

**Paternal Incarceration and Children's Food Insecurity:
A Consideration of Variation and Mechanisms**

Kristin Turney
University of California-Irvine

September 2014

Preferred citation

Turney, K. Paternal Incarceration and Children's Food Insecurity: A Consideration of Variation and Mechanisms. *University of Kentucky Center for Poverty Research Discussion Paper Series, DP2012-12.*

Author correspondence

Kristin Turney, University of California, Irvine, 3151 Social Science Plaza, Irvine, CA 92697-5100;
Email: kristin.turney@uci.edu

Paternal Incarceration and Children's Food Insecurity:
A Consideration of Variation and Mechanisms

Kristin Turney
University of California, Irvine

September 25, 2014

Direct correspondence to Kristin Turney, University of California, Irvine, 3151 Social Science Plaza, Irvine, CA 92697-5100. Direct email to kristin.turney@uci.edu. This project was supported with a grant from the University of Kentucky Center for Poverty Research through funding by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, contract number AG-3198-B-10-0028. The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are solely those of the author(s) and should not be construed as representing the opinions or policies of the UKCPR or any agency of the Federal Government. Funding for the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study was provided by the NICHD through grants R01HD36916, R01HD39135, and R01HD40421, as well as a consortium of private foundations (see <http://www.fragilefamilies.princeton.edu/funders.asp> for the complete list). I am grateful to Britni Adams for excellent research assistance and to Jim Ziliak, Craig Gundersen, and participants of the Research Program on Childhood Hunger workshops for their thoughtful feedback. Any errors are my own.

ABSTRACT

Despite growing attention to the unintended intergenerational consequences of incarceration, little is known about whether and how paternal incarceration is related to children's food insecurity, an especially acute and severe form of deprivation. In this article, I use data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, a cohort of urban children born to mostly unmarried mothers, to examine the relationship between paternal incarceration and food insecurity among young children. Results from the most rigorous modeling strategy, propensity score matching models that further adjust for all covariates, indicate that recent paternal incarceration is associated with an increased likelihood of current food insecurity (at age five), an increased likelihood of onset into food insecurity (between ages three and five), and a decreased likelihood of exit from food insecurity (between ages three and five), but only among children living with fathers prior to incarceration. These associations are partially explained by changes in the parental relationship occurring after the onset of paternal incarceration. Taken together, the findings highlight the salience of parental relationships in linking paternal incarceration to children's food insecurity and have a number of implications for public policy.

The rise in incarceration rates since the mid-1970s, especially among poorly educated minority men living in disadvantaged neighborhoods, means that a historically unprecedented number of children experience paternal incarceration (Carson 2014; Patillo, Weiman, and Western 2004; Wakefield and Uggen 2010). In response, scholars across an array of disciplines have developed an acute interest in understanding the intergenerational consequences of incarceration. This rapidly burgeoning literature documents the mostly negative academic, behavioral, and health consequences for children of incarcerated fathers (for reviews, see Eddy and Poehlmann 2010; Johnson and Easterling 2012; Murray, Farrington, and Sekol 2012; Travis, Western, and Redburn 2014; Wakefield and Uggen 2010; Wildeman, Wakefield, and Turney 2013; Wildeman and Western 2010). Further, because paternal incarceration is concentrated among already vulnerable poor and minority children, an unintended consequence of the growing prison population may be increased inequality among children (Wakefield and Wildeman 2013).

Despite growing attention to the unintended consequences of paternal incarceration for children's wellbeing across the life course, little is known about whether and how paternal incarceration is related to food insecurity among children (though see Wallace and Cox 2012). There are good reasons to expect that paternal incarceration increases children's risk of food insecurity, defined by the Economic Research Service (ERS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) as having limited access to adequate food due to lacking economic or other resources (Coleman-Jenson, Nord, and Singh 2013), especially for children living with fathers prior to their incarceration. But there are also good reasons to expect that any relationship between paternal incarceration and children's food insecurity results not from paternal incarceration but from factors associated with selectivity into incarceration (e.g., poverty, prior incarceration).

Adjudicating between these two possibilities is critical for at least two reasons. First, children's food insecurity, an often-overlooked dimension of child wellbeing, is an especially acute and severe form of deprivation that is distinct from other indicators of economic deprivation or hardship (McIntyre et al. 2003). Second, food insecurity among children is negatively associated with a range of educational, behavioral, and health difficulties (e.g., Alaimo, Olson, and Frongillo 2001; Dunifon and Kowaleski-Jones 2003) and, therefore, may explain some of the negative effects of paternal incarceration on children's educational (e.g., Haskins 2014; Turney and Haskins 2014), behavioral (e.g., Geller et al. 2012; Wakefield and Wildeman 2013), and health (e.g., Foster and Hagan 2013; Roettger and Boardman 2012; Turney 2014) outcomes.

In this manuscript, I use data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, a longitudinal sample of urban children born to mostly unmarried parents in 1998 and 1999, many of whom experience paternal incarceration during early childhood, to answer two research questions. First, what is the relationship between paternal incarceration and children's food insecurity (defined as current food insecurity [at age five], onset into food insecurity [between ages three and five], and exit from food insecurity [between ages three and five]) among children with residential fathers (prior to incarceration) and children with non-residential fathers (prior to incarceration)? Second, to what extent do post-incarceration changes in economic wellbeing, parental relationships, maternal parenting, and maternal health explain the relationship between paternal incarceration and children's food insecurity? Overall, given the substantial number of children who experience paternal incarceration, the unequal distribution of incarceration across the population, and the importance of food insecurity for children's life course trajectories,

disentangling the consequences of paternal incarceration for children's food insecurity will add a fundamental new dimension to our understanding of childhood inequality.

BACKGROUND

Food Insecurity among Children

Food insecurity, defined as lacking consistent access to adequate amounts of food, is a large and growing problem in the United States (Nord 2009). In 2012, nearly 18 million households in the United States were food insecure. About 3.9 million households with children were food insecure. Food insecurity affects about 10% of children and 15% of households (Coleman-Jenson et al. 2013). Food insecurity among children is not evenly distributed across the population and, instead, is more common among minority children, children living in households with incomes below the poverty line, and children with single parents. About three-fifths of food insecure households participate in at least one federal food and nutrition program, suggesting that these programs still leave some families vulnerable (Coleman-Jenson et al. 2013).

Additionally, food insecurity or hardship is associated with a host of academic outcomes, including reduced test scores, a greater likelihood of retention, and lower school engagement (Alaimo et al. 2001; Ashiabi 2005; Howard 2011; Jyoti, Frongillo, and Jones 2005; though see Dunifon and Kowaleski-Jones 2003); behavioral outcomes including internalizing problems, externalizing problems, poor social skills, and visits to a psychologist (Alaimo et al. 2001; Belsky et al. 2010; Dunifon and Kowaleski-Jones 2003; Huang, Oshima, and Kim 2010; Kleinman et al. 1998; Murphy et al. 1998; Slack and Yoo 2005; Slopen et al. 2010; Weinreb et al. 2002; Whitaker, Phillips, and Orzol 2006; Zaslow et al. 2009; also see Fram et al. 2011); and health outcomes including stomachaches, headaches, and poor general health (Chilton et al.

2009; Cook et al. 2006; Eicher-Miller et al. 2009; Gundersen and Kreider 2009; Kaiser and Townsend 2005). Young children are especially at risk of experiencing food insecurity, as they are exposed to fewer alternative food resources than older children (e.g., school meal programs, meals at friends' houses), and food insecurity may be especially detrimental to the wellbeing of young children (Slack and Yoo 2005).

Therefore, given the relatively large number of children who experience food insecurity, as well as food insecurity's attendant consequences, it is especially important to understand the predictors of children's food insecurity. Additionally, because food insecurity among children is a relatively transitory state (Coleman-Jensen et al. 2012; also see Jacknowitz, Morrissey, and Brannegan 2012), understanding how children differentially transition into and out of experiencing food insecurity is also important.

Why Might Paternal Incarceration Increase Children's Food Insecurity?

There are many reasons to expect a positive relationship between paternal incarceration and children's food insecurity. Although the portrait of incarcerated men is often one that is solitary and isolated from family members, the majority of incarcerated men have children (Mumola 2000). Many of these fathers are involved in their children's lives before incarceration. Prior to incarceration, many fathers are employed, contribute economically to family life, and are engaged in parenting their children (e.g., Arditti 2012; Geller, Garfinkel, and Western 2011; Turney and Wildeman 2013). Therefore, for families connected to incarcerated fathers, incarceration is a disruption that affects not only the lives of the incarcerated but also the lives of the families and children of the incarcerated. At least four possible pathways may link paternal incarceration with children's food insecurity: changes in family economic wellbeing that result

from incarceration, changes in parental relationships, changes in maternal parenting, and changes in maternal health.

