

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]

**AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE OVERREPRESENTATION
OF INCARCERATED AFRICAN AMERICAN MALES**

**A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty
Of the Ethelyn R. Strong School of Social Work**

Norfolk State University

**In partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of**

DOCTOR OF SOCIAL WORK

By

Dianne Davis-Wagner

Norfolk, Virginia

May 2000

UMI Number: 9974725

Copyright 2000 by
Davis-Wagner, Dianne LaVerne

All rights reserved.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 9974725

Copyright 2000 by Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company.
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

**AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE OVERREPRESENTATION
OF INCARCERATED AFRICAN AMERICAN MALES**

By

Dianne Davis-Wagner

Approved by:

Signature

Dianne G. Wagner

May 26, 2000
Date

Signature

Dianne R. Harvey

May 26, 2000
Date

Signature

Martha Harvey Sawyer

May 26, 2000
Date

Signature

Anthony M. Sherman

May 26, 2000
Date

Signature

Otto L. Womble

May 26, 2000
Date

ABSTRACT

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE OVERREPRESENTATION OF INCARCERATED AFRICAN AMERICAN MALES IN LOCAL JAILS

By

Diane L. Davis-Wagner

A within group study of the overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males in local jails was conducted using variables consisting of structural influences as measured by family structure, educational experiences, and employment experiences as possible contributors to this occurrence. Merton's Theory of Social Structure and Anomie and Cloward and Ohlins' Opportunity Theory provided the theoretical basis for this study. Secondary data obtained from the 1996 Bureau of Justice Statistics Survey of Local Jail Inmates was used. A sub-sample of 864 African American male inmates 18–29 representing 47.03% of the total population of African American males in the jail survey sample was used for this research. Responses to selected items on the socioeconomic section of the survey instrument were analyzed using descriptive and chi square statistical measures. The results did not support the three null hypotheses. Significant differences were found between family structure and highest grade attended, employment and highest grade attended; employment and yearly income. The implications from these findings suggest that African American males in the age group 18–29, despite their probability for employment and increased educational status, are at higher risk for underemployment/unemployment and low income. Consequently, it is suggested that these structural influences may provide an important link to the causes of disproportionate imprisonment among African American males. The findings provide preliminary evidence of these issues.

Additional research is needed to obtain increased statistical support in the relationship between structural influences and the overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males.

Copyright 2000 Dianne Davis-Wagner. All Rights Reserved.

DEDICATION

Dedicated to my beloved father, Howard L. Davis.

He provided a stable and loving home environment for our family. His love made it possible for me to be successful in life. Thank you.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to first give honor and glory to God almighty who provided me with the strength, guidance, and wisdom for this endeavor.

I owe a great deal of gratitude to thank Dr. Douglas Glasgow, my dissertation committee chairman, who shared his scholarly knowledge through enlightening discussion that stimulated me to successfully complete this dissertation. His inspiring influence and insight as a scholar were invaluable to me in my growth and development as a doctoral student.

I would also like to acknowledge the many ideas and suggestions provided to me by my committee members, Dr. Martha Bracey-Sawyer, Dr. Anthony Sherman, Dr. Otha Wright, and Dr. Amnifu Harvey.

To my friends, Cecile Davis, Dr. Margaret Buxton, and La Cretia White, thank you for your constant and continuous support and for being my friends. Thank you for your encouragement.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the contributions of my immediate and extended family, for without them I would not be where I am today. To my devoted and loving husband, Joel, thanks for providing me with encouragement and the financial resources needed to complete my doctoral education. During long absences from home, you were there to care for our children and to make sure their needs were met. A very special thanks to my children, Joel and Lauren. In your own way, you challenged me to persevere until I reached my goal. Words cannot express how much my mother, Helen V. Davis, has meant to me not only through this process, but since I entered this world. She has always been there for me. She has been my rock, a source of strength and

encouragement which has nurtured me in the spirit of love that only a mother can provide. Without her daily pep talks, I would not have come this far. Also, my dear sister, Carolyn Kelly, who has been my foundation every step of the way. Thanks, "C," for the wonderful gourmet meals that you prepared for my family when I was too tired to cook. My brother-in-law, James Kelly, has been a blessing in devoting countless hours preparing the statistical tables for this research study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
DEDICATION	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xi
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Imprisonment and Family Disruption	2
Imprisonment and Educational Barriers	3
Imprisonment, Employment and Other Social Problems	4
Statement of the Problem	7
Significance of the Study	7
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	9
Theoretical Framework	9
Factors and Forces Driving African American Male	
Overrepresentation in Prisons	13
Family Structure	16
Education	21
Employment Experiences	32
Studies Examining Criminal Justice Characteristics and	
Influences on Overrepresentation of Incarcerated African	
American Males	35
Summary	36
3. METHODOLOGY	38
Study Questions	38
Measures	39
Design of the Study	40
Sample Population Used in the Bureau of Justice Statistics Study	41
Study Sample	41
Data Collection Procedures	43
Measurement Instrument	44
Data Analysis	45
Ethical Issues	46

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
4. RESULTS	47
Characteristics of Study	48
Additional Descriptive Findings	54
Income	58
Additional Correlation of Findings	58
Statistical and Practical Significance	68
Unexpected Descriptive Findings	69
Relationship Findings	70
5. DISCUSSION	72
Summary of the Study	72
Discussion	73
Application to Social Work Practice	80
Limitations of the Study	82
REFERENCES	84
 APPENDICES	
A. Survey Instrument	102
B. Table of Missing Data	125
C. Age of Respondents' Children	163
D. Frequency of Communication by Children of the Respondents	169
VITA	171

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Gender of the 1996 Population Sample of Jail Inmates	41
2. Profile of Population Sample and Study Group - 1996 Jail Survey	43
3. Age Distribution of African American Male Sample Population	48
4. Age Distributions of African American Males in the Study Group	49
5. Respondents' Living Arrangements While Growing Up	50
6. Highest Grade Attended by Respondents	51
7. Highest Grade Completed by Respondents	51
8. Percentage of Respondents with GED or High School Diploma	52
9. Percentage of Respondents Working in a Job or Business Prior to Incarceration	53
10. Employment Status Full Time, Part Time, or Occasional Work by Respondent	53
11. Looking for Work by Respondents	54
12. Income by Respondents Prior to Incarceration	55
13. Number of Children by Respondents	55
14. Biological, Adopted and Stepchildren Living with Respondents Prior to their Incarceration	56
15. Living Arrangements of Respondents' Children at the Time They Were Admitted to Jail	57
16. Source of Income By Respondents	58
17. Relationship Between Family Structure and Educational Experience	61
18. Relationship Between Education and Employment	63

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table		Page
19.	Relationship Between Obtaining a GED or High School Diploma and Employment Status	65
20.	Relationship Between Income and Employment Prior to Incarceration	67
C1.	Age of First Child	164
C2.	Age of Second Child	165
C3.	Age of Third Child	166
C4.	Age of Fourth Child	167
C5.	Age of Fifth Child	168
D1.	Frequency of Mail Correspondence by Children of Respondents	170
D2.	Frequency of Visitation by Children of Respondents	170

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

African American males are increasingly overrepresented among the population of prison and jail inmates across the United States. The concept of overrepresentation refers to the disproportionate rates of imprisonment of African American males. The overrepresentation is out of proportion to the overall population of inmates and the general population of African American males in the United States. This trend towards high rates of imprisoned African American males is not a new occurrence but one that has persisted since the 1980's (Torney, 1995; Mauer, 1999).

The Sentencing Project, along with other research studies, reported that African American males comprise the greatest population of prison and jail inmates in the United States (The Virginian Pilot, 2000; Lotke, 1998; Mumola & Beck, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1997; Mauer, 1999, 1995, 1994; Marable, 1995; Gilliard & Beck, 1996). These researchers state that from 1980–1999, rates of imprisonment for African American males has steadily increased in a pattern much higher than that of their white counterparts.

The boom in the prison population of African American males has created devastating consequences in all aspects of society. Given the severity and impact of this problem, very little information exists in the social work literature addressing the causes creating this disparity. The need to study this issue from a social work perspective is compounded by the fact that the function of the profession is to provide services for disenfranchised populations, maintain social justice, and alleviate discrimination. This problem figures prominently in the scope and intent of social work practice, along with the consequences associated with the disproportionate representation of incarcerated

African American males. Hence, this research is driven by a deep concern to examine the issues contributing to the overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males from a social work perspective.

To understand the magnitude of this problem, a brief discussion of some of the institutions effected by the overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males is presented in the following section.

Imprisonment and Family Disruption

The impact of the overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males is so widespread that it can be felt in all aspects of society, beginning with the families they leave behind. The family represents one of the most fundamental institutions involved in shaping an individual's life (Reiss, 1994). In most instances, African American males are incarcerated during the most productive years of their lives, at a time when they may have young families and are beginning their employment careers. Removing them from their families at this stage in their lives has enormous effects and adverse consequences on their families.

The loss of income represents one of the more visible consequences confronting the families of imprisoned African American males. Many of these men represent a source of financial support for their immediate and extended families. Regardless of the level of support they provided, the loss of income in most instances places a tremendous financial burden on the families that are left behind. Typically under these circumstances, females within the family unit must bear the responsibility of sole financial provider, which changes the formation and conditions of the family structure. According to some experts, the rise in the rate of incarcerated African American males is one of the

generate the same kind of economic rewards as whites (Mauer, 1995). Far too many African American males are disenfranchised from obtaining a quality education, which would allow them to compete and become gainfully employed in a global marketplace. Education is perceived as an almost guaranteed route to success. In many cases, African American males are confronted with a negative school environment, which often forces them to drop out and to become either victims or perpetrators of crime.

Imprisonment, Employment and Other Social Problems

The impact of high rates of incarceration among African American males creates yet another social problem, and that is the loss of a potentially skilled labor workforce. Historically, from the arrival of the first slave ship, America benefited from the skills of African American slaves. Particularly, African American slaves who contributed significantly to the reconstruction of the country. Various scholars have observed, since urbanization took hold in this country in the 1960's, that African American males have been particularly hard hit in urban areas due to the elimination of manufacturing jobs (McAdoo, 1997; Wilson, 1996). African American males continue to represent a vast human capital in terms of their labor and expertise. According to Clear (1996), these skills are necessary to maintain healthy neighborhoods. He maintains that the removal of large numbers of African American males from their communities as a result of imprisonment represents a tremendous loss in potential day care providers, elder care givers, and other wage earning positions, which seriously disrupts their communities and neighborhoods.

An equally disturbing trend emerging from the disproportionate representation of incarcerated African American males is their removal in large numbers from participation

in the political process. Because of felony disenfranchisement laws, several states (including Virginia) have permanently eliminated one in four black men from the voting process (Sizemore, 2000). According to some experts, an estimated 14%, or roughly 1 in 7, of the 10.4 million voting age African American males are excluded from participating in the voting process. This is due to their involvement in the criminal justice system either as inmates, as parolees, or due to their probationary status (Mauer, 1995; Lee, 1997; Siegal, 1997).

Data compiled by the Sentencing Project and Human Rights Watch (1998) revealed that of the 1.4 million African American men who are either in prison, on probation or parole, an estimate of 13% could not vote in the 1998 elections. These numbers represent a sizeable block of individuals who have no political influence on their communities or the policies that will shape the future of their children.

A final negative effect related to the large-scale imprisonment of African American males is the further devaluing of African American males in the United States. Imprisonment creates yet another mark of oppression for African American males that is difficult, if not impossible, to cast off once they have “served their time” and are ready to re-enter society. The stigma attached to being an ex-convict, combined with being an African American male, further decreases and often destroys their access to mainstream opportunities and the means for attaining success. As a result, they are restricted from becoming productive members of society.

During the past decade, much has been said about the increasing numbers of imprisoned African American males but little attention is given to the causes creating this disparity. One approach towards responding to this need is to examine the role of

structural influences as a factor in the disproportionate representation of incarcerated African American males. Structural explanations of criminal behavior express the idea that crime is caused by poverty and economic inequality (Krisberg, Schwartz, Fishman, Eiskovits, & Guttman, 1986; Pfhol, 1994). During the 1950's through the 1970's, the structural perspective was widely used as a framework for explaining crime and deviance (Pfhol, 1994). Within recent years, very few studies have examined the impact of structural influences as possible links to the excessive imprisonment of African American males. Because of this gap in the research literature, this study will explore selected characteristics of structural influences consisting of family structure, education, and employment as an approach to understanding the causes of the disparity in the rate of imprisoned African American males.

Existing literature on criminality and imprisonment written by prominent criminologists and sociologists gives less attention to the effects of structural influences and more attention to individual and cultural factors as causes of criminal behavior among blacks and other minorities (Hudson, 1994; Reiner, 1989, 1992; Sutton & Young, 1996).

Based on this information, this study was conceptualized and conducted to provide information critical to the understanding of structural influences as factors contributing to the overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males. The intent of this study is to explore the relationship between structural influences as a link to the overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males. This examination will be determined by assessing whether or not incarcerated African American males experienced a positive or negative experience within these structures. This analysis will contribute

substantially to the discussion on the factors linked to the disproportionate representation of African American males incarcerated in the prison and jail population in the United States. For the purpose of this study, structural influences are defined as external conditions which may encourage or discourage criminal behavior among African American males. These external conditions consist of the family structure, educational experiences, and employment experiences.

Statement of the Problem

African American males are overrepresented among the incarcerated population in the United States. This study addresses this problem through an exploratory examination of selected characteristics of structural influences consisting of family structure, educational experiences, and employment experiences as possible contributors to the excessive imprisonment of African American males.

Significance of the Study

The primary objective of this research study is to advance social work knowledge by extending our understanding regarding the factors associated with the high incarceration rates of African American males in the United States. The scarcity of research knowledge on this issue makes this study unique. As exploratory research, this study will add to the body of literature and also serve as a springboard to spur additional research that examines the connection between structural influences and the high rates of imprisonment among African American males.

From a policy standpoint, this study will seek to provide additional data to drive social policies towards reform of structural influences that have an impact on the

behavior of African American males. Therefore, it is important to know specific factors that influence young African American males into the criminal justice system.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter two contains a review of the literature relevant to the disproportionate imprisonment of African American males. The literature review is organized into several sections. Section one provides the theoretical explanation, followed by various conceptualizations regarding the image of the African American male in the United States. This is followed by various explanations on the factors and forces driving the disproportionate rates of imprisonment among African American males. Section two consists of a review of studies directly related to the independent variables of family structure as well as educational and employment experiences. Section three examines recent studies conducted on disproportionality. Section four concludes with a summary of Chapter 2 and a reiteration of the evaluation of the literature review.

Theoretical Framework

Merton's Theory of Social Structure and Anomie (1975) and Cloward and Ohlin's Differential Opportunity Theory (1960) provide critical assumptions for exploring the impact of selected characteristics of structural influences in the overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males. According to the theoretical concepts presented in both models, the major predictors of crime and delinquency are attributed to limited access to opportunities for success. Groups in society who are unable to achieve success through legitimate means will likely engage in illegal activities to achieve success.

Merton hypothesized that high rates of deviant behavior are anticipated among groups in American society who are discontented in achieving societal goals, such as monetary success, and obtaining a quality education and employment because of their

disadvantaged position. American society places considerable importance on wealth and success and the means for achieving these goals through hard work. Obtaining an education is one of society's prescribed means for becoming successful and ensuring financial well being. Individuals who accept these goals by conforming their behavior to societal rules and who have the resources and means to achieve wealth and success are categorized as conformists (Merton, 1975; Pfhol, 1994; Davis & Stasz, 1990; Macionis, 1987; Hill, 1993).

In contrast, individuals who are unable to realize and achieve society's prescribed goals of success and wealth and the means for reaching these goals by obtaining an education, working hard and playing by the rules will develop alternative behaviors, which Merton defines as deviant. Merton's theory further contends that these deviant individuals or groups will likely fall within four deviant role adaptations: innovation, ritual, retreatism, and rebellion. The innovator is one classification of individuals who are unable to attain society's goals. As a result of their negative experience, innovators adopt the belief that society's goals are unattainable. Innovators adapt to this incompatibility by responding negatively to society's goals and the means to obtain them. They use illegitimate means for attaining wealth and success, such as drug trafficking.

Ritualists are individuals who have accepted society's means for achieving success and wealth. They have played by the rules, worked hard, and obtained what society considers an ample education. Ritualists respond to their inability to achieve society's promises of wealth and success by rejecting society's goals while accepting its rules. Bureaucrats or individuals with no interest in achieving beyond their current status are likely to be classified as ritualists. Ritualists are likely to display deviant behavior

through delaying tactics better known as “bureaucratic red tape” in organizations. A third behavioral adaptation resulting from individuals being blocked from mainstream opportunities is defined as retreatism. Merton theorizes that individuals who reject society’s goals and means will retreat and literally drop out of society. Retreatists are likely to be chemically addicted homeless people who develop unorthodox methods of survival. Rebellion is the fourth behavioral adaptation. Merton maintains that individuals who reject and abandon society’s goals and means as a result of being unsuccessful in achieving them will adapt radical behaviors and illegitimate means for attaining success, aimed at changing social order, including developing new norms, values, and beliefs. Religious extremists and terrorists are examples of this form of deviant behavior (Clinard, 1964; Coser, 1975; Pfohl, 1994; Davis & Stasz, 1990; Macdonald, 1987; Rosenfeld, 1989).

Critics of Merton’s theory maintain that his model is limited in the sense that its premise is based on lower class behavioral adaptations while ignoring deviance among the middle and upper classes known as white collar crime (Pfohl, 1994). Other observers challenge Merton’s assumption that individuals in American society are a homogenous group seeking similar goals of wealth and success (Pfohl, 1985; Liska, 1981; Leonard & Davis, 1982; Stasz, 1990). This notion is misleading, the authors contend, since America’s population is one of diversity. From a scientific perspective, some social scientists argue that Merton’s Theory on Social Structure and Anomie hasn’t been empirically tested (Pfohl, 1994; Clinard, 1964). Clinard challenges Merton’s assumptions on the occurrence of deviance among the lower class. “There is doubt that deviant behavior is disproportionately more common in the lower class as the theory of anomie

maintains. More studies on the incidence and prevalence of deviant behavior are needed before what is assumed by theory can be stated as fact" (Clinard, 1964).

Despite these views, Merton's Theory of Social Structure and Anomie (Merton, 1975) does offer an appropriate theoretical background for researching the subject of the overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males. This theory indicates that certain groups of individuals within American society experience systematic exclusion from mainstream societal goals and institutional means. Merton conceptualizes institutional means as social structures consisting of systems such as economics and education. Oppressed and disenfranchised individuals are at a much greater risk for being denied access to these means of opportunity to help them realize the American dream of wealth and success. They respond to this rejection by developing illegitimate means such as crime and deviance as an alternative to the legitimate means to satisfy their aspirations.

Along the same lines, the Social Strain Theory, which evolved from the works of Robert K. Merton and was later developed by Cloward and Ohlin (1964), asserts that individuals who commit crimes are no different from those individuals who are not involved in criminal behavior. Essentially, all individuals who commit crimes have the same values as everyone else, which are to achieve success (Clinard, 1964; Cloward & Ohlin, 1960). The Social Strain Theory maintains that individuals who commit crimes are likely to be restricted from achieving success through legitimate means. The theory believes that certain groups experience frustration as a result of being denied access to opportunities, which forces them to engage in illegitimate means for success. Disadvantaged groups such as minorities are often deprived of opportunities, therefore entering illegitimate avenues for success. Given these assumptions, the main tenets of the

Theory of Social Structure and Anomie and Differential Opportunity Theory suggest that independent variables of family structure, and educational and employment experiences provide a general understanding to specific expectations regarding the dependent variable, overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males.

Although family structure was not included in Merton's theory and Cloward and Ohlin's theoretical model, this researcher examined family structure as a secondary means of influence on the overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males. Nonetheless, these theories clearly provide insight to the factors that may predict the overrepresentation of African American males. In reviews of the literature on black families' poverty, Merton's Theory of Social Structure and Anomie (1957; 1964) and Cloward and Ohlin's Differential Opportunity Theory (1960) are most often cited among black scholars as being a practical theoretical model for understanding black families (Hill, 1993; Willie, 1976; Taylor, 1996). Thus, the Theory of Social Structure and Anomie and the Differential Opportunity Theory present a useful approach for studying the role of structural influences in the overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males. This population provides an appropriate sample selection for examining some of the theoretical assumptions hypothesized in Merton's Theory of Social Structure and Anomie and Cloward and Ohlin's Differential Opportunity Theory.

Factors and Forces Driving African American Male Overrepresentation in Prisons

The relationship between structural influences and the overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males can only be understood by exploring societal perceptions and characterizations of African American males in general. One of the more

prevalent perceptions of African American males considers them a population of social loafers, illiterates, criminals, and drug addicts.

According to the National Black Congress (1992), characterizations of African American males as thugs and drug dealers are largely attributed to the media. Rosenblatt (1996) argued that the media has discredited African Americans and other ethnic groups by characterizing them as criminals and drug addicts. This organization asserted that daily reporting, through print and television news sources, portrayed images of African American males as drug traffickers, murderers, and school dropouts to such an extent that the average citizen is afraid of black men. Consequently, they are labeled as the criminal underclass, the author asserts, which then spills over to all aspects of society and creates a racial divide between African Americans and whites. This is especially discernible for African American males who are forced out of mainstream society because they represent a threat to the white establishment (Olson, 1996). The cumulative effect of these negative perceptions and characterizations of African American males in the United States has further devalued their status in America as reflected in their consistent patterns of severe economic and social hardships. Added to the fact that African American males are among the most maligned group of people in the United States is the stark reality that they also represent an overwhelmingly large number of the prison inmate population in this country.

One of the most important unanswered questions concerning the large numbers of imprisoned African American males is: what are the forces driving this disparity in the United States? This question has been debated through various research studies over the past three decades among sociologists, criminologists and other scholars (Conley, 1994).

Some authors observed that the trend towards increased imprisonment of African American males began during the decade from 1980–1990 as result of the nation's war on drug policies (Lowry, 1996; The Sentencing Project, 1995). Others pointed to the dismantling of the anti-poverty programs during the Reagan years in the mid-1980's as an essential factor in the dramatic increase in imprisonment of African American males.

The social programs associated with the "War on Poverty" created employment opportunities, decent housing and neighborhoods, and an overall message of hope for many African American males and their families who desired to move out of poverty. Once these programs disappeared as a result of a shift in the nation's social policy towards the poor and other disenfranchised populations, many African American males and their families were launched into conditions of unemployment, inadequate education, and deteriorating neighborhoods. According to many experts, these conditions are often connected to increased criminal behavior and involvement in the criminal justice system among African American males (Wilson, 1996; Darity & Myers, 1994; Hill, 1993).

Two of the most significant indicators of the plight of African American males in the United States are the issues of race and class. The reality is the existence of institutional racism, which has created oppressive conditions of underemployment. This has limited opportunities for African American males (Mears & Burman, 1995; Booker, 1998), who have responded to these restricted opportunities by exhibiting criminal behavior. Restricted opportunities in mainstream society, according to several authors, may contribute to the disproportionate representation of incarcerated African Americans in this country (Young & Sulton, 1996; Vontress, 1962; Davis, 1976; Banks, 1977;

Barnett, 1977; Bell & Joyner, 1977; Brown, 1977; Edwards, 1978; Primm, 1987; Sulton, 1989; Ohlin & Cloward, 1960; Leighninger, 1997).

Another version of the race and social class approach as a basis for contributing to the overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males maintains that the criminal justice system's approach to drug sentencing discriminates against African Americans, poor people, and other people of color. The result of this sentencing approach is an alleged increase in the number of African American males imprisoned for drug offenses. There are numerous studies and analyses that investigate the relationships between incarceration rates and drug sentencing policies. These studies conclude that African American males are at a substantially greater risk of being incarcerated due to drug offenses than white males (Jones, 1994; Coleman & Todd, 1996; Weatherspoon, 1994; Blakemore, 1998; Mauer & Huling, 1995).

Family Structure

The link between family structure as a predictor of delinquency and criminal behavior among African American males is examined in this section.

Family structure is considered one of the strongest influences that may identify individuals at a higher risk for crime and delinquency. As the most fundamental social institutions among all racial groups, the family plays a significant role in the growth, development, and socialization of its members (Zinn & Eitzen, 1990). The family is linked to external forces in society, which can significantly impact the formation and structure of the family. External forces such as employment and income can have a significant impact on the family's ability to perform its role. African American families in

particular are continually being affected by these influences, resulting in various changes in the composition of the family.

Beginning in the 1960's, the black family began to change dramatically due to accelerated urbanization, changes in government policies, and other social forces which forced large numbers of African American males on the unemployment roles (Joint Center for Political Studies, 1993; McAdoo, 1997). These external influences had a tremendous impact on the black family. An aftermath of these occurrences is the decline in marriages among African Americans and an increase in the number of single female-headed households (Farley, 1995).

