Gender, Social Ties, And Reentry Experiences

A Dissertation Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Jennifer Rhiannon Scroggins
August 2012

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It would not have been possible for me to complete this dissertation without the help and support of those around me, and I would like to express my gratitude to these individuals for all that they have done.

Dr. Hoan Bui has been an important mentor and supportive advisor to me throughout my time at Tennessee, and she was generous enough to allow me to use her data for my dissertation. Hoan has been patient and encouraging in her dealings with me, and even when I did not recognize it at the time, her tough comments on my work were a reflection of her faith in my ability to do better. I hope that one day I will become as great an advisor to my students as Hoan has been to me.

As my first advisor at Tennessee, Dr. Ben Feldmeyer has always been there to listen and give advice, the most important of which has been "You can do anything for ___ weeks." He was right, but I admit to feeling like he tricked me when it turned out that what he really should have been saying was "You can do anything for ___ months." Come to think of it, that was probably a tactical decision on his part, and I am grateful that he made it.

I also appreciate the advice and encouragement I received from Drs. Suzanne Kurth and Cheryl Travis. I am thankful to both of them for the thoughtful suggestions they provided about my dissertation, and I am grateful for the time they spent talking with me about topics completely unrelated to my dissertation, as those conversations helped to remind me that the world does not revolve around my research. That was an important lesson to have learned.

The past five years would have been much less rich without the support of my friends, many of whom are fellow graduate students, and for this I thank them. You've been important in so many ways, and I likely could not have survived this process without you.

I would also like to thank my partner, Matthew. Although I will never let him forget that strong women do not need men to do things for them, I appreciate all the meals he cooked so that I would not starve, the loads of laundry he washed so that I would not smell, and the words of support he gave me so that I would not break while I was writing this dissertation. Most of all, however, I appreciate him. He is a truly wonderful person and I am lucky to have him in my life.

Finally, I want to thank my grandmother, Joan, for her unwavering support. I do not know that I would have pursued a doctoral degree at all had it not been for her encouragement, and I am not sure that I would have made it through the first two years of my doctoral program had it not been for our Friday phone calls. Although she was not here long enough to see me complete the degree, I know she always believed that I would. I will carry that with me forever.

ABSTRACT

A great deal of research has been conducted on factors associated with successful prisoner reentry. However, except for a few studies on women's reentry, most studies have failed to examine the role of parolees' social ties in contributing to reentry outcomes. Additionally, most studies on prisoner reentry only focused on male parolees, and few addressed the influence of gender on reentry experiences. Thus, my goal in this dissertation is to understand the influence of gender on male and female parolees' social ties, and how the resources their ties provide shape their reentry experiences. My dissertation research examines men and women's strong- and weak-tie relationships and the resources available to them via their relationships to understand how these resources shape their reentry experiences. Study data, which were collected from in-depth interviews with fifty men and women under parole supervision, showed that they underwent many changes in their strong- and weak-tie relationships during and after incarceration. Shifts toward closer and more positive relationships with families and the addition of pro-social weak-tie relationships resulted in more tangible and intangible resources that were considered by the men and women as important to their reentry success. Data analysis showed that the relationship patterns experienced by the men and women in the present study were largely consistent with gendered relationship patterns described in the literature, but that patterns of resource availability from their social ties were less consistent with those described in the literature. Findings from the study suggest the influence of gender on men and women's social ties, as reflected in different patterns of strong-tie relationships experienced prior to, during, and after incarceration, and also reveal some similarities between men and women with regard to increases in the number of weak-tie relationships with various pro-social individuals after

incarceration. By showing the significant role of social ties, especially strong-ties, in providing tangible and intangible resources to parolees upon their release from prison, this study provides support for social control theory and highlights the importance of helping ex-offenders develop and maintain positive social ties with pro-social individuals to enhance the availability of resources necessary for successful reentry.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: Introduction 1
The Current Study 5
Overview of Chapters 5
CHAPTER 2: Literature Review 7
Factors Related to Reentry Experiences 11
Gender and Reentry 26
Gaps in the Literature 33
CHAPTER 3: Social Ties and the Reentry Experience 36
Social Tie Composition 36
Social Ties, Social Control, and Reentry Experiences 38
Relationships Among Gender, Social Ties, and Reentry Experiences 44
CHAPTER 4: Method and Data 48
Feminist Standpoint 48
Methods for the Study 49
Concept Definitions 50
Sample and Data 51
Sample Characteristics 54
Analytical Procedure 60
CHAPTER 5: Gender and Social Ties Among Men and Women on Parole 63
Strong-Tie Relationships 64
Weak-Tie Relationships 92
Conclusions 111
CHAPTER 6: Gender, Resources, and Reentry Experiences 116
Resources from Strong-Tie Relationships 118
Resources from Weak-Tie Relationships 129
The Importance of Resources on Reentry Experiences 141
Conclusions 156
CHAPTER 7: Conclusion 159
Summary of Findings from the Study 160
Discussion of Findings and Contributions of the Study 164
Policy Implications 178
Limitations of the Study 181
REFERENCES 186
APPENDIX 224
Appendix A: Interview Guide 225
Appendix B: Demographic Characteristics 257
Appendix C: Coding 258
VITA 264

LIST OF TABLES

Table A: Demographic Characteristics and Criminal Justice History 257

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

As a result of the incredible growth in the United States prison population since 1980, the number of men and women on parole has increased from just 220,438 in 1980 to a staggering 840,700 in 2010 (Glaze and Bonczar 2011). Unfortunately, the transition back from incarceration to freedom is not easy, and of the approximately 2,244 inmates released from state and federal prisons each day (Bonczar & Glaze 2011), more than two-thirds will be rearrested, half will be reconvicted, and one-quarter will find themselves resentenced to prison for a new crime (Langan & Levin 2002).

High parole failure rates have created the need for a better understanding of post-incarceration experiences. Reentry, known as "the transition of offenders from prisons or jails back into the community" (Office of Justice Programs 2001), has been a topic of research for the past decade. A large body of literature has discussed factors related to successful reentry, including housing, employment, healthcare and substance abuse treatment, transportation, and childcare, though many of the ideas about factors associated with the reentry process have not yet been tested with empirical research. For example, scholars believe that employment is related to reentry success (La Vigne et al. 2008; Nelson, Deess, & Allen 1999; Metraux & Culhane 2004), but there is a dearth of empirical studies testing this idea. Similarly, although literature suggests that access to transportation makes it possible for parolees to meet their reentry needs (La Vigne, Wolf, & Janetta 2004), the role of transportation in reentry outcomes is not well understood due to a lack of research on the relationship between transportation and the reentry experience.

What empirical studies do reveal, however, is that parolee's social ties are the primary mechanism through which they meet their varied reentry needs (Dodge & Pogrebin 2001; Leverentz 2006; McMurray 1993; Mills & Codd 2008; Nelson et al. 1999). For example, upon their release from prison many returning offenders are unable to secure housing in their own names and, therefore, must stay with families and friends (Hebert, 2005; Nelson et al. 1999; Visher, La Vigne, & Travis 2004). Similarly, many former prisoners have difficulties finding adequate employment and instead must rely on their families for financial support (McLean & Thompson 2007; Nelson et al. 1999; Visher et al. 2004). Family members are also the primary means through which parolees meet a host of other reentry needs, including transportation (La Vigne et al. 2008) and childcare (Naser & Visher 2006).

Social ties are the connections or relationships between individuals (Granovetter 1973; Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992). A benefit of social ties is that they have the potential to connect individuals to tangible and intangible resources (Bourdieu 1986; Coleman 1988; Granovetter 1973; Putnam 2000). Although reentry research has not traditionally been intended to analyze the specific sources from which parolees draw resources upon their release from prison, strong-tie relationships, such as the relationships people have with family members or intimate partners, have been implicated as a main source of these resources. Indeed, strong-tie relationships are the primary source of post-prison housing (Hebert 2005; McMurray 1993; Nelson et al. 1999; Visher et al. 2004; Wolff & Draine 2004) and financial resources (McLean & Thompson 2007; Nelson et al. 1999; Visher et al. 2004). Help with transportation (La Vigne et al. 2008) and childcare (Naser & Visher 2006) also often come from parolees' strong-ties.

As a source of resources during the reentry period, weak-tie relationships, such as those an individual might share with peers, coworkers, or a parole officer, have had little research attention, especially with regard to men's reentry, despite suggestions that they, too, are important (Granovetter 1973; Lin & Dumin 1986; Lin, Dayton, & Greenwald 1977; 1987). Lin and Dumin (1986), for example, found that weak-ties provide better access to resources such as information about employment than strong-ties, especially for individuals of low social status. Limited research on women's reentry supports this view, showing that the relationships female parolees developed with pro-social community members or community agencies (Cobbina 2009; Rumgay 2004), the clergy (Bui & Morash 2010), ex-inmate peers (Arditti & Few 2006; Leverentz 2006; O'Brien 2001), and parole officers (Skeem, Encandela, & Eno Louden 2003; Skeem et al. 2007) have positively contributed to their parole outcomes.

Despite research on factors associated with successful reentry, notable gaps in the literature exist. First, there is a lack of knowledge about the influence of men's social ties on reentry outcomes. Although a great deal of research on men's reentry has focused on the resources necessary for successful reentry, the exact sources of these resources have received less attention. Additionally, in studies that do look at men's social ties as contributors of reentry resources, the focus has largely been on strong-tie relationships, such as those with intimate partners and relatives. Few studies have examined the role of weak-tie relationships in influencing reentry outcomes (Bui & Morash 2010; Cobbina 2009; Gottfredson et al. 2007; Skeem et al. 2007; Skeem et al. 2009; Visher & Courtney 2006), and existing studies focus primarily on women. Thus, empirical studies examining the role of weak-tie relationships

overall, and for men specifically, are needed to improve the understanding of the role of weak-tie relationships on reentry experiences.

Second, although reentry research suggests the importance of social ties on the reentry process, the influence of gender on social ties and the resources they contribute to parolees during the reentry period is not well understood. The fact that gender, particularly the social construction of masculinity and femininity, shapes all social experiences and social interactions (Lorber 1994) suggests its influence on relationships and the resources that they make available to parolees. Thus, the influence of social ties on reentry may not be the same for men and women.

Likewise, the overall impact of gender on reentry experiences has largely been ignored, despite the fact that different profiles of male and female offenders suggest the likelihood of gender differences in reentry outcomes. For example, women are more likely than men to be incarcerated for drug-related offenses (O'Brien 2001), and drug offenders have higher recidivism rates than other types of offenders (Petersilia 2003). Similarly, female inmates report more severe physical and mental health and substance abuse problems than male offenders (Covington 2003; Leverentz 2006; Richie 2001), and such problems have been considered a challenge for successful reentry (Petersilia 2003). Female offenders also have greater histories of unemployment than male offenders and are less likely than men to have engaged in vocational training before their incarceration (Bloom, Owen, & Covington 2003), which puts them in a more disadvantaged position in the labor market than their male counterparts.

Finally, research on the role of social ties on desistance from crime has largely focused on the positive aspects of relationships, and fewer attempts have been made to understand the

negative influence of strong- and weak-tie relationships on reentry experiences. It is possible that relationships contribute to the high rates of recidivism experienced by parolees due to their contribution of negative resources such as criminal capital, but this cannot be confirmed without further research.

The Current Study

Given the gaps in the research detailed above, the goal of this dissertation research is to examine the experiences of a sample of parolees to understand 1) how gender shapes parolees' social ties and the resources they provide and 2) how the resources parolees receive from their social ties contribute to successful reentry outcomes. Specifically, I seek to answer the following research questions:

1) What is the composition of men's and women's social relationships prior to, during, and after incarceration and how does gender influence these relationships?

2) What resources do men and women receive from their strong- and weak-tie relationships prior to, during, and after incarceration, and how does gender influence these resources?

3) How do the resources available to male and female parolees via their social ties shape their reentry experiences?

To answer these research questions, I conducted a study based on data collected through in-depth interviews with a sample of 50 male and female parolees in Knox County, Tennessee.

Overview of Remaining Chapters

This dissertation is a study of the role of gender in parolees' reentry experiences. Specifically, I examine how gender shapes parolees' social ties and the resources their ties provide, as well as how the resources available to parolees via their ties influence their reentry

outcomes. In Chapter 2, I provide an overview of the literature on factors associated with successful prisoner reentry in general, as well as the role of gender in prisoner reentry. In Chapter 3, I discuss strong- and weak-tie relationships, which serve as the theoretical framework for this dissertation. In Chapter 4, I present a detailed description of the research method and data used for this research. Chapter 5 contains findings from the study and responds to the first research question by describing the strong- and weak-tie relationships men and women had prior to, during, and after incarceration as well as the quality of these relationships at each time period; special attention is paid to changes in social ties and relationship quality during and after incarceration. In Chapter 6, I discuss the resources the men and women in the study had available to them via their social ties as well as the influence they believed these resources to have had on their reentry experiences, which responds to my final two research questions. Finally, in Chapter 7, which is the study conclusion, I discuss findings from the study as well as contributions of the study to knowledge about the influence of gender on social ties and reentry experiences. I conclude by providing recommendations for program and policy changes to increase the number of parolee social ties, improve the quality of parolees' social relationships, and enhance the availability of positive resources necessary for successful prisoner reentry.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Interest in prisoner reentry has been renewed in the past decade for a variety of reasons, most notably the incredible growth in the United States prison population, growth in the number of people released from state and federal prisons each year, and high recidivism rates. Indeed, from 1980 to 2009, the U.S. prison population increased more than five-fold, growing from 319,598 (Glaze 2010) to 1,613,740 (Sabol & West 2011). Because approximately 95% of incarcerated men and women are released at some point (Petersilia 2003), the significant growth in America's correctional population resulted in a corresponding increase in the number of individuals placed on parole supervision after a period of incarceration; at yearend 1980 only 220,438 men and women throughout the United States were on parole, while 840,700 men and women were on parole following a prison term at the end of 2010 (Glaze & Bonczar). For these parolees the outlook is bleak: more than two-thirds will be rearrested within 3 years of their release from prison, nearly half will be reconvicted, and one-quarter will be resentenced to prison for a new crime (Langan & Levin 2002). In light of such startling statistics, numerous efforts have been made to understand the post-prison experience and to identify factors that contribute to successful reentry outcomes.

The U.S. Office of Justice Programs defines reentry as "the transition of offenders from prisons or jails back into the community" (2011). Petersilia (2003: 3) provides similar definition of reentry when she suggests that prisoner reentry includes "all activities and programming conducted to prepare ex-convicts to return safely to the community and to live as law abiding citizens." In either conceptualization, reintegration--living as a productive, law-abiding citizen--is the mark of success of one's return to society after a period of incarceration.

Reeintegration is much more than simple non-offending and includes finding sufficient employment and creating new social bonds (Petersilia 2004). Bases for the argument that reeintegration is necessary for successful reentry can be found in a variety of criminological theories, such as strain (Merton 1938; Agnew 1992) and social bond theories (Hirschi 1969; Sampson & Laub 1993). Such theories suggest that employment and social bonds reduce one's desire to offend, either by decreasing strain or by increasing the perceived cost of engaging in crime. Thus, criminological theory informs us that reintegration--as opposed to only desistance from crime--should be a goal of prisoner reentry since it is linked to reduced offending.

Despite our understanding of the effect of reintegration on prisoner reentry, high rates of recidivism reveal that many ex-offenders have difficulty adjusting to life outside of prison and successfully reintegrating into society (Shinkfield & Graffam 2009). Returnees' disadvantaged backgrounds have been considered a primary barrier to successful integration: returning prisoners are likely to be disconnected from friends and families due to separation during incarceration, have high rates of physical and mental health problems, and have low rates of education and employment skills (Petersilia 2003). Many returning prisoners also experience ongoing legal difficulties, have trouble finding safe, affordable housing, and are unable to secure forms of government assistance such as welfare, which puts them at an increased risk of reoffending (Petersilia 2003).

Although male and female ex-offenders are similar in many ways, they also differ in a few important ways. First, women receive shorter sentences and serve less time in prison than men (Bonczar 2011). Second, women are more likely than men to commit a drug-related offense or to commit an offense while under the influence of drugs (O'Brien 2001). Third, female

inmates have more severe substance abuse problems, greater levels of physical and mental health problems, and more extensive histories of physical and sexual abuse than male inmates (Covington 2003; Leverentz 2006; Richie 2001). Fourth, female inmates are much more likely to be parents than male inmates, and more than two-thirds of mothers--compared to 47 percent of fathers--report living with their minor children in the month before incarceration (Glaze & Maruschak 2008). Finally, mothers are two-and-one-half times more likely than fathers to report living in a single-parent household in the month before their arrest (Glaze & Maruschak 2008), which means that female inmates experienced greater childcare burden than their male counterparts.

It is likely that these differences between male and female inmates affect the reentry experience in differing ways. For example, female detainees are less likely than male detainees to benefit from prison programming, such as substance abuse treatment or educational and vocational programs, due to their relatively short periods of incarceration when compared to male inmates (McLean, Robarge, & Sherman 2006). Additionally, despite the high prevalence of substance abuse problems and drug-related crimes reported among female inmates, only 14 percent of women report receiving formal substance abuse treatment while incarcerated, compared to 29 percent of men (Mallik-Kane & Visher 2008). Individuals with substance abuse problems before incarceration are more likely than others to use again after release from prison (Mallik-Kane & Visher 2008). This means that women's histories of substance abuse problems and drug-related criminal activity combined with their low receipt of substance abuse treatment during incarceration put them at greater risk for recidivism than men.

Women with physical health problems are also more likely than their male counterparts to report living with potentially negative influences, such as former prisoners and current substance abusers, after prison release (Mallik-Kane & Visher 2008). Moreover, women with mental health problems are less likely than their male counterparts to be able to find employment shortly after prison release, and are less like than others to support themselves financially through work or to receive financial support from family members after release from prison (Mallik-Kane & Visher 2008). Finally, unlike men with mental health problems--who are no more likely than other men to be rearrested after release from prison--women with mental health problems report more criminal behavior than other women after their release from prison and are arrested at higher rates than other women (Mallik-Kane & Visher 2008).

Additionally, because female inmates are more likely than male inmates to be parents, parenting and childcare are important components of their successful reentry. Indeed, Covington (2002) found that for many women, children are a source of motivation during the transition back to the community. Other research indicates that women who have maintained strong familial ties--including ties with children--during incarceration have improved reentry outcomes and reduced recidivism (Hairston 1998; Dowden & Andrews 1999). Unfortunately, many mothers have difficulty securing adequate childcare upon their release from prison, and many mothers report feeling anxious about these fluctuating childcare arrangeents (Arditti & Few 2008). Such anxiety may contribute to maternal distress upon release from prison, and maternal distress may intensify other physical and mental health problems (Arditti & Few 2008), which can make the process of reintegraiton more challenging. This chapter provides a review of the

literature on factors related to reentry experiences and discusses unresolved issues in our current knowledge about prisoner reentry.

Factors Related to Reentry Experiences

Reentry and, more specifically, reintegration is a difficult process for returning offenders that is related to many factors, including housing, employment and financial resources, healthcare and substance abuse treatment, transportation, child care, and social ties. For many returning offenders, a lack of these resources can lead to reoffending, since an individual will not have the means to provide for his or her basic needs. For those who do desist from crime after a period of incarceration, however, a lack of necessary resources can stand in the way of reintegration by reducing the likelihood of becoming a productive, law-abiding citizen.

Housing

Literature indicates histories of homelessness among the men and women who fill America's prisons, and research suggests that individuals who have been homeless at some point during their lives are more likely to be homeless after their release from prison (California Department of Corrections 1997; Ditton 1999; Langan & Levin 2002; Metraux & Culhane 2004; Rossman et al. 1999). One study, for example, found that 24 to 34 percent of inmates had been homeless in the two months preceding their arrest (Michaels, Zoloth, & Alcabes 1992), and another found that more than 11 percent of parolees spent at least one night in a homeless shelter upon their release from prison (Metraux & Culhane 2004). Given these findings, it is unsurprising that housing becomes a critical need the moment an offender is released from prison (La Vigne et al., 2008).

Despite their desperate need for it, many ex-offenders face barriers to securing housing. These include policies that restrict rentals to individuals without criminal backgrounds or without certain kinds of criminal backgrounds (Roman and Travis 2004), landlord unwillingness to rent to individuals with a criminal background (La Vigne et al. 2008), lack of appropriate identification or references (La Vigne et al. 2008), histories of homelessness (Langan & Levin 2002; Ditton 1999; Roman & Travis 2004), long wait lists for housing (Stand Up for What's Right and Just 2007; Roman and Travis 2004), or a general lack of affordable housing in a given area (La Vigne, Wolf, & Jannetta 2004). For the individual who can manage to overcome these barriers, it is likely that gaining access to the funds necessary to secure housing will be problematic (La Vigne et al. 2008). Consequently, many ex-offenders must stay with family and friends immediately upon their release from prison (Hebert 2005; Nelson et al. 1999; Visher et al. 2004) or risk becoming homeless. A study by the Vera Institute found that 82% of parolees lived with their families upon their release from prison (Nelson et al. 1999) and the Urban Institute's *Returning Home* Project found that anywhere from 48 to 88 percent of parolees were living with a family member or romantic partner upon their release from prison (Visher et al. 2004). Although this arrangement is sufficient for some returning prisoners and their families, it may be neither a feasible nor a stable option for others (La Vigne et al. 2008). A 2005 study, for example, found that some family members may not permit a returning prisoner to reside with them, while others may be barred from doing so, as is the case for those who receive government subsidized housing (Hebert 2005).

Returning offenders who are unable to live with family or friends upon their release from prison are often forced to rely on temporary housing options, such as shelters (La Vigne et al.

2008). Temporary housing options can be dangerous and may be conducive to the use of drugs and alcohol or criminal offending (Hammett, Roberts, & Kennedy 2001; Hebert 2005), which can interfere with successful reentry, though there is a general lack of research which tests these claims. We do, however, know that parole violation leading to re-arrest is more likely for parolees who lack long term housing (Nelson et al. 1999), and returning prisoners who rely on temporary housing options report greater difficulty maintaining their sobriety and finding work and, therefore, face an increased likelihood of re-incarceration (Nelson et al. 1999; Metraux & Culhane 2004).

The literature reviewed above suggests that housing is an important factor for reentry success, but there is a lack of empirical research on the connection between housing and reintegration outcomes. So far, one study of women under parole supervision found that the odds of parole failure increased by almost 995% when women had unstable housing (Schram et al. 2006), but knowledge on gender differences in housing opportunities after prison release, as well as its impact on reentry experiences, is still limited.

Employment and Financial Resources

Employment and the financial resources it provides are commonly considered to be among the most important factors associated with reentry; they are also two of the greatest barriers that returning prisoners face (La Vigne et al. 2008). Employment is thought to be important to successful reentry for a variety of reasons, including the fact that it can provide ex-offenders with the financial means necessary to support themselves, contribute to self-confidence and self-efficacy, and reduce the incentives to commit crime (Bushway & Reuter 1997; La Vigne et al. 2008; Travis 2005). Employment is also believed to provide returning offenders with

access to new, pro-social relationships which can provide a buffer against future criminal activity (National Academies 2007; Rossman & Roman 2003; Warr 1998).

Literature indicates a strong belief among most returning inmates that having a job will help them stay out of prison (La Vigne & Kachnowski 2005; La Vigne, Visher, & Castro 2004; La Vigne et al. 2004; Visher et al. 2004; Visher, Baer, & Naser 2006). Research also shows that more than 60 percent of employers were unwilling to hire applicants with a criminal background (Holzer, Raphael, & Stoll 2004). Parolees face a variety of barriers to employment, such as rules prohibiting individuals with felony convictions from being employed in certain occupations or regulations barring ex-felons from receiving the occupational licensing necessary to work in a variety of fields (Aukerman 2008). Thus, it is not surprising that less than 20 percent of prisoners have employment lined up when they are released from prison (Visher et al. 2004). Even for parolees who are able to secure employment, access to sufficient financial resources to support themselves is not guaranteed.

Many formerly incarcerated men have educational deficiencies and insufficient employment skills in addition to their histories of criminal involvement (Altschuler & Brash 2004; Mears 2001; Mears & Aron 2003; Snyder 2004; Sullivan 2004; Uggen, Wakefield, & Western 2005), and only slightly more than half of the women incarcerated in state prisons have completed high school or a GED program (Bloom et al. 2003). Even fewer have begun college at the time of their incarceration (Freudenberg et al. 2005). Among offenders with work histories, 37 percent of women and 28 percent of men had incomes of less than $600 per month prior to their arrest, and two-thirds of women reported that they had never held a job that paid more than

$6.50 per hour (Bloom et al. 2003). Given these educational and employment histories, it is likely that parolees who find employment will earn low wages (Holzer, Raphael, & Stoll 2004).

The fact that employed parolees are likely to earn low wages is problematic since prisoners must have enough money to meet their basic needs upon their release from prison. Many inmates earn money through employment while incarcerated, but their wages are usually low and a portion of them can be taken in order to pay court-ordered debts and fees (McLean & Thompson 2007), which means that they are unlikely to leave prison with any significant form of financial resources. Additionally, although some prisoners are given an allotment of money upon their release from prison, the amount is usually not sufficient to provide for everything a newly released offender may need (La Vigne et al. 2008). The cumulative effect of these things is that many prisoners lack sufficient financial resources to cover their immediate financial needs upon release from prison (La Vigne et al. 2008).

Inability to secure employment or to earn adequate income has forced many former prisoners to rely on their families for financial support when they return home (McLean & Thompson 2007; Nelson et al. 1999; Visher et al. 2004), but many ex-prisoners come from families who lack the financial resources to provide such assistance (Jorgensen, Santos, & Warren 1986; Kiser 1991). Moreover, although some former prisoners are able to secure government assistance, many lose their eligibility for such benefits because of their incarceration (Stand Up for What is Right and Just 2007), as existing federal legislation permanently bans individuals with felonious drug convictions from receiving public assistance (Samuels & Mukamal 2004). For returning offenders who do meet the qualifications for government assistance, it is usually necessary to re-file for benefits, which is a process that takes an average

of 3 months (La Vigne et al. 2008) and can only be done once the individual has obtained proper documentation (La Vigne et al. 2008). Difficulty accessing financial resources upon release from prison is not rare. A study of 151 male and female parolees found that only 25 percent of the study participants' financial resources upon release from prison came from their own wages, whereas just over 50 percent came from family; friends, public assistance, savings, and illegal activities contributed the remaining portion of financial resources (Visher et al. 2004).

Although many returning offenders have relied on a variety of sources of financial support, it is theorized that financial self-sufficiency is the more critical need. Schram and colleagues (2006) suggest that female parolees face an increased risk of recidivating if they are unable to become financially independent; this claim is consistent with strain theory, which suggests that strain may lead to criminal offending as an individual seeks ways to meet his or her needs (Merton 1938; Agnew 1992). In this sense, limited educational attainment and few job skills mean that parolees are unable to compete in the labor market, which decreases their chance of successful reentry (Koons et al. 1997; La Vigne et al. 2008), as stresses related to lack of employment and financial struggles may lead to criminal behaviors (Hall, Baldwin, & Prendergast 2001). However, few studies have directly examined the role of financial resources in facilitating successful reentry and have tended instead to focus on the role of employment, which provides financial resources, in the reentry process.

Research on the relationship between employment and reentry success is inconclusive, and the mechanism through which employment contributes to desistance from crime is not yet well understood. In their longitudinal study of criminal behaviors among 411 London males, Farrington and colleagues (1986) found some evidence that episodes of unemployment lead to

higher crime rates. Similarly, a qualitative study on women's reentry found that frequent unemployment increased the odds of parole failure by 250 percent (Shram et al. 2006). O'Brien (2001) found that employment allowed female parolees to create new, non-criminal identities and also to support themselves and their children via legal means, which contributed to their successful reentry after incarceration. In their life course perspective on crime, Sampson and Laub (1993) suggest that salient life events influence behavior and modify criminal trajectories, most likely because they influence social bonds and levels of informal social control. Using this perspective, a variety of studies examining the influence of employment on desistance from crime has been undertaken, though their results have been inconclusive. For example, using data from the National Supported Work Demonstration Project, Uggen (2000) found that employment decreased the likelihood of recidivism for men over the age of 26. Sampson and Laub (1990), however, found that the relationship between work and crime is dependent upon some characteristic of the job or the worker, and other researchers have found that the effect of work on desistance from crime may dissipate over time (Cave et al. 1993; Mallar et al. 1982). Additionally, other studies found that a majority of efforts to reduce offending through employment have had null or small effects (Pilavian & Gartner 1982; Sherman et al. 1998), especially among juveniles (Orr et al. 1996). In addition, it is important to note that most offenders have employment histories that tend to be characterized by short jobless spells rather than prolonged periods of unemployment (Cook 1975; Sullivan 1989), leading some scholars to argue that job stability is what actually promotes desistance from crime (Laub, Nagin, & Sampson 1998; Laub & Sampson 1993; Sampson & Laub 1993), though little research exists to test this theory.

Health Care and Substance Abuse Treatment

In addition to the problems former prisoners face with regard to locating housing and securing employment and adequate financial resources, many returning offenders report difficulty obtaining health care and substance abuse treatment. This is particularly problematic because a significant number of men and women released from prison report a combination of physical, mental health, and substance abuse problems (Mallik-Kane & Visher 2008), and such conditions may hinder successful reentry if left untreated (La Vigne et al. 2008).

Data from the Returning Home Project shows that nearly all returning prisoners--8 in 10 men and 9 in 10 women--have chronic health problems (Mallik-Kane & Visher 2008). Specifically, one-half of men and two-thirds of women have been diagnosed with physical health problems and fifteen percent of men and more than one-third of women returning from prison have been diagnosed with mental health problems (Mallik-Kane & Visher 2008). Additionally, two-thirds of male and female inmates report having had problems with substance abuse in the six months preceding their incarceration (Mallik-Kane & Visher 2008). Among the men and women who report such problems, many have co-occurring problems. For example, 4 in 10 men and 6 in 10 women report a combination of physical health, mental health, or substance abuse conditions. Individuals with physical health problems are more likely to receive treatment during incarceration than are prisoners with mental health or substance abuse problems, but individuals from any of these categories are less likely to receive medical treatment upon their release from prison than are other returning prisoners (Mallik-Kane & Visher 2008).

Although returning prisoners who are afflicted by physical and mental health and substance abuse problems need immediate and ongoing medical care if they are to experience

successful reentry (Gaynes 2005), 68 percent of returning men and 58 percent of returning women lack health insurance 8 to 10 months after their release from prison (Mallik-Kane & Visher 2008). Many of these individuals may qualify for government subsidized healthcare, but the application process can be lengthy (Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law 2001; Hammet et al. 2001; Nelson & Trone 2000; New York State Bar Association 2006). Thus, many are forced to go without the care they need. As a result, former inmates are more than 12 times as likely to die from their health problems than the general population in the first few weeks after their release from prison (Binswanger et al. 2007). Additionally, returning prisoners with untreated physical, mental, and substance abuse problems may have difficulty locating safe, affordable housing and securing employment, both of which are integral to successful reentry (La Vigne et al. 2008). Research shows that men and women with untreated mental health and substance abuse problems are more likely to experience homelessness upon their release from prison and also report poorer employment outcomes due to an inability to work (Mallik-Kane and Visher 2008).

Literature indicates a link between recidivism and physical health, mental health, and substance abuse problems. For example, studies found that unmet needs for health care often directly preceded re-arrest for released prisoners (Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law 2001), and substance abusers are more likely than non-abusers to engage in criminal behavior and be re-incarcerated in the year following their release from prison (Mallik-Kane & Visher 2008). Research by Baillargeon and colleagues (2009) indicated that prison inmates with major psychiatric disorders are more likely than those without such disorders to have had previous incarcerations, thus suggesting that mental illness is related to recidivism. Similarly, Freudenberg

and colleagues (2005) found that for men, having drug or alcohol related problems was associated with an increased likelihood of being rearrested, while having health insurance was associated with lower re-arrest rates. For women, drug and alcohol related problems were associated with an increased likelihood of being arrested, although participation in self-help drug and alcohol treatment problems decreased the likelihood of re-arrest (Freudenberg et al. 2005). Freudenberg and colleagues (2005) suggest that these problems contribute to recidivism because they limit the ability of the returning offender to become a productive member of his or her society. Despite empirical evidence about the relationship between mental health and reoffending, knowledge about the effect of health care and substance abuse treatment on the reentry experience is limited due to a general lack of empirical research on the relationship between health treatment and reentry outcomes and gender differences in health treatment and reentry experiences.

Transportation

Upon release from prison, transportation becomes a critical need for ex-offenders in order to secure employment and meet a variety of other parole requirements (La Vigne et al. 2008). Many returning prisoners, however, experience barriers to finding their own transportation, such as difficulty getting a driver's license reinstated due to past driving violations (Pawasarat 2007). Studies have found that one in four returning prisoners reports difficulty in accessing public transportation (La Vigne et al. 2004; Rossman & Roman 2003). O'Brien and Leem (2006) indicate that 78 percent of women in their study had the need for transportation. The lack of transportation is especially problematic, since even if a returning prisoner is able to find a job, he or she may find it difficult to access the job due to limited transportation options (Nelson et al.

1999; Regerstein, Meyer, & Dickhemper-Hicks 1998). Consequently, ex-offenders must often rely on family, friends, or public transportation from the moment they leave prison until they are able to secure alternate forms of transportation (La Vigne et al. 2008). However, access to public transportation is limited in many areas, and in other areas location of bus stops and hours of operation may be prohibitive (La Vigne et al. 2008). In addition, parolees who are forced to rely on public transportation become vulnerable to victimization or may encounter opportunities for criminal offending (La Vigne et al. 2008).

Literature suggests that a lack of transportation limits a parolee's ability to meet other needs associated with reentry, such as secure housing or healthcare (La Vigne et al. 2004). One study participant is even quoted as saying "There's no way to pull yourself up if you have no access to transportation" (La Vigne et al. 2004: 12). Although the need for transportation among ex-prisoners has been recognized, the role of transportation in reentry outcomes is not well understood due to a lack of research on the relationship between transportation and reentry experiences.

Custody and Childcare Assistance

Approximately 62 percent of female inmates and 51 percent of male inmates are parents (Glaze & Maruschak 2008). Most of these parents have 3 or more children, most of their children are under the age of 10 (Mumola 2000), and women are more likely than men to have been the primary caregiver for their children in the month preceding their arrest (Glaze & Maruschak 2008). Overwhelmingly, parents in state prisons report maintaining some form of contact with their children while incarcerated, though frequency of contact decreases as the length of one's prison sentence increases (Travis 2005). According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, 70 percent

of incarcerated parents report exchanging letters with their children, 53% speak with their children on the telephone, and 42% receive in-person visits from their children (Glaze & Maruschak 2008). Despite overall high levels of reported contact, mothers are more likely than fathers to report having had any form of contact with their children. For parents who seek to resume their parenting responsibilities upon their return from prison, custody issues and childcare become important.

When mothers are incarcerated, their children are most often cared for by grandparents or other relatives or placed in foster care, whereas the children of incarcerated men are most often cared for by their mother (Glaze & Maruschak 2008). The vast majority of women report a desire to resume care of their children upon release from prison (Hagan & Dinovitzer 1999), though we lack information about the number of women who are actually able to do so (Bloom & Steinhart 1993). If they are to be successful in regaining custody of their children, however, women must successfully navigate a variety of governmental and social service agencies and prove that they can provide basic resources such as safe housing for their children (O'Brien 2001; Sharp & Eriksen 2003). For parents who are able to successfully regain custody of their children, child care becomes an important need. Indeed, findings from one study reveal that approximately 9 percent of women and 12 percent of men report childcare as a priority need upon their release from prison (Freudenberg 2006). Unfortunately, mothers who are released from prison often have difficulty finding child care (Petersilia 2001), and about one third of these mothers have to rely on family members for child care (Naser & Visher 2006). However, not all mothers receive childcare support from families (Arditti & Few 2006).

Childcare can be related to reentry success in different ways. Women with children must secure child care so that they can seek employment, receive health care or substance abuse treatment, or participate in other programs as required by their parole conditions, all while they avoid reoffending (Berman 2005; O'Brien 2001). If women are unable to satisfy parole conditions, the likelihood that they will experience difficulties during the reentry period increases. For example, women who are unable to secure child care may become dependent on abusive or criminal male partners (Freudenberg 2006), which could lead to reoffending. In addition, a mother's perception that she can effectively parent her children is related to reentry success (Koons et al. 1997), and women who are able to care for their children are less likely to engage in criminal activity (O'Brien & Young 2006).Thus, access to child care is related to reentry success not only because it increases feelings of self-efficacy among women (Koons et al. 1997), but also because it enables mothers to meet other reentry needs. Unfortunately, because women have been the subject of all studies about the role of childcare and childrearing in reentry, the role of these things in men's reentry success is unknown.

Social Ties

Literature has suggested the importance of social ties in reentry experience (Bui & Morash 2010; Cobbina 2009; Visher & Courtney 2006). Social ties have been recognized as an influence on criminal behavior (Becker 1953; Schroeder, Giordana, & Cernkovich 2007). On the other hand, social ties may be beneficial to individuals through their potential to connect them to tangible and intangible resources, including financial and housing assistance as well as emotional support. In fact, research shows that most offenders who return home live with family members (McMurray 1993), and female offenders often rely on family members for additional material

assistance such as transportation, money, and childcare (Dodge & Pogrebin 2001; Leverentz 2006; Mills & Codd 2008; Nelson et al. 1999). Social ties are also important in employment seeking. A survey in 2003 found that 51% of ex-offenders who had employment or training after their release from prison made these arrangements through a family member, friends, or other personal contact (Mills & Codd 2008). Thus, social ties can be helpful for the acquisition of housing, employment and financial resources, health care and substance abuse treatment, transportation, and childcare.

Literature suggests that social support is also an important component of post-release success (Nelson et al. 1999), since it provides an ex-offender with guidance, advice, and encouragement that may help them desist from crime (Mills 2004). Indeed, emotional support from family members has been found to prevent drug relapse among women (O'Brien 2001; Petersilia 2003) and spousal support is the most helpful factor for recovery from drinking problems (Sobell et al. 1993). Parolees with supportive families are more likely to complete parole than prisoners with non-supportive families (Ohlin 1954; Glaser 1964) and female offenders cite family support as crucial to their reintegration (Cobbina 2009). Research also indicates that marriage and a bond with romantic partners can be related to desistance from crime (Burnett 1992; 2004; Farrall 2004; Graham & Bowling 1995; McIvor, Murray, & Jamieson 2004; Sampson & Laub 1993; Laub et al. 1998), and good relationships with law-abiding intimate partners can also contribute to successful reentry outcomes (Giordano, Cernkovich, & Schroeder 2007; Leverentz 2006; O'Brien 2001).

More recent literature indicates that positive social ties with criminal justice officials, such as judges, probation, and parole officers, can also influence reentry outcomes. For example,

in a study of 157 offenders who participated in drug court, those who reported having a strong social bond with the judge were less likely to use drugs in a 3-year follow-up period than those who did not report such a bond, since they did not want to lose the approval and respect of the judge (Gottfredson et al. 2007). Additionally, a probationer's relationship with his or her probation officer has been shown to predict violations among mentally ill probationers (Skeem et al. 2007). Offenders also appear more likely to comply with the rules they are given when they have a positive relationship with the person implementing those rules (Skeem et al. 2009).

Despite the potential benefits of social ties on reentry outcomes, such ties can also be detrimental to reentry success. Recent studies have found that, for many female offenders, relationships with men were actually related to their criminal offending (Henriques & Manatu-Rupert 2001; Jones 2008; Leverentz 2006; O'Brien 2001; Welle & Falkin 2000). For example, many women offenders have family members or spouses who have also been involved in criminal activity (Owen & Bloom 1995), and women's introduction to deviant behaviors is often facilitated by such individuals (Miller 1986). Cobbina (2009) found that relationships with criminally-involved family members can inhibit desistance from crime, and additional research shows that some family members, partners, and friends contribute to illegal behavior for women (Bonta, Pang, & Wallace-Capretta 1995; Brown 2006; Danner et al. 1995; Griffin & Armstrong 2003; Henriques & Manatu-Rupert 2001; Leverentz 2006; Simons et al. 2002).

In sum, a large body of the literature has been devoted to the understanding of factors associated with reentry experiences. Particularly, the literature suggests that social ties can potentially contribute to reentry success via their ability to connect returning offenders tangible and intangible resource, including employment, income, housing, and child care, that are

considered crucial for parole success. Social ties do not always contribute to successful reentry outcomes, however, because some relationships are actually criminogenic and do not help parolees successfully manage their parole periods. In addition, the influence of these factors on the reentry process and outcomes may not be the same for men and women, as discussed in the next section.

Gender and Reentry

Literature indicates that male and female ex-offenders have several similarities in terms of social disdvantage (low socio-economic status, high levels of substance abuse, as well as high levels of physical mental health problems), but they also differ in many important ways. For example, incarcerated women are more likely than incarcerated men to have committed a drug-related offense (O'Brien 2001). Women also receive shorter sentences and serve less time in prison than men. Nationally, the average sentence length is 49 months for women and 61 months for men; most women serve one year of their prison sentence compared to 16 months for men (Bonczar 2011). Differences in the personal histories of male and female inmates also exist. First, female offenders often experience more severe substance abuse problems, greater levels of physical and mental health problems, and more extensive histories of physical and sexual abuse than male inmates (Covington 2003; Leverentz 2006; Richie 2001). Second, female inmates are much more likely to be parents than male inmates, and more than two-thirds of mothers--compared to 47 percent of fathers--report living with their minor children in the month before incarceration (Glaze & Maruschak 2008). Third, women are less likely to have been employed at the time of their incarceration than men, and female inmates who were employed at the time of their incarceration report lower earnings than their male counterparts (Bloom et al. 2003).

Finally, women are less likely to have engaged in vocational training before their incarceration than male inmates (Bloom et al. 2003), which puts them in a more disadvantaged position in the labor market than men. These differences may have implications for the reentry experience, as property and drug offenders have the highest recidivism rates compare to violent offenders, and mental and physical health problems have been considered a challenge for successul reentry outcomes (Petersilia 2003).

Human Capital and Economic Resources Opportunities

Both male and female inmates have low levels of educational attainment, though women tend to fare slightly worse than men. In 1997, 40% of males and 42% of females in state prisons had not graduated high school or completed a GED program (Harlow 2003). Women are also less likely than men to have engaged in vocational training before incarceration, and those who do engage in such training tend to focus on training for traditional women's jobs, such as cosmetology, clerical work, and food service (Bloom et al. 2003). Once incarcerated, men are slightly more likely than women to engage in educational and vocational training programs, and 52% of males and 50% of females in state prisons in 1997 reported participating in an educational program since their most recent admission to prison (Harlow 2003). One explanation for women's lower participation in such programs is that their shorter periods of incarceration afford them fewer opportunities to do so (McLean et al. 2006).

Incarcerated women also report lower levels of pre-incarceration employment than incarcerated men. In 1998, 60% of men, but only 40% of women, in state prisons reported that they were employed full-time at the time of their arrest (Bloom et al. 2003). Among those who were employed, 37% of women and 28% of men had incomes of less than $600 per month prior

to their arrest, and two-thirds of women reported that they had never held a job that paid more than $6.50 an hour (Bloom et al. 2003). It is possible that these differences will have implications for the reentry experience, especially with regard to women. First, women's low educational attainment combined with few vocational skills may limit employment their post-incarceration employment opportunities; lack of employment, in turn, is believed to decrease a parolee's chance for successful reentry (Farrington et al. 1986; Hall et al. 2001; Koons et al. 1997; La Vigne et al. 2008; Schram et al. 2006). Second, the low wages commonly reported by women with criminal histories are likely to pose a challenge to financial independence, and financial independence is believed to be necessary for successful reentry (Schram et al. 2006).

