

Texas Southern University

Digital Scholarship @ Texas Southern University

Dissertations (2016-Present)

Dissertations

8-2021

Data Analysis, Policies, and Practices Addressing Parental Incarceration and Behavioral Outcomes.

Jennifer Wyatt Bourgeois

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalscholarship.tsu.edu/dissertations>

Recommended Citation

Bourgeois, Jennifer Wyatt, "Data Analysis, Policies, and Practices Addressing Parental Incarceration and Behavioral Outcomes." (2021). *Dissertations (2016-Present)*. 39.

<https://digitalscholarship.tsu.edu/dissertations/39>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Dissertations at Digital Scholarship @ Texas Southern University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations (2016-Present) by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship @ Texas Southern University. For more information, please contact haiying.li@tsu.edu.

DATA ANALYSIS, POLICIES, AND PRACTICES ADDRESSING PARENTAL
INCARCERATION AND BEHAVIORAL OUTCOMES

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of Texas Southern University

By
Jennifer Wyatt Bourgeois, B.S., M.S.
Texas Southern University
2021

Approved By

Howard Henderson, Ph.D.
Chairperson, Dissertation Committee

Dr. Gregory H. Maddox
Dean, The Graduate School

Approved By

Howard Henderson, Ph.D.
Chairperson, Dissertation Committee

6/23/2021
Date

David Baker, Ph.D.
Committee Member

6/23/2021
Date

Jasmine M. Drake, Ph.D.
Committee Member

6/23/2021
Date

Glenn Johnson
Committee Member

6/23/2021
Date

© Copyright by Jennifer Wyatt Bourgeois

2021 All Rights Reserved

DATA ANALYSIS, POLICIES, AND PRACTICES ADDRESSING PARENTAL
INCARCERATION AND BEHAVIORAL OUTCOMES

By

Jennifer Wyatt Bourgeois

Texas Southern University, 2021

Howard Henderson, Ph.D., Advisor

Research has demonstrated differential offending due to age, race, and gender. Prior studies have also found relationships between parental incarceration and negative effects such as greater odds of substance abuse, delinquency, instability at home, and depression. In response to this concern, therefore, this study's objective is to assess the impact of parental status, race, and age on arresting charges in a large Southwestern metropolitan county. This study used self-reported information collected from intake forms administered during the jail classification process to examine parental offending patterns. Findings indicate that parental status and gender are significant predictors for property arresting charges. Additionally, race and age are significant predictors for public order and other arresting charges. Furthermore, age is also a significant predictor for drug-related arresting charges. Policy implications are provided in perspective with the study's limitations, in addition to suggestions for future research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vii
VITA.....	ix
DEDICATION.....	x
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xi
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Study	4
Purpose of the Study	7
Significance of the Study	8
Organization of the Study	10
CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	12
Background.....	12
Theoretical Framework.....	15
Intersectionality.....	16
Merton and Agnew’s Strain Theories	17
Strain Effects, Parental Status, and Offending.....	19
Strain and Parental Incarceration	19

Strain and Intersectionality Limitations	20
Previous Research on Differences in Offending.....	22
Race and Crime.....	23
Gender and Crime.....	27
The Intersection of Race, Gender, and Crime.....	28
Parental Involvement in Crime	29
Parental Status and Sentencing Outcomes	30
Previous Research on Parental Incarceration.....	32
Parents and Incarceration.....	32
Household Impacts.....	33
Mental and Physical Health Impacts.....	34
Long Term Impacts and Intergenerational Criminal Justice System Involvement...	36
Prior Methodological and Statistical Approaches.....	37
Limitations of Parental Incarceration Research	38
The Current Study.....	40
CHAPTER 3 DESIGN OF THE STUDY	43
Purpose of the Study.....	43
Research Questions and Hypotheses	43
Research Design.....	44
Target Population.....	44
Study Setting.....	44

Sample.....	45
Procedures.....	46
Data Collection	46
Analytic Techniques	47
Description of Measures	47
Missing Data	49
Ethical Considerations	49
Summary	50
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS.....	51
Sample Characteristics.....	52
Multivariate Analysis.....	57
Multinomial Logistic Regressions	57
Multinomial Regressions Interactions	61
Summary.....	65
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION.....	68
Introduction.....	68
Limitations	70
Implications.....	73
Suggestions for Future Research	77
Conclusion	79

APPENDIX.....	80
Appendix A. Violent Arresting Charges.....	81
Appendix B. Property Arresting Charges	82
Appendix C. Drug-Related Arresting Charges	83
Appendix D. Public Order Arresting Charges	84
Appendix E. Other Arresting Charges	85
Appendix F. Correlations Matrix (Race and Arresting Charge).....	86
REFERENCES	87

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Sample Characteristics	53
2. Correlations Matrix	54
3. Chi-Square Analysis	56
4. Multinomial Logistic Regression Analysis (Property and Drug-Related Arresting Charges)	59
5. Multinomial Logistic Regression Analysis (Public Order and Other Arresting Charges)	60
6. Multinomial Logistic Regression Interaction (Race and Parental Status/Property and Drug-Related Arresting Charges)	62
7. Multinomial Logistic Regression Interaction Effect (Race and Parental Status/Public Order and Other Arresting Charges).....	62
8. Multinomial Logistic Regression Interaction Effect (Gender and Parental Status/Property and Drug-Related Arresting Charges).....	63
9. Multinomial Logistic Regression Interaction Effect (Gender and Parental Status/Public Order and Other Arresting Charges).....	64

10.	Multinomial Logistic Regression Interaction Effect (Race, Gender, and Parental Status/Property and Drug-Related Arresting Charges).....	64
11.	Multinomial Logistic Regression Interaction Effect (Race, Gender, and Parental Status / Public Order and Other Arresting Charges).....	65

VITA

2005..... Bachelor of Science
Baylor University
Waco, Texas

2007..... Master of Science
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, Texas

2014-Present..... Professor of Criminal Justice
Lone Star College-CyFair
CyFair, Texas

2018-Present..... Research Fellow
The Center for Justice Research
Texas Southern University
Houston, Texas

Major Field..... Administration of Justice

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Charlie and Beatrice Mack, Sr. (Paw Paw and Bea), who instilled in me the importance of education. It is because of them that I never stop learning.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First giving honor to God, because without my faith I would have never made it to the end of this journey. The road to becoming Dr. Jennifer Wyatt Bourgeois was definitely a marathon and not a sprint. It took endurance. To my mom, you're one of the strongest people I know. I get my grit, drive, determination, and perseverance from you. It's because of those traits passed down to me I was able to finish this program. Now we are both TSU Alumnae. To my husband Jeremy, thank you for being by my side the entire way to remind me to "Just Breathe." It was because of you that I kept my eyes and focus on the finish line. To my big brother, Larry (Pookey), they say your siblings are your first best friends. Thank you for believing in me when I did not have the strength and thank you for being my protector and one of my biggest supporters in all of my education aspirations.

I am immensely grateful for my dissertation chair and mentor, Dr. Howard Henderson. In the words of Sean "Jay Z" Carter, "I'm a writer for myself and others." Thank you, Dr. Henderson, for challenging me throughout this entire process. It's because of you that during the hard times I continued to put pen to paper, and never gave up. I appreciate your guidance and feedback. To my committee: Dr. Drake, you are the true definition of sisterhood, "...we help each other." Thank you for all of the pep talks over the last few years, and the constant reminder to never doubt myself. Dr. Baker and

Dr. Johnson, I appreciate the morning coffee chats that kept me on my toes and pushed me to think critically and increase my depth of knowledge. Ms. Hope, you were always there to lend an ear and to make me smile during the hard times.

To my day ones, Alicia, Jason, and Camille. Y'all were with me from the very beginning when I started this process. Words cannot express how much each of your support and friendship means to me. To my sister circle (Jennifer, Candice, Chastidy, and yep...Camille again lol), I appreciate your support and love. I could always count on popping into our group text messages for a laugh or words of encouragement. To my friend, Tecovia Stepp, not only did you keep my hair slayed throughout my PhD journey, each time I sat in your chair you listened, and encouraged me to keep pushing until the end. Thank you to my college roomie Dr. Courtney Swisher Banks; I am grateful for our 20 years of friendship, and your support during my doctoral journey.

Dr. Robin Jackson and Dr. Sherri Simmons-Horton, I am grateful for our friendship. I could always count on the both of you to answer the phone...no matter the time of day y'all were there for me. Lots of good (and rough) times at the coffee shop. Shout out to Barbarossa Coffee for letting me hold down the front coffee table for four years. Dr. Tri Keah Henry, that final stretch was a serious matter, and you were there to give me that extra push to keep going. To my fellow TSU Tigers, Dr. Devonte White and Dr. Whitney Threadcraft-Walker, thank you for always telling me, "Jenn you got this!" Many thanks and positive vibes to my fellow yogi, Dragana Derlic, the light in me sees and honors the light in you. It's difficult to list everyone, but I am forever grateful to my family and friends who provided support and kind words the last four years.

In the words of Snoop Dogg, “Last but not least, I want to thank me for believing in me. I want to thank me for doing all this hard work, I want to thank me for having no days off, I want to thank me for never quitting.” Despite the challenges that came with writing this dissertation, I have to thank myself. Despite being impacted by parental incarceration, I AM RESILIENT.

“Speak up for those who cannot speak for themselves; ensure justice for those being crushed. Yes, speak up for the poor and helpless, and see they get justice.” Proverbs 31:

8-9

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Despite the vast amount of literature that has examined differences in offending (i.e., age, gender, and race) (Daly, 1998; Hindelang, 1978; Piquero, 2015; Piquero & Brame, 2008; Steffensmeier, 1989;), there is a shortage of information about the offending patterns of parents or the primary caregiver of a child(ren) under the age of 18. A significant amount of research about justice involved parents is centered on the short and long term impacts incarceration has on their children (Gaston, 2016; Gifford, 2019; Lee et al., 2013; Miller & Barnes, 2015; Murray et al., 2012; Wildeman et al., 2018). The Bureau of Justice Statistics defines confinement in jail or prison (before or after conviction) as incarceration. Therefore, parental incarceration is considered the confinement of a parent in a correctional facility (local, state, or federal). Although arrest is the point of entry into the criminal justice system, few studies have examined the impact parental status has on arresting charges. Prior studies that have examined children whose parents have had interactions with the criminal justice system focus heavily on incarceration and overlook the process prior to that point. The following sections will review the pervasiveness of parental incarceration at state and federal levels, emphasizing the importance of this study which seeks to add to the body of literature an understanding

about the relationship between race, gender, parental status (their interactional effect) and arrest patterns.

Determining the number of children separated from their parents due to incarceration is not an easy task. Estimates range from as low as 2 million upwards to 10 million children impacted by parental incarceration (jail or prison) at some time during their lives (Western, 2010). One study determined that of the estimated 70 million children in America, approximately 5 million (7 percent) of children under 18 years old have encountered separation from a residential parent due to incarceration in jail or prison; this number is higher when parents were not living in the same household as the child is taken into consideration (Murphey & Cooper, 2015). Black children are disproportionately impacted by parental incarceration. According to the Annie E. Casey Foundation for 2017-2018, approximately 6 percent (2.3 million) of White children, 13 percent (1.2 million) of Black children, 7 percent (1.2 million) Hispanic children, and 26 percent of American children have experienced parental incarceration. Black children are over twice as likely to have a parent behind bars in comparison to White children. There has been an increase in interdisciplinary studies that has found associations between parental incarceration and adversities such as an interruption in parenting, residential instability, loss of unemployment and financial support, poor educational outcomes, increased likelihood of depression, delinquency, substance abuse usage, anxiety, asthma, and migraines (Davis & Schlafer, 2017; Wildeman et al., 2018; Murray et al., 2012; Kjellstrand & Eddy, 2011; Lee, 2013; Western & Wildeman, 2009; Wildeman, 2009). Despite the potential for children to be impacted indirectly and directly by the spillover

effects of their parent's incarceration, it is disturbing that prior parental incarceration research focuses mostly on prison confinement.

Recent parental incarceration studies have started to examine the prevalence of incarcerated parents confined short term in local jails (Kramer, 2016; Shlafer & Saunders, 2017). Kramer (2016) found that between two county jails in California (Alameda and San Francisco), approximately 69 percent of incarcerated individuals were parents or the primary caregivers to at least one child under the age of 25. Similarly, Shlafer and Saunders (2017) administered a survey to individuals in Minnesota jails, and found that 69 percent of individuals had children under the age of 18. Both of the aforementioned studies provided descriptive information (i.e., age, race, and gender) about the parental jail population; neither contained data about the parent's arresting offense.

Aside from prior studies examining racial and gender differences in offending (Beck & Blumstein, 2018; Ibañez et al., 2019; Piquero & Brame, 2008; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996), there has been a lack of focus on the association between parental status and arresting charges. In 2007, there were approximately 1.5 million individuals held in American prisons, and about 800,000 reported being a parent. Simply stated, over half of the individuals incarcerated in state and federal correctional facilities were parents. From 1991 to 2007, the number of parents incarcerated increased by 76 percent, and the number of mothers incarcerated doubled. Additionally, four out of ten fathers were Black (46 percent), and nearly half of the mothers incarcerated were White (48 percent), and Black and Hispanic mothers represented 28 percent and 19 percent, respectively (Glaze & Maruschak, 2010). In state facilities during 2004, approximately 48 percent of parents were serving time for violent offenses, 60 percent for drugs or public order crimes, and

nearly 50 percent for property offenses (Glaze & Maruschak, 2010). The latest Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) report used information from the Survey of Prison Inmates, 2016, to estimate how many parents were in prison. Taking into account both state and federal facilities, approximately 684,5000 incarcerated individuals identified as parents. Consistent with previous reports, the majority of state and federal incarcerated parents were females (58%) compared to males (47%). One limitation of the new BJS parental incarceration report is that it did not contain information about the type of crimes committed by parents. At this time there are nearly 2.3 million individuals serving time in correctional facilities, and the number rises to nearly 6 million when probation and parole are taken into account (Sawyer & Wagner, 2020).

In Texas, there are more than 200,000 individuals separated from their families due to incarceration (Kaeble & Cowhig, 2018), and approximately 477,000 children in the Lone Star state have been exposed to parental incarceration during their childhood (Annie Casey Foundation, 2016). Nestled within the 4th largest city (Houston), Harris County is the third largest county and has approximately 4.6 million residents. Annually, the Harris County jail processes almost 100,000 persons, and the most recent average daily jail population hovers around 9,600 (Bourgeois et al., 2018).

Background of the Study

A significant amount of research about incarcerated parents and their children uses data based on long term confinement in a prison. The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health) and Fragile Families Well-Being (FFCW) are frequently used longitudinal datasets to analyze relationships between parental incarceration and its impact on children, adolescents, and young adulthood (Burgess-

Proctor et al., 2016; Gaston, 2016; Geller et al., 2009; Poehlmann-Tynan & Eddy, 2019, Wildeman & Western, 2010). The Bureau of Justice Statistics used the Survey of Inmates in State Correctional Facilities and the Survey of Inmates in Federal Correctional Facilities and Prison to estimate how many children have experienced parental incarceration (Maruschak et al., 2020; Glaze & Maruschak, 2010; Mumola, 2000). The Uniform Crime Report (UCR) compiled by the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI), National Incident-Based Report System (NIBRS), and the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) are some of the most commonly used sources of data among racial and gender difference offending research. Connected, yet understudied, to parental incarceration research are the behaviors of the parents.

Despite the value of the information gathered from longitudinal studies and prison surveys, the datasets were not created specifically to examine outcomes of parental incarceration. Until recently, the special reports compiled by the Bureau of Justice Statistics about parents and their minor children were outdated by over 15 years (Glaze & Maruschak, 2010; Mumola, 2000). The same is true for research examining differences in offending based on race, ethnicity, and race; parental status and its interaction with other variables have yet to be examined. Therefore, limitations of previous parental incarceration and differences in offending behavior research will be addressed in this study.

First, whereas the majority of prior research about parental incarceration examines long term confinement in prison, this study's aim is to determine how many individuals in the Harris County jail are parents or primary caregivers to child(ren). To date, the majority of point-in-time estimates (i.e., parental incarceration counts from

surveys administered in correctional facilities during a particular year) about parental incarceration have been at the state and national levels. Annually there are approximately 12 million individuals held in local jails around the nation in comparison to about 600,000 admissions to state and federal prisons (Subramanian et al., 2015). In 2017, individuals in jails were confined for an average of 26 days (Zeng, 2019). Jail is referred to as the “front door of mass incarceration” and “gateway to the justice system.” With that being said, research has demonstrated that individuals in prison and jail have different experiences, and prison has historically received the lion’s share of parental incarceration empirical examinations. Individuals housed in a local jail may either be serving a sentence less than one year, awaiting a trial, there due to a probation or parole violation, or serving their prison time until space becomes available in a state prison. Secondary data from a needs assessment study conducted by Texas Children’s Hospital is used in this study to analyze associations between race, gender, parental status, and arresting charge in Harris County, the 3rd largest in the country (Correa et al., 2019). This initial needs assessment will allow for future studies that compares the impact of local parental incarceration in different locations such as rural and suburban, and examination of neighborhood characteristics and its impact on spillover effects of incarceration, and policy-based solutions specifically targeting short term confinement.

Second, prior studies that have examined family role or parental status did not look at type of offense as an outcome measure, but instead focused on the relationship between parental status and its influence on sentencing decisions and outcomes (Cho & Tasca, 2019; Tasca et al., 2019; Freiburger, 2010, 2011; Spohn, 1999). Therefore, this study’s objective is to examine arresting charges, and assess differences in offending

based on race, gender, age, and parental status. Additionally, this study seeks to identify predictors for pathways into which parents become justice involved. By comparing the types of offenses committed by parents will determine which individuals do not pose a threat towards the general public, and therefore can be diverted into another possibility to incarceration that will let them to remain in the community while lessening the impact of the negative economic, school-based, and health-related adversities their children will likely experience. Lastly, previous studies have examined race, gender, and crime separately; however, no studies have evaluated the interaction effect of race, gender, parental status, and arresting charge. Therefore, this study will use an intersectional framework integrated with the strain theory to understand which factors impact arrest patterns.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine the impact parental status, race, gender, and age have on arresting charges utilizing a sample of individuals in the Harris County jail. Specifically, the research questions are: (1) What is the relationship between parental status, race, gender, and, and arresting charge (i.e., violent, property, drug-related, public order, and other offenses) and (2) Is there an interaction effect between race, gender, parental status, and arresting charge (i.e., violent, property, drug-related, public order, and other offenses)? In order to determine the number of children impacted by the incarceration of a parent, information will be gathered from intake forms during the Harris County jail's classification process.

Significance of the Study

To reiterate, the purpose of this study is to fill a gap in existing research by examining the influence parental status has on arresting charges utilizing a sample of individuals at the Harris County jail. This study seeks to move us beyond descriptives in understanding the reasons parents are arrested, and advance the conversation about local criminal justice reform.

