

## **Annotated Excerpt**

What does it take to assemble a high-quality proposal and demonstrate your capacity to conduct the work? To guide potential applicants, the annotated excerpt from this proposal showcases the kind of thinking, theorizing, and methodological rigor we expect to see in proposals, whether one is conducting a qualitative, mixed method, or experimental study. This example is intended as a guide. It does not, however, dictate the specific topic or study design that we are seeking. This proposal includes clear thinking, research questions that are motivated by theory, well-defined terms, and tight alignment between the literature review, research questions, methods, and analyses.

**All content contained in this proposal is the property of the individual author and cannot be distributed or cited in any form without the express written permission of the author.**

### **Excerpted from:**

The Unequal Intergenerational Consequences of Paternal Incarceration:  
Considering Sensitive Periods, Resiliency, and Mechanisms  
Kristin Turney, University of California, Irvine

**Excerpted from the William T. Grant Foundation Scholars  
Proposal: The Unequal Intergenerational Consequences of  
Paternal Incarceration: Considering Sensitive Periods, Resiliency,  
and Mechanisms**

**Kristin Turney, University of California—Irvine**

**SIGNIFICANCE**

The rapid growth of mass incarceration in the United States, a phenomenon characterized by its concentration among already marginalized individuals, means that a historically unprecedented number of children experience parental incarceration (Patillo, Weiman, and Western 2004; Wakefield and Uggen 2010). More than 2.6 million children have a parent, usually a father, currently incarcerated in jail or prison, most of them for nonviolent offenses (Pettit 2012), and this number excludes children with parents recently released and under other forms of correctional supervision such as parole. Importantly, paternal incarceration is especially common among children of minority and poorly educated parents. Recent estimates suggest that 4% of White children compared to 25% of Black children, and more than 50% of Black children born to high school dropouts, had a father imprisoned by age 14 (Wildeman 2009). For children, especially vulnerable children of poorly educated minority men living in impoverished neighborhoods, paternal incarceration has become a normative and transformative life course event (e.g., Western and Pettit 2010).

*In the first two paragraphs, the applicant frames the magnitude of the problem, specifically identifying the population most affected by mass incarceration – children of Black men with low levels of education.*

Given the absolute number of children affected by paternal incarceration, together with the unequal distribution of paternal incarceration by

race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status, scholars across an array of disciplines have developed an acute interest in understanding the intergenerational consequences of incarceration (i.e., if and how paternal incarceration, above and beyond other sources of disadvantage, affects children). This burgeoning literature documents inequality in the wellbeing of children with and without incarcerated fathers (for reviews, see Eddy and Poehlmann 2010; Foster and Hagan forthcoming; Johnson and Easterling 2012; Murray and Farrington 2005; Murray et al. 2012; Travis, Western, and Redburn 2014; Wakefield and Uggen 2010; Wildeman, Wakefield, and Turney 2013; Wildeman and Western 2010). Therefore, in conjunction with the sheer volume of children affected by paternal incarceration and the concentration of paternal incarceration among vulnerable children, the mostly deleterious intergenerational consequences of incarceration means that mass incarceration has emerged as a mechanism of stratification among children (see, especially, Wakefield and Wildeman 2013).

But our understanding of how paternal incarceration contributes to inequality among children is incomplete. The vast majority of existing research considers the *average* effects of paternal incarceration on children's wellbeing. Fully understanding the consequences of paternal incarceration, as well as designing interventions that reduce inequality among children, necessitates a comprehensive identification of (1) the short-

and long-term consequences of paternal incarceration, (2) the heterogeneous and potentially countervailing consequences of paternal incarceration (e.g., identifying resilient children), and (3) the mediating mechanisms linking paternal incarceration to children’s wellbeing (Foster and Hagan forthcoming; Travis et al. 2014). Therefore, with the ultimate goal of generating a comprehensive theoretical framework for understanding the intergenerational consequences of incarceration and of informing effective policy and practice interventions to alleviate inequality, the aims of this five-year project are as follows:

Aim 1: To investigate the short- and long-term consequences of paternal incarceration on wellbeing from early childhood through adolescence and to consider the sensitive periods during which paternal incarceration is most consequential.

Aim 2: To understand heterogeneity in the consequences of paternal incarceration on inequality in wellbeing from early childhood through adolescence.

Aim 3: To evaluate the mechanisms through which paternal incarceration affects wellbeing from early childhood through adolescence.

I will conduct two complementary studies, both of which will substantially contribute to the existing knowledge base, to examine the complex and countervailing consequences of paternal incarceration for inequality. The first study will involve collecting longitudinal primary data from 120 families in California. I will conduct in-depth interviews with fathers incarcerated in jail, their children, and the mothers of their children, both during incarceration (to understand processes associated with incapacitation) and after incarceration (to understand processes of re-entry back into family life). The second study will use longitudinal secondary data (the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (FFCWB) and the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Kindergarten Cohort 2010-2011 (ECLS-K:2011)) to examine inequality in the academic, behavioral, and social outcomes between children with and without incarcerated fathers, outcomes that are linked to attainment throughout the life course and are key factors in intergenerational socioeconomic mobility (e.g., Farkas 2003; Featherman and Hauser 1978). These analyses, which will be further motivated by findings from the qualitative analysis, will especially pay attention to sensitive periods, resiliency, and mechanisms.

*The applicant identifies clear research aims and explains how two complementary studies – one qualitative, the other quantitative – will provide integrated answers to theoretically motivated questions about how paternal incarceration affects children over time and at different developmental points.*

*The applicant introduces the two ways in which this project constitutes a stretch: 1) methodologically, she will undertake substantial independent qualitative data collection and analysis; 2) conceptually, she will expand her expertise to incorporate developmental psychology into the project design and analysis.*

I have a number of theoretical, substantive, and methodological skills that make this five-year project a strategic extension of my previous and current research (described below in more detail). But, if supported by the William T. Grant Scholars Program, I will have the opportunity to undertake two concrete stretches that will be transformative for my

career development. First, the Program will enable me to execute my first independent qualitative data analysis effort. With mentorship from Dr. Sandra Danziger of the University of Michigan, I will enhance my qualitative data analysis skills, gain knowledge of how to effectively analyze and present mixed- methods research, and develop my ability to communicate findings to policy audiences. Second, with mentorship from Dr. Julie Poehlmann-Tynan of the University of Wisconsin, I will learn to rigorously incorporate theoretical (e.g., ecological systems theory, family process theory), methodological (e.g., growth curve models, structural equation modeling), and analytic (e.g., developmental trajectories) insights from developmental psychology into the project design and analysis and will develop my ability to communicate findings to policy audiences. These mentoring relationships will be augmented with workshops and course work.

These two forms of conceptual stretch are crucial for undertaking this project but will also positively influence my long-term career trajectory. One of my career goals is to become an expert at primary data collection and, toward the conclusion of this award, I plan to

*The applicant explains why these stretches are important for building her career in the long-term and clearly specifies how the project aligns with the Foundation's interest in reducing inequality. She identifies the dimensions of inequality (racial/ethnic and socioeconomic) on which her project will focus and concludes with the hope that her work will clarify mechanisms for reducing inequality along these dimensions.*

apply for funding to develop a large-scale, longitudinal study of family members of the incarcerated. Another career goal is for my broader research agenda on childhood inequality to both incorporate perspectives from developmental psychology and bring the sociological perspective into developmental research on vulnerable children.

This project aligns well with the goals of the William T. Grant Foundation's research initiative on inequality. It best fits into the Foundation's research on "descriptive studies meant to clarify the mechanisms for reducing inequality". This project considers the role of paternal

incarceration, a phenomenon that disproportionately affects minority and economically disadvantaged children, in shaping inequality from childhood to adolescence. Because paternal incarceration disproportionately affects minority and economically disadvantaged children, any deleterious consequences of paternal incarceration may increase race/ethnic and socioeconomic inequalities. This project further interrogates the role of paternal incarceration in shaping inequality from childhood to adolescence by specifying the race/ethnic and socioeconomic groups of children for which paternal incarceration is most detrimental (see, especially, Sampson 2011). For example, if incarceration has stronger deleterious consequences for economically disadvantaged children than for their more advantaged counterparts, this would suggest that incarceration has even larger implications for inequality than previously considered. Finally, and importantly, this project provides one of the first understandings of leverage points—or mediating mechanisms—for policies and practices to reduce inequality between children with and without incarcerated fathers.

## CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The life course perspective, in conjunction with family process theory (e.g., Arditti 2012, 2015), provides an overarching framework for understanding the intergenerational consequences of paternal incarceration (Elder 1998; Elder, Johnson, and Crosnoe 2003). In accordance with the life course perspective, and its proposition that individuals live interdependently of one another, incarceration may be a turning point for fathers with cascading consequences for their families and children (also see Arditti 2012, 2015). The majority of incarcerated men are fathers (Mumola 2000), and many of them contribute economically and emotionally to their families prior to incarceration (Arditti 2012; Geller, Garfinkel, and Western 2011; Turanovic, Rodriguez, and Pratt 2012).

*In this section, the applicant does an impressive job of providing a developed, integrated discussion of the theoretical framework for her project along dimensions central to the analysis: short- and long-term consequences, sensitive periods, and resiliency. She also identifies the mechanisms that – according to the relevant theories – may mediate how incarceration affects children’s outcomes.*

The life course perspective provides one way of uniting the commonly posited theoretical explanations for incarceration’s deleterious consequences for children’s academic, behavioral, and social outcomes. First, children may experience trauma resulting from the removal of fathers from households via incarceration (Hagan and Dinovitzer 1999). This trauma, as well as the corresponding ambiguous loss, where incarcerated fathers are both physically and emotionally absent, may hinder children’s behavioral and cognitive development (Boss 2007; Sharkey 2010). Second, children of incarcerated fathers may experience stigma and shame that impedes their social interactions and learning (Braman 2004; Dallaire, Ciccone, and Wilson 2010; McKown and Weinstein 2003). Third, paternal incarceration generates massive familial strain that may have cascading consequences for children (Arditti 2012; Patillo et al. 2004). Finally, given the concentration of paternal incarceration among vulnerable children, observed associations may result from social selection (Johnson and Easterling 2012).

### Short- and Long-Term Consequences

The life course perspective stresses the importance of developmental trajectories (Elder 1998). However, despite the fact that both paternal incarceration and child wellbeing are dynamic processes that unfold over time, little research adjudicates between the short- and long-term consequences of paternal incarceration for children’s academic, behavioral, and social outcomes. On one hand, the intergenerational consequences of paternal incarceration may be short-lived, consistent with the crisis model often used to explain the effects of divorce on child wellbeing (for a discussion of the similarities and differences between incarceration and divorce, see Turney 2014a). The crisis model assumes family disruption is a temporary disturbance that adults and children adapt to over time (Amato 2000, 2010). For example, mothers may use a romantic partner’s incarceration as an opportunity to find a new romantic partner (Nurse 2002; Turney and Wildeman 2013), which, given the emerging literature documenting that women move on to more advantaged romantic partners (e.g., Bzostek, McLanahan, and Carlson 2012), could improve children’s academic, behavioral, and social

outcomes. On the other hand, the chronic strain model suggests that family disruption leads to cumulative, persistent, and adversity throughout the life course (Amato 2000, 2010). Paternal incarceration may lead to chronic economic insecurity or mental health challenges for families. This, in turn, may fundamentally alter the life course in ways that make it challenging for children's academic, behavioral, and social outcomes to return to their pre-incarceration states.

