



The long reach of parental incarceration: The case of institutional engagement[☆]

Yader R. Lanuza^{a,*}, Kristin Turney^b

^a University of California, Santa Barbara, USA

^b University of California, Irvine, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Family
Inequality
Incarceration
Institutional engagement

ABSTRACT

Vast surveillance, especially of those with criminal justice contact, is a key feature of contemporary societies. As a consequence of this surveillance, formerly incarcerated individuals both avoid and are excluded from institutions, and this dampened institutional engagement may extend to offspring of the incarcerated. Using the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health, we examine the relationship between parental incarceration and young adult institutional engagement in different settings, including financial institutions, medical institutions, school and work, volunteer organizations, and religious institutions. We find parental incarceration is associated with diminished institutional engagement in young adulthood. This association is partially explained by reduced parental institutional engagement during adolescence in addition to young adult's impaired health, lack of trust in government, and criminal justice contact. Our findings highlight a subtle and pervasive way that parental incarceration influences the transition to adulthood.

1. Introduction

Social institutions—including banks, hospitals, and schools—are necessary for individual and community wellbeing (Small 2009). However, engagement with these entities is increasingly subject to surveillance (Giddens 1990), the concerted effort to develop strategies of governance, commerce, and social control (Foucault 1977; Haggerty and Ericson, 2000). The emerging “dragnet” of increasingly intertwined surveillance practices results in increased monitoring of individuals and groups, including those who previously experienced minimal or no observation (Angwin 2014). Arguably, no institution has adopted surveillance practices more forcefully than the criminal justice system, whose “mark” extends well beyond its domain (Brayne 2017; Goffman 2009; Pager 2003;

[☆] Direct correspondence to Yader R. Lanuza (yrlanzel@soc.ucsb.edu), Department of Sociology, University of California, Santa Barbara. Social Sciences & Media Studies Bldg. University of California, Santa Barbara. Santa Barbara, CA 93106–9430. This research uses data from Add Health, a program project directed by Kathleen Mullan Harris and designed by J. Richard Udry, Peter S. Bearman, and Kathleen Mullan Harris at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and funded by Grant P01-HD31921 from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, with cooperative funding from 23 other federal agencies and foundations. Special acknowledgment is given to Ronald R. Rindfuss and Barbara Entwisle for assistance in the original design. Information on how to obtain the Add Health data files is available on the Add Health website (<http://www.cpc.unc.edu/addhealth>). No direct support was received from Grant P01-HD31921 for this analysis. Turney's work on this project was supported by grants from the Foundation for Child Development and the William T. Grant Foundation.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: yrlanzel@soc.ucsb.edu (Y.R. Lanuza).

Simon 2005). Contact with the criminal justice system, particularly contact via incarceration, impairs an individual's engagement with a range of interconnected institutions and multiplies the number of sites where individuals can be targeted for inspection and punishment (Beckett and Herbert 2010; Haskins and Jacobsen 2017). For example, private rental landlords use background checks to discriminate against formerly incarcerated individuals (Thacher 2008). In addition to these exclusionary practices (and because of them), formerly incarcerated individuals commonly engage in institutional avoidance to circumvent intrusive state surveillance (Brayne 2014; Goffman 2009).

Importantly, formerly incarcerated individuals do not exist in isolation and are instead connected to a web of family members, including offspring (Comfort 2008), for whom their incarceration can be consequential (Foster and Hagan 2015). Therefore, institutional engagement practices (or lack thereof) stemming from incarceration may not be limited to formerly incarcerated individuals and instead may also be exhibited by their young adult children. Therefore, we investigate the relationship between parental incarceration and institutional disengagement in young adulthood—measured in the context of financial institutions, medical institutions, school and work, volunteer organizations, and religious institutions—using data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health). Anchored in theoretical perspectives around family, culture, and punishment, we first establish a relationship between parental incarceration and institutional disengagement in young adulthood. We then investigate the mechanisms underlying this relationship. Understanding institutional engagement in young adulthood is imperative because successful transition through this developmental milestone *requires* institutional engagement (Arnett 2014). Because parental incarceration is concentrated among the most disadvantaged children, diminished institutional engagement may exacerbate their precarious social position during this increasingly protracted, unequal, and tumultuous life course stage and further exacerbate social inequality.

2. Background

The American penal strategy is singularly characterized by a “marked, monitored existence” for those with criminal justice contact (Garland 2001), what Simon (2005) describes as a “new penology.” Incessant and constant monitoring is part of a larger trend in contemporary societies, which are characterized by omnipresent surveillance (Giddens 1990), what Garland (2001) refers to as a “culture of control.” In such a context, we observe the “disappearance of the disappearance,” whereby individuals find it increasingly difficult to maintain their anonymity (Haggerty and Ericson 2000:619).

Although surveillance is not new, what is different today is the extent of surveillance practices, especially those emanating from the criminal justice system whose purpose is to surveil and control the population. This surveillance reaches virtually all major social institutions, which are increasingly interdependent. This means that a “record” in the criminal justice system has a range of negative consequences for individuals in other settings (Marx 2002; Pager 2003), sometimes referred to as “collateral restrictions” (Ewald 2012). For example, owners and managers of private rental properties are increasingly conducting criminal background checks on prospective renters to discriminate against those with an incarceration history (Thacher 2008). Similarly, TANF and food stamps are not extended to individuals with felony drug-related incarceration histories (Rubinstein and Mukamal 2002). Currently and formerly incarcerated individuals also experience limits to their voting rights (Manza and Uggen 2008). Institutional rules limit, or outright ban, formerly incarcerated individuals' access to their services and resources. Further, negative interactions with authorities such as the police distance individuals from political, government, and private institutions by fostering “legal cynicism” (Stuart et al., 2015). This legal cynicism can outweigh even consistently positive encounters with these representatives. The increasing reach of incarceration's consequences, coupled with negative encounters with criminal justice representatives, fosters institutional detachment (Weaver and Lerman 2010).

Researchers document that individuals “marked” with a criminal record minimize their institutional engagement. For example, Lageson (2016) finds that individuals with criminal justice contact opt out of meaningful engagement with social institutions, largely due to fear that their records will be discovered by institutional representatives and their own family members (also see Haskins and Jacobsen 2017). Similarly, Goffman's (2009) ethnographic account suggests that individuals with a criminal record are constantly “on the run,” avoiding institutions such as banks and hospitals because engaging with these institutions can lead to further confinement. These processes are also documented in nationally representative survey data. Individuals with criminal justice contact practice “system avoidance,” defined as “the practice of individuals avoiding institutions that keep formal records” (Brayne 2014:368). Specifically, formerly incarcerated young adults are more likely than their counterparts to avoid financial institutions and to avoid school and work (Brayne 2014).

In short, for those with incarceration histories, the behavior toward institutions is a consequence of a mixture of *avoidance* and *exclusion* (Alexander 2010). Through a range of material, discursive, and symbolic processes, marginalized groups are discouraged from institutional engagement (Bourdieu 1980). For example, groups are excluded for being unable to pay entrance fees, not “dressing up the part,” not understanding or deploying the field's nomenclature, or not being able to physically reach organizational settings. Avoidance and exclusion are often mutually constitutive, as initial and recurrent exclusion from institutions may generate avoidance, a form of self-exclusion. Thus, avoidance and exclusion are two sides of the same coin that diminish institutional engagement.

2.1. Linking parental incarceration to institutional disengagement

Much previous research on the intergenerational consequences of parental incarceration relies on family stress theory, which considers the family an organizational unit that experiences and copes with stressors, the consequences of which can lead to obstacles, deterrents, and, in some cases, dissolution (Conger et al., 2002; McCubbin et al., 1980). Family stressors, which are unequally distributed across the population, can have negative repercussions for the individual experiencing the stress and for the entire family

unit. Indeed, parental incarceration has been conceptualized as a family stressor (e.g., [Arditti 2016](#); [Turney 2014](#)) and this stressor may lead to institutional disengagement for the offspring of the incarcerated.

Theorizing parental incarceration as a stressor has helped scholars understand how parental carceral confinement has intergenerational consequences. In addition to acting as a stressor, parental incarceration likely influences fundamental individual dispositions (*habitus*, in Bourdieu's language), including unexamined, routine behavior toward institutions, such as disengagement (see below for a full discussion) ([Bourdieu 1980](#)). Although we cannot disentangle the extent to which *stress* versus *habitus* shape intergenerational family dynamics, theorizing *habitus*—in addition to stress as an intergenerational consequential link that scholars largely rely on—helps us highlight another possible mechanism through which parental incarceration is related to institutional disengagement among young adults. Beyond subjecting family to stress, itself consequential for intergenerational family dynamics, parental incarceration may deflect dispositions, or *habitus*, that lead to institutional disengagement during young adulthood.

