Georgia State University
ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

African-American Studies Theses | Department of African-American Studies

12-14-2011

# Disappearing Acts: The Mass Incarceration of African American Women

Christina Faye Meares
*Georgia State University*

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/aas_theses

Recommended Citation
Meares, Christina Faye, "Disappearing Acts: The Mass Incarceration of African American Women" (2011). *African-American Studies Theses.* Paper 9.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of African-American Studies at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in African-American Studies Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

DISAPPEARING ACTS: THE MASS INCARCERATION OF AFRICAN AMERICAN WOMEN

by

CHRISTINA FAYE MEARES

Under the Direction of Dr. Cora Presley

ABSTRACT

The growth in the number of black women in the prison system necessitates more research become rooted in an intersectional approach. This quantitative study will empirically apply intersectionality to address the unique circumstances of imprisoned black women by comparing and analyzing sentence convictions shared between black and white incarcerated women in Georgia. Drawing on 600 inmate profiles published by Georgia Department of Corrections, this study will address the statistical significance of race, class and gender on the length of sentence for incarcerated white and black women using regression models.

INDEX WORDS: African American women, Black women, African Americans, Women, Incarceration, Criminal justice, Prison, Racism, Disparities.

# DISAPPEARING ACTS: THE MASS INCARCERATION OF AFRICAN AMERICAN WOMEN

by

CHRISTINA FAYE MEARES

A Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Masters of Arts

in the College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

2011

Copyright by

Christina Faye Meares

2011

# DISAPPEARING ACTS: THE MASS INCARCERATION OF AFRICAN AMERICAN WOMEN

by

CHRISTINA FAYE MEARES

Committee Chair: Cora Presley

Committee: Jonathan Gayles

Akinyele Umoja

Electronic Version Approved:

Office of Graduate Studies

College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

December 2011

# DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to all imprisoned black women. May this work open discussions between scholar and activist communities.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank Dr. Perry Hall and Dr. Rebecka Fisher for igniting my interest in Africana studies and research. I would like to acknowledge the department of African American Studies at Georgia State University and the Africana scholar-activist community for the support given to me over the years, notable Dr. Charles E. Jones. I would also like to acknowledge the members of the first cohort, Nafeesa, Asantewa, and Ahmon for the many hours spent in the graduate lab working on papers and presentations together. Finally, I acknowledge the National Council for Black Studies for allowing me the opportunity to present as a student and grow as a scholar-activist.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... v
1 INTRODUCTION ..... 1
1.1 Background of the Study ..... 2
1.2 Problem Statement and Purpose ..... 9
1.3 Significance and Nature of the Study ..... 10
1.3.1 Considered and Rejected Methodologies and Designs ..... 10
1.3.2 Selected Design Appropriateness ..... 11
1.4 Research Questions ..... 11
1.5 Conceptual Framework ..... 12
1.6 Definition ..... 14
1.7 Scope, Limitations, and Delimitations ..... 14
1.8 Chapter Conclusion ..... 15
1.9 Chapter Summary ..... 15
2 LITERATURE REVIEW ..... 17
2.1 Major Themes in the Literature ..... 17
2.2 Minor themes: ..... 24
2.3 Historical Relationship of Black Women and the Criminal Justice System: ..... 26
2.4 Black Criminology ..... 28
2.5 Feminist Criminology ..... 29
2.6 Black Feminist Criminology ..... 30
2.7 Chapter Conclusion ..... 31
2.8 Chapter Summary ..... 32
3 RESEARCH METHODS ..... 34
3.1 Research Design ..... 34
3.2 Design Appropriateness ..... 35
3.3 Procedure ..... 35
3.4 Sampling & Population ..... 36
3.5 Collection & Measures ..... 36
3.6 Validity & Reliability ..... 38
3.7 Chapter Conclusion ..... 39

3.8 Chapter Summary ..... 40
4 RESULTS & ANALYSIS ..... 41
4.1 Data Collection ..... 41
4.2 Data Analysis ..... 43
4.3 Chapter Summary ..... 47
4.4 Chapter Conclusion ..... 48
5 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION ..... 49
6 BIBLIOGRAPHY ..... 54
7 Appendix A ..... 58

LIST OF TABLES

**Table 1** *Total Sample and Convicted Offenses* 35

**Table 2** *Categories of Offenses* 36

**Table 3** *Descriptive Analysis of Sample (50 Incarcerated White Women/50 Incarcerated Black Women)* 40,50

**Table 4** *Sample of Incarcerated Women and Priors* 40

**Table 5** *Percentage of White Race of County as Predictor for Length of Sentence* 41

**Table 6** *White Race Educational Attainment as Predictor for Length of Sentence* 41

**Table 7** *White Race Median Income as Predictor for Length of Sentence* 42

**Table 8** *Percentage of White Race of County, White Race Educational Attainment and White Race Median Income as Predictors for Length of Sentence* 42

**Table 9** *Controlled for Offense: County Median Income, Racial Demographics, and Educational Attainment as Predictors for Length of Sentence* 43

**Table 10** *Controlled for Offense, Priors, and Race: County Median Income, Racial Demographics and Educational Attainment as Predictors for Length of Sentence* 44

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## Overview

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, a proliferation of punitive crime control legislation, led the U.S. to have the highest rate of female incarceration in the entire world (Skiffer 2009, 5). According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics between 1986 and 1991, the total state prison population grew by 58%. The number of men increased by 53%, while the number of women increased by 75%. By 1998, the majority of the estimated 950,000 women were under the care, custody, or control of U.S. correctional agencies for drug-related cases (Skiffer 2009, 8). Throughout the United States, Black Americans are overrepresented in the prison population. This has a unique impact on black women (Christianson 1981, 365). While black women account for 13 percent of the U.S. female population, they are fifty percent of the female prison population. Black women are 7 times more likely than white women to be incarcerated; and in 15 states African American women are incarcerated at rates 10 to 35 times greater than white women (Sokoloff 2005, 129).

Incarceration has become one of the social institutions shaping black women's experience. Mass incarceration and its lasting effects has become part of the socialization process. Incarceration ceases to be the outcome of a few criminal individuals and becomes a shaping institution for whole sectors of the population (Garland 2001, 2). The impact of mass incarceration shows a unique relationship with black women as they face unique challenges as both incarcerated women and women connected to imprisoned men and women (Christian and Thomas 2009, 69).

This study argues that unequal sentencing as a function of mass incarceration is due to the interlocking effects of race, gender, and class. The sentence inequality of black women is the

result of the cumulative effects of being members of a disadvantaged race, class and gender. This thesis will analyze this interaction by comparing the sentences of white and black imprisoned women in the state of Georgia. Using the intersectionality theoretical framework is essential to capture black women's experiences as both offenders and women who live through the collateral consequences of mass incarceration (Christian and Thomas 2009, 72). Intersectionality refers to the theoretical argument describing the multiplicative relationships among various, simultaneous oppressions unique to black women (King 1988, 47). Using this interactive model, the relative significance of race, sex or class in determining the conditions of black women's lives is neither fixed nor absolute but, rather, is dependent on the socio-historical context and the social phenomenon under consideration (King 1988, 49). This thesis will address whether black and white women differ in the severity of sentence and address the theoretical justification for such. This study will accomplish this by comparing the length of sentences for black and white women currently incarcerated in the state of Georgia.

## 1.1 Background of the Study

In the last twenty years, the increasing presence of women in correctional systems has sparked an interest in feminist research grounded in the area of women's pathways to incarceration (DeHart 2008, 2). The impact of various relationships within women's lives and economic circumstances both have been attributed to women's criminality and incarceration. However, according to Johnson, the discussions of black female criminality are often based on one key assumption by criminal justice scholars, that black women's' femaleness lessens the effects of the criminogenic factors associated with their race and that their blackness operates to counteract the otherwise low rate of offending associated with her sex. Black women are perceived to be less

criminal than the black male but more criminal, especially more violently criminal, than the white female (Johnson 1996, 84). This misinterpretation effectively erases any discussion of the impact of race, class and gender on black women's criminality within the criminal justice discourse. Furthermore, it ceases to address the impact of unequally applied policies while faulting black women for being black. This study will attempt to fill this gap by using intersectionality empirically to test the influence of race, class and gender among incarcerated black women. The available literature offers three main arguments in understanding the racial and gender disparities within incarceration: past victimization and sexual abuse which often leads women into a life of crime, the existence of racism, and incarceration as a tool of repression and social control.

First, several scholars argue that a history of sexual abuse and past victimization amongst women often leads them onto the pathways to incarceration (Geiger 2006, 2; McDaniels-Wilson and Belknap 2008, 2; Britton 2001, 6; DeHart 2008, 1). Female offenders as opposed to being passive victims propelled into a life of crime are resisting against intolerable socioeconomic deprivation and extreme forms of abuse (Geiger 2006, 2). Female offenders' engagement in crime, drugs, and prostitution often represent the last expression of resistance against severe socioeconomic deprivation, physical and sexual abuse (Geiger 2006, 11). Two scholars argue that past victimization, particularly various sexual abuses, is the leading contributor to women's incarceration (Mc Daniels-Wilson and Belknap 2008, 2). In a study of 391 women, seventy percent of the women reported one violation consistent with what qualifies as rape in most states in the U.S. today. Half of the women reported child sexual abuse victimization (Mc Daniels-Wilson and Belknap 2008, 2). Unfortunately, these studies do not include any substantive analysis of women's victimization with the role of race and the impact of race, class and gender in shaping

the lives of imprisoned black women. However, other research argues that the rise in incarceration is due to the role of race as opposed to the effects of gender in the lives of women.

The second argument offered in the literature to explain the disparities between the incarceration rates for white women and black women is the existence of racism during the trial, jury and sentencing (Rosenbaum 1988, 125, Sidanius 1988, 8; Steffensmeier, Ulmer, Kramer 1998, 26). Black women received more severe sentences as adults than white, Asian, or Latino women. Race remains the best predictor of arrest, incarceration and release when controlling for all other variables (Rosenbaum 1988, 125). The real effects of race on sentence severity are underestimated because of institutionalized and perhaps unintentional mechanisms. Not only are blacks likely to receive more severe sentences, but they are also more likely than whites to serve longer portions of their time (Sidanius 1988, 8). In a 1998 qualitative study, a 50% correlation between racism and sentence severity emerged. The study implies that racism is a key determinate in the sentencing process and young black males get the most severe sentences and further implies that a similar outcome is true for women (Steffensmeier, Ulmer, Kramer 1998, 26).

Also, racial disparities are often produced and maintained by colorblind policies and practices such as mandatory sentencing and sentencing enhancements. This occurs when sentencing practices increase punishments for traits or behaviors that black people are more likely to engage in, such as carrying a firearm (Schlesinger 2008, 1). Furthermore, the majority of sentence enhancements increase offenders' sentences if they have prior convictions, carry a weapon at the time of the offense, or commit the offense while in or near certain public spaces. Blacks are more likely to possess a record of prior convictions and whereas approximately 1 in 35 black offenders admitted to prison are serving a sentence for a weapons offense, only 1 in 50 white offenders are admitted for a weapons conviction (Schlesinger 2008, 4). Research on imprisoned

black women reveals a similar argument. Black women are disproportionately affected by mandatory minimums (Sudbury 2002, 59). Since the only way a lesser sentence can be given is in cases where the defendant provides 'substantial assistance' in the prosecution of another person, women, who tend to be in subordinate positions within drug syndicates and thus have little access to information are usually unable to make such an agreement i.e. plea bargaining. Therefore, black women with any involvement with men who are found guilty of a drug-related crime often receive similar sentences (Sudbury 2002, 64). Research that extends the focus of understanding the mass incarceration of black women is necessary due to the increase of black women's incarceration. Most of the scholarship that argues for the presence of racism does so without incorporation of class and gender. However, some research has taken the theme of racism a step further and emphasizes the role of repression and social control in mass incarceration.

The final relevant argument that is often used to explain incarceration disparities is the argument that repression and social control are the main culprits responsible for mass incarceration. Generalized racism within society is converted by law in politics and standards of social control (Haywood 1973, 156). For example, during social change movements of the 1960s and 1970s, numerous politically active African Americans became political prisoners as victims of political repression, such as leaders of the Black Panther Party for Self Defense, Rev. Martin Luther King Jr., Rosa Parks and others (Haywood 1973, 162). Furthermore, the number of prisoners in America has more than tripled over the last two decades from 500,000 to 1.8 million (Irwin, Schiraldi, and Ziedenberg 2000, 135). With African Americans consisting of 48% of that population, this post 1980 acceleration suggests the possibility that crime control and especially the drug war have had the effect of repressing dissent among the poor and making invisible disenfranchised populations (Sidanius 1998, 273; Oliver 2008, 1).

One particular scholar, David Merolla, argues that direct and ideological aspects of social control are contributors to black women's incarceration (Merolla 2008, 255). As federal and state decision makers funnel more money into social control mechanisms, such as prisons, the state becomes more directly repressive in attempting to maintain social order and neutralize any threats (Merolla 2008, 260). Merolla's argument suggests the state use of prisons as a form of social control represses black women the most. One aspect of the legislative war on drugs that is especially harmful to black women is conspiracy laws; often used to prosecute women who simply know or are romantically involved with a drug dealer (Merolla 2008, 261).

The literature also reveals an introduction of new theories and sub-fields within disciplines that place Black Feminism at the center of analysis. Several scholars such as Hillary Potter and Katheryn Russell, argue that a sub-field of Criminology can describe the unique circumstances of imprisoned black women.

Feminist Criminologist Hillary Potter introduces a Black Feminist Criminology theory that can advance future theorizing, research, and policy making regarding imprisoned battered black women (Potter 2008, 107). As a foundation for her research, Potter utilizes research from feminist criminology that argues the existence of a clear correlation and/or pathway between women's victimization and any consequent criminal behavior (Potter 2008, 107). Often, women who are victims of sexual abuse become involved in criminal behaviors. She then argues that much of the research and policies regard battered women as victims with similar life experiences without addressing the impact of class, race, and gender (Potter 2008, 109). Potter neglects to address what crimes black women are incarcerated for, such as drug-related offenses, and instead focuses exclusively on battered black women. A revised Black Feminist Criminological approach that bases its analysis on black women's criminality can be most beneficial in future re-

search on this imprisoned population. A basis for this approach can be found in the works of black criminology as described by Katheryn Russell.

Katheryn Russell presents a germane piece of literature on black criminology and argues that its development is necessary to fill a gap, in the same way feminist criminology filled a void. She argues that the discipline of criminology has failed to provide a well-developed, vibrant, and cohesive subfield that attempts to explain crimes committed by blacks. The discipline has not systematically cultivated or recognized a subfield that addresses why the race variable is such a significant predictor of incarceration (Russell 1992, 667). Katheryn Russell presents a compelling and necessary argument to the criminology scholar community that a need exists for black criminology and research particularly in regards to black women and mass incarceration.

Understanding mass incarceration and its impact on communities is vital for current and future research. Black women have long been the victims of "disappearing acts", legal sanctions in which black women are systematically imprisoned via the penal system, slavery and Jim Crow (Bowers 1997, 342). Currently, the prison serves as the place where the state places people deemed a threat to society. At the core of any state's power lies the ability to sentence certain individuals to prison. Only the state possesses the ability to use force legitimately on individuals to deprive them of their ability to live in the normal relationship with society. The power to assign an individual to his, or in this case her, place in or out of society is the most significant power wielded by an authority (Bowers 1997, 343).

Mass incarceration was not a policy proposed, researched, debated and democratically agreed upon. Mass incarceration emerged as the outcome of a converging series of policies and decisions. Building upon one another, several developments produced the high level of prisoners into custody: determinate sentencing, the war against drugs, mandatory sentencing, the emer-

gence of private corrections, truth in sentencing, political events and calculations that made everyone tough on crime (Garland, 2001, 2). Examples of how tough on crime policies become federal development are programs such as the Violent Offender Incarceration / Truth In Sentencing (VOITIS). The VOITIS program was introduced to award states for passing tough sentencing laws and partially offset the state costs building and operating additional prison space (www.dcor.state.ga.us/Research/Standing/Truth_in_sentencing.pdf). Developing mass incarceration policies is a consequence of relying on criminal justice theoretical solutions to manage long-term social problems such as deterioration of inner cities, homelessness, mental illness, substance abuse and unemployment (Ruddell, 2004, 16). Avery Gordon argues that homelessness, unemployment, drug addiction, illiteracy and dependency on welfare are only a few of the problems that disappear from public view when the human beings contending with them are relegated to cages. Prisons are therefore used to perform feats of magic by making human beings disappear as opposed to doing anything to solve or prevent the problems. Making thousands of people from poor and racially marginalized communities disappear from the public eye is a lucrative business (Gordon 1999, 147).

This is an era of mass incarceration with particular impact on the black community. For black women, already victimized by their dual status of being black and a woman (Young 1986, 322), mass incarceration is an ever present reality in their lives. Angela Davis asserted in a 1999 interview that the fastest growing group of prisoners is black women (Gorden 1999, 146). The American Correctional Association's (ACA) national survey of imprisoned women in the United States found the majority of imprisoned women to be young, of color, and single mothers, however, many studies have virtually ignored the experiences of imprisoned African American

women (Johnson 1995, 210). Research that empirically tests the effects and/or influences of race, class and gender on mass incarceration is missing within the literature that this study fills.

Although it is true that a rich stream of literature now exists that examines the factors contributing to the mass incarceration of African Americans and women, few empirically address the impact of intersectionality and black women's criminal convictions. Given the increase of number of black women in prison, more research rooted in an intersectional quantitative approach will prove most beneficial to the scholar community in addressing this growth.

## 1.2 Problem Statement and Purpose

Few scholars center analysis on mass incarceration and black women. Julia Sudbury, David Merolla and DeHart are a few that base their research on the experiences of Black women and mass incarceration. However, other current research does not consider the intersection of race, class, and gender and how it situates black women in a distinctive position that often yields to their mass incarceration (see Johnson 1985; Sidanius 1988; Steffensmeriers, Ulmer and Kramer 1998; Bushway and Piehl 2001; Spohn, Gruhl, and Welch 1981-1982; Spohn 1990; McDaniels-Wilson and Belknap 2008; Wacquant 2000; and Oliver 2008).

