MATERNAL MOTIVATIONS AND CRIMINAL DESISTANCE

By

Elizabeth A. Adams

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Criminal Justice-Master of Science

2014

ABSTRACT

MATERNAL MOTIVATIONS AND CRIMINAL DESISTANCE

By

Elizabeth A. Adams

Existing literature on reentry and community supervision experiences of mothers requires expansion. An age-graded informal social control life course theory perspective provided the framework for studying whether several indicators of bonds to children explained women's desistance from crime. The focus on bonds to children addressed a concern of feminist theorists, who criticize life course theory for omitting bonds that are salient influences on women's behavior. Because prior research from inmate surveys and qualitative assessments suggest that parental concerns are especially frequent, and they may be stressful for women offenders, stress from parenting is also studied as an influence on desistance. In order to statistically examine these distinct parenting-related challenges and protective factors, the connections of women's recidivism outcomes to maternal dispositions and motivations are investigated using a longitudinal design on a large sample of women offenders. Based on transcripts from three waves of interviews from a larger project's data set, and guided by life course theory and feminist criticisms of it, the current research examined parent-related factors and several measures of recidivism for 193 mothers on community supervision. This study expanded knowledge regarding maternal motivations, involvement with children, and stress from parenting, in relation to criminal desistance processes conceptualized in the theory of age-graded informal social control.

Dedicated to my mother and father for endlessly inspiring me by demonstrating strength and positivity through life’s many obstacles.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is an honor to express my appreciation for all of those who encouraged and helped me maintain balance during my first year in graduate school. I would not have been able to finish my required courses and thesis without the support of numerous individuals and agencies.

First, I would like to acknowledge the funding for this project was provided by the National Science Foundation (SES-1126162). Additionally, I'd like to thank those that facilitated this important research on women under community supervision. The current examination would not have been possible without the dedication and hard work of the investigators, graduate research assistants, interviewers, and undergraduate workers. I also must express my appreciation for Michigan State University's School of Criminal Justice for aiding me in developing a career plan to fit my interests by providing various opportunities for learning in the classroom as well as in the community.

In addition, I'd like to thank my thesis committee members, Drs. Jennifer Cobbina and Mahesh Nalla, for providing me with valuable input and support as I worked on my thesis. I also want to extend my deepest gratitude for my thesis chair, Dr. Merry Morash, for challenging me to think critically and teaching me how to utilize a mixed-methods approach for my thesis. Your daily involvement with students and research is nothing short of inspirational. I hope to emulate your work ethic and compassion for others throughout my life and career.

Additionally, I am pleased to acknowledge that several professors outside of my committee offered me opportunities and encouraged me during my first year as a graduate student. I am

thankful to Drs. Meghan Hollis, Jesenia Pizarro, and Ed McGarrell for offering me addtional research experience and providing me with strategies to examine and address community issues while collaborating with law enforcement personnel.

Finally, I am thankful for my family as they motivate and allow me to make my own decisions as I navigate life. My aunt, Annette Horan, has assisted me through challenges and served as a listening ear during many of my contemplations regarding my personal and professional life. In addition, my parents have always supported and validated my life choices. Their endless assurance has enabled me to confidently and creatively examine and attempt to address controversial societal issues. The completion of my thesis was one vital step in my journey as a researcher – this endeavor was made possible and exciting through the inspiration and motivation I've received from others.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES ix

Chapter 1: Rationale for the Study.....1
Challenges of Incarceration and Reentry for Mothers 1
Challenges for Mothers on Probation and Parole 3
The Importance of Identifying Influences on Women's Desistance 4

Chapter 2: Review of Existing Literature …….....7
Literature on Life Course Theories and Age Graded Social Control Theory.....7
Life Course Examinations of Female Offenders 12
Qualitative Research using Age-Graded Social Control……...12
Quantitative Research using Age-Graded Social Control…….15
Conceptualizations of Recidivism for Mothers…….15
Conceptualizations of Informal Social Control for Mothers…….16
Social Bonds to Children……...…17
Stress from Parenting…….20
Relevant Variables in Research on Women's Criminality and Recidivism……..22
Risks for Recidivism……..22
Age…….22
Demographics, Neighborhood Contexts, Relationships, and Peers……...23
Educational and Occupational History……..24
Criminal History, Substance Abuse, Mental Health Status, and Exposure to Abuse…….25
Conclusion …….....25
Hypotheses …….....26

Chapter 3: Methodology of the Current Study.....28
Sample 29
Quantitative Data.....30
Dependent Variables…….…….30
Independent Variables.....31
Maternal Motivations…….31
Social Bonds to Children……...31
Stress from Parenting…….31
Control Variables …….....…… 32
Women's Total Needs……...32
Predictive Risks…….32
Employment and Financial Needs…….32
Anti-Social Peers……...33
Criminal History……33
Substance Abuse History……...34
Mental Health Disorders……34

1. Mental Illness…….....34
2. Current Depression and Anxiety……..34
3. Current Psychosis…….34
Interviewer's indication of Women's Anger and Hostility……35
Interviewer's Indication of Women's Anti-Social Attitude……...35
Women Residing in Un-Safe Homes…….35
Predictive Strengths……...36
Educational Strengths……36
Self Efficacy……..36
Family Support……..36
Age and Race…….37
Supervision Status……..37
Neighborhood Context……...37
Coding of the Qualitative Data 37
Analysis of the Quantitative Data.....38

Chapter 4: Results 41
Qualitative Findings 41
Maternal Motivations…..41
Attachment to Children……..41
Being a Good Parent……..43
Being a Better Parent than Before…….45
Proving to be a Good Parent……..46
Parental Role Assertion……..49
Custody Motivations……..50
Routine Activities with Children……...52
Stress from Parenting 53
Quantitative Findings 56
Bivariate Analysis ….....56
Correlations among Independent Variables……56
Correlations among Dependent Variables…….60
Correlations of Independent with Dependent Variables……62
Regression Analysis 66
Alcohol Use Based on Supervising Officer Case Notes……....67
Number of Violations Based on Supervising Officer Case Notes…….69
Women's Self Reported Substance Abuse at the First Interview……..72
Drug Use Based on Supervising Officer Case Notes…….75
Official Arrest Records……..77
Official Conviction Records……..80
Findings for the Control Variables……84

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion 87
Limitations.....92

APPENDIX 95

REFERENCES 100

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 - Attachment to Children ..……..…...41

Table 2 - Being a Good Parent …….…….....43

Table 3 - Being a Better Parent than Before …….....……..……45

Table 4 - Proving to be a Good Parent .....……..……...….....……..46

Table 5 - Parental Role Assertion ...……...……..….49

Table 6 - Custody Motivations ……...……...……..…….50

Table 7 - Routine Activities with Children …….…….....……...52

Table 8 - Correlations among Dichotomous Independent Variables ...……...……..…57

Table 9 - Correlations among Continuous Independent Variables ……...…….....59

Table 10 - Correlations among Dependent Variables ……...…...…….61

Table 11 - Correlations of Dichotomous Independent Variables with Dependent Variables……63

Table 12 - Correlations of Continuous Independent Variables with Dependent Variables…...….65

Table 13 - Regression of Supervising Officer's Case Notes of Women's Alcohol Use while under Supervision on Control Variables and the Dichotomous Independent Variables …….….68

Table 14 - Regression of Supervising Officer's Case Notes of Women's Alcohol Use while under Supervision on Control Variables and the Continuous Independent Variables …….....….69

Table 15 - Regression of Supervising Officer's Case Notes of Women's Violations while under Supervision on Control Variables and the Dichotomous Independent Variables …….……...….71

Table 16 - Regression of Supervising Officer's Case Notes of Women's Violations while under Supervision on Control Variables and the Continuous Independent Variables ……...….72

Table 17 - Regression of Self-Reported Substance Abuse at the First Interview on Control Variables and the Dichotomous Independent Variables ……...……74

Table 18 - Regression of Self-Reported Substance Abuse at the First Interview on Control Variables and the Continuous Independent Variables …….….....75

Table 19 - Regression of Supervising Officer's Case Notes of Drug Use while under Supervision on Control Variables and the Dichotomous Independent Variables ……...…….76

Table 20 - Regression of Supervising Officer's Case Notes of Drug Use while under Supervision on Control Variables and the Continuous Independent Variables ……..…..…77

Table 21 - Regression of Official Arrest Records on Control Variables and the Dichotomous Independent Variables ….....….…79

Table 22 - Regression of Official Arrest Records on Control Variables and the Continuous Independent Variables …….…….80

Table 23 - Regression of Official Conviction Records on the Control and the Dichotomous Independent Variables ……..……...….82

Table 24 - Regression of Official Conviction Records on the Control and the Continuous Independent Variables …….……...……..83

Table 25 - Findings of Significance for Controls in Dichotomous and Continuous Regressions ……84

Table 26 - Findings of Significance for IVs in Dichotomous and Continuous Regressions….....88

Chapter 1: Rationale for the Study

Offender populations in the United States have been marked by slight reductions over the last few years (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2013 a), but the number of females involved in the criminal justice system remains higher than in previous decades (Salisbury & Van Voorhis, 2009). In 2012 females comprised 7% of those incarcerated, and accounted for 24% of probationers and 11% of parolees (Glaze & Hererrman, 2013; Maruschak & Bonczar, 2013). While females still comprise smaller percentages of offender populations than do men, from 1995 to 2012 their growth rate of imprisonment in jail and prison (80%), and on community supervision (42%) was approximately double the growth rate for male imprisonment in jail and prison (44%) and on community supervision (19%) (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1997; 2013b; 2013 c; 2013d). Although females continue to experience disproportionate growth in offender populations, criminological research and theoretical development remains inadequate in assessing gender-specific risk and protective factors for women (Salisbury & Van Voorhis, 2009), particularly the types of bonds that contribute to their desistance from crime.

The next section briefly reviews literature suggesting why establishing bonds to children might be problematic for women on parole and probation. Specifically, women's experiences in prison may make it difficult to maintain bonds, and all women supervised in the community may face special challenges maintaining ties to their children.

Challenges of Incarceration and Reentry for Mothers

Research on offender populations has revealed distinct negative effects related to the increasing numbers of mothers involved in the criminal justice system. From 1991 to 2007, there was an 80% increase in children with incarcerated parents (Glaze & Maruschack, 2008), and this was arguably attributable to the 75-80% of women that left behind an average of 2.11 minor

children upon incarceration (Eros, 2001; Greenfield & Snell, 1999). In 2007, 60% of incarcerated women resided with children who relied on them for care prior to imprisonment (Glaze & Maruschack, 2008). A related issue for mothers was finding placement for their children upon incarceration, as they have been found to be far less likely to be able to rely on the other biological parent (37%) for care during incarceration in comparison to incarcerated men (88%) (Glaze & Maruschack, 2008). In effect, women more often have had to rely on grandparents, other family members, and even foster care for child placement (Glaze & Maruschack, 2008; Mumola, 2000). Qualitative research has shown that mothers reported fear for the safety and protection of their children when placed with grandparents susceptible to manipulation from children, anti-social adult role models, or complete strangers, all of whom may reside in dangerous neighborhoods (Arditti & Few, 2008; Muhammad, 2012). In addition to mothers' stress over child safety, poor relationships or no relationships between the caregiver and the incarcerated parent has been associated with decreased visitation, as caregivers may limit children's relations with incarcerated or offender parents (Arditti & Few, 2008; Muhammad, 2012).

Abrupt lapses in communication due to incarceration or commitments to in-patient treatment facilities may be confusing and upsetting for both the child (Muhammad, 2012) and the removed parent (Arditti & Few, 2008; White, 2012). Evidence exists indicating inmates' that reported fewer visits from their children experienced higher rates of parental stress, depression (Poehlmann, 2005), and recidivism than those that were visited more often (Cochran, 2013). Additionally, incarcerated mothers may rarely, if ever, receive visits from their children during incarceration due to distances of facilities (Krisberg & Termin, 2001) averaging 160 miles further from their families than inmate fathers (Hagan & Dinovitzer, 1999). For women on

probation and parole, recidivism has been found to be harmful for offenders and their children due to exposure to illegal activity and increased risk for violations which may result in loss of child custody and imprisonment (Hagan & Dinovitzer, 1999; La Vigne et al., 2005).

Challenges for Mothers on Probation and Parole

Although female parolees have been found to experience additional barriers in maintaining family contact due to incarceration, for female offenders on probation as well as those on parole, many of their over-arching issues and stipulations of supervision create problems in forming and maintaining ties to children. For example, drug offenses that result in community supervision can bring about child abuse investigations that lead to more intensive supervision or imprisonment for an offender originally diverted to probation (Fagan, 1994). This issue has been especially prevalent for women involved in the criminal justice system, as a majority of them have drug charges, and more often than male offenders have histories of substance abuse (Boyd, 1999; Morash, 2010; Salisbury & Van Voorhis, 2009). Compared to men, women are more often the primary caregivers of their children, and this increased involvement may contribute to their greater risk of losing custody and facing charges concerning child abuse and endangerment (Glaze & Maruschack, 2008; Mumola, 2000). Disproportionate criminalization for mothers compared to fathers has also been associated with punitive legal policies for addressing drug use during pregnancy, which has been found to lead to child abuse cases, court ordered abortions, incarceration, and loss of custody (Paltrow, 1990). In addition, women more often than men report feelings of guilt and humiliation regarding their children's exposure to their criminal behavior; female offenders may experience more parental stress (Giordano, 2010), which has been associated with increased substance abuse, depression and recidivism (Arditti & Few, 2006; Arditti & Few, 2008; Salisbury & Van Voorhis, 2009).

The unique legal challenges that female offenders who are mothers face are often inflated by social sanctions that further scrutinize them for violating gender roles stipulating that females be lawful and nurturing to children (Clear, Waring & Scully, 2005; Heimer & DeCoster, 1999). Assumptions about women bearing the brunt of care giving responsibilities for children have set female offenders up for social ostracism by the community and the justice system, as these women have been generally viewed as out of control, inept parents that threaten their children's well-being (Boyd, 1999). Some scholars have mentioned this gendered stressor as protective in that it may deter maternal offending or motivate women offenders to seek substance abuse treatment (Riehman, Hser, & Zeller, 2000). On the other hand, researchers have also argued that in combination with legal sanctions, social sanctions may dissuade maternal or pregnant offenders from seeking treatment for substance abuse, in fear that they may lose their parental rights (Fagan, 1994).

The Importance of Identifying Influences on Women's Desistance

abuse, and also that they In addition to the potential influence of bonds to children and parenting stress on desistance, existing literature has identified several other possible influences for women (Giordano, 2010; Giordano et al., 2002; Salisbury & Van Voorhis, 2009). Numerous studies have found that female offenders more often struggle with substance abuse, mental illness, sexual and physical are more often economically marginalized than male offenders, and these factors influence desistance (Messina et al., 2006; Richie, 2001; Salisbury & Van Voorhis, 2009). Scholars have also found that programming varies in effectiveness across sexes and other traits of offender groups depending on whether they address relevant risks and needs (Moloney & Moller, 2009). Program effectiveness must be considered given the enormous cost of corrections and the expenses of increased foster care caseloads (Mumola, 2000; White, 2012), in

addition to the future expenses related to children of offenders' future criminal justice involvement (Murray & Farrington, 2008; Giordano, 2010). Research on women offenders must be increased due to the over-reliance of research on male offenders' risks, needs and pathways in and out of crime (Giordano, 2010; Salisbury & Van Voorhis, 2009).

In order to fill gaps in theory development, contemporary research has integrated gender relevant factors with concepts from traditional criminology to better explain recidivism (Salisbury & Van Voorhis, 2009; Giordano, 2010). Research on female offenders has found that mothers' commonly mentioned their concern and guilt regarding their offending and the subsequent circumstances for their children (Giordano, 2010; Arditti & Few 2008). For example, incarcerated women have expressed concern about their children's well-being while apart and their regret over the exposure their criminal actions may have had on their children (Arditti & Few, 2008). Maternal offenders in the community have also expressed concerns and distress for their children's well-being, especially if they were no longer their children's primary caregiver and were suspicious of their child's well-being and living circumstances (Giordano, 2010). To examine maternal offenders, several researchers have used life-course perspectives, especially the version of life course scholarship inspired by Sampson and Laub's (1993, 2003) theory of age-graded informal social control (Edin & Kafalas, 2005; Giordano, 2010; Giordano et al., 2002; Kreager, Matuesda & Erosheva, 2010;Michalsen, 2011; Thompson & Petrovic, 2009).These studies used this theory to examine hypothesized gender specific variables related to stability and change in criminal behaviors of mothers.

Age-graded informal social control theory is supported by research that has methodological strength gained through using both quantitative data and the qualitative, in-depth narratives that are arguably required to reveal the intricate nature of behavioral shifts throughout

the life course (Giordano, 2010; Laub & Sampson, 2003; Michalsen, 2010). Like many longitudinal research endeavors, the framework suggests the use of a research design involving the collection of quantitative measures of demographics, contextual factors and criminal behaviors though self-report surveys and official records at different time periods (Laub & Sampson, 2003). Especially distinctive to this approach is the supplement of quantitative data with life narratives based on interviews with offenders. Narratives help reveal the subjective perceptions of the offender regarding their experiences leading to desistance and persistence (Giordano, 2010; Laub & Sampson, 2003). The current study contributed to this line of research as the subject of motherhood and desistance for females on community supervision has never been approached longitudinally using quantitative and qualitative measures on a large sample.

Chapter 2: Review of Existing Literature

In order to contribute to knowledge on desistance for maternal offenders under community supervision, the current study examined key variables supported by existing life course studies and feminist research. This chapter begins with an overview of Sampson and Laub's age-graded informal social control theory (1993), as the current study examined maternal motivations and stressors using a gendered adaptation of this model. After the model is described, the theories and politics that influenced the evolution of age-graded informal social control theory are explored. This section is followed with a description of prominent studies and general findings across existing literature regarding age-graded informal social control theory applied to examining women and mothers. Overall, studies that considered heterogeneous populations, situational contexts and historical conditions found differences in desistance between individuals who varied in the quality of social bonds to their children. The majority of studies provide support for the significance of motherhood and increased attachment to children as turning points for female offenders (Edin & Kafalas, 2005; Kreager, Matuesda & Erosheva, 2010; Michalsen, 2011; Thompson & Petrovic, 2009).

After the review of literature connecting maternal offenders' bonds to children with desistance, a brief review of alternative factors commonly found to influence criminal involvement of women is presented. Several variables that are alternative explanations were incorporated in this analysis. Variables that were not in the available data set are identified, and this limitation is noted in the Discussion section. Relatedly, those factors found to clarify the nature of female offending and social bonds to children as a turning point but that this analysis is unable to address were also mentioned as limitations. Overall, this review justifies the design of the study, which the next chapter on methodology describes.

Literature on Life Course Theories and Age-Graded Social Control

For more than twenty years, criminal behavior over the life course has been examined by studying the continuation of criminality for individuals and subgroups of individuals (Laub & Sampson, 2003). Sampson and Laub (1993) made a significant shift in criminological focus to include the desistance processes for individuals over their life course. They discovered it was necessary to investigate desistance of formerly persistent offenders when they re-examined and extended Glueck and Glueck's data collected between 1939-1963 for 500 delinquent and 500 non-delinquent boys recruited for study between the ages of 10 and 17. Equipped with extensive data on this large sample of delinquents, Laub and Sampson (2003) were compelled to explore a prevailing controversy in the field of criminology regarding career criminals.