Notably, most currently and formerly incarcerated individuals are parents ([Mumola 2000](#)), and they too exhibit limited institutional engagement, resulting from a mixture of avoidance and exclusionary practices. Parents with incarceration histories limit engagement with organizations their children have quotidian contact with and to which they need their parents to be connected, such as schools ([Haskins and Jacobsen 2017](#)). There are at least four pathways through which parental incarceration may lessen institutional engagement among young adults: socialization processes, impaired health, lack of trust in government, and criminal justice contact. Each of these four processes results from a simultaneous mixture of avoidance and exclusion, albeit to varying degrees, and we cannot adjudicate between these two possibilities. An alternative possibility is that the relationship between parental incarceration and institutional disengagement among young adults is spurious.

2.2. Socialization

First, Bourdieu (1980:53) argues that socialization processes shape one's *habitus*, "a system of lasting and transposable dispositions which, integrating past experiences, functions at every moment as a matrix of perceptions, appreciations and actions and made possible the achievement of infinitely diversified tasks." It describes "one's conception of where one fits in the social world" ([Feliciano and Lanuza 2017:215](#)) and the set of tendencies, propensities, and inclinations that emerge from that conception. Bourdieu further highlights that structuring structures (*habitus*) are anchored in historical epochs. To understand *habitus* development among those who have experienced parental incarceration, then, it is crucial to see it as intimately tied to the era of mass incarceration ([Garland 2001](#)).

An application of this Bourdieuan framework suggests that parental incarceration may shape children's unconscious dispositions through parental institutional disengagement practices. Formerly incarcerated parents avoid and are excluded from institutions, which engenders disengagement practices that become routinized in their households. Their children are subject to these routinized institutional disengagement practices (and the logic behind these practices), which they internalize as normal and natural (that is, part of their *habitus*). In other words, parental incarceration may introduce limited institutional engagement practices into children's socialization process.¹ This may engender limited institutional engagement dispositions in children, even in the absence of their own criminal justice contact. For example, Goffman (2009:343) writes, "Children learn at an early age to watch out for the police and to prepare to run." Similarly, [Stuart \(2016\)](#) shows that Skid Row residents develop "interpretive schemas," such as "cop wisdom" that dictates behavior, expressed in "embodied knowledge" to deflect, subvert, and, importantly, *disengage from* criminal justice contact. Further, [Rios \(2011\)](#) shows how criminalization deflected parenting practices and "led young people to develop a specific set of beliefs, thoughts, actions, and practices"—or *habitus*—and made weary of community institutions ([Fong 2018](#)). These ethnographic accounts suggest that children who experience parental incarceration are exposed to their parents' limited institutional engagement. Parents' abstention from offspring's school settings highlights the quotidian exposure of children to limited institutional engagement ([Haskins and Jacobsen 2017](#)).² Importantly, early socialization processes, including dispositions toward social institutions, endures through the transition to adulthood ([Lareau 2003](#)).

Incarceration likely increases institutional disengagement among the formerly incarcerated, as described above, but it also likely increases institutional disengagement of those connected to the formerly incarcerated individual such as romantic partners. Indeed, a large literature documents mostly deleterious "spillover" consequences of incarceration ([Bruns 2017](#); [Comfort 2008](#); [Massoglia et al., 2011](#); [Turney and Wildeman 2013, 2018](#)). Accordingly, it is likely that mothers' incarceration influences her institutional disengagement and her partner's institutional disengagement and that fathers' incarceration influences his institutional disengagement and his partner's institutional disengagement. Partners of previously incarcerated individuals may disengage from institutional settings, for example, to protect their loved one from surveillance and social control ([Fong 2018](#); [Goffman 2014](#)). Because the consequences of incarceration reach both the parent who was incarcerated and the parent who was not incarcerated, institutional disengagement associated with parental incarceration likely reaches children, even if parents do not live together and the parent with whom the child lives is not the parent who experienced incarceration.

¹ In their review, [Foster and Hagan \(2015\)](#) refer to a theoretical framework called the "socialization" perspective. However, the theoretical argument that undergirds this socialization perspective—based on social learning theory and the formation of social bonds—differs from the argument we propose here.

² Of course, children can be exposed to and learn this behavior not just from parents, but also from other family members and their neighborhood context ([Goffman 2014](#)). Nevertheless, institutional disengagement's imperatives, reinforcing mechanisms, and quotidian practices are laid bare at home, as parents are most influential in shaping children's attitudes and subsequent behavior ([Harris 1998](#)).

In addition, the range of actors on whom the state relies on to punish and exclude families (“third-party intermediaries”) has proliferated (Elliott and Reid, 2019; Fong 2018). This expansion may lead to lower engagement across “surveilling” (such as financial, medical, labor market, and educational) and “non-surveilling” (such as volunteer or religious) institutions. Brayne (2014) argues that the distinction between surveilling and non-surveilling institutions is important for individuals with criminal justice contact. But for offspring of the formerly incarcerated, whose practices may not always be tied to formal sanctions, this distinction may be less informative and consequential, especially because incarceration affects entire communities and leads parents to reconfigure parenting practices across institutional domains to limit surveillance and punishment (Elliott and Reid, 2019; Fong 2018), though the extent to which the “surveilling” and “non-surveilling” distinction is important for those exposed to parental incarceration remains an empirical question.

2.3. Impaired health

Second, the stressor of parental incarceration may be associated with institutional disengagement through young adults’ impaired health. Parental incarceration is a stressor with reverberating consequences across generations (Pearlin et al., 2005), including lasting deleterious consequences for children’s health (Lee et al., 2013). Specifically, parental incarceration can strain the body’s immune and cardiovascular systems, making the body subject to impaired health (McEwen 1998). Parental incarceration increases the likelihood of experiencing health conditions including asthma, migraines, depression, PTSD, and anxiety (Lee et al., 2013). In turn, health limitations impair young adults’ ability to engage with social institutions. For example, young adults with depressive symptoms experience challenges in the labor market (Lerner et al., 2010). Likewise, physical and mental impairments can hinder schooling (Jackson 2009) and diminish social and civil participation (Sattoe et al., 2014).

2.4. Lack of trust

Third, the stressor of parental incarceration may be associated with institutional disengagement through young adults’ lack of trust in the government. Indeed, incarceration shapes beliefs about government legitimacy, and, therefore, in how much individuals trust institutions (Lee et al., 2014). These negative feelings and perceptions are not limited to those subjected to state punishment, but extend to their family members, including offspring, who witness their parents succumb to state power (Lee et al., 2014). In turn, lower levels of governmental trust among young adults can depress their willingness to engage in social institutions, especially if these institutions are connected to—or are perceived to be an extension of—the government (Tyler and Huo, 2002). For example, lower trust in state institutions may erode one’s willingness to solicit help from state-sponsored job-seeking programs, to seek insurance and medical care, or to engage in financial institutions such as banks (Fong 2018).

2.5. Criminal justice contact

Fourth, the relationship between parental incarceration and institutional disengagement may operate through young adults’ own contact with the criminal justice system in the form of police stops, arrests, convictions, and incarceration. Criminological scholarship suggests a number of mechanisms through which parental incarceration can increase criminal justice contact for their children, including psychological (separation anxiety) and social (stigma and strain) pathways (Farrington 2002; Flynn 2013; Murray et al., 2007). Among the most influential is general strain theory, which argues that strains—inability to achieve one’s goals, loss of positive stimuli, and being subject to negative stimuli—increase criminal involvement (Agnew 2012). Parents who have experienced incarceration are more likely to subject their children to criminogenic-inducing strains, increasing their likelihood of criminal involvement and its corresponding criminal justice contact. Indeed, the association between parental incarceration and criminal justice contact is well documented (Roettger and Swisher 2011). In turn, criminal justice contact among young adults can facilitate institutional disengagement for the same reasons it minimizes institutional engagement among their parents; that is, young adults with criminal justice contact may wish to avoid the negative consequences associated with increased surveillance, including stigma and social control (Braman 2004; Brayne 2014). Further, young adults may be subject to the same exclusionary practices that their parents (with incarceration histories) suffer, such as finding it difficult to secure rental housing or employment precisely because of criminal justice contact.

2.6. Selection into parental incarceration

A final possibility is that the association between parental incarceration and institutional disengagement in young adulthood is spurious. In accordance with theories of family stress, exposure to parental incarceration is not random; instead, it is concentrated among children of color, children of parents with low levels of educational attainment, and children living in households with incomes below the poverty line (Foster and Hagan 2015; Johnson and Easterling 2012; Wakefield and Ugen 2010). Those experiencing parental incarceration commonly experience other stressors (Turney 2018). That is, the generally disadvantaged social status of individuals exposed to parental incarceration may make them fundamentally likely to avoid or be excluded from institutions, regardless of whether their parent was incarcerated. The demographic and socioeconomic differences between those who do and do not experience parental incarceration may explain observed bivariate differences across groups.

3. Data, measures, and analytic strategy

3.1. Data

To examine the relationship between parental incarceration and institutional disengagement, we use data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health), a nationally representative sample of adolescents in seventh through twelfth grade during the 1994–1995 school year. Respondents were interviewed four times: at Wave I (1994–1995, with parents also interviewed at this time), Wave II (1996), Wave III (2001–2002, when respondents were ages 18 to 28), Wave IV (2008–2009, when respondents were ages 24 to 34), and Wave V (2016–2018, when respondents were ages 34 to 43). About 79% of sampled adolescents participated in Wave I; of these, 88% participated in Wave II, 77% in Wave III, 80% in Wave IV, and 69% in Wave V.