According to the United States Bureau of the Census (1993), there has been a significant decline in the number of married couple family structures from 78% in 1950 to 48% in 1991. Some researchers contend that shifts in the economy created poverty and unemployment, which had profound effects on the black family. One effect was the proliferation of single female-headed households (Wilson, 1987; Farley, 1995; McAdoo, 1997; Tucker & Kerman, 1995). Company downsizing, layoffs, plant closures, and periods of inflation and recession over a period of years have also resulted in increasing levels of unemployment and underemployment among all racial groups (Farley, 1995; Wilson, 1987, 1996). However, the effects of the restructured economy are excessively bleak and problematic for black families because the unemployment rate is twice that of white families (Tucker & Kerman, 1995). The authors maintain that, for many blacks, income derived from employment is likely to be much less than the employment income for whites. Because of this income disparity, black families are at a greater risk for poverty and family disruption. The most recent data on income support this assumption. For

instance, in 1990 the likelihood of African American families living in poverty was 29%, or three times that of white families (Leashore, 1995).

Some scholars argue that changes in the black family structure have resulted in a culture of poverty that has cultivated crime and delinquency (Day, 1997; Wilson, 1987; Sampson, 1995). A study of adult and juvenile robbery and homicide rates in 150 U.S. cities during 1980 (Sampson, 1995) predicted that the black male unemployment rate is significant to the rise in black crime and disruption of black families. The findings obtained in this study support the hypothesis that family disruption had a much greater impact on juvenile crime than adult crime. This finding seems particularly relevant to the contextual times of the 1980's when unemployment rates began escalating and the children of jobless black males were at a much greater risk for being thrust into poverty and ghetto living, thus making them more susceptible to crime and delinquency. On the other hand, the adult males sampled in this study were more likely products of a more stable family structure whose fathers were employed before the restructuring of the economy in the 1980's.

Another somewhat interesting and surprising finding in Sampson's research was the association between white juvenile and adult offenders and the percentage of this population whose families were headed by white females. This relationship, the researcher reports, evolved as a strong predictor of white robberies, which was parallel to that of blacks. This finding suggests that family disruption bears some affiliation with both black and white criminal involvement. Sampson concluded that black criminal involvement is largely associated with the structural influences of unemployment and blocked economic opportunities, which are connected to the disruption of black families.

He also concluded that two-parent families are critical to the prevention of criminal involvement among black youth.

Several studies examined the relationship of family structure and socioeconomic status as predictors of criminal and delinquency behavior among African American males and females (McLanahan & Sandefur, 1994; Hess 1996; Reiss, 1996; Rosen, 1985; Chulton & Markle, 1972; Taylor, 1996). Sampson (1995) concluded in his analysis of black urban violence in 171 United States cities that family disruption among blacks and whites are significantly linked to patterns of urban violence in these cities.

Other studies report that the evidence is inconclusive in support of the relationship between being reared in African American single female households and crime and delinquency (Taylor, 1996; Reiss, 1994; Smith & Clear, 1995). These researchers maintain that a variety of factors impinge on crime and delinquency rates among African Americans, some of which are not relative to being reared in a single female household.

One intensive study examined the relationship between family structure in the educational outcomes using a sample drawn from high school sophomores from 1,000 school districts in the U.S. (Heiss, 1996). One of the findings in this study determined that African American children reared in two-parent families do not receive any greater benefits than those African American children reared in one-parent homes, given the fact that African American children in general suffer from institutional disadvantages. Other significant findings obtained from this study revealed that the African American family structure had a small impact on the educational outcomes of African American adolescents. Interestingly enough, the findings further determined that parental involvement is more significant than family structure in the educational outcomes of

African American male and female adolescents. Single African American mothers are found to be just as involved in their children's lives as two-parent families. The findings are somewhat different when combining gender and race. Among African American adolescent males, parental involvement in education and other life events is less frequent when a father is absent from the family structure. It appears that female-headed families with males are more inclined to allow their adolescent males to take control of their academic endeavors. This trend may be related to the fact that in the absence of a father, African American males assume the role of "man of the house." Therefore, their mothers assume that they are quite capable of handling other areas of their life as well. At the same time, due to the pressures associated with being the primary breadwinner, single parent African American females with male children may place a lower priority on parental involvement. Heiss (1996) hypothesizes that the effects of family structure on school attitudes and performance are more significant for whites than blacks.

A similar study conducted by McLanahan and Sandefur (1994), using the same data set from the high school and beyond sample, found that the effects of family structure on school attitudes and performance fluctuate by race. Among both racial groups, family structure among whites had a greater impact on school attitudes and performance than blacks.

Differences in family background and criminal characteristics were examined in a study of federal inmates 18–25 years of age (Jackson, 1997). The sample consisted of 274 non-Hispanic African American males, 114 non-Hispanic white males, and 175 Hispanic males randomly selected from the population of federal inmates. The findings regarding the family structure of these inmates demonstrated that African American males were

more likely to have grown up in single mother only impoverished homes with other siblings. They were also more likely to have children of their own and provide support to other family members. On the other hand, white males in this sample were more likely to be reared in two-parent, high-income homes and to provide no financial support to other family members.

Along the same lines, Hispanic males also have lower incomes and were more likely to have lived in two-parent homes with siblings and to have supported others. They were also more likely to have had children of their own. The researcher further argued that the similarities between African American and Hispanic males regarding personal characteristics might be indicative of a greater degree of economic stress that these ethnic groups had to endure in contrast to white males. It also suggested that despite the variations in family structure among African American and Hispanic males, it appeared that a lack of income and access to financial resources might be a predictor in the percentages of incarcerated African American and Hispanic males.

Education

The organization of the literature presented in this section followed by the last section is informed by the concepts obtained from Social Structure and Anomie and Differential Opportunity theoretical models (Merton. 1957, 1975; Cloward & Ohlin, 1960). For African Americans and other minority groups, acquiring an education is perceived as an almost guaranteed route to success. However, for African American males in particular, educational experience does not always equate to success and economic prosperity. In many instances the educational system for African American males typifies a system that either facilitates or obstructs their access to opportunities in

mainstream America. Various studies have explored the causes of failure and success among African American males enrolled in school districts around the country. Louis Harris and Associates conducted one such study examining the causes of school dropouts among African American males living in impoverished inner cities (The Commonwealth Fund, 1994). The sample consisted of 360 randomly selected African American males ages 17–22. Fifty-three percent (53%) of the respondents who dropped out of school cited lack of teacher support and encouragement as reasons for their withdrawal from school. In sharp contrast, among the respondents who stayed in school, 76% felt that their teachers were encouraging and helpful in their educational endeavors. Some of the findings in this study were somewhat inconclusive, since actual numbers were not provided to allow for comparison between the African American male sample populations of dropouts and non-dropouts.

The National Black Catholic Congress (1991) supported this finding in its position paper entitled “The Plight of the African American Family.” The paper theorizes that the problems encountered by African American males in their early school years produced more barriers than opportunities. This conclusion is based on the fact that 20% of African American males do not complete high school. The reasons cited for the African American dropout rate, according to the National Black Catholic Congress, were inadequate resources and a devaluing of the African American male in the educational system.

More definitive research on the educational experiences of African American males has pointed to a hostile structural environment, which devalued their status by restricting access to education and economic opportunities. (Foster, 1995; Gordon,

Gordon & Jessica, 1994; Johnson, 1995; Smith, 1996; Ford, Kokjie & Lewis, 1996; National Black Catholic Congress Draft Position paper, 1991). This hypothesis was empirically tested in a study conducted by Foster (1995) involving the investigation of perceptions of black males by 3,130 educators and non-educators in New York. The findings in this study determined that educators continue to harbor negative stereotypical beliefs about black males, which are demonstrated in the increasing numbers of African American males placed in special education classes. The study further revealed that negative labeling of black males are also factors in the number of black males suspended from school (Foster, 1995). These negative factors engender in African American males a feeling of hopelessness and despair that eventually leads to a life of failure.

Other scholars have determined similar findings concluding that the educational system in this country discriminates against African American males (Harry & Anderson, 1995; Russo & Johnson, 1997; Noguera, 1997; Meir, Stewart & England, 1989). These literature sources supported Foster's findings that the educational system discriminates against African American males as evidenced by the disproportionate numbers of black males placed in special education classes, a number that may often exceed their school enrollment.

Added to the negative stigma associated with being placed in special education, African American males were also more likely to experience corporal punishment in our nation's schools. An investigation of 4,692 public school districts, which consisted of 43,034 schools across the United States, revealed that African American males are overly represented among the population of students that received corporal punishment (Gregory, 1995).

Similarly, another study analyzed the educational status of 25,000 at risk eighth graders in 1988 (Rodriguez, 1997; Jordan, Lara, & McPartland, 1996). The researchers concluded that African American males are at a much greater risk than other racial groups for school suspensions and expulsions. It has been suggested that the negative educational experiences associated with African American males result from the policies, events, and social interactions created by the school system. These factors have a detrimental impact on the quality of education this population received.

Inherent in this argument is the underlying notion that African American males are experiencing a major crisis in their attempts to obtain an education. Interestingly enough, the African American male educational crisis is generated by the very system that is touted by mainstream America as the avenue to success and prosperity. The evidence points to various contextual factors, such as the urbanization and socioeconomic status of the school district, financial and political resources, and teacher expectations as determinants of the success or failure of African American males in public schools (Davis & Jordan, 1994; Polinard & Wrinkle, 1995; Harry & Anderson, 1997). The authors suggest these factors are a clear example of negative structural influences in the educational environment, which more often than not quell the aspirations for success for many African American males in public schools across America.

An extensive study conducted by Jordan and Davis (1994) to determine the effects of educational inequities on the school experiences of African American males also supported the notion that black males' educational experiences are marred by inequalities and inadequacies. Using a sample of 25,000 eighth graders enrolled in 1,000 schools around the country, the researchers disclosed achievement levels for black males in urban

middle schools were lower than their counterparts in suburban or other school settings. A correlation also existed in this study's findings between lower achievement among black males in urban middle schools and the school's emphasis on discipline. Further, urban inner city schools concentrated in poor neighborhoods received insufficient funding and other resources, which were reflected in the poor academic standing of their African American male students. The researchers suggested the level of racial inequality of the black males' experience within the educational system limit their passage into the economic mainstream. In essence, some scholars maintained that our nation's schools are producing a population of failures rather than preparing students for successful careers.

From a somewhat different perspective, some scholars identify other factors that may play a greater role in shaping the educational experiences of African American males. A nationally representative sample conducted to determine the correlation of educational achievement among adolescent African American males disclosed that religious commitment and concern for others, the family unit consisting of father in the home, personality traits, and socioeconomic status were positive predictors of academic achievement among African American male high school seniors (Lispcomb, 1995). Along with these factors, place of residence may also be a determinant in defining the outcome of the African American males' educational experience. Ensminger, Lamkin, and Jacobson (1996) examined neighborhoods as a factor effecting the educational experiences of African American male adolescents using census data from 1970–1980. This study tracked 202 census tracts in the Chicago area with a sample size of 1,242 participants. The findings suggested that African American male adolescents living in middle class neighborhoods, controlling for family background, early school

performance, adolescent family supervision, and adolescent marijuana use, were more likely to graduate from high school. On the other hand, residency in poverty-stricken neighborhoods for African American males was not found to be an important predictor for graduating from high school.

Research on the effects of psychosocial factors on the educational outcomes of African American males has also been conducted. Psychosocial factors are defined as aspects of an individual's social and psychological behavior. African American males who harbor the external locus of control belief demonstrate behaviors of low self-esteem and poor academic performance (Howerton, Lynn, et. al, 1992, 1993). Individuals who practice an external locus of control believe that their lives are controlled by factors outside of their control. Whereas internal locus of control believers maintain that they are the masters of their fate in life. These researchers conducted a study of 42 at-risk African American males. The results indicated that these students' academic performance could be increased if they were able to assume an internal locus of control belief system.

In a subsequent study measuring parental verbal interaction and academic achievement for at-risk adolescent males, the researchers concluded that there was a significant correlation between locus of control and academic achievement. However, no degree of significance was found between parental verbal interaction and academic achievement among at-risk African American males in the study group. In a nationally representative study examining academic behaviors among high achieving African American students, Lee, Winfield, and Wilson (1991) found that African American students who manifest good academic behaviors, such as performing homework

assignments and reading, were more likely to focus beyond negative teacher perceptions and conditions to become academically successful (Gordon, 1995).

Other studies addressing the factors influencing the success or failure of black males in educational institutions attribute a more complex set of interactions as determinants in this equation. Hughes (1995) studied indicators of lifestyle changes among black and Latino males. Both groups have past histories of destructive behaviors involving crime, drugs, and school problems, but decided to change their lives. Factors emerging as significant in their decision to improve their lifestyles were honest and sincere support from adult role models, separation from peer influences, and their own maturity.

Along the same lines, a sample of the data obtained from the 1988 National Education Longitudinal Study is analyzed by Davis and Jordan (1994) regarding negative school experiences and their subsequent outcome on the achievement of African American males. Major determinants of lower achievement among African American males were found to be associated with school experiences such as the inability of teachers to motivate, greater attention to discipline, and study habits. In some, combinations of individual and school characteristics were considered to be a major determinant of either high achievement and/or low achievement among eighth and tenth grade African American males in this study.

Despite the structural and internal influences that may impede African American males' acquisition of a good education, many are able to make the grade despite the odds. These are African American males who are able to successfully negotiate through negative influences by obtaining a high school diploma and, in some instances, furthering

their education in vocational schools or college. According to the United States Bureau of the Census (1993), the percentage of African American males graduating from high school in the age group 25–34 is 82%, representing an increase from 75% in 1980. In comparison to their white male counterparts, the percentage of high school graduates in 1980 and 1991 remained stable at an estimated 87%. Interestingly, among both African American and white males during the time from 1980–1991, an estimated 12% of the African American male population completed college while 25% of the white male population completed college. The percentages of African American and white males completing college represented no significant gains in either group. Carnoy and Rothstein (1997) also observed similar findings on the educational gains achieved by black males in California. The authors analyzed data between 1980–1995 on the high school graduation rates of black males in California. They found a 90–95% increase in the high school graduation rates among black males that closely matched the white male graduation rate of 96% in 1995. At the same time, the findings demonstrated that the percentages of African American males attending college in California increased from 57% in 1980 to 63% in 1995 compared to 68% of white males in 1980 and 70% in 1995. In addition to bridging the educational disparity, test scores among African American males on the Scholastic Aptitude and the National Assessment of Educational Progress examinations also increased.

Clearly, African American males have made significant gains in educational experience over the past years even though their success has not always resulted in assurances of economic prosperity and social equality. There is an increasing body of literature suggesting that despite increasing levels of education coupled with a wide range

of skill levels, African American males are continuously confronted with blocked opportunities. Some research studies have established a correlation between increased educational experience among African American males and criminal involvement (LaFree & Drass, 1996). These authors conducted a time series analysis of the association between arrest rates of white and African American men from 1957–1990 and educational experience. The results demonstrated that in 1958 the median school years completed for African American males were 7.4, compared to 10.4 years for white males. Thirteen years later in 1990, the disparity in median school years completed among African American and white males was diminished, with African American males completing 12.4 years compared to an average of 12.7 years of school completed by white males.

Although African American males increased their educational qualifications, some researchers argued that they continued to show greater participation in criminal activity than their white counterparts because of blocked structural opportunities. A study conducted by LaFree and Drass (1996) comparing the Uniform Crime Reports from 1957–1990 to the National Crime Survey Reports on arrest rates provided some interesting findings on the relationship between income inequality, crime, and education by race and sex. The researchers found that during periods of economic growth, the level of education increased along with the crime rate, especially for African American males. They attribute the cause of this occurrence to increased disparities between the rich and poor among African Americans and whites during economic growth. Other related findings in the study determined that while African American males' level of education increased, there was also a corresponding increase in their crime rate, controlling for

within group differences of income inequality. On the other hand, a negative correlation exists between increased education levels among white males and increased crime rates, controlling for within income differences of income inequality. According to Lafree and Drass (1996), income disparities among African Americans resulted in middle and lower class structure, which will likely influence lower class African Americans to compare themselves with middle class African Americans as opposed to using whites as a means of comparison. The researchers contend that internal within group differences and the tendency for African Americans to compare themselves with each other creates a state of anomie and hopelessness among the lower class which in turn forces them to retreat to criminal behavior.

Moreover, Lafree and Drass (1996) argued that their findings supported the merits of Merton's Theory of Social Structure and Anomie (1975) and of Cloward and Ohlin's Differential Opportunity Theory (1960). Both theories maintained that when individuals within a society are blocked from achieving mainstream goals through established norms, they will attempt to reach these goals by adapting to their environment and engaging in deviant behaviors such as crime and delinquency. It is also important to indicate that this study raised another important concern regarding the relationship between African American males' educational achievement and their economic status. Inherent in this study's findings is the fact that despite the educational achievements made by African Americans, their economic status has not improved and, because of that, there is the likelihood of greater criminal behavior as a means of responding to their economic deprivation and feelings of powerlessness. African American males have not received the benefits and rewards of their investment in education. Using Merton's concepts, they

have accessed the institutional means through education but have been cut off from the economic rewards. What the research fails to mention is the fact that while the African American middle class is growing, it is not doing so in proportion to the population of African American citizens to adequately allow for statistical comparisons.

The argument raised by Lafree and Drass (1996) regarding the fact that African Americans were more likely to make within group comparisons as a measure of their income inequality is not a viable conclusion. It is quite the contrary, in fact. African Americans continue to be influenced by the media and other propaganda to compare themselves with European cultures and their standards of living. This measure is used by African Americans to determine economic stability and educational experience. Despite some flaws in the research, the study does provide an approach for examining educational experience and the disproportionate number of imprisoned African American males.

The educational gains made by African American males overall is impressive. However, the educational plight of African American males in the U.S. represents a complex set of individual and structural variables that allow some to become successful and others to fail. The overriding theme in the literature places the interaction between African American males and the educational institutions as a negative experience which is more likely to lead to an increased dropout rate and involvement in crime leading to incarceration. It is estimated that 41% of African American males who dropped out of school between the age group of 18–24 were under the supervision of the criminal justice system in 1988 (*The Futurist*, 1995). This summary was best reflected in a report of research findings prepared by the Maryland State Governor's Commission on Black Males, which concluded that the African American male has been marginalized from

mainstream education (Maryland Governor's Commission on Black Males, 1993). The exclusion and marginalization of African American males in the educational system placed them at a much greater risk of dropping out prior to completing high school and of engaging in criminal behavior as a means of employment. Holland (1996) and other scholars maintained that African American males who experience school failure as early as the first grade were more likely to be involved in criminal and violent activities.

Employment Experiences

Employment experiences of African American males have also been linked to their overrepresentation among the incarcerated population. Research conducted by Freeman (1994) supports this relationship. The researcher examined the relationship between crime and the economic incentives to crime and concluded that among the high percentage of incarcerated men are a large number of African American males who are considered to be of prime working age. For instance, in 1993, 1.9 % of the male work force was incarcerated and, of this percentage, 8.8 % were African American males who were taken out of the work force. It was also pointed out that the decline in wage earnings among African American males in the labor force may be a contributing factor in the increased motivation to commit crime, which will at some point increase the rate of incarceration among this population.

Other researchers support the findings establishing a relationship between income inequality and crime (Brinson, 1994; Johnson, 1995; Darity & Myers, 1994; Sampson, 1994). The thinking among these researchers suggests that the incarceration of African American males is interdependent and connected to economic factors such as wage disparity which forces many African American males to supplement their low wage

earnings through criminal means like drug dealing. Booker (1998) noted in his report on "The State of Black Males: 1998" that in terms of income, 15.9% of black males reported earnings of \$4,999 or less in comparison to 9.8% of white males with equal earnings.

As wage earnings increased, disparities in income also increased among African American males and white males. For example, approximately 9.1% of African American males had individual incomes between \$5,000 and \$9,999 representing 21.7% of the population of African American males in the United States. In comparison, white males had individual incomes of \$30,000 or more representing 40.3% of the white male population. Similar disparities can also be found in the overall median income, which for African American males is \$14,982 in contrast to \$24,122 for white males (Booker, 1998). Similar literature sources and studies establish a direct link between unemployment/underemployment and high rates of crime and involvement in the criminal justice system among African American males (Stein, 1996; Koll & Lichtenstein, 1996). These researchers analyzed the demographic characteristics of prison populations in 1990 and found that, of 561,700 individuals housed in jails, 58.2% were unemployed at the time of their arrest and approximately 68% of the population earned \$15,000 or less. The researchers argued that the high incarceration rates among African American males is closely aligned with their high rates of unemployment and noted that, in 1996, 50.5% of African American men were unemployed. Olson presented similar explanations (1996) linking the socioeconomic status of African Americans, particularly African American men, to their large representation in prison. For instance, in 1994, an estimated 33% of African Americans lived below the poverty line while 48% comprised the incarcerated

population, and 1 out of 3 black males 20–29 were under the control of the criminal justice system (Olson, 1996).

Moreover, other researchers have reiterated the unemployment/underemployment connection between crime and the overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males. Many of them observed that not only are they the most vulnerable to being jobless, or among the lowest wage earners, African American males are also more prone to spatial mismatch (Johnson, 1995; Wilson, 1987; Feguson, 1991; Kasarda, 1992). Spatial mismatch, according to these researchers, is defined as the transferring of blue-collar jobs from the inner cities where most African Americans live to other areas. Employment within the inner cities primarily consists of white-collar jobs that many African American males lack the training and education to enter. Some scholars maintain that the marginal employment experience of African American males and its relationship to imprisonment is not a modern social problem but one that dates back to slavery. They argue that, since slavery, African American males have been limited to certain occupations through control tactics such as the chain gang, convict leasing, and the vagrancy laws to keep them in service as a resource for cheap labor (Hudson, 1993; Hawkins & Thomas, 1991; Booker, 1997). This practice, according to the authors, began the historical criminalization and imprisonment of African American males, as driven by the need for cheap labor. There is nothing within the African American culture that is intrinsic to criminal behavior (Sampspon, 1987; Mears & Burnman, 1995). Rather, criminal behavior results from African American males being excluded and isolated from mainstream employment opportunities. This form of social alienation creates feelings of powerlessness, hopelessness, and anger resulting in a large population of what Glasgow (1980) defines as the underclass. The

underclass is marginalized from society and feels unwanted and useless (Glasgow, 1980; Darity & Myers, 1995).

The evidence appears to be supportive of the fact that the negative experiences many African American males confront in the labor force were attributed to structural influences outside of their individual control. However, there were some mainstream social scientists who contend that African American males were largely underemployed and/or unemployed because they lacked a strong work ethic, were often undisciplined, and lacked parental role models (Wilson & Herrnstein, 1985; Hudson, 1994). In essence, the personal responsibility theme representative of the conservative philosophy embraced by right wing theorists such as Charles Murray (1984) argued that, for those individuals who desired an education and employment and were law abiding, the institutions were there to provide these services (Mears & Burman, 1995).

Studies Examining Criminal Justice Characteristics and Influences on Overrepresentation of Incarcerated African American Males

Although a number of earlier works have examined the relationship between social structure and crime, there were few studies which have explicitly focused on an empirical analysis of structural influences relating to the overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males. It is quite apparent that there is a paucity of current information which specifically addresses this issue (McCarthy, 1991; Krisberg, Schwaretz; Fishman, Eisikovits, & Guttman, 1986; McCarthy, 1991; Sulton & Young, 1996; Hudson, 1994). The most recent research conducted, somewhat related to this topic, concentrated on the differences in the background and criminal justice characteristics of young African American, white, and Hispanic federal inmates (Jackson,

1997). Jackson concluded that there were significant differences among the various racial groups of prison inmates. Those differences indicated that the majority of the African American male inmates (49%) were products of single parent households. Jackson (1997) also determined that Hispanic males were less likely to have been previously incarcerated. On the other hand, white males were more likely to be incarcerated for committing violent crimes. Other findings obtained by Jackson (1997) determined that the overrepresentation of African American and Hispanic males in federal prisons was largely attributed to discrimination within the criminal justice system, along with other factors like lower incomes and unemployment.

Summary

By all accounts, the factors related to the overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males in our nation's prisons is a complex issue. This literature review has demonstrated the complexities of the issue by bringing together diverse ideas, prior research, and assumptions pertaining to the predictive factors associated with African American males, which may or may not lead to imprisonment. It is quite clear from the literature that African American males in today's society are confronted with numerous obstacles representing structural, cultural, family, and psychosocial influences.

Although somewhat inconclusive, it appears that there was overwhelming evidence that established a link between structural influences comprising the institutions of family structure, education, and employment as factors related to the crime and incarceration among African American males. This documentation supported some of the main theoretical propositions on education and economics, posted by Merton's Theory of Social Structure and Anomie (Merton, 1975) and Cloward and Ohlin's Differential

Opportunity Theory (1960). The literature cited demonstrated congruence with assumptions presented in these two theoretical perspectives regarding deviance as a behavioral response among individuals or groups who were denied access to mainstream social structures.

The research shows African American males are overrepresented in jails and prisons across the United States. However, few studies have been conducted during the 1990's on influences of family structure, education, and employment, all of which may contribute either positively or negatively to the overrepresentation of imprisoned African American males. A large body of literature points to biological and cultural factors as explanations, with little attention given to structural factors as possible indicators. Few empirical studies show the connection between family, education, and employment as a condition that leads to imprisonment. This is a concern because current trends indicate an increase in the numbers of African American males heading towards incarceration.

Consequently, the focus of this study is to examine the variables of family structure, educational experience, and employment experience as possible factors contributing to the excessive imprisonment of African American males.

The design and methodology for this study is presented in Chapter 3.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research design and methods used to investigate selected characteristics of structural influences as factors in the disproportionate representation of incarcerated African American males, and consisted of a within group study. Included in this section are description of the subjects, sampling procedures, and data collection, followed by a description of the procedures for analyzing the data.

