

Fall 2017

Imprisoned in the Hood: An Examination of Social Ecology Influenced by Mass Incarceration and its Effects on Low Income College Students Stress Levels

Christion V. Smith

La Salle University, christionsmith790@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.lasalle.edu/undergraduateresearch>



Part of the [Criminology Commons](#), [Human Ecology Commons](#), and the [Place and Environment Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Smith, Christion V., "Imprisoned in the Hood: An Examination of Social Ecology Influenced by Mass Incarceration and its Effects on Low Income College Students Stress Levels" (2017). *Undergraduate Research*. 16.

<http://digitalcommons.lasalle.edu/undergraduateresearch/16>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the La Salle Scholar at La Salle University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Research by an authorized administrator of La Salle University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact careyc@lasalle.edu.

**Imprisoned in the Hood: An Examination of Social Ecology Influenced by Mass
Incarceration and its Effects on Low Income College Students Stress Levels**

Student: Christian Smith

Faculty Mentor: Dr. Caitlin Taylor

Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice

Undergraduate Research Fall 2017

Abstract

Incarceration was once a promising crime control strategy, but over the last four decades it has increased exponentially and has been highly concentrated in disadvantaged communities. These high rates of imprisonment may be harming those communities greatly because at high rates incarceration loses its crime fighting ability and increases crime, which may compromise community safety and overall health. The current research explores the effects that high rates of neighborhood incarceration have on nonincarcerated individuals' stress levels and mental health. Data for this study were collected from a convenience sample of students in the La Salle University's Academic Discovery Program (ADP) and were paired with data from reentry rates provided by the online database, Justice Atlas. Ordinary least squares regression models using listwise deletion were employed. Findings indicate that high levels of incarceration did not have a significant impact on individuals' stress levels or mental health. Higher levels of stress were associated with three other predictor variables, which are neighborhood influence, perceived crime, and neighborhood attachment. The findings have policy implications for policies and strategies for post-release supervision agencies and law enforcement agencies.

Introduction

Over the last four decades the United States prison population has jumped exponentially to 2.1 million (Kaeble and Glaze, 2016: p.12), and individuals under community supervision have climbed to nearly 6.8 million (Kaeble and Glaze, 2016: p. 2). This growth in the prison population was caused by a shift in political objectives during the 1970s and 1980s between democrat and republican parties that were concerned with the war on drugs (Lynch and Sabol, 2004; Western and Wildeman, 2009; Wildman and Western, 2010; Roberts, 2004). The war on drugs spawned drastic changes to criminal justice policies that were perturbed towards crime control and sentencing for drug related offenses (Lynch and Sabol, 2004; Western and Wildeman, 2009; Wildman and Western, 2010; Roberts, 2004). These new policies primarily affected African American and Latino men in urban areas where drugs are the main form of economic opportunity (Western and Wildeman, 2010; Wildman and Western, 2009). Several crime and drug abuse bills were enacted and that increased funding for local and federal law enforcement agencies for expansion of drug operations in combination with the development of more prisons, and this created a breeding ground in the inner city that amplified the arrest and prosecution of African American and Latino individuals at disproportionate rates (Clear, 2008; Western and Wildeman, 2009; Lynch and Sabol, 2004; Sykes and Pettit, 2014; Martin, 2017; Wildeman and Western, 2010; Roberts, 2004; Perry and Bright, 2012).

Moreover, the war on drugs and its practices of aggressive policing and harsh sentencing are chiefly responsible for the mass imprisonment of African Americans (Roberts, 2004; Sykes and Pettit, 2014; Clear, 2007). African Americans represent approximately 50 to 60 percent (Roberts, 2004; Perry and Bright, 2012; Western and Wildeman, 2009) of the prison population and only 6% of the United States total population (Perry and Bright, 2012, p. 188). In

comparison to their white counterparts who only make up about a 14% increase of prison admissions for drug offenses (Roberts, 2004: p.1275). This discrepancy between white and black prison admissions is very prevalent and it is caused by several different reasons but the main reason for this discrepancy is in crack cocaine versus powder cocaine sentencing (Perry and Bright, 2012). These disparities occurred through the old 100 to 1 ratio sentencing of crack cocaine vs powder cocaine (Perry and Bright, 2012; Labar, 2014). The sentencing disparity was eventually lowered in 2010 to 18-1, but it is still affecting the African American community negatively (Fair Sentencing, 2010: p.7).

Furthermore, in more recent years some scholars have dug deeper and examined the criminal justice system with a more critical eye, more specifically at the prosecutor position and the power attached to it. John Pfaff (2017) argues that the cause of the prison population rising is high prison admissions, and the reason behind these high admissions is the prosecutor. Amidst the prison boom and fierce legislation being passed to have mandatory minimums for drug offenders, a power shift occurred in the courts between the judge and the prosecutor. With mandatory minimums in place, drug offenders were no longer at the judge's discretion, but at the prosecutor's. Prosecutors exercised this newly found power and abused it to the point where they were sending thousands of minorities away for longer sentences for minor drug offenses.

This prison admission increase can be seen during the early 1990s and up until 2008. During this period crime had dropped significantly, admissions kept rising and this is due in part by the increase in felony drug charges filed by the prosecutor. "In short, between 1994 and 2008, the number of people admitted to prison rose about 40 percent, from 360,000 to 505,000, and almost all that increase was due to prosecutors bringing more and more felony cases against a diminishing pool of arrestees" (Pfaff, 2017: p. 72).

This hyper incarceration has had huge negative health consequences for offenders, families, and communities. The incarcerated individual bears the brunt of the harsh prison conditions that inflict irreversible damage to their mental and physical health (Wildeman and Western, 2010; Drakulich, Crutchfield, Matsueda, Rose, 2012; Durmont, Allen, Brockmann, Alexander, Rich, 2013; Cloud, Parsons, Delany-Brushsey, 2014; Wildeman and Wang, 2017). Furthermore, these health problems stretch very far to the incarcerated person's romantic partner and children (Wildeman and Western, 2010; Hatzenbuehler, Keyes, Hamilton, Uddin, Galea, 2015; Western and Wildeman, 2009). Their partners experience extreme stress and depression from social isolation and financial burden of supporting the incarcerated (Wildeman and Western, 2010; Hatzenbuehler et al., 2015). Children experience mental and behavioral problems, and this can affect their school performance, daily activities, and ultimately decreasing their life chances (Wildeman and Western, 2010; Martin, 2017; Wildeman and Wang, 2017).

These spillover effects of incarceration are not just limited to the individual offender and their families (Roberts, 2004; Hatzenbuehler et al., 2015; Clear, Rose, Ryder, 2001; Wildeman and Western 2010; Western and Wildeman, 2009). It extends further to the communities these individuals reside in. There is great evidence that incarceration makes communities more susceptible to crime due to the high prison admissions and reentry rates (Clear, 2007; Drakulich et al., 2012; Lynch and Sabol 2004; Pettit, 2012; Sampson and Loeffler, 2010) High concentrations of incarceration alter the social ecology of the neighborhoods through the weakening of formal and informal social controls formed through familial networks and collective efficacy between neighbors (Clear, 2007; Clear et al., 2001; Clear, Rose, Waring, Schully, 2003; Drakulich, Crutchfield, Matsueda, Rose, 2012; Clear and Rose, 1998; Lynch and Sabol, 2004; Sampson and Loeffler, 2010; Roberts, 2004). The dismemberment of these

functions causes disorder and reduces its ability to maintain community and individual mental health. This exposes many non-incarcerated residents living in those communities to more violent and dangerous conditions that could cause bodily harm or even loss of life. Living in harsh conditions can cause individuals to be under heavy stress and this can cause mental health problems to occur.