The analytic sample contains 12,094 observations. Of the original 20,774 respondents, we exclude 6,452 observations without sampling weights. We also exclude 2,228 observations with missing values on any of the dependent variables (measured in Waves III and IV). Importantly, as sampling weights account for attrition and non-response, any differences between the original and analytic samples should not bias our results (also see [Brownstein et al. n.d.](#)).

3.2. Measures

3.2.1. Dependent variables

The primary dependent variable is a summary measure of institutional disengagement, which comprises five individual binary measures, consistent with previous research ([Brayne 2014](#)). The individual measures are as follows: (1) disengagement from financial institutions (1 = *does not have a checking account*); (2) disengagement from medical institutions (1 = *did not get medical care when necessary in the past year*); (3) disengagement from school and work (1 = *not enrolled in school and not working at least 10 hours*); (4) disengagement from volunteer organizations (1 = *did not perform any unpaid or volunteer or community service work in the past year*)³; and (5) disengagement from religious institutions (1 = *did not attend religious services in the past year*).

We measured institutional disengagement at two time points, first at Wave III and again at Wave IV. At Wave III, we sum together the five disengagement measures, and at Wave IV we sum together the four disengagement measures (as respondents were not asked about engagement with financial institutions at this wave); thus, higher values constitute more disengagement from institutional settings. We primarily consider these summary measures because we are interested in broad patterns of institutional disengagement, but we also separately estimate each of the individual forms of disengagement (see Appendix [Table 1](#)). We examine both Wave III and IV outcomes because previous research suggests that the contemporary transition to adulthood has become longer and more unequal, roughly spanning from ages 18 to early thirties ([Arnett 2014](#); [Furstenberg 2010](#); [Rumbaut and Golnaz, 2010](#); [Swisher et al., 2013](#)). Thus, it is important to understand whether parental incarceration has a long reach, possibly hindering the contemporary transition to adulthood in its entirety, extending its reach well into the early 30s (and beyond).

Institutional disengagement was fairly common among respondents. At Wave III, 27.4% of respondents disengaged from financial institutions, 22.7% disengaged from medical institutions, 16.2% disengaged from school and work, 71.7% disengaged from volunteer organizations, and 27.9% disengaged from religious institutions. On average, respondents were not engaged with 1.7 of the five institutions at Wave III.

3.2.2. Independent variables

We measure parental incarceration using the following questions ascertained in Wave IV: (1) “Has/did your biological father/mother ever (spend/spent) time in jail or prison?” and (2) “How old were you when your biological father/mother went to jail or prison for the first time?” The measure of parental incarceration comprises three mutually exclusive categories: no parental incarceration; parental incarceration in childhood or adolescence (prior to Wave I); and parental incarceration before birth and/or after Wave I. The analyses focus on differences between those who experienced parental incarceration in childhood or adolescence and those who never experienced parental incarceration. Importantly, we focus on these groups to ensure proper ordering between dependent, independent, mediating, and control variables. More than one-tenth of respondents (10.9%) experienced parental incarceration in childhood or adolescence.⁴ In supplemental analyses, we considered individuals whose parents had been incarcerated prior to their birth as having experienced parental incarceration—and therefore part of the “parental incarceration in childhood or adolescence” group—because family institutional disengagement, in particular, may have emerged prior to child’s birth. The results (available upon request) are substantively similar to those presented here.

3.2.3. Mechanisms

We consider four sets of mechanisms linking parental incarceration and institutional disengagement: (1) parental institutional disengagement, (2) young adult’s health, (3) young adult’s trust in government, and (4) young adult’s criminal justice contact.

³ Given high disengagement from volunteer organizations for the entire sample, we considered excluding this measure from our dependent variable. We opted to include it because it is important to show that *even in organizations with wide disengagement*, offspring who have experienced parental incarceration are more likely to disengage from these institutions compared to their peers who have not experienced parental incarceration. Further, scholars document that volunteering can be beneficial ([Piliavin and Siegl, 2007](#)).

⁴ In the case of different timing of paternal and maternal incarceration, we prioritize incarceration before Wave I.

Table 1
Weighted descriptive statistics of variables in analysis (N = 12,094).

	Mean or %	(S.D.)
<i>Dependent Variables</i>		
Institutional disengagement (Wave III, range: 0 to 5)	1.659	(1.118)
Disengagement from financial institutions	27.4%	
Disengagement from medical institutions	22.7%	
Disengagement from school and work	16.2%	
Disengagement from volunteer organizations	71.7%	
Disengagement from religious institutions	27.9%	
Institutional disengagement (Wave IV, range: 0 to 4)	1.356	(0.951)
Disengagement from medical institutions	25.0%	
Disengagement from school and work	15.2%	
Disengagement from volunteer organizations	63.6%	
Disengagement from religious institutions	31.7%	
<i>Independent Variables</i>		
Parental incarceration		
None	84.9%	
Before Wave I	10.9%	
Before birth or after Wave I	4.1%	
<i>Mechanisms</i>		
Parent needed but did not receive health care	19.5%	
Parent difficulty getting medical care for family (range: 0 to 3)	0.610	(0.905)
Mother not employed	21.4%	
Father not employed	5.9%	
Parent not a member of parent-teacher organization	68.2%	
Parent not a member of civic or social organization	87.2%	
Parent did not attend religious services in past year	21.2%	
Respondent health limitations (range: 0 to 2)	0.087	(0.222)
Respondent depressive symptoms (range: 0 to 3)	0.498	(0.450)
Respondent trust in government (range: 0 to 4)	2.303	(0.888)
Respondent criminal justice contact (range: 0 to 4)	0.412	(0.863)
<i>Control Variables</i>		
Respondent race		
Non-Hispanic White	66.9%	
Non-Hispanic Black	14.9%	
Hispanic	11.3%	
Non-Hispanic other race	6.9%	
Respondent age (range: 18 to 28)	22.293	(1.739)
Respondent female	50.7%	
Respondent native-born	94.9%	
Mother age (range: 30 to 89)	41.414	(6.504)
Parent educational attainment		
Less than high school	12.3%	
High school diploma or GED	31.6%	
Some college	21.8%	
College degree	34.3%	
Completed parent survey	88.3%	
Respondent number of siblings (range: 0 to 12)	1.377	(1.184)
Respondent reports verbal/physical/sexual abuse prior to age 12	24.4%	
Respondent quite or extremely close to biological mother	85.9%	
Respondent quite or extremely close to biological father	64.6%	
Respondent reports drugs available at home	3.0%	
Respondent delinquency (range: 0 to 3)	0.278	(0.342)
Respondent exposure to violence (range: 0 to 2)	0.094	(0.226)
Parent household income (\$)	33,986	(2,338)
Parent has enough money to pay bills	82.8%	
Parent married	72.5%	
Parent drinks at least three days a week	5.5%	
Parent reports drugs a big problem in neighborhood	7.8%	
Parent overall health (range: 0 to 4)	2.589	(1.037)
Parent religiosity (range: 0 to 3)	2.335	(0.930)

Notes: Analyses account for Add Health's stratified sampling design.

First, parental institutional disengagement is measured with seven variables reported by parents at Wave I, corresponding to the measures of institutional disengagement reported by respondents during young adulthood. Two variables capture parental disengagement from medical institutions, a binary variable indicating the parent reported needing but not receiving health care in the past

year and a continuous variable indicating the level of difficulty in getting medical care for family (0 = *very easy* to 3 = *very hard*). Parental disengagement from work is measured with binary variables indicating the mother and father is not employed, respectively.⁵ Parental disengagement from volunteer organizations is measured by two variables, a binary variable indicating the parent is not a member of a parent-teacher organization and a binary variable indicating the parent is not a member of a civic or social organization (e.g., Junior League, Rotary, or Knights of Columbus). Finally, parental disengagement from religious institutions is measured with a binary variable indicating the parent did not attend religious services in the past year.

Second, health is measured by health limitations and depressive symptoms at Wave III. Health limitations is an average of responses to 10 statements regarding the extent to which health limits activities such lifting or carrying a bag of groceries (0 = *not limited at all* to 2 = *limited a lot*; $\alpha = 0.89$). Depressive symptoms is an average of responses to nine statements, with respondents asked to reflect on the past seven days (0 = *never or rarely* to 3 = *most or the time or all of the time*) to statements such as “you were bothered by things that don’t usually bother you” and “you were too tired to do things” ($\alpha = 0.80$).

Third, trust in government is measured by averaging responses to the following three statements at Wave III (0 = *strongly disagree* to 4 = *strongly agree*): (a) I trust the federal government; (b) I trust the state government; and (c) I trust my local government ($\alpha = 0.94$; Lee et al., 2014).