On one side of this controversy, findings from a study of a Philadelphia birth cohort (1945-1963) inspired researchers' to fixate on chronic offenders. The specific finding was that a small percentage of their sample (6%) was responsible for the majority of crimes committed by the entire cohort (52%) (Wolfgang, Figilio, & Sellin, 1972). In the 1980's, developmental criminologists also took interest in career criminals' trajectories, and created typologies that identified the etiological characteristics of chronic offenders and other groups. These studies popularized the notion that a small percent of the population would become chronic offenders, and they could be recognized at a young age based on risk factors such as low IQ, low SES, and early and serious delinquency (Blumstein et al., 1986; Moffitt, 1993; Wolfgang, Figilio, & Sellin, 1972).

Although Laub and Sampson (2003) mentioned that typologies may provide benefits in terms of categorizing risk factors and suggesting treatment methods for groups of offenders, they warned of several policy implications that could arise if assumptions were made regarding career criminals. They mentioned potential policy issues such as the labeling of children as future

chronic offenders and discriminatory incarceration of those with childhood risk factors (Greenwood, 1982). They also raised questions about the operationalization of variables qualifying individuals as chronic offenders in research. In order to address these concerns, Laub and Sampson (2003) carried out empirical study by examining the criminal careers of the Gluecks' sample over the participants' life course.

To address criticisms of the career criminal approach, Laub and Sampson (2003) tried to identify the chronic offenders in the Gluecks' sample. They attempted to categorize chronic offenders based on childhood risk factors supported by Mofitt (1993), one of the most influential developmental criminologists of the time. After tracing the participants' criminal records up to age 70, they found that offending behaviors of the persistent group varied substantially by age and crime type in adulthood (Sampson & Laub, 1993). Moreover, Laub and Sampson (2003) found that childhood risk factors could not be relied on to prospectively identify persistent offenders. This finding motivated them to explain the variations in desistance for formerly persistent offenders in their study. In order to determine the causes of this variability, they set out to interview at least five participants from each of the different criminal career trajectories they found based on official records of the subjects' criminal histories and supplemented by the Gluecks' original data.

The narratives collected through interviews with the men in the different trajectories revealed common trends in life events of those who desisted earlier, especially in comparison to those that persisted in crime into late adulthood. Sampson and Laub (1993) found that despite cumulative risk factors indicative of persistence and the occurrence of antisocial behaviors in early life and through early adulthood, those who desisted more frequently mentioned the formation of quality pro-social bonds. The researchers concluded that variations in informal

social control were the primary causes for crime and desistance. They described bonds as creating inter-reliant systems of responsibility and restraint which carried related costs and rewards for the participants bringing them closer to or away from criminal behavior (Sampson & Laub, 1993). More specifically, they found life events during adulthood – such as employment, marriage, military commitment, and neighborhood changes – increased quality attachments and reduced the criminal behaviors of previously persistent offenders in the sample (Sampson & Laub, 1993; Laub & Sampson, 2003).

Noting the narrow scope of informal social control theory, they revised their theoretical framework to include additional concepts that they argued were of equal significance to other parts of the theory. They incorporated personal agency, situated choice, routine activities, age, the macro level historical events of the time, local culture, and community context (Laub & Sampson, 2003). They found these components helped explain the variation in bond formation and desistance across their groupings of persistent offenders (Laub & Sampson, 2003). With the expanded theory, the authors still concluded that the most influential types of informal social control for the men were employment, marriage, military commitment, and neighborhood changes (Laub & Sampson, 2003). Laub and Sampson's (2003) development and revision of age-graded informal social control theory provided the field of criminology with a methodological approach that incorporated subjective narratives of offenders with quantitative evaluations and official criminal histories.

Despite the in-depth nature of the theory, many feminist scholars have mentioned that their findings neglected the potential variability of desistance processes for females (Edin & Kafalas, 2005; Giordano et al., 2002; Kreager, Matuesda & Erosheva, 2010; Michalsen, 2011; Thompson & Petrovic, 2009). Laub and Sampson (2003) warned of this, writing that their

findings lacked generalizability across gender groups and historical context. They suggested that examinations should be conducted on females to identify the applicability of the framework and the significance of the turning points they found for the Gluecks' sample of men (Laub & Sampson, 2003).

Prior research that provided insight into female desistance has also been criticized (Giordano et al., 2002) for having deficient numbers of delinquent females in their samples (Elliott, Huizinga, & Menard, 1989; Osgood et al., 1988). As women are more often processed through the criminal justice system, gendered examinations grounded in research on large samples of women offenders have more recently expanded. This more recent research on women has found that their desistance was not explained by events associated with men's desistance (Edin & Kafalas, 2005; Giordano et al., 2002; Kreager, Matuesda & Erosheva, 2010; Michalsen, 2011; Thompson & Petrovic, 2009). For example, in Giordano and colleagues (2002) study, education and employment were not found to be predictive life events in explaining desistance for the women, as those that desisted from crime were unemployed or had low paying jobs, which prompted the authors to question the influences on these women's desistance (Giordano et al., 2002).

Additionally, as women have been increasingly examined using life course propositions and age-graded informal social control theory. These studies have consistently reported that life events found to influence women's transitions in and out of crime are significantly different from influences on men's transitions found in Laub and Sampson's (2003) work, and transitions of men from more current research (Thompson & Pertovic, 2009). Most notable is the influence of parenting on women's desistance from criminal behavior (Edin & Kafalas, 2005; Kreager, Matuesda & Erosheva, 2010; Michalsen, 2011; Thompson & Petrovic, 2009); on the other hand,

parenting has not been found to have a significant or as strong of a role for male desistance (Sampson & Laub, 1993; Giordano et al., 2002; Giordano, 2010; Thompson & Petrovic, 2009).

Life Course Examinations of Female Offenders

Qualitative Research Using Age-Graded Informal Social Control Theory

Life course scholars applying age-graded informal social control theory have regularly made use of qualitative narratives to provide insight into the thought-provoking perceptions of offenders regarding their personal struggles and turning points (Edin & Kafalas, 2005; Kreager, Matuesda & Erosheva; Giordano, 2010; Michalsen, 2011). Although the present research did not use data from complete life narratives, it used women's qualitative accounts of their thoughts about motherhood and their interactions with children. Such qualitative accounts are useful for studying underrepresented topics and populations in existing research (Arditti & Few, 2008). In addition, the qualitative data made it possible to identify the subjects' perceptions of their own parental motivations as triggers for cognitive and behavioral shifts away from crime (Giordano et al., 2002).

Giordano and colleagues (2002) expanded on age-graded social control to include more deliberate processes of change that they found in analyzing their interview data on a follow up sample of serious male and female delinquents. They outlined four transformative stages required for cognitive transformations, which are essential in the facilitation of change beyond the source of social control. First of all, the person needs to be open to change, and then they need to be exposed to a hook for change. Hooks for change vary for individuals, but usually an opportunity is presented for the person to create ties, or strengthen ties with another person, activity, or cause. This is followed by an ability to imagine their replacement self, which may be displayed by their planning process to change. Finally, their views on deviant behavior, or the lifestyle that accompanies deviant behavior, are converted and replaced with a new identity

(Giordano et al., 2002). These components were theorized to form mental filters based on cognitive reinforcements which are held stable by the new identity. Meaning, the new identity would be a stronger internal filter, providing more permanent change that would last upon separation from their control source (Giordano et al., 2002).

In a follow up of the same cohorts of 127 girls and 127 boys, Giordano (2010) found that female narratives were similar but more optimistic than those of males, especially concerning children (Giordano, 2010). The prevalence of mothers that mentioned children in Giordano's study is consistent with other qualitative assessments (Arditti & Few, 2008; Edin & Kefelas, 2005). Qualitative assessments have found that female offenders maintain prominent expressions of guilt and concern regarding their behavior's impact on their children (Arditti & Few, 2008; Giordano, 2010). Even female offenders that have lost custody of their children were found to mention them as motivational in their self-reported desistance processes (Michalsen, 2011). Relatedly, women have mentioned their love for their children as the reason they did not seek custody. These women talked about their fears of removing their children from stable living situations only to be unable to properly care for them. Mothers also spoke of these deficiencies as incentives for change, as they saw their current abilities to support children as inadequate and mentioned changes they needed to make to be a better role model and to provide more suitable care for their children (Arditti & Few, 2008; Michalsen, 2011).

Examples of content mentioned by mother offenders during qualitative interviews have been described as *mending relationships*, *making up for lost time*, and *providing guardianship for their existing or newborn children* (Edin & Kafalas, 2005; Michalsen, 2011). Qualitative accounts also reveal the daily routines that insulated women through new activity, pro-social

bonds and priorities (Edin & Kafalas, 2005; Hunt, Joe-Laider, & MacKenzie, 2005; Fleisher & Krienert, 2004; Michalsen, 2011).

Although convincing evidence of cognitive transformations and motivations have frequently been found in interview data of maternal offenders, in some cases, they are not associated with desistance (Giordano, 2010). In compiling alternative explanations based on survey responses and interview content, scholars described risk factors that may have impeded these and similar motivational accounts for desistance. Several terms have been used to describe these barriers. In research on juvenile offenders and their relations with parents, Schroeder and colleagues (2011) mentioned cumulative risks for continuance or cumulative continuity, which was described as events that snowball into more serious outcomes due to the impacts of prior criminal behavior paving the way for additional disadvantages (p. 67). In addition, qualitative accounts of mothers reentering the community have identified factors such as depression, violence and addiction to comprise the "triple threat" which in combination, were hypothesized to increase harmful stressors for maternal offenders with health problems, dysfunctional relationships, trauma related to loss, and concern and guilt regarding children (Arditti & Few, 2008, p. 304). Relatedly, Giordano (2010) found qualitative evidence for a "respectable person package" which comprised of marriage, and a job with stable income. She theorized that women, who expressed cognitive shifts and identity transformations away from criminal behavior to assume parenting responsibilities, but that still recidivated, lacked traits necessary in the respectability package (Giordano, 2010). To address the lack of available longitudinal qualitative research on mothers under community supervision, especially probation, the current study will provide unique information on the moderating effect of variation in risk for recidivism on the association of mothering-related variables to recidivism in a follow-up assessment (Edin &

Kafalas, 2005; Kreager, Matuesda & Erosheva, 2010; Michalsen, 2011; Thompson & Petrovic, 2009).

Quantitative Research Using Age-Graded Informal Social Control Theory

Conceptualizations of Recidivism for Mothers

As previously mentioned, Laub and Sampson (2003) noted several implications for the operationalization of variables used by scholars for the identification of chronic offenders. Based on their assessment, they promoted the use of data regarding multiple offending behaviors from several sources such as self-report surveys, interview content with participants, information from associates of the participant, and the use of official records (Laub & Sampson, 2003). Researchers who have studied maternal offending also used a variety of measures of desistance. For example, Michelson (2011) only considered the women's yes or no responses regarding reduction in their offending behaviors at the time of the interview compared to their behavior prior to their last incarceration. Although the measure was simple and did not necessarily capture the termination of offending behavior (Michelson, 2011), the study sheds light on the gradual progression often found in quality social bond formation and the actual processes of desistance (Elder, 1985; Giordano, 2010; Laub & Sampson, 2003).

Due to the high expense and the rigorous nature of life course longitudinal assessments, many scholars have made use of existing data sets which limit their ability to measure variables of interest and usually do not allow for follow-up with participants (Kreager, Matsueda, & Erosheva, 2010; Laub & Sampson, 2003; Warr, 1998). For example, Thompson and Petrovic (2009) measured the dichotomous response to subjects' self-reported illicit substance abuse and their responses for recurrent or single use over several interviews. The authors explained that their use of an existing data set inhibited their ability to triangulate their measure (Thompson & Petrovic, 2009). On the other hand, they argued that the existing dataset provided a timely

dependent variable through examining illicit use of drugs other than marijuana; this design feature is important in light of recent policies around the country that have decriminalized marijuana (Thompson & Petrovic, 2009). This example reveals some negative and positive aspects of utilizing existing data on the operationalization of dependent variables.

Another issue is the term desistance broadly encompasses the termination of all criminal behavior, which is problematic when broad and specific measures are compared without consideration of their vast differences (Kreager, Matsueda, & Erosheva, 2010). As the scope of criminal behavior has evolved, scholars also began to examine more specific behaviors for particular groups of maternal offenders. For example, behavioral shifts such as self-reported disaffiliations with gangs (Hunt, Joe-Laider, & MacKenzie, 2005) and reductions in self-reported underage alcohol consumption (see example with small sample, Fleisher & Krienert, 2004) have been examined and found to be common form of desistance for female gang members during their transition to motherhood. Although these group specific measures, and other single measures reviewed in this section provide specific insight into particular types of desistance, the findings must be taken with skepticism, as they may not be as telling for other groups of people, or for alternative behavioral changes. Studies that used age-graded social control theory and provided several measures provide insight into the nature of cessation for maternal offenders regarding multiple behaviors reported from varying agencies (Edin & Kafalas, 2005; Kreager, Matuesda & Erosheva; Giordano, 2010; Warr, 1998). The dependent variables used to measure desistance in these studies along with suggestions from Laub and Sampson (2003) were used to formulate the current study's dependent variables which will be elaborated in the next chapter.

Conceptualizations of Informal Social Control for Mothers

This section will review literature regarding social bonds to children and stress from parenting. These factors have been found as primary independent variables from prior research

on maternal desistance. Many of the recent studies on women using a life course approach obtained sample sizes that permit quantitative assessments to be generalizable across the populations sampled (Edin & Kafalas, 2005; Kreager, Matuesda & Erosheva, 2010; Michalsen, 2011; Thompson & Petrovic, 2009). The large numbers of participants allowed researchers to assess quantitative survey measures and to quantify qualitative data for empirical analysis. Surveys mainly have been used to provide a sense of maternal circumstances thought to serve as supports or barriers for desistance (Giordano, 2010; Kreager, Matuesda & Erosheva, 2010; Michalsen, 2011; Thompson & Petrovic, 2009).

Social Bonds to Children

As social bond formation is central to age-graded informal social control theory, attachment to children has been a dominant focus for studies on turning points for maternal offenders (Giordano, 2010; Graham & Bowling, 1996; Kreager, Matsueda & Erosheva, 2010). These measures of attachment have often been formulated based on situational dispositions and characteristics of the maternal populations of concern or interest to researchers and policy makers. For example, several criminological studies surveyed maternal offenders' on their maintenance of relationships with children during incarceration. The types of communication examined have included self-report measures for inmates regarding: pre-imprisonment co-habitation with children; inmate mothers' self-reports of caregiver relations; self-reported mail contact, phone contact, and visitation during imprisonment (Barnes & Stringer, 2014); comprehensive prison records of visitation (Cochran, 2013); and the frequency and timing of visitation throughout subjects' imprisonment (Bales & Mears, 2008). One of the studies found support for social bonds theory for inmate mothers based on correlations between increased communication with children, expectations of future child custody, and close ties to caregivers as they related to more salient maternal identities upon reentry (Barnes & Stringer, 2014). However,

studies that measured recidivism rates in relation to child visitation have provided mixed evidence of correlations for inmate mothers upon reentry. For example, one study found more child visitation was related to decreased recidivism for women (Cochran, 2013), while another examination found increased frequency and the timing of child visitation nearing the end women's incarceration to be associated with increased recidivism (Bales & Mears, 2008).

Mothers on community supervision that have not experienced imprisonment may have stronger relations with their children (Leverentz, 2006), and therefore attachment measures can address more specific parent-child involvement. Three indicators of attachments have been suggested as important in desistance processes: supervision, involvement and maternal agency (Giordano, et al., 2002; Giordano, 2010). Studies on offenders in the community have measured amount of mothers' supervision of their children. For example, through follow-up surveys on a sample of serious delinquents, Giordano (2010) asked how often women called their children per day for updates on their whereabouts. Another measure of social bonds to children has been the extent of involvement parents' maintain in children's lives, in areas such as health behaviors, school-related activities, and their children's social lives. For example, items that assessed involvement have included inquiries about how often parents assisted children with school work (Miller et al., 2011), and to what extent they had met their children's friends and the parents of their friends (Giordano, 2010). Finally, measures of parental preparedness have also been examined as influencing the effects of bonds with children (Giordano et al., 2002). These measures provide detailed portrayals of parent-child attachment in the community while touching on other theoretical components associated with Laub and Sampson's (2003) revised theory, such as routine activities, situated choice, and personal agency.

Although several studies of female desistance provided survey measures of attachment that assessed specific types of involvement, the majority relied on more general measures such as pregnancy and child-birth (Edin & Kefalas, 2005; Kreager, Matsueda, & Erosheva, 2010 Thompson & Petrovic, 2011; Wakefield & Uggen, 2004). It is possible that this is attributable to the salience of the transition into motherhood in comparison to specific measures of attachment such as those noted in the previous paragraph. However, broader factors may not provide insight into definitive transitions like measures of contact with children, custody of children, and residency with children. Next, the mixed findings regarding parent-related motivations, attachment to children, and desistance will be discussed, as the variations in populations examined and measurements of parent-child relationships certainly contribute to the inconsistent findings (Giordano et al., 2002; Kreager, Matsueda, & Erosheva, 2010; Thompson & Petrovic, 2011).

In all, theoretical assumptions from age-graded informal social control theory suggest that increased attachment to children results in decreased criminal activity (Giordano, 2010; Thompson & Petrovic, 2011). However, prior research has provided mixed findings regarding the relation of this theoretic concept with desistance; some scholars found attachment to children to be protective against criminality (Edin & Kefalas, 2005; Kreager, Matsueda, & Erosheva, 2010; Thompson & Petrovic, 2011) while others have not (Blokland & Nieuwbeerta, 2005; Giordano et al., 2002; Varriale, 2008). In order to determine the nature of this disjunction, scholars have continued to re-examine more general measures of attachment for heterogeneous populations (Kreager, Matsueda, & Erosheva, 2010; Thompson & Petrovic, 2011), and have also made use of unique measures, like the “wantedness” of children (Giordano et al., 2011) to better explain the variations in results. Although knowledge about attachment has been extended in

studies of diverse samples, no study has focused on parent-child attachments and desistance processes for a general population of women offenders in the community, with varying parental circumstances. By using secondary data for a sample of drug-involved women on community supervision, it was possible to examine mothers with varying types of relations with children.

Stress from Parenting

Parenting has often been mentioned as a stressor that could lead to criminal involvement, especially for at-risk populations (Arditti & Few, 2008). Stressors from parenting have been linked to depressive symptoms, mental illness, substance abuse, and criminal behavior (Arditti & Few, 2008). Some have found criminal behavior in disadvantaged populations, due to economic stressors experienced while trying to provide for children (Giordano, 2010; Thompson & Petrovic, 2009). In addition, parental stress has been associated with risks for those with present and past criminal justice involvement. Stress from parenting may exasperate or be exasperated by negative feelings surrounding formal criminalization and the challenges of meeting requirements of probation and parole (Arditti & Few, 2008; Giordano, 2010). Giordano (2010) used quantitative instruments to compare responses on the parental disposition of subjects that were institutionalized as juveniles compared to a control sample non-institutionalized delinquents. The survey measures she used to assess parental stress included questions like "Raising my child can be a nerve wracking job" or "I'd like to be able to do a better job at communicating with my child." She found subjects with prior juvenile institutionalization reported higher levels of depression and stress from parenting (Giordano, 2010).