### **Considering Sensitive Periods**

The developmental consequences of life transitions vary according to when they occur, according to the life course perspective (Elder 1998). This suggests that the consequences of paternal incarceration for children's outcomes are contingent on the developmental stage when children first experience paternal incarceration. On the one hand, the consequences of paternal incarceration may be strongest during early and middle childhood. Early and middle childhood are critical life course stages when children develop academic, behavioral, and social competencies (Entwisle and Alexander 1989; Kowaleski-Jones and Duncan 1999) and when key educational decisions, such as special education placement and retention, are made (Hibel, Farkas, and Morgan 2010; Warren and Saliba 2012). Therefore, children may be especially sensitive when paternal incarceration occurs during these developmental stages. On the other hand, the consequences of paternal incarceration may be strongest during adolescence, as stability during adolescence is especially important (Fomby, Mollborn, and Sennott 2010). Moreover, adolescents may have a heightened knowledge and sensitivity to paternal incarceration, and they may be more susceptible to the negative effects of social stigma and economic instability (Conger et al. 1997; Mistry et al. 2001).

### **Considering Resiliency**

The life course perspective highlights that the social contexts of children's lives are crucial to development (Elder 1998; also see Bronfenbrenner and Morris 1998). Although most research on the intergenerational consequences of paternal incarceration statistically controls for elements of the social context (e.g., children's developmental stage, family structure, poverty), very little research considers the complex and multidimensional ways elements of the social context interact with paternal incarceration to influence children's academic, behavioral, and social outcomes (Sampson 2011; also see Arditto 2015). The dominant theoretical model suggests paternal incarceration is detrimental for children's outcomes. But the family process perspective, along with theories of resiliency, suggests that some children adapt to adversity; therefore, for some groups of children, paternal incarceration may be beneficial or inconsequential. Furthermore, it is possible that this heterogeneity differentially exists across developmental stages (e.g., Travis et al. 2014).

*Resiliency by Children's Race/Ethnicity and Socioeconomic Status.* First, the relationship between paternal incarceration and children's outcomes may vary across children's race/ethnicity. On the one hand, the negative intergenerational consequences of paternal incarceration may be heightened among children who are racial/ethnic minorities. Seminal work on stigma suggests that both imprisonment and race extend to those connected to the stigmatized, and the stigmas of race and paternal incarceration may be compounding (Pager 2003; see also Goffman 1963). Relatedly, minority children experience more social and economic disadvantages than their

counterparts, and theories of cumulative disadvantage suggest that the added stressor of paternal incarceration could be especially damaging (DiPrete and Eirich 2006). On the other hand, resilience hypotheses suggest that forms of disruption or environmental shocks are less stressful when the experience is more common and alternative support systems are in place (Mineka and Kihlstrom 1978; Swisher and Waller 2008), suggesting paternal incarceration may be less consequential for minority children. The relationship between paternal incarceration and children's outcomes may also vary across children's socioeconomic status, as measured by children's household poverty status and mother's education. On the one hand, paternal incarceration may be most detrimental when children experience more disadvantaged social contexts (e.g., live in households with incomes below the poverty line), as these social contexts may make children less resilient to the deleterious consequences of paternal incarceration. On the other hand, paternal incarceration may be most detrimental when children experience more advantaged social contexts (e.g., live in households with incomes above the poverty line). It is possible that, for these children, paternal incarceration may be an event stressor, an unexpected life event that is especially detrimental to wellbeing (Eaton 1978; Wheaton 1982; also see Wheaton 1990).

#### *Resiliency by Fathers' Residential Status and Pre-incarceration Involvement*

Additionally, there is good reason to expect the relationship between paternal incarceration and children's outcomes varies by father's interactions with his child prior to his incarceration (Jaffee et al. 2003; also see Eddy and Reid 2003; Giordano 2010; Hagan and Dinovitzer 1999). Incarceration may be more consequential for children when fathers are physically present, emotionally involved, and economically supportive. There is some evidence that the negative effects of paternal incarceration on five-year-old children's behavioral problems are stronger for co-residential fathers (Geller et al. 2012), but it is necessary to understand if this variation exists for other aspects of paternal involvement, if these associations persist for academic outcomes, and if these associations persist throughout middle childhood and adolescence.

#### *Resiliency by the Conditions of Paternal Incarceration*

Finally, the consequences of paternal incarceration may depend on the conditions of incarceration including the incarceration facility type, incarceration duration, incarceration offense type, and child visitation. For example, children may be more resilient to certain facility types. On the one hand, it may be that children are especially resilient to jail incarceration, as jail inmates—compared to state and, especially, federal prison inmates—tend to be incarcerated very close to their homes, making visitation easier (e.g., Christian 2005; Comfort 2008). On the other hand, it may be that children are less resilient to jail incarceration, as there is often greater uncertainty surrounding the time of release for jail inmates relative to inmates of state or federal correctional facilities. Also, the incarceration of a father convicted of a violent crime may improve child wellbeing (Wildeman 2010), incarceration duration may be inversely associated with child wellbeing (Johnson and Easterling 2015), and maintaining contact with incarcerated fathers through visitation may enhance child wellbeing (Arditti, Lambert-Shute, and Joest 2003).

### **Considering Mediating Mechanisms**

Theoretical perspectives and existing research suggest paternal incarceration has

deleterious effects for children’s academic, behavioral, and social outcomes, at least at some developmental stages and for some groups of children. To develop effective interventions to reduce inequality between children with and without incarcerated fathers (as well as inequality *between* children with incarcerated fathers), it is necessary to understand the family-level mechanisms underlying the relationship between paternal incarceration and children’s wellbeing. Understanding these mechanisms, as well as their relative importance at different developmental stages, will point to different ways through which interventions may alleviate inequality.

The family process perspective suggests that paternal incarceration may be associated with children’s developmental outcomes through its influence on the family system (Arditti 2015). The familial context changes dramatically during and after paternal incarceration (Arditti 2012; Johnson and Waldfogel 2004; Phillips et al. 2006). First, maintaining romantic relationships while one partner is incarcerated is tenuous, given the distance of prisons to some communities, the often inflexible visiting schedules, and the high cost of making long-distance phone calls from prison (Braman 2004; Comfort 2008). It may be equally difficult to preserve romantic relationships after release (Lopoo and Western 2005; Massoglia, Remster, and King 2011) and both mothers and fathers may repartner (Turney and Wildeman 2013). Second, incarceration reduces family income, increases material hardship, and increases reliance on public assistance (Geller et al. 2011; Schwartz-Soicher, Geller, and Garfinkel 2011; Sugie 2012). Third, paternal incarceration may also lead to disengaged, ineffective parenting by mothers and fathers (Swisher and Waller 2008; Turney 2014b). Finally, paternal incarceration increases mental health problems of both parents (Turney, Wildeman, and Schnittker 2012; Wildeman, Schnittker, and Turney 2012) and decreases available social support from extended family members and friends (Turney, Schnittker, and Wildeman 2012; Turney 2014a). All of these aspects of family life are linked to children’s academic, behavioral, and social skills (e.g., Berger et al. 2009; Carlson and Corcoran 2001; Duncan and Brooks-Gunn 1997; Fomby and Cherlin 2007; Hawkins et al. 2007; Ryan et al. 2009; Turney 2011a), but how these factors link paternal incarceration to children’s wellbeing is largely unknown.

## EXISTING EVIDENCE

*The applicant extensively and concisely reviews existing empirical evidence to establish how her project will contribute to existing empirical and theoretical literature. Note that she makes a compelling case for using both qualitative and quantitative*

A rapidly growing literature documents the consequences of incarceration for children (for reviews, see Eddy and Poehlmann 2010; Foster and Hagan forthcoming; Johnson and Easterling 2012; Murray and Farrington 2005; Murray et al. 2012; Wakefield and Uggen 2010; Wildeman et al. 2013; Wildeman and Western 2010). By and large, this research consistently documents negative average effects of paternal

incarceration on the academic, behavioral, and social outcomes of offspring. For example, children with incarcerated parents, compared to their counterparts, are more likely to be placed in special education (Haskins 2014), have lower educational attainment (Foster and Hagan 2007, 2009; Hagan and Foster 2012), worse academic performance (Foster and Hagan 2009; Hagan and Foster 2012; Murray, Loeber and Pardini 2012), and more school absences (Murray and Farrington 2008a; Nichols and Loper 2012). Paternal incarceration is also deleteriously associated with children’s



behavioral problems (Geller et al. 2009, 2012; Haskins 2014, 2015; Murray and Farrington 2008a; Wakefield and Wildeman 2011, 2013; Wilbur et al. 2007; Wildeman 2010; though see Kinner et al. 2007; Murray and Farrington 2005), physical and mental health (Foster and Hagan 2013; Roettger and Boardman 2012; Turney 2014c), and delinquency (Murray and Farrington 2005; Roettger and Swisher 2011).

Despite the growing research on the consequences of paternal incarceration for children's academic, behavioral, and social outcomes, the vast majority of it relies upon secondary survey data that makes it difficult to capture the family-level processes associated with paternal incarceration. Most existing qualitative research, all of which lays an important foundation for future research, focuses on the consequences of incarceration for family life more broadly (Braman 2004; Comfort 2008; also see Edin, Nelson, and Paranal 2004); uses interview data to illustrate findings from a review of the literature (Arditti 2012) or from quantitative data (Wakefield and Wildeman 2013), as opposed to systematically using inductive reasoning to identify themes (though see Nesmith and Ruhland [2008] for an analysis of children's interview data); or conflates maternal and paternal incarceration (Arditti 2012; Turanovic et al. 2012; also see Siegel 2011 for an excellent qualitative account of the effects of *maternal incarceration*). Understanding how paternal incarceration, compared to maternal incarceration, affects children is especially important, as the family processes surrounding maternal and paternal incarceration are quite different (as children of incarcerated mothers often live with extended family members or are placed in foster care while children of incarcerated fathers often live with mothers).

Furthermore, by and large, there are opportunities to extend existing research to consider sensitive periods, risk and resiliency, and mechanisms with survey data. First, little research considers variation in the effects of incarceration by developmental stage (though, for research on *adult children* or for research using *non-representative data*, see Besemer et al. 2011; Foster and Hagan 2013; Johnson 2009; Kjellstrand and Eddy 2011; Murray, Janson, and Farrington 2007). Second, most existing research treats children of incarcerated fathers as a homogenous group that equally experiences the consequences of incarceration and does not consider moderating factors that may make children resilient. Several studies, using data from the FFCWB and the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN), consider heterogeneity by children's race/ethnicity; these studies find that the association between paternal incarceration and behavioral problems is similar for White and Black children (Haskin 2014; Wakefield and Wildeman 2011; also see Murray et al. 2012). However, these analyses should be replicated with the nationally representative ECLS-K:2011 data, as the FFCWB and PHDCN samples include only urban children who are quite different from a nationally representative sample of children. The moderating role of children's socioeconomic status or incarceration experiences also remain unresolved, likely due to data limitations. Third, despite the consistent call by scholars to consider the mechanisms underlying the relationship between paternal incarceration and children's wellbeing from childhood through adolescence (e.g., Foster and Hagan forthcoming; Murray et al. 2012; Travis et al. 2014), little research considers these pathways.

