Re-enfranchising the Disenfranchised: Increasing Political Participation among the Previously

Incarcerated through Parochial Social Controls

Isadora Palmer-Collins Stern

Political Science & Peace Studies

Dr. Jennifer Bess

Goucher College

Fall 2018

**Introduction**

In 2016, Maryland's legislature overrode a veto to enact HB 980 and SB 340 which alter specified qualifications for voter registration and provide that individuals discharged from incarceration are qualified to register to vote (McCray 2016). Although these bills restore voting rights to previously incarcerated citizens, political participation among this population remains low. Baltimore City is the epicenter for Maryland's use of incarceration: while one out of ten Maryland residents is from Baltimore, one out of three Maryland residents in state prison is from the city (Prison Policy Initiative 2015). In Baltimore City, the highest incarceration rates are within the Sandtown-Winchester/Harlem Park community. This neighborhood, like many of Baltimore's poorest neighborhoods, is over 95% black. In Sandtown-Winchester/Harlem Park, while 77.3% of the population over 18 is registered to vote, only 40.1% voted in the general election in 2016 (BNIA 2016). Nationally, voter turnout for the 2016 election was 61.4% (Krogstad and Lopez 2017). The black vote dropped to 59.6% from its record high of 66.6% in 2012 and was considerably lower when compared to white turnout at 65.3% (Krogstad and Lopez 2017). It appears that adopting legislation that returns voting rights is only a fraction of the larger social justice question surrounding attempts to increase political efficacy and engagement among those exiting the carceral system and returning to their communities.

Black voting behavior, according to Richard D. Shingles (1981), Associate Professor Emeritus of Political Science at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, can be explained through black consciousness or linked-fate, which is "the awareness among blacks of their shared status as an unjustly deprived and oppressed group" (pg. 77). Black consciousness informs political action by creating an environment in which black communities experience a low sense of trust in government paired with a high sense of political efficacy. The absence of

political trust provides the "need to act" and the sense of political efficacy is the perceived

"ability to act." This and "system-blame" rather than "self-blame" is what mobilizes black

communities to engage politically (Shingles 1981). Shingles claims that black consciousness

accounts for the findings of recent research that has demonstrated that black Americans are more

politically active than whites of similar socioeconomic status (1981). However, because of low

trust in government and a lack of education and community resources, communities with high

rates of incarceration and previously incarcerated people have low voter turnout and political

engagement. The black consciousness framework assumes low trust in government, but it

demands a sense of political efficacy. Based on this structure, I offer that increasing political

participation among returning citizens is directly connected to increasing their sense of internal

efficacy. Community level social controls create opportunities for increasing a sense of efficacy

for returning citizens.

The unabating trend of low political engagement in previously incarcerated people has

been related to a lack of social control.  Social controls create a vital "social bond" to

conventional community. Social controls are distinguished by the source of controls, as well as

the nature of their impact on individuals at risk of involvement in crime (Bazemore and

Stinchcomb 2004). Albert Hunter, Professor of Sociology and Northwestern University, suggests

that close family and extended family are the sources of "private controls," whereas

neighborhood groups are the source of more "parochial controls."  Communities that are stable

and homogeneous will have high levels of private and parochial control as well as optimum

levels of public control, with the result that levels of crime will be low relative to other areas

(Lynch and Sabol 2004). Parochial social control is imbedded in the structure of a community's

affiliational, interactional and communication ties among its residents (Bursik 1999). This paper

focuses on the parochial controls of the community and the effects this control has on increasing

political efficacy and engagement. Community-based controls for disenfranchised black

communities with high rates of incarceration are weak but can be strengthened through the black

consciousness framework. Community level social controls create opportunities for building

social capital and cohesion for returning citizens as well as creating a positive self-image and a

positive image within the community that lowers stigma and increases a sense of efficacy

(Bazemore and Stinchcomb 2004). Social controls also build efficacy by connecting returning

citizens in ways that allow them to be part of positive change within their communities.