Economic instability resulting from paternal incarceration is perhaps the most obvious pathway through which incarceration increases children's food insecurity. Incarceration necessitates that men, most of whom contribute earnings to families prior to incarceration, lose their jobs. This means that incarcerated men, while simultaneously accumulating legal debt (Harris, Evans, and Beckett 2010), have few opportunities to economically provide for their families (e.g., Western 2006). Incarceration facilitates human capital deficits, social network disruptions, and discrimination and, accordingly, incarcerated men have difficulty securing gainful employment after release (Hagan 1993; Pager 2003). Given the strong link between economic instability and food insecurity (e.g., Gundersen, Kreider, and Pepper 2011), it is quite likely that the economic instability resulting from paternal incarceration means that families experiencing paternal incarceration have difficulty providing nutritious and consistent access to food to their children.

The mechanisms linking paternal incarceration to children's food insecurity may not be narrowly economic. Indeed, incarceration has a number of cascading collateral consequences for family life. It is by now well known that paternal incarceration strains family relationships, leading to marital dissolution and poor relationship quality between parents (Comfort 2008; Massoglia, Remster, and King 2011; Turney forthcoming; Western 2006), increases maternal neglect and harsh parenting (Turney 2014), and increases maternal mental and physical health problems (Lee et al. 2014; Wildeman, Schnittker, and Turney 2012). Given that relationship instability (Bartfeld and Dunifon 2006; Manning and Brown 2006; though see Miller et al. 2014), parenting difficulties (Cook and Frank 2008), and health impairments (Whitaker et al.

2006) are all linked to food insecurity, it is likely that these mechanisms—in addition to resultant changes in economic wellbeing—explain some of the positive relationship between paternal incarceration and children’s food insecurity.

Why Might Paternal Incarceration Neither Increase Nor Decrease Children’s Food Insecurity?

Although there are good reasons to expect paternal incarceration to increase children’s risk of food insecurity, and make it more likely for children to experience an onset of food insecurity and less likely to experience an exit from food insecurity, it is equally plausible that any observed differences in food insecurity by paternal incarceration are driven by selection into incarceration rather than by incarceration itself. Children of incarcerated fathers, compared to their counterparts, experience economic and social disadvantages *prior* to the incarceration of their father and, in many cases, these disadvantages are intimately linked to incarceration and cannot be observed in observational survey data (e.g., Turney and Wildeman 2013). Indeed, unobserved heterogeneity is likely a crucial threat to causal inference when studying the intergenerational consequences of paternal incarceration (Giordano 2010; Wakefield and Uggen 2010). Furthermore, it is also possible that increased receipt of food stamps among families with incarcerated fathers (Chung 2012; Sugie 2012) offsets any negative consequences resulting from the incarceration (Kreider et al. 2012).

Considering Variation by Father’s Residential Status

Another possibility is that the relationship between incarceration and children’s food insecurity varies by fathers’ residential status prior to his incarceration. Previous research suggests that

there are vast differences in fathers' economic, emotional, and instrumental contributions by his residential status prior to incarceration (Turney and Wildeman 2013). Therefore, as residential fathers, on average, contribute more to family life than non-residential fathers, it is likely that the consequences of incarceration for children's food insecurity are strongest among children with residential fathers (for a qualitative examination of heterogeneity in the consequences of paternal incarceration, see Turanovic, Rodriguez, and Pratt 2012).

Contributions of This Study

Though research on the collateral consequences of paternal incarceration for child wellbeing has burgeoned in recent years (for reviews, see Eddy and Poehlmann 2010; Johnson and Easterling 2012; Murray et al. 2012; Travis et al. 2014; Wakefield and Uggen 2010; Wildeman et al. 2013; Wildeman and Western 2010), little research considers the consequences of paternal incarceration for children's food insecurity. In the one exception, Wallace and Cox (2012), who use data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study and a series of rigorous methods that account for selectivity into incarceration, find no relationship between parental incarceration (measured as either paternal incarceration or maternal incarceration) and children's food insecurity (also see Schwartz-Soicher et al. 2011, who consider material hardship among families). I extend this research by (1) considering if examining the average relationship between paternal incarceration and children's food insecurity masks variation by father's residential status and (2) exploring the mechanisms that explain any observed relationships.

DATA, MEASURES, AND ANALYTIC STRATEGY

Data Source: Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

I use data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (FFCWB), a longitudinal survey of nearly 5,000 new and mostly unmarried parents who gave birth in urban areas between 1998 and 2000, to examine the relationship between paternal incarceration and children's food insecurity (Reichman et al. 2001). Mothers and fathers were first interviewed in person at the hospital or as soon as possible after the focal child's birth. Both parents were re-interviewed by telephone when the focal child was about one, three, five, and nine years old. Additionally, when children were three, five, and nine years old, a subsample of families participated in an in-home interview, which included a questionnaire for caregivers (usually children's mothers) and an activity booklet for children. The FFCWB response rates are comparable or higher to response rates of other household-based surveys such as the National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG) (Sassler and McNally 2003).¹

The FFCWB are ideal for examining the relationship between paternal incarceration and children's food insecurity. First, unlike other data sources commonly used to study the prevalence and correlates of children's food insecurity (e.g., the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Birth Cohort [ECLS-B], the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Kindergarten Cohort [ECLS-K], the Study of Income and Program Participation [SIPP], none of which collect data on paternal incarceration), the FFCWB both collect data on paternal incarceration and, because the oversample of unmarried parents means that the sample is relatively disadvantaged, include a large number of fathers who experience incarceration. Additionally, these data include measures

¹ Baseline response rates were 86% for mothers and 78% for fathers. Completion rates for the one-, three-, five-, and nine-year interviews were 90%, 88%, 87%, and 76% for mothers and 74%, 72%, 70% and 59% for fathers, respectively. The completion rate for the five-year in-home survey, which is when the dependent variables are measured, is 78%.

of paternal incarceration and children's food insecurity at multiple survey waves, which facilitates the consideration of transitions into and out of food insecurity and a modeling strategy that attends to the time-ordering of the dependent, explanatory, and control variables. Third, they include a wealth of information about mothers, fathers, and children, making it possible to adjust for pre-existing differences between families that have and have not experienced paternal incarceration and to consider mechanisms underlying the relationship between paternal incarceration and children's food insecurity.

Analytic Sample. The Core Food Security Module (CFSM), the food security module established by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), was measured at the three- and five-year in-home surveys and, accordingly, the analyses primarily draw on data through the five-year survey. The analytic sample comprises the 3,004 families who participated in the five-year in-home survey. Though there exist some observed differences between the analytic sample and the baseline sample, most differences are small and statistically insignificant. Mothers in the analytic sample, compared to mothers in the full sample, are more likely to be non-Hispanic Black (51% compared to 48%). They are also less likely to be Hispanic (25% compared to 27%), non-Hispanic other race (3% compared to 4%), and foreign-born (13% compared to 17%). Relatively few observations are missing data on the key explanatory variable and control variables, and these observations are preserved by generating 20 multiply imputed data sets in Stata.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables are measured by caregivers' responses to the Core Food Security Module (CFSM). At the three- and five-year in-home surveys (but not other waves), caregivers are asked eight questions that measure children's food insecurity (e.g., "I relied on only a few

kinds of low-cost food to feed child because I was running out of money to buy food”; see Table 1 for details about all eight questions). Children’s food insecurity is measured by affirmative responses to at least two of the eight questions, consistent with methods described by others (Nord 2009; Nord and Bickel 2002).² The dependent variables are as follows: (1) *children’s current food insecurity*, a dummy variable measured at the five-year survey; (2) *children’s food insecurity onset*, a dummy variable indicating no food insecurity at the three-year survey and food insecurity at the five-year survey; and (3) *children’s food insecurity exit*, a dummy variable indicating food insecurity at the three-year survey and no food insecurity at the five-year survey.

[Table 1 about here.]

Independent Variable

The key independent variable is *recent paternal incarceration*, measured affirmatively if the father was in prison or jail after the three-year survey and up to or including the five-year survey. I consider recent paternal incarceration, instead of any paternal incarceration, because this allows for a precise estimation of the relationship between paternal incarceration and children’s food insecurity (and the ability to match observations based on observed characteristics measured prior to the measure of incarceration). The measure of recent paternal incarceration utilizes both mothers’ and fathers’ responses about fathers’ incarceration, which is advantageous because individuals are likely to under-report their own incarceration (Groves 2004) and consistent with other research using these data (see, especially, Geller et al. 2012). I consider the father to experience incarceration if either the mother or father reports incarceration.

² Caregivers that report two, three, or four conditions are classified as having low food security among children. Caregivers that report five or more conditions are classified as having very low food security among children. Because relative few children (< .8%) experience very low food security, I consider the more general condition, food insecurity among children, which includes both conditions.

Control Variables

The analyses match children with and without recently incarcerated fathers based on an array of characteristics, all measured prior to the measure of paternal incarceration unless otherwise noted. Demographic characteristics include mother's race (non-Hispanic White, non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic, non-Hispanic other race), foreign-born status, childhood family structure (with a dummy variable indicating the mother lived with both biological parents at age 15), co-residence with a parent, and number of children in the household. Child demographic characteristics include child gender (a dummy variable indicating the child is male), child born under 2,5000 grams, and child age (at the five-year survey).