Health Status and Health Treatment

Female ex-offenders have higher rates of physical and mental health problems than do men (Arditti & Few 2006; Berman 2005; Greenfeld & Snell 1999; Maruschak 2008), and upon their release from prison women are more likely than men to rate their health as poor (Mallik-Kane & Visher 2008), which makes health care an important need of returning women. Unfortunately, many returning women work in low-wage jobs that do not offer health benefits (Hammett et al. 2001; Lee, Vlahov, & Freudenberg 2006), and the application process for government subsidized health care can be lengthy (Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law 2001; Hammet et al. 2001 ; Nelson & Trone 2000; New York State Bar Association 2006). Because an unmet need for healthcare can also contribute to difficulties meeting other needs such as employment or housing, it is possible that women's physical and mental health problems can negatively affect their reentry experiences (O'Brien & Leem 2006). Indeed, a study of more than

8,5000 male and female prisoners found that mental illness was the primary predictor of recidivism (Messina et al. 2006).

In addition to the greater prevalence of physical and mental health problems among female offenders, incarcerated women are more likely to experience substance abuse problems than incarcerated men (Mumola & Karberg 2006; O'Brien 2001). During prison, however, women are less likely than men to receive substance abuse treatment (Mallik-Kane & Visher 2008). Consequently, women are more likely than men to report continued substance abuse upon their release from prison (Mallik-Kane & Visher 2008). Continued substance abused may affect reentry outcomes, as illegal drug use and intoxication are violations of parole conditions, and also because substance abuse may interfere with the ability to secure resources necessary for reentry success (Mallik-Kane & Visher 2008).

Custody, Parenting, and Child Care

The Bureau of Justice Statistics reports that 62 percent of women and 51 percent of men in state prisons are parents, and that the number of incarcerated mothers is growing faster than the number of incarcerated fathers (Glaze & Maruschak 2008). Indeed, between 1991 and 2007, the number of incarcerated mothers has grown 122 percent, while the number of incarcerated fathers has grown by only 76 percent (Glaze & Maruschak 2008). In addition to the fact that incarcerated women are more likely to be parents than incarcerated men, incarcerated women are more likely than their male counterparts to report having been the primary caregiver for their children before incarceration (Arditti & Few 2006; Glaze & Maruschak 2008; Greenfeld & Snell 1999). Mothers are also more likely than fathers to be the primary caregivers for their children upon release from prison (Glaze & Maruschak 2008), which means that childcare is an important

reentry issue for women. For women who have lost custody of their child(ren) because of their incarceration, being able to demonstrate the capacity to care for their children, including the ability to provide childcare for them, can be an important factor in regaining custody (O'Brien 2001). Limited research indicates that women who were able to gain custody of and care for their children following a period of incarceration were less likely to recidivate than those who faced difficulties in gaining child custody (O'Brien 2001; O'Brien & Young 2006).

Access to childcare is also important for women who seek to participate in educational, employment, or other programs that promote successful reentry (Berman 2005; O'Brien 2001), and a woman's ability to participate in such programs is related to her reentry experience (Lowenkamp & Latessa 2005; O'Brien 2001; Richie 2001). Women's childcare responsibilities can interfere with substance abuse treatment, however. Indeed, many women avoid treatment for their substance abuse problems because they fear losing custody of their children (Knight, Logan, & Simpson 2001). Thus, for some women it is possible that parenting responsibilities may shape the reentry experience in a way that is not entirely positive.

Social Ties and Resources

Research suggests that relationships are important with regard to women's well-being (Jordan et al. 1991), and many women seek out relationships hoping to find support upon release from prison. For example, women often seek new romantic partners (O'Brien 2001) and others attempt to repair or rebuild relationships with family members once released from prison (O'Brien 2001). Because women's relationships often come with histories of abuse, the ability to overcome previous problems may affect a woman's sense of growth following incarceration and this can contribute to successful reentry (O'Brien 2001).

Compared to their male counterparts, women offenders are likely to have access to social ties that lack social capital (Dodge & Pogrebin 2001; Hagan & Coleman 2001; Holtfreter, Reisig, & Morash 2004; Richie 2001). This is because women's social relationships tend to occur within kinship networks whose members share their socioeconomic disadvantage (Flavin 2004). The lack of social capital that characterizes women's social ties can be problematic, since successful reentry is considered dependent upon the ability of one's social ties to provide social capital and promote the development of human capital (Holtfreter et al. 2004). This may be of particular importance for women, since, compared to men, they more frequently rely on their social ties for financial assistance (Edin & Lein 1997).

In addition to these differences, research indicates that there are differences in the effect of social ties on men's and women's desistance from crime. For example, social support gained from family members and intimate partners influences desistance from substance abuse for female offenders (Oetzel et al. 2007; Stanton-Tindall, Royse, & Leukefeld 2007), although ties with abusive intimate partners can actually contribute to substance abuse (Bloom et al. 2003; Pelissier & Jones 2005). Moreover, familial and friendship ties are strong predictors of success for female parolees (Dowden and Andrews 1999; Leverentz 2006; Simons et al. 2002; Slaught 1999; Van Voorhis et al. 2008), though friendship relationships can contribute to re-incarceration for male parolees (Bahr et al. 2009). Additionally, Rountree and Warner (1999) found that men's neighborhood ties are less effective than women's neighborhood ties in controlling crime. Finally, developing relationships with pro-social community representatives can help women desist from crime (Rumgay 2004). Overall, less is known about the effect of men's social ties--especially weak-tie relationships--on desistance from crime, however, as the primary focus of

research on the effect of men's social ties on reentry has been their romantic relationships. Specifically, research suggests that romantic relationships contribute to men's desistance from crime (Horney, Osgood, and Marshall 1995; Laub et al. 1998; Sampson & Laub 1993; Warr 1998). Given the general lack of information about the effect of men's social ties other than family and romantic relationship on crime, additional empirical research is needed.

One of the primary benefits of social ties is that they can provide both tangible and intangible resources, and for returning offenders housing is one of the resources most commonly received through social ties. Housing is perhaps the most immediate need of returning prisoners, and incarcerated women are often at a greater economic disadvantage than are incarcerated men or other economically disadvantaged women (Mumola 2000), which means that they are more likely than men to lack the resources to secure housing in their own names (O'Brien 2001). Thus, returning women may be more likely than returning men to be forced to rely on their families for housing upon release from prison. Because women are often the primary caregivers of their children (Belknap 1996), they must secure housing not only for themselves but also for their children (Roman & Travis 2004). This may be difficult or even impossible because their families are already overburdened, because they may have severed ties with family (or vice versa) as a result of their criminal involvement (Richie 2001), or because restraining orders prevent them from doing so, which is often the case when domestic violence has occurred (Roman & Travis 2004). As a result of these things, inability to secure housing via her social ties may influence a woman's reentry experience, since lack of housing is thought to be related to parole violations (Nelson et al. 1999), and parole failure (Schram et al. 2006).

Gaps in the Literature

The incredible growth of the American prison population, the concurrent increase in the number of men and women returning to communities across the country after a period of incarceration, and high rates of recidivism have created significant interest in prisoner reentry in the past decade. Much of this inquiry has been related to factors that contribute to successful reentry, and researchers have been particularly concerned with factors that help returning offenders live as productive, law-abiding citizens. Integral to understanding factors associated with successful reentry is an awareness of the profiles of prison inmates, which differs between men and women. In general, female offenders have been incarcerated for non-violent offenses, spend less time in prison, report higher levels of physical, mental health, and substance abuse problems, have lower levels of education and sparse employment histories, and have a greater childcare burden than male inmates. Of the factors related to the reentry experience discussed so far, social ties seem to be the most important, since they increase the likelihood that a returning offender will be able to obtain the resources that have been shown to be related to reentry outcomes.

Despite discussions and empirical studies on prisoner reentry, our understanding of the reentry experience remains limited. First, there is a lack of knowledge about the impact of gender on the reentry experience. For example, studies show that a relationship with a pro-social spouse is important for desistance from crime for men (Horney et al. 1995; Laub et al. 1998; Sampson & Laub 1993; Warr 1998), but women may have different experience because female offenders tend to be involved in criminal activities by their intimate partners (Bonta et al. 1995; Brown 2006; Cobbina 2009; Danner et al. 1995; Griffin & Armstrong 2003; Henriques & Manatu-

Rupert 2001; Leverentz 2006; Miller 1986; Owen & Bloom 1995; Simons et al. 2002). Interestingly, marriage appears to have differential effects on reducing criminality for men and women (Mackenzie & De Li 2002; Simons et al. 2002), since it tends to reduce criminality among men but contributes to women's offending.

Second, literature suggests the importance of social ties in the reentry process (Bui & Morash 2010; Cobbina 2009; Visher & Courtney 2006), but the influence of gender on social ties and the resources they provide during the reentry period is not well understood. Gender, particularly the social construction of masculinity and femininity, may influence the composition of men and women's social ties, the availability and utilization of men's and women's social ties during the reentry period, and the resources gained from social ties. Thus, the influence of social ties on reentry may differ for men and women. Moreover, research on recidivism and crime resistance tends to focus on personal relationships, including those with relatives and intimate partners. A few studies have examined the role of weak-tie relationships, including peers and correctional ties such as parole officers and (ex) co-inmates (Bui & Morash 2010; Cobbina 2009; Skeem et al. 2007; Visher & Courtney 2006), but most of these studies focused on women’s experiences. Thus, the influence of weak-tie relationships and the resources they provide on men's reentry remains unknown. Finally, research on the influence of social ties and their resources on recidivism and crime desistance overwhelmingly focuses on positive aspects of family relationships, but less attention has been paid to the negative influence of social ties on behavior and reentry outcomes (Becker 1953; Schroeder et al. 2007). Thus, little is known about the ways that such ties contribute to criminal offending for men and women.

The goal of the proposed research is to address shortcomings of existing research on prisoner reentry. Specifically, the study will examine men and women's reentry experiences with a focus on the role of gender in shaping social ties and the resources they provide and the influence of these resources on reentry outcomes for men and women.

CHAPTER 3: SOCIAL TIES AND THE REENTRY EXPERIENCE

Social ties are the connections or relationships between individuals (Granovetter 1973; Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992). The value of social ties is their ability to connect individuals to tangible resources, such as money or assets, and intangible resources, such as social support (Bourdieu 1986; Coleman 1988; Granovetter 1973; Putnam 2000). Social ties are also important because they can influence the behaviors of people who are connected. Indeed, Hirschi (1969) suggests that attachments to others may inhibit youth delinquency, and Sampson and Laub (1990; 1993; 2001) found that adult social bonds, such as those with intimate partners and relatives, can inhibit criminal behavior. Conversely, Giordano, Cernkovich, and Holland (2003) found that contact with deviant peers and criminally involved romantic partners is associated with criminal behavior. Becker (1953) showed that association with marijuana users can help an individual learn the proper way to smoke marijuana, thereby increasing the likelihood that s/he will become an habitual marijuana user. Finally, in their study on successful female parolees, Bui and Morash (2010) found that women's criminal behavior was often facilitated by their intimate partners, and shifts to relationships with pro-social individuals contributed to successful parole. These findings suggest an important role of social ties in shaping reentry outcomes.

Social Tie Composition

Ties to others can be defined as either strong- or weak-tie relationships. The strength of ties is largely dependent upon the frequency of interaction among individuals, the emotional intensity of those interactions, and the reciprocal services they provide (Granovetter 1973). Strong-ties occur among people who have frequent, emotionally intense, reciprocal interactions, while weak-ties occur among individuals who have infrequent, less intense, less reciprocal

interactions. Examples of strong-tie relationships include those with family members, intimate partners, and close friends, while relationships with peers, coworkers, co-inmates and correctional officers, as well as formal ties with parole officers, are examples of weak-tie relationships.

As a result of long-duration relationships, strong-ties are generally more typically more motivated to be of assistance than weak-ties (Granovetter 1982), and a number of studies suggest that the poor tend to rely on their strong-ties more than they rely on their weak-ties (Stack 1974; Lomnitz 1977). Accordingly, it has often been thought that strong-ties may be more beneficial to people with regard to accessing resources (Bian 1997; Boorman 1975; Granovetter 1973). However, weak-ties are also beneficial to people because they facilitate the transmission of information and resources between social groups, whereas strong-tie relationships tend to be localized within a single group such as a family or romantic partnership, thereby limiting an individual to resources from within the group (Granovetter 1973). Because weak-ties connect groups of people, resources can pass between groups through various relationships (Granovetter 1973). Thus, weak-ties are an important source of opportunity and information in society (Granovetter 1973). Indeed, in his review of empirical research, Granovetter (1983) found that people with few weak-ties have less access to information about news, employment opportunities, and other important information than do people with a greater number of weak-ties. Studies of employment seeking confirm that weak-ties are more useful than strong-ties in finding jobs (Lin, Ensel, & Vaughn 1981; Watanbe 1987), likely as a result of their better ability to spread information (Granovetter 1973).

Everyone has social ties, but the number and composition of these ties varies. Numerically, women have more social ties than men (Antonucci & Akiyama 1987; Antonucci, Akiyama, & Lansford 1998; McLaughlin et al. 2010). However, women's social ties are formed primarily from their strong-tie relationships, such as those with family members and intimate partners (Dunbar & Spoors 1995; Fischer & Oliker 1983; McPherson et al. 2006; Marsden 1987; Moore 1990). Because of this, their social ties tend to be homophilous on age, education, religion, marital status, and work status (Popielarz 1999). Compared to women, men have a smaller number of social ties overall (Antonucci & Akiyama 1987; Antonucci et al. 1998; McLaughlin et al. 2010). Men also have fewer kin ties than women (Dunbar & Spoors 1995; Fischer & Oliker 1983; McPherson et al. 2006; Marsden 1987; Moore 1990). Instead, men have a variety of weak-tie relationships that they gain as a result of participation in voluntary organizations (Eby & Allen 2012; Fischer & Oliker 1983; Marsden 1987; Moore 1990). Because of the more varied sources of their social ties, men's ties are more likely to be heterogeneous on age, education, religion, marital status, and work status (Popielarz 1999). As a result, of these differences, men have better access than women to the important resources Granovetter suggests hail from weak-tie relationships despite their smaller number of social ties overall.

Social Ties, Social Control, and Reentry Experiences

Social ties are important to reentry experiences because they have the potential to connect ex-offenders to tangible resources such as housing or information about employment, and intangible resources, such as emotional support and advice. For returning offenders, such resources are considered contributions to successful reentry (La Vigne et al. 2008; Petersilia 2003). Social ties may also provide social control believed to inhibit offending (Hirschi 1969).

However, social ties can also threaten successful reentry if they provide returnees with criminogenic resources, such as criminal capital, as social learning suggests that criminal behaviors can be learned through one's social ties (Akers 1973; Burgess & Akers 1966; Sutherland 1947). A discussion of the importance of social ties on the reentry experience follows.

Strong-Tie Relationships

Hirschi's (1969) social control theory is useful for understanding the potential role of strong-ties in preventing recidivism. A central concept of Hirschi's theory is that attachments to others may inhibit adolescent delinquency. Strong attachments, which are measured by close ties, admiration, and caring about the expectations of others, are believed to be more useful than weak attachments for inhibiting criminal behaviors. Primarily, this occurs because the supportive relationships which result from strong attachments act as a form of social control, as adolescents do not want to disappoint those they care about (Hirschi 1969). Sampson and Laub (1992; 1993; 2001) share a similar perspective about the role of social bonds in inhibiting criminal behavior. in their life course perspective on desistance from crime. According to this perspective, social ties in adulthood act as a form of informal social control because they increase emotional obligations to others and impose significant costs to criminal participation (Sampson & Laub 1992; 1993; 2001). Although these social control perspectives are important for understanding criminal offending, one shortcoming is a focus only on the role of emotional support on crime desistance. Recent literature, however, indicates that material resources from strong-tie relationships are also important to reentry success.

Strong-tie relationships with relatives are a potential source of the material resources necessary for successful reentry. Indeed, studies have shown that housing is one of the primary resources parolees often receive through family connections, as most offenders return home to live with family (McMurray 1993; Wolff & Draine 2004). Research also found that parolees who lived with their families were less likely to abscond from parole than those who do not (Nelson et al. 1999). Family members may also provide intangible resources, such as moral and emotional support, to returnees to encourage them to go straight. Research suggests that these intangible resources are an important component of post-release success (Nelson et al. 1999), and prisoners with supportive families are more likely to complete parole than prisoners with non-supportive families (Ohlin 1954; Glaser 1964). Just as families are a potential source of the resources necessary for successful parole, romantic partners can also provide support for crime desistance. Indeed, research indicates a relationship between having a pro-social spouse and desistance from crime for men (Horney et al. 1995; Laub et al. 1998; Warr 1998), and this is likely a result of the emotional support available through the relationship. These research findings are consistent with social control theory and Sampson and Laub's life course perspective, both of which suggest that close bonds to family and other social groups can prevent deviant or criminal behaviors (Hirschi 1969; Sampson & Laub 1992; 1993; 2001).

Although social control theory is important for understanding the influence of social bonds on crime desistance, its primary focus is the positive impact of family relationships on criminal offending. Social learning theory, however, makes the assumption that criminal behaviors can be learned through association with others (Akers 1973;Burgess & Akers 1966; Sutherland 1947). According to this theory, differential association (interaction with others),

favorable definitions (attitudes), differential reinforcement (anticipated rewards or punishments), and imitation (learning through observation) coalesce to determine whether an individual will engage in criminal behaviors (Akers 1973; Burgess & Akers 1966; Sutherland 1947). If an individual has ties to deviant others, approving attitudes about deviance or crime, anticipates rewarding outcomes for the criminal act, and can imitate others in its commission, s/he may induced to crime. As a result, relationships with family members and intimate partners can help ex-offenders access positive reentry resources as discussed above, or they can connect returnees to criminogenic resources that negatively affect reentry outcomes.

Research supports this idea and indicates many women have family members, such as parents or siblings, who break the law, and those family members expose women to crime, sometimes even pressuring them to engage in criminal behaviors (Cobbina 2009; Miller 1986; O'Brien 2001). Family members can also contribute to women's offending in other ways, as parent-child relationships characterized by abuse or neglect are related to women's participation in crime (Brown 2006; Griffin & Armstrong 2003). Similarly, involvement in a relationship with a romantic partner and spousal abuse are both associated with women's participation in crime, as women's partners may include them in their criminal activities, sometimes under threat of violence (Cobbina 2009; Danner et al. 1995; Griffin & Armstrong 2003; Henriques & Manatu-Rupert 2001; Jones 2008; Leverentz 2006; O'Brien 2001; Welle & Falkin 2000). Research on the negative effect of men's families and romantic relationships on reentry is lacking, but the assumptions of social learning theory suggest that deviant or criminal family members would pose a similar challenge to men's crime desistance during the reentry process (Akers 1973; Burgess & Akers 1966; Sutherland 1947).

Weak-tie Relationships

In addition to its usefulness in understanding the potential influence of men and women's strong-tie relationships on their behaviors, social learning theory (Akers 1973;Burgess & Akers 1966; Sutherland 1947) is beneficial for understanding how weak-tie relationships can contribute to offending. Ties to former friends and gang members are easily reestablished upon release from prison (Fleisher and Decker, 2001), and, consistent with social learning theory, those relationships may actually contribute criminal capital, which can result in incarceration (Hagan & McCarthy 1997; Wolff & Draine 2004).

Weak-tie relationships with pro-social friends and peers can also contribute resources that contribute to successful reentry, however. According to Granovetter (1973), an important function of weak-tie relationships is that they connect individuals to resources they would not otherwise have been able to access. Indeed, through one's weak-tie relationships, an individual may have access not only to the immediate resources of the individual with whom s/he shares a relationship, but also to the resources available to his or her social ties via their social ties (Granovetter 1973). This is especially important for returning offenders, as their strong-ties often have limited access to resources (Clear, Rose, & Ryder 2001). Thus, weak-tie relationships can provide access to tangible and intangible resources that would otherwise be unavailable to them, and these resources may help facilitate successful reentry outcomes.

Research findings indicate that information about jobs is passed through weak-tie relationships with peers and acquaintances, and this information helps individuals find out about a greater number of employment opportunities and, in some cases, better quality jobs (Eby 2001; Granovetter 1973; Montgomery 1991;Six 1997). In addition, weak-ties with community-based

agencies can provide tangible resources, such as shelter, food, clothing, and job assistance to women upon their release from prison, and women view such resources as essential to their reintegration since they make it possible for them to meet their needs and the needs of their children upon release from prison (Cobbina 2009).

Weak-tie relationships formed through community and civic organizations can also provide access to intangible resources that are believed to influence reentry outcomes (Cobbina 2009; Coleman 1988; Rumgay 2004; Sampson and Laub 1993; Warr 1998). Research on female ex-offenders suggests that emotional support, advice, and positive role models provided by community organizations can be helpful in desisting from crime since they provide women with options for non-deviant lifestyles (Cobbina 2009; Rumgay 2004); such organizations can also facilitate pro-social bonds with others, which may act as a form of social control and buffer against offending (Hirschi 1969). Relationships developed in prison with fellow inmates, correctional officers, the clergy, and mentors in rehabilitation programs may also provide ex-offenders with access to intangible resources that contribute to successful parole outcomes. Positive relationships formed during incarceration are an important source of support for women after their release from prison because in many cases, these relationships continue after prison release. For example, after prison release, many women maintained their relationships with their prison mentors who provided counseling and mentoring during the reentry period (Bui & Morash 2010). Similarly, studies on female parolees indicated that ex-inmate peers, who share prison experiences, can provide emotional support and advice that can help women learn to navigate obstacles after prison (Arditti and Few 2006; Leverentz 2006; O'Brien 2001). In her research, Ebaugh (1988) found that nondrinking alcoholics formed friendships with fellow members of

self-help groups who understood their problems as a way of helping them maintain sobriety, which is similar to the idea that ex-prisoners would seek assistance from ex-inmate peers who understand the difficulties associated with the transition from incarceration to freedom.

In addition, relationships with criminal justice officials such as judges and probation and parole officers can be an important source of resources that facilitate successful parole. For example, in a study of 157 offenders who participated in drug court, those who reported having a strong social bond with the judge were less likely to use drugs in a 3-year follow-up period than those who did not report such a bond, since they did not want to lose the approval and respect of the judge (Gottfredson et al. 2007). Research findings also show that women considered their parole officers a source of support because they listened to, encouraged, and provided them with emotional support (Cobbina 2009). Parole officers may not always provide resources that are supportive of successful reentry, however, and the belief that one's parole officer is unsupportive is related to failed reentry (Skeem et al. 2007; 2003; Angell &Mahoney 2007).

Relationships Among Gender, Social Ties, and Reentry Experiences

Gender can have an important role in shaping social tie composition, resources available via social ties, and, consequently, reentry experiences. The social construction of gender and gender roles influences social tie composition for men and women. From childhood, boys and girls are set on different paths as a result of their gender, and these paths include different expectations for relationships and social interactions (Lorber 1994). Women learn to place great importance on their relationships with family members and intimate partners, whereas men learn independence from their families (Bulcroft, Carmody, & Bulcroft 1996; Lorber 1994). As a result, the composition of men and women's social networks differ. For example, because of their

extensive strong-tie relationships with relatives, women traditionally have a greater number of social ties than men (Antonucci & Akiyama 1987; Antonucci et al. 1998; McLaughlin et al. 2010) . These relationships can provide financial resources and emotional support, but because of resource homogeneity within families, strong-ties are limited in their ability to connect women to other resources (Clear et al. 2001). Although men have fewer social ties than women overall, their greater number of weak-tie relationships are useful because they can provide more diverse resources and information about where to get resources (Granovetter 1983; Popielarz 1999).

Due to the composition of their social networks, women are also less likely than men to possess social capital that can help in the reentry process (Dodge & Pogrebin 2001; Hagan & Coleman 2001; Holtfreter et al. 2004; Richie 2001). For example, research suggests that employment and income are important for reentry success (Bushway & Reuter 1997; La Vigne et al. 2008; Schram et al. 2006; Travis 2005) and that there is a relationship between an individual's employment status and the variety of social ties s/he has (Aguilera, 2002). Because women have fewer strong-tie relationships than men, they have an overall lesser variety of relationships (Eby & Allen 2012; Fischer & Oliker 1983; Marsden 1987; Moore 1990) and may find it more difficult to secure employment upon release from prison. Additionally, Granovetter (1973; 1983) suggests that weak-ties are more important than strong-ties with regard to labor force participation, since they bridge—or connect—social groups to one another, thus exposing individuals to a greater degree of information (Halpern 2005). Because women have fewer weak-tie relationships than men (Eby & Allen 2012; Fischer & Oliker 1983; Marsden 1987; Moore 1990), they are at a disadvantage with regard to post-incarceration employment. As a result of difficulty finding employment, women may be at a greater risk of re-incarceration than men who

are able to secure employment through their weak-tie relationships (Farrington et al. 1986; Hall, Baldwin, & Prendergast 2001; Koons et al. 1997; La Vigne et al. 2008; Schram et al. 2006).

Just as women have fewer connections to outside resources than men through their social ties, they are also more likely than men to have social networks that are deficient in resources (Dodge & Pogrebin 2001; Hagan & Coleman 2001; Holtfreter et al. 2004; Richie 2001). Particularly, female offenders have social networks that are characterized by socioeconomic disadvantage (Flavin 2004). Thus, women's social ties may be less likely to be able to provide them with housing (Richie 2001; Roman & Travis 2004) or the financial resources they depend on for reentry success, despite the fact that women are more likely to rely on their social ties for resources than men (Edin & Lein 1997; Flavin 2004). Here too, women are at a disadvantage when compared to men, as research suggests that without these resources parolees are at an increased risk of reoffending (Nelson et al. 1999; Petersilia 2003; Schram et al. 2006).

In sum, relationships with social ties are important for the reentry experience for two primary reasons. First, they can potentially connect parolees to tangible and intangible resources necessary to successful reentry. Gender differences in the composition of social networks and resources available through social ties, however, mean that men and women likely have different types and numbers of social ties and different resources available to them through their ties (Dunbar & Spoors 1995; Moore 1990; Popielarz 1999). In addition to their potential to connect individuals to resources, social ties can also influence the behavior of their members. Consistent with social learning theory, research findings suggest that these influences are not always positive for women, however, which means that women's relationships can negatively impact reentry experiences in ways that men's relationships with others have not been shown to do

(Brown 2006; 2003; Cobbina 2009; Danner et al. 1995; Griffin & Armstrong 2003; Henriques & Manatu-Rupert 2001; Jones 2008; Leverentz 2006; Miller 1986; O'Brien 2001; Welle & Falkin 2000). Given these differences, a social tie framework within the context of gender relations can be a useful analytical tool for understanding the influence of social networks and the resources they provide on reentry experiences.

CHAPTER 4: METHOD AND DATA

My goal for this research is to examine strong- and weak-tie relationships experienced by male and female parolees prior to, during, and after incarceration, the resources available to these parolees via their social ties at each time period, and the influence the parolees believe the resources provided to them by their social ties had on their reentry experiences. To accomplish these goals, I relied on structured, in-depth interviews conducted with a sample of male and female parolees in the Knoxville, Tennessee area. Data from the interviews were analyzed using a feminist standpoint approach.

Feminist Standpoint

Feminist standpoint approach focuses on giving voices and can be adopted as an analytical tool. As an analytical tool, feminist standpoint emphasizes the lived experiences of the research subjects and calls researchers to make the day-to-day reality of those being researched the center of their analysis (Harding 1991; Swigonski 1993). A feminist standpoint approach also emphasizes the individual's interpretation of their experiences (Gorelick 1991; McCall & Wittner 1990), which is important with regard to giving voices to individuals who have not been included in social research (Gorelick 1991). Additionally, a feminist standpoint approach places gender at the heart of analysis of social relationships and interactions (Harding 1991), which means that it is useful in understanding the experiences of both men and women. Because the production of social knowledge has been based largely on the experiences of those who are privileged in society, a feminist standpoint makes the analysis of those who are less privileged, such as women who have largely been excluded from social research and some categories of less privileged men, like parolees, possible (Harding 1991; Smith 1990). Finally, a feminist

standpoint approach asserts that research must be conducted for the research subjects (Cook & Fonow 1990), which means that researchers operating from a feminist standpoint must consider how their research findings can contribute to the lives of the people whom they are researching by providing a better understanding of their lived experiences, an opportunity to be heard, and even suggestions for changes that may improve their quality of life.

Because the goal of this research is to understand how the resources men and women receive from their social ties shape their reentry experiences, a feminist standpoint approach is well-suited to the research project. In this research, I privilege the parolees' interpretations of their experiences in my data analysis, and include their voices throughout the research findings. I also consider the influence of gender on social ties and the resources available to the parolees via their social ties throughout my analyses so as to account for structural factors that shaped the experiences of the men and women in the sample. Finally, the research findings can have practical implications for corrections because they provide a better understanding of the ways that social ties can shape parolees' reentry experiences. An improved understanding of the influence of social ties on reentry experiences may indicate a need for correctional policies aimed at helping prison inmates and parolees develop strong- and weak-tie relationships that may ultimately help them obtain the resources necessary for successful reentry.

Methods for the Study

This research examines men’s and women’s reentry experiences and answers the following questions:

1) What is the composition of men's and women's social relationships prior to, during, and after incarceration? How does gender influence these relationships?

2) What resources do men and women receive via their social ties prior to, during, and after incarceration? How does gender influence these resources?

3) How do the resources available to the men and women via their social ties shape their reentry experiences?

Concept Definitions

1) Reentry Experience. Reentry is "the transition of offenders from prisons or jails back into the community," (Office of Justice Programs 2001) and the reentry experience includes any social interaction and resource acquisition that is related to the goal of avoiding recidivism and becoming a law-abiding and productive citizen. For example, does a parolee have access to all of the resources needed for successful reentry? Does he or she desist from crime or continue to engage in criminal behavior? Does he or she become part of society through employment and the formation of new pro-social bonds? Finally, does he or she believe these things to have been useful with regard to the post-incarceration transition?
2) Social Ties. Social ties are the connections and relationships between people (Bourdieu &Wacquant 1992; Granovetter 1973). Social ties may be differentiated as strong- and weak-ties, and the strength of the tie is determined by three criteria: frequency of interaction, emotional intensity, and reciprocity (Granovetter 1973). Strong-ties are characterized by frequent, emotionally-intense reciprocal interactions, and weak-ties are characterized by less frequent, less emotionally-intense interactions that may not be reciprocal in nature (Granovetter 1973). Examples of strong-ties include romantic partners, children, and other relatives, and examples of weak-ties are friends, peers,

coworkers, and clergy. For those on parole, parole officers become weak-tie, as parolees are required to interact with their parole officers in regular intervals and may turn to their parole officers for both tangible and intangible resources.

3) Resources. Resources include the tangible items, such as housing and food, employment and money, education and job training, and treatment services, that the study participants receive through their various social ties as well as emotional support and advice. In the context of this research, resources from social ties are important because they can help parolees meet their immediate needs and avoid reoffending.

Sample and Data

The data used for the dissertation research comes from a larger project entitled "Gender and Reentry" and was collected by Dr. Hoan Bui in 2007 and 2010 (IRB# 7428B and IRB # 7200B). Although there was a three-year time lapse in data collection for men and women, the lapse in time does not affect the research findings, as my research questions are not bound in time or comparative in nature, but instead are related to the perspective each parolee has about his or her social ties and the resources they provide during the reentry experience.

The sample for the study consists of 25 male and 25 female parolees who were recruited from a parole program in Knox County (Tennessee). Selection criteria for the sample included at least one year in prison and one year on parole supervision, at the time of recruitment. The requirement of one year in prison is important because it is a sufficient amount of time for inmates to participate in and complete prison-based education, job training, or rehabilitation programs which may contribute to successful reentry. Additionally, the requirement of one year

on parole is important because most parole failures occur in the first year when released inmates begin facing the challenges of reintegration (Langan & Levin 2002).

According to the parole office, a total of 60 men and 38 women met these selection criteria, and parole officers were asked to determine whether parolees meeting the selection criteria were willing to participate in the research project. Because parole officers were charged with determining which parolees met the selection criteria, it is possible that some were unwilling to forward contact information for parolees they did not view as particularly successful or responsible. It is also possible that self-selection may have resulted in certain types of parolees (e.g., those who were more successful) agreeing to participate in the research more than others (e.g., those who continued to struggle during the parole period). Ultimately, however, names and contact information for twenty-five male and twenty-five female parolees who indicated a willingness to participate in the project were forwarded to the researcher, who then contacted the parolees by telephone to determine their continued willingness to participate in the research project. Interviews were scheduled for parolees who remained willing to participate, but nine male parolees who agreed to be interviewed did not show up for their interviews and were replaced by other male parolees, and one man who initially agreed to participate expressed that he no longer wished to participate once he was contacted by the researcher; these problems did not occur among the sample of female parolees. In order to replace men who did not show up for their scheduled interviews or no longer wished to participate in the research project, parole officers were asked to provide contact information for any additional men who were willing to participate in the research project until interviews with twenty-five male parolees had been conducted.

At least one year after the interviews (at least two years after prison release), parole record checks revealed that, of the 50 parolees included in the research, 4 men and 1 woman had been re-incarcerated for violating the conditions of their parole or committing new offenses. The rest remained on parole or were successfully discharged from parole. Including the four men and one woman who were re-incarcerated, all men and women in the study had no official record of crime for *at least* twenty-four months after being released from prison. Given the failure rate of 39% in the second year and 46% in the third year of parole in Tennessee (Tennessee Department of Corrections, 2010), all the study participants attained some degree of success.

Data for the project were collected through in-depth interviews that asked the respondents to reflect on their social relationships and the resources available to them via their relationships prior to, during, and after incarceration. In looking at experiences prior to, during, and after incarceration, I will be able to understand how an individual and his or her circumstances changed over time. Most of the respondents were interviewed just once, though five men and nine women were interviewed twice as a result of their more extensive histories of incarceration and their more detailed descriptions of their social ties and the resources they provided; a tenth woman was interviewed three times. The parolees were paid twenty-five dollars for each interview session.

Interviews were structured (see Appendix A for the interview guides used during the men and women's interviews) and were conducted by one of three trained interviewers[1] in either a

[1] I personally conducted interviews with all twenty-five men and six women.

private room in the parole office[2] or in a public space such as a cafeteria, shopping mall, fast food restaurant, or library. Although the men and women in the sample were given their choice of interview location and assured of the confidentiality of their interviews, it is possible that their responses were not candid. First, developing rapport with research participants can be difficult (Liamputting & Ezzy 2005), and research participants may be unwilling to disclose personal information on sensitive topics (Brannen 1998). Additionally, because most parolees chose to be interviewed in the parole office, they may have been unwilling to provide truthful responses to some of the research questions, since interview sites themselves may reflect power dynamics (Elwood & Martin 2000), and parolees are in positions of relatively little power while in a parole office.

Information available from the study data includes: 1) demographic and offense characteristics, 2) education, employment and income before and after incarceration, 3) social ties and resources before, during and after incarceration; and 4) criminal justice experiences (arrests, convictions and sentences) before and after incarceration.

Sample Characteristics

Women

The women in the sample ranged in age from 25 to 58, with a mean of 40.6 years. Seventeen of the women were non-Hispanic White, one woman was Hispanic White, and six women were non-Hispanic Black; one woman identified herself as bi-racial (Black and White).

[2] Most men and women chose to be interviewed in a private room in the parole office because it was convenient for them to complete their monthly report with their parole officer and participate in the interview in the same location.

At the time of the interviews, five women were married, eleven women were divorced, and nine women had never been married. Most (n=18) of the women had children, and seven had children under the age of eighteen. Most of the women (n = 22) had at least a high school education or its equivalent (five women completed a GED while in prison) and twelve had either some college education or a college degree at the time of the interview, including one woman who earned two Associate's degrees while incarcerated. Most (n=18) of the women were employed at the time they were interviewed. Of the seven women who did not work, three women were disabled and receiving disability benefits, three had applied for disability benefits but not yet received them, and one was experiencing health problems that kept her from working but had not applied for disability benefits. Twenty of the women in the sample earned incomes that ranged from $400 to $2400 per month, with a mean of $1228, but less than half of the women (n=11) earned at or above the federal minimum wage of $1200 per month. More than half of the women (n = 14) said they were receiving cash or food stamp assistance at the time of the interview, but only one woman was also receiving government housing assistance. A majority of the women (n = 16) rented apartment or houses; only three women owned their homes, and the rest (n = 6) lived with relatives, friends, or acquaintances.

Most (n=21) of the women in the sample had multiple arrests, convictions, and incarcerations, often for minor offenses. Consistent with the profile of female offenders (O'Brien 2001), only six women in the sample committed violent crimes, including murder, facilitation of murder, and armed robbery, and the rest of the women committed non-violent offenses, including burglary, fraud, driving offenses, and drug-related offenses. Age at first arrest ranged

from 14 to 40 for the women in the sample, and twenty-one of the women had more than one arrest, with a mean number of arrests of 6.3. More than half of the women (n=17) had multiple convictions (twelve had two to five convictions and five had six or more convictions). Consistent with their histories of arrest and conviction, fifteen women had been sentenced to probation between one and six times prior to incarceration, twenty-two women had between one and five previous incarcerations in jails and prisons, and three women had between six and nineteen previous incarcerations, with a mean of 3.7. Including the parole period during which they were interviewed, a substantial majority of women in the study (n = 22) had been on parole just once, and the remaining three women had just two experiences each with parole.

Men

The men in the sample had ages ranging from 25 years to 82 years, with a mean of 45.5 years (five men were over 60 years old). Sixteen of the men were non-Hispanic White, one man was Hispanic White, and eight men were non-Hispanic black. At the time of the interviews, only six men were married; the remaining men were either divorced (n=9) or never married (n=10). A majority of the men (n=18) had children. Of those with children, eight men had children under the age of eighteen. As was the case with the women in the sample, the men had generally high levels of education when compared to the general parole population, as twenty-two had at least a high school education or GED (seven men earned a GED while in prison). Eight men in the sample had either some college education or a college degree at the time they were interviewed, including two men who earned Associate's degrees while incarcerated.

More than half of the men (n = 14) in the sample were employed at the time of the interview; one additional man was not formally employed but supported himself by working a variety of odd jobs. Of the ten men who did not work, eight were disabled and received disability benefits; one man was in the sample had retired and was receiving social security benefits at the time of his interview, and one man was actively seeking employment. Most of the men (n = 24) in the sample earned incomes that ranged from $400 per month to $2700 per month, with a mean of $1,336; a majority of the men (n = 14) earned at least $1200 each month, placing them at or above the federal minimum wage ($1200 or higher each month). At the time of interview, three men received cash or food stamp assistance, but only one received government housing assistance. Similar to the women, five men owned their own homes, fifteen rented apartments or houses, and four lived with relatives, friends or acquaintances.

The men in the sample had extensive records of arrests, convictions, and incarcerations, often for more than one type of offense. Eighteen men committed violent offenses, including murder and attempted murder, armed robbery, rape, and aggravated assault. Other offenses committed by the men in the sample include theft, burglary, driving offenses, and drug-related offenses. The age of first arrest for the men ranged from 13 to 45, and most had more than one arrest (7.9 was the mean number or arrests reported by the men in the study). Most of the men (n=20) also had more than one conviction; fourteen men had two to five convictions and six men had six or more convictions. A majority of men (n=15) were sentenced to probation one to five times prior to their incarceration in prison, and most of them (n = 22) had between six and nineteen incarcerations in jails and prisons, with a mean of 5.1 incarcerations. Including the

parole period during which they were interviewed, about half of the men (n=13) had been placed on parole only once, and the rest had two to three parole experiences each.

In sum, the women in the sample were slightly younger than the men and the sample consisted of both white and black respondents. Slightly fewer women were married at the time of their interviews than men, but an equal number of men and women were parents at that time. A similar number of men and women had at least a high school education or GED at the time of their interview, and both the men and women in the study were better educated than the general parole population[3] (Petersilia 2003). A greater number of women than men were employed at the time of their interview, but their incomes were lower than those earned by men. As a result, a significantly greater number of women received cash or food stamp assistance during this time period. More men than women owned their own homes, and more women than men lived with friends, relatives, and acquaintances. Although both the men and women in the sample had long histories of arrests, convictions, and incarcerations, the mean number of arrests and incarcerations was greater for men than for women, and women committed less violent offenses overall than men. Table 1 in Appendix B provides a comparison table of the demographic characteristics and criminal justice histories of the men and women in the study.

Overall, however, the sample was not typical in terms of race/ethnicity, educational attainment, and income of incarcerated individuals. First, 68 percent (n=17) of the women and 64 percent (n=16) of the men included in the sample were non-Hispanic white. Only twenty-eight percent of the women and thirty-two percent of the men in the sample were non-Hispanic black,

[3] Roughly half of all parolees have less than a high school education.

including one woman who identified herself as bi-racial; just one man and one woman were Hispanic. Black men have an imprisonment rate nearly seven times higher than non-Hispanic white men, however, and black women have an imprisonment rate that is nearly three times higher than non-Hispanic white women (Glaze 2011). Likewise, the imprisonment rate for Hispanic men is three times as great as it is for non-Hispanic white men, and the incarceration rate for Hispanic women is nearly twice than for non-Hispanic white women (Glaze 2011). Thus, black and Hispanic men and women were underrepresented in the study sample. Second, most of the women (n=22) and men (n=22) in the sample had at least a high school education at the time of their interview, including twelve women and eight men who had some college education or a college degree at the time of their interview. Among incarcerated men and women, however, roughly half have not completed high school or received a GED (Petersilia 2003), and just 11.4 percent have completed some college (9 percent) or earned a college degree (2.4 percent) (Harlow 2003). Thus, men and women with a high school diploma or its equivalent and men and women with at least some college education were overrepresented in the study sample. Finally, most of the women (n=18) and more than half of the men (n=14) in the study sample were employed at the time of their interview, and nearly half of the women (n=11) and a majority of the men (n=14) earned at or above the minimum wage. Previous research showed, however, that just 45 percent of parolees were employed eight months after their release from prison, and that those who were employed earned a median monthly income of just $700 (Visher, Debus, & Yahner 2008). Thus, the men and women included in the current study have slightly higher rates of employment and higher income levels than other parolees.

These differences in racial composition, educational attainment, and income when compared to the incarcerated population and other parolees may affect the study findings by placing the men and women included in the current study in a better position to achieve success than other parolees. First, because a higher percentage of men and women in the current study are non-Hispanic white than the incarcerated population, they may be subject to less discrimination based on race/ethnicity, and being white has been shown to be associated with post-prison employment (Visher, Debus, & Yahner 2008), which can contribute to reentry success. Second, the relatively high levels of educational attainment among the men and women in the study may have facilitated their job-seeking experiences (Visher, Debus, & Yahner 2008), making it easier for them to secure employment and support themselves through legal means. Finally, because they earned relatively sufficient incomes when compared to other parolees, the men and women included in the current study may have experienced less financial strain that might have otherwise induced them to crime (Agnew 1992).

Analytical Procedure

Interviews were transcribed from handwritten notes. Interview transcriptions were coded and analyzed using QDA Miner, a program for analysis of qualitative data (see Appendix C for a description of coding and a list of codes used). Three types of coding were used when analyzing the data. First, I used open coding to scrutinize interview transcriptions line-by-line and reveal themes related to the focus of the study (Strauss 1987). In this stage of coding I used both in vivo codes and codes based on my sociological understanding to interpret the data to identify themes regarding social tie composition and resources available to men and women prior to, during, and

after incarceration. Once I uncovered these initial themes, I used axial coding to organize the themes created during open coding into categories related to my research questions (Strauss & Corbin 1990). Some of these categories included social relationship composition, frequency of contact with ties, quality of relationships, types of resources available, and belief about the influence of the resources social ties provided on the reentry experience. Finally, selective coding was used to find relationships among the categories created during axial coding so as to understand the relationship between social ties, resources from social ties, and reentry experiences. Here, I also looked for consistencies between my research findings and theoretical framework and examined any inconsistencies that emerged, which allowed me to provide insight and conclusions about my research questions, including the effect of gender on social relationship composition and resources and the influence of social ties on the reentry experience. To enhance the credibility of the findings, in each stage of data analysis I emphasized the experiences reported by multiple men and women (Strauss 1987).

Although three types of coding were used to analyze the study data and the experiences reported by multiple men and women were emphasized, the intersectionality of gender, race, social class, age, sexual orientation, or other statuses was not considered. Because feminist scholarship suggests that social statuses intersect to shape experiences (Collins 2000; Crenshaw 1991; McCall 2005), it is possible that data coding and analysis based only on sex ignored several important distinctions between the men and women in this sample and their experiences.

