Impact of Mass Incarceration on American Society

Posted on September 17, 2018

View this essay online:
https://academic-master.com/impact-of-mass-incarceration-on-american-society/

Introduction

Mass incarceration refers to the unusually extensive use of prisons, jails, probation, parole, and other forms of correctional supervision in the United States. It is not simply the imprisonment of individuals who have committed serious crimes. The term describes a system in which confinement and criminal records affect millions of people, their families, their neighborhoods, and the wider economy.

At the end of 2023, approximately 1.85 million people were incarcerated in state or federal prisons and local jails. Another 3.77 million were living in the community under probation or parole supervision. These figures mean that more than 5.6 million adults were under some form of correctional control in the United States during that period (Gann & Kaeble, 2025).

Incarceration serves legitimate purposes. It punishes unlawful conduct, protects the public from individuals who present a serious and immediate danger, and can create opportunities for treatment, education, and rehabilitation. Victims of crime also have a legitimate interest in safety, accountability, and justice. However, a system becomes socially damaging when imprisonment is used more broadly or for longer periods than public safety reasonably requires.

The modern expansion of incarceration did not result only from changes in crime. Sentencing laws, mandatory minimum penalties, drug policies, restrictions on parole, longer prison terms, and increased use of imprisonment all contributed to the rise. The National Research Council concluded that the American imprisonment rate increased more than fourfold after the early 1970s and that policy choices were central to this growth (National Research Council, 2014).

The consequences extend far beyond prison walls. Mass incarceration affects employment, family relationships, education, public health, racial inequality, neighborhood stability, government spending, and confidence in legal institutions. Its effects are especially concentrated among people who were already experiencing poverty, limited educational opportunities, unstable housing, poor health, or racial discrimination.

A balanced assessment must avoid two extremes. It should not suggest that incarceration has no role in public safety, but it should also reject the idea that increasingly severe punishment automatically produces safer communities. The central issue is whether American society can hold people

accountable while reducing unnecessary imprisonment and supporting successful reintegration.

The Scale of Mass Incarceration

Prisons and jails perform different functions. Prisons generally hold people who have been convicted and sentenced to longer terms under state or federal authority. Local jails usually hold people serving shorter sentences or awaiting a court decision.

This distinction is important because many people in jail have not been convicted of the charge for which they are being detained. At midyear 2023, local jails held approximately 664,200 people. About 70 percent of the jail population was unconvicted and was awaiting court action or being held for another legal reason (Zeng, 2025).

Pretrial detention can have severe consequences even when it lasts only a few days or weeks. A detained person may lose employment, miss rent payments, become separated from children, or experience interruption in medical treatment. These consequences can occur before guilt has been established.

People with financial resources may be better able to obtain legal assistance or meet conditions for pretrial release. Poor defendants may remain detained because they cannot afford financial requirements. As a result, the burden of the system is not determined only by the seriousness of alleged conduct. It may also be shaped by income, local policies, access to legal representation, and the speed of court proceedings.

The large number of people under correctional control also demonstrates that mass incarceration is not limited to the prison population. Probation and parole allow people to live in the community, but they frequently impose reporting duties, travel restrictions, fees, testing requirements, and other conditions. A technical violation, such as missing an appointment, may result in sanctions or renewed incarceration even when no new crime has occurred.

Public Safety and the Limits of Severe Punishment

Incarceration can protect the public through incapacitation. A person who is confined cannot commit offenses in the community during that period. This function is particularly important when an individual presents a continuing risk of serious violence.

However, incapacitation should not be confused with deterrence. Deterrence is the idea that the threat or experience of punishment discourages future crime. Evidence indicates that the perceived likelihood of being caught generally has a stronger deterrent effect than increasing the severity of punishment.

The National Institute of Justice summarizes this finding by stating that “the certainty of being caught is a vastly more powerful deterrent than the punishment” (National Institute of Justice, 2016, para. 1). Research reviewed by the agency indicates that adding more years to an already lengthy sentence usually produces, at most, a modest additional deterrent effect.

This does not mean that sentences should be insignificant. Rather, the punishment should be proportionate to the offense, the harm caused, and the individual’s risk. A sentence that is long enough to establish accountability may achieve its purpose without continuing for decades after the person’s risk has substantially declined.

Age is also relevant. Bureau of Justice Statistics data show that among people released from prison in 2012, 81 percent of those aged 24 or younger were arrested within five years, compared with 61 percent of those aged 40 or older. Although rearrest is not the same as reconviction, the difference illustrates the well-established relationship between age and offending patterns (Durose & Antenangeli, 2021).

Mass incarceration may produce diminishing public-safety returns when low-risk people are imprisoned, when sentences extend far beyond the period of significant risk, or when incarceration damages the conditions required for successful reentry. Public safety depends not only on what happens while a person is confined but also on the person’s ability to live lawfully after release.