To date, there has been a limited amount of attention on short term (i.e., jail) parental incarceration studies. It remains unknown how many children are impacted by the collateral consequences of parental incarceration at the local level due to inconsistent findings or lack of data collection. Despite the abundance of parental incarceration research, policy implications should focus on data-driven solutions to foster resiliency for both the child and the parent/primary caregiver. In doing so, a specialized approach about parental incarceration policy implications should encompass an interdisciplinary and culturally responsive approach, while also addressing the problem locally. The body of literature about the impact of parental incarceration on children whose parents are in jail is limited (Shlafer & Saunders, 2017). Until recently, the local jail in this particular study was not collecting information about incarcerated individuals' children—leaving the number of impacted children in Harris County unknown. Therefore, prevention and intervention strategies cannot be implemented without first an understanding of data to clearly identify the population of parents that are incarcerated and their types of arresting charges. Incarceration research shows that families face several challenges such as disruption in the relationship between the parent and child, financial troubles, stigma, visitation barriers, and others in the household taking on the role of caregivers (Arditti,

Burton, & Neeves-Botelho, 2010; Davis & Shlafer, 2017; Kjellstrand & Eddy, 2011; Tasca, et al., 2014; Western & Wildeman, 2009; Wildeman, 2009).

Understanding the lived experiences of children, parents, and primary caregivers impacted by incarceration is essential to identify their needs. In some instances, the sole provider for the family is removed when a parent is incarcerated, which can result in economic strain. Prior to incarceration or arrest, over 50 percent of both mothers and fathers indicated that they were the main source of financial support for their children, and 75 percent of the parents were employed (Glaze & Maruschak, 2010). Additionally, when a father is incarcerated, the family's household income is lowered during and after their release (Johnson, 2009). With the loss of income due to incarceration, there is also a gain of expenses such as phone calls and travel expenses associated with prison visits (Clear, 2008).

It is imperative to understand the needs of families clearly, but also recognize the uniqueness of the population. Using approaches from multiple disciplines such as psychology, sociology, social work, and economics helps to understand the social inequalities related to incarceration and provides a widespread understanding of the issue. One in 14 children have experienced the incarceration of a parent, but Black children are impacted at a disparate rate at 1 in 9 (Murphey & Cooper, 2015). Children of different races, ethnicities, and socioeconomic statuses are impacted by the incarceration of loved ones; however, both the parent and child are in need of supportive resources.

In addition to an interdisciplinary approach, research should have culturally responsive approach to account for racial disparity as it pertains to parental incarceration. Often, collateral consequences of incarceration research involve studying vulnerable

populations and their outcomes. Preexisting life stressors worsens the conditions of children and families in disadvantaged communities problems when a parent is incarcerated, and after the incarcerated individual's release (Finkeldy & Dennison, 2019; Clear, 2007; Pager, Western, & Bonikowski, 2009; Murray & Farrington, 2008; Wakefield & Wildeman, 2011; Pager, 2003).

Incarceration is no longer a unique experience in the United States for racial and ethnic minorities or the poor. Close to half of all U.S. adults have been impacted by the incarceration of a family member (Elderblom et al., 2019), and as many as five million children have experienced parental incarceration (Murphey & Cooper, 2015). Therefore, justice report policies are essential that focus on mass de-incarceration while simultaneously providing support to families and communities that are impacted by the spillover effects of incarceration.

Organization of the Study

This study has five chapters, beginning with the current introduction chapter. Chapter one provides an overview of the study focusing on the scope of the problem, purpose of the research, contribution to the current body of literature, and structure of the study. The second chapter is a literature review that discusses the theoretical framework for the study in alignment with the variables of interest, previous studies about differences in offending, the impacts of children separated from their parents due to incarceration, and prior studies' methodological limitations. However, chapter two begins with background information about incarceration in America. The research design, methodology, and steps used for data collection and analysis is illustrated in chapter three. Chapter four emphasizes the study's findings based on the statistical analysis of the

data used to examine the research questions and hypotheses. In chapter five, results are discussed, limitations are identified, and implications are addressed. The study concludes with a discussion addressing future research suggestions.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter 2 disentangles the complexities of parental criminal justice contact (i.e., parental arrest and parental incarceration) by assessing an assortment of information, such as examining literature about differences in offending patterns, and negative impacts of parental incarceration. The review of prior research is separated into four sections, which will: (1) discuss race, gender, parental status, and crime, (2) emphasize literature examining the relationship between the incarceration of a parent and individual, household, and societal outcomes; (3) provide an overview of prior parental incarceration methodological limitations, and (4) concludes with the current study's purpose. However, the section will begin with an overview of the criminal (in)justice system and the connection between parental arrest and incarceration.

Background

The surge in mass incarceration in the United States is well documented in the literature. Approximately 340,000 individuals were incarcerated in the 1970s. At this time close to 2.3 million people are imprisoned (Sawyer & Wagner, 2020). This number reaches 6.6 million with the inclusion of probation and parole supervision (Kaeble & Cowhig, 2018). David Garland (2001) coined the term “mass imprisonment” as a description for the increase in the imprisonment rate between 1975 and the latter part of the 1990s and describes the phenomenon based on two elements. First, the surge in the

prison population size and imprisonment was notably above the norm. Second, the drastic increase did not solely target individual offenders but instead resulted in systematic inequalities that impacted certain groups of the population at a disparate rate. In the United States, young Black men were the concentrated group of individuals who were disproportionately incarcerated in compared to their White and Hispanic counterparts (Nellis, 2016). The United States represents about 5% of the world's population, but accounts for approximately 25% of the world's incarceration population. This phenomenon of mass incarceration simply mean that in comparison to other countries, the United States incarcerates the most individuals in the world.

Research about justice-involved parents focuses heavily on the incarceration experience. Approximately 47 percent of individuals in state prisons, and about 57 percent of federal incarcerated are parents (Maruschak et al., 2021). According to Murphey and Cooper (2015), over 5 million children, about 7% of all children in America have experienced parental incarceration (i.e., jail or prison) during their childhood. It is estimated that this number increases to 10 million children when parental arrest is taken into account. Parental incarceration is one of the least studied childhood adverse experiences, and there is an abundance of research that suggests that children who have a parent incarcerated at some point in their lives will have adversities that harm their mental, physical, and educational well-being. For example, African American children exposed to parental incarceration are significantly more likely to experience depression than White children who have experienced parental incarceration (Kopak & Smith-Ruiz, 2016). Parental incarceration has also been linked to low educational attainment and an increased likelihood of school discipline such as suspensions and

expulsions (Turney & Haskins, 2014; Hanlon et al., 2005; Trice & Brewster, 2004). Several qualitative studies have revealed resiliency in children and young adults and their capability to overcome the negative impacts of parental incarceration (Johnston & Sullivan, 2016; Muhammad, 2018; Nesmith & Ruhland, 2008; Zhang & Flynn, 2019), the fact remains that Black children are impacted at a disparate rate by the negative outcomes of having a parent incarcerated. The number of children separated from their parents due to incarceration was the highest among Black children at 1 in 9 in comparison to 1 in 17 White children (Murphey & Cooper, 2015).

Before incarceration, there are several steps in between. Arrest is the initial step in the criminal justice system that leads to the pathway to incarceration. Previous research about mass incarceration overlooks the process between arrest and incarceration, and the racial disparity obvious at each stage of the decision-making process. Black individuals are more likely to be detained, searched, arrested, prosecuted, and ultimately incarcerated than to their White counterparts. A recent study found that out of 800 jurisdictions, Black people are 5 times more likely to be arrested than White people, and up to 10 times more likely in 250 jurisdictions (Thomas et al., 2020). Black persons account for approximately 13% of the United States' population, but represent about 33% of the prison population (Gramlich, 2019). The impacts of arrest, prosecution, and incarceration are felt by the individual directly engulfed in the system, as well as their families and the community.

As previously mentioned, literature about parental incarceration focuses heavily on short and long term impacts of parental incarceration on children and youth. Additionally, the majority of literature about parental incarceration focuses on long term

incarceration, such as confinement in state and federal facilities. There are limited studies highlighting other types of parental criminal justice contact besides incarceration (Wakefield & Montagnet, 2019). Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between race, gender, parental status, and the arresting offense of individuals at a local jail. For the purpose of this study, when the term parental incarceration is used, it is to signify a child that has experienced their parent or primary caregiver being incarcerated in either a jail or prison. The next section will discuss the theoretical framework for this study as it seeks to understand the relationship between race, gender, parental status, and offending patterns.

Theoretical Framework

This current study used the General Strain Theory as a theoretical framework to provide a different lens for understanding parental offending patterns. A review of literature found studies on race, gender, and crime; however, no previous studies have examined the intersection of race, gender, parental status and influence on arresting charge. Therefore, this study seeks to analyze the relationship between race, gender, age, parental status, and arresting charge by integrating an intersectionality framework with the general strain theory. Race and gender are common traits studied in differential offending studies; however, missing from the discussion is parental status (whether or not a person is the parent or primary caregiver to an individual under the age of 18 at the time of arrest). This study aims to add to the current body of literature by determining how the intersectionality of race, gender, and parental status relate to arrest. The following section will: 1) provide an overview about intersectionality and strain theories, 2) discuss how the strain theory has been used in prior studies to explain

differences in offending and the negative impacts of parental incarceration, and conclude with 3) limitations of intersectionality and strain theories.

Intersectionality

Criminological theories consistently grapple with considering gender and racial differences in offending, and do not offer explanations about the intersectional relationship between race, gender, and criminal behavior. Kimberle Crenshaw is considered a pioneer in the Critical Race Theory and credited with coining the term “intersectionality.” Crenshaw’s research created a dialogue about the intersection of race, gender, class, and other individual characteristics (Crenshaw, 1989). Intersectionality addresses bias and discrimination associated with the colliding of two identities, being Black and female. Collins (2000) illustrates intersectionality as two systems of oppression colliding: race and gender. Intersectionality uses a critical perspective and emphasizes the understanding of human behavior must acknowledge various social identities and statuses. Potter (2015) advocates for using of an intersectional framework in research for a more comprehensive understanding of crime, criminal behavior, and the judicial system. Brown (2015) suggests that mainstream criminological theories can benefit from the inclusion of an intersectional approach to better understand the race and gender gap in crime. Therefore, this study seeks to incorporate intersectionality into the general strain theory by the relationship between race, gender, parental status, and arresting patterns. Before discussing the merging of intersectionality into the general strain theory, the following section will overview the origins of the strain theory, its application to prior differential offending and parental incarceration studies, and its

limitation. The section will conclude with a conversation about the purpose of the current study.

Merton and Agnew's Strain Theories

Despite the purpose of this study focusing on how the general strain theory can be integrated into the intersectionality of race, gender, and parental status, first, a summary of Merton's (1938) strain theory is discussed. Merton argued that norms are divided into goals and means, and strain develops due to whether or not an individual has access to one or the other. Simply stated, individuals are in pursuit of the "American Dream" where culturally defined goals are associated with financial success, and the legitimate pathway to acquiring these goals is through education and work. Additionally, Merton discussed how an individual responds to certain situations in response to their accessibility to goals and means by creating a classification system with five types of adaptations: conformity, innovation, ritualism, retreatism, and rebellion. Although there are several types of goals and means present in different societies, Merton emphasized that wealth is considered the ultimate goal in American society and prosperity ultimately determines how success is defined. However, everyone does not have equal access to obtain wealth, and therefore strain is the result. Consequently, individuals from a lower socioeconomic status are assumed to resort to illegal means (criminal activity) to attain their goal (the "American Dream"). Merton's theory focuses solely on financial stressors.

Recognizing a limitation in Merton's research, Agnew (1992) general strain theory builds off of Merton's theory by incorporating additional stressors and explanations of strains. Agnew's main types of strains are hypothesized as the incapability to achieve positively valued goals, the removal of a positively valued stimuli,

or the presence of a negatively valued stimuli. Each of the postulated strains have the potential to result in anger or frustration. How an individual responds and deals with strain depends on the timing, duration, and strength of the strain. Some individuals respond to strain by engaging in criminal activity, and it is challenging to determine which type of strain influences a person to feel compelled towards that particular choice (Agnew, 1992).

Agnew's additions about strain have broadened the scope of what factors have the potential to contribute to engagement in criminal activity by addressing Merton's assumption that strain is not related to other factors that are not associated with socioeconomic status. Although Agnew (1992) fails to address structural factors, the general strain theory recognizes that individual factors result in certain groups responding differently to a range of stressors. For example, all communities are not monolithic; Black and White females, and Black and White males respond differently to strain. There is an extensive amount of prior research using strain as a theoretical framework for examining race and gender disparities in crime.

Strain theories have been used extensively in parental incarceration research (Gaston, 2016; Murray et al., 2012; Porter & King; 2015; Swisher & Shaw-Smith, 2015). However, what is missing from current research are the events preceding incarceration and an intersectionality approach. Therefore, this study seeks to examine the relationship between race, gender, parental status, and arresting offense and their interactional effects. Following is an overview of prior research on strain, offending, and parental incarceration.

Strain Effects, Parental Status, and Offending

Existing literature about parenthood and crime is ambiguous, and has shown that being a parent can either have positive or negative effects on the likelihood of engaging in criminal activity (Byrne & Trew, 2008; Ferraro & Moe, 2003; Sampson & Laub, 2003; Monsbakken et al., 2013). There are variations in the results regarding parenthood as a significant turning point for deterring parents from engaging in crime due to the dynamics of the parent-child relationship (Garcia, 2016, Garcia-Hallett, 2017; Monsbakken et al., 2013; Sharpe, 2015). There are some studies that have shown that being a parent decreases participation in crime for both genders (Byrne & Trew, 2008). Prior research shows that women are commonly the primary caretaker of children under the age of 18 (Glaze & Maruschak, 2010). Financial strains of being a mother have been used to provide an explanation about the associations between mothering and crime (Byrne & Trew, 2008; Carlen, 1988; Davies, 2002; Ferraro & Moe, 2003). At each stage of the criminal justice system process there are strains associated with having a justice-involved parent. Strains that may have increased the likelihood of a parent engaging in criminal activity present additional pressures through the adjudication and incarceration phases. The next session discusses strain in relationship to parental incarceration.

Strain and Parental Incarceration

Strain theories are used frequently to examine and explain differences in types of offending (Broidy & Agnew, 1997; Kaufman et al., 2008; Piquero & Sealock, 2000; Hartinger-Saunders et al., 2019). However, when applied to parental incarceration research, strain is theorized as an event that causes different forms of stressors on the individual incarcerated as well as their families. The parent's amount of involvement

with their children prior to incarceration impacts the level of strain. Prior studies have applied strain related theories in order to explain the removal of a parent results in economic stress (Western & Pettit, 2010; Wakefield & Uggen, 2010; Arditti et al., 2003). Over 50% of mothers and fathers in state correctional facilities were the primary financial providers for their children before they were incarcerated, and 75% of parents had jobs the month before their arrest (Glaze & Maruschak, 2010). Strain caused by incarceration can also result in negative effects on youth's development (Hagan & Dinovitzer, 1999).

Additionally, strain perspectives have also been used to examine the relationship between parental incarceration and psychological related issues (Gaston, 2016; Arditti, 2012; Poehlmann, 2005), health related problems (Muftic & Smith, 2018; Swisher & Shaw-Smith, 2015) and instability in housing conditions (Foster & Hagan, 2009; Glaze and Maruschak, 2010). Foster and Hagan's (2009) study examined the intersectionality of living arrangements between parents and children before and after incarceration. Fifty-eight percent of mothers lived with their child(ren) before incarceration, and 76% were likely expected to live with their child(ren) after incarceration. In comparison to fathers, 38% resided with their child(ren) before incarceration, and 56% after incarceration. Although the strain perspective is used commonly to provide knowledge about the relationship between parental incarceration and negative outcome, there are also limitations with the application of the strain theoretical approach.

Strain and Intersectionality Limitations

Despite the incorporation of an intersectionality approach to the general strain theory as the selected theoretical framework for this study, there are limitations. Although well-cited as an explanation for crime and delinquency (Merton, 1938; Cloward & Ohlin,

1960; Messner & Rosenfield, 2012), strain theories have been subjected to several critiques (Kornhauser, 1978; Hirschi, 1969). There is a significant amount of literature about parental incarceration and the strain theory for explaining why parents engage in criminal activity (Foster & Hagan, 2009; Murray et al., 2009), as well as other past empirical studies that have tested the main assumptions about strain theories and offending (Piquero & Sealock, 2004). However, there is a scarce application of strain perspectives and their variation to different racial and ethnic groups. This criticism about strain theories is also commonly referred to as middle class bias (Gabbidon, 2015). The lack of generalizability of the theory to different groups of individuals does not provide a comprehensive perspective on how strain caused by parental incarceration can have variance in the impacts on individuals from different racial and ethnic backgrounds and neighborhoods. Strain theories commonly suggest that people who commit crimes are the source of the “problem” of parental incarceration. Due to stressors in society and lacking the resources and the means to obtain socially acceptable goals, one rejects society’s norms, and instead of confirming, engages in criminal activity (Merton, 1938; Agnew, 1992). Strain theories postulate that individuals from lower socioeconomic status environments engage in criminal activity in order to position themselves amongst the middle class.

Despite the widespread call for more intersectionality approaches used in differential offending studies, the perspective is not without criticism. As a result of Crenshaw and other scholars work, intersectionality as a theoretical framework has been incorporated into various criminal justice related studies such as policing (Owusu-Bempah, 2017), risk assessment and probation outcomes (Steinmetz & Henderson, 2015;

Threadcraft-Walker, et al., 2018), the pretrial release process (Demuth & Steffensmeier, 2004b); sentencing decisions and outcomes (Freiburger & Hillinski, 2013; Demuth & Steffensmeier, 2004b). As research on intersectionality expands, concerns have been its definition. For example, intersectionality studies have incorporated other social identities beyond race, gender, and class, such as sexual orientation, age, and religion. With that being said, scholars have addressed the critiques by reaffirming that an individual can have multiple traits they may identify with, and they are not mutually exclusive to one category. Therefore, depending on the context of the study, a combination of identities may be used in order to explore structural inequalities and oppression (Cho et al., 2013; Paik, 2017; Collins, 2015). Methodological challenges are another noted criticism of the intersectionality perspective (McCall, 2005). Methodology critics argue that there are no set ways “to study” intersectionality due to its broad use of different variables and their interpretations (Garry, 2011; McCall, 2005)

Even with limitations, intersectionality research has crossed over into other disciplines such as public health (Bowleg, 2012; Heard et al., 2020) and education (Lopez et al., 2018), and continues to be a positive influence for Black feminist thought, and understanding the impact being a member in different social groups has on crime. Following is a section that examines the predictor variables for this particular study, and includes a review of prior research on race, gender, parental status and its relationship to crime.

Previous Research on Differences in Offending

Literature examining differences in offending has focused on race, age, and gender (Nagel & Hagan, 1983; Peck, 2016; Piquero & Brame, 2008; Rodriguez et al.,

2006; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996; Steffensmeier et al., 1989; Ulmer & Steffensmeier, 2014). However, few studies have examined the relationship between parental status and the type of arresting charge. Thus, what follows is a review of prior research on differences in criminal offending. I begin with a summary of racial differences in offending, followed by an overview of studies focused on the gender gap in crime, and finally a discussion focused on the intersectionality of race and gender associated with offending. The section concludes with an emphasis on the limited amount of empirical research focused on the influence parental status has on the type of crimes committed.

