

THE MASS INCARCERATION OF MINORITIES AND WOMEN

by

TANISHA ANN BOWENS

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Arlington in Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

MASTERS IN CRIMINOLOGY & CRIMINAL JUSTICE

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

MAY 2013

Copyright © by Tanisha Ann Bowens 2013

All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to offer my sincerest gratitude to Dr. Jaya Davis for her patience and dedication to my success in completing this thesis. I can't thank Dr. Davis enough for guiding, supporting, and encouraging me throughout the process of preparing my thesis. Dr. Davis has been a great inspiration throughout this process and made the completion of this thesis possible.

I would also like to extend my appreciation to Dr. Dobbs and Dr. Bing for contributing their generous time and support to this thesis. Professors and administrators within the Criminology and Criminal Justice Department have been truly exceptional, and for that I will always be grateful. I would also like to thank all of the professors outside and within the Criminal Justice Department that assisted in the distribution of my survey.

I am truly indebted to each professor for helping with each process of compiling and distributing my surveys to the students of the University of Texas at

the Arlington. Without their assistance, I probably would not have been able to complete this research in a timely manner for graduation.

Thanks all for your help and participation toward my success!

Last, but certainly not least, I would like to thank my sister Latoya McCoy for all her support and guidance, immediate family, close loved ones, special friends, coworkers, and I can't forget my sorority sisters. For their continuous prayers and support I have received while working on this thesis. I would not be where I am today without their encouragement and most importantly their LOVE!

April 22, 2013

Abstract

The Mass Incarceration of Minorities and Women

Tanisha Bowens, M.A.

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2013

Supervising Professor: Dr. Jaya Davis

The purpose of this study is to examine the knowledge and perceptions of educated students attending the University of Texas of Arlington Spring 2013.

The data for this study was obtained from a sample students primarily majoring in criminology and criminal justice, social work, and business enrolled at the University of Texas at Arlington. Students appeared to appeared to be more knowledgeable about the mass incarceration of minorities, however there was little no significant difference in knowledge and perception among criminology and justice and other departments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....iii
ABSTRACT.....v
LIST OF TABLES.....vii
LIST OF CASES.....ix

Chapter	Page
1. INTRODUCTION TO MASS INCARCERATION.....	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Hypothesis	3
2. DEVELOPMENT OF MINORITIES MASS INCARCERATED.....	4
2.1 Historical Background.....	4
2.2 African American Men and How They Are Affected.....	10
2.3 Case Law.....	17
2.4 Hispanic Communities Affected by Mass Incarceration Rates.....	22
2.5 Case Law.....	23
2.6 How Imprisonment Affects Women.....	28
2.7 Case Study.....	33
3. DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF RESEARCH.....	37
3.1 Methodology.....	37
3.2 Sample and Sample Size.....	38

3.3	Survey Instrument.....	39
3.4	Survey Implementation.....	41
3.5	Procedures of Analysis.....	42
4.	Research Findings.....	44
4.1	Demographic Information.....	44
4.2	Perception Based Information.....	47
4.3	Knowledge Based Information.....	55
5.	Conclusion.....	63
5.1	Statistically Significant Perceptions.....	64
5.2	Policy Recommendations.....	65
5.3	Agreeable Perceptions.....	68
5.4	Knowledge.....	68
5.5	Contributions to the Body of Knowledge.....	69
5.6	Limitations of Research.....	69
5.7	Future Suggestions for Further Research.....	70
	APPENDIX	71
A.	SURVEY INSTRUMENT.....	71
	REFERENCES.....	79
	BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION.....	88

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Spring 2013 Courses Utilized In Study.....	41
2 Demographic Information.....	45
2(a)Race Demographics.....	46
3 Perception Questions Statistical Significance.....	47
4 Perception Questions Percentages	49
5 Knowledge Questions Statistical Significance.....	56
6 Knowledge Questions Percentages.....	57

LIST OF CASES

Cases

1. *United States vs. Christopher Lee Armstrong et al.*,
517

US 456(1996)

2. *Rodriguez vs. California Highway Patrol*, C-99-20895

JF/HRL (N.D.F. February 27, 2003)

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION OF MASS INCARCERATION

1.1INTRODUCTION

In the era of colorblindness, it is no longer socially permissible to use race, explicitly, as a justification for discrimination, exclusion, and social contempt. So we don't. Rather than rely on race, we use our criminal justice system to label people of color "criminals" and then engage in all the practices we supposedly left behind. ~Michelle Alexander (Alexander, 2010, p.2)

Since the end of the twentieth and the beginning of the twenty first century there has been a tremendous rise in the prison population due to the mass incarceration of minorities (Garrison, 2011). The prison system has tripled in size in the last forty years, which has caught the eye of many. How has this increase impacted societal attitudes and beliefs?

The purpose of this study is to determine if the perceptions and attitudes of educated college students on the mass incarceration of minorities are consistent with the stated reasoning of why minorities are incarcerated in high numbers. A review of articles,

references, and books published over the last forty years focusing specifically on the mass incarceration of minorities and the consequences both the imprisoned and communities have endured will be presented. Ironically, minorities have been the foundation of increased prison population for years, yet there seems to be no conclusion as to how race plays a part.

This study's purpose is to examine the perception and knowledge of the mass incarceration of minorities between undergraduates and graduate students in different departments at the University of Texas at Arlington. It is hoped that this research will shed light on whether educated students perceive that there is a correlation between race and increased populations of the prison system.

This research will attempt to offer a better understanding regarding the role race plays in prison population increases. Do students feel that increases in prison population are a result of disparate treatment or are they more likely to agree with taglines such as, "if you do the crime you do the time"? Additionally, this research attempts to uncover opinions regarding those wrongly convicted to crimes

and the relationship between criminalizing behavior and its effect on African Americans, Hispanics, and women at higher proportions over other race and ethnicities.

1.2 Hypothesis

This study will examine if there are significant differences and similarities of perception and knowledge of both undergraduate and graduate students attending on-campus classes at the University of Texas at Arlington. This study is to examine the knowledge and perceptions of students in the Criminology and Criminal Justice, Social Work, Math, Business, and other departments at the University of Texas at Arlington concerning the mass incarceration of minorities.

CHAPTER 2

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF MINORITIES MASS INCARCERATED

2.1 Historical Background

This is an unprecedented event in the history of the United States, and more generally, in the history of liberal democracy ~David Garland (Roberts, 2004, p. 1272).

The history of the mass incarceration of minorities in the United States dates back to the post war (Fader, Katz, & Stern, 2005). Although the significant rise in minority prison population began in the latter twentieth century, history displays increases well before then. In the United States researchers have reported that during the late 1980s crime lagged behind imprisonment rates, thus acknowledging that crime alone is insufficient in explaining increased prison rates (Arvanites & Asher, 1998). Researchers have for a long time ignored both the mass incarceration of the late twentieth century and post war era (Thompson, 2010). There is a tremendous amount of research concerning the

wrongdoing of society's imprisonment rates and how minorities have been affected. Such research shows that increased incarceration rates are primarily populated by men and women of color (Thompson, 2010). Front runners are African Americans whom are incarcerated 6.5 times higher than whites and 2.5 times higher than Hispanics (Thompson, 2010).

Many may wonder why there is such discretion of imprisonment due to color and not crime alone. Understanding the history of slavery and politics may lead us to a more accurate conclusion. The twentieth century brought about overt racial discrimination that barred African Americans from most jobs, denial of education, and political disenfranchisement (Fader, Katz, & Stern, year). According to several studies the emancipation of African Americans redefined crime, which imprisoned an uncounted number of African American men (Thompson, 2010). Although old barriers of racism were erased others were erected (Fader, Katz, & Stern). Although states abolished slavery, many new laws were passed in order to unsecure the freedom of African Americans, primarily men (Thompson, 2010). Laws which were previously legal became

illegal, and seemed to set up African Americans into committing a crime, which ultimately placed them in a new form of slavery, prison. Once imprisoned convict labor consisted of logging, mining, railroad, and farm work contracted by white businesses as free market labor (Hallett, 2002). This convict lease system was racist, yet was the new legal labor practice for those convicted as paupers, migrants, or vagrants (Hallett, 2002). Once free slaves envisioned a life of freedom and peace, but were legally exploited by the system. Work that was previously done by slaves unwillingly was not left for whites to attend. Hallett (2002) contends that white men and women viewed fulfilling their own private and business duties, previously carried out by slaves, as a disgrace. In the minds of many whites, paying for services that were once the job of slaves was not an option. Slaves whom believed they accomplished freedom were misguided into a new world of corruption. Thus, the criminal justice apparatus was used as a tool to ensure a steady supply of labor and maintain a system of slavery. A once white dominated prison system was replaced by the high rates of freed slaves being imprisoned (Hallett, 2002). The increased post war prison population became

known as the Second Reconstruction, which incarcerated over 52,249 people during that time period (Thompson, 2010).

It was not until 1926 that prison statistics were officially established by Congress under the National Prisoner Statistics series of 1925-1983 (Austin & Krisberg, 1985). Although the data does not reference race it does give a broad historical view of increased prison populations. Data will show that there was indeed a massive population increases of minority inmates in which the government appealed to. In the years between 1925 and 1940 the prison population was steady. It was not until 1940 that the prison population began to decline due to the impact of World War II (Austin & Krisberg, 1985). Over the next couple of years the prison population rose and declined once again. However, Austin and Krisberg (1985) reveal that prison populations tremendously increased in the early 1970's and 1980's around the same time new laws for mandatory sentencing were enacted. Prison populations rose from 196,429 inmates in 1970 to a massive 438,830 inmates in 1983 (Austin & Krisberg, 1985).

