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Abstract

Revisiting the Effects of Incarceration on Communities:
An Analysis of A Study of Inner City Baltimore Neighborhoods

BY
DeAndre Rowles

Masters of Science in Interdisciplinary Studies

The intent of this paper is to examine the association between urban neighborhoods, social capital, incarceration rates and community solidarity. The impact of incarceration on predominantly inner city minority communities provides a social factor that influences the community structure of a neighborhood. To date, many researchers, scholars, and social commentators (Harrison and Huntington 2000; Newman 2008; Wilson 2009) have addressed the emergence of cultural differences developing within societies. The present research contributes to the discourse by first understanding which latent structure comprises the demographic composition of the cultural zone; second, by understanding which variables constitute community solidarity as it pertains to urban neighborhoods and social context; and thirdly, by understanding how such cultural zones are affected by the loss of social capital to incarceration.
Introduction

The impact of incarceration on communities has had a tremendous influence at both the local and national levels. Researchers, scholars, and social commentators have gone to great lengths to tease out explanations about how and why disproportionate numbers of American citizens (minorities to be specific) are caught within the grips of the prison industrial complex. The term ‘prison industrial complex’ refers to an aggregation of the nation’s prison systems and private interests (i.e. services) that latch on to reap a profit from an influx in human warehousing (Alexander 2010; Clear 2007; Herivel and Wright 2009).

In light of this, there has been a broad array of topics related to the effects of incarceration. This research adds to the discourse about the realities that prisoners and the households, communities and contexts from which they have been detached constitute concrete social life and meaning. Often times the circumstances that families and communities affected by incarceration have to endure can be discussed in relation to their socio-economic status, race/ethnicity, and positions within the overall class structure. This paper examines the impact of incarceration on urban neighborhoods to obtain an in-depth understanding of the function of social capital and community solidarity.

To date, there is a plethora of research that captures the relationship between the culture and structure of diverse segments of urban neighborhood communities (Hattery and Smith 2010; Sampson and Wilson 1995; Wilson 2009; Patillo, Weiman, and Western 2004). Through exploring the functional dynamics of the family structure, household and communities of prisoners there is insight to be gained. The manner in which distance, deinstitutionalization, and slow economic development have detached many central city residents across the nation from
comparable opportunities, equal access to job prospects and resources that would help to sustain sufficient, competitive lifestyles have been staggering and left unattended (see Wilson 2009). As a result, patterns of adaptation that stem from underdevelopment begin to show tendency of cultural divergence; that is, away from the dominant ideology of mainstream practice. The differential forms of development (economic and cultural) stem not only from a lack of resources but also from within the aforementioned spatial context (i.e. central cities). The term ‘space’ in academic discourse is a complex term which defines the parameters of social enclaves and the ensuing relations and behaviors that it may encompass. According to Bourdieu (1984) space may defined by three fundamental dimensions: “volume of capital, composition of capital, and change in these two properties over time” (p.114). Where space and place converge in communities within larger residential tracts (i.e. ghetto, enclave) it is important to note that:

These can be viewed as context, cause, or outcome for other social processes. From the smallest unit of the human body through multiple aggregate and collective examples such as household, community, neighborhood, city, region, state, nation, or global system, particular places provide a locale that may operate as a container and backdrop for social action, as a set of causal factors that shape social structure and process, and finally as an identifiable territorial manifestation of social relations and practices that define that particular setting (Tickamyer 2000).

And, for the purpose of this research it is important to recognize that:

locations can be defined and compared in terms of their population size, distribution, density, social and demographic characteristics; types of
eco-nomic activity; distance from other places; and physical, cultural, and political features. One or more of these may be delineated separately and specified for a particular place… (2000:806).

In past studies, the concept of “concentrated disadvantage” had been taken up extensively within the fields of criminology and urban studies (Sampson and Wilson 1995). This theoretical framework suggested that the degree of disenfranchisement experienced by a homogenous population with comparable socio-economic status, when confined to a particular locale, produced transformations in behavior; it was also critical to understanding the crime plaguing the inner city (Sampson and Wilson 1995; Wilson 2009; Krivo and Peterson 2010). The persistent tendency of authorities and policy-makers to negate the staggering effects of uneven economic and cultural development occurring at and around the central city was cause for differential adaptation; that is, on the part of urban dwellers to maintain equal footing with a participatory, mainstream society. Recent studies attribute the phenomena to the post-industrial transition and the resulting economic inactivity and joblessness that isolated a ‘still’ dependent population (see also Baysu, Phalet, and Brown 2011: 123). Pondering the lasting effects of ‘being left alone’ Wilson (2009) contends that the circumstances of those whose lives were sketched-out within segregated boundaries may have only slightly changed; thus, further adding to the idea of longevity for the cultural orientation derived from the spatial segregation of poor, marginalized, and disenfranchised urbanites.

Understanding the borders that contribute to spatial concentration also helps to discern the context for which cross-cultural relevance may be argued. That is, the geographic area in which disenfranchised minorities, working poor and poor are often confined (the inner city), provide legitimate context for cultural interpretation. In past research, scholars have designated
‘centralization’ and ‘concentration’ as dimensions of residential segregation. These terms refer to the degree to which groups are spatially located near the center of an urban area. In this way, groups that are highly centralized, spatially concentrated, “and minimally exposed to majority members” are viewed as residentially segregated (Massey and Denton 1988) Taken together, the two informs us about differential residential/physical spatial zones that comprise larger aggregated geographical space (Los Angeles, Baltimore, Detroit etc.) and the groups that occupy them (see Massey and Denton 1988; Krivo and Peterson 2010). Such an elaborate and formulaic approach to segregation allows one to accurately pinpoint the conditions under which slight differentiation from mainstream cultural practice and behavior develops. Accordingly, an inherent focus on “concentrated disadvantage” exposes the normative and non-normative distinctions that may be attributed to an apparent bifurcation in the cultural practice of a given population. Mainstream cultural practice refers to the normative behavior espoused beyond the specified spatial context (i.e. concentration, central city) ---wherein which self-interest and individual orientation prevail over interdependence and group orientation. The constant threat of instability experienced on the part of communities affected by losses to prisons and jails as well as other external factors places them on the verge of extinction (Clear 2008; Wacquant 2008). This form of dismantling chips at the fabric of home, family, and community-- as well as provide an historical context for the accompanying narratives of oppression, struggle, tradition, and triumph of the residents confined to these spaces; in turn triggering an affinity for preservation (Spencer-Walters 2011).