Race and Crime

The majority of research about race and crime differences compares Black and White individuals (Beck & Blumstein, 2018; Hinton et al., 2018; Neck, 2016; Tonry & Melews, 2008), with official crime measurements consistently showing that Black individuals are arrested at a disparate rate in comparison to White people (Beck & Blumstein, 2018; Blumstein, 1982; Tonry, 1995). Although Black individuals account for about 12 percent of America's population, they represent nearly 38 percent of violent crimes (murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault) and 29 percent of property crimes (burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson) according to the 2018 Uniform Crime Report (UCR). Conversely, 72 percent of the population is White, and they represent approximately 59 percent of violent crimes and close to 68 percent of property crimes. As shown by the UCR, there is a stark difference in the offending patterns between Black and White persons. Studies involving self-reports and victimization surveys also reveal similar estimates that Black individuals are arrested at a disparate rate, especially for violent offenses (Piquero & Brame, 2008).

Literature suggests that Black individuals' overrepresentation in the prison population is the spillover effect of their overrepresentation in arrests for crimes with a higher likelihood of incarceration (Nellis, 2016). Case processing decisions (i.e., arrest, pretrial detention, and adjudication) impacts consequences at the back end of the system (i.e., sentencing and corrections). However, Mears et al. (2016) argue that there is a lack of evidence-based literature that explains the causes of racial disparity in processing (arrest, detention, and conviction). Simply stated, in comparison to White individuals, Black people are more likely to be arrested, which increases their likelihood of conviction, and once adjudicated, Black people are more likely to be sentenced longer (The Sentencing Project, 2018).

There are several studies that focus on identifying explanations for racial differences in crime participation and arrests (Kochel et al., 2011; Sampson & Lauritsen, 1997). Biological, sociological, and structural theories continue to inform the focal point of past studies examining the racial differences in offending (Gabbidon & Greene, 2018; Unnever & Gabbidon, 2011; Walker et al., 2017). Differential involvement and differential selection are two of the most cited explanations for the higher arrest rates of Black individuals, despite their conflicting conclusions (Peck, 2016; Piquero, 2008; Piquero, 2015). The differential involvement hypothesis assumption is that arrest rates of Black individuals are higher than those of White individuals due to the incorrect cultural narrative that Black people commit more crime (Mears et al., 2016). Scholars cannot examine an involvement theory without taking into consideration systematic racism and its impact on African American offending (Unnever & Gabbidon, 2011). The notion contrary to differential involvement is differential selection in the criminal justice system

(i.e., differential police presence, patrolling, profiling) results in more Black individuals being arrested. This is further perpetuated explicitly through discrimination and racism in the court and correctional systems, which leads to more Black individuals being adjudicated and sentenced.

Hindelang (1978) is credited with being one of the initial studies to evaluate racial differences based on differential involvement and selection theories. Analysis of both UCR and NCS data (previously referred to the National Crime Survey victimization statistics) found that Black people had higher rates of arrest for rape, assault, and robbery. Despite suggestions of differential selection, Hindelang (1978) concluded that an overrepresentation of Black individuals in the UCR arrest data was found in NCS data because of Black individuals being associated with more involvement in personal crimes where a victim could ascertain the race of the suspect. Three years later, Hindelang and colleagues (1981) continued to examine racial differences in offending. While still using crime measures and self-report data, this study focused on the behavior of juveniles in Seattle. The self-reported data found no racial differences in offending; however, when using the arrest data to examine the differential selection theory, the study found racial discrimination present in the criminal justice system process, as well as differences in offending between Black and White juveniles (Hindelang, Hirschi, and Weis, 1981).

The National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) is more detailed and captures more information on each incident about the victim and the known offender if available. D'Alessio and Stolzenberg (2003) used NIBRS data to examine the differential involvement and selection theories in order to determine if racial differences in offending existed. Contrary to prior research, the study looked at 17 states during 1991, and the

multivariate regressions analyses found no racial differences in offending for forcible rape, robbery, and assault. Specifically, White individuals in comparison to Black individuals had a greater likelihood of arrest for robbery (22%), aggravated assault (13%), and simple assault (9%). Despite the findings of no racial discrimination during the arrest phase, the authors acknowledge that it remains unknown as to whether or not racial discrimination may appear during later junctures during the criminal justice system process.

Piquero and Brame (2008) used data from a longitudinal study consisting of male and female justice-involved adolescents in Philadelphia and Maricopa counties to negate differential involvement. A large majority of the offenses were for serious crimes such as felonies. The self-reported findings revealed no statistically significant differences in offending based on race for males or females. Similarly, research conducted by McNulty and Bellair (2003) examined offending patterns of adolescents using Add Health data. Based on descriptive information, found racial differences were found in violent offenses (i.e., fighting, assault, and use of a weapon). In comparison to White adolescents, Black, Hispanic, and Native American adolescents engaged in more serious violent offenses.

In recent years, discussions about differential involvement and selection hypotheses are now centered around the topic of disproportionate minority contact or referred to as “DMC.” In 2007, Huizinga and colleagues analyzed the differential involvement hypothesis by examining three longitudinal datasets (Pittsburgh Youth Study, Rochester Youth Development Study, and the Seattle Social Development Project). The study focused solely on African American, Hispanic, Asian, and White male youths, and three offenses (total, violent, and property offenses). After controlling

for risk factors (i.e., socioeconomic status, family structure, mother's age at birth, educational attainment, etc.), for each city, African American males were more likely to be arrested in comparison to Asian, White or Hispanic male youths. A more recent study used self-report data from the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN)'s longitudinal study was used in previous research to test the differential offending hypothesis in juvenile interactions with law enforcement looked at a cohort consisting of 9, 12, 15, and 18-year youth, and found that Black youth did not have an increased likelihood of offending based on their neighborhoods in comparison to White youth.

Gender and Crime

Spanning several decades, research has consistently shown that men are more likely to engage in criminal activity than women, and for every category except for prostitution, women are arrested at a lower rate than men (Carson & Anderson, 2016; Schwartz et al., 2009; Steffensmeier, & Allan, 1996). When excluding prostitution, females in comparison to males have the highest rates of arrest for minor property crimes. Women account for the majority of drug and property-related arrests in comparison to men who make up the majority of violent and public order offenses (The Sentencing Project, 2015). The incarceration of women has increased at a pace twice that of men from 2000-2009, and women in local jails are impacted at a disproportionate rate (Kajstura, 2019; Sawyer, 2018). The growth in drug-related offenses has been linked to the number of women imprisoned in state and federal correctional facilities over the last 10 years, increasing by 21.6% in comparison to 15.6% for men (The Sentencing Project, 2015). The United States incarcerates approximately 219,000 women at the federal, state,

and local levels, with the majority of women being in local and state facilities (Kajstura, 2019).

Due to the notable increase in the incarceration of females from 2000-2009, examining the gender gap in crime has resurfaced as a topic of urgency. However, it is difficult to explain the increase in female incarceration rates due to a lack of gender-specific data collection. Nearly half of the incarcerated female population is in local jails. Approximately 101,000 women are held in city or county jails, and nearly 66% have yet to be convicted of a crime. Furthermore, 32,000 of the offenses were property-related crimes, followed by 29,000 for drug-related offenses, 20,000 for violent offenses, and 20,000 for public order crimes (Kajstura, 2019).

The next section will review literature that examines the intersection of race and gender on offending.

The Intersection of Race, Gender, and Crime

The literature remains steady in the observation that gender and race are commonly researched disjointedly as two distinct demographic variables when examining criminal behaviors (Jackson & Motley, 2019). However, the interactional effects of race, gender, parental status, and arresting charges may serve as an important contribution in studying differential offending. Few studies have examined the intersection of race, gender, and offending patterns (Chilton & Datesman, 1987; Hill & Crawford, 1990). An abundance of the literature that sought to emphasize the importance of examining the intersectionality of race and gender offending was written during the emergence of feminist criminology and did not take into account Black women's dual oppressive identities of gender and race (Adler, 1975; Broidy & Agnew, 1997; Greene,

1981; Pollak, 1950; Young, 1980; Pollock, 1999). Intersectionality studies have added to the body of knowledge about differences in offending and sentencing outcomes. Despite criticism of differential offending studies examining race and gender separately, there still has been limited research that has examined the interaction effect of race, gender and crime (Bell, 2013).

Race and gender are amongst the most common identities associated with the framework of intersectionality; however, the previous section will discuss the prevalence of parenthood and crime. Therefore, the inclusion of parental status as a variable in differential offending research is beneficial for contributions in both theoretical and practical application research.

Parental Involvement in Crime

There is scarce information about the influence parental status has on arresting charges. As the number of females incarcerated continues to increase and the literature about spillover effects of incarceration becomes exhaustive, few studies have examined the types of crimes committed by individuals that are parents or the primary caregiver of a child or children under the age of 18; this is true in federal, state, and local analyses. Moreover, a majority of present information about differential offending research emphasizes race and gender. In 2000 and 2008, the Bureau of Justice Statistics provided information about incarcerated parents' arresting charges. In 1999, 44 percent of individuals incarcerated for violent offenses were parents in comparison to 51 percent of non-parents. The percent of individuals incarcerated for property crimes were very similar with parents and non-parents at 22 percent and 23 percent respectively; however, the percentage of persons serving time for drug-related offenses who were parents was

higher at 24 percent in comparison to 17 percent for non-parents (Mumola, 2000). An analysis of state prisons in 2004 found that 47.5 percent of individuals serving time for violent offenses were parents. The percent of property, drug, and public order crimes for parents were higher at 49.9 percent, 59.6 percent and 59.9 percent, respectively (Glaze & Maruschak, 2010). The Pew Charitable Trusts (2010) examined the racial breakdown of parents' convicted offenses. The study found racial disparity in arresting charge. For drug-related crimes, 1% of all children have experienced parental incarceration. However, Black children's parents are more likely to be incarcerated for a violent (3.9 percent) or drug-related (3.8 percent) crime in comparison to Hispanic (3.5 percent) or White (1.8) children for violent, drug, property and other crimes combined.

Parental Status and Sentencing Outcomes

Although sentencing outcomes are beyond the scope of this study, it is necessary to discuss how parental status has been used in literature. The dataset for this study does not contain information about the sentencing outcomes of the individuals; however, future research seeks to explore this topic in more detail. Despite being at the end of the criminal justice system process, parental sentencing outcomes can have spillover impacts on their children. The few studies that have analyzed the effects of family role or parental status have not been within the context of the type of offenses committed, but instead in determining its impact on sentencing decisions. Gender and sentencing outcomes have been researched widely at both the federal and state level, with the consensus being that women are less likely to receive incarceration as a sentencing outcome (Doerner & Demuth, 2010; Spohn & Beichner 2000; Steffensmeier, Kramer, & Streifel, 1993). In comparison to males, women's incarceration sentences are more likely to be shorter

(Albonetti, 1997; Daly & Bordt, 1995; Griffin & Wooldredge, 2006; Nagel & Johnson, 1994).

Research has found that parents with children, except for those charged with drug offenses, received shorter sentences from judges (Cho & Tasca, 2019; Fernando et al., 2006; Freiburger, 2011; Spohn, 1999; Spohn, & Beichner, 2000). Tasca and colleagues (2019) found that when controlling for legal and extralegal factors, there is not a significant relationship between parents and non-parents and their sentence lengths. Simply stated, individuals without children were not sentenced differently than those with children. However, there is a significant relationship between gender and prison length. In comparison to males and fathers, women and mothers' sentences were longer. For fathers, there is no significant relationship between parental involvement and sentence length. However, mothers who lived with their children prior to their arrest were more likely to receive a shorter sentence. Simply stated, as supported by previous work, parental involvement was a stronger predictor of sentence length rather than parental status (Daly, 1987a, 1987b, 1989a, 1989b; Freiburger, 2010, 2011). In a different study looking specifically at motherhood, Cho and Tasca (2019) found that there was not a significant relationship between maternal status and length of incarceration. However, based on the type of crime some individuals received a shorter prison sentence. Contrary to past harsh punishment for "war on drugs" offenses, Cho and Tasca (2019) found that women serving time for drug-related offenses incarceration lengths were shorter than women incarcerated for violent, property, and public order offenses.

After the sentencing phase in the criminal justice system process is punishment, and the reality for many individuals is incarceration. There has been an increase in

interdisciplinary studies that have found relationships between parental incarceration and negative impacts such as mental and physical health difficulties, financial hardship, and negative educational outcomes such as an increased likelihood of dropping out and low performance in school (Davis & Schlafer, 2017; Haskins & Poehlmann-Tynan, 2018; Kjellstrand & Eddy, 2011; Murray et al., 2012; Western & Wildeman, 2009; Wildeman, 2009). Although there are numerous negative effects of parental incarceration, the following section provides a review of literature specifically about parental incarceration and the impact it has on household financial resources, harms to children such as problems in school, and poor physical and mental health. The next section will review literature about the adverse influences of parental incarceration.

Previous Research on Parental Incarceration

Parents and Incarceration

As a result of the increase in parental incarceration, a significant amount of previous research focuses on the negative impacts of incarceration on children and adolescents who have experienced the incarceration of their parents. Both qualitative and quantitative research has found associations between parental incarceration and negative impacts such as substance abuse, delinquency, instability at home, and depression (Arditti, 2005, Arditti, 2012; Cho, 2009; Foster & Hagan, 2013; Murray & Farrington, 2005; Swisher & Roettger, 2012, Turanovic et al., 2012). In addition to short term adversities associated with parental incarceration exposure, studies have found long term effects into adulthood such as depressive symptoms, behavioral problems, economic difficulties, and future criminal justice involvement (Gaston, 2016; Huebner &

Gustafson, 2007; Wakefield & Wildeman, 2011). Following is an overview of previous research focused on short term and long term effects of parental incarceration exposure.

Household Impacts

When an individual is incarcerated or involved in the criminal justice system, the entire household is impacted. Household impacts can be in the form of socioeconomic obstacles and disruption in the family that can cause unsteadiness (Geller, 2013; Geller, Cooper, & Mincy, 2009). Separation due to parental incarceration causes disruption in parenting and deterioration for the development of effective parent-child relationships. When a parent is arrested, often children are not aware of what is happening. From the eyes of the child, there might be confusion as to why their mother or father is absent from a household, which can result in trauma (Arditti, 2012). Literature about incarceration shows that families face several challenges such as disruption in the relationship between the parent and child, financial troubles, stigma, visitation barriers, and others in the household taking on the role as caregivers (Murray et al., 2007). It is not uncommon for households that have been exposed to incarceration to experience hardships that contribute to poverty such as poor living conditions (Arditti, Burton, & Neeves-Botelho, 2010) and low household income, which can make an already challenging situation more difficult (Kjellstrand & Eddy, 2011; Western & Wildeman, 2009; Wildeman, 2009). When a parent is incarcerated, the non-imprisoned parent or grandparent(s) become the primary caregiver at 84 percent and 15 percent respectively. When the other parent or grandparent(s) cannot take on the duty of caring for a child while a parent is incarcerated, another relative (6 percent) or foster care (3 percent) resume the role as a caregiver (Glaze & Maruschak, 2010).

In some instances, the lone provider for the family is removed when a parent is incarcerated, which can result in economic hardships. Prior to incarceration or arrest, over 50 percent of both mothers and fathers indicated that they were the main source of financial support for their children, and 75 percent of parents were employed (Glaze & Maruschak, 2010). Additionally, when a father is incarcerated, the family's household income is lowered during and after their release (Johnson, 2009). Despite the loss of income due to incarceration, there is a gain of expenses such as phone calls and travel expenses associated with prison visits (Clear, 2008). Parents that are transferred to correctional facilities that are not near their families cause disruptions in relationships. If a family does not have the resources to travel to visit a loved one, it can lead to further instabilities within the household (Western & Pettit, 2010).

Mental and Physical Health Impacts

A number of studies have assessed the relationship between parental incarceration and various mental and physical health-related outcomes (Gifford, 2019; Hiolski et al., 2019; Murray & Farrington, 2008; Whitten et al., 2019). The incarceration of a parent is a traumatic experience, and children can exhibit symptoms that are associated with Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) such as, depression, disruption in sleep patterns, problems with concentration, and social withdrawal (Kampfner, 1995). If a child is present during the arrest of a parent, the traumatic experience and PTSD symptoms are exacerbated. Incarcerated individuals have an increased likelihood of suffering from chronic medical conditions (Glaze & Maruschak, 2010; Wilper et al., 2009), and research has also shown that family members and partners of incarcerated individuals are also likely to experience poor health-related issues (Murray & Farrington, 2005; Foster &

Hagan, 2007). Parental incarceration has also been linked to depression, anxiety (Murray & Farrington, 2008; Foster & Hagan, 2013), and various physical health concerns such as asthma, migraines, and high cholesterol (Lee et al., 2013).

A meta-analysis by Murray and his colleagues (2012) synthesized evidence-based studies about the relationship between parental incarceration and health-related outcomes such as antisocial behavior, symptoms related to mental health (anxiety and depression), and educational performance, and the results were inconsistent. Forty studies were synthesized, which contained 50 samples which totaled 73,734 children that had experienced the incarceration of a parent, and 37,325 children in the comparison group that had no exposure to parental incarceration. Overall the findings from the meta-analysis were ambiguous; some studies found negative associations between children exposed to parental incarceration, and other studies concluded no association of risk or harm associated with parental incarceration. Although, Murray et al., (2012) found significant relationships between parental incarceration and antisocial behavior, results varied regarding associations related to mental health, drug use, and negative educational performance.

The most current systematic review of parental incarceration, physical, and behavioral mental health outcomes was conducted by Wildeman, Goldman, and Turney (2018). The 62 studies assessed in the systematic review spanned nearly two decades (2000-2017). Studies examining the relationship between paternal incarceration and children's health outcomes showed negative associations for prenatal health, infant and child mortality, and self-reported health and obesity. On the contrary, there were inconsistent relationships between maternal incarceration and negative health and

behavioral effects on children; some found negative associations while others revealed null effects. Therefore, the question remains unanswered as to whether or not there is a causal relationship between negative child health outcomes and maternal incarceration (Wildeman et al., 2018).

Long Term Impacts and Intergenerational Criminal Justice System Involvement

A substantial number of prior studies about parental incarceration focus on economic, educational, mental, and physical health outcomes of children under the age of 18 (Murray et al, 2012). An understudied area of parental incarceration are its effects across the life course. As a child ages, the adversities of parental incarceration have the potential to follow children into adolescence and young adulthood. Research has shown that parental incarceration is linked to long term impacts such as mental health (Gaston, 2016; Gifford et al., 2019; Murray & Farrington, 2005; 2008), neighborhood disadvantage (Finkeldey & Dennison, 2019), future delinquency, offending, and criminal justice involvement (Norris et al., 2018; Burgess-Proctor et al., 2016; Foster & Hagan, 2015; Roettger & Swisher, 2011; Huebner & Gustafson, 2007; Murray et al., 2007), and premature mortality (Van De Weijer et al., 2018).

