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Introduction

• Research emphasizes
  • Neighborhood dynamics and crime
    • Change over time
    • Spatial concentration of crime
  • Comparing neighborhood effects across population and location
    • Sex, race, and intersectionality
  • Housing and crime
    • Impact of foreclosures on crime, domestic violence, child maltreatment
  • Neighborhoods and Reentry
The Beginning...

Criminal Justice
Brooklyn, NY

Residents on Probation/Parole

- 126 to 250
- 51 to 125
- 26 to 60
- 11 to 25
- Under 11
- None 0
Large Number of Prisoners Returning
(Source: Uggen, Manza, & Thompson 2006)
They All Come Back

- At end of 2016, there were 4.5M individuals under community supervision (BJS, 2018)
  - More than 800,000 released onto parole
- Parolees and communities must navigate challenges associated with reintegration
- What impact do neighborhoods have on former prisoners?
- What impact do parolees have on neighborhoods?
Neighborhoods Play a Factor in Parolee Success

- Parolees returning to disadvantaged neighborhoods are more likely to reoffend (Kubrin & Stewart, 2006)
- Individuals returning to poor neighborhoods less likely to be employed, and lower wages (Morenoff & Harding, 2011)
- Parolees residing in neighborhoods near social services have lower rates of recidivism (Hipp, Petersilia & Turner, 2010)
- Recidivism rate higher for those returning to areas with few socioeconomic resources (Mears, Wang, Hay & Bales, 2008)
Magnitude of Reentry Matters (Chamberlain & Wallace, 2016)

- Clustering of former inmates into small number of neighborhoods
- Does this concentration at the neighborhood level exacerbate reoffending at the individual level.
- Challenges of reentry—housing, employment, social services—become scarcer as more individuals compete for limited opportunities
- Prevents disassociating from criminal associates
- Primarily return to disadvantaged neighborhoods
  - Low levels of informal social control to monitor behavior
  - Fewer resources/organizations to meet service needs
Findings: Magnitude of Reentry Matters (Chamberlain & Wallace, 2016)

• Concentration: 24% of parolees in Cincinnati; 18% in Cleveland, 26% in Columbus concentrated in 5% of neighborhoods

• Former prisoners returning to neighborhoods with high concentrations of parolees were 67% more likely to recidivate compared to those in low return neighborhoods (controlling for individual factors)
  • Those returning to neighborhoods with average concentrations of former prisoners were 41% more likely compared to low return neighborhoods
  • Residential stability tempers these effects
Specific Concentrations of Former Prisoners Matter (Chamberlain & Boggess, 2018)

• Parolees can contribute to neighborhood crime directly through reoffending

• But, not all offenders are created equal (not an equal likelihood of reoffending)
  • Certain characteristics—priors, crime type, age—increase the like of recidivating
  • Neighborhoods with greater concentrations of higher-likelihood-of-recidivating parolees may be affected by higher crime rates

• The criminogenic effects of these concentrations of certain types of offenders may be conditioned by neighborhood
  • Disadvantaged neighborhoods, which lack services, social capital, informal social control, may experience higher rates of crime
Specific Concentrations of Parolees Matter (Chamberlain & Boggess, 2018)

Figure 1: Effect of Interaction of Percent Parolees Convicted of Drug Offense and Concentrated Disadvantage on Neighborhood Property Crime
Former Prisoners can Impact Crime & Neighborhood Structure (Chamberlain, 2018)

- Former prisoners may contribute to crime directly and indirectly

  - Directly → engage in crime/reoffend
  - Directly → impact neighborhood structure
    - Exacerbate poverty, instability, vacancy
  - Indirectly → a source of ecological change
    - Disadvantaged neighborhoods are more accessible to reentrants; may reduce neighborhood desirability, impacting vacancy, poverty, stability
  - Indirectly → engagement in criminal activity may result in out-migration; decreases likelihood of people moving to the neighborhood
Former Prisoners can Impact Crime & Neighborhood Structure (Chamberlain, 2018)
Former Prisoners can Impact Crime & Neighborhood Structure (Chamberlain, 2018)

- Findings:
  - Parolees have a direct effect on neighborhood structure
    - Increase residential vacancies, property sales,
  - Parolees have a direct effect on neighborhood crime
    - Increase violent and property crime
  - Parolees have an indirect effect neighborhood structure
    - Parolees increase property sales through property crime
    - Parolees increase vacancy rates through violent crime
    - Violent crime increases property sales through parolees
Parole Recidivism and Rural Context: Assessing Similarities and Differences across Urban and Rural Areas

- Coauthored with Tony Grubesic and Danielle Wallace
- Does neighborhood context differentially impact recidivism across urban and rural contexts?
Less Urbanized Neighborhoods and Recidivism

• Neighborhood characteristics in non-urban areas may impact recidivism differently

