SOCIAL TIES AND SOCIAL SUPPORT OF REENTRANTS AND PROBATIONERS: EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP WITH INDIVIDUAL AND NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTERISTICS

By

Willow Burns

Submitted to the

Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences

of American University

in Partial Fulfillment of

the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

In

Sociology

Chair:

Michael Bader, Ph.D.

jinni adams, Ph.D.

Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences

May 1, 2013

Date

2013

American University

Washington, D.C. 20016

SOCIAL TIES AND SOCIAL SUPPORT OF REENTRANTS AND PROBATIONERS: EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP WITH INDIVIDUAL AND NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTERISTICS

BY

Willow Burns

ABSTRACT

A recent body of literature shows that social ties and social support are important for individuals involved in the criminal justice system, yet few studies have examined who gets support and why within offender populations. Using baseline data from the Structures, Health, and Risk among Reentrants, Probationers, and Partners (SHARRPP) study (N=302), this research examines the relationships that neighborhood context has with the social ties of reentrants and probationers and their perceived social support. Results from OLS and logistic regression analyses suggest that at the time baseline data were collected, concentrated disadvantage and residential stability have no relationship with the social ties or perceived social support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Drastic increases in the U.S. prison population in the latter half of the 20th century sparked interest among academics in offender reentry, or the reintegration of (ex-)offenders into the community following a period of incarceration (Pager 2007). Research shows that social support helps offenders find employment and housing, reduces the likelihood of recidivism, and promotes optimism in reentrants, which is a potentially crucial factor for the maintenance of those healthy, supportive relationships (Visher and O'Connell 2012; Berg and Heubner 2010; Bales and Mears 2008; Visher, Kachnowski, La Vigne, and Travis 2004). As more evidence emerges demonstrating the value of social ties and social support for those involved in the criminal justice system, some scholars have begun making policy recommendations to develop and strengthen reentry programs that facilitate social support from family and close friends (Visher and Travis 2011). And yet, relatively little research exists describing or explaining who gets support and why within ex-offender populations. These are questions that have been asked for other groups (e.g. single mothers, see Harknett and Hartnett 2011). Bales and Mears (2008) and the Minnesota Department of Corrections (2011) found prison visitation to be negatively associated with recidivism. Only 41 percent of the sample from the Bales and Mears (2008) study and only 61 percent of the sample from the Minnesota DOC (2011) study reported having any visitors at all, and therefore limited the conclusions that they could provide.

Some researchers have turned to the study of neighborhood effects to better understand the social networks and support of individuals. Neighborhood effects theory suggests that neighborhoods matter for individual outcomes and that neighborhood characteristics likely affect social ties and support. This study has two aims: to determine (1) the extent of variation in the

social ties and social support of reentrants and probationers (2) if certain neighborhood characteristics are associated with social ties and support for this population. Using OLS and logistic regression analyses, this research examines the associations (controlling for individual characteristics), that neighborhood context has with reentrants' and probationers' social ties, and their perceived social support.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Significance of Social Ties and Social Support

Social ties are important in that they may help determine some individual outcomes, particularly through the resources that can be received through them. Studies of social ties largely stem from social capital and social network theories, which both stress the importance of social relations for facilitating certain outcomes (Coleman 1988; Granovetter 1973). For Coleman, social ties and the structure of those ties determine the availability of social capital (1988). Coleman's conceptualization of social capital relates to the connections between individuals and the capacity for action rather than the specific resources that one might receive through such relationships (1988). One possible resource that can be received or achieved as a result of social capital is human capital, which then offers more benefits to the recipients (1988). My research question stems from this theoretical relationship in that I am interested in the support that can be received through social ties. For this study, social support is considered a resource received through relationships where social capital exists. Granovetter's work on social ties is also important to consider. He argued that different types of social ties were important for different reasons: strong ties provide support, but weak ties provide resources and access to information, such as job referrals (1973, 1982). However, for poor and less-educated individuals, Granovetter argues that close friends and family can be a resource for finding jobs. Reentrants and probationers may constitute another vulnerable group that receives resources and information through close ties to friends and family.

Research has supported the idea that individuals can receive support through their social ties/networks of friends and family (Wellman 1992; Wellman and Wortley 1990). Strong ties and

family ties can provide support in the form of emotional aid, services, companionship, and financial assistance (Wellman and Wortley 1990). Extensive literature has observed that those living in poverty rely on family and friend networks to mitigate the deleterious effects and experiences of living in poverty, making the determinants of social ties and social support important to investigate. Some of the support that individuals receive can be in the form of instrumental support, such as help paying bills, finding housing, or childcare (Harknett 2006; Edin and Lein 1997). Instrumental support, in particular, is strongly associated with economic stability and psychological well-being (Harknett 2006; Henly, Danziger, and Offer 2005; Ladewig, McGee, and Newell 1990; Wethington and Kessler 1986). Research has also shown that a higher level of perceived overall support is associated with a reduced likelihood of relying on welfare and an increased likelihood of employment (Harknett 2006; Henly et al. 2005). Social support may also be used for purposes of upward mobility (Henly et al. 2005; Briggs 1998).

In recent years, scholars have turned their attention to the role of organizations in facilitating social support. Small, Jacobs, and Massengill (2008) found that individuals with ties to local organizations can receive resources from the organizations themselves as well as receive network access to other individuals and organizations (See also Small 2006, 2009). Small and colleagues suggest that researchers looking at neighborhood effects on social support would benefit from considering organizational ties because they may be an important but overlooked source of support for residents of disadvantaged neighborhoods (2008). While this study does not include a measure for organizational membership, it does include a measure of perceived institutional instrumental support—support received through a private or government organization—which provides a rough indicator of social connectedness to an organization or

institution. This may help determine whether or not organizations/institutions are sources of support for reentrants and probationers.