Fourth, criminal justice contact is measured by summing together four (non-mutually exclusive) binary variables ascertained at Wave III: (1) ever stopped or detained by the police; (2) ever arrested or taken into custody by the police; (3) ever convicted of a crime; and (4) ever sentenced to jail or prison.

3.2.4. Control variables

The multivariate analyses adjust for control variables measured at Wave I (unless otherwise noted). We adjust for respondents’ race/ethnicity (non-Hispanic White, non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic, non-Hispanic other race), age, gender, nativity (a binary indicating the respondent was born in the United States), number of siblings, reports of verbal/physical/sexual abuse prior to age 12 (measured at Wave IV), closeness to biological fathers and mothers (1 = *extremely close*), and reports of drugs at home. We also account for mother’s age, parental highest educational attainment, and whether a parent survey was completed. Respondent’s delinquency is measured by averaging responses to 15 questions about the frequency (0 = *never* to 3 = *5 or more times*) of engagement in delinquent activities such as theft, fighting, or vandalism ($\alpha = 0.84$). Respondent’s exposure to violence averages responses to five questions about the frequency (0 = *never* to 2 = *more than once*) of witnessing events such as shootings or stabbings ($\alpha = 0.66$). We also adjust for parent-reported household income (logged) and the following parent-reported binary measures: parent has enough money to pay bills; parent is married; parent drinks at least three days per week; parent reports drugs are a big problem in the neighborhood; parent overall health (0 = *poor* to 4 = *excellent*); and parent religiosity (0 = *not important at all* to 3 = *very important*). Supplemental analyses adjust for the gender of the reporting parent. The results (available upon request) are substantively similar as the more parsimonious models presented here.

3.3. Analytic strategy

The analysis of the relationship between parental incarceration and institutional disengagement occurs in three stages. In the first analytic stage, we examine descriptive differences in institutional disengagement and the proposed mechanisms across two groups: respondents who experienced parental incarceration in childhood or adolescence (prior to Wave I) and respondents who did not experience parental incarceration. We use chi-square and t-tests, depending on the distribution of the outcome variable, to test for statistically significant differences across groups.

In the second analytic stage, we use negative binomial regression models to estimate institutional disengagement as a function of parental incarceration, adjusting for an array of control variables that might render this relationship spurious. Negative binomial regression is appropriate because the dependent variable is a count variable (Long 1997).⁶ Note that the key explanatory variable, parental incarceration, occurs between the respondents’ birth and Wave I and the control variables are measured at Wave I (and necessarily after exposure to parental incarceration). Therefore, this fully adjusted model is likely a conservative estimate of the relationship between parental incarceration and institutional disengagement. As a robustness test, we employ propensity score models to ascertain average treatment effects, using doubly robust kernel matching (Shadish et al., 2002).⁷ We also use logistic regression models to estimate the individual indicators of institutional disengagement as a function of parental incarceration.

In the third analytic stage, we examine four sets of mechanisms that might explain the relationship between parental incarceration and institutional disengagement: (1) parental institutional disengagement, (2) health, (3) trust in government, and (4) criminal justice contact. To ensure proper time ordering, we present analyses that use Wave III mechanisms and Wave IV outcomes, in addition to ensuring that parental incarceration occurred before Wave I. We estimate the relationship between parental incarceration and each of

⁵ Mothers (and fathers) who are working either full- or part-time are considered institutionally engaged.

⁶ In supplemental analyses, we estimate our dependent variable with ordered logistic regression models. The results are consistent with those presented in the manuscript but the models do not meet the proportional odds assumption.

⁷ Fixed effects models that consider change in institutional disengagement as a function of change in parental incarceration would allow us to account for time-stable individual characteristics, strengthening causal inference. Fixed effects models are not appropriate here, though, as few individuals experience changes in parental incarceration between Wave III and Wave IV (when institutional disengagement is measured) and because experiencing changes in parental incarceration status during young adulthood is a qualitatively unusual experience.

the proposed mechanisms, the relationship between each of the proposed mechanisms and institutional disengagement, the relationship between parental incarceration and institutional disengagement without the mechanisms, and the relationship between parental incarceration and institutional disengagement with the mechanisms (Baron and Kenny 1986). We also conduct formal Sobel-Goodman tests and use the counterfactual framework to examine mediation (Imai et al., 2010; MacKinnon et al., 1995).

Following Add Health guidelines, all analyses use cross-sectional weights (for more information about the study design, see Harris et al., 2009). The primary stratification unit is school identification and the strata is region. Relatively few observations are missing values. About 9% of observations are missing information on the independent variable, parental incarceration. Between 0% (gender) and 23% (household income) of observations are missing information on the control variables. We preserve these missing values with multiple imputation (chained equations method), pooling results across 20 data sets (Allison 2001).

3.4. Sample description

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics of the analytic sample. The majority of respondents identified as White (66.9%), followed by Black (14.9%), Hispanic (11.3%), and other race (6.9%). Slightly more than half (50.7%) of respondents were female and most (94.9%) were born in the United States. On average, respondents were 22 years old at Wave III. Nearly three-quarters (72.5%) had married parents and more than one-third (34.6%) had at least one parent with a college degree or higher.

4. Results

4.1. Institutional disengagement and proposed mechanisms, by parental incarceration

Table 2 presents means and frequencies of institutional disengagement for two groups of respondents: those who experienced parental incarceration in childhood or adolescence (prior to Wave I) and those who did not experience parental incarceration. All forms of institutional disengagement are more common among respondents who experience parental incarceration in childhood or adolescence. At Wave III, respondents exposed to parental incarceration, compared to their counterparts, are more likely to disengage from financial institutions (45.2% compared to 24.8%, $p < .001$), medical institutions (27.2% compared to 22.0%, $p < .01$), work and school (27.3% compared to 14.7%, $p < .001$), volunteer organizations (81.7% compared to 70.1%, $p < .001$), and religious institutions (33.1% compared to 27.1%, $p < .01$). On average, respondents exposed to parental incarceration reported 2.1 types of institutional disengagement (compared to 1.6 [$p < .001$] among respondents not exposed to parental incarceration). These statistically significant

Table 2

Weighted descriptive statistics of institutional disengagement and mechanisms, by parental incarceration (N = 12,094).

	Parental incarceration		
	Before Wave I <i>n</i> = 1,335	None <i>n</i> = 10,247	
<i>Dependent Variables</i>			
Institutional disengagement (Wave III)	2.145	1.587	***
Disengagement from financial institutions	45.2%	24.8%	***
Disengagement from medical institutions	27.2%	22.0%	**
Disengagement from school and work	27.3%	14.7%	***
Disengagement from volunteer organizations	81.7%	70.1%	***
Disengagement from religious institutions	33.1%	27.1%	**
<i>Institutional disengagement (Wave IV)</i>			
Institutional disengagement from medical institutions	1.664	1.308	***
Disengagement from school and work	35.6%	23.3%	***
Disengagement from volunteer organizations	19.6%	14.6%	***
Disengagement from religious institutions	72.4%	62.3%	***
Disengagement from religious institutions	38.8%	30.6%	***
<i>Mechanisms</i>			
Parent needed but did not receive health care	22.9%	19.1%	**
Parent difficulty getting medical care for family	0.838	0.574	***
Mother not employed	26.6%	20.6%	***
Father not employed	8.5%	5.5%	**
Parent not a member of parent-teacher organization	83.5%	65.7%	***
Parent not a member of civic or social organization	93.2%	86.2%	***
Parent did not attend religious services in past year	30.9%	19.8%	***
Respondent health limitations	0.101	0.085	
Respondent depressive symptoms	0.593	0.483	***
Respondent trust in government	2.055	2.340	***
Respondent criminal justice contact	0.595	0.383	***

Notes: Respondents with parents incarcerated before birth or after Wave I ($n = 512$) are omitted from this table. Chi-square tests and t-tests (depending on the distribution of the outcome variable) indicate statistically significant differences between individuals who experience parental incarceration before Wave 1 and those who never experience parental incarceration. Analyses account for Add Health's stratified sampling design.

** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

differences in institutional disengagement persist at Wave IV.

Table 2 also presents means and frequencies of the four sets of proposed mechanisms—parental institutional disengagement, young adult’s health, young adult’s trust in government, and young adult’s criminal justice contact—for respondents exposed and not

Table 3
Negative binomial regression models estimating institutional disengagement a function of parental incarceration (N = 12,094).