The purpose of this quantitative study is to empirically test intersectionality. It will attempt to address the unique circumstances of imprisoned black women by comparing and analyzing the length of sentences for black and white incarcerated women in Georgia. This study will uncover the statistical significance of intersectionality on length of sentence by using the profiles of 600 incarcerated black and white women in the state of Georgia as provided by the Georgia Department of Corrections Offender Search (http://www.dcor.state.ga.us).

## 1.3 Significance and Nature of the Study

This study will empirically test black feminist theory of intersectionality which has only received qualitative application in previous studies. It will fill a gap in the literature by quantitatively testing this theory. This is also significant in its emphasis on mass incarceration in the state of Georgia. This type of research is a rarity in its focus on Georgia.

Current and future scholars will benefit from a quantitative testing of intersectionality as well as a unique analysis combining theories from criminal justice and black studies. It will provide an analysis to the literature on a historically ignored population. The activist community will have an understanding of those multiple factors, which can motivate them to push for reforms.

This study argues that part of the purpose of Black Studies is to produce scholar activists who are equipped with the knowledge to tackle the issues of the black community by studying and engaging issues within the community. The expectation for students of the discipline is be knowledgeable of the present circumstances of people of African descent and theoretically address those issues while engaging the community to resolve those problems. The non-experimental quantitative study attempts to explore a section of the population that receives little attention within the black community in order to address incarceration disparities among black women.

### 1.3.1 Considered and Rejected Methodologies and Designs

Several qualitative methods were considered and rejected to see which would best fit the study. Ethnography is an approach that emphasizes the study of a phenomenon in the context of its culture. The most common ethnographic approach is field research in which the researcher

goes in the field to observe the phenomenon in its natural state (Trochim and Donnelly 2008, 180). This approach was rejected for this study due to time and population restrictions. Phenomenology is a second qualitative method that focuses on people's subjective experiences and interpretations of the world (Trochim and Donnelly 2008, 180). A third approach that was considered was grounded theory. The purpose of grounded theory is to develop a theory about a phenomenon of interest that is rooted in observations (Trochim and Donnelly 2008, 181). These approaches were rejected as well due to population restrictions. In order to assess incarceration disparities, a quantitative approach is best for this study.

### 1.3.2 Selected Design Appropriateness

The design of this study relies on analysis of data using regression models. Regression analysis determines the influence of variables on a dependent variable which in this study is the length of sentence. These tests will address the first and second research questions: Using intersectionality as the theoretical approach, do black and white women differ significantly with regard to the length of sentence/time given?

## 1.4 Research Questions

To examine the arguments of mass incarceration and disparities between incarcerated black and white women three research questions were formed:

Is the length of black women's sentences similar to white women?

What impact does intersectionality have on the length of sentence for black and white women?

What current theories and explanations exist to explain the mass incarceration of black women?

These questions were chosen to test the impact of intersectionality among incarcerated black and white women in Georgia and introduce a discussion of the results with current theories on mass incarceration.

## 1.5 Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework of this study combines Black Feminism and Criminology. Black Feminism posits an intersectionality of oppression faced by women of color: racism, sexism, and classism (not specifically in that order). Intersectionality is particularly relevant to the growing body of research about mass incarceration because relations with prison, either as an inmate or through connections to incarcerated individuals, creates another disadvantaged status that interacts with the other subordinated statuses black women face (Christian and Thomas 2009, 70). This standpoint stresses the importance of the black women's experiences for generating new questions, issues and interpretations (Collins 2000, 43). Heline Nevile and Jennifer Hamer, developers of Revolutionary Black Feminism, expanded this point of view by positing that studies focusing on this tripartite of race, class and gender will uncover, redefine, contextualize, and validate the experiences of black women and in this instance, the experiences of incarcerated black women. The oppression and victimization of black women occurs on multiple interlocking levels of race, class and gender. Research focusing on these issues can manifest themselves in various related studies and disciplines such as a black feminist criminological theory (Neville and Hamer 2001, 458).

The next conceptual framework for this study is the minority threat model of formal social control theory introduced by Hubert Blalock in 1967 and developed furthered by Liska and Chamlin (Markert 2010, 307). The model suggests that the larger the minority group's size, the greater the threat to the majority group, who will respond to the perceived threat by instituting legal controls and other measures to protect their dominant status (Markert 2010, 307). The perceived internal racial or ethnic threat as well gendered produces larger incarceration rates among specific groups (Jacobs and Kleban 2003, 725).

Furthermore, the minority groups are subjected to more severe punishment than members of dominant social groups within the U.S. such as disproportionate policing and incarceration. The model also proposes that as the ethnic and cultural landscape of a given country begins to change, so does the nature of punishment. As the size of a racial/ethnic minority group increases, they also challenge existing social relationships. The minority threat approach suggests that these challenges to the status quo are met with an increasing use of formal social control, i.e. incarceration (Ruddell 2004, 47). This model offers three hypotheses to explain the relationship between growing minority threat and the majority.

The first hypothesis of the minority threat model is the power threat. Power threat is the argument that as the percentage of blacks in the population grows progressively larger the state increasingly views blacks as a threat to the political ascendency of whites (Eitle, D'Alessio and Stolzenberg 2002, 559). Subsequent work by Donald Horowitz emphasizes that the increased population of blacks affords them the opportunity to mobilize their resources for collective action and political mobilization which in essence increases their threat (Eitle, D'Alessio and Stolzenberg 2002, 559). The second hypothesis of the minority threat model centers on the economic threat posed by blacks. This hypothesis asserts that competition between whites and

blacks for jobs and other finite economic resources results in an increase in the amount of social control imposed on blacks (Eitle, D'Alessio and Stolzenberg 2002, 559). The final hypothesis of the minority threat model is rooted in the threat of black-on-white crime. This hypothesis asserts that social control measures directed against blacks intensify as the black population grows progressively larger and black-on-white crime increases (Eitle, D'Alessio and Stolzenberg 2002, 560). The disproportionate incarceration as a form of social control on black women warrants more scholarly attention and quantitative analysis.

This study will use black feminism and the minority threat model of social control as the conceptual basis. Black women as a minority threat face unique circumstances due to the intersection of race, class and gender that renders them susceptible to mass incarceration.

## 1.6 Definition

The main term that is frequently used in this study is mass incarceration as developed by David Garland.

David Garland defines mass incarceration as referring to the penal system over the past two decades and the systematic incarceration of whole groups of the population. It emerged as the over determined outcome of a converging series of policies and decisions (Garland 2001, 6). Therefore, mass incarceration is the culmination of laws and policies as opposed to a conspiracy contrived by a group of policy makers.

## 1.7 Scope, Limitations, and Delimitations

The subject of this study is incarcerated black and white women in Georgia state prisons. This allows the study to be manageable and creates a sizeable sample for generalization. This

study does not include personal interviews and is limited to public information of the incarcerated women which includes year of birth, race, gender, current and past conviction, county of conviction, sentencing, and place of judicial supervision.

## 1.8 Chapter Conclusion

Black women account for 13 percent of the U.S. population but are fifty percent of the female prison population (Sokoloff 2005, 129). This study argues that unequal sentencing as a function of mass incarceration is due to the interlocking effects of race, gender, and class. Past victimization and sexual abuse which often leads women into a life of crime, the existence of racism, and incarceration as a tool of repression and social control are the main themes explaining racial and gender incarceration inequalities found in the literature.

This study fills a gap by combining theories from Black Feminism and Criminology. Intersectionality will be quantitatively tested and its impact on length of sentence for black and white incarcerated women. This study will accomplish this by comparing conviction records of black women to white women currently incarcerated in the state of Georgia and running regression tests.

## 1.9 Chapter Summary

Chapter 1 presented the purpose of the study. It included an introduction of the conceptual framework for the study and chosen research design. Intersectionality, as a theoretical standpoint, stresses the importance of the black women's experience in relation to the tripartite of race, class and gender (Nevile and Hamer 2001, 458). This study argues that research on mass incarceration of black women necessitates a conceptual framework of Black Feminism theory

and Criminology. Chapter 2 reviews the available literature on mass incarceration with three major themes and three minor themes.

# 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews the current literature on mass incarceration. The literature provides a discussion of three main themes and several minor themes that contribute to the body of knowledge on mass incarceration. This review also includes a historical analysis of the oppression of black women that has resulted in their overrepresentation in prisons. The literature review also discusses Feminist Criminology, Black Criminology, and Black Feminist Criminology.

The body of literature on mass incarceration presents three (3) major themes to explain racial and gender disparities: the presence of racism in the penal system, past victimization and sexual abuse, and repression and social control. Minor themes were also found in the literature that contributed to mass incarceration and are gender and family responsibilities, societal problems, public opinion, and the rise of non-violent criminal convictions among women of color.

## 2.1 Major Themes in the Literature

Major theme 1: Presence of racism in the Prison Industrial Complex and penal system

Racial privilege and related oppression are deeply rooted in both history and law, thus making racism a normal and ingrained feature of our political landscape (Brewer and Heitzeg, 2008, 3). This can be seen in the prison industrial complex that is rooted in a racist and classist agenda where women of color are disproportional imprisoned. Julia Sudbury defines the Prison Industrial Complex (PIC) as the combination of three components. The first of the three is the media's role in creating a rise in the fear of crime in the US population. Sudbury argues that the consolidation of large media corporations relies on violent and crime-oriented content to increase ratings and which then creates a dramatic rise in the fear of crime in the US population at large (Sudbury, 2002, 61). The second component involves the increasing use of polls by politicians

to align their platform with the popular views on policy making, leading to "tough on crime" rhetoric. This rhetoric then turns into policies such as mandatory minimums in which for certain offenses a person convicted of that crime serves at least a minimum number of years, truth-in-sentencing refers to policies and legislation aim at abolishing or limiting parole so that convicted offenders serve the period of time they have been sentenced, and the three strikes clause is when an offender receives mandatory and extended period of incarceration for committing a serious criminal offense on three or more separate occasions. Finally, the creation of privatized prisons has allowed the government to expand their prison estate without having to spend the initial capital cost of prison construction. States reallocate funds from welfare, health or education into contracts with privately run-for-profit prisons (Sudbury, 2002, 61).

These three components converge to make what is the Prison Industrial Complex (PIC). The PIC is an intricate web of relations between state penal institutions, politicians and profit-driven prison corporations as well as the War on Drugs (Sudbury 2002, 70). Increasingly, black women and women of color are the raw material that fuels the prison industrial complex: as scapegoats of tough-on-crime rhetoric, targets of drug-busting operations that generate millions of dollars in funding for police, customs and military budgets (Sudbury 2002,72). The relationship between state penal institutions, politicians, and profits is evident with federal programs such as the truth-in-sentencing program. The state of Georgia has received over $80,000,000 from the federal government for its participation in the Violent Offender Incarceration/Truth-In-Sentencing Program. The program rewards states for passing tough sentencing laws. Only eight states have received more money under this program than the state of Georgia (www.dcor.state.ga.us/Research/Standing/Truth_in_sentencing.pdf). The Prison Industrial

Complex's operation has a particular impact on black women as they are, on average, incarcerated more often and serve longer sentences than their white counterparts.

Another manifestation of racial oppression is evident during the sentencing at trials and jury selection. During the trial, with the existence of peremptory challenges and other practices, racism continues to surface. Under *Swain v. Alabama*[1], a prosecutor may deliberately use his peremptory challenges to exclude all blacks from a jury trying a black defendant (Johnson 1985, 48). The Supreme Court has also drastically cut back on the due process right to question potential jurors about their racial prejudice. The Court remains unsympathetic to arguments that racial prejudice has, in fact, infected jury deliberations, most notably when it has ignored claims of racially discriminatory applications of the death penalty (Johnson 1985, 48).

Racism also proves to be evident in determining the severity and outcome of sentence given to defendants. In a study determining whether race correlates with the over incarceration of blacks or whether race causes these disparities Sidanius concluded that the real effects of racism on sentence severity is underestimated (Sidanius 1988, 279). The severity of criminal charges is at the discretion of prosecutors and police authorities. Empirical evidence indicates that the more discretion officials have, the greater the level of discrimination is likely to be among black offenders (Sidanius 1988, 279). Not only are young blacks likely to receive more severe sentencing, but they are also more likely than whites to serve longer portions of their time once in prison (Steffensmeier, Ulmer, and Kramer 1998, 796). In a Maryland study, sentencing discretion by the judge on average results in African Americans having 20% longer sentences than whites. The authors, Bushway and Piehl, took into account age, gender, and recommended sentence length from federal sentencing guidelines (Bushway and Piehl 2001, 733). Further-

[1] *Swain v Alabama*, 380 U.S. 202 (1965).

more, similar results are present involving women. Black women received more severe sentences as adults than did white, Asian, or Latino women. Race is the best predictor of arrest, incarceration and release when controlling all other variables (Rosenbaum 1988, 125).

Three studies find significant differences in the conviction rates of black and white defendants. A 1962 Missouri study by Gerard and Terry examined a random selection of all jury convictions and concluded that juries convicted ten of thirteen black defendants but only two of six white defendants (Johnson 1985, 12). A similar study sample of all felony cases docketed and disposed of between July 1968 and June 1974 in a large northeastern metropolitan area also found a statistically greater overall conviction rate for black defendants; 72% of all white defendants were found guilty while 75.9% of black defendants were found guilty (Uhlman 1979, 13). Finally, a 1979 study of all persons indicted for first-degree murder in twenty-one Florida counties between 1972 and 1978 revealed that black defendants were significantly more likely to be found guilty than were white defendants (Foley 1987,464).

In contrast, a few scholars posit that race does not have a direct effect on sentence severity. Using a sample of 50,000 felony cases between 1968 and 1979 in a northeastern city, scholars Spohn, Gruhl and Welch concluded that blacks are more likely than whites to be incarcerated, while sentence severity is not affected by race. Disparities were due primarily to the seriousness of offense and prior criminal record. The city remained anonymous due to the data requested by the scholars for the study (Spohn, Gruhl, and Welch 1981-1982, 85). In addition, whether the judge is white or black proves to have no effect on sentencing. The race of the judge has little predictive power. Black and white judges both sentence black offenders more severely than white offenders (Spohn 1990, 1197). Although Spohn, Gruhl and Welch argue that race does not have a direct effect on sentence severity, its correlation and presence is unarguably evi-

dent. African Americans continue to receive more severe sentences (Steffensmeier, Ulmer, and Kramer 1998, 796; Bushway and Piehl 2001, 733).

Major theme 2: Past victimization and sexual abuse

The rise of incarceration among women stems from a history of victimization and sexual abuse that women experience. Some scholars theorize that resistance against physical and sexual abuse rather than passivity is responsible for women's involvement in crime. Geiger argues that female offenders, as opposed to being passive victims propelled into a life of crime, are resisting against intolerable socioeconomic deprivation and extreme forms of abuse (Geiger 2006, 2). Geiger furthers that female offenders' engagement in crime, drugs, and prostitution often represent the last expression of resistance against severe socioeconomic deprivation, physical and sexual abuse (Geiger 2006, 11). This conclusion is supported by early feminist criminologist who posed the problematic emancipation theory.

The emancipation theory argues that women's rate of participation in criminal activity can be explained by their confinement to domestic roles and by discrimination that limits their aspirations and opportunities. The theory is used to argue that the increasing participation in violent crime is inevitable as women became more like men, as a result of their social and political emancipation and that black women's higher rates of participation in crime can be explained by their more liberated status (Britton 2000, 61). This theory has several issues. One, it entirely ignores the existence of racism and sexism and instead uses liberation rhetoric to explain the rise of black women's incarceration. The theory does not explain measures of liberation and if black women have a more liberated status due to their race. Second, relegating women's survival strategies to their aspirations to be more like men silences the reality of their lived experiences as

uniquely oppressed. Other studies suggest that victimization provides a pathway to crime as opposed to resistance.

In a study of 391 women, McDaniels-Wilson and Belknap argue the existence of extensive sexual victimization in the lives of incarcerated women is evident. Seventy percent of the women reported one violation consistent with what qualifies as rape in most states in the U.S. today. Half of the women reported child sexual abuse victimization. Also, the most prevalent victim-offender relationships were male strangers, male lovers or boyfriends, male dates, husbands, uncles, brothers, male cousins and stepfathers (McDaniels-Wilson and Belknap 2008,2). Most of the women suffered multiple traumas and were victimized in multiple ways (e.g., child abuse and neglect, adult relationship violence, sexual violence). The cumulative impact of victimization over the life span of women created ripple effects in multiple arenas of the women's lives, causing overall disruption (McDaniels-Wilson and Belknap 2008,4). The pathway from abusive and/or sexual victim to a convicted felon can follow multiple routes. One instance such as partner abuses can lead to homicide of the abuser or coercion into crimes by her partner (DeHart 2008, 15).

Major Theme 3: Repression and social control

A final theme in the literature is the penal system usage as a mechanism to repress and control certain populations. Several peculiar institutions have been in place to define, confine, and control African Americans in the history of the United States. It began with chattel slavery from the colonial era to the Civil War, the Jim Crow system in the agrarian South from Reconstruction to the Civil Rights Revolution, and the ghetto in the northern industrial metropolis. Beginning in the 1970s, the prison system was employed to help contain a population viewed as

deviant and dangerous (Wacquant 2000, 377). The prison is an extension of confining institutions which have historically specialized in the forced confinement of black people and entrusted with enclosing a stigmatized category so as to neutralize the material and/or symbolic threat those people pose for the surrounding society (Wacquant 2000, 378). One manifestation of this repression and social control is the penal system's relationship with politics.

The law has been the vehicle by which the generalized racism in society is made particular and converted in politics and political standards of social control (Burns 1973, 156). Controlling the bodies of those who symbolizes dissent is arguably a function of social control. The acceleration of the mass incarceration of African Americans in the United States after 1980 suggests the possibility that crime control and especially the War on Drugs have had the consequence of repressing dissent among the poor and making disenfranchised populations invisible (Oliver 2008, 1). The coordination of state and federal programs such as welfare and criminal justice systems furthers this agenda. McCorkel infers that the correlation of the increased number of imprisoned women and a decrease in welfare programs are no coincidence. The sharp restrictions in welfare provisions and dramatic increases in the number of women sentenced to prison do not constitute a war on drugs, crime, and poverty so much as a war on women (McCorkel 2004, 386).