Considering that high concentrations of incarceration can make disadvantaged communities worse and cause adverse health conditions, it's very plausible that research into the effects of incarceration and public health is extremely valuable. There are several criminological theories that can provide some explanation for how mass incarceration influences the breakdown of formal and informal social controls and key familial networks within these communities, but research into the relationship of how an altered social ecology influenced by high concentrations of incarceration affects non-incarcerated individuals' mental health and stress levels is lacking. This study uses a convenience sample of college students to examine the relationship between prison reentry rates at the neighborhood level and individual mental health.

Literature Review

Incarceration and effects on Returning Citizens

Furthermore, the high concentrations of mass imprisonment in inner city communities may affect stress levels of previously incarcerated individuals and non-incarcerated residents because it leaves behind a byproduct that makes these areas more susceptible to crime and urban violence. The process of becoming incarcerated effects an individual's ability to make meaningful contributions to one's family and community success. Also, it has been well documented that being imprisoned damages employment opportunities, wage earning potential, housing opportunities, voting rights, mental and physical health and much more (Perry and Bright, 2012; Roberts, 2004; Pettit, 2012; Wildeman and Western, 2010). Imprisonment can

decrease an African American male's earning potential by up to 30% (Western and Wildeman, 2010; Western and Wildeman, 2009). Also after being incarcerated the rate of finding employment significantly drops due to having a felony conviction, and this in turn increases criminal ties to these reentering citizens (Roberts, 2004: p. 1271). Furthermore, the ability to gain housing after release is hindered due to laws that prohibit individuals who have a criminal record from obtaining public housing and other governmental services (Roberts, 2004; Drakulich et al., 2012; Clear et al., 2001; Lynch and Sabol, 2004). In certain states the right to vote is terminated, so these reentering citizens can't vote on legislation or public officials running for office that are in their city or state that they live in (Roberts, 2004: p. 1277).

In addition to that by spending time in prison these individuals are subjected to harsh living conditions that influence their physical and mental health (Dora et al., 2013; Wildeman and Wang, 2017; Cloud et al., 2014). This is very problematic because these pernicious prison conditions can worsen the state of existing mental health problems (Cloud et al., 2014; Dumont et al., 2013; Wildeman and Wang, 2017; Wyant and Harner, 2016). Also, these persons are under tremendous stress because they may have families that rely on them as the primary breadwinner and they can't support them while imprisoned, so this stresses the individual more (Wildeman and Western, 2010; Wyant and Harner, 2016). Even the money they make from working in the prison isn't even a humane wage that they can send to their family or let alone support themselves (Wyant and Harner, 2016). This burden of financial stress can increase mental health problems.

Subsequently, these men are not only under heavy financial stress they also experience physical stress that can be very detrimental to their overall health. Being in prison these individuals can be victimized by other incarcerated individuals (Cloud et al, 2014; Wildman and

Wang, 2017). Also, the prison environment and its services, specifically health care is very inadequate and does not provide the incarcerated with proper medical care as needed (Cloud et al., 2014; Dora et al., 2013; Wildeman and Wang, 2017). Consequently, when these individuals are released from prison they are more severely damaged mentally and physically before being incarcerated (Wildeman and Wang, 2017). In combination with these new health problems they reenter their communities civily dead with decreased human and social capital, which in turn can cause these individuals to engage in criminal activities.

Additionally, this influences the environmental backcloth of the neighborhood they reside in inducing more deleterious conditions that affect the social norms and ecology of the communities. Returning citizens that reenter communities that have high rates of poverty tend to come back to their communities with a “master status”, because they now have a criminal record (Clear, 2007). This influences children and young adults living within these communities in a negative manner by making a trip to prison a rite of passage for many of these individuals, but at the same token those individuals going against the negative influence may experience extreme stress and mental health problems, because they trying to lead a legitimate way of life. College students from those poverty-stricken areas experiencing high concentrations of mass incarceration can be subject to these kinds of conditions and this ultimately can lead to them experiencing higher levels of stress and mental health related issues.

Relationship between Incarceration and Partners and Children

Another reason why high rates of neighborhood reentry might influence individual mental health is because some of those individuals may have familial relationships with the people cycling in and out of prison. Mass incarceration has had a spillover effect that has greatly affected families of the incarcerated, specifically partners and children. These families

experience financial hardships through their support for their male partners in prison. Female partners have pressure to support their loved one by sending money, so their partner can buy other things while in prison such as food and other commissaries (Willdeman and Western, 2010). Additionally, partners must pay for phone time to communicate with their partner while in prison, and these things can be very expensive due to the monopoly and partnership many of these prison systems have with telephone companies that specialize in providing these services. The fees and net cost of the telephone service are burdensome to purchase and places more financial strain on an already handicapped income that the partner possesses. “At the very least, incarceration may take a toll on familial resources. In the short term- while a man is in prison – it both diminishes family income and increases family expenses” (Willdeman and Western, 2010). This leads the partner to experience financial stress, anxiety, and depression because they must balance providing for their children and their incarcerated partner.

Western and Wildeman (2010) found that partners experience alienation because their partner is an incarcerated. Spouses keep their partner’s incarceration a secret from family and friends to avoid the stigma of having a partner imprisoned (Wildeman and Western, 2010). Alienation causes them to withdraw from family and other social support networks that could offer relief. Withdrawing from these support networks in combination with living in poverty causes negative effects on women’s mental and overall health.

Furthermore, the children of these incarcerated men experience negative mental health, behavior problems, and diminished life chances. Parental incarceration leads to more generational inequality and lack of transformative assets that children can inherit. The lack of these resources and parental support drastically changes the life trajectory and increases the likelihood that these children fall into the vicious cycle that will lead them to being imprisoned

or worse (Rosenfield, Edberg, Fang, and Florence, 2013: p. 283). Specifically, young black male children are at higher risk of these inimical outcomes because they inherit most of the burden of assuming the role of being the man of their home since the male parent may be imprisoned or absent from their life for other reasons. Without the help of a male parent from an income and mentor perspective the lone mother can only provide and help her children so much, and this can induce high stress on the female parent, causing harsher parenting. In turn, children who are exposed to harsh parenting and disadvantaged conditions regularly may experience higher levels of stress, and without a solid support system it can influence their brain development making them more vulnerable to engaging in youth violence and other illegal activities (Rosenfield et al., 2013: p. 283).

Children who have a parent incarcerated tend to exhibit more aggressive behavior and this comes in the form of throwing temper tantrums, acting out, being anxious, depressed and withdrawn (Wideman and Western, 2010). Also, these children are subject to living in disadvantaged communities without having any parental guidance and they can be subject to a lot of negative outside influence in the communities they reside in. Children growing up in these communities are taught by old heads in the communities that going to prison is a rite of passage (Clear, 2007). This mentality has become the norm for many young children growing up in those communities. 1 and 3 African American men will spend time in prison or jail in their lifetime (Hatzenbuehler et al., 2015). “In Washington, DC, for example, more than 95% of black men have been in prison in their lifetime” (Hatzenbuehler et al., 2015: p. 138). African American children growing up in these inimical conditions have a very high chance of being victims of our current criminal justice system and urban violence, especially the children that don’t conform to their neighborhoods criminal identity maybe subject to higher stress levels (Clear, 2007). These

children are walking on a tightrope of legality, trying to elevate themselves and their families to a higher social status, while the criminal justice system and the possibility of victimization are waiting below in the abyss. The pressure to make each step count coupled with the possibility of losing it all is what exerts the intense stress on these individuals.