Study Questions

The following questions shaped the design of this research study:

1. Does family structure contribute to the disproportionate representation of incarcerated African American males 18–29 as identified by selected characteristics of growing up in a single parent household, two-parent household including stepparents, or living with other relatives including step-relations?
2. Do educational experiences contribute to the disproportionate representation of incarcerated African American males 18–29 as identified by selected characteristics of highest grade attended, highest grade completed, and obtaining a high school diploma or GED?
3. Do employment experiences contribute to the disproportionate representation of incarcerated African American males 18–29 as identified by income, employed full-time, part-time, working occasionally, and looking for work before being incarcerated?

In order to answer the above research questions, the following null hypotheses are posed, with the results presented in additional findings:

Null Hypothesis 1. There is no relationship between selected characteristics of family structure of the respondents 18–29 as measured by growing up in a single parent or two-parent family including stepparents, or living with other relatives including step-relations, and the highest grade attended, highest grade completed, and obtaining a high school diploma or GED.

Null Hypothesis 2. There is no relationship between selected characteristics of educational experiences of the respondents 18–29 as measured by highest grade completed, obtaining a GED or high school diploma, and being employed, being employed full-time, part-time, or working occasionally, and looking for work prior to incarceration.

Null Hypothesis 3. There is no relationship between income before incarceration among respondents 18–29 and selected characteristics of employment as measured by being employed, being employed full-time, part-time, or working occasionally, and looking for work before incarceration.

Measures

Selected structural characteristics were analyzed as they pertain to the observation of overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males. Three categories of variables were used in this study because of their significance in research cited in the literature as factors influencing the high rates of imprisonment of African American males. These variables included family structure, educational experiences, and employment experiences.

The variable of family structure included examining the properties in one of three categories of respondents' household structure in the age group 18–29 while growing up in a single parent household, two-parent household, or extended family. Responses to 12 questions under section 10 of the socioeconomic section of the questionnaire were used to measure this independent variable.

The variable of educational experiences involved an examination of properties of 18 to 29-year-old respondents' education as defined by highest grade attended, highest grade completed, and reasons for not completing school. Six questions in section 10 of the socioeconomic section of the questionnaire were used to measure this independent variable.

The analysis of employment experiences was measured by 18 to 29-year-old respondents' properties of: income level, including whether or not the inmates were unemployed, employed full-time, part-time, or occasionally prior to their admission to jail. Responses to nine questions in section 10 of the socioeconomic section were used to measure this independent variable.

Design of the Study

Conducted every 5 to 6 years, the Survey of Local Jail Inmates is designed for the collection of descriptive data involving a nationally representative sample of local jail inmates. Designed by the United States Bureau of the Census, the survey explores socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents, criminal histories, substance abuse history and treatment, current offenses and time served, jail activities, jail conditions and programs, and jail health care services (U.S. Dept. of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics Survey of Local Jail Inmates, 1996). For the purpose of this study, secondary data was

used which was obtained from the 1996 Bureau of Justice Statistics Survey of Inmates of Local Jails (ICPSR 6858).

Sample Population Used in the Bureau of Justice Statistics Study

The sample population included in this study consisted of 6,133 inmates from 431 local jails located in all regions of the United States. The sample population consisted of male and female inmates housed in jails for convicted offenses, awaiting transfers to prison, or being held before trial. The United States Bureau of the Census used a multi stage sampling procedure on the basis of the size of the male and female inmate populations. A sampling stratum was created to allow for equal probability in selection of jails housing females and jails housing males to be included in the sample. A total of 4,311 males (70.3%) were included in the sample. Females accounted for 1,822 (29.7%). Table 1 provides a breakdown of the sample population by gender.

Table 1. Gender of 1996 Population of Jail Inmates

Sex	Frequency	%
Male	4311	70.3
Female	1822	29.7
Total	6133	100.0

Study Sample

The research questions guiding this study were appropriate to a specific sub sample of African American males 18–29 years of age who were incarcerated in various local jail jurisdictions across the United States. Included in this age group was a study

sample of 864 African American male inmates. This age group was selected because it accounted for approximately 47.03% (864), representing the highest concentration of age groups represented among the African American male inmate population of 1,837 in the survey sample. Moreover, this age group is cited in the literature as being most affected by the criminal justice system, chronic long-term unemployment, and school dropouts (Mauer, 1995, 1997; Miller, 1997; Mears & Burman; 1995; The National Black Catholic Congress, V11). At the time of this study, respondents either were being held in local jails for crime convictions, awaiting trial, or pending transfer to state correctional facilities. As shown in Table 2, the sample population consisted of 6,133 male and female inmates. Of this number, 2,704 (44.09 %) were African American male and female inmates. A subset of all African American males was created representing 1,837 (29.95%) of the total population of male and female inmates. The researcher collapsed and recoded age groups from the subset of African American males, which determined that 18 to 29-year-olds (864) represented 69.4% of the total population of male inmates in the sample, and 47.3% of the population of African American male inmates (1,837). Table 2 presents a profile of the population sample and study group used in this research.

Table 2. Profile of Population Sample and Study Group - 1996 Jail Survey

Population / Sample – 1996	N	%
Total Population	6133	100.00
Total African Americans	2704	44.09
Total African American Males	1837	*29.95
 Total African American Males ages 18–29 (Study Group)	 864	 *69.94
		*47.03

Note: *29.95% represents the percentage of African American male inmates in the total population of jail inmates

*69.94% represents the percentage of African American male inmates in the total population of jail inmates

*47.03% represents the percentage of 18 to 29-year-old African American males in the total population of 1,837

Data Collection Procedures

Since this research study involved the use of secondary data, the researcher was not directly involved in collecting the data. Nonetheless, a thorough understanding of the procedures for data collection was obtained through telephone conversations with the Bureau of Justice Statistics and the United States Bureau of the Census in addition to utilizing supporting documentation on data collection procedures. Data collection for the general survey began in October 1995 and was completed in 1996 involving 431 jails. A computer assisted personal interviewing procedure lasting one hour in length were used in the data collection process. Data was also collected from jail and inmate records for background information including inmate offenses.

Although this research study is a sub-study of the Survey of Local Jail Inmates (U.S. Bureau of Statistics, 1996), the procedures documented by the United States Bureau of the Census and the Bureau of Justice Statistics allowed the researcher to obtain a clear understanding of the data set and its appropriateness for developing the research questions for this sub-study. The Bureau of Justice Statistics' existing database was selected for this study because it contained measures for the independent variables of family structure, educational experience, and employment experience, which allowed a more complete data set with a better than average response rate. Following cleaning of the data set, a working data file was created by the researcher to include the variables of family structure, educational experiences, and employment experiences for African American males in the age group 18–29. Utilization of this data set enabled greater access to all cases of incarcerated African American males in the sample within the age group 18–29 which otherwise might be problematic to obtain through other data collection methods.

Measurement Instrument

The survey instrument used to collect the data for general survey of local jail inmates is a 300-item questionnaire designed to provide basic categorical data on characteristics of the local jail population across the United States. The United States Bureau of the Census uses the instrument every five years for this purpose. For the 1996 survey of local jail inmates, a computer aided design instrument (CAPI) involved the use of a computer by interviewers to conduct the inquiry (Survey of Local Jail Inmates, 1996 ICSPR). Reliability and validity of the survey instrument could not immediately be established.

For this study, 34 items were drawn from the section 10 entitled Socioeconomic Characteristics of the main survey instrument to measure selected characteristics of family structure, educational experiences, and employment experience. Family structure was measured by the study group's responses to twelve items. Educational experiences were measured by the study group's responses to six items, and employment experience was measured by the study group's responses to nine questions. Individual characteristics such as race and date of birth were coded and calculated based on data obtained from Section 1 of the questionnaire.

Data Analysis

The Bureau of Justice Statistics data, which consisted of 16 Megs in mainframe format, was transmitted via the phones to Norfolk State University's computer lab. The data was then converted to Statistical Package for the Social Sciences format version, which was the latest version for analysis and synthesis (SPSS Reference Guide 9.0, 1999).

Descriptive analysis of the data was performed using SPSS. This procedure allowed the researcher to assess the demographic characteristics of the sample population and the distribution of the variables of educational experiences, employment experience, and family structure. This statistical measure allowed the researcher to describe the characteristics of the study group as well as compute percentages, including the mean and standard deviation where appropriate. For the purpose of this study, data was analyzed based on the number of responses. However, tables including responses and missing data are presented in Appendix B.

Statistical measures used to test the three hypotheses consisted of a Chi Square test. This test enabled the researcher to assess the significance of the findings, which was set at .05 level of significance.

Ethical Issues

Every effort was made by interviewers with the United States Bureau of the Census and representatives of the Bureau of Justice Statistics to meet all of the standards for the treatment of human subjects and other ethical issues for conducting research. Before the interviews, respondents in the survey sample were informed both verbally and in writing about the purpose of the survey, which was to gather statistical information on the inmate population. They were also advised that their participation in the survey was voluntary, that all information would be held in the strictest of confidence, and their anonymity would be protected (U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Local Jail Inmates, 1996).

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents the data and findings of this research study. The chapter is divided into several sections beginning with a descriptive analysis of sample population of African American males included in the Bureau of Justice Statistics Survey, followed by a descriptive analysis of African American males 18–29 in the study sample. The second section includes the presentation of findings, and a discussion of the statistical and practical significance of the study.

Data for this study consisted of a nationally representative sample of African American male inmates in the age group 18–29 who were serving sentences in 431 local jails across the United States of America. The study sought to examine selected characteristics of structural influences as factors contributing to the overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males in local jails. Several research questions guided this study:

1. Does family structure contribute to the disproportionate representation of incarcerated African American males 18–29 as identified by selected characteristics of growing up in a single parent household, two parent household including stepparents or living with other relatives including step-relations?
2. Do educational experiences contribute to the disproportionate representation of incarcerated African American males 18–29 as identified by selected characteristics of highest grade attended, highest grade completed, obtaining a GED or high school diploma?

3. Do employment experiences contribute to the disproportionate representation of incarcerated African American males 18-29 as identified by income level, being employed, being employed full time, part time, or working occasionally, and looking for work prior to incarceration?

Characteristics of Study

In order to conduct this study, a sub-sample of 864 African American male inmates in the age group 18–29 was extrapolated from the sample population of 6,133 male and female jail inmates. This represented the largest age group in the total of 1,837 African American males in the sample. Table 3 shows the age distribution of African American males in the sample population.

Table 3. Age Distribution of African American Male Sample Population

Age	N	%
57–67	14	0.9
46–56	90	4.8
35–45	469	25.5
30–34	340	18.5
18–29	864	47.1
13–17	60	3.2
Total	1837	100.0

The study group consisted of 864 African American male inmates ranging in age 18–29 with the majority of the respondents born between 1973–1976. Table 4 provides the age distribution of African American males 18–29 in the study group.

Table 4. Age Distribution of African American Males in the Study Group

Age	N	%
29	69	8.0
28	77	8.9
27	64	7.4
26	63	7.3
25	59	6.8
24	59	6.8
23	66	7.6
22	84	9.7
21	81	9.4
20	82	9.5
19	87	10.1
18	73	8.5
Total	864	100.0

Research Question 1. Does family structure contribute to the disproportionate representation of incarcerated African American males 18–29 as identified by selected characteristics of growing up in a single parent household including stepparent, two parent household including stepparents, or living with other relatives including step-relations?

Living Arrangements While Growing Up. Sixty percent (513) reported living with their mother most of the time while growing up, while 20.6% (176) of the respondents reported growing up in a household with both mother and father, including stepparents. (See Table 5. Respondents Living Arrangements While Growing Up.)

Table 5. Respondents' Living Arrangements While Growing Up

Parents/Guardianship	N	%
Mother	513	60.0
Father	22	2.6
Both Parents (including one stepparent)	176	20.6
Grandparents	96	11.2
Other relatives (including step-relations)	28	3.3
Friends	5	0.6
Foster Care	9	1.0
Agency or institution (including religious institution)	1	0.6
Someone else	5	
Total	855	100.0

Research Question 2. Do educational experiences contribute to the disproportionate representation of incarcerated African American males 18–29 as identified by selected characteristics of highest grade attended, highest grade completed, obtaining a GED or high school diploma?

Highest Grade Attended. A larger percentage of the respondents (285, or 33.2%) reported attending the 12th grade. The analysis also revealed that 222 (25.9%) of the respondents reported attending the 11th grade and 171 (19.9%) of the respondents reported attending the 10th grade.

The number of respondents reported attending undergraduate and graduate school was 69 (2.8%). Of that number, a majority of the respondents attended up to their sophomore level in college. Table 6 presents the distribution of the respondents by highest grade attended. (Appendix B provides table inclusive of missing data.)

Table 6. Highest Grade Attended by Respondents

Grade	N	%
First	1	0.1
Sixth	3	0.4
Seventh	3	0.4
Eighth	25	2.9
Ninth	78	9.1
Tenth	171	19.9
Eleventh	222	25.9
Twelfth	285	33.2
Freshman-college	23	2.7
Sophomore-college	24	2.8
Junior-college	7	0.8
Senior-college	6	0.7
One year-graduate school	6	0.7
Two or more years-graduate school	3	0.4
Total	857	100.0

Highest Grade Completed. Table 7 illustrates the percentage of respondents who reported completing the highest grade attended. Most of the respondents (410, or 52%) reported that they had completed their respective grade levels compared to 48% (376) who failed to complete their highest grade attended.

Table 7. Highest Grade Completed by Respondents

Grade	N	%
Yes	410	52.2
No	376	47.8
Total	786	100.0

Respondents with a GED or High School Diploma. As shown in Table 8, a majority of the respondents (210, or 77.2%) reported having a high school diploma.

Table 8. Percentage of Respondents with GED or High School Diploma

Diploma	N	%
GED	62	22.8
High School Diploma	210	77.2
Total	272	100.0

Research Question 3. Do employment experiences contribute to the disproportionate representation of incarcerated African American males 18–29 as identified by income level, employed full-time, part-time, working occasionally and looking for work before being incarcerated?

Respondents Holding a Job or Business Prior to their Incarceration. The findings indicated that the majority of the respondents (479, or 55.9%) reported having a job or business prior to their incarceration. Also, 378 (44.10%) of the respondents reported that they were not participating in the labor force prior to being admitted to jail.

Table 9 presents the percentage of respondents who reported working in a job or business prior to entering jail.

Table 9. Percentage of Respondents Working in a Job or Business Prior to Incarceration

Job or Business	N	%
Yes	479	55.9
No	378	44.1
Total	857	100.0

Full-Time, Part-Time, or Occasional Work. Of the respondents who were employed, a majority of them reported being employed on a full-time basis (479, or 55.9%). Part-time employment accounted for 132 (27.6%) of the respondents, while 40 (8.4%) reported their employment as occasional work. Table 10 presents the findings on employment experience as indicated by the respondents.

Table 10. Employment Experience with Full-time, Part-Time, or Occasional Work By Respondents

Work Status	N	%
Full-time	307	64.0
Part-time	132	27.6
Occasional	40	8.4
Total	479	100.0

Looking for Work. In a related finding, 252 (66.7%) of the respondents looked for work, while 126 (33.3%) of the respondents did not look for work. Table 11 summarizes the results of the findings on whether or not respondents were looking for work.

Table 11. Looking for Work by Respondents

Looking for Work	N	%
Yes	275	66.7
No	126	33.3
Total	378	100.0

Income Prior to Incarceration. Data on income revealed that approximately half of the respondents (324, or 51.4%) reported their income below \$800-999 prior to being incarcerated. Sixty-seven (10.7%) of the respondents reported their income between \$800-999 and 49 (7.8%) of the respondents reported no income prior to their incarceration. Table 12 provides a description of the respondents' income prior to incarceration.

Additional Descriptive Findings

Family Structure

Number of Children. A majority of the respondents (250, or 47%) reported having one child for a mean score of 2.01 and a standard deviation of 1.38. A total of 141 (27%) of the respondents indicated that they had two children, and 76 (15.5%) reported having three children. Table 13 shows the number of children by respondents.

Table 12. Income by Respondents Prior to Incarceration

Yearly Income	N	%
No income	49	7.8
\$1–99	38	6.0
\$100–199	47	7.5
\$200–299	53	8.4
\$300–399	49	7.8
\$400–499	61	9.7
\$500–599	38	6.0
\$600–699	38	6.0
\$700–799	67	10.6
\$800–999	39	6.2
\$1000–1199	42	6.7
\$1200–1499	25	4.0
\$1500–1999	28	4.5
\$2000–2499	28	4.5
\$2500–4999	13	2.1
\$5000 or more	14	2.2
Don't know	629	100.0
Total		

Table 13. Number of Children by Respondents

Number of Children	N	%
1	250	47.8
2	141	26.9
3	76	14.5
4	21	4.0
5	15	2.9
6	11	2.1
7	6	1.1
8	2	0.4
9	1	0.2
Total	523	100.0

Mean score=2.01, SD=1.38.

Age of Children. The mean age score for the respondent's first child was 4.13 with a standard deviation of 3.39. The mean age score for the second child was 4.09 with a standard deviation of 3.51. The mean age of the third child was 4.02 with a standard deviation. In Appendix A, Tables A1-A5 provide the mean and standard deviation of age of children by respondents.

Children. Including Adopted and Stepchildren. Living With Respondents Prior to their Incarceration. Respondents were also asked whether or not their children, including adopted or stepchildren, lived with them prior to their incarceration. A majority of the respondents (335, or 63.9%) expressed that their children did not live with them prior to their incarceration. Table 14 provides a description of the response regarding respondents' biological, adopted and stepchildren living with them before their incarceration.

Table 14. Biological, Adopted and Stepchildren Living with Respondents

Biological, Adopted and Stepchildren Living with Respondents	N	%
Yes	189	36.1
No	335	63.9
Total	524	100.0

Current Residence of Respondents' Children. Most of the respondents (469, or 54.3%) reported that at the time of the interview, their children were living with either their mother/father, including their stepparents, when they were admitted to jail. A smaller percentage of respondents (80, or 13.3%) reported that following their

incarceration; their children resided with their grandparents. Table 15 provides a description of living arrangements of the respondents' children at the time they were admitted to jail.

Table 15. Living Arrangements of Respondents' Children at the Time They Were Admitted to Jail

Residence of Respondents' Children	N	%
Child's mother/father (including stepparents)	469	77.9
Child's grandparents	80	3.3
Other relatives	29	4.8
Friends	7	1.2
Foster home	7	1.2
Agency or institution (including religious institutions)	2	0.3
Alone	1	0.1
Someone else	7	1.2
Total	602	100.0

Frequency of Communication with Respondents' Children by Telephone, Mail, and Visitation since Respondents' Admission to Jail. Thirty-eight percent (201) of the respondents reported never talking with their children by telephone since being admitted to jail. Sixty percent (315) never received mail from their children, and fifty-four percent (283) have not been personally visited by their children while in jail. In Appendix D, Tables D1-D2 give a description of the data on frequency of communication with respondents' children by telephone, mail, and visitation since respondents' admission to jail.

Income

Income Sources. As shown in Table 16, the highest percentage of respondents (503, or 56.4%) reported wages, salaries, and/or pay from employment as their source of income, followed by 131 (14.7%) of the respondents who reported receiving their income from a family member or friend.

Table 16. Source of Income by Respondents

Source of Income	N	%
Wages, Salaries, or pay from a job	503	56.4
Any type of pension	41	4.6
Any type of welfare, charity or other public assistance	1	0.1
Assistance from a family member or friend	55	6.2
Compensation payments	131	14.7
Alimony payments and/or child support	10	1.1
Educational assistance	3	0.3
Investment income	19	2.1
Any other income (excluding income from illegal sources)	3	0.3
None of these	22	2.5
No income	28	3.1
Total	892	100.0

Additional Correlation of Findings

The researcher was interested in determining what if any correlation existed among selected characteristics of family structure, educational experiences, and employment experience. Therefore, the following null hypotheses were developed and tested using chi square with the level of significance set at .05.

Null Hypothesis 1. There is no relationship between selected characteristics of family structure of the respondents 18–29 as measured by growing up in a single parent or two-parent family including stepparents, living with other relatives including step-relations, and the highest grade attended, highest grade completed, obtaining a GED or high school diploma.

Finding. As shown in Table 17, the statistical results showed a significance level of .001 for one item of family structure and education as follows: grade level attended and family structure while growing up. Therefore, Null Hypothesis 1 is rejected. Respondents reared in single mother households (157, or 30.6%) and attended up to the 12th grade and above high school was significantly different from the respondents who were reared by both parents including step-relations (70, or 40%) and attended up to the 12th grade and respondents reared by grandparents (34, or 35.4%) as well as respondents reared by other relatives including step-relations (9, or 32.1%) who attended up to the 12th grade and above high school.

Null Hypothesis 2. There is no relationship between selected characteristics of educational experiences of the respondents 18–29 as measured by highest grade completed, obtaining a GED or high school diploma, and being employed, being employed full-time, part-time, or working occasionally, and looking for work prior to incarceration.

Finding. The statistical results showed a significance level of .0026 for one item of employment and education. Respondents' employment status prior to being incarcerated was significantly related to grade completion. Therefore, null hypothesis 2 is rejected. (See Table 18.) There was no significance between respondents who obtained a

GED or high school diploma and employment experience prior to being admitted to jail as shown in Table 19.

Null Hypotheses 3. There is no relationship between income prior to incarceration among respondents 18–29 and selected characteristics of employment as measured by being employed, being employed full-time, part-time, or working occasionally, looking for work while employed, and looking for work prior to incarceration.

Finding. As shown in Table 20, the statistical results showed levels of significance for three items of employment and income as follows: employed prior to incarceration and yearly income was significant at .000; employment experience and yearly income was significant at .000; and looking for work prior to being incarcerated and yearly income was significant at .032. Therefore, null hypothesis 3 is rejected. Significant differences were found between respondents who were employed prior to being admitted to jail and had yearly incomes of \$1–499 a year compared with respondents who were not employed prior to being admitted to jail but also reported a yearly income between \$1–499 (94, or 37.9%); respondents who were employed whose yearly income was \$1,000 or above (122, or 69.7%) compared with respondents who were not employed (53, or 80.3%) whose yearly income was \$1,000 or above.

Table 17. Relationship Between Family Structure and Educational Experiences

Grade Level		Family Structure					Total	Chi Square	P
		Mother	Father	Both Parents (including Step-parents)	Grand Parents	**Other Relatives (including Step-relations)			
8th grade or less	N	18	2	5	4	2	31	44.6%	.001*
	%	3.5%	9.1%	2.9%	4.2%	7.1%	3.7%		
9th grade	N	49	4	8	11	3	75		
	%	9.6%	18.2%	4.6%	11.5%	10.7%	9.0%		
10th grade	N	110	1	28	24	5	168		
	%	21.4%	4.5%	16.0%	25.0%	17.9%	20.1%		
11th grade	N	142	10	37	22	7	218		
	%	27.7%	45.5%	21.1%	22.9%	25.0%	26.1%		
12th grade	N	157	4	70	34	9	274		
	%	30.6%	18.2%	40.0%	35.4%	32.1%	32.9%		
Above high school	N	37	1	27	1	2	68		
	%	7.2%	4.5%	15.4%	1.0%	7.1%	8.2%		
Total	N	513	22	175	96	28	834		
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		

(Table Continued)

Table 17. Relationship Between Family Structure and Educational Experiences (Continued)

Grade Level	Mother	Father	Both Parents (including Step-parents)	Grand Parents	**Other Relatives (including Step-relations)	Total	Chi Square	P
Completed Grade Level								
Yes	N	240	8	86	51	17	402	6.14%
	%	50.5%	38.1%	58.1%	53.7%	65.4%	52.5%	.189
No	N	235	13	62	44	9	363	
	%	49.5%	61.9%	41.9%	46.3%	34.6%	47.5%	
Total	N	475	148	148	95	26	765	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Obtained GED or High School Diploma								
GED	n	37	1	18	4	2	62	1.10
	%	24.5%	33.3%	23.1%	16.0%	20.0%	23.2%	.894
High School	N	114	2	60	21	8	205	
	%	75.5%	66.7%	76.9%	84.0%	80.0%	76.8%	
Total	N	151	3	78	25	10	267	
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	

*Denotes significance at .05 level.

**Other relatives includes aunts, uncles, cousins, etc. Step-relations include relatives of step-parents.

Table 18. Relationship Between Education and Employment

			<u>Completed Grade Level</u>			Chi Square	P
Employment Status Prior to Incarceration			Yes	No	Total		
Employed	Yes	N %	238 58.2%	189 50.3%	427 54.4%	4.96	.026*
	No	N %	171 41.8%	187 49.7%	358 45.6%		
	Total	N %	409 100%	376 100%	785 100%		
Employed	Full-Time	N %	152 68.1%	112 59.3%	274 64.2%	4.07	.130
	Part-Time	n %	60 25.2%	57 30.2%	117 27.4%		
	Total	N %	238 100%	189 100%	427 100%		

(Table Continued)

Table 18. Relationship Between Education and Employment (Continued)

			<u>Completed Grade Level</u>			Chi Square	P
Employment Status Prior to Incarceration			Yes	No	Total		
Looking for Work	Yes	n %	49 64.5%	44 57.1%	93 60.8%	.86	.353
	No	n %	27 35.5%	33 42.9%	60 39.2%		
	Total	N %	76 100%	77 100%	153 100%		

*Denotes significance at .05 level.