The analyses also match observations based on an array of socioeconomic characteristics including mother's education (less than high school, high school diploma or GED, post-secondary education), residence in public housing, receipt of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) in the past year, receipt of food stamps in the past year, employment in the past week, household income below the poverty line (established by the U.S. Census), and material hardship (measured by summing affirmative responses to 10 questions about hardship in the past 12 months [e.g., received free food or meals; did not pay the full amount of rent or mortgage payments]). Neighborhood disadvantage is measured by the following census tract characteristics (that are added together and standardized): percent unemployed in the civilian labor force, percent living below the poverty line, percent receiving public assistance, and percent more than 25 years old without a high school degree ($\alpha = .90$).

In addition to demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, the analyses match on a range of familial characteristics. These characteristics include mother's relationship quality with

the child's father that ranges from 1 (*poor*) to 5 (*excellent*); mother's engagement, an average of 13 items (e.g., sing songs or nursery rhymes with child; hug or show physical affection to child) that ranges from 0 (*0 days per week*) to 7 (*7 days per week*) ($\alpha = .66$); parenting stress, an average of four items (e.g., being a parent is harder than I thought it would be; I feel trapped by my responsibilities as a parent) that ranges from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*) ($\alpha = .60$); neglect, a sum of five questions about behaviors in the past year (e.g., had to leave your child home alone, even when you thought some adult should be with him/her; were so caught up in your own problems that you were not able to show or tell your child that you loved him/her). Dummy variables indicate mother's overall health (1 = *fair or poor*, 0 = *excellent, very good, or good*), mother's depression (measured with the Composite International Diagnostic Instrument-Short Form [CIDI-SF]), and mother's substance abuse (measured affirmatively if the mother reports having more than five or more drinks in one sitting or using illicit drugs in the past month).

Finally, the analyses match observations on parental characteristics that are especially associated with paternal incarceration. These characteristics include mother's and father's cognitive ability, measured by the Weschler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS), and mother's and father's impulsivity (at the five-year and one-year surveys, respectively), an average of six items (e.g., I will often say whatever comes into my head without thinking first; I often say and do things without considering the consequences) that ranges from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*) ($\alpha = .83$ for fathers, $\alpha = .86$ for mothers).³ Dummy variables indicate the following: the mother reports the father engaged in domestic violence, the mother or father reports the father has problems (e.g., keeping a job, getting along with family and friends)

³ Therefore, mother's impulsivity was measured after paternal incarceration. This should not bias the results because impulsivity is considered a stable characteristic (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990).

because of alcohol or drug use; and the mother or father reports the father was incarcerated at or prior to the three-year survey.

Mechanisms

I consider four sets of mechanisms: economic wellbeing (poverty, material hardship, employment), parental relationship characteristics (co-residence with father, relationship quality), maternal parenting (engagement, parenting stress, neglect) and maternal health (fair/poor health, depression, substance abuse). All mechanisms are measured at the five-year survey and, therefore, at or after the measure of paternal incarceration.

Analytic Strategy

Estimating the Relationship between Paternal Incarceration and Children's Food Insecurity. In the first analytic stage, I use propensity score matching to estimate the relationship between paternal incarceration and the three dependent variables: children's current food insecurity, children's food insecurity onset, and children's food insecurity exit. I first estimate a logistic regression model that generates a propensity score, the probability of experiencing paternal incarceration (ranging from 0 to 1), for each observation as a function of the covariates described above (see Appendix Table A). I then restrict the analyses to regions of common support and ensure the means of the covariates are statistically indistinguishable across the treatment and control groups (see Appendix Table B). Finally, I employ a logistic regression model to estimate children's food insecurity as a function of paternal incarceration, averaging the estimates across 20 imputed data sets. I estimate these relationships first with standard kernel matching, which matches each treatment observation to all control observations by weighting control observations

by their distance from treatment observations (kernel = Epanechnikov; bandwidth = 0.06).⁴ I then employ doubly robust matching, as subtle post-match differences may still exist between the treatment and control groups (Shafer and Kang 2008). Because of the vast differences in family life across father's residential status, and other research suggesting the consequences of paternal incarceration may be strongest when fathers are residential prior to incarceration (Turney and Wildeman 2013), I conduct all analyses separately for residential fathers (those living with mothers and children at the three-year survey, prior to the measure of incarceration) and non-residential fathers (those not living with mothers and children at the three-year survey).

Estimating Mechanisms. In the second analytic stage, I consider the mechanisms underlying the association between paternal incarceration and children's food insecurity. The above analyses suggest that the relationships are concentrated among children with residential fathers and, accordingly, I restrict these analyses to those observations. Similar to Kirk and Sampson (2013), I use logistic regression models to estimate children's food insecurity as a function of the mechanisms, controlling for the treatment (paternal incarceration) and the propensity for the treatment. Model 1 presents the baseline estimate. Model 2 includes changes in economic wellbeing, Model 3 includes changes in the parental relationship, Model 4 includes changes in maternal parenting, and Model 5 includes changes in maternal health. Model 6 adjusts for all possible mechanisms. To consider how much of the treatment effect is explained by each set of mechanisms, I compare Models 2 through 6 to Model 1.⁵

⁴ Results are robust to alternative matching strategies, including nearest neighbor matching (which matches each treatment observation to control observations with the closest propensity scores) and radius matching (which matches each treatment observation to control observations within a specific radius), and to different bandwidths.

⁵ There are problems inherent in comparing across logistic regression models (Mood 2010); however, these results are similar when instead using linear probability models.

Sample Description

Table 2 presents descriptive statistics for all variables, by father's residential status at the three-year survey. Food insecurity was more common among children with non-residential fathers. About 6.7% of children with residential fathers and 9.4% of children with non-residential fathers experienced current food insecurity (at the five-year survey; see Miller et al. 2014 to see how the prevalence of children's food insecurity in the FFCWB compares to the prevalence in other samples). Among children with residential fathers, about 4.6% experienced an onset of food insecurity between the three- and five-year surveys and about 4.2% experienced an exit from food insecurity between the three- and five-year surveys (compared to 6.6% and 7.0% of children with non-residential fathers). Additionally, there are sharp differences in incarceration by fathers' residential status; about 8.7% of residential fathers and 26.7% of non-residential fathers were recently incarcerated.

[Table 2 about here.]

Families with residential fathers differ from families with non-residential fathers in additional ways. Among families with residential fathers, about 30% of mothers are non-Hispanic White, 36% are non-Hispanic Black, and 30% are Hispanic. Among families with non-residential fathers, the majority (66%) are non-Hispanic Black and fewer are non-Hispanic White (12.4%) or Hispanic (19.9%). Residential father families are less likely to be in poverty (29.8% compared to 59.9%), less likely to live in public housing (9.7% compared to 19.7%), and have lower levels of material hardship (1.411 compared to 2.036). Mothers are less likely to report neglect (0.117 compared to 0.184), be depressed (16.1% compared to 25.2%), or abuse substances (8.7% compared to 10.7%).

RESULTS

Paternal Incarceration and Children's Food Insecurity

Table 3 presents results from the propensity score matching models. The analyses in Panel A are restricted to children living with their fathers at the three-year survey. The unmatched models, which are essentially the unadjusted association between paternal incarceration and children's food insecurity, show that children of incarcerated fathers are about three times as likely as their counterparts to experience food insecurity. Recent paternal incarceration is associated with a greater likelihood of children's current food insecurity ($b = 1.055$, $OR = 2.87$, $p < .001$) and a greater likelihood of children's onset into food insecurity ($b = 1.016$, $OR = 2.76$, $p < .01$). There is no unadjusted relationship between paternal incarceration and children's exit from food insecurity ($b = -0.151$, $OR = 0.86$, $n.s.$), although this relationship is in the expected direction. In the matched models, paternal incarceration continues to be associated with children's current food insecurity ($b = 0.894$, $OR = 2.44$, $p < .05$) and children's onset into food insecurity ($b = 0.892$, $OR = 2.44$, $p < .05$). These relationships persist in the most rigorous specification, the doubly robust matching models, and, in this specification, paternal incarceration emerges as being negatively associated with children's exit from food insecurity ($b = -.850$, $OR = 0.43$, $p < .05$). Taken together, these findings suggest that, when fathers are living with children prior to incarceration, paternal incarceration both increases the likelihood children experience an onset of food insecurity and decreases the likelihood children exit from food insecurity.

[Table 3 about here.]

The analyses in Panel B are restricted to children not living with their fathers at the three-year survey. The unmatched models show that paternal incarceration is not significantly associated with children's current food insecurity ($b = 0.090$, $OR = 1.09$, $n.s.$), children's onset

into food insecurity ($b = -0.078$, $OR = 0.92$, $n.s.$), or children's exit from food insecurity ($b = 0.121$, $OR = 1.13$, $n.s.$). These patterns persist in the matched models and in the doubly robust matched models. Therefore, when fathers are not living with children prior to incarceration, there is no relationship between paternal incarceration and children's food insecurity.⁶

Supplemental Analyses

The above analyses document a relationship between paternal incarceration and children's food insecurity, among families with residential fathers prior to incarceration, but suffer from two threats to causal inference: unobserved heterogeneity and reverse causality.

