=.233) by variables incarcerated parent, adult child, age, race, sex, income, criminal history, physical abuse by parent, and marital status (Model Chi-Square=658.074; p<.001). In support of H1, first-generation incarceration increased the likelihood of third generation incarceration by an odds ratio of 2.758 ([exp(b)]= [.746]; Wald Chi-Sq = [5.983]; p< [.001]). The relationship between first and third generation incarceration was consistently supported in each of the nine models. Additionally, the continuous variable of age served to increase the likelihood of third generation incarceration by a 1.1 unit increase per year of age ([exp(b)]= [1.071]; Wald Chi-Sq = [124.878]; p< [.001]). As the age of the second generation offender increases, with it the likelihood of having an adult child also increases. To further elaborate, age of the child did affect the strength of the relationship as adult children were 3.12 times more likely to be incarcerated ([exp(b)]= [3.120]; Wald Chi-Sq = [70.719]; p < [.001]). Minor children are unlikely to be incarcerated, thus, prompting a need for the effects of age to be clarified. Criminal history and marital status also had significant effects on third generation incarceration. Reoffenders increased the likelihood – or odds—of third generation incarceration by a factor of 2 ([exp(b)]= [2.025]; Wald Chi-Sq = [29.860]; p < [.001]). The repeated arrest and removal of second generation offenders significantly

affected third generation incarceration. Akin to age, marital status increased the likelihood of third generation incarceration due to the increased probability of having a child. Second generation offenders that were married increased the likelihood of third generation incarceration by a factor of 1.6 ($[\exp(b)] = [1.611]$; Wald Chi-Sq = [14.343]; $p < .001$). Overall, first-generation incarceration had a significant measurable effect on third generation. This coupled with demographic information such as age, marital status, and criminal history worked to explain the generation effect of incarceration (first to third).

In support of H2, the incarceration of a mother demonstrated a greater effect on third generation incarceration than that of a father. In the full model (See Table 5), a mother's incarceration increased the likelihood of third generation by an odds ratio of 3 ($[\exp(b)] = [3.233]$; Wald Chi-Sq = [100.012]; $p < .001$). While the partial model limited to men showed that males with adult children were more than 5 times more likely to be incarcerated ($[\exp(b)] = [5.423]$; Wald Chi-Sq = [64.149]; $p < .001$), the incarceration of a mother remained the more significant predictor. To expand upon the first generation (See Table 6), first-generation mothers and fathers were equally likely to have incarcerated adult grandchildren ($[\exp(b)] = [3.14]$; Wald Chi-Sq = [59.5;70.30]; $p < .001$) but females with incarcerated mothers were more likely to have incarcerated children ($[\exp(b)] = [3.216]$; Wald Chi-Sq = [83.310]; $p < .001$). As a result, the gendered relationship was not only evident but was a significant predictor of their children's incarceration.

In terms of the relationship between males and females and their incarcerated mothers or fathers the gendered differences were less transparent (see Table 7). For

instance, males ($[exp(b)] = [3.112]$; Wald Chi-Sq = [39.428]; $p < .001$) were more likely to have an incarcerated father than females while females are more likely to have incarcerated mothers ($[exp(b)] = [2.164]$; Wald Chi-Sq = [13.401]; $p < .05$). In regards to mothers, there was not a significant relationship between mothers and their sons ($[exp(b)] = [1.763]$; Wald Chi-Sq = [1.889]; $p < .001$) while there was a significant relationship between mothers and daughters ($[exp(b)] = [2.164]$; Wald Chi-Sq = [4.070]; $p < .05$). This may appear to contradict the previously noted gendered findings, however, it's important to note that only 2.2% of the entire sample had incarcerated children, thus, when splitting the file by biological sex, the numbers become very small. Additionally, some findings that were significant in the full model did not remain that way in the partial models (See Tables 5-7). For instance, marriage was not a significant predictor of third generation incarceration for females ($[exp(b)] = [1.354]$; Wald Chi-Sq = [1.983]; $p > .05$) but it was for males ($[exp(b)] = [1.727]$; Wald Chi-Sq = [12.023]; $p < .001$). Females were also less likely to have lawful income prior to incarceration.