Amongst the several negative long-term effects of parental incarceration, the next section will discuss prior literature that focuses on relationships between parental incarceration and intergenerational criminal justice system involvement. Huebner & Gustafson (2007) is noted as the first study to examine the relationship between maternal incarceration and its impact on adult children using the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 (NLSY79). Consistent with previous research, the study found a statistically significant association between maternal incarceration and predicting future adult

criminal justice system involvement (conviction and probation). Muftic et al. (2016) replicated Huebner & Gustafson (2007) by using Add Health data, and also found a significant relationship between maternal incarceration and adult arrest, conviction, and incarceration. Using a gendered pathways approach, Burgess-Proctor et al (2016) observed the effects of parental incarceration on adult offspring and predicting adult future criminal justice involvement. The findings concluded same-sex parental incarceration is a strong predictor for adult arrest and conviction. However, maternal incarceration had a stronger correlation predicting adult incarceration for both daughters and mothers. Also using Add Health data, Gaston (2016) found a statistically significant relationship between children that have experienced parental incarceration and later adult depressive symptoms (i.e., felt depressed, trouble concentrating, feeling too tired to do things, etc.) based on the Epidemiologic Studies Depression (CES-D) scale. However, there was no significant relationship when interaction factors (race and ethnicity) were introduced into the model. Therefore, children of different races/ethnicities that have been exposed to parental incarceration have the same probability of experiencing depressive symptoms as adults.

Prior Methodological and Statistical Approaches

The preceding sections discussed extensively previous research about differences in offending and the impact of parental incarceration on children and young adults. However, no study is without limitations. The following section will discuss research limitations in prior parental incarceration studies, and how the current study aims to address some of these limitations and contribute to the body of knowledge examining differential offending and parental incarceration.

Limitations of Parental Incarceration Research

The list of prior parental incarceration studies that have used quantitative methodology is exhaustive and has a pattern of exhibiting inconsistent findings (Murray et al., 2012; Wildeman et al., 2017) attributed to methodological limitations. The most cited weakness of parental incarceration research is the lack of randomized experimental designs. An exhaustive amount of previous research has linked parental incarceration to negative childhood-related mental, physical and behavior-related outcomes, and increased likelihood of intergenerational cycles of incarceration. Due to few studies that have used a randomized experiment design, it has been very difficult for parental incarceration studies to identify if the negative impacts of being exposed to parental incarceration are due to incarceration or another factor. Research conducted by Norris, Pecenco, and Weaver in 2018 is credited with being the first quasi-experimental study to examine parental and sibling incarceration in the United States. The study analyzed various Ohio administrative data (i.e., adult court cases, juvenile court records, birth records, school data, and voter records), spanning 30 years to examine the relationship between sibling and parental. Differing from other studies, Norris, Pecenco, and Weaver (2018) concluded that children who were subjected parental incarceration had a decreased likelihood of future incarceration by 3.2 percentage points, and better socioeconomic status in their adulthood. Additionally, the parental incarceration resulted in better academic performance in childhood and less likelihood of teen parenthood. The study found that exposure to sibling incarceration also resulted in positive impacts such as a decreased likelihood of future incarceration as an adult by 6.7 percentage points.

Second, another noted limitation is the operationalization of the main independent variable that measures parental incarceration. Most parental incarceration studies do not distinguish between prison or short term confinement such as jail. Flawed operationalizations of parental incarceration are consistent disadvantages of using longitudinal datasets such as Add Health (Burgess-Proctor et al., 2016; Miller & Barnes, 2015) and the Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study (Branigan & Wildeman, 2019; Turney & Haskins, 2019; Turney & Wildeman, 2013; Geller et al., 2009; Geller et al., 2012) because they were not originally intended to collect information about parental incarceration and its impacts. For example, variables about a parents' incarceration not being available in datasets. Commonly used longitudinal studies and surveys of incarcerated individuals that have been used for parental incarceration research was not intended specifically to capture this type of information; therefore, information distinguishing between the type of parental incarceration (maternal or paternal), timing (age of the child at the time of their parent's incarceration, dosage (the amount of times the parent was incarcerated and the length of incarceration), and the level of parental involvement prior to incarceration is not available in most datasets. A few studies mentioned timing and dosage of parental incarceration as important factors in examining their impact on children (Johnson, 1995; Myers et al., 1999); however, prior to Cho (2010) study examining timing and dosage of maternal incarceration and high school dropout rates, there were no empirical studies focused on this topic.

Third, the use of national data for parental incarceration can be viewed as both a methodological strength and weakness. The generalization of results is a strength of using national data since it focuses on more than one particular location and population.

However, when studies use national data and control for variables, such as race, gender, and socioeconomic status, their now heterogeneous sample has the possibility to undervalue the extent of the impacts of parental incarceration (Bruns & Lee, 2019; Martin, 2017). Although it is difficult for all of the aforementioned research limitations to be addressed in one study, this particular study seeks to advance the research about parental incarceration by acknowledging some of the weaknesses mentioned above.

In summary, despite the noted limitations in the abundance of parental incarceration research, there were several disadvantages due to either lack of data collection or the use of longitudinal studies. Due to the lack of new datasets, limitations about the operationalization of the common independent variable parental incarceration, and lack of information about parental incarceration timing and dosage have not been addressed in recent literature. The following section will discuss the current study and its aims for addressing some of the aforementioned limitations in prior parental incarceration studies.

The Current Study

The purpose of this chapter was to provide an overview of the literature about differential offending and the impact that parental incarceration has on non-imprisoned family members (specifically their children). This study seeks to focus some of the shortcomings of previous parental incarceration studies, such as lack of data collection at the local level, and fill in the gaps of prior parental incarceration research by examining parental status and its influence on arresting offenses. As previously discussed, parental incarceration studies are commonly focused on the punishment phase of the criminal justice system without examining the behavior that initially resulted in an arrest.

Therefore, the dependent variable in this study is the arresting charge. Typically in parental incarceration research the purpose is to determine the impact parental incarceration has on a child(ren). First, this study seeks to determine the impact race, gender, age, parental status has on the type of arresting charge. By examining the type of arresting of parents that resulted in their incarceration (in this study the detention at the Harris County jail) is an attempt to understand how the most restrictive form of punishment (incarceration) can be avoided in order to possibly alleviate the harms incarceration can have on the individual incarcerated, their non-imprisoned family members, and the community as a whole. To reiterate, jail and prison are used interchangeably in literature to indicate incarceration. This is also a noted limitation in prior parental incarceration studies because when the term parental incarceration is used, there is typically not a distinction between jail or prison. For this study, the term parental incarceration will be used in reference to the individuals in the Harris County jail that are parents or the primary caretaker to a child under the age of 18. This is significant because although the individuals in this study have yet to be convicted and sentenced, they are still separated from their child(ren) due to being held in the county jail. Second, this study aims to analyze the interaction effect between parental status, race, gender, and arresting charge will be examined.

Due to limitations in data (i.e. unclear distinction between jail, prison or other forms of criminal justice involvement) few parental incarceration analyses have evaluated associations between parental incarceration exposure and lesser forms of sentences such as jail, pretrial diversion, probation, or other forms of community-based alternatives. Therefore, the current study seeks to address this third limitation by using data from a

local county jail where the majority of the individuals are held until their trial or confined short term. This is of importance because prior literature has demonstrated that individuals in prison and jail have different experiences (Holleran & Spohn, 2004). Individuals housed in a county jail may either be serving a sentence less than one year, awaiting a trial, probation or parole violations, or due to overcrowding in state prisons (Kaeble & Cowhig, 2018; Wagner & Sawyer 2018; Zeng, 2019). However, whatever the reason, their housing in jail is typically closer to family than if they were serving a longer sentence in prison. Prisons are usually farther from families, and remaining in contact is very challenging due to a different set of visitation rules and regulations. The next chapter will provide a detailed discussion about the research design and chosen methodology for examining the current study's research questions and hypotheses.

CHAPTER 3

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Chapter 3 describes the research methodology for the current study. The research design (the methodology, participants, procedures, and ethical concerns) is the main focus of this chapter. This chapter will initially reiterate the purpose of this study, and then discuss the appropriate statistical analysis approaches based on the research questions and hypotheses.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to fill a gap in existing research about factors that impact arrest. Prior studies have found both gender and racial differences in offending (Beck & Blumstein, 2018; Piquero & Brame, 2008; Steffensmeier & Allen, 1996). This study seeks to examine the influence parental status, race, and gender has on arresting charge utilizing a sample of individuals being held at the Harris County jail.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Using data from the Harris County jail, the following research questions will be the concentration of this study. After each question are its respective alternative and null hypotheses.

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between parental status, age, race, gender, and arresting charge (i.e., violent, property, drug-related, public order or other)?

H₀: Parental status, age, race, and gender has no effect on arresting charge?

H₁: Parental status, age, race, and gender has a negative effect on arresting charge?

Research Question 2: What is the interactional effect of race, gender, parental status, and arresting charge (i.e., violent, property, drug-related, public order or other)?

H₀: There is no interaction effect between race, gender, parental status, and arresting charge?

H₁: There is an interaction effect between race, gender, parental status, and arresting charge?

Research Design

Using a quantitative, correlational, and non-experimental approach, this study examines differences in parental offending by conducting univariate/ bivariate analyses, and logistic regressions. In this study, the independent variables (i.e., parental status, age, race, and gender) are categorical, and will be utilized to predict the arresting charge. Arresting charge will be separated into five types of categories (i.e., violent, property, drug-related, public order, or other) for multinomial logistic regression analysis.

Target Population

Study Setting

The next section will discuss the study's population and the sampling process by the original data collectors. In Texas jails and prison, there are over 200,000 individuals incarcerated (Kaeble & Cowhig, 2018), and about 477,000 children in Texas have experienced parental incarceration (Annie Casey Foundation, 2016). The largest city in

the country is Houston, and Harris County is the third largest county in the nation with an estimated population of 4.6 million residents. In Harris County, the racial and ethnicity breakdown is approximately twenty-nine percent White, forty-four percent Latinx, twenty percent Black, and seven percent Other (Asian, American Indian, Alaskan Native, and Pacific Islander) (U.S. Census Bureau, 2019).

Sample

The sample for this study was individuals incarcerated in the Harris County jail. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, imprisonment in a correctional facility (jail or prison) prior to or after conviction is considered incarceration. Individuals confined in a local jail may either be serving a sentence less than one year, awaiting a trial, confined due to a probation or parole violation, or serving their prison time until space becomes available in a state prison (Kaeble & Cowhig, 2018; Wagner & Sawyer 2018; Zeng, 2019). Annually, there are approximately 80,000-100,000 bookings into the Harris County jail (Bourgeois et al., 2018).

The study will rely on secondary data from the Harris County, Texas jail. Specifically, information gathered from intake forms administered during the jail classification process. The instrument used self-reported information from incarcerated individuals about their parental status. The study's population only included individuals during the classification process; therefore, the generalizability of the results is limited to only persons booked into the jail within 48-72 hours who were either not eligible or could not afford bail. A total of 1406 individuals responded to questions about their parental status. Although some individuals may have declined to answer questions about their parental status, the information gathered is important because it provides insight into a

population (a primary caregiver or parent to a child(ren) under the age of 18) that would otherwise go unnoticed. Prior to Texas Children's Hospital needs assessment, the Harris County jail was not collecting information about parental status or their children.

Procedures

Following is an explanation about the data collection process, the steps utilized to analyze the data, and ethical considerations.

Data Collection

The data in this study is from a needs assessment of children of incarcerated parents conducted by Texas Children's Hospital (Correa et al., 2019). During the classification stage, individuals are interviewed by a classification officer and asked a series of questions and information such as demographics (age, gender, race, etc.), criminal history, case status, etc. One component of the needs assessment conducted by Texas Children's Hospital consisted of having the Harris County Sheriff's Office add additional questions to the intake form used during the classification process at the Harris County jail (Correa et al., 2019).

The classification stage takes place approximately 48-72 hours after the individual is booked. Therefore, this is a conservative estimate of individuals because some individuals are released prior to classification through some form of pretrial release such as a cash bond or on their own recognizance. During the classification stage, the following information was recorded on the intake form: age, gender and race, their residence zip code, and arresting charge. Spanning approximately 15 ½ weeks (October 14, 2018-November 30, 2018), eight additional questions were added to the jail intake form. The following questions about parental incarceration were asked: (1) Do you have

children or are there children that you are responsible for under 18 years of age? If the individual responded yes, the following questions were then asked: (2) How are you related to this child? (3) Did they live with you before you were arrested? (4) Do they depend on you for money? (5) Who is caring for your child now? (6) What school does your child go to? (7) At any point during your childhood, did your parents go to jail or prison? and (8) Have you been to jail or prison before?

Analytic Techniques

Multiple steps will be used to examine the differences in offending. First, univariate analysis will be utilized to illustrate the characteristics of the sample with frequencies and percentages. Next, a correlations matrix will analyze the significance of relationships between each variable, and determine if multicollinearity exists. Third, chi-square analysis will examine group differences between (and within) age, parental status, race, gender, criminal history, and the type of arresting charge. Fourth, multinomial regressions analysis will examine the relationship between age, race/ethnicity, gender, parental status and arresting charge. Finally, the multinomial regressions model was reestimated to determine the influence the interaction effect of race, gender, and parental status has on arresting charges of jailed individuals.

Description of Measures

Dependent Variable

Previous studies have examined differences in offending based on race and gender (Camplain et al., 2020; Gase et al., 2017). In the current study, the type of arresting charge is analyzed. Specifically, arresting offense is operationalized into five types of categories (0 = violent; 1 = property; 2 = drug-related; 3 = public order; 4 =

other). Refer to Appendices A-E for additional information about the type of arresting charges collapsed into each category.

Independent Variables

The purpose of this study is to examine factors that impact arrest patterns, and determine if there is a difference in offending based on parental status. Therefore, the main predictor variable, parental status, is operationalized using two dichotomous measures, parents/primary caregivers and non-parents/non-primary caregivers. Individuals that responded yes to the question, “Do you have children or are there children that you are responsible for under 18 years of age?” was coded as 1 (parent/primary caregiver), and individuals that responded no were coded as 0 (non-parent/primary caregiver). Individuals that responded yes but indicated that their children were over 18 years of age were coded as 0. Demographic variables of interest were coded as well. Gender was coded as 0=male and 1=female. Due to the small number of Asian and Pacific Islander jailed individuals, race was captured as 0=Non-Black; 1=Black). The age of the jailed individuals was collapsed into 3 categories: 0 = individuals 17 through 29, 1 = individuals aged 30 through 49, and 2 = individuals 50 and older.

Control Variables

The incarcerated individual’s age measured in years is included in the model as a control. Prior criminal justice system involvement was coded as 1 if participants responded yes to “Have you been to jail or prison before?” and 0 if their response was no. A dichotomous variable was also used for coding incarceration generation status. Consistent with prior literature, a second generation prisoner is considered an individual that is currently incarcerated that experienced the incarceration of a parent when they

were a child (Novero et al., 2011). Responses to the question “At any point during your childhood, did your parents go to jail or prison?” was coded as 1 = yes and 0 = no.

Additional Variables

Additional parental variables were coded as the following dichotomous variables. Participants that responded yes to being parents were asked, “Do they depend on you for money?” and coded as 1 = yes and 0 = no. “Did they live with you before you were arrested?” was coded 1= yes and 0 = no. Caregiver for the child(ren) while the parent is incarcerated was coded as 0 = other parent, 1 = grandparent, 2 = other. Financial support for the child(ren) prior to their arrest was coded as 0 = no and 1 = yes. Variables not included in the study due to missing information was the ages of the children, and the children’s school district.

Missing Data

Missing information in survey data is not uncommon and can happen due to questions not applicable to participants or due to nonresponses. Omitted information can impact the representativeness of the sample, and can mislead interpretations about the population in the study. In this study, less than one percent was missing from the independent variables analyzed.

Ethical Considerations

The secondary data collected from the Harris County jail contained de-identified information and did not result in interaction with the vulnerable population. The study’s protocol was reviewed and approved by Texas Southern University Institutional Review Board.

Summary

The intent of this chapter was to provide an outline of the methodological steps utilized to address the purpose of this study. This chapter sought to provide context to the study's setting in Harris County, Texas, the target population, and data collection process. Based on the research questions and hypotheses, chapter 3 also discussed the study's research design, and how the predictor and outcome variables were operationalized. The chapter concluded with a discussion about the analytical techniques used to answer the research questions, explanation of missing data, and ethical concerns. The next chapter will detail the results of the statistical analysis.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This study adds to the parental incarceration body of literature by conducting a local analysis about parenthood and incarceration. By using data from the Harris County jail, the current study examines the individual and interaction effects of jailed individual's parental status, race, gender, and arresting charge. Univariate analyses were conducted to understand frequencies of the sample. Chi-square analyses were also run to examine bivariate relationships between race, gender, parental status, criminal history, age, parental status, and arresting charge. Finally, multiple multinomial logistic regression models were estimated to determine direct and interactional relationships between race, gender, age, and parental status on type of arresting charge, while controlling for legal and extralegal variables. The findings demonstrated that Blacks were more likely to be arrested for public order or other offenses. Additionally, females and individuals that self-identified as parents had a greater chance of having a public order or other arresting charge. Furthermore, depending on the age of the jailed individual, they were more likely to be jailed for a drug-related, public order, or other offense. Lastly, when taking into account parental status, race, and/or gender simultaneously, there was not a greater chance of being jailed for a particular arresting charge. In the following chapter, you will find a more detailed discussion about the results.

Sample Characteristics

Before examining the relationships between the independent and dependent variables, univariate analyses were conducted to examine each variables' frequencies and percentages. Table 1 demonstrates the sample characteristics of race, gender, parental status, criminal history, age, and the outcome measure of interest, arresting offense. There were originally 1406 individuals in the total population; however, 279 cases were removed with missing arresting charge data. Additionally, 8 cases were removed due to having unknown and missing race information, 1 case with an incorrect age, and 36 cases with unsure listed for prior criminal history. As a result of having few Asian and Pacific Islander classifications, race was categorized as Black and Non-Black. After the excluded cases, there were 1082 individuals remaining in the sample which consisted of 85.3% (923) males and 14.7% (159) females, followed by 50.3% (544) parents/primary caregivers, and 49.7% (538) non-parents/non-primary caregivers. Age was collapsed into 3 categories: individuals 17 through 29 represented 37% (400) of the sample, persons 30 through 49 accounted for 48.6% (526), and individuals 50 and older represented 14.4% (156) of the sample. The mean age was 35.47 ranging from 17 to 84 years of age. Non-Black incarcerated individuals represented 49.7% (538) of the sample, followed by 50.3% (544) Black jailed individuals. In terms of the arresting charge, the majority of individuals were arrested for violent offenses, 31.7% (347), followed by 23.6% (255) property, 16.5% (178) drug-related, 14.3% (155) public order, and 14.0% (151) other offenses (i.e., compliance, motion to revoke/under supervision, transportation, and evading arrest/detention/escape/fugitive. Two hundred and seventy-five individuals were arrested for more than one offense. Due to some individuals having more than one

arresting charge, the Uniform Crime Report (UCR) Hierarchy Rule was applied; the most serious offense in multi-arrest situations were used to characterize the arresting charge.