First, because the propensity score models only match on observed characteristics, it is possible that unobserved characteristics would render the relationship between paternal incarceration and children's food insecurity spurious. I address this concern by implementing Mantel-Haenszel bounds, a statistical procedure that quantifies the degree to which an omitted variable may render the results statistically insignificant (Becker and Caliendo 2007; Mantel and Haenszel 1959). This is a nonparametric test that compares the observed number of observations that experienced paternal incarceration that also experienced the dependent variable with the expected number if the effect of paternal incarceration is zero. I present results from the Q-statistic, which estimates negative unobserved selection, in Appendix Table C. These results show that an omitted variable would not render the results statistically insignificant until $\Gamma =$

⁶ Existing research using these data (Wallace and Cox 2012), examining the full sample of children, finds no relationship between parental (paternal and maternal) incarceration and children's food insecurity. In supplemental analyses, I pooled children with residential and non-residential fathers and used propensity score matching models to estimate the relationship between paternal incarceration and children's food insecurity. These results, not presented, are consistent with Wallace and Cox (2012), further suggesting the importance of considering heterogeneous relationships.

1.65 (for children’s current food insecurity) and $\Gamma = 1.75$ (for children’s food insecurity onset).⁷ Compare this to the predictors of paternal incarceration from Appendix Table A, which shows very few characteristics would increase the likelihood of paternal incarceration by 165% or 175%. Therefore, it is unlikely that the analyses omit a variable—that is not correlated with the other control variables included in the model—that would render the relationship between paternal incarceration and children’s food insecurity statistically insignificant.

Second, I conduct falsification tests, which consider both unobserved heterogeneity and reverse causality (e.g., fathers living in households with food insecurity might engage in criminal behavior to help family get more resources and, therefore, be more likely to experience incarceration). I use propensity score modeling to estimate children’s food insecurity (measured at the three-year survey) as a function of future paternal incarceration (measured between the three- and five-year surveys, as in the main analyses) and all control variables. Here, I expect to find no relationship between future paternal incarceration and children’s food insecurity, and the presence of one might indicate spuriousness or reverse causality. These analyses (not presented but available upon request) show no relationship between future paternal incarceration and children’s food insecurity ($b = 0.129, p = .537$), suggesting that unobserved characteristics are unlikely a threat to causal inference and reverse causality is unlikely to be operating.

Mechanisms Linking Paternal Incarceration to Children’s Food Insecurity

Table 4 considers the mechanisms underlying the relationship between paternal incarceration and children’s food insecurity among families with residential fathers. I use logistic regression models to estimate two dependent variables—children’s current food insecurity and children’s

⁷ Because it is not possible to estimate Mantel-Haenszel bounds for the doubly robust matching models, these estimates are based on the matched models.

onset into food insecurity, the two measures consistently associated with paternal incarceration in the previous analyses—as a function of recent paternal incarceration and the propensity for experiencing recent paternal incarceration. Turning first to the estimates of children’s current food insecurity, Model 1 provides a baseline association between paternal incarceration and children’s current food insecurity, and the results are consistent with the matched results presented in Table 3. The coefficient for paternal incarceration increases by 3% when adjusting for economic wellbeing in Model 2, decreases by 18% (and to statistical insignificance) when adjusting for parental relationship characteristics in Model 3, decreases by 14% when adjusting for maternal parenting in Model 4, and decreases by 12% (and to statistical insignificance) when adjusting for maternal health in Model 5. The estimates of children’s onset into food insecurity are consistent, with economic wellbeing explaining virtually none of the association (0%) and the other mechanisms explaining a moderate portion of the relationship (18% for the inclusion of parental relationship characteristics in Model 3, 12% for the inclusion of maternal parenting in Model 4, and 8% for the inclusion of maternal health in Model 5). Taken together, these results suggest that relationship characteristics most explain the relationship between paternal incarceration and children’s food insecurity.

[Table 4 about here.]

DISCUSSION

In this manuscript, I use data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, a longitudinal cohort of children born to mostly unmarried mothers, to estimate the relationship between paternal incarceration and food insecurity among five-year-old children. The results, estimated through a series of propensity score matching models, yield two substantive

conclusions. First, recent paternal incarceration is associated with an increased risk of children's current food insecurity, an increased risk of children's onset into food insecurity, and a decreased risk of children's exit from food insecurity, but only among children living with fathers prior to experiencing paternal incarceration. Second, post-incarceration changes in economic wellbeing explain little of these observed associations, which is contrary to expectations, but post-incarceration changes in the parental relationship explain a moderate proportion of the association.

The first finding, that paternal incarceration has deleterious consequences for children's food insecurity when children are living with their fathers prior to incarceration, is consistent with prior research documenting the mostly negative intergenerational consequences of paternal incarceration. Children of incarcerated fathers, compared to their counterparts, experience educational (e.g., Haskins 2014; Turney and Haskins 2014), behavioral (e.g., Geller et al. 2012; Wakefield and Wildeman 2011), and health impairments (e.g., Foster and Hagan 2013; Roettger and Boardman 2012; Turney 2014). These analyses show that young children are disadvantaged across another important and distinct dimension—access to nutritionally sound and adequate food. Children's food insecurity signifies an extreme level of disadvantage and, given the relationship between children's food insecurity and children's educational, behavioral, and health outcomes (e.g., Alaimo et al. 2001; Ashiabi 2005; Howard 2011; Dunifon and Kowaleski-Jones 2003), it is quite possible that children's food insecurity explains some of the relationship between paternal incarceration and children's educational, behavioral, and health outcomes. Although a consideration of this possibility is beyond the scope of this manuscript, it is an important direction for future research.

The heterogeneous relationship between paternal incarceration and children's food insecurity, which shows paternal incarceration has no relationship to children's food insecurity when children are not living with their fathers prior to experiencing paternal incarceration, is important. For one, the combination of negative associations (for children with residential fathers, where we would most expect to find negative associations) and null associations (for children with non-residential fathers, where we may or may not expect to find negative associations) lends face validity to the results. Additionally, the divergent findings between children with residential fathers and children with non-residential fathers provide one explanation for why prior research finds no relationship between incarceration and children's food insecurity (Wallace and Cox 2012). More generally, these findings highlight that paternal incarceration is not equally detrimental for all children and document the importance of considering heterogeneity in the relationship between paternal incarceration and child wellbeing.

The second finding, that post-incarceration parental relationship characteristics, measured as co-residential status and relationship quality, explains the largest share of the association between paternal incarceration and children's food insecurity (compared to economic wellbeing, maternal parenting, and maternal health), is both consistent and inconsistent with expectations. Consistent with expectations is the fact that parental relationship characteristics are important mechanisms. It is well known that incarceration destabilizes romantic relationships (e.g., Lopoo and Western 2005), and that family instability, in turn, has negative consequences for children's general wellbeing (e.g., Fomby and Cherlin 2007), and, specifically, for children's food insecurity (e.g., Bartfeld and Dunifon 2006; though see Miller et al. 2104). Mothers who recently separated from children's fathers — via incarceration — may be less equipped than their counterparts to provide adequate access to food. Inconsistent with expectations is the fact that

economic wellbeing explains virtually none of the association between paternal incarceration and children's food insecurity. Perhaps mothers, who often face financial difficulties during and after the incarceration of a romantic partner (Schwartz-Soicher et al. 2011), are able to rely on government programs to ensure their children receive enough food. An alternative explanation is that mothers, acutely aware of the challenges children experience while fathers are incarcerated, sacrifice financial resources to ensure their children receive enough food. Adjudicating between these and other explanations is not necessarily possible with these data but these issues should be given attention in future research.

Limitations

These analyses should be interpreted cautiously, as several limitations—many of them common to studying either paternal incarceration or children's food insecurity—exist. First, the relatively small number of children who experience both incarceration and food insecurity—especially within the residential father subsample—precludes some additional analyses that might be instructive. For example, it is not possible to consider sources of heterogeneity among children with residential fathers (e.g., variation by poverty status, variation by food stamps receipt), despite the fact that these analyses may yield useful findings. Relatedly, too few mothers experience incarceration between the three- and five-year surveys, which makes it impossible to consider the independent effects of maternal incarceration. Very low food security among children, an even more severe marker of disadvantage, is extremely rare in the sample, making it impossible to precisely estimate the relationship between paternal incarceration and very low food security among children. Given these data limitations, researchers collecting information on

children's food insecurity should also consider collecting information on parental incarceration, and vice versa.