	Wave III				Wave IV			
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 1		Model 2	
	unadjusted		+ controls		unadjusted		+ controls	
Parental incarceration (reference = none)								
Before Wave I	0.303	***	0.091	**	0.237	***	0.092	**
	(0.027)		(0.026)		(0.027)		(0.028)	
Before birth or after Wave I	0.149	**	0.008		0.140	**	0.036	
	(0.044)		(0.042)		(0.044)		(0.043)	
Respondent race (reference = non-Hispanic White)								
Non-Hispanic Black			0.101	***			-0.089	**
			(0.028)				(0.027)	
Hispanic			0.019				-0.116	**
			(0.324)				(0.036)	
Non-Hispanic other race			0.031				-0.032	
			(0.033)				(0.033)	
Respondent age			0.004				-0.014	*
			(0.005)				(0.006)	
Respondent female			-0.069	***			-0.066	***
			(0.015)				(0.018)	
Respondent native-born			0.065	*			-0.030	
			(0.032)				(0.038)	
Mother age			-0.004	**			-0.003	*
			(0.001)				(0.002)	
Parent educational attainment (reference = less than high school)								
High school diploma or GED			-0.063	*			-0.051	
			(0.025)				(0.027)	
Some college			-0.163	***			-0.156	***
			(0.030)				(0.032)	
College degree			-0.326	***			-0.225	***
			(0.030)				(0.033)	
Completed parent survey			0.011				0.019	
			(0.032)				(0.032)	
Respondent number of siblings			0.002				-0.014	
			(0.007)				(0.008)	
Respondent reports verbal/physical/sexual abuse prior to age 12			-0.022				-0.008	
			(0.019)				(0.021)	
Respondent quite or extremely close to biological mother			-0.085	***			-0.057	*
			(0.021)				(0.023)	
Respondent quite or extremely close to biological father			-0.057	**			-0.072	***
			(0.019)				(0.017)	
Respondent reports drugs available at home			0.048				0.086	*
			(0.045)				(0.041)	
Respondent delinquency			0.183	***			0.129	***
			(0.024)				(0.030)	
Respondent exposure to violence			0.066	+			0.073	
			(0.035)				(0.043)	
Parent household income (log)			-0.072	***			-0.056	***
			(0.013)				(0.015)	
Parent has enough money to pay bills			-0.076	***			-0.053	*
			(0.020)				(0.025)	
Parent married			-0.020				-0.026	
			(0.018)				(0.024)	
Parent drinks at least three days a week			-0.089	*			-0.113	**
			(0.045)				(0.042)	
Parent reports drugs a big problem in neighborhood			0.080	**			0.010	
			(0.028)				(0.033)	
Parent overall health			-0.037	***			-0.015	
			(0.009)				(0.010)	
Parent religiosity			-0.089	***			-0.099	***
			(0.008)				(0.009)	
Constant	0.462	***	1.350	***	0.270	***	1.518	***

Note: Standard errors in parentheses. All models account for Add Health’s stratified sampling design. **p* < .05, ***p* < .01, ****p* < .001 (two-tailed tests).

exposed to parental incarceration. First, parental institutional disengagement is more common among respondents who experienced parental incarceration in childhood or adolescence than among those who did not experience parental incarceration. Parents of these respondents are more likely to report disengaging from medical institutions, measured by unmet health care needs (22.9% compared to 19.1%, $p < .01$) and difficulties in getting medical care for family (0.838 compared to 0.574, $p < .001$). Both mothers (26.6% compared to 20.6%, $p < .001$) and fathers (8.5% compared to 5.5%, $p < .01$) of these respondents are more likely to disengage from the labor market. Parents with an incarceration history are also more likely to disengage from volunteer organizations, measured by not being a member of a parent-teacher organization (83.5% compared to 65.7%, $p < .001$) and not being a member of a civic or social organization (93.2% compared to 86.2%, $p < .001$), and they are more likely to disengage from religious institutions (30.9% compared to 19.8%, $p < .001$).

There are statistically significant group differences across the other proposed mechanisms. Respondents who experienced parental incarceration in childhood or adolescence, compared to their counterparts, report more depressive symptoms (0.593 compared to 0.483, $p < .001$), lower trust in government (2.055 compared to 2.340, $p < .001$) and greater criminal justice contact (0.595 compared to 0.383, $p < .001$).

4.2. Relationship between parental incarceration and institutional disengagement

Table 3 presents results from negative binomial regression models that estimate institutional disengagement as a function of parental incarceration. We again focus on the differences between respondents who experienced parental incarceration in childhood or adolescence (before Wave I) and respondents who never experienced parental incarceration. We turn first to the estimates of institutional disengagement at Wave III, when respondents are between ages 18 and 28. Model 1, the unadjusted association, shows that respondents who experience parental incarceration in childhood or adolescence, compared to their counterparts who never experienced parental incarceration, report more institutional disengagement ($b = 0.303$, $p < .001$). This statistically significant difference is reduced but persists in Model 2, which adjusts for an array of individual- and family-level control variables ($b = 0.091$, $p < .01$).⁸ Results from propensity score matching models, using doubly robust kernel matching, are consistent with these results ($b = 0.092$, $p < .001$).

We turn next to the estimates of institutional disengagement at Wave IV, when respondents are between the ages of 24 and 34. The results are similar in magnitude and statistical significance as the results estimating institutional disengagement at Wave III. In the final model, which adjusts for all control variables, parental incarceration is associated with more institutional disengagement ($b = 0.092$, $p < .01$). Doubly robust propensity score matching models provide similar results ($b = 0.095$, $p < .01$).

4.3. Supplemental analyses

In additional analyses, we use logistic regression models to estimate the individual measures of institutional disengagement, as parental incarceration may be associated with specific types of disengagement (Appendix Table 1). The unadjusted models show that parental incarceration is associated with all individual measures of institutional disengagement at Waves III and IV, consistent with the frequencies presented earlier. After adjusting for individual- and family-level characteristics, parental incarceration is significantly associated with three of the five types of institutional disengagement at Wave III, including a higher likelihood to disengage from financial institutions ($b = 0.312$, OR = 1.37, $p < .01$), work and school ($b = 0.305$, OR = 1.36, $p < .05$), and volunteer organizations ($b = 0.261$, OR = 1.30, $p < .05$). Parental incarceration is also significantly associated with two of the four types of institutional disengagement at Wave IV, including more likely to disengage from medical institutions ($b = 0.223$, OR = 1.25, $p < .05$) and volunteer organizations ($b = 0.230$, OR = 1.26, $p < .05$).

In additional analyses, we separately considered maternal and paternal incarceration, as maternal and paternal incarceration may be differentially consequential (Turney and Goodsell 2018). Both maternal and paternal incarceration are positively associated with institutional disengagement in Waves III and IV in bivariate models; however, once accounting for the control variables (the equivalent of Model 2 in Table 3), only paternal incarceration is statistically significantly associated with institutional disengagement. This may result from the relatively small number of cases of maternal incarceration, which diminishes the statistical power to precisely estimate this parameter. Further, the coefficients of paternal and maternal incarceration are *not* statistically significantly different from one another.

4.4. Explaining the relationship between parental incarceration and institutional disengagement

Table 4 presents results that consider four sets of mechanisms linking parental incarceration and institutional disengagement: (1) parental institutional disengagement, (2) health, (3) trust in government, and (4) criminal justice contact (see Appendix Table 2 for estimates of the association between parental incarceration and each of these mechanisms).

Model 1, which includes all control variables (the equivalent of Model 2 in Table 3), provides a baseline model for comparing subsequent models ($b = 0.092$, $p < .01$). In Model 2, we adjust for parental institutional disengagement. These measures explain 19.6%

⁸ In supplemental analyses, we included a contemporaneous measure of respondent income, which yielded results similar to those presented. We exclude this variable from the main models to ensure proper time-ordering of events (and Wave III respondent income likely stems from parental incarceration).

Table 4

Negative binomial regression models estimating institutional disengagement at Wave IV as a function of parental incarceration, considering mechanisms (N = 12,094).

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	<i>Baseline</i>	<i>+ family institutional disengagement</i>	<i>+ health</i>	<i>+ trust in government</i>	<i>+ criminal justice contact</i>	<i>+ all mechanisms</i>
Parental incarceration (reference = none)						
Before Wave I	0.092 ** (0.028)	0.074 ** (0.028)	0.086 ** (0.029)	0.082 ** (0.028)	0.087 ** (0.028)	0.060 * (0.028)
Before birth or after Wave I	0.036 (0.043)	0.030 (0.042)	0.036 (0.043)	0.035 (0.043)	0.035 (0.043)	0.028 (0.042)
Parent needed but did not receive health care		0.072 ** (0.022)				0.052 * (0.022)
Parent difficulty getting medical care for family		0.009 (0.010)				0.010 (0.010)
Mother not employed		0.051 * (0.023)				0.045 * (0.022)
Father not employed		0.121 ** (0.038)				0.112 ** (0.037)
Parent not a member of parent-teacher organization		0.067 ** (0.021)				0.064 ** (0.021)
Parent not a member of civic or social organization		0.069 * (0.027)				0.062 ** (0.027)
Parent did not attend religious services in past year		0.162 *** (0.028)				0.154 *** (0.027)
Respondent health limitations			0.174 *** (0.033)			0.165 *** (0.033)
Respondent depressive symptoms			0.144 *** (0.018)			0.122 *** (0.018)
Respondent trust in government				-0.074 *** (0.011)		-0.059 *** (0.011)
Respondent criminal justice contact					0.031 ** (0.010)	0.022 * (0.010)
Constant	1.518 ***	1.196 ***	1.343 ***	1.679 ***	1.492 ***	1.170 ***

Note: Standard errors in parentheses. All models adjust for control variables in Model 2 of Table 3. All models account for Add Health’s stratified sampling design. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

of the association between parental incarceration and institutional disengagement ($b = 0.074, p < .01$). The inclusion of health in Model 3 explains 6.5% of the association between parental incarceration and institutional disengagement ($b = 0.086, p < .01$). The inclusion of trust in government in Model 4 explains 10.9% of the association ($b = 0.082, p < .01$), and the inclusion of criminal justice contact in Model 5 explains 5.4% of the association ($b = 0.087, p < .01$). Appendix Table 3 provides mediation results using Sobel-Goodman and counterfactual framework tests for each of the variables separately, and these results are consistent with those presented here.