Table 1. Sample Characteristics

Characteristics	Sample (<i>N</i> = 1082)	
	n	%
Dependent Variable		
Arresting Charge		
Violent	343	31.7
Property	255	23.6
Drug-Related	178	16.5
Public Order	155	14.3
Other	151	14.0
Race		
Non-Black	538	49.7
Black	544	50.3
Gender		
Male	923	85.3
Female	159	14.7
Age		
17-29	400	37.0
30-49	526	48.6
50+	156	14.4
Mean	35.47	
Prior Criminal History		
No	93	8.6
Yes	989	91.4
Parental Status		
No	538	49.7
Yes	544	50.3

Prior to conducting chi-square and regression analyses, bivariate correlations were analyzed for each of the independent and dependent variables and show correlations

between some of the variables; however, none of the variables were highly correlated with each other, excluding multicollinearity (see Table 2). Research suggests that correlation coefficients greater than .80 indicate that more than one variable has a linear relationship, referred to as multicollinearity. Multicollinearity has the potential to impact regression estimates. The closer the correlation coefficient is to 1, the stronger the linear relationship, which means the two variables are related. However, in this study, none of the variables had intercorrelations of .80 or higher; therefore, no multicollinearity was identified (Mertler & Reinhart, 2017). Bivariate correlations in Table 2 examine the extent of relationships between the sample's characteristics and outcome arresting charge. Arresting charge is significantly related to age ($r = .157, p < .05$) and race ($r = -.127, p < .05$). Additionally, criminal history is significantly related with age ($r = .097, p < .05$), gender ($r = -.124, p < .05$), and parental status ($r = -.078, p < .01$). It is also notable that parental status is significantly related with race ($r = .076, p < .01$).

Table 2. Correlations Matrix

Summary of Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Study Variables						
Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Arresting Charge						
2. Age	.157**					
3. Gender	-.031	-.016				
4. Race	-.127**	.029	-.005			
5. Parental Status	-.015	.021	.000	.076*		
6. Criminal History	.043	.097**	-.124**	.038	-.078*	
<i>M</i>	1.5527	.7745	.147	.5028	.5028	.9140
<i>SD</i>	1.41666	0.68076	0.35422	.50022	.50022	.28042

*Correlation is significant at the $p < .01$ level (2-tailed)

** Correlation is significant at the $p < .05$ level (2-tailed)

Table 3 demonstrates chi-square test of independence analyses. Chi-square analyses were used on the sample to examine group differences between age, parental status, race, gender, criminal history, and the type of arrest charge outcome. There were no significant relationships between prior criminal history, parental status, and the outcome measure arresting offense. A significant relationship was found between race and arresting charge, $\chi^2=23.701$, 4 df; $p<0.001$. Additionally, there were significant relationship between gender and arresting charge, $\chi^2=25.077$, 4 df; $p<0.001$. Lastly, there was a significant relationship between age and arresting charge, $\chi^2=41.077$, 8 df; $p<0.001$. Chi-square analyses were also conducted on the two groups (parents/primary caregivers and non-parents/non-primary caregivers). For within parents/primary caregiver group, there were no significant relationships between race, gender, and the outcome arresting offense. However, for age and arresting charge, there was a significant relationship, $\chi^2=23.273$, 8 df; $p<0.01$. For prior criminal history, there was also a significant relationship, $\chi^2=30.038$, 4 df; $p<0.05$. For within non-parents/non-primary caregivers' group, there was not a significant relationship between prior criminal history and the outcome arresting offense. Significant relationships were identified between race and arresting charge, $\chi^2=18.162$, 4 df; $p\leq 0.001$ and between gender and arresting charge, $\chi^2=18.199$, 4 df; $p\leq 0.001$. Moreover, there was a significant relationship between age and arresting charge, $\chi^2=26.435$, 8 df; $p\leq 0.001$.

Table 3. Chi-Square Analysis

Sample Characteristics	Parental Status								
	Total Sample (N = 1082)			Parents/Primary Caregivers (N = 544)			Non-Parents/Primary Caregivers (N = 538)		
	n	%	χ^2	n	%	χ^2	n	%	χ^2
Dependent Variable									
Arresting Charge									
Violent	343	31.7		188	34.6		155	28.8	
Property	255	23.6		109	20.0		146	27.1	
Drug-Related	178	16.5		91	16.7		87	16.2	
Public Order	155	14.3		82	15.1		73	13.6	
Other	151	14.0		74	13.6		77	14.3	
Race									
Non-Black	538	49.7		250	46.0		288	53.5	
Black	544	50.3	***23.701	294	54.0	8.552	250	46.5	***18.162
Gender									
Male	923	85.3		464	85.3		459	85.3	
Female	159	14.7	***25.077	80	14.7	9.437	79	14.7	***18.199
Age									
17-29	400	37.0		165	30.3		235	43.7	
30-49	526	48.6		329	60.5		197	36.6	
50+	156	14.4	***41.077	50	9.2	**23.273	106	19.7	***26.435
Prior Criminal History									
No	93	8.6		35	6.4		58	10.8	
Yes	989	91.4	3.481	509	93.6	*9.608	480	89.2	1.861
Parental Status									
No	538	49.7							
Yes	544	50.3	9.183						

Note. * χ^2 analysis was statistically significant at the $p < .05$

Note. ** χ^2 analysis was statistically significant at the $p < .01$

Note. *** χ^2 analysis was statistically significant at the $p < .001$

Note: The relationship between criminal history versus outcome arresting charge significance could not be estimated using a chi-square test because 1 cell (10.0%) has expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.76. The results here were taken from estimations using Fisher's exact test.

Multivariate Analysis

Multinomial Logistic Regressions

Multinomial logistic regression models were used to determine the relationship between race, gender, parental status, age, and arresting charge. Specifically, four multinomial regression models were used to predict the influence various categorical independent variables have on a dependent variable separated into five categories. The dependent variable (arresting charge) was operationalized into five arresting charge categories: violent, property, drug-related, public order, and other offenses. Refer to Appendix A for additional information about the type of arresting charges collapsed into each category. The first multinomial logistic regression model analyzed the direct effect of race, gender, age, and parental status on arresting charges, and the second model included interactions for race, gender, age, and parental status and their impact on arresting charges. In this study's regression analyses, violent arresting charge was the reference category for the dependent variable; therefore, the findings are interpreted as the odds of an individual be charged with a property, drug-related, public order, or other offense in comparison to a violent offense.

Tables 4 illustrates multinomial regression analyses examining the impact of race, age, gender, parental status on property and drug-related arresting charges. The findings show that race was not a significant predictor for property and drug-related arresting charges, indicating that Black jailed individuals did not have significantly different odds of being arrested for a property or drug-related offense than Non-Black jailed individuals. Table 4 also shows that the coefficient for parental status was significant ($b = .492$ $p < .01$) and parents were .612 times more likely to have a property arresting charge as

opposed to a violent arresting charge. Similar results were found for gender. The coefficient for gender was significant ($b = .920$ $p < .001$), indicating that females (in comparison to males) were 2.5 times more likely to have an arresting charge of property as opposed to a violent arresting charge. Conversely, there was no relationship between parental status and drug-related offenses, nor was there a relationship between gender and drug-related offenses. Therefore, jailed parents and non-parents, nor jailed males and females, did not have significantly different odds of having drug-related arresting charges.

In order to follow the assumptions of a multinomial regression having categorical independent variables, in this study, the continuous variable for age was collapsed into three categories: 17-29, 30-49, and 50 and older). The multinomial regression model illustrated in Table 4 shows that the coefficient for ages 30-49 was not significant, indicating that jailed individuals between the ages of 30-49 did not have significantly different odds of being arrested for a property offense than jailed individuals between the ages of 17-29. However, the odds of being charged with a drug-related offense ($b = .406$, $p < .05$) was significant, which means that individuals 30-49 years of age were 1.5 times more likely to be charged with a drug-related offense. There was no relationship between individuals aged 50 and older and property and drug-related for; therefore, jailed individuals over the age of 50 did not have significantly different odds of being arrested for a property or drug-related offense than jailed individuals between the ages of 17-29.

Table 4. Multinomial Logistic Regression Analysis (Property and Drug-Related Arresting Charges)

	Violent vs. Property Arresting Charges			Violent vs. Drug-Related Arresting Charges		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	Exp(<i>b</i>)	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	Exp(<i>b</i>)
Individual Characteristics						
Non-Black (Reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Black	.173	.170	1.197	.103	.187	.902
Male (Reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Female	.920***	.229	2.510	.281	.277	1.325
Non-Parent (Reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Parent	.492**	.174	.612	.210	.192	.811
Age						
17-29 (Reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--
30-49	.160	.185	1.174	.406*	.203	1.505
50+	.567	.268	1.764	.326	.320	1.385
Nagelkerke R ²				.091		

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

Note: Violent Arresting Charge is the reference category

The regression models demonstrated in Table 5 examines the effects of race, age, gender, and parental status on public order and drug-related arresting charges. The coefficient for race was negative and significant ($b = -.655, p < .001$), signifying that Black jailed individuals (compared to Non-Black jailed individuals) were half as likely to be charged with a public order offense as opposed to a violent offense. Similarly, the coefficient for race and other offenses were negative and significant ($b = -.653, p < .001$), suggesting that Black jailed individuals (in comparison to Non-Black jailed persons) were half as likely to be charged with an other offense as opposed to violent offenses. For jailed individuals between the ages of 30-49, the likelihood of being charged with a public order offense ($b = .824, p < .001$), and other offenses ($b = .631, p < .001$) were both significant. Individuals 30-49 years of age (compared to individuals 17-29) were 2.3 times more likely to be arrested and charged with a public order offense, and 1.9 times

more likely for other offenses in comparison to a violent offense. For jailed individuals 50 years of age and older, the coefficient was positive and significant ($b = 1.499$, $p < .001$) for other offenses; this suggests that jailed individuals 50 years of age or older (compared to jailed individuals between the ages of 17 and 29) were 4.5 times more likely to be charged with other offenses as opposed to violent offenses. However, there was no relationship between individuals aged 50 and older and public order offenses, which suggests that jailed individuals aged 50 or older had the same odds of being arrested for a public order offense versus a violent offense. Additionally, there was no relationship found between parental status and public order or other offenses. Lastly, there was no relationship between gender and public order or other offenses. In other words, compared to males, jailed females had the same odds of being arrested for a public order or other offense versus a violent offense.

Table 5. Multinomial Logistic Regression Analysis (Public Order and Other Arresting Charges)

	Violent vs. Public Order Arresting Charges			Violent vs. Other Arresting Charges		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	Exp(<i>b</i>)	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	Exp(<i>b</i>)
Individual Characteristics						
Non-Black (Reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Black	-.655***	.200	.519	-.653***	.203	.520
Male (Reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Female	.379	.285	1.461	-.367	.351	.693
Non-Parent (Reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Parent	.147	.203	.863	.162	.207	.850
Age						
17-29 (Reference)	--	--	--	--	--	--
30-49	.824***	.224	2.278	.631**	.234	1.879
50+	.835	.330	2.305	1.499***	.297	4.476
Nagelkerke R ²				.091		

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

Note: Violent Arresting Charge is the reference category

Multinomial Regressions Interactions

As previously discussed, main effect multinomial logistic regressions were estimated to examine the impact of age, gender, race, and parental status on arresting charge. Race, gender, and parental status interaction variables were used in three models to address the second research question: What is the interaction effect between parental status, race, gender, and arresting charge. In this study, race, gender, and parental status interaction variables were used to analyze their impact on arresting charges. First, to analyze the joint effect of race and parental status on arresting charge, a dummy variable for Black Parent was created and entered into the original regression model; the Non-Black Non-Parent dummy variable was left out as the reference category. Table 6 illustrates the interaction effect of race and parental status on property and drug-related arresting charges, and the coefficient for Black Parent was not significant for neither property or drug-related offense categories. Therefore, both Black and Non-Black Parents had equal odds of being arrested for a property or drug-related, in comparison to violent offenses.

Table 6. Multinomial Logistic Regression Interaction (Race and Parental Status/Property and Drug-Related Arresting Charges)

	Violent vs. Property Arresting Charges			Violent vs. Drug-Related Arresting Charges		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	Exp(<i>b</i>)	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	Exp(<i>b</i>)
Race x Parental Status						
Non-Black Non-Parent (reference)						
Black Parent	0.016	0.342	1.016	0.026	0.373	1.027
Nagelkerke R ²						0.093

Note: Violent Arresting Charge is the reference category

Table 7 illustrates the analysis of the interaction effect of race and parental status on public order and other arresting charges. The coefficient for Black Parent was not significant for public order arresting charges, nor for other arresting charges. Consequently, both Black and Non-Black Parents had equal chances of being arrested for a public order or other offenses, in comparison to a violent arresting charge.

Table 7. Multinomial Logistic Regression Interaction Effect (Race and Parental Status/Public Order and Other Arresting Charges)

	Violent vs. Public Order Arresting Charges			Violent vs. Other Arresting Charges		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	Exp(<i>b</i>)	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	Exp(<i>b</i>)
Race x Parental Status						
Non-Black Non-Parent (reference)						
Black Parent	0.615	0.408	1.850	0.061	0.406	1.063
Nagelkerke R ²						0.093

Note: Violent Arresting Charge is the reference category

For the second multinomial logistic regression model to examine the simultaneous influence gender and parental status has on property and drug-related arresting charges, a dummy variable for Female Parent was created (see Table 8). The dummy variable Female Parent was entered into the original model, and Male Non-Parent was left out as

the reference category. The coefficient for Female Parent was not significant, which means Female Parents and Male Non-Parents had equal odds of being arrested for a property or drug-related offense in comparison to a violent offense.

Table 8. Multinomial Logistic Regression Interaction Effect (Gender and Parental Status/Property and Drug-Related Arresting Charges)

	Violent vs. Property Arresting Charges			Violent vs. Drug-Related Arresting Charges		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	Exp(<i>b</i>)	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	Exp(<i>b</i>)
Gender x Parental Status						
Male Non-Parent (reference)						
Female Parent	-0.425	0.461	0.654	-0.312	0.556	0.732
Nagelkerke R ²				0.092		

Note: Violent Arresting Charge is the reference category

Table 9 shows the impact gender and parental status combined have on public order and other arresting charges. Similar to the previous gender and parental status interaction model, the dummy variable Female Parent was entered into the model, and Male Non-Parent was left out as the reference category. Comparable to property and drug-related arresting charges, the coefficient for Female Parent was not significant, which means Female Parents and Male Non-Parents had equal odds of being arrested for a public order or other offense in comparison to a violent offense.

Table 9. Multinomial Logistic Regression Interaction Effect (Gender and Parental Status/Public Order and Other Arresting Charges)

	Violent vs. Public Order Arresting Charges			Violent vs. Other Offenses Arresting Charges		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	Exp(<i>b</i>)	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	Exp(<i>b</i>)
Gender x Parental Status						
Male Non-Parent (reference)						
Female Parent	0.045	0.573	1.046	-0.382	0.731	0.682
Nagelkerke R ²				0.092		

Note: Violent Arresting Charge is the reference category

In order to assess the combined effect of race, gender, and parental status on arresting charge, a third multinomial logistic regression interaction model was estimated. Therefore, a dummy variable for Black Female Parent was used to assess the interaction effect of race, gender, and parental status on arresting charge. The dummy variable for Black Female Parent was entered into the original model, and Non-Black Male Non-Parent was left out as the reference category. The coefficient for Black Female Parent was not significant, which means Black Female Parents and Non-Black Male Non-Parents had equal odds of being arrested for a property or drug-related offense in comparison to a violent offense (see Table 10).

Table 10. Multinomial Logistic Regression Interaction Effect (Race, Gender, and Parental Status/Property and Drug-Related Arresting Charges)

	Violent vs. Property Arresting Charges				Violent vs. Drug-Related Arresting Charges		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	Exp(<i>b</i>)		<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	Exp(<i>b</i>)
Race x Gender x Parental Status							
Non-Black Male Non-Parent (Reference)							
Black Female Parent	-0.389	0.532	0.678	0.097	0.518	0.593	1.679
Nagelkerke R ²							

Note: Violent Arresting Charge is the reference category

Finally, Table 11 illustrates the shared influence of race, gender, and parental status has on public order and other arresting charges. The dummy variable for Black Female Parent was entered into the original model, and Non-Black Male Non-Parent was left out as the reference category. Comparable to property and drug-related arresting charge categories, the coefficient for Black Female Parent was not significant, which implies that Black Female Parents and Non-Black Male Non-Parents had equal odds of being arrested for a public order and other offense in comparison to a violent offense (see Table 10).

Table 11. Multinomial Logistic Regression Interaction Effect (Race, Gender, and Parental Status / Public Order and Other Arresting Charges)

	Violent vs. Public Order Arresting Charges				Violent vs. Other Arresting Charges		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	Exp(<i>b</i>)		<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	Exp(<i>b</i>)
Race x Gender x Parental Status							
Non-Black Male Non-Parent (Reference)							
Black Female Parent	1.028	0.607	2.797	0.097	0.634	0.793	1.884
Nagelkerke R ²							

Note: Violent Arresting Charge is the reference category

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to examine the relationship between race, gender, age, parental status, and violent, property, drug-related, public order, and other arresting charges on jailed individuals in the Harris County jail. In this study, a series of analyses were conducted to determine the significance of relationships and the influence parental status, race, gender and age have on arresting charges. Chi-square analyses were conducted in order to determine significant relationships between race, age, gender,

parental status, criminal history, and type of arresting offenses. Multinomial logistic regressions examined the influence of parental status, race, gender, have on the outcome measure, arresting charge, among the sample of incarcerated individuals. Although the purpose of this study emphasizes the examination of parental status of jailed inmates and arresting charge, race, gender, and age were also analyzed in order to provide additional context about differential offending. Prior research has consistently shown differences in offending due to race, gender, and age. In this particular study, the data suggest that race is a significant predictor for public order and other types of offenses in comparison to violent offenses. Specifically, Black jailed individuals had a greater chance of being arrested for public order and other offense categories. Additionally, the results found that gender and parental status were significant predictors for property offenses; this implies that jailed females (compared to males) and jailed parents (versus jailed non-parents) had higher odds of property offense arresting charges in comparison to violent arresting charges. Furthermore, age was a significant predictor for arresting charge. Jailed individuals between the ages of 30-49 were more likely to be charged with a public order or other offense, and jailed individuals 50 years of age or older were likely to be charged with other offenses as opposed to violent offenses. Lastly, none of the interaction models were significant, which implies that the simultaneous effect of race and gender did not influence the odds of an individual being arrested for any offense category in comparison to violent offenses. Similarly, the joint impact of gender and parental status did not have an influence on the type of arresting charge. Additionally, the impact of race, gender, and parental status jointly did not influence the odds of arresting charge. The following

chapter discusses the limitations of the current study, implications, and suggestions for subsequent research.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Introduction

The current study sought to examine the impact race, gender, age, and parental status has on arresting charges by comparing a sample of 1,082 individuals in the Harris County jail. In the direct effect multinomial logistics model, while controlling for legal (i.e., criminal history) and extralegal variables (i.e., residence zip code, race, age, gender, and parental status) were examined to determine their influence on five categories of arresting charges (violent, property, drug-related, public order, and other charges). The main purpose of this study was to examine the influence parental status has on the type of arresting charges. Jailed parents/primary caregivers were not charged with drug-related, public order, or other offenses significantly different than jailed non-parents/non-primary caregivers. Nevertheless, parental status was a significant predictor of property offenses; parents were more likely to be arrested for a property offense in comparison to a violent offense than jailed non-parents/primary caregivers. Although dated, the Bureau of Justice Statistics Parents and Their Minor Children report from 2004 found that 47.5 percent of parents were incarcerated in state correctional facilities for violent offenses. Specifically, the percent of property, drug-related, and public order crimes for parents were higher at 49.9 percent, 59.6 percent and 59.9 percent, respectively (Glaze & Maruschak, 2010). Additionally, individuals between the ages of 30-49 had a greater chance of being

arrested for drug-related, public order, and other offenses versus a violent offense in comparison to individuals between the ages of 17 and 29. Furthermore, persons older than 50 were more likely to be charged with another offense as opposed to property, drug-related, and public order offenses.