In order to check for inter-rater reliability and check for agreement with regard to themes that emerged from the data, three additional researchers were asked to identify themes and create codes in a sample of transcripts. The results showed close agreement on the themes of the data,

though, as was the case with Armstrong and colleagues (1997), the language used to create specific codes sometimes varied in minor ways among the researchers.

CHAPTER 5: GENDER AND SOCIAL TIES AMONG MEN AND WOMEN ON PAROLE

Gender can influence the structure and quality of men and women's relationships. As a result of socialization, women and men form different numbers and types of social ties. Women tend to have an overall greater number of social ties than men (Antonucci & Akiyama 1987; Antonucci et al. 1998; McLaughlin et al. 2010), and they also share greater levels of emotional intimacy (Belle 1987; Caldwell & Peplau 1982; Ross & Mirowsky 1989; Stokes & Wilson 1984; Turner & Marino 1994) with their social ties than do their male counterparts. Women's social ties, however, consist primarily of strong-tie relationships with family members and intimate partners (Dunbar & Spoors 1995; Fischer & Oliker 1983; McPherson et al. 2006; Marsden 1987; Moore 1990), likely as a result of gender roles which have traditionally limited women's social interactions by keeping them in the domestic realm (Cikara et al. 2009; Fletcher 1998; Hook 2010; Martinengo, Jacob, & Hill 2010; Poortman and Van Der Lippe 2009). Men, on the other hand, have fewer strong-tie relationships and instead tend to develop a variety of weak-tie relationships, including non-kin relationships with coworkers, advisors, and friends (Eby & Allen 2012; Fischer & Oliker 1983; Marsden 1987; Moore 1990). With the exception of the heterogeneous strong-tie relationships shared with family members, women's relationships tend to be sex homogeneous, whereas the relationships of men are more varied with regard to sex (Dunbar & Spoors 1995; Marsden 1990; Hanson & Pratt 1991; Marx and Leicht 1992; McPherson et al. 2006; Roberts et al. 2008; Roberts et al. 2009). Finally, although women and men spend similar amounts of time with their strong- and weak-ties, men have more frequent contact with their ties than women (Caldwell & Peplau 1982).

This chapter discusses strong- and weak-tie relationships experienced by the men and women in the study prior to, during, and after incarceration. Included in the discussion is the way gender and experiences with crime, incarceration, and reentry shaped the men's and women social ties. This is important for understanding the resources available to the men and women during reentry, which is the topic of Chapter 6.

Strong-Tie Relationships

Dysfunctional and Violent Intimate Relationships Prior to Incarceration

Data analysis revealed that most (n=17 or 68%) of the women in the study were involved in intimate relationships with individuals they considered to be spouses or significant others prior to incarceration, including one woman who was involved in a same-sex relationship. Of those women, seven (41%) were married and ten (59%) were in dating relationships. An additional four women were divorced prior to their incarceration, and the remaining four women were not involved in intimate relationships and had never been married before they were sentenced to prison.

Of the seventeen women who had intimate partners prior to incarceration, only two (12%) described their relationships in positive ways. The remaining women said that spousal abuse (n=9 or 53%), spousal criminal influence (n=5 or 29%), and spousal indifference (n=1) led to feelings of unhappiness within their relationships. Indeed, of the seven women who were married prior to incarceration, four (57%) characterized their marriages as abusive, as did half (n=5 or 50%) of the women who were in dating relationships. These nine women indicated multiple forms of violence at the hands of their partners, including physical, verbal, and emotional abuse. For four (44%) of the nine abused women, the physical abuse was so severe

that they had been hospitalized at least once as a result. Two of the abused women explained their experiences:

> [My] live-in boyfriend was verbally and emotionally abusive. He was an alcoholic. He encouraged me to jump bond, told me that things would be better in Arizona. I wasn't allowed to go anywhere without him. (Respondent W12)
>
> [I experienced] physical abuse by my common-law husband. Got stitches, cracked ribs. [There] was also verbal and emotional abuse by him for nine years. I tried to leave him a couple times with the children, [but I] went back...mainly because he was their dad. (Respondent W13)

In addition to these experiences of abuse, five women (29%) said they were involved in illegal behaviors at the inducement of their intimate partners. Indeed, one woman was convicted of felony murder because she was asked by her husband to drive him to and from the sites where he was committing robberies; two other women packaged, sold, or retrieved illegal drugs at the behest their boyfriends, and two women were charged with possession of illegal goods because their partners placed the items in their homes or vehicles.

According to data analysis, slightly fewer men (n=15 or 60%) than women in the study were involved in intimate relationships with spouses or significant others prior to their incarcerations. Of these men, eight (53%) were married and seven (47%) were involved in dating relationships. An additional two men were divorced prior to incarceration, and the remaining eight men were not involved in any intimate relationships during this time period.

Of the fifteen men with pre-incarceration intimate relationships, five (33%) said that the relationships were positive. Spousal drug use (n=3) and intimate partner violence (n=7) led to

unhappy relationships for the remaining men. Seven (47%) of the fifteen men with pre-incarceration intimate relationships characterized the relationships as abusive, and only two of the seven men--Respondents M16 and M20-- said the abuse was directed toward them. Although these two men reported victimization at the hands of their partners, neither indicated that their victimization had reached the level of violence that the women reported experiencing. As these men explained:

> If it was [abuse], it was her hittin' me. She'd get mad, maybe smack me. (Respondent M16)
>
> She hit me in the head with a frying pan, stabbed me [when we were arguing]. All kinds [of abuse]. This was once a week at least. I just pushed her away or shoved her. (Respondent M20)

Unlike their female counterparts, none of the men in the study reported connections between their intimate relationships and their criminal offending.

Based on these findings, the men in the study had more positive intimate relationships prior to incarceration than the women, but few men and women overall said that their relationships were positive. Abuse within intimate relationships explained a great deal of the unhappiness experienced by the study participants, but the women experienced this abuse as victims whereas the men were most commonly the perpetrators of abuse against their partners. Finally, women's pre-incarceration intimate relationships were problematic because their intimate partners introduced them to criminal behaviors, whereas the men in the study did not report similar criminal influences from their wives and girlfriends.

The influence of gender on these pre-incarceration intimate relationships is striking. That so many women reported abuse at the hands of their intimate partners is consistent with literature indicating that women are more likely than men to experience violent victimization (Bureau of Justice Statistics 1995; World Health Organization 2005). This victimization is caused by an imbalance of power and is often used by men as a way to maintain their dominant position in the relationship (Dobash & Dobash 1979; Goode 1971; Martin 1976; Stark & Flitcraft 1991; Yllo 1993).

Women's inducement into crime by their intimate partners is also consistent with the literature on women and crime. Studies have shown that involvement in romantic relationships with deviant others may contribute to women's offending (Henriques & Manatu-Rupert 2001; Jones 2008; Mullins & Wright 2003; O'Brien 2001; Rafter 1990; Richie 1996; Welle & Falkin 2000). This may happen because women’s attempts to adhere to traditional gender roles require them to protect their loved ones, and a woman may go so far as to commit crimes with or take the blame for the crimes committed by her significant other (Rafter 1990; Richie 1996).

Research also revealed that women might go along with their partner's deviant behaviors so as to avoid the negative repercussions associated with not doing so, and that many women had been coerced into their crimes by their intimate partners or had remained unaware of the intentions of their partners until arriving at the would-be crime scene (Mullins & Wright, 2003; Richie 1996). These gender issues were experienced by many women in the study. Respondent W24 explained that a desire to protect her boyfriend meant that she did not speak up and tell the police that the drugs she had been carrying actually belonged to him, Respondent W5 claimed that threats of violence caused her to continue packaging and selling cocaine for her boyfriend,

and Respondent W4 explained that at first she was unaware of her husband's illegal activities, but that when she learned what he was doing, he coerced her to participate by telling her she was obligated to do so because she was married to him. These women explained as follows:

> I just went and picked it [the drugs] up [for my boyfriend]. They [the police] came and started asking me about him and said they was going to arrest me. All I did was pick the stuff for him. I was scared. I didn't even understand what was going on. I never said 'Hey, it's his.' I wanted to protect him. I was so stupid, so crazy. (Respondent W24)
>
> [My] boyfriend was making me package and sell cocaine. [I would] go to the hotel and package it up and then sell it. At first, [I] wanted to because it was good money. After a couple of arrests, I wanted to stop. But he wouldn't let me. I wouldn't give him up. If I had said his name [to the police] he'd have probably killed me. So, I took the blame [the drug charge when we were caught] and 30 years [prison sentence]. (Respondent W5)
>
> I was dumb at first, thought he was selling drugs. When I realized what he and his friend were doing [armed robberies], he said 'You're my wife, you have to.' I would drive and drop them off a few blocks from where they robbed. He would tell me that I wasn't part of it – I was just dropping them off. I took that in [believed it] too. (Respondent W4)

Changes in Intimate Relationships During Incarceration

Data analysis indicated that the women in the study experienced a great deal of change in their intimate relationships during incarceration. While in prison, two women were abandoned by

their boyfriends and two women received divorce papers from their husbands; women who experienced abusive intimate relationships prior to incarceration (n=2) or who were induced to crime by their intimate partners (n=2) were more susceptible to these changes than women who did not report these experiences. Additionally, one woman got married to a man she met via the Internet while she was in prison. As a result of these changes, six women (24%) were married while in prison and eight women (32%) were involved in dating relationships during this time period.

Data analysis revealed that of the fourteen women involved in intimate relationships while in prison, only six (43%) said their intimate partners visited them at least once. Of those six women, two (33%) reported regular in-person visits from their romantic partners (every other weekend for Respondent W1 and once monthly for Respondent W15). One woman said that she received one visit per year from her husband, and the remaining three women (50%) received only one in-person visit from their intimate partners for the duration of their incarcerations. In addition to in-person contact, nine women (64%) said they received letters from their intimate partners while they were in prison, and six women (43%) said they spoke with their intimate partners on the telephone occasionally during this time period.

The women in the study continued to experience unhappy intimate relationships while they were in prison. Overall, just four women (29%) characterized the contact they had with their intimate partners while in prison as supportive. The remaining ten women (71%) explained that limited contact, arguments, and a lack of support led them to feel unhappy with their intimate partners.

According to data analysis, the men in the study also experienced shifts in their intimate relationships while in prison. Two men were abandoned by their girlfriends, three men began dating relationships with women they had met prior to incarceration, and one man got married to a woman he met before he was sent to prison. Ultimately, these changes meant that nine men (36%) were married during this time period and seven[4] men (28%) were in dating relationships while incarcerated.

According to the data, ten of the sixteen (63%) men involved in intimate relationships during incarceration received in-person visits from their intimate partners. Four of those men (40%) said that they received weekly visits from their intimate partners and one man received monthly visits. Three men said their intimate partners visited them three to four times per year, and only two men (20%) said they received just one visit from their intimate partners for the duration of their prison sentences. In addition to the in-person contact men shared with their intimate partners during this time period, ten men (63%) received letters from their wives and girlfriends while they were in prison and six men (38%) said they were able to speak with their intimate partners on the telephone at least occasionally during incarceration.

Despite their incarcerations, data analysis revealed that men's intimate relationships became more supportive while they were in prison. Indeed, although only 33% of men said their pre-incarceration intimate relationships were positive, 44% (n=7) of men characterized the contact they had with their wives and girlfriends while in prison as supportive. Strain as a result

[4] One man who had been in a dating relationship prior to incarceration was sentenced to prison for killing his romantic partner during a domestic dispute so is not counted among men who were involved in dating relationships while in prison.

of their incarcerations was a common explanation given by men who said that the contact they had with intimate partners was negative during this time period. Respondents M9 and M22 described their experiences:

> The second time [that I was in prison] I had some contact with my ex-wife [we were married at the time]. Mail, phone, stuff like that. It was strained though. I was on a continuous pattern of destruction. It led to our divorce. (Respondent M9)
>
> We [my multiple girlfriends and I] had all types of contact [in-person, phone, mail]. Sometimes it was warm and supportive, sometimes it was strained 'cause there'd be days I was pissed (Respondent M22).

In sum, data analysis revealed that the intimate relationships experienced by the men while they were in prison were more positive than those experienced by the women. In part, these differences can be explained by the greater percentage of men than women who received in-person visits from their intimate partners. The greater frequency with which men were in contact with their intimate partners, as well as the more supportive contact they shared with their wives and girlfriends, also contributed to this difference. As a result of changes in intimate relationships, however, the relationships experienced by the men and women during incarceration were better overall than they had been prior to incarceration.

The differential experiences with the intimate relationships experienced by the men and women in the study while they were incarcerated also reflect gender relations in society. Incarceration can cause irreparable damage to intimate relationships (Petersilia 2003), which sometimes leads to divorce (Rindfuss & Stephen 1990). This is problematic, as stable romantic relationships can contribute to successful reentry (Nelson et al. 1999; Zamble & Quinsey 1997).

Because women commit less crime than men overall (Glaze 2011; Minton 2012), there are fewer women's prisons, which mean that women are more likely than men to be incarcerated a great distance from their intimate partners (Travis 2005). Consequently, it may be time- and cost-prohibitive for women to receive physical visits from their romantic partners, whereas the relative abundance of men's prisons may facilitate visitation from intimate partners (Travis 2005).

Additionally, women tend to put forth more effort to relationship maintenance than men, especially as the relationship progresses (Kirkpatrick & Lee 1994), which is likely a result of traditional views of gender roles (Owen 1998). Thus, men are more likely to receive personal visits from their intimate partners than women simply because their female partners are more likely to put forth the effort to visit than the male partners of incarcerated women. Moreover, the masculine ideology, such as the belief that a man is in control of his relationship, influences men's responses to certain situations (Pleck 1995; Thompson & Pleck 1995). This may explain why men were more likely than women to take responsibility for the strain in their intimate relationships during this time period. Simply, by claiming responsibility for creating situations in which contact with intimate partners was negative, the men were maintaining control within their relationships.

New Intimate Relationships After Incarceration

Data analysis showed that the women in the study continued to experience changes in their intimate relationships after incarceration. Immediately upon leaving prison, six women (24%) were married and eight women (32%) were involved in dating relationships. However, only ten of those women (71%) remained in their relationships in the months following their

release from prison. Women who ended their marriages after prison release cited the desire to end negative relationships and avoid any negative influence from their romantic partners as the impetus for the divorce. For example, Respondent W20 chose to divorce her husband, who was criminally involved, after her release from prison. As she explained:

> While I was in prison I tried to file for divorce but I ended up not doing so until a month after I got out. The whole time I was incarcerated I knew that was a relationship that wasn't going anywhere. I'd changed and he hadn't, so I ended up cutting all ties with him when I got out.

Nine other women began new intimate relationships in the months after their prison release, and overall only six women (24%) remained single at the time of their interview, which occurred at least one year after the women left prison. For all six women, the desire for positive change was cited as the reason for choosing to remain single. As respondent W17, who was involved in a verbally abusive relationship prior to and during incarceration, explained: "[It is] best for me to be on my own right now. Get myself together. Figure out what I want."

Despite these changes, the women in the study continued to experience unhappy intimate relationships after their release from prison. Indeed, just eight women (42%) characterized their post-incarceration intimate relationships as good, which generally meant that they believed their partners to be understanding and that they got along well with one another. Eleven women (58%), however, said the intimate relationships they experienced after prison were unhappy or plagued by problems, including arguments and other forms of strain (n=5), abuse (n=3), general indifference (n=2) and spousal incarceration (n=1).

Like the women, the men in the study saw a variety of changes in their intimate relationships after incarceration. Upon their release from prison, nine men (36%) were married and seven (28%) were involved in dating relationships. Only five (31%) men remained in their intimate relationships in the months following their release, however, and thirteen men (52%) began new intimate relationships after incarceration, including three men who rekindled romances with women from whom they had been divorced (n=2) or broken up with (n=1) prior to their incarcerations. Ultimately, just five men (20%) remained single for at least one year after their release from prison.

An increase from previous time periods, nine men (50%) who were involved in intimate relationships after prison characterized their relationships as positive or supportive. Eleven men (55%), however, said their post-incarceration relationships were unhappy. Infidelity (n=3), money problems (n= 2), and feeling trapped in the relationship (n=2) were the primary reasons men provided for their unhappiness.

Overall, data analysis showed that the men in the study experienced improved intimate relationships after incarceration than their female counterparts, but that neither the men nor the women experienced overwhelmingly positive relationships. Several women continued to experience intimate partner violence during this time period. Twice as many men as women ended their pre-existing intimate relationships in the months following their release from prison, though most men ultimately began new intimate relationships within a year of their release. Ultimately, more women than men chose to remain single after prison release, and all the women who chose to remain single cited the negative influence of previous intimate partners as the primary reason for this decision. As a result of changes in their intimate relationships during

incarceration, and despite continuing problems in many of their intimate relationships, a greater number of men and women reported good or supportive relationships after prison release than had done so prior to or during incarceration.

The patterns of intimate relationships experienced by the men and women in the study upon their release from prison continued to be shaped by gender. Indeed, the fact that more women than men remained with their intimate partners after their release from prison--sometimes despite unhappiness and abuse in the relationship--is reflective of gender relations in society. Socially constructed ideas about femininity suggest that a woman's value lies in her ability to maintain her personal relationships (Benjamin 1988; Chodorow 1978; Dimen 1986; Gilligan 1982; Jordan & Surrey 1986; Miller 1976; Swift 1987), and women's attempts to adhere to traditional gender roles often lead them to participate in unhealthy romantic relationships, or remain in the relationships in which they are unhappy (Rafter 1990).

Interestingly, several women who chose to remain single upon their release from prison said their decision was based on a desire to avoid further inducement to crime by intimate partners. This lends support to suggestions that women often commit crimes as a result of gender roles mandating them to help or protect their intimate partners (Rafter 1990; Richie 1996). It also suggests, however, that gendered relationship patterns can shift as women become empowered to enact positive change in their lives (Davis & Greenstein 2009).

Family Relationships Prior to Incarceration

According to data analysis most women (n=18 or 72%) in the study had children prior to incarceration. Of these women, ten (56%) had minor children, seven (39%) had adult children over the age of eighteen, and one mother had both minor and adult children prior to being

sentenced to prison. Overall, 82% of women (n=8) with minor children lived with their children at least part time during this time period, as did one mother who had adult children with whom she lived. Most of the women whose children did not live with them prior to incarceration said this was because their adult children lived on their own (n=7), but one mother lost custody of her child as a result of divorce, and another had been stripped of her parental rights by the state. The mother who was stripped of her parental rights had no further contact with her children after losing custody.

Of the women who were in contact with their children prior to incarceration (n=16), all but two (n= 14 or 88%) described supportive, close relationships. The two women who described their relationships with their children as strained cited their drug use as the primary reason for this, saying "They just wanted me to straighten my life out" (Respondent W2) and "[Our relationship was] not so good at that time because of my drug use. I distanced myself from them" (Respondent W9).

Data analysis showed that like the women, most men (n=18 or 72%) in the study had children prior to incarceration. Seventeen men (94%) had minor children during this time period, and one man had adult children over the age of eighteen[5]. Overall, 70.5% of men (n=12) with minor children lived with their children at least part time before they were sentenced to prison. Loss of custody as a result of separation or divorce (n=4) was the primary reason men did not live with their children prior to incarceration, but one man had been stripped of his parental

[5] Women had a greater mean age of first arrest, first conviction, and first incarceration than the men in this study, which may explain why fewer men than women had adult children prior to incarceration.

rights by the state and had no further contact with his children, and another man had adult children who had already begun living on their own,

Of the thirteen men who were in contact with their children prior to incarceration, all but one described the relationships as close or good. The remaining man said that his pre-incarceration relationship with his child was problematic, and indicated that arguments within the family household were the primary cause of the problems.

In addition to relationships with children, analysis of the data revealed that twenty-one women (84%) had relationships with relatives prior to incarceration. Relationships with parents formed the majority (n=15 or 71%) of women's family ties, though nearly half (n=12 or 57%) of the women with ties to relatives were also in contact with siblings during this time period. Several women also had relationships with members of their extended family, including grandparents (n=2), aunts and uncles (n=2) and cousins (n=1) before they were incarcerated. Three women said they were not in contact with relatives during this time period as a result of their substance abuse, and the remaining woman said she had no living relatives prior to incarceration.

The relationships women shared with their relatives prior to incarceration were tenuous at best. Of fifteen women who had relationships with parents during this time period, just eight (53%) described the relationships as good, friendly, or supportive. For the other women, parental alcoholism (n=3), parental abuse (n=2), and their own substance abuse (n=2) were credited as the primary causes of the poor relationships they shared with their parents. Most of the women (n=9 or 75%) who shared relationships with siblings prior to incarceration, however, said these

relationships were positive and supportive, as did all but one woman with extended family relationships.

According to the data, most (n=20 or 80%) of the men in the study also had relationships with relatives prior to incarceration. The primary source of these relationships were parents (n=18 or 90%), but three men were in contact with their siblings during this time period. Only one man, who was in contact with the grandparents who had raised him, maintained any form of relationship with members of his extended family. All five men who said that they lacked family relationships prior to incarceration said that this was a result of their attempts to distance themselves from relatives so as to hide their drug use.

Unlike the women in the study, the men shared supportive pre-incarceration relationships with relatives. Indeed, of the eighteen men who were in contact with their parents prior to incarceration, just three (17%) said the relationships were poor. These three men indicated that a lack of closeness (n=2) and arguments (n=1) led to strain within their relationships. All of the men who had pre-incarceration relationships with siblings, as well as the one man with extended family relationships, described them as good or supportive.

Based on data analysis, the relationships men shared with children and relatives prior to incarceration were more positive than those experienced by women. A larger percentage of women lived with their minor children during this time period, however. Additionally, although women shared relationships with a greater variety of relatives than men before they were sentenced to prison, physical and substance abuse led to strain within their relationships.

The finding that a smaller percentage of men in the study lived with their minor children prior to incarceration is consistent with the traditional ideology of mother as caregiver as well as

research on incarcerated parents suggesting that fathers are almost half as likely than mothers to have lived with their minor children prior to incarceration (Glaze & Maruschak 2008). The gendered division of labor dictates that child care is women's responsibility (West & Zimmerman 1987; Wille 1995). Consequently, men are less likely to live with or care for their minor children than women.

Additionally, the fact that women reported a wider variety of pre-incarceration family relationships than men was consistent with literature suggesting that women have a greater number of strong-tie relationships with relatives than men (Dunbar & Spoors 1995; Fischer & Oliker 1983; McPherson et al. 2006; Marsden 1987; Moore 1990). This finding is also consistent with literature which argues that through gender socialization women are taught to assume responsibility for creating and maintaining family relationships, whereas men are not (Cikara et al. 2009; Hook 2010; Poortman and Van Der Lippe 2009; Walters et al. 1991).

Changes in Family Relationships During Incarceration

Regarding relationships with children, data analysis indicated that most (n=15 or 83%) women with children had at least some contact with their children while in prison. Specifically, four women (22%) received in-person visits from their children at least monthly, and eight women (44%) had in-person visits from their children anywhere from one to four times per year. In addition to in-person visits, ten women (56%) corresponded with their children through letters while incarcerated, and nine women (50%) spoke with their children via telephone at least once. For three women (17%), letters and phone calls were the only form of parent-child contact during this time period. Finally, three women had no contact with their children; for two of these women, the distance between their children's homes and the prison location was the primary

reason for lack of contact, and the other woman lost custody of her child to the state prior to being incarcerated and had no further contact with him after that.

When asked about the relationships women shared with their children while incarcerated, only three (17%) described them as entirely supportive or characterized by encouragement on the part of the children. The other twelve women (67%) who were in contact with their children during incarceration said that strain, anxiety, hurt, and anger sometimes affected their relationships. Only one woman ultimately believed that her incarceration caused lasting damage to her relationship with her children, however. Respondent W25 described this change:

> I didn't get a lot of visits. My family's just not visitors. They don't want to come and hear those big old prison doors lock behind them. At first, they were so mad at me. They felt betrayal. My first grandchild was born when I was locked up. My daughter will probably never forgive me for that.

Despite the fact that so many women felt as if the contact they shared with their children during incarceration was marred by problems, all but two women (13%) said that they were pleased to have been able to maintain these relationships while in prison. The remaining two women expressed that the feelings brought about by contact with their children were sometimes painful, and one woman explained that as a result of this pain she requested that her children not visit her again.

> [The] first time [they visited], they cried and I said 'you need to leave. This is not helping me. I told them that I had done this to myself and this [prison] is something I have to do. (Respondent W2)

Like the women in the study, eighteen men (72%) had children at the time they were incarcerated, but only thirteen (72%) had contact with their children while they were in prison. Among men who were in contact with their children, six (33%) had in-person visits with their children at least monthly, and three (17%) saw their children from one to four times per year. Additionally, seven men (39%) received letters from their children while they were in prison, and six men (33%) spoke to their children via telephone at least once during this time period. Four men (22%) said that letters and phone calls were the only form of contact they had with their children while they were incarcerated, and five men (28%) had no contact with their children for the entirety of their prison sentences. Of these five men, three believed that the children's mothers were keeping the children from them intentionally, one blamed a poor relationship with his children, and one lost custody to the state. Respondent M5, who believed he was intentionally being kept from his children, described his failed attempts to resume contact with them while he was in prison:

> My [now-ex] wife took the children. They were 13 and 10. I wrote letters and tried to find them but it was hard to do without resources. We were separated, but she told the kids I was dead and took off with them.

As was the case with their female counterparts, not all of the men who had contact with their children while incarcerated described the contact in wholly positive ways. Indeed, just seven men (54%) used adjectives such as "warm," "supportive," and "good" to describe their parent-child relationships. The other six men (46%) said that feelings of hurt and anger affected their parent-child relationships. Only one man, however, felt that his incarceration caused lasting damage to his relationship with his son, explaining: "In my youngest boy's eyes I never did no

wrong. With my oldest one, he was still a little angry. You could still see the anger in my oldest one's eyes [even after I was released]" (Respondent M2). Another man indicated that visits with his daughter forced him to reflect upon his circumstances, causing them to be painful. Ultimately, however, those feelings helped to facilitate internal change because he realized he did not want to be separated from his daughter again. In his own words:

> I didn't want my daughter to see me and I didn't really want them [my daughter and her mother] to leave. The first time she came, she cried and I was like 'What have I done?' (Respondent M17)

Data analysis revealed that in addition to relationships they shared with children, most women (n=23 or 92%) had contact with relatives during incarceration, representing an increase from the twenty-one women (84%) who were in contact with relatives prior to incarceration. Ties to relatives were limited to those with parents and siblings for more than half of the women (n=13 or 52%), however. Just seven women (28%) had contact with extended family members, including grandparents (n=2), aunts and uncles (n=4), and cousins (n=3) during this time period.

Although most women in the study were in contact with relatives during incarceration, the contact was not always regular. Indeed, only ten women (43%) said the contact they shared with relatives occurred on at least a weekly basis. Three additional women (13%) said they were in contact with relatives on a monthly basis, eight women (35%) said they had contact with their relatives only quarterly, and two women (9%) described their contact with relatives as occurring on an annual basis. Telephone calls represented the most common form of contact for women (n=15 or 60%), though thirteen women (52%) said they corresponded with relatives via letters

and nine women (36%) spoke to their relatives on the telephone while in prison. In total, just two women said they were not in contact with relatives during incarceration.

In general, most women (n=21 or 91%) characterized the contact they had with family members while in prison as supportive, explaining that their relatives attempted to incorporate them into their lives as best they could despite the fact that they were incarcerated. Respondent 22 described attempts her family made to include her:

> My ex [husband] was the only one who visited. I didn't really want my family seeing me there. They offered, but I didn't want that. Instead, we did phone calls, letters, pictures. It was supportive. They videotaped everything about my grandson so that I could watch when I got home. (Respondent W22)

Two women, however, believed that their family members were not supportive of them and doubted that they would be able to adopt non-criminal lifestyles upon their release from prison. For these women, contact that occurred with relatives during incarceration was disappointing (n=1) and hurtful (n=1).

According to data analysis, most men (n=21 or 84%) were also in contact with relatives during incarceration. For fifteen men (71%), this contact was limited to relationships with parents and siblings. Six men (29%), however, described ties to extended family members, including grandparents (n=3), aunts and uncles (n=3), cousins (n=1), and nieces and nephews (n=1); this represented a marked increase from before incarceration, when only one man shared a relationship with members of his extended family.

The men in the study had more frequent contact with relatives during incarceration than their female counterparts. Seventeen men (81%) said that they were in regular contact--usually

multiple times each week--with their relatives, and one man said he was in contact with relatives on a monthly basis. Only three men described less frequent contact, including one man who said he had quarterly contact with relatives and two men who said the contact occurred on an annual basis. Telephone calls represented the most common form of contact between men and their families (n=15 or 60%), but twelve men (48%) said they communicated with relatives through letters. Just nine men (36%) received in-person visits from relatives. Of the nine men who received in-person visits two (22%) did not receive these visits during their most recent incarcerations because their parents had passed away; one additional man put an end to the in-person visits partway through his sentence because of frustration and anger he felt as a result of his incarceration. As he explained:

> They'd come to visit and would sit and talk. After they left it was over with. [Back] then in prison it was not a playground. You went and grew up fast. You have to program your mind to function, to survive by any means. To me I was trying to live in two worlds [when people visited], which you can't do. In prison it's a world inside of a world and to survive in here you've got to stay focused only on what's going on in there. In the early years they could only write. I started out writing but it just didn't work because you're living in a jungle and you have to focus on surviving in there. Eventually [in 1998] I got frustrated and angry and took everyone off my visiting list. (Respondent M21)

In total, only four men reported no contact with family members while incarcerated. When describing reasons for their lack of contact, one man expressed a belief that his family did not wish to be in contact with him since they did not initiate any contact, and another man said that

he lost contact with his relatives once they moved and did not provide him with a forwarding address, explaining:

> I talked to my aunt and uncle for about 3 months but then they moved and didn't give me their new address and phone number. After about 1 year I sent a letter to their last known address and found out they'd moved back. I was pretty hurt over that one. (Respondent M16)

Analysis of the data revealed that most of the men (n=17 or 81%) who were in contact with relatives during incarceration characterized the relationships as supportive. Respondent M25, who was incarcerated for a drug offense, explained that his relatives did not make any attempt to cause him to feel badly about his incarceration. He considered this a form of support, saying:

> [I spoke with] my parents mainly, but some other family as well. At Christmas time my mom would pass the phone around and I'd talk to them, too. It was warm, supportive. I guess when you've done something stupid, there's no point in rubbing it in your face.

Three of the four men who described the contact they had with their relatives while in prison as poor felt that their families acted judgmentally toward them (n=1), lectured them (n=1), or were disingenuous (n=1), and the fourth man believed that his mother was ashamed of him because of his incarceration. For these men, contact with relatives while in prison was a source of stress (n=2), disappointment (n=1), or pain (n=1).

In sum, data analysis showed that more women than men had contact with their children while incarcerated, but men's relationships with their children were more positive than those

described by women. Men also had more frequent contact with their children during this time period, likely a result of the more positive relationships they shared with their intimate partners when compared to women. A greater number of women than men were also in contact with relatives while they were in prison, including a larger number of women who were in contact with members of their extended families. More women than men described the relationships they shared with relatives during this time period as supportive, but despite women's more positive relationships with relatives, men had significantly more frequent contact with their relatives while incarcerated. When compared to the pre-incarceration time period, fewer men and women shared positive relationships with their children, but the relationships the men and women had with relatives improved with regard to perceived levels of happiness and support.

Just as the influence of gender on men and women's family relationships prior to incarceration was visible, gender continued to influence these relationships during incarceration. First, consistent with gender norms that led a greater number of women to live with children prior to incarceration, the ideology that mothers are the more important caregiver (Poortman et al. 2009; West & Zimmerman 1987; Wille 1995) meant more women than men were given the opportunity to be in contact with their children while incarcerated. Second, although the number of men in contact with relatives during incarceration increased, a greater number of women remained in contact with their relatives. This was expected given gendered patterns of family relationships which lead women to have a greater number of strong-ties to relatives than men (Dunbar & Spoors 1995; Fischer & Oliker 1983; McPherson et al. 2006; Marsden 1987; Moore 1990). Interestingly, the increase in the number of men in contact with relatives during incarceration was due primarily to an increase in the number of men in contact with female

relatives (mothers, aunts, etc.), which is compatible with literature suggesting that women assume primary responsibility for family contact as a result of socialization into gender roles (Walters et al. 1991). Finally, the quality of relationships men and women shared with relatives while incarcerated appears to have been influenced by gender. Literature suggests that gender socialization leads women to form more emotionally intense relationships with their strong-ties than men (Belle 1987; Caldwell & Peplau 1982; Ross & Mirowsky 1989; Turner & Marino 1994; Stokes & Wilson 1984), which is compatible with findings from data analysis in the current study.

More Positive Relationships with Relatives After Incarceration

Data analysis showed that eighteen women had either adult (n=11 or 61%) or minor (n=7 or 39%) children upon their release from prison. Most (n=5 or 71%) women with minor children lived with them at least part time when they returned from prison, as did one woman with adult children. Loss of custody was the reason given by both women in the study who did not reside with their minor children upon their release from prison, and both lamented over the difficulties of regaining custody:

> [Their] paternal grandparents have custody, but you have to file for full custody. They filed for me before I got out of prison. Don't know why it takes so long to get my child back. I do everything I'm supposed to, but continually can't get my child back. His grandparents don't want to give him up, but they filed so I wouldn't just show up at their house and take him or something. (Respondent W8)
>
> They all live with their dad now. He has custody [and] I don't have visitation. I don't have the finances [enough money] to get back in court. (Respondent W21)

Eleven of the twelve women who lived separately from their children during this time period were in contact with them; the twelfth woman had not been in contact with her child--now an adult--since being stripped of her parental rights by the state.

Ten of the seventeen women (59%)[6] who shared relationships with their children specifically described the relationships as positive and said they got along well with one another. The remaining women, however, said their relationships with their children were sometimes unhappy as a result of minimal contact (n=2), lack of respect (n=2), the child's substance abuse (n=2), and frequent arguments (n=1).

As was the case with the women in the study, eighteen men (72%) had children upon their release from prison. Of those men, ten (56%) had adult children and eight (44%) had minor children. Of men with minor children, just 50% (n=4) lived with their children when they returned from prison, as did three men who lived with their adult children. All four men who lived separately from their minor children cited custody issues as the primary reason, though, unlike the women who lost custody as a result of incarceration, the men lost custody as a result of separation or divorce. Overall, just two men said they had no contact with their children upon their release from prison, including one man who had become estranged from his children as a result of substance abuse, and a second man who was stripped of his parental rights and had fallen out of his contact with his now adult children prior to incarceration.

When asked to describe the relationships they shared with their children, fifteen of the sixteen men (94%) who were in contact with their children said the relationships were good, and

[6] Because she was no longer in contact with her child as a result of being stripped of her parental rights by the state, the eighteenth woman is not counted here.

including the man who had become estranged from his children, 88% of men had positive relationships with children. One man with only partial custody of his child, however, expressed worry over the potentially negative effects of the situation. As he explained:

> She doesn't [live with me] now, except for the weekends because her mom is back out [of prison]. I think this all affects my relationship with my daughter. It's got days where it's alright, and it's got days where it's just terrible. (Respondent M4)

Overall, the men in the study believed that the relationships they shared with their children did not suffer as a result of incarceration, and this belief is consistent with the greater number of men who reported positive relationships with their children after incarceration than had done so prior to incarceration.

In addition to findings about men and women's relationships with their children, data analysis revealed that most of the women (n=24 or 96%) in the study also had post-incarceration relationships with other family members. Fifteen women (60%) shared relationships with parents, and thirteen women (52%) described relationships with siblings. Five women also said they had relationships with members of their extended family, including aunts and uncles (n=3), cousins (n=2), and nieces and nephews (n=1) in the months following their release from prison. One woman reported that all of her relatives had passed away by the time she left prison. Based on these findings, the overall number of women who shared relationships with relatives was greater after incarceration than it had been prior to or during incarceration.

When asked to describe the relationships they shared with relatives after incarceration, seventeen women (71%) said they were positive, citing high levels of emotional support. Seven women (29%) described negative relationships with relatives, however. Among these women,

three felt distant from their parents, two felt angry about the abuse they experienced at the hands of their parents, and five experienced regular arguments with siblings. Despite problems experienced by these women in their family relationships, data analysis revealed that a greater number of women characterized their post-incarceration relationships with relatives as positive than had done so prior to incarceration.

Like the women in the study, most men (n=22 or 88%) had post-incarceration relationships with relatives. Fifteen men (60%) shared relationships with parents, and seven men (28%) described sibling relationships. Three men also said they had post-incarceration relationships with members of their extended family, including grandparents (n=1), cousins (n=1), and nieces and nephews (n=1). Finally, two men said that although they had relatives during the post-incarceration period, they shared no relationships with them because they wanted to avoid their negative influence, and one man reported that all of his relatives had passed away by the time he was released from prison. Overall, the number of men who shared relationships with relatives after incarceration was greater than it had been prior to or during incarceration.

Of the twenty-two men who reported post-incarceration relationships with relatives, most (n=19 or 86%) labeled the relationships as positive, citing closeness, acceptance, and frequent contact in their relationships. Only three men (14%) said the relationships they shared with relatives were problematic. Reasons for these problems included lack of closeness with parents (n=1), feeling financially exploited by a sister and nephew (n=1), and arguments with a grandmother (n=1). Despite these problems, a larger percentage of men characterized their post incarceration relationships with relatives as positive than had done so prior to or during incarceration.

Based on the analysis of data, men's post-incarceration relationships with children were more positive than those experienced by women, but more women were in contact with their children than men. Additionally, the relationships men shared with relatives upon their release from prison were more supportive than women's relationships with their relatives. More women than men were in contact with their relatives during this time period, however, and more women than men were in contact with members of their extended family after prison. Interestingly, changes that occurred in men and women's family relationships after incarceration meant that men experienced better, more positive relationships with their children and their relatives than they had prior to and during incarceration, and that women's post-incarceration relationships with relatives were of better quality than they had been prior to incarceration. Finally, women's relationships with their children were better after incarceration than they had been during incarceration, but the relationships were less positive after incarceration than they had been prior to it, likely as a result of strains brought about as a result of separation from their children while they were in prison and their children's drug use.

As was the case with their pre-incarceration family relationships, the influence of gender was evident in men and women's post-incarceration family relationships. First, the fact that more women than men reported relationships with members of their extended family is reflective of gendered patterns of socialization that push women--but not men--toward family relationships (Bulcroft et al. 1996; Cikara et al. 2009; Fletcher 1998; Hook 2010; Lorber 1994; Martinengo et al. 2010; Poortman and Van Der Lippe 2009). Second, the fact that more women than men described their post-incarceration family relationships as problematic continued to be a reflection of patterns of violence that women so commonly experience within the context of their

relationships (Stanko 1985), despite socialization that orients women toward a positive bias with regard to their relationships (Bettencourt et al. 1997; Carli, LaFleur, & Loeber 1995; Eagly 1987; Eagly & Steffen 1984; Eagly & Wood 1999; Winquist, Mohr, & Kenny 1998). Finally, that only men were able to completely end problematic family relationships after incarceration, whereas women remained in the relationships even after describing them as poor, is further demonstration of the influence of gender. Research suggests that women form a sense of self-worth and identity through their ability to maintain relationships with others (Benjamin 1988; Chodorow 1978; Dimen 1986; Gilligan 1982; Jordan & Surrey 1986; Miller 1976; Swift 1987). Thus, that women remain in unhappy relationships is a reflection of the strong influence of gender, which is deeply embedded in all family relations.

Weak-Tie Relationships

Prior to Incarceration

Analysis of data regarding weak-tie relationships showed that most (n=19 or 76%) women in the study had friendship (n=8 or 32%) or associate (n=11 or 44%) relationships prior to incarceration. According to the women, the primary difference between friends and associates was whether the individual was viewed as a source of support (a friend) or whether the person was described as a using buddy and/or engaged in criminal behaviors together with the woman (an associate). Just six women (24%) said they had no friendship relationships prior to incarceration, primarily as a result of their substance abuse (n=5).

Only ten women (53%) who described relationships with friends or associates prior to incarceration said the relationships were positive. Of these women, two (20%) indicated that their friends had been a good influence on them, and eight women (80%) said that they got along

well and had fun together. The remaining nine women described their relationships in negative terms, saying they were characterized by mistrust or partying (n=3 or 33%) and substance abuse (n=6 or 67%). Respondents W8 and W22 described the role of drugs in these pre-incarceration relationships:

> I had friends. Drug buddies. [The] relationships revolved around selling and using drugs. (Respondent W8)
>
> Drug addicts and alcoholics get together and party and that's what happened. It's like we have a big sign on our head that says 'I'm an addict/I'm an alcoholic.' All my friends, they were using me because I had money and they were using drugs. They weren't true friends. (Respondent W22)

As was the case for the women in the study, a majority of the men (n=19 or 68%) had relationships with friends (n=4 or 16%) or individuals they referred to as associates (n=15 or 60%) prior to incarceration. Relationships with associates were not close relationships and often lacked trust and the ability to depend on one another, as described by Respondents M3 and M4:

> I knew everybody. Associated with everybody, but didn't trust everybody. I have trust issues. I had trust issues. I didn't really associate that much. I would talk, get along with people, but I didn't have friends. (Respondent M3)
>
> My friends...it's hard to find good friends anymore. I had some associates with what I did, but no ones you could really depend on. (Respondent M4)

The remaining six men (24%) said they had no friendship relationships prior to incarceration because of their substance abuse .

Even fewer men (n=6 or 32%) than women (n=10 or 53%) who described pre-incarceration relationships with friends and associates said the relationships were positive, which meant that they got along well and had fun together. The remaining thirteen men (68%) described their relationships in negative ways, explaining that they were based around substance abuse. Respondents M9 and M17 elaborated on this:

> I look back and don't think none were friends. We were just drug associates. (Respondent M9)
>
> Back then it was just get together, get drunk and other deviance. Nothing positive. Friends...I wouldn't use that word. (Respondent M17)

In addition to relationships with friends and associates, data analysis indicated that nearly half (n=10 or 40%) of women had relationships with neighbors prior to incarceration. Most often, the relationships women shared with their neighbors were not close and simply involved waving hello to one another (n=8 or 80%), but two women described their primary interactions with their neighbors as drug-related. As they explained:

> I was a drug dealer. They all loved me [because they bought from me] but wasn't any of them friends. (Respondent W12)
>
> Well, the ones across the hallway would buy drugs from me, if you call that a relationship. (Respondent W21)

The remaining fifteen women (60%) indicated that they did not have any relationships with neighbors prior to incarceration. Interestingly, all ten women (100%) who had pre-incarceration relationships with neighbors said the relationships were good despite limited contact (n=8 or 80%) and illegal activities (n=2 or 20%).

According to the data, more men (n=19 or 76%) than women (n=10 or 40%) had relationships with neighbors prior to incarceration. Many of these relationships (n=11 or 58%) were not close and only involved was saying hello to one another, but nearly half (n=8 or 42%) of the men said that relationships they shared with neighbors revolved around criminal activities. Indeed, four men (21%) said that the relationships they shared with neighbors included committing crimes together, and four men (21%) said their relationships with neighbors involved drug use. The remaining six men (24%) in the study indicated that they had no relationships with their neighbors prior to incarceration.

When asked about the quality of their relationships with neighbors, several men (n=4 or 21%) said they were problematic as a result of personal conflict (n=2), regular parties (n=1), or nosiness (n=1). The remaining fifteen men (79%)--including all eight who were involved in criminal activities with their neighbors--said that although they had limited contact with their neighbors, the relationships were good and they got along well with one another.

In sum, data analysis showed that the men were more likely than women to have weak-tie relationships prior to incarceration, and that their relationships tended to be of poorer quality when compared to those experienced by women. Overall, however, the men and women had very few weak-tie relationships prior to incarceration. Indeed, their weak-tie relationships were limited to ties with friends, associates, and neighbors. During this time period, a greater number of men's relationships with friends and associates involved substance abuse, and the degree to which their relationships with neighbors included substance abuse and criminal activity was also greater for men than it was for women.

During Incarceration

According to data analysis very few men (n=1 or 5%) and women (n=5 or 26%) in the study had contact with their pre-incarceration friends and associates while in prison; no men or women had contact with their pre-incarceration neighbors during this time period. Of the five women who maintained contact with friends and associates, only one described the contact as regular, saying her friend came to visit her every two weeks. The only man to report contact with his friends during incarceration indicated that this contact was just for "updates," and that most of his friends and associates had also gone to jail around the same time he had. Generally, these relationships were replaced by ties to co-inmates.