Parental stress has been measured with many instruments expected to be related to mental health issues and recidivism (Giordano, 2010; Thompson & Petrovic, 2009). For example, prior research has measured stress experienced due to varying influences such as: parenting efficacy; family, partner, or parental support; financial standing; perceptions of difficulty of parenting;

community conditions for raising children; and behavioral variations in reactivity of children (Arditti & Few, 2008; Giordano, 2010). Guilt regarding criminal activity and time spent incarcerated or away from children has been quantified for male and female offenders, and was found to be more prevalent for females (Giordano, 2010). These stressors have been correlated with increased depression, substance abuse, and even recidivism (Salisbury & Van Voorhis, 2009) Transitions into motherhood have also been associated with vulnerabilities for harmful stressors that prompt negative coping and criminal activity. New mothers may experience more stress causing them to turn to criminal outlets or negative coping more often than experienced mothers (Thompson & Petrovic, 2009).

Although stress from parenting and transition into motherhood has often been associated with risk, prior research has also found these negative or overwhelming emotions to be associated with pro-active behavioral shifts (Edin & Kefelas, 2005; Thompson & Petrovic, 2009). For example, the majority of new mothers in a pool of gang affiliated young women with prior heavy-alcohol use were found to abstain from alcohol consumption during pregnancy. Even though the majority reported drinking after child-birth, the amounts were considerably lower, and the subjects' reported drinking alone and for the purpose of winding down after a busy and stressful day rather than for social reasons (Hunt, MacKenzie, and Joe-Laidler, 2005). Other research has found young women's' transition into single motherhood in disadvantaged neighborhoods to be more strongly correlated with reductions in offending behaviors than for their counterparts transitioning into motherhood with a marital partner or significant other (Kreager, Matuesda & Erosheva, 2010; Thompson & Petrovic, 2009). Though this could be explained by criminally-involved partners' influence on the continuation of criminality (Salisbury & Van Voorhis, 2009), the absence of partner support has been consistently

recognized as a stressor in research, yet single parenthood has been described as protective based in some research (Edin & Kafalas, 2005; Kreager, Matuesda & Erosheva, 2010).

In the face of stress due to limited assistance, mothers may experience more pressure to assume sole responsibility over children, which in turn creates incentives for identity transformation and behavioral changes (Kreager, Matuesda & Erosheva, 2010). Stressors experienced by these women may also influence their outreach to pro-social networks in the community, such as other single mothers (Anderson, 1990; Edin & Kafalas, 2005; Kreager, Matuesda & Erosheva, 2010).

Relevant Variables in Research on Women's Criminality and Recidivism

Quantitative surveys have also identified variables that promote or inhibit the effects of traditional pro-social events like child-bearing or assuming responsibilities for children (Sampson & Laub, 1993; Giordano, 2010). Even in describing the operationalization of social bonds to children and stress from parenting, effects of alternative variables were mentioned due to the mixed findings across samples and the individuals in the samples. It is therefore important to identify other major predictors of recidivism that could account for relationships of independent and dependent variables. This section will detail the use of control variables from prior research to help determine the directional effects these measures will posed on the current sample and to justify their incorporation into the current study's methodology.

Risks for Recidivism

Age

One of the characteristic findings from Sampson & Laub (1993) research is that with age most people eventually desists from crime, whether desistance was brought on by cognitive shifts, routine activity changes or barriers to criminal activity. They disentangled the age-crime curve based on crime types and found that lesser crimes, such as property offenses, better fit with

Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) model which identified property and violent crime peaks during early teenage years between 16 and 18. Although Sampson and Laub (1993) found support for this model while considering lesser offenses for men, they found more serious offenses to have later peaks and more prolonged persistence through adulthood than suggested by the age-crime curve. Scholars who included women in their samples have found mixed results as well, with some finding that females' criminal activity peaks in earlier years than do males (Fergusson & Horwood 2002), and others finding that women have a late onset in offending - starting after age 30 (Chung, Hill, Hawkins, Gilchrist, & Nagin, 2002), and that they commit different types of crimes (Salisbury & Van Voorhis, 2009).

Demographics, Neighborhood Contexts, Relationships, and Peers

Prior research has indicated criminal justice involvement is positively associated with neighborhood disadvantages such as depleted resources and service limitations (Visher & Travis, 2003). These areas have also been associated with high levels of racial minorities, mainly African Americans, and single mother households. Despite these commonly documented correlations, research on maternal desistance has provided mixed results of their effects (Giordano et al., 2011). For example, several studies have indicated these traits decrease the likelihood for mothers to form quality bonds to children, which is associated with their continued persistence in crime (Blokland & Nieuwbeerta, 2005; Giordano et al., 2002; Varriale, 2008). Extensions on research have found this effect to be reversed for those in disadvantaged areas for mothers who expressed "wantedness" for their children, meaning women planned their pregnancy, or accepted it and held positive attitudes about being pregnant (Giordano et al., 2011).

Other life course research found the transition to motherhood increased desistance for women in disadvantaged neighborhoods (Edin & Kafalas, 2005; Kreager, Matuesda & Erosheva,

2010; Thompson & Petrovic, 2009). Some of these studies cited support from Anderson's (1999) ethnographic study on an urban neighborhood in Philadelphia (Edin & Kafalas, 2005; Kreager, Matuesda & Erosheva, 2010). Anderson (1999) found that women in these disadvantaged neighborhoods were more likely to mature out of crime and create social bonds based on children, through connections with other single mothers. He postulated that the effect of motherhood was more influential on the maturation of these women due to their bleak likelihood of forming traditional relationships or marriages with men in their communities (Anderson, 1999). These mixed findings indicate that single parenting is associated with increased desistance for those in disadvantaged neighborhoods (Edin & Kefalas, 2005; Kreager, Matsueda, & Erosheva, 2010; Thompson & Petrovic, 2011), but studies on other populations have found no effect (Blokland & Nieuwbeerta, 2005; Giordano et al., 2002; Varriale, 2008) or the opposite effect (Bales & Mears, 2008).

Although several studies have noted reductions in time spent with criminal peers upon transition into motherhood (Edin & Kefelas, 2005; Fleisher & Krienert, 2004), others studies found parenting to be insignificant regarding changes in peers without marriage commitments (Warr, 1998). In expanding on age-graded informal social control theory, Giordano (2010) describes the need to focus more attention on peers, as they were not found to be of importance in Sampson and Laub's (1993) original model, which relied on a sample recruited during a time when marriage was more customary (1940) than it has been in more recent years (see also Warr, 1998).

Educational and Occupational History

Another variable that has been found to influence parental stressors and recidivism outcomes is socio-economic status. Despite some researchers' findings that disadvantage provides incentive for maternal offenders, as mentioned in the prior section (Edin & Kefalas,

2005; Kreager, Matsueda, & Erosheva, 2010; Thompson & Petrovic, 2011), many studies have found debilitating stressors to be created or inflated based on level of resources (Arditti & Few, 2008; Giordano, 2010). In order to control for these economic issues, researchers have used simple measures such as income-level (Giordano et al., 2011) or status as a single parent in the household (Thompson & Petrovic, 2009). In contrast, some studies used more complex measures that assessed the financial and occupational prospects of offenders (Cobbina et al., 2014). Complex measures were created to further refine the economic risk factors of marginalized populations. Questions about previous employment challenges, current employment and financial situation have been included in this type of measure. Measures of educational attainment have also been factored in employment and financial related controls to provide for future prospects of the offender.

Criminal History, Substance Abuse, Mental Health Status, and Exposure to Abuse

As mentioned in the above discussion of risk factors identified by developmental criminologists, criminal history has been found to have strong effects on persistence of criminal behavior. In addition to early onset of offending, scholars have shown that the seriousness of criminal acts contribute to persistence in crime (Sampson & Laub, 1993; Giordano, 2010; Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). Additional predictors of continued illegal behavior are history of sexual and physical abuse, current abuse, mental illness substance abuse, anger, hostility, and anti-social attitudes (Salisbury & Van Voorhis, 2009).

Conclusion

The review of the existing literature on the life course provides justification for the current study. Prior findings suggest that individual differences and variations in heterogeneous populations alter the effects of life events, like parenting, on desistance (Giordano et al., 2002). In addition, unlike findings based on male offenders, female offenders' more often fare better

over their life course upon establishing quality bonds to children. Contemporary findings surrounding this proposition have been especially supported for African American females residing in disadvantaged neighborhoods as they transition into parenthood (Edin & Kafalas, 2005; Kreager, Matuesda & Erosheva, 2010; Thompson & Petrovic, 2009).

Although prior research has found that stress from parenting can be debilitating on those reestablishing connections with children, those seeking custody of children and those estranged from their children through incarceration or legal termination of rights, females continue to mention their children as primary reasons for change (Arditti & Few, 2008; Michalsen, 2011). An important extension this study provided to prior research was to determine if motivations associated with motherhood were related to desistance from crime for women on community supervision. In addition, follow up research using the current study's findings and data, will shed light on those mothers with motivations, yet who remained in conditions that inhibited these motivations from having an effect on cessation. It is possible that such identified barriers could be targeted for interventions, providing better outcomes for mothers with desires to embrace their parenting role, but who struggle with desistance.

Hypotheses

1. Women's mention of maternal motivations during interviews will be negatively associated with measures of recidivism.
2. The frequency with which women mention maternal motivations during interviews will be negatively associated with measures of recidivism.
3. Higher levels of involvement with children based on a scale administered at the first interview will be negatively associated with measures of recidivism.

4. Higher levels of stress from parenting based on a scale measure administered at the first interview will be positively associated with measures of recidivism.

Chapter 3: Methodology of the Current Study

The data for the current subsample was collected in a study that examined 402 drug-involved women on probation and parole. From November 2011 to November 2012, three interviews were conducted in urban and rural cities across 17 counties in Michigan, including major cities such as Detroit, Lansing and Grand Rapids. Extending understanding of female offenders using the current data set based on women under supervision in Michigan is of special importance because the state established women-specific caseloads. The Department of Corrections provides probation and parole agents with these specialized caseloads with training on the use of female offender risk assessment tools and also provides them with supervision methods to address unique challenges women offenders have been found to experience (MacKenzie, 2013). Given that information, the mothers in this study may fare better than those under traditional supervision, because their gender-unique challenges can be more specifically identified and addressed under women-specific supervision (MacKenzie, 2013; Salisbury & Van Voorhis, 2009).

Recruitment of the female offenders was based on their assignment to one of the 73 probation and parole agents that agreed to participate in the study. Three methods were used to recruit the female offenders: the agent introduced the researcher to interested participants at the office, the agents forwarded contact information to the researcher when permitted by their clients, or the agents' displayed and handed out flyers allowing their clients to contact the researcher (Cobbina et al., 2014). Once recruited, participating female offenders were informed that their participation was voluntary and that the information they provided would be confidential. The female offenders were compensated in gift cards to their choice of stores in the amount of $30 for the first, $50 for the second, and $75 for the third interview. The one-on-one

structured interviews were conducted by trained interviewers at various locations of convenience for the participants such as supervision offices, the participants' homes, or in public places. Responses to the quantitative measures were entered into a computerized database, while open-ended responses to questions were audio-recorded and transcribed (Cobbina et al., 2014).

Sample

The selection of the subset of the sample for the current analysis was based on responses to the question "Do you have kids?" First, those that reported, "I have children who I have contact with" were included. Then those that responded, "I do not have children under 18" were omitted because the current study seeks to uncover maternal challenges regarding responsibilities, custody and contact with minor children. Lastly, respondents that responded "children adopted out and thus no contact" were also omitted. Four mothers were excluded because they permanently lost parental rights, which may alter the presence of maternal motivations and its association with desistance if included in the current analysis. Based on this selection process, 194 mothers that indicated they had contact with their minor children that they did not lose parental rights for were included in the initial study sample. During the coding of the interviews, the researchers found one of the women did not have minor children, or custody of any minor children, reducing the sample to 193 women. During analysis, several women were also excluded because they did not respond to at least one of the questions used to form the variables, reducing the sample to 162 for the quantitative analysis.

In addition to selection variables, the women in this subset can be described using an array of quantitative survey measures. This sample consists predominantly of white (44.1%), black (36.6%), and multi-racial women (17%) in their 30's ($\bar{x}$ = 33, *SD* = 8.65), on probation (82.5%), with no prior prison sentences (76.3%), that reported being unmarried (89.2%), single mothers (69.6%) that had or sought custody of their minor children (91.8%). In addition, the

majority of the subsample reported the offense that led to their existing supervision term as drug-involved (61.9%), and that their income was below$10,000 per year (77.8%). These variable percentages provide insight into the risks and protective factors the majority of the women in the study experienced.

Quantitative Data

Dependent Variables

Six measures of recidivism were used as dependent variables in the current study. The measures were from the women's self-reported substance abuse at first interview, the supervising agents' case notes on the women's probation and parole violations, the agents' case notes on the women's substance abuse, the agents' case notes on the women's substance abuse, the agents' case notes on the women's substance abuse violations, official police reports on the women's arrests, and official court reports on the women's convictions.

Self-reported substance abuse was examined during the first interview. The 7-item scale combined the yes=1 or no=0 responses. The scale's questions include: "Have you had any recent (past 6 months) conduct violations, law violations, or technical violations related to drugs or alcohol use?" "During the last 6 months have you received a drug screen that was rated positive or diluted?" "Do you associate with individuals who drink heavily or use?" "In the past six months, have you missed treatment appointments or stopped participating in support groups?" "Does anyone in your home use drugs or alcohol?" "Are you currently using?" "Do you currently have any feelings that you need to use drugs first thing in the morning?"

The total number of supervision officer's reports of the women's violations, alcohol use, and drug use in 18 months was based on three follow-ups that were adjusted for the number of months the women were under supervision. This was done to adjust for periods when detection

was not possible because supervision was revoked or ended. In addition, women's recidivism was measured by the number of arrests and convictions they had, which were taken from official police records, beginning from the time women began supervision.

Independent Variables

Maternal Motivations

The primary independent variables reflect themes that captured women's different types of maternal motivations. These themes were coded from the qualitative data for the 181 women who took part in all three interviews. The categories agreed upon and the coding process for the transcripts will be explained later, in the Coding the Qualitative Data section.

Social Bonds to Children

Attachment to children was measured by a scale from the original data set that comprised of the sum of yes=1 or no=0 responses to three questions. The questions included "Do any children 18 or younger live with you? Or do you have at least monthly contact with a child 18 or younger? If no, skip to next section." "Are you involved in important decisions regarding your children (e.g., school-related, health, outside activities)?" "Do you feel prepared to be a good parent?" The higher numbers from this scale were created to reflect greater levels of parental involvement.

Stress from Parenting

Stress from parenting was measured through an available scale that combined four reversed responses for the following questions; "Raising children is a nerve-wracking job." "Raising children is harder than I expected." "I have trouble keeping my kids from misbehaving." "My children are difficult to control." The possible responses for these questions included: 0=strongly agree, 1=agree, 2=disagree, and 3=strongly agree. In this existing scale, the numerical values of the responses were reversed so that the larger values represented respondents

stress from parenting. The responses culminate in the following groupings zero representing the lowest level of stress (0 thru 14=0), 1 representing mid-range parental stress (15 thru 24=1), and 2 representing the highest level of parental stress (25 thru Highest=2).

Control Variables

There are several factors that prior research suggested alternative explanations of recidivism to the independent variables of interest. Those variables available in the existing data set include: age, race, supervision status (parole or probation), relationship status, anti-social peers, neighborhood context, educational needs, employment and financial needs, criminal history, substance abuse history, mental health issues, exposure to abuse as a child, exposure to abuse as an adult, and family support. Many of these variables are from an assessment measure for women's risk for recidivism that provides a composite score of items known to predict women's recidivism (Van Voorhis, Bauhman & Brushett, 2013). The composite index was created by adding together risk scores and subtracting the women's strengths scores.

The description that follows includes the title of the subscale and one or two examples of the questions. In addition, some of the variables in the available scales were reversed so the cumulative sum of the responses would provide a valid and consistent measure of the control variable, similar to those mentioned in the Independent Variable section. The control variables that include reversed responses include anti-social peers, neighborhood context, educational needs, employment and financial needs, and family support.

Women's Total Needs

Predictive Risks

Employment and Financial Needs

To control for employment and financial issues, the current analysis made use of the available 10-item scale that comprises of questions regarding employment and financial needs.

The first question, “Are you currently employed?” provides three possible responses, fulltime=0, part-time or unable to work because of child/family care, poor health, student, etc. =1, and unemployed but able to work=2. An example of a variable that’s numerical response was reversed in this scale is question 10, “Do your children have medical insurance? If not responsible for children, score N/A” The applicable responses include yes=1 or no=0 and these values were swapped so the higher value indicates a greater disadvantage when compiled with the other responses.

Anti-Social Peers

Association with anti-social peers was measured with an 8-item scale comprising of questions questions regarding their friends’ criminality. For example, the first two questions asked “Have any of your close friends been in trouble with the law?” “Have any of you close friends done prison time?” The composite variable responses for the questions in this scale were operationalized as 1=yes and 0=no.

Criminal History

In order to measure the participants’ criminal history, a 6-item scale was used from the available data set. The first three questions were related to arrests. For example, the second question asked “What is the number of prior felonies you were convicted of? Was this the only one? Were there one or two others? Were there three or more?” The responses included only one=0, one or two others=1, three of more=2, don’t know=7, or refused=9. The next three questions asked about the participant’s criminal history related to supervision. For example, question 7 asked “Were you ever revoked on a current or prior term of probation or parole?” The possible answers include yes=1 and no=0.

Substance Abuse History

The substance abuse history of the subjects was measured using an 8-item scale from the available data set using yes=1 or no=0 responses. Two examples of these questions are, “Have drugs or alcohol ever made it difficult for you to perform at work or in school?” “Have you ever experiences health or emotional problems resulting from alcohol or drug use?”

Mental Health Disorders

The existing data set provided several scales to measure participants’ mental health issues including Mental Illness, History of Depression and Anxiety, Current Depression and Anxiety, History of Psychosis, and Current Psychosis.

1. *Mental Illness*

A 5-item scale was made available through the existing data set to measure mental illness. The scale included the five questions with yes=1 or no=0 responses. For example one of the questions asked, “Have you ever taken any prescribed medication to help you feel better emotionally?”

2. *Current Depression and Anxiety*

The participants’ history of depression and anxiety were measured based on yes=1 or no=0 responses to 6 questions from the available dataset. For example one the questions asked, “Worrying so much about things that you have trouble getting going and getting things done?” Current depression and anxiety was measured using the same question, but also included a supplemental yes=1 or no=0 question for each which asks, “If yes, has this happened in the last several days?”

3. *Current Psychosis*

Two items from the available dataset were used to measure the participants’ history of psychosis. This scale combined subjects’ yes=1 or no=0 responses to, “Have many thoughts that

others are out to harm you?" "Seeing things or hearing voices that are not really present?" The current measure of psychosis comprised of the same two items but each item was supplemented by an additional yes=1 or no=0 question that asked, "If yes, has this happened in the last several days?"

Interviewer's indication of Women's Anger and Hostility

The indicator for women's anger and hostility was measured through a scale that combined the subjects' yes=1 or no-0 responses to 7 items asked at the first interview. Examples of questions include, "Would you describe yourself as having a strong temper?" and "Do you have trouble controlling your temper when you get upset?" The responses were summed, so that 7 would be the highest score for anger and hostility, while 0 would be the lowest.