## **CONTRIBUTIONS OF THIS PROJECT**

This project, comprised of two distinct studies that each address the three aims, will

draw on both qualitative data and quantitative analysis to expand our theoretical and empirical knowledge about the consequences of paternal incarceration for children. The qualitative project will extend prior research by systematically considering the processes that unfold during and after incarceration and how these processes change during incarceration (e.g., incapacitation effects) and after incarceration (e.g., re-entry effects) and by systematically considering variation across social groups (e.g., residential fathers, facility type, race/ethnicity). The deeply textured longitudinal data will be augmented by a consideration of fathers', mothers', and children's perspectives. The quantitative project will use *newly available secondary data* from both the FFCWB (the 15-year data, as well as information about facility type) and the ECLS-K:2011 to consider the short- and long-term consequences of paternal incarceration for children's wellbeing; the sensitive periods in which paternal incarceration is most consequential; the factors that promote resiliency among children; and the family mechanisms that may be *strategic points of policy and practice interventions*.

### **RESEARCH DESIGN (STUDY #1): PRIMARY DATA COLLECTION**

The two studies are complementary and synergistic, with the qualitative data collection and analysis being informed by existing research on the intergenerational consequences of paternal incarceration and the quantitative analyses being informed by the findings from the qualitative data analysis (Small 2011). Different types of data collection—in this case, in-depth interviews and secondary data— inherently produce different types of knowledge and different types of data collection have both strengths and weaknesses (Axinn and Pearce 2006). Together, these two synergistic projects will provide a comprehensive portrait of how paternal incarceration is associated with childhood inequality and will inform the development of effective policy and practice interventions.

#### **Research Questions**

Aim 1, RQ1: What is the range of intergenerational consequences of paternal incarceration and how do these intergenerational consequences change during and after incarceration?

Aim 2, RQ1: How do the range of intergenerational consequences of paternal incarceration, and changes in these consequences, vary across groups (e.g., facility type)?

Aim 3, RQ1: What are the processes through which paternal incarceration affects children, and how do these processes change during and after incarceration?

#### **Data**

The first study will rely on data obtained through longitudinal qualitative interviews with fathers, mothers, and children connected to incarcerated fathers. This qualitative approach is especially appropriate for answering the three specific research questions. First, in-depth interviews will provide rich empirical data that is lacking from most previous research on the

*The applicant offers the rationale for why a qualitative approach answers the three research questions above, as well as how it will connect to her quantitative study.*

intergenerational consequences of paternal incarceration. I expect these data will document the complex and dynamic consequences of paternal incarceration for children as they are being lived out. Second, these rich data points will allow me to make strong yet nuanced assertions about the intergenerational consequences of paternal incarceration; the variation in these consequences across groups; and the processes through which children respond to paternal incarceration. From these data, I will be positioned well to use secondary data to test hypotheses generated from the ground up (Small 2011; see Study #2). Below I briefly describe the sampling and recruitment strategies, the in-depth interview protocols, and plans for protecting human subjects. I then outline my analytic strategy.

*Sample and Recruitment.* The sample will comprise 120 families (fathers, mothers, and children under age 18) that are experiencing paternal incarceration. Along with a team of trained interviewers, I will collect longitudinal in-depth interviews from fathers, mothers, and children (those 8 or older).

Interviewing fathers, mothers, and children will provide a nuanced picture of the lifeworlds affected by paternal incarceration. Fathers can provide useful information about their incapacitation and re-entry experiences as related to their family life and mothers, who are often children's primary caregivers, can provide useful information about family and child functioning (e.g., Lareau 2003).

But it is also important to incorporate children into qualitative research (Eder and Corsaro 1999; also see Avison 2010), as children may have different perspectives than parents (e.g., Thorne 1987) and may provide the most direct accounts of school and peer experiences (e.g., Calarco 2011).

I will recruit families, with the cooperation of the XXX Sheriff's Department, through three jails in California. I expect to recruit eight to 10 families per month over the course of a year. Considering jail incarceration—as opposed to prison incarceration—is strategic for three reasons. First, because sentences are relatively short in duration, considering jail incarceration allows me to capture both incapacitation effects (e.g., during incarceration) and re-entry effects (e.g., after incarceration) for children and families. As prior research on children's wellbeing suggests instability is especially associated with deleterious outcomes for children (e.g., Fomby and Cherlin 2007), these sentences of short duration may be especially consequential to children. Second, though most quantitative data sources that gather information on paternal incarceration do not distinguish between jail and prison experiences, researchers using the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (FFCWB), arguably the premier U.S.-based quantitative data source for studying the effects of incarceration on children, have speculated that at least half of fathers are incarcerated in jails (Turney, Wildeman, and Schnittker 2012:470). Third, jail incarceration is more commonly experienced than prison incarceration, making the results applicable to a larger group of children than only considering prison incarceration.

*Applicants should always explain the feasibility of carrying out their research. In cases like this where applicants are recruiting from vulnerable populations, we encourage you to provide supporting documentation that data collection will happen. Note that all identifying information has been masked or deleted in this excerpt.*

*The applicant explains how and why she will recruit from the jail population and defines inclusion criteria.*

Men sentenced to jail will participate in a short assessment to determine if they and their family members are eligible for study participation. Inclusion criteria for the study will be the

following: (1) the man has a sentence length of at least 60 days (or has been awaiting trial for at least 60 days); (2) the man has at least one child under the age of 18 that he saw in the month prior to incarceration; and (3) one or more of these children currently reside with his/her mother (who may or may not be in a romantic relationship with the father). After their interview, I will ask fathers to provide the names and contact information of children's mothers (and, in the event the father has children with multiple partners, will ask him to identify the focal child he saw most often prior to incarceration).

I will enroll six groups of 20 that are stratified by father's residential status prior to incarceration (residential with child and not residential with child) and jail facility. Because non-Hispanic Blacks are under-represented in these jails, I will oversample for these fathers. I will stratify by father's residential status to explore the differential processes associated with incarceration among residential fathers and non-residential fathers (e.g., Turney and Wildeman 2013). I will stratify by jail facility to explore variation in policies and practices across facilities. There is some unique variation in both the official and unofficial policies and practices among the three jails. For example, one is a minimum-security facility that requires inmates to work (most of whom work full-time), another is a maximum-security jail where some inmates work, and the final one is a maximum-security jail without work opportunities. Visiting hours also vary across the three jails. Furthermore, my interactions with officials at each of the jails suggest that there is a great deal of informal variation in the implementation of policies across the jails and that the deputies vary quite dramatically in their interactions with inmates. I will pay attention to this informal variation as data collection gets underway. Although the research design does not explicitly stratify by children's age (doing so in conjunction with father's residential status and facility type would prove to yield small cells in any one group), there will be enough families enrolled to strategically consider variation in how children react to paternal incarceration across different developmental stages (e.g., Elder 1998).

XXX County, CA, is a strategic site to conduct this study. First, as a practical matter, all of the county's jails are in close proximity to UC-Irvine, facilitating recruitment. Second, though XXX County includes notably wealthy cities, the county is racially and socioeconomically diverse. Third, the incarceration rate in California is similar to the incarceration rate nationally (Walmsley 2013). Fourth, California has been undergoing prison realignment (or, Assembly Bill 109) that has altered the way the state handles offenders. Realignment, which began in response to a Supreme Court ruling (*Brown v. Plata*) to reduce the overcrowding in California prisons, shifts the responsibility of those convicted of many non-serious offenses from the state to counties. Therefore, many individuals who would have been sentenced to state prisons, pre-realignment, are now sentenced to jails.

*The applicant offers a justification for her site. She acknowledges the convenience of the site, but she also provides a strong rationale for why this site is a good one in which to conduct her research.*

*In-depth Interviews.* Fathers, mothers, and children will be interviewed at least twice: (1) during the fathers' incarceration and (2) within one and two months following the fathers' release. I will interview again mothers and children if fathers are re-incarcerated upon release (to further capture processes of incapacitation and re-entry). Given that the average stay in XXX County jails is about 90 days, I expect many fathers to be released relatively quickly. Under realignment, though, fathers can be incarcerated in jails for longer than one year. If fathers have not been released within one year, I will conduct follow-up interviews with mothers and children at that point and will then conduct additional interviews after the father has been released. The interviews with fathers will occur in the attorney bonds rooms (in the jails) and the interviews with mothers and children will occur where they are comfortable (ideally their home to provide additional contextual data). In the first round of interviews, I will ask fathers to discuss details of their incarceration, their family lives prior to incarceration, contact with family members since being incarcerated, and their expectations for their lives when they are released. I will ask mothers to describe details surrounding the father's incarceration, family life prior to incarceration, family life during incarceration, and the wellbeing of the child(ren). I will ask the focal children, as well as their siblings (if applicable), to talk about their experiences related to the father's incarceration. The follow-up interviews, which will be conducted by whomever conducted the initial interview, will focus on changes since the first interview. I will ask similar, mostly open-ended questions of all respondents, but will vary the wording and timing of the

*The appendices for this proposal (not included here, per researcher's request) fleshed out important details about data collection and analysis. Appendices can provide useful information to reviewers who need as complete a picture as possible to determine a project's feasibility and potential contributions.*

questions to make the interviews flow as much as possible like a conversation. Following each interview, interviewers will compose detailed field notes (Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw 2011). I expect the first round of interviews to last between two and three hours for fathers and mothers, between 20 and 30 minutes for children ages 8 to 12, and between 30 and 60 minutes for children ages 13 to 17. The second round of fathers' and mothers' interviews will last about one and a half hours

and the second round of children's interviews will last between 20 and 30 minutes (regardless of age). To facilitate cooperation, fathers and mothers will be paid \$50 (for fathers, only after release, as the XXX County Sheriff's Department prohibits paying them while incarcerated) and children will be paid \$10 per interview. See Appendix A for a draft of the children's interview guide.

I will conduct many of the interviews, but am also involving a team of graduate student researchers. I will actively recruit under-represented minority graduate students at UC-Irvine. I will ensure that most interviewers are fluent in Spanish. I will provide extensive training to the interviewers that will include, at a minimum, a three-day training session, their attendance at two interviews I conduct, and my attendance at two interviews they conduct. We will also have weekly meetings to discuss the interviews and emerging themes derived from fieldwork (May and Patillo-McCoy 2000).

*Human Subjects.* This project was approved by UC-Irvine's Institutional Review Board (IRB) on June 22, 2015 (see Appendix B, not included here). Written (but not verbal)

consent is waived for fathers. Mothers will sign an informed consent form (granting permission for their interview and their child's/children's interview(s)), and children will sign an assent form. The IRB protocol includes detailed information about how the research team will protect respondent confidentiality. The IRB protocol also includes detailed information about how the research team will conduct interviews with children to minimize risk (e.g., how to pay attention to verbal and non-verbal cues, how to interview a child who does not know about his/her father's incarceration, when and how to disclose information [about neglect or abuse, harm to self, or harm to others] to the appropriate authorities).