Indeed, data analysis revealed that all the women in the study had at least some contact with their co-inmates while incarcerated. Nine women (36%) said that their co-inmates became friends, and fourteen women (56%) indicated that while they never became close with their co-inmates, they did speak and interact regularly with them, often out of a desire for companionship and human interaction. Just two women said that they attempted to keep their distance from co-inmates.

Few women described problems in the relationship they shared with co-inmates, and overall just two women (8%) engaged in physical altercations with their co-inmates. Both women said that these altercations were limited to just one incident each. Two additional women (8%) described occasional arguments with co-inmates, and the remaining twenty-one women (84%), including both women who tried to keep their distance from co-inmates, said that their relationships with co-inmates were problem-free for the duration of their imprisonment.

As was the case with the women in the study, all of the men had at least some contact with their co-inmates while in prison. Five men (20%) said that their co-inmates became friends during this time period, and eighteen men (72%) described occasional interaction with co-inmates. Of those eighteen men, six (33%) specified that their primary reason for interacting with other inmates was for protection, including Respondent M21:

> There was no relationship because it was every man for himself and God for us all. It was kill or get killed. You can't take a chance because if you do you lose. Prisons are built and designed for poor people. It's modern day slavery. I was exploited for my labor. There's more guns and drugs inside prison. You never feel completely safe nowhere. It still haunts me the type of life I lived. You had to have a weapon everywhere you went. At one time it was so bad that when you laid down in your cell and went to sleep...the tension was so thick. When you'd wake up in the morning you'd know someone was going to die. Every day you woke up in there was a bad day. I've never seen a good day being locked up in there. You do become friends with some people who would fight with you. Back then they would call 'em cliques. Just about anybody who was supposed to be somebody had a clique. They would kill for one another. I had quite a few associates. It was more on the basis of, like, and organization though. Everybody is governed by somebody out here. In there, everyone is governed by somebody.

The remaining two men said that attempted to keep their distance from co-inmates, but added that it was not possible to avoid co-inmates entirely.

According to data analysis, most men in the study reported positive relationships with their co-inmates while in prison. Indeed, nineteen men (76%) said they had friendly relationships with co-inmates, and the two men who avoided contact with their co-inmates said they did not experience any problems. Overall, just four men (16%) described difficulties in their relationships with co-inmates, and for each man these difficulties resulted in physical violence. For two of the men who described violence in their relationships with co-inmates, physical altercations were a result of gang membership, which is not a phenomenon reported by any of the women in the study. Three of the four men who fought with inmates said that the altercations occurred multiple times over the term of their incarceration.

In addition to ties with co-inmates, data analysis revealed that every woman in the study also had at least some contact with prison staff while incarcerated. All twenty-five women interacted with prison guards, and five women (20%) also interacted with other members of the prison staff. For three women, this contact was with a prison counselor or psychologist, one woman formed a mentor relationship with her prison employment supervisor, and the remaining woman was in contact with the prison warden while incarcerated.

The relationships women shared with prison staff while incarcerated were not problem-free. Indeed, just eight women (32%) said the relationships were good, indicating that the staff was supportive and encouraging. Fifteen other women (60%), however, cited lack of support and abuse of authority among the prison staff. Two women (8%) labeled the relationships as explicitly negative. The first of these women, Respondent W6, explained that prison staff did little to help accommodate an emergency request for visitation from her son, which angered her. The second woman was sexually assaulted by one of the correctional offers. In her own words:

> I was raped in prison by a man guard. I was working in the kitchen...that's where it happened. It was continuous. I was told not to tell anyone. Finally told my friend, she said to tell the warden. I was afraid. I went to the sergeant [who] went to the warden. I was sent to the doctor. I was even pregnant. The baby was aborted. The decision was more or less made for me. He was fired, no criminal charges. (Respondent W4)

Every man in the study was also in contact with prison staff while incarcerated. Primarily, this contact was with prison guards (n=25 or 100%), but several men (n=4 or 16%) also formed with other prison staffers, including the prison counselor (n=1), a prison nurse (n=1), a kitchen worker (n=1), and the prison warden (n=1).

Unlike the women in the study, more than half of the men (n=16 or 64%) said that the relationships they shared with prison staffers were problem-free and respectful. Seven men (28%), however, described at least some of their relationships with prison staff as negative. Of those seven men, four (57%) said that some of their relationships had been positive, while others were negative. For example, Respondent M3 described the initial problems he experienced with prison guards because of his anger over having been incarcerated:

> It [my relationship with prison staffers] was not so good for a while. I was still angry for being there so I beat up some guards. They had to bring out the riot gear to stop me. That lasted for about two years.

Respondent M3 went on to describe his later relationship with prison staff as "perfect," despite initial problems. Similarly, other men said that some of the contact they had with prison staff was

good while other contact was not, as was the case for Respondent M21, who felt that some prison staffers treated him poorly.

> Nurses and guards talked down to me. They didn't just talk down to you, they talked to you like you was nothing. But I did meet some good, down-to-earth people that wasn't corrupt. As long as you respect them and did what they asked you to do, they didn't have no problem. (Respondent M21)

Three other men (12%) had nothing positive to say about their contact with prison staff, and one man went so far as to try to kill a prison guard while he was incarcerated. The remaining two men--both of whom were Black--said that all their contact with prison staff was negative, citing racism on the part of prison guards as the primary reason for this.

Finally, data analysis showed that twenty women (80%) developed ministerial ties with prison chaplains or individuals involved in prison ministries during incarceration. For eleven of the women (55%), these ties were formed as a result of church attendance. Two additional women (10%) participated in church groups, and four women (20%) were involved in prison ministries. Finally, three women (15%) said they were in contact with the prison chaplain while incarcerated, but this contact was limited to a time of crisis when the chaplain informed them that their relatives had passed away. The remaining five women (20%) formed no ministerial ties while incarcerated.

Although a substantial number of women (n=20 or 80%) in the study had ministerial ties while incarcerated, the relationships were of little importance to most (n=14 or 70%) of them. Indeed, when asked to describe their ministerial ties, just five women (25%) said they were good

and supportive. Only one woman--a recovering alcoholic--said the relationship she shared with her chaplain was poor, citing alcohol consumption by the chaplain as the reason for this.

Most (n=18 or 72%) men in the study also formed ministerial ties with the prison chaplain or members of a prison ministry while incarcerated. Of these men, three (17%) said they attended church and two (11%) were involved with prison ministries. Respondent M15 credited his involvement with the prison ministry with his desistance from crime. As he explained:

> My preacher now, his wife used to come see me all the time. She does a lot of prison ministry. She once lived that life [drug use] too, and I see how God changed her life. I see God changed her so he can change me. (Respondent M15)

Eleven men (61%) said they had contact with the prison chaplain while incarcerated, but, similar to the women, two men (18%) said that this contact was limited to times of crisis, as prison chaplains were responsible for informing them of the deaths of their relatives. The remaining seven men (28%) did not form ministerial ties while they were incarcerated.

Overall, few men saw their during incarceration ministerial ties as important. Just four men (22%) said the relationships they formed with such ties were good and supportive, and two men (11%) did not have good things to say about the clergy or the relationships they forged with them while incarcerated because they believed them to be reluctant to help and disingenuous. As these men explained:

> I had a bad experience with him [the chaplain] to be honest. He brushed a lot of people off. The counselor really had to stop in to force him to help with stuff when I needed it. (Respondent M7)

> The minister...he wasn't a very good guy. It wasn't about what he believed in but the kind of person he portrayed to be. He was just there for the paycheck. (Respondent M10)

In sum, data analysis showed that while they were incarcerated more women than men were in contact with the weak-ties they had formed prior to incarceration, but that very few men and women overall maintained this contact. Weak-ties with co-inmates, prison staff, and ministerial ties replaced these ties, and with the exception of their relationships with prison staffers, the women experienced more positive relationships with their newly-formed weak-ties than their male counterparts; women also reported more of these weak-tie relationships than men. Overall, these findings show that the men and women in the study had more weak-tie relationships while they were in prison than they did prior to their incarcerations, and that these relationships were more positive than those they experienced prior to incarceration because they did not involve substance abuse and criminal behaviors.

Two important gender-based patterns emerged from the men and women's descriptions of weak-tie relationships during incarceration. First, data analysis showed that a greater number of women than men formed relationships with co-inmates, prison staffers, and ministerial ties, despite suggestions that women form fewer weak-tie relationships than men (Eby & Allen 2012; Moore 1990) because of gender role socialization and the gender-based division of labor (Cikara et al. 2009; Hook 2010; Fletcher 1998; Martinengo et al. 2010; Poortman and Van Der Lippe 2009), which separates men and women into the public and private spheres, respectively, and encourages women to focus on relationships with relatives (Cikara et al. 2009; Hook 2010; Poortman and Van Der Lippe 2009). It is likely that the absence of the public/private sphere

divide as well as prolonged separation from their strong-ties and the struggles inherent in prison life led the women in this study to deviate from gendered patterns of relationship formation (Owen 1998).

The interactions with prison staffers described by the men and women in this study were also shaped by gender. Perhaps the most salient example of the influence of gender in these interactions can be seen in Respondent W4's account of sexual assault at the hand of a prison guard. As previously described, violence against women is used by men to maintain their dominant position in society (Dobash & Dobash 1979; Goode 1971; Martin 1976; Stark & Flitcraft 1991; Yllo 1993). Although incarcerated women have little power overall, Respondent W4 had been successfully working a prison job at the time of the assault. For an inmate, successful prison employment can be a way of gaining power, and research suggests that violence against women is most likely to occur when power differentials between men and women decrease (Coleman & Strauss 1986; Yllo 1983). Interestingly, although the men in the study did not report violent victimization while in prison, two men said they engaged in physical violence with prison guards while incarcerated; this may be a reflection of the norms of masculinity, which suggest that violence against others is a way to achieve masculine ideals, including dominance over others (Katz 1995). Additionally, it has been theorized that when men perceive they have lost power--as might be the case for incarcerated men--they may act violently toward others (Kahn 1984), which is consistent with statements made by Respondent M3, who said the violence he perpetrated while in prison was a result of his anger over having been incarcerated.

After Incarceration

Data analysis revealed that most (n=19 or 76%) women in the study had relationships with friends and associates after incarceration, including four women who maintained relationships with their (ex) co-inmates and referred to them as friends. Of women with friendship and associate relationships during this time period, thirteen (68%) described the relationships as friendships and six (32%) said they had associates. Eight women (42%) specified that the friends and associates they had upon leaving prison were not the same ones they had before they were incarcerated because the former friends were still using drugs (n=5), because they had lost contact (n=2), or because the former friends had continued to engage in criminal activities other than substance abuse (n=1). Four of the women with friends and associates after prison formed these relationships with individuals they met as a result of their participation in Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous meetings (n=3) and while living in a halfway house after release from prison (n=1) The six remaining women (24%) specified that they did not develop any friendships after incarceration, and two of those women (33%) said that a desire to stay out of trouble was a guiding factor in this decision. As they explained:

> [I] don't really have friends now. Trying to stay out of negative, drama, drugs trouble. (Respondent W12)
>
> I really don't hang with nobody. I really just want to stay out of trouble. I really just talk to people at work but I don't go to hang out with people. (Respondent W24)

Although nineteen women (76%) described relationships with friends or associates after prison, just seven (37%) spoke about the relationships in positive ways. Among them was

Respondent W18, who described her ex-co-inmate as her "closest friend" and the four women who met their friends and associates in Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous meetings and a halfway house. Overall, women who said their relationships with friends and associates were positive believed this to be the case if their friends did not encourage drug use, as described by Respondents W1 and W19:

> [My friends are] very supportive. They were there for me. [They] don't do drugs or anything. They didn't do any so they helped me not do any. (Respondent W1)
>
> I've got one friend, Eddie. I tell him stuff. He doesn't use [drugs] but he knows if I do. He won't go and repeat it, not even to my boyfriend [they are also friends]. He will get mad at me but he'll still be there for me. He's older. He's relaxed and more laid back. (W19)

The remaining twelve women (63%) said that lack of closeness and trust issues characterized their post incarceration relationships with friends and associates.

According to data analysis, nearly all the men (n=23 or 92%) in the study had relationships with friends or associates after incarceration, including two men who were in occasional contact with (ex) co-inmates and another who still spoke with a prison staffer he met while incarcerated. Interestingly, sixteen men (70%) described these post-incarceration relationships as friendships, and just seven (30%) said they were associate relationships, which was represented a marked change from prior to incarceration. Two men indicated that they were no longer in contact with the friends and associates they had prior to incarceration as a result of their continued participation in criminal activities. Respondents M5 and M19 explained their choice to end old friendships in favor of new ones:

> I have all new friends now. Every friend I have now is somebody I met after I was incarcerated. I don't think you can go back to...I couldn't have gone back to those relationships I had before. (Respondent M5)
>
> I have two to three new friends. I no longer associate with my old friends because I feel passed by due to my incarceration. (Respondent M19)

The two remaining men had not developed any friendship relationships after their release from prison, though they did not necessarily view this as a bad thing, as indicated by Respondent M20 who said "Even though I'm trying to find some new friends, I'm mostly by myself now. That's a very good thing. That's mostly keeping me out of trouble."

More than half (n=16 or 70%) of men who described post-incarceration relationships with friends or associates said the relationships were positive. Men primarily described their relationships as "good" or "fine" if all parties involved simply got along well, though one man described self-disclosure as the defining factor of a good relationship, citing that his post-prison relationships were poor because he did not feel as if he could tell his friends and associates much about himself. The remaining seven men (30%) said that their post-incarceration friendship and associate relationships were not close and that they did not contain high levels of trust.

Data analysis showed that in addition to relationships with friends and associates, several (n=8 or 32%) women in the study shared relationships with neighbors after incarceration. For four of these women, relationships with neighbors involved nothing more than just saying hello, but four women described their neighbors as friends. Three other women reported that they try to avoid their neighbors because of their drug activities, and the remaining fourteen women had no relationships with their neighbors upon their release from prison. When asked about the quality

of their relationships with neighbors during this time period, all eight women said that they were good. Two women elaborated and said that the relationships were positive because of the help their neighbors provide (n=1) and because uplifting personalities of the neighbors made them "happy" (n=1).

A majority (n=20 or 80%) of the men also had post-incarceration ties to their neighbors, but most of these relationships (n=18 or 90%) involved just saying hello on occasion. Just two men (10%) described close interaction with their neighbors, and both of those men said their neighbors had become friends. The remaining five men reported that they attempted to avoid their neighbors for fear of altercations or negative influence. Despite lack of closeness, all twenty men described the relationships with neighbors as positive because they lacked conflict, though five men went on to say that the relationships were good because they speak to one another on occasion.

Data analysis also revealed that ministerial ties with ministers, pastors, or members of a prison ministry were a source of weak-tie relationships for the women in the study following their release from prison. Upon their release, a majority (n=15 or 60%) of women continued to attend church (n=8), interact with members of the clergy (n=4), participate in the religious ministries they became associated with during prison (n=2), and involve themselves in religious groups (n=1). The remaining ten women (40%) had no ministerial ties during this time period. When asked to describe the quality of their ministerial ties, all fifteen women said they were positive because they provided support and counseling.

Fewer men (n=13 or 52%) than women (n=15 or 60%) maintained ministerial ties with ministers, pastors, or members of a prison ministry after prison release. Among men who did

report such ties, the majority were with members of the clergy (n=8), but church attendance (n=7), participation in religious groups (n=4), and engagement with religious ministries they were introduced to while in prison (n=2) also formed a foundation for men's religion-based weak-tie relationships . Overall, twelve men (48%) said they had no ministerial ties upon their release from prison.

All thirteen men who reported ministerial ties in the post-incarceration period described them in positive ways. Several men said their ministerial ties were important to their desistance from crime because they provided them with support, encouragement, and someone to talk to. Respondent M21 felt especially affected by the relationship he shared with his pastor during the post-incarceration period. As he explained:

> I really miss church in Memphis. He [Memphis pastor] didn't just preach. He taught as well. He inspired me in a lot of ways. He helped direct my path...kept me out of harm's way and from doing crazy things.

Finally, data analysis showed that every woman (n=25) in the study was assigned a parole officer of either the same- or opposite-sex upon her release from prison. Overall, findings from the data suggest that all twenty-five women had generally positive relationships with their parole officers. Indeed, nineteen of the women (76%) described their relationships with parole officers as supportive and characterized by fairness, and one woman said her original parole officer was supportive but that her current parole officer is too busy to spend much time with her. The remaining five women indicated that they do not have close relationships with their parole officers, but they also did not characterize their relationships as poor. Respondent W19, for

example, explained: "Hell, I don't ever talk to him more than five minutes. He don't know anything. Just want to get in and get out. I guess he'd help you if you'd get into it."

As was the case with their female counterparts, all twenty-five men were assigned a parole officer of either the same- or opposite-sex after prison. Twenty-three men were satisfied with the relationships they shared with their parole officers, describing them as helpful, concerned with their success, and respectful. Interestingly, three men who described their relationships with their parole officers in a positive manner elaborated to say that their relationships with previous parole officers were poor. All three of the men who said they had problematic relationships with previous parole officers described the parole officers as unhelpful, as was the case with respondent M18:

> [Our relationship was] not good at all. All they [previous parole officers] did was look for people they thought was violating. They just locked you up for anything back then...Deep down, I think they don't care. They just want their paycheck too. There's nobody kicking my door down to help me. It's just a money racket. They want your money. They want you to pay. (Respondent M18)

Only one man, Respondent M20, described his relationship with his current parole officer as poor, explaining that the parole officer had high expectations for him but did not help him meet those expectations. He elaborated by saying: "He wants me to get a job, keep a job, but he's not willing to work with me. He's not looking out for our best interests. I stopped trying to ask him for things" (M20), A final man had nothing to say about his relationship with his current parole officer, as he had recently been transferred to a new parole officer whom he had not yet met.

Based on data analysis, an overall greater number of men had weak-tie relationships after incarceration than women, and their relationships were generally more positive than those experienced by the women. The greatest difference in men and women's weak-tie relationships during this time period was ties to neighbors, as significantly more men said they shared relationships with neighbors than women. Equal numbers of men and women described close relationships with neighbors, however. Additionally, although women reported more relationships with friends (including (ex) co-inmates) than men, a smaller percentage of women said their friendship relationships were positive, as they lacked closeness and trust. Finally, most of the men and women in the study reported supportive relationships with their parole officers, except one man who did not believe his parole officer was interested in helping him experience successful reentry. As a result of these changes in their weak-tie relationships, the men and women in the study had an overall greater number of weak-ties after incarceration than they had prior to and during incarceration; the relationships were also of higher quality because the men and women specifically sought to avoid individuals who might be a negative influence on them and instead worked to develop pro-social relationships.

Research findings suggest that gender influenced the weak-tie relationships experienced by the men and women in the study after incarceration. First, a greater number of men than women had weak-tie relationships. This is consistent with suggestions that, as a result of gender socialization and gender roles which limit women's participation in the public sphere (Cikara et al. 2009; Hook 2010; Fletcher 1998; Martinengo et al. 2010; Poortman and Van Der Lippe 2009),, men have a greater number and variety of weak-tie relationships than women (Eby & Allen 2012; Fischer & Oliker 1983; Marsden 1987; Moore 1990).

A second example of the influence of gender on the weak-tie relationships reported by the men and women in the study is visible in the descriptions of the relationships the research participants shared with their parole officers. As a result of gender socialization, women are more likely than men to focus on emotional support and time spent together within their relationships (Barbee et al 1993), whereas men focus on instrumental support (Aukett et al. 1988; Bell 1991). This is consistent with findings of this research that women who expressed dissatisfaction with any aspect of the relationship they share with the parole officer focused on lack of time spent together, which can be classified as emotional support, whereas the dissatisfied man focused on the lack of assistance with paying his parole fees and finding employment, both of which are forms of instrumental support.

Conclusions

This chapter discussed the composition and quality of men and women's social ties prior to, during, and after incarceration. Data analysis revealed that the men and women in the study experienced a variety of changes in their strong- and weak- tie relationships during and after incarceration. For men, these changes resulted in more supportive post-incarceration relationships with intimate partners, children, and other relatives, as well as a greater variety of pro-social weak-tie relationships than they had experienced prior to incarceration. The shifts in women's relationships as a result of incarceration were not as uniformly positive, however. Because several women saw an end to abusive and criminogenic intimate relationships, their post-incarceration intimate relationships were more positive, though not all the women in the study were able to escape abuse during this time period. In addition, the relationships women shared with their children after incarceration were not as positive as they had been prior to

incarceration, and several women also described less supportive relationships with relatives after incarceration. Primarily, changes in relationship quality were a result of emotional distance created by incarceration, but women's anger over the substance and physical abuse as well as other problems that characterized their relationships with relatives also contributed to this change. The women did, however, experience a greater number of weak-tie relationships with pro-social individuals after incarceration than they had at either other time period.

Based on data analysis, gender was an important influence on the relationships experienced by the men and women in this study prior to, during, and after incarceration. As a result of gendered relationship patterns, women had a greater variety of family ties than men, but were also significantly more likely to experience abuse in their intimate and familial relationships and to be induced to crime by their intimate partners. Gendered norms surrounding childrearing also meant that women were more likely than men to live with their minor children prior to and after incarceration. However, because gender roles push women--but not men--toward relationship maintenance, they were less likely than men to receive physical visits from their intimate partners while in prison, and they were less likely than men to end unhappy intimate relationships upon their release from prison. Finally, the greater encouragement men experience with regard to participation in the public sphere meant that they had a greater number of weak-tie relationships than women prior to and after incarceration.

In addition to the influence of gender on the men and women's social ties after incarceration, their ex-offender status helped shape the relationships they had after their release from prison. Histories of substance abuse and criminal behaviors meant that many of the pre-incarceration relationships in which the men and women were involved were criminogenic. As a

result, the pro-social ties men and women had immediately upon their release from prison were very limited to those with relatives and, to a lesser extent, intimate partners, though several men and women continued pro-social relationships with (ex) co-inmates and other individuals they became associated with while incarcerated. Overall, many of the weak-tie relationships the men and women were involved in after prison release were with (ex) co-inmates, individuals from prison ministries, and friends and associates met through substance abuse treatment programs, which meant that after incarceration the men and women in this study had ties to a variety of other ex-offenders and substance abusers.

Because the social ties of law-abiding men and women are also influenced by gender, which shapes all social interactions (Lorber 1994), many of the gender-based patterns of men and women's post incarceration relationships can also be seen amongst law-abiding individuals. Women in the general population, for example, have a greater variety of emotionally intimate strong-tie relationships than men (Belle 1987; Caldwell & Peplau 1982; Ross & Mirowsky 1989; Turner & Marino 1994; Stokes & Wilson 1984) and are at a greater risk for intimate partner violence than men as a result of gender socialization and the gendered experience of violence (Bureau of Justice Statistics 1995; Dobash & Dobash 1979; Goode 1971; Martin 1976; Stark & Flitcraft 1991; World Health Organization 2005; Yllo 1993). Likewise, the gendered division of labor places childrearing at the heart of the private sphere, to which women are commonly relegated (Cikara et al. 2009; Hook 2010; Fletcher 1998; Martinengo et al. 2010; Poortman and Van Der Lippe 2009). Men, on the other hand, exhibit greater amounts of participation in the public sphere (Cikara et al. 2009; Martinengo et al. 2010), a result of which is that they form

more weak-tie relationships than women (Eby & Allen 2012; Fischer & Oliker 1983; Marsden 1987; Moore 1990).

The social ties of law-abiding men and women are not affected by incarceration in the same way that the social ties of so many parolees are, however. For example, research suggests that because of criminal activities and/or high levels of substance abuse prior to incarceration, few parolees have access to pro-social weak-ties relationships after prison (Graffam et al. 2004). Additionally, individuals with mental illness have fewer social ties than those who are not mentally ill (Pogorzelski et al. 2005), and fifteen percent of men and one-third of women in prison have been diagnosed with mental health problems (Mallik-Kane & Visher 2008). When combined with the stigma of incarceration, which can limit social ties for returning prisoners (Clear et al. 2001), these patterns mean that parolees have fewer weak-tie relationships than non-offenders.

The extent to which parolees' social ties differ from those of non-offenders may be problematic with regard to their reentry experiences. For example, some housing options available to parolees, such as the halfway houses that many of the men and women in the current study lived in temporarily after prison, may encourage them to establish social ties to other ex-offenders who have similar backgrounds as they do (Rowe 2002). Social learning theory suggests that this may be problematic, since associations with deviant others can lead to offending (Akers 1973; Burgess & Akers 1966; Sutherland 1939). Associations with other ex-offenders may also be problematic with regard to resource acquisition, as ex-offenders have relatively few pro-social resources to share (Petersilia 2003). Additionally, because of their limited number and type of social ties, ex-offenders have few employment contacts (Webster et

al. 2001). Although ex-offenders can sometimes direct one another to employers who have histories of hiring individuals with histories of incarceration (Nelson et al. 1999; Sullivan 1989), wages associated with the jobs readily available to parolees are often quite low (Holzer et al. 2003), which limits their ability to be self-sufficient and may pose a challenge to successful reentry (Schram et al. 2006). Relationships with supportive parole officers may counteract some of these deficiencies by connecting parolees to resources and information after prison release (Cobbina 2009; Gottfredson et al. 2007; Lynch & Sabol 2001; O'Brien 2001), but it is not known whether the resources provided by parole officers are enough to overcome problems associated with the influence of gender and histories of incarceration on men and women's social ties and, ultimately, the resources they provide during the reentry period.

Building on this information, the next chapter (Chapter 6) examines the resources available to the men and women in this study via their social ties prior to, during, and after incarceration. The influence of gender on these resources is highlighted, and the chapter concludes with a discussion of the influence of resources provided by social ties on men and women's reentry experiences.

CHAPTER 6: GENDER, RESOURCES AND REENTRY EXPERIENCES

Structural differences in men and women's social ties lead to differences in resource availability within their relationships. In general, the strength of a relationship (strong-tie versus weak-tie) is believed to be associated with the willingness of one's social ties to provide resources (Granovetter 1982; Hurlbert, Haines, & Beggs 2000), and research suggests that strong-tie relationships are a better source of emotional and financial support, housing, and childcare than weak-tie relationships (Wellman & Wortley 1990). Weak-tie relationships are a better source of information about employment than strong-tie relationships, however, since weak-ties can act as bridges between groups of people (Granovetter 1973; 1983; Lin et al. 1981; Watanbe 1987). Although women tend to have an overall greater number of social ties than men (Antonucci & Akiyama 1987; Antonucci et al. 1998; McLaughlin et al. 2010), they are limited primarily to strong-tie relationships with relatives and intimate partners (Dunbar & Spoors 1995; Fischer & Oliker 1983; McPherson et al. 2006; Marsden 1987; Moore 1990) and tend to be resource homogeneous (Lin 2000a). As a result, women may not have better access to resources than men, whose weak-tie relationships can provide them with more diverse resources (Gittell & Vidal 2005; Halpern 2005).

The variety of social ties an individual has is also related to the tangible and intangible resources available to him or her, and individuals with a limited variety of social ties have relatively few resources available to them (Lin 1982; 2000; Lin & Dumin 1986; Campbell et al. 1986). Men are more likely than women to be involved in activities such as paid employment outside the home and this allows them to form a greater variety of weak-tie relationships than women (Eby & Allen 2012; Fischer & Oliker 1983; Marsden 1987; Moore 1990), whose

concentration in the private sphere fosters strong-tie relationships with relatives and intimate partners (Dunbar & Spoors 1995; Fischer & Oliker 1983; McPherson et al. 2006; Marsden 1987; Moore 1990). Because of the greater variety of social ties they form, men have more access to resources from their social ties than their female counterparts (Lin 1982; 2000; Lin & Dumin 1986; Campbell et al. 1986). Additionally, because men and women tend to occupy different positions in society as a result of the gendered division of labor (Cikara et al. 2009; Fletcher 1998; Hook 2010; Martinengo et al. 2010; Poortman and Van Der Lippe 2009), the resources available to them via their social ties differ (Munch, McPherson, & Smith-Lovin 1997). Men are in a better position than women to access information about employment and other opportunities for personal advancement because they belong to larger organizations with economic and employment bases (McPherson & Smith-Lovin 1982). Conversely, women belong to small domestic- and community-focused organizations which expose them to information about the domestic sphere that is not likely to help them acquire material resources (McPherson & Smith-Lovin 1982).

Data analysis showed that these patterns of resource availability were of mixed consistency with regard to the patterns experienced by the men and women in this study. In this chapter, I describe the resources available to men and women prior to, during, and after incarceration via their strong- and weak-tie relationships. Because gender shapes resource availability for men and women, its influence is considered. I conclude with a discussion of the influence of the tangible and intangible resources men and women received from their strong- and weak-ties on their reentry experiences.

Resources from Strong-Tie Relationships

Prior to Incarceration

Prior to incarceration, most of the men and women in the study had strong-tie relationships with intimate partners (seventeen women and fifteen men), children (eighteen women and eighteen men), and relatives (twenty-one women and twenty men). Relationships with intimate partners were characterized by abuse and other strains, but relationships with children were generally positive during this time period. Men had more supportive relationships with their relatives prior to incarceration, as women's relationships with their relatives were affected by physical and substance abuse. In total, most of the women (n=17) and half of the men (n=12) in the study received tangible and/or intangible resources from their strong-ties prior to incarceration.

In spite of the overall poor quality of the relationships they shared with their strong-ties prior to incarceration, most women (n=17) received resources and support from these relationships. Seventeen women said their strong-ties provided them with material resources prior to incarceration, and relatives (n=13) were the most common source of tangible resources for women during this time period. Money was the most readily available tangible resource women received from their relatives (n=9), but parents, siblings, and extended family members also provided several women with housing (n=4) and food (n=1). Intimate partners were a source of money for nine women prior to incarceration, and three women also said their adult children gave them money on occasion. The resources women received from their strong-tie relationships were intended to help them meet their basic needs, but several women used money from relatives and children to support their drug habits. As two of these women explained:

> My parents and grandparents gave money, paid my bills. I ran though $40,000 in less than a year on drugs. (Respondent W17)
>
> I've always had money from my kids. They've always helped me, which made it so easy for me to use. (Respondent W23)

In addition to tangible resources provided to the women in the study by their strong-ties, almost half of the women (n=9) received intangible resources in the form of emotional support. Relatives (n=5) and intimate partners (n=4) were the primary sources of this support, but four women also said their adult children provided them with emotional support prior to incarceration. Finally, intimate relationships were a source of criminal capital for three women whose intimate partners introduced them to skills that ultimately led to their criminal activities.

Data analysis also showed that half of the men (n=12) in the study received tangible resources prior to incarceration and that relatives (n=10) were the primary source of these resources. From relatives, men had access to money (n=5), housing (n=5), food (n=2), employment assistance (n=2), and transportation assistance (n=2). Although none of the men received tangible resources from relatives other than parents prior to incarceration, intimate partners were also a source of money (n=3) and clothing (n=1) for three men. In addition to the tangible resources they received from their strong-ties, seven men said that parents (n=5), siblings (n=1) and intimate partners (n=1) provided them with emotional support before they were incarcerated. Several men who said that their relatives provided them with emotional support prior to incarceration added that despite the provision of support, relatives did not approve of their criminal lifestyles, as was the case with respondent M2 who explained: "It

wasn't bad. I could go see em no problem. My parents was supportive of me, they just wanted me off dope" (M2).

In sum, data analysis revealed that women were more likely than men to receive resources from their strong-ties--especially relatives--prior to incarceration, but that men received a greater variety of resources from their strong-ties than women. Tangible resources from strong-ties were more available to the men and women than emotional support, which was likely a reflection of women's poor quality relationships with intimate partners and relatives and the lower levels of emotional intimacy that characterize men's strong-tie relationships (Belle 1987; Caldwell & Peplau 1982; Ross & Mirowsky 1989; Turner & Marino 1994; Stokes & Wilson 1984).

That the material and emotional support women received from their relatives prior to incarceration came from a greater variety of family members, including parents, siblings, and aunts and uncles, is consistent with research suggesting that women's familial relationships are more diverse than those of men as a result of structural constraints based on gender (Dunbar & Spoors 1995; Fischer & Oliker 1983; McPherson et al. 2006; Marsden 1987; Moore 1990). However, literature also suggests that as a result of resource homogeneity, women's strong-ties may not provide better access to resources than men's strong-ties (Gittell & Vidal 2005; Halpern 2005). This was the case among the men and women in the study, as prior to incarceration the men were able to access a greater variety of tangible resources through their strong-ties than the women, whose tangible resources were limited primarily to money and housing.

During Incarceration

As described in the previous chapter, the men and women in the study experienced a variety of changes in strong-tie relationships during incarceration. Several women saw the end of their intimate relationships, but many men became closer to their intimate partners while they were in prison. Men had more frequent contact with their relatives during this time period, but women were in touch with a greater variety of relatives and were more likely than men to feel that their contact with relatives was good or supportive; both men and women reported better relationships with relatives during incarceration than they had prior to incarceration. As a result of this, most of the men (n=24) and women (n=21) in the study received tangible and/or intangible resources from their strong-tie relationships while incarcerated.

Overall, twenty-one women received resources and support from their strong-ties during incarceration, and relatives (n=17) were the primary source of these resources. Fifteen women received money from parents (n=8), siblings (n=4), and other relatives (n=4), and four women said their adult children provided them with money. Only three women received money from intimate partners. Of the women who received money from intimate partners, only one received money on a regular basis; the other two women said that their husbands would send them money only occasionally. In addition to money, nearly half of the women (n=12) received clothing, stamps, and packages containing small items from relatives and intimate partners while they were in prison. The most commonly available resource during incarceration, however, was emotional support. Twenty-one women said their strong ties, including relatives (n=21), intimate partners (n=4), and children (n=3) were sources of emotional support during this time period.

Twenty-four men also received tangible and/or intangible resources during incarceration, and relatives continued to be the primary source of their resources. Twenty men received money from parents (n=10), members of their extended family (n=8), and siblings (n=3). Intimate partners (n=10) and children (n=2) were also a source of money for eleven men. Most of the men used the money they received through their strong-tie relationships in positive ways, such as for buying stamps to send letters home, paying for phone calls to relatives, or getting a college education, as in the case of Respondent M25 who said: "Yeah. I mean, they [my parents] sent me to school [paid for school]. They sent me money when I needed it. They sent other stuff, like tennis shoes." One man, however, used the money his intimate partner sent him to purchase drugs. In addition to money, eight men received clothing from parents (n=6), intimate partners (n=4), other relatives (n=2), and children (n=1), and three men received televisions from their parents (n=2) and intimate partners (n=1). Finally, fourteen men said they received emotional support from their strong-ties while in prison. Emotional support came primarily from parents (n=8), but intimate partners (n=5), children (n=3), and grandparents (n=1) were also sources of emotional support for several men.

Based on these findings, the men and women in the study experienced an increase in tangible and intangible resources from their strong-tie relationships during incarceration. Money was the most commonly available tangible resource, and men were slightly more likely than women to have access to money from their strong-ties. Most of the women in the study received emotional support from their strong-tie relationships, especially those with parents, but emotional support was less available to the men.

The influence of gender on the resources available to the men and women in the study during this time period was not as marked as it was prior to incarceration. A greater number of men than women received money from their strong-ties while incarcerated, which was an unexpected finding because the source of this money was usually relatives, with whom women actually reported better quality relationships while in prison. The remote location of many women's prisons (Travis 2005) may explain this difference, since it limited women's contact with relatives. Generally, women are incarcerated farther from home than men because there are fewer women's prisons as a result of the smaller number of women who are sentenced to prison when compared to men (Glaze 2010). Gender-based differences in offending and incarceration have been attributed to differences in the number and type of social bonds that foster social control (Hagan, Gillis, & Simpson 1985), the influence of feminine ideals on offending (Heimer 1996; Messerschmidt 1986; Smart 1976) and experiences of victimization and economic marginalization that explain differences in the type and severity of crimes that women commit when compared to men (Chesney-Lind 1989). Thus, gender-based differences in men and women's patterns of offending mean that there are fewer women's prisons and that, as a result, women are incarcerated further from their social ties than men, which can influence their relationships and the resources made available to them via those relationships.

Also interesting is the finding that more than twice as many men as women said their intimate partners provided them with material support while incarcerated. This was likely due to men's higher quality intimate relationships when compared to those experienced by women, who reported long histories of gender-based violence within their intimate relationships and were more likely than men to come to experience unexpected end to their intimate relationships while

in prison. Finally, it is possible that gender roles--specifically those suggesting that gender socialization causes women to seek out emotional support and men to avoid emotion-oriented exchanges (Tamres, Janicki, & Helgeson 2002)--led to differences in the number of women (n=21) and men (n=14) who said they received emotional support from their strong-ties while incarcerated.

After Incarceration

According to data analysis, the strong-tie relationships experienced by the men and women in the study continued to change after incarceration. Few men (n=5) and women (n=10) ultimately remained in the intimate relationships they were involved in prior to and during incarceration, instead choosing to seek out new relationships with pro-social individuals. Despite these changes, less than half of the men (n=9) and women (n=8) had positive post-incarceration intimate relationships. Relationships with children were better and more supportive than they had been during incarceration for most of the men and women, however, and a greater number of men and women had relationships with their relatives upon their release from prison than they had prior to incarceration. Women continued to share relationships with a greater variety of relatives during this time period, but most men and women said their post-incarceration relationships with relatives were supportive. As a result, the number of men (n=23) and women (n=24) who received tangible and/or intangible resources from their strong-ties upon prison release was higher than it had been prior to incarceration.

Prior to incarceration, just seventeen women received tangible and/or intangible resources from their strong-tie relationships, but twenty-four women said these resources were available to them via their strong-ties after incarceration. For women, money (n=13) and housing

(n=13) were the most commonly available tangible resources after prison release. Parents (n=7) were the primary source of money for the women, but intimate partners (n=5), aunts, uncles, and cousins (n=4), children (n=3), and siblings (n=2) also provided money to the women in the months following their release from prison. Thirteen women lived with relatives for at least a short time after incarceration, and four women lived with their intimate partners. Likely as a result of their improved familial relationships, eleven of the women also said they received emotional support from relatives (n=8) and children (n=6) upon their release from prison, and six women said their intimate partners provided them with emotional support during this time period. Although fewer women received emotional support (n=13) than material support (n=21) from their strong-ties after release from prison, the emotional support they received was especially important to them. In their own words:

> Emotional support from family has been very important. They are supportive. This is important in recovery [from my drug problem], too. (W17)
>
> My sister and cousin give support for what I'm doing. Once you've been out there and been on drugs--if people don't forgive you, it makes a big difference in your life. If they hold that over your head it's not going to be good. (W2)
>
> A lot of emotional support. Being a mother--I lost so much of that. I wasn't the best mother that I could be, using drugs. Thank God I got that back. (W2)
>
> [I've had] emotional support [from my partner] the whole time. Telling me 'You can do this [parole].' She has kept me out of trouble the whole time. (W1)

> [My husband has given me] support, definitely. I think that was one of the things that attracted me to him in the first place. He knows who I am, what I've done, and just supports me. He's 100% behind me (W20).

Data analysis showed that twenty-three men received tangible and intangible resources after release from prison, though only twelve men received these resources prior to incarceration. As was the case with their female counterparts, the resources men received after prison were commonly related to their most basic needs, including housing and money. Housing (n=17) was the resource most commonly received by the men in the study, and relatives including parents (n=10), siblings (n=2), children (n=2), grandparents (n=2), aunts (n=1), and cousins (n=1) were the primary source of this housing, though six men lived with their intimate partners in the months following their release from prison (often after living with relatives for a short time). In addition to housing, fourteen men said their strong-ties, including intimate partners (n=9), parents (n=7), siblings (n=3), and other relatives (n=1) provided them with financial support upon their release from prison. The men in the study also reported a variety of resources that the women did not receive, including clothing (n=2), information about employment (n=2), and food (n=1) from parents and intimate partners. Using the material support received from their strong-ties, several men were able to create savings accounts (n=3), purchase vehicles (n=2), attend college (n=2), and start their own businesses (n=1) during the reentry period. Finally, twelve men received emotional support from relatives (n=11) and intimate partners (n=7) after they were released from prison (n=12), whereas only seven men said their strong-ties provided them with emotional support prior to incarceration.

Overall, analysis of data regarding the resources available to the men and women via their strong-tie relationships revealed that relatives, especially parents, were the parolees' primary source of resources after prison release. When compared to the resources available to them prior to incarceration, more men and women had access to both tangible and intangible resources, which was likely a result of improved relationships with relatives and intimate partners. Men had access to a greater variety of tangible resources than their female counterparts during this time period, including information about employment and transportation that women did not receive. Consistent with research suggesting that most parolees return home to live with their families (Hebert 2005; Nelson et al. 1999; Visher, et al. 2004) and rely on their families for financial support after prison (McLean & Thompson 2007; Nelson et al. 1999; Visher et al. 2004), housing and money were the most commonly reported material resources after prison. The men in the study had greater access to financial resources from relatives and intimate partners, which is consistent with differences in the overall quality of relationships reported by the men and women. Finally, slightly more women than men received emotional support from their strong-ties during this time period, but both men and women reported greater levels of emotional support from strong-ties after incarceration than they had prior to incarceration.

The findings suggest the influence of gender on the resources available to the men and women in the study via their strong-tie relationships. First, a greater number of men than women had access to financial resources from relatives and intimate partners after incarceration. Although the relationships women shared with relatives were better after incarceration than they had been before incarceration, several women indicated that emotional and physical abuse from their parents led to strain in their relationships. Issues of gender and power are at the root of

women's victimization (Anderson 1997; Dobash & Dobash 1979; Stark & Flitcraft 1991; Yllo 1993) relatives can be a source of violence against adult women (Hedin 2000). Violence that results from gender-based inequality may affect the frequency, emotional intensity, and reciprocity of interactions between strong-ties, all of which are factors associated with the overall strength of social ties (Granovetter 1973). As a result, the social ties of women who experience gender-based violence may be weaker than those of women who do not have such experiences. Strength of social ties is related to willingness to provide resources (Granovetter 1982; Hurlbert et al. 2000), and strong-tie relationships that have been weakened as a result of years of abuse may be less useful with regard to resource acquisition.

Similarly, socially constructed ideas about femininity place incredible importance upon women's abilities to maintain relationships, even when they are unhappy (Benjamin 1988; Chodorow 1978; Dimen 1986; Gilligan 1982; Jordan & Surrey 1986; Miller 1976; Rafter 1990; Swift 1987). Twice as many women (n=10) as men (n=5) remained in their pre-incarceration intimate relationships after their release from prison, and eight women experienced ongoing violence and strain within their intimate relationships; these experiences likely influenced resource availability, as discussed above. Although only slightly more men than women reported good intimate relationships at the time they were interviewed, the intimate relationships men experienced upon their release from prison did not include gender-based violence. As such, they were likely a better source of resources and support than those experienced by women.

Despite patterns of violence within their relationships, women received slightly greater levels of emotional support from their strong-tie relationships than men after prison release. It may be the case that because of gender socialization women in this study were more likely than

men to focus on emotional support and time spent with relatives. This would be consistent with other research findings (Barbee et al 1993) and would explain the differences in reported levels of emotional support.

Resources from Weak-Tie Relationships

Prior to Incarceration

As described in Chapter 5, data analysis showed that the men and women in the study had few weak-tie relationships prior to incarceration, and the weak-tie relationships they did have were limited to ties with friends (eight women and four men), associates (eleven women and fifteen men), and neighbors (ten women and nineteen men)[7]. Although some men (n=6) and women (n=10) shared positive relationships with friends and associates prior to incarceration, more than half of the men and women said that these relationships, as well as those with neighbors, revolved around substance abuse and other forms of criminality. Accordingly, only six women and four men received positive resources from their weak-tie relationships prior to incarceration.