Interviewer's Indication of Women's Anti-Social Attitude

Following the first interview, the interview completed a 6 item scale of yes=1 and no=0 questions regarding the offender's attitude about her crime during the interview. Two questions asked whether the offender attributed the offense to others, one focused on the women's mention of co-defendants, and the other question focused on whether the offender blamed victims or others. The final question appraised whether the woman displayed feelings of remorse for the offense, not including remorse for apprehension. The women's antisocial attitude was measured by the sum of these responses, with the 6 being the highest and most indicative of women's anti-social attitude during the first interview.

Women Residing in Un-Safe Homes

A four item scale was administered to determine the women's thoughts about the safety of her residence, the certainty of her residence, and if there was violence and substance abuse at the residence. The score was summed and served to measure whether the home was un-safe.

Predictive Strengths

Educational Strengths

An available scale from the existing dataset was used to measure women's educational attainment. The items in this scale capture the yes=1 or no =0 responses regarding education. For example, the one of the questions asked, "Have you graduated from high school or received a G.E.D.?"

Self-Efficacy

A 17 item scale was used to measure the women's general self-efficacy based. The responses to these items included often=2, sometimes=1, and seldom/never=0. Some examples of questions asked include, "When you make plans, are you fairly certain that you can make them work?" and "Does failure just make you try harder?" When the items scale items were summed, larger numbers indicated higher levels of general self-efficacy.

Family Support

The measure for family support comprised of 3 items that measured women's responses regarding general family life. In addition, yes=1 or no=0 responses to 3 items that measured family support, and 2 items that measured family conflict. The questions regarding conflict were reverse coded when combined with family support measures, so that a higher number would reflect increased family support. The first question incorporated into this scale asked, "How is your relationship with your parents (parent figures) and/or siblings (check the option that best applies)?" and provided the responses: Good, just minor conflicts=3, Conflictual some of the time(mixed)=2, Conflictual most of the time=1, or Family, no contact=0. An example of one of the items that were reverse coded to measure family support asked, "Do your parents or any siblings tend to be critical of you when they communicate with you?"

Age and Race

Women in the study were asked to provide their age at the first interview, and the average the women was 33 years old. Although the current study was unable to rigorously examine trajectory changes of participants' during childhood and their recidivism beyond 18 months after the first interview, the wide age range of the subset (19-59) provides insight into age-crime relationships for mothers of varying ages, risk factors, and recidivism scores. In addition, Race was operationalized based on a scale that compiled responses as "White only" "Black only" "Multiracial woman of color include Hispanic" "Asian only" "Unclear" "Native American."

Supervision Status

To determine supervision status, the participants were asked, "Are you on probation or on parole?" The responses included "probation" or "parole". The measure of supervision status for the women found that 82.5% of the mothers were sanctioned to probation, 16.5% were sanctioned to parole, and 1% selected both responses, indicating they were under both forms of supervision. The current study considered 17.5% as parolees in consideration of the unique disadvantages associated with imprisonment and reentry that may provide different outcomes for them compared females' on probation alone (Leverentz, 2006).

Neighborhood Context

The available data set included an 8-item scale to measure issues of neighborhood safety. A few examples of questions from this scale include "Are there drugs in your neighborhood?" and "Do the police come into your neighborhood a lot?"

Coding the Qualitative Data

Audio recordings were transcribed, formatted into Microsoft Word documents and then read into NVivo software for qualitative data analysis. After being placed into NVivo, two trained coders unitized and coded all transcript information from the interviews the women in the

sample participated in. The units of analysis were comments indicating involvement or motivation related to being a mother. During this process of unitization, the coders agreed that one of the women in the original sample did not have custody or contact with minor children based on transcript content, and this participant was excluded from the analysis, leaving 193 women in this study's sample. Based on 20 cases, Guetzkow's U (Guetzkow, 1950) was calculated to determine if agreement on the units of analysis was acceptable, and U = .056, which met an acceptable level of agreement.

After unitizing the data, the coders agreed upon several categories based on informal social control that reoccurred for women in the sample on topics of motherhood during unitization. The coding scheme was created inductively based on the content of the data, but was influenced by variables and trends found in prior research on the theory of informal social control (Giordano, 2010; Michalsen, 2011; Sampson & Laub, 2003). The categories included attachment to children, being a good parent, being a better parent than before, proving to be a good parent, parental role assertion, custody motivation, and routine activities with children. Once the categories were determined, the two coders returned to the data and coded 20 transcripts in order to establish initial coding reliability as well as to assess discrepancies that might exist between coders. Once adequate reliability was established and all discrepancies were resolved, the remaining transcripts were coded independently by the first coder. Acceptable levels of reliability (Cohen, 1960) were obtained for the themes relevant to motherhood (k = .913).

Analysis of the Quantitative Data

After all of the interviews were coded for the 193 women in the sample, the categories were exported to SPSS software as both dichotomous and continuous variables. Retaining those

two variables for each category allowed the presence (i.e., mentioned, not mentioned) and frequency (number of times mentioned) of these maternal factors to both be compared and tested as correlates and predictors of the dependent variables. In addition to these variables, parental involvement and parental stress, both based on data collection at the first interview, were included as independent variables from the existing data set. The dependent variable measures also came from the existing data set and included the women's self-reported substance abuse at the first interview, alcohol use based on the supervision officer's case notes, drug use based on the supervision officer's case notes, violations based on the supervision officer's case notes, arrests based on official police reports, and convictions based on official court reports. Several control variables were also found in the existing data set and included in the regressions (e.g., age, a measure for bad neighborhood conditions, being a single parent, and supervision status). The two remaining controls used in the regression analyses, race and needs, were created based on variables from the available dataset. Dummy variables for race were generated based on an existing measure and indicated whether women were black, multi-racial or other. The other category was the omitted category in regression analyses. As mentioned earlier, in order to reduce the complexity of the regression analysis, a needs measure was created through the combination of theoretically relevant variables indicating risk for recidivism, minus those strengths expected to aid in desistance. The risk variables included employment and financial needs; family conflict; anti-social friends; criminal history; substance abuse history; current depression/anxiety; current psychosis, living in an un-safe home; the interviewer's indication that the woman exhibited anger or hostility at the third interview; and the interviewer's indication that the woman exhibited an anti-social attitude at the third interview. The support variables included educational strengths, family support, and self-efficacy.

In order to address the research questions, several statistical tests were conducted. First, bivariate analyses were generated between the independent variables, between the dependent variables, and between the dichotomous independent variables and dependent variables to determine the extent of association between each variable. Correlations were also generated for the continuous independent variables that indicated the number of times the women expressed each parental behavior or motivation over the three interviews. The continuous independent variables were also correlated with the dependent variables to determine the relationship between the frequency of parental behaviors and motivations and the dependent variables.

Next, regression diagnostics were carried out to determine whether there were problems with multicollinearity or outliers. Although most of VIF scores were under 4, and the historgrams and scatterplots were distributed normally, the large number of control variables prompted the creation of a needs measure, which was previously explained. Multiple regression analyses were then conducted for all of the dependent variables to determine if the independent variables explained significant variance beyond what control variables explained. In this process, linear regressions were conducted between each dependent variable, with the control variables entered in step 1, and the independent variables entered in step 2. First the full regression model R^2 was tested for significance, then the R^2 change with the addition of the independent variables to the model with just control variables was examined. Then tests were conducted for the significance of Betas for each variable. Regressions for each dependent variable were generated this way for the grouping of both the dichotomous and continuous independent variables with the controls.

Chapter 4: Results

Qualitative Findings

Maternal Motivations

Based on concepts from prior research on age-graded informal social control, and interview content from the sample, seven categories were created to classify the ways women in the current study talked about their parent-related motivations and behaviors. The coding process is detailed in the Codebook, which is located in the Appendix. As stated in the Codebook, statements that fit with the definition of several categories were coded for all relevant motivations. Exceptions for multiple coding procedures were limited to the three categories where women talk about properly parenting their children, as *Proving to be a Good Parent*, and *Being a Better Parent than Before*, would not also be coded in *Being a Good Parent*. The logic of this was that the definitions for being a good parent overlapped for the three areas, but the reasoning for the motivation and behavior differed. Next, an overview of the qualitative findings highlight the number of women and the frequency of women's statements coded for each category. In addition, explanations and examples of each category are detailed.

Attachment to Children

Table 1 – Attachment to Children

# of Times Talked About in Interviews	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	12	Total Number of Women that Talked About Attachment = 121
Number of Women	67	22	16	8	3	2	1	2	

Above, Table 1 shows 121 women in the sample referred to bonds between them and their children as making their lives better or keeping them away from criminal activity. This table also displays the number of women and the frequency with which they talked about attachment to their children. For example, 67 women talked about attachment once, 22 women talked about it twice, and so forth.

Inspection of message content revealed that women in the sample spoke about attachment in a variety of ways, and in some cases talked differently about how bonds served as forces in their lives. For example, several women attributed their driving force being their transition into motherhood during their current criminal justice involvement and mentioned their attachment to their first child as facilitating their life changes and motivations. Relatedly, some women with existing children mentioned that their bonds to children became stronger after they experienced an event that facilitated a realization of their bonds, or increased bonds to children. Some examples of events that brought about changes in or awareness to these attachments included separation from children, sobriety, and even changes in interactions that caused their children to display increased connection to the mother. In the excerpt, below, a woman was asked how her personal message to be positive and abstain from drug use, helped her do something she was proud of. This excerpt detailed the women's response, as she attributed her continued positivity and abstinence from drugs to her subsequent strengthened relationship with her daughter and the realization that, as a single mother, she and her daughter only had each other.

Q: Has the message helped you to do something you were proud of?
A: Staying home more often with my daughter, growing up. I mean being able to stay home and not … today when I went to parole, just saying bye to my daughter was like, "I don't want to leave you." I mean we've grown a bond closer. I mean I thought we had before, but we didn't and now me being home and me being clear minded just … it helps a lot.
Q: Mhmm (yes), like you said you've developed a closer bond with your daughter too.
A: Definitely.
Q: Like you thought you had that before, but now you really see that you do have it.
A: Right.
Q: How is that really helping you?
A: It's making me feel better as a person, and making me, you know … not look back. I'm a mom, single mom, not married who doesn't have a father in her life for her daughter. I'm doing well, I'm doing fine, and she loves me. And I can feel the love, I can feel the way she looks at me, she knows that, "I love my mom, she's doing good." You know what I mean. It's just … I don't know, it's hard to explain.

Similar to the excerpt above, many women in the sample also talked about their new or existing children as being all they had, or as central in their life. For some women, and in the example below, the thought of being removed from children caused anxiety.

> Q: And has this message helped you stop from doing something you would later regret?
> A: Oh, absolutely, you know … he does all the time, sometimes when I have a stressed out day, it's like, "God, you know, I would love to smoke a joint," and I just look at him, you know, the just the thought of doing something … to risk him not being with me every day, that's pretty much all it takes.

Being a Good Parent

Table 2 – Being a Good Parent

# of Times Talked About in Interviews	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	12	14	18	Total Number of Women that Talked About Being a Good Parent = 137
Number of Women	45	44	16	14	6	8	1	1	1	1	

Based on Table 2, above, 137 mothers in the sample spoke about being a good parent during the interviews. This table also displays 45 of the women in the sample mentioned actions they'd taken or motivations related to this topic once, 44 spoke of this topic two times during the interviews, and so on.

A review of the statements coded into this theme revealed that there were numerous ways women talked about being, or being motivated to be good parents. Many women talked about their need to be and the actions they've taken to serve as a financial support for their children. Women also talked about many ways they protected or were motivated to safeguard against threats to their children. Common issues that the sample mentioned were physical harm, mental illness, neighborhood dangers, and even their efforts or motivations to protect their children from following a criminal lifestyle. Some of the ways women talked about protecting their children included teaching them safety measures, knowing their whereabouts, watching them enter school

or while they were outside, keeping them away from bad influences, and even confronting those that posed a threat. An interesting example of a woman that spoke of protecting her daughter due to dangerous housing conditions is referenced below.

> Q: So you said that your neighborhood isn't, like, the safest
> A: Like 12 houses on my block is abandoned … 10. They knocked two down.
> Q: Did they? Are they going to knock the rest of them down?
> A: I have no idea. I think I'm going to have to call in and start complaining because the house next door to mine was boarded up all downstairs … front door and everything. Now I come out … last night … and noticed that the window across from my daughter's room … the board they knocked off from the inside of the house and the doors is wide open on the house. So I'm like, "Okay no." I'm going to have to go to sleep, because I ain't been to sleep since I noticed that the board been knocked off and the window is right directly across from her room. So I ain't been to sleep.

Some women talked about raising their children differently than the way they were raised to prevent their children from experiencing similar negative experiences and trauma. An example of this can be seen in the statement below.

> Q: Has the message helped you to do something you were proud of?
> A: Yeah, because I, I look at it like me being a teenager and going through all the stuff that I went through – being molested, being on drugs, being on the streets, and stuff like that – that, listening to my mom, that helped me in raising my kids. Because I don't have those problems, I don't have … like my mom wasn't there for me to talk to her, she wasn't that ear that I needed as a teenage girl with certain stuff that you need to know, she wasn't that mom, you know. Me learning the hard way which I had to be removed from my mom's home and put with somebody else. Me learning that way – that … that's not how I want to raise my kids. So everything that my mom didn't do, I'm doing, you know, everything she didn't teach me, I taught my daughters so there will never be a repeat of what happened to me, you know what I mean. And I, I think the stuff that I went through in my life made me the person that I am because I'm way stronger than anybody that I know, you know, some people can't deal with the fact of losing somebody and then trying to start over or raising five kids and not having no help for half of the time that you been raising these five kids. My daughter is gunna be 18, her baby dad got killed when I was five months pregnant so I never really had that, in the beginning, nobody to help me out, nobody to get up and make bottles with me, nobody to change a diaper or none of that. I did that on my own and I'm proud of the fact that my daughter is a great student and about to go to college, you know, so I feel like I learned from my mom.

Several other ways that women talked about being a good parent include providing their children with motivation or support in school and extra-curricular activities. In addition, women who said they were motivated to take parenting classes, or said parenting classes helped them were also included in this category.

Being a Better Parent than Before

Table 3 – Being a Better Parent than Before									
# of Times Talked About in Interviews	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total Number of Women that Talked About Being a Better Parent = 90
Number of Women	42	28	9	5	2	1	2	1	

Table 3, above, indicates that 90 women mentioned a statement related to being a better parent than before. Additionally, this table shows this topic was mentioned by 42 women just once, 28 women twice, and so forth.

As mentioned earlier, women that talked about being better parents than they were before were categorized separately from those that did not mention prior guilt or reference to poor parenting in the past. A common theme that appeared in these statements was the women's desire, or compensatory actions they've made, to make up for lost time, and the damage experienced by their children. A few examples of the past behaviors women talked about making up for included being incarcerated, emotionally distant, physically distant, and even negligent to their children. Below is an example of a mother that spoke of being more emotionally available for her son after becoming sober.

> Q: And how do you feel about this whole situation now, looking back on it?
> A: I never really thought of like the danger that I put my son in making the choices that I made. I've learned a lot, like them sending me to CPI. I've learned a lot in ways to deal with things better – tools to stay clean, NA and AA meetings. I don't know; it's changed me, like I know I hate the idea of being in recovery court because I get scared sometimes. What if I fail, like what would the consequences be? But, it's made me a

better person and clean. And a mother … I mean I was a mother before, but it's made me a better mom and actually being there for my son – because before I was there, but not mentally or emotionally there.

Another example exhibits the effect their children's behaviors were capable of having on a mother's new ideals on parenting and staying out of trouble with the law. In the example below, a woman said she stays out of trouble because she thinks about the pain her son experienced while she was incarcerated, and how he continued to wake up in the middle of the night to check if she was still there.

Q: What about … how do you not get caught up in, like, the drugs, or just the drama, like how do you not get mixed into it?
A: Kids. I see my kids' faces.
Q: Yeah?
A: I think about all the tears they cried, and all that stuff while I was gone. So it makes it a lot easier to stay away and say no. My baby coming home and saying, "Mommy, don't leave no more." He woke up … we went to bed at … he went to bed at, like, two something. I stayed up until, like, 7:00am … 7:30am. But at like 5:30am I got in the bathtub and get all this stuff off me, shaved, all that stuff. And he wakes up; I thought he was asleep. He still does it to come make sure I'm still home. So that's … he shouldn't have to be … they should haven't to go through that. But, like, they say that when I'm – when your family member is locked up; you do the time with them.

While many women spoke of the effects incarceration on their children, women also mentioned being better parents in that they changed the roles they held with their children. For example, instead of acting like a friend, women would talk about how they started serving a parental role, which was different from their prior inconsistent or lenient parenting style.

Proving to be a Good Parent

Table 4 – Proving to be a Good Parent			
# of Times Talked About in Interviews	1	3	Total Number of Women that Talked About Proving to be a Good Parent = 7
Number of Women	6	1	

Above, Table 4 shows that 7 women spoke about proving themselves as a good parent. The table also displays the information that 6 women talked about this once, and one woman spoke of this three times throughout the interviews.

This variable was created based on women's mention of proving themselves as good parents as something that was important to them. Women in the sample spoke of a few types of people they wanted to prove themselves to, including their parents, the criminal justice system, governmental programs, their children's father or his parents, their children, and even themselves. The women also spoke about a variety of ways they would prove themselves, and these areas mainly comprised of supporting children and abstaining from drug use. Below, is an excerpt of a woman that talked about her need to prove to everyone that she was a good parent, and especially better than her boyfriend's sister, as the participant found her to be a bad mother. She also mentioned that she received praise from her mother for proving everyone wrong by being a good mother.

> Q: So it's just … it's a different thing for anyone. It's just a little message that like you think about someone saying it and it changes your behavior kind of.
> A: I don't think it's … I don't think it's a message that someone has given me but everybody kind of, like people that I … besides my boyfriend and my grandparents … everybody seemed like I was gunna fail and not get clean and not be a good mother. And I've had my mom tell me … completely showed me, "Like, you've proved me wrong. I really thought that you weren't gunna be a good mom." So I guess you could say that and it just, when I had the baby I just wanted to prove to everybody that, you know, I can do this, I can be the greatest mom ever. And the way that my boyfriend's sister is, she's the worst mom I've ever seen and we live with his parents and she still lives there. And I just wanted to show everybody … especially that I could be better than her. Cause it like, it breaks my heart, she's got three kids and we were pregnant at the same time, pretty much. Her baby will be one July like 10th I think.
> Q: Okay so only, like, what three months?
> A: Yep.
> Q: Three months age difference.
> A: Yeah, which is crazy and I swear … when you live with someone, I think getting pregnant is like contagious. Like, when someone's already pregnant in the house … cause I just … I … that was weird cause I tried having a baby for the longest time with

my ex-fiancé and it just never worked. And that first couple times with my new boyfriend, it was just like, "Whoa, I'm pregnant."
Q: So has thinking about this, kind of, you know your determination to show people that you can be a good mom and thinking about your mom saying that she didn't think that you were gunna do it. Has that helped you to do something that you were really proud of?
A: Oh yeah definitely.
Q: Like what?
A: My daughter for example.
Q: Yeah?
A: Yeah, I'm proud of myself because I didn't think I could do it. I was scared. And when I was doing drugs, I didn't think I was ever gunna be clean. I always just said, "I'm just gunna do … I like doing drugs, I'm gunna keep doing it. I don't have to stop. And I definitely proved myself.

