

Supporting Information for:

Does Incarceration Reduce Voting? Evidence about the Political Consequences of Spending Time in Prison

This appendix contains the following material:

Supplemental Appendix 1: Description of Process for Merging Felon and Voter File Records

Supplemental Appendix 2: Robustness Checks of Approaches One and Two Using Data from Connecticut

Supplemental Appendix 3: Matching Stats from Pennsylvania Merge

Supplemental Appendix 4: Summary Statistics for Pennsylvania Cases Used in Tables 4 & 5 Analysis

Supplemental Appendix 5: 2012 Voting for Pennsylvania Convicts Sentenced to Jail or a Non-incarcerative Punishment Between 2008 and 2012 Elections

Supplemental Appendix 6: Previous Criminal Justice Contact by First-Time Inmates in 2004 Survey of State Inmates

Supplemental Appendix 1

This section describes the data preparation procedures for the analyses presented in Tables 2-5 in the main text and Tables SA2-SA5 in the Supporting Information.

Pennsylvania Data Merge

We measure the political participation of individuals listed in the Pennsylvania Corrections and Sentencing data using the Pennsylvania Voter File (PVF). The PVF contains the name, address, birthdate, party registration, date of registration, and vote history of every person who is registered to vote in Pennsylvania. Unfortunately, there is no unique identifier that allows us to link records in the criminal justice data to the PVF. We thus wrote a computer program to search the PVF for a record that matched each record in the criminal justice data. In this case, a criminal justice record matches to the PVF if there is a record in the PVF that shares a similar name and the same birthdate.

We face a tension between two forms of measurement error when matching records across these sources. One form occurs when we incorrectly match an individual in the criminal justice data to another individual's record in the PVF. The other form of measurement error occurs when we fail to match an individual in the criminal justice data to their own voter file record. When deciding whether a name in the PVF matches a name in the criminal justice records, we face a tradeoff between these two forms of measurement error. Allowing for more discrepancies between matched names across the two sources reduces the number of matches we miss because of issues like the use of nicknames in one source, misspellings, or typos. Doing so, however, also expands the potential pool of other people that have a sufficiently similar name and the same birthdate.

Column 1 of Table SA1 shows the number of matches we find between the criminal justice records and the PVF when we use different matching criteria. For example, the first row shows that we find 34,698 records in the corrections data that share the exact same first name, middle name, last name, and birthdate as a record in the PVF. Table SA1 illustrates the importance of using a flexible matching definition when matching names across sources. There are about 48,000 more records in the corrections data that share the exact same first name, last name, and birthdate, and have a similar middle name, as a

record in the PVF (see Meredith and Morse (2014b) for more details on how we define a fuzzy match).

There are also thousands of additional potential matches that have the same birthdate and similar, but not identical, first or last names.

[Insert Table SA1 about Here]

We use the placebo matching approach proposed by Meredith and Morse (2014b) to make an informed tradeoff between these two forms of measurement error when deciding which of the matches presented in Table SA1 to include in our analysis. We match criminal justice records with slightly permuted birthdates to the PVF. Permuting the birthdates in the criminal justice records makes it so that the matches we find are examples of the first form of measurement error. The total number of matches we find between the permuted criminal justice records and the PVF approximates the number of matches between the actual criminal justice records and the voter file that are false. Thus, the additional matches we find in the actual data relative to the permuted data provide a sense of the number of additional true matches we capture by expanding our matching criteria. Based on the results of the placebo match presented in Table SA1, we count any criminal justice record that satisfies matching criteria 1 through 10 to match the PVF.

Connecticut Data Merge

As a robustness check, we also measure the participation of individuals who have been incarcerated in Connecticut (this analysis appears in Supplemental Appendix 3). In cooperation with the Connecticut Secretary of State's office, we obtained lists of every person convicted of a felony in the state, as well as those released, between the beginning of January 2004 and the end of September 2012. These files included each individual's name, date of birth, address,¹ date of conviction, most serious crime for which they were convicted, release date and sentence length (in the release file only), and a unique identifier (an inmate number).² Using this inmate number, we merged the conviction and release

¹ The addresses in the conviction and release files may differ due to an individual's decision to reside in another location after they are released from prison.