Table 19. Relationship Between Obtaining a GED or High School Diploma and Employment Status

Employment Status		Education			Chi Square	P
		GED	High School Diploma	Total		
Yes	N	38	138	175	.410	.522
	%	61.3%	65.7%	64.7%		
No	n	24	72	96		
	%	38.7%	34.3%	35.3%		
Total	N	62	210	272		
	%	100%	100%	100%		
Full-Time	n	28	94	122	.522	.770
	%	73.7%	68.1%	69.3%		
Part-Time	n	8	37	45		
	%	21.1%	26.8%	25.6%		
Occasional	n	2	7	9		
	%	5.3%	5.1%	5.1%		
Total	N	38	138	176		
	%	100%	100%	100%		

(Table Continued)

Table 19. Relationship Between Obtaining a GED or High School Diploma and Employment Status (Continued)

Employment Status		Education			Chi Square	P
		GED	High School Diploma	Total		
Looking for Work						
Yes	n %	11 45.8%	48 63.9%	57 59.4%	.243	.119
No	n %	13 54.2%	26 36.1%	39 40.6%		
Total	n %	24 100%	72 100%	96 100%		

Table 20. Relationship Between Income and Employment Prior to Incarceration

		Yearly Income				Total	Chi Square	P
Employed Prior to Incarceration		No Income	1-499	500-999	1000 or above			
Yes	N	10	154	98	122	384	43.13	.000*
	%	20.4%	62.1%	68.5%	69.7%	62.4%		
No	N	39	94	34	53	231		
	%	79.6%	37.9%	31.5%	30.3%	37.6%		
Total	N	49	248	143	175	615		
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		
Employment Status								
Full-Time	N	3	80	76	96	255	34.22	.000*
	%	30.0%	51.9%	77.6%	78.7%	66.4%		
Part-Time	N	5	58	18	21	102		
	%	50.0%	37.7%	18.4%	17.2%	26.6%		
Occasional	n	2	16	4	5	27		
	%	20.0%	10.4%	4.1%	4.1%	7.0%		
Total	n	10	154	98	122	394		
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		
Looking for Work								
Yes	N	30	74	27	32	163	8.84	.032*
	%	76.9%	78.7%	60.0%	60.4%	70.8%		
No	n	9	20	18	21	68		
	%	23.1%	21.3%	40.0%	39.6%	29.4%		
Total	N	39	94	45	54	231		
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		

*Denotes significance at .05 level

Significant differences were found between respondents' employment status and yearly income. Observed relationships were found between respondents who worked full-time and had yearly incomes of \$1,000 or above (96, or 78.7%) compared with the respondents employed on a part-time basis whose yearly incomes were also \$1,000 or above. Respondents employed full-time prior to incarceration had yearly incomes between \$1–499 a year (80, or 51.9%) compared to respondents who worked part-time whose yearly incomes were \$1–499 a year (58, or 37.7%) and respondents who worked occasionally whose yearly incomes were \$1–\$499 a year (16, or 10.4%).

Significant relationship between respondents who were looking for work prior to being admitted to jail and had incomes of \$1–499 a year (74, or 78.7%) compared with the respondents who were not looking for work and had yearly incomes of \$1–499 a year (20, or 21.3%); respondents who were looking for work and had yearly incomes of \$1,000 a year (32, or 60.4%) compared with respondents who were not looking for work and reported their yearly incomes at \$1,000 a year and above (21, or 39.6%).

Statistical and Practical Significance

Descriptive Results

The findings in this study determined that the largest proportions of the respondents (513, or 60%) were raised in single female-headed households. The findings further show a slightly smaller proportion of respondents were reared in two-parent households, including stepparents (176, or 20.6%). By contrast, respondents living with grandparents (96, or 11.2%) were even smaller, as well as respondents living with other relatives (28, or 3.3 %).

The results of the educational experiences suggested a high percentage (285, or 33.3%) of the respondents attended the 12th grade, followed by 222 (25.9%) respondents reported attending the 11th grade, and 171 (20%) attended the 10th grade. In addition, a large proportion of respondents (410, or 52.2%) reported completing their last grade level attended. The findings further determined a high percentage of respondents (210, or 77.2%) held a high school diploma.

Information obtained from the findings showed a substantial number of respondents (479, or 55.9%) reported working on a job or as a business owner prior to their admission to jail during the month before their arrest. Most of these respondents (307, or 64.10%) were employed full-time, while 252 (66.7%) of the respondents reported that they were looking for employment prior to going to jail.

Analysis of income distribution determined that a large proportion of the respondents (373, or 59.2%) earned below \$800–999 before being admitted to jail, with 67 (10.7%) earning \$800–999, while 49 (7.8%) reported earning no income. In addition, a majority of the respondents reported their source of income was from wages, salaries, or pay from a job (503, or 56.4%).

Unexpected Descriptive Findings

A majority of the respondents were fathers (250, or 47.8%), averaging at least one child under the age of five. Most of the respondents' children (335, or 63.9%) did not live with them before they were incarcerated. Children of the respondents were more likely to live with their mother, including stepparents (46, or 54.3%).

A majority of the respondents (201, or 38%) were not maintaining communication with their children once they were admitted to jail. A larger percentage of the respondents

(315, or 60%) did not receive mail from their children, while 283 (54%) reported that their children did not visit them in jail.

Chi Square Significance

Statistical analysis of the relationship between selected characteristics of family structure of the respondents 18–29 revealed a significance of .001 for one item of family structure and education. Significant differences were found between family structure and highest grade level attended. The most observable difference was found between respondents who grew up in a single mother household (157, or 30.6%) and attended the 12th grade and above high school compared to those respondents reared by both parents including step-relations (70, or 40%) as well as respondents reared by other relatives, including step-relations (9, or 32.1%) and attended the 12th grade and above high school.

Significant differences were found between respondents who were employed prior to their admission to jail and completion of grade level. For instance, a relationship between one item of employment and education was significant at .0026. Respondents who were employed prior to being admitted to jail (238, or 58.2%) and completed their grade level was different compared to the respondents who were employed prior to entering jail and did not complete their grade level (189, or 50.3%) and among respondents who were not employed and did not complete their grade level (187, or 49.7%).

Several items related to income and employment were determined to be significant as follows: respondents employed prior to being admitted to jail and yearly income was significant at .000; respondents' employment experience and yearly income was significant at .000 and respondents who were looking for work and yearly income

was significant at .000. Observable differences were noted between respondents who were employed prior to incarceration and yearly incomes between \$1–499 (154, or 62.1%) compared with respondents who were not employed (94, or 37.9%) and who had yearly incomes between \$1–499. Significant differences were also found between respondents employed prior to incarceration and whose yearly income was \$1,000 or above (122, or 69.7%) compared to respondents who were not employed and had yearly incomes of \$1,000 or above (53, or 30.3%).

Respondents who worked full-time prior to incarceration and had yearly incomes of \$1,000 or above (96, or 78.7%) was significantly different from those respondents who were employed part-time and had yearly incomes of \$1,000 or above (21, or 17.2%). Differences were also observed between respondents who worked full-time and had yearly incomes between \$1–499 a year, compared to those respondents who worked occasionally (16, or 10.4%) and had yearly incomes of the same amount.

Respondents who were looking for work prior to being admitted to jail with yearly incomes between \$1–499 a year (74, or 78.7%) was significantly different from respondents who were not looking for work with the same amount of yearly income (20, or 21.3%). At the same time, respondents who were looking for work prior to incarceration with yearly incomes between \$1,000 a year or above (32, or 60.4%) was significantly different from respondents who were not looking for work with yearly incomes of the same amount (21, or 39.6%).

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The organization of this chapter consists of a discussion of the descriptive and statistically significant findings regarding selected characteristics of structural influences as possible indicators for the excessive representation of incarcerated African American males. The extent to which these findings can be applied to social work practice, research, and policy will also be discussed along with the limitations of this research study.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this research study was to explore selected characteristics of structural influences as possible contributors to the overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males. The theoretical constructs of Merton's Social Structure and Anomie (1975) and Cloward and Ohlin's Differential Opportunity Theory (1960) provided the specific assumptions relevant to this research study. Both theories attribute high rates of deviant behavior and involvement in illegal activities to individuals and groups who are denied access to society's prescribed goals of economic prosperity and the means for achieving those goals (Merton, 1975; Cloward & Ohlin, 1960). Guided by these perspectives, a literature review was conducted on structural influences of family structure, educational experiences, and employment experiences. The literature provided some evidence that these variables may be associated with the excessive representation of incarcerated African American males, which led to the conceptualization of three research questions involving selected characteristics of the variables of family structure, and educational and employment experiences as contributors to the overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males. This study tested three null hypotheses consisting

of: family structure and education; employment and education; and employment and income using secondary data obtained from the 1996 Bureau of Justice Statistics Survey of Local Jail Inmates (ICSPR Number 6858). The sub-sample consisted of 864 African American males ages 18-29 admitted to local jails in the United States. Descriptive and chi square statistical procedures were used to conduct the analysis. The results of the analysis will be interpreted and discussed in the following section.

Discussion

Descriptive measures of selected characteristics of family structure and the overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males 18-29 found that the majority of incarcerated African American males 18-29 in this study were reared in single female-headed families.

The results of the first hypothesis, which tested selected characteristics of family structure and educational experiences, rejected the null hypothesis. Significant differences were found between males 18-29 who were reared by a single mother, single father, both parents including step-relations, grandparents and other relatives including step-relations, and grade level attained up to the 12th grade and above high school. This finding suggests that there is an association between selected characteristics of family structure and selected characteristics of educational experiences, which may be related to a number of unexplained factors existing specifically with this study sample. The most obvious significant difference was the tendency for African American male inmates reared by single mothers to attend from the 8th grade or less up to the 12th grade and above high school more frequently than African American males reared by both parents, including relatives, grandparents, and relatives, including step-relations. These results indicate the

relative significance African American families attach to obtaining an education, particularly for their children. Educational expectations for African American mothers raising sons may be much greater because they recognize the difficulties black males are confronted with in an unjust society. Therefore, as the primary providers of social and emotional support, single African American mothers are more likely to encourage their sons academic performance. Recent research confirms the positive nurturing environment provided to the children of families headed by single African American females, which is significant in the overall well-being and school attendance of their children (Taylor, 1996; Acock, 1994; and Demo, 1998). Recognizing that there could be other factors associated with this relationship, this researcher believes that this finding suggests the relative importance African American single female mothers place on the value of their sons obtaining an education.

Analysis of the descriptive data on selected characteristics of educational experience revealed that most of the males in this study group made notable educational advances as demonstrated by their ability to obtain a high school diploma. This finding suggests that a lack of educational experience was not a major contributor to their imprisonment. This is inconsistent with other research studies suggesting a positive relationship between the rate of school dropouts among black males and their involvement in the criminal justice system and other social problems (Latke, 1998; World Future Society, 1995; Lerman, 1996; Gordon, Gordon, & Nehad, 1995; Delamatre, 1996; Holzer, 1994). Clearly, this study suggests that African American males in this study recognized the importance of obtaining an education through their efforts in obtaining a high school diploma. Inherent in this finding is the suggestion that their motivation to

engage in academic learning did not produce higher income earnings in accordance with societal assumptions that education is the vehicle to economic success. Therefore, it is concluded that the African American males' educational experiences, including highest grade attended and highest grade completed, might not be a contributing factor in their disproportionate representation in the jail population. Structural factors may exist elsewhere within the educational process that may have contributed to their imprisonment. The literature points to influences in education and economic failure among black males as factors contributing to their crime and prison rates (Tatum, 1996; Sulton, 1996; Dreier, & Reiman, 1996; Holzer, 1994).

The second hypothesis tested the relationship between selected characteristics of education and employment. This finding revealed significant differences between African American male inmates 18–29 who were employed in a job or business prior to being admitted to jail and who completed their grade level. These results did not support the hypothesis. African American males who were employed prior to going to jail were more likely to have completed their grade level compared to those who were not employed and did not complete their grade level. Although this difference may be attributed to other unexplained factors, these results suggest that educational requirements as defined by grade completed is an important dimension of employment for African American males irrespective of whether the grade completed was in middle school, high school, or post secondary school. A reasonable assumption can be drawn suggesting that despite completing their grade levels, the likelihood exists that African American males in this study remained underemployed. Studies supporting this assertion conclude that educational experience among African American males, in particular, may not yield the

benefits of stable employment (Mears & Burman, 1995; Bates, 1998). Discrimination against African American males is seen as the major factor contributing to the disparity between educational experience and gainful employment (Thomas, Herring, & Horton, 1994; Darity & Myers, 1994; Jones & Herring, 1993).

The association between grade completion and being employed among incarcerated African American males in this study, further substantiates the descriptive findings that a majority of the incarcerated African American males exhibited educational aspirations. This was determined by their ability to remain in school and complete their respective grade levels. It further demonstrates the African American males' desire to enter the labor force, along with the expectations and responsibilities associated with being employed.

Other descriptive findings on the selected characteristics support the previous observation that a strong work ethic existed among this population, as evidenced by a high number of African American males who were employed in a job or business full-time before they were admitted to jail. Equally important, the prevalence of African American males who were seeking employment prior to entering jail suggests that they did not elect to drop out of the labor force, nor were they discouraged from seeking employment.

The third hypothesis tested the relationship between employment and yearly income. The results did not accept the null hypothesis, which stated that no relationship existed when in fact significant differences were obtained on three items of employment and yearly income. A majority of the incarcerated African American males in the study were employed and had yearly incomes that fell below the poverty level, but there was

also an association between the yearly incomes of the employed African American males prior to incarceration compared to the yearly incomes of those who were not employed. Interestingly, the results suggest a greater tendency for African American males who were employed prior to being admitted to jail to have yearly incomes from \$1-499 to \$1,000 and above compared to those incarcerated African American males who were not employed prior to being admitted to jail whose yearly incomes were in the same range. These results can be interpreted to suggest the continued concentration of African American males employed in low wage jobs. Although the yearly income of African American males cannot be directly associated with employment earnings in this cross tabulation, the descriptive findings in this study lend support to the idea that the majority of incarcerated African American males in this study derived their income from wages and salaries.

This evidence further implies that despite their participation in the labor force, African American males appear to be concentrated at the bottom of the economic ladder. Equally important, the results obtained on employment experience and yearly income disclosed significant differences among incarcerated African American males employed full-time prior to their admittance to jail compared to the yearly incomes of those employed on a part-time or occasional basis. Although other variables may explain these differences, it appears that a greater number of African American males employed full-time had yearly incomes of \$1,000 and above compared to those African American males working part-time, or were not employed prior to going to jail.

In sharp contrast, significant differences were also found among African American males who were looking for work prior to incarceration and their yearly income

compared to those who were not looking for work. These results show that incarcerated African American males who reported that they looked for employment prior to being incarcerated were more likely than others to have yearly incomes between \$1-499 a year. Other factors may be related to the yearly incomes of this study group. This evidence on obtaining yearly income while unemployed may relate to African American males in the study group acquiring income by working in odd jobs or through illegal activities.

The reality regarding the differences between employment and yearly income would suggest that whether or not African American males were employed, underemployed, or unemployed prior to incarceration, their yearly incomes were considerably low. These are clear indicators of economic oppression of young African American males which may have caused them to resort to illegal means to achieve their economic goals. The descriptive findings lend considerable support to the low yearly incomes of the African American males in this study. A growing body of research studies provide considerable support to this perspective, noting the presence of large numbers of young African American males who are economically marginalized and disadvantaged due to their high rates of unstable employment patterns and unemployment combined with low income earnings (Wilson, 1996; Sampson, 1995; Thomas, Herring, & Horton, 1994; Darity, Myers, & Carson, 1994; Burbridge, 1995; Leashore, 1995). Further studies directly analyzing the relationship between poverty, race, and imprisonment conclude that poverty and unemployment among black males is a sound predictor of their high representation in jails and prisons (Arvantes, 1993; Arvantes & Asher, 1995).

One of the unexpected findings in this study was the lack of communication that African American males had with their children while incarcerated. However, it does

provide considerable insight into the scope and magnitude of the problems associated with the excessive numbers of African American males being incarcerated. The study showed that the African American males had at least three children under the age of five but failed to maintain relationships with them before or during their incarceration. At the same time, there was some indication that these children were more likely being cared for by their mother or stepfather. These findings represent one of the unexpected consequences associated with the imprisonment of young African American males and can be interpreted as contributing to the disruption of many African American families. Added to the problem are social and psychological effects children of the incarcerated may experience as a result of being detached from their fathers. This finding supports an earlier study which analyzed data relating to the impact of incarceration on African American males and their families (King, 1993). The study found that children of incarcerated African American males are susceptible to psychological and emotional problems and feelings of abandonment resulting from their father's incarceration.

The significant differences obtained from this study regarding the variables of employment and education; and employment and income as contributors to the overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males 18–29 are consistent with the expectations of this researcher. However, the uncertainty regarding the presence of other factors impacting these differences suggest additional research testing is needed to further substantiate these findings as having significant relationship to the overrepresentation of African American males. Nonetheless, the preliminary findings on the selected characteristics of employment and education, and employment and income appear to provide some statistical support for a possible relationship to the

overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males in this study. These findings also lend credence to the theoretical contentions of Merton's Theory of Social Structure and Anomie (1975) and Cloward and Ohlin's Opportunity Theory (1960), which provided the conceptual framework for the development of this research study. These theoretical models maintain that certain groups or individuals, because of their disadvantaged status in society, are more likely to engage in criminal behavior when they are blocked from achieving economic success and prosperity through legitimate means. These theories are helpful in explaining the excessive imprisonment rates of African American males in this study.

Application to Social Work Practice

Important to understanding the causes of disproportionate representation of incarcerated African American males in our nation's prisons and jails is the need to explore the role of structural factors such as the family structure, and educational and employment experiences in greater depth. Social work researchers must continue to evaluate the distinct African American culture and its impact on educational achievement as a means of ameliorating involvement in crime and delinquency. The results obtained from this research would provide important diagnostic and assessment information critical to social work practice with black families.

Many of the findings have policy implications. For instance, the findings regarding the lack of communication between incarcerated African American males and their children suggests the need to develop policies in jails and prisons that foster parenthood, and activities that encourage visitation among children of the inmates.

Establishing children and family networks may be helpful in reintegrating African American male inmates back into society.

There are significant findings regarding African American males 18-29 who were employed full-time. However, as demonstrated by their low income earnings, their employment appeared to be at lower paying jobs. This clearly underscores the need for the social work profession to advocate for policies that create employment programs to promote technological and career advancement compatible with the employment demands and trends of the labor force. Establishing meaningful work for young African American males will reduce the need for policies and programs that build jails and prisons.

Social workers must become proactive in ensuring that state welfare reform policies contain provisions for training and employment opportunities for African American males. Programs created under this existing initiative would not only improve the economic conditions of African American males, but also improve the socioeconomic conditions of their families.

Historically, social work has been at the helm of providing programs and services directed towards disadvantaged populations. The implications derived from this study chart new ground by bringing the issue of excessive imprisonment of African American males to the national forefront. At the same time, the profession should foster a broad understanding through research initiatives, concept papers, and a massive public relations campaign to bring full attention to the service delivery needs associated with incarcerated African American males and their families. Clinical social work practice should address some of the educational needs of African American males and work in collaboration with

the educational arena to provide transition programs from high school to college, vocational school or job training.

The findings related to the structural conditions of employment, education, and income imply that social workers should return to their traditional roles as community organizers, social agents, and advocates. They need to change structural institutions that promote social injustice and limit opportunities for African American males and their families. It is also critical that social workers provide attention to empowering African American males to negotiate structural institutions such as the educational and employment systems to ensure that they receive equitable treatment and resources.

Limitations of the Study

Because of the limitations associated with the use of secondary data sets, this study was restricted to an examination of only selected dimensions of structural influences as contributors to the disproportionate imprisonment of African American males. Although the Bureau of Justice Statistics Survey of local jail inmates has been tested reliable, self-reporting of information supplied by incarcerated African American males may have been influenced by the presence of the interviewer. Other limitations include:

- Some questions were insufficient to allow a more detailed analysis of selected characteristics of structural influences as indicators in the overrepresentation of incarcerated African American males.
- Data files may have been lost or damaged because the computer aided interviewing method was used to collect the data.

- Generalizations for the overall population of incarcerated African American males may be subject to other interpretations because of the aforementioned limitations.

Because of the limitations associated with the use of chi square, the findings should be viewed with caution in applying to the general population of incarcerated African American males.

REFERENCES

- Acock, A. and Dock, D. (1994). Family Diversity and Well-Being. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Anderson, R. E. (1968). Where is Dad? Parental Deprivation and Delinquency. Archives of General Psychiatry, 18, 641-649.
- American Bar Association (1995). Facts About the Criminal Justice System. Chicago.
- Arvantes, T. M., and Asher, M. A. (1998). State and County Incarceration Rates: the direct and indirect effects of race and inequality. The American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 57(2), (April 1998), 207(16).
- Associated Press Wire Report. (October 23, 1998). 1.4M Black Men Can't Vote.
- Bates, T. (1995). Rising Skill Levels and Declining Labor Force Status Among African American Males. The Journal of Negro Education, 64(3), (Summer), 373-383.
- Beck, A. J. (1995). Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Bell, C. and Joyner, I. (Ed.). (1977). Crime in the Black Community. In Blacks and Criminal Justice, Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Bennett, C. (1993). Statistical Brief: Black Americans: A Profile (Vol. SB/93-2, p. 2). Washington, DC: Department of Commerce.
- Bennett, C. (1997). The Black Population in the United States: March 1994 and 1993. Washington, DC: Bureau of the Census.
- Bergamann, B. (1996). In Defense of Affirmative Action. New York: University of California.

Bernstein, A. (1994). Inequality: How the Gap Between the Rich and Poor Hurts the Economy. Business Week, 78-83.

Bernstein, A. (August 15, 1994). Inequality. St. Louis Dispatch. (Newspaper Article, St. Louis).

Billingsley, A. (1993). Climbing Jacobs Ladder. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Blakemore, E. (1998). The Effect of Mandatory Minimum Sentencing on Black Males and Black Communities. Dayton, OH: Dayton School of Law, (Spring 1998).

Blau, P. (Ed.). (1975). Approaches to the Study of Social Structure: Parallels and Contrasts in Social Inquiries. New York: The American Sociological Association, 1-66.

Booker, C. (1998). The State of Black Male America: 1998 (Vol. 2, Number 2). Washington, DC: African American Male Research.

Bowman, P. (Ed.). (1993). The Impact of Economic Marginality on African American Husbands and Fathers. Newbury Park: Sage.

Breslow, M. (1997). "Last In, First Out: Black Men Take the Heat." Dollars and Sense Magazine, (Jan–Feb. 1997), (209), 24(2).

Brief, U.S. Bureau. of the Census Survey. (1993). Black Americans. (SB/93-2). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Brinson, J. A. (1994). The Incarceration of Black Males: Unsettled Questions. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 20(3-4), 85-95.

Brown, K. (1996). The Educational Crisis of African American Males. Journal of Law and Education, 25(3), 517.

Brown, L. (Ed.). (1977). Causes of Crime In Black Crime: A Police View. Washington, DC: Joint Center for Political Studies.

- Carnoy, M., and Rothman, R. (1997). Are Black Diplomas Worth Less? The American Prospect, 30 (January-February), 42-45.
- Cashmore, E., and McLaughlin, E. (Ed.). (1991). Out of Order? Policing Black People. Hawkins, D. F., and Thomas, R. "White Policing Black Population: A History of Race and Social Control in America," London: Routledge.
- Census Report. (1994). Statistical Abstracts of the United States: 1994 Social and Economic Characteristics of White and Black Workers. Washington, DC: United States Bureau of the Census.
- Chambliss, W. J. (1974). Functional and Conflict Theories of Crime. New York: Modular Publications.
- Chambliss, W. J. (1969). Crime and the Legal Process. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Chilton, R. J., and Narkle, G. L. (1972). "Family Disruption, Delinquency Conduct and the Effect of Subclassification." American Sociological Review, 37.
- Clear, T. R. (1996). The Unintended Consequences of Incarceration. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice and Office of Justice Programs.
- Clinard, M. (Ed.). (1964). The Theoretical Implications of Anomie and Deviant Behavior. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.
- Cloward, R., and Ohlin, L. E. (1960). Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs. New York: Free Press.
- Coleman, J., Jr., and Peterson, Todd D. (1996). Report of the Special Committee on Race and Ethnicity to the D.C. Circuit Task Force on Gender, Race and Ethnic Bias, George Washington Law Review, 64(189), 323-330.
- Collins, R. (1974). Conflict Sociology. New York: Academic Press.

Commonwealth Fund. (1997). Pilot Survey Conducted by Louis Harris and Associates of Young African American Males in Four Cities, New York: (Report #902066).

Compton Home Library (1997). The American Heritage Talking Dictionary. Conley, D. (1994). Adding Color To A Black and White Picture: Using Qualitative Data to Explain Racial Disproportionality in the Juvenile Justice System. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 31(2), 135-148.