The War on Drugs in which women are more likely to be arrested represents a direct aspect of social control (Merolla 2008, 255). Use of conspiracy laws are directly used to prosecute women who simply know or are romantically involved with drug dealers (Merolla 2008, 261). Another legislative aspect of the War on Drugs that increases women's vulnerability to arrest is the increasing trend to prosecute women that use drugs while pregnant. New laws have been passed on the heels of the drug war such as a mandate in some cases that women suspected of

drug use are tested when giving birth. These laws have obvious racial implications because poor, minority women are far more likely to be suspected of and tested for drug use under these laws (Merolla 2008, 262).

## 2.2 Minor themes:

A minor theme found in the literature is the peculiar space of women and the burden of family responsibilities and lack of economic opportunities due to gender and racial oppression. The responsibilities of child care, combined with the burdens of economic marginality and domestic violence, lead some women to choose economic crimes or drug dealing as an alternative to hunger and homelessness (Ferraro and Moe 2003, 10). It is also argued that a lack of educational and/or occupational opportunities (often caused by economic inequality and/or discrimination) may lead to crime, which in turn increases the level of incarceration (Arvanites and Asher 1995, 34). The Federal Sentencing Guidelines, which eliminated gender and family responsibility as factors for consideration at the time of sentencing, were also adopted. The policy of eliminating gender and family responsibility, combined with heightened penalties for drug related violations, has caused the level of women's incarceration to spiral upward (Jacobs 2004, 796).

Conflicting research concludes that women with children often receive lesser sentences than men; however when men and women appear in court in similar circumstances and charged with similar crimes, they receive similar treatment. Gender alone has no significant impact on the likelihood of incarceration (Koons-Witt 2002, 297 and Steffensmeier, Kramer, and Streifel 1993, 411). These studies however does not take into account that since gender and family responsibility is not considered during sentencing, the apparent equal convictions between men and women would be apparent.

Another minor theme found in the literature focuses on the increase of incarceration of black women as a reflection of their social exclusion from U.S. society. Black women's criminal involvement arises from more complex social problems than normal such as fractured familial relations and substance abuse (Henriques and Manatu-Rupert 2001, 6). A study of 77,236 federal offenders sentenced under the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 supports this theme. It concluded a culmination of social factors responsible for the disproportionate incarceration rates among African Americans. It revealed first, after controlling for extensive criminological, demographic and socioeconomic variables, that black offenders with low levels of education and income receive longer sentences. Second, disparities are primarily generated by departures from the guidelines, rather than differentiating sentences within the guidelines. Third, although black-white disparities occur across many offenses, the largest differences are for drug trafficking (Mustard 2001, 285). Therefore, the unique social circumstances of black women often results in their mass incarceration.

Other theorists posit that the increase in incarceration is the result of independent but interactive factors stemming from political and public pressures. As crime control has become a privileged function of government, political pressures for growth responding from reforms since the 1960s allows the penal system to maintain large populations of offenders. The intensification of the War on Drugs in the early 1980s coincided with the introduction of crack cocaine and the ensuing creation of an illegal mass market which further allows for the discover and production of large numbers of violations inevitable (Caplow and Simon 1999, 110-111). Public pressures, referred to as the political culture, pushes for an enduring set of publicly shared and socially communicated beliefs, values, and traditions about politics. This constitutes a general framework of plans, recipes, rules, and institutions for the conduct of political life, especially who gets

what, when, and how (Bowers 1997, 344). Therefore, whether a state takes a traditional approach or a moralistic approach to incarceration correlates with who is deemed to be a criminal, what crimes are given maximum sentencing, and who will face incarceration.

A final minor theme found in the literature is the rise of non-violent convictions impact on minority women. The profile of the incarcerated women is a women who is disproportionally poor and a woman of color who has experienced years of minority stress, drug addiction, violence, abuse, and convicted of a non-violent crime (Eliason, Taylor, and Williams 2004,176; Sokoloff 2005,129). Non-violent offenders account for most of the growth in America's prisons since 1978. The year 1998 was the first in which America's prisons and jails incarcerated more than one million nonviolent offenders. Between the years of 1978 to 1996, the number of violent offenders entering the nation's prisons doubled (from 43,733 to 98,672), the number of nonviolent offenders tripled (from 83,721 to 261,796), and the number of drug offenders increased seven-fold (from 14,241 to 114,071 inmates) (Irwin, Schiraldi, and Ziedenberg 2000, 136). As violent crime convictions substantially drop, the incarceration of women skyrockets (Sokoloff 2005, 128). With changes in the drug laws and the social construction of the drug user as a dangerous criminal, women are more vulnerable to arrest now than they were in the past (Sudbury 2002, 64). The literature also reveals a unique relationship between black women and the criminal justice system. The unequal punishment and attention by the criminal justice system to black women has roots in the nineteenth-century.

### 2.3 Historical Relationship of Black Women and the Criminal Justice System:

To be a black woman in the nineteenth-century America was to live in the double jeopardy of belonging to the "inferior" sex of an "inferior" race (Johnson 1995-96, 14). As chattel

slavery ended, prison population grew, specifically for black women. Although some of the more brutal punishments of the colonial period declined in the nineteenth century, every state still had a larger number of offenses for enslaved Africans than for whites (Johnson 1995-96, 9).

The dramatic increase of black women prison populations in southern states resulted in fewer female executions immediately following the Civil War. Before emancipation, southern states rarely incarcerated slaves because planters' production needs made few slaves eligible for public punishment. Furthermore, jailing of enslaved Africans was not profitable for the slave owners (Collins 2000, 6). After 1865 however, newly freed black women swelled the ranks of southern prison populations, with black females comprising between 40 and 70% of females committed to southern penitentiaries. Southern lawmakers created laws that would surely be broken by the multitude of homeless, unemployed former enslaved Africans (Collins 2000, 7). Black female incarceration rates increased because many black women had significant contact with whites as domestic servants and housemaids, thus rendering them especially prone to being accused of committing a crime, mostly property crimes (Baker 2008, 74). Crime was thus used as a form of resistance for black women. Some engaged in direct acts such as murder of masters, arson, and the refusal to be whipped. Other enslaved women's crimes included cruelty to animals, inducing abortions and particularly the use of poison (Johnson 1995-96, 22).

This rise of black women incarceration was not limited to southern states below the Mason Dixon line. During the Civil War and post-Civil War, in Maryland black women outnumbered white women incarcerated in state prison. White women born outside the state of Maryland, or the country, were more likely to be incarcerated than native white women. The two groups that did not fit the acceptable standard of womanhood of the time, foreign born and black, were more likely to be incarcerated than native, white women. Furthermore, state legislation

employed alternate means to control black women, and as a result, black women inmates often received longer sentences and served more time than their white counterparts (Young 2001, 116-117). As a function of the screening out of white female offenders, judges sometimes refused outright to send white women to penal institutions; however, little concern was paid to the incarceration of black women. For many white women, gender and race interacted to keep their numbers in state prisons low (Johnson 1995, 31). These studies reveal that racism, sexism, and repression where infused within the penal system. The historical incarceration of women of color was systematic and purposeful and may still be evident today. A theoretical understanding of the relationship between black women and state criminal legislation can begin with a discussion of Black Criminology.

## 2.4 Black Criminology

Black Criminology is a field within criminology that has historic roots in the scholarship of W.E.B. Dubois, Ida B. Wells-Barnett, E. Franklin Frazier and others. It is the understanding of crime, delinquency and punishment in the black community (Greene and Gabbidon 2000, 4). Presently it attempts to allow the discipline of criminology to go beyond the simple observation of a phenomenon - that African Americans are disproportionately involved in crime - and will encourage the testing of new paradigms to explain the race-crime relationship. This subfield can increase the policy options available to address the problem. A germane piece of literature of Black Criminology is a presented by Katheryn K. Russell.

Russell argues that Black Criminology has three main objectives: the application of existing theories to African Americans, the development of new theories to explain or refute the disproportionate rate, nature and scope of crimes committed by African Americans, and finally de-

veloping and testing new and unexplained variables (Russell 1992, 673). Ihekwoaba Onwudiwe and Michael Lynch support Russell's theory and argue that the theories within the field of Criminology are full of deficiencies, especially those that contain racial stereotypes or biological orientations linking criminality to genetic explanations. They also add the concept of fertilization of crime in which the institutional practices of the justice system in particular and society in general ingrains black criminality. Fertilization criminality holds that by the action and inactions of the government, opportunities for crime increases (Onwudiwe and Lynch 2000**,** 6).

## 2.5 Feminist Criminology

Feminist Criminology is an emerging theoretical field that recognizes the experiences of women as separate and equal to that of men. However, Feminist Criminology has only given the plight of black women a cursory glance. Statistics reveal the dangers that can come from viewing women as a unitary category. Differences in arrest rates between black and white women are often dramatic (Britton 2000, 60). The first studies to fall under feminist criminology are Freda Adler's *Sisters in Crime* and Rita James Simon's introduction of emancipation theory in *Women and Crime*.

Simon's emancipation theory puts forth that women's lower rates of participation in criminal activity is due to their confinement to domestic roles and to discrimination that limits their aspirations and opportunities (Britton 2000, 61). The emancipation theory further argues that the increased participation in violent crime is inevitable as women become more like men because of their social and political emancipation. Black woman's more liberated status explains their higher rates of participation in crime (Britton 2000, 61). In essence, white women's roles as newly emancipated housewives, women wanting to work outside the home and be more like

men is responsible for their rise in violent crimes. However, this theory has only received modest support and scholars attribute the increase to economic marginalization and changing views of women by social control authorities (Britton 2000, 61). The modest support is understandable given that foundation of the theory still places the role of the domestic and thus feminine white woman as central to their analysis. Furthermore, neglecting the existence of sexual and racial discrimination and instead arguing "liberation" rhetoric effectively silences the real lived experiences of imprisoned women. It silences the voice of women who engaged in criminal acts as a means of survival as oppose to a desire to be more like men. It also ignores the experiences of black women never being solely housewives.

Another theory in feminist criminology is the equity approach that posits that gender is an independent variable; men and women are essentially equal and therefore deserve equal treatment. However, even this approach holds experiences of men as the measurement to be equated too rather than independently (Britton 2000, 62). Furthermore, this approach does not consider the unique experiences of women and specifically women of color. Both emancipation and equity theories negate the experiences of black women within the penal system but are the foundation for feminist criminology. To reconcile this, the field is moving into a more "nuanced" position that moves away from putting women into a dichotomy category as victims or criminals (Britton 2000, 72). Black Feminist Criminology attempts to reconcile the gaps in Feminist Criminology and extend Black Criminology.

## 2.6 Black Feminist Criminology

Black Feminist Criminology (BFC) is grounded in Black Feminist theory and Critical Race Feminist theory (Potter 2006, 106). Critical Race Feminist theory developed in the 1990s

is rooted in Black Feminist theory, critical legal studies, and Critical Race theory (Potter 2006, 112). Critical Race Feminist theory is a valuable approach for studies of crime and African American women because it provides a specific application for women of color involved in the crime-processing system as victims, offender, or both (Potter 2006,112). BFC extends beyond traditional, feminist criminology to view African American women and other women of color from their multiple positions in society (Potter 2006, 107). This standpoint stresses that black women are frequently oppressed within both the black community and society at large, and research on black women should be conducted based on this perspective (Potter 2006, 111). Although this approach provides a valuable addition for future research, addressing the multiple relationships black women have with incarceration will only add to the strength of Black Feminist Criminology. For example, black women not only as victims of mass incarceration but also connected to incarcerated individuals. The mass incarceration of black men uniquely impacts black women who are involved with them. This can result in gender imbalance, relationship problems between the incarcerated male peers and other family members, family disruption and transformation, financial instability, psychological and social problems, and victimization (Christian and Thomas 2009, 75). Black Feminist Criminology not only addresses black women as victims of mass incarceration but can be extended to address the unique challenges black women face as collateral to mass incarceration.

## 2.7 Chapter Conclusion

The overall literature provides multiple explanations for mass incarceration as well as various theories. The presence of racism within the Prison Industrial Complex and penal system lead to mass incarceration specifically of black women (Sudbury 2002, 72). This racism can be

seen in the trial and jury as well as the severity and length of sentence imposed on black women (Johnson 1985, 5; Sidanius 1988, 279; Rosenbaum 1988, 125). The second major theme found in the literature are the past victimization and sexual abuse of women ultimately leads many women to commit crimes (McDaniels-Wilson and Belknap 2008, 2; DeHart 2008, 15). Female offenders are propelled to a life of crime as a means of resistance and survival against intolerable socioeconomic deprivation and abuse (Geiger 2006, 6). A final major theme is that the penal system use as a tool of repression and social control (Burns 1973, 156; Oliver 2008, 1; McCorkel 2004, 386, Merolla 2008, 255). The prison operates as an extension of institutions which specializes in the forced confinement of a stigmatized group of people that pose a symbolic treat (Wacquant 2000, 378). Several minor themes also appear to explain this phenomenon. Women were choosing crimes due to the responsibilities of childcare and the burden of economic marginality (Ferraro and Moe 2003, 10; Arvanites and Asher 1995, 34). Furthermore, the incarceration of women of color operates as an extension of their social exclusion within U.S. society (Henriques and Manatu-Rupert 2001, 6). Lastly, large imprisoned populations are the result of political and public pressure that rely on racial, gender, and class disparities to maintain the social order (Caplow and Simon 1999, 110-111).

## 2.8 Chapter Summary

Chapter 2 presented three main themes and several minor themes. It also included a historical analysis. Following was a discussion of theories within the field of criminology and black feminism. A black feminist criminology perspective was introduced and its potential addressed.

Chapter 3 describes the research design of the study and discusses the appropriateness of using a quantitative, statistical test. The study will use regression model to compare the incarcera-

tion of white and black women in the state Georgia. The procedure for the research design is described, the reliability and validity of the measures is addressed, and finally, the plans for the data analyses for the present research study are explained.

# 3 RESEARCH METHODS

Intersectionality refers to the theoretical argument describing the multiplicative relationships among various, simultaneous oppressions unique to black women (King 1988, 47). This study tested intersectionality by looking at the racial demographics of the convicting counties, educational attainment and median income and its influence on the length of sentence given to black and white women. The purpose of this quantitative study is to test the statistical significance of race, class and gender on length of sentence for incarcerated black and white women. It also attempts to understand how length of sentence is influenced by the intersection of race, class, and gender. The study will do this by analyzing and performing regression test on 100 incarcerated black and white women in the state of Georgia as provided by the Georgia Department of Corrections Offender Search website.

## 3.1 Research Design

This study utilized a quantitative method approach using regression models to measure the impact of race, class and gender on length of sentence given to black and white women imprisoned in Georgia. Measuring the influence of state racial, class, and gender composition on imprisonment and length of sentences is useful because it allows comparisons across jurisdictions. Focusing on state level analysis brings attention to the fact that state imprisonment rates are a function of decisions made by county law officials (Percival 2010, 1067).

The purpose of a regression model is to attempt to predict a normally distributed dependent variable from one or several independent variables. The regression model was used to test whether class as indicated by educational attainment and median income and the racial demographics of convicting counties impacts the length of sentence for black and white women. This

study's major purpose is to test the influence of intersectionality and reveal the relationship between race, class, and gender on length of sentence.

The controlled variables of this study are type of crimes committed and prior convictions. Independent variables include median income, educational attainment and racial demographics of the county of conviction. The dependent variable is the length of sentence while gender is the constant.

### 3.2 Design Appropriateness

The researcher chose not to do case studies or participatory observation given the nature of the at-risk population. Actively observing this population over a substantial period of time is extremely difficult. A quantitative approach was used to test and reveal the statistical significance of race, class and gender on length of sentence for incarcerated black and white women. The research questions can be best answered through quantitative analysis.

### 3.3 Procedure

The research began with broad analysis of available literature on the mass incarceration of black women. After gathering 50 sources of empirical and non-empirical published articles, several major and minor themes emerged: racism, victimization and sexual abuse, judicial guidelines and policies, the war on drugs, and repression. The researcher then gathered the files of 300 randomly selected incarcerated African American women and 300 white women currently serving time in Georgia state prisons. The researcher extracted several data points from each of the 600 individual profiles and created a spreadsheet detailing the crime the women were convicted, prior convictions, length of sentence given, race, and year of birth and county of convic-

tion and can viewed in Appendix A. A random sample of 100 was drawn and multiple data points on the convictions of all the women were identified. Further, median income by race, educational attainment, and racial makeup of the counties in which the women were convicted was obtained from fifty (50) counties using Social Explorer Professional (http://www.socialexplorer.com/pub/home/home.aspx). Social Explorer Professional is a database providing demographic information on all counties in the state of Georgia. Next using SPSS software, the researcher conducted twenty-two (22) regression tests.

### 3.4 Sampling & Population

The sample population was drawn from the profiles of 300 incarcerated black women and 300 white women. The subsample of 100 women identified as African American or white and are all serving time in one of the three state prisons for women in Georgia: Pulaski State Prison, Arrendale State Prison, or Metro State Prison.

### 3.5 Collection & Measures

The records of incarcerated persons in the state of Georgia are public information and can be obtained online through the Georgia Department of Corrections inmate search at www.dcor.state.ga.us. The query is limited to three search options and allowed the researcher to choose gender, race, and/or age of all incarcerated persons in the state of Georgia. Using this database, the researcher was able to access all incarcerated black and white women in transition centers, county jails, pre-release centers, and state prisons as well as the major offense the women are convicted for. The researcher then narrowed the results to 300 black women and 300 white women incarcerated in only state prisons. Next, a tally was collected for each major of-

fense from a subsample of 100 incarcerated black and white women and placed in 29 categories by major offense as indicated in table 1. Black women outnumbered white women when convicted for crimes involving cocaine, forgery, aggravated assault and battery, and armed robbery. White women outnumbered black women when convicted for burglary, crimes involving children and elderly, and murder.