In addition to examining the relationship between parental status and arresting charge, this study also analyzed the influence race and gender has on arresting charge to provide additional context. In this study, Black jailed individuals were more likely to be arrested for public order and other offenses in comparison to violent offenses than their Non-Black jailed counterparts. Although Black jailed individuals have higher frequencies of property and drug-related offenses, regression analysis demonstrated that Black individuals did not have a greater likelihood of being arrested for a property or drug-related offense. These results are inconsistent with prior studies which found that Black individuals are disparately overrepresented in justice involvement in comparison to White individuals. Official crime statistics, such as the Uniform Crime Report, are commonly used to examine arrest rates. Each year, although Black Americans account for approximately 13% of the population, Black individuals represent 27% of all persons arrested in the United States (UCR, 2018; Beck & Blumstein, 2018; Blumstein, 1982; Tonry, 1995). In the current study, despite showing higher numbers of arrests for Black individuals for property and drug-related offenses, regression analysis did not predict an increased likelihood of arrest for property or drug-related offenses. Therefore, additional analyses were conducted. Appendix F shows significant relationships between race and property offenses.

When analyzing gender, consistent with prior studies, the sample of jailed individuals mainly were men (85%). In the current study, women were not arrested for drug-related, public order, or other offenses significantly different than males. However, gender was a significant predictor for property offenses; women were more likely to be arrested for a property offense than a violent offense than their male counterparts. These findings are in alignment with prior studies about women offending patterns. Previous research has shown that when excluding prostitution offenses, females have the highest rates of arrest for minor property crimes (The Sentencing Project, 2015).

The second part of the analyses examined the interaction effects of race, gender, and parental status on arresting charges. Analysis of the interaction effects between race and parental status, and gender and parental status found no significant differences in their types of arresting charges. Therefore, it appears that jailed Black Parents and jailed Non-Black Parents have the same odds of being charged with a property, drug-related, public order, or other offense in comparison to a violent offense. Similarly, results showed that female parents and male non-parents had similar odds of an arresting charge of property, drug-related, public order, or other offense in comparison to a violent charge.

Limitations

Although there are significant contributions of this study to the body of knowledge about parental incarceration, there are limitations. First, the current research relied on data from one local jail in a major metropolitan city. It is unclear if the results from this study can be applied to other jail populations in different geographic locations. Despite generalizability as a limitation in parental incarceration research, there is an opportunity for the replication of past studies for future research to address concerns

about external validity (Cho & Tasca, 2019; Shlafer et al., 2017). It would benefit future research to replicate this study with samples from various jurisdictions.

Furthermore, the primary independent variable in this study was parental status; however, the measure of parental status was not exhaustive. Lack of information about parental status or insufficient measures for parental incarceration is common in datasets such as Add Health of Fragile Families and Child Well-Being (Burgess-Proctor et al., 2016; Miller & Barnes, 2015; Geller et al., 2009, 2012) because their sole purpose was not focused on parental incarceration data. The same can be said about the current study's imperfect measures of parental status. Despite the current study's parental incarceration measure being able to differentiate between prison and jail, the dataset was not able to capture "dosage" of parental incarceration. In parental incarceration research, the dosage is considered the timing and frequency of the parents' incarceration (Cho, 2010). The data set used in the current study did not assess the length of incarceration, nor other measures sufficiently such as the extent of the relationship between the parent and child. The definition of parenthood varies, and incarceration experiences are different. A person who responded as a parent or primary caregiver may not have had a relationship with their child before their arrest. Future parental incarceration datasets should include additional parental status measures such as the number of children, ages of the children, number of children, and the extent of the parent or primary caregiver's financial involvement prior to arrest and incarceration.

Another limitation of the current study pertains to the grouping of arresting charges. Due to the scarcity of previous studies evaluating the relationship between parental status and arresting charge, the current study used an approach for categorizing

arresting charges based on the Bureau of Justice Statistics Parents and Their Minor Children Special Report. Glaze and Maruschak (2010) focused on descriptive measurements for its parental incarceration analysis, and examined four arresting charge categories (violent, drug, public order, and property); the current study used a similar approach. However, for offenses that could not be grouped as violent, drug-related, property or public order, certain offenses were referred to as “other offenses” (see Appendix E).

It is notable to mention that some individuals were arrested for multiple charges, and therefore, the categorizing of types of arresting charges was based on the Uniform Crime Report Hierarchy Rule and offense definitions and classifications based on the Texas Penal Code.

The final notable limitation in this study is the timeframe the data was collected; the data only contained individuals who did not bond out of jail. In the current study, parental status information was collected from intake forms during the jail classification process. Therefore, individuals who the parental status questions on the form were individuals booked into the Harris County jail within 48-72 hours who were either not eligible or could not afford bail. In Harris County, approximately 75% of individuals in the Harris County jail are held in pretrial detention, and have yet to be convicted of a crime (Bourgeois et al., 2018). Although beyond the scope of this study, unknown is the disposition of the case. However, a reasonable assumption is that some individuals in this study remained jailed until their case was disposed of (i.e. dismissed, sentenced, diverted to pretrial, etc.). Nevertheless, detaining a person in jail until their trial or final case disposition removes individuals not only from the community, but also their families and

causes disruption. Prior research has shown that children separated from their parents due to jail or prison leads to adversity such as an increased risk of removal from school due to suspensions and expulsion, depression, anxiety, substance abuse, and future justice involvement (Davis & Shlafer, 2017; Haskins & Poehlmann-Tynan, 2018; Murray et al. 2012).

Implications

During the era of mass incarceration, collateral consequences of incarceration have been at the center of criminal justice reform efforts at the local, state, and federal levels; however, more knowledge is needed about the role of parental status/parenthood and arresting charges. Countless qualitative and quantitative studies have examined the short term and long term impacts incarceration has on children and families; nevertheless, prior studies have failed to determine if there are differences in the type of offenses committed by jailed parents compared to jailed individuals without children. The results of the current study have several practical implications.

Implications on the impacts of parental incarceration are imperative; however, research to date has not been able to address this topic sufficiently. For example, the scientific rigor of parental incarceration studies has been limited. The majority of studies examining the impacts of parental incarceration have been correlations and have not examined causality (Murray et al., 2012; Roettger et al., 2011; Hagan & Foster, 2012). Simply stated, it has yet to be determined whether or not parental incarceration adversely impacts children and young adults or are the adverse outcomes of parental incarceration due to other factors.

Despite public policy about parental incarceration and its lasting impacts gaining more attention nationally, several states remain in the dark about the specific number of children that have a parent incarcerated. Thus far, a small number of states have taken the initiative to assess the number of incarcerated parents (Shlafer et al., 2019; NYS, 2013; Lamb & Dorsey, Nutt et al., 2008). Furthermore, data collection of parental status and short term confinement in local jails is scarce (Kramer, 2016; Shlafer & Saunders, 2017). As previously mentioned, many departments of corrections at the local and state level fail to do a good job of keeping track of how many of its incarcerated and jailed individuals are parents or primary caregivers to minor children. Without knowledge about the parental status of jailed individuals, local governments cannot make evidence-based policy recommendations about jailed parents/primary caregivers and their children. Moreover, moving forward, it is imperative to address the lack of rigor in parental incarceration studies; therefore, public policy attention should be placed on data collection.

It is notable to mention that before the current study, the Harris County jail was not collecting parental incarceration measures such as whether or not an individual was a parent or primary caregiver to a child or children under the age of 18, and if so, their ages. Without the collection and transparency of data, future research cannot take place. In 2011, an advisory committee in Pennsylvania suggested legislation requiring agencies, such as the department of corrections, to collect data about children whose parents were incarcerated (Joint State Government Commission, 2011). Recently, Texas has proposed new legislation that will identify the scope of the parental incarceration problem in numbers. Gaining momentum during the 2019 and 2021 Texas legislative sessions were

bills related to children impacted by the criminal justice system. Nearly 2 million individuals are in Texas state prisons and jails (Wagner & Rabuy, 2017). Each year in the Houston area, 1 out of 14 children has a parent in the Harris County jail (Correa et al., 2019). During the 2019 legislative session, Texas House Bill 659 passed, which now requires the Texas Department of Criminal Justice to record the parental status of individuals in Texas correctional facilities. After the information is compiled annually, it will be provided to the Texas Education Agency and Department of Family and Protective Services. However, House Bill 659 does not apply to local jails throughout the state of Texas.

Recently there have been several state level policy recommendations to help decrease the pretrial population, and some target incarcerated parents specifically (Herring, 2020; Gotsch, 2018). In 2019, Texas passed HB 1374, which supported a grant focused on a pretrial intervention program provided through a probation department for pregnant or women who are parents or the primary caregiver of a minor. Similar to Texas' pretrial diversion opportunity for parents, California legislation has steps to consider children in sentencing matters. California Senate Bill 394 passed in 2019, which will result in the creation of a pretrial diversion court with a focus on diverting primary caregivers into programs instead of incarceration. Alternatives to incarceration are an option to alleviate jail and prison overcrowding, but also allows nonviolent individuals to remain in the community while serving their sentence. Despite states taking steps towards addressing the pretrial population, there is a need for action at the local level rooted in evidence-informed interventions. For example, a recent study proposed several evidence-based recommendations to alleviate the impact of parental incarceration at each stage of

the criminal justice process, specifically at the local level (Child Poverty Action Lab, 2020). Several of the proposed recommendations are centered around the arrest and pretrial stages, such as the diverting of pre-booking, decrease police interactions, and reimagining bail, and creating alternatives to pretrial detention.

Furthermore, with the surge in incarcerated women and a significant number of jailed inmates having children, there is the ineffectiveness of one size fits all intervention and rehabilitation approaches which lack the nuances of the complexities of parenthood/parental status and offending. Prior research has recommended a shift towards gender-responsive programming in corrections (Bloom et al., 2003). In addition to programs targeted for women, there is a need to focus on the onset of parental incarceration, which is the arresting charge of the parent or primary caregiver. Interaction with law enforcement is the first step in which a child is exposed to having a parent involved in the criminal justice system. The study's findings support the necessity and implementation of parent-specific programming. For example, Sesame Street's "Little Children, Big Challenges: Incarceration" initiative has been beneficial as a parenthood intervention tool (Poehlmann-Tynan et al., 2020). The study was a randomized efficacy trial that evaluated educational materials used for children with incarcerated fathers at multiple locations. Overall the study found positive effects in assisting caregivers in speaking with children about the separation from their parent(s) due to incarceration. Despite Armstrong et al. (2018) systematic review and meta-analysis finding small to moderate efficacy for parenting intervention programs, the study recommended future research in this area with more robust methods to better examine parenting programming.

Suggestions for Future Research

There are over 10 million jail admissions yearly (Zeng, 2020). Jails are local correctional facilities that house persons short term; individuals are detained in jail after being arrested, but individuals have yet to be convicted of a crime. Sometimes individuals remain detained in jail until their trial, or if they are convicted sentenced to less than a year (Sawyer & Wagner, 2020). Despite the majority of incarceration in the United States occurring in jails, the bulk of parental incarceration literature focuses on long term confinement in prisons (Poehlmann-Tynan, J., & Eddy, 2019). Recently, there has been a pivot and different approaches used in parental incarceration research that focus on short term confinement (Poehlmann-Tynan et al., 2021; Schlafer & Saunders, 2017). For that reason, the objective this study was to identify which predictor variables impact the types of arresting charges of jailed individuals; however, due to limitations previously, there is a need for additional research. First, subsequent research should examine bond amounts of the jailed individuals. Parental status measures were obtained from intake forms administered during the jail classification process, and were limited to only persons booked into the jail within 48-72 hours who were either not eligible or could not afford bail. Having bail amount information would be helpful to determine the socioeconomic status of the jailed individual.

Second, despite this study being quantitative, it would be beneficial to incorporate qualitative measures to determine a person's reasoning for engaging in criminal activity, and to gain additional parental status measures such as the age of their children, the parent or primary caregiver's level of financial contribution, and the length of their prior separations from their child(ren) to incarceration. Children and families are often viewed

as collateral consequences of incarceration. Focus groups or interviews have the potential to gather additional information about jailed parental incarceration. Qualitative studies provide a voice to the children or families that have been separated due to incarceration (Siegel & Luther, 2019). Arditti and McGregor (2019) proposed using a family perspective to gain insight into how incarceration impacts family life by bringing awareness to the non-incarcerated family member.

One of the most critical findings in the current study is the significant relationship between parental status, gender, race, and type of arresting charge. Therefore, a third recommendation is that subsequent studies must continue to analyze the influence parental status has on arresting charges at the local county jail level among various jurisdictions. In order to push the conversation research about the role of parental status and offending, more local jails need to include parental status measures on their intake forms. To date, few local jurisdictions that collect parental status measures prevent determining an accurate estimate of how many children are impacted by jailed parental incarceration (Cho & Tasca, 2019; Shlafer et al., 2017).

Lastly, data used in the current study focused on arresting charges in a local jail. The criminal justice system is multifaceted and has different points of contact where a parent is justice involved. For example, this study focuses solely on arresting charges, and the individuals have yet to have been convicted of a crime. Expanding on the current study, future work should also examine how parental status may influence case resolution, case disposition, and sentencing lengths. For example, are there significant differences in whether a jailed parent's case is dismissed, or if an individual receives placement into a pretrial diversion program, probation, or incarceration in comparison to

non-parents (Wakefield & Montagnet, 2019; Sugie & Turney, 2017; Wildemen et al., 2016; Cho & Tasca, 2019; Tasca et al., 2019).

Conclusion

The current study's goal was to determine if there was a difference in the types of arresting charges between jailed parents and non-parents. The findings reported in this study reveal that it is vital for local jails to collect and analyze parental status measures to determine the influence parenthood has on offending. Furthermore, jail data and its availability provide an opportunity to identify and allocate funds for treatment and diversion programs for parental jail populations. Although the population of jailed females is smaller in proportion to males, findings in the current study show that gender and parental status are significant predictors of types of arresting charges. With fifty percent of jailed individuals being parents/primary caregivers, it raises awareness about different pathways to offending based on parental status. A significant amount of prior research about differential offending focuses heavily on race and gender (Beck & Blumstein, 2018; Ibañez et al., 2019; Piquero & Brame, 2008; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996), and fails to take into account parenthood. Current research about parenthood and crime is unclear, and has shown that being a parent or primary caregiver as a deterrence for engaging in criminal activity depends on other factors such as the dynamics of the parent/child relationship (Garcia, 2016, Garcia-Hallett, 2017; Monsbakken et al., 2013; Sharpe, 2015). Therefore, it is essential to obtain additional information about jailed inmates and their parental status to ensure the application of fair and equitable policies and procedures.

APPENDIX

Appendix A. Violent Arresting Charges

AGG ASSAULT W/DEADLY WEAPON	MURDER
AGG ASSAULT-FAMILY MEMBER	POSS CHILD PORNOGRAPHY
AGG ROBBERY-DEADLY WPN	RETALIATION
AGG ROBBERY-OVER 65 OR DISABLE	ROBBERY
AGG SEX ASSAULT	ROBBERY-BODILY INJURY
AGG SEX ASSLT CHILD-UNDER 14	ROBBERY-THREATS
ASLT FAM/HOUSE MEM IMPED BRTH/	SEX ASSLT CHILD 14-17
ASSAULT - SECURITY OFFICER	SEXUAL ASSAULT
ASSAULT PEACE OFFICER	SUPER AGG SEX ASSLT CHILD < 6
ASSAULT PUBLIC SERVANT	TERRORISTIC THREAT
ASSAULT-BOD INJ-FAMILY MEMBER	TERRORISTIC THREAT FAMILY/HOUS
ASSAULT-BOD INJ-PUB SERV/RETAL	TERRORISTIC THREAT FEAR IMMINE
ASSAULT-BODILY INJURY	TRAFFICKING OF PERSONS
ASSAULT-FAM MEMB-2 PRIOR ASSAU	
ASSAULT-FAMILY MEMBER	
ASSLT FAM/HOUSEHOLD MEM W/PREV	
ASSLT INT/RCK/IMP/BRTH/CIRC/PR	
ATT RETALIATION OR OBSTRUCTION	
CAPITAL MURDER	
COMPEL PROST BY FORCE/THREAT/F	
CONTINUOUS VIOL AGAINST THE FA	
DEADLY COND-DISCH F-ARM HAB/BL	
DEADLY CONDUCT	
DIRECT ACTIVITIES OF STREET GA	
DISARMING POLICE OFFICER	
DISORDERLY COND/FIREARM/DEADLY	
ENDANGERING A CHILD	
ENGAGING IN ORG CRIM ACTIVITY	
FSRA ACC INVOLVING INJURY	
HARASSMENT OF PUBLIC SERVANT	
INDECENCY CHILD-TG	
INDECENCY-CHILD EXPOSURE	
INDECENT EXPOSURE	
INJURY CHILD UNDER 15 B/INJURY	
INJURY TO ELDERLY	
INTOXICATED ASSLT W/VEH SBI	