Cook, D., and Hudson, B. (Ed.). (1993, 1994). Racism & Criminology: Concepts and Controversies (2nd ed.). London, Thousand Oaks, and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Coser, L. (Ed.). (1975). The Idea of Social Structure in Honor of Robert K. Merton. Chicago: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Danziger, S. (1995). Commentary. In Tucker, M. B., and Mitchell-Kernan, C.M. (Ed.), The Decline in Marriage Among African Americans. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Darity, W. A., and Nyers, S. L. (1995). Family Structure and the Marginalization of Black Men. In Tucker, M. B., and Mitchell-Kernan, C. M. (Ed.), The Decline in Marriage Among African Americans. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Darity, W. A., and Nyers, S. L., with Carson, E. D., and Sabol, W. (1994). "Critical Studies in Black Life and Culture." The Black Underclass. (Editor, Trotman, C. J.) New York: Garland Publishing. (Vol. 27), 91-116.

Darity, W. A., and Nyers, S. L., with Carson, E. D., and Sabol, W. (1994). "Structural Versus Behavioral Models of the Underclass," The Black Underclass. New York: Garland Publishing, 58-59.

- Davis, J. E., and Jordan, W. J. (1994). The Effects of School Context, Structure, and Experiences on African American Males in Middle and High School. Journal of Negro Education, 63(4, Fall), 570-587.
- Davis N. J., and Stasz, C. (1990). Social Control of Deviance. (27-51 ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Day, P. (1997). A New History of Social Welfare. (Second Edition). Needham Heights: Allyn and Bacon.
- Delamatre, M. S. (1996). Investigating the Anecdotes of Youth Unemployment: Individuals, Families, and Neighborhood Factors. (Delinquency, High School, Substance Abuse). The Louisiana State University and Agriculture and Mechanical College, 597.
- Department of Planning and Research. (1996). Inmate Statistical Summary. Richmond: Department of Corrections.
- Dreier, P., and Raiman, J. (1996). "Prisoners of Misleading Facts." Dissent, 43(2), (Spring 1996), 8(3).
- Earls, F. J. (1994). Breaking the Cycle. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Edwards, R. (Ed.). (1995). Encyclopedia of Social Work. (Vol. 1). Washington, DC: NASW Press.
- Ensminger, M., Lamkin, R., and Jacobson, N. (1996). School Leaving: A Longitudinal Study. Sociological Abstracts, 4(45).
- Evans, D. L. (September 7, 1998). Lost Behind Prison Bars. Newsweek, 20.
- Farley, R. (1995). Children and Youth: Living Arrangements and Welfare. (Vol. 2), New York: Sage.

Feldman, D. (Ed.). (1969). Psychoanalysis and Crime. New York: Harper and Row.

Ferguson, R. (1991). Social and Economic Prospects of African American Males: Why Reading, Math, and Social Development Should Be Leadership Priorities. Paper presented at the W. K. Kellogg Foundation National Workshop on African American Men and Boys.

Ford, C. A., Kokjie, F. A., and Lewis, M. K. (1996). Factors that Contribute to Academic Resilience Among Urban "At Risk: African American Male College Students." A Journal of Research on African American Men, 7(3), 17-28.

Foster, H. L. (1995). Educators' and Non-Educators' Perceptions of Black Males: A Survey. New York: State University of New York at Buffalo.

Freeman, R. B. (1994). "Crime and the Job Market." Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

Gary, L. (1996). "African American Males." Social Work Research, 19(4), 193-256.

Gary, L., and Brown, L. (Ed.). (1976). Historical Overview of Crime and Blacks Since 1876. In Crime and Its Impact on the Black Community. Washington, DC: Howard University Institute for Urban Affairs and Research.

Gibbs, J. (1988). Young, Black and Male in America: An Endangered Species. Dover: Auburn House.

Gilliard, D. K., and Beck, A. J. (1996). Prison and Jail Inmates, 1995 Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, August 1996, (Report no. NCJ-161132).

- Gilliard, D. K., and Beck, A. J. (1998). Prison and Jail Inmates at Midyear, 1997. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, (Report no. NCJ-167247).
- Glasgow, D. (1980). The Black Underclass. San Francisco: Josey-Bass, Inc.
- Gorden, K. A. (1993). Resilient African American High School Students' Self Concept and Motivational Patterns: Sources of Strength. Unpublished Dissertation, Stanford University.
- Gordon, E. T., Gordon, E. W., and Nembhard, J. G. (1994). Social Science Literature Concerning African American Men. Journal of Negro Education, 63(Fall), 508-531.
- Gordon, K. (1995). Self Concept and Motivational Patterns of Resilient African American High School Students. The Journal of Black Psychology, 21(3), 239-255.
- Gregoray, J. F. (1995). The Crime of Punishment :Racial and Gender Disparities in the Use of Corporal Punishment in U.S. Public Schools. Journal of Negro Education, 64(4), 454-462.
- Harlow, C. W., Ph.D. (1998). Profile of Jail Inmates 1996. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, (Report no. NCJ-164620).
- Harrell, A. P., G. (Ed.). (1992). Drugs, Crime, and Social Isolation. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.
- Harry, B. A., and Anderson, M. G. (1995, Fall). The Disproportionate Placement of African American Males in Special Education Programs: A Critique of the Process. Special Issue: Pedagogical and Contextual Issues Affecting African American Males In School and Society. Journal of Negro Education, 63(4), 602-619.

- Harvey, A. R., Coleman, A. A., Wilson, R., and Finney, C. (1999). Psycho-Social-Cultural Needs of African American Males in the Juvenile Justice System. Journal of African American Men, 1-17.
- Heiss, J. (1996). Effects of African American Family Structure on School Attitudes and Performance. Social Problems, 43(3), 246.
- Hendrie, C. (1998). Education Week on the Web, (Vol. 17). Editorial Projects in Education, www.edweek.org.
- Herald, L. T. (1997). What the Numbers Show. Leader, 1-4.
- Herrnstein, R. J., and Neuracy, C. (1994). The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Hill, R. (1993). Research on the African American Family. Boston: Auburn House.
- Hilliard, T. O. (1991). "Applications of Psychology and the Criminal Justice System." In Jones, R. L. (Ed.). Black Psychology (Third Edition). Berkeley: Cobb and Henry.
- Holland, S. (1996). Project 2000: An Educational Mentoring and Academic Support Model for Inner City African American Boys. Journal of Negro Education, 65(3), 315-321.
- Holzer, H. (1994). Black Employment Problems: New Evidence, Old Questions. Journal of Policy, 13(4), 699-717.
- Homans, G. (Ed.). (1975). Approaches to the Study of Social Structure. New York: The American Sociological Association.

- Hood, D. (1991). Academic and Noncognitive Factors Affecting the Retention of Black Men at a Predominately White University. Journal of Negro Education, 61, 12.
- Howerton, D., Lynn, et al. (November 10-12, 1993). Parental Verbal Interaction and Academic Achievement for At Risk Adolescent Black Males. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Hudson, B. (1993). Racism and Criminology: Concepts and Controversies. In Cook, D., and Hudson, B. (Ed.), Racism and Criminology. London, Thousand Oaks, and New Delhi: Sage, 17.
- Huizinga, D. J., and Elliott, D. S. (1986). Juvenile Offenders: Prevalence, Offender Incidence and Arrest Rates. Paper prepared for the Meeting on Race and the Incarceration of Juveniles, Racine, Wisconsin, National Youth Survey Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado, Boulder.
- Jackson, K. L. (1997). Differences in the Background and Criminal Justice Characteristics of Young Black, White, and Hispanic Male Federal Prison Inmates. Journal of Black Studies, 27(4), 16.
- Johnson, G. J., and Herring, C. O. (1993). "Underemployment Among Black Americans." The Western Journal of Black Studies, 17(3), 126–133.
- Joint Center for Political Studies. (1983). A Policy Framework for Racial Justice. Washington, DC: Joint Center for Political Studies.
- Jones, N. R. (1994). For Black Males and American Society-The Unbalanced Scales of Justice: A Costly Disconnect. Capitalist U.L. Review, 1(23), 13-20.
- Jordan, W., Lara, J., and McPartland, J. (1996). Exploring the Causes of Early Dropouts Among Race-Ethnic and Gender Groups. Youth and Society, 28(1), 62-94.

- Joubert, P. E., Picou, J. Steven, and McIntosh. W. A. (1981). U.S. Social Structure, Crime, and Imprisonment. Criminology, 19(3), 344-357.
- Katz, J. (1988). Seductions of Crime. In Tucker, M. B., and Kernan, C. M. (Ed.), The Decline In Marriages Among African Americans. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 256.
- Keel, R. O. (1997). Sociological Theories of Deviance. Srokeel@umsluma.edu.
- King, A. (1993). The Impact of Incarceration on African American Families: Implications for Practice. The Journal of Contemporary Human Services, 74(3), 145-153.
- Krikorian, G. (February 13, 1996). Study Questions Justice System's Racial Fairness. Los Angeles Times, 1&2.
- Krisberg, B., Schwarentz, I., Fishman, G., Eisikovits, Z., and Guttman, E. (1986). The Incarceration of Minority Youth. Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, National Council on Crime and Delinquencies, University of Minnesota.
- Kuykendall, C. (1992). From Rage to Hope: Strategies for Reclaiming Black & Hispanic Students. Bloomington: National Educational Service.
- LaFree, F., and Drass, R. A. (1996). The Effect of Changes in Interracial Income Inequality and Educational Attainment on Changes in Arrest Rates for African Americans and Whites, 1970 to 1990. American Sociological Review, 61(August), 614-634.
- Lee, T. J. (1997). One in Seven Black Males Silenced at Polls 24(3), Chicago: American Bar Association.
- Lee, V. E., Winfield, L. F., and Wilson, T. C. (Ed.). (1991). Education and Urban Society (Special Edition). (Vol. 24).
- Leonard, E. B. (1982). Women, Crime, and Society. New York: Kongman.

- Lerman, R. I. (1996). America's Disconnected Youth: Toward a Preventative Strategy. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Lipscomb, R. (1995). The Relationship Between Ecological Factors and Educational Attainment Among African American High School Seniors, 56(12A). Ohio State University, 171.
- Liska, A. E. (1981). Perspectives on Deviance. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Lotke, E. (1998). Hobbling a Generation: Young African American Men in DC's Criminal Justice System Five Years Later. Washington, DC: National Center on Institutions and Alternatives.
- Loury, G. (1996). The Impossible Dilemma Between Black Crime and Judicial Racism. The New Republic, 1(5), 214.
- Macionis, J. J. (1987). Sociology. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Marable, M. (1995). Along the Color Lines. Newspapers Across the United States, 1-2.
- Maryland Governor's Commission on Black Males. A. (1993). Maryland's African American Males: Health, Education, Employment, and Economic Development and Criminal Justice. Report of the Governor's Commission on Black Males (ED381602). Maryland: Maryland Governor's Commission on Black Males, Annapolis.
- Mauer, M. (1999). Race to Incarcerate. New York: The Sentencing Project, The New Press.
- Mauer, M. (1998). Facts About Prisons and Prisoners. Washington, DC: The Sentencing Project.

- Mauer, M. (1995). Young Black Americans and the Criminal Justice System: Five Years Later. Washington, DC: The Sentencing Project.
- Mauer, M. (1997). The War on Drugs: Few Victories, Great Costs. Washington, DC: The Sentencing Project.
- Mauer, M. (1994). Americans Behind Bars: The International Use of Incarceration 1992-1993. Washington, DC: The Sentencing Project.
- Mauer, M. (1990). Young Black Males and the Criminal Justice System: A Growing Problem. Washington, DC: The Sentencing Project.
- McAdoo, H. P. (1997). In Black Families. (Third Edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- McCarthy, B. (1991). Social Structure, Crime and Social Control: An Examination of Factors Influencing Rates and Probabilities of Arrest. Journal of Criminal Justice, 19, 19-29.
- McLanahan, S. G. S. (1994). Growing Up With a Single Parent: What Hurts and What Helps. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- McLanahan, S. T. (1987). Parenthood and Psychological Well being. Annual Review of Sociology, 13, 237-251.
- Mears, P. A. and Bauman, S. (1995). The Endangerment of African American men: An Appeal for Social Work Action. Social Work, 40(2), 268.
- Meier, K., Stewart, J. and England, R. (1989). The Politics of Second Generation Discrimination. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Miller, J. (1997). African American Males in the Criminal Justice System. Kappan Special Report, 78(10), 1-18.

- Morgan, S. L. (1996). Trends in Black-White Differences in Educational Expectations: 1980-92. Sociology of Education, 69(October), 380-319.
- Moynihan, D. P. (1990). Families Falling Apart. Society, 27, 21-22.
- Mumola, C. B., and Beck, A. (1996). Prisoners in 1996. Junction City: Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin.
- Murray, C. (1984). Losing Ground: American Social Policy, 1950-1980. New York: HarperCollins.
- Myers, S., and Simmons, M. (Ed.). (1988). The Economics of Race and Crime. Brunswick: Transaction Books.
- National Black Catholic Church. (1992). The African American Family. New Orleans: Draft of unpublished paper.
- Neuman, W. L. (1997). Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. (Third Edition). Boston: Allyn and Beacon.
- Noguera, P. A. (1997). Reconsidering the Crisis of the Black Male in America. Social Justice, 24(2), 147(18).
- Olzak, S., Shanahan, S., McEneaney, E. (1996). Poverty, Segregation, and Race Riots. Sociological Abstracts, 61(4), 590-613.
- Owens, C. J., and Bell, J. (Ed.). (1977). "Discretionary Justice and the Black Offender." In Blacks and Criminal Justice. Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Owens, C. J., and Beck, J. (Ed.). (1977). "Researching Black Justice: Descriptions and Implications." In Blacks and Criminal Justice. Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Pfohl, S. (1994). Images of Deviance and Social Control. (Second Edition), New York: McGraw Hill.

- Pfohl, S. (1985). Images of Deviance and Social Control. (First Edition), New York: McGraw Hill.
- Polinard, J. L. and Wrinkle, R. D. (1995). The Influence of Educational and Political Resources on Minority Students' Success. Journal of Negro Education, 64(4), 463-474.
- Pope, W. (1976). Durkheim's Suicide: A Classic Reanalyzed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Popple, P. L. (1996). Social Work, Social Welfare, and American Society. (Third Edition). Needham Heights: Simon & Schuster.
- Primm, B. (Ed.). (1987). "Drug Use: Special Implications for Black America." In State of Black America, 1987. New York: National Urban League.
- Quarles, B. (1987). The Negro in the Making of America. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Reiner, R. (1989). Race and Criminal Justice. New Community, 16(1), 25-22.
- Reiner, R. (1992). Race, Crime and Justice: Models of Interpretation. Cambridge, MA: Paper given at the Cropwood Conference on Minority Ethnic Groups in the Criminal Justice System.
- Reiss, A. J. (1994). Breaking the Cycle. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Report, Bureau of Justice Statistics (1996). State and Federal Prisons Tops One Million. Washington, DC: Department of Justice.

Rodriguez, J. (March 24-28, 1997). "At Risk: A Measure of School Failure in American Education." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Rosenblatt (Ed.). (1996). Criminal Injustice. Boston: South End Press.

Rosenfeld, R. (1989). Robert Merton's Contributions to the Sociology of Deviance. Sociological Inquiry, 59(4).

Rothman, D. (Ed.). (1971). The Discovery of the Asylum; Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic. Boston: Little Brown.

Rothman, R. (1978). Inequality and Stratification in the United States. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Russo, C. J. and Talbert-Johnson, C. (1997). The Overrepresentation of African American Children in Special Education: The Resegregation of Educational Programming? Education and Urban Society, 29(2), 136-48.

Sampson, R. J. (1987). Urban Black Violence: The Effect of Male Joblessness and Family Disruption. American Journal of Sociology, 93, 348-382.

Scott, E. (1996). "Reducing the Involvement of African American Males in the Criminal Justice System." In A. T. Sutton (Ed.), African American Perspectives on Crime and Causation, Criminal Justice Administration and Crime Prevention (2nd Edition), Englewood: Butterworth-Heinemann, 185-198.

Shaw, C., and McKay, H. D. (1942). Juvenile Delinquency in Urban Areas, A Study of Rates of Delinquents in Relation to Different Characteristics of Local Communities in American Cities. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Shaw, C., and McKay, H. D. (1931). *Social Factors in Juvenile Delinquency*.
National Commission of Law Observance and Enforcement Report on the Causes of Crime. 2(13). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Sherman, S. (1996). What the Census Says About Black Men. Black Issues in Higher Education, 13(16), 26.
- Siegal, A. F. (1997). "Ballot Rights for Prisoners (MD)." Baltimore MD Sun, Originally From Justice Net Prison Issues Desk, 1-3.
- Sizemore, B. (March 7, 2000). "Prison Boom Among Blacks and Elderly." Virginian Pilot.
- Smith, E., and Parker, K.D. (1996). Precocious Black Youths: Neglect of an Academic Underclass. A Journal of Research on African American Men, 7(3), 5-28.
- Stephan, J. J. (1997). Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 1995 (NCJ-166582). Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice.
- Sudarkasa, N. (1997). African American Families and Family Values. (McAdoo, H. P.. Ed.) (Third Edition) Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications, 9-40.
- Sulton, A. T. (1989). "Inner City Crime Control." Washington, DC: Police Foundation.
- Sulton, A. T. (Ed.). (1996). African American Perspectives on Crime Causation (2nd Edition), Criminal Justice Administration and Crime Prevention. Taylor, D., "Family and Delinquency: African American Female-Headed Households and Chronic, Maladaptive Behavior by Juveniles," Englewood: Butterworth-Henemann.
- Tatum, B. L. (1996). An Analysis of Factors Contributing to the Delinquency of the Black Youth. Journal of Black Studies 26(3), 356(13).

Testa, M., and Krogh, M. (1995). The Effect of Employment on Marriage Among Black Males in Inner City Chicago. In Tucker, M. B., and Kernan-Mitchell, C. M. (Ed.), The Decline in Marriage Among African Americans. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 59-95.

Thomas, Melvin E., Herring, C., and Horton, H. D. (1994). Discrimination Over the Life Course: A Synthetic Cohort Analysis of Earnings Differences Between Black and White Males, 1940-1990. Journal of Social Problems, 41, 608-628.

Tucker, M. B., and Kernan-Mitchell, C. M. (Ed.). (1995). The Decline in Marriage Among African Americans. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Tucker, M. B., and Kernan-Mitchell, C. M. (Ed.). (1995). Family Structure and the Marginalization of Black Men: Policy Implications. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Turk, A. T. (1971). Criminality and the Legal Order. Chicago: Rand McNally.

United States Department of Justice. (1994). Record Number of Prisoners Reached Again Last Year. (BJS Bulletin NCJ-147036). Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice.

United States Department of Justice. (1997). Correctional Populations. (NCJ-163916). Annapolis Junction: Bureau of Justice.

United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1995). Census of State and Federal Adult Correctional Facilities. Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research [1995, 1998].

Vontress, C. (1962). Patterns of Segregation and Discrimination. Journal of Negro Education, 31, 108-16.

- Weatherspoon, F. D. (1994). Status of African American Males: An Overview Perspective. Cap.U.L. Rev. 23(23), 29-45.
- Wilkins, L. T. (1965). Social Deviance. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Wilson, J. Q., and Hernstein, R. (1985). Crime and Human Nature. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Wilson, W. J. (1987). The Truly Disadvantaged. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wilson, W. J. (1997). When Work Disappears. New York: Random House.
- World Future Society, (1995). "Black Males In Crisis," The Futurist. 29(1), (January-February), 43.
- York, R. (1997). On Becoming Discouraged: The Disillusioned African American Male in the Labor Market. The Fielding Institute (AAG9803466).
- Young, V. (1996). The Politics of Disproportionality. In A. T. Sutton (Ed.), African American Perspectives (2nd Edition). Newton: Butterworth-Heinemann, 69-72.
- Zimmerman, M. A., Salem, D. A., and Maton, K. I. (1995). Family Structure and Psychosocial Correlates Among Urban African American Adolescent Males. Child Development, 66, 1598-1613.
- Zinn, M. E., and Eitzen, S. (1990). Diversity In Families. (Second ed.). New York: HarperCollins.

APPENDIX A
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Frequencies

Statistics

	sex	DOBY	race
N	Valid	864	864
	Missing	0	0

Frequency Table

sex

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	male	864	100.0	100.0

DOBY

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	66	69	8.0	8.0
	67	77	8.9	16.9
	68	64	7.4	24.3
	69	63	7.3	31.6
	70	59	6.8	38.4
	71	59	6.8	45.3
	72	66	7.6	52.9
	73	84	9.7	62.6
	74	81	9.4	72.0
	75	82	9.5	81.5
	76	87	10.1	91.6
	77	73	8.4	100.0
Total		864	100.0	100.0

race

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	black/african american	864	100.0	100.0

Frequencies

Statistics

	s10q1a	s10q1b	s10q1bb	s10q1c1	s10q1c2	s10q1c3	s10q1c4
N	864	864	864	864	864	864	864
Valid							
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Statistics

	s10q1c5	s10q1c6	s10q1c7	s10q1c8	s10q1c9	s10q1d	s10q1e
N	864	864	864	864	864	864	864
Valid							
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Statistics

	s10q1f	s10q2a	s10q2c	s10q2c	s10q2d1	s10q2d2	s10q2d3
N	864	864	864	864	864	864	864
Valid							
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Statistics

	s10q2d4	s10q2d5	s10q3a	s10q3b	s10q3c	s10q4a	s10q4b0
N	864	864	864	864	864	864	864
Valid							
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Statistics

	s10q4b1	s10q4b2	s10q4b3	s10q4b4	s10q4b5	s10q4b6	s10q4b7
N	864	864	864	864	864	864	864
Valid							
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Statistics

	s10q4b8	s10q4b9	s10q4b10	s10q4b11	s10q4b12	s10q4b13	s10q4b14
N	Valid	864	864	864	864	864	864
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0

Statistics

	s10q4b15	s10q4c	s10q4d	s10q4e	s10q6a	s10q6g	s10q9a
N	Valid	864	864	864	864	864	864
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0

Statistics

	s10q9aa	s10q9b1	s10q9b2	s10q9b3	s10q9b4	s10q9b5	s10q9b6
N	Valid	864	864	864	864	864	864
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0

Statistics

	s10q9b7	s10q9b8	s10q9b9	s10q9b10	s110q9c	s10q9d	s10q9dd
N	Valid	864	864	864	864	864	864
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0

Statistics

	s10q9e	s10q9ee1	s10q9f	s10q9g	s10q10a	s10q10b	s10q10b1
N	Valid	864	864	864	864	864	864
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0

Statistics

	s10q10b2	s10q10b3	s10q10b4	s10q10b5	s10q10b6	s10q11a	s10q11b
N	Valid	864	864	864	864	864	864
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0

Statistics

	s10q11c1	s10q11c2	s10q11c3	s10q11c4	s10q11c5	s10q11c6	s10q11c7
N	Valid	864	864	864	864	864	864
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0

Statistics

	s10q11c8	s10q12a	s10q12b	s10q12c	s10q13cc	s10q13d	s10q13e0
N	Valid	864	864	864	864	864	864
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0

Statistics

	s10q13e1	s10q13e2	s10q13e3	s10q13e4	s10q13e5	s10q13e6	s10q13e7
N	Valid	864	864	864	864	864	864
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0

Statistics

	s10q13e8	s10q13e9	s10q13ea	s10q13eb	s10q13ee	s10q13f	s10q13g
N	Valid	864	864	864	864	864	864
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0

Statistics

	s10q13h	s10q13i	s10q13j	s10q13k	s10q13l	s10q14a	s10q14b
N	864	864	864	864	864	864	864
Valid							
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Statistics

	s10q14bb	s10q14c	s10q14d	s10q14e	s10q16	s10q17a	s10q17b1
N	864	864	864	864	864	864	864
Valid							
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Statistics

	s10q17b2	s10q17c	s10q17d1	s10q17d2	s10q17d3	s10q17d4	s10q17e
N	864	864	864	864	864	864	864
Valid							
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Statistics

	s10q17f1	s10q17f2	s10q17g
N	864	864	864
Valid			
Missing	0	0	0

Frequency Table

s10q1a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	first	1	.1	.1	.1
	sixth	3	.3	.3	.5
	seventh	3	.3	.3	.8
	eighth	25	2.9	2.9	3.7
	ninth	78	9.0	9.0	12.7
	tenth	171	19.8	19.8	32.5
	eleventh	222	25.7	25.7	58.2
	twelfth	285	33.0	33.0	91.2
	freshman-college	23	2.7	2.7	93.9
	sophomore-college	24	2.8	2.8	96.6
	junior-college	7	.8	.8	97.5
	senior-college	6	.7	.7	98.1
	one year-graduate school	6	.7	.7	98.8
	two or more years-graduate school	3	.3	.3	99.2
	don't know	1	.1	.1	99.3
	refused	1	.1	.1	99.4
	blank	5	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q1b

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	410	47.5	47.5	47.5
	no	376	43.5	43.5	91.0
	don't know	2	.2	.2	91.2
	blank	76	8.8	8.8	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q1bb

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	32	3.7	3.7	3.7
	no	34	3.9	3.9	7.6
	blank	798	92.4	92.4	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q1c1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	466	53.9	53.9	53.9
	convicted of crime or sent to jail/prison/detention center	119	13.8	13.8	67.7
	refused	1	.1	.1	67.8
	blank	278	32.2	32.2	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q1c2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	510	59.0	59.0	59.0
	involved in illegal activities	76	8.8	8.8	67.8
	blank	278	32.2	32.2	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q1c3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	451	52.2	52.2	52.2
	behavior or academic problems in school	135	15.6	15.6	67.8
	blank	278	32.2	32.2	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q1c4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	410	47.5	47.5	47.5
	lost interest	176	20.4	20.4	67.8
	blank	278	32.2	32.2	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q1c5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	530	61.3	61.3	61.3
	financial problems	56	6.5	6.5	67.8
	blank	278	32.2	32.2	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q1c6