**Table 1:**
*Total Sample and Convicted Offenses*

| Offense | Black | White |
|---|---|---|
| Aggravated Assault and Battery | 9 | 2 |
| Miscellaneous Assault and Battery | 0 | 1 |
| Armed Robbery | 5 | 2 |
| Attempt to Violate Substance Abuse Act | 0 | 1 |
| Burglary | 4 | 6 |
| Possession of Firearm Convict Felon | 0 | 2 |
| Possession of Meth | 0 | 1 |
| Rape | 0 | 1 |
| Racketeering | 0 | 1 |
| Robbery | 2 | 2 |
| Crimes Involving Children/Elderly | 2 | 6 |
| Criminal Damage/Interference | 1 | 2 |
| False Statement to Government | 1 | 0 |
| Forgery 1st Degree and Credit Card Fraud | 6 | 4 |
| Manufacturing Meth Unspecified Amount | 0 | 1 |
| Murder | 1 | 5 |
| Possession with Intent to Distribute Marijuana/Drugs | 1 | 1 |
| Possession of Cocaine | 6 | 1 |
| Possession of Counterfeit Drugs | 0 | 0 |
| Selling/Distribute Cocaine | 2 | 0 |
| Selling/Distribute Counterfeit Substance on Public | 0 | 1 |
| Selling/Distribute Marijuana | 0 | 1 |
| Sex Offender Fail Register | 0 | 1 |
| Theft | 6 | 6 |
| Trafficking cocaine less 200 grams | 1 | 0 |
| Trafficking cocaine 201-400 grams | 1 | 0 |
| Trafficking meth 200-399 | 0 | 1 |
| Trafficking meth unspecified amount | 0 | 1 |
| Voluntary Manslaughter | 2 | 0 |

In order to run the regressions a smaller sample of the general population of 600 was obtained by random sampling. A random sample of 100 was achieved using excel formula: =RAND()*300, drawing a random number from a chosen column in an excel worksheet. Convictions for this random sample were placed in 5 broad categories and are illustrated in table 2. The broad categories were assigned code numbers 1 through 5 for testing in the regression models and the corresponding number of women convicted of each charge is charted as well.

**Table 2**
*Categories of Offenses*

| Code | Categories | Black | White |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Drug-Related: manufacturing methamphetamine, possession with intent to distribute, selling and distributing, and trafficking | 11 | 9 |
| 2 | Violent Crimes: aggravated and misc. assault and battery, criminal damage, murder, and manslaughter | 12 | 9 |
| 3 | Property Crimes: burglary, theft, and robbery | 18 | 18 |
| 4 | Crimes w/ Children & Elderly: aggravated child molestation, cruelty to children and elderly, kidnapping, incest, rape and sex offender fail to register | 2 | 7 |
| 5 | Miscellaneous: criminal interference, racketeering, false statement, forgery, credit card fraud, possession of firearm as a convict | 7 | 7 |

### 3.6 Validity & Reliability

Reliability is determined by the prospect of repeating a study and obtaining the same or similar outcome. Threats to the study reliability were minimized by two major factors. First, reliability threats were minimized by quantitative testing publically available data. Second, threats were minimized by having a senior researcher oversee all regression testing to ensure consistency and accuracy of all results and measures.

External validity is determined by the strength of the study's conclusion to be generalized to other similar conditions (Trochim and Donnelly 2008, 36). The study addressed validity

threats by choosing an initial substantial sample size of six hundred and using random sample to achieve a smaller sample for testing. Also, using state data as oppose to county level data allows for generalizability across county jurisdictions, however due to the smaller sample size, results of the study may not be generalizable to the national population.

Construct validity is determined by the degree to which the method reflects the ideal, the relationship between the operationalizations in the study to the theoretical construct on which the study is based (Trochim and Donnelly 2008, 58). Operationalization is the translation of the idea of what you want to measure into a real measure. Intersectionality is the idea that was made into a real measure for statistical testing by simultaneously capturing three independent variables: racial demographics of convicting county, educational attainment of convicting county, and median income of black and white occupants of those counties. Furthermore, to test the impact of intersectionality on the sample population the study used regression model testing. Regression is used to predict a normally distributed dependent variable from one or multiple independent predictor variables (Morgan, Leech, Gloeckner, and Barrett 2007, 134). This study applied intersectionality by making the length of sentence the dependent variable and examining the combined influences of the racial demographics, educational attainment, and median income of convicting counties. Therefore, using regression models to test the impact of intersectionality on length of sentence strengthen the study's construct validity.

## 3.7 Chapter Conclusion

A quantitative approach was the optimal choice to examine intersectionality on length of sentence. The researcher began with a large sample size of 600 incarcerated black and white women in the state of Georgia and then through random sampling, obtained a size of 100 for re-

gression testing. Several data points were extracted from each profile of the individual women and included the crime the women were convicted, any prior convictions, length of sentence given, race, and year of birth and county of conviction. Furthermore, using Social Explorer Professional, demographic census data was taken from each of the convicting counties at www.socialexplorer.com.

Intersectionality was examining by measuring the influence of independent variables on length of sentence. Reliability threats were addressed by running regression tests on public data. External threats were minimized by allowing generalizability across county jurisdiction. Furthermore, regression model testing was chosen as the best measure to operationalize intersectionality and strengthen construct validity.

## 3.8 Chapter Summary

Chapter 3 presented the chosen research design and described the appropriateness of using a quantitative method to address the research question. The procedure for the method was detailed followed by a description of the sample. The collection of the data was then illustrated and reliability and validity threats were addressed.

The focus of chapter 4 will be the results and analysis of the regression tests. The chapter will also review the data collection and a descriptive analysis of the sample. The data analysis will include a discussion of the results with support from the literature.

# 4 RESULTS & ANALYSIS

Chapter four presents the results and analysis of the data collected through the methodology described in chapter three and addresses the purpose of the study and answers the research questions. The overriding research question and focus of the study was to quantitatively examine how intersectionality influences length of sentence among incarcerated black and white women in the state of Georgia.

## 4.1 Data Collection

The main research question was addressed first by gathering relevant data for incarcerated women. Primary data from 600 individual profiles were compiled from the Georgia department of corrections website, 300 white women and 300 black women. To test whether black women received longer sentences than white women, several pieces of data was taken from each profile: race, year of incarceration, type of offense, county of conviction, year of birth and criminal history. A random sample of 100 (50 white women and 50 black women) was taken and compiled by county. The random sample yielded 50 different counties. To obtain class-level data for testing, the study used Social Explorer Professional to compile several pieces of secondary data for each county of conviction: racial demographics, median income and educational attainment among white and black residents (http://www.socialexplorer.com/pub/home.aspx). A descriptive analysis was performed on the sample size and is illustrated in table 3. The table illustrates the average time each group of women are incarcerated for as well as mean year of incarceration and year of birth. The table also shows the variables that were used to test intersectionality. Table 4 illustrates the existence of priors among the incarcerated sample.

**Table 3**

*Descriptive Analysis of Sample (50 incarcerated white women, 50 incarcerated black women)*

| Race | Variables | Mean | Race | Variables | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| White | Time in Months | 77.05 | Black | Time in months | 82.12 |
| | Year of Incarceration | 2007.60 | | Year of Incarceration | 2007.66 |
| | Year of Birth | 1972.52 | | Year of Birth | 1975.40 |
| | Race of County: percentage white | 76.6% | | Race of County: percentage white | 59.6% |
| | Race of County: percentage black | 18.7% | | Race of County: percentage black | 34.5% |
| | Median Income: white | 43615.59 | | Median Income: white | 46599.97 |
| | Median Income: black | 29772.84 | | Median Income: black | 31426.15 |
| | Education percentage among white with hs diploma or equivalent | 77.6% | | Education percentage among white with hs diploma or equivalent | 82.3% |
| | Education percentage among black with hs diploma or equivalent | 69.1% | | Education percentage among black with hs diploma or equivalent | 74% |

**Table 4**

*Sample of Incarcerated Women and Priors*

| Race | Variables | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| White | Priors | 16% |
| | Did not have Priors | 84% |
| Black | Priors | 26% |
| | Did not have Priors | 74% |

Table 4 shows that 16% of incarcerated white women had prior convictions. The table also shows that from the sample of incarcerated women that 26% of black women had prior convictions, a 10% increase from incarcerated white women.

## 4.2 Data Analysis

The beginning phase of analysis consisted of first compiling all the data into a spreadsheet for SPSS analysis. Several simple regression models were conducted to investigate how race of county, education, and county median income predicts length of sentence. As illustrated in table 5, the racial demographic of a county was not a significant predictor for the length of sentence. Table 5 illustrates that when testing black and white incarcerated women, the percentage of white residents in the arresting county is not significant in determining the length of sentence for either women. Education was also not statistically significant and is illustrated in table 6. Table 6 indicates that the level of education achieved within a given county does not predict the length of sentence for black women.

**Table 5**

*Percentage of White Race of County as Predictor for Length of Sentence*

| Controlled Variable | F Value | df | P |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Black** | 0.931 | 1,42 | 0.339 |
| **White** | 0.094 | 1,47 | 0.76 |

**Table 6**

*White Race Educational Attainment as Predictor for Length of Sentence*

| Controlled Variable | F Value | df | P |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Black** | 0.017 | 1,47 | 0.896 |
| **White** | 0.246 | 1,42 | 0.623 |

In contrast, two regression tests did show statistical significance. A simple regression was conducted to investigate how county median income predicts length of sentence given to imprisoned black women. The results were statistically significant $F(1,35)=.026$, $p<.05$ and are illustrated in Table 7. The adjusted $R^2$ value was .134. This indicates that 13.4% of the variance in length of sentence for black women was explained by white county median income.

The identified equation to understand this relationship is:

Length of sentence = 176.248 -.002* (white median income)

**Table 7**

*White Race Median Income as Predictor for Length of Sentence*

| Controlled Variable | F Value | df | P | Adjusted R Square |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Black** | 5.398 | 1,35 | 0.026 | 0.134 |
| **White** | 1.309 | 1,41 | 0.259 | |

In essence, the median income of the white population in the arresting county significantly predicts the length of sentence for black women; as median income for whites increases so does the length of sentence for black women.

Furthermore, as indicated in Table 8, the percentage of white citizens in a county, white citizens educational attainment, and white citizens median income significantly predicts the length of sentence for black women as illustrated in Table 8, $F(3,33)=.019$, $p<.05$. The P value reveals a statistical significance for black women length of sentence but not for white women. The adjusted $R^2$ value was .190. This indicates that 19% of the variance in length of sentence for black women was explained by the model. The identified equation to understand this relationship is:

Length of sentence = -331.682 +-.006* (white population median income) + 134.935* (white race population) + 760.994* (white population county educational attainment)

**Table 8**

*Percentage of White Race of County, White Race Educational Attainment and White Race Median Income as Predictors for Length of Sentence*

| Controlled Variable | F Value | df | P | Adjusted R Square |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Black** | 3.823 | 3,33 | .019 | .190 |
| **White** | .467 | 3,39 | .707 | |

Regression Tables 7 and 8 represent the statistical impact of intersectionality on black's women length of sentence. When tested separately, race and educational attainment does not statistically impact length of sentence for black women. However, as median income increase for whites in a county so does length of sentence for black women. Also, Table 8 illustrates that

when testing intersectionality, white race percentage, educational attainment, and median income among the white population impacts length of sentence for black women.

A second set of regression models were conducted using multiple regressions and is illustrated in Table 9. Multiple regressions were conducted to investigate the best predictors for length of sentence while controlling for multiple variables. Controlling first for the type of offense, as indicated by the notation *o*: county median income, county racial demographics, and county educational attainment were not statistically significant for all women, without regard to race.

**Table 9**

*Controlled for Offense: County Median Income, Racial Demographics, and Educational Attainment as Predictors for Length of Sentence*

| Controlled Variable | F Value | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| **o1 = drug-related** | 0.167 | 4,13 | 0.951 |
| **o2 = violent crimes** | 2.5 | 4,5 | 0.171 |
| **o3 = property crimes** | 0.55 | 4,26 | 0.701 |
| **o4 = children & elderly** | 0.899 | 3,3 | 0.534 |
| **o5 = misc. crimes** | 0.734 | 4,9 | 0.591 |

A second multiple regression test was conducted and controlled for race, type of offense and prior convictions and is illustrated with Table 10. As a result it is not possible to conduct regression tests for each combination of variables. The controlled variables are indicated by the first three columns in Table 10 and the P value reveals that the convicting county's median income, level of education and racial demographics are not statistically significant in determining length of sentence for black women. However, when controlling for several variables members of the sample population were not equally represented across the combination of those controlled variables.

**Table 10**:
*Controlled for Type of Offense, Priors, and Race: County Median Income, Education and Racial Demographics as Predictors for Length of Sentence*

| | Priors Status | Race | F Value | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Crime 1:** Drug-Related | No Priors | Black | 194.647 | 3,1 | .053 |
| | | White | .447 | 3,3 | .737 |
| | Priors | Black | .635 | 3,1 | .702 |
| **Crime 2:** Violent Crimes: | No Priors | Black | 1.634 | 3.2 | .401 |
| | | White | - | 2,0 | - |
| **Crime 3:** Property Crimes: | No Priors | Black | 2.291 | 3,6 | .178 |
| | | White | 1.757 | 3,9 | .225 |
| | Priors | Black | - | 2,0 | - |
| | | White | 47.553 | 3,1 | .106 |
| **Crime 4:** Children & Elderly | No Priors | White | .899 | 3,3 | .534 |
| **Crime 5:** Miscellaneous | No Priors | Black | 2.731 | 3,1 | .412 |
| | | White | 1.316 | 3,1 | .553 |
| | Priors | Black | - | 1,0 | - |
| | | White | - | 1,0 | - |

Although the outcome of most of the regression tests revealed that the racial demographics of a county and educational attainment alone do not predict the length of sentence given to black women it does not mean that disparities do not exist. Also, the regression tests indicate that county racial demographics, educational attainment, and median income do not significantly impact length of sentence given to white women.

Two factors may explain unequal length of sentence. First, black women were convicted more for drug-related and violent offenses. These offenses often yield longer sentences while white women were convicted of less serious crimes. Second, incarcerated black women in the sample had more priors than white women which also lengthens time served.

The results are consistent with the work of existing scholarship. With a sample of 50,000 felony cases, race had no direct effect on the sentence severity. Still, blacks are incarcerated more than whites (Spohn, Gruhl, and Welch 1981-1982, 85). The conclusion that racial demographics had no direct effect on the length of sentence is consistent with the existing literature. The race of the judge, whether black or white, proves to have no effect on sentencing. The race of the judge has little predictive power. Black and white judges sentence black offenders more severely than white offenders (Spohn 1990, 1197). Furthermore, in a 1986 study with a stratified random sample of 16,798 felons convicted between 1976 and June 1982 from data made available by the Georgia Department of Corrections, Myers and Talarico concluded that both black and white offenders face equal amount of imprisonment in regards to serious offenses (1986, 243). Myers and Talarico conclude that prison sentences are not conditioned by the racial characteristics of the offender or the community (1986, 244).

## 4.3 Chapter Summary

Chapter four presented the methodology used to operationalize intersectionality. Intersectionality is the theoretical framework describing the multiplicative relationships among various, simultaneous oppressions unique to black women (King 1988, 47). Using this interactive model, the relative significance of race, sex or class in determining the conditions of black women's lives is neither fixed nor absolute but, rather, is dependent on the socio-historical context and the social phenomenon under consideration (King 1988, 49). This study operationalized intersectionality by testing the impact of the racial demographics, educational attainment, and median income of convicting counties on length of sentence for 100 incarcerated black and white women. The impact of intersectionality on length of sentence was tested by regression models and

shows that the racial demographics of a county and educational attainment do not have a direct effect on the length of sentence given to black women. Furthermore, when controlling for type of offenses and priors, intersectionality does not significantly predict length of sentence. However, two regression tests reveal a positive relationship of median income and intersectionality on length of prison sentence for black women. Table 7 illustrates that as the median income of a county increase so does the length of sentence for black women. Also, as illustrated in Table 8, as white population median income, white population educational attainment, and white population median income increase so do black women's length of sentence. The results reveal evidence that in some cases intersectionality significantly impacts black women's length of sentence.

## 4.4 Chapter Conclusion

Chapter 4 analyzed the results of the regression tests that were conducted. Intersectionality was operationalized and revealed evidence that racial demographics, median income, and educational attainment among white population impacts black women's length of sentence. The chapter discussed multiple reasons for the outcomes with support from the literature. Chapter 5 will conclude with recommendation for future research and the implications of quantitatively testing intersectionality.

# 5 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION

This study conducted a quantitative analysis using regression models to operationalize intersectionality. Chapter 5 discusses the conclusion from the study as well as its implications for further research.

Conducting a quantitative study of intersectionality provided an opportunity to understand the statistical significance of intersectionality on length of sentence. This study researched mass incarceration from a black feminist perspective by testing the impact of educational attainment, median income, and county racial demographics on length of sentence among black and white incarcerated women. Chapter 5 discusses the findings, implications, and recommendations for future research on intersectionality and criminology.

## Findings

This thesis concluded with mixed results. Several simple regression tests were conducted and revealed that the racial demographics of a county and level of educational attainment does not impact the length of sentence for black women. Several multiple regression models were also tested and controlled for type of crime, history of prior convictions and race. These models looked at how intersectionality impacts length of sentence while giving consideration to multiple factors. These multiple regression tests concluded that when other factors are being considered such as prior history and type of crime committed, intersectionality does not impact the length of sentence for black women. However, conclusions from this study did find some evidence that race and class impacts length of sentence for black women. Median income among whites showed a positive correlation to black women's length of imprisonment. Furthermore, the cumulative effects of the race of convicting county, educational attainment and median income

among whites reveal that intersectionality has a positive relationship to length of sentence for black women.

The purpose of this study was to address the impact of intersectionality of length in sentence given and theoretical justifications. The first research question is if the length of sentence for black women is similar to white women. A descriptive analysis of the sample revealed that on average black women receive longer sentence than white women. White women on average receive a sentence half a year less than black women.