Incarceration and Neighborhood Disadvantage

Returning citizens have a massive negative impact on the communities they are returning to because they are ill equipped and don't have the resources to make a meaningful contribution to their neighborhood. These individuals create a rift in the social ecology of their communities through their transient nature of reentry and admissions to prison, and the transient nature of these individuals negatively affects the physical and mental health of non-incarcerated individuals in the neighborhood (Clear et al., 2001; Hatzenbuehler et al., 2015; Rogers, Khan, Tan, Turner, Miller, and Erbeling, 2011; Thomas and Torrone, 2006). In Clear et al. (2001) conducted interviews in two Tallahassee, Florida neighborhoods to congregate a more comprehensive understanding of the impact associated with incarceration on ex-offenders, families and communities. A focus group of 26 people from the neighborhoods was conducted at the neighborhood rec centers and the 8 ex-offender interviews were done separately to fend off any bias that would come about from a mixed focus group. The results from the focus group and offender interviews yielded four main themes: Incarceration and stigma; financial impacts of incarceration; incarceration and the problem of identity; and incarceration and the dynamics of community relationships.

These four themes all provide insightful information into the impacts of incarceration but the main theme that is applicable to the scope of this section is incarceration and problem of identity. The findings from this section support the claim that high rates of imprisonment

concentrated in African American communities affect the mental health of residents living in those communities, specifically children. Children experience a loss of self-worth and self-esteem because they do not have anyone or anything positive to look to for guidance. In totality, community health and the ability to take collective action to suppress this detriment of poverty and lack of positive figures is lost. “People who feel low self-esteem may be less likely to set high personal goals and less likely to engage in goal-directed collective social activity, and this may be particularly problematic for the aspirations and activities of young people whose adult role models are incarcerated” (Clear et al., 2001: p. 342).

Additionally, returning citizens coming back to these neighborhoods can further exacerbate the already unhealthy disadvantage conditions. This occurs because of the lack of proper reentry for returning citizens. When these individuals reenter their communities, they are inserted back into a system where they don't have the proper skills or tools necessary to contribute, and under these strained circumstances some individuals revert to criminal activities to provide for themselves and maybe if they have a family, them too. High prison admissions and reentry can change a neighborhoods social ecology negatively and this can spill over to residents living in those communities, especially young black males, who maybe more impressionable due to the morass they are living in.

Mears et al. (2008) conducted a study that utilized Florida prison inmate information (N = 49, 420) and county data that came from a variety of sources. These sources included the U.S census, University of Michigan, Florida department of Law Enforcement, and the University of Florida. The data provided from these institutions captured several facets such as social structure characteristics, racial-residential segregation, police deployments, and public safety. Also,

resource deprivation and racial segregation were the two main contextual variables focused on to capture the effect that different social ecologies have on recidivism rates of returning citizens.

Results indicated that resource deprivation was associated with an increase in violent crime and returning citizens who enter those communities are at significantly higher risk of getting reconvicted of a violent crime (Mears et al., 2008: p. 322). Another significant finding was that drug reconviction is three times greater for young black males returning to those resource deprived communities (Mears et al., 2008: p. 322). Furthermore, racial segregation was associated with less recidivism for young black men, but for other groups' higher rates of recidivism were reported (Mears et al., 2008: p. 324). These findings foreshadow that disadvantaged social ecologies have harsher effects on young black men than on other races. Young black men growing up in these deleterious conditions are forever burdened by the almost inevitable rite of passage to prison. Knowing one can possibly be another statistic of the department of justice or homicide can intensify an individual's stress.

Incarceration, Crime, and Social Networks

Following that, concentrated hyper incarceration can increase criminogenic conditions that weaken informal and formal social controls within communities. This transforms the social ecology further and causes many individuals in those communities to become hyper-vigilant because of the fear of victimization (Covington and Taylor, 1991). Because of this fear of victimization it can increase an individual's stress level. Clear et al. (2003) conducted a study in Tallahassee, Florida and found evidence that increased prison admissions and releases increased crime in Florida neighborhoods. Data was collected from three places: the first was the Florida department of corrections for prison admissions and prison releases (1996); the second was from

the Tallahassee Police department for crime rates (1996 and 1997); and the third was from U.S. census for other neighborhood level data (1990).

Clear used prison admissions and release rates as the main independent variables and crime was used as the dependent variable. Four out of the five models found that release rates predicted an increase in crime, while admissions were associated with a reduction in crime in all models. Additionally, the analysis revealed that over a significant amount of time prison admission had a greater effect on crime. This suggest that at a certain point the benefits of alleviating communities of negative individuals go away, and instead increases criminogenic conditions. Also other studies have found similar finding to Clear's claim that coercive mobility through prison admissions and releases increases crime. Drakulich et al. (2012) found that high rates of reentry pose more of a negative impact on crime then prison admissions. The reason for this could be the damage that prison does to familial and other social networks, in conjunction with heavy sanctions that the justice system places on individuals with felony convictions.

Many people who reenter society after being incarcerated have weakened social ties to their family and community. Those social ties may have been damaged because of incarceration or maybe before incarceration occurred. When incarceration occurs, it creates a stigma on the incarcerated and those that are associated with the incarcerated individual, so in turn the incarcerated individual's family may not want to be associated with that individual and this creates a weakening of social support for the incarcerated individual. Taylor (2016) performed a study that examined the effect that family support can have on recidivism rates. Data used was collected between 2004 and 2008 for an evaluation of the Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative (SVORI). The finding indicated that family support, specifically emotional support had significant reductions on recidivism and arrest rates. Emotional Support saw a reduction between

a 6% and 9% in recidivism rates across waves. Also, the likelihood of rearrest saw a reduction between 4% and 14%.

But even with these significant reductions in recidivism and rearrest, garnering this familial support can be a challenge for many returning citizens. Many returning citizens may fail to reconnect with solid social and familial networks and this is detrimental for their health and the other residents living in those communities. Without a solid support system returning citizens face a losing battle of trying to make it in a legitimate way. Ultimately, slipping through the cracks and reverting to criminal activities to try to make a living for themselves.

Coupled with this is the weakening of informal social controls that help keep the neighborhood organized and crime under control. The weakening of informal social controls occurs when residents of that community become isolated from each other due to some residents having family that are returning citizens (Clear et al., 2001; Clear, 2007). The stigma of a returning citizen causes people in that community to harbor a distrust in that individual because they assume that individual is still capable of being criminal. Residents that are neighbors to these returning citizens fear that and this causes them to want to leave and move to a better area that doesn't have returning citizens (Clear et al., 2001; Clear, 2007). Consequently, this causes a heavy transient population of residents, combined with, high concentrations of prison admissions and reentry that result in a more disadvantaged neighborhood with high social disorganization, crime, and increased stress (Clear et al., 2001; Clear et al., 2003; Clear, 2007).

Incarceration and Community Physical and Mental Health

Communities that have high concentrations of incarceration have been experiencing declines of community mental and physical health. The spillover of mass imprisonment spreads far passed just the individual who has been incarcerated and their family. There is evidence that

high concentrations of incarceration influence non-incarcerated resident's physical health, but there is limited evidence that incarceration influences mental health. Thomas and Torrone (2006) study examined the negative effects that coercive mobility poses for communities that have High concentrations of incarceration, specifically looking at the effect it has on rates of sexually transmitted infections and teen pregnancy in 100 North Carolina counties. The results indicate that high rates of imprisonment were associated with higher rates of teen pregnancies and sexually transmitted diseases. Also, stronger correlations for health outcomes were found for individuals in prison versus jail, and this is because the length of time individuals were incarcerated. Jail sentences are usually briefer in comparison to prison sentences, which are longer. This was very significant when the one-year lag was applied because it made the correlation between high incarceration rates and community health stronger.

In Later research, Rogers et al., (2012) found similar findings that incarceration was associated with higher rates of Sexually transmitted diseases. This study examined men and women between the ages of 15 and 35 in Baltimore, Maryland. Results from this study found that men and women were both at elevated risk of contracting or having a sexually transmitted disease because of having multiple sexual partners. Additionally, among women who reported having a partner incarcerated were more likely to have an STI. Both studies suggest that due to higher prison admissions rates there is a shortage of male partners in these communities. This shortage of men is giving leverage to the men that remain in the communities because they can choose or even have multiple partners because of the shortage, and this is causing the spread of sexually transmitted diseases throughout these communities. With evidence of physical health risk that mass imprisonment brings, there has been recent research looking at the possibility that

mass imprisonment can have a negative effect on the mental health of non-incarcerated residents residing in those communities.