This paper will explore the ways in which social control methods can be used to reinstate

the political efficacy provided by the black consciousness framework. Although mass

incarceration in Maryland has systematically excluded Baltimore's poorest black communities

from engaging in the political process, the state legislature's return of voting rights has shifted

the focus to community level methods for increasing political participation. It is clear that simply

passing policy at a state level is not enough to increase political engagement among previously

incarcerated citizens: in order to reach a marginalized group with historically low trust and

participation in government, implementing programs at a community level is key. This study will

include an exploration of one such institution, Turnaround Tuesday, as described below.

Through the testimony of participants of Turnaround Tuesday as well as an analysis of secondary

research, this paper presents the most effective methods for increasing political participation

through parochial controls as demonstrated through high numbers of job obtention and retention,

participation in community events, voting, and prolonged contact with Turnaround Tuesday. As

communities develop stronger parochial controls through civic engagement and community

service events and programs, returning citizens combat stigma through networks within the

community which strengthens a sense of efficacy and increases political participation.

**Methods**

Through readings and interviews conducted with participant of Turnaround Tuesday, a

movement in Baltimore City that works to prepare returning citizens and unemployed citizens to

reenter the workforce, I identify and analyze the best methods for increasing political

participation within Baltimore's formerly incarcerated population. Turnaround Tuesday is a non-

profit founded in 2015 whose parent organization, Baltimoreans United in Leadership

Development (BUILD), has been working to improve housing, increase job opportunities, and

rebuild schools and neighborhoods in Baltimore since 1977. From September through December

2018, I engaged with Turnaround Tuesday by participating in their weekly meetings, attending

resource day as a volunteer to help with resume building, and participating in a Get Out the Vote

action in Sandtown-Winchester/Harlem Park. I also attended the 2018 mayoral accountability

meeting hosted by BUILD. Through a series of phone and in-person interviews, I collected

responses from three Turnaround Tuesday participants. Information from these interviews will

be referred to as interviews one, two, and three. All interviewees have been formerly

incarcerated, have varying degrees of political engagement, and are at varying points on the

pathway from incarceration to full integration back into the community (i.e. employed, stable

housing situation, asset building etc.).

**History of Mass Incarceration and Voter Disenfranchisement**

The United States prison population has grown as a result of the changing focus

regarding the purpose of incarceration. From the 1970s to 2018, the purpose of incarceration has

changed from one of indeterminate-sentencing and rehabilitation to one of retribution resulting in

the segregation and criminalization of the African American community. The United States

prison population has exponentially increased from 196,429 in 1970 to 2.3 million in 2018

(Justice Policy Institute). This increase can largely be attributed to the harshening of laws and

sentencing of drug related crime, known as the War on Drugs, that was introduced by President

Richard Nixon in the 1970s, amplified by President Ronald Reagan in the 1980s, and expanded

under the Bush and Clinton administrations (Wacquant 2001).

      The War on Drugs brought about the end of the indiscriminate-sentencing era. This era,

which spanned the early twentieth century into the 1970s, was defined by a sentencing model

that focused on inmate rehabilitation and reintegration (Travis 2004). This model allowed judges

to decide sentence length without set minimums and parole boards to decide the actual time of

release from prison. Emphasis was placed on an inmate's readiness to reenter society and created

the explicit objective of the transition from prison back to community (2004). However, new

sentencing reforms, beginning in the 1970s, drastically changed the punishment framework.

Mandatory minimums, abolition of parole release, "three-strikes" laws, and other sanctions for

felony convictions have shifted the focus away from reentry and rehabilitation and towards a

sentencing jurisprudence that favors just deserts and retribution (Clear 2007). The new carceral

framework reinforces and perpetuates the socioeconomic marginality and vilification of urban

black communities (Wacquant 2001). The War on Drugs that brought about this policy shift not

only increased incarceration; it widened the gap between white and black incarceration rates and

contributed to the systematic disenfranchisement and oppression of the African American

community. Although the gap between the percentage of white and black prisoners has shrunk

since 2009, blacks make up 33% of the total adult prison population and 12% of the U.S. total

adult population. In comparison, whites make up 64% of the total adult population, but only 30% of the adult prison population (Gramlich 2018).