Social ties and social support may be as important for inmates and ex-offenders as they are for those living in poverty. Individuals involved in the criminal justice system make up a particularly vulnerable group, often experiencing high rates of poverty, low educational attainment, histories of health and drug issues, and limited employment (Petersilia 2005). When returning to the community after incarceration, ex-offenders face even more obstacles finding housing, employment, and public assistance (Gideon and Sung 2011; Weisberg and Petersilia 2010; Travis 2005; Petersilia 2003). Researchers estimate that between 40 and 80 percent of returning offenders have to rely on their families for support (Berg and Heubner 2010; Visher et al. 2004).

Reentrants are also very likely to recidivate (Petersilia 1999). High rates of recidivism have prompted scholars to examine the ties to friends and family of individuals involved in the criminal justice system and how those ties may contribute to successful reentry. Many studies have focused on three important factors in the reentry process: employment, ties to family, and support from family (Visher and O'Connell 2012; Visher and Travis 2011; Bahr, Armstrong, Gibbs, Harris, and Fisher 2005; Laub and Sampson 2003; Petersilia 2003; Visher and Travis 2003; Shapiro and Schwartz 2001). Visher, Debus, and Yahner. (2008) suggest that strong ties to family may result in the provision of support finding employment upon release, which then lowers the risk of recidivating. Berg and Heubner (2010) found that offenders with strong ties to family were less likely to recidivate and were more likely to be employed. They also found that although a background with frequent unemployment reduced the likelihood of finding a job upon release, the effect was moderated by strong ties to family. Other scholars have found support for

the link between social ties and recidivism by looking at prison visitation. These studies found that visitation has an effect (albeit a modest one) on reducing recidivism (Mears, Cochran, Siennick and Bales 2012; Bales and Mears 2008). Visitation is thought to maintain social ties during incarceration, and through those ties reentrants can receive support, such as employment or housing, after they are released (Visher and Travis 2003). Although the need for and benefits of strong ties and social support for reentrants are well-documented, little research exists explaining who gets support through social relationships among those involved in the criminal justice system.

Neighborhood Effects

Both James Coleman and William J. Wilson contributed to the literature on neighborhood effects by proposing theories that suggest that certain individual outcomes are determined, in part, by social organization and the place that one lives (Coleman 1988; Wilson 1987). Today, much of the interest in neighborhood effects among academics was prompted by Wilson's work on concentrated poverty and social isolation in *The Truly Disadvantaged* (1987). Wilson's theory explains how the concentration of poverty leads to the social isolation of inner-city neighborhoods, where residents have limited access to resources by way of mainstream society (Wilson 1987). This is useful to my research in two ways. First, Wilson's theory highlights the importance of social ties as a means of access to resources, information, and social mobility. Second, it lays out an argument that takes into account not only individual conditions (or an aggregate of individual conditions), but also that those conditions exist within a particular space. In other words, it is not simply that high poverty leads to social isolation, but that high poverty concentrated within a particular area (which has its own political and economic history) leads to

social isolation. This is essential to my research question in that it explains how neighborhood conditions can have an effect on personal outcomes independent of other factors.

Research on urban neighborhoods has supported the idea that the place one lives can influence individual outcomes. Anderson (1990, 1999) used data obtained from a 14 year field study to show how residents of high-poverty neighborhoods experience social isolation, which then restricts social mobility. In response to Wilson's *The Truly Disadvantaged* (1987), Massey and Denton (1993) argued that residential segregation was the primary factor contributing to social isolation, which compounded the negative consequences of the concentration of poverty. Residents of highly segregated neighborhoods lack connections to the rest of society, and as a result, they have limited access to the economic opportunities that are available in mainstream, white society (Massey and Denton 1993). Their findings provide support for the idea that social isolation leads to limited social mobility in disadvantaged neighborhoods.

Many studies have focused on the relationship between neighborhood disadvantage and crime, health, families and social ties. Researchers have found strong associations between economically disadvantaged neighborhoods, residential stability, and violent crime (Peterson, Krivo, and Harris 2000). Morenoff, Sampson, and Raudenbush (2001) also found that concentrated disadvantage was an important predictor of neighborhood-level variations in violence rates. Strong evidence exists in sociological and epidemiological literature suggesting that neighborhood characteristics influence a variety of health outcomes (See Morenoff and Lynch 2004 for a review of the health-related literature). Rankin and Quane (2000) found that residents of poor, inner-city neighborhoods have a reduced likelihood of having friends who are employed or who have a college education, suggesting modest effects of the neighborhood on the composition of one's social network. Small (2007) found that neighborhood poverty was

positively associated with having no social ties and negatively associated with number of social ties. Neighborhood disadvantage is also associated with less support from family and friends in the form of financial assistance (Turney and Harknett 2010).

Another relationship frequently examined in neighborhood effects literature is between residential stability and social ties. Residential stability, or community-level long-term residency, is an important factor in determining community attachment and the formation of social ties (Coleman 1990). Coleman argued that high residential instability, or high residential turnover, not only disrupts existing ties but that "the severing of existing social ties initiates a disruptive process that affects the entire system of social networks" (Coleman 1990:316). Studies have found that residential stability is positively associated with the existence of ties among neighbors (Sampson, Morenoff, and Earls 1999; Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997). Residential stability encourages interactions among neighbors and participation in "expressive" organizations, which are organizations meant to promote a sense of community. Turney and Harknett (2010) found that residential stability is associated with stronger personal safety nets. Residential stability is also associated with information sharing among neighbors (Guest, Cover, Matsueda, and Kubrin 2006). Through information sharing, individuals can gain access to resources, like finding out about a job. Studies have also examined the interaction between disadvantage and residential stability in predicting outcomes. Schieman (2005) found that community-level residential stability and neighborhood disadvantage interact to predict social support.