² The Secretary of State's office did not produce files for December of 2007, July or December of 2008, and August or October of 2010, so we lack information for these five months. Some of these future felons can be identified from

files to compile a master list that consists of all individuals convicted of a felony since the beginning of 2004, as well as anyone convicted of a felony prior to this date but released later than 2003.³ Because we are interested in participatory history before the initial entrance into prison, we kept only the earliest conviction observation for those cases in which someone was incarcerated at multiple points during our time period. Because our analyses focus on registration before and voting in the November 2008 and 2012 elections, we removed from this list anyone whose first conviction was on or before the November 4, 2008 presidential election (i.e., these individuals became a felon prior to the first election we examine), as well as those too young to partake in both contests (i.e., those under eighteen on Election Day in 2008).

To measure the political participation of future felons relative to other citizens, we merged the list of these individuals with a Connecticut voter file⁴ produced by a third-party vendor shortly after the November 2008 presidential election.⁵ Unfortunately, no unique identifier existed to facilitate this procedure. The only reliably consistent variables across both the conviction and voter files were the released felon's date of birth and last name. We might also suspect that the addresses were the same, but it is probable that a number of individuals moved but failed to re-register before their convictions. In addition, informal versions or inaccurate recordings of first names hindered an exact match. In the former situation, a name may have been listed as "Mike" in the release file but took the more proper "Michael" form on the voter roll. With respect to the latter, variations of the same name (e.g., "Steven" vs. "Stephen") or simple misspellings (e.g., "Raymond" vs. "Reymond") appeared.

subsequent release files, but we exclude such cases due to the inability to capture the entire population for these months.

³ In restricting the data in this manner, we can characterize this list as containing the first felony conviction entry for all felons convicted on or after January 1, 2004, or for any felon convicted prior to but released after this date. Unfortunately, we cannot rule out the possibility that those remaining were not both convicted of a felony and released from jail prior to 2004.

⁴ Prior to merging the felon records with a Connecticut voter file, we removed those too young to vote in 2008, those who missed the registration deadline of one week before the election, and those without a registration date.

⁵ The vendor who compiled the data regularly collects Connecticut voter files, cleans the records, makes them uniform, and merges these data with vote history information from previous voter files as well as a number of other variables sold by consumer data vendors. They also process their file and verify registrants' addresses using a National Change of Address filter. The voter file includes information on active registrants and for large numbers of inactive or ineligible voters. Cumulative turnout in the file is 78.5% of the statewide total in 2008.

We thus merged the third-party voter file with the list of future felons by creating every potential pairwise combination based on the two common and reliably consistent variables (date of birth and last name). After this merge, we excluded cases for which the conviction date precedes the registration date (meaning these entries, if valid matches, correspond to convicted felons registered after their incarceration). We then assigned various levels of quality and confidence to the matches of future felons to the voter file via a multi-stage process. Based on the information common to both data sets, we determined six possible scenarios in which we might consider an individual in the voter file to be the same person as an individual in the conviction file. In addition to date of birth and last name, these included (in decreasing levels of quality) (1) same first name and town of address; (2) same first name but different town; (3) first name phonetically the same but spelled differently and same town; (4) first name phonetically the same but spelled differently and different town; (5) same first initial and town but first name phonetically and grammatically different; (6) same first initial, different town, and first name phonetically and grammatically different.⁶ Potential matches were machine coded for reliability and matches of lower quality were hand coded to eliminate suspect matches. Given our ability to match on address (which was not possible in the case of Pennsylvania), we prefer this more nuanced approach to the placebo matching technique employed above.

We examined each of the six match classifications separately, beginning with that in which we had the most confidence: identical first name, last name, town, and birth date. From these matches, we removed all duplicate entries.⁷ Then, since we considered these the highest quality matches possible, we dropped all pairs from the other five matching scenarios that contained one of these future felons' id numbers. We then turned to the remaining matches that shared the same date of birth, first name, and last

⁶ All six categories relied on matching the last name. It is conceivable, however, that an individual would have changed his or her last name after registration but before incarceration, perhaps due to marriage or for religious reasons. Unfortunately, the lack of other identifying indicators shared by the two datasets made the identification of any such cases impossible.

⁷ Among the reasons for duplicates in the third-party voter file is the presence of inactive and dropped entries, as well as bureaucratic errors that permit multiple entries for the same individual. In selecting which duplicate case to drop, we kept that which was an active record. When both observations were active, we retained the record with the most recent registration date. For the remaining duplicates (which all contained identical voting histories), we chose arbitrarily to keep the observation with the higher voter id number.

name, but had different towns. We treated these cases as valid matches, and dropped both the duplicates and remaining, unchecked entries with an inmate id number from these observations.