The War on Drugs and modern carceral institution have perpetuated "ethnoracial division" and domination in the United States and act as mechanisms for the relegation of black Americans to a permanent second-class status (Wacquant 2001). Between 1985 and 2000, the period of the U.S. penal system's most dramatic expansion, drug convictions accounted for about two-thirds of the increase in the federal prison system and more than half of the increase in the state prison system increase in both the state and federal prison systems. The strict sentencing laws and mandatory minimums for drug convictions that account for this increase in the incarceration rate allowed the government to systematically and disproportionately incarcerated African American men (Alexander 2010). Though whites and African Americans use drugs at similar rates, African Americans are disproportionately targeted for drug use and are charged at a rate almost six times that of whites (NAACP). The increase in drug sentencing has resulted in a deepening gap between the imprisonment of blacks and whites (Wacquant 2001). This disparity in freedoms between African Americans and whites illustrates that the current purpose of prisons is to disenfranchise and isolate African Americans. Additionally, while incarceration rates have increased, investments made in programmatic interventions designed for rehabilitation and reintegration have decreased (Travis 2004). This further emphasizes that the focus of incarceration has shifted away from rehabilitation and towards the segregation and criminalization of the black population. The changes in policy that the War on Drugs enacted shifted the focus of the carceral system to one of retribution that allows the system to segregate and disenfranchise African Americans.

This retribution extends beyond the time spent in prison. With the exception of Maine

and Vermont, both of which are over 94% white, all states have imposed voting limitation on

people who go to prison (source?). It has been estimated that more than 6 million people in the

United States are prohibited from voting as a consequence of their criminal records (Cha and

Kennedy 2014). Voter disenfranchisement has served to suppress political participation and

alienate people from influence on law and policy. The socio-demogaphics of disenfranchised

Americans mirrors those of the prison population: one in seven black males is disenfranchised.

They also tend to concentrate in poor neighborhoods so that mass incarceration "translates to the

denial of individual felon's voting rights into disenfranchisement of entire communities" (Clear

2007).  People with felony arrests who may legally vote are 18% less likely to vote than those

who have not been arrested; people in prison who are allowed to vote are 27% less likely to do

so than their non-incarcerated counterparts (Clear 2007). As the laws that restrict voting for

people with criminal records lift, the alienation and negativity toward authority and a weakened

sense of efficacy continues to suppress political participation among returning citizens.

**Social Controls and Efficacy**

Baltimore City citizens returning to their communities from jail or prison no longer face

restricted voting rights; however, weak parochial social controls in the neighborhoods to which

they return lower political efficacy and participation. The lack of community programs that

provide social control in the communities to which formerly incarcerated people return poses an

institutional roadblock that, combined with a low trust in government and weak sense of political

efficacy, prevents returning citizens from actualizing the level of political engagement proposed

by the black consciousness framework. While incarcerated, felons are denied access to a variety

of roles that bind most citizens to conventional society. Specifically, post-release adjustment is

inhibited by restrictions on occupational licensing and employment opportunities, loss of parental

rights, and prohibition from holding elective office or serving on juries, as well as other forms of

formal and informal social stigma (Bazemore and Stinchcomb 2004). Because personal and civic

identity is largely determined by the relative strength of ties to social institutions such as these,

such restrictions greatly diminish the reintegrative capacity of persons formerly under correctional

supervision.

Where the loss of voting rights is a clear symbol of a returning citizen's "outsider" status,

the return of these rights serves as a clear marker of reintegration and acceptance into a

community of law-abiding citizens (Uggen and Manza 2004). Yet returning citizens find it

difficult to integrate into the community and networks that provide social control because of the

stigma that accompanies the status of "ex-offender" (Clear, Rose, and Ryder 2001). It is this

stigma that interrupts the political efficacy proposed in the black consciousness framework and

keeps political participation low. Having substantial proportions of disconnected individuals

concentrated in certain geographical areas greatly diminishes networks of social controls that

sustain meaningful commitment to the "common good" in a neighborhood (Putnam 2000).

