The Prison Effect: Consequences of Mass Incarceration for the U.S.
Welcome and Introductions

Therese McGuire

IPR Faculty Fellow,
Professor of Strategy and Management,
Kellogg School of Management,
Northwestern University
Presentations

“Prisoner Re-entry: The Problems of Employment”
by Devah Pager

“Children with Fathers in Prison and Their Transition to Adulthood”
by John Hagan

“The Disenfranchisement and Civic Reintegration of Felons”
by Jeff Manza
“Prisoner Re-entry: The Problems of Employment”

Devah Pager
Associate, Office of Population Research,
Assistant Professor of Sociology,
Princeton University
Prisoner Reentry and the Problems of Employment

Devah Pager
Department of Sociology
Princeton University
Incarceration Rates for Selected Countries, 1999

- U.S.A. total
- South Africa
- England & Wales
- Canada
- Spain
- Australia
- Germany
- France
- Italy
- Austria
- Switzerland
- Belgium
- Ireland
- Sweden
- Japan

Rate per 100,000 residents
Offense Types for Felony Convictions in State Courts, 2002

- 32.4%
- 14.8%
- 3.1%
- 18.8%
- 30.9%
Figure 1. Sentenced Prisoners Admitted and Released from State and Federal Prisons, 1977–98

Prisoner Reentry

- Of the 2 million individuals currently incarcerated, more than 95% will be released.
- Over half a million individuals are released from prison each year.
- Consequences for employment, housing, families, political participation, among others.
The Case of Employment

• Legal restrictions on ex-offenders
  – occupational licensure
  – public sector employment

• Criminal stigma
  – employers are reluctant to hire individuals with criminal pasts
Matched Pair Test of Employment Discrimination
The Effect of a Criminal Record for Black and White Job Applicants in Milwaukee

![Graph showing the percent called back for Black and White applicants with and without a criminal record.]

- **Black Applicants**: 5% with a record, 14% without a record.
- **White Applicants**: 17% with a record, 34% without a record.
The Effect of a Criminal Record for Black and White Job Applicants in New York

- **Criminal Record (HS)**
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### Positive Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Record (HS)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Record</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

• Strong evidence of discrimination against minorities and ex-offenders

• Racial dimensions of prisoner reentry must be considered

• Implications for public safety
Policy Implications

- **Alternatives to Incarceration**
  - Prevention, treatment, community supervision
  - Drug courts

- **Availability of criminal background information**
  - Private services
  - Expungement/sealing of records
  - Certificates of rehabilitation

- **Assistance in transition from prison to home**
  - Education and training
  - Intermediaries
  - Support and supervision
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Figure 1. Incarceration Rates in the United States, 1925-2001

Figure 2. Numbers of Incarcerated Men and Women in the United States, 1925-2001

Numbers in Millions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number (thousands)</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>1366</td>
<td>1526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of all children</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number (thousands)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of all white children</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number (thousands)</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of all black children</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number (thousands)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of all Hispanic children</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Percent of Young Adults with an Incarcerated Father in the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health

- 12% incarcerated fathers
- 88% non-incarcerated fathers
Figure 3. Conceptual Model of Intergenerational Disconnection

- Father Imprisoned
- Paternal Absence
- Other Paternal Characteristics
- Early Adulthood Educational Attainment
- Child Control Variables
- Early Adult Disconnection
  - Political Disengagement
  - Homelessness
  - Health Care Uninsured
Table 2. Heightened Odds of Early Adulthood Disconnection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homeless</th>
<th>Healthcare Uninsured</th>
<th>Politically Disengaged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium vs. Low</td>
<td>High vs. Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Imprisoned</td>
<td>3.34 ***</td>
<td>2.00 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.96 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†p≤.10 *p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001
Figure 5. Conceptual Model of Homelessness Among Females

- Father Imprisoned
- Paternal Absence
- Other Paternal Characteristics
- Sexual Abuse
- Homelessness
- Child Control Variables
Table 3. Heightened Odds of Females’ Childhood Sexual Abuse and Early Adult Homelessness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sexually Abused</th>
<th>Homelessness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father Imprisoned</td>
<td>1.99*</td>
<td>3.07***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .10  **p ≤ .05  ***p ≤ .01  ****p ≤ .001
Summary/ Conclusions

• The proportion of children with imprisoned fathers is increasing:
  
  – 12 percent of U.S. youth in a national survey report their fathers served time in jail or prison.