For the rest of the scenarios, determining proper matches required varying degrees of subjectivity. As a next step, we examined those cases with the same last name, date of birth, town, and whose first names were phonetically the same but spelled differently. We relied on the Stata command “soundex” to identify these cases. For example, the program flagged as the same combinations such as “Terry” and “Terri,” “Lorenzo” and “Larenzo,” and “Stephen” and “Steven.” Each case that met this criterion was manually checked to ensure both a visual and audial match. After dropping duplicates and unchecked cases with the same felon id number, we repeated this process for matches that did not share the same town.

The last two matching scenarios included pairs with the same date of birth, last name, and first initial, but entire first names that were neither spelled the same nor phonetically identical. For these cases that shared towns in common, we manually compared their first names, kept the correct matches, and removed duplicates and unverified observations with matching felon identifiers. We conducted the same procedure for the pairs that had different towns. Finally, we combined those cases that matched one of the six matching criteria into a single file and dropped any existing duplicate entries.⁸ This file was merged to a cleaned version of the original third-party voter file,⁹ and duplicate entries were again removed.¹⁰ Given that the third-party voter file was created in April of 2009, and that we do not know whether this file

⁸ These eight duplicates were generated by matching the same observation in the voter file to either two different felons based on their inmate id numbers or the same felon who, through a bureaucratic error, was assigned two different id numbers. In three of these cases, the matches were of differing quality, so we kept the highest quality match. Two other pairs were identical except for a missing felon id number or release date, in which case we kept the complete entries. For the remaining three cases, the observations were identical and there was no obvious available manner with which to determine the match that had a greater probability of being correct. For these, we retained the entry with the earlier conviction date.

⁹ This involved keeping only those eighteen or older on Election Day in 2008, cases without missing registration information, and individuals who met the registration deadline of one week before the election.

¹⁰ Duplicates existed for those voter id numbers with an active entry in the cleaned voter file and an inactive or dropped entry that was originally matched to a future felon. For these cases, we kept the originally matched felon entry and discarded the active observation for that voter id. We were also concerned that the same person may appear in the voter file twice, having been assigned two distinct voter id numbers. As such, we treated as the same any entries that shared identical first names, last names, dates of birth, registration dates, towns, and voter histories. When we identified duplicates, we first kept the entry without a missing value for the controls used in our analyses, then kept from the remaining duplicates the entry with the higher voter identification number.

underwent a post-election purge, we then removed from the file any individual with a conviction date prior to May 1, 2009. The same process was used to merge our list of incarcerated individuals to a January 2013 voter file obtained from the Secretary of State's office.

Supplemental Appendix 2

This section describes our robustness check that uses data from Connecticut to replicate the analyses in Approaches One and Two conducted on data from Pennsylvania in the main text. Our data from Connecticut are similar to the corrections and voter file data from Pennsylvania. We have records of felons who are incarcerated in state prisons and match those records to pre- and post-incarceration voter files. One contextual difference in Connecticut is that incarcerated felons lose their voting rights until they complete both their prison sentences and the terms of their parole. Connecticut is also not a contested presidential election state, which may reduce efforts to register and mobilize ex-felons relative to Pennsylvania. See Supplemental Appendix 1 for a detailed discussion of the data merge process.

Approach One

We first compare the 2008 and 2012 participation of individuals first incarcerated in Connecticut during this time period. Apart from the fact that participation is generally increasing in age for young adults, if the prison experience causes people to be less likely to vote, we would expect these individuals' turnout rates to be substantially higher in the 2008 presidential election than it was in 2012. In contrast to this expectation, Table 2 in the main text shows little change in the participatory patterns of Pennsylvania residents first incarcerated after the 2008 election and released before the 2012 election (these individuals were 0.6 percentage points less likely to be registered but 0.4 percentage points more likely to vote after going to prison than before doing so).

Table SA3 shows a slightly greater decline in participation for the 4,572 felons who were incarcerated in Connecticut after the 2008 election and completed their entire sentence before the 2012 election. As in Pennsylvania, released felons in Connecticut have low levels of participation. Column (1) shows that 40.2% of these felons are registered in November 2012 and column (2) shows that 6.7% voted in that election. By contrast, columns (3) and (4) show that pre-incarceration, 35.6% are registered and 10.8% voted. Thus, per columns (5) and (6), incarceration is associated with a modest 4.6 percentage point increase in registration in Connecticut, while voting declines by 4.1 points.