Another limitation involves unobserved heterogeneity. It is possible that there exists unmeasured characteristics that might render the relationship between paternal incarceration and children's food insecurity spurious. For example, the data do not include indicators of criminal activity (though they do include measures of domestic violence and characteristics correlated with criminal activity [e.g., prior incarceration, substance abuse]), and it is possible that children of fathers engaging in criminal activity are likely to both experience paternal incarceration and food insecurity. Although I cannot rule out the possibility of a spurious relationship, several aspects of the analyses—including results from the Mantel-Haenszel bounds and the placebo regression—suggest unobserved heterogeneity may not bias the results. Relatedly, the concentration of statistically significant relationships among children with residential fathers strengthens the case for causal inference. Future research should exploit exogenous variation—perhaps in sentencing decisions, which is not possible with these data—to more explicitly consider causal relationships.

Finally, as with all broadly representative data that ascertain information about paternal incarceration, the measure of paternal incarceration is quite crude. For example, it is not possible to distinguish between prison and jail spells, even though it is plausible to assume that prison incarceration and jail incarceration differentially influence family life. Relatedly, though the data include some information about incarceration duration and incarceration offense type, there exists a large amount of missing data in these measures that make it impossible to consider among the relatively small sample sizes of residential and non-residential fathers.

Policy Implications and Conclusions

Taken together, these findings suggest that the consequences of paternal incarceration extend beyond the offender and spill over to children of offenders, consistent with a growing body of literature documenting the cascading consequences of incarceration for family life (e.g. Turney 2014; Turney and Wildeman 2013). These findings have a number of implications for policy. First, given the link between paternal incarceration and children's food insecurity, these findings suggest that families who experience paternal incarceration, especially those families that include residential fathers prior to incarceration, could benefit from being monitored for food insecurity. Relatedly, programs designed to target food insecurity among the vulnerable population of families affected by paternal incarceration may be most effective if targeted toward mothers and children living with fathers prior to incarceration. Furthermore, given that the relationship between paternal incarceration and children's food insecurity is both direct and indirect, operating especially through the parental relationship, in order to end hunger among children, policymakers should pay special attention to these additional collateral consequences of incarceration (as these additional collateral consequences have implications for children's food insecurity).

REFERENCES

- Alaimo, Katherine, Christine M. Olson, and Edward Frongillo Jr. 2001. "Food Insufficiency and American School-Aged Children's Cognitive, Academic, and Psychosocial Development." *Pediatrics* 108 (1): 44–53.
- Arditti, Joyce A. 2012. *Parental Incarceration and the Family: Psychological and Social Effects of Imprisonment on Children, Parents, and Caregivers*. New York: NYU Press.

- Ashiabi, Godwin. 2005. "Household Food Insecurity and Children's School Engagement." *Journal of Children and Poverty* 11 (1): 3–17.
- Bartfeld, Judi, and Rachel Dunifon. 2006. "State-Level Predictors of Food Insecurity among Households with Children." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 25 (4): 921–42.
- Becker, Sascha, and Marco Caliendo. 2007. "Sensitivity Analysis for Average Treatment Effects." *Stata Journal* 7 (1): 71–83.
- Belsky, Daniel W., Terrie E. Moffitt, Louise Arseneault, Maria Melchior, and Avshalom Caspi. 2010. "Context and Sequelae of Food Insecurity in Children's Development." *American Journal of Epidemiology* 172 (7): 809–18.
- Carson, E. Ann. 2014. "Prisoners in 2013." Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Chilton, Mariana, Maureen M. Black, Carol Berkowitz, Patrick H. Casey, John Cook, Diana Cutts, Ruth Rose Jacobs, Timothy Heeren, Stephanie Ettinger de Cuba, Sharon Coleman, Alan Meyers, and Deborah A. Frank. 2009. "Food Insecurity and Risk of Poor Health among US-Born Children of Immigrants." *American Journal of Public Health* 99 (3): 556–62.
- Chung, Yiyoon. 2012. "The Effects of Paternal Imprisonment on Children's Economic Well-Being." *Social Service Review* 86 (3): 455–86.
- Coleman-Jenson, Alisha, Mark Nord, Margaret Andrews, and Steven Carlson. 2012. *Household Food Security in the United States in 2011*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service.
- Coleman-Jenson, Alisha, Mark Nord, and Anita Singh. 2013. "Household Food Security in the United States in 2012." Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service.

- Comfort, Megan. 2008. *Doing Time Together: Love and Family in the Shadow of the Prison*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.
- Cook, John T., and Deborah A. Frank. 2008. "Food Security, Poverty, and Human Development in the United States." *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1136 (1): 193–209.
- Cook, John T., Deborah A. Frank, Suzette M. Levenson, Nicole B. Neault, Tim C. Heeren, Maurine M. Black, Carol Berkowitz, Patrick H. Casey, Alan F. Meyers, Diana B. Cutts, and Mariana Chilton. 2006. "Child Food Insecurity Increases Risks Posed by Household Food Insecurity to Young Children's Health." *The Journal of Nutrition* 136 (4): 1073–76.
- Dunifon, Rachel, and Lori Kowaleski-Jones. 2003. "The Influence of Participation in the National School Lunch Program and Food Insecurity on Child Well-Being." *Social Service Review* 77 (1): 72–92.
- Eddy, J. Mark, and Julie Poehlmann. 2010. *Children of Incarcerated Parents: A Handbook for Researchers and Practitioners*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.
- Eicher-Miller, Heather, April C. Mason, Connie M. Weaver, George P. McCabe, and Carol J. Boushey. 2009. "Food Insecurity is Associated with Iron Deficiency Anemia in U.S. Adolescents." *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 90 (5): 1358–71.
- Fomby, Paula, and Andrew Cherlin. 2007. "Family Instability and Child Well-being." *American Sociological Review* 72 (2): 181–204.
- Foster, Holly, and John Hagan. 2013. "Maternal and Paternal Imprisonment in the Stress Process." *Social Science Research* 42 (3): 650–69.
- Fram, Maryah Stella, Edward A. Frongillo, Sonya J. Jones, Roger C. Williams, Michael P.

- Burke, Kendra P. DeLoach, and Christine E. Blake. 2011. "Children are Aware of Food Insecurity and Take Responsibility for Managing Food Resources." *The Journal of Nutrition* 141 (6): 1114–19.
- Geller, Amanda, Carey E. Cooper, Irwin Garfinkel, Ofira Schwartz-Soicher, and Ronald B. Mincy. 2012. "Beyond Absenteeism: Father Incarceration and its Effects on Children's Development." *Demography* 49 (1): 49–76.
- Geller, Amanda, Irwin Garfinkel, and Bruce Western. 2011. "Paternal Incarceration and Support for Children in Fragile Families." *Demography* 48 (1): 25–47.
- Giordano, Peggy C. 2010. *Legacies of Crime: A Follow-Up of the Children of Highly Delinquent Girls and Boys*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gottfredson, Michael R., and Travis Hirschi. 1990. *A General Theory of Crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.
- Groves, Robert M. 2004. *Survey Errors and Survey Costs*. New York: Wiley.
- Gundersen, Craig, and Brent Kreider. 2009. "Bounding the Effects of Food Insecurity on Children's Health Outcomes." *Journal of Health Economics* 28 (5): 971–83.
- Gundersen, Craig, Brent Kreider, and John Pepper. 2011. "The Economics of Food Insecurity in the United States." *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy* 33 (3): 281–303.
- Hagan, John. 1993. "The Social Embeddedness of Crime and Unemployment." *Criminology* 31 (4): 465–91.
- Haskins, Anna R. 2014. "Unintended Consequences: Effects of Paternal Incarceration on Child School Readiness and Later Special Education Placement." *Sociological Science* 1 (1): 141–58.
- Howard, Larry L. 2011. "Does Food Insecurity at Home Affect Non-Cognitive Performance at

- School? A Longitudinal Analysis of Elementary Student Classroom Behavior.”
Economics of Education Review 30 (1): 157–76.
- Huang, Jim, Karen M. Matta Oshima, and Youngmi Kim. 2010. “Does Food Insecurity Affect Parental Characteristics and Child Behavior? Testing Mediation Effects.” *Social Service Review* 84 (3): 381–401.
- Jacknowitz, Allison, and Taryn Morrissey. 2012. “Food Insecurity across the First Five Years: Triggers of Onset and Exit.” University of Kentucky Center for Poverty Research Discussion Paper Series, DP2012-08.
- Johnson, Elizabeth I., and Beth Easterling. 2012. “Understanding Unique Effects of Parental Incarceration on Children: Challenges, Progress, and Recommendation.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 74 (2): 342–56.
- Jyoti, Diana F., Edward A. Frongillo, and Sonya J. Jones. 2005. “Food Insecurity Affects School Children’s Academic Performance, Weight Gain, and Social Skills.” *The Journal of Nutrition* 135 (12): 2831–39.
- Kaiser, Lucia L., and Marilyn S. Townsend. 2005. “Food Insecurity among U.S. Children: Implications for Nutrition and Health.” *Topics in Clinical Nutrition* 20 (4): 313–20.
- Kleinman, Ronald E., J. Michael Murphy, Michelle Little, Maria Pagano, Cheryl A. Wehler, Kenneth Regal, and Michael S. Jellinek. 1998. “Hunger in Children in the United States: Potential Behavioral and Emotional Correlates.” *Pediatrics* 101 (1): e3–e3.
- Kreider, Brent, John V. Pepper, Craig Gundersen, and Dean Jolliffe. 2012. “Identifying the Effects of SNAP (Food Stamps) on Child Health Outcomes When Participation is Endogenous and Misreported.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 107 (499): 958–75.