The present research contributes to the discourse about the impact of incarceration on communities by first understanding the demographic composition and community structure of urban neighborhoods; second, by understanding which variables constitute community solidarity
in certain tracts; and thirdly, by understanding how such neighborhoods may be conceived of as cultural zones. An inner city cultural zone may be conceived of as a demarcated urban space (i.e. neighborhood, community) whereby members of a particular social class or ethno-cultural background engage in a similar social practice and/or behavior. Typically, homogeneity in the cultural and social practice within a common environment may constitute a differentiated set of norms that coexist alongside a broader and more widely accepted cultural practice.

The following is a review literature on the connections between urban neighborhoods, social capital, incarceration rates and community solidarity. First, I examine the classic structure versus culture debate about the social conditions and states of marginalized groups. Second, I explore the function of social capital among urban villagers and informal social networks comprised of kin, friends and fictive kin. Thirdly, I look at community solidarity as it relates to layers of social ties, other directed-tendencies, and inter- and intra- group cohesion. Then, I discuss the connections between urban neighborhoods and incarceration by examining types of arrests and target blocks. Lastly, I make a concerted effort to clarify the relevance of a cross-cultural approach to understanding the effects of incarceration on the family structure, household, and community within urban neighborhoods.
Literature Review

To better grasp the vantage point from which the current discussion stems one should consider the position of individuals and groups located at the bottom of the class structure. Both the limitations and constraints placed on the huddled masses caught within the grips of poverty and working class instability provide an accurate depiction of the circumstances and life strategy that they employ on a day to day basis (Giddens and Held 1982). The development of semi-functional, interdependent units is adopted by residents as a necessary practice for navigating the life course and eking out an existence. This practice, when grafted onto urban space helps to further understand the distance and degrees of difference between ‘full’ and ‘partial’ economic participation. For this reason, the existence of a possible cultural alternative united under common principles, similar strivings and with common goals are more one in the same as the dominant culture--- differing only in matter of practice and identity (Drake 2010; Marable 1983/2000). Put differently, the premise is that there is nothing inherently antagonistic about the two cultures; they rather, coexist.

‘Structure’ vs. ‘Culture’

Identifying the structural and cultural properties of urban neighborhoods may help to discern viable information regarding its residents. Wilson (2009) offers an insightful exegesis of the interaction between culture and structure in the inner city. His insight into the lives of the black poor residing in urban enclaves throughout cities across the U.S. landscape provides a comprehensive analysis of the place-based circumstances which dictate and/or predicts direction and outcome in the lives of inner-city folk. In the traditional structure versus culture debate there
is the tendency to dissociate the two so as to not confound their properties. Accordingly, culture is defined as the “sharing of outlooks and modes of behavior” (Wilson 2009:4) by persons occupying similar social environments---as a response to urban segregation. Structure, on the other hand, is defined as the way “social positions, social roles, and networks of social relations are arranged in our institutions” (Wilson 2009:5). Although both culture and structure make distinct contributions to understanding the predicament of urban dwellers; Wilson reconciles the differences between structural and cultural analysis. He states:

In terms of major effects on immediate group social outcomes and racial stratification, structure trumps culture. Nevertheless, I firmly believe that to apply these explanations totally separately, without any attempt to show how they interact, is indeed a mistake. Moreover, if we are going to examine social and economic factors that, over time, contributed to the development of certain cultural traits and related behavior, we must also pay serious attention to the immediate impact of structural conditions (2009:21).

There must be a general consensus, however, about the cultural traits that arise from such structural conditions. Many explanations of culture are often discussed on the micro-level; the intention being to show significance in variation and separate out specific characteristics of individuals and groups. However, there is the possibility that macro-level explanations of culture may offer a more definitive criterion for categorizing and sorting out cultural differences. To this end, simply acknowledging the existence of patterns of cultural development and the negative attributes of that found within isolated urban ghettos has its limits. Such insight sidesteps the legitimacy of the divergent cultural response to strenuous structural inequities. Harrison and
Huntington (2000) represent a number of scholars that tap into the importance of recognizing adaptive cultural mechanisms and endemic cultural traits at both the local/national and international levels. In fact, their work *Culture Matters* places culture at the center of explanations for behavioral responses, group preferences as well as the awareness of political, religious, and moral values. Although urban segregation provides a platform for making the case against inflicted, man-made social conditions, the cultural response on the part of those cordoned-off in the central city fits within the parameters of a valid cultural orientation. Harrison and Huntington’s (2000) research offers a kind of ‘cultural yardstick’ on which to measure the prevalence of certain traits:

> Distinctive cultural zones exist and they have major social and political consequences, helping shape important phenomena from fertility rates to economic behavior…societies vary tremendously in the extent to which they emphasize “survival values” and “self-expression values”. Societies that emphasize the latter are far likelier to be democracies than those that emphasize survival values (Inglehart in Harrison and Huntington 2000: 80-81).