Such a historical postwar phenomenon is known as the criminalization of urban space. The name alone tells the story of how urban areas, which are populated heavily by those of color, were criminalized. There is no legal reasoning to the criminalization, but only that the area is urban and highly populated by men and women of color. Criminalization of urban space is when men and women of color become victims of new regulated laws, which violators were given unforeseen jail time during the close of Civil War (Thompson, 2010). Drug legislation became the newly revolutionized method of urban criminalization after the civil rights sixties, which was started in New York by then governor Nelson Rockefeller (Thompson, 2010). Rockefeller passed a series of drug laws in 1973 in which accounted for 66 percent of the prison population in New York alone by targeting, but also policed communities of color in areas known not to have high drug trafficking or nor drug usage (Thompson, 2010). Urban space criminalization can be seen as a beginning to the mass incarceration of primarily African American men and other minorities, which ultimately led to increased

prison populations in the late twentieth and early twenty first century (Thompson, 2010).

In order to help with overcrowding occurring from the rise, states could have responded in three ways. Generally, the three options available to relieve overcrowding associated with increased prison populations are through methods addressing front end, back end, or capacity expansion (Austin & Krisberg, 1985). States can reduce sentence lengths, decrease the amount of time served, or increase the number of cells through construction or renovation (Austin & Krisberg, 1985). Although states legally have the option to release offenders or regulate their sentencing as an answer in decreasing overcrowding prisons, As is evident by the current 2.4 million incarcerated in jails and prisons (Wilderman, 2009) states chose capacity expansion rather than reduction. This increase affects not only offenders but families and tax payers as well.

During the early 1980s states spent eight hundred million dollars in the expansion of prisons (Austin & Krisberg, 1985). It has been argued that funneling these funds into parole, probation, drug programs, or

counseling could have benefited offenders, families, or society, yet states chose incarceration rather than other forms of deterrence or rehabilitation to address the US crime problem.

According to the Bureau of Justice Statics (2011) there was 0.59% decline in the prison population rates in 2011 from 1,613,803to 1,598,780 prison inmates in the prison system. Poor minorities consist of a majority of the incarcerated population, which consist of African Americans, Hispanics, non-white, and women. Bureau of Justice (2011) show that about 63 percent of total 1.5 million inmates are black male under the age 39 and 68 percent Hispanic males. Black females comprised of 60 percent of the prison population rates in 2011, and Hispanic females under the age of 39 comprised of 67 percent of the prison population in 2011 according to the Bureau of Justice.

2.2 African American Men and How They Are Affected

"Mass incarceration of African Americans is not only morally unjustifiable, but morally repugnant. ~Dorothy

Roberts

(Roberts, 2004, p.1273)

Mass incarcerating minorities has had a huge impact on African Americans men since post slavery. Transformation of prison policy during the turn of the twenty-first century can be accurately characterized as the mass incarceration of African Americans (Roberts, 2004). If it is known that men and women of color are incarcerated at higher rates how can we correct such injustices that can be tagged as the discrimination or racism in which society says has been long removed. Michelle Alexander (2010) thinks otherwise in that we have not ended racism only redesigned it in which the criminal justice system has merely switched from using race as a justification to locking up those of color, and now relies on the criminal justice system to legally discriminate. There is sufficient evidence that African Americans have committed numerous crimes which should be punished. Yet, what type of punishment is fair and how the system can be better utilized are questions the US government must address.

Government official's number one goal should be deterrence and rehabilitation since numbers show that the severity of punishment does not influence ones

behavior when considering the consequences in committing crimes that potentially lead to imprisonment. Criminals won't consider consequences when their main goal is to not be apprehended for the crime they commit. Instead in 1972 a total of 28,680 minority offenders were incarcerated in federal, state, and county facilities, which rose to 480,519 within 30 years due to a substantial increase in drug related incarcerations (Caulkins & Chandler, 2006). There was little support for rehabilitation in the forms of community service, probation, parole, or drug treatment programs as a foundation in decreasing or altering drug crimes, instead government officials chose to build more prisons and privatize prisons as a way to capitalize. Although African Americans were nearly half of the prison population they only made up 12 percent of the United States population, and were incarcerated eight times more than whites in 1980 (Tonry, 2003). During the conclusion of 1983 the U.S Bureau of Justice Statistics estimated that of the 400,000 plus inmates living in county, state, and federal prisons, 48 percent were African American males (Austin & Krisberg, 1985). As data has shown 1983 was only the beginning of major increases of

African Americans males being incarcerated. Due to discrimination and income equality many more African Americans eventually saw the insides of a prison cell. Nearly half of our current federal prison population is made of nonviolent offenders of color (Ferguson & Faye, 2005). Only 7 percent of the federal prison population consist of violent offenders while 48 percent are drug offender a non-violent crime according to Bureau of Justice(2011).In spite of much support to use resources towards focusing on tracking down violent offenders we are a fighting a war on non-violent crimes that have been mishandled. Information of such exploitation was not available to the public until 1990 with the help of the Sentencing Project the public was alerted of the high incarceration rates of the black community in (Roberts, 2004). Sentencing Project reports revealed one-in-four black men ages 20-29 in the United States was were under the control of the criminal justice system, and 1995 revealed that one-in-three black men were either in jail, prison, on probation, or on parole (Roberts, 2004). In 2002 of the two million offenders incarcerated for all crimes in both jails and prisons, African American men represented 586,700 persons serving sentences of more

than one year nearly out numbering the total number of whites and Hispanics incarcerated (Roberts, 2004).

Although race can no longer be used as a legitimate factor in convicting and sentencing US citizens to prison, there are several ways the criminal justice system has masked race in order to imprison African Americans. A major way is through politics and the signing of new bills. Presidents Bill Clintons 1994 Federal Crime Bill increased penalties for many crimes and allowed for the construction of more state prisons (Gottschalk, 2009). Public officials are ready to house more prisoners, but states need to develop better sentencing polices and alternatives to building prison when crime rate increase (Gottschalk, 2009). As a strategy in winning elections public officials make it their duty to win by all means necessary even if it includes imprisoning non-violent blacks at higher rates. Being tough on crime has been a political move that has increased the prison population across the board, however, disproportionately African Americans have paid the ultimate price of going to prison (Tapia, 2010). Nationally politics have affected many urban areas

where a disproportionate numbers of African Americans reside. The five main states that have been affected by political abuse are California, Texas, New York, Florida, and Ohio (Austin & Krisberg, 1985).

Policymakers began to write and enact many laws that affected African Americans the most. Between 1975 and 1985 punishments became harsher, three strike laws were passed, minimum sentences for drugs laws were passed and the extension of capital punishment was passed (Tonry, 2003). These laws passed were caused by paranoid politicians who then brought the fear of crime to the attention of constituents. Although fear of crime and perception of crime did not overlap due to paranoia brought by politicians the public wanted answers (Pizarro, Pratt, & Stenius, 2006). Politicians then began enforcing laws under the slogans war on drugs and war on crime. There was no empirical evidence to suggest that drugs were the raising crime rates or that crime rates altogether had risen (Swisher, 2008). Going by the words of those whom we voted into office was enough to start a panic by the public. Public fear contributed and made it acceptable for policymakers to enact harsh policies, and argued the public wanted longer and harsher sentences

(Pizarro, Pratt, & Stenius, 2006). Prison at one time was a haven for the deviant and incorrigible offender, but now is a home of African Americans, especially males, due to the war on crime and drugs (Pettit & Western, 2004).

“War on drugs became its own prisoner generating machine, producing incarceration rates that defy gravity and continue to grow even as crime rates are dropping”. ~ Dorothy Roberts (Roberts, 2004, p. 1275)

Statistics show that whites have a higher rate of illegal drug use yet, sixty percent of those imprisoned for drug crimes are black men, compared to white men imprisoned at a rate of 14 percent (Myers, 2006). This disparity has continued over three decades (Roberts, 2004). Caulkins and Chandler (2006) point to the controversy concerning the benefits and costs of incarcerating those involved in drug violations. Drug offenses must have consequences, but at what cost does one pay for a non-violent crime. Incarcerating large rates of men of color for non-violent drug crimes affects families, civil liberties, minority communities, disenfranchisement of minorities, and general well-being (Caulkins & Chandler, 2006).

As the war on drugs and crime began so did the increased incarceration of African Americans

(Murachver, 2007). Policy makers passed the Uniform Sentencing Act, which created mandatory federal minimum sentencing for drug offenses which could not be overruled (Costanza & Helms, 2010). On the surface, this law did not single out African Americans males, yet incarceration rates for drug offenses would show that primarily African Americans males are arrested. Proving that black males are the targets of heightened drug arrest would be a tough task, and would take the help of local, state, and federal officials willing to fix centuries of broken policies and issues such as selective prosecution. In *United States vs. Armstrong* defendants attempted to show that they were apprehended due to race along with many other blacks, but were stumped by the appeal courts unwillingness to determine who has the burden of proving selective prosecution, which plaintiffs would have to prove there they were selected and apprehended along with many others based, with race being primary factor, without documented paperwork from arresting officials of previous arrest history as evidence as proof.

