

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

Christopher Wildeman<sup>1</sup>  
University of Michigan

---

<sup>1</sup> Direct mail to: Christopher Wildeman, University of Michigan, School of Public Health, 3648 SPH Tower, 109 Observatory, Ann Arbor, MI 48109. Direct email to: [wildeman@umich.edu](mailto:wildeman@umich.edu). I thank the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Health & Society Scholars for financial support and Sarah Burgard, Barry Lee, Andy Papachristos, Mike Roettger, Ray Swisher, John Eason, Jeff Morenoff, and Chris Muller for helpful comments. For a list of agencies funding the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, see <http://www.fragilefamilies.princeton.edu/funders.asp>.

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

**ABSTRACT**

Although the share of the homeless population composed of African Americans and children has grown since at least the early 1980s, the causes of these changes remain poorly understood. This article implicates mass imprisonment in at least the second of these shifts by considering the effects of parental incarceration on child homelessness using data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study. These are the only data that simultaneously represent a contemporary cohort of the urban children most at risk of homelessness, establish appropriate time-order between parental incarceration and child homelessness, and control for prior housing, which is vital given the imprisonment-homelessness nexus. Results show strong effects of recent but not distal parental incarceration on the risk of child homelessness. They also show that effects are concentrated among African American children. Taken together, results suggest that mass imprisonment exacerbates marginalization among disadvantaged children, thereby contributing to a system of stratification in which the children of the prison boom become virtually invisible.

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

On any given day, roughly 672,000 Americans are homeless (U.S. HUD 2008). This represents a drastic increase in the homeless population since the early 1980s, but the risk of being homeless on any given is still negligible for the average American (Lee, Tyler, and Wright *Forthcoming*; Shlay and Rossi 1992). Since point-in-time risks of homelessness accumulate over the life course, however, the risk of ever being homeless is much larger. Estimates show that fully 6.5 percent of the adult population has ever been homeless (Link et al. 1995:352), increasing to 15.2 percent when those ever on the brink of homelessness are included (Link et al. 1995:351). While changes in the size of the homeless population and corresponding increases in the lifetime risk of homelessness certainly merit attention, compositional shifts in this population may be even more important. Classic accounts of homelessness focused primarily on the single, adult, white men who composed the lion's share of that population (Bahr and Caplow 1974). Yet starting in the early 1980s, the share of the homeless population composed of African Americans and even children began to grow rapidly (Dennis, Locke, and Khadduri 2007; Shlay and Rossi 1992).

These shifts in the homeless population are likely symptomatic of broader changes in the vulnerability of these social groups and may have lingering effects on society by exacerbating dimensions of social stratification for African Americans, families, and children. As such, identifying the causes of these shifts likely yields insight into social inequality more broadly. On the macro-level, research identifies factors including (but not limited to) changing economic conditions and social policies, deindustrialization, the crack boom, and the housing squeeze as potential causes of the compositional shifts in the homeless population (Jencks 1994; Lee et al. *Forthcoming*). However, since estimates of the size and composition of this population are imprecise—and were perhaps more so in the past—relying on macro-level data to estimate the causes of these changes is not without its obstacles. At the micro-level, data obstacles also exist,

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

leaving researchers to use unrepresentative, cross-sectional data that identify the correlates but not causes of homelessness. Thus, though much research considers the causes of homelessness and shifts in the composition of this population, knowledge in this area remains limited.

One potential cause of these shifts is the onset of mass imprisonment, which roughly coincides with these broad changes in the homeless population. Much research has considered the effects of rising imprisonment rates on inequality among adult men (Pettit and Western 2004; Uggen and Manza 2006; Western 2006), but this sea change in the use of imprisonment as a form of punishment may also affect family life (Comfort 2007; Murray and Farrington 2008; Western and Wildeman 2009). The plausibility of the relationship between increasing imprisonment rates and compositional shifts in the homeless population is further demonstrated by the effects of the penal system on foster care caseloads. According to one analysis, changes in (female) imprisonment rates explain 30 percent of the increase in foster care caseloads between 1985 and 2000 (Swann and Sylvester 2006:328). Given overlaps between the populations of children at risk of foster care placement and homelessness, effects of mass imprisonment on child homelessness seem all the more plausible in light of strong effects on foster care caseloads.

Despite the plausibility of the relationship between the onset of mass imprisonment and changes in the composition of the homeless population, little research considers the relationship between parental incarceration and child homelessness (but see Foster and Hagan 2007). Since the micro-foundations upon which claims about the macro-level effects of the prison boom on the composition of the homeless population rest have not been rigorously tested, it is difficult to know if drastic increases in the imprisonment rate caused these changes in the composition of the homeless population or are merely spuriously related to them. This article fills this gap in the micro-level research by using data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study to

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

consider the effects of recent and distal parental incarceration on child homelessness. Since these data are representative of the children at highest risk of both parental incarceration and homelessness, establish appropriate time-order of events, and include measures of parental traits and prior living situations unavailable in other data, they facilitate the most rigorous empirical test of this relationship to date. Results from a series of multinomial logistic regression and propensity score models show that recent but not distal parental incarceration elevates the risk of child homelessness and that effects are concentrated among African American children. Taken together, these findings suggest that mass imprisonment affects not only traditional points of social stratification (such as the labor market) in America but also the risk of experiencing severe forms of disadvantage such as child homelessness. They also suggest that while troubled economic times bring to mind the effects of foreclosure and eviction on child and family homelessness, mass imprisonment may have played an invisible role in the creation of the population of homeless children even during the economic boom of the late 1990s.

**THE CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES OF CHILD HOMELESSNESS**

Few children ever experience homelessness, but the consequences for those who experience this event even briefly may be substantial. Possibly most important are effects on health. Homeless children (like homeless adults) tend to be exposed to more infectious diseases than they would have been had they been housed, so even short spells of homelessness may have long-lasting health effects (Haddad et al. 2005). In addition to negative effects on health, homeless children are also likely to have difficulty continuing with their academic work and are at high risk of abuse (Lee et al. *Forthcoming*; Rafferty et al. 2004). Thus, the future is bleak for homeless children, as these early disruptions in the life-course likely have ripple effects into later life.

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

Research also identifies a group on the brink of homelessness: those who are doubled up (see especially the excellent discussion of Lee et al. *Forthcoming*). Families are doubled up if they are living with friends or family but not paying rent. In other words, such families would be homeless if not for the largess of their social ties. Although this time of housing instability may harm children, it remains unclear whether being doubled up has lasting effects.

Given the negative effects of experiencing homelessness as a child even for a short time on subsequent adjustment in adolescence and adulthood, it would be beneficial to know both what individual-level factors predict the risk of homelessness and how the social patterning of homelessness is changing. Reliable estimates of the number of people who are homeless are notoriously difficult to generate, but we still know that children and African Americans now make up a greater share of the homeless population than they once did (Dennis et al. 2007), reflecting growing social marginalization among those groups. So while images of the homeless call to mind isolated single men, the risk of homelessness is growing for families with children.

What caused the share of the homeless population composed of children and African Americans to increase? Research points to numerous macro-level changes that may have increased the prevalence of child homelessness. At the least, changes in the structure of American families, the housing squeeze, deindustrialization, the crack boom, and decreasing welfare generosity are likely causes (Jencks 1994; Lee et al. *Forthcoming*). But given data limitations, it remains unclear which of these changes had the largest effects, and little research considers the role of social changes beyond those mentioned previously. In addition, since most attempts to consider macro-level shifts in the homeless population focus on the *size* of this population rather than its *composition*, the causes of these shifts remain poorly understood.