Given the relative dearth of weak-tie relationships experienced by the men and women in the study prior to incarceration, it is unsurprising that only four women received tangible resources--food (n=1) and money (n=3)--from these relationships. Emotional support was only slightly more available to the women via their weak-tie relationships prior to incarceration. Just six women said their friends and associates (n=5) and neighbors (n=1) provided them with emotional support. The resource that was most readily available to the women as a result of their

[7] 8 men and 2 women indicated that their relationships with neighbors during this time period involved anything other than just saying "hello,"

weak-tie relationships was criminal capital. Indeed, six women said they received drugs from or learned how to use drugs with their friends and associates prior to incarceration, four women said they got together with friends and associates to steal things (usually in support of their drug habits), two women said they sold drugs to their friends, associates, and neighbors, and one woman said that she learned how to commit check and credit card fraud from friends and associates prior to incarceration.

The men in the study were no better off than the women with regard to tangible resources from their weak-tie relationships prior to incarceration. Only two men said that friends and associates provided them with food and money during this time period. Friends and associates also provided emotional support for four of the men. Overall, criminal capital was the most commonly available resource for the men in the sample prior to incarceration, as thirteen of the men said that friends, associates, and neighbors used drugs with them (n=2), sold drugs to or with them (n=7), committed robberies and thefts with them (n=5), or helped them pimp women (n=1).

In sum, data analysis showed that the limited weak-tie relationships experienced by the men and women in the study prior to incarceration provided them with almost no positive tangible resources. Emotional support was more readily available from weak-tie relationships, though very few women, and even fewer men, ultimately received emotional support from their weak-ties; this finding can be explained by differences described by the men and women with regard to the closeness and quality of their pre-incarceration weak-tie relationships. Criminal capital was the primary resource available to the men and women in the study, most of whom had access to drugs and criminal opportunities as a result of their weak-tie relationships.

Because of the overall negative nature of the men and women's weak-tie relationships prior to incarceration, gender-based differences in resource availability were not apparent. Instead, it appears that drug abuse and criminal associations equalized the resources available to the men and women via their weak-tie relationships. Although literature suggests that men normally have better access to resources from their weak-tie relationships as a result gender roles that encourage greater involvement in pro-social activities outside of the home than women (Eby & Allen 2012; Fischer & Oliker 1983; Marsden 1987; Moore 1990), it is possible that the more extensive histories of arrest and incarceration (see Appendix B for a table of demographic and criminal justice histories), and greater levels of substance abuse reported by the men in this study interfered with their ability to engage in such activities or form positive weak-tie relationships during this time period, the result of which is that men and women reported very similar numbers of types of resources from their weak-tie relationships.

During Incarceration

During incarceration, most of the pre-incarceration weak-tie relationships the men and women in the study shared with friends, associates, and neighbors came to an end, and ultimately only five women and one man were in contact with any of these individuals while in prison. Relationships with co-inmates (twenty-five women and twenty-five men), prison staffers (twenty-five women and twenty-five men), and ministerial ties (twenty women and eighteen men) replaced these associations. The newly developed relationships were generally more positive for women than for men, but both the men and women had a greater number of supportive weak-tie relationships while in prison than they had prior to incarceration. As a result,

most of the men (n=21) and women (n=21) had access to tangible and/or intangible resources from their weak-tie relationships during incarceration.

Although the number of weak-tie relationships experienced by the women in the study increased during incarceration, material resources from these relationships remained limited. Four women who continued their pre-incarceration weak-tie relationships with friends and associates received small sums of money from them while incarcerated, but only two women said that co-inmates provided them with material support by sharing packages their families had sent them, and prison regulations limited the ability of prison staffers and ministerial ties to provide material support to inmates. Emotional support was more readily available during this time period than it had been prior to incarceration, however. Twenty-one women said that their weak-ties provided them with emotional support while they were incarcerated, including one woman who remained in contact with a friend she knew prior to incarceration. Co-inmates (n=18) were the primary source of emotional support for women, though ministerial ties (n=13) and prison staffers (n=11) also provided emotional support to the women.

Data analysis showed that most men (n=21) also received tangible and/or intangible resources from their weak-tie relationships during incarceration. As was the case with the women in the study, access to material resources was limited, and just five men had access to material support when co-inmates shared the contents of gift packages they received from friends and relatives. The more marked change in resources available to men via their weak-ties relationships during incarceration had to do with emotional support. Prior to incarceration, just four men said they received emotional support from their weak-ties, but during incarceration, twenty men said their weak-tie relationships were a form of emotional support for them. Co-inmates (n=12) were

the primary source of emotional support for the men while incarcerated, and Respondent M25 believed that emotional support from co-inmates was particularly important, as "That's all you have...the people around you." Prison staffers (n=14) and ministerial ties (n=8) were also important sources of emotional support for nearly half of the men. Four men viewed the emotional support provided by ministerial ties during this time period as particularly important with regard to making it through prison and successfully reentering society. As Respondent M2 explained:

> A lot of it was they would relate and they could teach me a lot about what I needed to know...the transitional phase. I didn't do 10 years or nothing, but I needed to transition from being a drug addict. Plus, they'd teach me more about God. (M2)

Overall, the time the men and women in the study spent in prison led to an important change with regard to the resources available from their weak-tie relationships. Prior to incarceration, the men and women had little access to positive resources from their weak-ties, though more than half had access to criminal capital. During incarceration, men and women's weak-tie relationships shifted and positive resources, especially emotional support, were made available to them from a variety of sources. A slightly greater number of women than men received emotional support from their weak-ties while in prison, and this difference resulted from the greater number of women than men who received emotional support from co-inmates and ministerial ties.

Gender appears to have influenced the material resources available to the men and women via their weak-tie relationships during incarceration. Four women, but no men, received

tangible resources from weak-ties they established prior to incarceration. Although this difference was at least partially attributable to the greater number of women (n=10) than men (n=6) who said their pre-incarceration friends and associates were a good influence on them (n=2) or that they had fun together while engaging in non-criminal activities (n=6), it is also possible that the influence of gender on social interaction explains some of this difference. Literature suggests that women are more inclined than men to maintain their relationships because of gender socialization that encourages relationship maintenance (Eagly 1987; Kirkpatrick & Lee 1994; Owen 1998). As a result, women may be more likely than men to maintain contact with friends, even when they are incarcerated. Additionally, patterns of gender socialization influence men and women to form same-sex friendship relationships (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Cook 2001), as was the case among the men and women in the current study. Accordingly, the described patterns of relationship maintenance are more likely to affect women than men.

Additionally, data analysis indicated that during incarceration a slightly greater number of women (n=21) than men (n=20) said that they received emotional support from their weak-tie relationships, and differences with regard to emotional support received by the men and women were larger for relationships with co-inmates (twelve men and eighteen women) and ministerial ties (eight men and thirteen women), with whom it was possible to form closer, more supportive relationships overall. This pattern may be explained by prevailing patterns of social interaction. Research suggests that women's relationships tend to be more emotionally intimate than those of men (Belle 1987; Caldwell & Peplau 1982; Ross & Mirowsky 1989; Turner & Marino 1994; Stokes & Wilson 1984) and involve greater levels of self-disclosure (Caldwell & Peplau 1982;

Rose & Rudolph 2006). This appears to be the result of gender socialization which orients women toward emotional intimacy in relationships and men toward activity (Galambos 2004). and may explain women's more emotionally supportive weak-tie relationships while in prison.

After Incarceration

As described in Chapter 5, the men and women in the study underwent a variety of positive changes in their weak-tie social relationships upon their release from prison. Prior to incarceration, few men and women had weak-tie relationships, and the relationships they did have often revolved around substance abuse and other criminal behaviors with friends, associates, and neighbors. Most of those relationships ended with incarceration but were replaced by positive ties to co-inmates, prison staffers, and ministerial ties. After incarceration several men (n=3) and women (n=5) maintained the weak-tie relationships they began with co-inmates and prison staffers while incarcerated, but many also developed new weak-tie relationships with pro-social individuals, including friends, associates, neighbors, treatment peers, and ministerial ties, and every man and woman had a relationship with at least one parole officer. Most of these relationships were positive and characterized by closeness and support, which signaled a marked improvement over the weak-tie relationships the men and women in the study had established prior to incarceration. As a result, more than half of the men (n=18) and women (n=15) in the study received material and/or emotional resources from their weak-tie relationships after incarceration.

After incarceration, more than half (n=15) of the women in the study received material or emotional support from their weak-tie relationships. Material support from weak-ties (n=6) was less available than emotional support (n=12), but housing and transportation were the most

commonly available material resources. Overall, five women received housing (n=3) and transportation assistance (n=3) from (ex) co-inmates, friends, and prison volunteers. One woman also received clothing from an (ex) co-inmate, another said a friend provided her with a small sum of money once she was released from prison, and a third woman said her parole officer found her a job shortly after she was released from prison. Although only six women received tangible support from their weak-ties during this time period, they believed the resources to have been incredibly important. Respondent W8, who received transportation assistance from an (ex) co-inmate, said the assistance made it possible for her to secure employment after prison, and Respondent W25, who was able to live with her (ex) co-inmate friend immediately upon leaving prison, explained that she would not have had a place to live without the help her friend provided her, saying:

> I went to the housing authority and they had such a long list and I didn't have children [which would have moved me up on the list]. If I didn't have my friend to let me live with her I don't know what I would have done. (W25)

The more evident change in resources from women's weak-tie relationships after incarceration came in the form of emotional support. Prior to incarceration, only six women received emotional support from their weak-ties, but after incarceration twelve women said their weak-ties provided them with emotional support. The most common source of emotional support for women after incarceration was parole officers (n=7), though friends (n=6), (ex) co-inmates (n=4), and treatment peers (n=3) were also a source of emotional support for the women during this time period. A parole officer's supervision style influenced whether a woman viewed him or her as a source of emotional support, and officers who were fair, asked questions about the

women's lives, and seemed genuinely concerned about their parole success were viewed as more emotionally supportive than those who only seemed interested in conducting drug tests or who took a law-enforcement approach to the relationship. Consistent with research findings that suggest parolees have better outcomes when they share a positive relationship with their parole officers (Skeem et al. 2009), four of the women in the study said that the emotional support they received from parole officers led to an important transformation in how they viewed themselves, as was the case of Respondent W20:

> She's very supportive. I know a lot of girls that have her as a P.O. and she's sent them to my job [to try to get hired since I've done so well there]. I feel proud of that, that she's proud of me. That means a lot. She has hundreds of people and I'm the one she looks to as an example, a success. Not many people can say "my parole officer is proud of me," but I can.

In addition to these sources of emotional support, ministerial ties who served as mentors for four women during the reentry period were viewed as an important source of emotional support, as were drug and alcohol treatment peers who provided advice and encouragement to three women upon their release from prison. As Respondents W22, W25, and W6 explained:

> I go to relapse prevention at the parole office. Well, I just graduated. I've also done AA and NA since I've been out. I don't go to NA quite as often as I go to AA. I go to Celebrate Recovery. I go 4-5 times a week. It's very helpful. (W22)
>
> I get most of my emotional support from my AA sponsor and friends in the program. (W25)

> [I] talk to her [a Catholic nun] every day. [It's a] very positive relationship and provides emotional support. She knows everything about my life. She is one of only two people who does" (W6).

Data analysis revealed that men (n=18) were more likely than women (n=15) to receive resources and support from their weak-tie relationships after incarceration. Material resources were less available than emotional support during this time period, but information about employment was the most commonly available material resource. Relationships with friends and ministerial ties were the most important with regard to resource availability but mentors, neighbors, and parole officers also provided nearly half of the men (n=10) with material resources during this time period. Overall, six men secured employment through their weak-ties, and several men received money (n=4), housing (n=4), transportation assistance (n=2) clothing (n=2), and help obtaining necessary documents such as driver's licenses (n=1) from mentors, neighbors, and parole officers after prison. As these man explained:

> Someone [from the prison ministry] saw a sign on a Tuesday--I was released on Monday--so came and told me about the job. I went down to the shop and was hired on the spot. I told him everything. I just got out of prison, moved up here with my wife and kids to get away from everything and he hired me. It was a blessing really. (M2)
>
> I found my job through the parole office three weeks into my parole. (M10)
>
> My girlfriend's mom and dad...I call them right now and tell them I need $500 and I'd have it. It's the first time in my life I've had that. (M23)

> When I got out, I didn't have no clothes. They [the religious ministry] bought me clothes, fed me. (M2).
>
> Friends gave me clothes because when I got out I didn't have nothing (M16).
>
> My mentor provided me material support. He paid for my clothing and the admission fee to Maryville College and helped me get a driver's license. (M5)

One additional man said that his neighbor allowed him to borrow a lawn mower each week that he could use it to earn extra money, which he viewed as an important form of material support.

In addition to material resources men accessed via their weak-tie relationships, most men (n=17) received emotional support from their weak-ties after prison release. Nearly half of the men in the study credited parole officers (n=10) with providing them with emotional support after incarceration. As was the case with the women in the study, the men indicated that parole officers who seemed concerned with a their success and ensured that their interactions with the men were respectful were considered to be more emotionally supportive than those who regularly ordered drug screens and took on a law enforcement role in support of their supervision efforts. Friends (n=4), (ex) co-inmates (n=2) neighbors (n=2), ministerial ties (n=2), and prison staff (n=1) were also important sources of emotional support for several men, as these relationships provided them with someone who was willing to let them be themselves without judgment. Respondents M4, M2, and M23 explained the importance of this type of support:

> I could just vent to him [my pastor]. Let the burden off my mom for a while. It felt good to have someone else give you a hug and know someone else does love you and care. (M4)

> I got a beer...a canned beer from my neighbor last Thursday. Being able to be myself and let them be aware of who they're around, that's emotional support. (M23)

> They had a counselor at the [faith-based] halfway house I could talk to. It's good to have the friends I have now because they are supportive and know what I've been through. (M2)

In sum, data analysis showed that the men and women in the study had more resources available to them via their weak-tie relationships after incarceration than they had prior to incarceration. Emotional support was the most commonly available resource from weak-tie relationships after prison, and parole officers were a primary source of this support for close to half of the men and women. Although more than half of the men and women received emotional support from their weak-ties after prison, men received emotional support from a greater variety of weak-tie relationships than women. Men also had access to a greater variety of tangible resources from a larger number of weak-tie relationships than women after incarceration, but both men and women reported being thankful for the material support they received. None of the men or women said that their weak-ties provided them with criminal capital after incarceration, and this represented an important change from the pre-incarceration time period.

Findings from data analysis suggest that gender helped to shape the resources available to the men and women via their weak-tie relationships after incarceration. Because of the influence of gender in shaping the composition of men and women's post-incarceration weak-tie relationships, women had fewer weak-ties who were willing and/or able to provide them with resources after prison release. Additionally, because of resource homogeneity in their social ties

(Lin 2000a; McPherson & Smith-Lovin 1982) the women in the study had access to a lesser variety of resources from their weak-tie relationships than the men. Finally, because of their greater childcare burden after prison release[8], women had fewer opportunities than men to acquire the variety of resources that were available to men as a result of their greater participation in non-domestic activities. Differences in men and women's participation in domestic activities can be explained by gendered patterns of socialization that result in a gendered division of labor (Cikara et al. 2009; Fletcher 1998; Hook 2010; Martinengo et al. 2010; Poortman and Van Der Lippe 2009) and result in women's greater exposure to information about domestic resources and men's greater access to a variety of non-domestic resources (McPherson & Smith-Lovin 1982).

The Importance of Resources on Reentry Experiences

Prior to Incarceration

As a result of shifts in their strong- and weak-tie relationships during and after incarceration, the men and women in the study experienced changes in the resources available to them via their social ties. The importance they placed on these resources also changed over time. Prior to incarceration, half of the men (n=12) and women (n=17) who maintained strong- and weak-tie relationships received material and/or emotional support from their social ties. Several of the men (n=4) and women (n=7) who received these resources considered them unimportant, however. Overall, just eight men and ten women said they placed any value on the support they received from their strong- and weak-ties prior to incarceration.

[8] 72% of women with minor children lived with their children after incarceration, compared to just 50% of men with minor children.

When discussing the importance of resources they received from their social ties prior to incarceration, women emphasized material resources, such as money and housing, that they received from their strong-tie relationships to help them meet their basic needs. As they explained:

> [The money] was very important. I tend to be very materialistic [and] I would have done what it takes to get money. Not kill somebody or rob somebody, but [I] would have stole something. (W7)
>
> Very important. It was something me and my kids needed. I wouldn't have had no food if I didn't go to them. (W16)
>
> [The] money from my boyfriend was really important. I cared about him, but nothing major. [I] really just needed money. (W19)

Just three women said that the emotional support they received from their strong- and weak-ties prior to incarceration was important to them, including Respondent W23 who said "It was my whole life. I mean, that's what I had to hold onto" when describing emotional support she received from her adult children and ex-husband (with whom she had maintained a friendship relationship) before she was sentenced to prison.

Interestingly, the men in the study emphasized the emotional support they received from their strong-tie relationships when they discussed the importance of the resources available to them prior to incarceration. Primarily, emotional support decreased the feelings of isolation men experienced during this time period as a result of extensive histories of drug use and criminal participation. As described by Respondents M2, M4, M10, and M21:

> It was important. I liked having somebody [parents] around to talk with, so just having someone around to talk to was good. It made things better. (M2)
>
> It was great. It was great just having someone [my mom] to go to that you could open up to. (M4)
>
> Well, I tell you, from my family it was a whole lot of help because they stood by me no matter what. Even when I was incarcerated they believed in me. (M10)
>
> It means a lot because right to this day I still have their [my family's] support...even through all the things I did wrong. When they did find out they didn't look down on me. It hurt em, but they still did whatever they could do for me. (M21)

When describing the lack of importance they placed on the tangible resources available to them via their strong-tie relationships prior to incarceration, several (n=7) men indicated that they took the support for granted, including Respondent M1 who said "I took it for granted. I took everything for granted back then" and Respondent M15 who explained "At the time...well, probably not too important. Like I said, I didn't care really. I think back then my mind was on how I'd get my next fix." The men in the study did not consider resources available from their weak-tie relationships prior to incarceration as having been important to them.

Overall, data analysis showed that just over half of the men and women who received resources from their social ties prior to incarceration believed these resources to have been important to their lives. Although the men indicated that material support from their social ties was unimportant to them prior to incarceration, women relied on this support to provide housing and food for themselves. The men did, however, view the emotional support they received from

their strong-ties as important with regard to fostering feelings of acceptance, though very few women described the emotional support they received from their social ties as having been as important during this time period. The men and women viewed resources available from strong-tie relationships prior to incarceration as having been more important than those from weak-tie relationships, which was likely a result of the poor quality of their weak-tie relationships during this time period.

The difference between the men and women in this study with regard to the perceived importance of resources may be reflective of patterns of gender inequality. Prior to incarceration, the women in the study had lower incomes than their male counterparts[9]. As a result, they may have been forced to rely on their social ties for material resources to a greater extent than the men. Women may also have placed a greater importance on material resources available to them during this time period because of the greater childcare responsibilities they had when compared to the men[10], which likely would have resulted in a greater need for material resources from outside sources.

After Incarceration

Material Support

Data analysis showed that because they left prison without any means to support themselves, material support from strong- and weak-tie relationships, including housing, money,

---

[9] The men in the study had a mean income of $1778.48 per month prior to incarceration, but the women had a mean income of only $932.04 during this time period.

[10] Prior to incarceration, ninety percent of women, but just 70.5% of men, with minor children lived with their children.

and transportation, addressed women's most immediate needs. Several women (n=8) explained that their relatives and intimate partners provided them with housing after prison release, and three women said that their (ex) co-inmate and friends gave them somewhere to live during this time period. Each of these women believed the housing they received to be especially important, explaining that they would have had nowhere to live without it. For example, Respondent W10 said: "[Housing was] very much important--I need[ed] a place to live." Likewise, Respondent W25, who received housing assistance from an (ex) co-inmate after her release from prison explained:

> I went to the housing authority [after I was released] and they had such a long list and I didn't have children. If I didn't have my friend [an (ex) co-inmate] to let me live with her I don't know what I would have done.

Financial support from women's post-incarceration strong- (n=13) and weak-tie (n=1) relationships also made it possible for them to provide food and other basic necessities for themselves, which they viewed as important to their reentry experiences. For example, Respondent W23 explained: " It's [money from my children] been wonderful. That's how I'm living. Without them I wouldn't be doing so great. I mean, I would try, but...". Similarly, when describing the importance of the financial support she has received from relatives ever since being released from prison, Respondent W15 indicated that she would not be able to provide anything for herself without it, saying "Financially, I'm broke."

In addition to housing and financial support available to women from their social ties, women's weak-ties were an important source of transportation (n=3) and clothing assistance (n=1) during the reentry period. These resources made it possible for several (n=4) women to

secure employment, as was the case with Respondent W18, who said that she would have been unable to find a job had an (ex) co-inmate not provided her with transportation assistance; because one must maintain employment as a condition of parole, this was especially important with regard to successfully completing her period of parole. Similarly, when explaining the importance of transportation and clothing assistance she received from a friend she met through the prison ministry in which she had participated, Respondent W8 said the help she received was "Very important [because] the way to success in this world is not by yourself. You just can't do it by yourself."

Material support from strong- and weak-tie relationships was also important with regard to helping the men in the study meet their basic needs upon their release from prison. Many of the men (n=9) indicated that being able to live with relatives after prison was important to them, including Respondent M7 who said "I didn't know what I would've done without that support [housing from parents]. It helped me a lot because I didn't have nothing when I got out." Respondent M17, who received housing from his relatives after his release from prison, explained that it was important to his reentry success saying "I believe if I'd have went to a halfway house I probably would have dibbed and dabbed, used drugs, smoked marijuana everyday [instead of desisting from crime]." Additionally, Respondents M3 and M6 explained that the housing made available to them via their relatives allowed them to successfully meet their parole requirements, since one cannot be paroled without approved housing arrangements.

Although more than half of the men (n=17) in the study received money from relatives after prison release, few (n=5) felt it was ultimately important with regard to helping them meet their basic reentry needs. Among those who did believe the financial assistance had been

important to their reentry success, however, was Respondents M1, who explained that his wife's paycheck was his only source of financial support immediately after prison release. Similarly, Respondent M2, who said that his mother provided him with money after his release from prison, viewed this form of support as especially important for reducing his financial strain and desisting from crime. Finally, Respondent M5 said that the financial help he received from an individual he met through the prison ministry in which he had participated was "very important, because when you come out of being incarcerated for 15 years...people need support when they get out of prison."

Overall, the men placed a greater emphasis on the employment assistance their social ties--especially their weak-ties--gave to them after prison than they did on the financial assistance they received. Employment opportunities availed to them by their social ties were viewed as a stepping stone to reentry success, and nearly half of the men (n=9) credited this resource with enhancing their overall reentry experiences. Two men talked about the importance of the employment assistance they received from their weak-tie relationships as follows:

> Very helpful. Especially the job [that I found through my parole officer]. The job situation has helped me tremendously. I've got benefits, insurance. It's a great company to work for. (M10)
>
> The job [that I found through my friend] was important so I could make enough to pay the rent. (M24)

Although weak-tie relationships were a primary source of information about employment for the men in the study, Respondent M19 explained that the job he found through his relatives contributed to his reentry success by allowing him to provide for himself. As he explained: "[My

job] provided me with excellent living conditions. It seems to help my life overall. Helps me not recidivate."

In sum, most of the men (n=16) and women (n= 20) in the study believed that the material resources they received from their social ties upon their release from prison helped shape their reentry experiences. Unlike the pre-incarceration time period, the resources available to the men and women came from both strong- and weak-tie relationships and helped them meet their most basic needs after release from prison. Consistent with literature suggesting that weak-tie relationships are an important source of information about employment Granovetter 1973; 1983; Lin et al. 1981; Watanbe 1987) and that men are better able to rely on their weak-tie relationships for information about employment opportunities (McPherson & Smith-Lovin 1982) as a result of their greater public sphere participation (Cikara et al. 2009; Fletcher 1998; Hook 2010; Martinengo et al. 2010; Poortman and Van Der Lippe 2009), weak-tie relationships experienced by several men connected them to paid work. Although they were less important for connecting women to employment, women's weak ties were an important source of material support, including housing and transportation, after prison, especially because gender-based patterns of violence within their intimate and familial relationships affected the quality of their relationships, which is believed to influence willingness of social-ties to provide resources (Hurlbert et al. 2000). Ultimately, however, strong-tie relationships were the most important sources of material support after incarceration, as more than half of the men and women in the study received housing and money that they believe shaped their reentry experiences as a result of these relationships.

Emotional Support

Although most men (n=16) and women (n=20) felt that the material resources they received from their strong- and weak-tie relationships upon their release from prison were important with regard to helping them meet their most basic needs, they also placed a great amount of importance on the emotional support their social ties provided to them. More than half of the men (n=15) and women (n=13) believed that the emotional support they received from their strong- and weak-ties was at least as important as the material support they received. For the men and women in the study, emotional support was important with regard to recovery from substance abuse and feeling accepted and encouraged, and these things positively influenced their reentry experiences.

According to data analysis, most of the women (n=22) in the study had substance abuse problems prior to their incarcerations. Although more than half of the women (n=14) received substance abuse treatment while incarcerated, several (n=9) women said that the emotional support they received from their strong-tie relationships was an important factor in their ability to remain sober after incarceration, which is a necessary component of reentry success. Primarily, emotional support was important to their post-incarceration sobriety because it gave the women in the study somewhere to turn when they were struggling. These women described their experiences:

> Sometimes you have good days and bad days. Having somebody there when you have bad days and need someone to talk to to get through that...if I didn't have that I'd probably violate parole [by using drugs] and be back in prison. (W9)

> [My] mom's and husband's support is very important. It helped me maintain. Support they gave me kept me from doing things I might have done [like selling and using drugs]. (W16)

For some women (n=3), fear of losing the support of relatives was also an important factor encouraging them to avoid relapse. This was the case for Respondent W3, who explained, "I'd hate to lose them [relatives] after all this. They have made a difference. Their support has made a difference, helped me stay clean." For women like Respondent W3, emotional support has been a crucial component of reentry success. Although strong-tie relationships were a primary source of sobriety-related emotional support after incarceration, weak-tie relationships that several (n=4) women shared with treatment peers and (ex) co-inmates were also believed to be important to their sobriety after prison release.

In addition to the influence of emotional support on post-incarceration sobriety for the women in the study, emotional support helped the women feel as if their social ties believed in them and wanted them to succeed, which many (n=7) women said was important to their reentry experiences. For the women in the study, long histories of incarceration, drug use, and abuse within familial and intimate relationships meant that women had little emotional support from their strong-ties prior to incarceration. As a result, women felt it was important to gain the trust and support of their strong-ties after incarceration. This was especially true for Respondent W20 who said:

> I mean, to know that, I guess, I have them backing me. To know that, it's unbelievable knowing how much they believe in me. It makes me feel better

> about myself to know that these people I've let down time and time again are supporting me. It's a big influence.

When speaking about the importance of emotional support they received from their strong-tie relationships after incarceration, the women indicated that knowing relatives and intimate partners cared for them contributed to their parole experiences by encouraging them to be successful. Four women shared their beliefs about this:

> [It's been] very important. I don't know if I could have made it without them being here saying 'You're going to make it.' And I did! (W1)
>
> It is very important. It has made all the difference just knowing they [relatives] are there. (W4)
>
> [The support has been] very important. The way to success in this world is not by yourself. You just can't do it by yourself. (W8)
>
> It helps a lot just to have someone there for you. I've known people who haven't had the support. They end up right back in [prison]. (W10).
>
> Support from [my] dad was a turning point in my life. Knowing that he loved me was all I needed. (W12)
>
> It's been a great deal of help to me. It lets me know I'm not alone. I probably wouldn't be doing so well without it. (W21)

Several women (n=7) also said that the emotional support they received from caring and supportive parole officers contributed to their parole success, as their parole officers helped them to understand that they had the power to enact positive change in their lives.

Like their female counterparts, the men in the study (n=21) had long histories of addiction. For men, emotional support from weak-ties formed through community-based addiction groups was believed to be particularly important to recovery, and several men (n=6) explained that they would likely have been re-sentenced to prison without this support. Respondent M1, who had problems with compulsive public masturbation prior to his incarceration, said that encouragement from others who understand his struggle has helped him change:

> Crucial. Without the support of SA (Sex Addicts Anonymous) fellowship I would have probably continued that behavior [compulsive public masturbation] and God only knows what would have happened. I'd probably be back in prison I'm sure. (M1)

Similarly, several men (n=6) believed the drug rehabilitation programs in which they participated helped them stay sober and remain on parole. Respondent M2, who became involved with a prison ministry while incarcerated and continued to participate in the ministry upon his release from prison, explained that the emotional and spiritual support he receives from other group members makes him feel as if he always has something to fall back on if he struggles with his sobriety.

> It's been very important, just me learning that...let me put it this way: I dropped meth after 8-10 years. It took god to take that from me. That does help, and then you learn that god loves you and doesn't want you to go back. There's so much that a prayer can help. You always have something stronger than you to fall back on. It's a big help to know that's there. (M2)

Although the focus of most of the men (n=9) in the study with regard to the influence of emotional support on sobriety had to do with support gleaned from weak-tie relationships, three men indicated that they viewed their relationships with relatives and intimate partners as sources of emotional support that contributed to their sobriety, primarily because their relatives did not use drugs and, therefore, encouraged them to remain sober as well. As Respondent M24 explained:

> The relationship with them [family] has helped me out a lot because they're not into the drugs and everything" (M24)

The men in the study also indicated that emotional support from their social ties was important with regard to making them feel accepted, which encouraged them to be successful in their parole efforts. Respondent M20, for example, said that emotional support from his wife was important because it showed him that she cared about his success despite his multiple incarcerations. Similarly, Respondent M1 believed that emotional support from his wife and father meant that they accepted him as an important part of their family again after the long separation caused by his two incarcerations, and this acceptance made him want to be successful. As he explained: "It makes me feel like part of a family. Part of a marriage. Friends. Part of society." Likewise, when describing the importance of emotional support he received after his release from prison, Respondent M15 said: "It was really important to me. If I didn't have all the support I had, I probably would've gone back. I would've given up and gone back to the old me." Nearly half of the men also said they felt encouraged to be successful by parole officers who made it clear that they wanted to see the men succeed. Respondent M21, M23, and M24 explained this belief:

> [My parole officer is] very supportive of me. He gives me quite a bit of leeway. Puts a lot of trust in me. He gives you a chance. He's not going to lock you back up--you're going to do it yourself. He really gives you a chance. If you mess it up, you can't blame nobody but yourself. (M21)
>
> [My parole officer is] great. And I don't use that word a lot, but in this situation it is. he's let me know he isn't going to hinder me in being successful on or off parole. From what we were told, they don't bend. They don't work with you. It's their way or no way. But it's not. It's all about me and he made that clear. We have an understanding and a respect for each other. (M23)
>
> [My parole officer has] been good. He's been great. He don't want to see people [including me] go back I believe. (M24)

A final theme in men's discussions of the emotional support available to them upon their release from prison had to do with the strength they gleaned from the support of their strong- and weak-ties. Several men (n=4) explained that when they began to struggle they were able to gain strength to continue their parole efforts from their social ties. Respondents M4 and M15 explained this:

> They was important, especially to my emotional support. It wouldn't have took much for someone to go back to prison. But if you know someone can support you...it will be alright. (M4)
>
> The church and the halfway house are really important to me because if I lay off any of em, of having that support at all...I don't know where I'll be. I'm not strong enough as one, but with others around me I can be strong enough. (M15)

Overall, more than half of the men (n=15) and women (n=13) in the study were able to rely on their social ties for emotional support that contributed to their sobriety and encouraged them to succeed on parole. Although women primarily relied on emotional support available to them via their strong-tie relationships, parole officers were also an important source of empowerment that created a desire for positive change for several women. More than their female counterparts, the men in the study often turned to weak-tie relationships for emotional support. For men, knowing that intimate partners and parole officers believed in them, as well as an awareness that their strong- and weak-ties accepted them despite their histories of incarceration, fueled efforts for successful parole. Men's weak-tie relationships also provided them with a source of strength that they could rely upon when they struggled during the reentry period, though women did not report this belief.

Although more than half of the men (n=16) and most of the women (n=23) believed that the resources they received from their social ties positively impacted their parole success, a few men (n = 4) and one woman did not consider the support they received as ultimately important to their reentry experiences. Nevertheless, each of them acknowledged that the resources they received made the transition from prison to community easier. As Respondent M11 explained:

> Well, I would've done it with or without [th]em, but it's been beneficial. It made the transition easier.

Three men and one woman who received tangible and intangible resources from their strong- and weak-ties after incarceration said the resources they received were in no way helpful with regard to their parole success, however. For these individuals, a belief that they would have been able to

provide for themselves in the absence of resources from social ties was the reason for their claims.

Conclusions

This chapter examined the tangible and intangible resources available to the men and women in the study via their strong- and weak-tie relationships. Data analysis revealed a great deal of change in the resources available to the men and women over time, which is consistent with changes in social tie composition described in the previous chapter. Prior to incarceration, the resources available to the men and women were limited, but shifts in strong- and weak-tie relationships during and after incarceration increased the availability of tangible and intangible resources for the men and women. Strong-tie relationships were the primary source of tangible resources for the men and women in the study, though many of the men and several women also received tangible resources from their weak-tie relationships. Men were especially able to mobilize their weak-tie relationships in order to find employment after their release from prison.

Strong-tie relationships were also a primary source of emotional support for the women in the study, though several women credited their weak-ties for providing them with emotional support that positively influenced their reentry experiences. Men also relied on their weak-tie relationships for emotional support, and support from these relationships helped men maintain their sobriety after incarceration and desist from crime. Ultimately, most of the men and women in the study considered the resources and support available to them via their social ties as having been important to their reentry experiences, and most also felt that these resources contributed to their reentry success.

The influence of gender on resources from men and women's post-incarceration social ties was visible. Overall, material resources were more available to men than women via their strong-tie relationships after incarceration, but women had greater access to emotional support from these relationships. Because the primary source of difference in women's access to material resources was intimate partners, it appears as if their less positive post-incarceration intimate relationships, which continued to be characterized by physical abuse and other strains, influenced resource availability. In this case, the gendered experience of violence shaped the availability of resources from women's intimate partners. Although several women received tangible resources from their weak-tie relationships after incarceration, men were more likely than women to receive material support from their weak-tie relationships during this time period. This finding is consistent with literature suggesting that because of resource homogeneity and differences in resources available to men and women because of the gendered division of labor, women are less likely than men to be able to access material resources from their weak-tie relationships (McPherson & Smith-Lovin 1982).

Also as a result of gendered patterns of relationships, the resources available to the men and women in the study influenced reentry experiences in different ways. Although both men and women benefitted from the resources provided to them via their social ties, the benefits women received came primarily from their strong-tie relationships and were more often related to basic reentry needs, like housing and money. Because gender roles limit women's participation in the public sphere, this pattern was expected (Cikara et al. 2009; Elshtain 1993). Although men also met their basic needs as a result of the resources they received, many were able to mobilize a greater variety of reentry resources in ways which allowed them to depend less on their social

ties over time. This may explain why more women than men felt that resources provided by their social ties contributed to their reentry success.

Finally, because strong-tie relationships tend to be resource homogenous, it is often the case that they can provide only limited access to resources (Marsden 1990; Hanson & Pratt 1991), which was consistent with the experiences of the women in this study, who received only the most basic of resources from their strong-tie relationships. Although in general strong-tie relationships are believed to provide better quality resources than weak-tie relationships (Lin et al. 1981; Bian 1994; Bian & Ang 1997; Lin & Dumin 1986; Sprengers, Tazellar, & Flap 1998; Lai, Lin, & Leung 1998; Volker & Flap 1999), this pattern was not entirely consistent with the findings of this research. Strong-tie relationships were certainly a very important source of resources for the women in the study, but women who received material support from their weak-ties viewed this support as especially important. The men in the study also received very important resources from their strong-tie relationships, though many of them strongly believed that the resources they gained from their weak-tie relationships were equally as important as those provided by their strong-ties with regard to their reentry experiences. Given the generally low social status of the men included in the study, it is possible that weak-tie relationships were able to compensate for resources that the men's relatives could not provide as a result of poverty that is common among prisoners' families (Jorgensen et al. 1986; Kiser 1991).

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS

The role of parolees' social ties in helping them meet their reentry needs has been largely ignored by research. A large body of scholarship on reentry has highlighted factors associated with successful reentry, including the ability to secure money and housing, but studies have paid little attention to the sources from which parolees acquire the resources they need in order to be successful on parole. Moreover, the role of intangible resources--such as emotional support--on reentry outcomes has been notably absent from research. Finally, there has been a dearth of scholarship on the influence of gender on parolees' social ties and the resources available to them via their social ties. Thus, the purpose of this dissertation is to contribute to the current body of prisoner reentry literature by examining parolees' social ties, the resources they received from those ties, and the influence of those resources on their reentry experiences.

In order to meet the study goals, I used data obtained from interviews with twenty-five male and twenty-five female parolees in Knox County, Tennessee. A feminist standpoint approach was used to analyze data obtained from in-depth interviews with a goal of understanding 1) parolees' perceptions of how their social ties changed over time 2) parolees' perceptions of how those changes were associated with changes in the tangible and intangible resources available to them and 3) the influence parolees believed the resources provided by their social ties had on their reentry experiences. In this chapter, I summarize major findings of the current study and discuss their contributions to the body of literature on prisoner reentry before outlining their criminal justice policy implications. The chapter concludes with a discussion of limitations of the study.

Summary of Findings from the Study

Data analysis showed that the relationships experienced by the men and women in the study underwent many changes over time. Prior to incarceration, the men and women experienced dysfunctional and violent intimate relationships. For several men and women, intimate relationships ended during incarceration. Although these changes resulted in overall better, more supportive intimate relationships for men, many women continued to experience unhappy intimate relationships and had limited contact with intimate partners. The post-incarceration time period brought about additional changes in men and women's intimate relationships, and overall just ten women and five men remained in the intimate relationships they began prior to incarceration. The percentage of men who believed their intimate relationships to be good after incarceration was greater than the percentage of women who described positive intimate relationships, as several women continued to experience abuse within their relationships.

Fewer changes occurred within the relationships men and women shared with their children. Prior to incarceration, more women than men lived with their minor children, but most men and women felt they shared positive or supportive relationships with their children. During incarceration, a greater number of women than men maintained contact with their children, but feelings of anger and unhappiness brought about by incarceration negatively affected these relationships. Upon their release from prison, the relationships men and women shared with their children became better than they had been during incarceration. Pre-incarceration patterns of childrearing persisted after incarceration, as more women than men lived with their minor children during this time period.

Several important changes also occurred with regard to men and women's relationships with relatives over time. Prior to incarceration, more women than men were in contact with their relatives, including more members of their extended family, but men's relationships with relatives were more positive and more supportive than those experienced by women; parental alcoholism, physical abuse, and distance caused by their own substance abuse characterized the relationships several of the women shared with parents. Although women were also more likely than men to be in contact with their relatives, including siblings, aunts and uncles, and cousins, during incarceration, an overall greater number of men and women shared relationships with relatives during this time period than had done so prior to incarceration. When compared to their pre-incarceration familial relationships, women described more supportive relationships than men while in prison, but men were in more frequent contact with their relatives than women. Upon their release from prison, many of the positive changes in men and women's relationships with relatives continued, and nearly all of the men and women maintained supportive relationships with parents and other relatives. Although women were slightly more likely than men to be in contact with their relatives during this time period, men reported greater levels of satisfaction with their relationships, primarily because they were characterized by high levels of acceptance and frequent contact.

In addition to changes in their strong-tie relationships, the men and women in the study experienced a variety of shifts in their weak-tie relationships during and after incarceration. Men were more likely than women to have weak-tie relationships prior to incarceration, but overall men and women had very few weak-tie relationships during this time period. Although some women reported supportive relationships with friends, most of their pre-incarceration weak-tie

relationships involved substance abuse and the transmission of criminal capital, as did the weak-tie relationships described by men. Only a minority of men and women maintained contact with their pre-incarceration weak-ties upon their incarceration, but ties to co-inmates, ministerial ties, and prison staff replaced these relationships, causing the men and women to have a greater number of supportive weak-tie relationships during incarceration than they had prior to incarceration. Positive changes in weak-tie relationships persisted after their release from prison, and several men and women continued their relationships with (ex) co-inmates and prison staffers in addition to forming new ties with treatment peers; these relationships were of particular importance to the women in the study. In addition to ties with co-inmates and prison staffers, most men and women developed friendship relationships and ties to neighbors and ministerial ties after their release from prison, though men's relationships with these individuals were closer and more supportive. Finally, every man and women in the study shared a relationship with a parole officer after incarceration, but men were more likely to characterize these relationships as supportive than women, as several women believed their parole officers were too busy to form close relationships with them.

Consistent with changes in their relationships during and after incarceration, resources available to the men and women from their social-ties changed during and after incarceration. Prior to incarceration, the resources available to the men and women in the study were limited. Strong-tie relationships--especially those with relatives--were the primary source of resources for men and women during this time period, and women had greater access to resources from their strong ties than men. For both men and women, material resources were more available than emotional support prior to incarceration. During incarceration, the men and women in the study

experienced an increase in resources available to them via their strong-tie relationships, especially those with parents. Although men had better access to tangible resources from their strong-tie relationships, emotional support was more available to the women. After incarceration, a greater number of men and women had access to resources from their social ties than they had prior to or during incarceration, and parents continued to be the primary source of these resources, though intimate partners were also an important source of money for men. When compared to women, men were more likely to access tangible resources from relatives, but women had better access to emotional support from their strong-ties.

Important changes in the resources available to the men and women in the study via their weak-tie relationships also occurred during and after incarceration. Prior to incarceration, men and women's weak-tie relationships provided them with almost no positive resources, and criminal capital, to which men had better access than women, was the most readily available resource. During incarceration, positive resources became available to the men and women via their weak-tie relationships, and emotional support was the resource men and women most commonly received as a result of these relationships. Women were slightly more likely than men to receive emotional support from their weak-tie relationships during this time period. Changes in resource availability continued after incarceration, when a greater number of men and women had access to positive resources from their weak-tie relationships than had been the case prior to incarceration. Emotional support was the most commonly available resource from these relationships, and more men than women said their weak-ties provided them with emotional support after their release from prison; men's post-incarceration resources came from a greater variety of weak-tie relationships than those received by women. In addition to their greater

access to emotional support, the men in the study were more likely to receive tangible resources from their weak-tie relationships. None of the men and women said their weak-ties provided them with criminal capital after incarceration.

Discussion of Findings and Contributions of the Study

Findings from the current study address important gaps in the literature because they 1) highlight the importance of gender on parolees' social ties, 2) show the influence of gender on resources available to men and women from their social ties, 3) describe how resources parolees received from their social ties after incarceration contributed to their reentry outcomes, and 4) point to the fluidity and transformation of parolees' social ties over time.

Gender and the Composition of Social Ties

Findings from the study highlight the influence of gender on parolees' social ties in several ways that are consistent with literature on gender and the composition of social ties. In the present study, women had more strong-tie relationships than their male counterparts at each time period, and kin-relationships and ties to intimate partners constituted the majority of women's social ties overall, which is consistent with literature showing that women's social ties overwhelmingly come from relationships with relatives and intimate partners (Dunbar & Spoors 1995; Fischer & Oliker 1983; McPherson et al. 2006; Marsden 1987; Moore 1990). Conversely, men had a larger number of weak-tie relationships with a more varied group of individuals than their female counterparts prior to and after incarceration, which is consistent with literature suggesting that men have a more weak-tie relationships with a greater variety of friends, co-workers, and other non-kin individuals than women (Eby & Allen 2012; Fischer & Oliker 1983; Marsden 1987; Moore 1990).

Study findings are also consistent with literature suggesting gender-based differences in the quality of strong-tie relationships experienced by men and women. Prior to incarceration, half of the women in the present study who were involved in intimate relationships experienced abuse at the hands of their intimate partners, and a few women continued to experience this abuse after prison release; these findings mirror research indicating that women experience high levels of violence within their strong-tie relationships (Anderson 1997; Dobash & Dobash 1979; Hedin 2000; Stark & Flitcraft 1991; Yllo 1993). Moreover, consistent with prior research suggesting that women may be induced to crime by their intimate partners (Cobbina 2009; Miller 1986; O'Brien 2001), several women were coerced by their intimate partners to commit crimes; none of the men in the study described a similar influence from intimate partners on their criminal offending. During incarceration, men's intimate partners put forth more effort to relationship maintenance than the intimate partners of women, as men were more likely than women to be in contact, including in-person contact, with their intimate partners; this finding provides support for prior research suggesting that women put forth more effort than men toward relationships maintenance (Kirkpatrick & Lee 1994). Upon their release from prison, few women were satisfied with their intimate relationships, though they were more likely to remain in their relationships than their male counterparts. Among women who did end their intimate relationships, acknowledgment of the role their intimate partners had played in their criminal activities caused several women to avoid beginning new relationships, again lending support to research findings suggesting the important role of women's intimate partners in their criminal offending (Cobbina 2009; Miller 1986; O'Brien 2001).