- Lee, Hedwig, Christopher Wildeman, Emily A. Wang, Niki Matusko, and James S. Jackson. 2014. "A Heavy Burden: The Cardiovascular Health Consequences of Having a Family Member Incarcerated." *American Journal of Public Health* 104 (3): 421–27.
- Manning, Wendy D., and Susan Brown. 2006. "Children's Economic Well-Being in Married and Cohabiting Parent Families." *Journal of Marriage & Family* 68 (2): 345–62.
- Mantel, Nathan, and William Haenszel. 1959. "Statistical Aspects of the Analysis of Data from Retrospective Studies of Disease." *Journal of the National Cancer Institute* 22 (4): 719–48.
- Massoglia, Michael, Brianna Remster, and Ryan D. King. 2011. "Stigma or Separation? Understanding the Incarceration-Divorce Relationship." *Social Forces* 90 (1): 133–55.
- McIntyre, Lynn, N. Theresa Glanville, Kim D. Raine, Jutta B. Dayle, Bonnie Anderson, and Noreen Battaglia. 2003. "Do Low-Income Lone Mothers Compromise Their Nutrition to Feed Their Children?" *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 168 (6): 686–91.
- Miller, Daniel P., Lenna Nepomnyaschy, Gabriel Lara Ibarra, and Steven Garasky. 2014. "Family Structure and Child Food Insecurity." *American Journal of Public Health* 104 (7): e70–e76.
- Mood, Carina. 2010. "Logistic Regression: Why We Cannot Do What We Think We Can Do, and What We Can Do About It." *European Sociological Review* 26 (1): 67–82.
- Mumola, Christopher J. 2000. *Incarcerated Parents and Their Children*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Murphy, J. Michael, Cheryl A. Wehler, Maria E. Pagano, Michelle Little, Ronald E. Kleinman, and Michael S. Jellinek. 1998. "Relationship between Hunger and Psychosocial Functioning in Low-Income American Children." *Journal of the American Academy of*

- Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* 37 (2): 163–70.
- Murray, Joseph and David P. Farrington. 2005. “Parental Imprisonment: Effects on Boys’ Antisocial Behaviour and Delinquency Through the Life-Course.” *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 46 (12): 1269–78.
- Murray, Joseph, David P. Farrington, and Ivana Sekol. 2012. “Children’s Antisocial Behavior, Mental Health, Drug Use, and Educational Performance After Parental Incarceration: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.” *Psychological Bulletin* 138 (2): 175–210.
- Nord, Mark. 2009. “Food Insecurity in Households with Children: Prevalence, Severity, and Household Characteristics.” United States Department of Agriculture: Economic Information Bulletin Number 56.
- Nord, Mark, and Gary Bickel. 2002. “Measuring Children’s Food Security in U.S. Households, 1995 – 1999.” Food Assistance and Nutrition Research Report FANRR25. Washington, DC: United States Department of Agriculture.
- Pager, Devah. 2003. “The Mark of a Criminal Record.” *American Journal of Sociology* 108 (5): 937–75.
- Patillo, Mary, David F. Weiman, and Bruce Western. 2004. *Imprisoning America: The Social Effects of Mass Incarceration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Reichman, Nancy E., Julien O. Teitler, Irwin Garfinkel, and Sara S. McLanahan. 2001. “Fragile Families: Sample and Design.” *Children and Youth Services Review* 23 (4): 303–26.
- Roettger, Michael E. and Jason D. Boardman. 2012. “Parental Incarceration and Gender-based Risks for Increased Body Mass Index: Evidence from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health in the United States.” *American Journal of Epidemiology* 175 (7): 636–44.

- Sassler, Sharon, and James McNally. 2003. "Cohabiting Couples' Economic Circumstances and Union Transitions: A Re-examination Using Multiple Imputation Techniques." *Social Science Research* 32 (4): 553–78.
- Schwartz-Soicher, Ofira, Amanda Geller, and Irwin Garfinkel. 2011. "The Effect of Paternal Incarceration on Material Hardship." *Social Service Review* 85 (3): 447–73.
- Slack, Kristen S., and Joan Yoo. 2005. "Food Hardship and Child Behavior Problems among Low-Income Children." *Social Service Review* 79 (3): 511–36.
- Slopen, Natalie, Garrett Fitzmaurice, David R. Williams, and Stephen E. Gilman. 2010. "Poverty, Food Insecurity, and the Behavior for Childhood Internalizing and Externalizing Disorders." *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* 49 (5): 444–52.
- Sugie, Naomi F. 2012. "Punishment and Welfare: Paternal Incarceration and Families' Receipt of Public Assistance." *Social Forces* 90 (4): 1403–27.
- Travis, Jeremy, Bruce Western, and Steve Redburn. 2014. *The Growth of Incarceration in the United States: Exploring Causes and Consequences*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Turanovic, Jillian J., Nancy Rodriguez, and Travis C. Pratt. 2012. "The Collateral Consequences of Incarceration Revisited: A Qualitative Analysis of the Effects of Caregivers of Children of Incarcerated Parents." *Criminology* 50 (4): 913–59.
- Turney, Kristin. 2014. "The Consequences of Paternal Incarceration for Maternal Neglect and Harsh Parenting." *Social Forces* 92 (4): 1607–36.
- Turney, Kristin. 2014. "Stress Proliferation Across Generations? Examining the Relationship

- between Parental Incarceration and Childhood Health.” *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 55 (3): 302–19.
- Turney, Kristin. Forthcoming. “Hopelessly Devoted? Relationship Quality During and After Incarceration.” *Journal of Marriage and Family*.
- Turney, Kristin, and Anna Haskins. 2014. “Falling Behind? Children’s Early Grade Retention after Paternal Incarceration.” *Sociology of Education* 87(4):241–58.
- Turney, Kristin, and Christopher Wildeman. 2013. “Redefining Relationships: Explaining the Countervailing Consequences of Paternal Incarceration for Parenting.” *American Sociological Review* 78 (6): 949–79.
- Wakefield, Sara, and Christopher Uggen. 2010. “Incarceration and Stratification.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 36: 387–406.
- Wakefield, Sara, and Christopher Wildeman. 2013. *Children of the Prison Boom: Mass Incarceration and the Future of American Inequality*. Cambridge: Oxford University Press.
- Wallace, Sally, and Robynn Cox. 2012. “The Impact of Incarceration on Food Insecurity among Households with Children.” University of Kentucky Center for Poverty Research Discussion Paper Series DP 2012-14.
- Weinreb, Linda, Cheryl Wehler, Jennifer Perloff, Richard Scott, David Hosmer, Linda Sagor, and Craig Gundersen. 2002. “Hunger: Its Impact on Children’s Health and Mental Health.” *Pediatrics* 110 (4): e41–e41.
- Western, Bruce. 2006. *Punishment and Inequality in America*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Whitaker, Robert C., Shannon M. Phillips, and Sean M. Orzol. 2006. “Food Insecurity and the

- Risks of Depression and Anxiety in Mothers and Behavior Problems in their Preschool-Aged Children.” *Pediatrics* 118 (3): e859–e68.
- Wildeman, Christopher, Jason Schnittker, and Kristin Turney. 2012. “Despair by Association? The Mental Health of Mothers with Children by Recently Incarcerated Fathers.” *American Sociological Review* 77 (2): 216–43.
- Wildeman, Christopher, Sara Wakefield, and Kristin Turney. 2013. “Misidentifying the Effects of Parental Imprisonment? A Comment on Johnson and Easterling (2012).” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 75 (1): 252–58.
- Wildeman, Christopher and Bruce Western. 2010. “Incarceration in Fragile Families.” *Future of Children* 20: 181–201.
- Zaslow, Martha, Jacinta Bronte-Tinkew, Randolph Capps, Allison Horowitz, Kristin A. Moore, and Debra Weinstein. 2009. “Food Security During Infancy: Implications for Attachment and Mental Proficiency in Toddlerhood.” *Maternal and Child Health Journal* 13 (1): 66–80.