Hazentbuehler et al. (2015) examined non-incarcerated individuals living in neighborhoods that have high rates of prison admission and parole rates to see whether that had an impact on individual's mental health. Data for this study were drawn from the Detroit Neighborhood Health Study (DNHS), which was a longitudinal study of predominantly black adults with ages ranging from 18 years and older. Other data on prison admission were drawn from Justice Atlas and Parole rates were obtained from the Michigan department of corrections. Results from this study were significant with 21.9% of the sample meeting the criteria for current major depressive disorders, and 16% of the sample meeting the criteria for generalized anxiety disorders at any wave. Also "after adjustment for demographic and neighborhood covariates, neighborhood incarceration was significantly associated with lifetime major depressive disorder" (Hatzenbuehler et al., 2015: p. 140). In addition, neighborhood parole rates were also associated with lifetime major depressive disorder, current generalized anxiety disorder, and lifetime generalized anxiety disorder.

High rates of prison admission and reentry in combination with stigmatization and damaged familial networks deform and erode the existing social ecology of already disadvantaged inner city communities. This erosion causes a disruption of social networks and ties, which become damaged or severed, and in turn this disables the ability for individuals to maintain and manage mental health. This current study explores stress levels of college students living in areas of Philadelphia and surrounding counties in relation to a social ecology influenced by mass incarceration.

Current Study

The current study aims to fill gaps in literature that are concerned with the mental health and stress levels of non-incarcerated individuals residing in neighborhoods that are experiencing high concentrations of incarceration, specifically with reentry rates. To examine this more closely, a non-probability convenience sample was employed to access college students living in Philadelphia and surrounding counties who participate in La Salle University's Academic Discovery program (ADP). This program is exclusively for low-income Pennsylvania residents who demonstrate the ability to complete work on the collegiate level and are highly motivated to graduate from La Salle University.

Background

To provide further understanding of the nature of this sample specifics are provided about the Pennsylvania Act 101 program and the population it serves. The Act 101 program was established in 1971 by the state of Pennsylvania, and it is designated for students who are of low socioeconomic status (SES) that come from a disadvantaged educational background (McEwen, 1979: p. 286; Spangler, 2017: p. 9). The primary goal of the program is to aid and assist students from disadvantaged backgrounds to receive a college education. Admissions for the program are simple; a student must be highly motivated, have high aspirations, and demonstrate great potential (McEwen, 1979: p. 286). These students enter college with the ambition and intention of doing well, but due to their former educational background, they lack the necessary tools to perform well in the rigors of academia.

The Act 101 program and the partnering institutions provide these students with several services to bridge this gap and make sure many of them succeed at the university level (Rheinheimer, Grace-Odeleye, Francois, Kusorgbor, 2010: p. 25). These services include

counseling, tutoring, and a 5-week summer bridge program. The summer bridge program takes place before the start of their freshman year, and it allows these students to get acclimated to the rigors of college (McEwen, 1979: p. 286). Additionally, during the summer bridge program the students are enrolled in developmental English and math courses. These courses help students develop the key skills that allow them to excel in further study after the summer program (McEwen, 1979: p. 286). All Act 101 programs are very successful in their efforts to bridge the gap between students of low SES and a high-quality college education, and if an institution does not meet the standards they are eliminated from the Act 101 program and all funds are withdrawn (McEwen, 1979: p. 287).

La Salle University's ADP is a partially funded Act 101 Program that has similar admissions process to most Act 101 programs, but it differs in the coursework offered during the summer bridge program. La Salle University's ADP program offers credit bearing English and math courses that go towards the students' graduation requirements. The math course would usually be taken by regular freshman entering in the fall semester, but the english course offers an integrated studies approach to teach students college writing, study skills, and critical thinking. Also since La Salle is a private university and is a partially funded Act 101 program it can offer its students a stimulated financial aid package that can offset some of the remaining cost of tuition and fees in comparison to other state funded universities. Additionally, even though La Salle's ADP program is open to all students from Pennsylvania, most of its students are from Philadelphia and surrounding nearby counties.

Research Question and Hypothesis

There is one research question and hypothesis used in this study, and it is listed below.

- RQ 1: Will neighborhood reentry rates have an independent effect on individuals' mental health rates after controlling for individuals' gender, income, age, race, first generation

status, NBH influence, perceived crime, NBH attachment, and support?

- H 1: Higher reentry rates will be associated with poorer mental health, after controlling for the other variables in the model.

Data and Method

This investigation examining stress levels of low income college students living in areas that have high levels of incarceration were conducted at La Salle University, a four-year, private, nonprofit institution of higher learning. La Salle University is located in the northwest section of Philadelphia, situated in the neighborhoods of Olney and Germantown. The University has a total student population approximately around 5,000. Data were collected using anonymous self-report surveys that were given out at the program's individual class monthly meetings. The participants included 67 (50.3%) of the 125 students currently enrolled in the ADP. Also, the racial composition of the sample consisted of 6 (9%) white students, 29 (43.3%) African American, 12 (17.9%) Asian/pacific Islander, 2 (3%) Native American/ American Indian, and 13 (19.4%) students identifying as other. Note that only 62 participants were included in the frequencies of race due to some students not answering this question. Additionally, this study was approved by La Salle University's Institutional Review Board and permission to administer the surveys was given by Leonard Daniels, executive director of ADP. Also, participants were not asked to provide any identifying information at any point during the investigation. Lastly participants were not compensated for their time.

Research Design

Potential participants were sent an email notifying them of their monthly meeting and informing them that a researcher would be attending their monthly meeting to offer an opportunity to complete a survey. The surveys were given out at the end of the monthly meetings, but before surveys were given the researcher introduced himself and briefly explained

his research and the importance of it. After that, the researcher gave more detailed information about the project in the form of the informed consent. To maintain the anonymity and confidentiality of the surveys, all informed consents and completed surveys were immediately placed in a sealed envelope. Also, all surveys were placed in the same brown envelope as the informed consent forms. Surveys took approximately 5 to 10 minutes to complete.

Measures

The survey asked 34 questions about basic demographic information (See appendix 1, questions 1-7), stress (See appendix 1, question 8-18), financial information (See appendix 1, questions 20-26), academic achievement (question 19), and neighborhood attachment (See appendix 1, questions 29-34). The basic demographic information was measured using items on gender, ethnicity, race, age, marital status, academic year, zip code for home residence, and type of high school attended. Next, stress was measured using the perceived stress scale (Cohen, 1994). Stress was measured with a 10-item index of questions on a 5-point scale of never to very often. Also, the perceived stress scale has a Cronbach alpha of .792. Additionally, participants were asked to indicate their current feeling about the following items: (a) In the last month, how often have you been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly? (b) In the last month, how often have you felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life? (c) In the last month, how often have you felt nervous and “stressed”? (d) In the last month, how often have you felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems? (e) In the last month, how often have you felt that things were going your way? (f) In the last month, how often have you found that you could not cope with all the things? (g) In the last month, how often have you been able to control irritations in your life? (h) In the last month, how often have you felt that you were on top of things? (i) In the last month, how often have you been angered because

of things that were outside of your control? (j) In the last month, how often have you felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them? The stress scale ranged from 0 to 40, with higher values indicating higher levels of stress. Additionally, four of the 10-index questions were recoded because they were positively stated items. Those four questions were; (d) In the last month, how often have you felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems? (e) In the last month, how often have you felt that things were going your way? (g) In the last month, how often have you been able to control irritations in your life? (h) In the last month, how often have you felt that you were on top of things?