Model 6 includes all proposed mechanisms. In this final model, which explains 34.8% of the association between parental incarceration and institutional disengagement, the parental incarceration coefficient remains statistically significant ($b = 0.060, p < .05$). As expected, many of the proposed mechanisms are significantly associated with institutional disengagement. Six of the seven indicators of parental institutional disengagement are associated with respondent institutional disengagement. For example, parental disengagement from medical institutions—measured as unmet health care needs—is positively associated with institutional disengagement ($b = 0.052, p < .05$). Similarly, parental avoidance of volunteer organizations—measured by lack of participation in parent-teacher organizations ($b = 0.064, p < .01$) and lack of participation in civic or social organizations ($b = 0.062, p < .01$)—and parental disengagement from religious institutions ($b = 0.154, p < .001$) is positively associated with institutional disengagement. Additionally, health limitations ($b = 0.165, p < .001$), depressive symptoms ($b = 0.122, p < .001$), and criminal justice contact ($b = 0.022, p < .05$) are positively associated with institutional disengagement, and trust in government ($b = -0.059, p < .001$) is negatively associated with institutional disengagement.

Taken together, these findings suggest an intergenerational transmission of diminished institutional engagement, with respondents who experience lower familial institutional engagement—in addition to those reporting worse health, lower trust in government, and more criminal justice contact—reporting less institutional engagement themselves.

5. Discussion

Widespread surveillance, particularly of those who experience criminal justice contact, is a defining feature of contemporary societies (Beckett and Herbert 2010; Foucault 1997; Giddens 1990; Haggerty and Ericson 2000; Simon 2005). This feature is associated with both institutional exclusion and avoidance, processes that can decrease institutional engagement practices among targeted groups

(Brayne 2014; Goffman 2009; Lageson 2016). To minimize engagement is risky, as social institutions—such as banks, hospitals, and schools—allow individuals and groups to access resources. Engaging in institutions exposes family members, including children, to important and necessary social organizations and corresponding resources. Alternatively, disengaging from them can limit resources, especially during the transition to adulthood, a life course stage that has become more tenuous and difficult to navigate, and, importantly, requires institutional attachment to traverse successfully (Arnett 2014). There are clear links between incarceration and institutional disengagement (Brayne 2014; Goffman 2009), and we extend this research to examine the relationship between parental incarceration and institutional disengagement during the transition to adulthood. Our results, drawn from the nationally representative and population-based National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health), complement and extend existing research on punishment, family life, and inequality.

We provide the first systematic accounting of a relationship between parental incarceration and institutional disengagement (Brayne 2014; Goffman 2009; Stuart 2016). We find parental incarceration during childhood or adolescence is associated with weaker institutional engagement (measured by disengagement from financial institutions, medical institutions, school and work, volunteer organizations, and religious institutions) in young adulthood. Diminished institutional engagement related to parental incarceration occurs at the beginning of the transition to adulthood (when individuals are between the ages of 18 and 28) and persists across time (when individuals are between the ages of 24 and 34). We further find that parental incarceration is similarly associated with young adults' mitigated engagement with surveilling (e.g., financial, medical, labor market, and educational) and nonsurveilling (e.g., volunteer or religious) institutions (Brayne 2014). It may be that those who experience incarceration directly (parents, in this case) are more attuned to the inner workings of different institutions, making them reticent to engage "surveilling" ones, or those they perceive as keeping formal records. Offspring of the incarcerated, by contrast, may be less discriminatory in their evaluations of institutions' surveillance efforts, viewing all of them with a measure of suspicion, and/or are subjected to exclusion across a wide range of institutions due to parental incarceration. Surveillance in the era of mass incarceration may blur surveilling and nonsurveilling distinctions for young adults with formerly incarcerated parents, generating diminished institutional engagement "spillover" effects.

In addition to establishing a link between parental incarceration and young adult's institutional disengagement, we examine possible mechanisms for this association. We find that parental institutional disengagement explains some of the relationship between parental incarceration and institutional disengagement among young adults. Specifically, those who experience parental incarceration are exposed to less parental institutional engagement in adolescence than their counterparts and, in turn, exhibit similar reduced engagement practices during the transition to adulthood (Andersen 2018). These findings are consistent with the socialization perspective. Prior research suggests incarceration is a stressor with repercussions for the broader family unit (Arditti 2016; Turney 2014). It is also possible that parental incarceration can shape offspring's habitus. Bourdieu (1980, 1984) argues that long-lasting dispositions and propensities—habitus—stem from family dynamics and their social milieu (e.g., Lareau 2003). Although we do not measure habitus directly, parental incarceration and its associated limited institutional engagement—itsself a consequence of institutional avoidance and exclusion—may deflect offspring's habitus, generating incarceration-related dispositions that engender naturalized, unexamined behavior such as limited institutional engagement. This behavior is both agentic and tethered to social arrangements that express surveillance in the era of mass incarceration (Elliott and Reid, 2019; Haskins and Jacobsen 2017; Lareau 2003).

Research finds that limited institutional engagement affects both the incarcerated parent and the nonincarcerated parent; carceral punishment is detrimental for the entire family (Braman 2004; Comfort 2008). Thus, children may be subjected to limited parental institutional engagement, shaping their habitus, even if they do not live with the incarcerated parent. The limited engagement of the incarcerated parent may spillover to the nonincarcerated parent (and to the rest of the family), highlighting the reach of the "collateral" consequences of incarceration for families and their offspring, for whom it may hinder institutional attachment (Ewald 2012). In theorizing the role of habitus in the intergenerational transmission of institutional engagement, we provide an important theoretical contribution, as it may be a general mechanism linking parental incarceration to a range of their children's outcomes. Finally, although we summon the role of habitus, we do not suggest it is determinative. Behavior *also* emerges out of "social interactions, expressions of agency, and identity work" (Bandelj and Lanuza 2018:1), as individuals engage in meaning making to understand their lives, especially in the context of marginalization and disadvantage (Frye 2012).

In addition to family dynamics (and, specifically, parental disengagement practices), we find that young adult's impaired health, lack of trust in government, and criminal justice contact also partly mediate the association between parental incarceration and institutional disengagement. Young adults whose parents have experienced incarceration, compared to their peers, have more depressive symptoms, less trust in the government, and more criminal justice contact. In other words, these young adults experience stressors during the transition to adulthood more commonly than their peers (Turney and Lanuza 2017). These stressors hinder institutional engagement, even in instances when these individuals would like to engage in social institutions. Take the case of criminal justice contact. Previous work documents criminal justice contact can lead to institutional exclusion from jobs, dwellings, and the state (Pager 2003; Thacher 2008). Thus, individuals subjected to parental incarceration may not only develop a habitus that naturalizes disengagement but may also be excluded from institutions during the transition to adulthood. Young adult institutional disengagement, therefore, is not only a consequence of *past* adolescent family dynamics, but is also shaped by *current* opportunities and obstacles, resources, attitudes, and behavior during the transition to adulthood. In other words, both past and present influence young adult's institutional disengagement. In sum, both stress- and habitus-induced changes to family life are likely consequential for the wellbeing of offspring. An examination of the relative importance of both of these mechanisms (stress vs. habitus) is an important next step in helping us comprehend the intergenerational consequences of parental incarceration.

5.1. Limitations

Our investigation has limitations. First, the parental institutional engagement measures are limited. These measures operationalize engagement with institutions during childhood and adolescence, which may shape offspring’s *habitus* (Bourdieu 1984), but we cannot disentangle avoidance from exclusion, and therefore, the extent to which incarceration-related habitus shapes institutional disengagement among those exposed to parental incarceration. Second, though our analyses adjust for covariates associated with both parental incarceration and institutional disengagement, the observational data cannot account for unobserved characteristics that might render this relationship spurious. Relatedly, we do not have a measure of financial disengagement during the child’s adolescence to examine whether it further explains the link between parental incarceration and institutional disengagement during the transition to adulthood. We suspect it is important. Finally, as described above, the incarceration of one parent may generate spillover repercussions for disengagement of the other parent, but considering the differential direct and spillover effects of incarceration is not possible with these data. In most instances, we are likely measuring the disengagement of the non-incarcerated parent. Relatedly, the extent to which young adults exhibit institutional disengagement also likely varies depending if they lived—during childhood and adolescence for a sustained period of time—with the parent with an incarceration history, a point we cannot adjudicate in the data.