The existence of a ‘survival’- ‘self-expression’ continuum further helps to put into perspective the cultural characteristics derived from spatial concentration and centralization. For this reason, culture defined within the parameters of segregated urban neighborhoods should be noted as concrete and definite. The manner in which culture functions differently on opposite ends of the class spectrum closely identifies with assertions made about the deviation from mainstream norms. Put simply, vertical stratification is inherently divisive; its effects are so pervasive that it determines both one’s position within the overall class structure and social
standing, as well as influences the formation and function of social groups. Research reveals that economic development serves as a key distinguishing factor in whether individuals and groups behave in a particular fashion. The presumption being that it affords persons a more liberal and less socially conservative lifestyle. Such is the case of underdeveloped tracts in urban neighborhoods. Deindustrialization and disinvestment have left many urban neighborhoods across the United States underdeveloped due to lack in job prospects and adequate funding (Wilson 2009; Baysu, et al 2011). The allocation of funds away from central cities has in turn had a dramatic impact on the community structure and social capital of its residents. Point being that there are finite cultural characteristics and properties that are derived from the creation of “definitive zones” (Wacquant 2008:258).

Moreover, this work seeks to address the way in which inner city culture(s) differ from mainstream culture(s) (see also Small and Newman 2001). Many first impressions of inner city residents leaves persons reluctant to acknowledge the stark contrast between the inner city and mainstream society. This research follows the presumption that mistaking forward projections of individualism and materialism as definitive characteristics of mainstream culture are stifling for discerning the cultural differences between the two (2001: 37). As the differences are structural in origin, the cultural practice of the inner city tends to function autonomously and is spatially, geographically, and ideologically representative of the states of residents. This makes the distinction between the ghetto (i.e. inner city) and mainstream culture recognizable on a broader scale.
Accordingly, Ron Inglehart’s ‘survival/self-expression’ dichotomy suffices to support claims about structural inequity and cultural dissimilarity (see Harrison and Huntington 2000). That is, the dichotomy helps to discern which strategy the individuals employ to navigate the sets of conditions that govern their existence. He also makes the point that economic development brings about positive, individuated adjustment. His study points to variations in culture throughout different regions of the world. Whether by preference, religious affiliation or degrees of political freedom, he contends that the overall cultural schema of societies tends more toward ‘self-expression’ or ‘survival’ practices. Without confounding the relationship between spatial concentration in urban neighborhood communities and the dynamics of collectivist oriented cultures, it appears that practices and life-strategies are on the surface, similar.

Additionally, the distribution of wealth, capital, space etc. among relatives, friends, and fictive kin (Patillo, Weiman, and Western 2004) further help to discern the association; such dynamics reveal comparable social forms. To add to this point, there is the possibility that the cultural traits which develop in response to structural conditions of urban neighborhood communities may be less arbitrary and identify closely with other cultures. Emergent cultural traits are derived from the interplay between the composition of capital, solidarity, and the community structure under scope (see Wang 2005). Much of the congruence that is evident across cultures, however, may be attributed to the composition and function of social capital.

Social Capital

Scarcity of resources among minorities, poor and the working poor often force them to turn inward for economic and emotional stability. The manner in which social capital aids in the integration of individuals via ethnic and familial ties is best exhibited in the urban terrain. In
most cases central cities function as reservoirs for the distribution of formal/informal social capital among minority groups. Households and communities are often the only sources that facilitate participatory integration in society on the part of marginalized individuals and groups (see Beilman and Realo 2012; Putnam 2000).

This reliance on social capital is notably a commonality shared between new immigrants as well as old groups occupying the same space. To this end, the city provides a certain degree of continuity that makes patterns of cultural adaptation observable. And, it is made even more apparent through intergenerational and inter-communal ties that span decades within a given socio-demographic space. This type of bonding is shared among individuals and groups with similar social backgrounds; and, it is particularly exhibited among those of the same class or those having similar social characteristics. Wellman (1999) attributes the limitations of social capital in this regard, however, to the prevalence of strong ties via networks of similar ethnic groups and kin; the point being that the range of networks do not extend beyond the boundaries of the immediate environment. The presence of such associations/liaisons provides a platform on which growth, stability and economic integration become a reality.

Wang (2005) describes this phenomenon as the benefit of “informal social capital”; a strategy that migrants employ for navigating the migration process. “Over time,” she contends, “family ties become a source of social capital, also defined as the wealth of the informal family” (2005:218). Used in this manner, social capital serves as a critical resource for aiding in economic assistance as well as reduces the costs and risks of migration. The security felt from being able to rely on an excess pool of others also functions as a safety net and reliable alternative against exclusion and the daunting effects of marginalization for central city natives. Therefore, to be high on social capital when disproportionately lacking in other forms of capital
(i.e. economic, cultural, political etc.) allows one to stand a chance at ‘survival’ as well as compete in various arenas with others.

‘Income parity’

A primary example of the benefits of social capital among disenfranchised urbanites is the manner in which the pooling of resources affords stability and competitive edge. Destabilization of such a unit, as is the case with incarceration and the removal of individual units reveal how fragile these networks are. Katherine S. Newman (2001) explores in-depth the inner workings of the family structure and the cultural dynamics of Harlem’s poor and working poor as they combat welfare reform. The ingenuity and innovation that central city residents employ during strenuous economic bouts make it evident that individuals are valuable assets for another. She puts on full display the cultural response to the structural conditions that would in most cases limit mobility and exclude persons from adequately competing in society.

The external influence of policy changes on marginalized groups demonstrate that common sense approach to ‘staying afloat’ vis-à-vis one’s access to social capital becomes the cornerstone of cultural values for central city occupants. For this reason, the lives of individuals discussed in Hard Times on 125St. resonate with that of minority groups in central cities across the U.S. landscape. In what is referred to as the “ecology of structural adjustment,” Newman reveals how the cooperation between Kyesha-, a 21 year old, minimum wage, fast food employee- and her 41 year old mother of five other dependents (and long-term AFDC recipient) navigate the negative impact of downward mobility (Newman 2001:763-764).