Also, financial stress was measured using items on employment, income, responsibility for financing education, and financial stress. Academic Achievement was measured using an item on current GPA. Neighborhood attachment was measured in the survey by using questions 29-34 (see Appendix 1 for complete survey questions). Most participants responded to all questions, but a considerable amount of the freshman ADP students did not respond to the question that pertained to their GPAs because they didn't know what it was off hand. To deal with the missing GPA data, mean imputation was used to preserve these cases in the sample (Allison, 2003: p. 548). Additionally, other questions in the financial stress section of the survey some students maybe felt were intrusive, so they didn't respond to. Furthermore, reentry rates were measured using 2008 prison reentry rate data from Justice Atlas.

Descriptive statistics for all independent and dependent variables are displayed in Table 1. Next financial information/pressure was measured using a multitude of different items that included outside employment, hours worked, income, responsibility for financing education, and financial stress (See appendix 1, questions 20-26). Academic achievement (See Appendix 1, question 19) was measured using the student's GPA. Neighborhood attachment (See Appendix

1, questions 29-34) was measured using a range of different items that included NBH attachment, responsibility of NBH conditions, NBH improvement, NBH Influence, perceived crime, and support.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

	N	Min	Max	M	SD
Gender	67	1	2	1.73	.447
Ethnicity	66	1	2	1.68	.469
Race	62	1	5	2.79	1.307
Age	67	1	5	2.13	1.072
Marital status	66	1	2	1.02	.123
Academic year	67	1	4	2.09	.996
Total Stress	66	6	29	18.89	5.114
Current GPA (grade point average)	67	1	5	3.75	.910
Employment	66	1	2	1.32	.469
Hours worked weekly	66	1	6	2.71	1.423
Income	62	1	4	1.53	.882
Are you solely responsible for financing your college education?	65	1	2	1.65	.482
Are you partially responsible for financing your college education?	65	1	2	1.37	.486
Approximately what percentage of your college education is financed by loans, scholarships, and/or grants?	65	1	5	4.12	1.256

Table 1. (Continued)

	N	Min	Max	M	SD
How often do you worry about finances?	66	1	3	2.44	.611
Are you a first-generation college student?	67	1	2	1.34	.478
What is the racial makeup of the neighborhood in which you grew up?	67	2	6	3.76	1.116
Do you feel attached to your neighborhood?	67	1	3	2.28	.692
Do you feel responsible for conditions in your neighborhood?	67	1	3	2.63	.546
Do you feel committed to improving your neighborhood?	67	1	3	2.12	.729
Does your neighborhood influence your mood positively?	67	1	3	2.12	.729
Do you perceive your neighborhood to be a high crime area?	67	1	3	1.96	.747
How satisfied are you with the level of support you have?	67	1	3	1.52	.704
Reentry rates (per 1,000)	67	0	19	7.65	6.357
Valid N (listwise)	51				

Model Specifications

Reentry rates were used as the main predictor variable to investigate students' stress levels. Individual-level control variables such as support, gender, age, race, income, and being a first-generation college student were used to reflect the students' individual characteristics. Also,

all other control variables provided a reflection of the current conditions these students live in at the time of the initial survey. Furthermore, the variables that measured these conditions included: neighborhood influence, perceived crime, and neighborhood attachment (See Appendix 2 for illustrated model)

Missing Data and OLS Regression

Listwise deletion was employed to handle missing data. This method was more suitable than pairwise deletion because it avoids having a higher chance of standard of errors. Although it may not maximize the use of all data it doesn't severely interfere with the randomness of the sample (Allison, 2000, 2003). Since listwise deletion excludes all cases of missing data from independent and dependent variables it preserves the wholeness of the data set by maintaining the same number of cases (Fitzgerald and Fitzgerald, 2014: p. 412). In addition, listwise deletion avoids the problem that the coefficients in regression analysis will be biased (Allison, 2003: p. 547). This in comparison to pairwise deletion which is a method that includes all independent variables despite having missing data in them. This may maximize the use all data in a sample but its runs the risk of analysis having different sample sizes of the same data set (Fitzgerald and Fitzgerald, 2014: 412). Additionally, other statistical methods such as multiple imputation would have been used in conjunction with listwise deletion to predict missing data, but due to financial constraints to this study that method could not implemented.

Ordinary least squares regression was used to find the foremost best possible prediction of student stress levels, while controlling for gender, income, reentry rates, age, race, first generation college student, neighborhood influence, perceived crime, neighborhood attachment, and support (Fitzgerald and Fitzgerald, 2014: 414). Furthermore, this statistical analysis allowed for independent variables that are nominal or categorical to be included in the analysis through

recoding into dummy variables (Fitzgerald and Fitzgerald, 2014: 423). This was integral because multiple regression analysis only allows for continuous variables measured on an interval or ratio level, and with the exception for certain variables that are not measured at the interval or ratio level but they must be recoded into dummy variables to be used (Fitzgerald and Fitzgerald, 2014: 414). This allowed for nominal and categorical variables such as gender (coded 0 = males, 1 = female), race (coded 0 = non-black, 1 = black), first generation college student (coded 0 = no, 1 = yes), NBH influence (coded 0 = not at all, 1 = very much), perceived crime (coded 0 = not at all, 1 = very much), NBH attachment (coded 0 = not at all, 1 = very much) and support (coded 0 = not all, 1 = very much) to be included in the analysis.

Results

Table 2 displays the results of the ordinary least squares regression analysis for predicting stress scores for low income college students that are living in neighborhoods that have high reentry rates.

Table 2. Linear Regression Predicting Stress Scores

	<i>b</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	Sig
Constant	18.424	3.086		.000
Gender (1 = female)	-2.874	1.386	-.257	0.44*
Income (1 = \$10,000 or greater)	2.108	1.639	-.160	.205
Reentry rate	-.136	.120	-.159	.261
Age	.349	.681	.063	.611
Race (1 = Black)	-.395	1.243	.039	.752
First Gen College Stu (1 = First gen)	-.475	1.349	-.045	.726
NBH Influenced Mood (1 = Very much)	3.177	1.526	.250	.043*
Perceived Crime (1 = very much)	7.140	1.597	.651	.000**
NBH Attachment (1 = Very much)	-3.413	1.847	-.237	.071
Support (1 = Very much)	-1.430	1.990	-.088	.476

*p < .05, ** p < .01
R² = .401

Additionally, regression diagnostics were run to test for any problems of multicollinearity, normality, and linearity. Those preliminary analyses didn't reveal any problems during those diagnostic tests.

The results from the analysis show that neighborhood reentry rates did not have a significant, independent effect on student stress scores. However, gender, neighborhood influence, and perceived crime were significant predictors of low income college students' stress scores. The effect of being female is to reduce the stress score by 2.874 points on the 40-point scale, after controlling for all other variables in the model. Next, students who reported that their neighborhood increased their stress very much had a stress score 3.177 points higher, after controlling for all other variables in the model. Moreover, the effect of perceived crime increased the stress score by 7.140. Lastly, as indicated by the R^2 the combination of independent variables in this model explained 40.1% of the variance in low income college students stress scores.

Discussion

Interpretation of Findings

It was originally hypothesized that reentry rates would have a significant impact on low income college students stress levels, but results indicated that the relationship between high reentry rates and students stress levels were not significant. This specific finding is not in line with previous research done on incarceration and community mental health. In the previous study done Hatzenbuehler et al. (2015) found prison admissions and parole rates to have a significant impact on community mental health through the high transient nature of it, because this transient population is causing a disruption and deformation of social norms and important social networks that are intrinsic for development of social capital and collective efficacy within these communities.