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

Given data obstacles at the macro-level, it may be reasonable to try to estimate what caused these macro-level shifts by considering the effects of individual-level factors that have changed over recent years (such as the risk of growing up with a single parent) on the risk of homelessness. Assuming the sizes of the effects of these predictors of the risk of homelessness have not changed, this strategy provides guidance in understanding the causes of macro-level compositional changes in the homeless population. Unfortunately, it is also difficult to estimate what the causes of child homelessness are at the individual-level because the small share of families ever experiencing homelessness makes it difficult to differentiate the causes of homelessness from its correlates. Thus, despite a large literature on the correlates of child homelessness, we still know little about what factors actually increase this risk.

Despite these obstacles, a new study using data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (FFCW) greatly extends our knowledge of the causes of child homelessness. Since these data establish appropriate time-order between factors thought to increase the risk of homelessness and whether a family experienced homelessness, this study provides great insight into what factors cause child homelessness. Results show that among families living in deep poverty, individual-level factors more consistently predict child homelessness than do city-level ones (Fertig and Reingold 2008). Children of nonresident fathers and whose mothers had low social support were at especially high risk of homelessness (Fertig and Reingold 2008:500-501). This is not to suggest that social policies have no effect, however. Both living in public housing and receiving a housing subsidy were associated with lower odds of experiencing homelessness at the subsequent interview. Taken together, results show that access to public housing and cash welfare, the presence of the child's biological father, and strong informal supports play a crucial role in diminishing the risk of homelessness among urban families living in poverty.

## Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness, and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

Previous research suggests a number of changes in American society over the last 30 years that contributed to the changing characteristics of the homeless population (Jencks 1994; Lee et al. *Forthcoming*). In the sections that follow, I suggest that mass imprisonment also had a part to play. Specifically, I suggest that mass imprisonment increased the share of the homeless population composed of children by disproportionately exposing recent birth cohorts to the experience of parental imprisonment. Since parental imprisonment not only touches the lives of the most vulnerable children but also has negative effects on familial functioning, finances, and access to institutional resources such as public housing and welfare, increases in the risk of experiencing parental imprisonment contributed to the compositional shifts in the homeless population. In advancing this argument, I start by outlining the contours of the American prison boom and then discuss the mechanisms through which having a parent go to prison increases the risk of child homelessness. I also speculate about how the timing of parental imprisonment may influence the size of its effects on child homelessness and why parental imprisonment may have larger effects on the risk of homelessness for African American children than other children.

### **THE PRISON BOOM AND CHILD HOMELESSNESS**

#### **The Changing Demography of Punishment in America**

Changes in the American imprisonment rate (Western 2006) and the corresponding effects of mass imprisonment on the life course of African American men and men with low levels of educational attainment have been well-established in recent years (Pettit and Western 2004). Less understood, however, is how changes in the imprisonment rate affect the risk of parental imprisonment for American children. Although the risk of parental imprisonment is almost certain to be increasingly unevenly distributed by child race and parental education, estimates of

## Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness, and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

changes in this risk have only recently been produced. These estimates suggest not only that the risk of parental imprisonment has increased dramatically for black children, culminating in a 25 percent chance of having a parent imprisoned, but also that the risk is much lower for white children. Only 4 percent of white children from the same cohort had a parent imprisoned at some point (Wildeman 2009:271). Furthermore, estimates show growth in absolute racial inequality in the risk of parental imprisonment. The absolute black-white gap for children born in 1978 was 12.8 percent; for children born 12 years later, it was 24.2 percent (Wildeman 2009:271).

Given substantial increases in the risk of parental imprisonment for children—especially African American children—it is plausible that mass imprisonment contributed to compositional shifts in the homeless population. For mass imprisonment to have contributed to the growing share of the homeless population composed of children (and African Americans), it must not only be increasingly unequally distributed, but also promote child homelessness. In the section that follows, I suggest channels through which parental imprisonment increases the risk of child homelessness, with attention to differences by the timing of incarceration and child race.

### **Parental Incarceration and Children’s Risk of Homelessness**

Like homeless children, children of imprisoned parents are a high-risk group. Research suggests that incarceration and homelessness often increase the risk of experiencing the other for adult men (Gowan 2002; Metraux, Roman, and Cho 2007; Roman and Travis 2006) and that having an ever-incarcerated father is associated with elevated risk of homelessness in late adolescence (Foster and Hagan 2007), so parental incarceration and child homelessness may be related. What remains unclear, however, is whether parental incarceration increases this risk or not. In this section, I argue that parental incarceration negatively affects familial functioning, finances, and

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

access to aid, thereby increasing the risk of child homelessness. I close by arguing that the effects of recent parental incarceration should be much more robust than are effects of distal parental incarceration and suggesting a host of reasons why effects may be largest for African Americans.

Consequences of parental incarceration—especially paternal incarceration—on the financial resources available to children may exert the largest effects of children’s risk of being homeless. The effects of imprisonment on adult men’s economic prospects have been well-documented. Having ever been incarcerated is associated not only with a lower probability of getting a callback for a job, but also with diminished earnings and probability of getting a “career job” (Pager 2003; Western 2002, 2006). Although some might argue that diminished earnings for formerly incarcerated fathers are unlikely to influence the resources available to children, research demonstrates that incarceration decreases men’s financial contributions to their families (Geller, Garfinkel, and Western *Forthcoming*). The loss of income associated with the incarceration experience also diminishes resources—especially when this period is accompanied by the high costs of keeping in contact with an incarcerated man (Braman 2004; Comfort 2008).

Parental incarceration seems unlikely to increase the risk of child homelessness solely through contributing to greater familial financial instability. Incarceration also tends to weaken the bonds between parents (Braman 2004; Nurse 2002; Swisher and Waller 2008) and increases the risk of divorce and separation (Lopoo and Western 2005). Given the strong protective effect of having a resident father on the risk of child homelessness (Fertig and Reingold 2008), the destabilizing effects of incarceration on family life likely also increase the risk of homelessness. Effects on social support are not limited to romantic unions, however. Some ethnographic research on the effects of incarceration on women suggests that the partners of incarcerated men withdraw from social networks in order to avoid the stigma of incarceration (Braman 2004).

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

Since social supports diminish the risk of homelessness (Fertig and Reingold 2008), the severing (or merely weakening) of these ties could increase the risk of child homelessness.

The destructive effects of incarceration on informal support likely have important effects on the risk of child homelessness. So too do negative effects on institutional support. Recent analyses suggest that for at-risk families, receipt of cash welfare and public housing benefits substantially diminish the risk of homelessness (Fertig and Reingold 2008). Current federal policies, however, ban individuals with a drug felony conviction from receiving cash welfare, food stamps, and subsidized (public) housing (see especially Rubinstein and Mukamal 2002). Thus, if the parents want to reside together and one of them has a felony conviction on their record, the other parent must choose between having the ever-incarcerated parent live in subsidized housing illegally—and hence maybe losing said housing—or living elsewhere, which may not be financially feasible. Thus, parental incarceration may also diminish the institutional support available to poor families, thereby increasing the risk of child homelessness.