Accordingly, alliance and ‘carrying capacity’ show-up as notable trends in the distribution of capital among networks of close and extended kin. The above scenario serves as
an illustration of how informal social capital (see Wang 2005:218) works to the benefit of inner city households and families in the face of marginality and stringent structural conditions due to policy changes in welfare reform. As a practice, the cooperation between kin and friends serves as evidence of emergent cultural traits; especially, when carried out over an extended period of time (Wilson 2009). The commonness of inter- and intra-group dependence exhibited among central city residents whose well-being necessitate this type of collaborative stance demonstrates the importance of solidarity in keeping neighborhoods, households, and communities solid.

Community Solidarity

The prevalence of informal social capital in urban neighborhoods not only serves as a reservoir but also helps to facilitate community development at the grassroots. The manner in which ties are forged between relatives, friends and neighbors is fundamental to establishing the broader network in which ‘community’ is defined. In this way, the bonding of individuals within the context of their environment is also predicated on what commonalities and/or similar traits may be shared among them. Although racial and ethnic background are the more immediate traits by which to establish connections, socio-economic status, and proximity to similar needed resources also aid in fostering solidarity (Ball 2001; Clear 2007).

In a comparative approach in which he examines the conditions of urban ghettos in United States and France, LoicWacquant (2008) describes the predicament of the urban environment as the ‘communal ghetto’. One point of contention is that disinvestment and racial polarization have made the urban ghetto an exclusionary space; one in which every bit of information and resources in the environment binds persons into viable units. This is in part why community is discussed in relation to familial ties. Layers of social ties often serve as building
blocks for community in urban neighborhoods. For many central city occupants social ties also serve as a significant source of capital. Although limited in measure, the foundation that immediate social ties provide for residents lacking substantial levels of education, employment, and economic sufficiency are critical for life strategy and navigating the life course. In the same vein, community is also conceived of as an extension of the primary social unit; therefore layers upon layers of social ties continue to foster solidarity by way of a cohesive network of friends and kin. Though some contend that the disproportionate number of strong to weak ties limit the efficiency of the aggregate population the interplay of both in the urban environment aid in carving out a functional community (Jeanotte 2003).

In a study of the urban settlement of Thai migrants, Korinek, et al (2005) explores the inner workings of family and community against a loose urban environment. The fragility of tight-knit relations is overcome by a combination of kin and liaisons established during the times of assistance with crisis situations. Similar characteristics have been observed in studies of the impact of prison on black families (see also Schneller 1975). The structural adjustments that occur in response to strenuous economic and tragic circumstances shift the locus of survival to a delicate combination of close social ties and newly formed ties that cut across the human services sector. Their research suggests that:

At the neighborhood-level migrants are embedded to the extent that they share the urban space with supportive, hospitable persons…Embeddedness emerges through a variegated web of social ties some of which link migrants to kin, co-villagers, and others with whom they are familiar and share common background, and others of which
link migrants to new, diverse, urban-based folks who share their new environment (Korinek et al 2005).

The extent to which migrant enclaves facilitate urban incorporation for existent families and newcomers is of crucial importance to understanding the dynamics of the relations among other central city occupants. There is a general consensus about the significance of social ties among urban residents. The resourcefulness of others is critical for incorporation and integration, but also helps to foster a solid foundation for community development in certain tracts. The commonalities exhibited among migrant enclaves and that of concentrated, marginalized groups form a body of knowledge and life practice that is essential for coping with and navigating the inefficiencies of full economic and cultural participation.

Community solidarity is a crucial point of investigation for the current research because of the collaborative and other-directed tendencies that accompany it. Previous research (for example, Triandis 2001; Wang 2005) suggests that such behavioral characteristics are a prerequisite for collectivist oriented traits. Although the level and degree of spatial concentration in central city neighborhoods differ substantially from societies that embody collectivism as a finite orientation and practice, the structural ecology of urban neighborhood communities often exhibit similar practice in the dynamics of households and the immediate environment in which they are situated; particularly, when group formation consists of a sizeable amount of friends and relatives. As mentioned, the development of informal social capital is predicated on the density of social ties and the benefits associated with assisting related individuals. The permanence of which may also be tied to persistent constraints on economic development and proper integration (Royster 2003; Marable 1983/2000; Harrison and Huntington 2000). Consequently, extended periods of habitual actions and behaviors lead to cultural adaptation. These properties are in turn
exacerbated by the impact of incarceration; for this reason, patterns of social and cultural adjustment that stem from these tight-knit associations, upon being dismantled, are proven fragile (Christian, Mellow, and Thomas 2006).

In retrospect, adjusting to the standards of the current political and economic climate of the urban environment is made easier when in conjunction with other persons with similar aims, under similar circumstances, at different levels of the integration process. To add to this point, it is apparent that the design and/or arrangement of networks of co-villagers, kin, and friends against a loose urban structure are indeed fragile; the same can be concluded about the communities that develop within this context. In the face of economic instability, marginality, and “insecurity” (Wacquant 2008) community is almost, always waning— and in need of constant adjustment.

Urban Neighborhoods and Incarceration

The need for adjustment is more readily discernible with the loss of individuals to incarceration. Many urban neighborhoods are in some ways enmeshed with the prison industrial complex; in part because of the racial and ethnic make-up, but due in large measure to the demographic characteristics that are endemic to concentrated urban spaces. To this end, socio-demographic spaces that are comprised of lower levels of educational attainment, insufficient employment prospects for young men and increasingly for young women and disproportionate drug offenses are often a hot-bed for crime and inevitably feed into incarceration rates. Alexander (2010) supports these claims on the premise that there is a broader connection between mass incarceration and disproportionate numbers of minorities overrepresented within
its boundaries. Her contention is that former systems of control, such as the plantation economy and Jim Crow were precursors for the development of mass incarceration (2010: 22-42).