Research findings also provide support for social learning theory (Akers 1973; Burgess & Akers 1966; Sutherland 1947). Consistent with prior research implicating women's intimate partners in their criminal behaviors (Henriques & Manatu-Rupert 2001; Jones 2008; Mullins & Wright 2003; O'Brien 2001; Rafter 1990; Richie 1996; Welle & Falkin 2000), several women in the current study were induced to crime by their intimate partners, and nearly half of the men and women indicated that their weak-tie relationships provided them with criminal capital that contributed to their offending. After incarceration, many of the men and women made a conscious effort to avoid individuals with whom they shared pre-incarceration weak-tie relationships as a result of the influence those relationships had on their earlier criminal offending. This finding suggests that criminal behaviors can be learned through one's social ties, which is a primary tenet of social learning theory (Akers 1973; Burgess & Akers 1966; Sutherland 1947).

Research findings also lend support to our existing understanding of the influence of gender on patterns of childrearing. Previous research shows that women are more likely than men to assume primary childcare responsibility (Cikara et al. 2009; Hook 2010; Fletcher 1998; Martinengo et al. 2010; Poortman and Van Der Lippe 2009), and the women in this study were more likely than their male counterparts to assume responsibility for the care of their children prior to and after incarceration. Additionally, women had greater contact with their children than men during incarceration, which is consistent with patterns of gender-socialization that emphasize the importance of women in child-rearing which are outlined in the literature (West & Zimmerman 1987; Wille 1995). Also consistent with gendered patterns of social relationships established in literature which suggest that women form more emotionally intense relationships

than men (Belle 1987; Caldwell & Peplau 1982; Ross & Mirowsky 1989; Stokes & Wilson 1984; Turner & Marino 1994), the relationships women in the present study shared with relatives during incarceration were more emotionally intense than those described by men, and even though women described poorer quality relationships with relatives after incarceration, they were more likely than men to continue the relationships.

Although to a lesser extent, experiences within men and women's weak-tie relationships were also shaped by gender in ways described in the literature. While in prison, one woman experienced sexual assault by a male prison guard, and prior research suggests that sexual violence overwhelmingly affects women (Bureau of Justice Statistics 1995; World Health Organization 2005). Several men in the present study perpetrated violence against co-inmates and prison staffers, and their reports of violence were consistent with research suggesting that men may act violently toward others as a means of achieving masculine ideals or regaining power that has been lost (Kahn 1984; Katz 1995). Finally, when describing relationships with parole officers, women focused on emotional intimacy, whereas men focused on instrumental support, which is reflective of patterns of gender socialization outlined in the literature (Barbee et a. 1993; Bell 1991).

Finally, findings from the study lend support to social control theory (Hirschi 1969; Sampson & Laub 1992; 1993). Prior to incarceration, patterns of drug abuse exhibited by many of the men and women in the study meant that several men and women did not share relationships with relatives and that the familial relationships they did have were not always close. Additionally, abuse within their pre-incarceration intimate relationships weakened the bonds the men and women shared with their intimate partners. During and after incarceration,

shifts in strong- and weak-tie relationships increased the number of supportive relationships the men and women in the study had, and these relationships acted as a form of social control that led to crime desistance because men and women did not want to disappoint their social ties by reoffending. In this way, pro-social bonds after prison release acted as a form of social control and contributed to desistance from crime for many of the men and women in this study, which is consistent with the assumptions of social control theory (Hirschi 1969; Sampson & Laub 1992; 1993; 2001).

Although several findings about the influence of gender on social tie composition were consistent with literature about gender and social ties in general, findings from the present study also add to the current body of knowledge about the influence of gender on the composition of parolees' social ties. First, although a significant body of literature regarding gender and social tie composition in general has been amassed, the influence of gender on the social ties of incarcerated and paroled individuals has been ignored in previous research. The current study adds to the existing body of literature by showing that in most ways, the social ties of incarcerated men and women and parolees are influenced by gender in the same way as are the social ties of law abiding citizens. Indeed, the women in this study had a greater number and variety of strong-tie relationships than their male counterparts, who had more weak-tie relationships at every time period, which is a pattern also seen in research on law-abiding individuals (Dunbar & Spoors 1995; Eby & Allen 2012; Fischer & Oliker 1983; McPherson et al. 2006; Marsden 1987; Moore 1990). However, an important distinction emerges with regard to women's during- and post-incarceration weak-tie relationships. Data analysis showed that incarceration creates a rare opportunity for women and men to build similar numbers and types

of weak-tie relationships, and that these relationships may continue after incarceration so that there are fewer differences in male and female parolees' post-incarceration weak-tie relationships than might have otherwise existed, based on literature suggesting that their greater participation in the public sphere provides men greater opportunities than women to form weak-tie relationships (Cikara et al. 2009; Fletcher 1998; Hook 2010; Martinengo et al. 2010; Poortman and Van Der Lippe 2009).

Second, findings from the present study about gender-based differences in social ties expand on the current understanding of the influence of women's intimate partners on their criminal offending. Specifically, data from the current study shows that among female parolees who acknowledge the role of their intimate partners in their offending, an effort was made to end the relationship and avoid a similar future influence. Although previous research implicates women's intimate partners in their offending (Henriques & Manatu-Rupert 2001; Jones 2008; Mullins & Wright 2003; O'Brien 2001; Rafter 1990; Richie 1996; Welle & Falkin 2000), it does not show the aftermath of these relationships. More specifically, previous research has failed to illustrate whether previously incarcerated women believe they must end their romantic relationships in order to avoid the negative influence of their intimate partners. By addressing this issue, the current study adds to the body of literature by showing a tendency of women who acknowledge the role of their intimate partners in their criminal offending to purposefully end those relationships in order to achieve successful reentry.

Gender and Resources from Social Ties

In addition to research findings about the influence of gender on the composition of parolees' social ties, findings from the current study also highlight the influence of gender on

resources available to parolees via their social ties. Prior to incarceration, women received more material and emotional support from their strong-ties than men, and the resources they received came from a greater variety of strong-tie relationships. This finding is consistent with research suggesting that women have better access to resources from strong-tie relationships than men as a result of gendered patterns of social tie composition (Wellman & Wortley 1990). Although more women than men had access to resources from their strong-tie relationships prior to incarceration, men had access to a greater variety of resources than women, providing support for the research findings suggesting that as a result of resource homogeneity in strong-tie relationships, women's greater number of strong-ties may not ultimately provide them with better access to resources (Lin 2000a). Moreover, prior to incarceration, the men and women in the study received very few resources overall from their weak-tie relationships. Although slightly more women than men had access to material and emotional support from their weak-tie relationships during this time period, more men than women overall had access to resources in the form of criminal capital as a result of these relationships, which is consistent with literature suggesting that men have greater access to resources from their social ties than women (Lin 1982; 2000; Lin & Dumin 1986; Campbell et al. 1986). After incarceration, women received material and emotional support from a smaller number of weak-tie relationships than men, and the variety of resources to which they had access as a result of these relationships was also smaller when compared to men, which is also consistent with literature suggesting that law-abiding women have limited access to resources from their social ties when compared to men (Lin 1982; 2000; Lin & Dumin 1986; Campbell et al. 1986).

In addition to its findings which are consistent with literature about the influence of gender on resources available to men and women via their social ties, the current study contributes to the current body of knowledge in several ways. First, findings from the current study show that as a result of gender-based patterns that influence offending, incarcerated men and women may not have access to resources from their social ties in the same ways as law-abiding citizens. Specifically, literature on law-abiding men and women suggests that because women have a greater number of strong-tie relationships than men (Dunbar & Spoors 1995; Fischer & Oliker 1983; McPherson et al. 2006; Marsden 1987; Moore 1990) they should have better access to material and emotional support from strong-ties (Wellman & Wortley 1990). In the current study, however, a greater number of men than women had access to tangible resources from their strong-tie relationships while in prison even though women reported more supportive relationships with relatives than men during this time period. It is possible that differences in the numbers of men and women who are incarcerated, which result from gender-based patterns of offending and create a need for fewer women's prisons overall, explain this finding. Because fewer women are incarcerated overall, there is a lesser need for women's prisons and women are usually incarcerated farther from home than men (Travis 2005); as a result, the contact women have with their social ties is limited when compared to contact men share with their social ties. Analysis of data from the present study showed that women's contact with relatives and intimate partners was less frequent than the contact men had with their strong-ties during incarceration. As a result of decreased contact with their social ties, and because frequency of contact is a defining measure of social tie strength and, by extension, willingness to provide resources (Granovetter 1982; Hurlbert et al. 2000), women's strong-ties may have been

less willing to provide resources to them than men's strong-ties. Thus, findings from the current study suggest that gendered patterns of offending result in differential access to resources for incarcerated men and women.

In addition, findings from the current study add to the extant body of literature on resources from social ties by suggesting that experiences of violence within their intimate relationships may also contribute to differences in resource availability for men and women, which is not a topic that has been explored in prior research. Literature suggests that widely held beliefs that men are providers in their relationships (Ridgeway & Correll 2004) combined with gender-based pay inequities (DiPrete & Buchmann 2006) result in women being more likely than men to receive financial support from their intimate partners and relatives during and after incarceration. In the present study, however, women were less likely than men to receive resources from their intimate partners while in prison. Prior to incarceration, nearly half of the women in the study said they experienced abuse from their partners, and several of these women remained in their abusive relationships during incarceration. It is likely that physical abuse eroded the emotional intimacy of their relationships, and because emotional intimacy is thought to be related to the strength of one's social ties (Granovetter 1973), changes in emotional intimacy may have influenced the willingness of women's intimate partners to provide resources and support to them while they were incarcerated. This finding is a notable addition to the current understanding of the influence of relationship quality--specifically, the experience of violence--on resource availability, since it indicates that relationship quality and not just the designation of strong-tie relationship is related to the willingness of one's social ties to provide resources and support.

Findings about resources available from weak-tie relationships during incarceration also add to the current body of literature by showing that the quality of weak-tie relationships is important with regard to resource availability, and that men do not have universally superior access to resources from their weak-tie relationships when compared to women. Prior research found that weak-ties are less willing than strong-ties to provide resources in general (Granovetter 1982; Hurlbert, Haines, & Beggs 2000), and that that men had better access to resources from their weak-ties than women (Gittell & Vidal 2005; Halpern 2005). However, other than a study of employment seeking that differentiated between friends and associates (Lin & Dumin 1986), prior research failed to examine the importance of the quality of weak-tie relationships in resource provision. The current study addresses this shortcoming by showing that not all weak-tie relationships are of the same quality, and that higher quality weak-tie relationships, such as those that women shared with friends and associates they met prior to incarceration, may be a better source of resources than poor quality weak-tie relationships, and that if women's weak-tie relationships are of a better quality than those experienced by men, women may have better access to resources from their weak-ties than men.

The Influence of Resources from Social Ties on Reentry Experiences

Findings from the current study are consistent with prior literature on prisoner reentry which shows that parolees' strong-tie relationships--especially those they share with relatives--are an important source of reentry resources (La Vigne et al. 2008). For most of the men and women in the current study, strong-tie relationships were the primary source of tangible resources after prison release. Strong-tie relationships were also important to the men and women's reentry experiences because they were a source of emotional support that helped them

maintain their sobriety after incarceration, made them feel accepted, and encouraged them to desist from crime during the reentry period.

In addition to findings regarding the role of parolees' social ties in providing valuable reentry resources, findings from the current study contribute to the current body of literature on prisoner reentry because they highlight the *perceived* importance of resources from strong- and weak-tie relationships on reentry experiences. Although previous research showed that parolees' social ties--especially their strong-ties--are a primary source of post-prison housing and financial support (La Vigne et al. 2008; McLean & Thompson 2007; Nelson et al. 1999; Visher et al. 2004), it failed to consider the importance placed on these resources by the parolees themselves. Analysis of data from the present study showed that nearly all of the men and women believed the resources provided to them via their social ties to have positively contributed to their reentry experiences. Thus, reliance on the perspectives of the parolees included in this study made it possible to understand whether and why they perceived the resources available to them via their social ties as important to their reentry success and, which is a notable addition to the current body of reentry literature.

Additionally, the present study expands on prior research by examining the role of resources from weak-ties on reentry experiences. Prior research on male parolees has largely ignored the role of weak-ties in resource provision (La Vigne et al. 2008; McLean & Thompson 2007; Nelson et al. 1999; Visher et al. 2004), though several studies of female parolees indicate that weak-ties are an important source of material and emotional support for women after prison release (Bui & Morash 2010; Cobbina 2009; Skeem et al. 2007; Visher & Courtney 2006). Analysis of data from the current study revealed that men viewed employment assistance and

emotional support from their weak-ties as especially important to their reentry experiences, and several men credited the support they received from their weak-tie relationships with providing them with the strength to be successful on parole. Thus, the current study contributes to the current understanding of the role of weak-ties in the provision of resources that are important to reentry by adding the experiences of men to the body of literature.

Moreover, the study findings expand on the current body of literature about prisoner reentry because they highlight the important relationship between intangible resources--such as emotional support--and reentry experiences, which has been absent from studies on men's reentry (La Vigne et al. 2008; McLean & Thompson 2007; Nelson et al. 1999; Visher et al. 2004) despite evidence from research on women's reentry (Bui & Morash 2010; Cobbina 2009; Leverentz 2006; O'Brien 2001; Visher et al 2004; Wolff & Draine 2004). More than half of the men and women in the present study said they believed the emotional support they received from their social ties was important to their reentry experiences, and more than half of the men and women believed the emotional support they received from their social ties to be equally as important as the material support they received. Thus, findings from the current study address a gap in the body of literature by showing that emotional support is an important resource for reentry success.

Finally, the current study contributes to the body of literature on prisoner reentry by showing that resources from weak-tie relationships were important to men and women's reentry experiences. Several women in the present study relied upon housing and transportation from (ex) co-inmates upon their release from prison, and weak-tie relationships were an important source of information about employment for several men during this time period. Although

strong-tie relationships were a primary source of emotional support for women, treatment peers and (ex) co-inmates helped women maintain their sobriety after incarceration, and parole officers encouraged women to desist from crime. Men also turned to treatment peers for emotional support that helped with their sobriety, and emotional support from parole officers and ministerial ties encouraged men to successfully complete their periods of parole. These findings contribute an understanding of the role of weak-ties in reentry experiences for men specifically and for men and women in general, as studies on men have failed to address the role of weak-tie relationships in desistance from crime (Horney et al. 1995; Laub et al. 1998; Sampson & Laub 1993; Warr 1998), and just a few studies on female parolees have looked at this (Arditti and Few 2006; Bui & Morash 2010; Cobbina 2009; Leverentz 2006; O'Brien 2001).

The Fluidity and Transformation of Social Ties

In addition these research contributions, findings from the current study point to the fluidity of social ties, which is an important addition to the current body of literature on social ties. Prior research on social ties (Eby & Allen 2012; Hurlbert, Haines, & Beggs 2000; McPherson et al. 2006; Moore 1990; Wellman & Wortley 1990) has relied on the rigid definitions of social ties outlined by Granovetter (1973). Specifically, Granovetter (1973) suggested that relatives, intimate partners, and best friends constitute strong-tie relationships, and that relationships with friends, acquaintances, and co-workers are weak-ties. Granovetter (1973) also suggested that the strength of a social tie is dependent upon the frequency of interaction among individuals, the emotional intensity of those interactions, and the reciprocal services they provide, but most research on social ties--including the current project--has not used these criteria for analysis, instead opting to use the simple categorizations provided by Granovetter

(Eby & Allen 2012; Hurlbert, Haines, & Beggs 2000; McPherson et al. 2006; Moore 1990; Wellman & Wortley 1990). However, analysis of study data revealed that these categories were not always appropriate. For example, relationships with relatives were always categorized as strong-tie relationships despite the fact that several men and women described these relationships in ways that were not close, lacked frequent interaction, or were not reciprocal. Likewise, friendship relationships were always characterized as weak-tie relationships, even though several women described relationships with (ex) co-inmates that were much closer, more reciprocal, or characterized by more frequent interaction than those they shared with relatives. This finding challenges rigid definitions of strong- and weak-ties and highlights a need to rely on criteria regarding quality and intensity of relationships for more accurate categorization into strong- and weak-ties.

In addition, findings from the current study highlight the potential for social ties to be transformed over time. Although research suggests that individuals maintain a range of social ties with regard to strength (Haythornwaite 2002), the potential for strong-ties to become weak-ties or weak-ties to become strong-ties is ignored in previous research. Findings from the current study, however, suggest that the strength of a social tie is not constant but that social tie strength can be transformed over time. For example, several women in the study indicated that their co-inmates started as acquaintances and then became casual friends before eventually becoming close friends; and one woman even referred to her (ex) co-inmate as her closest friend. Based on the criteria outlined by Granovetter (1973) for distinguishing between strong- and weak- tie relationships, this likely represented a transition from weak- to strong-tie relationships for the women and their (ex) co-inmates. Similarly, several men described relationships with treatment

peers and ministerial ties that would traditionally have been categorized as weak-tie relationships based on name alone, but that met the criteria outlined by Granovetter (1973) for categorization as strong-tie relationships. Thus, these findings suggest that social ties can change in strength over time and point to a need for researchers to consider the quality and intensity of a given relationship at any given time period in order to appropriately categorize it as a strong- or weak-tie relationship.

Policy Implications

Findings from the study suggest the need to help ex-prisoners maintain positive relationships during and after incarceration. Material and emotional support has been identified as an important factor in reentry success (Cullen, Wright, & Chamlin 1999), and in this study, the quality of the relationships parolees shared with their social ties was largely related to the availability of resources from the relationships. Prior to incarceration, relatives were the primary source of resources available to the men and women because physical abuse and other strains characterized their intimate relationships, and their weak-tie relationships involved high levels of substance abuse and criminal participation. Shifts in intimate relationships and the replacement of criminogenic weak-tie relationships during and after incarceration meant that the men and women in the study had better access to pro-social resources from a larger variety of their social ties upon their release from prison. Most men and women credited the resources available to them from their social ties as having had a positive role in shaping their reentry experiences. Given these patterns, programs intended to enhance the quality of inmate and parolee relationships will likely have a positive effect on the resources available to the parolees via the relationships.

To that extent, prison regulations should promote visitations to help prisoners maintain relationships with their strong- and weak-ties. Although prison inmates are granted physical visitation rights, it is not always feasible for relatives and other social ties to visit due to the cost associated with doing so (Christian 2005), distance to the correctional facility (Austin & Hardyman 2004; Schirmer, Nellis, & Mauer 2009; Travis 2005), limitations on the time or days that inmates may receive visitors (Farrell 2004), prison policies that bar visitation by anyone with a criminal background (Austin & Hardyman 2004), and, in some cases, policies requiring potential prison visitors to undergo background checks at their own expense prior to their visitation (Goode 2011). Additionally, visiting a correctional facility can be intimidating (Austin & Hardyman 2004; Sturges 2002), which may discourage people from maintaining strong bonds with their social ties. The use of videoconferencing or web-based conferencing programs such as Skype may reduce these obstacles and provide inmates with opportunities to build stronger relationships with their strong- and weak-ties, especially when used in conjunction with programs encouraging conjugal visitation that allows inmates to visit privately with relatives and intimate partners.

Programs intended to help inmates foster healthy social ties should also begin during incarceration. Many offenders come from dysfunctional families, but provided with guidance and insight, family members can be effective in giving both material and emotional support and interrupting negative behavior (Flavin, 2004). As many of the men and women in this study experienced strained family relationships due to their multiple incarcerations and experiences of abuse, family counseling and domestic violence services can improve family relationships and marital stability, which would in turn increase the availability of resources from intimate and

family relationships, as relationship quality is associated with willingness to provide resources (Hurlbert et al. 2000).

Similarly, reentry counselors should include families and intimate partners in the reentry process. When they are aware of parole conditions and details of their loved one's release, these groups may be able to help facilitate a smooth transition from incarceration to freedom. However, because many prisoners come from resource-poor families (Christian 2005), it is also important that relatives and intimate partners--as well as the returning offender--be made aware of help that is available via social service programs and community organizations. In addition, public housing authorities, which have a great deal of discretion in determining public housing admissions and occupancy (McCarty et al. 2012), should allow ex-prisoners to access subsidized housing complexes, so that they can maintain relationships with and receive housing assistance from family members who live in these facilities.

Parolees should also be encouraged to maintain pro-social relationships with (ex) co-inmates and other ties borne of the prison experience. Findings from this study indicated that weak-tie relationships were a better source of resources and support for men and women after their release from prison than they were prior to incarceration, and the weak-ties that several men and women viewed as particularly important were those with (ex) co-inmates, prison staffers, and those associated with prison ministries as a result of their own histories of incarceration. This suggests that parole rules barring contact between parolees and those with previous felony convictions (Travis & Stacey 2010) may not be universally beneficial to parole outcomes because they can limit parolees' access to some sources of pro-social resources and support.

It is also important that parolees receive support from their parole officers. Recall that men and women in this study who felt that their parole officers were emotionally supportive believed this support positively shaped that their reentry experiences, and research suggests that the belief that one's parole officer is not supportive is related to failed reentry (Skeem et al. 2007; 2003; Angell & Mahoney 2007). As several men and women in this study indicated that their parole officers were not supportive or did not appear to have enough time to spend helping them, it is important that parole officers receive training in establishing supportive relationships with parolees.

Finally, parole officers should provide their clients with information about reentry and community-based organizations that may allow them to form additional weak-tie relationships. Parole officers are a primary source of information about parole resources (Petersilia 2003) and many men and women in the study indicated that halfway houses, prison ministries, Alcoholics Anonymous, and other treatment groups were an important source of weak-tie relationships upon their release from prison. The tangible and intangible resources available to the men and women via these sources were perceived to be important with regard to their reentry success. Thus, a parole officer may be able to make a stronger contribution to his or her client's successful reentry if s/he can facilitate access to organizations that foster important weak-tie relationships.

Limitations of the Study and Directions for Future Research

Although findings from this research suggest that parolees' strong- and weak-ties contribute resources that positively shape their reentry experiences, it is important to interpret the study findings with caution and an awareness of the limitations of the study. First, there are several limitations of the study sample. Although data from this study suggest the important role

of parolees' strong- and weak-ties in providing them with resources necessary for reentry success, the small sample size of twenty-five men and twenty-five women signals the need for additional research in order to test the findings of this study and better understand the overall influence of parolees' social ties on their reentry experiences.

Additionally, the post-incarceration successes of the men and women included in the present study are markedly different than experiences shown in other incarceration literature, which suggests that parolees become more isolated and have fewer social ties as a result of their incarcerations (Haney 2001). This is likely a result of three factors: 1) men and women who failed on parole were not included in this study, 2) a self-selection bias may have led parolees who were most inclined toward positive change to participate in the research, and 3) differences in the demographic backgrounds of men and women in the study sample when compared to the general population of incarcerated and previously incarcerated men and women. To address these limitations, future research should include both successful and unsuccessful parolees and should seek participants from a broader variety of racial/ethnic, educational, and employment backgrounds so as to better understand the influence of resources from social ties on the reentry experiences of *typical* male and female parolees.

Another limitation of the study sample is the fact that validity of the data may be limited due to the sensitive nature of the interview questions, the interview setting, and the generally low position of the parolees. The responses provided by the parolees during their interviews may not have been candid, as literature suggests that research participants may be inclined to provide socially desirable answers to questions posed by researchers or that they may answer "yes" to questions without regard to their content (Ross & Mirowsky 1984). Rapport--or trust--between

research participants and the interviewer may also shape responses, as research participants may be disinclined to share sensitive information with researchers whom they do not trust (Marshall & Rossman 2010). Although several men and women disclosed illegal or risky post-incarceration behaviors during their interviews, it is possible that additional respondents chose not to disclose this information for fear of negative repercussions. Additionally, despite suggestions that allowing a research participant to select the interview location is the preferred approach (Warren 2002), interview setting may influence what a research participant feels comfortable revealing (Herzog 2005). In the present study, research participants described overwhelmingly positive relationships with parole officers and other criminal justice officials, which may have been a reflection of attempts toward social desirability, lack of trust in the confidentiality of information being shared, or discomfort with the interview location, since most interviews were conducted at the parole office--a location where parolees have relatively little power. Future research should consider alternative interview sites and make additional attempts to enhance rapport between the interviewers and research participants in order to minimize these potential problems.

The structured nature of the interview may also have limited the amount of information the men and women in the study were able to share about their relationships. Although questions about relationships were followed with a request to explain or elaborate on responses, the respondents may have felt that there was little room for them to add detail to their responses as a result of the format of the interview. Additionally, because of the structured nature of the interview, there were fewer opportunities to approach each respondent in a way that best suited

his or her history of incarceration or response style (Noor 2008). Future research should rely on a less-structured interview format in order to address these shortcomings.

A second category of study limitations is the confounding effects of other factors which were not considered. Indeed, factors such as educational attainment, employment status, or public support might have contributed to the reentry success of the men and women in this study. For example, a majority of the men (n=22) and women (n=22) in the study had at least a high school education or its equivalent, and most (eight men and twelve women) had a college education. Additionally, most of the men and women earned incomes, with fourteen men and eleven women earning above the Federal minimum wage. Relatively sufficient incomes might have enabled the men and women in this study to meet their financial needs without resorting to illegal means for generating incomes (Jurik, 1983; O'Brien, 2001). Moreover, the men and women included in this research received a variety of forms of public support upon their release from prison that may have influenced their reentry experiences. The availability of public support varies by place, and not all individuals may have the information necessary to access such resources, as was the case of several men in the study who believed that their criminal histories disallowed them from receiving any form of public assistance. It is possible that parolees who do not receive public support upon their release from prison will have different reentry experiences than those who do, and future research should examine differences among paroles who do and do not receive such support.

A final limitation of the present study is related to data analysis. Specifically, the present study fails to address the intersectionality of gender, race, social class, age, sexual orientation, or other statuses. Feminist scholarship suggests that social statuses intersect to shape experiences

(Collins 2000; Crenshaw 1991; McCall 2005), and included in this study were men and women of varied racial-ethnic backgrounds, sexual orientations, social classes, and age groups. It is likely that gender alone did not influence the social ties of the men and women in this study or the resources available to them via their social ties, and future research should address this limitation by considering the influence of these other statuses on the reentry experiences of the men and women in this study.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Agnew, Robert. 1992. "Foundation for a General Strain Theory of Crime and Delinquency." *Criminology* 30(1): 47-87.

Aguilera, Michael Bernabe. 2002. "The Impact of Social Capital on Labor Force Participation: Evidence from the 2000 Social Capital Benchmark Survey." *Social Science Quarterly* 83(3): 853-874.

Akers, Ronald L. 1973. *Deviant Behavior: A Social Learning Approach*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Altschuler, David M. and Rachel Brash. 2004. "Adolescent and Teenage Offenders confronting the Challenges and Opportunities of Reentry." *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* 2(1): 72-87.

Angell, Beth and Colleen Mahoney. 2007. "Reconceptualizing the Case Management Relationship in Intensive Treatment: A Study of Staff Perceptions and Experiences." *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research* 34: 172-188.

Anderson, Kristin L. 1997. "Gender, Status, and Domestic Violence: An Integration of Feminist and Family Violence Approaches." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 59(3): 655-669.

Antonucci, T.C. & H. Akiyama. 1987. "An Examination of Sex Differences in Social Support Among Older Men and Women." *Sex Roles* 11/12: 737-749.

Antonucci, T.C., H. Akiyama, & J.E. Lansford. 1998. "Negative Effects of Close Social Relations." *Journal of Applied Family Studies* 47: 379-384.

Arditti, Joyce A. and April L. Few. 2006. "Mothers' Reentry Into Family Life Following Incarceration." *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 17: 103-123.

Arditti, Joyce A. and April L. Few. 2008. "Maternal Distress and Women's Reentry Into Family and Community Life." *Family Process* 47(3): 303-321.

Armstrong, David, Ann Gosling, John Weinman, and Theresa Marteau. 1997. 1997. "The Place of Inter-Rater Reliability in Qualitative Research: An Empirical Study." *Sociology* 31(3): 597-606.

Auckett, R., J. Ritchie, and K. Mill. 1988. "Gender Differences in Friendship Patterns." *Sex Roles*, 19: 57-66.

Aukerman, Miriam. 2008. "Criminal Convictions as a Barrier to Employment: How Attorneys Can Help People with Records Get a Second Chance." *Michigan Bar Journal* 87(11): 32.34.

Austin, J. and P.L. Hardyman. 2004. "The Risks and Needs of the Returning Prisoner Population." *Review of Policy Research* 21(1): 13-29.

Bahr, Stephen J., Lish Harris, James K. Fisher, and Anita Harker Armstrong. 2009. "Successful Reentry: What Differentiates Successful and Unsuccessful Parolees?" *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 54(5): 667-692.

Baillargeon, Jacques, Ingrid A. Binswanger, Joseph V. Penn, Brie A. Williams, and Owen J. Murray. 2009. "Psychiatric Disorders and Repeat Incarcerations: The Revolving Prison Door." *The American Journal of Psychiatry* 166(1): 103-109.

Barbee, A.P., M.R. Cunningham, B.A. Winstead, V.J. Derlega, M.R. Gulley, P.A. Yankeelov, and P.B. Druen. 1993. "Effects of Gender-Role Expectations on the Social Support Process." *Journal of Social Issues* 49(3): 175-190.

Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law. 2001. *Finding the Key to Successful Transition from Jail to Community*. Washington, DC: Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law.

Becker, Howard S. 1953. "Becoming a Marihuana User." *American Journal of Sociology* 59(3): 235-242.

Belknap, Joanne. 1996. "Access to Programs and Health Care for Incarcerated Women." *Federal Probation* 60(4): 34-39.

Bell, R.A. 1991. "Gender, Friendship, Network Density, and Loneliness." *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality* 6: 45-56.

Belle, D. 1987. "Gender Differences in the Social Moderators of Stress." Pp. 257-277 In R.C.Barnett, L.Biener L, & G.K. Baruch (Eds.) *Gender and Stress*. New York: The Free Press.

Benjamin, J. 1988. *The Bonds of Love: Psychoanalysis, Feminism and the Problem of Domination*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Berman, J. 2005. *Women Offender Transition and Reentry: Gender Responsive Approaches to Transitioning Women Offenders from Prison to the Community*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.

Bettencourt, B.A., K.E. Dill, S.A. Greathouse, K. Charlton, & A. Mulholland. 1997. "Evaluations of Ingroup and Outgroup Members: The Role of Category-Based Expectancy Violation." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 33: 244-275.

Bian, Yanjie. 1994. *Work and Inequality in Urban China*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Bian, Yanjie. 1997. "Bringing Strong Ties Back In: Indirect Ties, Network Bridges, and Job Searches in China." *American Sociological Review* 62(3): 366-385.

Bian, Yanjie and Soon Ang. 1997. "Guanxi Networks and Job Mobility in China and Singapore." *Social Forces* 75: 981-1006.

Binswanger, Ingrid A., Marc F. Stern, Richard A. Deyo, Patrick J. Heagerty, Allen Cheadle, Joann G. Elmore, and Thomas D. Koepsell. 2007. "Release From Prison--A High Risk of Death for Former Inmates." *The New England Journal of Medicine* 356(2): 157-165.

Bloom, Barbara., Barbara Owen, and Stephanie Covington. 2003. *Gender-Responsive Strategies: Research, Practice and Guiding Principles for Women Offenders*. National Institute of Corrections Accession No. 018017. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections.

Bloom, Barbara. and D. Steinhart. 1993. *Why Punish the Children? A Reappraisal of the Children of Incarcerated Mothers in America*. San Francisco, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

Bonczar, Thomas P. 2011. *National Corrections Reporting Program: Sentence Length of State Prisoners, By Offense, Admission Type, Sex, and Race*. Retrieved January 10, 2012 (http://bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=2056)

Bonczar, Thomas P. and Lauren E. Glaze. 2011. *Probation and Parole in The United States, 2010*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Bulletin, NCJ 236019. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Bonta, James, Bessie Pang, and Suzanne Wallace-Capretta. 1995. "Predictors of Recidivism Among Incarcerated Female Offenders." *Prison Journal* 75: 227-294.

Boorman, S.A. 1975. "A Combinatorial Optimization Model for Transmission of Job Information Through Contact Networks." *Bell Journal of Economics* 6: 216-249.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. "The Forms of Capital." Pp. 241-258 in John G. Richardson (Ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. Richardson. New York: Greenwood.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Loic J.D. Wacquant. 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Brannen, Julia. 1998. "Research Note on the Study of Sensitive Topics." *The Sociological Review* 36(3): 552-563.

Brown, Marilyn. 2006. "Gender, Ethnicity, and Offending Over the Life Course: Women's Pathways to Prison in the Aloha State." *Critical Criminology* 14: 137-158.

Bui, Hoan N. and Merry Morash. 2010. "The Impact of Network Relationships, Prison Experiences, and Internal Transformation on Women's Success After Prison Release." *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 49(1): 1-22.

Bulcroft, Richard A., Dianne Cry Carmody, and Kris Ann Bulcroft. 1996. "Patterns of Parental Independence Giving to Adolescents: Variations by Race, Age, and Gender of Child." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 58(4): 866-884.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. 1995. *Violence Against Women: Estimates from the Redesigned Survey*. NCJ154348. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Burgess, Robert L. and Ronald L. Akers. 1966. "A Differential Association Reinforcement Theory of Criminal Behavior." *Social Problems* 14: 128-147.

Burnett, Ros. 1992. *The Dynamics of Recidivism*. Oxford: Centre for Criminological Research.

Burnett, Ros. 2004. "To Reoffend or Not to Reoffend? The Ambivalence of Convicted Property Offenders." Pp. 152-180 in Shadd Maruna and Russ Immarigeon (Eds.) *After Crime and Punishment: Pathways to Offender Reintegration*. Cullompton: Willan Publishing.

Bushway, S.D. and P. Reuter. 1997. "Labor Markets and Crime Risk Factors." Pp. 198-240 in Lawrence W. Sherman, Denise Gotfredon, Doris MacKenzie, and John Eck (Eds.) *In Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, and What's Promising*. Darby, PA: Diane Publishing Co.

Caldwell, M. and L. Peplau. 1982. "Sex Differences in Same Sex Friendship." *Sex Roles* 8: 721-732.

California Department of Corrections. 1997. *Prevention Parole Failure Program: An Evaluation*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Corrections.

Campbell, Karen E., Peter V. Marsden, and Jeanne S. Hurlbert. 1986. "Social Resources and Socioeconomic Status." *Social Networks* 8: 97-116.

Carli, L.L., S.J. LaFleur, and C.C. Loeber. 1995. "Nonverbal Behavior, Gender, and Influence." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68: 1030-1041.

Cave, George, Hans Bos, Fred Doolittle, and Cyril Toussaint. 1993. *Jobstart: Final Report on a Program for School Dropouts.* New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Chesney-Lind, Meda. 1989. "Girls' Crime and Woman's Place: Toward a Feminist Model of Female Delinquency." *Crime and Delinquency* 35: 5-29.

Chodorow, Nancy. 1978. *The Reproduction of Mothering*. Berkeley: University of California.

Christian, J. 2005. "Riding the Bus: Barriers to Prison Visitation and Family Management Strategies." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 25(1): 49-70.

Cikara, Mina, Tiane L. Lee, Susan T. Fiske, and Peter Glick. 2009. "Ambivalent Sexism at Home and at Work: How Attitudes Toward Women in Relationships Foster Exclusion in the Public Sphere." Pp. 444-462 in John T. Jost, Aaron C. Kay and Hulda Thorisdottir (Eds). *Social and Psychological Bases of Ideology and System Justification*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Clear, T., D.R. Rose, and J.A. Ryder. 2001. "Incarceration and Community: The Problem of Removing and Returning Offenders." *Crime and Delinquency* 47(3): 335-351.

Cobbina, Jennifer. 2009. "From Prison to Home: Women's Pathways In and Out of Crime." PhD dissertation, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, University of Missouri-St. Louis.

Coleman, D.H. and M.A. Strauss. 1986. "Marital Power, Conflict, and Violence." *Violence and Victims* 1: 141-157.

Coleman, James S. 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital." *American Journal of Sociology* 94: S95-S120.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. "It's All in the Family: Intersections of Gender, Race, and Nation." Pp. 156-176 in Uma Narayan and Sandra Harding (Eds.) *Decentering the Center:*

Philosophy for a Multicultural, Postcolonial, and Feminist World. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Cook, Judith A. and Mary Margaret Fonow. 1990. "Knowledge and Women's Interests: Issues of Epistemology and Methodology in Feminist Sociology and Research." Pp. 69-93 in J.M. Nielsen (Ed.) *Feminist Research Methods: Exemplary Readings in the Social Sciences*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Cook, Philip. 1975. "The Correctional Carrot: Better Jobs for Parolees." *Policy Analysis* 1: 11-54.

Covington, Stephanie S. 2002. "From Prison to Home: The Effect of Incarceration and Reentry on Children, Families, and Communities." Paper Presented at the From Prison to Home Conference, January 30-31, 2002, Bethesda, MD.

Covington, Stephanie. 2003. *Beyond Trauma: A Healing Journal for Women*. Center City, MN: Hazelden.

Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1991. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review* 43(6): 1241-1299.

Creswell, John W. 1998. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cullen, Francis T., John Paul Wright, and Mitchell B. Chamlin. 1999. "Social Support and Social Reform: A Progressive Crime Control Agenda." *Crime and Delinquency* 45: 188-207.

Danner, Terry.A., William.R. Blount, Ira J. Silverman, and Manuel. Vega. 1995. "The Female Chronic Offenders: Exploring Life contingency and Offense History Dimensions for Incarcerated Female Offenders." *Women and Criminal Justice* 6(2): 45-66.

Davis, Shannon N. and Theodore N. Greenstein. 2009. "Gender Ideology: Components, Predictors, and Consequences." *Annual Review of Sociology* 35: 87-105.

Denzin, Norman K. and Yvonne S. Lincoln. (Eds.). 1994. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dimen, M. 1986. *Sexual Contradictions*. New York: Macmillan.

DiPrete T.A., and C. Buchmann. 2006. "Gender-Specific Trends in the Value of Education and the Emerging Gender Gap in College Completion." *Demography* 43: 1-24.

Ditton, Paula M. 1999. *Mental Health and treatment of Inmates and Probationers*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Bulletin, NCJ 174463. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Dobash, R.P. & R.E. Dobash. 1979. *Violence Against Wives: A Case Against the Patriarchy*. New York: Free Press.

Dodge, Mary and Mark R. Pogrebin. 2001. "Collateral Costs of Imprisonment for Women: Complications of Reintegration." *The Prison Journal* 81: 42-54.

Dowden, Craig and D.A. Andrews. 1999. "What Works for Female Offenders: A Meta-Analytic Review." *Crime and Delinquency* 45: 438-452.

Duelli Klein, Renate. 1983. "How to Do What We Want to Do: Thoughts About Feminist Methodology." Pp. 88-104 in Gloria Bowles and Renate Duelli Klein (Eds.) In *Theories of Women's Studies*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Dunbar, R.I.M. and M. Spoors. 1995. "Social Networks, Support Cliques, and Kinship." *Human Nature* 6(3): 273-290.

Eagly, A.H. 1987. *Sex Differences in Social Behavior: A Social-Role Interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Eagly, A.H. and V.J. Steffen. 1984. "Gender Stereotypes Stem from the Distribution of Women and Men Into Social Roles." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 46: 735-754.

Eagly, A.H. and W. Wood. 1999. "The Origins of Sex Differences in Human Behavior: Evolved Disposition Versus Social Roles." *American Psychologist* 54: 408-423.

Ebaugh, Helen Rose Fuchs. 1988. *Becoming an Ex: The Process of Role Exit*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Eby, Lillian T. 2001. "The Boundaryless Career Experiences of Mobile Spouses in Dual-Earner Marriages." *Group and Organizational Management* 26(3): 343-368.

Eby, Lillian Turner de Tormes and Tammy D. Allen. 2012. *Personal Relationships: The Effect on Employee Attitudes, Behavior, and Well-Being*. New York: Routledge.

Edin, Kathryn and Laura Lein. 1997. *Making Ends Meet: How Single Mothers Survive Welfare and Low-Wage Work*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Elshtain, Jean Bethke. 1993. *Public Man, Private Woman*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Elwood, Sarah A. and Deborah G. Martin. 2000. "'Plaing' Interviews: Location and Scales of Power in Qualitative Research." *The Professional Geographer* 52(4): 649-657.

Erickson, Jenet Jacob, Giuseppe Martinengo, and E. Jeffrey Hill. 2010. "Putting Work and Family Experiences in Context: Differences by Family Life Stage." *Human Relations* 63(7): 955-979.

Farrall, Stephen. 2004. "Official Recorded Convictions for Probationers: The Relationship with Self Support and Supervisory Observations." *Legal and Criminological Psychology* 9: 1-11.

Farrell, D. 2004. "Correctional Facilities: Prisoners' Visitation Rights, The Effect of Overton v. Bazetta and Lawrence v. Texas." *Georgetown Journal of Gender and the Law* 5: 167-174.

Farrington, David P., Barnard Gallagher, Lynda Morley, Raymond J. St. Ledger, and Donald J. West. 1986. "Unemployment, School Leaving and Crime." *British Journal of Criminology* 26: 335-356.

Fischer, Claude & Stacey Oliker. 1983. "A Research Note on Friendship, Gender, and the Life Cycle." *Social Forces* 62: 124-132.

Flavin, Jeanne. 2004. "Employment Counseling, Housing Assistance...And Aunt Yolanda? How Strengthening Families' Social Capital Can Reduce Recidivism." *Criminology & Public Policy* 3(2): 209-216.

Fleisher, M.S. & Decker, S.H. 2001. "Going Home, Staying Home: Integrating Prison Gang Members Into the Community." *Corrections Management Quarterly* 5(1): 65-77.

Fletcher, Joyce. 1998. "Relational Practice." *Journal of Management Inquiry* 7: 136-186.

Freudenberg, Nicholas. 2006. *Coming Home From Jail: A Review of Health and Social Problems Facing US Jail Populations and of Opportunities for Reentry Interventions*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Freudenberg, Nicholas, Jessie Daniels, Martha Crum, Tiffany Perkins, and Beth E. Richie. 2005. "Coming Home From Jail: The Social and Health Consequences of Community Reentry

for Women, Male Adolescents, and Their Families and Communities." *American Journal of Public Health* 95(10): 1725-1736.

Galambos, Nancy L. 2004. "Gender and Gender Role Development in Adolescence." Pp. 233-262 in Richard M. Lerner and Laurence D. Steinberg (Eds.) *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Gaynes, Elizabeth. 2005. *Reentry: Helping Former Prisoners Return to Communities*. Baltimore, MD: Technical Assistance Resource Center, Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Gilligan, Carol. 1982. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard.

Giordano, P.C., S.A. Cernkovich, and D.D. Holland. 2003. "Changes in Friendships Relations Over the Life Course: Implications for Desistance from Crime." *Criminology* 41: 293-327.

Giordano, P.C., S.A. Cernkovich, and R.D. Schroeder. 2007. "Emotions and Crime Over the Life Course: A Neo-Meadian Perspective on Criminal Community and Change." American *Journal of Sociology* 112: 1603-1661.

Gittell, R. and A. Vidal. 2005. *Community Organizing: Building Social Capital as a Development Strategy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Glaser, Daniel. 1964. *The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System*. Indianapolis IN: Bobbs-Merrill

Glaze, Lauren. 2010. *Correctional Populations in the United States, 2009*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Bulletin, NCJ 213681.Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Glaze, Lauren E. 2011. *Correctional Population in the United States, 2010*. NCJ 236319. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Glaze, Lauren E. and Laura M. Maruschak. 2008. *Parents in Prison and their Minor Children*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Bulletin, NCJ 222984. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Glaze, Lauren E. and Thomas P. Bonczar. 2011. *Probation and Parole in the United States, 2010*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Bulletin, NCJ236019. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Goode, E. 2011. September 4. "Inmate Visits Now Carry Added Cost in Arizona." *New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/05/us/05prison.html

Goode, W. 1971. "Force and Violence in the Family." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 33: 624-636.