Appendix B. Property Arresting Charges

ARSON	THEFT <\$2,500 2/MORE PREV CONV
ATT TAMPER GOVT RECORD	THEFT >=\$100<\$750
ATTEMPT INVASIVE VISUAL RECORD	THEFT >=\$30,000 <\$150,000
BURG OF VEHICLE W/2 OR MORE CO	THEFT >=\$500 <\$1,500
BURGLARY MOTOR VEHICLE - ENHAN	THEFT >=\$750 <\$2,500
BURGLARY OF A BUILDING	THEFT >=2,500 <30,000
BURGLARY OF HABITATION	THEFT \$1500-20K
BURGLARY OF VEHICLE	THEFT AGGREGATE =>\$100<\$750 1C
CREDIT CARD/DEBT CARD ABUSE EL	THEFT AGGREGATE =>\$100<\$750 MU
CREDIT/DEBIT CARD ABUSE	THEFT AGGREGATE =>\$2,500<\$30K
CRIM MISCH	THEFT BY CHECK =>\$100<\$750
CRIM MISCH >=100 <\$750	THEFT BY CHECK \$50.00 - \$500.0
CRIM TRES HAB/SHLTR/SUPRFUND/I	THEFT BY CHECK 3RD OFFENDER
CRIMINAL MISCHIEF >=\$2,500<30K	THEFT FROM PERSON
CRIMINAL MISCHIEF >=\$750<\$2,50	THEFT OF A MOTOR VEHICLE
CRIMINAL TRESPASS	THEFT OF FIREARM
CRIMINAL TRESPASS W/DEADLY WEA	THEFT OF SERVICE >=\$750<\$2,500
CRIMINAL TRESSPASS	THFT MATERIAL ALUM/BRNZ/COPPR/
FORGERY	TRESPASS PROP/BLDG-NO FORB ENT
FORGERY FINANCIAL INSTRUMENT E	UNAUTH USE OF VEHICLE
FORGERY GOVT FINANCIAL INST	
FRAUD/DESTR - PRICE TAG	
FRAUD/USE/POSS ID INFO- 5-9 IT	
FRAUD/USE/POSS ID INFO-LESS 5	
FSGI ACC ATTEND DAMAGE VEH>=\$2	
HINDERING SECURED CREDITORS	
ISSUE BAD CHECK	
MISAPP/FIDUC/FINAN 100K-200K	
TAMP GOVT/SCL REC LIC/SEAL/PER	
TAMPER EVIDENCE	
TAMPER GOVT RECORD	
TAMPER GOVT RECORD-HARM	
TAMPER/FABRICATE EVIDENCE	
TAMPERING WITH RECORD	
THEFT	

Appendix C. Drug-Related Arresting Charges

ATT POSS CONT SUBT - PG II
CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE
DEL SYNTH CANNABINOIDS <1 GRAM
DEL SYNTH CANNABINOIDS OVER 40
MAN/DEL CS PG I <1GRAM
MAN/DEL CS PG I 4-200 GRAMS
MAN/DEL CS PG II < 1 GRAMS
MAN/DEL CS PG II 4-400 GRAMS
MAN/DEL CS PG II OVER 400 GRAM
MAN/DEL CS PG III/IV OVER 400
POS MARIJ OVER 2000 LB
POSS CS PG 1 1 - 4 GRAMS
POSS CS PG 1 <1G
POSS CS PG 1 4G - 200G
POSS CS PG 2 <1GRAM
POSS CS PG 2 1-4 GRAMS
POSS CS PG 2 4G - 400G
POSS CS PG 3 <28 GRAMS
POSS CS PG 4 <28 GRAMS
POSS CS PG 4 OVER 400 GRAMS
POSS DRUG PARAPHERNALIA
POSS MARIJ 4 OZ. - 5 LBS.
POSS MARIJ 0-2 OZ
POSS MARIJUANA
POSS MARIJUANA 2-4 OZ
POSS MARIJUANA UNDER 2 OZ (HSC
POSS METHAMPHETAMINE
POSS OF CS PG 1-A 20-79 ABUSE
POSS W/I DEL.CONT. SUBST.
POSS W/INT DEL CS PG1 1G <4 GR
POSS W/INT DEL/MAN/DEL PG1 >=4
POSS W/INT MAN/DEL CS PG1 >= 4
PROH SUBSTANCE CORRECT FACILIT

Appendix D. Public Order Arresting Charges

AGG PROMOTION PROST
 ATT POSS FIREARM BY FELON
 CARRYING HANDGUN IN MOTOR VEHI
 COMPELLING PROSTITUTION < 18 Y
 DRIVING WHILE INTOXICATED
 DWI 1ST OFFENDER BAC>=0.15
 DWI 2ND
 DWI 2ND OFFENDER BAC .08
 DWI 2ND OFFENDER BAC>=0.15
 DWI THIRD
 DWI W/CHILD UNDER 15 YOA
 FELON POSS WPN
 IMPERSON PUBLIC SERVANT
 LIQUOR-SALE W/O PERMIT WET ARE
 ONLINE SOLICITATION OF MINOR
 POSS OF PROHIBITED WEAPON
 POSS PROH WPN
 PROSTITUTION - NON PUBLIC OFFE
 PROSTITUTION WITH 3 OR MORE PR
 UNLAW CARRY WPN
 AGG PROMOTION PROST
 ATT POSS FIREARM BY FELON
 CARRYING HANDGUN IN MOTOR VEHI
 COMPELLING PROSTITUTION < 18 Y
 DRIVING WHILE INTOXICATED
 DWI 1ST OFFENDER BAC>=0.15
 DWI 2ND
 DWI 2ND OFFENDER BAC .08
 DWI 2ND OFFENDER BAC>=0.15
 DWI THIRD
 DWI W/CHILD UNDER 15 YOA
 FELON POSS WPN
 IMPERSON PUBLIC SERVANT
 LIQUOR-SALE W/O PERMIT WET ARE
 ONLINE SOLICITATION OF MINOR
 POSS OF PROHIBITED WEAPON
 POSS PROH WPN
 PROSTITUTION - NON PUBLIC OFFE
 PROSTITUTION WITH 3 OR MORE PR
 UNLAW CARRY WPN

Appendix E. Other Arresting Charges

BENCH WARRANT
CHILD SUPPORT VIOLATION
DISPLAY FICTITIOUS LICENSE PLA
DRIVER LICENSE/ID FALSE
DRV W/LIC INV W/PR CN/SUS/W/O
EVAD ARREST/DETENTION W/PREV C
EVAD ARREST/DETENTION W/VEH
EVADE ARREST W/MOTOR VEHICLE
EVADING ARREST/DETENTION
EVADING ARREST/DETENTION W/VEH
EXPIRED REGISTRATION
FAIL IDENT TO P-O-FUGITIVE
FAIL TO COMPLY AS SEX OFFENDER
FAIL TO ID TO P.O. FALSE INF
FAIL TO ID TO P.O. FALSE INF/F
FAIL TO REGISTER AS SEX OFFEND
FAILURE MAINTAIN FINANCIAL RES
INTERFERE DUTIES PUB SERVANT
INTERFERENCE W/EMERGENCY TELEP
MOTION TO REVOKE PAROLE
MUNICIPAL CHARGES ONLY
OUT OF STATE - FUGITIVE
POSS-UNL USE OF CRIM INSTR
RESIST ARR-SEARCH
UNLAW USE OF CRIMINAL INSTR
UNLAWFUL RESTRAINT
UNLAWFUL RESTRAINT CHILD
VIOL PROTECTIVE ORDER
VIOLATION PROTECTIVE ORDER
WRIT OF ATTACHMENT (WITNESS)

Appendix F. Correlations Matrix (Race and Arresting Charge)

Summary of Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Study Variables

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Race						
2. Violent Offense	0.054					
3. Property Offense	0.082	-0.378				
4. Drug-Related Offense	0.012	-0.302	-0.246			
5. Public Order Offense	-0.095	-0.279	-0.227	-0.181		
6. Other Offense	-0.090	-0.274	-0.224	-0.179	-0.165	
<i>M</i>	0.5028	0.317	0.2357	0.1645	0.1433	0.1396
<i>SD</i>	0.50022	0.46552	0.42462	0.37091	0.35049	0.34669

** Correlation is significant at the $p < .01$ level (2-tailed)

REFERENCES

- Adler, F. (1975). *Sisters in crime: The rise of the new female criminal*. McGraw-Hill.
- Agnew, R. (1992). Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency. *Criminology*, 30(1), 47-88.
- Albonetti, C. A. (1997). Sentencing under the federal sentencing guidelines: Effects of defendant characteristics, guilty pleas, and departures on sentence outcomes for drug offenses, 1991-1992. *Law and Society Review*, 789-822.
- The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2016). *Children of incarcerated parents, a shared sentence: The devastating toll of parental incarceration on kids, families and communities*. Baltimore, MD: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.aecf.org/resources/a-shared-sentence/>
- The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2020). *Kids Data Count Center: Children who had a parent who was ever incarcerated by race and ethnicity in the United States*. Retrieved from: <https://datacenter.kidscount.org/data/tables/9734-children-who-had-a-parent-who-was-ever-incarcerated-by-race-and-ethnicity?loc=1&loct=1#detailed/1/any/false/1648,1603/10,11,9,12,1,13/18995,18996>.
- Arditti, J.A., & McGregor, C.M. (2019). A family perspective: Caregiving and family contexts of children with an incarcerated parent. In *Handbook on children with incarcerated parents* (pp. 117-131). Springer, Cham.

- Arditti, J. A. (2012). Child trauma within the context of parental incarceration: A family process perspective. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 4(3), 181-219.
- Arditti, J., Burton, L., & Neeves-Botelho, S. (2010). Maternal distress and parenting in the context of cumulative disadvantage. *Family process*, 49(2), 142-164.
- Arditti, J. A., Lambert-Shute, J., & Joest, K. (2003). Saturday morning at the jail: Implications of incarceration for families and children. *Family relations*, 52(3), 195-204.
- Armstrong, E., Eggins, E., Reid, N., Harnett, P., & Dawe, S. (2018). Parenting interventions for incarcerated parents to improve parenting knowledge and skills, parent well-being, and quality of the parent-child relationship: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 14(3), 279-317.
- Beck, A. J., & Blumstein, A. (2018). Racial disproportionality in US state prisons: Accounting for the effects of racial and ethnic differences in criminal involvement, arrests, sentencing, and time served. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 34(3), 853-883.
- Bell, K. E. (2013). Young adult offending: Intersectionality of gender and race. *Critical criminology*, 21(1), 103-121.
- Bloom, B., Owen, B., & Covington, S. (2003). Research, practice, and guiding principles for women offenders: Gender responsive strategies. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.
- Blumstein, A. (1982). On the racial disproportionality of United States' prison populations. *J. Crim. l. & Criminology*, 73, 1259.
- Bourgeois, J., Huynh, J., & Henderson, H. (2018). Racial disparity in Houston's pretrial population. *Texas Southern University-Center for Justice Research*. <https://centerforjusticeresearch.org/houstonpretrialpopulation/>

- Bowleg, L. (2012). The problem with the phrase women and minorities: intersectionality—an important theoretical framework for public health. *American journal of public health, 102*(7), 1267-1273.
- Branigan, A. R., & Wildeman, C. (2019). Parental Incarceration and Child Overweight: Results From a Sample of Disadvantaged Children in the United States. *Public Health Reports, 134*(4), 363-370.
- Broidy, L., & Agnew, R. (1997). Gender and crime: A general strain theory perspective. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency, 34*(3), 275-306.
- Brown, W. (2015). An Intersectional Approach to Criminological Theory: Incorporating the Intersectionality of Race and Gender into Agnew's General Strain Theory. *Ralph Bunche Journal of Public Affairs, 4*(1), 6.
- Bruns, A., & Lee, H. (2019). Racial/ethnic disparities. In *Handbook on Children with Incarcerated Parents* (pp. 37-52). Springer.
- Burgess-Proctor, A., Huebner, B.M, & Durso, J.M. (2016). Comparing the effects of maternal and paternal incarceration on adult daughters' and sons' criminal justice system involvement. *Criminal Justice Behavior, 43*(8), 1034-1055.
- Byrne, C. F., & Trew, K. J. (2008). Pathways through crime: The development of crime and desistance in the accounts of men and women offenders. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice, 47*(3), 238-258.
- Carson, E. A., & Anderson, E. (2016). Prisoners in 2015 (NCJ 250229). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

- The Child Poverty Action Lab. (2020). *Criminal Justice: Internal Landscape Assessment*. Retrieved from: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1HhV_Z92SCBBq8DVkzgu88S-69LR5zFNE/view.
- Cho, R. M. (2009a). Impact of maternal imprisonment on children's probability of grade retention. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 65(1), 11-23.
- Cho, R. M. (2009b). The impact of maternal imprisonment on children's educational achievement results from children in Chicago Public Schools. *Journal of Human Resources*, 44(3), 772-797.
- Cho, R.M. (2010). Maternal incarceration and children's adolescent outcomes: Timing and dosage. *Social Service Review*, 84(2), 257-282.
- Cho, R. M. (2011). Understanding the mechanism behind maternal imprisonment and adolescent school dropout. *Family Relations*, 60(3), 272-289.
- Cho, A., & Tasca, M. (2019). Disparities in Women's Prison Sentences: Exploring the Nexus Between Motherhood, Drug Offense, and Sentence Length. *Feminist Criminology*, 1557085118773434.
- Clear, T. R. (2008). The effects of high imprisonment rates on communities. *Crime and Justice*, 37(1), 97-132.
- Clear, T. R., Rose, D. R., Waring, E., & Scully, K. (2003). Coercive mobility and crime: A preliminary examination of concentrated incarceration and social disorganization. *Justice Quarterly*, 20(1), 33-64.
- Clear, T. (2007). *Imprisoning communities: How mass incarceration makes disadvantaged neighborhoods worse*. (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

- Cloward, R. A., & Lloyd, E. Ohlin. (1960). *Delinquency and opportunity: A theory of delinquent gangs*, A17.
- Collins, P. H. (2000). Gender, black feminism, and black political economy. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 568(1), 41-53.
- Collins, P. H. (2015). Intersectionality's definitional dilemmas. *Annual review of sociology*, 41, 1-20.
- Correa, N., Bhalakia, A., Van Horne, B., Hayes, A., Cupit, T., Kwarteng-Amaning, V., Lopez, K., Keefe, R., & Greely, C. (2019). *The forgotten families: A needs assessment on children with incarcerated parents in Harris County, Texas*. Texas Children's Hospital.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *u. Chi. Legal f.*, 139.
- D'Alessio, S. J., & Stolzenberg, L. (2003). Race and the probability of arrest. *Social forces*, 81(4), 1381-1397.
- Daly, K., & Bordt, R. L. (1995). Sex effects and sentencing: An analysis of the statistical literature. *Justice Quarterly*, 12(1), 141-175.
- Daly, K. (1987a). Discrimination in the criminal courts: Family, gender, and the problem of equal treatment. *Social Forces*, 66(1), 152-175.
- Daly, K. (1987b). Structure and practice of familial-based justice in a criminal court. *Law and Society Review*, 267-290.
- Daly, K. (1989a). Neither conflict nor labeling nor paternalism will suffice: Intersections of race, ethnicity, gender, and family in criminal court decisions. *Crime & Delinquency*, 35(1), 136-168.

- Daly, K. (1989b). Rethinking judicial paternalism: Gender, work-family relations, and sentencing. *Gender & Society*, 3(1), 9-36.
- Daly, K. (1998). Gender, crime, and criminology. *The handbook of crime and punishment*, 85-108.
- Davis, L., & Shlafer, R. J. (2017). Mental health of adolescents with currently and formerly incarcerated parents. *Journal of adolescence*, 54, 120-134.
- Demuth, S., & Steffensmeier, D. (2004a). Ethnicity effects on sentencing outcome in large urban courts: Comparisons among White, Black and Hispanic defendants. *Social Science Quarterly*, 85, 994-1011.
- Demuth, S., & Steffensmeier, D. (2004b). The impact of gender and race-ethnicity in the pretrial release process. *Social Problems*, 51(2), 222-242.
- Doerner, J. K., & Demuth, S. (2010). The independent and joint effects of race/ethnicity, gender, and age on sentencing outcomes in US federal courts. *Justice Quarterly*, 27(1), 1-27.
- Ferraro, K. J., & Moe, A. M. (2003). Mothering, crime, and incarceration. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 32(1), 9-40.
- Finkeldey, J. G., & Dennison, C. R. (2019). Multilevel effects of parental incarceration on adult children's neighborhood disadvantage. *Social Problems*.
- Foster, H., & Hagan, J. (2013). Maternal and paternal imprisonment in the stress process. *Social Science Research*, 42(3), 650-669.
- Foster, H., & Hagan, J. (2015). Punishment regimes and the multilevel effects of parental incarceration: Intergenerational, intersectional, and interinstitutional models of social inequality and systemic exclusion. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 41, 135-158.

- Freiburger, T. L. (2010). The effects of gender, family status, and race on sentencing decisions. *Behavioral sciences & the law*, 28(3), 378-395.
- Freiburger, T. L. (2011). The impact of gender, offense type, and familial role on the decision to incarcerate. *Social Justice Research*, 24(2), 143.
- Gabbidon, S. L. (2015). *Criminological perspectives on race and crime*. Routledge.
- Gabbidon, S. L., & Greene, H. T. (2018). *Race and crime*. Sage Publications.
- Garcia, J. (2016). Understanding the lives of mothers after incarceration: Moving beyond socially constructed definitions of motherhood. *Sociology Compass*, 10(1), 3-11.
- Garcia-Hallett, J. (2017). *The navigation of motherhood for African American, West Indian, and Hispanic women in reentry* (Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University-Graduate School-Newark).
- Garland, David, ed. *Mass imprisonment: Social causes and consequences*. Sage, 2001.
- Garry, A. (2011). Intersectionality, metaphors, and the multiplicity of gender. *Hypatia*, 26(4), 826-850.
- Gaston, S. (2016). The long-term effects of parental incarceration: Does parental incarceration in childhood or adolescence predict depressive symptoms in adulthood? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 43(8), 1056-1075.
- Geller, A., Garfinkel, I., Cooper, C. E., & Mincy, R. B. (2009). Parental incarceration and child well-being: implications for urban families. *Social science quarterly*, 90(5), 1186-1202.
- Geller, A. (2013). Paternal incarceration and father-child contact in fragile families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 75(5), 1288-1303.
- Gifford, E. J. (2019). How incarceration affects the health of communities and families. *North Carolina medical journal*, 80(6), 372-375.

- Gifford, E. J., Kozecke, L. E., Golonka, M., Hill, S. N., Costello, E. J., Shanahan, L., & Copeland, W. E. (2019). Association of Parental Incarceration With Psychiatric and Functional Outcomes of Young Adults. *JAMA network open*, 2(8).
- Glaze, L. E., & Maruschak, L. M. (2010). Parents in prison and their minor children (Report No. NCJ 222984). *Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics*.
- Gotsch, K. (2018). Families and mass incarceration. *The Sentencing Project*.
- Gramlich, J. (2019). The gap between the number of blacks and whites in prison is shrinking. *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/04/30/shrinking-gap-between-number-of-blacks-and-whites-in-prison/>
- Griffin, T., & Wooldredge, J. (2006). Sex-based disparities in felony dispositions before versus after sentencing reform in Ohio. *Criminology*, 44(4), 893-923.
- Hagan, J., & Foster, H. (2012). Children of the American Prison Generation: Student and School Spillover Effects of Incarcerating Mothers. *Law & Society Review*, 46(1), 37-69.
- Hagan, J., & Dinovitzer, R. (1999). Collateral consequences of imprisonment for children, communities, and prisoners. *Crime and justice*, 26, 121-162.
- Hanlon, T. E., Blatchley, R. J., Bennett-Sears, T., O'Grady, K. E., Rose, M., & Callaman, J. M. (2005). Vulnerability of children of incarcerated addict mothers: Implications for preventive intervention. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 27(1), 67-84
- Harm, N. J., & Thompson, P. (1997). Evaluating the effectiveness of parent education for incarcerated mothers. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 24, 135-152.
- Hartering-Saunders, R. M., Snyder, S., St. Vil, C., Rittner, B., Nochajski, T., Wieczorek, W. F., & Trouteaud, A. (2019). Mediators between victimization and offending among young

- men in the context of general strain theory. *Journal of Evidence-Based Social Work*, 16(4), 386-403.
- Heard, E., Fitzgerald, L., Wigginton, B., & Mutch, A. (2020). Applying intersectionality theory in health promotion research and practice. *Health promotion international*, 35(4), 866-876.
- Herring, T. (2020). Releasing people pretrial doesn't harm public safety. *Prison Policy Initiative*.
- Hill, G. D., & Crawford, E. M. (1990). Women, race, and crime. *Criminology*, 28(4), 601-626.
- Hindelang, M. J. (1978). Race and involvement in common law personal crimes. *American sociological review*, 93-109.
- Hinton, E., Henderson, L., & Reed, C. (2018). An unjust burden: The disparate treatment of black Americans in the criminal justice system. *Vera Institute of Justice*. May.
- Hiolski, K., Eisenberg, M. E., & Shlafer, R. J. (2019). Youth self-reported health and their experience of parental incarceration. *Families, Systems, & Health*, 37(1), 38.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). A control theory of delinquency. *Criminology theory: Selected classic readings, 1969*, 289-305.
- Holleran, D., & Spohn, C. (2004). On the use of the total incarceration variable in sentencing research. *Criminology*, 42(1), 211-240.
- Huebner, B. M., & Gustafson, R. (2007). The effect of maternal incarceration on adult offspring involvement in the criminal justice system. *Journal of Criminal justice*, 35(3), 283-296.
- Huizinga, D., Thornberry, T., Knight, K., Lovegrove, P., Loeber, R., Hill, K., & Farrington, D. P. (2007). *Disproportionate minority contact in the juvenile justice system: A study of differential minority arrest/referral to court in three cities: A report to the office of juvenile justice and delinquency prevention*. US Department of Justice, NCJRS.