2.3 Case Law

United States versus Christopher Lee Armstrong sought to prove that federal agents indeed arrested

and prosecuted the respondents by their race and not the crime. The respondents were African American males whom were local drug dealers. A crime was committed, yet that crime was speculated by race first then criminally investigated. The respondents sought to prove that federal agents only were prosecuting men of color and eliminating their white counterparts. Plaintiff's case was dismissed in lower court and was ultimately dismissed by the United States Supreme Court as well.

United States vs. Christopher Lee Armstrong et al., 517 US 456(1996)

In 1992 Armstrong and others were indicted in the district court of California on charges of possession of crack cocaine with intent to distribute and firearms charges. Prior to the conviction the assailants were followed by the California narcotics unit and Federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms. Informants from both divisions were placed under cover and purchased crack cocaine from the assailants. During the numerous purchases firearms were also seen on the assailants. Once enough evidence was gathered assailants were arrested in a drug ring

at a local hotel, and crack cocaine and a firearm was apprehended.

In response to the district courts indictment assailants filed a motion for discovery or dismissal. Assailants filed on the grounds that the only reason they were selected for federal prosecution was because they were black. Respondents filed an affidavit with the district court that showed in the previous year only people of color were charged in crack cocaine cases. Resistance to the motion was brought by the government in stating there was no evidence verifying they only prosecuted black offenders. Although prosecutors fought hard to dismiss the motion, the district court granted it and ordered the government to bring forth evidence in the following categories. Firstly, the government had to provide a listing of all cocaine and firearms cases within the last three years. Secondly, the government had to identify the race of the defendants in those cases, and identify the law enforcement agencies that were first involved in those particular cases. Lastly, the government had to provide explanations of why they unquestionably

prosecuted those particular defendants for federal cocaine crimes.

In return the government filed for reconsideration of the motion. Attached to the motion were affidavits denying there were no discrepancies, yet the respondents broke the law in many ways without race being a factor. As time elapsed federal government officials would not comply with the motion for reconsideration was dismissed. Prosecutors appealed the trial court's decision and the appellate court affirmed the trial court's decision of dismissing prosecutor's reconsideration in which prosecutors would have to submit discovery of prior arrest history in relation to race. Once again in May of 1996 prosecutors appealed to the United States Supreme Court in which the case was heard en banc. Since Armstrong and respondents unsuccessfully acknowledged any white defendants as evidence who were not properly charged Armstrong was not entitled to a discovery motion. Armstrong's rationale for making a motion discovery for evidence was not justifiable for the United States Supreme Court who believed he should have had evidence in advance himself. All the

information Armstrong needed to prove racial bias was in the hands of the very people who were prosecuting him. Under Fed.R.Crim16(a) a defendant has the rights to look at government materials, but not in preparation of selective prosecution claims. This exclusion allows valuable evidence that is needed to be hidden and stands in the way of proving race may play a factor in the incarceration of black males. In order to prove selective prosecution one must prove discriminatory effect and discriminatory intent, which requires getting discovery, yet discovery will not be obtained without both effect and intent. This leads to many cases being dismissed or cases never making before a panel of judges due to the burden of proof allows for no discovery. Cases such as Yick Wo v. Hopkins, Oyler v. Boles, United States v. Berrios, and Wayne v. United States all seeking to define selective prosecution in providing justice. Each case had different conclusions showing that federal courts have not been uniform regarding the burden of proof defendants need to prove selective prosecution (Brand, 1997). Armstrong's case along with other significant case indicates that the prosecutors and government officials have a great amount of power and discretion,

making it impossible to prove race plays a factor in high incarceration rates. In the year 2013 many are still unaware such discretions the law provides in these circumstances that have affected many black males including college students. This research hope to get varies perceptions and knowledge educated students have on blacks being incarcerated at higher rates along with Hispanic males.

2.4 Hispanic Communities Affected by Mass Incarceration Rates

Just as African Americans have been vastly incarcerated Hispanics too have seen the similar effects of high incarceration rates (Lyons, 2011). Reasoning and cause of arrest may be different yet the outcome remains the same. Compared to white males Hispanics males are just as likely as African Americans males to be overrepresented among those whom have interactions with the criminal justice system (Alpert, & Smith, 2007). Research done nationwide will show that compared to whites, Hispanics will follow behind African Americans in increased arrest rates. Hispanics by far were the fastest growing minority group among inmates (Beck and Bulmstein, 1999).

Hispanics most significant rise in inmate population occurred between the years of 1980 and 1996 (Downes, 2001). Downes (2006) shows that over this sixteen year period, Hispanics were incarcerated at a higher rate than ever before. This is due to changes penal policies and practices and not crime rates (Caplow and Simon, (1999). Beck and Blumstein (1999) noted the severity of their crime was considered and Hispanics were incarcerated more than African Americans. Between 1980 and 1996 Hispanic incarceration rates grew by 554 percent, which was the fastest increase of minority incarceration (Beck & Blumstein, 1999). Hispanics were 3.6 more times likely to be incarcerated than non- Hispanics up from 2.8 percent (Day, 2007). Day (2006) also states in 1996 the rise of Hispanic population in prison was .7 percent of their total population. The rise constituted higher offenses of all crimes but drug offenses between 1980 and 1986. In 2003 there were approximately 1,778 Hispanics male prisoners per 100,000 Hispanic males (Ferguson & Faye, 2005). As 2010 those numbers have only slightly changed Hispanic male inmates made up 1,775 per 100,000 (Bureau of Justice, 2011).When incorporating age young Hispanic

males between the ages of 23-29 make up 3,892 per 100,000 of the prison population (Bureau of Justice, 2011) These numbers surpass whites and are steadily creeping up on the population of blacks. In total 1.2 percent of all Hispanic males was serving time in prison in 2011 according to Bureau of Justice. In Bureau of Justice (2011) Hispanics were imprisoned at higher rates than whites in all age groups. Hispanics were incarcerated (14%) for property crimes the lagging behind whites (24%) and blacks (15%). However Hispanics surpassed both white (49%) and blacks (55%) when imprisoned for violent crimes at 57 percent. Blacks are still the leaders in drug offenses while Hispanics trail behind at (20%) which is nine percent less than their white counterparts (Bureau of Justice, 2011). When it came to rape and sex crimes Hispanics accounted for (8%) and whites (16%). Overall data shows of all crimes Hispanics lead in violent crime in which they should be incarcerated to the fullest extent. Repeated violence effects our communities thus higher incarcerations can be considered correct justifications. Officials knowingly aware of the high rates in which Hispanics commit violent crimes can be a hindrance to the Hispanic community. This allows

officers to watch that target group as a precaution in deterring future violent crime that can be viewed as profiling. Although profiling may not be intentional it is discriminative and potentially affects non-violent offenders becoming repeated offenders whom will get lost in newly harsh policies (Foster, 2007). Below is a case that definitely relates to officers use of stopping offenders for a non-violent crime in attempt to capture those of the Hispanic race connected to a violent crime.

2.5 Case Law

Rodriguez vs. California Highway Patrol, C-99-20895 JF/HRL (N.D.F. February 27, 2003)

Curtis Rodriguez was a Hispanic attorney who residing in California. As Rodriguez and an acquaintance were passing through San Jose they noticed reoccurring traffic stops being made in the nearby vicinity. Rodriguez and his passenger noticed that officers of the California Highway Patrol were only stopping Latinos during their routine traffic stops. Knowing that no one would believe him Rodriguez and his passenger began to take pictures of the traffic stops. While attempting to leave the area

Rodriguez himself was stopped and pulled to the side of the street by California State Patrol. Rodriguez was told by officers that he was stopped for traffic violations, which he and his passenger knew were never committed.

Immediately after the initial traffic stop officers demanded to search Rodriguez's vehicle for weapons. Rodriguez refused to allow the search. As an attorney Rodriguez knew there was no probable cause and his constitutional rights were being violated. Although Rodriguez refused the search his vehicle was searched as he and his passenger were asked to wait outside his vehicle. Within thirty minutes Rodriguez's information was checked and was allowed to leave. Neither Rodriguez nor his passenger received tickets or warning. As a result, Rodriguez filed a lawsuit against California Highway Patrol.

American Civil Liberties Union of North Carolina was a key player in the lawsuit Rodriguez filed. Just as predicted by Rodriguez and his team California Highway Patrol had committed numerous traffic stops based on the race of the driver. Officers were not only targeting Latinos, but African Americans as well.

Evidence presented showed that Latinos and African Americans were more likely than their white counterparts to be stopped and searched in particular locations. Evidence and reports proved without a doubt racial profiling was happening in San Jose, California.

On February 27, 2003 California Highway Patrol agreed to a settlement. Although the settlement took almost five years the state of California realized changes needed to be made. Many reforms and mandates were put in place in an effort to reduce or eliminate racial profiling. By providing strict protocols the patrol department would be less likely to hide further acts of bias. Under the settlement California Highway Patrol were not allowed to substitute traffic stops as means to search for drugs without probable cause, and data had to be collected for all future traffic stops. Data collection included race of driver, reason and legality of stop, and if any jail time or tickets were received due to the traffic stop. These current reforms were successful steps in reframing our criminal justice department to protect and serve all citizens rather black, brown, or white.