### **Analysis**

I will use data from in-depth interviews to answer the three research questions. All interviews will be recorded and transcribed verbatim. In the first stage of coding, a team of trained undergraduate students will conduct preliminary coding of the transcripts with ATLAS.ti. This initial coding, which is an iterative process, will be primarily descriptive rather than analytic. For example, one large descriptive field may be called "contact" and will include all discussions of contact with the incarcerated father. The coding list will be pre-determined but revised after coding the first five transcripts. The second stage of coding, which will also be conducted with ATLAS.ti, will be analytic and inductive (Charmaz 2006; Katz 1983; Strauss and Corbin 1990). At this stage, I will organize the data into conceptual categories (or "nodes") and look for patterns in the data. I will pay special attention to patterns of subgroup variation and patterns of change over time. Thus, findings will emerge from the coding process itself. I will also carefully read interview transcripts, comprise analytic memos, and develop data matrices to look for and interpret disconfirming evidence (Miles and Huberman 1994). Although the small and non-representative sample means that findings will not be empirically generalizable, I do expect they will be theoretically generalizable (Charmaz 2006).

*We encourage more developed analysis plans that include as much detail as possible about the coding process, validity, and how the analysis connects to the questions asked. Ideally, the researcher should also connect any analysis plan to the theoretical framework. While we understand that applicants may be stretching to undertake qualitative data collection and analysis, we ask that you draw from related empirical and methodological literature to provide as much information as possible about the analysis plan for reviewers.*

### **RESEARCH DESIGN (STUDY #2): SECONDARY DATA ANALYSIS**

Although I expect the qualitative analysis to allow me to further refine the research questions and hypotheses, below I document the research questions and preliminary hypotheses for Study #2.

#### **Research Questions**

Aim 1, RQ2: What are inequalities in the academic, behavioral, and social developmental trajectories of children with and without incarcerated fathers from childhood to adolescence?

Aim 1, RQ3: How do the consequences of paternal incarceration for children's academic, behavioral, and social outcomes vary across developmental stages?

Aim 2, RQ2: How do the consequences of paternal incarceration for children's

academic, behavioral, and social outcomes vary across children's race/ethnicity, children's socioeconomic status, and father's residential status and pre-incarceration involvement?

Aim 2, RQ3: How do the consequences of paternal incarceration for children's academic, behavioral, and social outcomes vary across the conditions of paternal incarceration (including incarceration facility type, incarceration duration, incarceration offense type, and child visitation)?

Aim 3, RQ2: How do family characteristics mediate the relationship between paternal incarceration and children's academic, behavioral, and social outcomes?

## Data

I will use data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Kindergarten Cohort:2011 (ECLS-K:2011) and the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (FFCWB). Both the ECLS-K:2011 and FFCWB have strengths and weaknesses and, together, they will provide a comprehensive portrait of the intergenerational consequences of paternal incarceration for children's academic, behavioral, and social outcomes. Some research questions will be best answered with one data source. For example, the ECLS-K:2011, with its nationally representative sample, are better positioned than the FFCWB to understand the moderating role of children's socioeconomic status and the FFCWB are better positioned to understand the moderating role of incarceration conditions). However, when possible, I will use both data sources to answer each research question.

*Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Kindergarten Cohort:2011.* The ECLS-K:2011 comprises a nationally representative sample of children in kindergarten in 2010-2011. Data collection is ongoing; children's parents, teachers, and child care providers will be interviewed nine times through 2016 (twice in kindergarten, first, and second grades and once in third, fourth, and fifth grades, and all of these data will be available to restricted data users, myself included, by Summer 2017). Children are administered cognitive tests at each wave and, in later waves, will be interviewed themselves. These data, which provide an unparalleled opportunity to understand the intergenerational consequences of paternal incarceration in elementary school, have not yet been used to examine the intergenerational consequences of incarceration. First, these data will be the only nationally representative longitudinal data that contain repeated measures of paternal incarceration. The nationally representative nature of the data means the sample is more heterogeneous than the FFCWB sample (and, accordingly, may provide a better opportunity to understand variation in the relationship between paternal incarceration and children's outcomes). Additionally, the ECLS-K:2011 are advantageous because, in conjunction with the array of child and family characteristics, they include detailed school and neighborhood information at each wave. Finally, though the data only cover six years of children's lives, compared to the FFCWB that span 15 years, they include frequent data collection points (sometimes every six months), which is ideal for considering change over time.

*Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study.* The FFCWB is a population-based sample of nearly 5,000 children born to mostly unmarried parents in 20 large U.S. cities in

1998-1999 (for detailed information about the sampling design and response rates, see Reichman et al. 2001). Mothers and fathers were interviewed shortly after the child was born and were again interviewed when their child was 1, 3, 5, 9, and 15 years old (though data collection for the 15-year wave is ongoing and will be released to restricted-data users, myself included, in Summer 2016). These data provide an unparalleled opportunity to understand the intergenerational consequences of paternal incarceration from early childhood to adolescence. First, unmarried parents are a relatively disadvantaged group (McLanahan 2009), which means many children in the sample—one-third by the time they are nine years old—experienced paternal incarceration. Second, these incarcerated fathers have demographic characteristics that are similar to fathers incarcerated in local jails, state prisons, and federal prisons (Turney and Wildeman 2013:957). Third, because these data include a vast amount of information about the social contexts of children’s lives prior to paternal incarceration, it is both possible to precisely match children who do and do not experience paternal incarceration and to consider how family characteristics mediate such effects. Though these data have been used to consider the collateral consequences of incarceration for families and children (e.g., Geller et al. 2012; Haskins 2014; Turney and Wildeman 2013; Wildeman 2010), most of this research exclusively considers the average effects of paternal incarceration on children and does not consider trajectories (Aim 1, RQ2), sensitive periods (Aim 1, RQ3), heterogeneity (Aim 2, RQ2; Aim 2, RQ3), or mediating mechanisms (Aim 3, RQ2). They have not been used to answer the research questions contained in this proposal and, with two exceptions (for excellent examinations of the effects of paternal incarceration on special education placement and child-reported behavioral problems among nine-year-old children, see Haskins 2014, 2015), have not been used to examine effects on children through middle childhood and adolescence. See Appendix C for descriptive statistics of both data sources.

## Measures

The key dependent variables will be measures of children’s academic, behavioral, and social outcomes (see Appendix D for detailed descriptions of these measures). The measurement of the key independent variables will vary slightly across data sources. In the FFCWB, at all survey waves after baseline, it is possible to measure both current incarceration and recent incarceration (i.e., incarceration since the last survey wave). I will use both mothers’ and fathers’ reports of paternal incarceration, as is common with these data (see, especially, Geller et al. 2012). The FFCWB also includes the following additional information about incarceration, which will be used in some analyses: incarceration facility type (jail vs. state prison vs. federal prison, for fathers incarcerated at the 1-, 3-, and 5-year surveys), incarceration duration (for fathers incarcerated at any point between the 3- and 9-year surveys), incarceration offense type (for fathers incarcerated at any point between the 3- and 9-year surveys), and child visitation (for fathers incarcerated at the 15-year survey). In the ECLS-K:2011, it is possible to measure current paternal incarceration, among fathers previously living in the child’s household, during waves 4 to 9.

*Surprisingly, applicants do not always clearly identify the key dependent and independent variables, as the applicant does here. Applicants should always be very specific about how they will operationalize central measures for quantitative studies.*

The measurement and timing of the additional moderating and mediating variables will fluctuate across research questions, analytic strategies, and data sources (see



Appendix E for detailed descriptions of these measures). However, most analyses will adjust for a host of child (race/ethnicity, generation status, gender, age, low birth weight) and parental (age, educational attainment, income-to-poverty ratio, relationship status, number of children, engagement, neglect, harsh discipline, self-rated health, depression) characteristics associated with both paternal incarceration and children's academic, behavioral, and social outcomes. Analyses will also adjust for paternal behaviors repeatedly linked to incarceration such as impulsivity, substance abuse, domestic violence, and prior incarceration. All analyses will pay careful attention to the time ordering between the outcome, explanatory, and control variables.

### **A Note on Causal Inference in Secondary Data Analysis**

An ideal research design would randomly assign fathers to incarceration. But this ideal research design is both infeasible and impractical. Therefore, in the secondary data analysis, I will employ an

*The applicant plans a systematic series of analyses to address selection issues.*

array of methodological techniques to adjust for selection into incarceration. For example, in one set of analyses (analysis 1, outlined below), I will employ fixed-effect growth curve models to consider how changes in incarceration affect changes in children's wellbeing. The fixed-effects models allow for an examination of within-person changes, which accounts for the possibility that some individuals simply have a greater stable propensity for criminal activity or have other important unobserved disadvantages associated with children's outcomes (Teachman 2014). In many additional analyses (e.g., analyses 2 and 3, outlined below), I will use propensity score matching, a counterfactual framework for observational data, to estimate the intergenerational consequences of paternal incarceration (Morgan and Winship 2007; Rosenbaum and Rubin 1983) and will strengthen causal inference by investigating the ignorability assumption (Becker and Caliendo 2007; Rosenbaum 2002). Finally, throughout the analyses, I will further rigorously interrogate issues of causality by restricting the sample to fathers at high risk of recent incarceration, those previously incarcerated (LaLonde 1986; Leamer 1983), and/or will consider placebo models that use *future* incarceration to predict *current* outcomes (e.g., Conley and Springer 2001).

### **Analytic Plan**

Below I outline the proposed quantitative analytic strategies, although, for three reasons, I expect these details to be modified as the project progresses. First, I expect that the primary data collection will yield important insights. For example, I expect the findings from RQ 3-1 will generate testable hypotheses about the family mechanisms linking paternal incarceration to children's outcomes, and I may revise the quantitative hypotheses and analyses accordingly. Second, I expect to modify the analyses as I learn more about developmental psychology. Finally, although I have structured the analyses to build off of one another, I cannot precisely predict what findings will emerge from each set of analyses; therefore, the order of analyses may change.

*Note that this discussion of the analytic plan maps onto the three theoretically-informed dimensions of this project – developmental trajectories, sensitive periods, and resilience – as well as additional family mediators. She explains why the examination of each dimension warrants a particular approach.*

*Analysis 1: Examining Developmental Trajectories.* I will begin by examining descriptive statistics of paternal incarceration and children's academic,

behavioral, and social outcomes from birth through adolescence (Aim 1, RQ2). I will then use growth curve modeling to estimate children's developmental trajectories as a function of paternal incarceration trajectories (e.g., Bollen and Curran 2005). This approach, which captures the dynamic aspects of paternal incarceration and children's developmental trajectories, assumes that children differ in initial measures of wellbeing based on paternal incarceration and that variance in subsequent growth (or decline) of wellbeing trajectories also varies by paternal incarceration. I will address the non-random selection of fathers into incarceration in at least two ways: (1) by adjusting for an array of individual, family, and neighborhood characteristics, all measured prior to paternal incarceration, and (2) by estimating these growth curve models in an individual-level fixed-effects framework. The fixed-effects framework allows the latent trajectory of children's developmental outcomes to be correlated with time-varying measures of paternal incarceration and, if necessary, allows for additional slope terms to capture non-linear change over time (Teachman 2014, forthcoming; also see Bollen and Brand 2010). Relatedly, this approach allows for an adjustment of within-person time-invariant characteristics (e.g., race/ethnicity, self-control) that might render the relationship spurious. These analyses will necessarily be limited to outcome variables measured at least three times.