Prior research on the effects of imprisonment on family life suggests a number of avenues through which parental incarceration may increase the risk of child homelessness. Unfortunately, prior research provides limited insight into whether these effects last only a short time or linger. Nonetheless, it seems most likely that effects would be largest during incarceration and immediately after the parent leaves prison in light of the well-documented financial strains that come along with having an incarcerated family member (Comfort 2007) and the difficulties former prisoners have securing housing upon their release from prison (Gowan 2002; Metraux et al. 2007; Roman and Travis 2006). Thus, I suggest that the short-term effects of parental incarceration on the risk of child homelessness should be stronger than its long-term effects.

## Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness, and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

Given vast racial disproportionately in the American penal system and negative effects of parental incarceration on the risk of child homelessness, changes in the American imprisonment rate would almost certainly increase the share of the homeless population composed of African Americans—provided effects are not smaller for African Americans than they are for whites. In this section, I suggest two reasons why we might expect effects to be larger for black than white children. First, given that inequalities in the risk of imprisonment accumulate across the life-course (Pettit and Western 2004), more black children may not only have a parent go to prison at some point, but also have parents who have been in and out of the system multiple times. Since the risks associated with incarceration likely increase as the number of bouts of incarceration increases, this could elevate the risk of child homelessness associated with parental incarceration. Second, since black families tend to have less wealth than white families do (Conley 1999), they may be less financially prepared to deal with the shock of parental incarceration than are white families—and, similarly, their extended families and social circle more broadly may be less able to offer housing assistance since they are also likely to have less resources on average. To the degree that racial disparities exist not only in the risk of parental incarceration but also in the effects of experiencing this event, consequences for future racial inequality may be substantial.

### **DATA AND METHOD**

#### **Data**

In order to test my hypotheses, I used data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, which is a longitudinal birth cohort study that follows approximately 5,000 children born in urban areas between 1998 and 2000—the majority of whom were born to unmarried parents (Reichman et al. 2001). Initial interviews were conducted with mothers in 20 cities with

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

populations over 200,000 in hospitals shortly after they gave birth. Mothers were then contacted again 12, 30, and 60 months after the birth for interviews. By 60 months, approximately 85 percent of mothers were still in the sample. Fathers were also interviewed, although their response rates were lower. By 60 months, only 65 percent of fathers were in the sample.

I imposed two restrictions on the analytic sample. First, I limited the sample to children who had at least one parent complete both the 30 and 60 month interviews because I needed to include a host of measures from both of these waves in my analysis. Limiting the sample to children who had at least one parent complete both the 30 and 60 month interviews yields a large number of observations ( $N=3,774$ ), but this sample represents only slightly more than 75 percent of the children originally identified in the sample. Since the analytic sample represents 75 percent of the children originally identified, missing data is a concern. The second limitation imposed is that the child must have been living in poverty at 30 months. I limited the sample to these children because they are truly “at risk” of experiencing homelessness because of links between poverty and homelessness. The final analytic sample includes 1,410 observations.

Despite some limitations, the data have many benefits. First, and probably most importantly, these are the only data that are representative of contemporary children at highest risk of homelessness, have enough cases of both parental incarceration and child homelessness to conduct statistical analyses, and (because they are longitudinal) allow the analyst to establish appropriate time-order between factors thought to cause child homelessness and the experience of homelessness. Second, mothers are asked a host of questions about fathers not asked to partners in other surveys. Since low-SES fathers are underrepresented in surveys (Hernandez and Brandon 2002), these reports provide information unavailable elsewhere. Finally, because disadvantaged parents are overrepresented in the criminal justice system, many of the parents in

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

the sample have been incarcerated, with a large percentage incarcerated recently. The large share of the sample that has come into contact with the criminal justice system before allows me to more confidently isolate causal relationships than I could with a sample in which a smaller percentage of parents had ever been incarcerated. These data, therefore, provide the best test to date of the effects of parental incarceration on child homelessness because they establish appropriate time-order between the dependent and independent variables (and test for effects of recent and distal parental incarceration), include a large sample of at-risk children, and include a host of controls not available in other data (yet endogenous to incarceration and homelessness).

**Dependent Variables**

The dependent variables measured whether children had been homeless or doubled up in the last year. Children were coded as having been homelessness if they fit the following criteria at 60 months: (1) one parent reported either living in temporary housing, a group shelter, or on the street at the time of the interview or reported that they had stayed somewhere not intended for regular housing—such as an abandoned building or car—for at least one night in the last 12 months; and (2) the same parent reported that they lived with the child all or most of the time.

Although the ideal measure would also provide some indication of the duration of homelessness, this measure still provides insight into the degree to which the child is at risk of experiencing a more sustained period of homelessness. Children were coded as being doubled up at 60 months if their parents reported that (1) the child lived with them all or most of the time and (2) they lived with friends or family members in a residence they owned or rented but did not pay rent. Coding for these variables has been used in prior analyses using these data (Fertig and Reingold 2008).

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

Not surprisingly, few children were homeless or doubled up in the year before the 60 month interview. About 5 percent of children in this sample had been homeless, and about 2 percent of the sample had been doubled up (table 1). Nonetheless, there was sufficient variation in these outcomes to conduct statistical analyses. For children of recently incarcerated parents, the risk of homelessness was .09; for other children, the risk was only .04. Differences in the risk of being doubled up by recent parental incarceration were much less substantial. Children of recently incarcerated parents were only modestly more likely to have been doubled up (.03) than were other children (.02). At least descriptively, this suggests that parental incarceration is associated with elevated risk of homelessness but not of being doubled up. It also suggests—again, albeit only descriptively—that unmet housing need for children of incarcerated parents is more likely met by some form of homelessness than by living with friends or family.

**Explanatory Variables**

The explanatory variables measure parental incarceration. The first considers whether either parent had ever been incarcerated before the 30 month interview. This measure is based on whether either parent reported at any point up to and including the 30 month interview that they or the other parent had ever been incarcerated, were currently incarcerated, or had been incarcerated since the previous interview. When maternal and paternal reports about prior incarcerations conflicted, I assumed that the individual had been incarcerated at some point. Altering the coding of parental incarceration in reasonable ways did not substantially change results. The other measure of parental incarceration is based on parental reports at 60 months about whether the mother or father was currently incarcerated or had been incarcerated since the

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

last interview. I differentiated between these two measures of parental incarceration in order to test whether the effects of parental incarceration are short-lived or linger.

As table 1 shows, having a parent with a history of incarceration was quite normal for the children considered in this analysis. Even children who did not experience parental incarceration between 30 and 60 months had a 49 percent chance of having at least one ever-incarcerated parent. In the full sample, 59 percent of the children had at least one ever-incarcerated parent. A relatively large portion of the sample also experienced a new parental incarceration. Fully 27 percent of the children in the sample experienced a new bout of parental incarceration in this relatively short period. Given the large share of the sample experiencing parental incarceration, if this event substantially increases the risk of child homelessness, then mass imprisonment may have played a key role in the changing composition of the homeless population.

[Insert table 1 about here.]