2.6 How Imprisonment Affects Women

African American and Hispanic women have experienced disproportionality in incarceration; however, women of all races are facing the same problem. Simmons (2011) calls for a reform on the criminal justice system that makes visible not only class and race, but also makes visible injustice women experience as well. The overwhelming majority of incarceration research follows a female exclusionary approach. Not until recently have some studies focused on the effects of female incarceration (Simmons, 2011). Although the prevalence of female incarceration remains low in comparison to men, the rates have significantly increased. Over the last two decades, the growth of women inmates rose 5.2 percent (Ferguson & Faye, 2005). These increases are in contrast to the development of a prison system for male prisoners. From the origin of the prison system and extending through the recent prison construction boom, prisons have been designed exclusively by and for men (Simmons, 2011). Due to the prevalence of women compared to men, incarcerated women have been viewed as statistically insignificant (Simmons, 2011). However, it is argued that increases in female

population rates have the same, if not more, effects on communities whom are left without a mother, daughter, grandmother or sister. Just as neighborhoods suffer from the lack of minority men in the communities they suffer even more when both men and women have a larger presence in the prison system, rather than in their own communities (Arrigo Belvins, Coston, & Laughlin, 2008).

The recent expansion of prisons included addressing increased levels of women prisoners. While incarceration of men doubled, women incarceration rates tripled (Sudbury, 2002). According to Sudbury (2002) the levels increased from 5,600 to 75,000 within twenty six years in both state and federal prisons. African American females are 2.5 more likely to be arrested than Hispanics and 4.5 times more likely to be arrested than whites (Sudbury, 2002). Females of color, just like males, are more likely to be imprisoned over other races (Lipsitz, 2012). In comparison to Hispanic males black females have the fastest growing sector with the prison population (Robert, 2004). In 2006 African American incarceration rates increased by 800 percent since

1986 compared to an overall increase of 400 percent of all races (American Civil Liberties Union, 2006). As stated earlier as a whole woman of all races have seen increases in incarceration rates, but data shows that women of color will enter the criminal justice system over whites when abuse is a factor. American Civil Liberties Union (2006) points out that abused girls of color will be labeled as offenders and processed into the criminal justice system , while white girls have a better chance of treated as a victim or referred to child welfare or mental health facilities. Although women of color overall are likely to be criminalized for their crimes they play an equal part of being a victim incarcerated for drug crimes. American Civil liberties Union (2006) points out between 1896 and 1999 women incarcerated in state facilities for drug related crimes rose 888 percent outpacing men for similar crime. By the year 2003, 58% of all women in the federal prison system were convicted of drug related offenses (American Civil Liberties Union, 2006). Many times women played no part in the drug offenses but laws passed by Congress began to hold accountable those whom had minimal or no involvement in drug trade (Daniel, 2006). In 1998 Congress added

conspiracy to commit drug offenses on the list of crimes to be imposed, which expanded to partners, relatives, and bystanders of those who knowingly was part of the drug trade (American Civil Liberties Union, 2006). As more women became victim to conspiracy laws their children also became victims. The effects of increased women incarceration rates resulted in children left behind. Among female prisoners two thirds are mother to a minor child, and 1.5 million children have a parent in prison (American Civil Liberties Union, 2007). High rates of incarceration of minorities have resulted in children in some areas finding themselves without either parent. This cost the state over \$50,000 as a consequence of housing parents and foster care cost, which is seven times more costly than providing drug treatment services (American Civil Liberties Union, 2006) To better understand how children and loved one cope with women leaving the community we must first understand the history of women entering the criminal justice system.

Female involvement in the criminal justice system did not occur overnight. Female juveniles have

experienced increases in contact with the juvenile justice system (Craig, 2009). Overall the female juvenile cases have grown at an average rate of 3% per year between 1985 and 2009 (Juvenile Court Statistics, 2009). While female juvenile caseloads remained stable juvenile male caseloads were decreasing between 1997 and 2009 (Juvenile Court Statistics, 2009). As well Juvenile Court Statistics (2009) shows a peak in both property and drug offenses in the 1990s for female juveniles showing that females began surpass males in committing certain crimes as juveniles. However, the pathway to incarceration seems to be different for women than men. It is reported that half of incarcerated women were previously juvenile offenders who were runaways avoiding physical or sexual abuse (DeHart, 2008). As the juveniles became women that abuse followed them leading victimization. Victimization and crime have been linked to incarcerated women and largely place them in the hands of the criminal justice system (DeHart, 2008). To correlate victimization and crime several studies have been done, yet not enough to accurately pinpoint a significant correlation, thus more research must be done. Not only have women recently faced higher

incarceration rates they have for a long time faced burdens outside prison walls due to the high incarceration rates of males.

Women have for years been drastically affected by the imprisonment of their sons, husbands, brothers, and many other kin. Mass incarceration can be seen as an injustice that significantly shapes the lives of women whom are intimately tied to the carceral system through the imprisonment of a loved one (Simmons, 2012). High male incarceration rates have affected many women in such ways their lives are changed forever. A study conducted through Families to Amend California's Three Strikes (FACTS) focuses on how the incarceration of loved one's is both a source of burden and fuel for resistance.

2.7 Case Study

FACTS study was conducted in California which utilized participant observation and interviews with mothers of prisoners. FACTS interviewed and observed seven women whom are affected by the mass incarceration of a loved one. This study show how the women face burden because of mass incarceration, thus becoming victims living as prisoners outside of jail

walls. This study also examined how motherhood and activism has been impacted, and suggests that the mass incarceration of their loved ones is a form of injustice that significantly shapes the context of what it means to be a woman for those tied to the carceral system through imprisonment of a loved one. The finding of the study was to ultimately acknowledge that the mass incarceration is a phenomenon that not only affects the incarcerated, but the ripple effects are felt far beyond prison walls. Women are being affected in two ways by being incarcerated in higher rates and being left alone to be the head of their household when loved ones are being incarcerated at high rates.

Research found that incarceration harms families and communities almost as much as it harms prisoners themselves, which includes damaging social bonds and diminishing life chances (Simmons, 2012). Women become entangled in a web that they can't control. They are left to be the main source in providing for their families a role a man would normally play. This study show how women feel they have become objects in a large process they cannot control and consequences of

removing males from the family and community (Simmons, 2012). High incarceration rates cause community gender imbalance which impacts gender roles, gender relations, family structure, all which affected women's identity (Simmons, 2012). Simmons (2012) study suggests due to the following women assume pressing care giver demands, bringing children to prison visits, caring for non-biological children, and facilitating ex-prisoner re-entry. FACTS mothers that were interviewed all faced overlapping forms of collateral damages which included monetary, moral, and emotional damages. They were left to financially, emotionally, and morally care for the family and the imprisoned at all cost (Simmons, 21012). Financially, women have to ensure their loved one taken care of by sending money to their books, while at the same time providing for the family they left behind. Morally many of the women felt responsible for their loved one being locked up. They felt as if they went wrong in raising and properly providing for their imprisoned loved one, and emotionally the women in this study felt at a standstill worrying if their loved one will die and prison, and if they would every see them again (Simmons, 2012). Such impacts affect women differently

based on class. Low income women must make significant life changes, which includes multiple jobs and low education status. When mass incarceration targets low income and minority men, it also targets low income and minority women. A racial and class structured oppression of mass incarceration has created significant and gendered burden inside and outside prison walls among low income and minority women(Simmons, 2012).

Though this study is limited it acknowledges that low income and minority women are not only being incarcerated at higher rates, but are also the subject to burdens outside prison walls. Mothers are left single parents to raise children on their own, thus leaving their children home alone to work and provide. This study shows and acknowledges that women face a double burden due to the mass incarceration of minorities. Not only are minority women faced with losing a loved one to the prison system, becoming a victim of mass incarceration, but they must also subject to damages monetarily, morally, and emotionally.

CHAPTER 3

DEVELOPMENT and IMPLEMENTATION OF RESEARCH

3.1 Methodology

Mass incarceration of minorities is a major problem has been recognized throughout the United States and throughout the world. However, there is very limited research on the perceptions and knowledge of mass incarceration of minorities among college students. Thus, the purpose of this study is to address this need in the academic field by examining college student's perception and knowledge of incarcerated minorities. In this chapter, the author shall discuss data collection, analysis, and evaluation. Specifically, the survey instrument in this study was created by the author to measure the perceptions and knowledge of college students on the campus of the University of Texas at Arlington(UTA) by using literature review as a construct. The survey instrument was approved by the University of Texas at

Arlington's Institutional Review Board (IRB) in the Office of Research Integrity and Compliance.

The study was conducted to discover possible differences in perception and knowledge of minorities incarcerated of college students at the UTA in selected departments in the Spring semester of 2013. There is limited research on this topic, making this study exploratory. In this study a survey is a proper method to use, as it was easily self-administered and voluntary without respondent feeling pressured. In the next section, criteria for participation of the survey sample, sample size, the survey, and analysis of the survey questionnaire will be reviewed.

3.2 Sample and Size

A quantitative cross-sectional, empirical approach was used to measure college students' knowledge and perception of mass incarceration. Participants of the survey were from the University of Texas at Arlington. Criminology and criminal justice class, business, math, and other classes were eligible to participate in the study. In this particular survey, there were 105 total participants 105(n=105)

During the Spring 2013 semester 13 classes were randomly selected to conduct the survey. Of the 13 classes randomly selected only 5 responded through email, accepting to participate in research. Three undergraduate and two graduate classes at the University of Texas at Arlington were given the survey instrument. The only graduate courses excluded from the study were graduate level conference and thesis courses. All participants were told to complete the survey only once, and therefore did not complete the survey if they had already done so in an earlier class.