Likewise, the expendability of a sizeable amount of marginalized folk for which prisons and jails have been prescribed as the ‘cure-all’ is in turn sought out for capital gain. Herivel and Wright (2009) affirm that communities characterized by these deficiencies serve as a hunting ground and resource for contributing to human warehousing. However, the absence of proper effort at rehabilitation and correction continue to stifle reintegration, community redevelopment and preservation by thriving relentlessly on marginalization already apparent within the preexistent social conditions (Clear 2007; Charkoudian, Cosgrove, Ferrell and Flower 2012).

Jennifer Gonnerman refers to the geographical space associated with the disproportionate numbers of arrests as “million dollar blocks” (Harrison and Huntington 2000). Her contention is that urban neighborhoods and the community structure under scope serve as target blocks for filtering unadjusted citizens into prisons and jails. This insight is critical because the very same target blocks are those in which divergent cultural traits are prevalent. A combination of drug and property arrests associated with the socio-demographic space discussed is an indicator of relative dysfunctions. Negative properties aside, however, the ecological properties of target blocks may qualify them as cultural zones (Newman 2001; Wacquant 2008). Deprivation and the density of social ties for many minorities and lower class individuals (i.e. poor, working poor) are a precursor for the development of informal social capital provided their ability to collaborate with those in proximity to their own circumstances.

It is the consequent bleeding of capital from communities affected by the onslaught of mass incarceration that further alienates and disenfranchises them. The absence of potential husbands, fathers, and working men from their communities is stifling in and of itself. Smith and
Hattery (2010) view the extraction of large numbers of ‘black men’ by the prison industrial complex as an emptying out of multiple forms of capital that would otherwise foster semi-functional households and communities provided their access to better prospects. The indifference to the circumstances of minority men is another topic altogether, but the effects of the absence of what, in some cases are, key individuals (valuable assets) to networks of kin continue to be troubling where resources are lacking and help is needed. Exploiting those lacking proper education and skills needed for economic participation makes them more vulnerable to incarceration (Alexander 2010: 172). Had their alleged shortcomings and deficiencies been met head-on, a more fruitful contribution could have been made for sustaining family and community as well as fostering healthier cultural alternatives.

Patillo, et al (2004) and Clear (2007) reiterate this point by emphasizing the level of damage done to communities, families and households comprised of the poorest of the poor in society. The consensus is that every integral part of urban neighborhoods from the smallest dyadic linkages between spouses to that of parents and their children, to an even broader system of community are fragile; that is, both prior to and after the impact of incarceration. The predisposition to bad elements and inadequate resources continue to hinder access to opportunity as well as curtail innovation outside of normative opportunistic structures (i.e. readily accessible record companies and sports leagues). The potential for improvement and progress remain contingent upon sufficient education and decent income. Either of the two is crucial in preserving the individual’s standings in society and their contributions to economically sound and functional families. The ability to contribute on the part of well-adjusted persons to their primary social groups makes for more efficient binding practices and sustainable urban enclaves.
In light of this, the enclave may be conceived of as a foyer for denoting the congruence in its developing cultural schema across societies, communities, and cultures.

In what follows, I employ advanced statistical methods for exploring the interplay between community structure, social capital and solidarity against the impact of incarceration. Neighborhood-level data provides an opportunity to map out the structural ecology of residential segregation and patterns of cultural development. More specifically, I rely on exploratory factor analysis and correlation indices to determine the significance of association between variables related to the structure and culture of urban neighborhoods. I also examine the influence of incarceration on these associations. As a conceptual framework still in its developmental stages, I hypothesize about the strengths and weaknesses of the relationships between variables. Understanding the degree of the associations between factors provides a more accurate depiction of how they interact in the urban environment.

Conceptual Framework

The difficulty of conceptualizing a community structure stems from being able to locate and define key elements that comprise its environment. Community is typically thought of as a group of people occupying a specific locale; whereby its members exist in the same time and space. Structure in turn is defined as a set of interconnecting parts of any complex thing (Oxford 2002: 806). Thus, this research proposes that socio-demographic characteristics may be useful for delineating information about emergent structural and cultural properties of the inner city.

At the close of the nineteenth century Emile Durkheim, delineating on the effects of urbanization and industrialization, put forth the idea that society was trending in two different directions. That is, in response to the division of labor noticeable distinctions between simple and
complex societies were becoming more evident. Apparently, each type of society is characterized and/or held together by its own form of solidarity. Mechanical solidarity is characteristic of simpler societies wherein which division of labor and specialization of tasks are not fully developed; members as a result tend to closely resemble one another and exhibit a firmer sense of “common consciousness” (Durkheim 1893/1984). Organic solidarity is characteristic of complex societies wherein which the division of labor and specialization are fully developed and individuals function as interdependent parts of a whole. Although a major point of contention is that modernization inevitably brings about the gradual replacement of simpler societies by complex societies, Durkheim concludes that traces of mechanical solidarity may be found within a segmentary type of society whereby the individual: “[is held] more tightly in its grip, making him more strongly attached to his domestic environment, and consequently to tradition” (1893/1984: 242).