Increasing the presence and access to parochial controls will reduce stigma by building social

capital and social cohesion within communities and connect returning citizens to their

communities.

Parochial controls have been identified as "the local interpersonal networks and

interlocking of local institutions that serve the diurnal and sustenance needs of the residential

community: the local stores, schools, churches, and voluntary associations of various kinds"

(Hunter 1985, pg. 233). Albert Hunter, Professor of Sociology at Northwestern University, argues

that neighborhoods maintain order through private, parochial, and public control. According to

Hunter, a private control is primarily found within the family and intimate friendship networks where as a public control is based on the "formal bureaucratic agencies of the state," such as the court system and the police (pg. 234). Compared to the private controls of the family and the public controls of the state, pParochial controls have been most effective at reducing crime (Moore, 2016). Parochial controls have also been most effective at reinstating the political efficacy and engagement of the black consciousness framework among returning citizens. This is supported by the interviews conducted by Turnaround Tuesday participants.

**Interviews**

Interviews from participants of Turnaround Tuesday all proposed forms of parochial controls when asked how to increase political engagement in their communities. Interview one discussed how Turnaround Tuesday has provided a strong social control for her and the community. As a movement, Turnaround Tuesday builds social capital by connecting returning citizens with members of the community. It also connects participants to employers. Not only does Turnaround Tuesday operate on an individual level, but it connects the neighborhood through its activism. The movement mobilizes the community, garnering strength from numbers, and presents the community's needs to lawmakers and city officials. Because Turnaround Tuesday exercises strong social control within the community, it has enough clout to create change. As the first interviewee described, Turnaround Tuesday provides the changes people need to see in order to believe they can make a difference.

Focused on preparing returning citizens to reenter the workforce, Turnaround Tuesday builds networks between its members and potential employers, coaches, and professionals that attend the movement's meetings. To further prepare returning citizens, Turnaround Tuesday works to build trust through small-group and one-on-one discussions. This gives new members

the opportunity to take on leadership positions or work alongside the leaders of the movement. Meetings are typically comprised of new members; returning members; alumni who have progressed through the movement and found employment; leaders who have also progressed through the movement and have returned in a leadership capacity; and founders. All members have the opportunity to engage with one another, build connections and networks, and enter self-directed leadership roles. By engaging in a movement like Turnaround Tuesday, participants build a positive self-image and social capital that increases their sense of efficacy.

Interview two proposed the need for community-based civic education. Education is also a parochial control. The interviewee suggested registration drives and training sessions to help community members learn how to vote, what to expect in the process, and how to access information about candidates. It was suggested that members of the community find it easier to blame their lack of knowledge of the political process on disenfranchisement and lack of efficacy rather than taking personal accountability for their civic education. Interview two claimed that voting is intimidating to those who have been barred from this civic right and have been historically disenfranchised. Through community-based trainings and registration drives, this lack of information can be dispelled and mistrust in government can be used to increase political engagement as suggested by the black consciousness framework.

The future and well-being of the youth was another main concern of all interviews. Interview two proposed the need for youth program and including civic education in the classroom, implementing youth mentoring programs, and making safe places for youth to engage and learn in their communities. Such programs would provide social controls that would build social capital and reduce crime. These programs would also create a need for mentors that could provide returning citizens with meaningful roles in their community, which would in turn increase

internal efficacy. Youth was also a main focus in interview three who claimed that the coming

generation is where the change needs to happen. By building programs and parochial controls to

better tie the youth to their communities, crime will be reduced and efficacy increased.

Interview three reiterated the need for community based civic education and voter

registration drives. Unlike the others interviewed, interview three had never voted and expressed a

need to learn the process. When asked how to increase voter turnout in the community, interview

three responded, "People vote when they want to see changes in their communities." This

response suggests that with education comes a sense of efficacy; that when there are resources to

educate people on the voting process, civic avenues becomes accessible and people can use their

political efficacy to create change.