- Jackson, R. D., & Motley, S. M. (2019). Offending, Gender, Race, and Ethnicity. *The Encyclopedia of Women and Crime*, 1-5.
- Johnston, D., & Sullivan, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Parental incarceration: personal accounts and developmental impact*. Routledge.
- Joint State Government Commission. (2011). The effects of parental incarceration on children: Needs and responsive services. Retrieved from <http://jsg.legis.state.pa.us/resources/documents/ftp/documents/children%20of%20incarcerated%20parents.pdf>
- Kaeble, D. & Cowhig, M. (2018). *Correctional Populations in the United States, 2016*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Kajstura, A. (2019). States of women's incarceration: The global context 2019. *Prison Policy Initiative*.
- Kajstura, A. (2018). States of women's incarceration: The global context 2018. *Prison Policy Initiative*.
- Kampfner, C. J. (1995). Post-traumatic stress reactions in children of imprisoned mothers. *Children of incarcerated parents*, 89-100.
- Kaufman, J. M., Rebellon, C. J., Thaxton, S., & Agnew, R. (2008). A general strain theory of racial differences in criminal offending. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 41(3), 421-437.
- Kjellstrand, J. M., & Eddy, J. M. (2011). Parental incarceration during childhood, family context, and youth problem behavior across adolescence. *Journal of offender rehabilitation*, 50(1), 18-36.

- Kochel, T. R., Wilson, D. B., & Mastrofski, S. D. (2011). Effect of suspect race on officers' arrest decisions. *Criminology*, *49*(2), 473-512.
- Kopak, A. M., & Smith-Ruiz, D. (2016). Criminal justice involvement, drug use, and depression among African American children of incarcerated parents. *Race and Justice*, *6*(2), 89-116.
- Kornhauser, R. R. (1978). Social sources of delinquency: An appraisal of analytic models.
- Kramer, K. and the Children of Incarcerated Parents Jail Survey Teams. (2016). *Children, parents and incarceration: Descriptive overview of data from Alameda and San Francisco county jails*. Retrieved from:
<https://sfgov.org/sfentry/sites/default/files/Documents/CIP%20Jail%20Survey%20-%20Executive%20Summary%20FINAL%203.26.16.pdf>
- Lamb, K. A., & Dorsey, R. (2014). Survey of incarcerated parents in Ohio prisons. Retrieved from <https://drc.ohio.gov/Portals/0/Planning%20and%20Evaluations/SurveyofIncarceratedParents2015.pdf?ver=2016-08-03-101712-813>
- Lee, R. D., Fang, X., & Luo, F. (2013). The impact of parental incarceration on the physical and mental health of young adults. *Pediatrics*, *131*(4), e1188-e1195.
- López, N., Erwin, C., Binder, M., & Chavez, M. J. (2018). Making the invisible visible: Advancing quantitative methods in higher education using critical race theory and intersectionality. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *21*(2), 180-207.
- Martin, E. (2017). Hidden consequences: The impact of incarceration on dependent children. *National Institute of Justice Journal*, *278*, 1-7.
- McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of women in culture and society*, *30*(3), 1771-1800.

- Maruschak, L. M., Bronson, J., & Alpher, M.A. (2021). Survey of Prison Inmates 2016: Parents in prison and their minor children (Report No. NCJ 252645). *Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.*
- Mears, D. P., Cochran, J. C., & Lindsey, A. M. (2016). Offending and racial and ethnic disparities in criminal justice: A conceptual framework for guiding theory and research and informing policy. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 32*(1), 78-103.
- Merton, R. K. (1938). Social structure and anomie. *American sociological review, 3*(5), 672-682.
- Messner, S. F., & Rosenfeld, R. (2012). *Crime and the American dream.* Cengage Learning.
- Miller, H. V., & Barnes, J. C. (2015). The association between parental incarceration and health, education, and economic outcomes in young adulthood. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 40*(4), 765-784.
- Monsbakken, C. W., Lyngstad, T. H., & Skardhamar, T. (2013). Crime and the transition to parenthood: The role of sex and relationship context. *British Journal of Criminology, 53*(1), 129-148.
- Muftic, L.R., Bouffard, L.A., & Armstrong, G.A. (2016). Impact of maternal incarceration on criminal justice involvement of adult offspring: A research note. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 53*(1), 93-111.
- Muhammad, B. M. (2018). Against all odds: resilient children of incarcerated parents. *Contemporary Research and Analysis on the Children of Prisoners: Invisible Children, 141.*
- Mumola, C. J. (1999). *Incarcerated parents and their children.* Bureau of Justice Statistics. *Special Report.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

- Murray, J., & Farrington, D. P. (2005). Parental imprisonment: effects on boys' antisocial behaviour and delinquency through the life-course. *Journal of Child Psychology and psychiatry*, 46(12), 1269-1278.
- Murray, J., & Farrington, D. P. (2008). The effects of parental imprisonment on children. *Crime and justice*, 37(1), 133-206.
- Murray, J., & Murray, L. (2010). Parental incarceration, attachment and child psychopathology. *Attachment & human development*, 12(4), 289-309.
- Murray, J., Farrington, D. P., & Sekol, I. (2012). Children's antisocial behavior, mental health, drug use, and educational performance after parental incarceration: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *American Psychological Association*, 138(2), 175-210.
- Murray, J., Janson, C. G., & 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.
- Murphey, D., & Cooper, P.M. (2015). Parents behind bars: What happens to their children? *Child Trends*. Retrieved from <https://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/2015-42ParentsBehindBars.pdf>
- Nagel, I. H., & Hagan, J. (1983). Gender and crime: Offense patterns and criminal court sanctions. *Crime and justice*, 4, 91-144.
- Nagel, I. H., & Johnson, B. L. (1994). The role of gender in a structured sentencing system: Equal treatment, policy choices, and the sentencing of female offenders under the United States sentencing guidelines. *J. Crim. L. & Criminology*, 85, 181.
- Nellis, A. (2016). The color of justice: Racial and ethnic disparity in state prisons. The Sentencing Project.

- Nesmith, A., & Ruhland, E. (2008). Children of incarcerated parents: Challenges and resiliency, in their own words. *Children and Youth Services Review, 30*(10), 1119-1130.
- New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services. (2013). Children of incarcerated parents in New York state. Retrieved from [http://www.criminaljustice .ny.gov/pio/2013-children-with-inarcerated-parents-report.pdf](http://www.criminaljustice.ny.gov/pio/2013-children-with-inarcerated-parents-report.pdf)
- Norris, S., Pecenco, M., & Weaver, J. (2018). *The Effects of Parental and Sibling Incarceration: Evidence from Ohio*. Working paper.
- Novero, C.M., Loper A., & Warren, J.I. (2011). Second-generation prisoners: adjustment patterns for inmates with a history of parental incarceration. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 38*(8), 761-778.
- Nutt, L. M., Deaton, D., & Hutchinson, T. (2008). Children and families of incarcerated parents: A demographic status report and survey. Nashville, TN: Tennessee Department of Correction Policy, Planning and Research Unit.
- Owusu-Bempah, A. (2017). Race and policing in historical context: Dehumanization and the policing of Black people in the 21st century. *Theoretical Criminology, 21*(1), 23-34.
- Pager, D. (2003). The mark of a criminal record. *American journal of sociology, 108*(5), 937-975.
- Pager, D., Bonikowski, B., & Western, B. (2009). Discrimination in a low-wage labor market: A field experiment. *American sociological review, 74*(5), 777-799.
- Paik, L. (2017). Critical perspectives on intersectionality and criminology: Introduction. *Theoretical Criminology, 21*(1), 4-10.
- Peck, J. H. (2016). Contemporary issues of race/ethnicity, offending behavior, and justice responses.

- Piquero, A. R., & Brame, R. W. (2008). Assessing the race–crime and ethnicity–crime relationship in a sample of serious adolescent delinquents. *Crime & Delinquency*, *54*(3), 390-422.
- Piquero, N. L., & Sealock, M. D. (2000). Generalizing general strain theory: An examination of an offending population. *Justice Quarterly*, *17*(3), 449-484.
- Piquero, A. R. (2015). Understanding race/ethnicity differences in offending across the life course: Gaps and opportunities. *Journal of developmental and life-course criminology*, *1*(1), 21-32.
- Poehlmann-Tynan, J., Muentner, L., Pritzl, K., Cuthrell, H., Hindt, L. A., Davis, L., & Schlafer, R. (2021). The Health and Development of Young Children Who Witnessed Their Parent’s Arrest Prior to Parental Jail Incarceration. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18*(9), 4512.
- Poehlmann-Tynan, J., Cuthrell, H., Weymouth, L., Burnson, C., Frerks, L., Muentner, L., & Schlafer, R. (2020). Multisite randomized efficacy trial of educational materials for young children with incarcerated parents. *Development and Psychopathology*, 1-17.
- Poehlmann, J. (2005). Representations of attachment relationships in children of incarcerated mothers. *Child development*, *76*(3), 679-696.
- Poehlmann-Tynan, J., & Eddy, J. M. (2019). A research and intervention agenda for children with incarcerated parents and their families. In *Handbook on children with incarcerated parents* (pp. 353-371). Springer, Cham.
- Pollak, O. (1950). *The criminality of women*. University of Pennsylvania Press
- Pollock, J. M. (1999). *Criminal women*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

- Potter, H. (2015). *Intersectionality and criminology: Disrupting and revolutionizing studies of crime*. Routledge.
- Rodriguez, S., Curry, T. R., & Lee, G. (2006). Gender differences in criminal sentencing: Do effects vary across violent, property, and drug offenses?. *Social Science Quarterly*, 87(2), 318-339.
- Rodriguez, K. L., Schwartz, J. L., Lahman, M. K., & Geist, M. R. (2011). Culturally responsive focus groups: Reframing the research experience to focus on participants. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 10(4), 400-417.
- Rodriguez, S.F, Curry, T. R., & Lee, G. (2006). Gender differences in criminal sentencing: Do effects vary across violent, property, and drug offenses?. *Social Science Quarterly*, 87(2), 318-339.
- Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (2003). Life-course desisters? Trajectories of crime among delinquent boys followed to age 70. *Criminology*, 41(3), 555-592.
- Sampson, R. J., & Lauritsen, J. L. (1997). Racial and ethnic disparities in crime and criminal justice in the United States. *Crime and justice*, 21, 311-374.
- Sawyer, W. & Wagner, P. (2019). Mass incarceration: The whole pie 2018. *Prison policy initiative*.
- Sawyer, W. & Wagner, P. (2020). Mass incarceration: The whole pie 2020. *Prison policy initiative*.
- Schwartz, J., Steffensmeier, D., Zhong, H., & Ackerman, J. (2009). Trends in the gender gap in violence: Reevaluating NCVS and other evidence. *Criminology*, 47, 401.
- Shlafer, R. & Saunders, J.B. (2017). Parents in Minnesota jails and their minor children. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

- Siegel, J. A., & Luther, K. (2019). Qualitative Research on Children of Incarcerated Parents: Findings, Challenges, and Future Directions. In *Handbook on Children with Incarcerated Parents* (pp. 149-163). Springer, Cham.
- Spohn, C. (1999). Gender and sentencing of drug offenders: Is chivalry dead? *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 9(3-4), 365-399.
- Spohn, C., & Beichner, D. (2000). Is preferential treatment of female offenders a thing of the past? A multisite study of gender, race, and imprisonment. *Criminal justice policy review*, 11(2), 149-184.
- Steinmetz, K. F., & Henderson, H. (2015). On the precipice of intersectionality: The influence of race, gender, and offense severity interactions on probation outcomes. *Criminal Justice Review*, 40(3), 361-377.
- Subramanian, R., Delaney, R., Roberts, S., Fishman, N., & McGarry, P. (2015). Incarceration's front door: The misuse of jails in America.
- Swisher, R. R., & Shaw-Smith, U. R. (2015). Paternal incarceration and adolescent well-being: Life course contingencies and other moderators. *The Journal of criminal law & criminology*, 104(4).
- Tasca, M., Cho, A., Spohn, C., & Rodriguez, N. (2019). The Role of Parental Status and Involvement in Sentence Length Decisions: A Comparison of Men and Women Sentenced to Prison. *Crime & Delinquency*, 0011128718811929.
- Tasca, M., Rodriguez, N., & Zatz, M. S. (2011). Family and residential instability in the context of paternal and maternal incarceration. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 38(3), 231-247.
- The Pew Charitable Trusts (2010). *Collateral Costs: Incarceration's Effect on Economic Mobility*. Washington, DC: The Pew Charitable Trusts

- Thomas, P., Kelly, J., & Simpson, T. (2020). ABC news analysis of police arrests nationwide reveals stark racial disparity. *ABC News*. Retrieved from <https://abcnews.go.com/US/abc-news-analysis-police-arrests-nationwide-reveals-stark/story?id=71188546>
- Threadcraft-Walker, W., Threadcraft, M. M., Henderson, H., & Rembert, D. (2018). Gender, race/ethnicity and prediction: Risk in behavioral assessment. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 54(C), 12-19.
- Tonry, M. (1995). *Malign neglect: Race, crime, and punishment in America*. Oxford University Press.
- Tonry, M., & Melewsiki, M. (2008). The malign effects of drug and crime control policies on black Americans. *Crime and justice*, 37(1), 1-44.
- Trice, A. D., & Brewster, J. (2004). The effects of maternal incarceration on adolescent children. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 19(1), 27-35.
- Turney, K., & Haskins, A. R. (2019). Parental Incarceration and Children's Well-being: Findings from the Fragile Families and Child Well-being Study. In *Handbook on Children with Incarcerated Parents* (pp. 53-64). Springer, Cham.
- Turney, K., & Haskins, A. R. (2014). Falling behind? Children's early grade retention after paternal incarceration. *Sociology of Education*, 87(4), 241-258.
- Turney, K., & Wildeman, C. (2013). Redefining relationships: Explaining the countervailing consequences of paternal incarceration for parenting. *American Sociological Review*, 78(6), 949-979.
- Ulmer, J. T., & Steffensmeier, D. J. (2014). The age and crime relationship: Social variation, social explanations. In *The nurture versus biosocial debate in criminology: On the origins of criminal behavior and criminality* (pp. 377-396). SAGE Publications Inc.

- Unnever, J., Owusu-Bempah, A., & Deryol, R. (2019). A Test of the Differential Involvement Hypothesis. *Race and Justice*, 9(2), 197-224.
- Unnever, J. D., & Gabbidon, S. L. (2011). *A theory of African American offending: Race, racism, and crime*. Routledge
- Van De Weijer, S. G., Smallbone, H. S., & Bouwman, V. (2018). Parental imprisonment and premature mortality in adulthood. *Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology*, 4(2), 148-161.
- Wagner, P., & Sawyer, W. (2018). States of incarceration: The global context 2018. *Prison Policy Initiative*, 6.
- Wakefield, S., & Montagnet, C. (2019). Parental Criminal Justice Involvement. In *Handbook on Children with Incarcerated Parents* (pp. 25-35). Springer, Cham.
- Wakefield, S., & Wildeman, C. (2013). *Children of the prison boom: Mass incarceration and the future of American inequality*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Wakefield, S., & Uggen, C. (2010). Incarceration and stratification. *Annual review of sociology*, 36, 387-406.
- Walker, S., Spohn, C., & DeLone, M. (2017). *The color of justice: Race, ethnicity, and crime in America*. Cengage Learning. 6th edition
- Western, B. (2018). *Homeward: Life in the year after prison*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Western, B., & Wildeman, C. (2009). The black family and mass incarceration. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 621, 221-242.
- Western, B., & Pettit, B. (2010). Incarceration & social inequality. *Daedalus*, 139(3), 8-19.

- Whitten, T., Burton, M., Tzoumakis, S., & Dean, K. (2019). Parental offending and child physical health, mental health, and drug use outcomes: a systematic literature review. *Journal of child and family studies, 28*(5), 1155-1168.
- Wildeman, C. (2009). Parental imprisonment, the prison boom, and the concentration of childhood disadvantage. *Demography, 46*(2), 265-280.
- Wildeman, C., Goldman, A. W., & Turney, K. (2018). Parental incarceration and child health in the United States. *Epidemiologic reviews, 40*(1), 146-156.
- Wildeman, C., & Turney, K. (2014). Positive, negative, or null? The effects of maternal incarceration on children's behavioral problems. *Demography, 51*(3), 1041-1068.
- Wildeman, C., Haskins, A. R., & Poehlmann-Tynan, J. (2018). Introduction: Invigorating research and practice on children of incarcerated parents. In C. Wildeman, A. R. Haskins, & J. Poehlmann-Tynan (Eds.), *APA Bronfenbrenner series on the ecology of human development. When parents are incarcerated: Interdisciplinary research and interventions to support children* (pp. 3-8). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.
- Wildeman, C., & Western, B. (2010). Incarceration in fragile families. *The future of children, 157-177*.
- Wilper, A. P., Woolhandler, S., Boyd, J. W., Lasser, K. E., McCormick, D., Bor, D. H., & Himmelstein, D. U. (2009). The health and health care of US prisoners: results of a nationwide survey. *American journal of public health, 99*(4), 666-672.
- Young, V. D. (1980). Women, race, and crime. *Criminology, 18*(1), 26-34.
- Zeng, Z. (2019). *Correctional Jail Inmates in 2017*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Zeng, Z. (2020). *Correctional Jail Inmates in 2018*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Zhang, J., & Flynn, C. (2019). University students/graduates who have experienced parental incarceration: A qualitative exploratory study of protective processes. *Qualitative Social Work*, 1473325019888007.