In support of H3, abuse by a parent increased the likelihood of third generation incarceration (See Tables 5-7). Second generation offenders that were physically abused by their parents were 1.6 times more likely to have incarcerated children ($[exp(b)] = [1.591]$; Wald Chi-Sq = [8.062]; $p < .05$). Additionally, other adverse life experiences such as parental reoffending also appear to increase the likelihood of third generation incarceration ($[exp(b)] = [2.025]$; Wald Chi-Sq = [29.860]; $p < .05$). Females ($[exp(b)] = [1.686]$; Wald Chi-Sq = [4.603]; $p < .05$) who had been physically abused by a parent were more likely than males ($[exp(b)] = [1.533]$; Wald Chi-Sq = [3.592]; $p < .5$) who had been abused by a parent to have an incarcerated child. Females were also more likely

to have incarcerated children if they had a history of reoffending ($[\exp(b)] = [2.166]$; Wald Chi-Sq = [14.706]; $p < .001$). The model including incarcerated mothers and fathers (See Table 6) were about equally likely to have an incarcerated grandchild if their own children reported having been physically abused ($[\exp(b)] = [1.709; 1.630]$; $p < .05$). Physical abuse between mothers and their sons, however, was not significant in fact, there was not a significant relationship between a first generation mother's incarceration and that of their sons and grandchildren ($[\exp(b)] = [1.763]$; Wald Chi-Sq = [1.889]; $p = [.169]$). In comparison, a mother's incarceration did affect second generation females and with it, the third-generation incarceration. When incarcerated mothers were included, physical abuse evidenced an increase in third-generation incarceration by 1.6 times ($[\exp(b)] = [1.630]$; Wald Chi-Sq = [6.462]; $p < .05$). It is, however, important to once again note that only a very small percentage of the sample had incarcerated children. Therefore, when the sample was limited to males/females and mothers/fathers, the sample became even smaller. As a result, some findings between first and third generations may be nonsignificant (i.e., mothers and sons) when the risk of incarceration may be similar to other comparison groups.

DISCUSSION

While only 4.7% of those in the survey reported having an incarcerated child (2.2% of the entire sample) there remains strong support for H1; first-generation incarceration increases the likelihood of third-generation incarceration. This relationship is most apparent when examining the 21% of individuals with incarcerated parents. The presence of an incarcerated parent (first-generation) displayed a significant, positive relationship with third-generation incarceration. The literature would suggest this is due

to early exposure to the criminal justice system, weakened social bonds, and the stress of separation. Descriptive statistics echo this notion in that 23.7% of males and 19.8% of females reported having their children visit less than once a month; thus, insinuating an increase in the probability of a severed relationship between parent and child. Such findings are consistent with Martin's 2017 study on the hidden consequences of parental incarceration during which he found that 11% of all children are at risk of experiencing parental incarceration. Another study found that as of 2007 there were 809,800 parents of minor children incarcerated (Glaze and Maruschak 2008). In my own study, 77.9% of women and 65% of men reported having children and the relationship between first, second, and third generations was examined; a difference from existing studies. While this statistic includes both minor and adult children, knowing that the vast majority of incarcerated people are parents, aligns with the existing literature and probability of experiencing parental incarceration.

Martin (2017) also reported that a child 6 times more likely to become incarcerated themselves when parents were incarceration. This current study found that children with incarcerated grandparents (first-generation) were 2.8 times more likely to be incarcerated. This may be due to the age of this data in comparison with his more recent 2017 study or the generational aspect. The present study included first, second, and third generations as well as first generation mothers in comparison with fathers. Martin's study only examined children while my research examines first, second, and third generations. This suggests, then, that the relationship has either become more pronounced over time or that first-generation incarceration has a notably weaker effect on second generation and third generation incarceration.

For those that are exposed to parental incarceration the literature suggests, there is an increased likelihood of antisocial behaviors and physiological problems (Martin 2017). In addition, children of incarcerated parents are forced to confront economic, emotional, and social consequences (Hairston 2007). While the mental health of the child was unable to be examined in this study due to the structure of the dataset, exposure to deviance demonstrated an increase in future deviance. Adverse childhood experiences may present themselves in the way of exposure and/or use of illicit substances, physical abuse, and/or unstable living conditions. While the child's direct exposure to such substances cannot be ascertained, one can speculate that a parent's use of drugs and alcohol may serve to shape the interactions they have with their children. Early exposure to substance use and abuse may also serve to support arguments of learned social behaviors in that family serves as the primary unit of socialization. This coupled with the stress placed on a child of an incarcerated parent serves to increase the likelihood of third-generation substance abuse (Arditti 2012).

Additionally, the literature states that approximately half of incarcerated parents were providing support to their minor children (Glaze and Maruschak 2008). The present study reported similar findings in that 68.8% of men and 52.9% of women received income from lawful occupation one month prior to incarceration. While income did not serve as a significant predictor in the regression models, the findings were concurrent with existing literature in terms of financially providing for the children; thus, the economic struggles associated with parental incarceration appear to be mirrored in the data given the majority of incarcerated people are both lawfully employed and parents. Furthermore, the removal of both a financial and social provider serves to simultaneously

create strain and the removal of a social bond; in turn serving to support both the existing literature and the theoretical framework. Also of importance, children who had parents who had been incarcerated more than once were twice as likely to be incarcerated themselves; thus, resulting in a cycle of trauma in response to the sudden removal of a parent if that relationship is still intact to that point. Overall, the findings suggest that those who are subjected to adverse childhood experiences are more likely to engage in deviance as they enter adulthood. Generationally speaking, factors such as substance abuse and criminal history serve both to damage social bonds as well as work to create a learning effect. Demographic factors such as age and marital status should not be overlooked as they too increase the prevalence of third generation incarceration due to the probability of having adult children who have been subjected to adverse childhood experiences.