These null findings for the relationship between community mental health and neighborhood incarceration rates draw into question the actual effect they have on influencing the neighborhood ecology. Two possible explanations for this insignificant effect may be the measure of incarceration that was used and the reliability of that data. Incarceration was measured using reentry rates, but reentry rates are only one aspect of incarceration, and this may have failed to capture the full dimension of neighborhood incarceration. Prison admissions, reentry rates, and parole rates should have been used to capture the full dimensions of neighborhood incarceration. Additionally, this data on reentry rates provided by Justice Atlas was collected for the year of 2008, so it may not be an accurate measure for reentry rates, but it was the only available reentry rate data readily available for public use.

Other studies that have used at least two of these measures of incarceration and or used current data for when their study was done have found significant results for increases in crime, neighborhood disorganization, and mental health. In Clear's et al. (2003) study used relatively current prison admissions, reentry, and crime data in his study of coercive mobility. After controlling for prison admissions, reentry, and other neighborhood variables an increase in crime was found in four out of the five models. Drakulich et al. (2012) found a similar increase in crime after controlling for reentry rates, racial breakdown of communities, housing and labor market discrimination, and prior crime found a significant increase in future crime. "Renaur et al. replicate Clear's et al. 's study using new data from Portland, OR and generally support the findings of a curvilinear relationship between prison admissions and future crime, though multicollinearity prevents them from simultaneously estimating an effect for prison releases" (Drakulich et al., 2012: p. 499). Incarceration and crime are causally related, and it has been proven that incarceration has detrimental effects on a community's social ecology because it

fosters an environment that ripe for criminal activity. Ultimately, this jeopardizes community safety and overall health.

Additionally, other control variables such as perceived crime, neighborhood influence, and gender were found to be statistically significant. These variables suggest that incarceration does have an influence on the social ecology of the communities these students reside in because perceptions of crime and neighborhood influence were very significant. Crime is a side effect of the high incarceration rates, which means the effects of mass imprisonment are not directly felt by the college students.

Limitations

This study had several limitations concerning the sample and measures used. The first is that reentry rate data were gathered and utilized at the zip code level, and this may have not been the proper geographical unit to measure neighborhoods. Zip codes can be problematic for researchers because zip codes have been defined by political and governmental agencies, and these boundaries that are crafted sometimes are very large and not representative of the people in those areas (Weisburd, 2009). Next, the second limitation is that reentry rates from nearly 10 years ago were the only measure for neighborhood incarceration used to gauge the stress levels of the college students. This didn't capture all facets of the neighborhoods and the effects that incarceration has on them. Other measures of incarceration should have been used such as admissions rates, because it would document the full effect of coercive mobility and the rapid return of offenders. Furthermore, crime should have been included to capture the after effect that imprisonment has on a community. Previous research indicates that a combination of these measures yields a negative effect on the urban social ecology of inner city communities, which experiences increased crime and urban violence because incarceration tears the social ecology

through coercive mobility and rapid reentry (Clear et al., 2001; Clear et al, 2003; Clear, 2007; Drakulich et al., 2012; Lynch and Sabol 2004; Pettit, 2012; Sampson and Loeffler, 2010). This would be worth considering since students' perceptions of crime were significant, and even though reentry rates weren't significant in this study they still are worth considering in combination with the other two measures, because crime is an effect of the social ecology being changed by hyper-incarceration. Lastly, the convenience sample used for this study is not representative of the overall population, and this created a sampling bias.

Research Recommendations

Future research should measure incarceration with admissions and reentry rates to obtain the full effect of the problems incarceration poses on individuals' mental health and stress. Also, zip code boundaries should be redefined by the researcher to best measure the effects of mass incarceration on community health. Furthermore, to obtain a more representative sample other institutions in the Philadelphia area that have act 101 and summer bridge programs should be included in the target population, and a control group should be added. The control group could consist of other low-income students that are from the city but are not a part of any Act 101 or summer bridge program, and this would allow for comparisons to be made between the groups stress and overall mental health.

Policy Implications

This study didn't find a significant effect that neighborhood reentry rates influenced college students stress levels. After controlling for gender, NBH influence, and perceived crime significant results were found using these independent variables. NBH influence and perceived crime are the most pertinent of the three-significant finding. NBH influence and perceived crime fall in line with previous research that indicates that high rates of incarceration and reentry

increase crime (Clear et al., 2001; Clear et al, 2003; Clear, 2007; Drakulich et al., 2012; Lynch and Sabol 2004; Pettit, 2012; Sampson and Loeffler, 2010). This relationship between high rates of mass imprisonment and crime provides a plausible explanation for why these students stress levels increased greatly when examining those variables.

High rates of prison admissions and reentry concentrated in already disadvantaged communities further deform informal social controls and social norms within those communities. This makes for a prime environment that can sustain crime and in turn crime and urban violence go up (Clear et al., 2001; Clear et al, 2003; Clear, 2007; Drakulich et al., 2012; Lynch and Sabol 2004; Pettit, 2012; Sampson and Loeffler, 2010). Moreover, a positive feedback loop is formed, and the social ecology transforms and further destabilizes the neighborhood (Drakulich et al., 2012; Sampson and Loeffler, 2010). Two possible solutions to combat and create a negative feedback loop that will stabilize these neighborhoods would be to fund more reentry programs that accommodate the main problems experienced by returning citizens and implementing more C.O.P strategies. Some of the critical problems faced by returning citizens include: stable housing (Clark, 2014; Bauldry, Korom-Djakovic, McClanahan, McMaken, and Kotloff, 2009) employment (Clark, 2014, Bauldry et al., 2009) education (Clark, 2014; Braga et al., 2009) technical training (Miller and Khey, 2016; Clark, 2014) substance abuse (Braga et al., 2009, Bauldry et al., 2009; Clark, 2014), mental health (Miller and Khey, 2016; Clark 2014), and addressing other legal problems (Taylor and Smith, 2017).

Over the last one and half decades, city municipalities, state, and federal agencies have attempted to tackle these problems of reentry by funding programs that address multiple issues upon release. In Boston they have funded a city wide reentry program for the highest risk offenders in effort to transition these individuals back into their communities as productive

citizens. This interagency approach offered a multitude of services like mentoring, social service assistance, and vocational development (Braga, Piehl, Hureau, 2009: p. 419). These services directed the returning citizens to programs that were efficient in helping them get reconnected to the labor market and helping them bridge the gap with their communities (Braga et al., 2009: p. 419). Furthermore, another integral part in assisting the returning citizens were the faith based organizations.

These faith based organizations provided mentors that aided in easing the transition process of these returning citizens. This was accomplished through the mentors developing a relationship with the returning citizens while they were still incarcerated and post release (Braga et al., 2009: p. 419). This relationship was key in helping the returning citizens reintegrate into their respective communities, and this was made possible because many of the staff members from these organizations were once incarcerated themselves. This offers a palpable relationship that the returning citizen can relate to, in turn making the relationship more authentic in the support offered (Braga et al., 2009: p. 419). This program had some success in reintegrating these individuals and it was found that offenders participating in this program had a 30 percent lower rate of recidivism (Braga et al., 2009: p. 428).

Other states have utilized similar methods in their reentry efforts and they have found similar reductions in recidivism. Miller and Khey (2016) evaluated Louisiana's 22nd judicial district reentry court program and found a significant reduction in recidivism rates with its thirty-one participants and only one participant being reincarcerated, which accounted for 8.3 percent. This program slightly differed in its approach to providing adequate help prerelease and post release. This program provided services that included substance abuse education, social skills training, mentoring, and vocational training leading to a certification (Miller and Khey, 2016: p.

577). Moreover, the duration of the program was 5 years and during this process participants had to undergo mandatory substance abuse treatment, random drug testing twice a week, attendance to two 12 step meeting per week, close case management, and weekly status hearing with the reentry judge (Miller and Khey, 2016: p. 579). The stringent nature of the programs developed and properly rehabilitated participants and gave them the necessary skills to be contributing citizens in society.