*Analysis 2: Considering Sensitive Periods.* To examine the sensitive periods of paternal incarceration's consequences for children's academic, behavioral, and social outcomes (Aim 1, RQ3), I will estimate time-varying propensity score matching methods (Brand and Xie 2007). Propensity score models will estimate how first-time paternal incarceration (measured, in the FFCWB, as follows: early childhood [ages 0 to 5], middle childhood [ages 5 to 9], and later childhood [ages 9 to 15]) is associated with children's outcomes at age 15. The first model includes all children, separated into a treatment group (paternal incarceration between ages 0 and 5) and a control group (no paternal incarceration between ages 0 and 5). The second model drops all children no longer at risk of paternal incarceration, those who experienced paternal incarceration between ages 0 and 5, and the remaining children are separated into a treatment group (paternal incarceration between ages 5 and 9) and a control group (no paternal incarceration between ages 5 and 9). The third model drops all children no longer at risk of paternal incarceration, and the remaining children are separated into a treatment group (paternal incarceration between ages 9 and 15) and a control group (no paternal incarceration between ages 9 and 15). Each period is associated with a marginal probability weight of experiencing the treatment based on an array of covariates measured prior to incarceration. I will ensure balance between the treatment and control groups, restrict the analyses to regions of common support, and use kernel matching (Epanechnikov, bandwidth = .06) to estimate the time-varying effects of incarceration on children's outcomes at age 15.

*Analysis 3: Considering Resiliency.* To examine moderators (e.g., risk and resilience) in the association between paternal incarceration and children's academic, social, and behavioral outcomes, I will employ growth curve models or propensity score matching models. Here I will consider heterogeneity by children's race/ethnicity (Aim 2, RQ2), children's socioeconomic status (Aim 2, RQ2), father's residential status and pre-incarceration involvement (Aim 2, RQ2), and the conditions of paternal incarceration (including incarceration facility type, incarceration duration, incarceration offense type, and child visitation) (Aim 2, RQ3). The modeling strategy employed will depend upon

earlier findings. For example, if the growth curve models in Analysis 1 suggest that paternal incarceration has long-lasting consequences for children's outcomes, I will examine subgroup trajectory analyses when possible (e.g., Crosnoe et al. 2010). Alternatively, if the propensity score matching models show that paternal incarceration is only consequential when it occurs in middle childhood, I will employ propensity score models, estimating subgroup models (e.g., by race/ethnicity) and z-scores (e.g., Paternoster et al. 1998) to determine statistically significant differences between subgroups.

*Analysis 4: Considering Family-Level Mediators.* To examine the family-level characteristics that mediate the relationship between paternal incarceration and children's developmental outcomes, I will use structural equation modeling (SEM) (Aim 3, RQ2). Potential family-level mediators, which will be refined after qualitative data analysis, include the following: (1) changes in family economic wellbeing; (2) changes in the parental relationship; (3) changes in parenting behaviors; and (4) changes in parental mental health. I will estimate a longitudinal path model, with direct and indirect paths, in the SEM framework, following Baron and Kenny's (1986) commonly understood approach to mediation. Specifically, I will consider the following: (1) the relationship between paternal incarceration and each proposed mediator, (2) the relationship between each proposed mediator and children's outcomes, (3) the relationship between incarceration and children's outcomes without the mediator, (4) the relationship between incarceration and children's outcomes with the mediator (and the difference in the relationship with and without the mediator). To account for repeated measurement error, I will include correlations between time-varying measures and between all time-varying measures of child outcomes. Additionally, I will estimate multiple group models to see if the mechanisms vary across children's race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status.

*Additional Information.* I will preserve missing covariates (but not missing dependent variables) by producing multiply imputed data sets (the number of which will depend on the percentage of observations missing values) with the multivariate normal method in Stata's MI commands (Allison 2001; White, Royston, and Wood 2011). I will use sampling weights in the ECLS-K:2011 to account for the stratified sampling design. Finally, in the later years of the project, if data permits, I will consider how state-level variation in sentencing policies (e.g., mandatory minimum sentences, three strikes policies) is related to children's wellbeing in the ECLS-K:2011.

## **ROLE OF WILLIAM T. GRANT SCHOLARS PROGRAM**

### **Career Trajectory**

I have been fortunate to receive strong mentorship and training opportunities throughout my early career, as a doctoral student at the University of Pennsylvania, Robert Wood Johnson Health & Society Scholar at the University of Michigan, and assistant professor at UC-Irvine. This mentorship and training provided me with skills that are invaluable for the execution of this new project.

Theoretically and substantively, my existing scholarship falls broadly into one of two sociological research areas: (1) inequalities in child wellbeing (see, from my dissertation on the consequences of maternal depression for children, Turney 2011a, 2011b, 2011c, 2012a, 2012b) and (2) the collateral consequences of mass

incarceration for family life (Turney 2014a, 2014b, 2014c, 2014d, 2015; Turney, Schnittker, and Wildeman 2012; Turney, Wildeman, and Schnittker 2012; Turney and Wildeman 2013; Wildeman et al. 2012; Wildeman, Turney, and Schnittker 2014).

I have recently begun to combine these two research interests by considering how the collateral consequences of mass incarceration extend beyond family life (e.g., relationship quality, mental health) and proliferate to children’s wellbeing. This work began with a postdoctoral fellowship from the National Academy of Education (NAEd)/Spencer Foundation, where I used the FFCWB to examine how paternal incarceration affects educational outcomes in early childhood. One manuscript, recently published in *Sociology of Education*, finds that paternal incarceration puts children at risk of early grade retention. Another manuscript, currently under review at *Criminology*, employs a battery of rigorous quantitative analyses and finds that paternal incarceration has no average effects—but strikingly heterogeneous effects—on children’s tests scores (measured by reading comprehension, math comprehension, and verbal ability). The effects of paternal incarceration on test scores are concentrated among children who have a relatively low risk of experiencing paternal incarceration. These findings have motivated all aspects of the proposed project, and have especially motivated my interest in collecting qualitative data to document the processes through which incarceration structures childhood inequalities.

*The applicant fits her application for this award into her career trajectory, connecting the dots to show how her previous work has led to the proposed qualitative and quantitative projects.*

*In addition to proposing a strong project that fits with our interests and is poised to make a theoretical contribution, applicants must show how the award will allow them to make at least one critical stretch in their career. The stretch, or stretches, should be something the applicant would likely not be able to do without the award.*

### Development of New Skills

Although I bring many strengths to the project—especially, a deep understanding of the existing theoretical and substantive literature and an understanding of using quantitative methods to strengthen causal inference—the William T. Grant Scholars Program will be crucial for my career development. The Program will allow me to both capitalize on my existing skills and develop two new ones: (1) a methodological and conceptual stretch through qualitative data analysis and (2) a theoretical, substantive, and methodological (e.g., structural equation modeling, growth curve models) conceptual stretch by incorporating insights from developmental psychology.

*Successful applicants often – but certainly not always – undertake methodological stretches. Here, the applicant makes a strong case for why this methodological stretch is critical both for answering the questions asked.*

First, the Scholars Program will allow me to employ qualitative data analysis to answer questions that are of utmost importance to policymakers and practitioners. I do have some limited but important experience in qualitative research. This experience means that I have a sober

understanding of the challenges associated with both data collection and analysis. These challenges include understanding how to generate theory and

*The applicant emphasizes exactly how the Scholars grant will be used to access resources to support her methodological stretch.*

link theory to the empirical findings; coding (how to code effectively, how to code while still remaining the context of the interview, how to involve multiple coders [e.g., inter-rater reliability], decisions about software programs); analysis (how to manage and understand a large amount of data, how to develop themes and categories, how to use inductive reasoning); and effectively placing these results, which will not be empirically generalizable to a population, in the broader context of inequality in the United States. As a scholar who is steeped in the deductive reasoning of quantitative methods, I expect the conceptual transition to qualitative analysis—where I have to train my brain to think beyond independent and dependent variables—to be quite challenging. Support for the Scholars Program—through mentorship, auditing courses (Field Notes and Transcripts will be offered at UCI in the first year of the grant), and attending workshops on qualitative data analysis (a Qualitative Research Design and Analysis course at the Odom Institute at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill and an ATLAS.ti course at the University of California Berkeley)—will be crucial for making this project successful.

Second, the Scholars Program will allow me to rigorously incorporate theoretical (e.g., ecological systems theory, family process theory), methodological (e.g., SEM, growth curve models), and analytic (e.g., developmental trajectories) insights from developmental psychology. This training in developmental psychology will allow me to more fully consider, analytically, the family context before, during, and after incarceration. This training will also provide an important foundation for considering the sensitive periods during which incarceration is most consequential, measures of risk and resiliency that moderate the relationship between paternal incarceration and children's wellbeing, and the mediating mechanisms of this relationship. Support from the Scholars Program will provide mentorship; the opportunity to attend a Structural Equation Modeling with Stata course in Ann Arbor, Michigan; and an opportunity to audit two courses in developmental psychology at UC-Irvine, Theories of Human Development (taught by Dr. Deborah Vandell) and Social Context of Human Development (taught by Dr. Jacquelynne Eccles). Combining the developmental perspective with my existing sociological perspective (and perspective that is steeped in causal analysis) will be crucial for producing innovative insights on the intergenerational consequences of paternal incarceration.

*This sociologist proposes to stretch her expertise by learning and drawing from developmental psychology; again, she offers a strong rationale for why this knowledge is critical for doing this project well.*

Mentors. Dr. Sandra Danziger, of the University of Michigan, and Dr. Julie Poehlmann-Tynan, of the University of Wisconsin, have graciously agreed to provide formal mentorship to this project and their insights are reflected throughout the proposal.

Danziger, Professor of Social Work and Research Professor of Public Policy at the University of Michigan, will provide a tremendous amount of expertise to this research project. Substantively, Danziger is an expert on low-income families. Her research examines the wellbeing of low-income women and children and considers how public programs and policies structure wellbeing among these low-income women and children. Methodologically, she has expertise in qualitative data collection and analysis. She is skilled at recruiting respondents, especially low-income respondents

*The selection of mentors should make sense. Here, the applicant shows why and how this mentor will help guide her qualitative data collection and analysis.*

who are often difficult to track down and follow over time; is skilled at developing both closed- and open-ended data collection instruments; and has valuable experience managing a research team.

Importantly, she has decades of experience analyzing rich, textured qualitative data; making theoretical, empirical, and policy-relevant contributions from qualitative data; and incorporating mixed-methods approaches into her research. Danziger's expertise will be crucial for the execution of this project. She will advise on all aspects of the project, especially on the in-depth interview component. Specifically, in anticipation of this project, she has provided consultation as I have designed the in-depth interview guides, guiding to me ask appropriate questions that elicit rich and nuanced responses. As the project progresses, she will provide guidance about how to effectively incorporate the mixed-methods design into the overall research design and subsequent analyses; how to draw emerging themes from the qualitative data; how to generate broadly applicable and inductively-driven theoretical insights; how to develop a codebook and conducting qualitative data analysis; and provide guidance about how to manage a large research team. Additionally, Danziger will provide invaluable expertise about how to use my findings to inform policy and practice.

Poehlmann-Tynan, Professor and Chair of Human Development and Family Studies and Director of the Center for Child and Family Well-Being at the University of Wisconsin, will also provide a tremendous amount of expertise to this research project. Poehlmann-Tynan, who has a Ph.D. in clinical psychology, has substantive interests in the role of family relationships in the development of resilience among vulnerable children, especially children of incarcerated parents, and has methodological expertise in data collection. Poehlmann-Tynan is currently the PI of "Young Children of Jailed Parents", an NICHD-funded study that investigates risk and protective factors among children with mothers and/or fathers in jail. Poehlmann-Tynan will advise on all aspects of this project. She has provided initial guidance on project design, especially about aspects of interviewing children (e.g., appropriate length of interviews, interviewing about sensitive topics, issues of confidentiality and reporting upon abuse). Finally, Poehlmann-Tynan is uniquely focused on interventions and is an expert on translating empirical findings to policy and practice—for example, she provided consultation to PBS when they decided to include a character with a jailed parent on Sesame Street—and will provide invaluable expertise on how to effectively do this.