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	467	54.1	54.1	54.1
	family or personal problems	119	13.8	13.8	67.8
	blank	278	32.2	32.2	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q1c7

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	529	61.2	61.2	61.2
	went to work or into the military	57	6.6	6.6	67.8
	blank	278	32.2	32.2	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q1c8

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	586	67.8	67.8	67.8
	blank	278	32.2	32.2	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q1c9

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	525	60.8	60.8	60.8
	other	61	7.1	7.1	67.8
	blank	278	32.2	32.2	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q1d

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	convicted of crime or sent to jail/prison/detention center	15	1.7	1.7	1.7
	involved in illegal activities	22	2.5	2.5	4.3
	behavior or academic problems in school	29	3.4	3.4	7.6
	lost interest	16	1.9	1.9	9.5
	financial problems	15	1.7	1.7	11.2
	family or personal problems	26	3.0	3.0	14.2
	went to work or into the military	9	1.0	1.0	15.3
	don't know	1	.1	.1	15.4
	blank	731	84.6	84.6	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q1e

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	112	13.0	13.0	13.0
	no	473	54.7	54.7	67.7
	refused	1	.1	.1	67.8
	blank	278	32.2	32.2	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q1f

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	ged	62	7.2	7.2	7.2
	high school diploma	210	24.3	24.3	31.5
	refused	1	.1	.1	31.6
	blank	591	68.4	68.4	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q2a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	135	15.6	15.6	15.6
	no	721	83.4	83.4	99.1
	don't know	1	.1	.1	99.2
	refused	2	.2	.2	99.4
	blank	5	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q2c

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	70	8.1	8.1	8.1
no	788	91.2	91.2	99.3
refused	1	.1	.1	99.4
blank	5	.6	.6	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q2c

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	12	1.4	1.4	1.4
no	846	97.9	97.9	99.3
refused	1	.1	.1	99.4
blank	5	.6	.6	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q2d1

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	784	90.7	90.7	90.7
a learning disability, such as dyslexia or attention deficit	74	8.6	8.6	99.3
refused	1	.1	.1	99.4
blank	5	.6	.6	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q2d2

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	819	94.8	94.8	94.8
a speech disability, such as a lisp or stuttering	40	4.6	4.6	99.4
blank	5	.6	.6	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q2d3

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	799	92.5	92.5	92.5
a physical disability	60	6.9	6.9	99.4
blank	5	.6	.6	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q2d4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	799	92.5	92.5	92.5
	a mental or emotional condition	60	6.9	6.9	99.4
	blank	5	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q2d5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	173	20.0	20.0	20.0
	none	686	79.4	79.4	99.4
	blank	5	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q3a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	479	55.4	55.4	55.4
	no	378	43.8	43.8	99.2
	refused	2	.2	.2	99.4
	blank	5	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q3b

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	full-time	307	35.5	35.5	35.5
	part-time	132	15.3	15.3	50.8
	occasional	40	4.6	4.6	55.4
	blank	385	44.6	44.6	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q3c

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	107	12.4	12.4	12.4
	no	65	7.5	7.5	19.9
	blank	692	80.1	80.1	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q4a

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	252	29.2	29.2	29.2
no	126	14.6	14.6	43.8
refused	2	.2	.2	44.0
blank	484	56.0	56.0	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q4b0

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	118	13.7	13.7	13.7
not suitable	8	.9	.9	14.6
work available				
refused	2	.2	.2	14.8
blank	736	85.2	85.2	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q4b1

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	110	12.7	12.7	12.7
couldn't find any work	18	2.1	2.1	14.8
blank	736	85.2	85.2	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q4b2

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	120	13.9	13.9	13.9
lack of necessary schooling, training, skills, or experience	8	.9	.9	14.8
blank	736	85.2	85.2	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q4b3

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	109	12.6	12.6	12.6
medical condition, ill health, physical or mental disability	19	2.2	2.2	14.8
blank	736	85.2	85.2	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q4b4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable employers thought too young or too old	125	14.5	14.5	14.5
	blank	3	.3	.3	14.8
	Total	736	85.2	85.2	100.0
		864	100.0	100.0	

s10q4b5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable criminal record was a handicap	124	14.4	14.4	14.4
	blank	4	.5	.5	14.8
	Total	736	85.2	85.2	100.0
		864	100.0	100.0	

s10q4b6

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable family responsibilities or couldn't arrange child care	123	14.2	14.2	14.2
	blank	5	.6	.6	14.8
	Total	736	85.2	85.2	100.0
		864	100.0	100.0	

s10q4b7

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable on welfare or other public assistance	126	14.6	14.6	14.6
	blank	2	.2	.2	14.8
	Total	736	85.2	85.2	100.0
		864	100.0	100.0	

s10q4b8

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable in school/special program	116	13.4	13.4	13.4
	blank	12	1.4	1.4	14.8
	Total	736	85.2	85.2	100.0
		864	100.0	100.0	

s10q4b9

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	115	13.3	13.3	13.3
didn't need job	13	1.5	1.5	14.8
blank	736	85.2	85.2	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q4b10

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	100	11.6	11.6	11.6
didn't want job	28	3.2	3.2	14.8
blank	736	85.2	85.2	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q4b11

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	107	12.4	12.4	12.4
illegal activities	21	2.4	2.4	14.8
blank	736	85.2	85.2	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q4b12

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	118	13.7	13.7	13.7
on drugs/alcohol	10	1.2	1.2	14.8
blank	736	85.2	85.2	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q4b13

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	128	14.8	14.8	14.8
blank	736	85.2	85.2	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q4b14

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	112	13.0	13.0	13.0
other	16	1.9	1.9	14.8
blank	736	85.2	85.2	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q4b15

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	123	14.2	14.2	14.2
no specific reason	5	.6	.6	14.8
blank	736	85.2	85.2	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q4c

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid no suitable work available	2	.2	.2	.2
couldn't find any work	1	.1	.1	.3
lack of necessary schooling, training, skills, or experience	3	.3	.3	.7
medical condition, ill health, physical or mental disability	5	.6	.6	1.3
family responsibilities or couldn't arrange child care	2	.2	.2	1.5
didn't need job	1	.1	.1	1.6
didn't want job	4	.5	.5	2.1
illegal activities	7	.8	.8	2.9
on drugs/alcohol	4	.5	.5	3.4
other	1	.1	.1	3.5
blank	834	96.5	96.5	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q4d

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid					
never worked at all		60	6.9	6.9	6.9
1		23	2.7	2.7	9.6
2		18	2.1	2.1	11.7
3		13	1.5	1.5	13.2
4		14	1.6	1.6	14.8
5		22	2.5	2.5	17.4
6		37	4.3	4.3	21.6
7		29	3.4	3.4	25.0
8		32	3.7	3.7	28.7
9		31	3.6	3.6	32.3
10		17	2.0	2.0	34.3
11		10	1.2	1.2	35.4
12		21	2.4	2.4	37.8
never worked 2 consecutive weeks		13	1.5	1.5	39.4
don't know		20	2.3	2.3	41.7
refused		3	.3	.3	42.0
blank		501	58.0	58.0	100.0
Total		864	100.0	100.0	

s10q4e

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid					
full time		174	20.1	20.1	20.1
part time		98	11.3	11.3	31.5
occasional		12	1.4	1.4	32.9
blank		580	67.1	67.1	100.0
Total		864	100.0	100.0	

s10q6a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid					
house		439	50.8	50.8	50.8
apartment		347	40.2	40.2	91.0
trailer or mobile home		29	3.4	3.4	94.3
rooming-house, hotel, or motel		14	1.6	1.6	95.9
on the street or in a homeless shelter		12	1.4	1.4	97.3
in a group living situation or institution, such as hospital		9	1.0	1.0	98.4
in another type of housing		7	.8	.8	99.2
refused		2	.2	.2	99.4
blank		5	.6	.6	100.0
Total		864	100.0	100.0	

s10q6g

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	102	11.8	11.8	11.8
no	734	85.0	85.0	96.8
blank	28	3.2	3.2	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q9a

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	747	86.5	86.5	86.5
no	87	10.1	10.1	96.5
refused	4	.5	.5	97.0
blank	26	3.0	3.0	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q9aa

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	1	.1	.1	.1
no	20	2.3	2.3	2.4
blank	843	97.6	97.6	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q9b1

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	618	71.5	71.5	71.5
inmate's child (ren) / stepchild (ren) under age 18	130	15.0	15.0	86.6
blank	116	13.4	13.4	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q9b2

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	743	86.0	86.0	86.0
inmate's adult child (ren) stepchild (ren)	5	.6	.6	86.6
blank	116	13.4	13.4	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q9b3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	693	80.2	80.2	80.2
	spouse	55	6.4	6.4	86.6
	blank	116	13.4	13.4	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q9b4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	427	49.4	49.4	49.4
	parent(s) / step - parent(s)	321	37.2	37.2	86.6
	blank	116	13.4	13.4	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q9b5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	696	80.6	80.6	80.6
	grandparent(s)	52	6.0	6.0	86.6
	blank	116	13.4	13.4	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q9b6

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	492	56.9	56.9	56.9
	brother(s) / sisters(s) / Step-brother(s) / ste[psister(s)]	256	29.6	29.6	86.6
	blank	116	13.4	13.4	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q9b7

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	627	72.6	72.6	72.6
	other relative(s)	121	14.0	14.0	86.6
	blank	116	13.4	13.4	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q9b8

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	531	61.5	61.5	61.5
	girlfriend / boyfriend	217	25.1	25.1	86.6
	blank	116	13.4	13.4	
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	100.0

s10q9b9

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	698	80.8	80.8	80.8
	child(ren) under age 18	50	5.8	5.8	86.6
	unrelated to inmate				
	blank	116	13.4	13.4	
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	100.0

s10q9b10

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	678	78.5	78.5	78.5
	other friend(s) / non-relative(s)	70	8.1	8.1	86.6
	blank	116	13.4	13.4	
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	100.0

s110q9c

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	7	.8	.8	.8
	2	176	20.4	20.4	21.2
	3	179	20.7	20.7	41.9
	4	174	20.1	20.1	62.0
	5	97	11.2	11.2	73.3
	6	64	7.4	7.4	80.7
	7	28	3.2	3.2	83.9
	8	7	.8	.8	84.7
	9	6	.7	.7	85.4
	10	4	.5	.5	85.9
	11	4	.5	.5	86.3
	13	1	.1	.1	86.5
	don't know	1	.1	.1	86.6
	blank	116	13.4	13.4	
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	100.0

s10q9d

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 0	1	.1	.1	.1
1	23	2.7	2.7	2.8
2	420	48.6	48.6	51.4
3	191	22.1	22.1	73.5
4	83	9.6	9.6	83.1
5	17	2.0	2.0	85.1
6	6	.7	.7	85.8
7	5	.6	.6	86.3
9	1	.1	.1	86.5
don't know	1	.1	.1	86.6
blank	116	13.4	13.4	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q9dd

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	238	27.5	27.5	27.5
no	47	5.4	5.4	33.0
blank	579	67.0	67.0	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q9e

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 0	50	5.8	5.8	5.8
1	186	21.5	21.5	27.3
2	155	17.9	17.9	45.3
3	67	7.8	7.8	53.0
4	34	3.9	3.9	56.9
5	8	.9	.9	57.9
6	6	.7	.7	58.6
7	2	.2	.2	58.8
8	1	.1	.1	58.9
don't know	1	.1	.1	59.0
blank	354	41.0	41.0	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q9ee1

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	30	3.5	3.5	3.5
blank	834	96.5	96.5	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q9f

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	274	31.7	31.7	31.7
no	460	53.2	53.2	85.0
don't know	14	1.6	1.6	86.6
blank	116	13.4	13.4	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q9g

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	224	25.9	25.9	25.9
no	471	54.5	54.5	80.4
don't know	53	6.1	6.1	86.6
blank	116	13.4	13.4	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q10a

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	391	45.3	45.3	45.3
no	330	38.2	38.2	83.4
don't know	1	.1	.1	83.6
refused	4	.5	.5	84.0
blank	138	16.0	16.0	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q10b

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	250	28.9	28.9	28.9
2	141	16.3	16.3	45.3
3	76	8.8	8.8	54.1
4	21	2.4	2.4	56.5
5	15	1.7	1.7	58.2
6	11	1.3	1.3	59.5
7	6	.7	.7	60.2
8	2	.2	.2	60.4
9	1	.1	.1	60.5
refused	1	.1	.1	60.6
blank	340	39.4	39.4	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q10b3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than 1 year	11	1.3	1.3	1.3
1		13	1.5	1.5	2.8
2		20	2.3	2.3	5.1
3		27	3.1	3.1	8.2
4		17	2.0	2.0	10.2
5		9	1.0	1.0	11.2
6		10	1.2	1.2	12.4
7		8	.9	.9	13.3
8		6	.7	.7	14.0
9		2	.2	.2	14.2
10		2	.2	.2	14.5
11		1	.1	.1	14.6
14		1	.1	.1	14.7
15		1	.1	.1	14.8
16		1	.1	.1	14.9
18		1	.1	.1	15.0
blank		734	85.0	85.0	100.0
Total		864	100.0	100.0	

s10q10b4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than 1 year	7	.8	.8	.8
1		6	.7	.7	1.5
2		9	1.0	1.0	2.5
3		4	.5	.5	3.0
4		6	.7	.7	3.7
5		7	.8	.8	4.5
6		3	.3	.3	4.9
7		6	.7	.7	5.6
8		1	.1	.1	5.7
9		1	.1	.1	5.8
10		1	.1	.1	5.9
12		1	.1	.1	6.0
19		1	.1	.1	6.1
blank		811	93.9	93.9	100.0
Total		864	100.0	100.0	

s10q10b5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than 1 year	6	.7	.7	.7
	1	4	.5	.5	1.2
	2	2	.2	.2	1.4
	3	4	.5	.5	1.9
	4	2	.2	.2	2.1
	5	5	.6	.6	2.7
	6	4	.5	.5	3.1
	8	4	.5	.5	3.6
	21	1	.1	.1	3.7
	blank	832	96.3	96.3	
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q10b6

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than 1 year	3	.3	.3	.3
	1	3	.3	.3	.7
	2	2	.2	.2	.9
	4	2	.2	.2	1.2
	5	1	.1	.1	1.3
	6	3	.3	.3	1.6
	7	1	.1	.1	1.7
	12	1	.1	.1	1.9
	13	1	.1	.1	2.0
	blank	847	98.0	98.0	
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q11a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	2	.2	.2	.2
	blank	862	99.8	99.8	
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q11b

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	189	21.9	21.9	21.9
	no	335	38.8	38.8	60.6
	blank	340	39.4	39.4	
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q11c1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	53	6.1	6.1	6.1
	child's mother / father (including step-parents)	469	54.3	54.3	60.4
	don't know	1	.1	.1	60.5
	refused	1	.1	.1	60.6
	blank	340	39.4	39.4	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q11c2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	444	51.4	51.4	51.4
	child's grandparents	80	9.3	9.3	60.6
	blank	340	39.4	39.4	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q11c3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	495	57.3	57.3	57.3
	other relatives	29	3.4	3.4	60.6
	blank	340	39.4	39.4	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q11c4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	517	59.8	59.8	59.8
	friends	7	.8	.8	60.6
	blank	340	39.4	39.4	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q11c5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	517	59.8	59.8	59.8
	foster home	7	.8	.8	60.6
	blank	340	39.4	39.4	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q11c6

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	522	60.4	60.4	60.4
	agency or institution (including religious institutions)	2	.2	.2	60.6
	blank	340	39.4	39.4	
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q11c7

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	523	60.5	60.5	60.5
	alone	1	.1	.1	60.6
	blank	340	39.4	39.4	
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q11c8

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	517	59.8	59.8	59.8
	someone else	7	.8	.8	60.6
	blank	340	39.4	39.4	
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q12a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	daily	149	17.2	17.2	17.2
	at least once a week	98	11.3	11.3	28.6
	at least once a month	41	4.7	4.7	33.3
	less than once a month	35	4.1	4.1	37.4
	never	201	23.3	23.3	60.6
	blank	340	39.4	39.4	
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q12b

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	daily or almost daily	28	3.2	3.2	3.2
	at least once a week	97	11.2	11.2	14.5
	at least once a month	51	5.9	5.9	20.4
	less than once a month	32	3.7	3.7	24.1
	never	315	36.5	36.5	60.5
	don't know	1	.1	.1	60.6
	blank	340	39.4	39.4	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q12c

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	daily or almost daily	20	2.3	2.3	2.3
	at least once a week	117	13.5	13.5	15.9
	at least once a month	49	5.7	5.7	21.5
	less than a month	54	6.3	6.3	27.8
	never	283	32.8	32.8	60.5
	don't know	1	.1	.1	60.6
	blank	340	39.4	39.4	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q13cc

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	41	4.7	4.7	4.7
	no	112	13.0	13.0	17.7
	refused	1	.1	.1	17.8
	blank	710	82.2	82.2	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q13d

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid no income	6	.7	.7	.7
1-99	12	1.4	1.4	2.1
100-199	14	1.6	1.6	3.7
200-299	10	1.2	1.2	4.9
300-399	9	1.0	1.0	5.9
400-499	18	2.1	2.1	8.0
500-599	6	.7	.7	8.7
600-799	7	.8	.8	9.5
800-999	11	1.3	1.3	10.8
1000-1199	4	.5	.5	11.2
1200-1499	9	1.0	1.0	12.3
1500-1999	7	.8	.8	13.1
2000-2499	8	.9	.9	14.0
2500-4999	5	.6	.6	14.6
500 or more	4	.5	.5	15.0
don't know	4	.5	.5	15.5
blank	730	84.5	84.5	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q13e0

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	180	20.8	20.8	20.8
wages, salaries, or pay from a job	503	58.2	58.2	79.1
refused	2	.2	.2	79.3
blank	179	20.7	20.7	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q13e1

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	644	74.5	74.5	74.5
social security or supplemental security income	41	4.7	4.7	79.3
blank	179	20.7	20.7	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q13e2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	684	79.2	79.2	79.2
	any other type of pension	1	.1	.1	79.3
	blank	179	20.7	20.7	
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	100.0

s10q13e3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	630	72.9	72.9	72.9
	any type of welfare, charity, or other public assistance	55	6.4	6.4	79.3
	blank	179	20.7	20.7	
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	100.0

s10q13e4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	554	64.1	64.1	64.1
	assistance from family or friends	131	15.2	15.2	79.3
	blank	179	20.7	20.7	
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	100.0

s10q13e5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	675	78.1	78.1	78.1
	compensation payments	10	1.2	1.2	79.3
	blank	179	20.7	20.7	
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	100.0

s10q13e6

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	682	78.9	78.9	78.9
	alimony payments and / or child support	3	.3	.3	79.3
	blank	179	20.7	20.7	
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	100.0

s10q13e7

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	666	77.1	77.1	77.1
educational assistance	19	2.2	2.2	79.3
blank	179	20.7	20.7	
Total	864	100.0	100.0	100.0

s10q13e8

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	682	78.9	78.9	78.9
investment income	3	.3	.3	79.3
blank	179	20.7	20.7	
Total	864	100.0	100.0	100.0

s10q13e9

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	663	76.7	76.7	76.7
any other income (excluding income from illegal sources)	22	2.5	2.5	79.3
blank	179	20.7	20.7	
Total	864	100.0	100.0	100.0

s10q13ea

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	657	76.0	76.0	76.0
none of these	28	3.2	3.2	79.3
blank	179	20.7	20.7	
Total	864	100.0	100.0	100.0

s10q13eb

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	609	70.5	70.5	70.5
no income	76	8.8	8.8	79.3
blank	179	20.7	20.7	
Total	864	100.0	100.0	100.0

s10q13ee

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	144	16.7	16.7	16.7
no	536	62.0	62.0	78.7
don't know	1	.1	.1	78.8
refused	4	.5	.5	79.3
blank	179	20.7	20.7	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q13f

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid no income	49	5.7	5.7	5.7
1-99	38	4.4	4.4	10.1
100-199	47	5.4	5.4	15.5
200-299	53	6.1	6.1	21.6
300-399	49	5.7	5.7	27.3
400-499	61	7.1	7.1	34.4
500-599	38	4.4	4.4	38.8
600-799	38	4.4	4.4	43.2
800-999	67	7.8	7.8	50.9
1000-1199	39	4.5	4.5	55.4
1200-1499	42	4.9	4.9	60.3
1500-1999	25	2.9	2.9	63.2
2000-2499	28	3.2	3.2	66.4
2500-4999	28	3.2	3.2	69.7
5000 or more	13	1.5	1.5	71.2
don't know	14	1.6	1.6	72.8
refused	9	1.0	1.0	73.8
blank	226	26.2	26.2	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q13g

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	45	5.2	5.2	5.2
no	746	86.3	86.3	91.6
don't know	1	.1	.1	91.7
refused	2	.2	.2	91.9
blank	70	8.1	8.1	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q13h

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	1	.1	.1	.1
no	44	5.1	5.1	5.2
blank	819	94.8	94.8	
Total	864	100.0	100.0	100.0

s10q13i

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	16	1.9	1.9	1.9
no	775	89.7	89.7	91.6
don't know	1	.1	.1	91.7
refused	2	.2	.2	91.9
blank	70	8.1	8.1	
Total	864	100.0	100.0	100.0

s10q13j

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	2	.2	.2	.2
no	14	1.6	1.6	1.9
blank	848	98.1	98.1	
Total	864	100.0	100.0	100.0

s10q13k

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	13	1.5	1.5	1.5
no	32	3.7	3.7	5.2
blank	819	94.8	94.8	
Total	864	100.0	100.0	100.0

s10q13l

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	6	.7	.7	.7
no	26	3.0	3.0	3.7
blank	832	96.3	96.3	
Total	864	100.0	100.0	100.0

s10q14a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	mother	513	59.4	59.4	59.4
	father	22	2.5	2.5	61.9
	both parents (including on step - parents)	176	20.4	20.4	82.3
	grandparents	96	11.1	11.1	93.4
	other relatives (include step - relatives)	28	3.2	3.2	96.6
	friends	5	.6	.6	97.2
	foster homes	9	1.0	1.0	98.3
	agency or institution (including religious institution)	1	.1	.1	98.4
	someone else	5	.6	.6	99.0
	don't know	1	.1	.1	99.1
	refused	3	.3	.3	99.4
	blank	5	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q14b

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	102	11.8	11.8	11.8
	no	743	86.0	86.0	97.8
	don't know	2	.2	.2	98.0
	refused	2	.2	.2	98.3
	blank	15	1.7	1.7	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q14bb

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	foster home	43	5.0	5.0	5.0
	agency or institution	48	5.6	5.6	10.5
	both	11	1.3	1.3	11.8
	blank	762	88.2	88.2	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q14c

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	3	.3	.3	.3
	no	7	.8	.8	1.2
	blank	854	98.8	98.8	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q14d

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	452	52.3	52.3	52.3
no	375	43.4	43.4	95.7
don't know	28	3.2	3.2	99.0
refused	4	.5	.5	99.4
blank	5	.6	.6	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q14e

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	273	31.6	31.6	31.6
no	577	66.8	66.8	98.4
don't know	6	.7	.7	99.1
refused	3	.3	.3	99.4
blank	5	.6	.6	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q16

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 0	33	3.8	3.8	3.8
1	81	9.4	9.4	13.2
2	125	14.5	14.5	27.7
3	128	14.8	14.8	42.5
4	114	13.2	13.2	55.7
5	107	12.4	12.4	68.1
6	64	7.4	7.4	75.5
7	47	5.4	5.4	80.9
8	39	4.5	4.5	85.4
9	36	4.2	4.2	89.6
10	26	3.0	3.0	92.6
11	10	1.2	1.2	93.7
12	15	1.7	1.7	95.5
13	10	1.2	1.2	96.6
14	6	.7	.7	97.3
15	3	.3	.3	97.7
16	2	.2	.2	97.9
18	1	.1	.1	98.0
20	1	.1	.1	98.1
22	1	.1	.1	98.3
23	1	.1	.1	98.4
24	1	.1	.1	98.5
25	2	.2	.2	98.7
don't know	3	.3	.3	99.1
refused	3	.3	.3	99.4
blank	5	.6	.6	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q17a

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	205	23.7	23.7	23.7
no	634	73.4	73.4	97.1
don't know	15	1.7	1.7	98.8
refused	5	.6	.6	99.4
blank	5	.6	.6	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q17b1

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	143	16.6	16.6	16.6
moth/father	60	6.9	6.9	23.5
don't know	1	.1	.1	23.6
refused	1	.1	.1	23.7
blank	659	76.3	76.3	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q17b2

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	37	4.3	4.3	4.3
father / stepfather	168	19.4	19.4	23.7
blank	659	76.3	76.3	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q17c

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	309	35.8	35.8	35.8
no	537	62.2	62.2	97.9
don't know	8	.9	.9	98.8
refused	5	.6	.6	99.4
blank	5	.6	.6	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q17d1

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	302	35.0	35.0	35.0
spouse	7	.8	.8	35.8
blank	555	64.2	64.2	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q17d2

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not applicable	309	35.8	35.8	35.8
blank	555	64.2	64.2	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q17d3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	27	3.1	3.1	3.1
	brother / stepbrother	282	32.6	32.6	35.8
	blank	555	64.2	64.2	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q17d4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	260	30.1	30.1	30.1
	sister / stepsister	49	5.7	5.7	35.8
	blank	555	64.2	64.2	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q17e

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	110	12.7	12.7	12.7
	no	717	83.0	83.0	95.7
	don't know	27	3.1	3.1	98.8
	refused	5	.6	.6	99.4
	blank	5	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q17f1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	61	7.1	7.1	7.1
	mother / stepmother	49	5.7	5.7	12.7
	blank	754	87.3	87.3	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

s10q17f2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not applicable	33	3.8	3.8	3.8
	father / stepfather	77	8.9	8.9	12.7
	blank	754	87.3	87.3	100.0
	Total	864	100.0	100.0	

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid yes	232	26.9	26.9	26.9
no	606	70.1	70.1	97.0
don't know	18	2.1	2.1	99.1
refused	3	.3	.3	99.4
blank	5	.6	.6	100.0
Total	864	100.0	100.0	

APPENDIX B

TABLE OF MISSING DATA

S10 – SOCIOECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES

This group of questions concerns your education, employment, and income.