CHAPTER 3

DATA AND METHODS

Data

The analyses were based on data from the baseline dataset from the SHARRPP (Structures, Health, and Risk among Reentrants, Probationers, and Partners) study conducted by researchers at American University and the Yale School of Public Health. The SHARRPP study is ongoing, collecting data every six months with 302 participants who are either on parole, probation, or recently released from prison for drug-related offenses. This study used baseline data that were collected in the spring of 2011. Participants' first address upon release were geocoded to 2010 Census tract boundaries that allow me to merge data from the 2006-2010 American Community Survey 5-year estimates. Census tracts are small statistical subdivisions of a county with an ideal size of 4,000 people, but they generally range from 1,500 to 8,000 people (U.S. Census Bureau). Although imperfect, census tracts are a commonly-used and widely available option for studying neighborhoods (Small and Newman 2001; Sampson, Morenoff, and Gannon-Rowley 2002).

Dependent Variables

Social Ties

Two different variables were used to measure the number of social ties. The first measured the number of close family ties, while the second measured the number of ties to friends (non-family). I purposely modeled ties to family and ties to friends separately given the significant qualitative differences between the two types of ties in providing support to individuals (Wellman and Wortley 1990). The variable for family ties was created from an item on the questionnaire that asked, "How many close family relationships do you have now? By

close, I mean family members who look out for you, who would do you a favor even when you don't ask them to, and who will listen to you and offer you advice when you need it." This is a count variable and ranges from 0 to 56. To reduce skewness, all of the responses over 20 close family relationships were recoded as 20 and the variable was converted to the natural log of the number of family ties. The variable for ties to friends comes from a question on the survey that asked, "The next set of questions is about your friends, associates and people you spend time with who are not your family. Not including family and sexual partners, how many friends do you have?" The original variable was coded as: 0=None, 1=One to two, 2=Three to five, 3=Six to ten, 4=Over ten. Because this was structured as a categorical rather than a count variable, it was recoded into a dichotomous variable where 0=No friends and 1=At least one friend.

Instrumental support

The two variables measuring instrumental support came from an item on the questionnaire that asked, "Sometimes people have trouble paying their bills or getting by from month to month. Who would you turn to if you were unable to pay your bills? (Select all that apply)." Respondents could select from the following options: government agency or welfare program, private social security agency, church or religious social service agency, spouse/boyfriend/girlfriend, other sex partner, family member, friend, bank/credit union/financial institution, other, or no one. Most respondents reported that they would turn to one or none of the sources for help paying bills. I created two dichotomous measures of social support from these responses. Personal instrumental support was coded equal to one if the respondent reported that they could turn to any of spouse/boyfriend/girlfriend, other sex partner, family member, or friend. Institutional instrumental support was coded to equal one if they reported being able to

turn to a government agency, private social security agency, church or religious social service organization, or a bank/credit union/financial institution.

Emergency support

The measure of emergency support came from an item that asked respondents the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the following statement: "There are people I can count on in an emergency." This variable is coded as 0=disagree and 1=agree. Some researchers have used emergency support as an indicator of instrumental support (See Harknett and Hartnett 2011). This study is separating emergency support from instrumental support because the wording of the question does not specifically indicate the receipt of tangible support.

Emotional support

The measure for emotional support was created by combining four items into a scale. Respondents were asked the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the following statements: "I have close relationships that provide me with a sense of emotional security and well-being," "There is someone I could talk to about important decisions in my life," "There is a trustworthy person I could turn to for advice if I were having problems," and "I feel a strong emotional bond with at least one other person." The values for each item ranged from 1 to 4: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=agree, and 4=strongly agree. The scale ranges from 4 to 16, where 16 represents high emotional support and 4 represents low emotional support. Cronbach's alpha, a measure of the reliability of items in a scale, was .879.

The social support variables used for this study do not measure the actual support received, but rather the perceived available support of the respondents. Previous research has documented the importance of studying perceptions of support along with the problems inherent in studying an individual's receipt of support. Perceived support is strongly associated with

psychological well-being (more so than received support) and measuring receipt of support leaves open the possibility of confusing those who are not in need of support with those who have no support available (Wethington and Kessler 1986; See Harknett and Hartnett 2011 for a brief discussion).

Independent Variables

Individual Characteristics

The individual controls come from the baseline SHARRPP dataset, and include the following: race, gender, educational attainment, age, type of residence, and criminal justice status. The literature on race and social support/social ties has mixed findings regarding the direction of the relationship, but many studies have found that social support and social ties vary by race (Rankin and Quane 2000; Newman 1999; Fischer 1982; Aschenbrenner 1973). One of the race variables in the dataset was coded into three categories: white, black, and other. The race category other was constructed from participants who reported their race as "Hispanic" or "other" because both had low frequencies. Whites served as the reference group.

Strong evidence exists in the literature indicating the existence of gender differences in social ties (Tigges, Browne, and Green 1998; Fernandez and Harris 1992; Moore 1990). The variable for gender was originally coded into three categories: male, female, and transgender. This was recoded as a dummy variable where 0=female and 1=male because only one respondent reported as transgender (this case was removed from the dataset). Educational attainment has been found to be highly correlated with support, where those with more education receive more support (Eggebeen and Hogan 1990; Jayakody 1998). Educational attainment was recoded into three education categories: some high school or less, high school diploma or G.E.D., and some college or more, which served as the reference group. Age was also found to

be associated with support from family by Eggebeen and Hogan (1990). Age is a count variable in the dataset ranging from 20 to 62. The last control variable captures the type of residence where the respondent was living at the time baseline data were collected. A large number of study participants (N=138) moved into halfway houses, supportive housing facilities, in-patient treatment programs, homeless shelters, or other similar establishments. Several participants either moved onto the streets or into a hotel/motel following release. I controlled for type of residence given that the type of support reentrants receive could influence where they live upon release from incarceration and thus attribute the influence of individual factors to the neighborhood context.