The example below is of a woman that talked about proving to her supervising officer that she could be a good parent to her children and refrain from drinking and drunk driving.

Q: Do you have any message that has become memorable to you that you received since you went on probation or parole?
A: Just basically she don't think I can do it and I'll have to prove to her I can, basically.
Q: What is that message word for word?
Q: Okay, what was that message word for word?
A: It was just about my children. About, you know, they're better off because I violated my probation six times now and I can't have my children in a home where I drink and just to let… give up custody, basically.
Q: And that message was from the PO?
A: Yes.
Q: Has the message, like, helped you in any way or has it…?
A: Yeah, just because I'm very prideful and I have to show her now that, you know, I can get her back.
Q: Has the message helped you stop from doing something you would later regret?
A: Yes.
Q: Okay, what did it stop you from doing?
A: Going out and drinking and driving.
Q: Has the message come to mind when you did something you were not proud of?
A: Yes.
Q: And how did it come to mind?
A: I drank a couple of beers and I'm like "now I'm going to show her, you know, she's right." And so I just stopped drinking.

Parental Role Assertion

Table 5 – Parental Role Assertion		
# of Times Talked About in Interviews	1	Total Number of Women that Talked About Parental Role Assertion = 8
Number of Women	8	

Table 5 displays the finding that 8 women talked about asserting their parenting role one time during the interviews. This category included women that spoke of their need to or their actions taken to display maternal role or authority over their children. Two women talked about issues they had with the step-mother, or the partner of the child's father telling the participants' children call them, "Mom". In addition, women talked about difficulties parenting due to inconsistencies in how they wanted to raise their children compared to their children's prior or current caregiver. Women also mentioned children being non-compliant, and of their need to convey themselves as an authority figure to their children. In the example below, the woman talked about her difficulty and need to serve as the authority figure in her daughter's life, because her daughter would call her grandmother when the participant would not allow her to stay at a friends, as her grandmother served as her caregiver for four years while the participant was in prison.

> Q: [Multiple Choice] And so you said that situation is getting better or worse?
> A: [Multiple Choice] That … with my kids?
> Q: [Multiple Choice] Yeah, so you guys are starting to kind of figure out what you're going to do?
> A: [Multiple Choice] Well the thing is that is pretty much I just want my 12 year old with me but she's been with my mom for so long that she basically needs re-programmed is how I've been putting it. But with my mom in the background, what happens is like my mom went to see my grandma when she was dying. And I would say, "No Cameron, I'm not letting you do this." "Well my grandma let's me do it." "Well I'm not your grandma, you're not letting your friend spend the night on a school night, when you didn't get your homework done and you left it at school. And then you want a friend to spend the night." "Well then I'll call my grandma." And then my grandma says, "Alright, let her have her friend stay." Okay so that's where my issues come in, like we

need severe counseling because if this child is gunna ever have any respect and have any rules, she's gunna have to stay out of it. And that's hard for her to on her defense because she's raised her on her own for four years until I came back in the picture, so. We're having a lot of issues with that and we don't have the money for counseling and right now I don't even have my own home to get her if I wanted her, so I'm working on it though.

The criminal justice system and the public assistance locations were also mentioned by women as targets for their attempts to assert their parental roles, because they felt their role as parents were discounted. In the example below, the woman talks about how it bothered her that government agencies assessing applicants for cash assistance would say she wasn't a parent because she didn't have full custody of her children.

A: It doesn't, it really doesn't. And to the fact that they tell me I'm not a parent. I carried two children inside of me for nine months; do not tell me that I'm not a parent because I do not live under the safe roof as my kids. I am a parent. I parent my children, you know, I may not live with them but I'm still their mom. I'll always be their mom. That's not a fair thing for them to do, you know.

Custody Motivation

Table 6 – Custody Motivation

# of Times Talked About in Interviews	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total Number of Women that Talked About Custody Motivation = 74
Number of Women	36	16	8	6	4	1	3	

Table 6, above indicates that 74 women talked about motivations or actions they took regarding the custody of their children. This table also shows that during the interviews, 36 women mentioned this topic once, 16 women mentioned it twice, and so forth. Several themes emerged for actions women made or were motivated to make. One of the most common themes was women complying with the terms of their supervision to gain support in custody hearings. The example below shows a woman that talked about staying out of trouble with the law because she didn't want to pass up her chance on gaining custody of her children.

Q: And what sort of strategies have you used in the recent months to keep yourself from getting in trouble with the law and staying away from drug activity?
A: I just work for my children …
Q: Did they work? Why?
Q: How's that helping … why is that working?
A: Because I believe deep in my heart I will take about another six months to a year, probably more towards the year and I will be on my way very close to either having them back or getting them back. And if I get into any more trouble than it's not gunna look good for the courts for me trying to get these children back. And I still have a chance and I'm not gunna pass that up.

In addition, women talked about how they took actions with Child Protective Services, or took parenting classes in order to improve their chances of gaining custody. Women also spoke of hiring lawyers and even just speaking to their supervising officer to safeguard against having accusations from their families, their children's fathers, and others putting them at risk of losing custody or reducing their chances of gaining custody. This category also included women that spoke of their happiness and thankfulness for regaining custody of children despite great odds. In the example below a woman described her pride and thankfulness in gaining custody of her children, and explained how that kept her out of trouble and provided her incentive to take care of her kids.

Q: Is there a message you can remember in the past two or three months you received from anyone that stuck with you at all?
A: It might have been a little over three months, but the probate judge gave me custody back, my kids, and told me I should be really proud of myself because a lot of people don't get their kids back … so that stuck with me.
Q: Has the message helped you to do something you were proud of?
A: Just taking care of my kids.
Q: Has the message helped you stop from doing something you would later regret?
A: Definitely, every day [*laughs*].
Q: Can you tell me a little about that?
A: Well, I'm an addict so … but I remember what I lost and have back now and I can still hear the judge saying that he would never give them back twice [*laughs*]. You know that message also sticks with me every day.

Routine Activities with Children

Table 7 – Routine Activities with Children				
# of Times Talked About in Interviews	1	2	3	Total Number of Women that Talked About Routine Activities with Children = 59
Number of Women	42	12	5	

Table 7, above, indicates 59 of the mothers in the sample talked about their children occupying their time. In addition, this table shows that 42 women talked about this once, 12 talked about it twice, and three spoke of it five times over the interviews. Some women mentioned time spent on children as a distraction from criminal behaviors, while others said time spent with their children was all they had time for, or all they had time for among other pro-social or probation stipulated activities. Some women would reference the number of children and their ages to be especially time consuming. Below, is an example of a woman that said her toddler age children expended her time, keeping her out of trouble with the law.

Q: So what about from keeping yourself from getting in trouble. Like, how do you avoid, just, like, the drama and the drugs and things like that?
A: I got kids. I keep busy with my kids.
Q: Did they work? Why?
Q: Just staying busy with your kids. And that works for you?
A: Yeah.
Q: Why do you think that works?
A: Because they three and four. They need my all the time [*laughs*].

Although some women simply described their children as being time consuming, others recognized the pattern change in their daily routines, and some attributed living a normal life with their children as contributing to obedience with the law. In the example below a woman talked about how her patterns changed since she became a mother, because the party lifestyle did not align with raising children.

Q: Do these strategies generally work for you though?
A: Yeah.
Q: How specifically like..?
A: Because if you keep doing it, it gets easier. You know, I used to always drink and party like every Thursday, Saturday, maybe Sunday, you know what I mean? In the beginning of my life, when I was in high school, I mean we drank every weekend. I mean how can you drink every weekend with a kid? It just doesn't happen. So my patterns have changed.

Women in the current study also mentioned having children as influencing shifts in their social networks, however, only one woman in the sample mentioned becoming a mother as influential in her formation of a new pro-social network with other mothers in her community. This issue will be mentioned in the Discussion section, as research on mothers has found that women commonly replaced their negative social networks with pro-social networks of mothers after becoming parents (Anderson, 1999; Edin & Kelalas, 2005; Kreager, Matuesda & Erosheva, 2010).

Stress from Parenting

While coding interviews for maternal motivations, many illustrations of parental stress were observed and noted. However, since the focus of the qualitative analysis was on motivation, and a quantitative measure of parenting stress was used, the stressors were not coded. Nonetheless, several trends were still recognized for women's experiences with parent-related stress in the sample. For instance, some women talked about how difficult it was to make community supervision a priority, when their children were their main concern. Many spoke of struggles experienced in trying to support their children financially, and some mentioned being a single mother as increasing this challenge. The example below provides insight into the common occurrence for women in the sample that mentioned challenges in legally supporting children due to poverty. In this example the woman was seeking advice from others in jail on how to

avoid criminal activity when her kids were hungry and she didn't have resources to support them.

> A: I was in jail, wondering, like, "What am I gunna do when I got home? I ain't got no money, I ain't got this." And talking to people in my pod, like, "How do you keep from not doing something illegal with your kid's sitting there looking at you … "Mommy, I'm hungry," and you can't feed them?"

Relatedly, some women spoke of stress from parenting as causing them to become involved in the law in the first place due to their inability to provide support in a lawful manner, or as reducing their abilities to comply with probation orders. Challenges for complying with supervision due to parenthood and challenges of parenting children while on supervision were both common for the sample. Mothers also noted challenges in finding child care, and some mentioned that their stipulations on probation became overwhelming due to their inability to trust others for child care in their area or social network. Several women even mentioned the inconvenience resulting from rules that prohibited taking their children with them when they reported to their supervising officer. Other examples of these trials include mother's speaking of being prohibited to have contact with their children's father due to the father's criminal involvement, women being unable to secure benefits because they did not want to go to court against their children's father for child support, and women lacking the time to commit to work, school and parenting children.

Children were also described by the women as victims in their offenses, which many mentioned as a continuing source of guilt. In some cases, the women explained this victimization and guilt was related to the separation from their children due to sanctions, their own life choices, or their prior mental detachment from children. In one case a mother mentioned that she involved her children in her criminal activity and that this provided her with a great deal of stress, but that she wanted to do better for her grandchildren because of this. Although the

current study did not systematically code the data for stress, this example was coded as Be Better than Before. In the example below, another mother with parent-related stressors spoke of being a better mother than before, as she stayed clean after the death of her children's father, because she became her children's only source of support.

A: It's like MDOC rehab. So I violated and went there and that's when he passed away but, like, I'm glad I was there when it happened.
Q: So was it a brutal passing away, how'd it happen?
A: Yeah, he got shot.
Q: Did he?
A: Yeah, but I think it would've been way worse if I would've been out because that would've just escalated a whole other issue and drinking would've been a really big option and—but that I was there and that, you know, I could think about it and I dealt with it without any substances, at all, like I did cry for three days though but um…
Q: Typically you turn to the substance, naturally.
A: Yeah, that's what I do or used to do.
Q: Now how long has it been since he's…?
A: July.
Q: This year?
A: Yes.
Q: So how long did you have to stay in there after he was killed?
A: I didn't get out until September.
Q: So that really gave you time to grieve. Were you able to go to the funeral?
A: Oh yeah.
Q: So that really gave you some good time.
A: Yeah, and like it just, like, with that happening, like, that's just more of an inspiration for me not to want to do anything, because now my son doesn't have anyone else but me so like it's a good and a bad. I kept saying that there and I was like, "You know, I probably—this doesn't sound right. It sounds like it's mean but I'm not trying to be mean." That's… I don't know.
Q: It keeps you on track.
A: Yeah, like a reality check for real, seriously. Like, "Wow, what are you really doing, you know, doing with yourself?" You know, and if I continue to drink and live that kind of lifestyle then I won't be around much longer to be with my son either, so. I know that my kid needs me more now than ever, that, that just makes it to where I don't do anything stupid. Because then he wouldn't have anyone. Who would take care of my son, if I'm sitting in jail? So I think about that, like before I didn't think, and I think that the in-patient helped me a lot with that because I didn't think at all. I went to a Cognitive Behavioral Therapy.

Stressors were frequently mixed in with mothers' statements in Be a Better Parent than Before category, and others, including Proving to be a Good Parent, Parental Role Assertion,

Attachment to Children, and Custody Motivations. Although many statements within these categories reflected anxiety and stress, the mothers were still motivated in some way to reduce their parenting-related stress or guilt. These examples shed light on how parental stress can become an incentive for change.

Quantitative Findings

Bivariate Analysis

Correlations among Independent Variables

There were several statistically significant correlations among the independent variables based on Table 8, below. Looking first at the women's expression of maternal motivations that were coded from the qualitative data as present or not (i.e., yes/no), there are significant associations of women's expressions of attachment to their children with motivations to be a better parent, gain or maintain custody of children, and desire to be a good parent in general. Mention of being a better parent was also significantly associated with speaking of being a good parent in general. In addition, parental role assertion was significantly associated with women's mention of maintaining or gaining custody and proving themselves as a good parent. Women who spoke of being a good parent in general also mentioned spending time with their children on routine activities. There were significant correlations for the measures of parenting involvement as well. Both motivation to be a good parent and parent-related routine activities had a positive association with parental involvement scores at the first interview. The final significant association among the independent variables is for the women's mention of being a better parent which displays a significant negative association with the parental stress scores from the first interview.

Table 8 – Correlations among Dichotmous Independent Variables

		Assert Parental Role	Attachment	Better than Before	Custody	Good Parent	Prove Good Parent	Routine Activities	Involvement in Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	Stress from Parenting based on PV Scale at T1
Assert Parental Role	Pearson Correlation		.107	-.038	.264**	.076	.238**	.031	.057	-.104
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.140	.599	.000	.296	.001	.666	.433	.152
	N		193	193	193	193	193	193	193	192
Attachment	Pearson Correlation	.107		.163*	.146*	.215**	.092	.070	.053	-.034
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.140		.024	.043	.003	.202	.333	.466	.638
	N	193		193	193	193	193	193	193	192
Better than Before	Pearson Correlation	-.038	.163*		.117	.209**	.041	.056	.080	-.177*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.599	.024		.104	.004	.572	.439	.271	.014
	N	193	193		193	193	193	193	193	192
Custody	Pearson Correlation	.264**	.146*	.117		.082	.132	.078	-.043	-.020
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.043	.104		.260	.067	.280	.549	.783
	N	193	193	193		193	193	193	193	192
Good Parent	Pearson Correlation	.076	.215**	.209**	.082		.124	.176*	.232**	-.026
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.296	.003	.004	.260		.086	.014	.001	.721
	N	193	193	193	193		193	193	193	192
Prove Good Parent	Pearson Correlation	.238**	.092	.041	.132	.124		.052	-.019	.029
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.202	.572	.067	.086		.475	.789	.686
	N	193	193	193	193	193		193	193	192
Routine Activities	Pearson Correlation	.031	.070	.056	.078	.176*	.052		.145*	.014
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.666	.333	.439	.280	.014	.475		.044	.843
	N	193	193	193	193	193	193		193	192
Involvement in Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	Pearson Correlation	.057	.053	.080	-.043	.232**	-.019	.145*		.116
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.433	.466	.271	.549	.001	.789	.044		.108
	N	193	193	193	193	193	193	193		192
Stress from Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	Pearson Correlation	-.104	-.034	-.177*	-.020	-.026	.029	.014	.116	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.152	.638	.014	.783	.721	.686	.843	.108	
	N	192	192	192	192	192	192	192	192	

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

In Table 9, below, correlations were also generated for the continuous independent variables that indicated the number of times the women expressed each parental behavior or motivation over the three interviews. Results from the continuous independent variable correlations indicated that the number of times women talked about parental role assertion was significantly associated with the numbers of women's statements surrounding child custody attainment or maintenance, being a good parent, and proving to be a good parent. The number of women's expressions of attachment to their children was also significantly associated with number of comments about custody motivations and being a better parent. Mentions of being a better parent had significant negative associations with parental stress scores at the first interview. Lastly, continuous independent variable correlations showed that statements of routine activities with children were significantly associated with parenting involvement scores for the first interview.

Table 9 – Correlations among Continuous Independent Variables

		Assert Parental Role	Attachment	Better than Before	Custody	Good Parent	Prove Good Parent	Routine Activities	Involvement in Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	Stress from Parenting based on PV Scale at T1
Assert Parental Role	Pearson Correlation		-.001	.005	.235**	.355**	.154*	-.013	.057	-.104
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.987	.945	.001	.000	.033	.859	.433	.152
	N		193	193	193	193	193	193	193	192
Attachment	Pearson Correlation	-.001		.535**	.159*	0.133	.092	.018	.030	-.035
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.987		.000	.027	.065	.204	.801	.681	.629
	N	193		193	193	193	193	193	193	192
Better than Before	Pearson Correlation	.005	.535**		.035	0.135	.004	.038	-.014	-.145*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.945	.000		.630	.059	.955	.603	.842	.044
	N	193	193		193	193	193	193	193	192
Custody	Pearson Correlation	.235**	.159*	.035		.100	.044	.042	-.115	-.060
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.027	.630		.166	.545	.562	.111	.410
	N	193	193	193		193	193	193	193	192
Good Parent	Pearson Correlation	.355**	0.133	0.135	.100		.080	0.111	0.136	-.062
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.065	.059	.166		.266	.121	.058	.392
	N	193	193	193	193		193	193	193	192
Prove Good Parent	Pearson Correlation	.154*	.092	.004	.044	.080		-.020	.003	.064
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.033	.204	.955	.545	.266		.780	.968	.381
	N	193	193	193	193	193		193	193	192
Routine Activities	Pearson Correlation	-.013	.018	.038	.042	0.111	-.020		.142*	.055
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.859	.801	.603	.562	.121	.780		.049	.448
	N	193	193	193	193	193	193		193	192
Involvement in Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	Pearson Correlation	.057	.030	-.014	-.115	0.136	.003	.142*		.116
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.433	.681	.842	.111	.058	.968	.049		.108
	N	193	193	193	193	193	193	193		192
Stress from Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	Pearson Correlation	-.104	-.035	-.145*	-.060	-.062	.064	.055	.116	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.152	.629	.044	.410	.392	.381	.448	.108	
	N	192	192	192	192	192	192	192	192	

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Correlations among Dependent Variables

Several significant correlations among the dependent variables are displayed below in Table 10. The bivariate correlations for the dependent variables indicate that women's self-reported substance abuse at the first interview was significantly associated with their supervising officer's case notes regarding their drug use per month while on supervision. Supervising officer's notes on violations were related to their case notes on alcohol and drug use, in addition to official reports from the state police of the women's total number of arrests during the 18 month period following the first interview. These official arrest reports were also associated with official court records of the women's total number of convictions throughout the 18 months following the first interview.