S10Q1a. Before your admission (Display "to jail" if CDAJS11 is blank) otherwise (Display "on (Insert CDAJS11)"), what was the highest grade of school that you attended?

(Range 0-18)

<0> Never attended or attended } Skip to S10Q2a
kindergarten only }
}

ELEMENTARY

<1> First } Continue with S10Q1b
<2> Second }
<3> Third }
<4> Fourth }
<5> Fifth }
<6> Sixth }
<7> Seventh }
<8> Eighth }
}

HIGH SCHOOL

<9> Ninth }
<10> Tenth }
<11> Eleventh }
<12> Twelfth }
}

COLLEGE

<13> Freshman } Skip to S10Q1bb
<14> Sophomore }
<15> Junior }
<16> Senior }
}

GRADUATE SCHOOL

<17> One year }
<18> Two or more years } Skip to S10Q1f
Blind <D> or <R> } Skip to S10Q1c
}

S10Q1b. Did you complete that grade?

(Range 1-2)

<1> Yes } Continue with S10C1A
<2> No }
Blind <D> or <R> }
}

S10Q1bb. Did you complete that year?

(Range 1-2)

<1> Yes } Continue with S10C1A
<2> No }
Blind <D> or <R> }
}

S10C1A

Have computer check items S10Q1a and S10Q1b.

If S10Q1a = 12 and S10Q1b = 1 or S10Q1a > 12 } Skip to S10Q1f, otherwise continue with S10Q1c

S10Q1c. What were the reasons you stopped attending school when you did?

(READ EACH CATEGORY TO THE RESPONDENT)

(ENTER (X) FOR ALL THAT APPLY) (Range 1-9)

REORDER THE RESPONSES!!!

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| <1> Convicted of crime or sent to jail/prison/detention center | } Skip to S10CIB |
| <2> Involved in illegal activities | } |
| <3> Behavior or academic problems in school | } |
| <4> Lost interest | } |
| <5> Financial problems | } |
| <6> Family or personal problems | } |
| <7> Went to work or into the military | } |
| <8> Pregnancy | } |
| <9> Other - Specify | } Continue with S10Q1csp |
- Blind <D> or <R> } Skip to S10Q1e

Computer Instruction: If this question is left blank, return the FR to this screen until an answer is entered.

S10Q1csp. (ASK IF NECESSARY) Please specify other reason(s) why you stopped attending school. } Continue with S10CIB

Field length = 64 characters

Blind <D> or <R> continue with S10CIB if a <1> - <8> was marked
in S10Q1c. If not, skip to S10Q1e.

S10CIB

Is more than one reason entered in S10Q1c?

- | | |
|---------|------------------------|
| <1> Yes | } Continue with S10Q1d |
| <2> No | } Skip to S10Q1e |

S10Q1d. What is the most important reason?

Computer Instruction: Display the numbers and descriptions chosen from S10Q1c and S10Q1csp.

Enter number ____ (Range 1-9) } Continue with S10Q1e
Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q1e. Do you have a GED or high school equivalency certificate?

(Range 1-2)

- | | |
|---------|------------------------|
| <1> Yes | } Continue with S10Q2a |
| <2> No | } |
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q1f. Do you have a GED or high school diploma?

(Range 1-2)

- | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------|
| <1> GED | } Continue with S10Q2a |
| <2> High School Diploma | } |
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q2a. Do you have a physical, mental, or other health condition which limits the kind or amount of work you can do?

(Range 1-2)

- | | |
|---------|------------------------|
| <1> Yes | } Continue with S10Q2b |
| <2> No | } |
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q2b. Do you have any difficulty seeing ordinary newsprint even when wearing glasses?

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Continue with S10Q2c
- <2> No }
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q2c. Do you have any difficulty hearing a normal conversation even when using a hearing aid?

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Continue with S10Q2d
- <2> No }
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q2d. Do you have

(READ EACH CATEGORY TO THE RESPONDENT EXCEPT FOR (NONE))

(ENTER (X) FOR ALL THAT APPLY) (Range 1-4, 0)

- <1> A learning disability, such as dyslexia or attention deficit disorder? } Skip to S10Q3a
- <2> A speech disability, such as a lisp or stuttering? }
- <3> A physical disability? }
- <4> A mental or emotional condition? }
- <0> None } Skip to S10Q3a
- Blind <D> or <R> }

Computer Instruction: If this question is left blank, return the FR to this screen until an answer is entered.

S10Q3a. During the month before your (Display "admission to jail" if DOASI3 is blank) otherwise (Display "arrest on (Insert DOASI3)"), did you have a job or a business?

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Continue with S10Q3b
- <2> No } Skip to S10Q4a
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q3b. Was this full-time, part-time, or occasional work?

(Range 1-3)

- <1> Full-time } Skip to S10Q5
- <2> Part-time } Continue with S10Q3c
- <3> Occasional }
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q3c. Were you looking for other work at that time?

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Skip to S10Q5
- <2> No }
- Blind <D> or <R> } Continue with S10Q5

S10Q4a. Were you looking for work?

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Skip to S10Q4d
- <2> No } Continue with S10Q4b
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q4b. What were the reasons you were not looking for work? Any other reasons?

(ENTER X) FOR ALL THAT APPLY)

(ENTER N) FOR NO MORE) (Range 1-15, 0)

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| <1> No suitable work available | } Skip to S10C1C |
| <2> Couldn't find any work | } |
| <3> Lack of necessary schooling, training, skills, or experience | } |
| <4> Medical condition, ill health, physical or mental disability | } |
| <5> Employers thought too young or too old | } |
| <6> Criminal record was a handicap | } |
| <7> Family responsibilities or couldn't arrange child care | } |
| <8> On welfare or other public assistance | } |
| <9> In school/special program | } |
| <10> Didn't need job | } |
| <11> Didn't want job | } |
| <12> Illegal activities | } |
| <13> On drugs/alcohol | } |
| <14> Retired | } |
| <15> Other - Specify | } Continue with S10Q4bsp |
| <0> No specific reason | } Skip to S10Q4d |
| Blind <D> or <R> | } |

Computer Instruction: If this question is left blank, return the FR to this screen until an answer is entered.

S10Q4bsp. (ASK IF NECESSARY) Please specify reason why you were not looking for work.

} Continue with S10C1C

Field length = 64 characters

Blind <D> or <R> continue with S10C1C if a <1> - <14> was chosen in S10Q4b. If not, skip to S10Q4d.

S10C1C

Is more than one reason entered in S10Q4b?

If Yes } Continue with S10Q4c

If No } Skip to S10Q4d

S10Q4c. What is the most important reason?

Display the numbers and descriptions chosen from S10Q4b and S10Q4bsp (if applicable).

Enter number __ __ (Range 1-15 from S10Q4b) } Continue with S10Q4d

Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q4d. When did you last work at a job or business for at least 2 consecutive weeks? Exclude volunteer work, community service, any other form of uncompensated activity, and any work done while in jail or prison.

(NOTE: IF THE MONTH IS NOT KNOWN LEAVE BLANK)

Enter month: __ __ (Range 1-12, blank) } Continue with S10Q4e

Enter 2 digit year: 19 __ __ (Range 10-95) }

(Range N, A)

<N> Never worked at all } Skip to S10Q6a

<A> Never worked 2 consecutive weeks }

Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q4e. Was this full time, part time, or occasional work?

(Range 1-3)

<1> Full time } Continue with S10Q5

<2> Part time }

<3> Occasional }

Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q5. What kind of work were you doing then?

(PROBE FOR A SPECIFIC OCCUPATION)

} Continue with S10Q6a

Field length = 64 characters

Blind <D> or <R>

}

S10Q6a. Before you were admitted to jail (Display "on (Insert CDAJS11)" if there is a date in CDAJS11), were you living in a

(READ EACH CATEGORY TO THE RESPONDENT)

(ENTER ONLY ONE)

(Range 1-7)

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| <1> House? | } Continue with S10Q6g |
| <2> Apartment | } |
| <3> Trailer or mobile home? | } |
| <4> Rooming-house, hotel, or motel? | } |
| <5> On the street or in a homeless shelter? | } Skip to S10Q7c |
| <6> In a group living situation or institution, such as a hospital
halfway house, recovery home, dormitory, etc.? | } Skip to S10Q8e |
| <7> In another type of housing? - Specify — | } Continue with S10Q6asp |
- Blind <D> or <R>

} Skip to S10Q9a

S10Q6asp. (ASK IF NECESSARY) Please specify other type of housing.

} Continue with S10Q6g

Field length = 64 characters

Blind <D> or <R>

}

S10Q6g. In the 12 months before your admission (Display "on (Insert CDAJS11)" if there is a date in CDAJS11), had there been a time when you were homeless, living on the street or in a shelter?

(Range 1-2)

- | | |
|---------|------------------------|
| <1> Yes | } Continue with S10Q6h |
| <2> No | } |
- Blind <D> or <R>

}

S10Q6h. In the 12 months before your admission (Display "on (Insert CDAJS11)" if there is a date in CDAJS11), had you spent any time in a jail, prison, juvenile or other correctional facility?

(Range 1-2)

- | | |
|---------|------------------------|
| <1> Yes | } Continue with S10Q6i |
| <2> No | } Skip to S10Q9a |
- Blind <D> or <R>

}

S10Q6i. Which was it?

(ENTER (X) FOR ALL THAT APPLY)

(ENTER (N) FOR NO MORE) (Range 1-4)

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <1> State, Federal, or private prison | } Skip to S10Q9a |
| <2> Local or county jail | } |
| <3> Juvenile facility | } |
| <4> Other - Specify | } Continue with S10Q6isp |
- Blind <D> or <R>

} Skip to S10Q9a

S10Q6isp. (ASK IF NECESSARY) Please specify the place where you have spent time.

} Continue with S10Q9a

Field length = 64 characters

Blind <D> or <R>

}

S10Q7c. In the 12 months before your admission (Display "on (Insert CDAJSI11)" if there is a date in CDAJSI11), had you spent any time in a jail, prison, juvenile or other correctional facility?

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Continue with S10Q7d
- <2> No } Skip to S10Q9aa
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q7d. Which was it?

(ENTER (X) FOR ALL THAT APPLY)

(ENTER (N) FOR NO MORE) (Range 1-4)

- <1> State, Federal, or private prison } Skip to S10Q9aa
- <2> Local or county jail }
- <3> Juvenile facility }
- <4> Other - Specify } Continue with S10Q7dsp
- Blind <D> or <R> } Skip to S10Q9aa

Computer Instruction: If this question is left blank, return the FR to this screen until an answer is entered.

S10Q7dsp. (ASK IF NECESSARY) Please specify where you spent time.

} Skip to S10Q9aa

Field length = 64 characters

Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q8e. In the 12 months before your admission (Display "on (Insert CDAJSI11)" if there is a date in CDAJSI11), had there been a time when you were homeless, living on the street or in a homeless shelter?

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Continue with S10Q8f
- <2> No }
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q8f. In the 12 months before your admission (Display "on (Insert CDAJSI11)" if there is a date in CDAJSI11), had you spent any time in a jail, prison, juvenile or other correctional facility?

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Continue with S10Q8g
- <2> No } Skip to S10Q9aa
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q8g. Which was it?

(ENTER (X) FOR ALL THAT APPLY)

(ENTER (N) FOR NO MORE)

(Range 1-4)

- <1> State, Federal, or private prison } Skip to S10Q9aa
- <2> Local or county jail }
- <3> Juvenile facility }
- <4> Other - Specify } Continue with S10Q8gsp
- Blind <D> or <R> } Skip to S10Q9aa

S10Q8gsp. (ASK IF NECESSARY) Please specify where you served time.

} Continue with S10Q9aa

Field length = 64 characters

Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q9a. In the month before your admission (Display "on (Insert CDAJSI11)" if there is a date in CDAJSI11) was anyone living with you?

(ENTER "YES" ONLY IF INMATE WAS LIVING WITH OTHERS AS A FAMILY UNIT)

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Continue with S10Q9b
- <2> No } Skip to S10Q10a
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q9aa. In the month before your admission (Display "on (Insert CDAJSI11)" if there is a date in CDAJSI11), was anyone living with you as a family? (Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Continue with S10Q9b
- <2> No } Skip to S10Q10a
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q9b. And how were they related to you? Is that everyone?

(ENTER (X) FOR ALL THAT APPLY)

(ENTER (N) FOR NO MORE) (Range 1-10)

- <1> Inmate's child(ren)/Stepchild(ren) under age 18 } Continue with S10Q9c
- <2> Inmate's adult child(ren)/Stepchild(ren) }
- <3> Spouse }
- <4> Parent(s)/Step-parent(s) }
- <5> Grandparent(s) }
- <6> Brother(s)/Sister(s) or Stepbrother(s)/Step-sister(s) }
- <7> Other relative(s) }
- <8> Girlfriend/boyfriend }
- <9> Child(ren) under age 18 unrelated to inmate }
- <10> Other friend(s)/Non-relative(s) }
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q9c. Including yourself, how many persons lived with you before your current incarceration?

Enter total number of persons ___ (Range 2-25) } Continue with S10Q9d

Blind <D> or <R> }

Further Instructions: For one of the next two questions, either S10Q9d or S10Q9e, you will add the phrase "Including yourself", depending on the age of the respondent. From questions S1Q2b or S1Q2c, if the respondent is 18 years of age or older, S10Q9d should read - Including yourself, how many adults were aged 18 and over? S10Q9e would remain the same. The exact opposite holds true if the respondent is under age 18. If the age was not given in questions S1Q2b or S1Q2c, add the phrase "Including yourself" to both S10Q9d and S10Q9e.

S10Q9d. How many were adults aged 18 and over?

(ENTER 0 FOR NONE)

Enter number of adults age 18 and over ___ (Range 0-25) } Continue with S10C1C1

Blind <D> or <R> }

S10C1C1

Does the value in S10Q9d equal S10Q9c?

- <1> Yes } Continue with S10Q9dd
- <2> No } Skip to S10Q9e

S10Q9dd. So, there were no children under 18 living with you. Is that correct?

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Skip to S10Q9f and store a "0" in S10Q9e
- <2> No } Continue with S10Q9e
- Blind <D> or <R> } Continue with S10Q9f

S10Q9e. How many were children under age 18?

(ENTER 0 FOR NONE)

Enter number of children under age 18 ____ (Range 0-25) } Continue with S10CIC2

Blind <D> or <R> }

S10CIC2

Does the sum of the values in S10Q9d + S10Q9e = S10Q9c?

<1> Yes } Skip to S10Q9f

<2> No } Continue with S10Q9ee

S10Q9ee. Were (Insert sum of S10Q9d + S10Q9e) persons living with you before your current incarceration?

<1> Yes } Store that value in S10Q9c and continue with S10Q9f

<2> No } Go back to S10Q9c

S10Q9f. Were any of them receiving public assistance or welfare before you were admitted to jail?

(Range 1-2)

<1> Yes } Continue with S10Q9g

<2> No }

Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q9g. Are any of them now receiving public assistance or welfare?

(Range 1-2)

<1> Yes } Continue with S10CID

<2> No }

Blind <D> or <R> }

S10CID

Are responses 1 or 2 in S10Q9b marked?

<1> Yes } Skip to S10Q10b

<2> No } Continue with S10Q10a

S10Q10a. Do you have any children, including step or adopted children? (Range 1-2)

<1> Yes } Continue with S10Q10b

<2> No } Skip to S10CIF

Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q10b. How many children do you have?

Enter number of children ____ (Range 1-20) } Continue with S10Q10c

Blind <D> or <R> }

Further Instructions: Display the number of blanks (1-6) in S10Q10c depending on what is answered in S10Q10b. If they answer above 6 in S10Q10b, list six choices. If no numerical response is given in S10Q10b, display all six possible choices in S10Q10c.

S10Q10c. What are their ages (Ask "What is the child's age" if one child from question S10Q10b)?

(NOTE: FOR ANY CHILD (CHILDREN) LESS THAN ONE YEAR OLD, ENTER 0. IF INMATE HAS MORE THAN ONE CHILD AND KNOWS THE AGE OF AT LEAST ONE, ENTER THE AGE OF THOSE KNOWN AND A "D" FOR AGE NOT KNOWN FOR A CHILD/CHILDREN. IF RESPONDENT SIMPLY DOES NOT KNOW IF HE/SHE HAS A CHILD (CHILDREN) OR HAS ONE CHILD AND DOESN'T KNOW THE AGE OF THE ONE CHILD, ENTER D, OR REFUSES, R)

(0 MEANS LESS THAN ONE YEAR) (ENTER (N) FOR NO MORE)

(IF MORE THAN "6" CHILDREN, LIST THE SIX YOUNGEST)

Ages of Children

1st Child Enter age ____ (Range 0-50, D) } Continue with S10C1E
} }
2nd Child Enter age ____ (Range 0-50, D) }
} }
3rd Child Enter age ____ (Range 0-50, D) }
} }
4th Child Enter age ____ (Range 0-50, D) }
} }
5th Child Enter age ____ (Range 0-50, D) }
} }
6th Child Enter age ____ (Range 0-50, D) }
} }
Blind <D> or <R> }

S10C1E:

Are any of the children in S10Q10c under 18?

If Yes } Skip to S10Q11b

If No } Continue with S10Q11a

S10Q11a. Were any of your children under age 18 when you were admitted to jail on (Display "on (Insert CDAJS11)" if there is a date in CDAJS11)?

(Range 1-2)

<1> Yes } Continue with S10Q11b
<2> No } Skip to S10C1F
Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q11b. (Was this child/Were any of these children) under age 18 living with you just before your current incarceration?

(Range 1-2)

<1> Yes } Continue with S10Q11c
<2> No }
Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q11c. Who are they living with now?

(ENTER (X) FOR ALL THAT APPLY)

(ENTER (N) FOR NO MORE) (Range 1-8)

<1> Child's mother/father (including step-parents) } Skip to S10Q12a
<2> Child's grandparents }
<3> Other relatives }
<4> Friends }
<5> Foster home }
<6> Agency or institution (including religious institutions) }
<7> Alone }
<8> Someone else - Specify } Continue with S10Q11cs
Blind <D> or <R> } Skip to S10Q12a

S10Q11cs. (ASK IF NECESSARY) Please specify where they are living now.

} Continue with S10Q12a

Field length = 64 characters

Blind <D> or <R>

}

S10Q12a. Since your admission to jail on (Display "on (Insert CDAJSI11)" if there is a date in CDAJSI11), about how often have you talked with your child(ren) on the telephone? Would you say daily or almost daily, at least once a week, at least once a month, less than once a month, or never?

(Range 1-5)

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <1> Daily or almost daily | } Continue with S10Q12b |
| <2> At least once a week | } |
| <3> At least once a month | } |
| <4> Less than once a month | } |
| <5> Never | } |

Blind <D> or <R>

}

S10Q12b. And how often have you sent or received mail from your child(ren)?

(Range 1-5)

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <1> Daily or almost daily | } Continue with S10Q12c |
| <2> At least once a week | } |
| <3> At least once a month | } |
| <4> Less than once a month | } |
| <5> Never | } |

Blind <D> or <R>

}

S10Q12c. And how often have you been personally visited by your child(ren)?

(Range 1-5)

- | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------|
| <1> Daily or almost daily | } Continue with S10C1F |
| <2> At least once a week | } |
| <3> At least once a month | } |
| <4> Less than once a month | } |
| <5> Never | } |

Blind <D> or <R>

}

S10C1F

If INCARS16 = 1, "Yes", then continue with S10Q13a

If INCARS16 = 2, "No", then skip to S10Q13e

S10Q13a. Before your arrest (Display "on (Insert DOASI3)" if there is a date in DOASI3), were you free at least 1 year?

(Range 1-2)

- | | |
|---------|-------------------------|
| <1> Yes | } Skip to S10Q13e |
| <2> No | } Continue with S10Q13b |

Blind <D> or <R>

} Skip to S10Q13e

S10Q13b. How many months were you free?

(ENTER 0 FOR LESS THAN 1 MONTH, ROUND TO THE LOWEST MONTH)

Enter months __ __ (Range 0-11) } If 0 skip to S10Q13g, else continue with S10Q13c
Blind <D> or <R> } Skip to S10Q13g

S10Q13c. (SHOW CARD K)

During that time did you personally receive any income from —
(READ EACH CATEGORY TO THE RESPONDENT EXCEPT "None of these" and "No income")
(ENTER X FOR ALL THAT APPLY) (Range 1-11, 0)

- <1> (1) WAGES, SALARIES, OR PAY FROM A JOB?
- <2> (2) SOCIAL SECURITY OR SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME?
- <3> (3) ANY OTHER TYPE OF PENSION, including Federal or State employee retirement, veterans pension, or railroad retirement?
- <4> (4) ANY TYPE OF WELFARE, CHARITY OR OTHER PUBLIC ASSISTANCE, including AFDC (or ADC), food stamps, or WIC benefits?
- <5> (5) ASSISTANCE FROM FAMILY OR FRIENDS?
- <6> (6) COMPENSATION PAYMENTS, including unemployment insurance, Workman's Compensation, or Veteran's Compensation?
- <7> (7) ALIMONY PAYMENTS AND/OR CHILD SUPPORT?
- <8> (8) EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE which does not have to be repaid, including scholarships or grants?
- <9> (9) INVESTMENT INCOME, including rent, interest, dividends, money market funds, or trust funds?
- <10> (10) ANY OTHER INCOME from any other sources? - Specify — **(EXCLUDE INCOME FROM ILLEGAL SOURCES)**
- <11> None of these
- <0> No income

Blind <D> or <R> skip to S10Q13cc

*If a response in answers <1>-<8> or <10>, skip to S10Q13cc. If a response to <9>, continue with S10Q13cs.
If a response to <0> ONLY, then skip to S10Q13cc.*

Computer Instruction: If this question is left blank, return the FR to this screen until an answer is entered.

S10Q13cs. (ASK IF NECESSARY) Please specify the sources of this income.

Field length = 64 characters

Blind <D> or <R> } Continue with S10Q13cc
}

S10Q13cc. Did you receive any income from illegal sources? (Range 1-2)

<1> Yes } Continue with S10Q13d
<2> No } If S10Q13c was <0> only, skip to S10Q13g otherwise continue with S10Q13d
Blind <D> or <R> } Continue with S10Q13d

S10Q13d. (SHOW CARD L)

Which category on this card represents your personal monthly income from (Insert month prior to the month of arrest in DOASI3) first to (Insert month prior to the month of arrest in DOASI3) (Insert number of last day of month) (Insert year from DOASI3), the month before your arrest? (Unless arrested in January, then insert previous year)

NOTE: IF DOASI3 = NOT ARRESTED, USE DOASI4

(Range 0-14)

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| <0> No income | } Skip to S10C1G |
| <1> (A) \$1 - \$99 | } |
| <2> (B) 100 - 199 | } |
| <3> (C) 200 - 299 | } |
| <4> (D) 300 - 399 | } |
| <5> (E) 400 - 499 | } |
| <6> (F) 500 - 599 | } |
| <7> (G) 600 - 799 | } |
| <8> (H) 800 - 999 | } |
| <9> (I) 1,000 - 1,199 | } |
| <10> (J) 1,200 - 1,499 | } |
| <11> (K) 1,500 - 1,999 | } |
| <12> (L) 2,000 - 2,499 | } |
| <13> (M) 2,500 - 4,999 | } |
| <14> (N) 5,000 or more | } |
| <i>Blind <D> or <R></i> | } |

S10Q13e. (SHOW CARD K)

In the year before your (Display ("admission to jail" if DOASI3 is blank) otherwise (Display "arrest on (Insert DOASI3)"). did you receive any income from -

(READ EACH CATEGORY TO THE RESPONDENT EXCEPT "None of these" and "No income")

(ENTER (X) FOR ALL THAT APPLY) (Range 1-11, 0)

<1> (1) WAGES, SALARIES, OR PAY FROM A JOB?

<2> (2) SOCIAL SECURITY OR SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME?

<3> (3) ANY OTHER TYPE OF PENSION, including Federal or State employee retirement, veterans pension, or railroad retirement?

<4> (4) ANY TYPE OF WELFARE, CHARITY OR OTHER PUBLIC ASSISTANCE, including AFDC (or ADC), food stamps, or WIC benefits?

<5> (5) ASSISTANCE FROM FAMILY OR FRIENDS?