Neighborhood Characteristics

The neighborhood variables are concentrated disadvantage and residential stability, which were created using data from the American Community Survey. The measure of concentrated disadvantage used in this study was developed from the work of Sampson and colleagues (1997). I created an index by adding six poverty-related variables together: percent of individuals living below poverty, percent of individuals receiving public assistance, percent female-headed households, percent unemployed, percent under age 18, and percent black. Sampson et al. (1997) chose these variables to measure concentrated disadvantage because they were highly correlated with one another and consistent with urban theories and research. Sampson and colleagues conducted a factor analysis and weighted each of the poverty-related variables by their factor loading. For this study, each variable in the index is weighted equally. A reliability analysis was conducted for the index and the Cronbach's alpha was .753, which suggests that the measure is moderately reliable. Residential stability was measured by the

proportion of residents in the neighborhood who have lived in the same location for one year or longer.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Table 1 reports the descriptive statistics of the dependent and control variables. About half of the sample (47 percent) is black, 31 percent are white, and about 22 percent are non-black, racial/ethnic minorities. The proportions of racial minorities in this sample are much higher than those of the total U.S. population, but are more consistent with the racial makeup of those involved in the criminal justice system (U.S. Dept. of Justice 2011). Respondents are overwhelmingly male and the average age is about 41 years old. About half have a high school degree or G.E.D. and 22 percent have some college or more. Just over half of the sample lives in households. Most of the participants are reentrants, which means they had been recently released from incarceration at the time baseline data were collected. Only 11 percent of the respondents were on probation.

The average number of close family ties is 4.6 and 76.5 percent of participants reported having at least one friend, meaning about a quarter of the participants had no close ties to non-kin. There were more participants reporting perceived personal instrumental support than institutional instrumental support, and most perceive having emergency and emotional support available.

Table 2 presents descriptive statistics for the neighborhood predictors. The first six items were included in the index measure of concentrated disadvantage and are all positively correlated. Percent below poverty is not strongly associated with any of the measures in the index, and percent of female-headed households is not strongly associated with percent under 18. The rest of the items are positively correlated with strong or moderately strong associations. The last two items on Table 2 are concentrated disadvantage and residential stability, which are negatively correlated with one another.

Table 1. Summary Statistics for Dependent and Control Variables

Variable	N	Mean	*SD*
Number of Ties to Family	301	4.590	7.240
Ties to Friends	289	0.765	0.425
Personal Instrumental Support	300	0.633	0.483
Institutional Instrumental Support	300	0.290	0.455
Emergency Support	290	0.821	0.384
Emotional Support	290	12.017	2.803
Age	301	20.701	10.542
Male	301	0.817	0.387
Race			
Black (%)	142	0.472	0.500
White (%)	93	0.309	0.463
Other (%)	66	0.219	0.414
Education			
Some high school or less (%)	84	0.279	0.449
High school/G.E.D. (%)	152	0.505	0.501
Some college or more (%)	65	0.216	0.412
Residence Type			
Household (%)	162	0.540	0.499
Non-Household (%)	138	0.460	0.499
Criminal Justice Status			
Probationers (%)	34	0.113	0.317
Reentrants (%)	267	0.887	0.317

Table 2. Summary Statistics for Neighborhood Predictors (N=297)

Neighborhood Characteristics	1	2	3	4	5	6	Mean	SD
%Below Poverty	1.00						25.99	14.38
%Public Assistance	.435	1.00					20.78	13.68
%Female-Headed Households	.594	.569	1.00				45.54	8.92
%Unemployed	.067	.783	.401	1.00			7.60	3.84
%Under 18	.145	.750	.159	.741	1.00		23.58	9.94
%Black	.117	.611	.620	.607	.576	1.00	35.10	24.12
Concentrated Disadvantage	1.00						158.58	55.10
Residential Stability	-.045	1.00					77.44	13.16

Table 3 reports the results of OLS models that estimate the number of family ties. The effect on the table is the logged value. Model 1 examines the relationship between individual controls and the number of close family ties. Race categories Black and Other were the only statistically significant predictors of family ties ($p<.05$). Compared to whites, blacks have, on average, 1.5 more close family ties. Similarly, non-black, racial/ethnic minorities have, on average, 1.3 more close family ties than whites. Type of residence and gender were marginally statistically significant predictors of family ties ($p<.10$). Compared to women, men have 1.2 fewer family ties. For those living in households, they have an average of 1.2 more close family ties than those living in non-households. The model is statistically significant and accounts for 8.3 percent of the variation in number of family ties. Model 2 examines the relationship between the neighborhood variables, concentrated disadvantage and residential stability, and number of family ties. Neither of the neighborhood variables appears to have a relationship with number of family ties. The regression coefficients were .001 and -.001, respectively, and neither were statistically significant. Model 3 is the full model with both individual controls and neighborhood variables. Race categories Black and Other remain statistically significant predictors of family

Table 3. OLS Coefficients from the Multiple Linear Regression of Number of Family Ties on Selected Individual and Neighborhood Variables (N=289)