5.2. Conclusions

Our results suggest an intergenerational transmission of institutional engagement via parental institutional practices during childhood and adolescence in addition to young adult’s impaired health, lack of trust in government, and criminal justice contact. Aided through technology, the criminal justice system reaches far into individuals’ everyday existence, punishing families in such a way that their resistance, responses, and outright exclusion can lead to further marginalization throughout the life course (Elliott and Reid, 2019; Haskins and Jacobsen 2017; Rios 2011). These findings are troubling because a successful transition to adulthood requires institutional engagement. In contrast to the normative experience of *engaging* institutional settings during the transition to adulthood (Arnett 2014; Lareau 2015), *disengaging* from social institutions is common among individuals who have experienced parental incarceration. For disadvantaged young adults, limiting institutional engagement may be harmful, as these individuals are more reliant on social institutions to provide needed resources and ladders to social mobility. Therefore, our results suggest that parental incarceration can deepen existing social inequalities through institutional disengagement.

Appendix A

Appendix Table 1

Logistic Regression Models Estimating Individual Measures of Institutional Disengagement as a Function of Parental Incarceration (N = 12,094)

	Wave III		Wave IV	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
	<i>unadjusted</i>	<i>+ controls</i>	<i>unadjusted</i>	<i>+ controls</i>
A. Disengagement from financial institutions	0.898 *** (0.093)	0.312 ** (0.108)	—	—
B. Disengagement from medical institutions	0.363 *** (0.088)	0.106 (0.094)	0.556 *** (0.091)	0.223 * (0.104)
C. Disengagement from school and work	0.744 *** (0.115)	0.305 * (0.120)	0.361 *** (0.099)	0.054 (0.109)
D. Disengagement from volunteer organizations	0.602 *** (0.097)	0.261 * (0.113)	0.477 *** (0.093)	0.230 * (0.097)
E. Disengagement from religious institutions	0.310 ** (0.093)	0.036 (0.109)	0.363 ** (0.107)	0.208 (0.121)

Note: Coefficient for parental incarceration before Wave I (compared to no parental incarceration) presented. Model 2 adjusts for control variables in Model 2 of Table 3. All models account for Add Health’s stratified sampling design. **p* < .05, ***p* < .01, ****p* < .001 (two-tailed tests).

Appendix Table 2

Regression Models Estimating Mechanisms as a Function of Parental Incarceration (N = 12,094)

	Model 1	Model 2
	<i>unadjusted</i>	<i>+ controls</i>
Parent needed but did not receive health care	0.249 ** (0.082)	-0.093 (0.094)
Parent experienced difficulty providing medical care for family	0.270 *** (0.050)	-0.017 (0.047)
Mother not employed	0.352 ** (0.104)	0.097 (0.113)
Father not employed	0.452 ** (0.157)	0.477 * (0.182)
Parent not a member of parent-teacher organization	0.942 ***	0.418 **

(continued on next page)

Appendix Table 2 (continued)

	Model 1		Model 2	
	unadjusted		+ controls	
Parent not a member of civic or social organization	(0.111)		(0.120)	
	0.860	***	0.359	
	(0.175)		(0.195)	
Parent did not attend religious services in past year	0.628	***	0.435	**
	(0.098)		(0.151)	
Respondent health limitations	0.023	*	-0.002	
	(0.011)		(0.012)	
Respondent depressive symptoms	0.121	***	0.043	*
	(0.019)		(0.019)	
Respondent trust in government	-0.281	***	-0.118	**
	(0.037)		(0.039)	
Respondent criminal justice contact	0.240	***	0.137	**
	(0.048)		(0.044)	

Note: Logistic regression models estimate the following outcomes: parent needed but did not receive health care, mother not employed full-time, father not employed full-time, parent not a member of parent-teacher organization, parent not a member of a civic or social organization, and parent did not attend religious services in past year. Ordinary least squares (OLS) regression models estimate the following outcomes: parent experienced difficulty getting medical care for family, respondent depressive symptoms, respondent trust in government, and respondent criminal justice contact. Model 2 adjusts for control variables in Model 2 of Table 3. All models account for Add Health's stratified sampling design. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

Appendix Table 3

Results from Supplemental Mediation Analyses

	Counterfactual framework				Sobel-Goodman test
	Indirect effect (ACME)	Direct effect	Total effect	% mediated	% mediated
Parent needed but did not receive health care	-0.002	0.158	0.156	-1.3%	-1.2%
Parent difficulty getting medical care for family	-0.000	0.157	0.156	-0.2%	-0.7%
Mother not employed	0.001	0.155	0.156	0.6%	0.4%
Father not employed	0.006	0.150	0.156	3.6%	4.0%
Parent not a member of parent-teacher organization	0.008	0.150	0.158	5.1%	5.1%
Parent not a member of civic or social organization	0.002	0.551	0.157	1.6%	1.5%
Parent did not attend religious services in past year	0.009	0.144	0.154	6.0%	4.3%
Respondent health limitations	-0.004	0.160	0.156	-2.3%	-0.6%
Respondent depressive symptoms	0.008	0.147	0.156	4.8%	6.8%
Respondent trust in government	0.013	0.143	0.156	8.4%	7.6%
Respondent criminal justice contact	0.005	0.151	0.156	3.1%	3.6%

Note: Findings from the counterfactual framework and the Sobel-Goodman test of mediation provide results consistent with those presented in the manuscript. In the counterfactual framework, we use the medeff command in Stata. This assumes a gaussian distribution for our dependent variable, which is not met. However, the paramed command Stata, which can handle a negative binomial distribution for the dependent variable, is not flexible enough to account for sampling weights or imputation. The presented results come from the first of the 20 multiply imputed data sets.

Appendix B. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2020.102485>.

References

- Agnew, Robert, 2012. Reflections of a revised strain theory of delinquency. *Soc. Forces* 91 (1), 33–38.
- Alexander, Michelle, 2010. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. The New Press, New York.
- Allison, Paul D., 2001. *Missing Data*. Sage Publications, New York.
- Andersen, Lars H., 2018. Assortative mating and the intergenerational transmission of parental incarceration risks. *J. Marriage Fam.* 80 (2), 463–477.
- Angwin, Julia, 2014. *Dragnet Nation: A Quest for Privacy, Security, and Freedom in a World of Relentless Surveillance*. Times Books, New York.
- Arditti, Joyce A., 2016. A family stress-proximal process model for understanding the effects of parental incarceration on children and their families. *Couple and Family Psychology: Research and Practice* 5 (2), 65–88.
- Arnett, Jeffrey Jensen, 2014. *Emerging Adulthood: The Winding Road from the Late Teens through the Twenties*. Oxford University Press, Cambridge.
- Bandelj, Nina, Lanuza, Yader R., 2018. Economic expectations of young adults. *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World* 4, 1–23.
- Baron, Reuben M., Kenny, David A., 1986. "The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 51 (6), 1173–1182.
- Beckett, Katherine, Herbert, Steven Kelly, 2010. *Banished: The New Social Control in Urban America*. Oxford University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, 1980. *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford University Press, Palo Alto, CA.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of Judgment of Taste*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Braman, Donald, 2004. *Doing Time on the Outside: Incarceration and Family Life in Urban America*. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Brayne, Sarah, 2014. Surveillance and system avoidance. *Am. Socio. Rev.* 79 (3), 367–391.
- Brayne, Sarah, 2017. Big data surveillance: The case of policing. *Am. Socio. Rev.* 82 (5), 977–1008.