### **Control Variables**

I controlled for factors associated with both parental incarceration and child homelessness such as maternal and paternal age (both of which are centered) and high school completion (Fertig and Reingold 2008). I also controlled for the child's race (non-Hispanic black, Hispanic, white, and other), the number of children the mother had before the focal child's birth, the caretaker's self-rated health, whether the biological parents were living together at 30 months, and whether the caretaker was an immigrant. Caretaker self-rated health was based on caretaker reports of whether their health was excellent (1) to poor (5) at 30 months. If both parents claimed to live with the child all or most of the time, then the mean of their self-rated health scores was used.

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

I also controlled for maternal and paternal self-control, whether either parent had a drug or alcohol problem, whether the mother smoked during pregnancy, and whether the mother had been abused by the father since the focal child's birth. The measures of self-control were based on how parents responded to questions about themselves (and the other parent if they were not interviewed) about how often they did things without considering the consequences, got into trouble because they didn't think before they acted, did things that may cause trouble with the law, lied or cheated, got into fights, and didn't feel guilty when they misbehaved. Either parent was considered to have had a drug or alcohol problem if they or the other parent agreed that drugs or alcohol interfered with their work or personal relationships or made it more difficult for them to manage their life on a daily basis, or they had such a strong desire to drink that they had to have a drink. Maternal smoking was coded 0 if she never smoked during the pregnancy, 1 if she smoked less than one pack per day, and 2 if she smoked more than that. Mothers were considered to have been abused by the father if they reported having ever been hurt by the father in a fight since the child's birth. Given that many of these controls are endogenous to the risks of both child homelessness and parental incarceration, including them in the models is vital.

I also included controls for the ratio of household income to the poverty line, the caregiver's lack of social support, whether the caregiver lived in public housing, whether the caregiver received a housing subsidy, whether the caregiver received cash benefits, and the number of times the caregiver had moved since the child's birth. Total household income was based on caregiver responses to questions about their total household income at 30 months. When both parents completed the interview and claimed to live with the child all or most of the time, I took the mean of their household income as the household income. After finding out what their household income was, I divided this by the poverty line for families of a similar size living

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

in the same city. I then constructed dummy variables for those living below 50 percent of the poverty line and below 100 percent of the poverty line but above 50 percent of the poverty line. Lack of social support ranges from zero to four and was based on whether the caregiver thought they couldn't count on someone to loan them \$200, provide them with a place to live, provide emergency childcare, or cosign a loan for \$1000 with them. When both parents reported for the interview and claimed to live with the child all or most of the time, scores were averaged.

The final individual-level controls included in the models were measures of housing instability drawn from the 30 month interview. In addition to controlling for being homeless or doubled up at 30 months—operationalized in the same way as they are at 60 months—I also controlled for the total number of times the child moved between the 12 and 30 month interviews. Including these controls allowed me to look at change in these statuses as a result of parental incarceration and represents an improvement over other research in this area, which has traditionally used cross-sectional data because of how difficult this population is to retain in longitudinal surveys. Some models included city-level dummies in order to diminish concerns about city-level factors influencing both parental incarceration and child homelessness. Although including these controls improved model fit only minimally, I included them because of work showing effects of housing markets on homelessness (Lee et al. *Forthcoming*).

For a full presentation of the dependent, explanatory, and control variables, see table 1.

## **Method**

This article relied on four methods for considering the association between parental incarceration and child homelessness. Throughout the analyses, I used one-sided t-tests because my hypothesis—that parental incarceration elevates the risk of this event—is directional. In the first

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

stage of the analysis, I used a multinomial logistic regression model with the full analytic sample to consider the association of parental incarceration with children's odds of homelessness and being doubled up relative to experiencing neither event (table 2). I first presented a descriptive relationship between parental incarceration and child homelessness (model 1). I then ran models that adjusted for a host of covariates and included city-level dummies (model 2) and closed with a model that also controlled for children's prior living situations (model 3). In the second stage of the analysis (table 3), I used the same modeling strategy and incorporated controls in the same way but limited the sample to children whose parents had ever been incarcerated by the 30 month interview. By restricting the sample to children of parents who were likely engaged in criminal activity at some point in the past (because of their incarceration status), I diminished heterogeneity, thereby strengthening causal inference (see the discussion of LaLonde 1986).

In the third stage of the data analysis (table 4), I used propensity score models to test the relationship between parental incarceration and child homelessness. For this stage of the analysis, I dropped children who were doubled up at age five from the analysis because the propensity score models can only consider one outcome. Although propensity score models are not new, they are relatively new to sociology (Morgan and Winship 2007; Rosenbaum and Rubin 1983; see also Massoglia 2008 for a discussion). Propensity score models estimate average effects of a treatment (parental incarceration) on an outcome (homelessness) through a two stage-process. In the first stage, propensity scores were generated by running a logistic regression model predicting recent parental incarceration. After this, individuals were matched based on the probability of experiencing recent parental incarceration given their observed characteristics and the coefficients generated using the logistic regression model. Once matching was completed, effects of parental incarceration on child homelessness were estimated.

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

The model upon which the propensity to experience a new parental incarceration is based included the following variables: paternal and maternal age (including squared and cubed terms); dummies indicating that the father or mother had dropped out of high school; paternal and maternal self-control (including squared and cubed terms); a dummy indicating whether the child was non-Hispanic black; a dummy indicating whether either parent had ever been incarcerated before; a dummy indicating whether either parent abused drugs or alcohol; a dummy indicating that the household income was below 50 percent of the poverty line; and all possible two-way interactions. After checking for covariate balance, I restricted the sample to the region of common support and used three types of propensity score models to estimate average treatment effects. The first type of matching, nearest neighbor matching, estimates effects by comparing the probability of experiencing homelessness of the closest treated and control observations. For this analysis, I used nearest neighbor matching with replacement, which allows control observations to be used for more than one treated observation. The second type of matching, radius matching, compares the mean probability of experiencing homelessness of any treated and control observations that have propensity scores within a certain distance of each other. For this analysis, I relied on a caliper on .005. The final type of matching used in these analyses, kernel matching, uses all controls but weights them according to their distance from treated cases. This uses all information but gives more weight to controls that are more similar to treated cases. I used a bandwidth of .006 and a Gaussian kernel. All propensity score analyses were conducted using STATA-compatible software designed by Becker and Ichino (2002).

In the final stage of the analysis (table 5), I extended research by providing race-specific tests of the effects of parental incarceration on children. I did so by breaking the sample into black and non-black children and then running a multinomial logistic regression model

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

separately by child race. I split the sample in this way for two reasons. First, since the magnitude of the effects of mass imprisonment on childhood inequality vary depending on the size of the effects of parental incarceration on children at different risks of this event, splitting the sample into black children and all other children lends insight into the effects of mass imprisonment on childhood inequality. Second, since my theoretical framework suggests that black families, on average, may be less able to manage an economic shock like that introduced by a recent bout of incarceration, this allows me to test whether the effects are larger for blacks than other groups.

## **RESULTS**

### **Results from Multinomial Logistic Regression Models**

Table 1 showed a descriptive relationship between recent parental incarceration and children's risk of homelessness but not of being doubled up. In table 2, I begin a more rigorous investigation of the relationship between parental incarceration and children's risk of homelessness using multinomial logistic regression models. In the first model, I show a descriptive relationship between parental incarceration and children's odds of homelessness or being doubled up. Results from this model indicate that a new bout of parental incarceration is associated with a significant increase in the odds of being homeless at the .01 level. Furthermore, this association is large. Having a recently incarcerated parent is associated with a 148 percent ( $e^{.91}$ ) increase in the odds of being homeless. Having a parent with a history of incarceration is not associated with an elevated risk of homelessness—even descriptively—and there is no significant relationship between parental incarceration and children's risk of being doubled up. Thus, children of recently incarcerated parents whose parents cannot afford housing are no more likely to live with friends or family than other children but are much more likely to be homeless.