Gorelick, Sherry. 1991. "Contradictions of Feminist Methodology." *Gender and Society* 5(4): 459-477.

Gottfredson, Denise C. Brook W. Kearley, Stacy S. Najaka, and Carlos M. Rocha. 2007. "How Drug Treatment Courts Work: An Analysis of Mediators." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 44(1): 3-35.

Graffam, Joe, Alison Shinkfield, Barbara Lavelle, and Wenda McPherson. 2004. "Variables Affecting Successful Reintegration as Perceived by Offenders and Professionals." *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 40(1/2): 147-171.

Graham, J. and B. Bowling. 1995. *Young People and Crime*. Home Office, HORS 145. London: HMSO.

Granovetter, Mark S. 1973. "The Strength of Weak Ties." *American Journal of Sociology* 78(6): 1360-1380.

Granovetter, Mark S. 1982. "The Strength of Weak Ties: A Network Theory Revisited." Pp. 105-130 in P.V. Marsden and N.Lin (Eds.) *Social Structure and Network Analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Granovetter, Mark S. 1983. "The Strength of Weak Ties: A Network Theory Revisited." *Sociological Theory* 1(1): 201-233.

Greenfeld, Lawrence A. and Tracy L. Snell. 1999. *Women Offender*s. Bureau of Justice Statistics: Special Report, NCJ 175688. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Griffin, Marie L. and Gaylene S. Armstrong. 2003. "The Effects of Local Life Circumstances on Female Probationers' Offending." *Justice Quarterly* 20: 213-239.

Hagan, John, A.R. Gillis, and John Simpson. 1985. "The Class Structure of Gender and Delinquency: Toward a Power-Control Theory of Common Delinquent Behavior." *American Journal of Sociology* 90: 1151-1178.

Hagan, John and Bill McCarthy. 1997. *Mean Streets: Youth Crime and Homelessness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hagan, John and Juleigh Petty Coleman. 2001. "Returning Captives of the American War on Drugs: Issues of Community and Family Reentry." *Crime & Delinquency* 47(3): 352-367.

Hagan, John and Ronit Dinovitzer. 1999. "Collateral Consequences of Imprisonment for Children, Communities, and Prisoners." Pp. 121-16 in Michael Tonry and Joan Petersilia (Eds.) *Crime and Justice, Vol. 26*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Hairston, Creasie Finney. 1998. "The Forgotten Parent: Understanding the Forces that Influence Incarcerated Fathers' Relationships with Their Children." *Child Welfare* 77(5): 617-639.

Hall, Elizabeth A., Dana M. Baldwin, and Michael L. Prendergast. 2001. "Women on Parole: Barriers to Success after Substance Abuse Treatment." *Human Organizations* 60(3): 225-233.

Halpern, David. 2005. *Social Capital*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hammett, Theodore M., Cheryl Roberts, and Sofia Kennedy. 2001. "Health-Related Issues in Prisoner Reentry." *Crime & Delinquency* 47: 390-409.

Haney, Craig. 2001. "The Psychological Impact of Incarceration: Implications for Post-Prison Adjustment." Paper Presented at the From Prison to Home Conference, January 30-31, 2002, Bethesda, MD.

Hanson, Susan and Geraldine Pratt. 1991. "Job Search and the Occupational Segregation of Women." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 81: 229-253.

Harding, Sandra G. 1991. *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge? Thinking From Women's Lives*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Harlow, Caroline Wolf. 2003. *Education and Correctional Populations*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Bulletin, NCJ 195670. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Haythornwaite, Caroline. 2002. *Strong, Weak, and Latent Ties and the Impact of New Media*. The Information Society: An International Journal 18(5): 385-401.

Hebert, Tony. 2005. *The Invisible Tenant: Living in Federally Assisted Housing after Prison*. New York: Family Justice.

Hedin, Lena Widding. 2000. "Physical and Sexual Abuse Against Women and Children." *Current Opinion in Obstetrics and Gynecology* 12(5): 349-355.

Heimer, Karen. 1996. "Gender, Interaction, and Delinquency: Testing a Theory of Differential Social Control." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 59(1): 39-61.

Henriques, Zelma Weston and Norma Manatu-Rupert. 2001. "Living on the Outside: African American Women Before, During, and After Imprisonment." *The Prison Journal* 81(1): 6-19.

Herzog, Hanna. 2005. "On Home Turf: Interview Location and Its Social Meaning." *Qualitative Sociology* 28(1): 25-47.

Hirschi, Travis. 1969. *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Holtfreter, K., M.D. Reisig, and M. Morash. 2004. "Poverty, State Capital, and Recidivism Among Women Offenders." *Criminology and Public Policy* 3: 185-208.

Holzer, Harry J., Steven Raphael, and Michael A. Stoll. 2004. "Will Employers Hire Former Offenders? Employer Preferences, Background Checks, and Their Determinants." Pp. 205-246 in Bruce Western, Mary Patillo, and David F. Weiman (Eds.) *Imprisoning America: The Social Effects of Mass Incarceration*. New York: The Russell Sage Foundation.

Hook, Jennifer L. 2010. "Gender Inequality in the Welfare State: Sex Segregation in Housework, 1965-2003." *American Journal of Sociology* 115(5): 1480-1523.

Horney, Julie D., Wayne Osgood, and Ineke Haen Marshall. 1995. "Criminal Careers in the Short-Term: Intra-Individual Variability in Crime and its Relation to Local Life Circumstances." *American Sociological Review* 60(5): 655-673.

Hurlbert, Jeanne S., Valerie A. Haines, and John J. Beggs. 2000. "Core Networks and Tie Activation: What Kinds of Routine Networks Allocate Resources in Nonroutine Situations?" *American Sociological Review* 65: 598-618.

Jordan, J. and J. Surrey. 1986. "The Self-in-Relation: Empathy and the Mother Daughter Relationship." Pp. 81-104 in T. Bernay & D. Cantor (Eds.) *The Psychology of Today's Woman*. Hillsdale, NJ: The Analytic Press.

Jordan, Judith V., Alexandra G. Kaplan, Jean Baker Miller, Irene P. Stiver, and Janet L. Surrey. 1991. *Women's Growth in Connection: Writings from the Stone Center*. New York: Guilford Press.

Jorgensen, James D., Santos H. Hernandez, and Robert C. Warren. 1986. "Addressing the Social Needs of Families of Prisoners: A Tool for Inmate Rehabilitation." *Federal Probation* 50(4): 47-52.

Jones, Stephen. 2008. "Partners in Crime: A Study of the Relationship Between Female Offenders and their Co-Defendants." *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 8(2): 147-164.

Jurik, Nancy C. 1983. "The Economics of Female Recidivism." *Criminology* 21(4): 603-622.

Kahn, A.S. 1984. "The Power War: Male Response to Power Loss Underequality." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 8: 234-247.

Katz, Jason. 1995. "Reconstructing Masculinity in the Locker Room: The Mentors in Violence Prevention Project." *Harvard Educational Review* 6(2): 163-175.

Kirkpatrick, Lee A., and E. Keith Davis. 1994. "Attachment Style, Gender, and Relationship Stability: A Longitudinal Analysis." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 66(3): 505-512.

Kiser, George C. 1991. "Female Inmates and their Families." *Federal Probation* 55: 56-63.

Knight, Danica Kalling, Sarah M. Logan, and D. Dwayne Simpson. 2001. "Predictors of Program Completion for Women in Residential Substance Abuse Treatment." *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse* 27(1): 1-18.

Koons, Barbara A., John D. Burrow, Merry Morash, and Tum Bynum. 1997. "Expert and Offender Perceptions of Program Elements Linked to Successful Outcomes for Incarcerated Women." *Crime & Delinquency* 43: 512-532.

Lai, Gina Wan-foon, Nan Lin, and Shi-yin Leung. 1998. "Network Resources, Contact Resources, and Status Attainment." *Social Networks* 20(2): 159-178.

Langan, Patrick A. and David J. Levin. 2002. *Recidivism of Prisoners Released in 1994*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Bulletin, NCJ 193427.Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Laub, John H., Daniel S. Nagin, and Robert J. Sampson. 1998. "Trajectories of Change in Criminal Offending: Good Marriages and the Desistance Process." *American Sociological Review* 64: 225-38.

Laub, John H. and Robert J. Sampson. 1993. "Turning Points in the Life Course: Why Change Matters to the Study of Crime." *Criminology* 31(3): 301-325.

La Vigne, Nancy, Christy Visher, and Jennifer Castro. 2004. *Chicago Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

La Vigne, Nancy, Elizabeth Davies, Tobi Palmer, and Robin Halberstadt. 2008. *Release Planning for Successful Reentry: A Guide for Corrections, Service Providers, and Community Groups*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

La Vigne, Nancy, Samuel J. Wolf, and Jesse Jannetta. 2004. *Voices of Experience: Focus Group Findings on Prisoner Reentry in the State of Rhode Island*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

La Vigne, Nancy and Vera Kachnowski. 2005. *Texas Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home*. Washington, DC: The Urban institute.

Lee, J., D. Vlahov, and N. Freudenberg. 2006. "Primary Care and Health Insurance Among Women Released from New York City Jails." *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved* 17(1): 200-217.

Leverentz, Andrea M. 2006. "People, Places, and Things: The Social Process of Reentry for Female Ex-Offenders." PhD dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Chicago.

Liamputtong, P. and D. Ezzy. 2005. *Qualitative Research Methods*. South Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Lin, Nan. 1982. "Social Resources and Instrumental Action." Pp. 131-145 in P.V. Marsden and N. Lin (Eds.) *Social Structure and Network Analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lin, Nan. 2000. *Social Capital: A Theory of Structure and Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lin, Nan. 2000a. "Inequality in Social Capital." *Contemporary Sociology* 29(6): 785-795.

Lin, Nan and Mary Dumin. 1986. "Access to Occupations through Social Ties." *Social Networks* 8: 365-385.

Lin, Nan, Paul Dayton and Peter Greenwald. 1977. "The Urban Communication Network and Social Stratification." Pp. 107-19 in B. Ruben (Ed.) *Communication Yearbook I*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Book.

Lin, Nan, Paul Dayton and Peter Greenwald. 1987. "Analyzing the Instrumental use of Social Relations in the Context of Social Structure." *Sociological Methods and Research* 7: 149-166.

Lin, Nan, Walter M. Ensel, and John C. Vaughn. 1981. "Social Resources and Strength of Ties: Structural Factors in Occupational Status Attainment." *American Sociological Review* 46: 393-405.

Lomnitz, L. 1977. Networks and Marginality: *Life in a Mexican Shantytown*. New York: Academic Press.

Lopata, Helena Znaniecka. 1993. "The Interweave of Public and Private: Women's Challenge to American Society." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 55(1): 176-190.

Lorber, Judith. 1994. *Paradoxes of Gender*. Binghampton, NY: Yale University Press.

Lowenkamp, Christoper T. and Edward J. Latessa. 2005. "Increasing the Effectiveness of Correctional Programming Through the Risk Principle: Identifying Offenders for Residential Placement." *Criminology & Public Policy* 4(2): 263-290.

Lynch, James P. and William J. Sabol. 2001. *Prisoner Reentry in Perspective*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Mackenzie, Doris Layton and Spencer De Li. 2002. "The Impact of Formal and Informal Social Controls on the Criminal Activities of Probationers." *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency* 39(3): 243-276.

Mallar, Charles, Stuart Kerachsky, Craig Thornton, and David Long. 1982. *Evaluation of the Economic Impact of the Job Corps Program: Third Follow-Up Report*. Princeton: NJ: Mathematical Policy Research.

Mallik-Kane, Kamala and Christy A. Visher. 2008. *Health and Prisoner Reentry: How Physical, Mental, and Substance Abuse Conditions Shape the Process of Reintegration*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Marsden, Peter V. 1987. "Core Discussion Networks of Americans." *American Sociological Review* 52(1): 122-131.

Marshall, Catherine and Gretchen B. Rossman. 2010. *Designing Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Martin, D. 1976. *Battered Wives*. New York: Pocket Books.

Martinengo, Guiseppe, Jenet I. Jacob, and E. Jeffrey Hill. 2010. "Gender and the Work-Family Interface: Exploring Differences across the Family Life Course." *Journal of Family Issues 31*: 1363-1390.

Maruschak, Laura M. 2008. *Medical Problems of Prisoners*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Bulletin, NCJ 221740. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Marx, Jonathan and Kevin T. Leicht. 1992. "Formality of Recruitment to 229 Jobs: Variations by Race, Se and Job Characteristics." *Sociology and Social Research* 76: 190-196.

McCall, Leslie. 2005. "The Complexity of Intersectionality." *Signs* 30(3): 1771-1800.

McCall, Michael M. and Judith Wittner. 1991. "The Good News About Life History." Pp. 1-35 in Howard S. Becker and Michael McCall (Eds.) *Symbolic Interaction and Cultural Studies*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

McCarty, Maggie, Gene Falk, Randy Alison Aussenberg, and David H. Carpenter. 2012. *Drug Testing and Crime-Related Restrictions in TANF, SNAP, and Housing Assistance*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service R42394.

McIvor, Gill, Cathy Murray, and Janet Jamieson. 2004. "Desistance From Crime: Is It Different for Women and Girls?" Pp. 181-197 in Shadd Maruna and Russell Immariegon (Eds.) *After Crime and Punishment: Pathways to Offender Reintegration*. Portland, OR: Willan Publishing.

McLaughlin, Deirdre, Dimitrios Vagenas, Nancy A. Pachana, Nelufa Begum, and Annette Dobson. 2010. "Gender Differences in Social Network Size and Satisfaction in Adults in their 70s." *Journal of Health Psychology* 15(5): 671-679.

McLean, Rachel L., Jacqueline Robarge, and Susan G. Sherman. 2006. "Release from Jail: Moment of Crisis or Window of Opportunity for Female Detainees?" *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* 83(3): 382-393.

McLean, Rachel L. and Michael D. Thompson. 2007. *Repaying Debts*. New York: Council of State Governments Justice Center.

McMurray, Harvey L. 1993. "High Risk Parolees in Transition from Institution to Community Life." *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 19: 145-161.

McPherson, Miller and Lynn Smith-Lovin. 1982. "Women and Weak Ties: Differences by Sex in the Size of Voluntary Organizations." *American Journal of Sociology* 87(4): 883-904.

McPherson, Miller, Lynn Smith-Lovin, and James M. Cook. 2001. "Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27: 415-444.

McPherson, M., L. Smith-Lovin, and M.E. Brashears. 2006. "Social Isolation in America: Changes in Core Discussion Networks Over Two Decades." *American Sociological Review* 71: 353-375.

Mears, Daniel P. 2001. "Critical Challenges in Addressing the Mental Health Needs of Juvenile Offenders." *Justice Policy Journal* 1: 41-61.

Mears, Daniel P. and Laudan Y. Aron. 2003. *Addressing the Needs of Youth with Disabilities in the Juvenile Justice System: The Current State of Knowledge*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Merriam, S.B. 1998. *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education, 2nd Edition*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merton, Robert. 1938. "Social Structure and Anomie." *American Sociological Review* 3: 672-682.

Messerschmidt, James W. 1986. *Capitalism, Patriarchy, and Crime: Toward a Socialist Feminists Criminology*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield.

Messina, Nena, William Burdon, Garo Hagopian, and Michael Prendergast. 2006. "Predictors of Prison-Based Treatment Outcomes: A Comparison of Men and Women Participants." *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse* 32(1): 7-28.

Metraux, Stephen and Dennis P. Culhane. 2004. "Homeless Shelter Use and Re-incarceration Following Prison Release." *Criminology & Public Policy* 3(2): 139-160.

Michaels, David, Stephen R. Zoloth, Philip Alcabes. 1992. "Homelessness and Indicators of Mental Illness Among Inmates in New York City's Correctional System." *Hospital and Community Psychiatry* 43: 150-155.

Miller, Jean Baker. 1976. *Toward a New Psychology of Women*. Boston, MA: Beacon.

Miller, Eleanor M. 1986. *Street Women*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Mills, Alice. 2004. "Great Expectations? A Review of the Role of Prisoners' Families in England and Wales." Presented at the British Criminology Conference, July 6-9, Portsmouth, England.

Mills, Alice and Helen Codd. 2008. "Prisoners' Families and Offender Management: Mobilizing Social Capital." *Probation Journal* 55(1): 9-24.

Minton, Todd D. 2012. *Jail Inmates at Midyear 2011-Statistical Tables*. NCJ 237961. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of Justice.

Montgomery, James D. 1991. "Social Networks and Labor-Market Outcomes: Toward an Economic Analysis." *The American Economic Review* 81(5): 1408-1418.

Moore, Gwen. 1990. "Structural Determinants of Men's and Women's Personal Networks." *American Sociological Review* 55(5): 726-735.

Mullins, C.W. and R. Wright. 2003. "Gender, Social Networks, and Residential Burglary." *Criminology* 41(3): 813-839.

Mumola, Christopher J. 2000. *Incarcerated Parents and Their Children*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Bulletin, NCJ 182335. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Mumola, Christoper J. and Jennifer C. Karberg. 2006. *Drug Use and Dependence, State and Federal Prisoners, 2004*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Bulletin, NCJ 213530. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Munch, Allison, J. Miller McPherson, and Lynn Smith-Lovin. 1997. "Gender, Children, and Social Contact: The Effects of Childrearing for Men and Women." *American Sociological Review* 62: 509-520.

Naser, Rebecca L. and Christy A. Visher. 2006. "Family Members' Experience with Incarceration and Reentry." *Western Criminology Review* 7(2): 20-31: 2006.

National Academies. 2007. *Services and Programs for Releasees*. Washington, DC: National Research Council.

Nelson, Marta and Jennifer Trone. 2000. "Why Planning for Release Matters." *Issues in Brief*. New York: Vera Institute.

Nelson, Marta, Perry Deess, and Charlotte Allen. 1999. *The First Month Out: Post-Incarceration Experience in New York City*. New York: Vera Institute of Justice.

New York State Bar Association. 2006. *Executive Summary. Re-entry and Reintegration: The Road to Public Safety*. Albany, NY: New York State Bar Association.

Noor, Khairul Baharein Mohd. 2008. *Case Study: A Strategic Research Methodology*. American Journal of Applied Sciences 5(11): 1602-1604.

O'Brien, Patricia. 2001. "'Just Like Baking a Cake': Women Describe the Necessary Ingredients for Successful Reentry After Incarceration." *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services* 82(3): 287-295.

O'Brien, Patricia and Diane S. Young. 2006. "Challenges for Formerly Incarcerated Women: A Holistic Approach for Assessment." *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services* 87(3): 359-366.

O'Brien, Patricia and Nancy Leem. 2006. "Moving From needs to Self-Efficacy: A Holistic System for Women in Transition From Prison." *Women & Therapy* 29(3/4): 261-284.

Oetzel, John, Bonnie Duran, Yizhou Jiang, and Julie Lucero. 2007. "Social Support and Social Undermining as Correlates for Alcohol, Drug, and Mental Disorders in American Indian Women Presenting for Primary Care at an Indian Health Service Hospital." *Journal of Health Communication* 12(2): 187-206.

Office of Justice Programs. 2011. "What is Reentry?" Retrieved January 10, 2012 (http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/evaluation/program-corrections/reentry1.htm).

Ohlin, Lloyd E. 1954. "The Stability and Validity of Parole Experience Tables." PhD dissertation. Department of Sociology, University of Chicago.

Orr, Larry L., Howard S. Bloom, Stephen H. Bell, Fred Doolittle, Winston Lin, and George Cave. 1996. "Does Training for the Disadvantaged Work? Evidence from the National JTPA and the Distribution of Crime." *American Journal of Sociology* 94: 803-831.

Owen, Barbara and Barbara Bloom. 1995. "Profiling Women Prisoners: Findings from National Surveys and a California Sample." *The Prison Journal* 75(2): 165-185.

Owen, B. 1998. *"In the Mix": Struggle and Survival in Women's Prison*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Pawasarat, John. 2007. *Barriers to Employment: Prison Time*. Milwaukee, WI: Employment and Training Institute, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

Pelissier, Bernadette and Nicole Jones. 2005. "A Review of Gender Differences Among Substance Abusers." *Crime & Delinquency* 51(3): 343-372.

Petersilia, Joan 2001. "When Prisoners Return to Communities." *Federal Probation* 65(1): 3-8.

Petersilia, Joan 2003. *When Prisoners Come Home: Parole and Prisoner Reentry*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Petersilia, Joan. 2004. "What Works in Prisoner Reentry? Reviewing and Questioning the Evidence." *Federal Probation* 68(2): 4-8.

Piliavin, Irving and Rosemary Gartner. 1982. *The Impact of Supported Work on Ex-Offenders*. New York: Institute for Research on Policy and Mathematica Policy Research.

Pleck, Joseph H. 1995. "The Gender Role Strain Paradigm: An Update." Pp. 11-32 in Ronald F. Levant and William S. Pollack (Eds.) *A New Psychology of Men*. New York: Basic Books.

Pogorzelski, Wendy, Nancy Wolff, Ko-Yu Pan, and Cynthia L. Blitz. 2005. "Behavioral Health Problems, Ex-Offender Reentry Policies, and the "Second Chance Act." *American Journal of Public Health* 95(10): 1718-1724.

Poortman, Anne-Right and Tanja Van Der Lippe. 2009. "Attitudes Toward Housework and Child Care and the Gendered Division of Labor." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 71(3): 526-541.

Popielarz, Pamela A. 1999. "(In)Voluntary Association: A Multilevel Analysis of Gender Segregation of Voluntary Associations." *Gender & Society* 13: 234-250.

Putnam, Robert. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Rafter, N. 1990. *Partial Justice: Women, Prisons and Social Control, 2nd Edition*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Regerstein, Marsha, Jack A. Meyer, and Jennifer Dickemper Hicks. 1998. "Job Prospects for Welfare Recipients: Employers Speak Out." *New Federalism: Issues and Options for States A-25*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Reinharz, S. 1992. *Feminist Methods in Social Research*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Richie, Beth E. 1996. *Compelled to Crime: The Gender Entrapment of Battered Black Women*. New York: Routledge.

Richie, Beth E. 2001. "Challenges Incarcerated Women Face as They Return to Their Communities: Findings From Life History Reviews." *Crime & Delinquency* 47: 368-389.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. and Shelley J. Correll. 2004. "Unpacking the Gender System: A Theoretical Perspective on Gender Beliefs and Social Relations." *Gender and Society* 18(4): 510-531.

Rindfuss, R.R. and Stephen E.H. 1990. "Separation Does Not Make the Heart Grow Fonder." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 52: 259-270.

Roberts, S.G.B., S. Wilson, R. Fedurek, and R.I.M. Dunbar. 2008. "Individual Differences and Personal Social Network Size and Structure." *Personality and Individual Differences* 44: 954-964.

Roberts, Sam G.B., Robin I.M. Dunbar, Thomas V. Pollet, and Toon Kuppens. 2009. "Exploring Variation in Social Network Size: Constraints and Ego Characteristics." *Social Networks* 31: 138-146.

Roman, Caterina Gouvis and Jeremy Travis. 2004. *Taking Stock: Housing, Homelessness, and Prisoner Reentry*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Rose, A.J. and K.D. Rudolph. 2006. "A review of Sex Differences in Peer Relationship Processes: Potential Trade-Offs for the Emotional and Behavioral Development of Girls and Boys." *Psychological Bulletin* 132: 89-131.

Ross, C.E. and J. Mirowsky. 1984. "Socially-Desirable Response and Acquiescence in a Cross-Cultural Survey of Mental Health." Journal of Health and Social Behavior 25(2): 189-197.

Ross, C.E. and J. Mirowsky. 1989. "Explaining the Social Patterns of Depression: Control and Problem Solving--Or Support and Talking." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 30: 206-219.

Rossman, Shelli B. and Caterina Gouvis Roman. 2003. "Case-Managed Reentry and Employment: Lessons From the Opportunity to Succeed Program." *Justice Research and Policy* 5(2): 75-100.

Rossman, Shelli, Sanjeev Sridharan, Caterina Gouvis, Janeen Buck., and Elaine Morley. 1999. *Impact of the Opportunity to Success (OPTS) Aftercare Program for Substance-Abusing Felons: Comprehensive Final Report*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Rountree, Pamela Wilcox and Barbara D. Warner. "Social Ties and Crime: Is the Relationship Gendered?" *Criminology* 37(4): 788-814.

Rowe, J. 2002. "Survival Strategies of the Homeless and Drug Dependent: 'Don't Wander Around in Bare Feet'--The Squatting Experience." Paper Presented at Conference of Australian Institute of Criminology. Melbourne 6-7 May.

Rumgay, Judith. 2004. "Scripts for Safer Survival: Pathways Out of Female Crime." *The Howard Journal* 43(4): 405-419.

Sabol, William J. and Heather C. West. 2011. *Prisoners in 2009*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Bulletin, NCJ 231675. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Sampson, Robert J. and John H. Laub. 1990. "Crime and Deviance Over the Life Course: The Salience of Adult Social Bonds." *American Sociological Review* 55: 609-627.

Sampson, Robert T. and John H. Laub. 1992. "Crime and Deviance in the Life Course." *Annual Review of Sociology* 18: 63-84.

Sampson, Robert J. and John H. Laub. 1993. *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points through Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sampson, Robert J. and John H. Laub. 2001. "Understanding Desistance from Crime." *Crime and Justice* 28: 1-69.

Samuels, Paul and Debbie Mukamal. 2004. *After Prison: Roadblocks to Reentry: A Report on State Legal Barriers Facing People With Criminal Records*. New York: Legal Action Center.

Schirmer, S., A. Nellis, and M. Mauer. 2009. *Incarcerated Parents and their Children: Trends 1991-2007*. Washington, D.C.: The Sentencing Project.

Schram, Pamela J., Barbara A. Koons-Witt, Frank P. Williams III, and Marilyn D. McShane. 2006. "Supervision Strategies and Approaches for Female Parolees: Examining the Link Between Unmet Needs and Parole Outcome." *Crime & Delinquency* 52(3): 450-471.

Schroeder, Ryan D., Peggy C. Giordano, and Stephen A. Cernkovich. 2007. "Drug Use and Desistance Processes." *Criminology* 45(1): 191-122.

Sharp, Susan F. and M. Elaine Eriksen. 2003. "Imprisoned Mothers and Their Children." Pp.119-136 in Barbara H. Zaitzow and Jim Thomas (Eds.) *Women in Prison: Gender and Social Control*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Reinner Publishers.

Sherman, Lawrence W., Denise C. Gottfredson, Doris L. MacKenzie, John Eck, Peter Reuter, and Shawn D. Bushway. 1998. *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*. National Institute of Justice: Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Shinkfield, Alison J. and Joseph Graffam. 2009. "Community Reintegration of Ex-Prisoners: Type and Degree of Change in Variables Influencing Successful Reintegration." *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 53: 29-42.

Simons, Ronald L., Eric Stewart, Leslie C. Gordon, Rand D. Conger, and Glen H. Elder Jr. 2002. "A Test of Life-Course Explanations for stability and Change in Antisocial Behavior from Adolescence to Young Adulthood." *Criminology* 40: 401-434.

Six, Perri 1997. *Escaping Poverty: From Safety Nets to Networks of Opportunity*. London: Demos.

Skeem, Jennifer L., Jennifer Eno Louden, Devon Polasheck, and Jacqueline Camp. 2007. "Assessing Relationship Quality in Mandated Community Treatment: Blending Care With Control." *Psychological Assessment* 19: 397-410.

Skeem, Jennifer L., Jennifer Eno Louden, Sarah Manchak, Sarah Vidal, and Eileen. Haddad. 2009. "Social Networks and Social Control of Probationers with Co-Occurring Mental and Substance Abuse problems." *Law and Human Behavior* 33: 122-135

Skeem, Jennifer L., John Encandela, and Jennifer Eno Louden. 2003. "Perspectives on Probation and Mandated Mental Health Treatment in Specialized and Traditional Probation Departments." *Behavioral Sciences & the Law* 21: 429-458.

Slaught, E. 1999. "Family and Offender Treatment Focusing on the Family in the Treatment of Substance Abusing Criminal Offenders." *Journal of Drug Education* 19(1): 53-62.

Smart, Carol. 1976. *Women, Crime, and Criminology: A Feminist Critique*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Smith, Dorothy. 1990. *Texts, Facts, and Femininity: Exploring the Relations of Ruling*. New York: Routledge.

Snyder, Howard N. 2004. "An Empirical Portrait of the Youth Reentry Population." *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* 2(1): 39-55.

Sobell, Linda C., Mark B. Sobell, Tony Toneatto, Gloria I. Leo. 1993. "What Triggers the Resolution of Alcohol Problems Without Treatment?" *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research* 17: 217-224.

Sprengers, Maarten, Fritz Tazelaar, and Hendrik Derk Flak. 1998. "Social Resources, Situational Constraints, and Reemployment." *Netherlands Journal of Sociology* 24: 98-116.

Stack, C.B. 1974. *All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community*. New York: Harper & Row.

Stand Up for What's Right and Just (SURJ). 2007. *Ex-Offender Reentry in Delaware: A Report of the Delaware Reentry Roundtable*. Wilmington, DE: Stand Up for What's Right and Just.

Stanko, Elizabeth A. 1985. *Intimate Intrusions: Women's Experience of Male Violence*. NCJ 101603. Washington, DC: US Bureau of Justice.

Stanton-Tindall, Michelle, David Royse, and Carl. Leukfield. 2007. "Substance Use, Criminality, and Social Support: An Exploratory Analysis With Incarcerated Women." *American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse* 33: 237-243.

Stark, E. & A.H. Flitcraft. 1996. *Women at Risk: Domestic Violence and Women's Health*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stokes, J.P. and D.G. Wilson. 1984. "The Inventory of Socially Supportive Behaviors: Dimensionality, Predictions, and Gender Differences." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 12: 53-69.

Strauss, Anselm. 1987. *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Strauss, Anselm and Juliet Corbin. 1990. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. New York: Sage Publications.

Sturges, J.E. 2002. "Visitation at County Jails: Potential Policy Implications." *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 13(1): 32-45.

Sullivan, Mercer L. 1989. *Getting Paid--Youth Crime and Work in the Inner City*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Sullivan, Mercer L. 2004. "Youth Perspectives on the Experience of Reentry." *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* 2(1): 56-71.

Sutherland, Edwin H. 1947. *Principles of Criminology, Fourth Edition*. Philadelphia, PA: J.B. Lippincott.

Swigonski, Mary E. 1993. "Feminist Standpoint Theory and the Questions of Social Work Research." *Affilia* 8(2): 171-183.

Swift, C. 1987. "Women and Violence: Breaking the Connection." Wellesley, MA: Stone Center for Developmental Services and Studies.

Tamres, Lisa K., Denise Janicki, and Vicki S. Helgeson. 2002. "Sex Differences in Coping Behavior: A Meta-Analytic Review and an Examination of Relative Coping." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 6(1): 2-30.

Tennessee Department of Corrections. 2010. *Tennessee Department of Corrections Recidivism Study 2001-2007*. Nashville, TN: Tennessee Department of Corrections, Policy, Planning and Research Unit.

Thompson, Edward H. and Joseph E. Pleck. 1995. "Masculinity Ideologies: A Review of Research Instrumentation on Men and Masculinities." Pp. 129-163 in Ronald F. Levant and William S. Pollack (Eds.) *A New Psychology of Men*. New York: Basic Books.

Travis, Jeremy. 2005. *But They All Come Back: Facing the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

Travis, Lawrence F. and James Stacey. 2010. "A Half Century of Parole Rules: Conditions of Parole in the United States." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 38: 604-608.

Turner, R.J. and F. Marino. 1994. "Social Support and Social Structure: A Descriptive Epidemiology." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 35: 193-212.

Uggen, Christopher. 2000. "Work as a Turning Point in the Life Course of Criminals: A Duration Model of Age, Employment, and Recidivism." *American Sociological Review* 65(4): 529-546.

Uggen. Christoper, Sara Wakefield, and Bruce Western. 2005. "Work and Family Perspectives on Reentry." Pp. 209-243 in Jeremy Travis and Christy Visher (Eds.) *Prison Reentry and Public Safety*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Van Voorhis, Patricia., Emily J. Salisbury, Emily Wright, and Ashley Bauman. 2008. *Achieving Accurate Pictures of Risk and Identifying Gender Responsive Needs: Two New Assessments for Women Offenders*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Visher, Christy, Sara Debus, and Jennifer Yahner. 2008. *Employment After Prison: A Longitudinal Study of Releasees in Three States.* Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Visher, Christy, Demelza Baer, and Rebecca Naser. 2006. *Ohio Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Visher, Christy, Nancy G. La Vigne, and Jeremy Travis. 2004. *Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Visher, Christy and Shannon Courtney. 2006. *Cleveland Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Volker, Beate and Henk Flap. 1999. "Getting Ahead in the GDR: Social Capital and Status Attainment Under Communism." *Acta Sociologica* 41: 17-34.

Walters, Marianne, Betty Carter, Peggy Papp, & Olga Silverstein. 1991. *The Invisible Web: Gender Patterns in Family Relationships*. New York: Guilford Press.

Wantanbe, Shin. 1987. "Job-Searching: A Comparative Study of Male Employment Relations in the United States and Japan." Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA.

Warr, Mark. 1998. "Life-Course Transitions and Desistance From Crime." *Criminology* 36(2): 183-216.

Warren, C.A.B. 2002. "Qualitative Interviewing." Pp. 83-101 in J.F. Gubrium and J.A. Holstein (Eds.) *Handbook of Interview Research: Context & Method*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Webster, R., C. Hedderman, P.J. Turnbull, and T. May. 2001. *Building Bridges to Employment for Prisoners (Home Office Research Study 226)*. London: The Communication and Development Unit, Home Office.

Welle, Dorinda and Gregory Falkin. 2000. "Everyday Policing of Women with Romantic Codefendants: An Ethnographic Perspective." *Women and Criminal Justice* 11(2): 45-65.

Wellman, B. and S. Wortley. 1990. "Different Strokes for Different Folks: Community Ties and Social Support." *American Journal of Sociology* 96: 558-588.

West, Candace & Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender and Society* 1(2): 125-151.

Wille, Diane E. 1995. "The 1990s: Gender Differences in Parenting Roles." *Sex Roles* 33 (11/12): 803-817.

Winquist, L.A., C.D. Mohr, & D.A. Kenny. 1998. "The Female Positivity Effect in the Perception of Others." *Journal of Research in Personality* 32: 370-388.

Wolff, Nancy and Jeffrey Draine. 2004. "Dynamics of Social Capital of Prisoners and Community Reentry: Ties that Bind?" *Journal of Correctional Health Care* 10(3): 457-490.

World Health Organization. 2005. *Addressing Violence Against Women and Achieving the Millennium Development Goals*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.

Yllo, K. 1993. "Through a Feminist Lens: Gender, Power, and Violence." Pp. 47-62 in R.J. Gellese & D.R. Loseke (Eds.) *Current Controversies on Family Violence*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Zamble, E. and V.L. Quinsey. 1997. *The Criminal Recidivism Process*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW GUIDES

I - DEMOGRAPHICS

1. How old are you? _____
2. Your race [OBSERVE OR ASK INDIRECTLY]
   a. White
   b. African American
   c. Other (specify)_____
3. Your /ethnicity [OBSERVE OR ASK INDIRECTLY]
   a. Hispanic/Latino
   b. Non-Hispanic/Latino
4. Where were you born?
   a. In the US.
   b. Other country (specify): _____
5. What is your legal status
   a. US citizen
   b. US permanent resident
   c. Legal alien
   d. [DO NOT ASK] None of the above.
6. What is your religion?
   a. Christian (specify)
   b. Muslim
   c. Other
   d. None
   e. Don't know or unsure.
7. How much education have you completed?
   a. Less than high school
   b. High school
   c. Two years college or vocational training beyond high school, but no college degree.
   d. Two years college with a degree.
   e. Four year college, but no degree.
   f. Four year college degree and beyond.
   g. Other (specify) _____
8. Besides education, have you completed any training? (describe)
9. Did your education or training prepare you for a particular kind of vocation or professional job?
   a. Yes
   b. No [explain]
10. [IF HE WAS NOT BORN IN THE US] How good is your English?
   a. Excellent
   b. Good.
   c. Many problems

11. Are you working now?
    a. Yes.
    b. No [explain]
12. If yes, what type of job? [describe the job, such as truck driver, cook, waiter, etc.]
13. What is your yearly (or monthly) income earned from work, including all informal sources of income, such as mowing lawns? _____
14. What are other sources of financial support and assistance?
    a. Public assistance, including cash and food stamps.
    b. Public housing.
    c. WIC.
    d. Child support.
    e. Money from your children or other relatives.
    f. Social security (SSI).
    g. Disability.
    h. Other (specify) _____
15. What is your current housing type?
    a. Public housing (under your name)
    b. Apartment – house – condo (you rent)
    c. Apartment – house – condo (you own)
    d. Other (specify): _____
16. Housing arrangement: who are you currently living with? [mark all that apply]
    a. Wife/girlfriend
    b. Children
    c. Parents
    d. Friends
    e. Other (specify): _____
17. How would you describe the neighborhood where you are living? [probe on whether the neighborhood is safe, unsafe, or plagued with crime]
18. What is your (current) marital status?
    a. Married (living with wife)
    b. Married (does not live with wife)
    c. Never married, but have a live-in girlfriend
    d. Divorced and have a live-in girlfriend
    e. Divorced and no live-in girlfriend
    f. Other (specify): _____
19. How many children do you have?_____
    a. Number of children under 18_____
    b. Do you have custody of your children [under 18]?
        - Yes – How many? _____. How many of them live with you? _____
        - No – How many? _____. Where do they live? (specify)
    c. Number of children 18 or older: _____
    d. Do you live with them?
        - Yes

- No – Where do they live? (specify)

II - PRE-INCARCERATION EXPERIENCE

Could you tell me about your life before prison?

20. How much education did you complete before you were incarcerated for the first time?
    a. Less than high school
    b. High school
    c. Two years college or vocational training beyond high school, but no college degree.
    d. Two years college with a degree.
    e. Four year college, but no degree.
    f. Four year college degree and beyond.
    g. Other (specify): _____
21. Did you have any training?
    a. No
    b. Yes [describe]
22. What was your marital status prior to your [first] incarceration?
    a. Married (lived with wife)
    b. Married (did not live with wife)
    c. Never married, but had a live-in girlfriend
    d. Divorced and had a live-in girlfriend
    e. Divorced and no live-in girlfriend
    f. Other (specify): _____
23. Was there any abuse in your relationship prior to your first incarceration?
    a. No
    b. Yes [ask the respondent to describe how serious the abuse was]
24. If there was abuse in your relationship, did you or your partner seek help to avoid abuse?
    a. No [ask the respondent to explain why they did not seek help]
    b. Yes [describe type of help sought and received]
25. How many children did you have prior to your [first] incarceration?_____
26. How many of them were under 18?_____ Did they live with you?
    a. Yes.
    b. No (ask where they lived and with whom)
27. How many children were 18 or older? _____ Did they live with you?
    a. Yes.
    b. No (ask where did they live and with whom)
28. Did you work prior to your [first] incarceration?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes
        - [describe the job, such as truck driver, cook, waiter, etc.].
        - On the average, how many hours did you work per week: _____
        - Months of employment: _____
        - Income from work [weekly or monthly income]: _____

c. What was the job that provided the highest level of income prior to your first incarceration (ask for the earnings from the job)?

29. What were other sources of financial support and assistance prior to your first incarceration? [mark all that apply]
    a. Public assistance, including cash and food stamps.
    b. Public housing.
    c. WIC.
    d. Child support.
    e. Money from your children or other relatives.
    f. Social security (SSI).
    g. Disability.
    h. Other (specify): _____
30. Did you experience mental health problems prior to your first incarceration?
    a. No
    b. Yes [ask the respondent to describe his mental illness]
    c. If yes, did you receive any treatment for your mental illness? [ask the respondent to describe her experience with treatment, what kind of treatment, and where did he receive the treatment].
31. Did you use drugs prior to your [first] incarceration?
    a. No
    b. Yes
        - What type of drugs did you use?
        - How old were you when you first used drugs?_____
        - How often did you use drugs?
        - Did you receive any drug treatment? What kind?
        - Did you break laws under the influence of drugs or alcohol? Explain.
32. How many times were you arrested **prior to the most recent incarceration? _____**
    a. For what offenses/reasons?
        - First arrest:
        - Second arrest:
        - Third arrest:
        - Other:
33. How old were you when you were arrested for the first time?_____
34. How many times were you convicted **prior to the most recent conviction**?_____
    a. For what offenses?
        - First conviction:_____
        - Second conviction:_____
        - Third conviction:_____
        - Other:_____
35. How old were you when you received the first conviction as adult?_____
36. Besides incarceration, did you receive other types of sentence?
    a. No

   b. Yes [describe]
37. How many times were you sentenced to **probation**?_____
   a. For what offenses?
      - First time probation:_____
      - Second time probation:_____
38. How many times were you sent to prison or jail, **including the most recent incarceration**?_____
   a. For what offenses/reasons (e.g., probation or parole violations)?
      - First incarceration:_____
      - Second incarceration:_____
      - Third incarceration:_____
      - Other: _____
39. Prior to your incarceration, how was your relationship with [describe the relationship as good, supportive, or strained, exploitative, etc.]
   a. Your wife/partner
   b. Relatives
   c. Friends
   d. Social worker
   e. Clergy
   f. Neighbors
   g. Other:
40. What types of resources and support did you receive from:
   a. Your wife/partner
   b. Relatives
   c. Friends
   d. Social worker
   e. Clergy
   f. Neighbors
   g. Other:
41. How important was the support from these people?
42. Did any persons in your personal network engage in criminal activity?
   a. No
   b. Yes [describe what kind of criminal activity]
43. Did you participate in
   a. Church groups
      - No
      - Yes (how often, length of membership)
   b. Civic organizations
      - No
      - Yes (how often, length of membership)
   c. Organized clubs (specify)
      - No

- Yes (how often, length of membership)

44. Did you receive
    a. Housing assistance
        - No
        - Yes [type and length of support]
    b. Job placement service
        - No
        - Yes [types of job]
    c. Education and vocational training
        - No
        - Yes [types of service]
    d. mental health treatment
        - No
        - Yes [type and length of treatment]
    e. Drug treatment
        - No
        - Yes [type and length of treatment]
    f. domestic violence services
        - No
        - Yes [type and length of service]
    g. Social work and family court services
        - No
        - Yes [Types and length of service]
45. Was it easy to obtain these community resources?
46. What made it difficult to obtain these community resources?
47. How important were these community resources to your life?

III - PREVIOUS INCARCERATION EXPERIENCE

Now, I would like to learn about your previous incarceration experience.