	Model 1	**Model 2**	**Model 3**
Individual Variables			
Age	0.000		0.001
	(0.004)		(0.004)
Male	-0.196 #		-0.197 #
	(0.110)		(0.111)
Black	0.380 *		0.382 *
	(0.097)		(0.106)
Hispanic and Other	0.247 *		0.237 *
	(0.115)		(0.118)
Some HS or Less	-0.183		-0.169
	(0.119)		(0.119)
High School/GED	-0.148		-0.122
	(0.107)		(0.107)
Households	0.140 #		0.165 #
	(0.083)		(0.088)
Reentrants	-0.146		-0.176
	(0.135)		(0.138)
Neighborhood Variables			
Concentrated Disadvantage		0.001	0.000
		(0.001)	(0.001)
Residential Stability		-0.001	-0.003
		(0.003)	(0.003)
Intercept	1.475 *	1.347 *	1.740 *
	(0.184)	(0.281)	(0.330)
r square	0.083 *	0.003	0.088 *
	(0.701)	(0.720)	(0.670)
F statistic	3.295	0.454	2.740

*p<.05

#p<.10

Table 4. Logistic Regression of Ties to Friends on Selected Individual and Neighborhood Variables (N=289)

	Model 1		**Model 2**		**Model 3**	
	OR	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**
Individual Variables						
Age	1.006	0.979-1.033			1.006	0.979-1.034
Male	1.044	0.486-2.245			0.970	0.447-2.108
Black	0.676	0.336-1.358			0.677	0.319-1.439
Hispanic and Other	0.563	0.259-1.225			0.537	0.241-1.197
Some HS or Less	0.547	0.238-1.255			0.530	0.229-1.227
High School/GED	0.793	0.363-1.731			0.751	0.342-1.650
Households	1.285	0.730-2.262			1.498	0.825-2.718
Reentrants	0.653	0.227-1.878			0.725	0.249-2.114
Neighborhood Variables						
Concentrated Disadvantage			0.998	0.993-1.003	0.999	0.994-1.005
Residential Stability			0.986	0.964-1.008	0.979	0.249-2.114
Intercept	6.703*		14.323*		36.254*	

*p<.05

#p<.10

Table 5. Logistic Regression of Personal Instrumental Support on Selected Individual and Neighborhood Variables (N=300)

	Model 1		**Model 2**		**Model 3**	
	OR	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**
Individual Variables						
Age	0.984	0.962-1.008			0.985	0.979-1.034
Male	1.172	0.599-2.294			1.168	0.447-2.108
Black	1.006	0.559-1.811			1.003	0.319-1.439
Hispanic and Other	0.556#	0.284-1.090			0.563	0.241-1.197
Some HS or Less	0.628	0.306-1.287			0.653	0.229-1.227
High School/GED	0.660	0.341-1.276			0.694	0.342-1.650
Households	1.304	0.796-2.136			1.227	0.825-2.718
Reentrants	0.278#	0.099-0.780			0.299*	0.249-2.114
Neighborhood Variables						
Concentrated Disadvantage			0.999	0.995-1.004	1.000	0.995-1.005
Residential Stability			1.010	0.992-1.028	1.000#	0.986-1.025
Intercept	9.454*		0.885		36.254*	

*p<.05

#p<.10

ties ($p<.05$), and gender and type of residence remain marginally statistically significant predictors ($p<.10$). Compared to whites, blacks have 1.5 more family ties and non-black, racial/ethnic minorities have 1.3 more family ties. Men have 1.2 fewer family ties than women, and those living in households have 1.2 more family ties than those living in non-households. The similarity in coefficients after adding neighborhood covariates suggest that racial, gender, and type of residence differences do not result from the type of neighborhoods in which participants lived. The neighborhood variables remain insignificant with almost no relationship to number of family ties.

Table 4 reports the results from the logistic regression models estimating ties to friends. Model 1 includes only the control variables in the analysis, model 2 includes only the independent neighborhood variables, and model 3 is the full model with both neighborhood variables and controls. None of the predictor variables are statistically significant in any of the models estimating the presence of ties to friends.

Table 5 reports the results from the logistic regression estimating perceived personal instrumental support. Model 1 includes only the individual controls in the model. Compared to whites, non-black, racial/ethnic minorities have decreased odds of having personal instrumental support by a factor of .556 ($p<.10$). Reentrants have decreased odds of having personal instrumental support by a factor of .278 compared to those who were on probation. Model 2 shows that neither concentrated disadvantage nor residential stability predicted personal instrumental support. In model 3, which includes both individual and neighborhood variables, only reentrants are significantly associated with perceived instrumental support from personal ties. Compared to those on probation, participants who had most recently been incarcerated had decreased odds of having personal instrumental support by a factor of .299 ($p<.05$).

Table 6. Logistic Regression of Institutional Instrumental Support on Selected Individual and Neighborhood Variables (N=300)

	Model 1		**Model 2**		**Model 3**	
	OR	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**
Individual Variables						
Age	1.045 *	1.018-1.072			1.044 *	1.018-1.072
Male	0.947	0.478-1.878			0.913	0.459-1.816
Black	0.787	0.431-1.438			0.799	0.410-1.554
Hispanic and Other	0.615	0.287-1.317			0.604	0.275-1.325
Some HS or Less	0.576	0.277-1.197			0.588	0.281-1.230
High School/GED	0.613	0.321-1.172			0.633	0.329-1.221
Households	1.023	0.601-1.742			1.092	0.618-1.928
Reentrants	0.509 #	0.230-1.126			0.523	0.231-1.186
Neighborhood Variables						
Concentrated Disadvantage			0.998	0.994-1.003	0.999	0.994-1.004
Residential Stability			0.997	0.978-1.016	0.991	0.970-1.012
Intercept	0.540		-0.424		1.176	

*p<.05

#p<.10

Table 6 reports the results from the logistic regression estimating perceived institutional instrumental support. In model 1, age is positively associated with perceived institutional support. For each additional year of age, the odds of having perceived instrumental support from institutions increases by a factor of 1.045, an influence that is statistically distinct from no association ($p<.05$). Compared to those on probation, reentrants had 0.509 the odds of having instrumental support from institutions ($p<.10$). Neither of the neighborhood variables is significant in model 2. Age remains statistically significant in model 3 with a similar association to that found in model 1.