All participants interviewed expressed distrust in government. Interviewee two expressed

this distrust by saying: "The only thing politicians are obligated to respond to is power. If there is

no power in a community you will not get support from a politician." This response not only

expresses a distrust in the political arena, but it also denotes the importance of community power.

Interview one praised Turnaround Tuesday for its role in bringing the voice of the community to

those in power. However, the interview also expressed an inherent distrust in government when

discussing politicians. The interview makes it clear that in the eyes of the community, politicians

are self-serving and will abandon the needs of the community once elected. All interviewees

responded that they did not feel represented in Baltimore politics. This mistrust is accepted by the

black consciousness framework, and the parochial controls suggested by all interviews fulfill the

efficacy component of the framework.

**Key Methods for Increasing Efficacy and Political Participation**

The need for parochial controls suggested by the interviews emphasizes the importance

these controls have on communities with high concentrations of formerly incarcerated people.

The need for these controls is further reinforced in literature that is able to suggest institutions and

methods for implementing these controls. Incarceration has unintended negative effects on the

organization of communities, interrupting or weakening institutions that create parochial social

controls; these social controls are often the first line of defense against crime in communities that

have high levels of distrust in government and authority (Lynch and Sabol 2004). Given the high

rate of incarceration in communities like Sandtown-Winchester/Harlem Park, the most effective

and long-lasting parochial controls for reintegrating previously incarcerated people are programs

and institutions that allow former offenders to work side by-side in key leadership roles with other

community members to plan and execute tasks that build collective efficacy. Bazemore and

Stinchcomb, Professors Emeritus in the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice at

Florida Atlantic University, give examples of such tasks:

> Building safer parks; redesigning neighborhood common areas to reduce fear and
>
> victimization; teaching conflict resolution and peacemaking skills in schools; mediating
>
> interracial conflicts; planning and implementing voter registration drives; building
>
> domestic violence "safe houses"; organizing support groups for victims and perpetrators
>
> of family violence; mentoring and providing positive guardianship for youth at risk;
>
> promoting and participating in informal neighborhood restorative processes; leading anti-
>
> drug initiatives; facilitating community discussion groups about drugs, guns, or police
>
> profiling; and organizing victim support groups through churches or other local groups.

These roles and programs contribute to and expand the list created in the interviews with

Turnaround Tuesday participants. When returning citizens engage in these roles and are part of

positive change, they create a positive self-image and a positive image within the community that

lowers stigma and increases a sense of efficacy. Turnaround Tuesday provides roles for returning citizens through many of the above-mentioned means. Organizations like Turnaround Tuesday are classified as civil society organizations (CSOs), which, in recent research, have been proven to increased non-voting political participation among those who have had the heaviest criminal justice contact (Owens and Walker 2018).

CSOs can be harnessed as a form of parochial control that allow returning citizens to engage in leadership roles and develop skills that build efficacy and increase political participation. CSOs shape political behavior through civic skills development, community organizing, services provision, and opportunities for activism and mobilization (Owens and Walker 2018). The functions and purposes of charities, associations, and other forms of CSOs create a strong foundation for building the efficacy and tools for political participation. Many CSOs- including faith-based CSOs like black churches as well as secular CSOs like labor unions- educate, train, and socialize individuals for political participation. The education and training component for preparing returning citizens to vote was heavily discussed in the interviews which makes it clear that there is a strong need for such social controls. Organizations like Turnaround Tuesday and other CSOs teach people to develop opinions and perceive their interests, form group consciousness and identify shared grievances, speak their concerns, and amplify their voices. They cultivate personal commitments to public issues and collective problem solving (Owens and Walker 2018). They help individuals develop political efficacy, education, and civic skills for participation.