Opposing existing literature, the present study found that married individuals were nearly twice as likely to have incarcerated children. Marital status is typically considered a social bond that serves to decrease the prevalence of deviant behavior (Hirschi and Gottfredson 1990). However, in the case of intergenerational incarceration, marriage served as a risk factor for third-generation incarceration. While this appears to be in contrast with the literature around social bonds, it is sensible to assume that marital status affects parental status and therefore, intergenerational incarceration. Moreover, the bonds that do form serve to socialize a child into the norms of that family unit; thus, resulting in an increased likelihood of exposure to deviance for the children of incarcerated parents (Light 2018).

In addition, the data suggests that a mother's incarceration has a notably greater effect on the third generation than father's incarceration. That is, third generation incarceration was more than 3 times more likely to occur when second generation offenders were female. While first-generation father's incarceration was an important factor for males and females, there was a clear relationship between mother's (first-generation) and daughter's (second-generation) incarceration increasing the likelihood of third generation incarceration. This concurs with the existing literature in that custody is more likely to be retained by the mother following the incarceration of a father. The literature suggests that the removal of a mother is more traumatic to a child as they are then more likely to enter the foster care system or be placed with a relative. In a study conducted by Mumola (2000) examining incarcerated children and their parents, it was found that 58% of women and 36% of men were living with their children prior to arrest. In fact, the same study found that one third of women were living alone as the primary caretakers of their children. Thus, children would be more dramatically affected by the arrest and removal of a mother. When adding a variable to measure financial aid received by the guardian while the parent was incarcerated (model not shown), the likelihood of third-generation incarceration decreased. This is of course concurrent with what existing literature has found regarding access to resources. However, when also considering the marital status of those incarcerated, it appears that it would be less likely for a mother to receive aid when her demographic information reports she is married. In fact, the partial models showed that marital status was a significant predictor of third-generation incarceration only when considered father's incarceration, not mothers. In comparison, a grandparent who has custody of the child (following a mothers incarceration) would be

more likely to receive aid. Thus, while the gendered effect of incarcerated females is still pertinent, the ability for a woman who is a single mother, who is already statistically more likely to live in poverty, to receive aid demonstrates a gendered relationship between incarceration and access to resources. The literature echoes this in that incarcerated women are significantly more likely to commit crimes of survival such as theft (McConnell 2017). With mothers already statistically more likely to retain custody of their children when the father of the child is incarcerated, the existing need for financial aid increases. However, access to such aid does not act as a correlate to need. Instead, the arrest and removal of the mother works to increase the likelihood of a grandparent retaining custody, thus, increasing access to aid. Despite access to aid, children who do not enter the custody of a grandparent are placed in the care of the state, thus, creating strain, degraded social bonds, and exposure to the criminal justice system.

In terms of the theoretical framework, there was support in the findings for social strain, social bonds, and social learning theories. The reduction in the strength of social bonds by the arrest and removal of a parent was displayed in both the present study's findings as well as in the literature. As previously noted, the removal of a mother serves as a more substantial change in the child's life due to the near certainty of the child having to leave their family home. Moreover, as previously noted, a father's incarceration statistically results in the child remaining in the care of the mother. As a result, not all of the social bonds in the family unit are degraded. In fact, the relationship between mother and child may strengthen due to a new dependence on the mother for support or result in more strain due to decreased opportunity or financial burdens of single motherhood. In terms of strain, the incarceration of either parent places financial hardship on the family.

However, while less likely than males, the majority of females reported receiving income from lawful occupation; thus, relieving some financial burden.

Additionally, literature has found that a mother's incarceration has a greater effect on female children. While the dataset used in the present study does not fully capture this due to the age of the findings, there is still a strong relationship between mother and child. More recent literature on the rate of female incarceration has found a steady upward trend since 1980. However, at the time of this data collection, the rate of female incarceration was much lower. As a result, a mother's incarceration, while significant, was not as prevalent as it would appear now. This serves to shed some light on the nonsignificant relationship between mothers (first) and their sons (second-generation). So, few males in the sample experienced maternal incarceration. Despite the age of the data, the arrest and removal of a mother has a much more significant effect on second and third-generation incarceration.