*Similarly, the applicant shows how her second mentor will support the second stretch of this project – using developmental psychology to think about critical aspects of the research related to youth and youth outcomes.*

*Connecting with Mentors.* I have not worked closely with either mentor. I initially met Danziger when I was a post-doctoral researcher at the University of Michigan and I initially met Poehlmann-Tynan when I gave a talk at the University of Wisconsin in February (and subsequently asked her to serve as a mentor during the finalist stage of the Scholars Program last year). Though I have previously not worked closely with either of them, both have provided consultation on this application.

I plan to connect with both mentors in four ways. First, I have budgeted funds to travel to Ann Arbor, MI, and Madison, WI, once a year. Second, we will meet in person at annual meetings (e.g., Society for Research on Child Development (SRCD), Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM)). Third, we will have telephone or

Skype meetings. These meetings will be at least monthly and, during strategic points of the project (e.g., at the beginning of data analysis), more frequently. Finally, we will be in email contact about all aspects of the project. I will ask Danziger to read at least three interview transcripts, provide feedback on coding schemes and analytic memos, and read drafts of manuscripts. I will ask Poehlmann-Tynan to review the interview guides for children, provide statistical consultation on structural equation modeling and growth curve modeling, and read drafts of manuscripts. Both of my mentors reside outside of Irvine, but I do not expect the distance to impede the mentoring relationships.

### **A Note on Additional Funding**

It appears probable (but not yet certain) that the National Science Foundation (NSF) will fund data collection for the qualitative project (over a three-year time period). If funded, the NSF would provide resources to interview mothers and children (stipends, transcription, and travel to and from interviews), resources to fund my time (one summer month for each of the three years), and resources to hire graduate student research assistants (one during the academic year and two during the summer). The NSF would not provide resources to support my time during the academic year, would not support Danziger or Poehlmann-Tynan, and would not support any of the training activities or conference travel. The NSF would also not support *any* of the secondary data analysis.

*The applicant is transparent about the likelihood she will receive additional funding. This boosts the feasibility of the project, given that the Scholars award budget is insufficient to carry out the entire research plan. At the same time, the applicant also very clearly explains why the Scholars Program will provide important benefits she would likely not receive otherwise.*

The William T. Grant Scholars Program—with its emphasis on programs, policies, and practices for reducing inequality, its opportunities for advancing my interdisciplinary expertise, and its opportunities for mentorship and training—would provide tremendous added value to the pending NSF award. First, the NSF grant would only fund the qualitative project; thus, support from the William T. Grant Scholars Program is necessary to conduct the analysis of secondary data. Second, the Scholars Program would allow me to benefit from the mentorship of Danziger and Poehlmann-Tynan. As detailed above, their mentorship is crucial to the successful execution of this project. Third, the Scholars Program would also provide me the resources to attend three training courses (an SEM course, a qualitative analysis course, and a qualitative software course), also important to the successful execution of this project. Fourth, the Scholars Program, and its support of my time during the academic year, would allow me to audit relevant courses at UC-Irvine, as described earlier, and dedicate uninterrupted time to analysis and writing. Therefore, the mentorship and training opportunities provided by the Scholars Program, by allowing me to expand my disciplinary and methodological toolkit, would be transformative for my research career.

### **Timeline and Feasibility**

This five-year research project is ambitious in scope but, with the mentorship and resources provided by the William T. Grant Scholars Program, I am confident that it is feasible for me to successfully accomplish all aspects of the project in the five-year

time frame (see Appendix F for a timeline). Although this project incorporates various forms of conceptual stretch, it is a natural extension of my existing research and, accordingly, I am well-versed in the substance, strengths, and weaknesses of relevant existing research. Additionally, I have obtained support from the Sheriff's Department to recruit families (please see supporting letter) and IRB approval from UC Irvine. Additionally, my application to the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) to receive the restricted ECLS-K:2011 data was approved on July 6.

However, the project is not without challenges. First, though the Sheriff's Department has committed to helping me recruit families, I may still have difficulty recruiting through California jails. I have two back-up plans for recruitment. One back-up plan involves working with a local non-profit with whom I have developed a relationship, Get On the Bus. The second back-up plan involves connecting with participants of Pains of the Prison System (POPS), a school-based club in Los Angeles for children with incarcerated parents. Furthermore, the ECLS-K:2011 waves that include paternal incarceration have not been released. It is possible (though unlikely) that few fathers are incarcerated or that there is no bivariate association between paternal incarceration and children's developmental outcomes. If necessary, I will rely solely on the FFCWB or consider adding another data source that makes it possible to consider the effects of paternal incarceration in adolescence (e.g., the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997 (NLSY97)). To manage these and other challenges that will undoubtedly arise, I will rely heavily on my mentors, who have successfully managed larger studies, and on the additional professional networks provided by the Foundation.

*The applicant provides evidence (above paragraph) regarding the feasibility of her project but also acknowledges potential challenges, as well as how she plans to surmount them. This provides reviewers with assurances that she has carefully considered the likely challenges she will face in carrying out the project.*

## **IMPLICATIONS AND DISSEMINATION**

This project will also have important implications. First, by documenting the processes through which paternal incarceration affects children and how these processes change during and after incarceration, I anticipate that findings from the primary data collection will provide new insights into how the unintended consequences of the expanding penal system transforms the life course of children and adolescents. Furthermore, the secondary data analysis, by moving beyond an examination of the average causal effects of paternal incarceration, will have implications for social policies and interventions. Understanding the dynamic relationship between paternal incarceration and children's developmental trajectories, as well as when in the life course children are especially sensitive to paternal incarceration, will provide guidance about when and how long to intervene.

Understanding heterogeneity in the consequences of paternal incarceration across population subgroups will provide an understanding about which children most need and will most benefit from interventions and, therefore, provide guidance about how to allocate resources. Understanding the mediating role of families will provide direction about how to most successfully intervene.

I expect this project will result in a book manuscript and a series of peer-reviewed articles. Target outlets include a university press (e.g., Chicago) and peer-reviewed



journals (e.g., *Child Development*, *Developmental Psychology*, *American Journal of Sociology*). I anticipate presenting my findings at conferences including the Society for Research on Child Development (SRCD), the Society for Research on Adolescence (SRA), and the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM). I also anticipate disseminating findings through policy briefs via the Scholars Strategy Network, of which I am a member, and through opinion pieces in newspapers (e.g. *The Washington Post*). Furthermore, I have agreed to disseminate my findings in research briefs and presentations to the XXX County Sheriff's Department, as they are in the beginning planning stages of developing a comprehensive program, Lasting Change, to provide services to offenders and family members. I will also work to disseminate the findings to other non-profit organizations to which I have become connected (Get On The Bus, POPS).

## REFERENCES

- Achenbach, Thomas M. 1992. *Manual for the Child Behavior Checklist / 2-3 and 1992 Profile*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont Department of Psychiatry.
- Allison, Paul. 2001. *Missing Data*. New York: Sage Publications.
- Amato, Paul R. 2000. "The Consequences of Divorce for Adults and Children." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62:1269–1287.
- Amato, Paul R. 2010. "Research on Divorce: Continuing Trends and New Developments." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72:650–666.
- Arditti, Joyce A. 2012. *Parental Incarceration and the Family: Psychological and Social Effects of Imprisonment on Children, Parents, and Caregivers*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Arditti, Joyce A. 2015. "Family Process Perspective on the Heterogeneous Effects of Maternal Incarceration on Child Wellbeing." *Criminology & Public Policy* 14:169–182.
- Arditti, Joyce A., Jennifer Lambert-Shute, and Karen Joest. 2003. "Saturday Morning at the Jail: Implications of Incarceration for Families and Children." *Family Relations* 52:195–204.
- Avison, William R. 2010. "Incorporating Children's Lives Into a Life Course Perspective on Stress and Mental Health." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 51:361–375.
- Axinn, William G., and Lisa D. Pearce. 2006. *Mixed Method Data Collection Strategies*. Boston, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Becker, Sascha O., and Marco Caliendo. 2007. "Sensitivity Analysis for Average Treatment Effects." *Stata Journal* 7:71–83.
- Berger, Lawrence M., Christina Paxson, and Jane Waldfogel. 2009. "Income and Child Development." *Children and Youth Services Review* 31:978–989.
- Besemer, Sytske, Victor Van der Geest, Joseph Murray, Catrien CJH Bijleveld, and David P. Farrington. 2011. "The Relationship between Parental Imprisonment and Offspring Offending in England and the Netherlands."

- British Journal of Criminology* 51:413–437.
- Bollen, Kenneth A., and Jennie E. Brand. 2010. "A General Panel Model with Random and Fixed Effects: A Structural Equations Approach." *Social Forces* 89:1–34.
- Bollen, Kenneth A., and Patrick J. Curran. 2005. *Latent Curve Models: A Structural Equation Perspective*. New York: Wiley.
- Boss, Pauline. 2007. "Ambiguous Loss Theory: Challenges for Scholars and Practitioners." *Family Relations* 56:105–111.
- Braman, Donald. 2004. *Doing Time on the Outside: Incarceration and Family Life in Urban America*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.
- Brand, Jennie E. 2010. "Civic Returns to Higher Education: A Note on Heterogeneous Effects." *Social Forces* 89:417–433.
- Brand, Jennie E., and Yu Xie. 2007. "Identification and Estimation of Causal Effects with Time-Varying Treatments and Time-Varying Outcomes." *Sociological Methodology* 37:393–434.
- Brand, Jennie E., and Yu Xie. 2010. "Who Benefits Most from College? Evidence for Negative Selection in Heterogeneous Economic Returns to Higher Education." *American Sociological Review* 75:273–302.
- Bronfenbrenner, Urie, and Pamela A. Morris. 1998. "The Ecology of Developmental Processes." Pp. 993-1028 in *Handbook of Child Psychology: Volume 1: Theoretical Models of Human Development*, edited by W. Damon and R. M. Lerner. New York: Wiley.
- Bzostek, Sharon H., Sara S. McLanahan, and Marcia J. Carlson. 2012. "Mothers' Repartnering After a Nonmarital Birth." *Social Forces* 90:817–841.
- Calarco, Jessica McCrory. 2011. "'I need help!' Social Class and Children's Help-seeking in Elementary School." *American Sociological Review* 76:862–882.
- Carlson, Marcia J., and Mary E. Corcoran. 2001. "Family Structure and Children's Behavioral and Cognitive Outcomes." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 63:779–792.
- Charmaz, Kathy. 2006. "Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Research." London: Sage Publications.
- Christian, Johnna. 2005. "Riding the Bus: Barriers to Prison Visitation and Family Management Strategies." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 21:31–48.
- Comeau, Joseph A. 2012. "Race/Ethnicity and Family Contact: Toward a Behavioral Measure of Familialism." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 34:251–268.
- Comfort, Megan. 2008. *Doing Time Together: Love and Family in the Shadow of the Prison*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.
- Conger, Rand D., Katherine Jewsbury Conger, and Glen H. Elder. 1997. "Family Economic Hardship and Adolescent Adjustment: Mediating and Moderating Processes." Pp. 284–310 in *The Consequences of Growing Up Poor*, edited by