Likewise, Wacquant (2008) deliberates on what constitutes advanced marginality and a segmentary type of society in the current times. He contends that the criminalization of poverty and the “containment of the poor” in isolated neighborhoods may be attributed in large measure to “deindustrialization and public policies of urban abandonment” (2008: 277). His research reveals that prolonged under- and unemployment, the absence of resources and work in general places constraints on the division of labor and hinder specialization. Thus, it may be included that this type of marginalization breeds structural inequity as well as defines the demarcated urban spaces where culture tends to differ.
The contention of this research is that this structure may be characterized by a set of interrelated variables that are endemic to the socio-demographic space of interest (i.e. inner city neighborhoods): socio-economic status and types of arrests. When the relationships between community structure, community solidarity, and informal social capital are the focus, emergent properties such as culture become evident. For this reason, interaction among households, families, and individuals may constitute a cultural zone---a geographic area characterized by time sequence and a dominant cultural orientation.
Methods

This research uses data collected in a study of neighborhoods in Baltimore, Maryland to examine the impact of incarceration on community structure and social capital in urban neighborhoods. The dataset was retrieved from the ICPSR (The inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research) database; it was first released in 2003. James P. Lynch and William J. Sabol explore the effects of arrests and incarceration on informal social control in Baltimore 1980-1994. With a specific focus on Baltimore neighborhoods and their residents, their study looks into the impact of aggressive arrest policies on 30 neighborhood communities; the researchers wanted to see if policy changes negatively affected social organization and the willingness to engage in informal social control. The final product and/or information collected consists of aggregate community-level data on crime rates, demographics, socio-economic attributes, elements of collective efficacy, community attachment and other sensitive details. Although not a major focal point for the current study, the racial and ethnic composition of the demographic with which this research covers was comprised of blacks, Hispanics, Native Americans, Asians, and whites. Data was collected for the time periods 1970-1994 and 1999-2001. The institution did not receive labels for missing values and reports data as it was given to them by the principle investigators.

The current study extracts variables from the dataset to construct a general representation of the structural and cultural dynamics of urban neighborhoods and the distribution of social capital. Additionally, relevant hypothesis are tested to illustrate the effects of incarceration on community structure and social solidarity among persons residing in central city similar that of Baltimore. In all, there were approximately 16 variables used for conducting this research. For number of ‘friends’ and ‘relatives’ ranges were calculated by subtracting the highest number
from the lowest number reported. The mean score for the variable labeled ‘sense of community with neighborhood’ shows the average response for those indicating that they (on a scale of 1-3) felt that they were not at all, somewhat, or great deal. Residents were also asked if they were ‘attached to the neighborhood’; their responses were tracked on a scale of 1-4 which indicated that they were either: 1. not attached, 2. somewhat attached, 3. moderately attached, or 4. strongly attached. Researchers were also interested in whether the neighborhood was a ‘place people knew each other’; respondents were asked on a scale of 1-4 if this was very untrue or very true. The extent to which residents were ‘accepted by their neighbors’ was also informative; responses were recorded on a scale of 1-4 indicating that were not at all, a small extent, medium extent, or large extent. Whether or not residents were ‘attached to their block’ was measured on the same scale used for neighborhood attachment.

Additionally, residents were asked on a scale of 1-4 how much they ‘relied on neighbors for emotional support’: not at all, small extent, medium extent, or large extent, respectively. Whether or not an individual visited a neighbor in the past year was a dichotomous variable; responses were coded as 0, yes and 1, no and approximately 63.1% of the cases reported missing values. Residents were also asked to report the highest level of education completed; the mean score indicates the number of persons reporting that they had achieved ‘less than 12 years of education’. The mean for ‘percent blue collar’ shows the average number of persons reporting blue collar occupations; this data is presented as a raw count. The mean score for ‘households on welfare’ shows the number of persons (i.e. raw count) that reported receiving AFDC assistance. A mean score for people below poverty shows the average number of persons (i.e. raw count) reporting experience with persistent poverty. Likewise, the remaining mean scores for general arrests, drug arrests, and property arrest to property crime are percent averages (proportions) for
types of arrests prevalent for all Baltimore neighborhoods studied by the researchers. The units of the standard deviation are the same as the units of the original data values.

**Conceptual Definitions- Operationalization**

*Socio-economic status.* SES is a sociological measure of a person’s economic and social position in relation to others. Indicators include income, occupation and education of individuals, households and families. For the purpose of this study and to investigate the SES of the demographic in question, a combination of scores for households on welfare, blue collar occupation, and persistent poverty provide a comprehensive measure for the general economic make-up the geographic area and neighborhood.

*Informal Social Capital.* Social capital is the collective benefit (i.e. economic, social) derived from cooperation of individuals and groups. To tap into the informal social capital of urban villagers measures for ‘friends in area’ and ‘relatives and area’ are combined; as these are networks that serve as substitutes for lack of attachment to or, in some cases, a bridge for participation in the formal economy.

*Incarceration.* Incarceration is a form of punishment for the commission of crime and other offenses. This research utilizes types of arrests that are most associated with the demographic under investigation as a combined measure: drug arrests, property arrests to property crime, and general arrests.

*Community Solidarity (Individual-level).* Solidarity refers to the unity and/or glue that holds a society or community together. In this study a combination of measures are used to assess individual level attachment to neighborhoods. Persons were asked if they felt a sense of community with their neighborhood, if whether they were attached to neighborhood, if the
neighborhood was a place people knew each other, if they relied on neighbors for emotional support, the extent to which they were accepted by neighbors, if they were attached to their block, and if whether within the past year they had visited a neighbor.

*Zone Characteristics (community structure).* Zone characteristics are the socio-demographic variables of an aggregate geographical space comprised of neighborhoods and communities. This study considers a combination of socio-economic status variables and incarceration indicators a physical representation of the cultural zone in question

In the final analysis I chose simple and multiple linear regressions so as to give a clear depiction of how the relevant latent structures function in relation to other demographic information in the urban environment. First, however, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted to see which latent structures map onto the geographic area of the urban neighborhoods most affected by incarceration.

See Appendix A, Table 1.

**Hypotheses Testing**

**Hypothesis 1:** The lower the socio-economic status of a population, the higher the rate of incarceration.

**Hypothesis 2:** As informal social capital increases, community solidarity increases.

**Hypothesis 3:** The higher the informal social capital and community solidarity, the stronger the community structure.

**Hypothesis 4:** A loss of informal social capital to incarceration has a substantive impact on solidarity.
Factor Analysis

The factor analysis yielded three components. The first component consisted of high loadings on six variables that included types of arrests and general demographic information and was labeled ‘socio-demographic characteristics’. The second component consisted of moderate to high loadings on seven variables for general attachment to community and neighboring. Taken together, the two help to discern the degree of cooperativeness and familiarity with one’s neighborhood and was labeled ‘community solidarity’. The third component consisted of high loadings on two variables: the range of friends in area and range of relatives in area. The combination of the two variables was labeled ‘informal social capital’.