In support of H3, criminal history and exposure to violence increased the likelihood of third-generation incarceration. Individuals who were subjected to physical abuse by a parent were 1.6 times more likely to have an incarcerated child. This is consistent with both the existing literature as well as the theoretical framework. The Intergenerational Transmission of Violence perspective, which is a social learning theory, postulates that violent behaviors are more easily transmitted generationally, a viewpoint that is supported by the data (Besemer 2017). Additionally, the role of the parent in the act of committing the abuse appeared to be significant in that the model that included any abuse was not found to be significant. Wildeman and Wakefield found in their 2014 study of families in the era of mass incarceration that exposure to crime, victimization,

and neglect serve to increase the likelihood of deviant behaviors through the process of socialization. Moreover, Murray and Farrington found in their 2005 study of parental imprisonment and delinquency throughout the life course that parental incarceration is more detrimental than any other form of parental separation. Thus, the dual effect of both socialization and strain serve to increase the probability of third-generation incarceration.

Criminal history, as previously mentioned, was a significant predictor of third generation incarceration in each of the nine models. This may again be due to early exposure to the criminal justice system, or simply normalizing incarceration. Once again, the repeated removal of an incarcerated parent serves to increase the likelihood of a severed relationship (i.e. social bond) between parent and child. Additionally, experiencing victimization by the parent, someone within the primary unit of socialization, works to increase the probability that the behaviors will be both internalized and repeated. In the findings, eight of the nine models support a significant relationship between physical abuse by a parent and third generation incarceration. However, in the model examining males with incarcerated mothers, there was not a significant relationship. This may be due to the fact that male children who are exposed to violence are more likely to engage in violence, thus, increasing the probability of the male child responding to the abuse with violence. The literature concurs with this assumption in that children learn to adopt attitudes through socialization and engage in crime when there is a greater motivation for deviance than normative behaviors (Besemer 2017). Victimization at the hands of a parent would certainly constitute motivation for violence and/or deviance. Children who are exposed to violence and/or are victimized by

a parent show a greater likelihood of engaging in deviance, therefore demonstrating that violence is more easily transmitted generationally.

CONCLUSION

This study examined intergenerational incarceration and specifically the way multiple generations follow pathways to prison. In all of the analyses, inmates in the sample who indicated they had a parent who was incarcerated were significantly more likely to have a child incarcerated also. Although the percentages of parents with incarcerated children was relatively small, patterns of association were worthy of attention. Females are more likely than males to have incarcerated children in all models, and this was true regardless if the first-generation incarcerated parent was their mother or father. Adverse experiences, in addition to parental incarceration, such as physical abuse by a parent also increased the likelihood of their children's risk of incarceration. Overall, the findings suggest that strains, weakened social bonds, and socialization play a role in intergenerational incarceration. In order to address the cycle of incarceration in families these factors must also be addressed.

REFERENCES

- Agnew, R. 1992. Foundation for a General Strain Theory of Crime and Delinquency. *Criminology*, 30: 47-88.
- Arditti, J. A. 2012. Child trauma within the context of parental incarceration: A family process perspective. *Journal of Family Theory and Review*, 4, 181–219.
- Besemer S, Farrington DP, Bijleveld CCJH. 2017. Labeling and intergenerational transmission of crime: The interaction between criminal justice intervention and a convicted parent.
- Cawthorne, A. 2008. The straight facts on women in poverty. *Center for American Progress*.
- Caruso, V. 2018. “Report: Recidivism to cost Illinois more than \$13 billion over next 5 Years”. *Illinois Policy*.
- Enns, Peter K, et. al. 2019. What Percentage of Americans Have Ever Had a Family Member Incarcerated?: Evidence from the Family History of Incarceration Survey (FamHIS). *Sociu*
- Geller, A., Garfinkel, I., Cooper, C. E., and Mincy, R. B. 2009. Parental incarceration and child wellbeing: Implications for urban families. *Social Science Quarterly*, 90(5), 1186–1202.
- Glaze, L. E., and Maruschak, L. M. 2008. Parents in Prison and Their Minor Children [Scholarly project]. *Bureau of Justice Statistics*.
- Goshin, L. S., and Byrne, M. W. 2009. Converging Streams of Opportunity for Prison Nursery Programs in the United States. *Journal of offender rehabilitation*, 48(4), 271–295.
- Goodwin, M. 2020. *Policing the Womb: Invisible Women and the Criminalization of Motherhood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gottfredson, Mi. and Hirschi, T. 1990. *A general theory of crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press.
- Greenfeld, L., and Snell, T. 2000. Women Offenders. *Bureau of Justice Statistics*.
- Hagan, J. 1996. The Next Generation: Children of Prisoners. Journal of the Oklahoma Criminal Justice Research Consortium. 3.
- Hairston, C. 2007. Focus on the Children with Incarcerated Parents. The Annie E. Casey Foundation.