<6> (6) COMPENSATION PAYMENTS, including unemployment insurance, Workman's Compensation, or Veteran's Compensation?

<7> (7) ALIMONY PAYMENTS AND/OR CHILD SUPPORT?

<8> (8) EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE which does not have to be repaid, including scholarships or grants?

<9> (9) INVESTMENT INCOME, including rent, interest, dividends, money market funds, or trust funds?

<10> (10) ANY OTHER INCOME from any other sources? - Specify — (EXCLUDE INCOME FROM ILLEGAL SOURCES)

<11> None of these

<0> No income

Blind <D> or <R> skip to S10Q13ee

If response in answers <1>-<8> or <10>, skip to S10Q13ee. If response to <9>, continue with S10Q13es.

If response to <0>, then skip to S10Q13ee

Computer Instruction: If this question is left blank, return the FR to this screen until an answer is entered.

S10Q13es. (ASK IF NECESSARY) Please specify what kind of income you received.

} Continue with S10Q13ee

Field length = 64 characters

Blind <D> or <R>

}

S10Q13ee. Did you receive any income from illegal sources? (Range 1-2)

<1> Yes } Continue with S10Q13f

<2> No } If S10Q13e was <0> only, skip to S10Q13g otherwise continue with S10Q13f

Blind <D> or <R> } Continue with S10Q13f

S10Q13c. (SHOW CARD L) (Range 0-14)

Which category on this card represents your TOTAL personal income (Insert month prior to the month of arrest in DOASI3) first to (Insert month prior to the month of arrest in DOASI3) (Insert number of last day of the month) (Insert year from DOASI3), the month before your arrest? (Unless arrested in January, insert previous year)

NOTE: IF DOASI3 = NOT ARRESTED, USE DOAJSI4.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| <0> No income | } Continue with S10C1C |
| <1> (A) \$1 - \$99 | } |
| <2> (B) 100 - 199 | } |
| <3> (C) 200 - 299 | } |
| <4> (D) 300 - 399 | } |
| <5> (E) 400 - 499 | } |
| <6> (F) 500 - 599 | } |
| <7> (G) 600 - 799 | } |
| <8> (H) 800 - 999 | } |
| <9> (I) 1,000 - 1,199 | } |
| <10> (J) 1,200 - 1,499 | } |
| <11> (K) 1,500 - 1,999 | } |
| <12> (L) 2,000 - 2,499 | } |
| <13> (M) 2,500 - 4,999 | } |
| <14> (N) 5,000 or more | } |
| <i>Blind <D> or <R></i> | } |

S10C1C

Is <2> selected in S10Q13c or S10Q13e?

- | | |
|---------|-------------------------|
| <1> Yes | } Skip to S10Q13k |
| <2> No | } Continue with S10Q13g |

S10Q13g. Have you ever received income from Social Security as a result of a retirement, survivors, or disability benefit?

(Range 1-2)

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <1> Yes | } Continue with S10Q13h |
| <2> No | } Skip to S10Q13i |
| <i>Blind <D> or <R></i> | } |

S10Q13h. Are you currently receiving this income?

(Range 1-2)

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <1> Yes | } Continue with S10Q13i |
| <2> No | } |
| <i>Blind <D> or <R></i> | } |

S10Q13i. Have you ever received Supplemental Security Income (SSI)?

(Range 1-2)

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <1> Yes | } Continue with S10Q13j |
| <2> No | } Skip to S10Q14a |
| <i>Blind <D> or <R></i> | } |

S10Q13j. Are you currently receiving this income?

(Range 1-2)

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| <1> Yes | } Skip to S10Q14a |
| <2> No | } |
| <i>Blind <D> or <R></i> | } |

S10Q13k. Are you now receiving income from Social Security because of a retirement or a survivor or disability benefit?

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Skip to S10Q14a
- <2> No } Continue with S10Q13l
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q13l. Are you now receiving income from Supplemental Security Income (SSI)?

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Continue with S10Q14a
- <2> No }
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q14a. When you were growing up, who did you live with most of the time? If more than one relative, select?? closest blood relative.

(ENTER ONLY ONE) (Range 1-9)

- <1> Mother } Skip to S10Q14b
- <2> Father }
- <3> Both parents (Including one step-parent) }
- <4> Grandparents }
- <5> Other relatives (Include step-relations) }
- <6> Friends }
- <7> Foster homes } Skip to S10Q14c
- <8> Agency or institution (Including religious institution) }
- <9> Someone else - Specify — } Continue with S10Q14as
- Blind <D> or <R> } skip to S10Q14b

S10Q14as. (ASK IF NECESSARY) Please specify who you lived with most of the time.

} Continue with S10Q14b

Field length = 64 characters

Blind <D> or <R>

}

S10Q14b. Was there ever a time while you were growing up that you lived in a foster home, agency or institution?

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Continue with S10Q14bb
- <2> No } Skip to S10Q14d
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q14bb. Was it a foster home, agency or institution, or both?

(Range 1-3)

- <1> Foster Home } Skip to S10Q14d
- <2> Agency or institution }
- <3> Both }
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q14c. Was there ever a time while you were growing up that you lived in a (Insert "foster home" if 08 was marked in S10Q14a and "agency or institution" if 07 was marked in S10Q14a?)

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Continue with S10Q14d
- <2> No }
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q14d. Did any of your parents or guardians ever receive welfare or public assistance while you were growing up?

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Continue with S10Q14e
- <2> No }
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q14e. Did you ever live in public housing or publicly assisted housing, for example, Section 8 housing, while you were growing up?

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Continue with S10Q15
- <2> No }
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q15. When you were growing up, did any of your parents or guardians abuse alcohol or drugs?

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Continue with S10Q15a
- <2> No } Skip to S10Q16
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q15a. Was it alcohol, drugs, or both?

(Range 3-5)

- <3> Alcohol } Continue with S10Q16
 - <4> Drugs }
 - <5> Both alcohol and drugs }
- Blind <D> or <R> continue with S10Q16

S10Q16. How many brothers and sisters have you had? Include half and step brothers and sisters.

(ENTER 0 FOR NONE)

Enter number of brothers and sisters __ (Range 0-25) } Continue with S10Q17a
Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q17a. Have any of your parents or stepparents ever served time in jail or prison?

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Continue with S10Q17b
- <2> No } Skip to S10Q17c
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q17b. Who was that? Anyone else?

(ENTER (X) FOR ALL THAT APPLY)

(ENTER (N) FOR NO MORE)

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Mother/Stepmother } Continue with S10Q17c
- <2> Father/Stepfather }
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q17c. Have any of your spouses, children, brothers, or sisters ever served time in jail or prison?

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Continue with S10Q17d
- <2> No } Skip to S10Q17e
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q17d. Who was that? Anyone else?

(ENTER (X) FOR ALL THAT APPLY)

(ENTER (N) FOR NO MORE)

(Range 1-4)

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| <1> Spouse | } Continue with S10Q17e |
| <2> Child/Stepchild | } |
| <3> Brother/Stepbrother | } |
| <4> Sister/Stepsister | } |
| Blind <D> or <R> | } |

S10Q17e. Have any of your parents or stepparents ever served time on probation?

(Range 1-2)

- | | |
|------------------|-------------------------|
| <1> Yes | } Continue with S10Q17f |
| <2> No | } Skip to S10Q17g |
| Blind <D> or <R> | } |

S10Q17f. Who was that? Anyone else?

(ENTER (X) FOR ALL THAT APPLY)

(ENTER (N) FOR NO MORE)

(Range 1-2)

- | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| <1> Mother/Stepmother | } Continue with S10Q17g |
| <2> Father/Stepfather | } |
| Blind <D> or <R> | } |

S10Q17g. Have any of your spouses, children, brothers, or sisters ever served time on probation?

(Range 1-2)

- | | |
|------------------|-------------------------|
| <1> Yes | } Continue with S10Q17h |
| <2> No | } Skip to S10Q18a |
| Blind <D> or <R> | } |

S10Q17h. Who was that? Anyone else?

(ENTER (X) FOR ALL THAT APPLY)

(ENTER (N) FOR NO MORE)

(Range 1-4)

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| <1> Spouse | } Continue with S10Q18a |
| <2> Child/Stepchild | } |
| <3> Brother/Stepbrother | } |
| <4> Sister/Stepsister | } |
| Blind <D> or <R> | } |

S10Q18a. When you were growing up, did you ever belong to a group of friends that engaged in activities such as -

(READ EACH CATEGORY TO THE RESPONDENT EXCEPT LAST; PAUSE FOR RESPONSE)

(ENTER (X) FOR ALL THAT APPLY) (Range 1-10, 0)

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| <1> Using drugs? | } Continue with S10Q19a |
| <2> Destroying or damaging property that did not belong to them? | } |
| <3> Having fights with other groups? | } |
| <4> Shoplifting? | } |
| <5> Stealing motor vehicles or parts from motor vehicles? | } |
| <6> Selling stolen property? | } |
| <7> Breaking into homes or other buildings? | } |
| <8> Selling, importing, or manufacturing drugs? | } |
| <9> Mugging, robbing or extorting money from people? | } |
| <10> Any other illegal activity? - Specify | } Continue with S10Q18as |
| <0> None | } Continue with S10Q19a |
| Blind <D> or <R> | } Continue with S10Q19a |

Computer Instruction: If this question is left blank, return the FR to this screen until an answer is entered.

S10Q18as. (ASK IF NECESSARY) Please specify other type of illegal activity.

} Continue with S10Q19a

Field length = 64 characters

Blind <D> or <R>

} Continue with S10Q19a

S10Q19a. Have you ever been physically or sexually abused?

(Range 1-2)

<1> Yes } Continue with S10Q19aa

<2> No } Skip to S11Q1

Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q19aa. Which was it? (Range 1-3)

<1> Physically abused only

} Continue with S10Q19b

<2> Sexually abused only

}

<3> Both physically and sexually abused

}

Blind <D> or <R> } Skip to S11Q1

S10Q19b. Did this occur once or more than once?

(Range 1-2)

<1> Once } Continue with S10Q19c

<2> More than once } Skip to S10Q19g

Blind <D> or <R> } Continue with S10Q19c

S10Q19c. Did this occur before or after you were 18 years old?

(Range 1-2)

<1> Before age 18 } Continue with S10Q19d

<2> Age 18 or older }

Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q19d. When this incident occurred, was the person who abused you an adult, age 18 or older?

(Range 1-2)

<1> Yes } Continue with S10Q19e

<2> No }

Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q19e. Was this person someone you knew?

(Range 1-2)

<1> Yes } Continue with S10Q19ee

<2> No } Skip to S10CIH

Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q19ee. Was this person --

(READ EACH CATEGORY TO THE RESPONDENT)

(ENTER ONLY ONE) (Range 1-6)

<1> Your parent or guardian? } Continue with S10CIH

<2> Your spouse/ex-spouse? }

<3> Another relative? }

<4> A boyfriend or girlfriend? }

<5> Another friend or acquaintance? }

<6> Someone else? }

Blind <D> or <R> }

S10CIH

Is 2. "sexually abused" or 3 "both" entered in S10Q19aa?

<1> Yes } Continue with S10Q19f

<2> No } Skip to S11Q1

S10Q19f. In this incident did someone rape you or attempt to rape you?

(Range 1-2)

<1> Yes } Continue with S10Q19ff

<2> No } Skip to S11Q1

Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q19ff. Which was it?

(Range 1-2)

<1> Completed rape } Skip to S11Q1

<2> Attempted rape }

Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q19g. Did these incidents occur before you were 18 years old, after age 18, or both?

(Range 1-3)

<1> Before age 18 } Continue with S10Q19h

<2> Age 18 or older }

<3> Both before and after age 18 }

Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q19h. Did one person abuse you or more than one?

(Range 1-2)

<1> One } Skip to S10Q19i

<2> More than one } Continue with S10Q19hh

Blind <D> or <R> } Skip to S10Q19i

S10Q19hh. How many?

Enter number of persons __ (Range 1-25) } Skip to S10Q19i

Blind <D> or <R> } skip to S10Q19i

S10Q19i. When these incidents occurred, was the person who abused you an adult, age 18 or older?

(Range 1-3)

<1> Yes, 18 or older } Continue with S10Q19j

<2> Both under and over age 18 }

<3> No, under 18 only }

Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q19j. Did you know the person who abused you?

(Range 1-2)

<1> Yes } Continue with S10Q19jj

<2> No } Skip to S10CII

Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q19jj. Was this person --

(READ EACH CATEGORY TO THE RESPONDENT)

(ENTER ONLY ONE) (Range 1-6)

- <1> Your parent or guardian? } Continue with S10CII
- <2> Your spouse/ex-spouse? }
- <3> Another relative? }
- <4> A boyfriend or girlfriend? }
- <5> Another friend or acquaintance? }
- <6> Someone else? }
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10CII

Is 2 "sexually abused" or 3 "both" entered in S10Q19aa?

- <1> Yes } Continue with S10Q19k
- <2> No } Skip to S11Q1

S10Q19k. In any of these incidents did this person rape you or attempt to rape you?

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Continue with S10Q19kk
- <2> No } Skip to S11Q1
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q19kk. Were any of these rapes completed?

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Some or all completed } Skip to S11Q1
- <2> None completed }
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q19l. When these incidents occurred, were any of the persons who abused you adults, age 18 or older?

(Range 1-3)

- <1> Yes, 18 or older } Continue with S10Q19m
- <2> Both under and over age 18 }
- <3> No, under 18 only }
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q19m. Did you know any of the persons who abused you?

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Continue with S10Q19mm
- <2> No } Skip to S10CIJ
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10Q19mm. Were any of them --

(READ EACH CATEGORY TO THE RESPONDENT)

(ENTER (X) FOR ALL THAT APPLY) (Range 1-6)

- <1> Your parent or guardian? } Continue with S10CIJ
- <2> Your spouse/ex-spouse? }
- <3> Another relative? }
- <4> A boyfriend or girlfriend? }
- <5> Another friend or acquaintance? }
- <6> Someone else? }
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S10CIJ

Is 2 "sexually abused" or 3 "both" entered in S10Q19aa?

- <1> Yes } Continue with S10Q19n
- <2> No } Skip to S11Q1

S10Q19n. In any of these incidents did anyone rape you or attempt to rape you?

(Range 1-2)

- | | |
|------------------|--------------------------|
| <1> Yes | > Continue with S10Q19nn |
| <2> No | > Skip to S11Q1 |
| Blind <D> or <R> | } |

S10Q19nn. Were any of these rapes completed?

(Range 1-2)

- | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| <1> Some or all completed | > Continue with S11Q1 |
| <2> None completed | } |
| Blind <D> or <R> | |

Section II — ALCOHOL AND DRUG USE AND TREATMENT

SIIQ1. The next questions are about drinking alcohol. In your entire life, have you had at least 12 drinks of any kind of alcohol, not counting small tastes or sips?

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Continue with SIIQ2 - Store response in ALCOHSI9
- <2> No } Skip to SIIQ12 - Store response in ALCOHSI9
- Blind <D> or <R> } skip to SIIQ12

SIIQ2. About how old were you when you first started drinking, other than small tastes or sips?

Enter Age ____ (Range 0-95) }

- Blind <D> or <R> } Continue with SIIQ3

SIIQ3. Have you ever drunk alcoholic beverages on a regular basis, that is more than once a week for more than a month?

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Continue with SIIQ1A
- <2> No }
- Blind <D> or <R> }

SIIQ1A

Is DETSTS15 = 4 "No Offense?"

- <1> Yes } Skip to SIIQ1A1
- <2> No } Continue with SIIQ4a

SIIQ4a. During the year before (Display "your admission to jail" if CONOFSI2 and DOAJSI4 are both blank) or (Display "the offense for which you were admitted to jail on (Insert DOAJSI4)" if there is no offense stored in CONOFSI2) otherwise (Display "the (Insert CONOFSI2)"). did you drink any alcohol?

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Continue with SIIQ4b
- <2> No } Skip to SIIQ1A
- Blind <D> or <R> }

SIIQ4b. During that year how often did you USUALLY drink alcohol — daily or almost daily, at least once a week, less than once a week, about once a month, or less than once a month?

(Range 1-5)

- <1> Daily or almost daily } Continue with SIIQ1A
- <2> At least once a week }
- <3> Less than once a week }
- <4> About once a month }
- <5> Less than once a month }
- Blind <D> or <R> }

SIIQ1A

Is 1 or 2 marked for DETSTS15?

(Range 1-2)

- If Yes } Continue with SIIQ5a
- If No } Skip to SIIQ1A1

SIIQ5a. Had you been drinking any alcohol at the time of the (Display "your admission to jail" if CONOFSI2 and DOAJSI4 are both blank) or (Display "the offense for which you were admitted to jail on (Insert DOAJSI4)" if there is no offense stored in CONOFSI2) otherwise (Display "the (Insert CONOFSI2)"?)?

(Range 1-2)

- <1> Yes } Continue with SIIQ5b
- <2> No } Skip to SIIQ1A1
- Blind <D> or <R> }

S9Q5b. (SHOW CARD J)

What kind of firearms have you owned or possessed? Any others?

(ENTER (X) FOR ALL THAT APPLY) (Range 1-9)

(ENTER (N) FOR NO MORE)

- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| <1> (1) A regular handgun (revolver) | } Skip to S9Q6b |
| <2> (2) An automatic or semi-automatic handgun | } |
| <3> (3) A single-shot handgun (derringer) | } |
| <4> (4) A regular rifle | } |
| <5> (5) A military-type automatic or semi-automatic rifle | } |
| <6> (6) A regular shotgun | } |
| <7> (7) A sawed-off shotgun | } |
| <8> (8) An automatic or semi-automatic shotgun | } |
| <9> (9) Other - Specify | } Continue with S9Q5bsp |

Blind <D> or <R>

} Skip to S9Q6b

COMPUTER INSTRUCTION: Allow all entries before skipping out of question

S9Q5bsp. (ASK IF NECESSARY) Please specify the type of firearms you have owned or possessed.

Field length = 64 characters } Continue with S9Q6b
Blind <D> or <R> }

S9Q6a. How old were you the first time you used a gun to commit a crime?

Enter Age: ____ (Range 12-95) } Skip to S9Q6b

Blind <D> or <R> }

Verify that the age given in S9Q6a is <= age given in S1Q2b. If yes, skip to S9Q6b. If S1Q2a is blank, verify against S1Q2c. If S9Q6a is > S1Q2b and or S1Q2c then go to S9Q6av.

S9Q6av. You said that you are (Insert age from S1Q2b or S1Q2c) years old, and the first time you used a gun to commit a crime you were (Insert age from S9Q6a) years old, is that correct? (Range 1-2)

- | | |
|---------|---|
| <1> Yes | } Continue with S9Q6b |
| <2> No | } Go to S9Q6a, enter correct age, continue with S9Q6b |

Blind <D> or <R> } Continue with S9Q6b

S9Q6b. Did you ever steal a gun?

(Range 1-2)

- | | |
|---------|-----------------------|
| <1> Yes | } Continue with S9Q6c |
| <2> No | } Skip to S10Q1a |

Blind <D> or <R> } Continue with S9Q6c

S9Q6c. Did you ever keep a stolen gun for your own personal use?

(Range 1-2)

- | | |
|---------|-----------------------|
| <1> Yes | } Continue with S9Q6d |
| <2> No | } |

Blind <D> or <R> }

S9Q6d. Did you ever sell or trade a stolen gun to somebody?

(Range 1-2)

- | | |
|---------|------------------------|
| <1> Yes | } Continue with S10Q1a |
| <2> No | } |

Blind <D> or <R> }

APPENDIX C

AGE OF RESPONDENTS' CHILDREN

Table C1. Age of First Child

Age	N	%
Less than 1 year	61	11.7
1	61	11.7
2	84	16.1
3	67	12.8
4	50	9.6
5	43	8.2
6	40	7.6
7	29	5.5
8	30	5.7
9	17	3.3
10	18	3.4
11	11	2.1
12	5	1.0
13	3	0.5
16	1	0.2
18	1	0.2
19	1	0.2
24	1	0.2
Total	523	100.0

Mean score=4.13, Standard Deviation=3.39

Table C2. Age of Second Child

Age	N	%
Less than 1 year	32	11.8
1	30	11.1
2	48	17.7
3	30	11.1
4	28	10.3
5	31	11.4
6	15	5.5
7	15	5.5
8	15	5.5
9	12	4.4
10	3	1.1
11	2	0.7
12	3	1.1
13	1	0.4
14	2	0.7
16	2	0.7
18	1	0.4
24	1	0.4
Total	271	100.0

Mean score=4.09, Standard Deviation=3.51

Table C3. Age of Third Child

Age	N	%
Less than 1 year	11	8.5
1	13	10.0
2	20	15.4
3	27	20.8
4	17	13.1
5	9	6.9
6	10	7.7
7	8	6.2
8	6	4.6
9	2	1.5
10	2	1.5
11	1	0.8
14	1	0.8
15	1	0.8
16	1	0.8
18	1	0.8
Total	523	100.0

Mean score=4.02, Standard Deviation=3.23

Table C4. Age of Fourth Child

Age	N	%
Less than 1 year	7	13.0
1	6	11.1
2	9	16.7
3	4	7.4
4	6	11.1
5	7	13.0
6	3	5.6
7	6	11.1
8	1	1.9
9	1	1.9
10	1	1.9
11	1	1.9
12	1	1.9
19	1	1.9
Total	54	100.0

Mean score=4.02, Standard Deviation=3.52

Table C5. Age of Fifth Child

Age	N	%
Less than 1 year	6	18.8
1	4	12.5
2	2	6.3
3	4	12.5
4	2	6.3
5	5	15.6
6	4	12.5
8	4	12.5
21	1	3.1
Total	32	100.0

APPENDIX D

**FREQUENCY OF COMMUNICATION BY
CHILDREN OF THE RESPONDENTS**

Table D1. Frequency of Mail Correspondence by Children of Respondents

Mail Sent or Received from Children	N	%
Daily	28	5.4
At least once a week	97	18.5
At least once a month	51	9.8
Less than once a month	32	6.1
Never	315	60.2
Total	523	100.0

Table D2. Frequency of Visitation by Children of Respondents

Frequency of Visitation by Children	N	%
Daily	20	3.8
At least once a week	117	22.4
At least once a month	49	9.4
Less than once a month	54	10.3
Never	283	54.1
Total	523	100.0

Mean Score=5.19, Standard Deviation=3.40

Vita
Dianne Davis Wagner

Education

1965–1967	Virginia Union University Bachelor of Arts	Major: Sociology
1976	Norfolk State University Master of Social Work	Major: Social Work
1995–1998	Norfolk State University Selected as the Council on Social Work Minority	
1995–Present	Admitted to the Doctoral Program; Major: Social Work	

Professional Experience

1990–Present	JRON Associates, Inc. – CEO/Employer Assistance Director (On Contract with Norfolk Naval Shipyard)
1985–Present	JRON Associates, Inc. – President (8A Certified Counseling and Training Firm; Sole Owner)
1988–1990	Contact Tidewater, Inc. – Executive Director
1988–1990	Paul D. Camp Community College – Adjunct Instructor
1987–1988	Hampton University (Department of Social Work) Academic Consultant – Black Family Institute
1981–1985	Computron, Incorporated – Vice President of Operations
1977–1981	City of Portsmouth – Federal Grants Manager/Community Planning Analyst

Certifications

- American Academy of Certified Social Workers, Certified Employee Assistance Counselor; Qualified Social Work

Past Board Memberships

- Past Member and Secretary of Virginia State University's Board of Visitors – Petersburg, VA
- Past Chairman, Institutional Advance Committee of Virginia State University's Board of Visitors
- Past Board of Visitor's Representative to the Presidential Search Committee to select a President for Virginia State University

Board Appointments

- 1995–Present Appointed by State Board of Corrections
 1996–1998 Appointed by Governor of the Correctional Enterprise Board
 1988–1990 Member, Board of Directors, Portsmouth's Small Business and Minority Business Committee
 1992–1995 Member, Board of Directors, Effingham Street YMCA
 1992–Present Member of the Ethelyn R. Strong Social Work Advisory Board
 1993–Present Appointed to serve as a member of Governor Allen's Transition Team on Commerce and Trace

Community Affiliations

- Portsmouth Chapter of Links, Inc.
 Past President, Central Civic Forum

Awards and Citations

- 1989 Outstanding Community Leaders Award presented by the YMCA, City of Norfolk
 1987 Presented the 1987 Outstanding Citizen Award by Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Inc.
 1977, 1988 Outstanding Community Service Award presented by the Portsmouth Central Civic Forum
 1976 Citation presented by the Mayor for performance on the All American City Application for the City of Portsmouth's All American City Award

Presentations/Workshops/Seminars

- 1987 Presented a paper on "Issues Impacting on the Black Family" at the National Convention of the United Council on Negro Women
 1990–1997 Conduct Monthly Supervisor Training Sessions on "Employers/Employee Workplace Issues" for the Department of Defense Personnel
 1995 Seminar Speaker for Graduation, MSW (Master of Social Work), The Ethelyn R. Strong School of Social Work
 1996 Conducted Stress Management Seminars for Employees of the Department of the Navy
 1997–2000 Conduct Supervisory Training Sessions with the Department of Defense Personnel
 2000 Conducted Seminar on Operating a Home-Based Business for Virginia Tech University's Extension Program
 1998–2000 Paper selected for presentation on the Overrepresentation of Incarcerated African American Males, National Institute of Mental Health Minority Dissertation Workshop