[Insert Table SA3 about Here]

Overall, it is clear that released criminals voted at much lower rates than the general population prior to going to prison. Incarceration is associated with a slight increase in post-release voting in Pennsylvania but a small decline in Connecticut. However, this decline in turnout post-incarceration in Connecticut is still a fraction of the estimated decline in reported turnout that Lerman and Weaver (2014a) find after people's first reported spell of incarceration.

Approach Two

We next compare the 2012 participation of formerly incarcerated individuals who were registered in 2008 to other 2008 registrants. The downside of this approach is that we discard previously unregistered released prisoners. The benefit is that we can account for the changing effects of demographics and electoral context. We show that as we make those who serve prison time observably more similar to those who do not, our estimates of the negative effect of incarceration on voting decline substantially. Moreover, this happens when we use a relatively sparse set of controls, suggesting that the decline would be even more substantial if we could observe a broader set of controls. Using this analysis in Table 3 in the main text, we explain more than 80% of the difference in 2012 turnout in Pennsylvania between those 2008 registrants who serve time and those who do not.

We replicate this analysis using data from Connecticut. There are 2,399,214 Connecticut residents who were registered in 2008 according to an April 2009 voter file, 1,627 of whom first spent time in Connecticut prisons and completed their sentences between the 2008 and 2012 elections. Results using this sample appear in Table SA4, which parallels Table 3 in the main text. In column (1), we predict voting in the 2012 general election using an indicator for former felon status and find that felons are 36.9 percentage points less likely ($p < .01$) to vote than other 2008 registrants. This estimate decreases when we add precinct fixed effects (column (2)) and the same covariates used in Pennsylvania (see column (3)). Finally, in column (4) we add an indicator for 2008 voting that vastly reduces the negative effect of incarceration on voting to 14.5 points ($p < .01$). Thus, moving from column (1) to column (4) reduces the estimated effect of incarceration on voting by 23 points, or about 63%. When we use a matched-pairs design, matching on all of the variables listed in column (4), we find a slightly larger 17.1-point ($p < .01$)

decrease in voting among the incarcerated population.

[Insert Table SA4 about Here]

In both Pennsylvania and Connecticut, we can explain a majority of differential turnout between those who spend time in prison and those who do not using a relatively sparse set of covariates. Looking back at Table 1 of the main text, previous work estimated that, holding many characteristics fixed, reported turnout is between 11 and 29 percentage points lower if someone reported a previous spell of incarceration. Thus, our estimates (5 points in Pennsylvania, 14 in Connecticut) suggest a smaller relationship between incarceration and turnout, despite only holding fixed a subset of the characteristics for which previous work controls.

Table SA1: Results of Placebo Matching Technique for Pennsylvania

Date of Birth	Actual	Corrections Data		Actual	Sentencing Data	
		Actual - 35 Days	Actual + 35 Days		Actual - 35 Days	Actual + 35 Days
1 Exact First, Exact Middle, Exact Last, Exact DOB	34,698	37	27	19,903	8	11
2 Exact First, Fuzzy Middle, Exact Last, Exact DOB	15,766	9	6	15,768	2	7
3 Exact First, Missing Middle, Exact Last, Exact DOB	32,157	158	135	12,353	32	28
4 Fuzzy First, Exact Middle, Exact Last, Exact DOB	2,066	32	36	720	6	11
5 Fuzzy First, Fuzzy Middle, Exact Last, Exact DOB	634	8	9	474	2	5
6 Fuzzy First, Missing Middle, Exact Last, Exact DOB	2,444	188	167	936	42	40
7 Exact First, Exact Middle, Fuzzy Last, Exact DOB	1,566	101	114	554	34	30
8 Exact First, Fuzzy Middle, Fuzzy Last, Exact DOB	361	34	25	269	36	30
9 Exact First, Missing Middle, Fuzzy Last, Exact DOB	1,781	575	646	533	185	179
10 Exact First, Not Middle, Exact Last, Exact DOB	594	106	100	274	62	55
11 Fuzzy First, Exact Middle, Fuzzy Last, Exact DOB	202	114	144	66	30	38
12 Fuzzy First, Fuzzy Middle, Fuzzy Last, Exact DOB	33	25	26	21	24	24
13 Fuzzy First, Missing Middle, Fuzzy Last, Exact DOB	498	590	603	129	200	190