The sampling size for this study was calculated using Cohen's Size Categories. This allows the researcher to reasonably estimate the sample size in which the study needs to be conducted. Participation in the study was voluntary, meaning participants were given the opportunity to discontinue the survey instrument at any time. As mentioned previously, 105 students surveys were returned completed to the researcher, this the total number of participants and completed surveys to 105 (N=105).

3.3 Survey Instrument

A thirty question self-administered survey was created by the researcher to collect data of students' perception and knowledge on the mass incarceration of minorities, as well as demographical data. This survey was created by the researcher using academic literature presented in Chapters 1 and 2.

A five point Likert scale was used on the first 21 questions of the survey. Participants were asked to respond on the scale of "1"strongly agreed, "2" agreed, "3" neutral, "4"disagreed, or "5"strongly disagreed. Questions measuring perception and knowledge were evenly distributed throughout the survey instrument. The last seven questions on the survey pertained to demographics including race, ethnicity, level of employment, marital status age, gender, and level of education.

Prior to being distributed, all appropriate forms and the survey instrument were submitted to the IRB for evaluation and approval. Letters of approval from all participating professors at the University of Texas at Arlington was obtained. The researcher received full approval from the IRB and Office of Research Integrity and Compliance to perform the

study. Please see Appendix A for a copy of the survey instrument.

3.4 Survey Implementation

The researcher obtained permission in Spring 2013 from professors at the University of Texas at Arlington to implement the survey to students. IRB sent the researcher a letter of approval for the study and survey instrument to be implemented starting April of 2013. Surveys were distributed to three undergraduate classes and two graduate classes, excluding conference and thesis courses, from the Criminology and Criminal Justice, Social Work, and Business Management departments. A summary of courses selected to participate are shown on Table 1.

Table 1: SPRING 2013 COURSES UTILIZED IN STUDY

Course Title	Level
BCOM 3360 Business Communication	Undergraduate
CRCJ 4301 The American Judicial System	Undergraduate
SOCW 2313 Social Work Practice I	Undergraduate
SOCW 5301 Human Behavior and Social Environment	Graduate
SOCW 5310 Micro and Macro Field Seminar	Graduate

This survey instrument contained a disclaimer that participation in the survey was entirely voluntary, and participation could stop at any time while filling out the survey, and would not result in a penalty of any kind. It was also stated participants' personal identities and responses were to be kept confidential. Upon completion of the survey, the researcher placed all surveys together in an envelope to maintain the anonymity of the participant. The survey was available for students to complete during the month of April 2013.

3.5 Procedures of Analysis

The researcher used Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 21.0 to code and analyzes data obtained from completed survey instruments. Data compiled from student responses was be compared and contrasted. Survey items were measured on a Likert scale and coded to their respective values. Demographical questions were also coded to reflect their respective categories and nominal values. The survey participants' responses were coded in SPSS, and frequencies generated from each variable.

The main purpose for using statistical analysis was to find possible significances on the knowledge and perception on the mass incarceration of minorities. An independent samples t-test is a variance analysis that compares means of multiple groups (Sweet & Grace-Martin, 2003). This type of test was determined to be most appropriate to compare the means and determine if statistical significance existed between students. In Chapter 4, the author will present the findings of the survey instrument as they are relevant to this study.

CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH FINDINGS

This chapter will detail the results of the survey as it pertains to students' perception and knowledge of the mass incarceration of minorities. Data collected for this study were analyzed using independent samples t-test. By using this method it is expected that there will be differences found in the survey responses between students in various departments at the University of Texas at Arlington.

The finding of this study will be described and presented in three sections. Firstly, the demographic findings of the respondents surveyed. Secondly and third sections will describe findings of the independent samples t-test when perception and knowledge questions from the survey were ran in SPSS.

4.1 Demographic Information

TABLE 2: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Variable	Percentage
Race	
American Indian/Alaskan Native	4
Table 2 Continued	
Asian	8
Black/African American	20
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1
White	58
Abstained from Question	14
Ethnicity	
Hispanic/Latino	31
Not Hispanic/Latino	66
Abstained from Question	8
Level of employment	
City/Municipality	4
County	5
State	3
Federal	5
None of the Above	87
Abstained from Question	1
Marital status	
Single	81
Married	13
Widowed	1
Divorced	7
Separated	2
Abstained from Question	1
Age	
Under 23	62
24-35	35
36-45	4
46-55	2
56 or older	1
Abstained from Question	
Gender	
Female	70
Male	34
Abstained from Question	1
College Major	
CriminalJustice/Criminology	35
Social Work	34
Business Management/Other	31
Abstained from Question	5

TABLE 2(a): Race Demographics on "Race has no Influence in prison rates"

Race	Percentage
Asian American/Alaskan Native	4
Asian	8
Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	20
Black/African American	1
White	58

The survey contained seven questions pertaining to demographics. There were a total of 105 participants in the survey. The majority of the respondents in this survey were female(70%) and male (34%). The majority of respondents identified themselves as White (58%), American Indian/Alaskan Native(4%), Asian(8%),African American/Black(20), and Hawaiian/Pacific Islander(1%), with ethnicities of Hispanic/Latino (31%) and Non-Hispanic/Latino (66%). All participants were over the age of 18 years old. Of these (62%) were in the age bracket of 23 and under, (35%) were 23 to 35,(4%) were 36 to 45, (2%) were 46 to 55, and (1%)was 56 or older. Participants were asked their level of employment city/municipality (4%) represented county (5%), state (3%), federal (5%), and (86%) of the participants classified their employment

as none of the above. The researcher asked participants to indicate their marital status, giving the five options. Of participants surveyed 81% indicated they were single, (13%) married, (1) widowed, (7) divorced, while (2) were separated. Of the participants who had pursued higher education were 35% Criminal Justice or Criminology , (34%) Social Work, (13%) Business Management, (18%) while were not. For a complete summary of demographics refer to Table 2.

4.2 Perception Based Information

TABLE 3: PERCEPTION BASED QUESTIONS COMPARING CRIMINAL JUSTICE TO SOCIAL WORK AND COMPARING CRIMINAL JUSTICE TO BUSINESS AND OTHER MAJORS STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE

Variable	Criminology Mean	Social Work Mean	Significance	Business/Other	Significance
Sentencing for women is generally more lenient than for men.	2.02	2.44	.992	2.19	.187
Race does not have any influence on the increases within prison incarceration rates.	3.91	3.85	.086*	3.54	.161

Table 3 Continued					
Increased prison population rates are overanalyzed	3.20	3.50	.327	3.25	.259
Minorities main contributor to increased crime.	3.42	5.11	.277	3.16	.138
Women play a small role in prison incarceration rates.	3.08	3.47	.013*	2.64	.026*
Males dominate the prison system.	1.74	2.05	.471	1.67	.921
All drug crimes should require prison time.	3.31	5.20	.598	3.22	.136
With the absence of racial profiling, prisons wouldn't be overcrowded	2.94	3.14	.368	3.03	.166
Current drug laws are racially biased.	3.28	3.52	.273	3.54	.223
War on drugs is profit motivated.	2.28	2.47	.378	2.80	.990
Communities have no effect on crime.	3.77	3.55	.813	3.80	.786
Crime is:	4.14	4.35	.395	4.32	.662
Race is not an issue in crime	1.82	1.85	.919	1.61	.352
Over the last 30 years	1.85	2.02	.034*	1.96	.069*

*statistically significant at .05/** statistically significant at .01

TABLE 4: PERCEPTION BASED QUESTIONS TOTAL
PERCENTAGES

Variable	Percentage Agree	Percentage Disagree	Percentage Neutral
Sentencing for women is generally more lenient than for men.	73	18	14
Race does not influence increases in incarceration rates.	16	73	16
Increased prison population rates are overanalyzed.	21	48	36
Minorities are the main contributors to increased crime.	24	64	17
Women play a small role in prison incarceration rates.	45	46	14
Males dominate the prison system.	89	3	13
All drug crimes should require prison time.	36	54	15
With the absence of racial profiling, prisons wouldn't be overcrowded.	35	43	27
Current drug laws are racially biased.	19	57	28
War on drugs is profit motivated.	61	24	19
Race issue in crime	22	72	10

Table 4 Continued			
Communities have no effect on crime.	3	96	5
Crime is:	Inevitable	Avoidable	Neither
	48	32	24
Over the last 30 years crime has:	Decreased	Increased	Neither
	18	73	1

Items within this section were presented within the survey to measure the perception of criminal justice majors compared to social work majors, criminal justice majors compared to business and other majors, and the overall perceptions of the mass incarceration of minorities. There were thirteen perception questions identified on the survey. Of the thirteen perception questions, three reached statistical significance when the independent samples t-test was run, and those will be identified later in the section. The first question on the survey was "sentencing for a woman is generally more lenient than for men. The mean for a criminal justice majors (CJ) was 2.02 compared to a mean of 2.44 for social work majors (SOCW), and compared to business/other majors (BM/O) a mean of 2.19. When CJ was compared to SOCW this yielded sig value of .992 and when CJ was compared

to BM/O this yielded a sig value of .187. Overall 73% of the participants agreed with this statement, 18% disagreed, and 14% were neutral or did not know. "Race does not influence increases in incarceration rates" was the second perception question, and the mean for a CJ respondent was 3.91. SOCW (3.85) and BM/O(3.54) were both compared to CJ and means slightly differed. This means criminal justice majors agreed with this statement over social work and other majors. When CJ was compared to SOCW this yielded a statistically significant value of .086 that reached a statistical significance at a 0.05 level. When CJ was compared to BM/O this yielded a sig value of .161. Overall 16% of the participants agreed with this statement, 73% disagreed, and 16% were neutral or did not know. "Increased prison population rates are overanalyzed" the mean 3.20 for a CJ respondent was compared to a mean of 3.50 for SOCW respondent, and compared to BM/O respondent a mean of 3.25. When CJ was compared to SOCW this yielded sig value of .327 and when CJ was compared to BM/O this yielded a sig value of .259. Overall 21% of the participants agreed with this statement, 48% disagreed, and 36% were neutral or did not know. " Minorities are the main contributors to

increased crime". The mean for a CJ was 3.42 compared to a mean of 5.11 for SOCW, and compared to BM/O a mean of 3.16. When CJ was compared to SOCW this yielded sig value of .277 and when CJ was compared to BM/O this yielded a sig value of .138. Overall 24% of the participants agreed with this statement, 64% disagreed, and 17% were neutral or did not know.