Additionally, implementation of C.O.P strategies such as problem oriented policing (P.O.P) would allow police to form better relationships with residents and form a complete understanding of the communities they police. Also with the calculated use of resources and manpower C.O.P strategies could bring crime down in neighborhoods that are hotbeds of crime and possibly reduce residents' perceptions of crime, fear of victimization, and stress levels. In Braga, David, Waring, and Piehl (2001) did an evaluation of Boston's Operation Ceasefire. This P.O.P effort aimed to bring down youth homicide and gun violence in Boston's inner city communities (Braga et al., 2001: p. 198). Youth violence in Boston was very high from 1980 to the mid 1990's the youth homicide rate was a staggering 418 percent, and this was on account that an increased number of youth possessed firearms (Braga et al., 2001: p. 195 - 196).

This operation took an interagency approach that consisted of a number of agencies that ranged from the Boston police department to gang outreach programs at local community centers (Braga et al., 2001: p. 198). Also the effort specifically honed in on targeting illegal firearm traffickers and deterring gang violence. They accomplished this by restoring destroyed serial numbers and stopping the flow of guns from coming in the city. Furthermore, harsh penalties for gang related violence were made known to the various gangs in the city, and law enforcement

agencies took a zero tolerance approach to this aspect of the operation to make sure the violence ceased (Braga et al., 2001: p. 199).

Operation ceasefire showed a significant reduction in youth homicides after it was implemented. Boston had an average youth homicide rate of 44 youth per year in 1991 to 1995, and after implementation this average dropped to 26 in 1996. This average continued to drop and in 1997 it was an average 15 youth homicides per year (Braga et al., 2001: p. 204). Moreover, a time series showed a 63 percent reduction in youth homicides per month. Before operation ceasefire the youth homicide rate was 3.5 per month and once the program was in place this rate dropped to 1.3 per month. These results indicate that problem oriented policing can be successful when resources and other agencies interact with a focused and sustained effort to solve a complex problem, and in turn it reduces crime and disorder within communities effectively (Braga et al., 2001, Jenkins, 2015; Stein and Griffith, 2017; Weisburd et al., 2010; Lord et al., 2008).

Reentry programs coupled with problem oriented policing could set the tone for reversing the positive feedback loops that are ingrained in many inner city African American communities. Reentry programs pose a heavy rehabilitation and reintegration effort which gives a leg up to returning citizens coming back into the community, and by providing these individuals with proper legitimate avenues to succeed it reduces the possibility of reverting back to criminal activities in order support one's self. In turn, this reduction negates the negative effects that high rates of prison admission and reentry can exert on the communities they reside in. Problem oriented policing with its more proactive nature could mend the broken bridge between African Americans and police. This would allow African Americans to abandon the preconceived notion that they have to protect themselves and their property because the police will not. If people

begin to believe in the police than it could maybe allow the police to better perform their jobs, because the people maybe more open to helping the police solve crimes and better address neighborhood disorder. This will make for better formal and informal social controls, and overall better community collective efficacy. With solid reentry programs and problem oriented policing efforts, crime and neighborhood disorder will possible go down and this will conceivably make residents in those communities feel safer, and overall lower the stress levels within those communities.

Conclusion

The spillover effects of mass incarceration go far beyond individuals, partners, and children. They have pervasive effects on nonincarcerated individuals living in those communities physical and mental health. Through the breakdown of a social ecology's informal and formal social controls and norms creates an environment that festers with increased crime and urban violence. This is the product of a criminal justice system that is still using a retribution and incapacitation punishment philosophy. Prior work suggests that high rates of imprisonment cause crime to go up, and with this increase in crime police utilize crime control strategies, which only exacerbate the problem further by continuing the cycling of individuals into the revolving door of justice. These finding bring light to the micro issues of hyper incarceration on community mental health, and call for a change in criminal justice policy, specifically policing practices and better reentry programs. These policy adjustments may put a block on the cycling of individuals in and out of the criminal justice system, and restore informal and formal social controls to foster higher levels of collective efficacy in these neighborhoods. With these systems intact the rift in the social ecology may be mended and better community overall health can be achieved.

References

- Allison, P. D. (2000). Multiple Imputation for Missing Data. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 28(3), 301-309. doi:10.1177/0049124100028003003
- Allison, P. D. (2003). Missing Data Techniques for Structural Equation Modeling. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 112(4), 545-557. doi:10.1037/0021-843x.112.4.545
- Bauldry, S., Korom-Djakovic, D., Kotloff, L., McClanahan, W. S., & McMaken, J. (2009, February 10). Mentoring Formerly Incarcerated Adults: Insights from the Ready4Work Reentry Initiative. Retrieved August 08, 2017, from http://ppv.issuelab.org/resource/mentoring_formerly_incarcerated_adults_insights_from_the_ready4work_reentry_initiative
- Braga, A. A., Kennedy, D. M., Waring, E. J., & Piehl, A. M. (2001). Problem-Oriented Policing, Deterrence, and Youth Violence: An Evaluation of Bostons Operation Ceasefire. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 38(3), 195-225. doi:10.1177/0022427801038003001
- Braga, A. A., Piehl, A. M., & Hureau, D. (2009). Controlling Violent Offenders Released to the Community: An Evaluation of the Boston Reentry Initiative. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 46(4), 411-436. doi:10.1177/0022427809341935
- Clark, V. A. (2014). Making the most of second chances: an evaluation of Minnesotas high-risk revocation reduction reentry program. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 11(2), 193-215. doi:10.1007/s11292-014-9216-5
- Clear, T. R., Rose, D. R., & Ryder, J. A. (2001). Incarceration and the Community: The Problem of Removing and Returning Offenders. *Crime & Delinquency*, 47(3), 335-351. doi:10.1177/0011128701047003003

- Clear, T. R., Rose, D. R., Waring, E., & Scully, K. (2003). Coercive mobility and crime: A preliminary examination of concentrated incarceration and social disorganization. *Justice Quarterly*, 20(1), 33-64. doi:10.1080/07418820300095451
- Clear, T. R. (2007). *Imprisoning communities: how mass incarceration makes disadvantaged neighborhoods worse*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cloud, D. H., Parsons, J., & Delany-Brumsey, A. (2014). Addressing Mass Incarceration: A Clarion Call for Public Health. *American Journal of Public Health*, 104(3), 389-391. doi:10.2105/ajph.2013.301741
- Cohen, S. (1994). Perceived Stress Scale. *Mind Garden*. Retrieved May, 2017.
- Covington, J., & Taylor, R. B. (1991). Fear of Crime in Urban Residential Neighborhoods: Implications of Between- and Within-Neighborhood Sources for Current Models. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 32(2), 231-249. doi:10.1111/j.1533-8525.1991.tb00355.x
- Drakulich, K. M., Crutchfield, R. D., Matsueda, R. L., & Rose, K. (2012). Instability, informal control, and criminogenic situations: community effects of returning prisoners. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 57(5), 493-519. doi:10.1007/s10611-012-9375-0
- Dumont, D. M., Allen, S. A., Brockmann, B. W., & Rich, J. D. (2013). Incarceration, Community Health, and Racial Disparities. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*, 24, 78-88. Retrieved November, 2017.
- Fitzgerald, J. D., & Fitzgerald, J. (2014). *Statistics for criminal justice and criminology in practice and research: an introduction*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Hatzenbuehler, M. L., Keyes, K., Hamilton, A., Uddin, M., & Galea, S. (2015). The Collateral Damage of Mass Incarceration: Risk of Psychiatric Morbidity Among Nonincarcerated Residents of High-Incarceration Neighborhoods. *American Journal of Public Health*,

105(1), 138-143. doi:10.2105/ajph.2014.302184

Jenkins, M. J. (2015). Police Support for Community Problem-Solving and Broken Windows Policing. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 41(2), 220-235. doi:10.1007/s12103-015-9302-x

Kaeble, D., & Glaze, L. (2016). Correctional Populations in the United States, 2015. *U.S. Department of Justice*, 1-19. Retrieved November, 2017.