Solidarity, social capital, and the specified zone characteristics are three latent factors that are endemic to urban neighborhood communities. The presence of persistent poverty (.870), households on welfare (.901), and blue collar occupations (.738) in conjunction with disproportionate drug and property arrests is a clear representation of the composition of many urban neighborhoods. Likewise, a feeling of sense of community (.672), familiarity with and attachment to one’s block (.690), and acceptance by others are key indicators of solidarity at the individual-level. A strong presence of kin (.839) and friends (.785), in the same context, serve as a source of informal social capital and is fundamental to the preservation of community. There is the possibility that divergent cultural trends emerge where the association across the three latent factors are strong. Previous research has already revealed that high volumes of informal social capital and solidarity are conducive to other-directed values (see also Wang 2005; Triandis 2001; Triandis 2006; Beilmann and Realo 2012).

See Appendix B, Table 2
Reliability Scales

Composite measures were constructed based on latent variables retrieved from the factor analysis. High internal consistency for people below poverty, households on welfare, and percent blue collar were an indication of socio-economic status. Similarly, the combination of drug arrests, general arrests, and property arrest to property crime were determinants for ‘incarceration’. Taken together, all the variables produce a factor structure that is useful for identifying the characteristics of the anticipated cultural zone, $\alpha=.685$. Consistent loadings for range of friends and range of relatives in a given area were used to indicate informal social capital, $\alpha=.780$. In addition, factor loadings for community solidarity also produced a reliable Cronbach’s $\alpha$ of .767.

Together the three serve as important latent indices for mapping out the parameters of concentration and emergent cultural information in the urban neighborhoods. Correlations were also run to test for the strength and significance of relationships between latent variables that are representative of urban neighborhood communities (see Table 3 Appendix C). The interplay between variables should allow one to see the influence of incarceration on community structure and solidarity; as well as tease out information about the impact of other variables on these constructs as they relate to the current discussion about urban neighborhoods, emergent cultural trends, and the influence of incarceration.

See Appendix C, Table 3.
Results

The latter hypotheses were tested using simple and multiple regressions. The findings illustrate the interplay between latent structures associated with urban neighborhoods. Whereas a previously run correlation matrix reveals a complex web of association for latent variables derived from the three components; the regressions were also run to determine the strength and degree of association, directionality, and time-order for the impact and/or influence of incarceration on characteristics of emergent cultural and structural properties located in urban neighborhood communities.

Results from hypothesis one revealed that SES, $\beta=.697$, $t=25.73$, $p<.01$, was a significant predictor of incarceration. Approximately 48.5% of the variation in socio-economic status is useful in explaining incarceration trends. Previous research supports the hypotheses about the influence of income and socio-economic status variables on types of crime and crime rates (Krivo and Peterson 2010). Hypothesis 2 is also confirmed; the higher informal social capital, $\beta=.167$, $t=4.36$, $p<.01$, the higher community solidarity. Ties between friends and kin are influential on individual attachment to neighborhood communities.

Hypothesis three and four which are precursors for qualifying assumptions about urban neighborhoods as potential cultural zones produced interesting findings as well. Results from the regression for hypothesis three indicated that relationship between attachment and community structure was also relatively weak. Findings were inconclusive; community solidarity, $\beta=-.088$, $t=-2.32$, $p<.05$ and informal social capital, $\beta=.054$ (not significant) only account for 0.9% of the variance in explaining characteristics of community structure and possible reinforcement. That is, whether or not community structure is strengthened due to a combination of the two factors
was indeterminable. Hypothesis four, however, is confirmed; although the relationship stipulating the loss of social capital to incarceration and its consequential effect on solidarity did not register very high. Incarceration, $\beta = -0.086$, $t = -2.32$, $p < .05$, and informal social capital, $\beta = 0.166$, $t = 4.46$, $p < .01$ account for only 3.4% of the variance explaining community solidarity (i.e. individual-level attachment). Conclusions are drawn on the basis that simply because the relationships are weak does not mean that they are not existent.

Critical attention has been placed on the latter hypotheses, 3 and 4; when situated in the appropriate residential dimensions (i.e. concentration and centralization) (see also Massey and Denton 1988; Peterson and Krivo 2010) the interplay between solidarity, community structure, and informal social capital provide divergent structural trends. On the whole, incarceration has been proven to be a social factor that influences neighborhood characteristics. However, emergent cultural traits were not highly discernible given the available data.

See Appendix D, Table 4

**Conclusion/Implications**

In review, the influence of incarceration on urban neighborhoods has been confirmed. The negative impacts of exogenous factors in the urban environment are stifling for proper community development and possible, emergent cultural alternatives. This conceptual research merely sketches the boundaries through which the politics of representation are harder to identify. Some find it relatively difficult to grapple with the ecological properties both manifest and latent in central cities throughout various parts of the nation. Incarceration, however, remains inextricably linked with this population; in fact, research continues to show that prison and jails
often serve as a “spill way” for the unadjusted who remain stigmatized by the boundaries to which they are confined (Wacquant 2008: 278).

The persistence of structural inequities, inequality, and under- and unemployment continue to fuel divergent social trends. The manner in which social groups are inevitably affected by such realities reinforces the notion of structure as a more concrete theoretical vantage point for which to properly identify and discuss the issue of vertical stratification and the resulting cultural adaptation on the part of individuals, families, households and communities. As mentioned in previous research strong associations between informal social capital, solidarity, and community structure (see Wang 2005; Beilman and Reialo 2012) were an indication of cooperativeness and other directed values.