Table SA2: Characteristic of Convicts Receiving Prison and Non-Prison Sentences

Variable	Restricted Sample		Full Sample	
	State Prison	Non-Prison Sentence	State Prison	Non-Prison Sentence
Voted in 2012 (1=yes)	0.1592 [.3662]	0.1588 [.3655]	0.1479 [.355]	0.1527 [.3597]
Registered in 2012 (1=yes)	0.471 [.4996]	0.4629 [.4986]	0.4612 [.4985]	0.4605 [.4984]
Voted in 2008 (1=yes)	0.2371 [.4257]	0.2186 [.4133]	0.21 [.4074]	0.2138 [.41]
Registered in 2008 (1=yes)	0.5091 [.5003]	0.4927 [.5]	0.493 [.5]	0.4931 [.5]
Corrections record pre-2008 (1=yes)	0.0879 [.2834]	0.0101 [.1]	0.31 [.4625]	0.0733 [.2606]
Imprisoned during 2008 elections (1=yes)	0.0282 [.1657]	0.0021 [.0459]	0.082 [.2743]	0.0139 [.1173]
Corrections record pre-2012 (1=yes)	0.874 [.3322]	0.0406 [.1973]	0.9523 [.2132]	0.1432 [.3503]
Imprisoned during 2012 elections (1=yes)	0.3433 [.4752]	0.0222 [.1475]	0.4988 [.5]	0.06 [.2375]
Any corrections records (1=yes)	0.8806 [.3245]	0.0557 [.2294]	0.9567 [.2036]	0.1702 [.3758]
Age (years) 2012	34.5207 [11.3245]	35.8567 [11.6804]	36.1042 [10.564]	36.3739 [11.3354]
Gender (1=male, 0=female)	0.8706 [.3359]	0.7312 [.4433]	0.911 [.2847]	0.774 [.4182]
Race=Black	0.3317 [.4712]	0.1537 [.3607]	0.3626 [.4808]	0.2209 [.4149]
Race=Hispanic	0.0763 [.2657]	0.0181 [.1334]	0.0531 [.2243]	0.0199 [.1397]
Race=Other	0.0415 [.1995]	0.0715 [.2577]	0.0403 [.1967]	0.0643 [.2453]
Offense gravity score (OGS)	7.0431 [2.5908]	2.6468 [1.8426]	6.658 [2.7854]	2.9495 [1.8937]
Any felony conviction (1=yes)	0.796 [.4033]	0.1263 [.3322]	0.7962 [.4029]	0.2078 [.4057]
Guideline recommended minimum sentence (years)	1.2526 [1.2495]	0.0793 [.2037]	2.2803 [6.6524]	0.1747 [.4059]
Multiple counts sentenced (1=yes)	0 [0]	0 [0]	0.5849 [.4928]	0.285 [.4514]
Prior record (1=yes)	0 [0]	0 [0]	0.7961 [.4029]	0.4609 [.4985]
Number of additional sentences	0.0531 [.2316]	0.0953 [.3365]	0.2299 [.5375]	0.2325 [.5355]
Observations	603	33628	9993	92375

Note: Cell entries are means with standard deviations in brackets

Table 3: 2012 and 2008 Voting and Registration Among Connecticut Residents Incarcerated in State Prison after 2008 Election and Released before 2012 Election

	(1) Registered 2012 (1=yes)	(2) Voted 2012 (1=yes)	(3) Registered 2008 (1=yes)	(4) Voted 2008 (1=yes)	(5) Δ Registration 2012-2008	(6) Δ Voting 2012-2008
Mean	0.402	0.067	0.356	0.108	0.046	-0.041
[Standard Deviation]	[.490]	[.250]	[.479]	[.310]	[.341]	[.346]

Note: N=4,572.