"Women play a small role in prison incarceration rates" was statistically significant at .026 and .013 being statistically significant .05 levels. There was a significant difference between the majors in which each major where nearly 50% of each major both agreed and disagreed. The mean for a criminal justice major 3.08 and was compared to both social work major 3.47 , and business management/other majors(2.64) When CJ was compared to SOCW this yielded sig value of .013 and when CJ was compared to BM/O this yielded a sig value of .026. Overall 45% of the participants agreed with this statement, 46% disagreed, and 14% were neutral or did not know. Response to "males dominate the prison system" have a mean for a criminal justice major mean of 1.74. When compared to both social work major (2.05) and compared to business/other major a mean of 1.67. When CJ was compared to SOCW this yielded sig

value of .471 and when CJ was compared to BM/O this yielded a sig value of .921. Overall 89% of the participants agreed with this statement, 3% disagreed, and 13% were neutral or did not know. All drug crimes should require prison time had a criminal justice major mean of 3.31, social work major mean of 5.20, and a , business/other major mean of 3.22. Making the sig value of CJ compared to SOCW .598 and the sig value of CJ compared to BM/O .136. Overall 36% of the participants agreed with this statement, 54% disagreed, and 15% were neutral or did not know. "With the absence of racial profiling, prisons wouldn't be overcrowded" had a criminal justice major mean of 2.94, social work major mean of 3.14, and a , business/other major mean of 3.03. Making the sig value of CJ compared to SOCW .368 and the sig value of CJ compared to BM/O .166. Overall 35% of the participants agreed with this statement, 43% disagreed, and 27% were neutral or did not know.

"Current drug laws are racially biased" had a criminal justice major mean of 3.28, social work major mean of 3.52, and a , business/other major mean of 2.47 Making the sig value of CJ compared to SOCW .273 and

the sig value of CJ compared to BM/O .223. Overall 19% of the participants agreed with this statement, 57% disagreed, and 28% were neutral or did not know. War on drugs is profit motivated had a criminal justice major mean of 2.28, social work major mean of 2.47, and a , business/other major mean of 2.80. Making the sig value of CJ compared to SOCW .378 and the sig value of CJ compared to BM/O .990. Overall 61% of the participants agreed with this statement, 24% disagreed, and 19% were neutral or did not know.

"Communities have no effect on crime" had a criminal justice major mean of 3.77, social work major mean of 3.55 and a , business/other major mean of 3.80. Making the sig value of CJ compared to SOCW .813 and the sig value of CJ compared to BM/O .786. Overall 22% of the participants agreed with this statement, 72% disagreed, and 10% were neutral or did not know. Race is not an issue in crime had a criminal justice major mean of 4.14, social work major mean of 4.35, and a , business/other major mean of 4.32. Making the sig value of CJ compared to SOCW .395 and the sig value of CJ compared to BM/O .662. Overall 3% of the participants agreed with this statement, 96% disagreed, and 5% were neutral or did not know. "Crime

is inevitable, avoidable, or neither" is had a criminal justice major mean of 1.82, social work major mean of 1.85, and a , business/other major mean of 1.61. Making the sig value of CJ compared to SOCW .185 and the sig value of CJ compared to BM/O .352. Overall 48% of the participants' responded crime is inevitable, 32% responded crime avoidable, and 24% responded to neither or did not know. "Over the last 30 years crime has decreased, increased, or neither" was the last perception question and was statistically significant with a value of .069 and .034 both being statistically significant at a .05 level. Almost 80% of all majors agreed that crime has indeed increased The mean for a criminal justice major 1.85 was compared to social work major (2.02), and compared to business/other major (1.96). When CJ was compared to SOCW this yielded sig value of .034 and when CJ was compared to BM/O this yielded a sig value of .069. Overall 18% of the participants' responded crime has decreased, 73% responded that crime has decreased, and 1% were neutral or did not know.

4.3 Knowledge Based Information

TABLE 5: KNOWLEDGE BASE QUESTIONS CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMPARED TO SOCIAL WORK and COMPARING CRIMINAL JUSTICE TO BUSINESS AND OTHER MAJORS STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE

Variable	Criminal Justice Mean	Social Work Mean	Significance	Business/Other Mean	Significance
Massive increases in prison population have occurred within the last forty years.	1.68	1.73	.846	1.83	.312
Incarcerated women have past abuse history that contributed to their crime(s).	2.22	2.17	.492	2.00	.261
African American men and women are incarcerated at the highest rate.	2.60	2.70	.255	2.64	.159
African American females are incarcerated at higher rates than Hispanics females.	2.48	2.70	.152	3.41	.161
Hispanic male incarceration rates are surpassing African American male incarceration rates.	2.85	3.14	.213	3.12	.282
Crime decreased when incarceration increases	3.85	4.00	.919	3.70	.396

Table 5 Continued					
Racial profiling significantly contributes to mass incarceration rates.	3.88	4.17	.672	3.64	.105
Increased sentencing and massive incarceration rates have reduced the fear of crime.	2.28	2.23	.718	2.45	.209
Increased incarceration rates of Hispanics are primarily due to immigration problems.	2.62	2.44	.642	2.80	.790

TABLE 6: KNOWLEDGE BASED QUESTIONS TOTAL

PERCENTAGES

Variable	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage
	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
Massive increases in prison population have occurred within the last forty years.	93	1	11
Incarcerated women have past abuse history that contributed to their crime(s).	52	18	34
African American men and women are incarcerated at the highest rate.	73	12	20
African American females are incarcerated at higher rates than Hispanics females.	42	16	46

Table 6 Continued			
Hispanic male incarceration rates are surpassing African American male incarceration rates.	24	38	43
Crime decreased significantly when incarceration rates increased.	11	78	16
Racial profiling significantly contributes to mass incarceration rates.	69	19	17
Increased sentencing and massive incarceration rates have reduced the fear of crime.	9	78	18
Increased incarceration rates of Hispanics are primarily due to immigration problems.	49	27	29

Similar to perception questions on the survey knowledge questions were presented to measure the depth of knowledge students had about the mass incarceration of minorities. There were nine questions pertaining knowledge. Questions were identified on a scale of 1 to 5 referencing "1" as strongly agrees, "2" agrees, "3" neutral "4" disagrees, and "5" strongly disagrees The first question "massive increases in prison population have occurred within the last forty years", found a criminal justice major mean (CJ) 1.68, social work major (SOCW) mean 1.73, and business/other major (BM/O) mean 1.83. When CJ was

compared to SOCW this yielded sig value of .846 and when CJ was compared to BM/O this yielded a sig value of .312. Overall 93% of the participants agreed with this statement, 1% disagreed, and 11% were neutral or did not know. This shows that overall all majors are knowledgeable in correctly responding to this question at almost 95%. The second question "incarcerated women have past abuse history that contributed to their crime(s)", found a CJ mean of 2.22, SOCW mean of 2.17, and BM/O mean of 2.00. When CJ was compared to SOCW this yielded sig value of .492 and when CJ was compared to BM/O this yielded a sig value of .261. Overall 52% agreed, (18%) disagreed, (11%) were either neutral or did not know. In response to question two all majors are not as knowledgeable in understanding the history of abuse and incarcerated women. Almost 30% of respondents either disagreed or didn't know, which it is true that past abuse has contributed to crimes. Regarding whether "African American men and women are incarcerated at the highest rate", found a CJ mean of 2.60, SOCW mean of 2.70, and BM/O mean of 2.64. When CJ was compared to SOCW this yielded sig value of .255 and when CJ was compared to BM/O this yielded a sig value of .159. Overall 73% agreed,