  – the second generation children of first generation imprisoned fathers are now moving to and through adulthood.
Summary/ Conclusions

• The children of imprisoned fathers are at heightened risk of institutional disconnection:
  – compared to other youth, children of imprisoned fathers are more than three times more likely to be homeless
  – twice as likely to be without healthcare insurance
  – nearly two times more likely to be politically disengaged
Summary/ Conclusions

- Young adults’ institutional disconnection is explained by their lower educational attainment, apart from the low education and high risk profiles of their fathers.

- Daughters of incarcerated fathers are at special risk of sexual abuse and resulting homelessness.
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Felon Disenfranchisement Restrictions - 2004

Disenfranchisement Restrictions

- No Restriction
- Inmates Only
- Inmates and Parolees
- Inmates, Parolees, and Probationers
- Inmates, Parolees, Probationers, and Some or All Ex-Felons
Disenfranchisement in 2004

- 5.4 million disenfranchised felons in the U.S. (2.5% of the voting age population)

- 2 million African Americans (8% of the African American VAP)

- Prison, Parole, and Probation Straightforward

- Ex-felon estimates based on state-level exit data, *adjusted* for mortality and recidivism to avoid double-counting

- Jail inmates (excepted convicted felons) *not* included in total – over 600,000
Total Felon Disenfranchisement as Percentage of Voting Age Population

by State, 2004
African American Felon Disenfranchisement as Percentage of African American Voting Age Population

by State, 2004

African American Disenfranchisement Rates - 2004
Disenfranchised as Percentage of African American State Population
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Estimated Distribution of Legally Disenfranchised Felons in the U.S.

- Ex-Felons (1,609,710) 35%
- Convicted Felony Jail (56,410) 1%
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Graph showing the distribution of illegally disenfranchised felons in the U.S.
Prisoner Voting Rights Around the World

Europe:

• **No Restrictions:** Bosnia, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Iceland, Ireland, Finland, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Netherlands, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine

• **Selective Restrictions:** Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Malta, Norway, San Marino

• **Total Ban on Current Prisoners:** Armenia, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Luxembourg, Romania, Russia, United Kingdom

Elsewhere:

• **No Restrictions:** South Africa, Canada

• **Selective Restrictions:** Australia, New Zealand
Timeline of Statehood and Disenfranchisement Laws

Adoption of First Disenfranchisement Laws

- Brown: 1818 - 1864
- Dark Brown: 1865 - 1899
- Light Brown: 1900 - 2000

State Information

- Disenfranchisement
- Not yet a State
- Occurred within One Year of Statehood
- No Disenfranchisement Laws

Timeline:
- 1787 to 1864
- 1865 to 1899
- 1900 to 2000
History: Percentage of States Disenfranchising Felons and Ex-Felons, 1788-2002

1. 14th and 15th Amendments (1868, 1870)
2. 19th Amendment (1920)
3. Civil Rights Act (1964) and Voting Rights Act (1965)
## Estimated Turnout and Party Preference of Disenfranchised Felons (National Results)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Turnout</th>
<th>% Dem.</th>
<th>Turnout</th>
<th>% Dem.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>McGovern</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Mondale</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Dukakis</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Gore</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Opinion

Does the public support felon disenfranchisement?

• Two master trends:
  * rising support for civil liberties and civil rights
  * public support for harsh criminal justice policies
Percentage Supporting Enfranchisement of Probationers, Parolees, and Prisoners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Current Felons</th>
<th>Percentage Supporting Enfranchisement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probationers1 (N = 206)</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probationers2 (N = 228)</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parolees (N = 240)</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners (N = 235)</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage Supporting Enfranchisement of Generic and Specific Categories of Ex-felons

- Generic (N = 232): 80%
- White-Collar (N = 239): 63%
- Violent Crime (N = 247): 66%
- Sex Crime (N = 234): 52%
Interview #1

- I think that just getting back in the community and being a contributing member is difficult enough…. And saying, “Yeah, we don’t value your vote either because you’re a convicted felon from how many years back,” okay? … But I, hopefully, have learned, have paid for that and would like to someday feel like a, quote, “normal citizen,” a contributing member of society, and you know that’s hard when every election you’re constantly being reminded, “oh yeah, that’s right, I’m ashamed.” … It’s just like a little salt in the wound. You’ve already got that wound and it’s trying to heal and it’s trying to heal, and you’re trying to be a good taxpayer and be a homeowner. … Just one little vote, right? But that means a lot to me. … It’s just loss after loss after loss. And this is just another one. Another to add to the pile. … You can’t really feel like a part of your government because they’re still going like this, “Oh, you’re bad. Remember what you did way back then? Nope, you can’t vote.” (female prisoner, age 49).
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