Table 10 – Correlations among the Dependent Variables

		Self-Reported Substance Abuse from PV Scale at T1	Supervising Officer's Case Notes on Alcohol Use	Supervising Officer's Case Notes on Drug Use	Supervising Officer's Case Notes on Violations	Official Arrest Records	Official Conviction Records
Self-Reported Substance Abuse from PV Scale at T1	Pearson Correlation		.047	.283**	.088	-.004	-.010
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.519	.000	.223	.959	.895
	N		193	193	193	193	193
Supervising Officer's Case Notes on Alcohol Use	Pearson Correlation	.047		-.071	.145*	.002	.060
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.519		.326	.044	.973	.406
	N	193		193	193	193	193
Supervising Officer's Case Notes on Drug Use	Pearson Correlation	.283**	-.071		.482**	.111	.073
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.326		.000	.125	.314
	N	193	193		193	193	193
Supervising Officer's Case Notes on Violations	Pearson Correlation	.088	.145*	.482**		.185**	.136
	Sig. (2-	.223	.044	.000		.010	.059
	N	193	193	193		193	193
Official Arrest Records	Pearson Correlation	-.004	.002	.111	.185**		.830**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.959	.973	.125	.010		.000
	N	193	193	193	193		193
Official Conviction Records	Pearson Correlation	-.010	.060	.073	.136	.830**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.895	.406	.314	.059	.000	
	N	193	193	193	193	193	

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Correlations of Independent with Dependent Variables

Significant findings were also found in correlations of the both the dichotomous and continuous independent variables with the dependent variables. Table 11, below, displays bivariate correlations of the dichotomous independent with the dependent variables, which indicate that self-reported substance abuse at the first interview, had a significant negative association with both parental involvement and stress at the first interview. In addition, parenting involvement scores from the first interview were negatively associated with the supervising officer's case notes on the women's alcohol use while under supervision. Lastly, the dichotomous independent correlations with the dependent variables showed that the PO's case notes on women's violations per month while under supervision were negatively associated with women's mention of routine activities with children, and their parental involvement scores at the first interview.

Table 11 – Correlations of Dichotomous Independent Variables with Dependent Variables

		Self-Reported Substance Abuse from PV Scale at T1	Supervising Officer's Case Notes on Alcohol Use	Supervising Officer's Case Notes on Drug Use	Supervising Officer's Case Notes on Violations	Official Arrest Records	Official Conviction Records
Assert Parental Role	Pearson Correlation	.025	-.058	.043	-.019	-.113	-.072
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.728	.422	.551	.795	.118	.320
	N	193	193	193	193	193	193
Attachment	Pearson Correlation	-.118	-.073	.067	.011	.054	.073
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.101	.310	.353	.877	.459	.315
	N	193	193	193	193	193	193
Better than Before	Pearson Correlation	.021	.050	-.042	.050	.096	.122
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.772	.493	.561	.486	.186	.091
	N	193	193	193	193	193	193
Custody	Pearson Correlation	-.040	.021	.019	.074	.016	.036
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.577	.777	.792	.305	.827	.623
	N	193	193	193	193	193	193
Good Parent	Pearson Correlation	-.086	-.051	-.028	-.009	.044	.110
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.232	.483	.701	.901	.540	.129
	N	193	193	193	193	193	193
Prove Good Parent	Pearson Correlation	.007	.136	-.019	.085	.070	.054
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.918	.059	.798	.238	.336	.458
	N	193	193	193	193	193	193
Routine Activities	Pearson Correlation	-.109	.063	-.089	-.176*	-.090	-.110
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.132	.382	.219	.014	.211	.128
	N	193	193	193	193	193	193
Involvement in parenting based on PV Scale at T1	Pearson Correlation	-.216**	-.146*	-.083	-.151*	-.114	-.080
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.043	.253	.036	.115	.269
	N	193	193	193	193	193	193
Stress from Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	Pearson Correlation	-.287**	.016	-.108	-.127	-.103	-.113
	Sig. (2-	.000	.821	.135	.079	.155	.118
	N	192	192	192	192	192	192

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Bivariate correlations of the continuous independent measures with the dependent variable are displayed below, in Table 12. Similar to the bivariate correlation between the dichotomous independent variables and the dependent variables, the correlation including the continuous independent variables indicated a significant relationship between the supervising officer's notes of the women's violations while under supervision and the number of times they talked about routine activities with children. Conversely, the inclusion of the continuous independent variables illustrates several other trends that did not appear in the correlation of dichotomous independent variables. One of the significant correlations showed the number of times women mentioned being a better parent was positively associated with the supervising officer's case notes of women's alcohol use and violations while under supervision. The last trend found upon continuous independent variable inclusion showed the number of times women expressed attachment to children had a significant positive association with the PO's case notes on drug use during supervision.

Table 12 - Correlations of Continuous Independent Variables with Dependent Variables

		Self-Reported Substance Abuse from PV Scale at T1	Supervising Officer's Case Notes on Alcohol Use	Supervising Officer's Case Notes on Drug Use	Supervising Officer's Case Notes on Violations	Official Arrest Records	Official Conviction Records
Assert Parental Role	Pearson Correlation	.025	-.058	.043	-.019	-.113	-.072
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.728	.422	.551	.795	.118	.320
	N	193	193	193	193	193	193
Attachment	Pearson Correlation	.008	.109	.151*	.133	-.064	-.003
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.907	.133	.036	.065	.374	.967
	N	193	193	193	193	193	193
Better than Before	Pearson Correlation	.028	.194**	.087	.207**	.048	.051
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.696	.007	.230	.004	.511	.483
	N	193	193	193	193	193	193
Custody	Pearson Correlation	-.025	.093	.016	.093	-.023	.021
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.728	.199	.820	.199	.753	.775
	N	193	193	193	193	193	193
Good Parent	Pearson Correlation	-.073	-.050	-.076	-.037	-.074	.001
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.316	.490	.291	.609	.306	.984
	N	193	193	193	193	193	193
Prove Good Parent	Pearson Correlation	.002	.082	-.039	.034	.027	.017
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.974	.256	.592	.638	.711	.816
	N	193	193	193	193	193	193
Routine Activities	Pearson Correlation	-.086	.081	-.084	-.182*	-.116	-.122
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.233	.263	.243	.011	.108	.091
	N	193	193	193	193	193	193

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analyses were conducted for all of the dependent variables to determine if the independent variables explained significant variance beyond what control variables explained. For each dependent variable, an explanation for the regression is provided. As mentioned in the Method section, the analysis incorporated analyses for the dichotomous variables for maternal motivations and behaviors, which indicate that the woman had any code for the theme, and the continuous variables, which indicate the frequency with each topic was mentioned during all three interviews. Below, regressions of the dependent variables on control variables and independent variables that include the dichotomous, yes/no codes for presence of a theme are referred to as dichotomous regressions. Regressions of the dependent variables on control variables and independent variables that include the frequency with which themes were coded in the interview transcript are referred to as continuous regressions.

For each regression, the test or significance of the model that includes control and independent variables, referred to as the whole or full model, is presented first. This test determined the predictive validity of the regression when both the control and independent variables were included. Then most relevant to this study, the significance of the R^2 change was reported to indicate whether the inclusion of independent variables explained more variance in the dependent variable than just the control variables. When the R^2 change was significant, the results of tests of significance of each independent variable were also examined and reported based on the beta values found in the column entitled β on the two tables presented below each description of findings. In the tables, one asterisk indicates that the test or variable was significant at .10, two asterisks indicate these items were significant at .05, and those with no asterisk were significant at a level above .10. In the description, the level of significance for betas between .05 and .10 were reported, and those of greater significance, below .05, were just

described as significant. The direction of each measure's relation was based on the positive or negative values in the column titled B on the regression tables.

In cases where the R^2 changes were not significant at .05, meaning the independent variables did not explain more variance in the dependent variables than the control variables alone, the independent variables with significant betas were mentioned. However it was noted that those betas should be considered with caution, as findings for those independent variables were not as reliable as when there were significant R^2 changes. A final paragraph will outline the significant findings for the control measures and the betas of significance. Theoretical and policy implications relevant to the findings from the correlations and the regressions are presented in the Discussion section.

Alcohol Use Based on Supervising Officer Case Notes

Based on Tables 13 and 14, below, the F values for the full model are significant, meaning the entire model has statistically significant predictive validity in both regressions. The change in R^2 was also significant, meaning the independent variables explained significantly more variation than the controls alone for supervising officer case note reports of women's alcohol use while under supervision in both the dichotomous (R^2 change = .061 df =16,162, p = .013) and continuous (R^2 change = .077 df = 16, 162 p = .005) regressions. Considering both regressions, parenting involvement measured with a scale administered at the first interview was the only independent variable to have a significant relationship with the dependent variable, and this relationship was negative. In other words, women's high parenting involvement was related to their low levels of alcohol use as indicated in the case notes. In the continuous regression, there was also a significant positive relationship between women speaking of being a better parent and their supervising officer's notes on the women's alcohol use while under supervision. In the dichotomous regression, the variable indicating that women talked about proving

themselves as a good parent was also positively related to the dependent variable, but this association was only significant at the level of .058. Overall, women speaking of being better parent in the continuous regression, and speaking of proving to be a good parent in the dichotomous regression were both related to higher levels of alcohol use being noted in the case notes.

Table 13 - Regression of Supervising Officer's Case Notes of Women's Alcohol Use while under Supervision on Control Variables and the Dichotomous Independent Variables

	B	Std. Error	B
Control Variable			
Black	0.003	0.005	0.045
Multi/Other Race	-9.62E-05	0.006	-0.001
Age	2.86E-05	0	0.008
Supervision Status	-0.004	0.005	-0.057
Total Needs	7.47E-05	0	0.023
Bad Neighborhood	-0.002	0.001	-0.183**
Single Parent	0.001	0.005	0.02
Independent Variables			
Assert Parental Role	-0.007	0.011	-0.053
Attachment	-0.005	0.005	-0.087
Better than Before	0.004	0.004	0.066
Custody	-0.003	0.005	-0.05
Good Parent	-0.005	0.005	-0.085
Prove Good Parent	0.021	0.011	0.15*
Routine Activities	0.004	0.005	0.073
Involvement in Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	-0.018	0.005	-0.264**
Stress from Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	0	0	0.045
R^2	.145		
Adjusted R^2	.061		
F	1.718**		
df	16, 162		
R^2 Change	.116		
F Change	2.432**		
df	9, 162		

** $p \leq .05$ * $p \leq .10$

Note: The R^2 change reflects the R^2 difference between a model with just control variables and a model with control variables and independent variables.

Table 14 - Regression of Supervising Officer's Case Notes of Women's Alcohol Use while under Supervision on Control Variables and the Continuous Independent Variables			
	B	**Std. Error**	**β**
Control Variable			
Black	.003	.005	.059
Multi/Other Race	-.001	.006	-.010
Age	7.799E-05	.000	.023
Supervision Status	-.004	.005	-.054
Total Needs	1.616E-05	.000	.005
Bad Neighborhood	-.002	.001	-.195**
Single Parent	.002	.005	.028
Independent Variables			
Assert Parental Role	-.004	.011	-.028
Attachment	.000	.002	-.011
Better than Before	.003	.002	.186**
Custody	.000	.002	.020
Good Parent	-.001	.001	-.097
Prove Good Parent	.010	.007	.098
Routine Activities	.004	.003	.114
Involvement in Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	-.019	.005	-.275**
Stress from Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	.000	.000	.051
R^2	.160		
Adjusted R^2	.077		
F	1.922**		
df	16, 162		
R^2 Change	.130		
F Change	2.785**		
df	9, 162		

** $p \leq .05$ * $p \leq .10$

Note: The R^2 change reflects the R^2 difference between a model with just control variables and a model with control variables and independent variables.

Number of Violations Based on Supervising Officer Case Notes

In both the dichotomous and continuous regressions on Tables 15 and 16, the F values were significant, indicating the whole model had statistically significant predictive validity. However, based on the significance of the R^2 change, only for the continuous regression did the independent variables explain significant variation in the dependent variable beyond what was explained by the control variables (adjusted R^2 = .136 df = 16, 162 p = .021). In this continuous regression, there was a significant positive relationship between the number of violations and the

measure indicating women spoke of being a better parent. In both regressions, the independent variables for involvement based on a scale value assessed in the first interview and the measure indicating that a woman spoke of routine activities with children had significant negative associations with number of violations. However, this finding should be taken with caution for the dichotomous regression, because the R^2 change was not significant.

Table - 15 Regression of Supervising Officer's Case Notes of Women's Violations while under Supervision on Control Variables and the Dichotomous Independent Variables			
	B	**Std. Error**	**β**
Control Variable			
Black	-.003	.018	-.012
Multi/Other Race	.024	.024	.080
Age	-.001	.001	-.101
Supervision Status	.034	.019	.136*
Total Needs	.002	.001	.158*
Bad Neighborhood	-.002	.003	-.050
Single Parent	-.026	.018	-.108
Independent Variables			
Assert Parental Role	-.032	.040	-.062
Attachment	-.005	.017	-.022
Better than Before	.003	.016	.013
Custody	.005	.017	.022
Good Parent	.002	.019	.010
Prove Good Parent	.027	.042	.051
Routine Activities	-.036	.017	-.161**
Involvement in Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	-.045	.020	-.173**
Stress from Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	-.001	.002	-.065
R^2	.179		
Adjusted R^2	.098		
F	2.205**		
df	16, 162		
R^2 Change	.064		
F Change	1.405		
df	9, 162		

** $p \leq .05$ * $p \leq .10$

Note: The R^2 change reflects the R^2 difference between a model with just control variables and a model with control variables and independent variables.

Table 16 – Regression of Supervising Officer's Case Notes of Violations while under Supervision on Control Variables and the Continuous Independent Variables			
	B	**Std. Error**	**β**
Control Variable			
Black	-.006	.017	-.029
Multi/Other Race	.015	.023	.052
Age	-.002	.001	-.136*
Supervision Status	.038	.018	.150**
Total Needs	.002	.001	.121
Bad Neighborhood	-.002	.003	-.034
Single Parent	-.020	.018	-.084
Independent Variables			
Assert Parental Role	-.022	.040	-.043
Attachment	-.003	.006	-.041
Better than Before	.016	.006	.229**
Custody	.000	.006	.002
Good Parent	-.001	.003	-.020
Prove Good Parent	.001	.027	.003
Routine Activities	-.023	.011	-.160**
Involvement in Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	-.049	.020	-.187**
Stress from Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	-.001	.002	-.030
R^2	.214		
Adjusted R^2	.136		
F	2.749**		
df	16, 162		
R^2 Change	.099		
F Change	2.260**		
df	9, 162		

** $p \leq .05$ * $p \leq .10$

Note: The R^2 change reflects the R^2 difference between a model with just control variables and a model with control variables and independent variables.

Women's Self-reported Substance Abuse at the First Interview

Below, Tables 17 and 18, show that the F values for the full models for both the dichotomous and continuous regressions are significant. However the R^2 change when the independent variables were added was only significant at .099 for the continuous regression, and was not significant for the dichotomous regression of women's self-reported substance abuse at the first interview. In the continuous regression, custody motivations, parenting stress scores, and parenting involvement scores all displayed significant negative relationships to self-reported

substance abuse at the first interview. Based on the dichotomous regression results, the only independent variable that significantly explained variance was parenting stress measured with a scale during the first interview, which exhibited a significant negative relation to self-reported drug use. Parenting involvement scores measured at the first interview also had a negative relation with self-reported drug use in the dichotomous regression, but the association only met significance at .075. As previously mentioned, findings about individual variables when there was not a significant R^2 change should be considered with caution, because they are less reliable than those findings when there was a significant R^2 change.

Table 17 – Regression of Self-Reported Substance Abuse at the First Interview on Control Variables and the Dichotomous Independent Variables			
	B	**Std. Error**	**β**
Control Variable			
Black	.464	.196	.181**
Multi/Other Race	.296	.263	.085
Age	-.007	.011	-.045
Supervision Status	.024	.209	.008
Total Needs	.051	.012	.342**
Bad Neighborhood	.049	.038	.092
Single Parent	-.209	.203	-.073
Independent Variables			
Assert Parental Role	.247	.440	.041
Attachment	-.230	.186	-.089
Better than Before	-.023	.177	-.009
Custody	-.131	.188	-.051
Good Parent	-.067	.206	-.024
Prove Good Parent	-.142	.462	-.022
Routine Activities	-.261	.191	-.097
Involvement in Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	-.402	.225	-.129*
Stress from Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	-.039	.019	-.151**
R^2	.282		
Adjusted R^2	.211		
F	3.973**		
df	16, 162		
R^2 Change	.062		
F Change	1.562		
df	9, 162		

** $p \leq .05$ * $p \leq .10$

Note: The R^2 change reflects the R^2 difference between a model with just control variables and a model with control variables and independent variables.

Table 18 – Regression of Self-Reported Substance Abuse at the First Interview on Control Variables and the Continuous Independent Variables			
	B	**Std. Error**	**β**
Control Variable			
Black	.435	.195	.170**
Multi/Other Race	.395	.261	.113
Age	-.005	.011	-.031
Supervision Status	-.002	.209	-.001
Total Needs	.052	.012	.347**
Bad Neighborhood	.044	.038	.083
Single Parent	-.197	.201	-.068
Independent Variables			
Assert Parental Role	.454	.457	.075
Attachment	.066	.066	.086
Better than Before	-.071	.071	-.084
Custody	-.138	.066	-.158**
Good Parent	-.036	.039	-.067
Prove Good Parent	-.178	.307	-.041
Routine Activities	-.077	.120	-.046
Involvement in Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	-.459	.224	-.148**
Stress from Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	-.040	.019	-.157**
R^2	.286		
Adjusted R^2	.215		
F	4.055**		
df	16, 162		
R^2 Change	.066		
F Change	1.676*		
df	9, 162		

** $p \leq .05$ * $p \leq .10$

Note: The R^2 change reflects the R^2 difference between a model with just control variables and a model with control variables and independent variables.

Drug Use Based on the Supervising Officer's Case Notes

Below, Tables 19 and 20 indicate that F values were significant for both full-model regressions. However, the R^2 changes were not significant for either regression in explaining variation in supervising officer's case notes on the participant's drug use during supervision. Also, none of the independent variables had betas that significantly explained the variance of this dependent variable.

Table 19 – Regression of Supervising Officer's Case Notes of Drug Use while under Supervision on Control Variables and the Dichotomous Independent Variables			
	B	**Std. Error**	**β**
Control Variable			
Black	.005	.009	.048
Multi/Other Race	-.018	.012	-.119
Age	-.001	.000	-.137*
Supervision Status	.035	.010	.259**
Total Needs	.002	.001	.280**
Bad Neighborhood	.000	.002	.009
Single Parent	-.022	.009	-.167**
Independent Variables			
Assert Parental Role	.010	.021	.038
Attachment	.005	.009	.042
Better than Before	-.011	.008	-.100
Custody	-.004	.009	-.039
Good Parent	.000	.010	-.002
Prove Good Parent	-.019	.022	-.067
Routine Activities	-.002	.009	-.017
Involvement in Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	-.005	.011	-.036
Stress from Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	.000	.001	-.040
R^2	.192		
Adjusted R^2	.133		
F	2.709**		
df	16, 162		
R^2 Change	.019		
F Change	.426		
df	9, 162		

** $p \leq .05$ * $p \leq .10$

Note: The R^2 change reflects the R^2 difference between a model with just control variables and a model with control variables and independent variables.

Table 20 – Regression of Supervising Officer's Case Notes of Drug Use while under Supervision on Control Variables and the Continuous Independent Variables			
	B	**Std. Error**	**β**
Control Variable			
Black	.005	.009	.044
Multi/Other Race	-.020	.012	-.126
Age	-.001	.000	-.146**
Supervision Status	.032	.010	.238**
Total Needs	.002	.001	.269**
Bad Neighborhood	.000	.002	.016
Single Parent	-.019	.009	-.147**
Independent Variables			
Assert Parental Role	.025	.021	.094
Attachment	.004	.003	.123
Better than Before	.001	.003	.029
Custody	-.003	.003	-.088
Good Parent	-.002	.002	-.092
Prove Good Parent	-.018	.014	-.092
Routine Activities	.000	.006	-.005
Involvement in Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	-.004	.010	-.032
Stress from Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	.000	.001	-.016
R^2	.192		
Adjusted R^2	.159		
F	2.967**		
df	16, 162		
R^2 Change	.034		
F Change	.796		
df	9, 162		

** $p \leq .05$ * $p \leq .10$

Note: The R^2 change reflects the R^2 difference between a model with just control variables and a model with control variables and independent variables.