• Magnitude of reentry is smaller
  • Fewer criminal associates, possibly better social networks
  • Stigmatization may be greater
  • Acquaintanceship density (Freudenbury, 1986)

• Less economic diversity
  • Poverty is higher in rural areas compared to urban, but not as concentrated
  • Rural job market is small
  • Small business owners, service sector jobs (Besser, 1997; Gibbs, Kusmin & Cromartie, 2004)
Less Urbanized Neighborhoods and Recidivism

- **Housing and homelessness**
  - Most housing in rural areas is owner occupied
  - Rural homeless population more likely to have been incarcerated (64%) compared to urban (55%) or suburban (44%) (Burt, et al., 1999)

- **Services/programs**
  - Spatial isolation—live an average of 13 miles from nearest provider (Leukefeld et al., 2002)
  - Rural residents less likely to use illegal drugs, more likely to use alcohol, compared to urban residents (Ellsworth, 2001)
    - ...but among former prisoners, this does not hold (Leukefeld et al. 2002)
  - Distrustful of outsiders; difficult to keep private matter
Research Question

• Expanding on previous research
  • Large number of parolees, multiple cities, differing degrees of urbanization

• Does parolee success vary across neighborhood and community type?

• Does the degree to which a community is considered “urban” differentially impact recidivism?
Data comes from Multiple Sources

• Subject Data comes from ODRC
  • All prisoners released in Ohio and under some form of community supervision between 2000 and 2009
  • Data includes inmate profiles, criminal histories, risk level, community movements, and reincarceration
  • Address information every 6 months
    • Geocoded to block group (n=8,855)
    • Examining 81,857 parolees released to 1,037 cities

• Contextual data comes from US Census and ACS
### Parolee Characteristics

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent Male</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent African American</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent White</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Age</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Married</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Convicted of Violent Crime</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Convicted of Property Crime</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Convicted of Drug Crime</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Sex Offenders</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Gang Members</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Priors</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Individual and Neighborhood Variables

• Outcome: Recidivism

• Individual-Level Characteristics
  • Demographics (age, race, sex, marital status)
  • Offense/Supervision Characteristics
    • Most serious conviction offense, priors, level of supervision

• Neighborhood-Level Characteristics
  • Poverty, unemployment, HH income, length of residence, occupancy status, percent single parent HH, ethnic heterogeneity, percent Black
Developing a Measure of Urbanization

• Different degrees of “urban”

• Census designated Places

• Used two-stage clustering approach based on:
  • Presence of primary road (interstate)
  • Population (logged), population density (square mile), nearest urbanized area, area (size)

• Resulted in 5 categories (0-4), with 0 being least urban
  • Majority of parolees return to urban areas
Breakdown of Parolees by degree of Urbanization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Urbanization</th>
<th>Number of Parolees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>59,334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average Distribution of Parolees by Block Group, Ohio 2000-2009
Average Distribution of Parolees by Block Group, 2000-2009
Average Distribution of Parolees by Block Group, Cuyahoga County, 2000-2009
Average Distribution of Parolees by Block Group, Marion County, 2000-2009
Average Distribution of Parolees and Services by Block Group, Cuyahoga County, 2000-2009
Methods

• Hierarchical Discrete Time Hazard Model

• Allows for estimation for individual, neighborhood and city effects simultaneously
  • Enables the examination of moves within individual within 1 spell out of prison

• Data censored at discharge
Results: Overall Model

• Individual Characteristics
  • Positive association: black, male, intense supervision, high supervision, basis supervision, property offense, other offense, priors
  • Negative association: married, drug offense, days out

• Neighborhood Characteristics
  • Positive association: unemployment, occupied, ethnic heterogeneity, percent black
  • Negative association: HH income, poverty, owner, single parent HH

• Urbanization
  • Less urbanized places have higher rates of recidivism compared to most urbanized.
  • Most rural not significant
Odds of Recidivating based on Individual Level Factors Across Differing Levels of Urbanization
Odds of Recidivating based on Individual Level Factors Across Differing Levels of Urbanization

- Intense
- High
- Basic

Urbanization Levels:
- Urban=1
- Urban=2
- Urban=3
- Urban=4
Odds of Recidivating based on Neighborhood Level Factors Across Differing Levels of Urbanization

- Urban=1
- Urban=2
- Urban=3
- Urban=4
Neighborhoods Influence Parolee Success

- Individual and neighborhood factors differ across levels or urbanization
- Neighborhood factors most prevalent in more Urbanized areas
- Individual-level factors seem to be augmented in both rural and urban areas
- Pathways of inequality
  - Where someone returns to has a profound impact on success
Future Directions

• Magnitude of reentry
  • Does the type of clustering vary by community type?

• Proximity of resources
  • Location of services vs. burden of services

• Assess differences in community types
  • Regardless of what city or location a reentracer moves to, are there differences in community types and resources?

• Residential instability among reentrants
  • Are they moving to better or worse neighborhoods when they move?
Thank you!