Recidivism and the Challenges of Reentry

Recidivism refers to renewed involvement with the criminal justice system after release. It can be measured through rearrest, reconviction, return to prison, or a technical violation. These measures should not be treated as identical. An arrest does not prove guilt, and a return to prison may result from a supervision violation rather than a new offense.

Among people released from prisons in 34 states in 2012, approximately 62 percent were arrested within three years and 71 percent within five years. About 46 percent returned to prison within five years because of a new sentence or a probation or parole violation (Durose & Antenangeli, 2021).

These rates should not be interpreted as evidence that people leaving prison are naturally incapable of change. They reflect the interaction of individual behavior with unstable housing, unemployment, untreated illness, substance-use disorders, supervision requirements, family conflict, and limited access to services.

A person may leave prison with no current identification, no permanent address, little money, and no reliable transportation. The same person may be expected to report to a parole officer, attend treatment, seek employment, and pay fees almost immediately. Failure in one area can make every other requirement more difficult.

Effective reentry therefore begins before release. It should include identification documents, health coverage, medication, housing arrangements, employment preparation, family contact, and a clear supervision plan. Reentry assistance is not the removal of accountability. It is a practical strategy for reducing the likelihood of future victimization.

Employment and Economic Opportunity

Mass incarceration affects the economy by removing people from the labor market during confinement and weakening their employment prospects after release. Time in prison can interrupt job experience, professional networks, training, and career development.

A criminal record may continue to affect a person even after the formal sentence has been completed. Employers may reject applicants because of a conviction, licensing rules may prevent entry into certain occupations, and gaps in employment history may raise concerns. Some restrictions are justified for particular positions, but broad exclusions can prevent qualified applicants from obtaining lawful work.

Research reviewed by the National Research Council found that incarceration was associated with reductions in employment and earnings. Several studies reported employment reductions of approximately 5 percent and earnings losses ranging from 10 to 30 percent, although estimates differed according to the population, method, and period examined (National Research Council, 2014).

Pager's influential employment study also demonstrated that a criminal record substantially reduced employers' responses to job applicants. The results were especially damaging for Black applicants, showing how criminal records and racial discrimination can interact in the labor market (Pager, 2003).

It is inaccurate to claim that incarcerated American workers are simply replaced by unauthorized immigrants. Labor markets are far more complex, and there is no sound basis for treating immigrants as the cause of the economic losses associated with incarceration. The direct issues are the removal of people from employment, the deterioration of their skills and work histories, and the barriers they face after release.

Steady employment can contribute to successful reentry by providing income, daily structure, social connections, and a lawful identity. However, employment alone is not enough. A low-paying or unstable job may not cover housing, transportation, food, child support, and supervision costs. Policies should therefore focus on access to sustainable employment rather than merely placing people in any available position.

The Effects on Families and Children

Incarceration affects entire households. When a parent is imprisoned, the remaining caregiver may lose income, childcare assistance, housing stability, or emotional support. Families may also have to pay for telephone calls, prison visits, transportation, legal services, and financial support for the incarcerated person.

Geographic distance creates another burden. State and federal prisons may be located far from the incarcerated person's community. Visiting can require long journeys, unpaid time away from work, and expenses that low-income families cannot easily meet.

Children may experience the sudden absence of a parent without receiving an age-appropriate explanation. Some are told that the parent is working elsewhere or has moved away. Others experience shame because of social stigma. The emotional effects depend on the child's age, prior relationship with the parent, nature of the offense, quality of the new caregiving arrangement, and frequency of continued contact.

Research associates parental incarceration with increased risks of behavioral difficulties, educational problems, housing instability, and economic hardship. However, researchers also warn against assuming that incarceration alone causes every poor outcome. Families affected by imprisonment often faced poverty, conflict, substance misuse, or neighborhood disadvantage before the parent entered prison (Murray et al., 2012; National Research Council, 2014).

The consequences may differ according to which parent is incarcerated. The incarceration of a mother can produce major changes in caregiving and may increase the likelihood that children live with relatives or enter foster care. The incarceration of a father may remove a source of income and daily involvement, although family circumstances vary considerably.

Policies should preserve safe and appropriate family relationships. Affordable communication, child-friendly visitation, parenting programs, and placement closer to home may reduce unnecessary harm. Contact should not be required when it would endanger the child or another family member, but healthy relationships can support both child well-being and successful reentry.

Education and Human Development

Educational disadvantage is common among incarcerated adults, but imprisonment should not be described as directly damaging a person's brain or making later learning impossible. Many people enter correctional facilities with limited education, learning disabilities, poor school experiences, or low literacy.

A national prison study reported that approximately 30 percent of incarcerated adults had not

obtained a high school diploma or equivalent, compared with 14 percent of adults living in American households. Incarcerated adults were also more likely to demonstrate low levels of literacy and numeracy (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017).