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

Results from model 1 in table 2 suggested that there is a positive, significant association between a new bout of parental incarceration and children's risk of homelessness. Results from model 2, which adjusts for a host of covariates likely associated with both parental incarceration and children's risk of homelessness, provide further evidence of an association between recent parental incarceration and children's risk of homelessness. The relationship is positive and significant—albeit at only the .05 level in this model—and effects are substantial. Having a recently incarcerated parent is associated with an increase in the odds of homelessness of about 101 percent ( $e^{.70}$ ). Once again, this relationship is the only substantial or statistically significant relationship between parental incarceration and children's risk of homelessness. Prior bouts of parental incarceration do nothing to increase the risk of either measure of homelessness. And none of the measures of parental incarceration affect the risk of being doubled up at all.

[Insert table 2 about here.]

Results from models 1 and 2 in table 2 provided evidence of an association between a new parental incarceration and children's risk of experiencing homelessness. Nonetheless, these models did not include controls for children's prior living situations, which may well be the best predictors of future living situations—and may also be associated with the risk of experiencing a new parental incarceration. Results from model 3, which adjusts for prior living situations, provide such evidence. Having a recently incarcerated parent is a statistically significant predictor of experiencing homelessness and is associated with a 77 percent increase in the odds of being homeless ( $e^{.57}$ ). Results from model 3 provide the strongest evidence to date that having a parent incarcerated increases the risk of child homelessness. They also suggest, however, that distal parental incarceration is unlikely to have a direct effect on child homelessness and that effects of recent parental incarceration on being doubled up are negligible.

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

Results show a consistent, positive, statistically significant association between a new parental incarceration and children's risk of homelessness. But what is the magnitude of this association? In order to decipher the magnitude of these effects, I used results from model 3 in table 2 to consider the probability of experiencing homelessness for children experiencing and not experiencing a new parental incarceration, holding all other predictors at their means. Under this scenario, children of newly incarcerated parents had a .048 probability of experiencing homelessness; for other children, the risk was .029. As such, it appears that a new bout of parental incarceration is associated with an increase of about 65 percent in the probability of experiencing homelessness in this sample, holding all other covariates at their means.

Results from table 2 showed a positive, significant, and substantial association between a new parental incarceration and children's risk of homelessness after adjusting for individual-level and city-level covariates. Unfortunately, covariate adjustment may be an inadequate solution to endogeneity bias in this sample since parents who have ever been in contact with the penal system may differ from other parents in unobserved ways. In order to allay concerns that parents who have been incarcerated are "just different" from other parents and that it is these unobserved characteristics rather than the experience of parental incarceration that are driving the association, I run the same models as those presented in table 2 but limit the sample to children of ever-incarcerated parents. This provides a more rigorous test of the hypothesis that parental incarceration increases children's risk of homelessness because it limits unobserved heterogeneity, maybe most importantly in the area of prior criminal activity.

Results from model 1, which considers the descriptive relationship between a new parental incarceration and children's risk of homelessness, show a significant (at the .001 level) and positive association between a new parental incarceration and children's risk of

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

homelessness. In this model, children of newly incarcerated parents have 172 percent higher odds of experiencing homelessness than other children. Not surprisingly, children of newly incarcerated parents have no higher risk of being doubled up than do other children.

[Insert table 3 about here.]

In models 2 and 3 in table 3, I present results from more rigorous models that not only diminish unobserved heterogeneity by limiting the sample to children of ever-incarcerated parents, but also adjust for individual-level and city-level confounders (model 2) and children's prior housing situations (model 3). Results from these models provide support for the hypothesis that parental incarceration elevates children's risk of homelessness. In both models, the relationship is positive, statistically significant, and large, representing a 139 percent (model 2) and 116 percent (model 3) increase in the odds of homelessness. Results again show a nonsignificant relationship between parental incarceration and being doubled up.

But what is the magnitude of the effect of parental incarceration on children's risk of homelessness in this sample? In order to decipher the magnitude of the effect, I follow the same procedure outlined previously in table 2—although I use the means for the new analytic sample rather than the previous analytic sample to generate the predicted probabilities. Under this scenario, children of recently incarcerated parents would have a .056 chance of being homeless, while other children would have a .026 chance of experiencing this event. This again provides support for the hypothesis that parental incarceration affects children's risk of being homeless.

### **Results from Propensity Score Models**

Results from tables 2 and 3 yielded consistent results in multinomial logistic regression models. Throughout these tables, recent parental incarceration was consistently a statistically significant

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

predictor of children's risk of homelessness. No other associations between parental incarceration and homelessness were statistically significant—even in the descriptive models.

Although multinomial logistic regression models provide one method for considering this relationship, they do not offer the only method for testing it. In recent years, researchers have started to use propensity score (or matching) models to consider so-called “incarceration effects” since these models may yield less biased estimates of effect sizes (see the discussion of Massoglia 2008). In table 4, I present estimates of the effects of a new bout of parental incarceration—consistently the best predictor of children's risk of experiencing homelessness in the earlier models—on children's risk of homelessness using radius, nearest neighbor, and kernel matching since there is no consensus concerning which type of matching is superior. Since I do not consider effects on being doubled up, I drop children who were doubled up at 60 months.

Results from the three models presented in table 4, which consider the relationship between a new bout of parental incarceration and children's risk of experiencing homelessness, consistently support the hypothesis that a new bout of parental incarceration significantly elevates the risk of homelessness (each time at the .01 or .05 level). Results suggests that the mean probability of experiencing homelessness was between 4 and 5 percentage points higher among those receiving the treatment than those not receiving it. The magnitude of these effects is somewhat larger than what was found using predicted probabilities based on the multinomial logistic regression models, where differences ranged from slightly under two percent to around three percent depending on the model used. The difference in the magnitude of the effects should not come as a surprise, however, since the matched controls used in these models are likely at elevated risk of homelessness relative to the mean child in the sample who did not experience

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

parental incarceration. As such, absolute differences in the magnitude of the effects of parental incarceration should be larger in the high-risk sample than the low-risk one.

[Insert table 4 about here.]

Although results from the propensity score models presented in table 4 do not provide definitive evidence of a relationship between recent bouts of parental incarceration and children's risk of homelessness, they do provide an additional test of the hypothesis using a different method that attempts to assign new bouts of parental incarceration randomly. Taken together, results from multinomial logistic regression models and propensity score models suggest that parental incarceration likely elevates children's risk of homelessness.

**Race-Specific Effects of Parental Incarceration on Child Homelessness**

Results thus far suggest that mass imprisonment may have contributed to elevated risks of homelessness among American children. Yet results to this point provide little insight into whether we should expect mass imprisonment to have exerted larger effects on the population of black or non-black children since they have not tested for race-specific effects at the individual level. In this section, I take a first step toward considering race-specific effects of parental incarceration on children's risk of homelessness by using the same controls used in model 3 in table 2 but splitting the sample into black and non-black children. In so doing, I provide insight into the effects of mass imprisonment on the share of the homeless population composed of African Americans beyond what would be expected given disproportionately in imprisonment.