Official Arrest Records

Tables 21 and 22 indicate that the F value did not meet significance, meaning the whole model was not significant for this regression. In addition, the R^2 change was not significant at .05 or .10 in explaining the variance in the women's official arrests. However, based on the beta values, several of the variables significantly explained variation independently. The continuous regression showed a negative relationship between official arrests and the independent variable

measures indicating how often women spoke of attachment to children at a significance of .058 and how often they spoke of asserting their parental role at a significance of .076. In the dichotomous regression, women that spoke about asserting their parental role also had a negative relation to arrests based on police records with a significance of .058. Despite these findings for single variables, there is very limited evidence that any of the variables explain a significant amount of the variation in official arrests.

Table 21 – Regression of Official Arrest Records on Control Variables and the Dichotomous Independent Variables			
	B	**Std. Error**	**β**
Control Variable			
Black	-.029	.130	-.019
Multi/Other Race	.062	.174	.030
Age	-.010	.007	-.113
Supervision Status	.274	.139	.155**
Total Needs	.005	.008	.059
Bad Neighborhood	-.015	.025	-.049
Single Parent	.035	.135	.021
Independent Variables			
Assert Parental Role	-.557	.292	-.156*
Attachment	-.032	.124	-.021
Better than Before	.089	.118	.061
Custody	-.058	.125	-.038
Good Parent	.044	.137	.026
Prove Good Parent	.416	.307	.110
Routine Activities	-.079	.127	-.050
Involvement in Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	.140	.149	.077
Stress from Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	-.011	.013	-.072
R^2	.089		
Adjusted R^2	-.001		
F	.987		
df	16, 162		
R^2 Change	.044		
F Change	.875		
df	9, 162		

** $p \leq .05$ * $p \leq .10$

Note: The R^2 change reflects the R^2 difference between a model with just control variables and a model with control variables and independent variables.

Table 22 - Regression of Official Arrest Records on Control Variables and the Continuous Independent Variables			
	B	**Std. Error**	**β**
Control Variable			
Black	-.035	.129	-.023
Multi/Other Race	.047	.172	.023
Age	-.013	.007	-.145*
Supervision Status	.325	.138	.183**
Total Needs	.003	.008	.034
Bad Neighborhood	-.012	.025	-.039
Single Parent	.023	.133	.014
Independent Variables			
Assert Parental Role	-.540	.302	-.152*
Attachment	-.083	.043	-.181*
Better than Before	.064	.047	.129
Custody	-.008	.043	-.016
Good Parent	-.001	.026	-.004
Prove Good Parent	.146	.203	.056
Routine Activities	-.081	.080	-.082
Involvement in Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	.087	.148	.048
Stress from Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	-.011	.013	-.074
R^2	.102		
Adjusted R^2	.013		
F	1.152		
df	16, 162		
R^2 Change	.058		
F Change	1.154		
df	9, 162		

** $p \leq .05$ * $p \leq .10$

Note: The R^2 change reflects the R^2 difference between a model with just control variables and a model with control variables and independent variables.

Official Conviction Records

Below, in Tables 23 and 24, the F values for the full models were not significant for either regression. Similar to the dependent variable measuring official arrest, the variance in official convictions of the women based on police reports could not be significantly explained by the grouping of the controls before or after independent variable inclusion based on R^2 changes. Although, none of the independent variables explained conviction at a level of significance, in

the continuous regression, parental stress based on a survey at the first interview was significant at .084 and the number of times women talked about asserting their parental role was significant at .096. Both of these variables were negatively associated with convictions, and explained more variation in conviction than the other independent variables. These significant betas, and those for official arrest records, are both less reliable because the R^2 changes were not significant.

Table 23 - Regression of Official Conviction Records on the Control and the Dichotomous Independent Variables			
	B	**Std. Error**	**β**
Control Variable			
Black	-.028	.121	-.019
Multi/Other Race	-.102	.162	-.052
Age	-.006	.007	-.069
Supervision Status	.380	.129	.227**
Total Needs	.000	.007	-.004
Bad Neighborhood	-.015	.023	-.051
Single Parent	-.092	.125	-.057
Independent Variables			
Assert Parental Role	-.402	.272	-.119
Attachment	-.020	.115	-.014
Better than Before	.088	.110	.063
Custody	.009	.116	.007
Good Parent	.190	.127	.120
Prove Good Parent	.278	.285	.077
Routine Activities	-.113	.118	-.075
Involvement in Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	.157	.139	.090
Stress from Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	-.021	.012	-.143*
R^2	.118		
Adjusted R^2	.031		
F	1.359		
df	16, 162		
R^2 Change	.059		
F Change	1.208		
df	9, 162		

** $p \leq .05$ * $p \leq .10$

Note: The R^2 change reflects the R^2 difference between a model with just control variables and a model with control variables and independent variables.

Table 24 - Regression of Official Conviction Records on the Control and the Continuous Independent Variables			
	B	**Std. Error**	**β**
Control Variable			
Black	-.030	.122	-.021
Multi/Other Race	-.133	.163	-.069
Age	-.009	.007	-.106
Supervision Status	.401	.130	.240**
Total Needs	-.002	.008	-.024
Bad Neighborhood	-.014	.024	-.048
Single Parent	-.084	.125	-.052
Independent Variables			
Assert Parental Role	-.476	.285	-.141*
Attachment	-.048	.041	-.111
Better than Before	.040	.044	.086
Custody	.026	.041	.053
Good Parent	.018	.024	.061
Prove Good Parent	.116	.191	.047
Routine Activities	-.078	.075	-.082
Involvement in Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	.142	.139	.082
Stress from Parenting based on PV Scale at T1	-.021	.012	-.147*
R^2	.107		
Adjusted R^2	.019		
F	1.216		
df	16, 162		
R^2 Change	.048		
F Change	.969		
df	9, 162		

** $p \leq .05$ * $p \leq .10$

Note: The R^2 change reflects the R^2 difference between a model with just control variables and a model with control variables and independent variables.

Findings for the Control Variables

Table 25 - Findings of Significance for Controls in Dichotomous and Continuous Regressions

Dependent Variables	Dichotomous Control / - or + relationship with DV	Continuous Control / - or + relationship with DV
Alcohol Use from Case Notes	Bad Neighborhood / -	Bad Neighborhood / -
Violations from Case Notes	Supervision Status / + Age/ -	Supervision Status / + Age/ -
Self-Report Substance Abuse	Needs / + Black / +	Needs / + Black / +
Drug Use from Case Notes	Needs / + Supervision Status / + Age / -	Needs / + Supervision Status / + Age / -
Arrests based on Police Records	Supervision Status/ + Age/ -	Supervision Status/ + Age/ -
Convictions Based on Court Records	Supervision Status / +	Supervision Status / +

Note: Control Variables that meet significance below .05 are colored black, while those that meet significance below .10 are colored gray.

Although not the focus of the present study, it is informative to examine all the relationships of control variables to various dependent variables, net of the effects of other variables (condensed above in Table 25). Based on results in Tables 13 and 14, in the dichotomous and continuous regressions, the scale measure for bad neighborhood conditions had a significant negative relationship with women's alcohol use indicated by supervising officer's case notes on the . Specifically, living in a bad neighborhood was significantly associated with fewer case notes indicating alcohol use.

In addition, Tables 15 and 16 display violations based on case notes of supervising officers as having a significant positive relationship to women's supervision status, which indicated that parole status was significantly associated with more violations while on supervision. The control measure for age was negatively related to the dependent variable, but

this association was only significant at the .064 level. Older age was associated with fewer violations noted in the case notes.

A few of the control variables in Tables 17 and 18 reached significant levels in explaining the variation in the women's self-reported substance abuse at the first interview. In both the dichotomous and continuous regressions, the measure for the women's total needs and the indicator of women being black had significant positive relationships with self-reported substance use at the first interview. In other words, women with higher needs, indicated by risk for recidivism minus strengths, and being black were both associated with higher scores on self-reported substance abuse based on a scale administered at the first interview.

In Tables 19 and 20, supervision status and the measure of the women's needs both had significant positive relations to the dependent variable, so those women on parole and those with higher needs scores were both associated with more indications of drug use based on their supervising officer's case notes. On the other hand, the case note indicator for drug use was significantly negatively associated with age and being single parents. However, age was only significant at the .097 level in the dichotomous regression, and the .065 level in the continuous regression.

In the dichotomous and continuous regressions on Tables 21 and 22, supervision status had a significant positive relationship to the arrest variable, meaning that parole status was associated with more official arrests. In the continuous regression, age had a significant negative relationship with arrest, meaning older age was associated with fewer arrests based on official police records. The dichotomous regression also revealed this negative relation between age and arrests, but this was only significant at .065.

In Tables 23 and 24, the only control variable to significantly explain variation in official records of conviction was supervision status, and it explained a significantly positive association with conviction in both the regressions. This means that parole status was significantly associated with more records of official conviction.

Chapter 5: Discussion

Several statistical tests were carried out to address the research hypotheses. First, the explanatory power of the whole model and the significance of change for the independent measures was considered for dichotomous and continuous regressions, as these both differed for each of the six measures of recidivism that were included. Women's alcohol use based on their supervising officer's case notes was the only measure that was explained significantly more by the independent variables than the controls alone for both the dichotomous and continuous regressions. For the continuous regressions, for which the number of comments women made about material motivations were the independent variables, the variance in violations based on case notes and women's self-reported substance abuse scores from the first interview were also significantly explained by the inclusion of the independent measures. However, the relationship for women's self-reported substance abuse was only significant at a level of .099. Therefore, the independent variables were not able to explain significant variance beyond the controls for the dichotomous regressions of violations indicated by case notes and of women's self-reported substance abuse, or for the dichotomous and continuous regressions for drug use based on case notes, official arrest records, and official conviction records.

Table 26 - Findings of Significance for IVs in Dichotomous and Continuous Regressions

Dependent Variables	Dichotomous IV/ - or + relationship with DV	Continuous IV/ - or + relationship with DV
Alcohol Use from Case Notes	Prove Good Parent/+	Be Better than Before/+
Violations from Case Notes	Routine Activities/ -	Routine Activities/ - Be Better than Before/ +
Self-Report Substance Abuse		Custody Motivations/ -
Drug Use from Case Notes		
Arrests based on Police Records		Attachment/ -
Convictions Based on Court Records	Parental Role Assertion/ -	Parental Role Assertion/ -

Note: Independent Variables that are more reliable due to R^2 Significance changes are in black, while those that are less reliable because the whole model did not indicate a significant change beyond the controls are colored gray.

Second, each independent measure's significance and Beta value were also considered to determine each variable's directional strength in explaining women's recidivism. The independent variables reflected seven types of maternal motivations coded from the qualitative data and two quantitative measures from the first interview, one an indication of parenting involvement, and the other of parenting stress. Based on the associations between the independent variables and the measures of recidivism from the regressions in Tables 13-24 (condensed above in Table 26), several conclusions were made regarding the research questions. First, a few of the parent-related motivations and behaviors found in the interview content were associated with reduced recidivism, because they had a negative relationship to the dependent variables based on Beta values. Most reliably, both regressions for women's talk of routine activities with children were associated with fewer violations based on case notes. In the continuous regression, women's custody motivations were significantly associated with decreased self-reported substance abuse at the first interview. The other independent variables based on interview content, and that had significant negative Betas, were less supported as

significant, because inclusion of the independent variables did not explain significant change in the dependent measure beyond the controls. These less reliable findings showed that fewer arrests were related to attachment (for the continuous regression) and parental role assertion (for the dichotomous regression). Parental role assertion was also less reliably related to fewer convictions for both regressions.

A review of the Betas with significant positive relationships with the dependent variable shows that, contrary to the proposition of the first research question and second research questions, two parent-related motivations and behaviors were associated with increased recidivism. In continuous regressions, the number of times women spoke of being a better parent than before was related to both increased alcohol use and increased violations based on supervising officer's case notes. In addition, women's mention of trying to prove they were good parents was also related to alcohol use based on supervising officers' case notes, but only in the dichotomous regression. These findings, paired with those linking women's parent-related motivations and behaviors to desistance, provide mixed results for the first two hypotheses. In some cases, the dichotomous and continuous regressions identified significant associations of different independent variables relations with the recidivism measures. The different findings for the dichotomous and continuous maternal motivation variables suggest that whether a woman spoke of a particular motivation and the number of times she spoke of a motivation vary in what they tell us about the motivation's relation desistance. This trend appeared for the motivation to be a better mother than before, which was significant in the continuous regression and was spoken of more often by more women than the measure for proving to be a good parent, which was only significant in the dichotomous regression.

Based on the quantitative scales included as independent variables, parenting involvement significantly explained fewer indications of alcohol use and violations based on the case notes, and lower scores for women's self-reported substance abuse at the first interview. Higher levels of parenting stress also explained fewer violations based on case notes, and fewer convictions based on official records. However, stress as an explanation for convictions is less reliable due to the same issues mentioned before, since there was no significant change in explained variance for convictions for the whole model beyond the model with just controls.

In addition to providing insight to address the research questions, the findings contribute to the debate on the components necessary for bond formation to be effective in contributing to desistance. As mentioned in the review of the literature, Giordano and colleagues (2002) proposed that cognitive shifts were necessary to form strong bonds for desistance. In a later study, Giordano (2010) investigated women's parent-related motivations and labeled these as indicators of a cognitive shift, but they were not able to statistically support this concept, and concluded that barriers in other aspects of life impeded the effect of motivations on reducing recidivism. Sampson and Laub (2003) maintained that involvement with the source of bonds? (e.g., children) would be sufficient in supporting desistance. The interesting findings were that routine activities with children were significantly associated with fewer violations based on supervising officer case notes. In addition, parenting involvement was significantly associated with fewer violations and fewer indications of alcohol use based on supervision case notes, in addition to reduced self-reported substance abuse. With this finding, the second research question was addressed, affirming that, parental involvement was related to less recidivism indicated by two different measures.

Taken as a whole, these findings suggest routine activities and parental involvement were more indicative of compliance with the law than the other motivations. This conclusion is strengthened because it holds for indicators of recidivism based on both the women's and their supervising officers' accounts. On the other hand, motivation to be a good parent had no significant relationship to any dependent variables, parental role assertion had less reliable relationships to desistance, and attachment also had less reliable relationships with desistance, or in some cases was even positively related to recidivism. Most importantly, motivation to be a better parent than before and to prove oneself as a good parent were both significantly and positively related to recidivism. These findings suggest that informal social control through bonds to children may be based more on spending time with children and on activities with children than on comments about motivations to be a good or better mother. This finding is in line with Sampson and Laub's (2003) proposition that involvement alone was sufficient in forming bonds related to desistance. This provides further support that cognitive transformations mentioned in the literature review may not be necessary, or effective in determining those that will desist. Alternatively, motivation based on interview content may not be sufficient in capturing the process of cognitive transformation.

The hypothesis for the fourth research question was contradicted by opposite results, more specifically, stress from parenting was significantly related to lower scores in women's self-reported substance abuse at the first interview, and less reliably related to fewer convictions. In addition, custody motivations, which, based on the content from the qualitative data caused the women's anxiety and stress, were also significantly related to lower scores in women's self-reported substance abuse at the first interview. These findings provide support for prior research suggesting that women may be motivated by their parent-related stressors (Arditti & Few, 2008;

Edin & Kefalas, 2005; Giordano, 2010; Kreager, Matsueda, & Erosheva, 2010; Thompson & Petrovic, 2011). In addition, these findings also are in line with the motivations found for many of the women that experienced stress in the current study's qualitative data.

Limitations

In all, there were mixed findings across dependent and independent measures for all four research questions. There were two primary issues based on the hypotheses that contributed to inconsistent findings. First, the hypotheses did not consider the range and complexity of accounts women would have regarding their parent-related motivations and behaviors. A more thorough or more specific investigation should be conducted in the future to provide more conclusive results for the hypotheses. The second issue was the hypotheses did not predict the extent of differences that would exist in the influence independent measures would have on the six recidivism variables. Although the limitations based on the hypotheses provide inconclusive answers for the research questions, the analyses provided a vivid portrayal of statements that were related to a range of desistance and persistence for an array of parent-related motivations and behaviors.

Unfortunately, the current study was also not able to assess which control variables affected women that persisted, but talked about parent-related motivations and behaviors. These issues will be addressed in a follow-up study using this data that will examine the interaction effects between control variables of interest and independent variables suggested by prior research and the findings in the current study. Although a follow-up study will provide more insight into the control variable's effects on motivations and desistance, abuse throughout the women's lives was not captured in the current study, even though it is considered an important factor in previous research on women's criminality (Salisbury & Van Voorhis, 2009). In addition, the needs measures in the current study combined several risk factors and protective

factors against recidivism, so the interaction effect each of these measures present on their own will not be uncovered if identical data is used in the follow-up.

In addition, as a secondary study of an existing data set, this examination was unable to capture several parent-related variables that were identified as significant mediating or moderating factors in previous studies. First, this study did not account for the transition into motherhood, which was found as an important indicator of women's desistance in prior research (Edin & Kefalas, 2005; Kreager, Matsueda, & Erosheva, 2010; Thompson & Petrovic, 2011). Although the qualitative assessment provided some insight into the maternal circumstances for some of the women's transitions into motherhood, there was no quantitative measure of this and it was not uniformly detectable based on the interviews because there were no questions to that end. Similarly, there was no measure for women's custody transitions or whether they were separated and reunited with children. Future research on parent-related motivations and desistance should ask questions about these issues to refine the conceptualization of bond changes between women and their children.

Several other issues that were not addressed in the current study were the women's relationships with caregivers of their children; their contact with children while separated, either during imprisonment or through other forms of separation like residential treatment; the number of and the age(s) of children (Barnes & Stringer, 2014). In addition, the qualitative analyses only discovered one woman that mentioned replacing a negative social network with a pro-social network of other mothers. However this idea, inspired by Anderson's (1999) concept of "baby clubs", was found to be related to women's transitions into motherhood, and their desistance in studies that used age-graded informal social control to examine mothers in disadvantaged neighborhoods (Edin & Kelalas, 2005; Kreager, Matuesda & Erosheva, 2010). Mother's social

networks changes, and the other parent-related variables that were not captured in the current study should also be investigated in future studies on maternal desistance to reveal the influence more specific parental circumstances have on parent-related motivations and desistance over the life course. Investigations of this nature will help uncover unmet needs of maternal offenders, and services that may help women live up to their parent-related motivations and abandon criminal lifestyles.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

Codebook for Maternal Involvement and Motivation

Rules

1. Read over each passage originally coded as motivations and stressors and code for the motivations based on the themes on the next page.
2. Do not code in categories when questions are leading and the responses are close-ended, yes or no responses. For example, you would not code the following statement:

   -"Does having your kids around make your life better?"
   "Yes."

3. Statements that fit with the definition of several categories were coded for all relevant motivations. Exceptions for multiple coding procedures were limited to the three categories where women talk about properly parenting their children, as *Proving to be a Good Parent*, and *Being a Better Parent than Before*, would not also be coded in *Being a Good Parent*. The logic of this was that the definitions for being a good parent overlapped for the three areas, but the reasoning for the motivation and behavior differed.

4. If children are in the content or are the senders of memorable messages and the women says these messages serve as motivations, help them, or if the women says the message helped her do something she was proud of or stopped from doing something she would later regret, then code in the suitable theme. See example below with a slight variation.