Labar, H. E. (2014). The Fair Sentencing Act isn't all it's "cracked" up to be: how recent congressional action on federal crack cocaine sentencing schemes failed to end the disparity between crack and powder cocaine offenses. *Syracuse law review*, 64(2), 314-334. Retrieved October, 2017.

Lord, V. B., Kuhns, J. B., & Friday, P. C. (2009). Small city community policing and citizen satisfaction. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 32(4), 574-594. doi:10.1108/13639510911000713

Lynch, J. P., & Sabol, W. J. (2004). Assessing The Effects Of Mass Incarceration On Informal Social Control In Communities. *Criminology* <html_ent glyph="@amp;"
ascii="&"></html_ent> *Public Policy*, 3(2), 267-294. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9133.2004.tb00042.x

Martin, E. (2017). Hidden Consequences: The Impact of Incarceration on Dependent Children. *National Institute of Justice*, 278. Retrieved February, 2017.

McEwen, M. J. (1979). Help for Pennsylvania's Culturally and Economically Deprived College Students. *Eric*, 61(4), 286-87. Retrieved October, 2017.

Mears, D. P., Wang, X., Hay, C., & Bales, W. D. (2008). Social Ecology And Recidivism: Implications For Prisoner Reentry. *Criminology*, 46(2), 301-340. doi:10.1111/j.1745-

9125.2008.00111.x

- Miller, J. M., & Khey, D. N. (2016). Fighting America's Highest Incarceration Rates with Offender Programming: Process Evaluation Implications from the Louisiana 22nd Judicial District Reentry Court. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 42(3), 574-588. doi:10.1007/s12103-016-9372-4
- Perry, A. R., & Bright, M. (2012). African American Fathers and Incarceration: Paternal Involvement and Child Outcomes. *Social Work in Public Health*, 27(1-2), 187-203. doi:10.1080/19371918.2011.629856
- Pettit, B. (2012). *Invisible men: mass incarceration and the myth of black progress*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Rheinheimer, D. C., Grace-Odeleye, B., Francois, G. R., & Kusorgbor, C. (2010). Tutoring: A Support Strategy for At-risk Students. *TLAR*, 15(1), 23-34. Retrieved October, 2017.
- Roberts, D. E. (2004). The Social and Moral Cost of Mass Incarceration in African American Communities. *Stanford Law Review*, 56(5), 1271-1305. Retrieved February, 2017.
- Rogers, S. M., Khan, M. R., Tan, S., Turner, C. F., Miller, W. C., & Erbeding, E. (2012). Incarceration, high-risk sexual partnerships and sexually transmitted infections in an urban population. *Sexually Transmitted Infections*, 88(1), 63-68. doi:10.1136/sextrans-2011-050280
- Rosenfield, R., Edberg, M., Fang, X., & Florence, C. S. (2013). *Economics and Youth Violence: Crime, Disadvantage, and Community*. NYU Press.
- Sampson, R. J., & Loeffler, C. (2010). Punishments place: the local concentration of mass incarceration. *Daedalus*, 139(3), 20-31. doi:10.1162/daed_a_00020
- Saris, P. B., Breyer, C. R., Friedrich, D. L., Barkow, R. E., Pryor, W. H., Jr., Wroblewski, J. J.,

- & Smoot, P. W. (2015). *Report to the Congress: Impact of the Fair Sentencing Act of 2010* (pp. 1-91, Rep.). United States Sentencing Commission.
- Spangler, A. (2017, October). "Act 101---an EOP program" (Doctoral dissertation, Kutztown University of Pennsylvania, 2014) [Abstract]. *Proquest*, 1-74. (UMI No. 1571586)
- Stein, R. E., & Griffith, C. (2016). Resident and Police Perceptions of the Neighborhood. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 28(2), 139-154. doi:10.1177/0887403415570630
- Sykes, B. L., & Pettit, B. (2014). Mass Incarceration, Family Complexity, and the Reproduction of Childhood Disadvantage. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 654(1), 127-149. doi:10.1177/0002716214526345
- Taylor, C. J. (2016). The Family's Role in the Reintegration of Formerly Incarcerated Individuals. *The Prison Journal*, 96(3), 331-354. doi:10.1177/0032885516635085
- Taylor, C.J. and Smith, C. (2017, November). *MENTOR Program – Process Evaluation*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology. Philadelphia, PA.
- Thomas, J. C., & Torrone, E. (2008). Incarceration as Forced Migration: Effects on Selected Community Health Outcomes. *American Journal of Public Health*, 98(Supplement_1). doi:10.2105/ajph.98.supplement_1.s181
- Weisburd, D., Bernasco, W., & Bruinsma, G. (2009). *Putting crime in its place: units of analysis in geographic criminology*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Weisburd, D., Telep, C. W., Hinkle, J. C., & Eck, J. E. (2010). Is problem-oriented policing effective in reducing crime and disorder? *Criminology & Public Policy*, 9(1), 139-172. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9133.2010.00617.x
- Western, B., & Wildeman, C. (n.d.). The Black Family and Mass Incarceration. *American*

Academy of Political and Social Science, 621, 221-242. Retrieved February, 2017.

Wildeman, C., & Western, B. (2010). Incarceration in Fragile Families. *The Future of Children*, 20(2), 157-177. doi:10.1353/foc.2010.0006

Wildeman, C., & Wang, E. A. (2017). Mass incarceration, public health, and widening inequality in the USA. *The Lancet*, 389(10077), 1464-1474. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(17)30259-3

Wyant, B., & Harner, H. (2016). Being Poor in Prison: An examination of the Prevalence and Sources of Financial Stress Among a Sample of Male Inmates . *Prison Service Journal*, (224), 28-34. Retrieved February, 2017.

14. In the last month, how often have you found that you could not cope with all the things that you had to do?					
15. In the last month, how often have you been able to control irritations in your life?					
16. In the last month, how often have you felt that you were on top of things?					
17. In the last month, how often have you been angered because of things that were outside of your control?					
18. In the last month, how often have you felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?					

Part C Instructions: For each of the following questions, please check the box that best represents yourself.

19. Current GPA (grade point average): 2.0 or below 2.1 – 2.5 2.6 – 3.0 3.1 – 3.5
3.6 – 4.0

20. Are you currently employed? Yes No

21. In an average week, how many hours a week do you work?
N/A (I'm not employed) 1-10 11-20 21-30 31-40 41 or more

22. What is your approximate annual income for this year?
\$0-\$4,999 \$5,000-\$9,999 \$10,000-\$14,999 \$15,000-\$19,999 \$20,000 or more

23. Are you solely responsible for financing your college education? Yes No

24. Are you partially responsible for financing your college education? Yes No

25. Approximately what percentage of your college education is financed by loans, scholarships, and/or grants?
0 – 20% 21 – 40% 41 – 60% 61 – 80% 81 – 100%

26. How often do you worry about finances? Never Occasionally Always

27. Are you a first-generation college student? Yes No

28. What is the racial makeup of the neighborhood in which you grew up?
100% Caucasian (white) Predominately Caucasian (white) Racially balanced / mixed
Predominately African-American (black) 100% African American (black) Other:

29. Do you feel attached to your neighborhood?
Very much Somewhat Not at all

30. Do you feel responsible for conditions in your neighborhood?

Very much Somewhat Not at all

31. Do you feel committed to improving your neighborhood?

Very much Somewhat Not at all

32. Does your neighborhood influence your mood positively?

Very much Somewhat Not at all

33. Do you perceive your neighborhood to be a high crime area?

Very much Somewhat Not at all

34. How satisfied are you with the level of support you have?

Very much Somewhat Not at all

Appendix 2

Model Specifications