[Insert table 5 about here.]

For black children, experiencing a new bout of parental incarceration is associated with a significant, substantial increase in the odds of experiencing homelessness but virtually no change

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

in the risk of being doubled up. Having a recently incarcerated parent is associated with about a 141 increase in the odds of being homeless, all else equal. For non-black children, the majority of whom are Hispanic in this sample, a new bout of parental incarceration is not associated with a significant change in the risk of homelessness or being doubled up. Coefficients also suggest that new bouts of parental incarceration almost certainly do not increase the risk of homelessness for non-black children, as the coefficient is large (-1.09) and in the opposite direction expected. As such, results suggest that mass imprisonment likely exacerbated racial inequality in the risk of child homelessness since black children are not only more likely to have a parent imprisoned but also much more likely than other children to be negatively affected by this event.

## **DISCUSSION**

Results from a series of multinomial logistic regression and propensity score models provided a consistent story about the consequences of parental incarceration for children's subsequent risk of homelessness. Based on these models, solely having a parent with a history of incarceration appears to have minimal effects on the risk of homelessness. This finding is of no small import in an era in which many children are born to parents with histories of incarceration—and many more experience parental incarceration at some point in their lives (Pettit and Western 2004; Western and Wildeman 2009; Wildeman 2009). While having a parent with a history of incarceration does not elevate the risk of child homelessness, having a recently incarcerated parent significantly increases the risk of experiencing this event. These significant effects are news in their own right, but their magnitude is also worth considering. Having a recently incarcerated parent elevates the risk of homelessness by 65 percent in the full sample, 114 percent in the limited sample. Taken together, results suggest that recent parental incarceration

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

has significant—and substantively important—effects on children’s risk of homelessness. They also suggest, however, that this period of elevated risk may be short, as children of formerly but not recently incarcerated parents did not experience higher risk of homelessness.

Rapid decay in the effects of parental incarceration on children’s risk of homelessness differs from findings from recent research (but not my hypotheses) suggesting that having a father with a history of incarceration elevates the risk of homelessness (Foster and Hagan 2007). Given the more extensive controls for the timing of parental incarceration in the Fragile Families data, it may be the case that my results would overlap with recent research if model specification was altered somewhat. In order to test this possibility, I did two things. First, I ran the same models presented here *without* including recent parental incarceration. Results from these models showed no effects of distal parental incarceration even in the absence of recent parental incarceration. Second, I ran models that excluded all controls measured at 30 months and recent parental incarceration since prior incarceration affects characteristics at 30 months (Geller et al. 2009). Results from these models again suggested no effects of distal parental incarceration on the risk of child homelessness. Thus, it appears that any effects of parental incarceration on this risk decay within the first 30 months of having a parent go to jail, at least for young children. On a practical level, this suggests that interventions attempting to decrease the effects of parental imprisonment on child homelessness should focus on the periods during and immediately following parental incarceration in order to have the largest protective effects.

Possibly even more crucial than the average effects of parental incarceration discovered for all children is that these effects are concentrated among African American children. Indeed, based on results from the analyses presented here, *only* black children experience elevated risks of homelessness as a result of parental incarceration. For other children, having a parent go to jail

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

has no effect on their risk of homelessness, on average. Since it is well-known that the risk of parental imprisonment is concentrated among African American children and children whose parents have low levels of educational attainment, the finding that negative effects of this experience are also concentrated among the most marginalized suggests that the consequences of mass imprisonment for racial disparities in childhood (and beyond) may be even larger than suspected. Given these findings, researchers should interrogate further the extent to which race-specific effects of parental incarceration are found for other outcomes.

These findings are provocative, but there are still limitations to this study. As always, a limitation is that incarceration is not randomly assigned. Although searching for exogenous variation is always important, it may be especially vital in order to isolate incarceration effects since the selection problems in this area are acute. Another difficulty is attrition. In light of substantial attrition in these data, the findings from these analyses may not be representative of the full sample. A third difficulty with this analysis is that the measure of homelessness used did not provide insight into the duration of homelessness. Thus, it remains unclear whether having a parent go to prison leads to a long or short spell of homelessness. A final difficulty is that I was not able to test this relationship at the macro-level. Thus, although results point toward effects of mass imprisonment on compositional shifts in the homeless population, there is no way to be sure that the micro-level effects shown here account for these macro-level shifts.

Despite these limitations, the findings speak not only to the effects of parental incarceration on the plight of marginalized children, but also to the effects of mass imprisonment on racial inequality in America more broadly. Possibly most importantly, they fall in line with research showing not only that the imprisoned are virtually invisible but also that this invisibility has implications for American inequality (Pettit *Forthcoming*). Findings from this study suggest

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

that the children of incarcerated parents may be at elevated risk of becoming invisible as well. By pushing prisoners and their children further to the margins of society, the prison boom sets the stage for a distinctively American form of inequality that is both severe—in that it makes dishonored groups invisible—and durable (Tilly 1999)—in that it is passed through generations.

## REFERENCES

- Bahr, Howard M., and Theodore Caplow. 1974. *Old Men Drunk and Sober*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Becker, Sascha, and Andrea Ichino. 2002. “Estimation of Average Treatment Effects Based on Propensity Scores.” *Stata Journal* 2:358-377.
- Braman, Donald. 2004. *Doing Time on the Outside: Incarceration and Family Life in Urban America*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Comfort, Megan. 2007. “Punishment Beyond the Legal Offender.” *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 3:271-296.
- , 2008. *Doing Time Together: Love and Family in the Shadow of the Prison*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Conley, Dalton. 1999. *Being Black, Living in the Red: Race, Wealth, and Social Policy in America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Dennis, Deborah, Gretchen Locke, and Jill Khadurri, Eds. 2007. *Toward Understanding Homelessness: The 2007 National Symposium on Homelessness Research*. United States Department of Health and Human Services and United States Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- Fertig, Angela, and David Reingold. 2008. “Homelessness among At-Risk Families with Children in Twenty American Cities.” *Social Service Review* 82:485-510.

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

- Foster, Holly, and John Hagan. 2007. "Incarceration and Intergenerational Social Exclusion." *Social Problems* 54:399-433.
- Geller, Amanda, Irwin Garfinkel, Carey Cooper, and Ronald Mincy. 2009. "Parental Incarceration and Child Wellbeing: Implications for Urban Families." *Social Science Quarterly* 90:1186-1202.
- Geller, Amanda, Irwin Garfinkel, and Bruce Western. Forthcoming. "Incarceration and Support for Children in Fragile Families." *Demography*.
- Gowan, Teresa. 2002. "The Nexus: Homelessness and Incarceration in Two American Cities." *Ethnography* 3:500-534.
- Haddad, Maryam B., Todd W. Wilson, Kashef Ijaz, Suzanne M. Marks, and Marisa Moore. 2005. "Tuberculosis and Homelessness in the United States." *JAMA* 293:2762-2766.
- Hernandez, Donald, and Peter Brandon. 2002. "Who Are the Fathers of Today?" Pp. 33-62 in *Handbook of Father Involvement: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, edited by Catherine Tamis-Lemonda and Natasha Cabrera. Mahway, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Jencks, Christopher. 1994. *The Homeless*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- LaLonde, Robert. 1986. "Evaluating the Econometric Evaluations of Training Programs with Experimental Data." *The American Economic Review* 76:604-620.
- Lee, Barrett A., Kimberly A. Tyler, and James D. Wright. Forthcoming. "The New Homelessness Revisited." *Annual Review of Sociology*.
- Link, Bruce, Jo Phelan, Michael Bresnahan, Ann Stueve, Robert Moore, and Ezra Susser. 1995. "Lifetime and Five-Year Prevalence of Homelessness in the United States: New Evidence on an Old Debate." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 65:347-354.
- Lopoo, Leonard, and Bruce Western. 2005. "Incarceration and the Formation and Stability of Marital Unions." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 67:721-734.
- Massoglia, Michael. 2008. "Incarceration as Exposure: The Prison, Infectious Disease, and Other

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

Stress-Related Illnesses.” *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 49:56-71.