Table 1. Description of Individual Questions Used to Measure Children's Food Insecurity

Question	Response categories	Affirmative response?
1 [I/We] relied on only a few kinds of low-cost food to feed [child/the children] because [I was/we were] running out of money to buy food	1 = often, 2 = sometimes, 3 = never	1, 2
2 [I/We] couldn't feed [child/the children] a balanced meal because [I/we] couldn't afford that	1 = often, 2 = sometimes, 3 = never	1, 2
3 [Child was/The children were] not eating enough because [I/we] just couldn't afford enough food	1 = often, 2 = sometimes, 3 = never	1, 2
4 In the last 12 months, did you ever cut the size of [child's/any of the children's] meals because there wasn't enough money for food?	1 = no, 2 = yes	2
5 In the last 12 months, did [child/any of these children] ever skip a meal because there wasn't enough money for food?	1 = no, 2 = yes	2
6 How often did [child/any of these children] skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?	1 = almost every month, 2 = some months but not every month, 3 = only 1 or 2 months	1, 2
7 In the last 12 months, [was child/were the children] ever hungry but you just couldn't afford more food?	1 = no, 2 = yes	2
8 In the last 12 months, did [child/any of the children] ever not eat for a whole day because there wasn't enough money for food?	1 = no, 2 = yes	2

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Variables Used In Analyses, by Father's Residential Status

	Residential fathers		Non-residential fathers	
	Mean	(S.D.)	Mean	(S.D.)
Children's current food insecurity (ih5)	0.067		0.094	**
Children's onset into food insecurity (ih5)	0.046		0.066	*
Children's exit from food insecurity (ih5)	0.042		0.070	***
Paternal incarceration (y5)	0.087		0.267	***
Mother race/ethnicity (b)				
Non-Hispanic White	0.299		0.124	***
Non-Hispanic Black	0.361		0.662	***
Hispanic	0.300		0.199	***
Non-Hispanic other race	0.040		0.016	***
Mother foreign-born (b)	0.198		0.064	***
Mother age (range: 14 - 47; b)	26.406	(6.163)	23.777	(5.595) ***
Mother lived with both biological parents at age 15 (b)	0.516		0.319	***
Mother education (y3)				
Less than high school	0.246		0.331	***
High school diploma or GED	0.230		0.268	*
Post-secondary education	0.524		0.401	***
Mother lives in public housing (y3)	0.097		0.197	***
Mother receives welfare (y3)	0.121		0.344	***
Mother receives food stamps (y3)	0.264		0.576	***
Mother neighborhood disadvantage index (y3)	-0.222	(0.985)	0.219	(0.967) ***
Mother lives with parent (y3)	0.076		0.211	***
Mother number of children in household (range: 0 - 10; y3)	2.323	(1.273)	2.334	(1.421)
Mother multi-partnered fertility (y3)	0.303		0.565	***
Mother in poverty (y3)	0.298		0.599	***
Mother material hardship (range: 0 - 9; y3)	1.411	(1.508)	2.036	(1.740) ***
Mother employment (y3)	0.554		0.579	
Mother relationship quality (range: 1 - 5; y3)	3.974	(0.949)	2.189	(1.264) ***
Mother engagement with child (range: 0 - 7; y3)	4.984	(0.891)	4.979	(0.965)
Mother parenting stress (range: 1 - 4; y3)	2.213	(0.642)	2.313	(0.693) ***
Mother neglect (range: 0 - 5; ih3)	0.117	(0.430)	0.184	(0.536) ***
Mother fair or poor health (y3)	0.107		0.161	***
Mother depression (y3)	0.161		0.252	***
Mother substance abuse (y3)	0.087		0.107	***
Mother impulsivity (range: 1 - 4; y5)	1.474	(0.468)	1.592	(0.496) ***
Mother cognitive ability (range: 0 to 15; y3)	7.092	(2.716)	6.419	(2.543) ***
Father engaged in domestic violence (y3)	0.019		0.147	***
Father abused substances (b, y1, y3)	0.097		0.259	***
Father impulsivity (range: 1 - 4; y1)	1.946	(0.656)	2.091	(0.727) *
Father cognitive ability (range: 0 to 15; y3)	6.576	(2.806)	6.434	(2.649)
Father previously incarcerated (b, y1, y3)	0.266		0.570	***
Child is male (b)	0.514		0.531	
Child age, in months (range: 56 - 73; y5)	61.140	(2.524)	61.456	(2.472) ***
Child born low birth weight (b)	0.080		0.128	***
N		1,509		1,495

Notes: b = measured at the baseline survey; y1 = measured at the one-year telephone survey; y3 = measured at the three-year telephone survey; y5 = measured at the five-year telephone survey; ih3 = measured at three-year in-home survey; ih5 = measured at five-year in-home survey. City dummy variables not presented in the interest of parsimony. Asterisks indicate statistically significant differences between families with residential fathers at the three-year survey and families with non-residential fathers at the three-year survey. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table 3. Propensity Score Matching Estimates of the Average Effect of Paternal Incarceration and Children's Food Insecurity, by Father's Residential Status

	Unmatched	Matched	Matched, doubly robust
Panel A. Residential fathers			
Children's current food insecurity	1.055 *** (0.275)	0.894 * (0.369)	0.896 * (0.458)
Children's onset into food insecurity	1.016 ** (0.325)	0.892 * (0.414)	1.048 * (0.523)
Children's exit from food insecurity	-0.151 (0.537)	-0.299 (0.596)	-0.850 * (0.394)
Treatment N	132	118	118
Control N	1,377	1,316	1,316
Panel B. Non-residential fathers			
Children's current food insecurity	0.090 (0.202)	-0.057 (0.240)	-0.137 (0.257)
Children's onset into food insecurity	-0.078 (0.251)	-0.224 (0.296)	-0.273 (0.304)
Children's exit from food insecurity	0.121 (0.250)	-0.005 (0.293)	0.012 (0.320)
Treatment N	381	379	379
Control N	1,096	1,033	1,033

Notes: Propensity scores are estimated with a logistic regression model estimating paternal incarceration (between the three- and five-year surveys) as a function of pre-incarceration covariates in Table 2. Matched estimates are based on kernel matching. Coefficients from logistic regression models are presented (with standard errors in parentheses). * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

Table 4. Mechanisms of the Average Effect of Paternal Incarceration on Children's Food Insecurity, Restricted to Residential Fathers

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	<i>Baseline</i>	<i>+ economic wellbeing</i>	<i>characteristic s</i>	<i>+ parenting</i>	<i>+ health</i>	<i>+ all mechanisms</i>
<i>Estimating children's current food insecurity</i>						
Paternal incarceration	0.892 *	0.918 *	0.729	0.769 *	0.786	0.719
	(0.383)	(0.430)	(0.449)	(0.387)	(0.407)	(0.479)
Propensity for paternal incarceration	0.844	0.619	0.827	0.988	0.530	0.621
	(0.924)	(0.979)	(0.951)	(0.928)	(0.935)	(1.057)
<i>Estimating children's onset into food insecurity</i>						
Paternal incarceration	0.890 *	0.890	0.727	0.779	0.819	0.713
	(0.422)	(0.462)	(0.519)	(0.418)	(0.465)	(0.539)
Propensity for paternal incarceration	0.591	0.537	0.570	0.651	0.253	0.450
	(0.995)	(1.037)	(1.038)	(1.021)	(1.023)	(1.136)
N	1,434	1,434	1,434	1,434	1,434	1,434

Notes: Logistic regression models estimate children's food insecurity and children's food insecurity onset as a function of the mechanisms, controlling for paternal incarceration and the propensity for paternal incarceration (from the kernel matching models presented in Table 3). Model 2 includes mother in poverty, mother material hardship, and mother employment (all measured at the five-year survey). Model 3 includes mother and father co-residential and mother relationship quality (all measured at the five-year survey). Model 4 includes mother engagement, mother parenting stress, and mother neglect (all measured at the five-year survey). Model 5 includes mother fair/poor health, mother depression, and mother substance abuse (all measured at the five-year survey). Model 6 includes all mechanisms. Coefficients from logistic regression models are presented (with standard errors in parentheses). * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

Appendix Table A. Logistic Regression Model Estimating Paternal Incarceration

	Residential fathers		Non-residential fathers	
Mother race/ethnicity (reference = non-Hispanic White)				
Non-Hispanic Black	0.158	(0.393)	0.405	(0.246) ^
Hispanic	-0.374	(0.453)	-0.104	(0.307)
Non-Hispanic other race	0.386	(0.723)	0.012	(0.595)
Mother foreign-born	-0.314	(0.506)	-0.638	(0.400)
Mother age	-0.081	(0.028) **	-0.046	(0.015) **
Mother lived with both biological parents at age 15	-0.700	(0.271) *	-0.033	(0.160)
Mother education (reference = less than high school)				
High school diploma or GED	-0.276	(0.320) ***	-0.043	(0.184)
Post-secondary education	-0.040	(0.321)	-0.126	(0.182)
Mother lives in public housing	-0.549	(0.387)	-0.102	(0.188)
Mother receives welfare	1.170	(0.331)	0.079	(0.180)
Mother receives food stamps	0.509	(0.315)	-0.067	(0.187)
Mother neighborhood disadvantage index	0.012	(0.152)	0.001	(0.086)
Mother lives with parent	-0.221	(0.430)	-0.090	(0.185)
Mother number of children in household	-0.077	(0.104)	-0.052	(0.054)
Mother multi-partnered fertility	0.265	(0.275)	0.039	(0.159)
Mother in poverty	-0.099	(0.287)	0.335	(0.174) ^
Mother material hardship	0.063	(0.079)	0.039	(0.043)
Mother employment	0.330	(0.264)	0.222	(0.159)
Mother relationship quality	-0.225	(0.132) ^	0.104	(0.059) ^
Mother engagement with child	-0.382	(0.133) **	-0.053	(0.074)
Mother parenting stress	0.010	(0.199)	-0.055	(0.109)
Mother neglect	0.197	(0.242)	0.138	(0.130)
Mother fair or poor health	0.280	(0.350)	-0.222	(0.199)
Mother depression	-0.094	(0.310)	0.048	(0.173)
Mother substance use	0.669	(0.364) ^	0.524	(0.214) *
Mother impulsivity	-0.602	(0.263) *	-0.035	(0.145)
Mother cognitive ability	0.077	(0.053)	-0.048	(0.030)
Father engaged in domestic violence	1.556	(0.637) *	0.247	(0.190)
Father abused substances	0.595	(0.331) ^	0.820	(0.163) ***
Father impulsivity	0.195	(0.179)	-0.073	(0.097)
Father cognitive ability	-0.135	(0.048) **	-0.060	(0.028) *
Father previously incarcerated	1.571	(0.270) ***	1.943	(0.184) ***
Child is male	0.655	(0.241) **	0.175	(0.140)
Child age, in months	0.048	(0.055)	0.114	(0.032) ***
Child born low birth weight	-0.796	(0.469) ^	-0.187	(0.211)
Log likelihood	-271		-659	
Constant	-0.904		-8.027	
N	1,509		1,495	