The results from the models estimating emergency support are reported in Table 7 and emotional support are reported in Table 8. None of the individual or neighborhood characteristics were statistically distinguishable from no association for either of these outcomes.

Table 7. Logistic Regression of Emergency Support on Selected Individual and Neighborhood Variables (N=290)

	Model 1		**Model 2**		**Model 3**	
	OR	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**
Individual Variables						
Age	0.996	0.968-1.026			0.999	0.970-1.030
Male	0.612	0.245-1.528			0.607	0.240-1.534
Black	1.094	0.517-2.317			0.797	0.351-1.811
Hispanic and Other	0.621	0.277-1.393			0.495	0.211-1.160
Some HS or Less	0.841	0.336-2.105			0.847	0.337-2.128
High School/GED	0.807	0.356-1.827			0.846	0.371-1.934
Households	1.280	0.687-2.387			1.422	0.729-2.776
Reentrants	1.462	0.537-3.977			1.573	0.566-4.370
Neighborhood Variables						
Concentrated Disadvantage			1.004	0.998-1.009	1.005	0.998-1.011
Residential Stability			0.998	0.976-1.020	0.991	0.967-1.014
Intercept	5.926 *		3.216		6.183	

*p<.05

#p<.10

Table 8. OLS Coefficients from the Multiple Linear Regression of Emotional Support on Selected Individual and Neighborhood Variables (N=289)

	Model 1	**Model 2**	**Model 3**
Individual Variables			
Age	-0.003		-0.001
	(0.755)		(0.016)
Male	0.131		0.095
	(0.449)		(0.453)
Black	0.382		0.233
	(0.397)		(0.431)
Hispanic and Other	-0.475		-0.600
	(0.464)		(0.478)
Some HS or Less	-0.168		-0.148
	(0.484)		(0.488)
High School/GED	-0.320		-0.275
	(0.432)		(0.438)
Households	0.379		0.507
	(0.339)		(0.361)
Reentrants	0.678		0.718
	(0.559)		(0.580)
Neighborhood Variables			
Concentrated Disadvantage		0.002	0.002
		(0.003)	(0.003)
Residential Stability		-0.007	-0.014
		(0.013)	(0.013)
Intercept	11.307 *	12.153 *	12.032 *
	(0.755)	(1.113)	(1.339)
r square	0.027	0.003	0.032
	(2.804)	(2.812)	(2.812)
F statistic	0.970	0.492	0.898

*p<.05

#p<.10

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between neighborhood context, controlling for individual characteristics, and social ties/support for reentrants and probationers. The results indicate some relationship between the number of family ties and race, gender, and type of residence. Blacks and non-black racial/ethnic minorities have more family ties than whites, males have fewer family ties than women, and those living in households have more family ties than those in non-households. The results also suggest that non-black, racial/ethnic minorities and reentrants have a reduced likelihood of having perceived personal instrumental support. Age is positively associated with perceived institutional instrumental support, and reentrants have a reduced likelihood of having perceived institutional instrumental support. Most of the individual characteristics included in the models had no statistically significant association with ties or support. Finally, the results suggest that at the time baseline data were collected, no relationship exists between neighborhood characteristics and the social ties and support of reentrants and probationers.

Both Wilson and Coleman highlight neighborhoods as important influencers of social relationships. This study looked at two different neighborhood characteristics: concentrated disadvantage and residential stability. For reentrants and probationers, other measures of neighborhood disadvantage may be more important, which could explain why the models found no association between neighborhoods and social ties/support. There were also significant differences between the measure of concentrated disadvantage in this study and that in the work of Sampson and colleagues (1997). First, the items in the measure of concentrated disadvantage that I used were not as highly correlated as what previous literature and theory suggest. Second, each item of the index was weighted equally in this study, whereas Sampson et al. (1997)

weighted each variable by their factor loading. These differences might explain the null results found in the models.

Another possibility is that coercive mobility matters more than neighborhood characteristics alone. Coercive mobility describes the involuntary movement into and out of a community as a result of involvement in the criminal justice system (Clear, Rose, Waring, and Scully 2003). This involuntary mobility may have an effect on the residents who are forced to move prior to and after being incarcerated, as well as the residents who remain in the neighborhood, thus playing a destabilizing role in the community (Clear et al. 2003). Results from research on the Moving to Opportunity experiment and HOPE VI point to residential mobility (frequent residential changes on an individual level) as a possible influencer of social ties and social support (Turney, Clampet-Lundquist, Edin, Kling, and Duncan 2006; Clampet-Lundquist 2004; Petit and McLanahan 2003). Although the population is different in the case of MTO and HOPE VI, the same may be true for those involved in the criminal justice system. Involuntary, and possibly frequent, movement in and out of neighborhoods may be a more important predictor of social ties and social support than simply living in a disadvantaged neighborhood.

That so few of the individual characteristics were significantly associated with ties or support is surprising. Race, gender, and type of residence were significant predictors of the number of ties to family, which is consistent with the literature. However, none of the controls were significantly associated with the presence of ties to friends. About 24 percent of the sample reported having no close ties to friends, which is consistent with other studies of more general populations (Small 2007; McPherson, Smith-Lovin, and Brashears 2006; Bearman and Parigi 2004). It remains an important question as to what determines social ties for those involved in

the criminal justice system. The findings suggest that predictors of social ties and social support may have some differences for reentrants and probationers than what has been found for other populations.