Metraux, Stephen, Caterina G. Roman, and Richard S. Cho. 2007. “Incarceration and Homelessness.” Pp. 9:1-31 in *Toward Understanding Homelessness: The 2007 National Symposium on Homelessness Research*, edited by Deborah Dennis, Gretchen Locke, and Jill Khadurri. United States Department of Health and Human Services and United States Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Morgan, Stephen, and Christopher Winship. 2007. *Counterfactuals and Causal Inference: Methods and Principles for Social Research*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Murray, Joseph, and David P. Farrington. 2008. “Effects of Parental Imprisonment on Children.” *Crime and Justice* 37:133-206.

Nurse, Anne. 2002. *Fatherhood Arrested: Parenting from Within the Juvenile Justice System*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

Pager, Devah. 2003. “The Mark of a Criminal Record.” *American Journal of Sociology* 108:937-975.

Pettit, Becky. Forthcoming. “Enumerating Inequality: The Constitution, the Census Bureau, and the Criminal Justice System.” *University of Connecticut Public Interest Law Journal*.

Pettit, Becky, and Bruce Western. 2004. “Mass Imprisonment and the Life Course: Race and Class Inequality in U.S. Incarceration.” *American Sociological Review* 69:151-169.

Rafferty, Yvonne, Marybeth Shinn, and Beth C. Weitzman. 2004. “Academic Achievement among Formerly Homeless Adolescents and Their Continuously Housed Peers.” *Journal of School Psychology* 42:179-199.

Reichman, Nancy, Julien Teitler, Irwin Garinfinkel, and Sara McLanahan. 2001. “Fragile Families: Sample and Design.” *Children and Youth Services Review* 23:303-326.

Roman, Caterina Gouvis, and Jeremy Travis. 2006. “Where Will I Sleep Tomorrow? Housing,

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

- Homelessness, and the Returning Prisoner.” *Housing Policy Debate* 17:389-418.
- Rosebaum, Paul, and Donald Rubin. 1983. “The Central Role of the Propensity Score in Observational Studies for Causal Effects.” *Biometrika* 70:41-55.
- Rubinstein, Gwen, and Debbie Mukamal. 2002. “Welfare and Housing—Denial of Benefits to Drug Offenders.” Pp. 37-49 in *Invisible Punishment: The Collateral Consequences of Mass Imprisonment*, edited by Marc Mauer and Meda Chesney-Lind. New York: The Free Press.
- Shlay, Anne B., and Peter H. Rossi. 1992. “Social Science Research and Contemporary Studies of Homelessness.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 18:129-160.
- Swann, Christopher, and Michelle Sheran Sylvester. 2006. “The Foster Care Crisis: What Caused Caseloads to Grow?” *Demography* 43:309-335.
- Swisher, Raymond R., and Maureen Waller. 2008. “Confining Fatherhood: Incarceration and Paternal Involvement among Unmarried White, African American, and Latino Fathers.” *Journal of Family Issues* 29:1067-1088.
- Tilly, Charles. 1999. *Durable Inequality*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (U.S. HUD). 2008. *The Third Annual Homeless Assessment Report to Congress*. Washington, DC: Office of Community Planning and Development.
- Western, 2002. “The Impact of Incarceration on Wage Mobility and Inequality.” *American Sociological Review* 67:477-498.
- , 2006. *Punishment and Inequality in America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Western, Bruce, and Christopher Wildeman. 2009. “The Black Family and Mass Incarceration.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 621:221-242.
- Wildeman, Christopher. 2009. “Parental Imprisonment, the Prison Boom, and the Concentration of Childhood Disadvantage.” *Demography* 46:265-280.

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

**TABLE 1**  
**Descriptive Statistics for the Full Sample and by New Parental Incarceration**

	Full Sample		New Parental Incarceration		No New Parental Incarceration	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Homeless (at 60 Months)	.05	--	.09	--	.04	--
Doubled Up (at 60 Months)	.02	--	.03	--	.02	--
New Parental Incarceration	.27	--	--	--	--	--
Previous Parental Incarceration	.59	--	.83	--	.49	--
Maternal Age (Centered)	-.19	(5.62)	-.91	(5.54)	.07	(5.63)
Paternal Age (Centered)	.54	(7.23)	-.46	(7.00)	.91	(7.29)
Mother HS Dropout	.54	--	.58	--	.52	--
Father HS Dropout	.51	--	.57	--	.49	--
Resident Father	.33	--	.24	--	.36	--
Child's Race/Ethnicity						
Black	.63	--	.71	--	.60	--
White	.06	--	.07	--	.05	--
Hispanic	.30	--	.22	--	.33	--
Other	.01	--	.01	--	.02	--
Mother's Other Children (0-12)	1.46	(1.56)	1.42	(1.47)	1.47	(1.60)
Caretaker's Self-Rated Health (1-5)	2.39	(1.01)	2.38	(1.01)	2.40	(1.01)
Caretaker an Immigrant	.14	--	.06	--	.17	--
Maternal Self-Control (1-4)	3.35	(.50)	3.28	(.54)	3.38	(.48)
Paternal Self-Control (1-4)	3.14	(.82)	2.58	(.88)	3.34	(.69)
Either Parent Has a Drug Problem	.28	--	.42	--	.22	--
Maternal Smoking During Pregnancy (0-2)	.30	(.53)	.39	(.57)	.26	(.42)
Domestic Abuse	.11	--	.19	--	.08	--
Household Income/Poverty Level						
Below 50%	.48	--	.55	--	.46	--
Below 100%, Above 50%	.52	--	.45	--	.54	--
Caregiver Lacks Social Support (0-4)	1.26	(1.21)	1.43	(1.25)	1.19	(1.18)
Caregiver Lives in Public Housing	.27	--	.26	--	.28	--
Caregiver Receives Housing Subsidy	.29	--	.31	--	.28	--
Caregiver Receives Cash Welfare	.43	--	.55	--	.39	--
Number of Moves in Last 18 Months	.93	(1.00)	1.09	(1.13)	.87	(.94)
Homeless (at 30 Months)	.05	--	.10	--	.04	--
Doubled Up (at 30 Months)	.09	--	.10	--	.09	--
<i>N</i>	1,410		381		1029	

SOURCE: Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (1998-2005).