**Table 3**

*Descriptive Analysis of Sample (50 incarcerated white women, 50 incarcerated black women)*

| Race | Variables | Mean | Race | Variables | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| White | Time in Months | 77.05 | Black | Time in months | 82.12 |
| | Year of Incarceration | 2007.60 | | Year of Incarceration | 2007.66 |
| | Year of Birth | 1972.52 | | Year of Birth | 1975.40 |
| | Race of County: percentage white | 76.6% | | Race of County: percentage white | 59.6% |
| | Race of County: percentage black | 18.7% | | Race of County: percentage black | 34.5% |
| | Median Income: white | 43615.59 | | Median Income: white | 46599.97 |
| | Median Income: black | 29772.84 | | Median Income: black | 31426.15 |
| | Education percentage among white with hs diploma or equivalent | 77.6% | | Education percentage among white with hs diploma or equivalent | 82.3% |
| | Education percentage among black with hs diploma or equivalent | 69.1% | | Education percentage among black with hs diploma or equivalent | 74% |

This is supported by several studies concluding that black women receive longer sentences than white women (Steffensmeier, Ulmer, and Kramer 1998, 796; Bushway and Piehl 2001, 733; Rosenbaum 1988, 125).

The second research question is the impact of intersectionality on the length of sentence for black and white women. The results of the statistical analysis showed that intersectionality does and does not impact length of sentence for black women. Regression models reveal that racial demographics of arresting county, educational attainment and median income impacts black women's length of sentence. Regression also illustrated that racial demographics and educational attainment alone do not predict length of sentence. Furthermore, when controlling for multiple variables, intersectionality is not statistically significant. Also, black women are convicted more for drug-related and violent offenses which yield to longer sentences. The literature also has mixed views on the impact of race, class and gender to sentencing.

The results also challenges minority threat hypothesis. Minority threat theory proposes that social control measures directed against blacks intensifies as the black population grows progressively larger and competition for jobs, economic resources and political power increase (Eitle, D/Alessio and Stolzenberg 2002, 559). Although the descriptive analysis reveal that black women receive longer sentences than white women, regression tests show that the racial demographics of the convicting county has no significance to the length of sentence for black women. Therefore, although the increase of minority populations may raise competition, race alone is not statistically significant in predicting the extent of social control methods i.e. mass incarceration.

The results of this thesis and the existing literature reveals the need to address the multiple oppressions faced by women of color, black women's unique relationship to the criminal justice system, and test current theories. This study combined black feminist thought and criminol-

ogy's social control theory and concluded that mass incarceration affects black women most uniquely. Black women are disproportionately incarcerated and suffer from the collateral consequences of being connected to imprisoned black men and women. Furthermore black women as members of an inferior sex within an inferior race places them as the ultimate minority threat (Johnson 1995-96, 14). However, future scholarship needs to test present beliefs and understanding on the impact of race, class and gender.

## Implications & Recommendations

Findings from this study have implications for future research on understanding the roles race, class and gender have in contributing to the mass incarceration of black women and the collateral consequences. This study expanded research by quantitatively applying intersectionality to address black women's length of sentence. Through this study, several factors were tested and new factors for future analysis emerged. Racial demographics of arresting county, educational attainment and median income were tested by regression models to see if those variables influence the length of sentence for black women. Median income was the only single variable tested that significantly impacts the length of sentence given to black women and when taking together, median income, racial composition, and educational attainment, are statistically significant. These findings can also allow more space for the development of research centered on African American women within the academy.

The outcome of this thesis can serve Criminology by incorporating race, class, and gender into the discourse. Some of the regression models showed that intersectionality has a positive relationship with the length of sentence for black women. Therefore, understanding crime and its impact on various communities necessitates an intersectionality approach. This study al-

so adds to the Africana discipline by quantitatively testing the impact of intersectionality as well as other variables such as the impact of prior convictions and type of offense. Testing intersectionality is necessary to develop new theories and understanding of the impact or lack thereof intersectionality is argued to have by black feminist scholars. Several of the regression models show that intersectionality is not a predictor for the length of sentence for black women.

This study combined black feminist thought and social control theory as a basis for understanding black women's unique relationship with the penal system. This study recommends that more scholars incorporate different variables and statistically test present theories. This will provide alternative explanations and understandings of mass incarceration and its relationship with black women. This thesis reveals that black women on average receive longer sentences than white women. However, traditional understandings of the impact race, class and gender have on predicting length of sentence for black women needs to be altered. Regression tests show that when controlling for type of offense and priors, intersectionality is not statistically significant. This study challenges the belief that race, class and gender unquestionably impact length of sentence for black women and complicates the discussion of intersectionality. Scholars must expand their analysis of intersectionality and include quantitative testing to examine its impact. This type of study can broaden the utility and range of Black Feminist and social control theories in a way that will expand both the Africana and Criminology disciplines and enrich the discourse on mass incarceration. Quantitatively testing current Africana theories and incorporating Criminological thought will re-define and extend traditional understanding.

# 6 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arvanites, Thomas and Martin Asher. "The Direct and Indirect Effects of Socio-EconomicVariables on State Incarceration Rates," *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 7 (1995): 27-53.

Baker, David. "Black Female Executions in Historical Context," *Criminal Justice Review* 33 (2008): 64-88.

Bowers, David. "Political Culture and Felony Sentencing: An Examination of Trial Courts in 300 Counties," *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 8 (1997): 343-364.

Brewer, Rose and Nancy Heitzeg. "The Racialization of Crime and Punishment: Criminal Justice,Color-Blind Racism, and the Political Economy of the Prison Industrial Complex," *American Behavior Scientist* 51 (2008): 625-644.

Britton, Dana. "Feminism in Criminology: Engendering the Law," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 571 (2000): 57-76.

Burgess-Proctor, Amanda. "Intersections of Race, Class, Gender, and Crime: Future Directions for Feminist Criminology," *Feminist Criminology* 1 (2006): 27-47.

Burns, Haywood. "Black People and the Tyranny of American Law," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 407 (1973): 156-166.

Bushway, Shawn and Anne Piehl. "Judging Judicial Discretion: Legal Factors and Racial Discrimination in Sentencing," *Law & Society Review* 35 (2001): 733-764.

Caplow, Theodore and Jonathan Simon. "Understanding Prison Policy and Population Trends," *Crime and Justice* 26 (1999): 63-120.

Christian, Johnna and Shenique S. Thomas. "Examining the Intersections of Race, Gender, and Mass Incarceration," *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice* 7 (2009): 69-84.

Christianson, Scott. "Our Black Prisons," *Crime Delinquency*, 27 (1981): 364-375.

Collins, Patricia. "Gender, Black Feminism, and Black Political Economy," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* 568 (2000): 41-53.

DeHart, Dana. "Pathways to Prison: Impact of Victimization in the Lives of Incarcerated Women," *Violence Against Women,* 14 (2008): 1362-1381.

Eitle, D'Alessio and Lisa Stolzenberg. "Racial Threat and Social Control: A Test of the Political, Economic, and Threat of Black Crime Hypotheses." *Social Forces*, 81 (2002):557-576.

Eliason, Michele, Janette Taylor, and Rachel Williams. "Physical Health of Women in Prison: Relationship to Oppression," *Journal of Correction Health Care*, 10 (2004): 175-203.

Ferraro, Kathleen and Angela Moe. "Mothering, Crime, and Incarceration," *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 32(2003): 9-40.

Garland, David. *Mass Incarceration: Social Causes and Consequences.* London: SAGE Publications, 2001.

Geiger, Barbara. "Crime, Prostitution, Drugs, and Malingered Insanity: Female Offenders' Resistant Strategies to Abuse and Domination," *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 50 (2006): 582-594.

Gordon, Avery. "Globalism and the Prison Industrial Complex: An Interview with Angela Davis," *Race & Class* 145 (1999): 145-157.

Greene, Helen. *African American Criminological Thought*. State University of New York: State University of New York Press-Albany, 2000.

Henriques, Zelma and Norma Manatu-Rupert. "Living on the Outside: African American Women Before, During, and After Incarceration," *The Prison Journal* 81(2001):6-19.

Irwin, John, Vincent Schiraldi and Jason Ziedenberg. "America's One Million Nonviolent Prisoners," *Social Justice* 27 (2000): 135-147.

Jacobs, David and Richard Kleban. "Political Institutions, Minorities, and Punishment: A Pooled Cross-National Analysis of Incarceration Rates," *Social Forces* 82 (2003): 725-755.

Jacobs, Michelle. "Piercing the Prison Uniform of Invisibility for Black Female Inmates," *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 94 (2004): 795-822.

Johnson, Paula C. "At the Intersection of Injustice: Experiences of African American Women in Crime and Sentencing," *Journal of Gender and Law* 4 (1995-1996): 1-76.

Johnson, Sheryl. "Black Innocence and the White Jury," *Michigan Law Review* 83(1985): 1611-1708.

King, Deborah. "Multiple Jeopardy, Multiple Consciousness: The Context of a Black Feminist Ideology," *Signs* 14(1988): 42-72.

Koons-Witt, Barbara. "The Effect of Gender on the Decision to Incarcerate Before and After the Incarceration of Sentencing Guidelines," *Criminology* 40 (2002): 297-327.

Markert, John. "The Changing Face of Racial Discrimination: Hispanics as the Dominant Minority in the USA – A New Application of Power-Threat Theory," *Critical Sociology* 36 (2010): 307-327.

McCorkel, Jill. "Criminally Dependent? Gender, Punishment, and the Rhetoric of Welfare Reform," *Social Politics* 11 (2004): 386-410.

McDaniels-Wilson, Cathy and Joanne Belknap. "The Extensive Sexual Violence and Sexual Abuse Histories of Incarcerated Women," *Violence Against Women* 14 (2008): 1090-1127.

Merolla, David. "The War on Drugs and the Gender Gap in Arrests: A Critical Perspective," *Critical Sociology* 34 (2008): 255-270.

Morgan, George, Nancy Leech, Gene Gloeckner, and Karen Barrett, *SPSS for Introductory Statistics: Use and Interpretation, Fourth Edition*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishing, New York (2011).

Mustard, David. "Racial, Ethnic, and Gender Disparities in Sentencing: Evidence from the U.S. Federal Courts," *Journal of Law and Economics* 44 (2001): 285-314.

Neville, Helen and Jennifer Hamer. "We Make Freedom: An Exploration of Revolutionary Black Feminism," *Journal of Black Studies* 31(2001): 437-461.

Oliver, Pamela.(2008). "Repression and Crime Control: Why Social Movement Scholars Should Pay Attention to Mass Incarceration as a Form of Repression," *Mobolization: The International Quarterly* 13 (2008): 1-24.

Onwudiwe, Ihekwoaba and Michael Lynch. "Reopening the Debate: A Reexamination of the Need for a Black Criminology," *Social Pathology* 6 (2000).

Percival, Garrick. "Ideology, Diversity, and Imprisonment: Considering the Influence of Local Politics on Racial and Ethnic Minority Incarceration Rates," *Social Science Quarterly* 91 (2010): 1063-1082.

Potter, Hillary. "An Argument for Black Feminist Criminology: Understanding African American Women's Experiences with Intimate Partner Abuse Using an Integrated Approach," *Feminist Criminology* 1 (2006): 106-124.

Rosenbaum, Jill. "Age, Race, and Female Offending," *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 4 (1984):125-138.

Ruddell, Rick. *America Behind Bars: Trend in Incarceration, 1950 to 2000*, LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC, New York, 2004.

Russel, Kathyrn. "Development of a Black Criminology and the Role of the Black Criminologist," *Justice Quarterly* 9(1992):667-683.

Schlesinger, Traci. "The Failure of Race Neutral Politics: How Mandatory Terms and Sentencing Enhancements Contribute to Mass Racialized Incarceration," *Crime & Delinquency*, (2008): 1-28.

Sidanius, Jim. "Race and Sentence Severity: The Case of American Justice," *Journal of Black* Studies 8 (1988): 273-281.

Skiffer, L. *How Black Female Offenders Explain Their Crimes and Describe Their Hopes: A Case Study of Inmates in a California Prison*. New York: Edwin Mellon Press, 2009.

Sokoloff, Natalie. "Women Prisoners at the Dawn of the 21st Century," *Women & Criminal Justice* 16 (2005): 127-137.

Spohn, Cassia. "The Sentencing Decisions by Black and White Judges: Expected and Unexpected Similarities," *Law & Society Review* 24 (1990): 1197-1216.

Spohn, Cassia, John Gruhl and Susan Welch. "The Effect of Race on Sentencing: A Re-Examination of an Unsettled Question," *Law & Society Review 16* (1981-1982): 71-88.

Steffensmeirer, Darrell, John Kramer and Cathy Streifel. "Gender and Incarceration Decision," *Criminology* 31(1993): 411-446.

Steffensmeirer, Darrell, Jeffery Ulmer and John Kramer. "The Interaction of Race, Gender, and Age in Criminal Sentencing: The Punishment Cost of being Young, Black, and Male," *Criminology* 36 (1998): 763-797.

Sudbury, Julia. "Celling Black Bodies: Black Women in the Global Prison Industrial Complex," *Feminist Review* 70 (2002): 57-74

Trochim, William and James Donnelly. *The Research Methods Knowledge Base*. Mason, Ohio: Atomic Dog of Cengage Learning, 2008.

Wacquant, Loic. "The New Peculiar Institution: On the Prison as a Surrogate Ghetto," *Theoretical Criminal* 4 (2000): 377-389.

Young, Vernetta. "All the Women in the Maryland State Penitentiary: 1812-1869," *The Prison Journal* 81(2001): 113-132.

Young, Vernetta. "Gender Expectations and Their Impact on Black Female Offenders and Victims," *Justice Quarterly* 3 (1986): 305-327.

# 7 Appendix A

Primary Sample 600

| Name | Race | Crime | Priors | County | Y.O.B | Sentence |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ackey, Elizabeth | 1 | 2 | 0 | Carroll | 1971 | 20 |
| Acree, Latanya Dee | 1 | 4 | 0 | Dou | 1978 | 2 |
| Adams, Kizzy | 1 | 0 | 1 | Muscogee | 1980 | 7 |
| Adams, Teresa Ann | 1 | 2 | 1 | Thomas | 1961 | 20 |
| Akabueze, Becky | 1 | 2 | 1 | Dekalb | 1965 | 3 |
| Akers, Anicia Ann | 1 | 2 | 0 | Mcduffie | 1982 | 17 |
| Alexander, Lyndsay Vanessa | 1 | 0 | 0 | Clayton | 1983 | 2 |
| Alexander, Tangin Tequia | 1 | 1 | 0 | Clayton | 1980 | life |
| Alford, Anita | 1 | 3 | 0 | Polk | 1971 | 2 |
| Allen, Amanda | 1 | 1 | 0 | Dekalb | 1979 | life |
| Allen, Cynthia Marie | 1 | 1 | 0 | Lowndes | 1969 | life |
| Allen, Mary | 1 | 4 | 0 | Richmond | 1976 | 10 |
| Allen, Sharletta | 1 | 3 | 1 | Dekalb | 1973 | 2 |
| Allen, Stacie Michelle | 1 | 5 | 1 | Richmond | 1977 | 5 |
| Allison, Teresea | 1 | 0 | 1 | Cobb | 1955 | 5 |
| Alls, Brenda N | 1 | 0 | 1 | Carroll | 1967 | 3 |
| Ambles, Abia | 1 | 3 | 0 | Dekalb | 1984 | 12 |
| Anderson, Angela Denise | 1 | 1 | 0 | Wilcox | 1983 | life |
| Anderson, Ashley Nicole | 1 | 6 | 0 | Ben Hill | 1984 | 5 |
| Anderson, Evelyn Marie | 1 | 11 | 1 | Gwinnett | 1969 | 13 |
| Anderson, Maleka Danielle | 1 | 3 | 0 | Chatham | 1980 | 3 |
| Anderson, Mozel | 1 | 1 | 0 | Fulton | 1942 | life |
| Anderson, Tamika Elaine | 1 | 0 | 1 | Cobb | 1986 | 2 |
| Anderson, Zulehka Michelle | 1 | 2 | 0 | Douglas | 1983 | 12 |
| Arnold, Betty D | 1 | 2 | 1 | Fulton | 1958 | 12 |
| Arnold, Chenise S | 1 | 3 | 1 | Cobb | 1958 | 3 |
| Ashley, Tanya Renie | 1 | 0 | 0 | Spalding | 1968 | 15 |
| Ates, Courtney | 1 | 0 | 0 | Henry | 1978 | 10 |
| Atkins, Gloria Ann | 1 | 2 | 0 | Dougherty | 1953 | 20 |
| Atkins, Pauline | 1 | 1 | 0 | Cook | 1962 | life |
| Austin, Crystal | 1 | 5 | 0 | Muscogee | 1979 | 6 |
| Baker, Delores | 1 | 0 | 1 | Cobb | 1964 | 5 |
| Baker, Jennifer L | 1 | 0 | 0 | Toombs | 1964 | 15 |
| Baker, Rosetta Laura | 1 | 0 | 0 | Carroll | 1971 | 15 |
| Baker, Sharon Denise | 1 | 0 | 1 | Cobb | 1971 | 2 |