Of the above mentioned CSOs, black churches have had a significant influence in shaping efficacy and political behavior within poor black neighborhoods in Baltimore with high rates of incarceration. Blacks are more politically active than whites of comparable socioeconomic status

in a wide range of activities which have a considerably more demanding and more significant impact on the participants' lives and the local political process (Shingles 1981). Blacks have been involved in numerous community activities that have a significant influence on politics at the local level. Such activities include: Community Action Agencies, Model City and Head Start programs, civil rights organizations, block associations, neighborhood development projects, and tenant associations (Shingles 1981). Many of these connections are established and supported by black churches. Black churches' political involvement is associated with calls for social justice and moral action, electoral and protest politics, redress for social problems, and a linked fate mentality and collective memory (Barnes and Nwosu 2014). This unconventional form of political behavior is shaped by the activism of black communities in the 1960s civil rights movement (Shingles 1981). This activism also allows blacks to escape the Protestant work ethic model perpetuated in our society that generates the idea that each individual is responsible for his or her own successes and failures in life (Shingles 1981). The Protestant work ethic weighs particularly heavily on the poor and racial minorities at the bottom of the socioeconomic hierarchy. Through the activism model of black churches, which create a linked-fate and black consciousness mentality, blacks are able to replace the more negative overtones of the Protestant work ethic with a "system-blame" ethic (Shingles 1981). The result is a heightened sense of personal efficacy and an increased mistrust of the political system. Through their specific brand of activism, black churches play a significant role as a social control that provides both a heightened sense of efficacy and means through which to engage in civic society.

Through the roles and institutions suggested in the readings, compiled with the testimony of returning citizens, it is clear that parochial controls at the community level increase efficacy and give returning citizens the tools they need to engage in the political system.

**Conclusion**

As communities develop stronger parochial controls through civic engagement and community service events and programs, returning citizens combat stigma through community networks that strengthen a sense of efficacy and increase political participation. The lack of efficacy in communities with high rates of incarceration demands an examination of social controls that can foster and strengthen internal and communal efficacy. The political participation model provided by the black consciousness framework emphasizes the need for efficacy in black communities. The framework assumes a high level of mistrust in government, but this mistrust must be paired with a heightened sense of efficacy in order for the accelerated rate of political participation proposed by the theory to become actualized. As proven in the interviews with Turnaround Tuesday participants, there is a need for strong parochial controls in neighborhoods where support networks have been negatively impacted by high rates of incarceration.

The most effective parochial controls are those that create leadership positions for returning citizens that allow them to work side-by-side with other community members to plan and execute tasks that build collective efficacy. In these roles, formerly incarcerated members of the community build social capital and interact in the community in a way that creates a positive self-image and positive image within the community that helps to lower stigma and strengthens internal efficacy. These roles are often created by CSOs. These organizations also provide the tools and trainings to increase political participation. In Baltimore, black churches play a significant role in this socialization and training process for poor black communities with high rates of incarceration.

As states take steps to reform the unintended consequences of mass incarceration, it is important to know how such laws affect the population they aim to reach. The return of voting

rights to formerly incarcerated people who have finished their sentences is an important first step,

but many more steps must be taken to re-empower and re-enfranchise returning citizens and the

communities to which they return. Community-level institutions and social controls provide

returning citizens with roles and trainings that build efficacy and increase political participation.

However, these controls are weakened by the disorganization of networks resulting from high

rates of incarceration within the communities they seek to empower. Turnaround Tuesday and

other CSOs have been the leaders of reinstating political efficacy within Baltimore City. As

political participation within previously disenfranchised communities is cultivated through strong

parochial controls paired with the state-level return of voting rights, these community-level social

controls will continue to build efficacy and bring power back into the community.

References

Alexander, M. (2010, December 6). *The New Jim Crow*. Retrieved from

http://prospect.org/article/new-jim-crow-0.

Barnes, S. L., & Nwosu, O. (2014). Black Church electoral and protest politics from 2002 to

2012: a social media analysis of the resistance versus accommodation dialectic. *Journal*

*of African American Studies*, *18*(2), 209+. Retrieved from http://link.galegroup.com.

goucher.idm.oclc.org/apps/doc/A382951232/PPCJ?u=goucher_

main&sid=PPCJ&xid=80b34977.

Bazemore, G.; Stinchcomb, J. (2004). civic engagement model of reentry: Involving community

through service and restorative justice. *Federal Probation* 68(2), 14-24.