- Halter, E. 2018. Parental Prisoners: The Incarcerated Mother's Constitutional Right to Parent. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*.
- Hunter, G. 2010. "Prison Nursery Programs Reduce Recidivism. Promote Bonding" *Prison Legal News*.
- Kajstura, A. 2017. "Women's Mass Incarceration: The Whole Pie 2019". *Prison Policy Initiative*.
- Kanaboshi, N., Anderson, J. F., and Sira, N. 2017. Constitutional Rights of Infants and Toddlers to Have Opportunities to Form Secure Attachment with Incarcerated Mothers: Importance of Prison Nurseries. *International Journal of Social Science Studies*, 5(2), 55–72.
- Light, S. 2018. "Intergenerational Incarceration and Inmate Adjustment" *Grand Valley State University*.
- Makariev, D. W., and Shaver, P. R. 2010. Attachment, parental incarceration and possibilities for intervention: An overview. *Attachment & Human Development*, 12(4), 311–331.
- Martin, E. 2017. "Hidden Consequences: The Impact of Incarceration on Dependent Children," *National Institute of Justice*.
- McConnell, T. 2017. The War on Women: The Collateral Consequences of Female Incarceration. *Lewis & Clark Law Review*, 21(2), 493–524.
- Mumola, C. 2000. Incarcerated Parents and Their Children. [Scholarly Report] *Bureau of Justice Statistics*.
- Murray, J., Janson, C.-G., and Farrington, D. P. 2007. Crime in adult offspring of prisoners: A cross-national comparison of two longitudinal samples. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34(1), 133–149.
- Murray, J., and Farrington, D. P. 2005. Parental imprisonment: Effects on boys' antisocial behaviour and delinquency through the life-course. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, (46): 1269–1278.
- Pearl, M. S., and Knittel, A. K. 2020. Contraception need and available services among incarcerated women in the United States: a systematic review. *Contraception and reproductive medicine*, 5(2).
- Sawyer, W., and Bertram, W. 2018. Jail Will Separate 2.3 Million Children From their Mothers This Year. *Prison Policy Initiative*.
- Scotti, C. 2020. Generating Trauma: How the United States Violated the Human Rights of Incarcerated Mothers and Their Children. *CUNY Law Review*, 23(1): 38–99

Thomson, N. D., Kiehl, K. A., and Bjork, J. M. 2018. Predicting violence and aggression in young women: The importance of psychopathy and neurobiological function. *Physiology and Behavior*, 201, 130–138.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2006. American Community Survey: Selected economic characteristics.

Wildeman, C., and Wakefield, S. 2014. The long arm of the law: The concentration of incarceration in families in the era of mass incarceration. *Journal of Gender, Race & Justice*, 17(2), 367–389.

Worrall, J. and Morris, R. 2012. Prison gang integration and inmate violence. *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 40. 425–432

Zhao, Qianwei, Cepeda, Alice, Chou, Chih-Ping, and Valdez, Avelardo. 2021. Maternal incarceration trajectories and the intergenerational transmission of imprisonment: A nationwide study. *Children and Youth Services Review*, Vol. 122, 105942

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: TABLES

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Second-Generation Incarcerated Persons by Inmate Sex (n=14499)

	Male	Female	Total Sample
<u>Sex</u>			
Male	--	--	78.9%
Female			20.1%
<u>Has Children</u>			
Yes, minor children	51.9%	61.7%	30.9%
Yes, adult children	13.4%	18.9%	52.7%
No	34.7%	19.4%	14.2%
<u>Marital Status</u>			
Married	16.1%	18.1%	16.6%
Never Married	57.8%	45.1%	55.2%
Divorced/ Separated	19.4%	22.2%	25.7%
Widowed	1.7%	5.0%	2.4%
<u>Race</u>			
White	34.6%	43.9%	36.5%
Non-White	65.4%	56.1%	63.5%
<u>Age</u>			
<25	17.7%	14.0%	16.9%
25-34	33.4%	31.3%	33.0%
35-44	29.7%	38.1%	31.4%
45-54	14.1%	14.0%	14.1%
55-64	4.2%	2.3%	3.8%
65-96	1.0%	0.4%	0.9%
Mean Years	35.27 (10.715)	35.55 (9.348)	35.32 (10.453)
<u>Education</u>			
Less than High School	61.5%	56.3%	60.4%
High School Diploma	25.1%	25.1%	25.1%
Some College	13.4%	18.6%	14.4%
<u>Income from Job Prior to Incarceration</u>			
Yes	68.8%	52.9%	65.6%
No	31.2%	47.1%	34.4%
<u>Prior Incarceration</u>			
Yes	71.6%	63.8%	70.0%
No	28.4%	36.2%	30.0%
<u>History of Physical Abuse (by parent)</u>			
Yes	9.6%	15.0%	10.7%
No	90.4%	85.0%	89.3%
<u>History of Substance Abuse</u>			
Yes, Alcohol	62.8%	58.2%	61.7%
Yes, Drugs	7.6%	8.4%	7.8%
Yes, Both	29.6%	33.4%	30.5%
<u>Ever Homeless</u>			
Yes	8.3%	12.8%	9.2%
No	91.7%	87.2%	90.8%
<u>Ever in Foster Care</u>			
Yes	12.6%	13.5%	12.8%
No	87.4%	86.5%	87.2%