Another interesting finding was that reentrants had a reduced likelihood of having both personal and institutional instrumental support. It could be the case that those with fewer avenues of support are more likely to engage in criminal activity, and therefore more likely to enter the criminal justice system. Another possibility is that involvement in the criminal justice system disrupts social ties, which then disrupts the availability of support through those ties. The latter of these explanations would fit with coercive mobility theory.

This study was conducted with limitations. First, the reduced likelihood of having perceived institutional instrumental support among reentrants may be attributable to the fact that some reentrants are not eligible for public assistance (Travis, Solomon, and Waul 2001). It is also unclear whether this particular population would have reported instrumental support from institutions prior to their involvement in the criminal justice system. As a result, limited conclusions can be made from this finding. Second, the analyses do not take into account the length of time that participants had been living in the neighborhood when baseline data were collected. Research shows that length of residence matters for local friendship and community ties (Keene, Bader, and Ailshire 2013; Sampson 1988; Kasarda and Janowitz 1974). Many of the participants had been released in the same year that the data were collected, so it is possible that some of them have not been living in their neighborhood long enough for neighborhood characteristics to matter. Finally, residential mobility was not included in the models as a predictor of ties or support. As previously discussed, studies have found that residential mobility may have an effect on tie formation and the availability of social support. While the models take

into account residential stability as a neighborhood predictor, the frequency of residential moves of the participants, whether voluntary or involuntary (coercive mobility), was not accounted for. Overall, the analyses presented in this study provide no support for the idea that neighborhoods matter for the social ties and social support of reentrants and probationers at the time that baseline data were collected. Future research should focus on identifying which individual characteristics matter for the formation of social ties and availability of social support among offender populations. Future research might also consider the influence of social ties at baseline on future outcomes, where neighborhoods might moderate or mediate the relationship between ties and future outcomes.

REFERENCES

Anderson, E. 1990. *Streetwise: Race, class, and change in an urban community.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Anderson, E. 1999. Code of the Street: Decency, violence, and moral life in the inner city New York: Norton.

Aschenbrenner, Joyce. 1973. *Lifelines: Black Families in Chicago.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Bales, William D. and Daniel P. Mears. 2008. "Inmate Social Ties and the Transition to Society: Does Visitation Reduce Recidivism?" *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 45(3):287-321.

Bearman, Peter and Paolo Parigi. 2004. "Cloning Headless Frogs and Other Important Matters: Conversation Topics and Network Structure." *Social Forces* 83(2):535-557.

Briggs, Xavier de Souza. 1998. "Brown Kids in the White Suburbs: Housing Mobility and the Many Faces of Social Capital. *Housing Policy Debate* 9:177-221.

Clampet-Lundquist, Susan. 2004. "Hope VI Relocation: Moving to New Neighborhoods and Building New Ties." *Housing Policy Debate* 15:415-447.

Clear, Todd, Dina R. Rose, Elin Waring, and Kristen Scully. 2003. "Coercive Mobility and Crime: A Preliminary Examination of Concentrated Incarceration and Social Disorganization." *Justice Quarterly* 20(1):33-64.

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

Coleman, James S. 1990. *Foundations of Social Theory.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

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

Eggebeen, David J., and Dennis P. Hogan. 1990. "Giving Between Generations in American Families." *Human Nature* 1:211-232.

Fernandez, Roberto M., and David Harris. 1992. "Social Isolation and the Underclass." Pp 257-293 in *Drugs, Crime, and Social Isolation: Barriers to Urban Opportunity*, edited by A.V. Harrell and G.E. Peterson. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

Fischer, Claude. 1982. *To Dwell Among Friends.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Granovetter, Mark. 1972. "The Strength of Weak Ties." *The American Journal of Sociology* 78(1):1360.

Granovetter, Mark. 1983. “The Strength of Weak Ties: A Network Theory Revisited.” *Sociological Theory* 1:201-233.

Guest, Avery M., Jane K. Cover, Ross L. Matsueda, and Charis E. Kubrin. 2006. “Neighborhood Context and Neighboring Ties.” City & Community 5:363-385.

Harknett, Kristen S. 2006. “The Relationship Between Private Safety Nets and Economic Outcomes Among Single Mothers.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 68:172-191.

Harknett, Kristen S. and Caroline Sten Hartnett. 2011. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 73(4):861-875.

Henly, Julia R., Sandra K. Danziger, and Shira Offer. 2005. “The Contribution of Social Support to the material well-being of low-income families. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67:122-140.

Jayakody, Rukmalie. 1998. “Race Differences in Intergenerational Financial Assistance.” *Journal of Family Issues* 19:508-533.

Kasarda, John D., and Morris Janowitz. 1974. “Community Attachment in Mass Society.” *American Sociological Review* 39:328-339.

Keene, Danya, Michael Bader, and Jennifer Ailshire. 2013. “Length of Residence and Social Integration: The Contingent Effects of Neighborhood Poverty.” *Health and Place* 21:171-178.

Massey, Douglas and Nancy Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

McPherson, Miller, Lynn Smith-Lovi,, and Matthew E. Brashears. 2006. “Social Isolation in America: Changes in Core Discussion Networks over Two Decades.” *American Sociological Review* 71:353-375.

Mears, Daniel P., Joshua C. Cochran, Sonja E. Siennick, and William D. Bales. 2012. “Prison Visitation and Recidivism.” *Justice Quarterly* 29(6):888-918.