(18%), disagreed, (20%) were either neutral or did not know. Another question "African American females are incarcerated at higher rates than Hispanics females", found a CJ mean of 2.48, SOCW mean of 2.70, and BM/O mean of 3.41. When CJ was compared to SOCW this yielded sig value of .152 and when CJ was compared to BM/O this yielded a sig value of .161. Overall 42% agreed, (12 %) disagreed, (46%) were either neutral or did not know. In response to the statement "Hispanic male incarceration rates are surpassing African American male incarceration rates", found a CJ mean of 2.85, SOCW mean of 3.14, and BM/O mean of 3.12. When CJ was compared to SOCW this yielded sig value of .213 and when CJ was compared to BM/O this yielded a sig value of .282. Overall 24% agreed, (38%) disagreed, (43%) were either neutral or did not know. Almost 50% of respondents were neutral or did not know if Hispanic incarceration rates are surpassing African Americans, thus showing most respondents were not knowledgeable about such question. Responses to the question "crime decreased significantly when incarceration rates increased", found a CJ mean of 3.85, SOCW mean of 4.00, and BM/O mean of 3.70. When CJ was compared to SOCW this yielded sig value of .919

and when CJ was compared to BM/O this yielded a sig value of .396. Overall 11% agreed, (78%) disagreed, (16%) were either neutral or did not know. The seventh question "racial profiling significantly contributes to mass incarceration rates", found a CJ mean of 3.88, SOCW mean of 4.17, and BM/O mean of 3.64. When CJ was compared to SOCW this yielded sig value of .672 and when CJ was compared to BM/O this yielded a sig value of .105. Overall 69% agreed, (19%) disagreed, (17%) were either neutral or did not know. Another question "increased sentencing and massive incarceration rates have reduced the fear of crime", found a CJ mean of 2.28, SOCW mean of 2.23, and BM/O mean of 2.45. When CJ was compared to SOCW this yielded sig value of .718 and when CJ was compared to BM/O this yielded a sig value of .209. Overall 9% agreed (78%) disagreed, (18%) were either neutral or did not know. Further, the last knowledge question "increased incarceration rates of Hispanics are primarily due to immigration problems", found a CJ mean of 2.62, SOCW mean of 2.44, and BM/O mean of 2.80. When CJ was compared to SOCW this yielded sig value of .642 and when CJ was compared to BM/O this yielded a sig value of .790. Respondents were all over the board when responding to this

question. Almost 50% agreed that most Hispanics are incarcerated due to immigration which is not true. Most Hispanics are incarcerated due to violent crimes. Overall participants agreed 49%, (27%) disagreed, (29%) were either neutral or did not know. Table 5 below represents the results from data collected on the knowledge based questions on the survey instrument. In Chapter 5, the author will have the discussion and conclusion section. Results from the survey instrument will be explained and tied in with literature and suggestions.

CHAPTER 5

Conclusion

In this chapter, the author will discuss what the findings from chapter 4 mean. The mass incarceration of minorities is a recognizable problem that is very challenging and complex. This study was to examine the knowledge and perceptions of various departments on the mass incarceration of minorities. By obtaining this goal the researcher distributed a survey instrument that measured the knowledge and perception.

As illustrated in chapter 2 literature outlined previous research that explored history, case law, and effectiveness on the mass incarceration of minorities.

Data obtained from a survey implemented in three undergraduate classes and two graduate classes at the University of Texas at Arlington. Upon collection of all surveys data was analyzed utilizing SPSS 21.0. Independent samples t-test was used to compare the means among criminal justice students and other

departments. Questions on both perception and knowledge differed among students. The majority of questions that were statistically significant were at a 0.05 level.

5.1 Statistically Significant Perceptions

Criminal justice students, social work, business, and various departments seemed to have similar perceptions on the matter of the mass incarceration of minorities. Each department's opinions proved to be statistically significant on three perception questions. Students from each department tended to disagree significantly on the question "Race does not influence increases in incarceration rates". Although business and other departments had a smaller surveying population size they believe more than likely race has an influence over prison rates, while criminal justice and social work majors have similar views.

They disagree on the matter whether or not women play small role in prison incarceration rates. Nearly half of business management and other departments agree that women play a small role in prison rates. On the other hand over half of both criminal justice and social work respondents disagree that women play a

small role in prison incarceration rates. The differences could come from several factors. It could be that both CJ and SOCW respondents have more educational background with regarding the prison population.

Their perceptions were also statistically significant when responding to the question has over the last thirty years crime has decreased, increased, or none of the above. At high rates all departments agree that crime has increased. Overall the findings indicate that all departments tend to have similar view regardless of knowledge.

5.2 Policy Recommendations

As of November 2012 the total number of people serving time in jail or prison is 2,253,705 nationally (The Sentencing Project: Research and Advocacy for Reform, n.d.). Although respondents were very knowledgeable over the subject matter, there is always room for adjustments and improvement. Universities should require that all departments cross train several electives within other departments. For I greatly believe that until a person has walked in another's shoes one will never fully understand that

persons rationale. This is true in life and understanding the educational forum. Until I had taken a music class I had always believed it was as easy class to enjoy and breeze through. Yet I learned a valuable lesson and appreciate music majors to this day. All this is said to get to the point that other departments will not truly the effect that crime, overpopulated prisons, and impoverished communities affect everyone. Required cross training classes will help in making all students aware of just their environment.

Students become more knowledgeable, therefore becoming more powerful. Also as part of the criminal justice department undergraduate and graduates students should be required to take intern and practicum courses that teach students life lessons a book has no way of accomplishing. This also allows criminal justice majors to realize what area of criminal justice one may or may not be interested in. These are recommendations I stand by because even though criminal justice and social work respondents were very knowledgeable when it came to survey questions, neutral as an answer had high ratios.

Neutral is when one stands middle ground or prefers not to engage in, undecided, or prefers not to be engaged in either side. An issue such as the mass incarceration of minorities must be recognized, as the slogan says, every vote counts.

While some criminals deserve to be behind bars and throwing away the key, there are others who are fighting a losing battle of injustices in which educational programs provides no assistance. Major changes should include taking away or properly monitoring the discretion police and correctional officers, attorneys, prosecutors, and judges are allowed. Establishing standards laws and regulations for all states arrest, and financing mandatory re-entry programs in all functioning prisons gives everyone equal time, and prepares those exiting prison life into public communities. This allows for fair and swift justice, while giving offenders another chance in making better choices. Making the littlest of changes could possibly lead to the greatest of changes when given an opportunity.

5.3 Agreeable Perceptions

Of those respondents surveyed the majority showed some knowledge about the mass incarceration of minorities. Criminal Justice, social Work, and Business Management/Other majors were all likely to have a strong opinion of their knowledge that "within the last thirty years crime has increased", which was statistically significant. They agreed that "racial profiling contributed to high incarceration rates". Respondents also agreed "mass increase in prison populations have occurred within the last forty years". Findings indicate respondents tend to have similar views on the mass incarceration of minorities.

5.4 Knowledge

Of respondents surveyed, a majority seemed to show some knowledge on the mass incarceration of minorities. Respondents had a strong opinion on their knowledge that "incarcerated women have had past abuse which contributed to their crime. However, more in depth knowledge of the criminal justice system would be necessary to fully understand the mass incarceration of minorities.

5.5 Contribution to the Body of Knowledge

It is anticipated that the study will add to the contribution of body of knowledge on the mass incarceration of minorities. Numerous of studies have contributed to the knowledge of the mass incarceration of minorities, however, no studies are found that compares other on campus departments to the criminal justice department within North Texas on the subject of the mass incarceration of minorities.

5.6 Limitations of Research

The author acknowledges the limitations presented in this study. All graduate classes, excluding, conference and thesis courses were selected, and three undergraduate courses were randomly selected to complete the survey. All participants were from the University of Arlington and all respondents come from an educational background. The University of Texas at Arlington may not necessarily share the same perception as the general population. The author recognizes the exploratory nature of the study; therefore it may not be possible to generalize this studies data.

5.7 Future Suggestions

Future research could include statutes and laws that attorneys and judges reference to when sentencing offenders, and see how these policies can be need to be updated. More case laws need to be added within this research and previous research to see precedent in stare decisis cases, which ensures certainty, consistency, and stability.

Criminal justice and Criminology students are future researchers of this criminal justice system including working within the prison populations. More studies need to be conducted on the perception and knowledge of the mass incarceration of minorities on other campuses and many more departments.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Survey of Students Knowledge and Perception of the
Mass Incarceration of Minorities

This purpose of this survey is aimed to measure student's perceptions and knowledge on the mass incarceration of minorities in the US prison system. This research will hopefully lead to a better understanding of the prison population and how minorities have been affected. This survey is for my research purposes only and is not a requirement of your class. As a participant in this research you must be 18 years old, otherwise at this time those not of age may take a short break. This research is voluntary and anonymous, and if they are interested I will pass out the consent forms to be signed, then upon agreement you will receive your survey. If you have questions or concerns about this research please ask at this time. If you have questions later, please contact me at tanisha.bowens@mavs.uta.edu or my major professor, Dr. Jaya Davis at jbdavis@uta.edu . If no further questions I thank you all and will pick up each survey upon completion.