   -"What is that message?"
   "I just think about my children's faces"
   "Has that helped you do something you're proud of?"
   "Yes, I didn't use because I thought about them." → Code as *Attachment to Children*

   -"What is that message?"
   "I just think about my children's faces"
   "Has that helped you do something you're proud of?"
   "Yes, I didn't use because I thought about them and how that would affect their future." → Code as *Good Parent*
5. When unborn children, grandchildren or other children that are not the biological child of the offender should still be coded in the themes. These will hold the same weight as codes for biological children, but will be referenced as examples of how

women are motivated by children in these categories similarly and differently than motivations for biological children.

6. There are statements related to parental stressors within the unitizing document that will be as examples, but not coded for because the quantitative measures for stressors are more reliable because they were uniformly posed.

Themes

1. **Attachment to children**

   Expresses children as being central in their thought processes; expresses enjoyment in spending time with their children; expresses that being away from kids is upsetting. Expresses that she wants to keep children around her or give birth and/or care for child despite challenges.

   For example, in response to questions about what keeps them away from criminal activity or what makes their life better:
   -"It's about my kids now"
   -"I spend more time with my kids because they are the most important thing in my life"
   -"I stay away from those activities because I take my kids everywhere and I hate spending time without them"
   -"Everyone tried to persuade me to get an abortion because it would be very difficult to get through school, but I didn't because I wanted to keep the baby."

   For statements like*:*
   -"What are you doing to keep yourself out of trouble?"
   "I just hang out with my kids." → Code as *Routine Activities* because this is not explicitly attachment

   -"I could never touch drugs again, because I remember how difficult it was being away from my kids while I was in prison and I would never want to put them through that again" → Code as *Be Better Parent then Before*

2. **Routine Activities**

   Expresses involvement in children's life and activities as occupying their time or being of priority over other activities, especially criminal activities; kids serve as a distraction and consume time.

   For example, in response to questions about what keeps them away from criminal activity or what makes them abide the law or change ways:
   -"I just stay focused on my kids …"
   -"My kids and I go to the park"
   -"My kids keep me busy"
   -"I don't have time to even think about criminal activity because I am too busy doing things with my kids"
   -"Spending more time with my kids"

If the above statements are in response to a question about making life better, or the woman expands and says more about enjoying this time spent with children, or how spending time with children makes their life better, code as *Attachment to Children* instead.

3. Good Parent

a. Good Parent

Serve as a positive role model (practice what you preach, be strong for children either through guarding against temptations or addressing parental difficulties); serve as financial support; serve as a guardian; protect child from threats like mental illness, physical harm, bad influences, neighborhood characteristics etc.

Pursues parenting classes due to challenges in disciplining children and says that she needs or has benefited from parenting classes. Expresses aspiration and appreciation for parenting tips from PO or others but must also speak of this as necessary to combat parental stress. Also code for women that talk about things that their partners or fathers could do to make to would benefit children.

-"I watch my kids as they walk to the bus."
-"I won't let my kids be raised the way I was, because I don't want them to end up breaking the law like I did."
-"My PO referred me to parenting classes and it made things better because I was able to learn new ways to discipline my child consistently."
-"It would be better if my child's father would take a parenting class, because he has issues raising our child."

Only code for parenting classes that the women mention for being better parent, those that are mentioned to fulfill custody requirements should be coded in *Custody*.

b. Prove Good Parent

For new moms, or those that mentioned needing to prove self as good parent without indication of prior parenting failures or guilt**,** prove to others that said you would not be a good parent like her PO, her parents, a partner, her children, and even to herself.

-"When I was pregnant, everyone told me to get an abortion, and it just made me want to show them how good a mom I am going to be."
-"My grandma keeps telling me that I don't know how to take care of my kids, this makes me mad every time and I just want to show her how good of a mom I am by taking even better care of my children."
"I have to prove that I am a good parent to myself, and then I think the guilt will go away."

c. Be Better Parent than Before

Motivated to spend time with children, make up for lost time with children, or be a better parent due to guilt brought on by prior actions or criminal sanctions either with the child that was effected, new children, grandchildren.

-"I was out of their lives for two years, and I feel so bad about that. Now I am trying to be the best mother that I can for them."
-"My daughter keeps trying to guilt me into being lenient on my rules. It's very difficult to get past the guilt I have from being in jail and emotionally distant all these years, but I am just trying to be a good parent now to make up for that."
-"My kids are mostly grown and I didn't do that great of a job with them, so now I am doing all I can to make sure I play a big role in raising [Granddaughter]."

4. **Custody**

Keep kids in custody, gain more custody or visitation, or get kids back
This includes women who are motivated to be proactive in behavior or complying with supervision stipulations (letting PO know of any issues like people that may contact PO with lies about female's treatment of children) to maintain or gain legal parental rights.

-"I am seeking full custody of my child."
-"I am fighting for my kids."
-"The father of my child threatened to call my PO and tell her lies about how I treat my kids bad, because he doesn't want me to get to see them. I showed [PO] the voicemail just in case he was to contact her about this."

5. **Asserting Parental Role**

The women talks about how she wants to or had to talk to her child, family members, caregivers, and even the criminal justice system about how she is the parent to this child, because she feels her parent status or her parenting is being diminished, threatened, or undermined.

For example:

-"No, no, the only problem that I ever have is I tend to – family tends to be mother-hen-ish. [Laughs] So, there are times I have to tell my mom or Grandma that "I'm the parent, you're the grandparent. So, you know, I can't ground them for this and then you guys go behind my back and it's okay to, you know, do that sort of stuff." [*Laughs*] Family drama …"
-"My ex-husbands wife called me and told me that she wants [Son] to call her Mommy, and I told her that wasn't going to happen because I am the mother to this child."

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Altheide, D.L., & Coyle, M.J. (2006).Smart on crime: The new language for prisoner release. *Crime, Media, Culture: An International Journal, 2*(3), 286-303 .doi: 10.1177/1741659006069561

Arditti, J. A. and Few, A. L. (2006). Mothers' reentry into family life following incarceration. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, *17*(1), 103-123.

Arditti, J. and Few, A. (2008).Maternal distress and women's reentry into family and community life. *Family Process 47*(3): 303-321.

Austin, J. (2001). Prisoner reentry: Current trends, practices and issues. *Crime & Delinquency, Vol. 47*(3), 314-334.

Austin, J., Bruce, M. A., Carroll, L., McCall, P. L., & Richards, S. C. (2001). The use of incarceration in the United States: American Society of Criminology National Policy *Committee. Critical Criminology: An International Journal, 10*, 17-41.

Bales, W. D., and Mears, D.P. (2008). Inmate social ties and the transition to society: Does visitation reduce recidivism? *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *45*(3), 287-321.

Barnes, S. L. and Stringer, E. C. (2014). Is motherhood important? Imprisoned women's maternal experiences before and during confinement and their postrelease expectations. *Feminist Criminology, 9*(1), 3-23.

Beck, A. J. (2000).*Prisoners in 1999*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Benda, B. B. (2005). Gender differences in life-course theory of recidivism: a survival analysis. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 49*, 325-342.

Blaustein, M. and Kinniburgh, K. (2007).British Psychological Society, Briefing Paper 26, 48-53.

Blumstein, A., Cohen, J., Roth, J. A., and Visher, C. A, eds. (1985). *Criminal careers and career criminals'*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Blokland, A. A. J., & Nieuwbeerta, P. (2005). The effects of life circumstances on longitudinal trajectories of offending. *Criminology, 43*, 1203–1240

Braman, D. (2004). *Doing time on the outside: Incarceration and family life in urban America*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Boyd, S. C. (1999). *Mothers and illicit drugs: transcending the myths*. Toronto; Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.

Bureau of Justice Statistics.(1997). Correctional populations in the United States, 1995. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2014). Recidivism of prisoners released in 30 states in 2005: Patterns from 2005 to 2010. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Bureau of Justice Statistics.(2013a). Correctional populations in the United States, 2012. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Bureau of Justice Statistics.(2013b). Probation and parole in the United States, 2012. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Bureau of Justice Statistics.(2013c). Jail inmates at mid-year 2012 – Statistical tables. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Bureau of Justice Statistics.(2013d). Prisoners in 2012 – Advance counts. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Chesney-Lind, M. & Shelden, R.G., (1998). *Girls, delinquency, and juvenile justice* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: West Wadsworth.

Clear, T. R. (1997). Evaluating intensive probation: The American experience', In Mair, G. (ed.) *Evaluating the effectiveness of community penalties*.Aldershot: Avebury.

Clear, T.R. (2003). The problem with "addition by subtraction": The prison-crime relationship in low-Income communities. In Mauer, M., & Chesney-Lind, M. (Eds.) *Invisible Punishments*. (56-74). New York: The New Press.

Clear, T. (2007). *Imprisoning communities: How mass incarceration makes disadvantaged communities worse*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Clear, T., Waring, E., and Scully, K. (2005). Communities and reentry: Concentrated reentry cycling. In J. Travis and C. Vishers (Eds.), *Prison reentry and crime in America* (pp. 179-208) Cambrige, UK: Cambrige University Press.

Cobbina, J. E., Morash, M., Kashy, D. A., and Smith, S. W. (2014). Race, neighborhood danger, and coping strategies among female probationers and parolees.*Race and Justice*, 1-26.

Cochran, J. C. (2013). Prison experiences, social ties, and inmate behavior: Examining visitation and its effects on incarceration and reentry outcomes. Dissertation submitted to the College of Criminology and Criminal Justice, The Florida State University.

Cohen, J. A. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Education and Psychological Measurement, 20,* 37-46.

Edin, K., and Kefalas, M. (2005). *Promises I can keep:Why poor women put motherhood before marriage.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Elder, G. H., Jr. (1985). Perspectives on the life course. In G. H. Elder,, Jr. (Eds.*), Life course*

dynamics: Trajectories and transitions, (pp. 23-49). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Elliott, D. S., Huizinga, D., and Menard, S. (1989). *Multiple problem youth: delinquency, substance abuse, and mental health problems*. New York: Spinger-Verlag.

Fagan, J. 1994. "Women and drugs revisited: Female participation in the cocaine economy. *The Journal of Drug Issues, 2*(2),179-225.

Fleisher, M. S., and Krienert, J. L. (2004). Life-course events, social networks, and the emergence of violence among female gang member. *Journal of Community Psychology, 32*, 607-622.

Garland, D. (2001). *The culture of control and social order in contemporary society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Glaze, L. E., &Maruschak, L. M. (2008).*Parents in prison and their minor children*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report (NCJ 222984). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Glueck, S., and Glueck, E. (1950). Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. New York, NY: Commonwealth Fund.

Giordano, P. C. (2010). Legacies of crime: A follow-up of the children of highly delinquent girls and boys. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Giordano, P. C., Cernkovich, S. A., and Rudolph, J. L. (2002). Gender, crime, and desistance: Toward a theory of cognitive transformation. *American Journal of Sociology, 107*(4), 990-1064.

Giordano, P. C., Seffrin, P. M., Manning, W. D., and Longmore, M. A. (2011). Parenthood and crime: The role of wantedness, relationships with partners, and ses. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 39*, 405-416.

Gottfredson, M. R., and Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Graham, J., and Bowling, B. (1996). *Young people and crime*. London: Home Office Research Study.

Greene, S., Haney, C., & Hurtado, A. (2000). Cycles of pain: Risk factors in the lives of imprisoned mothers and their children. *Prison Journal, 80*, 3-23.

Greenfield, L. A., and Snell, T. L. (1999). *Women offenders*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Washington, DC. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Greenwood, P. W. (1982). *Selective incapacitation*. Report to the National Institute of Justice. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Guetzkow, H. (1950). Unitizing and categorizing problems in coding qualitative data. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 6*, 47-58.

Hagan, J. and Dinovitzer, R. (1999).Collateral consequences of imprisonment for children, families and prisoners.*Crime and Justice 26*: 121-162.

Hagger, M.S., Anderson, M., Kyriakaki, M. and Darkings, S. (2007). Aspects of identity and their influence on intentional behavior: Comparing effects for three health behaviors. *Personality and Individual Differences 42*, 355-367.

Hardyman, P. L., & Van Voorhis, P. (2004).Developing gender-specific classification systems for women offenders. Washington, DC: USDOJ, National Institute of Corrections.

Hatterly, A., and Smith, E. (2010). Prisoner reentry and social capital: The long road to reintegration. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Heimer, K., and De Coster, S. (1999). *The Gendering of Violent Delinquency, Criminology 37*(2), 277 - 318.

Hunt, G. P., MacKenzie K., and Joe-Laidler, K. (2005). Alcohol and masculinity: The case of ethnic youth gangs. In T.M., Wilson, (Eds.) *Drinking cultures: Alcohol and identity* (pp. 225–254). Oxford, UK: Berg.

Joplin, L., Bogue, B., Campbell, N., Carey, M., Clawson, E., Faust, D., Florio, K., Wasson, B., and Woodward, W. (2005). In *What works and why: Effective approaches to reentry*. 109 145.American Correctional Association. Lanham, Maryland: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.

Kreager, D. A., Matstuesda, R. L., and Erosheva, E. A. (2010).Motherhood and criminal desistance in disadvantaged neighborhoods.*Criminology, 48*(1), 221-258.

Krisberg, B.A., & Temin, C.E. (2001). The plight of children whose parents are in prison. NCCD Focus. Retrieved from http://www.nccd-crc.org/nccd/n_pubs_main.html

Kubrin, C.E., Stucky, T.D., Krohn, M.D. (2009). *Researching theories of crime and deviance*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. 198-217.

La Vigne, N. G. Naser, L. E. and Castro, J. L. (2005). Examining the effect of incarceration and in-prison family contact on prisoners' family relationships. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 21*(4), 314-335.

Laub, J. H. and Sampson, R. J. (2003).*Shared beginnings, divergent lives: Delinquent boys to age 70.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Leverentz, A. (2006). The love of a good man? Romantic relationships as a source of support or hindrance for female ex-offenders. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 43,* 459-488.

MacKenzie, D. L. (2013). First do no harm: A look at correctional policies and programming today. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 9*, 1-17.

Maurua, S. (2001). Making good: How ex-convicts reform and rebuild their lives. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Books.

Mazza, C. (2002). And then the world fell apart: The children of incarcerated fathers. Families in Society: *The Journal of Contemporary Human Services, 83* (5/6), 521- 529.

Messina, N., Burdon, W., Hagopian, G., and Prendergast, M. (2006). Predictors of prison TC treatment outcomes: A comparison of men and women participants. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse, 32*(1), 7-28.

Michalsen, V. (2011). Mothering as a life course transition: Do women go straight for their children? *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 50*, 349-366.

Miller, J. M., Schrenk, C. J., & Tewksbury, R. (2011).*Criminological theory: A brief introduction.* (3 eds.). Pearson Education, Inc.

Minow, M. (1990).Adjudicating differences: Conflicts among feminist lawyers. In Hirsch, M. and Keller, E. F. (ed.) *Conflicts in Feminism*, (149-164) New York, NY: Routeledge.

Moloney, K.P., and Moller, L. F. (2009). Good practice for mental health programming in prison: Reframing the parameters. *Public Health, 123*(6), 431-433.

Moffitt, T. (1993). Adolescent-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review, 100*, 674-701.

Morash, M. (2010). *Women on probation and parole: a feminist critique of community programs & services.* Boston: Hanover [N.H.]: Northeastern University Press; University Press of New England.

Muhammad, B.M. (2012). Exploring the silence among children of prisoners: A descriptive study. Dissertation submitted to the Graduate School-Newark Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey.

Mumola, C.J. (2000). Incarcerated parents and their children (NCJ 182335). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Murray, J., & Farrington, D. P. (2005). Parental imprisonment: Effects on boys' antisocial behaviour and delinquency through the life-course. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 46*(12), 1269–1278.

Murray, J., & Farrington, D.P. (2008). Parental imprisonment: Long-lasting effects on boys' internalizing problems through the life course. *Development and Psychopathology, 20*(1), 273-290.

Osgood, D. W., Johnston, L.D., O'Malley, P. M., and Bachman, J. G. (1988). The Generality of Deviance in Late Adolescence and Early Adulthood. *American Sociological Review, 53*(1): 81–93.

Paltrow, L. M. (1990). When becoming pregnant is a crime. *Criminal Justice Ethics, 9*(1), 41-47.

Petersilia, J. (2003). *When prisoners come home: Parole and prisoner reentry*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, USA.

Petersilia, J. (2005). Meeting the challenges on prisoner reentry. In *What works and why: Effective approaches to reentry*. 175-192. American Correctional Association. Lanham, Maryland: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.

Poehlmann, J. (2005b). Incarcerated mothers' contact with children, perceived family relationships, and depressive symptoms. *Journal of Family Psychology, 19*(3), 350-357.

Porporino, F. J. (2005). Revisiting responsivity: Organizational change to embrace evidence-based principles and practices. In *What works and why: Effective approaches to reentry*. 193-230. American Correctional Association. Lanham, Maryland: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.

Richie, B. (2001). Challenges incarcerated women face as they return to their communities: Findings from life history interviews. *Crime and Delinquency, 47*, 368-389.

Riehman K. S., Hser, Y., and Zeller, M. J. (2000). Gender differences in how intimate partners influence drug treatment motivation. *Drug Issues, 30*(4), 823-838.

Salisbury, E., and Van Voorhis, P. (2009). Gendered pathways: A quantitative investigation of women probationers' paths to incarceration. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 36*(6), 541-566.doi:10.1177/0093854809334076

Schroeder, R. D., Bulanda, R. E., Giordano, P. C. and Cernkovich, S. A. (2011). Parenting and adult criminality: An examination of direct and indirect effects by race. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 25(1), 64*-98.

Sherer, M., Maddux, J.E., Mercadante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S., Jacobs, B., and Rogers, R.W. (1982). The self-efficacy scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological Reports, 51*, 663-671.

Stringer, S. M. (2006).*Breaking parole: A critical analysis of the New York State Division of Parole's caseload management standards*, New York, NY: Manhattan Borough President.

Thompson, M., and Petrovic, M. (2009). Gendered transitions: Within-person changes in employment, family, and illicit drug use. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 46*, 377-408.

Tibbetts, S. G. (2002). Gender, emotions, and criminal offending. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Crime Justice Sciences, Anaheim, CA. Available from S. G. Tibbetts at California State University, San Bernadino.

Uggen, C., Wakefield, S., and Western, B. (2005).Work and family perspectives on reentry.In Travis, J., and Visher, C. *Prisoner Reentry and Crime in America*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Van Voorhis, P., Baumann, A., and Brushett, R. (2013). *Revalidation of the Women's Risk Needs Assessment: Probation Results.* (Final Report) (pp. 1–177). University of Cincinnati.

Varriale, J. A. (2008). Female gang members and desistance: Pregnancy as a possible exit strategy? *Journal of Gang Research, 15*, 35–64.

Visher, C. A., and Travis, J. (2003). Transitions from prison to the community: Understanding individual pathways. *Annual Review of Sociology, 29*, 89-113.

Warr, M. (1998). Life course transitions and desistance from crime. *Criminology, 36*(2), 183-216.

White, G. D. (2012). Gender-Responsive Programs in U.S. Prisons: Implications for Change. *Social Work in Public Health, 27*(3), 283-300.

Wright, J. P., Tibbetts, S. G., and Daigle, L. E. (2008).*Criminals in the making: Criminality across the life course*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.