Table 2: Incarceration History of First-Generation Parents			
	Male	Female	Total
<i>Respondent (2nd Gen)...</i>			
Had Incarcerated Parent	20.3%	23.7%	21.0%
Incarcerated Parent was their Mother	6.5%	10.5%	7.3%
Incarcerated Parent was their Father	17.7%	19.5%	18.1%
Caretaker Abused Alcohol/Drugs	32.5%	41.8%	34.4%
<u>Growing up they Lived with:</u>			
Both Parents	44.3%	43.0%	44.0%
Mother	38.4%	36.6%	38.1%
Father	4.4%	4.6%	4.4%
Grandparents	7.8%	9.9%	8.2%
Other	5.1%	5.9%	5.3%

Table 3: Profile for Third-Generation Children of Incarcerated Parents			
	Male	Female	Total
<i>Respondent (2nd Gen)...</i>			
Has Incarcerated Child	3.5%	10.1%	4.7%
<u>Child(ren) Living with:</u>			
Other parent	44.2%	21.6%	39.6%
Grandmother	5.8%	25.7%	9.8%
Grandfather	1.8%	7.3%	2.9%
Other relative	2.3%	13.5%	4.5%
Foster care	1.1%	6.4%	2.2%
Child(ren)'s Guardian Received Financial Aid	26.8%	31.7%	27.9%
<u>Child(ren) Visited Parent in Prison:</u>			
Daily or almost daily	0.6%	0.4%	0.6%
At least once a week	5.2%	6.8%	5.5%
At least once a month	11.6%	13.9%	12.1%
Less than once a month	23.7%	19.8%	22.8%
Never	59.0%	59.1%	59.0%

Table 4: Bivariate Results of Third-Generation Incarceration by Select Variables

	Has Incarcerated Child(ren)	
Total	4.7%	
<u>Sex</u>		
Male	3.5%	134.419(1); $p = .000$
Female	10.1%	
<u>First-Generation Incarceration</u>		
Parent was incarcerated	6.9%	18.806 (1); $p = .000$
Mother was incarcerated	5.1%	.589(1); NS
Father was Incarcerated	7.2%	20.056(1); $p = .000$
<u>Adult Children</u>		
Yes	17.1%	550.674(1); $p = .000$
No	2.5%	
<u>Marital Status</u>		
Married	7.5%	29.586(1); $p = .000$
Not Currently/Ever Married	4.2%	
<u>Race</u>		
White	4.7%	.004(10: NS
Non-White	4.8%	
<u>Age</u>		
<25	0.3%	413.216(5); $p = .000$
25-34	0.9%	
35-44	6.5%	
45-54	11.3%	
55-64	14.8%	
65-96	11.2%	
Mean Years	45.91 (8.951)	
<u>Education</u>		
Less than High School	4.0%	8.214(1); $p = .004$
High School Diploma/Some College	5.3%	
<u>Income from Job Prior to Incarceration</u>		
Yes	4.3%	7.590(1); $p = .006$
No	5.6%	
<u>Prior Incarceration</u>		
Yes	5.5%	22.247(1); $p = .000$
No	3.3%	
<u>History of Physical Abuse (by parent)</u>		
Yes	7.9%	19.195(1); $p = .000$
No	4.4%	

**Table 5. Binary Logistic Regression Models Predicting 3rd Generation Incarceration
(Full Model and Models Split by Sex) (n=8241)**

	Model 1a: Full		Model 1b: Males		Model 1c: Female	
	B (SE)	Exp(B)	B (SE)	Exp(B)	B (SE)	Exp(B)
Female	1.173*** (.117)	3.233	--	--	--	--
Incarcerated Parent (yes)	1.015*** (.139)	2.758	1.135*** (.181)	3.112	.972*** (.225)	2.644
Physical Abuse by Parent (yes)	.465** (.164)	1.591	.427* (.225)	3.592	.522** (.243)	1.686
Prior Incarceration (yes)	.706*** (.129)	2.025	.649*** (.168)	1.914	.773*** (.202)	2.166
Received Income from Job Prior to Incarceration (yes)	-.151 (.114)	.860	-.171 (.149)	.251	-.100 (.179)	.905
Age (years)	.069*** (.006)	1.071	.061*** (.007)	1.063	.083*** (.012)	1.087
Adult Children (yes)	1.138*** (.135)	3.120	1.395*** (.174)	5.423	.686** (.223)	1.986
Married	.477*** (.126)	1.611	.546*** (.158)	1.727	.303 (.215)	1.354
White	-.386*** (.114)	.680	-.297** (.148)	.743	-.481** (.183)	.618
Constant	-8.267*** (.369)	.000	-6.876*** (.373)	.000	-6.300*** (.533)	.002
Nagelkerke R ²		.233		.211		.206