The Mass Incarceration of Minorities

1. Massive increases in prison population have occurred within the last forty years.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree
 Strongly Disagree

2. African American men and women are incarcerated at the highest rate.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree
 Strongly Disagree

3. Increased incarceration rates of Hispanics are primarily due to immigration problems.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree
 Strongly Disagree

4. African American females are incarcerated at higher rates than Hispanics females.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree
 Strongly Disagree

5. Hispanic male incarceration rates are surpassing African American male incarceration rates.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree
Strongly Disagree

6. Sentencing for women is generally more lenient than for men.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree
Strongly Disagree

7. Crime decreased significantly when incarceration rates increased.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree
Strongly Disagree

8. Race does not influence increases in incarceration rates.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree
Strongly Disagree

9. Increased sentencing and massive incarceration rates have reduced the fear of crime.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree
Strongly Disagree

10. Increased prison population rates are overanalyzed.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree
Strongly Disagree

11. Women play a small role in prison incarceration rates.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree
Strongly Disagree

12. Minorities are the main contributors to increased crime.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree
Strongly Disagree

13. Males dominate the prison system.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree
Strongly Disagree

14. All drug crimes should require prison time.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree
Strongly Disagree

15. Current drug laws are racially biased.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree
Strongly Disagree

16. Racial profiling significantly contributes to mass incarceration rates.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree
Strongly Disagree

17. With the absence of racial profiling, prisons wouldn't be overcrowded.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree
Strongly Disagree

18. War on drugs is profit motivated.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree
Strongly Disagree

19. Incarcerated women have past abuse history that contributed to their crime(s).

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree
Strongly Disagree

20. Race is not an issue in crime.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree
Strongly Disagree

21. Communities have no effect on crime.

- Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree
 Strongly Disagree

22. Crime is:

- Inevitable Avoidable Neither

23. Over the last 30 years, crime has:

- Decreased Increased None of the
above

Please answer the following demographic questions.

Race:

- American Indian/Alaskan Native Asian
 Black/African American Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander
White

Ethnicity:

- Hispanic/Latino Not Hispanic / Latino

Level of employment in the criminal justice field (IF
ANY):

- City/Municipality County State Federal
 None of the above

Marital Status:

Single Married Widowed Divorced Separated

Age:

Under 23 24-35 36-45 46-55 56 and older

Gender:

Female Male

College Major:

REFERENCES

(2006, June 12). Retrieved April 2013 from American Civil Liberties Union:

<http://www.aclu.org/womens-rights/wordsprison>

(2007, December 12). Retrieved April 2013 from American Civil Liberties Union:

<http://www.aclu.org/womens-rights/facts-about-over-incarceration-women-united-states>

(2011, January 6). Retrieved July 2011, 25, from Bureau of Justice Statistics:

<http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/index.cfm?ty=tda>

(2012 May). Retrieved April 2013 from Juvenile Court Statistics:

<http://www.ncjj.org/pdf/jcsreports/jcs2009.pdf>

Alexander, M. (2010). *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. New York: New Press.

- Alpert, G. P., & Smith, M. R. (2007, Oct). Explaining police bias: A theory of social conditioning and illusory correlation. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34(10), 1262-1283.
- Arrigo, B. A., Belvins, K. R., Coston, C., & Laughlin, J. S. (2008, June). Incarcerated mothers and child visitation. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 19(2), 215-238.
- Arvanites, T. M., & Asher, M. A. (1998, April). State and county incarceration rates: The direct and indirect effects of race and inequality. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 57(2), 207-221.
- Austin, J., & Krisberg, B. (1985, March). Incarceration in the United States: The extend and future of the problem. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 478, 15-30.
- Beck, A. J., & Blumstein, A. (1999). Population growth in U.S. prison. *Crime and Justice*, 26, 17-61.
- Belknap, J., & Cathy, W. (2008, October). The extensive Sexual violation and sexual abuse

histories of incarcerated women. *Violence Against Women*, 14(10), 1090- 1127.

Blitz, C. L., Shi, J., & Wolff, N. (2008, December). Racial and ethnic disparities in types of sources of victimization Inside Prison. *The Prison Journal*, 88(4), 451-472.

Brand, Robert C. (1997), United States v. Armstrong prosecutorial discretion, *Mercer L. Rev.* (48). Retrieved <http://www2.law.mercer.edu/lawreview/getfile.pdf>

Bouffard, J. A., Bouffard, L. A., & Muftic, L. R. (2007, October). An exploratory analysis of victim preception among men and women arrested for intimate partner violence. *Feminist Criminology*, 2(4), 327-346.

Caplow, T. & Simon, J. (1999) Understanding prison policy and populations trends. *Crime and Justice*, 26, 63-120

Caulkins, J. P., & Chandler, S. (2006, October). Long-run trends in incarceration of drug offenders in

the United States. *Crime and Delinquency*, 52(4), 619-641.

Costanza, S. E., & Helms, R. (2010, June). Modeling the politics of punishment: A context analysis of racial disparity in drug sentencing. *Criminal Justice Review*, 34(4), 422-471.

Craig, S. C. (2009, March). A historical view of mother and child programs for incarcerated women. *The Prison Journal*, 89(1), 35-53.

Daniel, C. A., & Mahoney, A. M. (2006, March). Bridging the power gap: Narrative therapy with incarcerated women. *The Prison Journal*, 86(1), 75-88.

Day, R. D. (2007). The G.I. Bill of the 21st Century; Mass Incarceration and how crime is paying. *Applied Development Science*, 11(4), 249-253.

Dehart, D. D. (2008, December). Pathways to prison: Impact of victimization in the lives of incarcerated women. *Violence Against Women*, 14(12), 1362-1381.

- Downes, D. (2001). The Macho Penal Economy: Mass incarceration in the United States. *Punishment and Society*, 3(1), 61-80.
- Fader, J. J., Katz, M. B., & Stern, M. J. (2005, June). The new African American inequality. *The Journal of American History*, 92(1), 75-108.
- Faris, J., & JoAnn, M. (2010). Family matters: Perceptions of fairness among incarcerated women. *The Prison Journal*, 90(2), 139-160.
- Ferguson, R., & Faye, M. (2005, May). Responding to prisoner re-entry, recidivism, and incarceration of inmates of color: A call to the communities. *Journal of Black Studies*, 35(5), 633-649.
- Foster, H., & Hagan, J. (2007, November). Incarceration and intergenerational social exclusion. *Social Problems*, 54(4), 399-433.
- Gottschalk. (2009). Money and mass incarceration: The bad, mad, and penal reform. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 8(1), 97-109.

- Hallett. (2002, July). Race, crime, and for profit imprisonment. *Punishment and Society*, 4(3), 369-393.
- Harrington, M. P. (2008, November). Revisiting the total incarceration variable: Should researchers separate jail from prison sentences in sentencing research. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 24(4), 463-478.
- Lipsitz, G. (2012). Mass incarceration and women's fair housing rights. *UCLA Law Review*, 59, 1746-1808
- Lynch, J. P., & Sabol, W. J. (2004). Assessing the effects of mass incarceration on informal social control in communities. *Commentary*, 3(2), 267-294.
- Lyons, C. J., & Pettit, B. (2011, May). Compounded disadvantage: race: Incarceration and wage growth. *Social Problems*, 58(2), 257-280.
- Murachver, T., & Robertson, K. (2007, May). Correlates of partner violence for incarcerated women and men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22(5), 639-655.

- Myers, N. A., & London, A. S. (2006, May). Race, incarceration, and health: A life-course approach. *Research on Aging*, 28(3), 409-422.
- Pettit, B., & Western, B. (2004, April). Mass imprisonment and the life course: Race and class inequality in the U.S. incarceration. *American Sociological Review*, 69, 151-169.
- Pizarro, J. M., Pratt, T. C., & Stenius, V. (2006, March). Supermax prisons: Myths, reality, and the politics of punishment in American society. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 17, 6-21.
- Roberts, D. E. (2004, April). The social and moral cost of mass incarceration in African American communities. *Punishment and Its Purpose*, 56(5), 1271-1305.
- Rodriguez vs. California Highway Patrol*, C-99-20895
JF/HRL (N.D.F.) February 27, 2003
- Sudbury, J. (2002). Celling black bodies: Black women in the global prison industrial complex. *Feminist Review*, 70, 57-74.
- Simmons, M (2012). Voices on the outside: Mass incarceration and the women left behind.

International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences, 6(14), 71-83

Swisher, R., & Waller, M. R. (2008, August). Confining fatherhood: incarceration and paternal involvement among nonresident White, African American, and Latino fathers. *Journal of Family Issues*, 29(8), 1067-1088.

Tapia, N. D., & Vaughn, M. S. (2010, October 11). Legal issues regarding medical care for pregnant inmates. *The Prison Journal*, 90(4), 417-446.

The Sentencing Project: Research and Advocacy for Reform. (n.d.). Retrieved November 25, 2012, from <http://www.sentencingproject.org/map/map.cfm>

Thompson, H. A. (2010). Why Mass Incarceration matters: rethinking crisis, decline, and transformation in postwar American history. *The Journal of American History*, 703-734.

Tonry, M. (2003). Explanations of American punishment policies: a national history. *Punishment and Society*, 11, 377-395.

United States vs. Christopher Lee Armstrong et al.,
517 US 456(1996)

Wilderman, C., & Bruce, W. (2009). The black family
and mass incarceration. *The Annals of the American
Academy of Political and Social Science*, 621, 221-242

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Tanisha Bowens was born July 14, 1984 in Dallas, Texas to Debbie Bowens and Abraham Kraut. She graduated from El Centro College May 2006 with her Associated in Paralegal Studies. She continued her education from Texas Woman's University in May 2008, where she earned her Bachelors in Government with an Emphasis in Legal Studies and minor in Criminal Justice. Tanisha earned her Masters of Arts in Criminology and Criminal Justice in May 2013 from the University of Texas at Arlington. She has always had an interest in the mass incarceration of minorities. It is her hope to continue to learn more and conduct further research of prison populations. The author has one toddler son Aidan Chase Bowens and is currently employed with Dallas County family District Courts. She hopes to pursuit her career either at the state or federal government in the State of Texas.