| Name | Race | Crime | Priors | County | Y.O.B. | Sentence |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ball, Susan | 1 | 4 | 0 | Fulton | 1964 | 15 |
| Ballard, Cora | 1 | 1 | 0 | Cobb | 1958 | life |
| Banks, Shandrell | 1 | 1 | 1 | Fulton | 1977 | life |
| Barker, Phyllis | 1 | 7 | 0 | Carroll | 1965 | 5 |
| Barkley, Sheree Denise | 1 | 3 | 0 | Monroe | 1984 | 5 |
| Barnes, Shonta | 1 | 2 | 0 | Fulton | 1976 | 10 |
| Barnes, Yvette | 1 | 3 | 0 | Liberty | 1962 | 15 |
| Barrett, Erica Shuntella | 1 | 2 | 0 | Floyd | 1985 | 7 |
| Bass, Ann M | 1 | 2 | 1 | Dougherty | 1968 | 6 |
| Bass, Nadine | 1 | 0 | 0 | Bibb | 1958 | 1 |
| Bates, Sumalia | 1 | 3 | 0 | Dekalb | 1987 | 10 |
| Battle, Cyndricka | 1 | 2 | 0 | Bibb | 1982 | 15 |
| Battle, Stephanie | 1 | 4 | 0 | Early | 1987 | 10 |
| Baugh, Dionne Andrea | 1 | 2 | 0 | Fulton | 1968 | 10 |
| Beard, Runkay Denise | 1 | 0 | 0 | Fayette | 1982 | 5 |
| Bell, Jasmine Lashia | 1 | 3 | 0 | Bibb | 1989 | 8 |
| Bell, Tammara | 1 | 3 | 1 | Fayette | 1985 | 2 |
| Bell, Wynola Maxie | 1 | 2 | 0 | Seminole | 1964 | 15 |
| Bellamy, Jasee Nicole | 1 | 3 | 0 | Clayton | 1988 | 1 |
| Benbry, Lor Denise | 1 | 2 | 0 | Dekalb | 1957 | 10 |
| Bennett, Donna Rena | 1 | 0 | 1 | Gwinnett | 1970 | 4 |
| Bennett, Shawanda Lafaye | 1 | 3 | 0 | Fayette | 1970 | 3 |
| Benson, Demetria | 1 | 2 | 0 | Fulton | 1974 | 5 |
| Benton, Anita Nicole | 1 | 5 | 1 | Spalding | 1972 | 1 |
| Betha, Mary Butts | 1 | 3 | 1 | Baldwin | 1970 | 3 |
| Bether, Carolyn | 1 | 4 | 0 | Liberty | 1965 | 5 |
| Black, Shurya Dietrich | 1 | 6 | 0 | Jones | 1974 | 8 |
| Blake, Julia Ann | 1 | 3 | 1 | Chatham | 1980 | 2 |
| Blake, Kamya | 1 | 5 | 1 | Chatham | 1983 | 5 |
| Blake, Wynona | 1 | 0 | 1 | Appling | 1976 | 2 |
| Blakely, Falicia | 1 | 1 | 0 | Dekalb | 1983 | life |
| Blue, Patricia Davis | 1 | 5 | 1 | Chatham | 1947 | 5 |
| Boatwright, Deedee | 1 | 3 | 0 | Jenkins | 1979 | 10 |
| Bobo, Ebony Africa | 1 | 0 | 0 | Clayton | 1971 | 15 |
| Bohannon, Agnes Regina | 1 | 3 | 1 | Coweta | 1959 | 5 |
| Bolden, Alice D | 1 | 0 | 1 | Bibb | 1969 | 5 |
| Bolston, Lachandra Lavett | 1 | 5 | 0 | Baldwin | 1978 | 1 |

| Name | Race | Crime | Prios | County | Y.O.B. | Sentence |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bolton, Melissa Elaine | 1 | 3 | 1 | Coweta | 1956 | 7 |
| Bonner, Eyiloni M | 1 | 4 | 1 | Muscogee | 1959 | 5 |
| Bookman, Elvira | 1 | 0 | 0 | Cobb | 1965 | 1 |
| Boone-Monroe, Lori Lynn | 1 | 3 | 0 | Gwinnett | 1964 | 1 |
| Booth, Tyquashia Janella | 1 | 2 | 0 | Evans | 1991 | 20 |
| Borders, Sharon Ann | 1 | 1 | 0 | Hall | 1949 | life |
| Boss, Charlene | 1 | 3 | 1 | Washington | 1960 | 15 |
| Boston, Kimberly Michelle | 1 | 0 | 1 | Whitfield | 1981 | 4 |
| Bowers, Phyllis | 1 | 5 | 0 | Chatham | 1963 | 4 |
| Boykins, Rachel | 1 | 0 | 0 | Wayne | 1986 | 3 |
| Boykins, Temesha | 1 | 1 | 0 | Wayne | 1983 | life |
| Boynton, Nicole Rochelle | 1 | 1 | 0 | Cobb | 1980 | life |
| Bradley, Creshenda Shanet | 1 | 3 | 0 | Rockdale | 1978 | 5 |
| Bradley, Whitney Nicole | 1 | 3 | 0 | Dekalb | 1986 | 10 |
| Brannon, Sheila | 1 | 1 | 0 | Fulton | 1967 | life |
| Braybob, Lura Lorraine | 1 | 8 | 1 | Gwinnett | 1964 | 2 |
| Breland, Penny Lassandra | 1 | 2 | 0 | Fulton | 1978 | 20 |
| Bridges, Marquita Lavette | 1 | 3 | 0 | Telfair | 1983 | 10 |
| Brigthwell, Tawanta | 1 | 3 | 0 | Gwinnett | 1982 | 1 |
| Brinson, La Angels | 1 | 1 | 0 | Richmond | 1956 | life |
| Brinson, Tina D | 1 | 1 | 1 | Bibb | 1963 | life |
| Brisco, Connie | 1 | 6 | 1 | Wilkinson | 1965 | 10 |
| Brittian, Lisa Latreass | 1 | 5 | 1 | Douglas | 1974 | 8 |
| Brooks, Lisa | 1 | 3 | 0 | Muscogee | 1961 | 5 |
| Brooks, Quanessa Sherice | 1 | 4 | 0 | Richmond | 1985 | 1 |
| Brooks, Tamika | 1 | 2 | 1 | Meriwether | 1973 | 4 |
| Brown, Audrey | 1 | 3 | 0 | Clayton | 1970 | 3 |
| Brown, Bronica M | 1 | 3 | 1 | Hall | 1973 | 6 |
| Brown, Carolyn R. | 1 | 5 | 0 | Dekalb | 1948 | 20 |
| Brown, Christy | 1 | 3 | 0 | Dekalb | 1979 | 12 |
| Brown, Courtney | 1 | 3 | 0 | Dougherty | 1982 | 3 |
| Brown, Cynthia Ann | 1 | 1 | 0 | Elbert | 1972 | life |
| Brown, Laray | 1 | 3 | 0 | Liberty | 1988 | 5 |
| Brown, Laticia D | 1 | 3 | 0 | Clayton | 1973 | 11 |
| Brown, Linda Renae | 1 | 1 | 0 | Bibb | 1973 | life |
| Brown, Marie | 1 | 0 | 0 | Carroll | 1959 | 5 |
| Brown, Najuwa A | 1 | 5 | 1 | Ware | 1969 | 3 |
| Brown, Nicole Netasha | 1 | 2 | 0 | Dougherty | 1988 | 10 |
| Brown, Patricia A | 1 | 1 | 1 | Sumter | 1971 | life |
| Brown, Ruby D | 1 | 2 | 0 | Terrell | 1969 | 20 |

| Name | Race | Crime | Priors | County | Y.O.B. | Sentence |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Brown, Samantha A | 1 | 2 | 0 | Baldwin | 1986 | 12 |
| Brown, Shelia | 1 | 4 | 0 | Houston | 1972 | 5 |
| Brown, Sylvia Ann | 1 | 5 | 0 | Gwinnett | 1971 | 3 |
| Brown, Tondelia Y | 1 | 3 | 1 | Muscogee | 1969 | 3 |
| Cade, Bobbie J | 1 | 1 | 0 | Clarke | 1939 | life |
| Caesar, Alifa Shakti | 1 | 3 | 1 | Lowndes | 1977 | 5 |
| Cain, Brandy Shancea | 1 | 0 | 0 | Fayette | 1990 | 5 |
| Caldwell, Lawanda | 1 | 5 | 0 | Laurens | 1981 | 3 |
| Caldwell, Mary Ann | 1 | 2 | 1 | Dekalb | 1957 | 5 |
| Caldwell, Quinetto R | 1 | 3 | 0 | Dekalb | 1982 | 3 |
| Calhoun, Roslynn L | 1 | 3 | 0 | Henry | 1971 | 5 |
| Cameron, Tiffany Marie | 1 | 3 | 0 | Liberty | 1983 | 12 |
| Campbell, Linda L | 1 | 3 | 1 | Henry | 1964 | 5 |
| Cantrell, Nikki Tocara | 1 | 5 | 1 | Clayton | 1981 | 3 |
| Cantrell, Shelia Ann | 1 | 3 | 1 | Hall | 1960 | 4 |
| Carey, Valerie | 1 | 1 | 0 | Fulton | 1976 | life |
| Carlton, Jamie Laverne | 1 | 3 | 0 | Decatur | 1983 | 1 |
| Carman, Deatarh Celes | 1 | 3 | 0 | Gwinnett | 1987 | 2 |
| Carmichael, Donna | 1 | 2 | 0 | Fulton | 1959 | 20 |
| Carr, Lashundra | 1 | 1 | 0 | Dekalb | 1981 | life |
| Carrol, Tierra Shernice | 1 | 2 | 0 | Cobb | 1983 | 10 |
| Carson, Leslie | 1 | 3 | 0 | Fulton | 1959 | 3 |
| Carswelldanso, Aiysha | 1 | 11 | 0 | Dekalb | 1976 | 20 |
| Carter, Cheree Kay | 1 | 0 | 0 | Spalding | 1973 | 15 |
| Carter, Doreen | 1 | 5 | 1 | Douglas | 1979 | 5 |
| Carter, Ebonie | 1 | 5 | 0 | Chatham | 1985 | 2 |
| Carter, Lasandra | 1 | 3 | 0 | Dekalb | 1985 | 3 |
| Carter, Mavita Lashun | 1 | 2 | 1 | Dougherty | 1982 | 3 |
| Carter, Yolanda Yvette | 1 | 2 | 0 | Harris | 1981 | 15 |
| Casado, Anakia | 1 | 11 | 0 | Dekalb | 1973 | 20 |
| Cater, Lalindus | 1 | 2 | 0 | Dekalb | 1959 | 8 |
| Ceasar, Lakendra | 1 | 3 | 0 | Tattnall | 1986 | 5 |
| Chambers, Tenika La | 1 | 4 | 0 | Clayton | 1979 | 3 |
| Champion, Ivy | 1 | 2 | 0 | Dekalb | 1970 | 20 |
| Chapman, Tasha R | 1 | 3 | 0 | Liberty | 1976 | 10 |
| Chapple, Saquarius | 1 | 3 | 1 | Muscogee | 1980 | 15 |
| Cheeks, Donna M | 1 | 3 | 1 | Floyd | 1964 | 3 |
| Cherry, Sherette | 1 | 5 | 1 | Henry | 1958 | 5 |
| Cherry, Takelia Keyatta | 1 | 9 | 0 | Troup | 1988 | 5 |
| Cherry, Tiffany Tinnea | 1 | 3 | 0 | Cobb | 1983 | 10 |

| Name | Race | Crime | Priors | County | Y.O.B. | Sentence |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Christian, Cheryl Genice | 1 | 1 | 0 | Fulton | 1969 | life |
| Christian, Gretchen Scott | 1 | 3 | 0 | Chatham | 1961 | 15 |
| Christian, Strauna | 1 | 9 | 0 | Mitchell | 1986 | 8 |
| Christian, Tonya | 1 | 2 | 0 | Fulton | 1974 | 20 |
| Clark, Angelita M | 1 | 6 | 1 | Gwinnett | 1964 | 1.6 |
| Clark, April Annette | 1 | 3 | 1 | Dekalb | 1971 | 2 |
| Clark, Ashley Victoria | 1 | 5 | 1 | Chatham | 1983 | 2 |
| Clark, Bonadeen Lenzie | 1 | 0 | 1 | Crisp | 1941 | 5 |
| Clark, Komeika Michelle | 1 | 1 | 0 | Henry | 1981 | life |
| Clark, Patricia Anette | 1 | 10 | 1 | Bulloch | 1969 | 5 |
| Clark, Shanna L | 1 | 3 | 0 | Douglas | 1988 | 3 |
| Clay, Dishi | 1 | 2 | 1 | Dougherty | 1970 | 11 |
| Clay, Vickie | 1 | 2 | 0 | Tattnall | 1972 | 15 |
| Clayton, Crystal Elaine | 1 | 2 | 0 | Dooly | 1977 | 8 |
| Clayton, Kelletta Kathlee | 1 | 0 | 0 | Sumter | 1985 | 2 |
| Clemmons, Tara Ann | 1 | 4 | 0 | Dougherty | 1978 | 10 |
| Clemmons, Wanda D | 1 | 0 | 0 | Cobb | 1966 | 2 |
| Clemons, India Marie | 1 | 3 | 0 | Douglas | 1981 | 11 |
| Clifford, Sharonda L | 1 | 3 | 0 | Richmond | 1990 | 13 |
| Clines, Geneva Jannina | 1 | 5 | 0 | Grady | 1985 | 8 |
| Clines, Sylvia | 1 | 0 | 0 | Lowndes | 1981 | 7 |
| Cobb, Denise L | 1 | 2 | 0 | Liberty | 1972 | 20 |
| Cody, Sherrill Sabrina | 1 | 2 | 1 | Richmond | 1955 | 5 |
| Coggins, Waponica L | 1 | 1 | 0 | Spalding | 1979 | life |
| Coker, Joyce Jean | 1 | 2 | 0 | Bibb | 1956 | 12 |
| Colbert, Kimberly | 1 | 6 | 0 | Rockdale | 1980 | 4 |
| Colbert, Melissa | 1 | 1 | 1 | Dougherty | 1966 | life |
| Coleman, Ciara Matala | 1 | 2 | 0 | Candler | 1988 | 3 |
| Coleman, Pamela Riddles | 1 | 3 | 1 | Emanuel | 1954 | 20 |
| Coleman, Roberta | 1 | 1 | 0 | Richmond | 1967 | life |
| Coleman, Tamika Joy | 1 | 3 | 0 | Cobb | 1977 | 2 |
| Coleman, Tamika Lashanc | 1 | 4 | 1 | Dekalb | 1976 | 2 |
| Collins, Alexis Maxine | 1 | 0 | 0 | Chatham | 1971 | 3 |
| Collins, Barbara G | 1 | 2 | 1 | Fulton | 1967 | 10 |
| Columbus, Antisa Denise | 1 | 3 | 0 | Gwinnett | 1983 | 1 |
| Coney, Patricia Ann | 1 | 5 | 1 | Ben Hill | 1981 | 4 |
| Cook, Alfreda Chariette | 1 | 5 | 1 | Douglas | 1966 | 5 |
| Cook, Linda D | 1 | 3 | 1 | Dekalb | 1964 | 2 |
| Cooks, Annette | 1 | 2 | 0 | Muscogee | 1978 | 7 |
| Cooksey, Angel Lenora | 1 | 2 | 1 | Newton | 1957 | 2 |

| Name | Race | Crime | Priors | County | Y.O.B. | Sentence |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cooper, Lisa Elaine | 1 | 5 | 1 | Cobb | 1972 | 10 |
| Cooper, Sandra Dee | 1 | 0 | 1 | Cobb | 1965 | 5 |
| Cooper, Tiffany | 1 | 3 | 0 | Dekalb | 1979 | 20 |
| Cope, Faye | 1 | 5 | 0 | Screven | 1960 | 4 |
| Copeland, Julisa Adrian | 1 | 3 | 0 | Douglas | 1988 | 12 |
| Copeland, Veretta Y | 1 | 0 | 1 | Cobb | 1959 | 2 |
| Cornell, Aiasha | 1 | 6 | 0 | Douglas | 1978 | 3 |
| Cotton, Patricia Ann | 1 | 2 | 1 | Muscogee | 1959 | 5 |
| Cowart, Denise Latrail | 1 | 5 | 1 | Lowndes | 1973 | 4 |
| Cox, Ashley D | 1 | 0 | 0 | Douglas | 1984 | 14 |
| Craig, Kesha | 1 | 3 | 0 | Dekalb | 1987 | 12 |
| Crayton, Deborah Denise | 1 | 0 | 1 | Long | 1960 | 10 |
| Crouch, Erica | 1 | 0 | 1 | Muscogee | 1985 | 3 |
| Crowder, Helen | 1 | 3 | 0 | Henry | 1958 | 3 |
| Crowell, Johnnie | 1 | 0 | 1 | Muscogee | 1957 | 2 |
| Crowley, Crystal | 1 | 3 | 1 | Troup | 1979 | 5 |
| Crumbley, Brittany | 1 | 11 | 0 | Dekalb | 1989 | 18 |
| Crumbley, Mary | 1 | 2 | 1 | Burke | 1960 | 5 |
| Crutchfield, Karen | 1 | 3 | 1 | Walton | 1967 | 6 |
| Cummings, Gwendolyn | 1 | 3 | 0 | Fulton | 1960 | 4 |
| Cummings, Roiland Denise | 1 | 5 | 0 | Washington | 1980 | 8 |
| Cunningham, Courtney Turne | 1 | 1 | 0 | Dekalb | 1969 | life |
| Cunningham, Denise | 1 | 2 | 1 | Floyd | 1960 | 5 |
| Cunningham, Tameka Lasean | 1 | 2 | 0 | Dekalb | 1974 | 3 |
| Curry, Chiquita Lawanda | 1 | 0 | 1 | Richmond | 1973 | 10 |
| Curry, Iona Denise | 1 | 3 | 0 | Chatham | 1967 | 7 |
| Curry, Nikita Lametrice | 1 | 11 | 0 | Bibb | 1981 | 15 |
| Curry, Patricia | 1 | 7 | 1 | Wilcox | 1969 | 5 |
| Curtis, Pauline | 1 | 2 | 0 | Twiggs | 1930 | 5 |
| Cypress, Yvette | 1 | 3 | 0 | Fulton | 1958 | 1 |
| Dale, Rhonda | 1 | 3 | 1 | Seminole | 1969 | 10 |
| Dallas, Cheneasa | 1 | 3 | 0 | Camden | 1985 | 10 |
| Damons, Sabrina | 1 | 3 | 1 | Jackson | 1973 | 4 |
| Daniels, Ikethia Tanise | 1 | 2 | 0 | Richmond | 1982 | 20 |
| Daniels, Patricia | 1 | 0 | 0 | Screven | 1960 | 4 |
| Daniels, Sherrie Jeanette | 1 | 3 | 1 | Whitfield | 1971 | 5 |
| Daniels, Vassilla | 1 | 2 | 0 | Toombs | 1980 | 10 |
| Darden, Polly Ann | 1 | 0 | 1 | Chattooga | 1968 | 10 |
| Darrisaw, Jessica Nicole | 1 | 3 | 0 | Baldwin | 1981 | 8 |
| Davenport, Bernice | 1 | 2 | 1 | Fulton | 1960 | 15 |