Notes: Results presented for first imputed data set. Standard errors are in parentheses. City dummy variables not presented in the interest of parsimony. ^ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

Appendix Table B. Covariate Balance, Before and After Matching

	Residential fathers						Non-residential fathers					
	Unmatched mean			Matched mean			Unmatched mean			Matched mean		
	$E(X) d = 1$	$E(X) d = 0$	<i>p</i>	$E(X) d = 1$	$E(X) d = 0$	<i>p</i>	$E(X) d = 1$	$E(X) d = 0$	<i>p</i>	$E(X) d = 1$	$E(X) d = 0$	<i>p</i>
Mother race/ethnicity												
Non-Hispanic White	0.185	0.315	0.003	0.178	0.155	0.638	0.129	0.126	0.890	0.129	0.141	0.635
Non-Hispanic Black	0.524	0.343	0.000	0.534	0.453	0.218	0.698	0.650	0.086	0.697	0.692	0.885
Hispanic	0.258	0.299	0.335	0.254	0.366	0.063	0.157	0.208	0.033	0.158	0.150	0.754
Non-Hispanic other race	0.032	0.043	0.584	0.034	0.025	0.695	0.016	0.016	0.926	0.016	0.017	0.894
Mother foreign-born	0.073	0.207	0.000	0.068	0.083	0.656	0.029	0.072	0.003	0.029	0.029	0.971
Mother age	23.169	26.836	0.000	23.025	22.897	0.840	22.459	24.266	0.000	22.480	22.528	0.900
Mother lived with both biological parents at age 15	0.282	0.540	0.000	0.271	0.280	0.883	0.281	0.332	0.067	0.282	0.280	0.935
Mother education												
Less than high school	0.355	0.229	0.002	0.373	0.390	0.785	0.381	0.300	0.004	0.380	0.371	0.806
High school diploma or GED	0.258	0.222	0.357	0.246	0.254	0.880	0.265	0.270	0.851	0.266	0.263	0.908
Post-secondary education	0.387	0.549	0.001	0.381	0.356	0.682	0.354	0.430	0.010	0.354	0.366	0.723
Mother lives in public housing	0.137	0.092	0.103	0.144	0.186	0.390	0.194	0.194	0.979	0.195	0.211	0.591
Mother receives welfare	0.403	0.090	0.000	0.390	0.380	0.872	0.412	0.321	0.001	0.409	0.406	0.934
Mother receives food stamps	0.629	0.227	0.000	0.619	0.615	0.949	0.638	0.553	0.004	0.636	0.622	0.686
Mother neighborhood disadvantage index	0.075	-0.264	0.000	0.066	-0.007	0.545	0.189	0.221	0.577	0.188	0.226	0.576
Mother lives with parent	0.097	0.071	0.302	0.102	0.098	0.920	0.192	0.221	0.236	0.193	0.194	0.952
Mother number of children in household	2.395	2.314	0.496	2.390	2.222	0.300	2.356	2.327	0.732	2.358	2.385	0.787
Mother multi-partnered fertility	0.427	0.287	0.001	0.407	0.318	0.155	0.575	0.552	0.440	0.578	0.560	0.627
Mother in poverty	0.476	0.275	0.000	0.458	0.518	0.353	0.669	0.571	0.001	0.668	0.668	0.998
Mother material hardship	2.129	1.347	0.000	2.085	2.005	0.704	2.250	1.971	0.008	2.249	2.214	0.791
Mother employment	0.548	0.554	0.905	0.542	0.488	0.409	0.551	0.587	0.231	0.551	0.535	0.642
Mother relationship quality	3.537	4.028	0.000	3.623	3.569	0.693	2.173	2.184	0.887	2.163	2.199	0.695
Mother engagement with child	4.735	5.016	0.001	4.788	4.755	0.818	4.924	4.991	0.245	4.925	4.937	0.866
Mother parenting stress	2.234	2.215	0.752	2.216	2.198	0.821	2.387	2.289	0.018	2.384	2.371	0.799
Mother neglect	0.231	0.105	0.002	0.192	0.163	0.652	0.253	0.165	0.005	0.249	0.231	0.688
Mother fair or poor health	0.169	0.098	0.013	0.161	0.228	0.194	0.152	0.162	0.667	0.153	0.148	0.854
Mother depression	0.266	0.150	0.001	0.254	0.331	0.199	0.302	0.234	0.009	0.301	0.285	0.636
Mother substance use	0.194	0.075	0.000	0.178	0.106	0.113	0.157	0.092	0.000	0.156	0.149	0.789
Mother impulsivity	1.452	1.469	0.698	1.446	1.380	0.271	1.635	1.573	0.036	1.635	1.633	0.955
Mother cognitive ability	7.210	7.105	0.681	7.119	7.237	0.703	6.221	6.494	0.070	6.253	6.314	0.735
Father engaged in domestic violence	0.113	0.011	0.000	0.068	0.068	0.997	0.213	0.129	0.000	0.211	0.204	0.823
Father abused substances	0.250	0.084	0.000	0.237	0.317	0.173	0.415	0.206	0.000	0.412	0.417	0.872
Father impulsivity	2.198	1.916	0.000	2.175	2.182	0.932	2.158	2.072	0.047	2.153	2.148	0.920
Father cognitive ability	5.724	6.706	0.000	5.778	6.044	0.439	6.203	6.496	0.067	6.214	6.203	0.953
Father previously incarcerated	0.758	0.222	0.000	0.746	0.717	0.620	0.882	0.468	0.000	0.881	0.892	0.645
Child is male	0.581	0.505	0.105	0.568	0.571	0.963	0.575	0.519	0.061	0.575	0.557	0.616
Child age, in months	61.355	61.027	0.157	61.381	61.356	0.937	61.669	61.264	0.005	61.633	61.550	0.665
Child born low birth weight	0.073	0.081	0.733	0.076	0.049	0.393	0.121	0.131	0.619	0.121	0.135	0.582
N	132	1,377		118	1,316		381	1,096		397	1,033	

Note: Results presented for first imputed data set. $E(X) | d = 1$ indicates means for treatment group (children with incarcerated fathers). $E(X) | d = 0$ indicates means for control group (children without incarcerated fathers). Postmatch estimates based on kernel matching. City dummy variables not presented in the interest of parsimony.

Appendix Table C. Results from Sensitivity Analysis for Treatment Effect on Food Insecurity among Children, Assuming Overestimation of the Treatment Effect

Gamma (<i>I</i>)	Children's current food insecurity		Children's onset into food insecurity	
	M-H statistic	<i>p</i>	M-H statistic	<i>p</i>
1.00	3.465	0.000	3.462	0
1.05	3.276	0.001	3.291	0.001
1.10	3.097	0.001	3.128	0.001
1.15	2.927	0.002	2.974	0.001
1.20	2.765	0.003	2.829	0.002
1.25	2.611	0.004	2.69	0.004
1.30	2.464	0.007	2.557	0.005
1.35	2.324	0.010	2.431	0.008
1.40	2.189	0.014	2.31	0.01
1.45	2.060	0.020	2.194	0.014
1.50	1.936	0.026	2.082	0.019
1.55	1.816	0.035	1.974	0.024
1.60	1.700	0.045	1.871	0.031
1.65	1.589	0.056	1.771	0.038
1.70	1.481		1.675	0.047
1.75	1.376		1.581	0.057
1.80	1.274		1.491	
1.85	1.176		1.403	
1.90	1.080		1.318	
1.95	0.987		1.235	
2.00	0.897		1.154	

Note: Analyses restricted to families with residential fathers at the three-year survey. P-values exceeding .05 are omitted (unless they were the point where the relationship became statistically insignificant at the .05 level), which shows where the relationships become statistically insignificant.