- G. J. Duncan and J. Brooks-Gunn. New York: Russell Sage.
- Conley, Dalton, and Kristen W. Springer. 2001. "Welfare State and Infant Mortality." *American Journal of Sociology* 107:768–807.
- Crosnoe, Robert, Tama Leventhal, R. J. Wirth, Kim M. Pierce, and Robert C. Pianta. 2010. "Family Socioeconomic Status and Consistent Environmental Stimulation in Early Childhood." *Child Development* 81:972–987.
- DiPrete, Thomas A., and Gregory M. Eirich. 2006. "Cumulative Advantage as a Mechanism for Inequality: A Review of Theoretical and Empirical Developments." *Annual Review of Sociology* 32:271–297.
- Duncan, Greg J., and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn. 1997. *Consequences of Growing Up Poor*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Eaton, William W. 1978. "Life Events, Social Supports, and Psychiatric Symptoms: A Re-Analysis of the New Haven Data." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 19:230–234.
- Eddy, J. Mark, and Julie Poehlmann. 2010. *Children of Incarcerated Parents: A Handbook for Researchers and Practitioners*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.
- Eddy, J. Mark, and John B. Reid. 2003. "The Adolescent Children of Incarcerated Parents: A Developmental Perspective." Pp. 233–258, edited by J. Travis and M. Waul. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Eder, Donna, and William Corsaro. 1999. "Ethnographic Studies of Children and Youth: Theoretical and Ethical Issues." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 28:520–531.
- Edin, Kathryn, Timothy J. Nelson, and Rechelle Paranal. 2004. "Fatherhood and Incarceration As Potential Turning Points in the Criminal Careers of Unskilled Men." Pp. 46–75 in *Imprisoning America: The Social Effects of Mass Incarceration*, edited by M. Patillo, D. Weiman, and B. Western. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Elder, Glen H. Jr. 1998. "The Life Course as Developmental Theory." *Child Development* 69:1–12. Elder, Glen H. Jr., Monica Kirkpatrick Johnson, and Robert Crosnoe. 2003. "The Emergence and Development of Life Course Theory." Pp. 3–19 in *Handbook of the Life Course*, edited by J. Mortimer and M. Shanahan. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Elliott, Delbert S., David Huizinga, and Scott Menard. 1989. *Multiple Problem Youth: Delinquency, Substance Use, and Mental Health*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I. Fretz, and Linda L. Shaw. 2011. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes, Second Edition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Entwisle, Doris R., and Karl L. Alexander. 1989. "Early Schooling as a 'Critical Period' Phenomenon." Pp. 27–55 in *Sociology of Education and Socialization*, vol. 8, edited by K. Namboodiri and R. G. Corwin. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Farkas, George. 2003. "Cognitive Skills and Noncognitive Traits and Behaviors in

- Stratification Processes." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29:541–562.
- Featherman, David, and Robert Hauser. 1978. *Opportunity and Change*. New York: Academic Press.
- Fomby, Paula, and Andrew Cherlin. 2007. "Family Instability and Child Well-being." *American Sociological Review* 72:181-204.
- Fomby, Paula, Stefanie Mollborn, and Christie A. Sennott. 2010. "Race/Ethnic Differences in Effects of Family Instability on Adolescents' Risk Behavior." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72:234–253.
- Foster, Holly, and John Hagan. 2007. "Incarceration and Intergenerational Social Exclusion." *Social Problems* 54:399–433.
- Foster, Holly, and John Hagan. 2009. "The Mass Incarceration of Parents in America: Issues of Race/Ethnicity, Collateral Damage to Children, and Prisoner Reentry." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 623:179–194.
- Foster, Holly, and John Hagan. 2013. "Maternal and Paternal Imprisonment in the Stress Process." *Social Science Research* 42:650–669.
- Foster, Holly, and John Hagan. Forthcoming. "Punishment Regimes and the Multilevel Effects of Paternal Incarceration: Intergenerational, Intersectional, and Interinstitutional Models of Social Inequality and Systemic Exclusion." *Annual Review of Sociology*.
- Geller, Amanda, Carey E. Cooper, Irwin Garfinkel, Ofira Schwartz-Soicher, and Ronald B. Mincy. 2012. "Beyond Absenteeism: Father Incarceration and Child Development." *Demography* 49:49–76.
- Geller, Amanda, Irwin Garfinkel, Carey E. Cooper, and Ronald B. Mincy. 2009. "Parental Incarceration and Child Well-Being: Implications for Urban Families." *Social Science Quarterly* 90:1187–1202.
- Geller, Amanda, Irwin Garfinkel, and Bruce Western. 2011. "Paternal Incarceration and Support for Children in Fragile Families." *Demography* 48:25–47.
- Giordano, Peggy C. 2010. *Legacies of Crime: A Follow-Up of the Children of Highly Delinquent Girls and Boys*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Goffman, Erving. 1963. *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hagan, John, and Ronit Dinovitzer. 1999. "Collateral Consequences of Imprisonment for Children, Communities, and Prisoners." *Crime and Justice* 26:121–162.
- Hagan, John, and Holly Foster. 2012. "Intergenerational Educational Effects of Mass Imprisonment in America." *Sociology of Education* 85:259–286.
- Haskins, Anna R. 2014. "Unintended Consequences: Effects of Paternal Incarceration on Child School Readiness and Later Special Education Placement." *Sociological Science* 1:141–158.

- Haskins, Anna R. 2015. "Paternal Incarceration and Child-reported Behavioral Functioning at Age 9." *Social Science Research* 52:18–33.
- Hawkins, Daniel N., Paul R. Amato, and Valarie King. 2007. "Nonresident Father Involvement and Adolescent Well-Being: Father Effects of Child Effects?" *American Sociological Review* 72:990–1010.
- Hibel, Jacob, George Farkas, and Paul L. Morgan. 2010. "Who Is Placed Into Special Education?" *Sociology of Education* 83:312–332.
- Jaffee, Sara R., Terrie E. Moffitt, Avshalom Caspi, and Alan Taylor. 2003. "Life With (or Without) Father: The Benefits of Living with Two Biological Parents Depend on the Father's Antisocial Behavior." *Child Development* 74:109–126.
- Jann, Ben, Jennie E. Brand, and Yu Xie. 2007. "HTE: Stata Module to Perform Heterogeneous Treatment Effect Analysis." Statistical Software Components S457129, Boston College Department of Economics.
- Johnson, Rucker. 2009. "Ever-increasing Levels of Parental Incarceration and the Consequences for Children." Pp. 177–206 in *Do Prisons Make Us Safer? The Benefits and Costs of the Prison Boom*, in S. Raphael and M.A. Stoll. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Johnson, Elizabeth I., and Beth Easterling. 2012. "Understanding the Unique Effects of Parental Incarceration on Children: Challenges, Progress, and Recommendations." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 74:342–356.
- Johnson, Elizabeth I., and Beth A. Easterling. 2015. "Coping With Confinement Adolescents' Experiences With Parental Incarceration." *Journal of Adolescent Research* 30:244–267.
- Johnson, Elizabeth I., and Jane Waldfogel. 2004. "Children of Incarcerated Parents: Multiple Risks and Children's Living Arrangements." Pp. 97–131 in *Imprisoning America: The Social Effects of Mass Incarceration*, edited by M. Pattillo, D. Weiman, and B. Western. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Katz, Jack. 1983. "A Theory of Qualitative Methodology: The Social System of Analytic Fieldwork." Pp. 127-148 in *Contemporary Field Research*, edited by R. Emerson. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.
- Kinner, Stuart A., Rosa Alati, Jake M. Najman, and Gail M. Williams. 2007. "Do Paternal Arrest and Imprisonment Lead to Child Behaviour Problems and Substance Use? A Longitudinal Analysis." *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 48:1148–1156.
- Kjellstrand, Jean M., and J. Mark Eddy. 2011. "Parental Incarceration During Childhood, Family Context, and Youth Problem Behavior Across Adolescence." *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 50:18–36.
- Kowaleski-Jones, Lori, and Greg J. Duncan. 1999. "The Structure of Achievement and Behavior Across Middle Childhood." *Child Development* 70:930–943.
- LaLonde, Robert J. 1986. "Evaluating the Econometric Evaluations of Training Programs with Experimental Data." *American Economic Review* 76:604–620.
- Lareau, Annette. 2003. *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life*. Berkeley,

CA: University of California Press.

- Leamer, Edward. 1983. "Let's Take the Con Out of Econometrics." *American Economic Review* 73:31–43.
- Lopoo, Leonard M., and Bruce Western. 2005. "Incarceration and the Formation and Stability of Marital Unions." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67:721–734.
- Massoglia, Michael, Brianna Remster, and Ryan D. King. 2011. "Stigma or Separation? Understanding the Incarceration-Divorce Relationship." *Social Forces* 90:133–155.
- Maumary-Gremaud, Anne. 2000. "Things that You Have Done: Technical Report." Available online, <http://www.fasttrackproject.org/>.
- May, Reuben A. B., and Mary Pattillo-McCoy. 2000. "Do You See What I See? Examining a Collaborative Ethnography." *Qualitative Inquiry* 6:65–87.
- McKown, Clark, and Rhona S. Weinstein. 2003. "The Development and Consequences of Stereotype Consciousness in Middle Childhood." *Child Development* 74:498–515.
- McLanahan, Sara S. 2009. "Fragile Families and the Reproduction of Poverty." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 62:111–131.
- Miles, Matthew B., and A. Michael Huberman. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. London: Sage Publications.
- Mineka, Susan and John F. Kihlstrom. 1978. "Unpredictable and Uncontrollable Events: A New Perspective on Experimental Neurosis." *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 87:256–271.
- Mistry, Rashmita S., Danielle A. Crosby, Aletha C. Huston, David M. Casey, and Marika N. Ripke. 2001. "Lessons from New Hope: The Impact on Children's Well-Being of a Work-Based Antipoverty Program for Parents." Pp. 179–200 in *For Better or for Worse: Welfare Reform and the Well-Being of Children*, edited by G. J. Duncan and P. Lindsay Chase-Lansdale. New York: Russell Sage.
- Morgan, Stephen L., and Christopher Winship. 2007. *Counterfactuals and Causal Inference: Methods and Principles for Social Research*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Mumola, Christopher J. 2000. *Incarcerated Parents and Their Children*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Murray, Joseph, and David P. Farrington. 2005. "Parental Imprisonment: Effects on Boys' Antisocial Behaviour and Delinquency Through the Life-Course." *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 46:1269–1278.
- Murray, Joseph, and David P. Farrington. 2008a. "The Effects of Parental Imprisonment on Children." *Crime and Justice* 37:133–206.
- Murray, Joseph, and David P. Farrington. 2008b. "Parental Imprisonment: Long-Lasting Effects on Boys' Internalizing Problems through the Life Course." *Development and Psychopathology* 20:273–290.
- Murray, Joseph, David P. Farrington, and Ivana Sekol. 2012. "Children's Antisocial Behavior, Mental Health, Drug Use, and Educational Performance After Parental Incarceration: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis." *Psychological Bulletin* 138:175–210.