48. How old were you when you were incarcerated for the first time?_____
49. How long were these incarcerations?
    a. The first: _____
    b. The second: _____
    c. The third:_____
    d. The fourth:_____

(If there is only one incarceration skip and move to Section V)

50. Back then, did you receive education and vocational training in prison?
    a. No [explain – e.g., you were not interested, or training was not available]
    b. Yes [describe the education and vocational training]
51. Did you work in prison?

a. No [explain]
b. Yes
   - Types of work:
   - Hours of work per day:_____
   - Total time of work in prison (months or weeks):_____
   - How much was the work compensation? _____

52. Did you have contact with your wife/partner while you were in prison?
    a. None applicable (no wife/partner)
    b. No [explain]
    c. Yes [describe the types of contact, such as in person, mail, telephone, etc.; how often; the nature of the contact, such as warm, supportive, or strained).
53. Did your wife/partner provide you with material or emotional support?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe the type of material or emotional support]
54. Did you have contact with your children while you were incarcerated?
    a. None applicable (no children)
    b. No [explain]
    c. Yes [describe the types of contact, such as in person, mail, telephone, etc.; how often; the nature of the contact, such as warm, supportive, or strained).
55. Did your children provide you with material or emotional support?
    a. No [Explain]
    b. Yes [describe the type of material or emotional support]
56. Who lived with your children while you were in prison? [describe children's living arrangement]
57. Did you have contact with other family members or friends while you were incarcerated?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe the types of contact, such as in person, mail, telephone, etc.; how often; the nature of the contact, such as warm, supportive, or strained).
58. Did other family members and friends provide you with material or emotional support?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe the type of material or emotional support]
59. How were your contact and relationships with other inmates in prison?
60. Did other inmates provide you with emotional and material or emotional support while you were in prison?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe]
61. How were your contact and relationships with the prison staff while you were in prison?
62. Did they provide you with emotional and material or emotional support?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe].
63. How was your contact with clergymen in prison?
64. Did they provide you with emotional and material or emotional support?

a. No [explain]
b. Yes [describe]

65. Did you receive mental health treatment in prison?
    a. N/A (no mental health problem)
    b. No (mental health problem, but no treatment)
    c. Yes [describe]
66. Did you receive psychological counseling in prison?
    a. N/A (no need for counseling)
    b. No
    c. Yes [describe]
67. Did you receive drug treatment in prison?
    a. N/A (no drug problem)
    b. No (drug problems but no treatment)
    c. Yes [describe]
    d. Overall, what were negative effects of prison on your life (family, job, heath, etc)?
    e. What were positive effects of prison on your life (family, job, heath, etc)?

IV - PREVIOUS PAROLE EXPERIENCE

(If there is only one incarceration, skip and move to section VI)

Now, Could you tell me what happened when you were released from prison?

68. Where did you live after you were released from prison back then? (take notes of all housing conditions, including moves)
69. What was the housing type?
    a. Public housing (under your name)
    b. Apartment – house – condo (you rent)
    c. Apartment – house – condo (you own)
    d. Other (specify): _____
70. Who were you living with after you were released from prison? [mark all that apply]
    a. Wife/girlfriend
    b. Children
    c. Parents
    d. Friends
    e. Other (specify): _____
71. How would you describe the neighborhood where you were living after release? [probe on whether the neighborhood is safe, unsafe, or plagued with crime]
72. What was your marital status when you were released from prison?
    a. Married
    b. Never married
    c. Divorced
    d. Other (specify): _____
73. How many children did you have when you were released from prison?_____

a. Number of children under 18_____
b. Did you have custody of your children [under 18] after your release?
   - Yes – How many? _____. How many of them lived with you after you were released? _____
   - No – How many? _____. Where did they live? (specify)
c. Number of children 18 or older: _____
d. Did you live with them after your release?
   - Yes
   - No – Where do they live? (specify)

74. Was there abuse in your relationship/
    a. No
    b. Yes [describe the nature of abuse].
75. Did you or your partner seek help to avoid domestic abuse?
    a. N/A [no domestic violence]
    b. No [explain why]
    c. Yes [describe type of help sought and received]
76. Did you have any training after being released?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe]
77. Did you work after being released back then?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe the job, such as such as truck driver, cook, waiter, etc. and earnings].
    c. If yes, what was the job that provided the highest level of income after you were released back then?
78. What were other sources of financial support and assistance after you were released back then? [mark all that apply]
    a. Public assistance, including cash and food stamps.
    b. Public housing.
    c. WIC.
    d. Child support.
    e. Money from your children or other relatives.
    f. Social security (SSI).
    g. Disability.
    h. Other (specify): _____
79. Did you experience mental health problems after being released back then?
    a. No
    b. Yes [ask the respondent to describe his mental illness]
    c. If yes, did you receive any treatment for your mental illness?
       - No [explain]
       - Yes [ask the respondent to describe his experience with treatment, what kind of treatment, and where did he receive the treatment].
80. Did you use drugs after being released back then?

a. No
b. Yes
   - What type of drugs did you use?
   - How often did you use drugs?
   - Did you receive any drug treatment? What kind?
   - Did you break laws under the influence of drugs or alcohol? Explain.

81. After your release from prison back then, how were your relationships with [describe the relationship as good, supportive, or strained, exploitative, etc.]
    a. Your wife/partner
    b. Relatives
    c. Friends
    d. Social worker
    e. Clergy
    f. Neighbors
    g. Other (specify): _____
82. What types of resources and support did you receive from ____ after being released back then?
    a. Your wife/partner
    b. Relatives
    c. Friends
    d. Social worker
    e. Clergy
    f. Neighbors
    g. Other (specify): _____
83. How important were these types of support to your **experience with parole** back then?
84. Did any person in your personal network engage in criminal activity?
    a. No
    b. Yes [describe what kind of criminal activity]
85. After your release from prison, did you participate in
    a. church groups?
       - No [explain]
       - Yes (how often, length of membership)
    b. civic organizations?
       - No {explain]
       - Yes (how often, length of membership)
    c. organized clubs?
       - No {explain]
       - Yes (specify, how often, length of membership)
86. Did you receive
    a. housing assistance?
       - No [explain]
       - Yes [type and length of support]

b. job placement service?
   - No [explain]
   - Yes [types of job]
c. education and vocational training?
   - No [explain]
   - Yes [types of service]
d. mental health treatment?
   - No [explain]
   - Yes [type and length of treatment]
e. drug treatment?
   - No [explain]
   - Yes [type and length of treatment]
f. domestic violence services?
   - No (explain]
   - Yes [type and length of service]
g. social work and family court services?
   - No [explain]
   - Yes [Types and length of service]

87. Was it easy to obtain these community resources?
88. Back then, what made it difficult for obtaining these community resources?
89. How important were these community resources to your **experience with parole** back then?
90. How did you feel about your parole conditions back then?
    a. How supportive was your supervising officer?
    b. What made it difficult for meeting parole conditions?
91. Did you engage in criminal activity while under parole back then?
    a. No
    b. Yes [describe types of offense - frequency of offending and reasons for re-offending].
92. What caused you to be back in prison/jail again?
93. If multiple parole violations, ask for reasons for, or circumstances of, each violation.
    a. First violation
    b. Second violation
    c. Third violation
    d. Fourth violation

V- RECENT INCARCERATION EXPERIENCE

Now, I would like to learn about your most recent incarceration experience.

94. Did you receive education and vocational training in prison?
    a. No [explain – e.g., you were not interested, or training was not available]
    b. Yes [describe the education and vocational training]
95. Did you work in prison?

a. No [explain]
b. Yes
   - the type of work:
   - hours of work per day:_____
   - the total time of work in prison (months or weeks):_____
   - How much was the work compensation: _____

96. Did you have contact with your wife/partner while you were in prison?
    a. None applicable (no wife/partner)
    b. No [explain]
    c. Yes [describe the types of contact, such as in person, mail, telephone, etc.; how often; the nature of the contact, such as warm, supportive, or strained).
97. Did your wife/partner provide you with material or emotional support?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe the type of material or emotional support]
98. Did you have contact with your children while you were incarcerated?
    a. None applicable (no children)
    b. No [explain]
    c. Yes [describe the types of contact, such as in person, mail, telephone, etc.; how often; the nature of the contact, such as warm, supportive, or strained).
99. Did your children provide you with material or emotional support?
    a. No [Explain]
    b. Yes [describe the type of material or emotional support]
100. Who lived with your children while you were in prison? [describe children's living arrangement]
101. Did you have contact with other family members or friends while you were incarcerated?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe the types of contact, such as in person, mail, telephone, etc.; how often; the nature of the contact, such as warm, supportive, or strained).
102. Did other family members and friends provide you with material or emotional support?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe the type of material or emotional support]
103. How were your contact and relationships with other inmates in prison?
104. Did other inmates provide you with emotional and material or emotional support while you were in prison?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe]
105. How were your contact and relationships with the prison staff while you were in prison?
106. Did they provide you with emotional and material or emotional support?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe].
107. How was your contact with clergymen in prison?

108. Did they provide you with emotional and material or emotional support?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe]
109. Did you receive mental health treatment in prison?
    a. N/A (no mental health problem)
    b. No (mental health problem, but no treatment)
    c. Yes [describe]
110. Did you receive psychological counseling in prison?
    a. N/A (no need for counseling)
    b. No
    c. Yes [describe]
111. Did you receive drug treatment in prison?
    a. N/A (no drug problem)
    b. No (drug problems but no treatment)
    c. Yes [describe]
112. Overall, what were negative effects of prison on your life (family, job, health, etc.)?
113. What were positive effects of prison on your life (family, job, health, etc.)?

VI - RECENT EXPERIENCE OF REENTRY

Could you tell me about your current experience of parole?

114. Where did you live after you were released from prison at that time? [take notes all moves or changes in housing]
115. What was the housing type?
    a. Public housing (under your name)
    b. Apartment – house – condo (you rent)
    c. Apartment – house – condo (you own)
    d. Other (specify): _____
116. Who were you living with after you were released from prison? [mark all that apply]
    a. Wife/girlfriend
    b. Children
    c. Parents
    d. Friends
    e. Other (explain): _____
117. How would you describe the neighborhood where you were living after release? [probe on whether the neighborhood is safe, unsafe, or plagued with crime]
118. What was your marital status when you were released from prison?
    a. Married
    b. Never married
    c. Divorced
    d. Other (specify): _____
119. How many children did you have when you were released from prison?_____
    a. Number of children under 18_____

b. Did you have custody of your children [under 18] after your release?
   - Yes – How many? _____. How many of them lived with you after you were released? _____
   - No – How many? _____. Where did they live? (specify)
c. Number of children 18 or older: _____
d. Did you live with them after your release?
   - Yes
   - No – Where do they live? (specify)

120. Was there abuse in your relationship?
   a. No
   b. Yes [describe the nature of abuse].
121. Did you or your partner seek help to avoid domestic abuse?
   a. N/A [no domestic violence]
   b. No [explain why]
   c. Yes [describe type of help sought and received]
122. Did you have any training after prison?
   a. No {explain
   b. Yes [describe]
123. Did you work prior to that incarceration?
   a. No [explain]
   b. Yes
      - [describe the job, such as secretary, cook, waitress, nurse, teacher, etc.].
      - On the average, how many hours did you work per week: _____
      - Months of employment
      - Income from work [weekly or monthly income]: _____
   c. What was the job that provided the highest level of income after you were released from prison?
124. What were other sources of financial support and assistance after you were released from prison? [mark all that apply]
   a. Public assistance, including cash and food stamps.
   b. Public housing.
   c. WIC.
   d. Child support.
   e. Money from your children or other relatives.
   f. Social security (SSI).
   g. Disability.
   h. Other (specify): _____
125. Did you experience mental health problems after you were released from prison?
   a. No
   b. Yes [ask the respondent to describe his mental illness]
   c. If yes, did you receive any treatment for your mental illness?
      - No [explain]

- Yes [ask the respondent to describe his experience with treatment, what kind of treatment, and where did he receive the treatment].

126. Did you use drugs after you were released from prison?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes
        - What type of drugs did you use?
        - How often did you use drugs?
        - Did you receive any drug treatment? What kind?
        - Did you break laws under the influence of drugs or alcohol? Explain.
127. After your release from prison, how was your relationship with [describe the relationship as good, supportive, or strained, exploitative, etc.]
    a. Your wife/partner
    b. Relatives
    c. Friends
    d. Social worker
    e. Clergy
    f. Neighbors
    g. Other (specify): _____
128. What types of resources and support did you receive from ____ after your release from prison?
    a. Your wife/partner
    b. Relatives
    c. Friends
    d. Social worker
    e. Clergy
    f. Neighbors
    g. Other (specify): _____
129. How important were these types of support to your life after prison? (e.g., family, jobs, health, and parole experience)
130. Did any person in your personal network engage in criminal activity?
    a. No
    b. Yes [describe what kind of criminal activity]
131. Did you participate in
    a. Church groups
        - No [explain]
        - Yes (how often, length of membership)
    b. Civic organizations
        - No [explain]
        - Yes (how often, length of membership)
    c. Organized clubs (specify)
        - No {explain]
        - Yes (how often, length of membership)

132. Did you receive
    a. Housing assistance
        - No [explain]
        - Yes [type and length of support]
    b. Job placement service
        - No [explain]
        - Yes [types of job]
    c. Education and vocational training
        - No [explain]
        - Yes [types of service]
    d. mental health treatment
        - No [explain]
        - Yes [type and length of treatment]
    e. Drug treatment
        - No [explain]
        - Yes [type and length of treatment]
    f. domestic violence services
        - No (explain]
        - Yes [type and length of service]
    g. Social work and family court services
        - No [explain]
        - Yes [Types and length of service]
133. Was it easy to obtain these community resources?
134. What made it difficult obtaining these community resources?
135. How important are these community resources to your effort to get straight?
136. How supportive is your supervising officer?
    a. What made it difficult to meet parole conditions?
137. Did you engage in criminal activity while under parole?
    a. No
    b. Yes [describe types of offense - frequency of offending and **reasons** for re-offending].

.

I - DEMOGRAPHICS

1. How old are you? _____
2. Your race [OBSERVE OR ASK INDIRECTLY]
   a. White
   b. African American
   c. Other (specify)_____
3. Your /ethnicity [OBSERVE OR ASK INDIRECTLY]
   a. Hispanic/Latino
   b. Non-Hispanic/Latino
4. Where were you born?
   c. In the US.
   d. Other country (specify): _____
5. What is your legal status
   a. US citizen
   b. US permanent resident
   c. Legal alien
   d. [DO NOT ASK] None of the above.
6. What is your religion?
   a. Christian (specify)
   b. Muslim
   c. Other
   d. None
   e. Don't know or unsure.
7. How much education have you completed?
   a. Less than high school
   b. High school
   c. Two years college or vocational training beyond high school, but no college degree.
   d. Two years college with a degree.
   e. Four year college, but no degree.
   f. Four year college degree and beyond.
   g. Other (specify) _____
8. Besides education, have you completed any training? (describe)
9. Did your education or training prepare you for a particular kind of vocation or professional job?
   a. Yes
   b. No [explain]
10. [IF SHE WAS NOT BORN IN THE US] How good is your English?
    a. Excellent
    b. Good.
    c. Many problems
11. Are you working now?
    a. Yes.

   b. No [explain]
12. If yes, what type of job? [describe the job, such as secretary, cook, waitress, nurse, teacher, etc. and earnings]
13. What is your yearly (or monthly) income earned from work, including all informal sources of income, such as mending? _____
14. What are other sources of financial support and assistance?
    a. Public assistance, including cash and food stamps.
    b. Public housing.
    c. WIC.
    d. Child support.
    e. Money from your children or other relatives.
    f. Social security (SSI).
    g. Disability.
    h. Other (specify) _____
15. What is your current housing type?
    a. Public housing (under your name)
    b. Apartment – house – condo (you rent)
    c. Apartment – house – condo (you own)
    d. Other (specify): _____
16. Housing arrangement: who are you currently living with? [mark all that apply]
    a. Husband/boyfriend
    b. Children
    c. Parents
    d. Friends
    e. Other (specify): _____
17. How would you describe the neighborhood where you are living? [probe on whether the neighborhood is safe, unsafe, or plagued with crime]
18. What is your (current) marital status?
    a. Married (living with husband)
    b. Married (does not live with husband)
    c. Never married, but have a live-in boyfriend
    d. Divorced and have a live-in boyfriend
    e. Divorced and no live-in boyfriend
    f. Other (specify): _____
19. How many children do you have?_____
    a. Number of children under 18_____
    b. Do you have custody of your children [under 18]?
        - Yes – How many? _____. How many of them live with you? _____
        - No – How many? _____. Where do they live? (specify)
    c. Number of children 18 or older: _____
    d. Do you live with them?
        - Yes

- No – Where do they live? (specify)

II - PRE-INCARCERATION EXPERIENCE

Could you tell me about your life before prison?

20. How much education did you complete before you were incarcerated for the first time?
    a. Less than high school
    b. High school
    c. Two years college or vocational training beyond high school, but no college degree.
    d. Two years college with a degree.
    e. Four year college, but no degree.
    f. Four year college degree and beyond.
    g. Other (specify): _____
21. Did you have any training?
    a. No
    b. Yes [describe]
22. What was your marital status prior to your [first] incarceration?
    a. Married (lived with husband)
    b. Married (did not live with husband)
    c. Never married, but had a live-in boyfriend
    d. Divorced and had a live-in boyfriend
    e. Divorced and no live-in boyfriend
    f. Other (specify): _____
23. Was there any abuse in your relationship prior to your first incarceration?
    a. No
    b. Yes [ask the respondent to describe how serious the abuse was]
24. If there was abuse in your relationship, did you or your boyfriend seek help to avoid abuse?
    a. No [ask the respondent to explain why they did not seek help]
    b. Yes [describe type of help sought and received]
25. How many children did you have prior to your [first] incarceration?_____
26. How many of them were under 18?_____ Did they live with you?
    a. Yes.
    b. No (ask where they lived and with whom)
27. How many children were 18 or older? _____ Did they live with you?
    a. Yes.
    b. No (ask where did they live and with whom)
28. Did you work prior to your [first] incarceration?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes
        - [describe the job, such as secretary, cook, waitress, nurse, teacher, etc. and earnings].
        - On the average, how many hours did you work per week: _____

- Months of employment: _____
- Income from work [weekly or monthly income]: _____

c. What was the job that provided the highest level of income prior to your first incarceration (ask for the earnings from the job)?

29. What were other sources of financial support and assistance prior to your first incarceration? [mark all that apply]
    a. Public assistance, including cash and food stamps.
    b. Public housing.
    c. WIC.
    d. Child support.
    e. Money from your children or other relatives.
    f. Social security (SSI).
    g. Disability.
    h. Other (specify): _____
30. Did you experience mental health problems prior to your first incarceration?
    a. No
    b. Yes [ask the respondent to describe her mental illness]
    c. If yes, did you receive any treatment for your mental illness? [ask the respondent to describe her experience with treatment, what kind of treatment, and where did she receive the treatment].
31. Did you use drugs prior to your [first] incarceration?
    a. No
    b. Yes
        - What type of drugs did you use?
        - How old were you when you first used drugs?_____
        - How often did you use drugs?
        - Did you receive any drug treatment? What kind?
        - Did you break laws under the influence of drugs or alcohol? Explain.
32. How many times were you arrested **prior to the most recent incarceration? _____**
    a. For what offenses/reasons?
        - First arrest:
        - Second arrest:
        - Third arrest:
        - Other:
33. How old were you when you were arrested for the first time?_____
34. How many times were you convicted **prior to the most recent conviction**?_____
    a. For what offenses?
        - First conviction:_____
        - Second conviction:_____
        - Third conviction:_____
        - Other:_____
35. How old were you when you received the first conviction as adult?_____

36. Besides incarceration, did you receive other types of sentence?
    a. No
    b. Yes [describe]
37. How many times were you sentenced to **probation**?_____
    a. For what offenses?
        - First time probation:_____
        - Second time probation:_____
38. How many times were you sent to prison or jail, **including the most recent incarceration**?_____
    a. For what offenses/reasons (e.g., probation or parole violations)?
        - First incarceration:_____
        - Second incarceration:_____
        - Third incarceration:_____
        - Other: _____
39. Prior to your incarceration, how was your relationship with [describe the relationship as good, supportive, or strained, exploitative, etc.]
    a. Your husband/boyfriend
    b. Relatives
    c. Friends
    d. Social worker
    e. Clergy
    f. Neighbors
    g. Other:
40. What types of resources and support did you receive from:
    a. Your husband/boyfriend
    b. Relatives
    c. Friends
    d. Social worker
    e. Clergy
    f. Neighbors
    g. Other:
41. How important was the support from these people?
42. Did any persons in your personal network engage in criminal activity?
    a. No
    b. Yes [describe what kind of criminal activity]
43. Did you participate in
    a. Church groups
        - No
        - Yes (how often, length of membership)
    b. Civic organizations
        - No
        - Yes (how often, length of membership)

c. Organized clubs (specify)
    - No
    - Yes (how often, length of membership)

44. Did you receive
    a. Housing assistance
        - No
        - Yes [type and length of support]
    b. Job placement service
        - No
        - Yes [types of job]
    c. Education and vocational training
        - No
        - Yes [types of service]
    d. mental health treatment
        - No
        - Yes [type and length of treatment]
    e. Drug treatment
        - No
        - Yes [type and length of treatment]
    f. domestic violence services
        - No
        - Yes [type and length of service]
    g. Social work and family court services
        - No
        - Yes [Types and length of service]
45. Was it easy to obtain these community resources?
46. What made it difficult to obtain these community resources?
47. How important were these community resources to your life?

III - PREVIOUS INCARCERATION EXPERIENCE

Now, I would like to learn about your previous incarceration experience.

48. How old were you when you were incarcerated for the first time?_____
49. How long were these incarcerations?
    a. The first: _____
    b. The second: _____
    c. The third:_____
    d. The fourth:_____

(If there is only one incarceration skip and move to Section V)

50. Back then, did you receive education and vocational training in prison?
    a. No [explain – e.g., you were not interested, or training was not available]

b. Yes [describe the education and vocational training]

51. Did you work in prison?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes
        - Types of work:
        - Hours of work per day:_____
        - Total time of work in prison (months or weeks):_____
        - How much was the work compensation? _____
52. Did you have contact with your husband/boyfriend while you were in prison?
    a. None applicable (no husband/boyfriend)
    b. No [explain]
    c. Yes [describe the types of contact, such as in person, mail, telephone, etc.; how often; the nature of the contact, such as warm, supportive, or strained).
53. Did your husband/boyfriend provide you with material or emotional support?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe the type of material or emotional support]
54. Did you have contact with your children while you were incarcerated?
    c. None applicable (no children)
    d. No [explain]
    e. Yes [describe the types of contact, such as in person, mail, telephone, etc.; how often; the nature of the contact, such as warm, supportive, or strained).
55. Did your children provide you with material or emotional support?
    a. No [Explain]
    b. Yes [describe the type of material or emotional support]
56. Who lived with your children while you were in prison? [describe children's living arrangement]
57. Did you have contact with other family members or friends while you were incarcerated?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe the types of contact, such as in person, mail, telephone, etc.; how often; the nature of the contact, such as warm, supportive, or strained).
58. Did other family members and friends provide you with material or emotional support?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe the type of material or emotional support]
59. How were your contact and relationships with other inmates in prison?
60. Did other inmates provide you with emotional and material or emotional support while you were in prison?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe]
61. How were your contact and relationships with the prison staff while you were in prison?
62. Did they provide you with emotional and material or emotional support?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe].

63. How was your contact with clergymen in prison?
64. Did they provide you with emotional and material or emotional support?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe]
65. Did you receive mental health treatment in prison?
    a. N/A (no mental health problem)
    b. No (mental health problem, but no treatment)
    c. Yes [describe]
66. Did you receive psychological counseling in prison?
    a. N/A (no need for counseling)
    b. No
    c. Yes [describe]
67. Did you receive drug treatment in prison?
    a. N/A (no drug problem)
    b. No (drug problems but no treatment)
    c. Yes [describe]
    d. Overall, what were negative effects of prison on your life (family, job, heath, etc)?
    e. What were positive effects of prison on your life (family, job, heath, etc)?

IV - PREVIOUS PAROLE EXPERIENCE

(If there is only one incarceration, skip and move to section VI)

Now, Could you tell me what happened when you were released from prison?

68. Where did you live after you were released from prison back then? (take notes of all housing conditions, including moves)
69. What was the housing type?
    a. Public housing (under your name)
    b. Apartment – house – condo (you rent)
    c. Apartment – house – condo (you own)
    d. Other (specify): _____
70. Who were you living with after you were released from prison? [mark all that apply]
    a. Husband/boyfriend
    b. Children
    c. Parents
    d. Friends
    e. Other (specify): _____
71. How would you describe the neighborhood where you were living after release? [probe on whether the neighborhood is safe, unsafe, or plagued with crime]
72. What was your marital status when you were released from prison?
    a. Married
    b. Never married
    c. Divorced

d. Other (specify): _____

73. How many children did you have when you were released from prison?_____
    a. Number of children under 18_____
    b. Did you have custody of your children [under 18] after your release?
        - Yes – How many? _____. How many of them lived with you after you were released? _____
        - No – How many? _____. Where did they live? (specify)
    c. Number of children 18 or older: _____
    d. Did you live with them after your release?
        - Yes
        - No – Where do they live? (specify)
74. Was there abuse in your relationship/
    a. No
    b. Yes [describe the nature of abuse].
75. Did you or your boyfriend seek help to avoid domestic abuse?
    a. N/A [no domestic violence]
    b. No [explain why]
    c. Yes [describe type of help sought and received]
76. Did you have any training after being released?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe]
77. Did you work after being released back then?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe the job, such as secretary, cook, waitress, nurse, teacher, etc. and earnings].
    c. If yes, what was the job that provided the highest level of income after you were released back then?
78. What were other sources of financial support and assistance after you were released back then? [mark all that apply]
    a. Public assistance, including cash and food stamps.
    b. Public housing.
    c. WIC.
    d. Child support.
    e. Money from your children or other relatives.
    f. Social security (SSI).
    g. Disability.
    h. Other (specify): _____
79. Did you experience mental health problems after being released back then?
    a. No
    b. Yes [ask the respondent to describe her mental illness]
    c. If yes, did you receive any treatment for your mental illness?
        - No [explain]

- Yes [ask the respondent to describe her experience with treatment, what kind of treatment, and where did he receive the treatment].

80. Did you use drugs after being released back then?
    a. No
    b. Yes
        - What type of drugs did you use?
        - How often did you use drugs?
        - Did you receive any drug treatment? What kind?
        - Did you break laws under the influence of drugs or alcohol? Explain.
81. After your release from prison back then, how were your relationships with [describe the relationship as good, supportive, or strained, exploitative, etc.]
    a. Your husband/boyfriend
    b. Relatives
    c. Friends
    d. Social worker
    e. Clergy
    f. Neighbors
    g. Other (specify): _____
82. What types of resources and support did you receive from ____ after being released back then?
    a. Your husband/boyfriend
    b. Relatives
    c. Friends
    d. Social worker
    e. Clergy
    f. Neighbors
    g. Other (specify): _____
83. How important were these types of support to your **experience with parole** back then?
84. Did any person in your personal network engage in criminal activity?
    a. No
    b. Yes [describe what kind of criminal activity]
85. After your release from prison, did you participate in
    a. church groups?
        - No [explain]
        - Yes (how often, length of membership)
    b. civic organizations?
        - No {explain]
        - Yes (how often, length of membership)
    c. organized clubs?
        - No {explain]
        - Yes (specify, how often, length of membership)
86. Did you receive

a. housing assistance?
   - No [explain]
   - Yes [type and length of support]
b. job placement service?
   - No [explain]
   - Yes [types of job]
c. education and vocational training?
   - No [explain]
   - Yes [types of service]
d. mental health treatment?
   - No [explain]
   - Yes [type and length of treatment]
e. drug treatment?
   - No [explain]
   - Yes [type and length of treatment]
f. domestic violence services?
   - No (explain]
   - Yes [type and length of service]
g. social work and family court services?
   - No [explain]
   - Yes [Types and length of service]

87. Was it easy to obtain these community resources?
88. Back then, what made it difficult for obtaining these community resources?
89. How important were these community resources to your **experience with parole** back then?
90. How did you feel about your parole conditions back then?
    a. How supportive was your supervising officer?
    b. What made it difficult for meeting parole conditions?
91. Did you engage in criminal activity while under parole back then?
    c. No
    d. Yes [describe types of offense - frequency of offending and reasons for re-offending].
92. What caused you to be back in prison/jail again?
93. If multiple parole violations, ask for reasons for, or circumstances of, each violation.
    a. First violation
    b. Second violation
    c. Third violation
    d. Fourth violation

V- RECENT INCARCERATION EXPERIENCE

Now, I would like to learn about your most recent incarceration experience.

94. Did you receive education and vocational training in prison?

a. No [explain – e.g., you were not interested, or training was not available]
b. Yes [describe the education and vocational training]

95. Did you work in prison?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes
        - the type of work:
        - hours of work per day:_____
        - the total time of work in prison (months or weeks):_____
        - How much was the work compensation: _____
96. Did you have contact with your husband/boyfriend while you were in prison?
    a. None applicable (no husband/boyfriend)
    b. No [explain]
    c. Yes [describe the types of contact, such as in person, mail, telephone, etc.; how often; the nature of the contact, such as warm, supportive, or strained).
97. Did your husband/boyfriend provide you with material or emotional support?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe the type of material or emotional support]
98. Did you have contact with your children while you were incarcerated?
    a. None applicable (no children)
    b. No [explain]
    c. Yes [describe the types of contact, such as in person, mail, telephone, etc.; how often; the nature of the contact, such as warm, supportive, or strained).
99. Did your children provide you with material or emotional support?
    a. No [Explain]
    b. Yes [describe the type of material or emotional support]
100. Who lived with your children while you were in prison? [describe children's living arrangement]
101. Did you have contact with other family members or friends while you were incarcerated?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe the types of contact, such as in person, mail, telephone, etc.; how often; the nature of the contact, such as warm, supportive, or strained).
102. Did other family members and friends provide you with material or emotional support?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe the type of material or emotional support]
103. How were your contact and relationships with other inmates in prison?
104. Did other inmates provide you with emotional and material or emotional support while you were in prison?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe]
105. How were your contact and relationships with the prison staff while you were in prison?
106. Did they provide you with emotional and material or emotional support?

a. No [explain]
b. Yes [describe].

107. How was your contact with clergymen in prison?
108. Did they provide you with emotional and material or emotional support?
    a. No [explain]
    b. Yes [describe]
109. Did you receive mental health treatment in prison?
    a. N/A (no mental health problem)
    b. No (mental health problem, but no treatment)
    c. Yes [describe]
110. Did you receive psychological counseling in prison?
    a. N/A (no need for counseling)
    b. No
    c. Yes [describe]
111. Did you receive drug treatment in prison?
    a. N/A (no drug problem)
    b. No (drug problems but no treatment)
    c. Yes [describe]
112. Overall, what were negative effects of prison on your life (family, job, health, etc.)?
113. What were positive effects of prison on your life (family, job, health, etc.)?

VI - RECENT EXPERIENCE OF REENTRY

Could you tell me about your current experience of parole?

114. Where did you live after you were released from prison at that time? [take notes all moves or changes in housing]
115. What was the housing type?
    a. Public housing (under your name)
    b. Apartment – house – condo (you rent)
    c. Apartment – house – condo (you own)
    d. Other (specify): _____
116. Who were you living with after you were released from prison? [mark all that apply]
    a. Husband/boyfriend
    b. Children
    c. Parents
    d. Friends
    e. Other (explain): _____
117. How would you describe the neighborhood where you were living after release? [probe on whether the neighborhood is safe, unsafe, or plagued with crime]
118. What was your marital status when you were released from prison?
    a. Married
    b. Never married
    c. Divorced

d. Other (specify): _____

119. How many children did you have when you were released from prison?_____
   a. Number of children under 18_____
   b. Did you have custody of your children [under 18] after your release?
      - Yes – How many? _____. How many of them lived with you after you were released? _____
      - No – How many? _____. Where did they live? (specify)
   c. Number of children 18 or older: _____
   d. Did you live with them after your release?
      - Yes
      - No – Where do they live? (specify)

120. Was there abuse in your relationship?
   a. No
   b. Yes [describe the nature of abuse].

121. Did you or your boyfriend seek help to avoid domestic abuse?
   a. N/A [no domestic violence]
   b. No [explain why]
   c. Yes [describe type of help sought and received]

122. Did you have any training after prison?
   a. No {explain
   b. Yes [describe]

123. Did you work prior to that incarceration?
   a. No [explain]
   b. Yes
      - [describe the job, such as secretary, cook, waitress, nurse, teacher, etc.].
      - On the average, how many hours did you work per week: _____
      - Months of employment
      - Income from work [weekly or monthly income]: _____
   c. What was the job that provided the highest level of income after you were released from prison?

124. What were other sources of financial support and assistance after you were released from prison? [mark all that apply]
   a. Public assistance, including cash and food stamps.
   b. Public housing.
   c. WIC.
   d. Child support.
   e. Money from your children or other relatives.
   f. Social security (SSI).
   g. Disability.
   h. Other (specify): _____

125. Did you experience mental health problems after you were released from prison?
   a. No

b. Yes [ask the respondent to describe her mental illness]
c. If yes, did you receive any treatment for your mental illness?
   - No [explain]
   - Yes [ask the respondent to describe his experience with treatment, what kind of treatment, and where did she receive the treatment].

126. Did you use drugs after you were released from prison?
   a. No [explain]
   b. Yes
      - What type of drugs did you use?
      - How often did you use drugs?
      - Did you receive any drug treatment? What kind?
      - Did you break laws under the influence of drugs or alcohol? Explain.

127. After your release from prison, how was your relationship with [describe the relationship as good, supportive, or strained, exploitative, etc.]
   a. Your husband/boyfriend
   b. Relatives
   c. Friends
   d. Social worker
   e. Clergy
   f. Neighbors
   g. Other (specify): _____

128. What types of resources and support did you receive from ____ after your release from prison?
   a. Your husband/boyfriend
   b. Relatives
   c. Friends
   d. Social worker
   e. Clergy
   f. Neighbors
   g. Other (specify): _____

129. How important were these types of support to your life after prison? (e.g., family, jobs, health, and parole experience)

130. Did any person in your personal network engage in criminal activity?
   a. No
   b. Yes [describe what kind of criminal activity]

131. Did you participate in
   a. Church groups
      - No [explain]
      - Yes (how often, length of membership)
   b. Civic organizations
      - No [explain]
      - Yes (how often, length of membership)

c. Organized clubs (specify)
    - No {explain]
    - Yes (how often, length of membership)

132. Did you receive
    a. Housing assistance
        - No [explain]
        - Yes [type and length of support]
    b. Job placement service
        - No [explain]
        - Yes [types of job]
    c. Education and vocational training
        - No [explain]
        - Yes [types of service]
    d. mental health treatment
        - No [explain]
        - Yes [type and length of treatment]
    e. Drug treatment
        - No [explain]
        - Yes [type and length of treatment]
    f. domestic violence services
        - No (explain]
        - Yes [type and length of service]
    g. Social work and family court services
        - No [explain]
        - Yes [Types and length of service]
133. Was it easy to obtain these community resources?
134. What made it difficult obtaining these community resources?
135. How important are these community resources to your effort to get straight?
136. How supportive is your supervising officer?
    a. What made it difficult to meet parole conditions?
137. Did you engage in criminal activity while under parole?
    a. No
    b. Yes [describe types of offense - frequency of offending and **reasons** for re-offending].

APPENDIX B: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics and Criminal Justice History

	Number of Men	Number of Women		Mean for men	Mean for women
Black	8	6	Age	45.5 years	40.64 years
White	16	17	Income	$1,336	$1,228
Hispanic	1	1	Arrests (mean)	7.9	6.3
Bi-Racial	0	1	Convictions (mean)	4.6	4.2
Married	6	5	Probation (mean)	1.5	1.4
Divorced	9	11	Total # Incarcerations	5.1	3.7
Never married	10	9	Parole	1.6	1.1
Has children under 18	8	7			
Less than HS	3	3			
High school	14	10			
College	8	12			
Employed	14	18			
Unemployed	3	1			
Disability	8	6			
Juvenile record	5	8			

APPENDIX C: CODING

Three different coding techniques were used to analyze the data obtained from interviews with twenty-five male and twenty-five female parolees. These techniques were open coding, axial coding, and systematic coding.

Open Coding

Open coding was performed by closely examining transcriptions for all fifty interviews to identify categories related to my research questions. These categories included 1) pre-incarceration experiences, 2) experiences with incarceration, and 3) parole experiences. Data in each category were then re-analyzed to create sub-categories. For example, data under the category "pre-incarceration experiences" were re-analyzed and coded into four sub-categories categories, including 1) educational attainment and job training, 2) relationships, 3) sources of resources and support, and 4) crime and criminal justice. When necessary, data under sub-categories were further analyzed to create lower-level sub-categories. Data in the sub-category "sources of resources and support," for example, were coded to create four lower-level sub-categories, including 1) employment, 2) social ties, 3) community organizations, and 4) public assistance.

Axial and Systematic Coding

Following open coding, axial coding was performed by analyzing the categories of codes that resulted from open coding to create codes that were consistent with the main axes of my research questions, which were: 1) men and women's social ties prior to, during, and after incarceration, 2) resources from social ties prior to, during, and after incarceration, and 3) the influence of resources on reentry experiences. For example, data in the category "parole

experiences" and its sub-categories were re-analyzed to identify codes that were consistent with the axis "parole experiences." This resulted in twelve axial codes, including 1) strong-tie relationships after incarceration, 2) weak-tie relationships after incarceration, 3) quality of relationships with strong-ties after incarceration, 4) quality of relationships with weak-ties after incarceration, 5) frequency of contact with strong-ties after incarceration, 6) frequency of contact with weak-ties after incarceration, 7) tangible resources available from strong-ties after incarceration, 8) intangible resources available from strong-ties after incarceration, 9) tangible resources available from weak-ties after incarceration, 10) intangible resources available from weak-ties after incarceration 11) influence of strong-tie resources on reentry experiences, and 12) influence of weak-tie resources on reentry experiences.

Finally, systematic coding was performed by identifying concepts that fit with the framework of the study, including the influence of gender on social ties and the resources they provide, and the influence of resources from social ties on men and women's reentry experiences. This stage of coding made it possible to assess the usefulness of a social tie framework to understand reentry experiences and to identify new ideas about the relationship between social ties, social resources, and reentry experiences.

List of Categories and Sub-Categories

1. Pre-incarceration experiences
    - Educational attainment and job training
        - Highest level of education completed
        - Job training programs/classes completed
    - Relationships
        - Strong-ties
            - Composition (Intimate partners, relatives, children)
            - Quality (Supportive, abusive, positive, negative)
            - Frequency of contact (Daily, bi-weekly, weekly, monthly, yearly, other)

        - Reason for contact (Celebrations, care giving, recreation, criminal behaviors, other)
        - Forms of contact (In-person, telephone, letters)
    - Weak-ties
        - Composition (Friends, associates, co-workers, neighbors, religious figures, other)
        - Quality (Supportive, abusive, positive, negative)
        - Frequency of contact (Daily, bi-weekly, weekly, monthly, yearly, other) Reason for contact (Celebrations, care giving, recreation, criminal behaviors, other)
        - Forms of contact (In-person, telephone, letters)
- Sources of resources and support
    - Employment (Type of job, full- or part-time, income)
    - Social ties
        - Strong-ties
            - Tangible resources (Housing, money, food, clothing, transportation, employment assistance, other)
                - Importance of resources (Very important, important, not important, very unimportant, other)
            - Intangible resources (Emotional support, spiritual support, advice, other)
                - Importance of resources (Very important, important, not important, very unimportant, other)
        - Weak-ties
            - Tangible resources (Housing, money, food, clothing, transportation, employment assistance, other)
                - Importance of resources (Very important, important, not important, very unimportant, other)
            - Intangible resources (Emotional support, spiritual support, advice, other)
                - Importance of resources (Very important, important, not important, very unimportant, other)
    - Community organizations (Type, length of membership)
        - Tangible resources (Housing, money, food, clothing, transportation, employment assistance, other)
            - Importance of resources (Very important, important, not important, very unimportant, other)
        - Intangible resources (Emotional support, spiritual support, advice, other)
            - Importance of resources (Very important, important, not important, very unimportant, other)
    - Public support (Type of support, amount of support)
- Crime and criminal justice

        - Prior arrests (Number, reasons, ages)
        - Prior convictions (Number, reasons, ages)
        - Prior incarcerations (Number, reasons, ages, length of)
        - Probation experience (Number, reasons, length of, problems with)
        - Parole experience (Number, reasons, length of, problems with)
        - Criminal behaviors (Substance abuse, DUI, robberies, theft, check fraud, other)

2. Incarceration experiences
    - Reason for most recent incarceration (Type of crime, circumstances surrounding)
    - Length of most recent incarceration
    - Educational or vocational training during (Type, length)
    - Employment during (Type, hours per day, total time employed, compensation)
    - Relationships
        - Strong-ties
            - Composition (Intimate partners, relatives, children)
            - Quality (Supportive, abusive, positive, negative)
            - Frequency of contact (Daily, bi-weekly, weekly, monthly, yearly, other)
            - Reason for contact (Celebrations, care giving, recreation, criminal behaviors, other)
            - Forms of contact (In-person, telephone, letters)
        - Weak-ties
            - Composition (Friends, associates, co-workers, neighbors, religious figures, other)
            - Quality (Supportive, abusive, positive, negative)
            - Frequency of contact (Daily, bi-weekly, weekly, monthly, yearly, other) Reason for contact (Celebrations, care giving, recreation, criminal behaviors, other)
            - Forms of contact (In-person, telephone, letters)
    - Sources of resources and support
        - Employment (Type of job, income)
        - Social ties
            - Strong-ties
                - Tangible resources (Money, food, clothing, television, other)
                - Importance of resources (Very important, important, not important, very unimportant, other)
                - Intangible resources (Emotional support, spiritual support, advice, other)
                - Importance of resources (Very important, important, not important, very unimportant, other)
            - Weak-ties
                - Tangible resources (Money, food, clothing, television, other)
                - Importance of resources (Very important, important, not important, very unimportant, other)

            - Intangible resources (Emotional support, spiritual support, advice, other)
                - Importance of resources (Very important, important, not important, very unimportant, other)
- Negative effects of prison (Relationships, employment, health, other)
- Positive effects of prison (Relationships, employment, health, crime desistance, sobriety, other)

3. Parole experiences
    - Housing (Housing upon release, reason(s) for moving, neighborhood quality)
    - Employment (Employment status, ease of securing employment)
    - Educational attainment and job training
        - Highest level of education completed
        - Job training programs/classes completed
    - Relationships
        - Strong-ties
            - Composition (Intimate partners, relatives, children)
            - Quality (Supportive, abusive, positive, negative)
            - Frequency of contact (Daily, bi-weekly, weekly, monthly, yearly, other)
            - Reason for contact (Celebrations, care giving, recreation, criminal behaviors, other)
            - Forms of contact (In-person, telephone, letters)
        - Weak-ties
            - Composition (Friends, associates, co-workers, neighbors, religious figures, other)
            - Quality (Supportive, abusive, positive, negative)
            - Frequency of contact (Daily, bi-weekly, weekly, monthly, yearly, other)
            - Reason for contact (Celebrations, care giving, recreation, criminal behaviors, other)
            - Forms of contact (In-person, telephone, letters)
    - Sources of resources and support
        - Employment (Type of job, full- or part-time, income)
        - Social ties
            - Strong-ties
                - Tangible resources (Housing, money, food, clothing, transportation, employment assistance, other)
                - Importance of resources (Very important, important, not important, very unimportant, other)
                - Intangible resources (Emotional support, spiritual support, advice, other)
                - Importance of resources (Very important, important, not important, very unimportant, other)
            - Weak-ties

            - Tangible resources (Housing, money, food, clothing, transportation, employment assistance, other)
                - Importance of resources (Very important, important, not important, very unimportant, other)
            - Intangible resources (Emotional support, spiritual support, advice, other)
                - Importance of resources (Very important, important, not important, very unimportant, other)
    - Community organizations (Type, length of membership)
        - Tangible resources (Housing, money, food, clothing, transportation, employment assistance, other)
            - Importance of resources (Very important, important, not important, very unimportant, other)
        - Intangible resources (Emotional support, spiritual support, advice, other)
            - Importance of resources (Very important, important, not important, very unimportant, other)
    - Public support (Type of support, amount of support)
- Parole requirements
    - Difficulties meeting (Criminal behaviors, substance abuse, unemployment, other)
    - Parole officer
        - Quality of relationship(Supportive, good, caring, poor, adversarial, other)
        - Resources from
            - Tangible resources (Housing, money, food, clothing, transportation, employment assistance, other)
                - Importance of support (Very important, important, not important, very unimportant, other)
            - Intangible resources (Emotional support, advice, other)
                - Importance of support (Very important, important, not important, very unimportant, other)
    - Perception of overall importance of resources and support to reentry experience (Very important, important, not important, very unimportant, other)

VITA

Jennifer Rhiannon Scroggins holds BA and MA degrees in Sociology from California State University, Bakersfield, and this dissertation is in partial fulfillment of the Ph.D. degree in Sociology with a concentration in Criminology from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Her research interests include gender and crime, prisoner reentry, and immigration and crime.