BNIA. (2016). Sandtown-Winchester/Harlem Park. Retrieved from

https://bniajfi.org/community/Sandtown-Winchester_Harlem Park/.

Cha, J. M., & Kennedy, L. (2014). Millions to the Polls Practical Policies to Fulfill the Freedom

to Vote for All Americans. Retrieved from https://www.demos.org/sites/

default/files/publications/m2p-Main.pdfhttps://www.demos.

org/sites/default/files/publications/m2p-Main.pdf.

Bursik, R. (1999). The informal control of crime through neighborhood networks.

*Sociological Focus, 32*(1), 85-97. doi:10.1080/00380237.1999.10571125

Clear, T. R. (2007). *Imprisoning Communities: How Mass Incarceration Makes Disadvantaged*

*Neighborhoods Worse*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Clear, T. R., Rose, D. R., & Ryder, J. A. (2001). Incarceration and the Community: The

Problem of Removing and Returning Offenders. *Crime & Delinquency*, *47*(3),

335–351. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128701047003003.

Gramlich, J. (2018, January 12). Gap between number of blacks, whites in prison narrows.

      Retrieved from http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/01/12/shrinking-gap-

      between-number-of-blacks-and-whites-in-prison/

Hunter, A. J. (1985). Private, parochial, and public social orders: The problem of crime and

      incivility in urban communities. In Suttles, G. D., Zald, M. N. (Eds.), The challenge

      of social control: Citizenship and institution building in modern society (pp.

      230-242). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Krogstad, J. M., & Lopez, M. H. (2017, May 12). Black voter turnout fell in 2016 US

      election. Retrieved from http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank

      /2017/05/12/black-voter-turnout-fell-in-2016-even-as-a-record-number-of-

      americans-cast-ballots/

Lynch, J. P., & Sabol, W. J. (2004). Effect of Incarceration on Informal Social Control in

      Communities. In *Imprisoning America: The Social Effects of Mass Incarceration*

      (pp. 135-164). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

McCray. (2016). General Assembly. Retrieved from

      http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/webmga/frmMain.aspx?stab=01&pid=

      billpage&tab=subject3&ys=2015rs&id=HB0980

Moore, M. D., & Recker, N. L. (2016). Social Capital, Type of Crime, and Social Control.

      Crime & Delinquency, 62(6), 728–747. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128713510082

      https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0011128713510082

Putnam, Robert D. (2000). Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American

      Community. New York: Simon & Schuster

Prison Policy Initiative, & Justice Policy Institute. (2015, February). The Right

　　　　Investment?: Corrections Spending in Baltimore City. Retrieved from

　　　　https://www.prisonpolicy.org/origin/md/report.html

NAACP. (n.d.). Criminal Justice Fact Sheet. Retrieved from

　　　　https://www.naacp.org/criminal-justice-fact-sheet/

Owens, M. L., & Walker, H. L. (2018). The Civic Voluntarism of "Custodial Citizens":

　　　　Involuntary Criminal Justice Contact, Associational Life, and Political Participation.

　　　　*Perspectives on Politics,16*(4), 990-1013. doi:10.1017/s1537592718002074

Shingles, R. D. (1981). Black Consciousness and Political Participation: The Missing Link. *The*

　　　　*American Political Science Review, 75*(2), 76-91. doi:10.2307/1961380

Travis, J. (2004). Reentry and Reintegration: New Perspectives on the Challenges of Mass

　　　　Incarceration. In *Imprisoning America: The Social Effects of Mass Incarceration* (pp.

　　　　247-265). New York, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Uggen, C., & Manza, J. (2004). Lost Voices: The Civic and Political Views of Disenfranchised

　　　　Felons. In *Imprisoning America: The Social Effects of Mass Incarceration* (pp. 165-204).

　　　　New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Wacquant, L. (2001). Deadly Symbiosis: When Ghetto and Prison Meet and Mesh. *Sage*

　　　　*Journals,3*(1), 95-133. doi:14624740122228276