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

**TABLE 2**  
**Results from Multinomial Logistic Regression Models**

	Model 1				Model 2				Model 3			
	Homeless		Doubled Up		Homeless		Doubled Up		Homeless		Doubled Up	
New Parental Incarceration	.91**	(.26)	.27	(.39)	.70*	(.30)	.20	(.46)	.57*	(.31)	.05	(.47)
Previous Parental Incarceration	.30	(.28)	.30	(.39)	-.19	(.31)	.17	(.44)	-.18	(.32)	.30	(.44)
Maternal Age (Centered)	--	--	--	--	.01	(.04)	.02	(.06)	.03	(.04)	.03	(.06)
Paternal Age (Centered)	--	--	--	--	.00	(.02)	-.03	(.04)	-.00	(.03)	-.03	(.04)
Mother HS Dropout	--	--	--	--	-.08	(.29)	-.65	(.42)	.00	(.30)	-.72	(.43)
Father HS Dropout	--	--	--	--	.05	(.28)	-.15	(.40)	.10	(.29)	-.06	(.40)
Resident Father	--	--	--	--	.21	(.31)	.27	(.44)	.19	(.32)	.38	(.45)
Child's Race/Ethnicity (White = Ref.)												
Black	--	--	--	--	.49	(.61)	1.36	(1.13)	.35	(.62)	1.26	(1.13)
Hispanic	--	--	--	--	-1.13	(.72)	.99	(1.25)	-1.17	(.74)	1.00	(1.26)
Other	--	--	--	--	.89	(.98)	1.90	(1.58)	.84	(1.06)	1.70	(1.61)
Mother's Other Children (0-12)	--	--	--	--	-.17	(.12)	-.63**	(.23)	-.15	(.12)	-.63**	(.23)
Caretaker's Self-Rated Health (1-5)	--	--	--	--	.02	(.13)	.46*	(.19)	-.02	(.14)	.47*	(.20)
Caretaker an Immigrant	--	--	--	--	-.33	(.60)	.47	(.73)	-.15	(.61)	.52	(.74)
Maternal Self-Control (1-4)	--	--	--	--	-.29	(.25)	-.36	(.39)	-.39	(.26)	-.36	(.40)
Paternal Self-Control (1-4)	--	--	--	--	-.31#	(.17)	-.01	(.26)	-.28	(.18)	-.02	(.26)
Either Parent Has a Drug Problem	--	--	--	--	-.19	(.32)	.25	(.44)	-.25	(.33)	.23	(.45)
Maternal Smoking During Pregnancy (0-2)	--	--	--	--	.59*	(.24)	.09	(.40)	.53*	(.25)	.12	(.40)
Domestic Abuse	--	--	--	--	-.17	(.41)	.49	(.50)	-.02	(.42)	.52	(.52)
Below 50% of Poverty	--	--	--	--	-.22	(.27)	-.02	(.39)	-.22	(.28)	-.16	(.40)
Caregiver Lacks Social Support (0-4)	--	--	--	--	.19#	(.10)	.13	(.17)	.12	(.11)	-.13	(.17)
Caregiver Lives in Public Housing	--	--	--	--	-.61#	(.34)	-.23	(.47)	-.48	(.35)	-.04	(.48)
Caregiver Receives Housing Subsidy	--	--	--	--	-.26	(.31)	-.93#	(.55)	-.25	(.33)	-.78	(.57)
Caregiver Receives Cash Welfare	--	--	--	--	.57#	(.29)	.48	(.42)	.47	(.30)	.44	(.43)
Number of Moves in Last 18 Months	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	.30**	(.11)	.13	(.18)
Homeless (at 30 Months)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1.52***	(.37)	.70	(.74)
Doubled Up (at 30 Months)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-.65	(.57)	1.40**	(.46)
Intercept	-3.94***	(.31)	-3.94***	(.31)	-.62	(1.38)	-4.39*	(2.20)	-.92	(1.43)	-4.69*	(2.27)
Includes City Dummies?		NO				YES				YES		
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>		.02				.14				.18		
N		1,410				1,410				1,410		

SOURCE: Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (1998-2005).

NOTE: All t-tests for parental incarceration are one-sided.

\*\*\* P<.001    \*\* P<.01    \* P<.05

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

**TABLE 3**  
**Results from Multinomial Logistic Regression Models, Children of Ever-Incarcerated Parents at 30 Months Only**

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Homeless	Doubled Up	Homeless	Doubled Up	Homeless	Doubled Up
New Parental Incarceration	1.00*** (.31)	-.03 (.45)	.87** (.35)	.05 (.56)	.77* (.36)	-.01 (.58)
Intercept	-3.27*** (.24)	-3.52*** (.27)	-2.27 (1.70)	-25.66 --	-2.45 (1.76)	-27.12 --
Includes City Dummies?	NO		YES		YES	
Adjusts for Parental Characteristics?	NO		YES		YES	
Adjusts for Living Situation at 30 Months?	NO		NO		YES	
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	.02		.17		.22	
N	825		825		825	

SOURCE: Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (1998-2005).

NOTE: All t-tests for parental incarceration are one-sided. Model 1 includes no controls. Model 2 includes all controls included in model 2 of table 2 except previous parental incarceration. Model 3 includes all controls included in model 3 of table 2 except previous parental incarceration.

\*\*\* P<.001    \*\* P<.01    \* P<.05

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

**TABLE 4**  
**Results from Propensity Score Models**

	M1 (Radius)		M2 (Neighbor)		M3 (Kernel)	
New Parental Incarceration	.04**	(.02)	.04*	(.02)	.05**	(.02)
N	1313	--	596	--	1361	--

SOURCE: Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (1998-2005).

NOTE: All t-tests for parental incarceration are one-sided. M1 includes 347 treated and 966 controls; M2 includes 370 treated and 226 controls; and M3 includes 370 treated and 991 controls. The model upon which the propensity to experience a new parental incarceration is based on the following covariates: paternal and maternal age (including squared and cubed terms); dummy variables indicating that the father and mother did not complete high school; paternal and maternal self-control (including squared and cubed terms); a dummy variable indicating whether the child is black; a dummy variable indicating whether either parent had ever been incarcerated by the 30 month interview; a dummy variable indicating that either parent abused drugs or alcohol; a dummy variable indicating that the household income was below 50 percent of the poverty line; and all possible two-way interactions. For more details on the model upon which the propensity scores are based, contact the author.

\*\*\* P<.001    \*\* P<.01    \* P<.05

Parental Incarceration, Child Homelessness,  
and the Invisible Consequences of Mass Imprisonment

**TABLE 5**  
**Results from Multinomial Logistic Regression Models, Black and Non-Black Children**

	Black Children				All Other Children			
	Homeless		Doubled Up		Homeless		Doubled Up	
New Parental Incarceration	.88**	(.35)	-.01	(.60)	-1.09	(.96)	.56	(1.02)
Intercept	-.69	(1.49)	-2.96	(2.65)	-1.39	(3.26)	-3.08	(4.23)
Includes City Dummies?			YES				YES	
Adjusts for Parental Characteristics?			YES				YES	
Adjusts for Living Situation at 30 Months?			YES				YES	
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>			.21				.35	
N			892				518	

SOURCE: Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (1998-2005).

NOTE: All t-tests for parental incarceration are one-sided. Both models include all controls included in model 3 of table 2.

\*\*\* P<.001    \*\* P<.01    \* P<.05