| Name | Race | Crime | Priors | County | Y.O.B. | Sentence |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Davis, Carolyn | 1 | 2 | 1 | Worth | 1959 | 15 |
| Davis, Carolyn | 1 | 2 | 0 | Muscogee | 1955 | 20 |
| Davis, Charlotte E | 1 | 3 | 0 | Muscogee | 1986 | 10 |
| Davis, Crystal | 1 | 3 | 0 | Bibb | 1987 | 5 |
| Davis, Cynthia P | 1 | 3 | 0 | Carroll | 1964 | 3.8 |
| Davis, Demetria | 1 | 5 | 1 | Floyd | 1970 | 3 |
| Davis, Janice Marie | 1 | 0 | 1 | Walker | 1972 | 3 |
| Davis, Jeanelle Shanee | 1 | 3 | 0 | Fulton | 1986 | 10 |
| Davis, Kimberly | 1 | 3 | 0 | Fulton | 1969 | 17 |
| Davis, Lakeisha | 1 | 1 | 0 | Laurens | 1990 | life |
| Davis, Maleda Louise | 1 | 3 | 0 | Fulton | 1980 | 19 |
| Davis, Mary Ann | 1 | 11 | 0 | Glynn | 1961 | 15 |
| Davis, Natalie | 1 | 0 | 1 | Bartow | 1984 | 3.8 |
| Davis, Shirleta | 1 | 2 | 0 | Jefferson | 1972 | 8 |
| Davis, Tameika Shanta | 1 | 2 | 0 | Richmond | 1985 | 4 |
| Davis, Zandra | 1 | 3 | 0 | Clayton | 1973 | 3 |
| Day, Shacrystal | 1 | 3 | 0 | Dekalb | 1988 | 20 |
| Dean, Penney C | 1 | 3 | 1 | Troup | 1964 | 10 |
| Dean, Theresa | 1 | 3 | 1 | Whitfield | 1964 | 10 |
| Debelbot, Ashley | 1 | 1 | 0 | Muscogee | 1984 | life |
| Delaney, Regina Haynes | 1 | 5 | 0 | Cobb | 1981 | 0.7 |
| Demery, Natasha | 1 | 1 | 0 | Cobb | 1976 | life |
| Demory, Deborah Denise | 1 | 0 | 1 | Hall | 1965 | 5 |
| Denton, Sheila | 1 | 1 | 0 | Ware | 1966 | life |
| Deriso, Wanda Joyce | 1 | 1 | 0 | Coffee | 1958 | life |
| Dewberry, Patricia Ann | 1 | 2 | 0 | Talbot | 1955 | 8 |
| Diamond, Yolanda Delois | 1 | 1 | 0 | Clayton | 1972 | life |
| Dickens, Latoya Leandra | 1 | 1 | 0 | Gwinnett | 1971 | life |
| Dickerson, Sierra | 1 | 2 | 0 | Cobb | 1983 | 5 |
| Dillard, Angela Tiffany | 1 | 3 | 0 | Clarke | 1982 | 20 |
| Dillon, Regina M | 1 | 1 | 0 | Whitfield | 1963 | life |
| Dixon, Demetria | 1 | 2 | 0 | Dekalb | 1971 | 15 |
| Dixon, Glenda Michelle | 1 | 2 | 1 | Floyd | 1968 | 4 |
| Dixon, Jacqueline Lemora | 1 | 0 | 1 | Fulton | 1963 | 15 |
| Dixon, Marjore Rimeow | 1 | 3 | 0 | Newton | 1989 | 7 |
| Dixon, Shamair Dichelle | 1 | 0 | 0 | Gordon | 1983 | 3 |
| Dixon, Yolanda Evetta | 1 | 0 | 1 | Carroll | 1963 | 3 |
| Dobbs, Stephanie Renee | 1 | 0 | 0 | Carroll | 1983 | 3 |
| Dodd, Senta Christine | 1 | 3 | 0 | Cobb | 1978 | 5 |
| Dodson, Kristy | 1 | 5 | 1 | Floyd | 1975 | 5 |

| Name | Race | Crime | Priors | County | Y.O.B. | Sentence |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Douchette, Rhonda Lynn | 1 | 6 | 1 | Newton | 1966 | 3 |
| Douglas, Shuwanda Nicole | 1 | 5 | 0 | Henry | 1977 | 2 |
| Doyle, Juanita | 1 | 3 | 0 | Chatham | 1968 | 4 |
| Dozier, Kendra | 1 | 2 | 0 | Coweta | 1985 | 2 |
| Driskell, Lena Sims | 1 | 2 | 0 | Fulton | 1927 | 10 |
| Dudley, Glenda F | 1 | 3 | 0 | Muscogee | 1962 | 7 |
| Dukes, April M | 1 | 2 | 1 | Dougherty | 1965 | 3.8 |
| Dukes, Shanitera Latrell | 1 | 0 | 0 | Chatham | 1978 | 1 |
| Duncan, Patricia Ann | 1 | 2 | 1 | Bibb | 1963 | 10 |
| Dupree, Neeley | 1 | 2 | 1 | Dodge | 1967 | 5 |
| Durden, Kendra | 1 | 1 | 0 | Walton | 1975 | life |
| Durham, Maisha Mahalia | 1 | 1 | 1 | Houston | 1972 | life |
| Dwight, Antoinette Leshon | 1 | 3 | 0 | Clayton | 1971 | 1 |
| Mack, Bonita Gail | 1 | 5 | 0 | Richmond | 1962 | 2 |
| Mack, Gretta | 1 | 0 | 1 | Chatham | 1957 | 3 |
| Mack, Tamika | 1 | 3 | 1 | Bartow | 1969 | 10 |
| Mack, Tarsha D | 1 | 5 | 1 | Chatham | 1967 | 10 |
| Mack, Tomeika | 1 | 3 | 0 | Muscogee | 1979 | 2.7 |
| Macklin, Dawn | 1 | 2 | 0 | Bibb | 1975 | 5 |
| Maddox, Cynthia Denise | 1 | 0 | 1 | Newton | 1957 | 5 |
| Maddox, Emma J | 1 | 0 | 1 | Newton | 1954 | 5 |
| Maddox, Melissa | 1 | 0 | 0 | Fulton | 1967 | 3 |
| Malcom, Benita | 1 | 0 | 0 | Walton | 1985 | 2 |
| Malone, Monique Michelle | 1 | 0 | 0 | Hall | 1979 | 6 |
| Malone, Nikita Renea | 1 | 5 | 1 | Dekalb | 1967 | 5 |
| Abell, Lorraine Diane | 2 | 0 | 0 | Cobb | 1966 | 10 mths |
| Abernathy, Lori | 2 | 4 | 0 | Hall | 1964 | 20 |
| Abney, Rhonda J. | 2 | 0 | 0 | McIntosh | 1958 | 2 |
| Adair, Amanda Roberts | 2 | 5 | 0 | Pulaski | 1981 | 2 |
| Adams, Angela Denise | 2 | 2 | 1 | Fulton | 1979 | 20 |
| Adams, Dawn Renee | 2 | 5 | 1 | Rockdale | 1965 | 5 |
| Adams, Lashay D | 2 | 1 | 0 | Floyd | 1980 | 20 to life |
| Adcock, Brittany Dawn | 2 | 0 | 0 | Dawson | 1985 | 5 |
| Addison, Kimberly | 2 | 5 | 0 | Troup | 1972 | 2 |
| Adkins, Deborah Lynn | 2 | 3 | 0 | Catoosa | 1974 | 10 |
| Akin, Sandy Dawn | 2 | 3 | 0 | Richmond | 1978 | 20 |
| Alday, Tamara Chae | 2 | 2 | 0 | Whitfield | 1988 | 5 |
| Alexander, Rita | 2 | 0 | 1 | Stephens | 1964 | 4 |
| Allen, Denise Fisk | 2 | 0 | 1 | Cherokee | 1964 | 3 |
| Allen, Diana | 2 | 2 | 0 | Carroll | 1973 | 7 |

| Name | Race | Crime | Priors | County | Y.O.B. | Sentence |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Allen, Misty Nicole | 2 | 5 | 0 | Floyd | 1977 | 75 mths |
| Allen, Shannon Denise | 2 | 7 | 0 | Towns | 1981 | 4 |
| Almon, Sheila Ann | 2 | 3 | 1 | Gwinnett | 1954 | 15 |
| Alphord, Tanya | 2 | 3 | 0 | Decatur | 1973 | 2 |
| Alterbaum, Emily Lauren | 2 | 3 | 0 | Chatham | 1988 | 4 |
| Alvaradogonzalez, Cynthia | 2 | 4 | 0 | Gwinnett | 1990 | 5 |
| Amerson, Brenda Marie | 2 | 3 | 0 | McDuffie | 1982 | 12 |
| Ammons, Penny | 2 | 2 | 1 | Chattooga | 1971 | 7 |
| Amon, Mary Yvonne | 2 | 0 | 1 | Paulding | 1965 | 7 |
| Anders, Shannon | 2 | 3 | 0 | Gwinnett | 1970 | 3 |
| Anderson, Crystal | 2 | 3 | 0 | Chatham | 1986 | 10 |
| Anderson, Susan C | 2 | 0 | 0 | Cobb | 1959 | 3 |
| Andrews, Andrea L | 2 | 3 | 0 | Douglas | 1966 | 12 |
| April, Marnie Lea | 2 | 5 | 0 | Jones | 1970 | 4 |
| Argot, Candy Su | 2 | 2 | 0 | Cherokee | 1980 | 20 |
| Ariasvela, Felipa | 2 | 2 | 0 | Rockdale | 1975 | 20 |
| Arms, Angelda M | 2 | 4 | 0 | Colquitt | 1978 | 5 |
| Armstrong, Amanda Leigh | 2 | 0 | 0 | Douglas | 1982 | 3 |
| Arrington, Shirley A | 2 | 3 | 1 | Coweta | 1946 | 4 |
| Arthur, Robin Denise | 2 | 5 | 0 | Whitfield | 1979 | 1 |
| Artman, Tammy Lou | 2 | 5 | 0 | Jones | 1964 | 10 |
| Arvizu, Danina | 2 | 5 | 0 | Walker | 1977 | 4 |
| Ashe, Julie Renee | 2 | 0 | 0 | Union | 1976 | 3 |
| Atchinson, Avis Marie | 2 | 4 | 0 | Henry | 1977 | 10 |
| Atondo, Lorena Bustamante | 2 | 0 | 0 | Barrow | 1967 | 10 |
| Atwood, Amber Jene | 2 | 2 | 0 | Chatham | 1988 | 9 |
| Autry, Glenda Michael | 2 | 3 | 1 | Floyd | 1969 | 2 |
| Avila, Estella | 2 | 2 | 0 | Whitfield | 1951 | 14 |
| Avila, Maria Christina | 2 | 4 | 0 | Whitfield | 1968 | 20 |
| Babcock, Kimberly | 2 | 4 | 0 | Camden | 1969 | 4 |
| Baggett, Pamela | 2 | 3 | 0 | Floyd | 1960 | 3 |
| Baghose, Charlotte JO | 2 | 5 | 0 | Hall | 1942 | 9 |
| Bagley, Wendy | 2 | 7 | 1 | Gordon | 1965 | 10 |
| Bagwell, Janet Remete | 2 | 1 | 0 | Floyd | 1957 | life |
| Bailey, Marla L | 2 | 0 | 1 | Paulding | 1971 | 5 |
| Bailey, Sherry Ann | 2 | 2 | 0 | Muscogee | 1966 | 20 |
| Bailey, Theresa | 2 | 3 | 0 | Floyd | 1962 | 5 |
| Bain, Heather | 2 | 0 | 0 | Farmin | 1977 | 10 |
| Baker, Kelly Renee | 2 | 3 | 0 | Rabun | 1972 | 2 |
| Baker, Latasha Jean | 2 | 0 | 1 | Dekalb | 1987 | 9 mths |

| Name | Race | Crime | Priors | County | Y.O.B. | Sentence |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Baker, Suzanne | 2 | 3 | 0 | Rockdale | 1961 | 6 |
| Bales, Linda | 2 | 3 | 0 | Banks | 1961 | 12 |
| Ballard, Kelly Devon | 2 | 3 | 0 | Floyd | 1972 | 5 |
| Bamberg, Sonya | 2 | 1 | 0 | Jeff Davis | 1955 | life |
| Banta, Catherine Louise | 2 | 1 | 0 | Whitfield | 1958 | life |
| Barber, Regina Lynn | 2 | 5 | 0 | Gwinnett | 1961 | 2 |
| Barker, Lisa Anne | 2 | 5 | 0 | Floyd | 1963 | 10 |
| Barlow, Linda J | 2 | 3 | 0 | Washington | 1991 | 10 |
| Barnes, Holly Michelle | 2 | 10 | 0 | Peach | 1983 | 10 |
| Barnes, Michelle Elizabeth | 2 | 3 | 1 | Henry | 1973 | 2 |
| Barnes, Tiffany Faye | 2 | 3 | 0 | Cobb | 1984 | 2 |
| Barnett, Joanne Karr | 2 | 4 | 0 | Henry | 1970 | 3 |
| Barnett, Kay Joyce | 2 | 2 | 0 | Lamar | 1959 | 2 |
| Baron, Rhonda Renee | 2 | 3 | 1 | Coweta | 1971 | 5 |
| Barrett, Joanna Kayla | 2 | 3 | 1 | Franklin | 1983 | 5 |
| Barrett, Sheronica | 2 | 0 | 0 | Banks | 1979 | 1 |
| Barron, Jamie Michelle | 2 | 0 | 0 | Bartow | 1973 | 2 |
| Barrow, Diane Carol | 2 | 0 | 0 | Tattnall | 1965 | 4 |
| Bartlett, Staci Marie | 2 | 0 | 0 | White | 1975 | 5 |
| Barton, Heather Alicia | 2 | 3 | 0 | Fannin | 1988 | 8 |
| Bateman, Cynthia Lynn | 2 | 3 | 0 | Sumter | 1978 | 5 |
| Baugus, Glenda F | 2 | 2 | 0 | Dekalb | 1964 | 3 |
| Baum, Angela White | 2 | 0 | 1 | Bartow | 1971 | 2 |
| Baynor, Terri Lynn | 2 | 0 | 0 | Marion | 1963 | 10 |
| Bays, Teresa L | 2 | 0 | 0 | Clayton | 1972 | 10 |
| Beach, Shannon L | 2 | 0 | 0 | Gwinnett | 1971 | 8 |
| Beard, Paula Leeann | 2 | 0 | 1 | Walker | 1979 | 10 |
| Beaver, Carol | 2 | 4 | 0 | Colquitt | 1970 | 5 |
| Beaver, Deana | 2 | 3 | 0 | Dekalb | 1977 | 2 |
| Beck, Amanda Kate | 2 | 0 | 0 | Union | 1977 | 5 |
| Beck, Kathryn | 2 | 3 | 0 | Muscogee | 1984 | 5 |
| Beck, Sabrina Marie | 2 | 0 | 0 | Dekalb | 1983 | 2 |
| Beckum, Monica Lyn | 2 | 3 | 1 | Toombs | 1965 | 4 |
| Bedgood, Julia Melissa | 2 | 3 | 0 | Richmond | 1981 | 10 |
| Belcher, Kimberly | 2 | 4 | 0 | Walker | 1971 | 20 |
| Bell, Kimberly Sue | 2 | 5 | 1 | Wheeler | 1966 | 4 |
| Bell, Lorene Endona | 2 | 3 | 0 | Laurens | 1958 | 10 |
| Bell, Melanie Dawn | 2 | 0 | 1 | Gordon | 1968 | 2 |
| Bennett, Tracy L | 2 | 3 | 0 | Catoosa | 1970 | 4 |
| Benson, Rebecca | 2 | 2 | 0 | Monroe | 1969 | 8 |

| Name | Race | Crime | Priors | County | Y.O.B. | Sentence |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Berg, Betty | 2 | 4 | 0 | Bulloch | 1973 | 4 |
| Bergara, Samantha Lynn | 2 | 3 | 0 | Colquitt | 1989 | 5 |
| Bergerondekle, Toni Marie | 2 | 2 | 0 | Ben Hill | 1981 | 10 |
| Bernabe, Brandie Sage | 2 | 3 | 0 | Coweta | 1982 | 4 |
| Berry, Janet D | 2 | 3 | 1 | Fulton | 1968 | 10 |
| Betsill, Ginger Lynn | 2 | 5 | 1 | Carroll | 1967 | 3 |
| Beutner, Saray R | 2 | 3 | 0 | Chatham | 1987 | 10 |
| Billiter, Stacy Ranae | 2 | 6 | 1 | Long | 1972 | 2 |
| Bishop, Sandra J | 2 | 2 | 1 | Coweta | 1955 | 5 |
| Bishop, Stacye Lynn | 2 | 0 | 0 | Clayton | 1976 | 10 |
| Bjorklund, Terie Parrish | 2 | 3 | 0 | Richmond | 1956 | 5 |
| Black, Candace | 2 | 3 | 0 | Cobb | 1988 | 10 |
| Black, Mandy Kay | 2 | 5 | 0 | Habersham | 1980 | 2 |
| Black, Melissa Ann | 2 | 0 | 0 | Coweta | 1973 | 2 |
| Blackburn, Christie | 2 | 1 | 0 | Fulton | 1974 | LIfe |
| Blaha, Katheen | 2 | 10 | 0 | Chatham | 1972 | 2 |
| Blankenship, Debbie Sue | 2 | 3 | 1 | Carroll | 1958 | 1 |
| Blehm, Katherine Grace | 2 | 0 | 1 | Cherokee | 1983 | 1 |
| Blocker, Lisa Faye | 2 | 0 | 0 | Tattnall | 1968 | 3 |
| Blount, Mary Owen | 2 | 1 | 0 | Upson | 1952 | Life |
| Blount, Vicki | 2 | 3 | 0 | Baldwin | 1988 | 5 |
| Board, Cynthia Ann | 2 | 8 | 0 | Catoosa | 1963 | 2 |
| Boatner, Sheila Hicks | 2 | 0 | 0 | Floyd | 1957 | 3 |
| Boatright, Ashley Megan | 2 | 0 | 0 | Cobb | 1987 | 2 |
| Boatright, Donna Jean | 2 | 2 | 0 | White | 1962 | 5 |
| Bohn, Vanessa Renee | 2 | 3 | 0 | Gwinnett | 1969 | 3 |
| Bollen, Crystal Juannette | 2 | 5 | 1 | Floyd | 1971 | 5 |
| Bolt, Heather Ann | 2 | 0 | 0 | Cherokee | 1984 | 2 |
| Bolton, Dawn Michelle | 2 | 3 | 0 | Rockdale | 1968 | 12 |
| Bone, Leaha | 2 | 3 | 0 | Coweta | 1984 | 4 |
| Boone, Rebecca Regina | 2 | 3 | 0 | Cherokee | 1960 | 18 |
| Cabe, Katherine Rene | 2 | 3 | 0 | Coweta | 1984 | 3 |
| Callahan, Cheryl Morris | 2 | 10 | 0 | Gwinnett | 1960 | LIfe |
| Calloway, Bethel Rena | 2 | 5 | 0 | Walton | 1975 | 3 |
| Calloway, Suzzett Marie | 2 | 1 | 0 | Catoosa | 1973 | LIfe |
| Camp, Jennyfer Aissia | 2 | 3 | 0 | Dekalb | 1974 | 6 |
| Camp, Shannon | 2 | 2 | 0 | Douglas | 1970 | 10 |
| Camp, Wendy Michell | 2 | 3 | 0 | Spaulding | 1983 | 3 |
| Campbell, Amber Kristine | 2 | 4 | 0 | Houston | 1986 | 5 |
| Campbell, Cynthia Butler | 2 | 0 | 0 | Walker | 1961 | 15 |