Incarceration can interrupt schooling, particularly for young adults. However, confinement may also provide an opportunity for education when well-designed programs are available. High school equivalency courses, vocational training, college classes, digital skills, and special education services can improve employment readiness and self-confidence.

A major RAND meta-analysis found that participants in correctional education had 43 percent lower odds of recidivating than nonparticipants. The researchers also found improved odds of employment after release and concluded that correctional education could be cost-effective (Davis et al., 2013).

Educational programs should be connected to opportunities available after release. Training for a profession is of limited value when licensing restrictions automatically prevent participants from entering that occupation. Correctional education should therefore be coordinated with employers, colleges, unions, licensing agencies, and community service providers.

Public Health Consequences

People entering correctional facilities often have significant health needs. These needs may include chronic illness, mental-health conditions, substance-use disorders, traumatic injuries, HIV, hepatitis, tuberculosis, and sexually transmitted infections.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reports that the prevalence of several infections and health conditions is higher among incarcerated populations than in the general population. In 2021, approximately 1.1 percent of people in state and federal prisons were known to have HIV, about three times the prevalence in the general population (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2024).

These findings should not be used to portray people leaving prison as threats who spread disease. Many justice-involved individuals experienced limited access to healthcare, unstable housing, poverty, or substance-use risks before incarceration. The appropriate public-health response is screening, treatment, education, vaccination, and continuity of care.

Correctional facilities can identify illnesses that were previously undiagnosed and begin treatment. However, progress can be lost when medication and medical coverage are interrupted upon release. A person returning to the community should leave with necessary prescriptions, appointments, insurance arrangements, and information about local healthcare services.

Mental health also requires attention. Isolation, overcrowding, violence, uncertainty, and separation from family can worsen psychological distress. People with serious mental illnesses may struggle to follow institutional rules, increasing the likelihood of disciplinary punishment.

Substance-use treatment is especially important during reentry. Reduced drug tolerance after a period of confinement can increase the danger of overdose following release. Evidence-based medication, counseling, naloxone access, and immediate connection to community treatment can save lives.

Racial and Social Inequality

Mass incarceration has not affected every racial and ethnic group equally. At midyear 2023, the local jail incarceration rate for Black residents was 552 per 100,000, compared with 155 per 100,000 for White residents. The Black jail incarceration rate was therefore approximately 3.6 times the White rate. American Indian and Alaska Native residents also experienced a particularly high rate of 425 per 100,000 (Zeng, 2025).

These disparities cannot be explained responsibly by one factor. Crime patterns, neighborhood conditions, exposure to victimization, policing strategies, access to legal representation, charging decisions, pretrial detention, sentencing, and prior records can all influence who enters and remains in the system.

Historical segregation and continuing inequality have also concentrated poverty, underfunded schools, unstable housing, environmental hazards, and limited employment opportunities in particular communities. The National Academies concluded that reducing racial inequality in criminal justice requires addressing structural racism, residential segregation, and concentrated disadvantage as well as reforming justice institutions (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2023).

Racial disparities in imprisonment then contribute to wider inequality. When large numbers of people from one community lose earnings, voting access, family contact, and employment opportunities, the consequences accumulate across generations.

This cycle also harms crime victims in disadvantaged neighborhoods. The communities most affected by incarceration are frequently the same communities that experience serious violence and have the greatest need for effective protection. Reform should therefore combine fair treatment of defendants with investment in victim services, violence prevention, trustworthy policing, and neighborhood safety.

Community Stability and Civic Life

The social impact of incarceration becomes especially significant when imprisonment is concentrated in a small number of neighborhoods. A single incarceration may remove a dangerous person, but repeated removal of large numbers of residents can weaken families, local organizations, and informal systems of support.

Neighborhoods may lose wage earners, parents, mentors, tenants, and community participants. People returning from prison often come back to the same areas with limited employment and housing options. This concentration can create a cycle in which disadvantaged communities repeatedly absorb both the causes and consequences of criminal justice involvement.

Mass incarceration may also reduce trust in public institutions. Residents who believe that police, courts, or correctional agencies treat them unfairly may become less willing to report crimes, serve as witnesses, or cooperate with investigations. Low trust can make communities less safe rather than more secure.

Civic participation may also be affected by restrictions on voting and jury service, as well as by the social stigma attached to a criminal conviction. Laws differ among states, but long-term exclusion can leave large numbers of residents without a meaningful role in public decision-making.

Accountability and belonging should not be treated as opposites. After a person has completed a sentence, reasonable pathways back into civic and community life can reinforce lawful participation.

Government Spending and Opportunity Costs

Maintaining prisons and jails requires spending on buildings, security, food, transportation, medical care, administration, court proceedings, and supervision. Older prison populations can also create substantial healthcare and accessibility costs.