Table SA4: 2012 Pennsylvania Voting Among 2008 Registrants by Incarceration Status

	Dependent Variable is Voted 2012 (1=yes)				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Formerly Incarcerated (1=first convicted after May 1, 2009 and released by September 30, 2012)	-0.369***	-0.308***	-0.250***	-0.145***	-0.171***
Voted 2008 (1=yes)	[0.008]	[0.009]	[0.009]	0.525***	[0.013]
Age in years (2012)			0.031***	0.020***	-0.234**
Age squared / 100			[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.108]
Registered Democrat (1=yes)			-0.029***	-0.018***	
Registered Republican (1=yes)			[0.000]	[0.000]	
Gender=Male			0.086***	0.030***	
Gender=Unknown			[0.001]	[0.001]	
Constant	0.488***	0.487***	0.074***	0.036***	
	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.001]	[0.001]	
Observations	2,395,708	2,395,708	-0.022***	-0.009***	
Number treated to prison	1,626	1,626	[0.001]	[0.001]	
R-squared	0.000	0.102	-0.164***	-0.051***	
Zip code fixed effects		332	[0.005]	[0.004]	
Matched pair fixed effects			0.287***	0.319***	
			[0.002]	[0.002]	

Note: Cell entries are OLS estimates with robust standard errors in brackets. *p<.1; **p<.05; ***p<.01.

Table SA5: 2012 Voting for Pennsylvania Convicts Sentenced to Prison or Another Punishment Between 2008 and 2012 Elections

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Bivariate Regression	Past Participation	Demographics	Crime Characterstics	Complete Model	Matched Pairs	Excluding Potentially Imprisoned 2012
Any jail for most serious offense? (1=yes)	0.000 [0.004]	0.002 [0.004]	-0.001 [0.004]	0.001 [0.004]	0.002 [0.004]	0.001 [0.005]	0.002 [0.004]
Registered in 2008 (1=yes)		0.071*** [0.004]			0.071*** [0.004]		0.071*** [0.004]
Voted in 2008 (1=yes)		0.363*** [0.007]			0.363*** [0.007]		0.363*** [0.007]
Age (years) 2012			0.000 [0.001]		0.001 [0.001]	0.006 [0.014]	0.001 [0.001]
Age^2/100 2012			0.000 [0.001]		-0.001 [0.001]		-0.001 [0.001]
Gender (1=male, 0=female)			-0.003 [0.005]		-0.004 [0.004]		-0.003 [0.004]
Race=Black			-0.004 [0.006]		-0.005 [0.005]		-0.004 [0.005]
Race=Hispanic			0.002 [0.016]		0.01 [0.013]		0.015 [0.014]
Race=Other			0.001 [0.008]		-0.001 [0.007]		-0.002 [0.007]
Guideline recommended minimum sentence (years)				-0.011 [0.020]	-0.010 [0.017]	-0.067 [0.102]	-0.010 [0.017]
Any felony conviction (1=yes)				-0.006 [0.008]	0.001 [0.008]		0.001 [0.008]
Constant	0.159*** [0.002]	0.044*** [0.002]	0.154*** [0.023]	0.157*** [0.004]	0.025 [0.021]	-0.039 [0.511]	0.027 [0.021]
Observations	33,597	33,597	33,597	33,597	33,597	23,158	32,850
R-squared	0.000	0.220	0.002	0.000	0.222	0.613	0.222
Prop. Voting 2012	0.159	0.159	0.159	0.159	0.159	0.157	0.159
Prop. Voting 2008	0.219	0.219	0.219	0.219	0.219	0.214	0.219
Number Treated To Jail	12,075	12,075	12,075	12,075	12,075	11,579	11,786
County fixed effects	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Offense gravity score fixed effects	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Matched pair fixed effects	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No

Note: Cell entries are OLS estimates with robust standard errors in brackets. *p<.1; **p<.05; ***p<.01.

Table SA6: Previous Criminal Justice Contact by First-Time Inmates in 2004 Survey of State Inmates

	Share of Inmates	Prior Minor Incarceration	Prior Probation	Number or Previous Arrests			
				0	1	2	3+
No Prior Major Incarceration	61.9%	19.7%	53.4%	24.0%	18.9%	14.6%	37.8%
No Prior Major or Minor Incarceration	49.7%	0.0%	48.2%	29.7%	20.0%	14.6%	31.2%
No Prior Major or Minor Incarceration or Probation	25.7%	0.0%	0.0%	56.1%	17.9%	9.4%	12.7%

Notes: Minor incarceration refers to serving time in prison, jail, or another correctional facility for drunkenness, vagrancy, loitering, disorderly conduct, or minor traffic crimes. Major incarceration refers to serving time in prison, jail, or another correctional facility for any other conviction.