Interestingly, however, incarceration is shown to have an impact on solidarity and not the community structure under investigation. Despite the overrepresentation of members of lower rungs of society within the prison industrial complex, the removal of individuals may only slightly affect community structure as new individuals and groups replace old ones. A shortcoming for the current research is its relatively small sample size (N=704). Although it clearly identifies with a small portion of the population studied in the initial research and just as well may be posited theoretically for concentration and centralization; there is the possibility that it reduces explanatory power. A larger and more definitive sample could produce more fruitful findings. Another shortcoming may be the manner in which the data was retrieved; neighborhoods were randomly sampled from a total of 236 neighborhoods over several time periods. This in turn may have posed problems for extending the data in order to tap into below surface information that is not easily accessible.
Also, because culture is conceivably difficult to measure, further research should consider mix methods (i.e. qualitative data) to better fill-in the parameters sketched out in the abovementioned correlations and regressions. To date, critical attention has been given to the possibility of “neighborhood nationalisms” and its affinity for broader social and cultural debate (see Drake 2010). These economic and cultural specific ecologies serve as vestibules for viable information regarding the intersections of race, ethnicity, class, and place.

Katherine Newman’s insight into the lives of the working and working poor in the inner city as well as cultural trends emerging throughout various regions in the world reinforces the notion of ‘parallels’ between cultural zones. Her research serves as a springboard for understanding familial arrangements, community, and kinship structures within the lower rungs of advanced industrial societies and various parts of the world (i.e. East Asia, Southern Europe). The extents to which cultural similarities between societies emerge are proven circumstantial in some cases and endemic in others. A key indicator of cross-cultural relevance is addressed along the lines of “early independence” and “failure to launch” among young adults and their parents or primary family units. In a recent study, Newman (2008) expounds in detail on the issue of delayed departure occurring throughout parts of Europe and Japan. Research reveals that there are striking similarities between Southern European countries such as Italy and that of Japan on the issue of delayed adulthood and extended stay in the natal home. Cultural responses to the issue varied according to geographical location of groups.

Across the spectrum, however, the lessening of economic opportunities and prospects for youth stunts the gradual move toward autonomous, individualized lives. Unlike in the Nordic countries where the welfare state has tackled the problem to prevent the occurrence of extended stay and maintain its individualist orientation, functional interdependence in Spain, Italy, and
Japan are common. Although the origins of what brought about the need for structural adjustment differ for each, the patterns of adaptation are the same and persons appear more receptive of these trends because of the survival that it affords them (Newman 2008: 664-665). Findings about intergenerational household formation and pronounced interdependence for young adults and their families are congruent with the predicament of urban villagers in the central city; such dynamics reveal inherent cultural traits.

Already, scholars have gone to great lengths to place into perspective the prevalence of familiar behavior and relations throughout the world; in instances where adaptive mechanisms take on the characteristics of legitimate cultural practice the social arrangement of individual and groups within the relevant context remain true to form. A general consensus is that “culture emerges in specific ecologies” whereby the decision on “how to make a living in particular environment” is often contingent upon the availability of resources and its geographic features (Triandis 2001; Triandis 2006:209). Such is the case of spatially concentrated urban villagers and societies that fall onto the survival side of abovementioned cultural binary (see Harrison and Huntington 2000). This study is put forth as reclamation of macro- explanations of culture at the national and international levels. Evidence of these types of comparisons helps to further the debate on diversity both at home and abroad (Adeleke 2009: 167; Takaki 2002).


Appendix A. Table 1.

List of Variables, N=704

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Dev.</th>
<th>Skew Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relatives in Area</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends in Area</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Community</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached to Neighborhood</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood is a Place People Know each Other</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent you are accepted by Neighbors</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached to block</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rely on Neighbors for emotional support</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past yr visited a neighbor</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education less than 12yrs</td>
<td>555.14</td>
<td>406.60</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Blue collar</td>
<td>262.32</td>
<td>201.69</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households on Welfare</td>
<td>181.75</td>
<td>163.06</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People below poverty</td>
<td>603.05</td>
<td>552.88</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Arrests</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Arrest</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Arrest to Property Crime</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appendix B. Table 2.

### Factor Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 1: Socio-Demographic (Zone- Characteristics)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent Blue Collar</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households on Welfare</td>
<td>.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Below Poverty</td>
<td>.870 α=.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Arrests</td>
<td>.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Arrests</td>
<td>.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Arrests to Property Crime</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 2: Community Solidarity(Individual-level)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Community</td>
<td>.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached to Neighborhood</td>
<td>.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Place People Know Each Other</td>
<td>.563 α=.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent Accepted by Neighbors</td>
<td>.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached to Block</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rely on Neighbors for Emotional Support</td>
<td>.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past yr Visited a Neighbor</td>
<td>.458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 3: Informal Social Capital</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range of Friends in Area</td>
<td>.785 α=.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of Relatives in Area</td>
<td>.839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix C. Table 3
Correlation Matrix

Composite Measure Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone Characteristics</th>
<th>Community Solidarity</th>
<th>Informal Social Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone Characteristics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Solidarity</td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Social Capital</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.162**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>704</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix D. Table 4 Summary of Regression Analyses for Hypotheses

### Summary of Regression Analysis for Incarceration N=704; Hypothesis 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>$2.18 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>25.73</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R squared=.485

### Summary of Regression Analysis for Community Solidarity N=704; Hypothesis 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal SC</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R squared=.026

### Summary of Regression Analysis for Community Structure N= 704; Hypothesis 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Solidarity</td>
<td>-22.88</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-2.32</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal SC</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R squared=.009

### Summary of Regression Analysis for Community Solidarity N=704; Hypothesis 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal SC</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarceration</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>-2.32</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R squared=.034