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

Morenoff, Jeffrey D., Robert J. Sampson, and Stephen W. Raudenbush. 2001. *Neighborhood Inequality, Collective Efficacy, and the Spatial Dynamics of Urban Violence* (Report No. 00-451). University of Michigan: Population Studies Center at the Institute for Social Research.

Morenoff, Jeffrey D. and John W. Lynch. 2004. “What Makes a Place Healthy? Neighborhood Influences on Racial/Ethnic Disparities in Health over the Life Course.” Pp 406-449 in *Critical Perspectives on Racial and Ethnic Differences in Health in Late Life*, edited by

Panel on Race, Ethnicity, and Health in Later Life, National Research Council of the National Academies. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Newman, Katherine. 1999. *No Shame in My Game: The Working Poor in the Inner City.* New York: Russell Sage.

Pager, Devah. 2007. *Marked: Race, Crime, and Finding Work in an Era of Mass Incarceration.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Petit, Becky and Saran McLanahan. 2003. "Residential Mobility and Children's Social Capital: Evidence from an Experiment. *Social Science Quarterly* 84:632-649.

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

Petersilia, Joan. 2005. "From Cell to Society: Who is Returning Home?" In J. Travis and C. Visher (Eds.), *Prisoner Reentry and Crime in America* (pp. 15-49). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rankin, Bruce H. and James M. Quane. 2000. "Neighborhood Poverty and the Social Isolation of Inner-City African American Families." *Social Forces* 79:139-164.

Sampson, Robert J. 1988. "Local Friendship Ties and Community Attachment in Mass Society: A Multilevel Systematic Model." *American Sociological Review* 53:766-779.

Sampson, Robert J., Stephen W. Raudenbush, and Felton Earls. 1997. "Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy." *Science* 277(5328):918-924.

Sampson, Robert J., Jeffrey Morenoff, and Felton Earls. 1999. "Beyond Social Capital: Spatial Dynamics of Collective Efficacy for Children." *American Sociological Review* 64(5):633-660.

Sampson, Robert J., Jeffrey D. Morenoff, and Thomas Gannon-Rowley. 2002. "Assessing 'Neighborhood Effects': Social Processes and New Directions in Research." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28:443-478.

Sampson, Robert J. 2003. "The Neighborhood Context of Well-Being." *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* 46(3):S53-S64

Schieman, Scott. 2005. "Residential Stability and the Social Impact of Neighborhood Disadvantage: Gender- and Race-Contingent Patterns." *Social Forces* 83:89-122.

Shapiro, Carol and Meryl Schwartz. 2001. "Coming Home: Building on Family Connections." *Corrections Management Quarterly* 5(3):52-61.

Small, Mario Luis. 2004. *Villa Victoria: The Transformation of Social Capital in a Boston Barrio.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Small, Mario Luis. 2007. “Racial Differences in Networks: Do Neighborhood Conditions Matter?” Social Science Quarterly 88(2):320-43

Small, Mario Luis. 2009. *Unanticipated Gains: Origins of Network Inequality in Everyday Life.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Small, Mario Luis, Erin M. Jacobs, and Rebekah P. Massengill. 2008. “Why Organizational Ties Matter for Neighborhood Effects: A Study of Resource Access through Childcare Centers.” *Social Forces* 87(1):387-414.

Small, Mario Luis and Katherine Newman. 2001. “Urban Poverty after the Truly Disadvantaged: The Rediscovery of the Family, the Neighborhood, and Culture.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 27:23-45.

Tigges, Leann, Irene Browne, and Gary Green. 1998. “Social Isolation of the Urban Poor: Race, Class, and Neighborhood Effects on Social Resources.” *Sociological Quarterly* 39(1):53–77.

Travis, Jeremy, Amy L. Solomon, and Michelle Waul. 2001. *From Prison to Home: The Dimensions and Consequences of Prisoner Reentry.* Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, Justice Policy Center.

Turner, R. Jay and Franco Marino. 1994. “Social Support and Social Structure: A Descriptive Epidemiology.” *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 35(3):193-212.

Turney, Kristin, Susan Clampet-Lundquist, Kathryn Edin, Jeffrey R. Kling, and Greg J. Duncan. 2006. “Neighborhood Effects on Barriers to Employment: Results from a Randomized Housing Mobility Experiment.” Pp 137-172 in *Brookings-Wharton Papers on Urban Affairs*, edited by G. Burtless and J.R. Pack. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Turney, Kristin and Kristen Harknett. 2010. “Neighborhood Disadvantage, Residential Stability, and Perceptions of Instrumental Support among New Mothers.” *Journal of Family Issues* 31(4):499-524.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2012. "Census 2000 Geographic Definitions." Suitland, MD.

U.S. Department of Justice. Bureau of Justice Statistics. 2011. *Correctional Population in the United States, 2010.* Washington, D.C.

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, Vera Kachnowski, Nancy G. La Vigne, and Jeremy Travis. 2004. *Baltimore Prisoners’ Experiences Returning Home.* Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Visher, Christy A. and Daniel J. O’Connell. 2012. “Incarceration and Inmates’ Self Perceptions About Returning Home.” *Journal of Criminal Justice* 40(5):386-393.

Visher, Christy A. and Jeremy Travis. 2011. “Life on the Outside: Returning Home After Incarceration.” *The Prison Journal* 91(3):102S-119S).

Wellman, Barry and Scot Wortley. 1990. “Different Strokes from Different Folks: Community Ties and Social Support.” *American Journal of Sociology* 96(3):558-588.

Wethington, Elaine and Ronald C. Kessler. 1986. “Perceived Support, Received Support, and Adjustment to Stressful Life Events.” *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 27(1):78-89.

Wilson, William Julius. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Wilson, William Julius. 1991. “Another Look at the Truly Disadvantaged.” *Political Science Quarterly* 106(4):639-656.