| Name | Race | Crime | Priors | County | Y.O.B. | Sentence |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Campbell, Jessica Lynn | 2 | 3 | 0 | Walton | 1983 | 2 |
| Campen, Teresa | 2 | 5 | 0 | Dekalb | 1957 | 5 |
| Campo, Rachel Marie | 2 | 3 | 0 | Cobb | 1985 | 4 |
| Cantrell, Julie Shai | 2 | 5 | 0 | Whitfield | 1976 | 5 |
| Cantu, Leticia Michelle | 2 | 2 | 0 | Douglas | 1990 | 3 |
| Carder, Stacy Michelle | 2 | 3 | 0 | Hall | 1987 | 8 |
| Cardiosso, Alissia | 2 | 0 | 0 | Dekalb | 1979 | 8 |
| Carithers, Carol | 2 | 4 | 0 | Madison | 1971 | 10 |
| Carithers, Sharon | 2 | 10 | 0 | Clarke | 1977 | 3 |
| Carlisle, Lynn Edwards | 2 | 3 | 0 | Floyd | 1965 | 5 |
| Carlyle, Julie Lynn | 2 | 3 | 1 | Coweta | 1981 | 2 |
| Carney, Kimberly Marie | 2 | 5 | 0 | Bryan | 1985 | 3 |
| Carol, Queen | 2 | 12 | 0 | Camden | 1935 | 10 |
| Carr, Crystal Starr | 2 | 0 | 0 | Floyd | 1976 | 2 |
| Carroll, Jamie Michelle | 2 | 5 | 0 | Barrow | 1971 | 4 |
| Carter, Crystal Diane | 2 | 3 | 0 | Floyd | 1981 | 8 |
| Carter, Kimberlee | 2 | 0 | 0 | Walker | 1981 | 2 |
| Carter, Tabitha Denise | 2 | 0 | 0 | Catoosa | 1974 | 3 |
| Carter, Terrie Lynn | 2 | 0 | 0 | Hall | 1973 | 10 |
| Cash, Trisha Dean | 2 | 5 | 0 | Hall | 1981 | 1 |
| Cason, Jondi Danyelle | 2 | 3 | 0 | Cobb | 1978 | 16 |
| Castillo, Patricia Esparza | 2 | 0 | 0 | Douglas | 1972 | 25 |
| Castillo, Rebecca Lynne | 2 | 0 | 0 | Douglas | 1979 | 19 |
| Castillo, Veronica Esparz | 2 | 0 | 0 | Douglas | 1975 | 25 |
| Cates, Jessica Juanita | 2 | 3 | 0 | Hall | 1983 | 18 |
| Catone, Rana Maria | 2 | 0 | 0 | Decatur | 1970 | 3 |
| Cavender, Sherrie Smith | 2 | 0 | 0 | Troup | 1965 | 15 |
| Chamberlain, Jennifer Leig | 2 | 5 | 0 | Douglas | 1980 | 8 months |
| Chambers, Amanda Dawn | 2 | 0 | 0 | Clayton | 1979 | 3 |
| Chambers, Connie | 2 | 5 | 0 | Houston | 1948 | 4 |
| Chambers, Jennifer Anna | 2 | 0 | 0 | Cobb | 1980 | 3 |
| Chambers, Megan Elizabet | 2 | 3 | 0 | Henry | 1983 | 10 |
| Chambers, Shylow Lorraine | 2 | 6 | 1 | Dawson | 1982 | 5 |
| Chamblee, Rachel Denise | 2 | 3 | 0 | Toombs | 1978 | 10 |
| Chaney, Amanda Nicole | 2 | 2 | 0 | Colquitt | 1985 | 20 |
| Chapman, Regina | 2 | 5 | 0 | Richmond | 1969 | 3 |
| Chapman, Tammy Lynn | 2 | 0 | 0 | Troup | 1969 | 10 |
| Charles, Lisa Gail | 2 | 11 | 0 | Bulloch | 1965 | 15 |
| Chastain, Barbara Jean | 2 | 0 | 0 | Polk | 1987 | 2 |
| Chastain, Misty Lynn | 2 | 5 | 0 | Cobb | 1975 | 3 |

| Name | Race | Crime | Priors | County | Y.O.B. | Sentence |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Childs, Connielynn | 2 | 0 | 0 | Elbert | 1963 | 2 |
| Chilson, Carmalita | 2 | 3 | 1 | Glynn | 1977 | 4 |
| Christian, Dana Gail | 2 | 0 | 0 | Newton | 1977 | 6 |
| Christian, Jennifer Lynn | 2 | 5 | 1 | Cherokee | 1980 | 10 |
| Christy, Crystal Lindale | 2 | 0 | 0 | Chatham | 1978 | 3 |
| Churchwell, Jennifer A | 2 | 0 | 0 | Laurens | 1974 | 8 |
| Cividanes, Maria Delos | 2 | 2 | 0 | Gwinnett | 1949 | 3 |
| Clark, Dawn Louise | 2 | 4 | 0 | Cook | 1965 | 10 |
| Clark, Janet | 2 | 5 | 0 | Thomas | 1960 | 10 |
| Clark, Lisa Nichole | 2 | 3 | 0 | Gilmer | 1983 | 1 |
| Clark, Raquel Elena | 2 | 0 | 0 | Clayton | 1963 | 10 |
| Clark, Sherry L | 2 | 6 | 1 | Henry | 1965 | 36 mths |
| Clark, Terry Lynn | 2 | 2 | 1 | Clayton | 1982 | 5 |
| Clay, Mary Pamela | 2 | 0 | 1 | Hall | 1960 | 5 |
| Clegg, Nena Marie | 2 | 4 | 0 | Newton | 1969 | 3 |
| Clem, Laura Elizabeth | 2 | 4 | 0 | Walker | 1985 | 7 |
| Clemons, Gerri Lynn | 2 | 0 | 0 | Wayne | 1968 | 4 |
| Clifton, Toni D | 2 | 3 | 1 | Chatham | 1962 | 3 |
| Coan, Bobbie Lynn | 2 | 3 | 1 | Cherokee | 1982 | 10 |
| Cobb, Jodie | 2 | 2 | 0 | Clayton | 1983 | 15 |
| Cobb, Kay Katherine | 2 | 5 | 0 | Douglas | 1984 | 2 |
| Cobb, Nicole Candice | 2 | 2 | 0 | Candler | 1987 | 6 |
| Cobb, Wanda L | 2 | 3 | 0 | Fannin | 1960 | 5 |
| Cochran, Holly Juliana | 2 | 3 | 0 | Whitfield | 1987 | 3 |
| Cochran, Kendall Lee | 2 | 0 | 0 | Cobb | 1975 | 3 |
| Cody, Bridget Marie | 2 | 0 | 0 | Richmond | 1980 | 4 |
| Coffey, Cassie Renee | 2 | 2 | 1 | Fulton | 1983 | 1 |
| Coggins, Belinda Gail | 2 | 2 | 0 | Dekalb | 1951 | 5 |
| Cohn, Tina Anne | 2 | 5 | 1 | Richmond | 1959 | 7 |
| Cohran, Robin Leray | 2 | 0 | 0 | Gwinnett | 1981 | 7 |
| Coker, Gay | 2 | 2 | 0 | Cobb | 1968 | 3 |
| Cole, Deborah | 2 | 2 | 0 | Chatham | 1952 | 5 |
| Cole, Frankie | 2 | 0 | 0 | Whitfield | 1961 | 3 |
| Coleman, Kimberly Lynn | 2 | 11 | 0 | Fulton | 1966 | 20 |
| Collins, Cynthia A | 2 | 3 | 1 | Hall | 1964 | 2 |
| Collins, Holly E | 2 | 0 | 0 | Catoosa | 1966 | 9 |
| Collins, Misty Dawn | 2 | 5 | 0 | Whitfield | 1986 | 7 |
| Colson, Tabatha Hope | 2 | 1 | 0 | Brantley | 1979 | Life |
| Compton, Dreama | 2 | 3 | 0 | Fayette | 1985 | 3 |
| Conaway, Melissa | 2 | 3 | 0 | Muscogee | 1986 | 13 |

| Name | Race | Crime | Priors | County | Y.O.B. | Sentence |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Conley, Annette | 2 | 2 | 0 | Glynn | 1964 | 20 |
| Conley, Christy Caroline | 2 | 5 | 1 | Bibb | 1972 | 10 |
| Conner, Jamie | 2 | 7 | 1 | Gilmer | 1980 | 5 |
| Conway, Katherine Melissa | 2 | 1 | 0 | Richmond | 1971 | Life |
| Cook, Brandi | 2 | 0 | 1 | Lamar | 1979 | 5 |
| Cook, Christina | 2 | 3 | 0 | Monroe | 1977 | 4 |
| Cook, Crystal | 2 | 3 | 0 | Catoosa | 1972 | 9 |
| Cook, Dawn M | 2 | 3 | 0 | Tattnall | 1970 | 3 |
| Cook, Frances Bonner | 2 | 4 | 0 | Whitfield | 1964 | 5 |
| Cook, Tracey Jane | 2 | 3 | 0 | Cobb | 1971 | 4 |
| Cooley, Ginger | 2 | 3 | 0 | Lowndes | 1976 | 5 |
| Cooper, Brandy Nichole | 2 | 4 | 0 | Bartow | 1978 | 12 |
| Corbin, Angela Yvonne | 2 | 0 | 0 | Cobb | 1976 | 2 |
| Cordoba-Galindo, Susana | 2 | 0 | 0 | Gwinnett | 1983 | 10 |
| Corey, Wilma Allison | 2 | 3 | 0 | Bibb | 1962 | 3 |
| Cornejo, Micha Hee | 2 | 0 | 0 | Floyd | 1973 | 10 |
| Cornelius, Daphne Rae | 2 | 0 | 0 | Cook | 1972 | 10 |
| Coronado, Misty S | 2 | 3 | 0 | Hall | 1976 | 2 |
| Corry, Candace L | 2 | 5 | 0 | Gwinnett | 1972 | 3 |
| Cotney, Katherine | 2 | 0 | 0 | Spaulding | 1980 | 5 |
| Cotter, Connie | 2 | 1 | 0 | Paulding | 1966 | Life |
| Coulter, Alxendra Elizabet | 2 | 1 | 0 | Bulloch | 1984 | life |
| Courtney, Charlie Tamara | 2 | 0 | 1 | Clayton | 1988 | 2 |
| Cox, Amanda Lea | 2 | 3 | 0 | Mitchell | 1980 | 10 |
| Cox, Holly | 2 | 4 | 0 | Mitchell | 1962 | 20 |
| Cox, Jamie Leigh | 2 | 3 | 1 | Cherokee | 1976 | 3 |
| Cox, Mindy Leigh | 2 | 0 | 1 | Carroll | 1983 | 5 |
| Cox, Paula Jean | 2 | 5 | 0 | Cartow | 1967 | 10 |
| Crabb, Carla Dianna | 2 | 0 | 0 | Crisp | 1963 | 3 |
| Craft, Kimberly M | 2 | 3 | 0 | Pulaski | 1987 | 2 |
| Craig, Olivia Michelle | 2 | 0 | 0 | Murray | 1982 | 5 |
| Craig, Tina Loren | 2 | 8 | 0 | Fulton | 1972 | 1 |
| Cranford, Beverly | 2 | 0 | 0 | Cobb | 1981 | 5 months |
| Craven, Courtney Paige | 2 | 5 | 0 | Bartow | 1985 | 3 |
| Crawford, Amber | 2 | 0 | 1 | Telfair | 1976 | 3 |
| Crawford, Carrie | 2 | 0 | 0 | Gwinnett | 1973 | 15 |
| Crawford, Ivori D | 2 | 5 | 0 | Catoosa | 1979 | 2 |
| Dallinger, Angela D | 2 | 7 | 1 | Gwinnett | 1964 | 5 |
| Dalton, Barbara Elaine | 2 | 1 | 0 | Newton | 1960 | life |
| Dalton, Elaine Willette | 2 | 0 | 0 | Murray | 1973 | 1 |

| Name | Race | Crime | Priors | County | Y.O.B. | Sentence |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Darrah, Rhonda | 2 | 0 | 0 | Whitfield | 1965 | 2 |
| Daughterty, Brittney Miche | 2 | 0 | 0 | Douglas | 1978 | 2 |
| Davenport, Belinda Sue | 2 | 0 | 0 | Cobb | 1978 | 2 |
| Davenport, Dawn Marie | 2 | 0 | 0 | Towns | 1984 | 2 |
| Davenport, Linda Marie | 2 | 0 | 0 | Towns | 1966 | 3 |
| Davenport, Sheila A | 2 | 1 | 0 | Fannin | 1964 | life |
| Davis, Ashley N | 2 | 5 | 0 | Muscogee | 1987 | 10 |
| Davis, Hailey Sharee | 2 | 5 | 0 | Ben Hill | 1987 | 10 |
| Davis, Ivy J | 2 | 6 | 0 | Clarke | 1940 | 5 |
| Davis, Janice S | 2 | 5 | 0 | Laurens | 1958 | 4 |
| Davis, Lacinda Ann | 2 | 3 | 0 | Floyd | 1990 | 3 |
| Davis, Leesha Ann | 2 | 3 | 0 | Gilmer | 1975 | 5 |
| Davis, Libby A | 2 | 0 | 0 | Gordon | 1963 | 3 |
| Davis, Michelle | 2 | 3 | 1 | Chatham | 1972 | 10 |
| Davis, Priscilla A | 2 | 6 | 1 | Glynn | 1982 | 18mths |
| Davis, Regina | 2 | 0 | 0 | Newton | 1961 | 3 |
| Davis, Sonya Kay | 2 | 0 | 0 | Appling | 1977 | 5 |
| Davis, Tammy W | 2 | 1 | 1 | Pickens | 1973 | life |
| Deal, Carolyn D | 2 | 4 | 1 | Floyd | 1971 | 7 |
| Deal, Robin Kay | 2 | 5 | 0 | Barrow | 1959 | 1 |
| Dean, Camlyn Marie | 2 | 0 | 0 | Douglas | 1981 | 1 |
| Dean, Marsha Diane | 2 | 3 | 0 | Murray | 1980 | 11 |
| Dean, Reba L | 2 | 2 | 0 | Walker | 1982 | 10 |
| Defoggi, Debra | 2 | 5 | 0 | Jeff Davis | 1963 | 4 |
| Degollado, Nancy | 2 | 3 | 0 | Cherokee | 1981 | 2 |
| Delacruz, Savina | 2 | 1 | 0 | Cobb | 1982 | Life |
| Delagarza, Erika Yvonne | 2 | 0 | 0 | Union | 1978 | 5 |
| Delangel, Detra erlene | 2 | 0 | 0 | Colquitt | 1969 | 2 |
| Delany, Raven | 2 | 1 | 0 | Cobb | 1982 | life |
| Delap, Lisa Rene | 2 | 0 | 0 | Cobb | 1978 | 3 |
| Delemaria, Alejandra | 2 | 1 | 0 | Fulton | 1975 | life |
| Deleon, Deborah | 2 | 3 | 0 | Troup | 1959 | 1 |
| Delong, Terry Lynn | 2 | 3 | 1 | Forsyth | 1964 | 18 |
| Demers, Andrienne Suzan | 2 | 0 | 0 | Union | 1978 | 2 |
| Demicco, Kira Elena | 2 | 5 | 0 | Bartow | 1984 | 2 |
| Demore, Beverly Joe | 2 | 2 | 1 | Stephens | 1965 | 5 |
| Denman, Kim M | 2 | 7 | 1 | Carroll | 1960 | 5 |
| Denney, Anita Melissa | 2 | 4 | 0 | Walton | 1971 | 5 |
| Denson, Judy Ann | 2 | 1 | 0 | Cherokee | 1966 | life |

Key for Sample of 600

Race
1 = black
2 = white

Offense
0 = Narcotics
1 = Murder
2 = Other Violent crimes
3 = Theft/Robbery/Burglary
4 = Crimes with Children
5= Forgery/Fraud/Racketeering
6 = Conspiracy/Terrorism/Obstruction
7 = Firearm
8 = Escape/Fleeing
9 = Arson
10 = Sexual
11 = Kidnapping
12 = Stalking

Priors
0 = No
1 = Yes

Sentence is in years unless otherwise indicated