- Brownstein, Naomi, Kalsbeek, William D., Joyce, Tabor, Entzel, Pamela, Daza, Eric, Kathleen, M., Harris. National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/addhealth/data/guides/W4_nonresponse.pdf.
- Bruns, Angela, 2017. Consequences of partner incarceration for women's employment. *J. Marriage Fam.* 79 (5), 1331–1352.
- Comfort, Megan, 2008. *Doing Time Together: Love and Family in the Shadow of the Prison*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Conger, Rand D., Wallace, Lora Ebert, Sun, Yumei, Simons, Ronald L., McLoyd, Vonnie C., Brody, Gene H., 2002. Economic pressure in African American families: A replication and extension of the family stress model. *Dev. Psychol.* 38 (2), 179–193.
- Elliott, Sinikka, Reid, Megan, 2019. Low-income Black mothers parenting adolescents in the mass incarceration era: The long reach of criminalization. *Am. Socio. Rev.* 84 (2), 197–219.
- Ewald, Alec, 2012. Collateral consequences in the American states. *Soc. Sci. Q.* 93 (1), 211–247.
- Farrington, David P., 2002. "Families and crime." pp. 129–48. In: Wilson, J.Q., Petersilia, J. (Eds.), *Crime: Public Policies for Crime Control*. Institute for Contemporary Studies Press, Oakland, CA.
- Feliciano, Cynthia, Lanuza, Yader R., 2017. An immigrant paradox? Contextual attainment and intergenerational educational mobility. *Am. Socio. Rev.* 82 (1), 211–241.
- Flynn, Catherine, 2013. Understanding the risk of offending for the children of imprisoned parents: A review of the evidence. *Child. Youth Serv. Rev.* 35 (2), 213–217.
- Fong, Kelley, 2018. Concealment and constraint: Child protective services fears and poor mother's institutional engagement. *Soc. Forces* 97 (4), 1785–1810.
- Foster, Holly, Hagan, John, 2015. Punishment regimes and the multilevel effects of parental incarceration: Intergenerational, intersectional, and interinstitutional models of social inequality and systemic exclusion. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 41, 135–158.
- Foucault, Michel, 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Vintage, New York.
- Frye, Margaret, 2012. Bright futures in Malawi's new dawn: Educational aspirations as assertions of identity. *Am. J. Sociol.* 117 (6), 1565–1624.
- Furstenberg, Frank F., 2010. On a new schedule: Transitions to adulthood and family change. *Future Child.* 20 (1), 67–87.
- Garland, David, 2001. *Mass Imprisonment: Social Causes and Consequences*. Sage Publications, New York.
- Giddens, Anthony, 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.
- Goffman, Alice, 2009. On the run: Wanted men in a Philadelphia ghetto. *Am. Socio. Rev.* 74 (3), 339–357.
- Goffman, Alice, 2014. *On the Run: Fugitive Life in an American City*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Haggerty, Kevin D., Ericson, Richard V., 2000. The surveillant assemblage. *Br. J. Sociol.* 51 (4), 605–622.
- Harris, Judith R., 1998. *The Nurture Assumption: Why Children Turn Out the Way the Do*. Free Press, New York.
- Harris, Kathleen M., Carolyn, T. Halpern, Whitsel, E., Hussey, J., Tabor, J., Entzel, P., Udry, J.R., 2009. *The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health: Research Design*. <http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/addhealth/design>.
- Haskins, Anna R., Jacobsen, Wade C., 2017. Schools as surveilling institutions? Paternal incarceration, system avoidance, and parental involvement in schooling. *Am. Socio. Rev.* 82 (4), 657–684.
- Imai, Kosuke, Keele, Luke, Tingley, Dustin, 2010. A general approach to causal mediation analysis. *Psychol. Methods* 15 (4), 300–334.
- Jackson, Margot L., 2009. Understanding links between adolescent health and educational attainment. *Demography* 46 (4), 671–694.
- Johnson, Elizabeth I., Easterling, Beth, 2012. Understanding unique effects of parental incarceration on children: challenges, progress, and recommendations. *J. Marriage Fam.* 74 (2), 342–356.
- Lageson, Sarah Esther, 2016. Found out and opting out. *Ann. Am. Acad. Polit. Soc. Sci.* 665 (1), 127–141.
- Lareau, Annette, 2003. *Unequal Childhoods: Race, Class, and Family Life*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- Lareau, Annette, 2015. Cultural knowledge and social inequality. *Am. Socio. Rev.* 80 (1), 1–27.
- Lee, Rosalyn D., Fang, Xiangming, Luo, Feijun, 2013. The impact of parental incarceration on the physical and mental health of young adults. *Pediatrics* 131 (4), 1188–1195.
- Lee, Hedwig, Porter, Lauren C., Comfort, Megan, 2014. Consequences of family member incarceration: Impacts on civic participation and perceptions of the legitimacy and fairness of government. *Ann. Am. Acad. Polit. Soc. Sci.* 651 (1), 44–73.
- Lerner, Debra, Adler, David A., Rogers, William H., Lapitsky, Leueen, McLaughlin, Thomas, Reed, John, 2010. Work performance of employees with depression: The impact of work stressors. *Am. J. Health Promot.* 24 (3), 205–213.
- Long, J. Scott, 1997. *Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables*. Sage Publications, New York.
- MacKinnon, David P., Warsi, Ghulam, Dwyer, James H., 1995. A simulation study of mediated effects measures. *Multivariate Behav. Res.* 31 (1), 41–62.
- Manza, Jeff, Uggen, Christopher, 2008. *Locked Out: Felon Disenfranchisement And American Democracy*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Marx, Gary, 2002. "What's new about the 'new surveillance'?" Classifying for change and continuity. *Surveill. Soc.* 1 (1), 9–29.
- Massoglia, Michael, Remster, Brianna, King, Ryan D., 2011. Stigma or separation? Understanding the incarceration-divorce relationship. *Soc. Forces* 90 (1), 133–155.
- McCubbin, Hamilton I., Constance, B. Joy, Cauble, A. Elizabeth, Comeau, Joan K., Patterson, Joan M., Needle, Richard H., 1980. Family stress and coping: A decade review. *J. Marriage Fam.* 42 (4), 855–871.
- McEwen, Bruce S., 1998. Protective and damaging effects of stress mediators. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 338 (3), 171–179.
- Mumola, Christopher J., 2000. *Incarcerated Parents and Their Children* (Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, No. NCJ 182335). U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice, Washington, DC.
- Murray, Joseph, Janson, Carl-Gunnar, Farrington, David P., 2007. Crime in adult offspring of prisoners: A cross-national comparison of two longitudinal samples. *Crim. Justice Behav.* 34 (1), 133–149.
- Pager, Devah, 2003. The mark of a criminal record. *Am. J. Sociol.* 108 (5), 937–975.
- Pearlin, Leonard I., Scott, Schieman, Fazio, Elena M., Meersman, Stephen C., 2005. Stress, health, and the life course: Some conceptual perspectives. *J. Health Soc. Behav.* 46 (2), 205–219.
- Piliavin, Jane Allyn, Siegl, Erica, 2007. Health benefits of volunteering in the Wisconsin longitudinal study. *J. Health Soc. Behav.* 48 (4), 450–464.
- Rios, Victor M., 2011. *Punished: Policing the Lives of Black and Latino Boys*. New York University Press, New York, NY.
- Roetger, Michael E., Swisher, Raymond R., 2011. Associations of fathers' history of incarceration with sons' delinquency and arrest among, white, and hispanic males in the United States. *Criminology* 49 (4), 1109–1147.
- Rubinstein, Gwen, Mukamal, Debbie, 2002. Welfare and housing-denial of benefits to drug offenders. pp. 37–49. In: Mauer, M., Leda, C.-L. (Eds.), *Invisible Punishment: the Collateral Consequences of Mass Imprisonment*. The New Press, New York.
- Rumbaut, Rubén G., Gohnaz, Komae, 2010. Immigration and adult transitions. *Future Child.* 20 (1), 43–66.
- Satloe, Jane N.T., Hillberink, Sander R., Van Staa, Anneloes, Bal, Roland, 2014. Lagging behind or not? Four distinctive social participation patterns among young adults with chronic conditions. *J. Adolesc. Health* 54 (4), 397–403.
- Shadish, William R., Cook, Thomas D., Campbell, Donald T., 2002. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Cengage Learning, Boston, MA.
- Simon, Jonathan, 2005. Reversal of fortune: The resurgence of individual risk assessment in criminal justice. *Annu. Rev. Law Soc. Sci.* 1, 397–421.
- Small, Mario Luis, 2009. *Unanticipated Gains: Origins of Network Inequality in Everyday Life*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Stuart, Forrest, 2016. Becoming 'copwise': Policing, culture, and the collateral consequences of street-level criminalization. *Law Soc. Rev.* 50 (2), 279–313.
- Stuart, Forrest, Amada Armenta, Osborne, Melissa, 2015. Legal control of marginal groups. *Annu. Rev. Law Soc. Sci.* 11 (1), 235–254.
- Swisher, Raymond R., Kuhl, Danielle C., Chavez, Jorge M., 2013. Racial and ethnic differences in neighborhood attainments in the transition to adulthood. *Soc. Forces* 91 (4), 1399–1428.
- Thacher, David, 2008. The rise of criminal background screening in rental housing. *Law Soc. Inq.* 33 (1), 5–30.
- Turney, Kristin, 2014. The intergenerational consequences of mass incarceration: Implications for children's Co-residence and contact with grandparents. *Soc. Forces* 93 (1), 299–327.
- Turney, Kristin, 2018. Adverse childhood experiences among children of incarcerated parents. *Child. Youth Serv. Rev.* 89 (6), 218–225.

- Turney, Kristin, Lanuza, Yader R., 2017. Parental incarceration and the transition to adulthood. *J. Marriage Fam.* 79 (5), 1314–1330.
- Turney, Kristin, Wildeman, Christopher, 2013. Redefining relationships: Explaining the countervailing consequences of paternal incarceration for parenting. *Am. Socio. Rev.* 78 (6), 949–979.
- Turney, Kristin, Wildeman, Christopher, 2018. Maternal incarceration and the transformation of urban family life. *Soc. Forces* 96 (3), 1155–1182.
- Tyler, Tom R., Huo, Yuen, 2002. *Trust in the Law: Encouraging Public Cooperation with the Police and Courts*. Russell Sage Foundation, New York.
- Wakefield, Sara, Uggen, Christopher, 2010. Incarceration and stratification. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 36 (1), 387–406.
- Weaver, Vesla M., Lerman, Amy E., 2010. Political consequences of the carceral state. *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.* 104 (4), 817–833.