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

**Table 6. Binary Logistic Regression Models Predicting 3rd Generation Incarceration
(Partial Models for 1st Generation Fathers versus Mothers) (n=5169)**

	<u>Model 2a</u>		<u>Model 2b</u>	
	<u>1st Gen. Incarcerated Fathers</u>	<u>Exp(B)</u>	<u>1st Gen. Incarcerated Mothers</u>	<u>Exp(B)</u>
	B (SE)		B (SE)	
Female	1.138*** (.119)	3.122	1.168*** (.128)	3.216
Incarcerated Parent (yes)	1.037*** (.145)	2.820	.682** (.279)	1.978
Physical Abuse by Parent (yes)	.536*** (.165)	1.709	.489* (.192)	1.630
Prior Incarceration (yes)	.685*** (.130)	1.984	.614*** (.137)	1.848
Received Income from Job Prior to Incarceration (yes)	-.164 (.115)	.848	-.180 (.125)	.835
Age (years)	.067*** (.006)	1.070	.063*** (.007)	1.065
Adult Children (yes)	1.146*** (.137)	3.145	1.144*** (.148)	3.140
Married	.450*** (.128)	1.568	.334* (.142)	1.397
White	-.390*** (.116)	.677	-.363** (.126)	.696
Constant	-8.123*** (.371)	.000	-7.871*** (.397)	.000
Nagelkerke R ²	.229		.204	

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

**Table 7. Binary Logistic Regression Models Predicting 3rd Generation Incarceration
(Partial Models for 1st Generation Fathers versus Mothers Split by Sex) by (n=5169)**

	<u>Model 3: 1st Gen. Incarcerated Fathers</u>				<u>Model 4: 1st Gen. Incarcerated Mothers</u>			
	Model 3a: Males		Model 3b: Females		Model 4a: Males		Model 4b: Females	
	B (SE)	Exp(B)	B (SE)	Exp(B)	B (SE)	Exp(B)	B(SE)	Exp(B)
Incarcerated Parent (yes)	1.135*** (.181)	3.112	.886*** (.242)	2.425	.567 (.413)	1.763	.772* (.383)	2.164
Physical Abuse by Parent (yes)	.427** (.225)	1.533	.683** (.246)	.006	.420 (.264)	1.523	.563* (.281)	1.756
Prior Incarceration (yes)	.649*** (.168)	1.914	.740*** (.206)	2.097	.511** (.176)	1.666	.755*** (.217)	2.127
Received Income from Job Prior to Incarceration (yes)	-.171 (.149)	.843	-.156 (.183)	.856	-.242 (.163)	.785	-.085 (.195)	.918
Age (years)	.061*** (.007)	1.063	.080*** (.012)	1.083	.057*** (.008)	.896	.072*** (.013)	1.075
Adult Children (yes)	1.395*** (.174)	4.035	.710*** (.227)	2.033	1.414*** (.191)	4.114	.722** (.242)	2.058
Married	.546*** (.158)	1.727	.266** (.220)	1.305	.408* (.177)	1.058	.213 (.239)	1.237
Race: White	-.297** (.148)	.743	-.508** (.187)	.602	-.275* (.161)	.760	-.475* (.201)	.622
Constant	-6.876*** (.373)	.000	-6.099*** (.539)	.002	-6.487*** (.401)	.002	-5.811*** (.556)	.003
Nagelkerke R ²	.211		.200		.184		.171	

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

APPENDIX B: IRB APPROVAL

IRB**INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD**

Office of Research Compliance,
010A Sam Ingram Building,
2269 Middle Tennessee Blvd
Murfreesboro, TN 37129
FWA: 00005331/IRB Regn.. 0003571

**IRBN007 – EXEMPTION DETERMINATION NOTICE**

Tuesday, February 09, 2021

Protocol Title ***Predictors of Intergenerational Incarceration***
 Protocol ID **21-1110 4**

Principal Investigator **Presley Powers** (Student)
 Faculty Advisor Meredith Dye
 Co-Investigators NONE
 Investigator Email(s) *pha2c@mtmail.mtsu.edu; meredith.dye@mtsu.edu*
 Department/Affiliation Sociology

Dear Investigator(s),

The above identified research proposal has been reviewed by the MTSU Institutional Review Board (IRB) through the **EXEMPT** review mechanism under 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) within the research category **(4) Study involving existing data (Analysis of deidentified publicly-available data on incarceration)**. A summary of the IRB action and other particulars of this protocol are shown below:

<i>IRB Action</i>	EXEMPT from further IRB review***		
<i>Date of Expiration</i>	2/28/2022	<i>Date of Approval:</i> 2/9/21	<i>Recent Amendment:</i> NONE
<i>Sample Size</i>	FOUR THOUSAND (4,000)		
<i>Participant Pool</i>	Deidentified data collected from adult inmates in state and federal prisons		
<i>Exceptions</i>	NONE		
<i>Type of Interaction</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No interactions <input type="checkbox"/> Virtual/Remote/Online Interview/survey <input type="checkbox"/> In person or physical– Mandatory COVID-19 Management (refer next page)		
<i>Mandatory Restrictions</i>	1. All restrictions for exemption apply. 2. The participants must be 18 years or older. 3. NOT approved for new data collection		
<i>Approved IRB Templates</i>	IRB Templates: NONE Non-MTSU Templates: NONE		
<i>Research Inducement</i>	NONE		
<i>Comments</i>	NONE		

***Although this exemption determination allows above defined protocol from further IRB review, such as continuing review, MTSU IRB will continue to give regulatory oversight to ensure compliance.

Summary of the Post-approval Requirements: The PI and FA must read and abide by the post-approval conditions (Refer "Quick Links" in the bottom):

- **Final Report:** The Faculty Advisor (FA) is responsible for submitting a final report to close-out this protocol before **2/28/2022**; if more time is needed to complete the data collection, the FA must request an extension by email. **REMINDERS WILL NOT BE SENT. Failure to close-out (or request extension) may result in penalties** including cancellation of the data collected using this protocol or withholding student diploma.
- **Protocol Amendments:** IRB approval must be obtained for all types of amendments, such as:
 - Addition/removal of subject population and sample size.
 - Change in investigators.
 - Changes to the research sites – appropriate permission letter(s) from may be needed.
 - Alteration to funding.
 - Amendments must be clearly described in an addendum request form submitted by the FA.
 - The proposed change must be consistent with the approved protocol and they must comply with exemption requirements.
- **Reporting Adverse Events:** Research-related injuries to the participants and other events , such as, deviations & misconduct, must be reported within 48 hours of such events to compliance@mtsu.edu.
- **Research Participant Compensation:** Compensation for research participation must be awarded as proposed in Chapter 6 of the Exempt protocol. The documentation of the monetary compensation must Appendix J and MUST NOT include protocol details when reporting to the MTSU Business Office.
- **COVID-19:** Regardless whether this study poses a threat to the participants or not, refer to the COVID-19 Management section for important information for the FA.

COVID-19 Management:

The FA must enforce social distancing guidelines and other practices to avoid viral exposure to the participants and other workers when physical contact with the subjects is made during the study.

- The study must be stopped if a participant or an investigator should test positive for COVID-19 within 14 days of the research interaction. This must be reported to the IRB as an "adverse event."
- The FA must enforce the MTSU's "Return-to-work" questionnaire found in Pipeline must be filled and signed by the investigators on the day of the research interaction prior to physical contact.
- PPE must be worn if the participant would be within 6 feet from the each other or with an investigator.
- Physical surfaces that will come in contact with the participants must be sanitized between use
- **FA's Responsibility:** The FA is given the administrative authority to make emergency changes to protect the wellbeing of the participants and student researchers during the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the FA must notify the IRB after such changes have been made. The IRB will audit the changes at a later date and the PI will be instructed to carryout remedial measures if needed.

Post-approval Protocol Amendments:

The current MTSU IRB policies allow the investigators to implement minor and significant amendments that would not result in the cancellation of the protocol's eligibility for exemption. **Only THREE procedural amendments will be entertained per year (changes like addition/removal of research personnel are not restricted by this rule).**

Date	Amendment(s)	IRB Comments
NONE	NONE.	NONE

Post-approval IRB Actions:

The following actions are done subsequent to the approval of this protocol on request by the PI or on recommendation by the IRB or by both.

Date	IRB Action(s)	IRB Comments
NONE	NONE.	NONE

Mandatory Data Storage Requirement:

All research-related records (signed consent forms, investigator training and etc.) must be retained by the PI or the faculty advisor (if the PI is a student) at the secure location mentioned in the protocol application. The data must be stored for at least three (3) years after the study is closed. Additionally, the Tennessee IRBN007 – Exemption Notice (Stu)

Institutional Review Board, MTSU

FWA: 00005331

IRB Registration: 0003571

State data retention requirement may apply (refer "Quick Links" below for policy 129). Subsequently, the data may be destroyed in a manner that maintains confidentiality and anonymity of the research subjects. **The IRB reserves the right to modify/update the approval criteria or change/cancel the terms listed in this notice.** Be advised that IRB also reserves the right to inspect or audit your records if needed.

Sincerely,

Institutional Review Board
Middle Tennessee State University

Quick Links:

- Post-approval Responsibilities: <http://www.mtsu.edu/irb/FAQ/PostApprovalResponsibilities.php>
- Exemption Procedures: <https://mtsu.edu/irb/ExemptPaperWork.php>
- MTSU Policy 129: Records retention & Disposal: <https://www.mtsu.edu/policies/general/129.php>