- Murray, Joseph, Carl-Gunnar Janson, and David P. Farrington. 2007. "Crime in Adult Offspring of Prisoners a Cross-National Comparison of Two Longitudinal Samples." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 34:133–149.
- Murray, Joseph, Rolf Loeber, and Dustin Pardini. 2012. "Parental Involvement in the Criminal Justice System and the Development of Youth Theft, Marijuana Use, Depression, and Poor Academic Performance." *Criminology* 50:255–302.
- Musick, Kelly, Jennie E. Brand, and Dwight Davis. 2012. "Variation in the Relationship Between Education and Marriage: Marriage Market Mismatch?" *Journal of Marriage and Family* 74:53– 69.
- Nesmith, Ande, and Ebony Ruhland. 2008. "Children of Incarcerated Parents: Challenges and Resiliency, In Their Own Words." *Children and Youth Services Review* 30:1119–1130.
- Nichols, Emily Bever, and Ann Booker Loper. 2012. "Incarceration in the Household: Academic Outcomes of Adolescents with an Incarcerated Household Member." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 41:1455–1471.
- Nurse, Ann M. 2002. *Fatherhood Arrested: Parenting from Within the Juvenile Justice System*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Pager, Devah. 2003. "The Mark of a Criminal Record." *American Journal of Sociology* 108:937–975.
- Paternoster, Raymond, Robert Brame, Paul Mazerolle, and Alex Piquero. 1998. "Using the Correct Statistical Test for the Equality of Regression Coefficients." *Criminology* 36:859–866.
- Patillo, Mary, David F. Weiman, and Bruce Western. 2004. *Imprisoning America: The Social Effects of Mass Incarceration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Pearlin, Leonard I. 1989. "The Sociological Study of Stress." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 30:241–256.
- Pettit, Becky. 2012. *Invisible Men: Mass Incarceration and the Myth of Black Progress*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Phillips, Susan D., Alaattin Erkanli, Gordon P. Keller, E. Jane Costello, and Adrian Angold. 2006. "Disentangling the Risks: Parent Criminal Justice Involvement and Children's Exposure to Family Risks." *Criminology and Public Policy* 5:677–702.
- Radloff, Lenore Sawyer 1977. "The CES-D Scale: A Self-Report Depression Scale for Research in the General Population." *Applied Psychological Measurement* 1:385–401.
- Reichman, Nancy E., Julien O. Teitler, Irwin Garfinkel, and Sara S. McLanahan. 2001. "Fragile Families: Sample and Design." *Children and Youth Services Review* 23:303–326.
- Rock, Donald A., and Judith M. Pollack. 2002. *Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Kindergarten Class of 1998-99 (ECLS-K): Psychometric Report for Kindergarten through First Grade*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Roettger, Michael E., and Jason D. Boardman. 2012. "Parental Incarceration and Gender-based Risks for Increased Body Mass Index: Evidence from the

- National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health in the United States." *American Journal of Epidemiology* 175:636–644.
- Roettger, Michael E., and Raymond R. Swisher. 2011. "Associations of Fathers' History of Incarceration with Sons' Delinquency and Arrest among Black, White, and Hispanic Males in the United States." *Criminology* 49:1109–1147.
- Rosenbaum, Paul R. 2002. *Observational Studies*. New York: Springer.
- Rosenbaum, Paul R., and Donald B. Rubin. 1983. "The Central Role of the Propensity Score in Observational Studies for Causal Effects." *Biometrika* 70:41–55.
- Ryan, Rebecca, Ariel Kalil, and Lindsey Leininger. 2009. "Low-Income Mothers' Private Safety Nets and Children's Socioemotional Well-being." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 71:279–298.
- Sampson, Robert J. 2011. "The Incarceration Ledger: Toward a New Era in Assessing Societal Consequences." *Criminology & Public Policy* 10:819–828.
- Schafer, Markus H., Lindsay R. Wilkinson, and Kenneth F. Ferraro. 2013. "Childhood (Mis)Fortune, Educational Attainment, and Adult Health: Contingent Benefits of a College Degree?" *Social Forces* 91:1007–1034.
- Schwartz-Soicher, Ofira, Amanda Geller, and Irwin Garfinkel. 2011. "The Effect of Paternal Incarceration on Material Hardship." *Social Service Review* 85:447–473.
- Sharkey, Patrick. 2010. "The Acute Effect of Local Homicides on Children's Cognitive Performance." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107:11733–11738.
- Siegel, Jane. 2011. *Disrupted Childhoods: Children of Women in Prison*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Small, Mario Luis. 2011. "How to Conduct a Mixed Methods Study: Recent Trends in a Rapidly Growing Literature." *Annual Review of Sociology* 37:57–86.
- Stack, Carol B. 1974. *All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Strauss, Anselm, and Juliet M. Corbin. 1990. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. London: Sage Publications.
- Sugie, Naomi F. 2012. "Punishment and Welfare: Paternal Incarceration and Families' Receipt of Public Assistance." *Social Forces* 90:1403–1427.
- Swisher, Raymond, and Maureen Waller. 2008. "Confining Fatherhood: Incarceration and Paternal Involvement Among Nonresident White, African American and Latino Fathers." *Journal of Family Issues* 29:1067–1088.
- Teachman, Jay. Forthcoming. "Body Weight, Marital Status, and Changes in Marital Status." *Journal of Family Issues*. Online first.
- Teachman, Jay. 2014. "Latent Growth Curve Models with Random and Fixed Effects." Pp. 3–17 in *Emerging Methods in Family Research*, edited by S.M. McHale and Paul Amato. New York: Springer.
- Thorne, Barrie. 1987. "Re-visioning Women and Social Change: Where are the Children?" *Gender & Society* 1:85–109.



- Travis, Jeremy, Bruce Western, and Steve Redburn. 2014. *The Growth of Incarceration in the United States: Exploring Causes and Consequences*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Turanovic, Jillian J., Nancy Rodriguez, and Travis C. Pratt. 2012. "The Collateral Consequences of Incarceration Revisited: A Qualitative Analysis of the Effects on Caregivers of Children of Incarcerated Parents." *Criminology* 50:913–959.
- Turney, Kristin. 2011a. "Chronic and Proximate Depression Among Mothers: Implications for Child Well Being." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 73:149–163.
- Turney, Kristin. 2011b. "Labored Love: Examining the Link Between Maternal Depression and Parenting Behaviors." *Social Science Research* 40:399–415.
- Turney, Kristin. 2011c. "Maternal Depression and Childhood Health Inequalities." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 52:314–322.
- Turney, Kristin. 2012a. "Pathways of Disadvantage: Explaining the Relationship between Maternal Depression and Children's Problem Behavior." *Social Science Research* 41:1546–1564.
- Turney, Kristin. 2012b. "Prevalence and Correlates of Stability and Change in Maternal Depression: Evidence from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study." *PLoS ONE* 7:e45709– e45709.
- Turney, Kristin. 2014a. "The Consequences of Paternal Incarceration for Maternal Neglect and Harsh Parenting." *Social Forces* 92:1607–1636.
- Turney, Kristin. 2014b. "The Intergenerational Consequences of Mass Incarceration: Implications for Children's Co-residence and Contact with Grandparents." *Social Forces* 93:299–327.
- Turney, Kristin. 2014c. "Stress Proliferation Across Generations? Examining the Relationship between Parental Incarceration and Childhood Health." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 55:302–319.
- Turney, Kristin. 2014d. "Incarceration and Social Inequality: Challenges and Directions for Future Research." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 651:97–101.
- Turney, Kristin. 2015. "Hopelessly Devoted? Changes in Relationship Quality During and After Incarceration." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 77:480–495.
- Turney, Kristin, Jason Schnittker, and Christopher Wildeman. 2012. "Those They Leave Behind: Paternal Incarceration and Maternal Instrumental Support." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 74:1149–1165.
- Turney, Kristin, and Christopher Wildeman. 2013. "Redefining Relationships: Explaining the Countervailing Consequences of Paternal Incarceration for Parenting." *American Sociological Review* 78:949–979.
- Turney, Kristin, Christopher Wildeman, and Jason Schnittker. 2012. "As Fathers and Felons: Explaining the Effects of Current and Recent Incarceration on Major Depression." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 53:467–483.

- Wakefield, Sara, and Christopher Uggen. 2010. "Incarceration and Stratification." *Annual Review of Sociology* 36:387–406.
- Wakefield, Sara, and Christopher Wildeman. 2011. "Mass Imprisonment and Racial Disparities in Childhood Behavioral Problems." *Criminology & Public Policy* 10:793–817.
- Wakefield, Sara, and Christopher Wildeman. 2013. *Children of the Prison Boom: Mass Incarceration and the Future of American Inequality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Walmsley, Roy. 2013. *World Prison Population List*. London: International Centre for Prison Studies.
- Warren, John Robert, and jim saliba. 2012. "First- Through Eighth-Grade Retention Rates for All 50 States A New Method and Initial Results." *Educational Researcher* 41:320–329.
- Western, Bruce. 2006. *Punishment and Inequality in America*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Western, Bruce, and Becky Pettit. 2010. "Incarceration and Social Inequality." *Daedalus* 139:8–19.
- Wheaton, Blair. 1982. "A Comparison of the Moderating Effects of Personal Coping Resources on the Impact of Exposure to Stress in Two Group." *Journal of Community Psychology* 10:293–311.
- Wheaton, Blair. 1990. "Life Transitions, Role Histories, and Mental Health." *American Sociological Review* 55:209–223.
- White, Ian R., Patrick Royston, and Angela M. Wood. 2011. "Multiple Imputation Using Chained Equations: Issues and Guidance for Practice." *Statistics in Medicine* 30:377–399.
- Wilbur, MaryAnn B., Jodi E. Marani, Danielle Appugliese, Ryan Woods, Jane A. Siegel, Howard J. Cabral, and Deborah A. Frank. 2007. "Socioemotional Effects of Fathers' Incarceration on Low-Income, Urban, School-aged Children." *Pediatrics* 120:e678–e685.
- Wildeman, Christopher. 2009. "Parental Imprisonment, the Prison Boom, and the Concentration of Childhood Advantage." *Demography* 46:265–280.
- Wildeman, Christopher. 2010. "Paternal Incarceration and Children's Physically Aggressive Behaviors: Evidence from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study." *Social Forces* 89:285–309.
- Wildeman, Christopher, Jason Schnittker, and Kristin Turney. 2012. "Despair by Association? The Mental Health of Mothers with Children by Recently Incarcerated Father." *American Sociological Review* 77:216–243.
- Wildeman, Christopher, Kristin Turney, and Jason Schnittker. 2014. "The Hedonic Consequences of Punishment Revisited." *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 104:133–163.
- Wildeman, Christopher, Sara Wakefield, and Kristin Turney. 2013. "Misidentifying the Effects of Parental Imprisonment? A Comment on Johnson and Easterling (2012)." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 75:252–258.

Wildeman, Christopher, and Bruce Western. 2010. "Incarceration in Fragile Families."  
*Future of Children* 20:181–201.

Woodcock, Richard W., Kevin S. McGrew, and Nancy Mather. 2001. *Woodcock-Johnson III Tests of Achievement*. Itasca, IL: Riverside Publishing.

Xie, Yu, Jennie E. Brand, and Ben Jann. 2012. "Estimating Heterogeneous Treatment Effects with Observational Data." *Sociological Methodology* 42:314–347.