The financial impact is not limited to correctional budgets. Families may require housing, food, childcare, or healthcare support after losing an income earner. Local economies lose earnings and consumer spending, while employers lose potential workers.

Every public budget involves choices. Money devoted to unnecessary incarceration is unavailable for education, mental-health services, substance-use treatment, housing, victim assistance, infrastructure, or violence-prevention programs.

This does not mean that every dollar spent on correctional systems is wasted. Safe facilities, qualified staff, healthcare, education, and rehabilitation require adequate funding. The concern is whether society is paying to confine people who could be safely supervised or treated in less restrictive settings.

A more efficient system would reserve expensive prison space for individuals who present significant risks while using evidence-based community sanctions, treatment, restorative practices, and supervision for appropriate cases.

Approaches to Reform

Reducing the harms of mass incarceration does not require abandoning punishment or ignoring victims. It requires a more selective and evidence-based use of incarceration.

Sentencing reform should review mandatory minimums, excessively long terms, and penalties that are disproportionate to the harm caused. Judges should have sufficient discretion to consider the seriousness of the offense, the person's history, the risk to the public, and the possibility of rehabilitation.

Pretrial reform should avoid detaining people merely because they are poor. Decisions should focus on flight risk and danger rather than a defendant's ability to make a payment. Courts should also process cases promptly so that unconvicted people are not held unnecessarily.

Diversion may be appropriate for some people with mental illness, substance-use disorders, or low-level offenses. Treatment courts and community programs must be properly funded and should not impose conditions so burdensome that minor noncompliance leads to incarceration.

Correctional facilities should expand evidence-based education, vocational training, mental-health care, substance-use treatment, and preparation for release. Programs should be evaluated for quality rather than offered only to create the appearance of rehabilitation.

Reentry policy should address identification, housing, employment, healthcare, transportation, and family reunification. Criminal-record relief and fair-chance hiring can reduce permanent exclusion while still allowing employers to consider convictions that are directly relevant to a specific position.

Finally, community investment must be part of criminal justice reform. The National Academies has emphasized that improving material well-being, educational access, health, and neighborhood conditions can reduce criminal justice involvement and racial inequality over time (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2023).

Conclusion

Mass incarceration has deeply influenced American society. Although imprisonment can punish serious wrongdoing and protect communities from dangerous individuals, its widespread use has created social and economic consequences that extend beyond the people who are confined.

The effects appear in reduced employment and earnings, unstable family relationships, interrupted education, untreated health problems, racial inequality, weakened communities, and substantial public expense. Children and family members may experience hardship even though they committed no offense.

The original assumption that people leaving prison are undisciplined, revenge-seeking, or responsible for spreading disease is neither fair nor supported by evidence. People returning from prison are a diverse population. Some present continuing risks, while many are attempting to rebuild their lives under difficult conditions. Policies should be based on individual behavior and evidence rather than stereotypes.

High recidivism rates demonstrate the importance of accountability, but they also reveal failures in rehabilitation and reentry. A person released without housing, employment, healthcare, or support is being placed in circumstances that make lawful stability harder to achieve.

A more effective criminal justice system would use incarceration where it is genuinely necessary, impose proportionate sentences, protect victims, and provide meaningful opportunities for rehabilitation. It would also recognize that lasting public safety depends on strong families, accessible education, healthcare, employment, fair institutions, and stable communities.

Mass incarceration is therefore not only a prison issue. It is an economic, public-health, educational, racial-justice, family, and community issue. Reforming it responsibly can strengthen both justice and safety in American society.

References

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2024). *Public health considerations for correctional health*.

Davis, L. M., Bozick, R., Steele, J. L., Saunders, J., & Miles, J. N. V. (2013). *Evaluating the effectiveness of correctional education*. RAND Corporation. https://doi.org/10.7249/RR266

Durose, M. R., & Antenangeli, L. (2021). *Recidivism of prisoners released in 34 states in 2012*. Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Gann, S., & Kaeble, D. (2025). *Correctional populations in the United States, 2023*. Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Murray, J., Farrington, D. P., & Sekol, I. (2012). Children's antisocial behavior, mental health, drug use, and educational performance after parental incarceration. *Psychological Bulletin, 138*(2), 175–210. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026407

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2023). *Reducing racial inequality in crime and justice*. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/26705

National Center for Education Statistics. (2017). *U.S. program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies prison study results*. U.S. Department of Education.

National Institute of Justice. (2016). *Five things about deterrence*. U.S. Department of Justice.

National Research Council. (2014). *The growth of incarceration in the United States*. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/18613

Pager, D. (2003). The mark of a criminal record. *American Journal of Sociology, 108*(5), 937–975. https://doi.org/10.1086/374403

Zeng, Z. (2025). *Jail inmates in 2023*. Bureau of Justice Statistics.