INFLUENCES ON DRUG AND ALCOHOL-INVOLVED FEMALE OFFENDERS
ENGAGEMENT IN DESIRED COMMUNICATION WITH THEIR PROBATION/PAROLE
OFFICERS

By

Jennifer Cornacchione

A DISSERTATION

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

Communication – Doctor of Philosophy

2014

ABSTRACT

INFLUENCES ON DRUG AND ALCOHOL-INVOLVED FEMALE OFFENDERS
ENGAGEMENT IN DESIRED COMMUNICATION WITH THEIR PROBATION/PAROLE
OFFICERS

By

Jennifer Cornacchione

This study investigates factors that affect female probationers' and parolees' decision to
engage or not engage in desired communication with their probation/parole officers (PO) about
difficult issues they face. The influence of perceived norms, conversational goals, and various
secondary variable considerations (such as criminogenic needs, perceptions of PO characteristics
and influences, and social network qualities) on communication behavior are examined.
Interviews were conducted with 402 women on probation and parole across the state of
Michigan, and both quantitative and qualitative data were collected. Of these 402 women, 127
stated that there was a time when they wanted to talk to their PO about a difficult need or issue
they were facing. Issues they wanted to talk about included housing, relationship issues, and
illegal activity. Results indicated that social norms did not predict whether or not communication
occurred, but that personal resource goals were a significant predictor. Women who were
concerned about threats to their freedom and resources were less likely to have talked to their PO
about the issue. Additionally, women who reported that they felt anxiety and psychological
reactance during and after their meetings with their PO were also less likely to engage in the
conversation. These findings illuminate possible reasons that impact whether or not individuals
engage in difficult conversations.

This dissertation is dedicated to the memory of my mom and dad. You always supported, encouraged, and praised me, and those words have stuck with me every day, pushing me through many days of self-doubt. I couldn't have done this without you, knowing you've always been my biggest fans.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Finally, I would like to thank my family. Thank you, Jon, Tony, Nicole, and Jill for always being proud of your little sister. Thank you to Beth and Gary for being constant sources of support. Thank you to Gus, Oliver, and Farkas for being such great companions, especially on stressful days. And thank you to Dennis for putting up with more than anyone, and always finding a way to make me laugh. Most of all, I'd like to thank my mom and dad for raising someone who never quits.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Over one million women in the United States are on probation or parole (Bonczar & Glaze, 2009). Women offenders are unique from male offenders because of their past experiences, which are often characterized by physical and sexual abuse both in childhood and as adults. As a result, many of their offenses are often substance-centered because they turn to drugs and alcohol to cope (Morash, 2010). Previous research has indicated female offenders report their probation/parole officers (PO) as a main source of support and an important member of their social network (Morash, 2010). However, almost no research has been reported on the interaction between female offenders and their POs. This study examines the factors that impact whether or not female offenders who want to talk to their POs about a difficult issue or problem they are facing actually engage in communication. Some of these difficult issues or problems could be criminogenic needs, which are risks and predictors of crime, and include things such as the stress that comes from parenting, being abused by a partner, or not having access to safe housing (Van Voorhis, Wright, Salisbury, & Bauman, 2010). Other topics of conversation could include wanting to go to substance treatment and moving into a new home. Goals and social norms are used to examine this phenomenon.

The multiple goals perspective (Caughlin, 2010) may help to explain whether or not women on probation or parole engage in communication with their POs about difficult issues or needs they are facing about which they *want* talk to their POs. Goals, defined as desired end states (Wilson, 2007), often have been distinguished as primary or secondary (i.e., constraints) (Dillard, Segrin, & Hardin, 1989). Primary goals define the interaction, whereas constraints are generally derived from the primary motivations of the interaction, and can include things such as maintaining positive relationships and not offending the other interactant. Women on probation

or parole may face multiple, conflicting goals when thinking about engaging in communication with their PO about any of their needs or issues that they may wish to discuss. Palomares noted (in press) that individuals may have certain goals, but no behavioral indicators may ever be exhibited. For example, a woman may have a goal to seek help, but the presence of a behavioral indicator (talk or not talk) can vary depending on a variety of reasons, including constraints.

Wanting to conform to perceived social norms may facilitate or constrain the offender's actual engagement in communication. Social norms are defined as beliefs about the expected or ideal behavior within a situation (Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, & Sherif, 1961). The three main types of norms often used in research are descriptive (what is done), injunctive (what ought to be done), and subjective (what one thinks important others want one to do) (e.g., Anderson, Cornacchione, & Maloney, 2013; Kam, Matsunaga, Hecht, & Ndiaye, 2009; Park & Smith, 2007). Although there is a great deal of social norms research, social norms research about communication is limited. Specifically, most research examines social norms about behavior, such as recycling or using condoms, but not about communication as the behavior. In fact, much of the research examining communication within the social norms framework has studied it as a vehicle for norms transmission. This paper examines normative influences on communication (i.e., whether or not a female offender engages in communication with her PO) between female offenders and their PO about difficult issues or topics, including criminogenic needs.

This paper will first provide an overview of the need to study communication between POs and their female clients, as well as factors that make women on probation and parole a unique population to study. The multiple goals approach and social norms will be explained, and an overview of their predicted relationships with engaging in communication will be provided. Additional factors that may also predict whether a woman communicates to her PO about her

needs will also be discussed. Research questions and hypotheses will be advanced, the study

method and analyses will be outlined, and the findings will be discussed. Implications and

directions for future research will also be provided.

CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE REVIEW

Women on Probation and Parole

Women on probation and parole face unique needs that males often do not. Some of these needs or issues include providing for children and dealing with issues of custody. Additionally, in comparison to male offenders and women in the general population, women offenders are often the victims of domestic violence both as children and adults (Morash, 2010). These experiences often lead them to cope by using controlled substances. Substance use and abuse is one of the most common offenses committed by women (Morash, 2010; Salisbury & Van Voorhis, 2009). In one study, 91% of women re-entered into the community after prison release reported using crack, cocaine, or heroin six months prior to their most recent arrest (Freudenberg, Daniels, Crum, Perkins, & Richie, 2005).

When women offenders have been convicted of a felony or misdemeanor crime, they are assigned to a term of supervision called parole (for felony-level offenders who have completed their prison term) or probation (for felony- or misdemeanor-level offenders supervised in the community instead of being incarcerated). Although probation and parole are two distinct types of community supervision, the rules and conditions that are mandated by the court for both are quite similar, such as being required to attend substance abuse treatment, go to educational and employment services, obtain housing, attend medical appointments, and obey all supervising agent's instructions. The offenders must also regularly report to an assigned probation or parole officer (USBJS, n.d.). Failure to comply with these conditions can result in being placed in prison or jail.

One of the main goals of community supervision is to prevent recidivism, which is defined as a relapse in criminal behavior. Recidivism rates among female parolees are especially

high. In a sample of a female release cohort in 15 states, approximately 60% of paroled women were rearrested. Additionally, 30% returned to prison within three years (Deschenes, Owen, & Crow, 2007). Several factors have been identified that can affect female offenders' future recidivism rates, and they are called criminogenic needs. Criminogenic needs are factors that have been found to predict or cause crime. These factors include parental stress; self-efficacy; trauma, victimization, and abuse; mental health; self-esteem; and intimate relationships, among others (Van Voorhis, Salisbury, Wright, & Bauman, 2008). Having antisocial attitudes, including criminal thinking, and associating with antisocial friends are some of the strongest predictors of future criminal behavior (Andrews & Bonta, 2003). Other needs and problems faced by female offenders include educational challenges, financial and employment problems, housing safety, family conflict (i.e., with family of origin), stresses associated with parenting, substance abuse and treatment, and mental health problems, including anxiety and depression (Van Voorhis et al., 2008). These factors may be important topics of conversation between women and their POs. Talking to their POs about these things may be important for avoiding future arrests and recidivism, as well as having successful outcomes, such as finding a job or getting an education. Because of the significant role these challenges can place on women who are living in the community and are currently serving probation or parole sentences, it is important to examine whether the women initiate conversations about these, or other, topics (such as relapsing) with their PO.

Female offenders' relationships with their POs can be especially important because they often receive little family support. In fact, women substance users receive less tangible and emotional support than non-substance users (Mallik & Visher, 2008). Other factors also complicate their social networks. For example, many family members themselves have broken

the law, or have been the ones to abuse the women (Morash, 2010). Furthermore, uneducated and low-income women often have smaller social networks upon which to rely (Reisig, Holtfreter, & Morash, 2002). The offenders' reliance on their POs has been suggested in several studies. For example, a recent study found that a greater percentage of women on parole received memorable messages from their PO compared to women on probation (Cornacchione et al., 2013). This may be because women on parole have spent time in prison, and, thus, their social networks have been severed, making communication with their PO even more important and salient. Other research (e.g., Cobbina, 2010) indicates that the nature of the relationship between female parolees and their supervising officers impacts reentry. One study, for example, found that female offenders who were more submissive, isolated, and friendly were more likely to develop strong alliances with a therapist compared to women who were hostile and aggressive (Ross, Polaschek, & Ward, 2008). These traits could make women feel more comfortable talking with their PO about issues they are facing compared to women who are more hostile and aggressive. Women who are isolated may tend to develop closer relationships with their PO.

Female offenders tend to have limited access to information and social support (Skeem, Eno Louden, Manchak, Vidal, & Haddad, 2009). Because of their diminished access to support and a minimal social network, the relationship with their POs could play a significant role in their outcomes, as the PO might be their only source of information and support. Research conducted by Skeem and colleagues (2009) found that female probationers with mental illness and substance abuse problems tended to have better probation outcomes (e.g., fewer violations) when they had a satisfying relationship with their POs, which also included participatory decision-making. Skeem, Eno Louden, Polaschek, and Camp (2007) found that female probationers who perceived their POs to be tough had a higher number of violations. Taxman

6

and Ainsworth (2009) noted similar findings for offenders: perceptions of fairness and caring lead to more positive outcomes. Although research has demonstrated the positive outcomes related to successful supervision, there is minimal literature on studying the communicative relationship between female offenders and their POs to determine what successful supervision entails. Communicating with their POs may be the one of the keys to successful supervision and this communication might be influenced by the women's conversational goals and constraints, as well as the perceived norms that exist within their relationships or networks. Women on probation and parole may only be able to obtain the necessary resources they need if they communicate with their POs about these issues.

However, the relationship between offenders and their supervising officers can be quite complicated. POs serve dual-roles in relation to their clients. Although research indicates numerous positive outcomes for offenders when POs are caring and supportive, POs must also enforce the law and protect public safety (Kennealy, Skeem, Manchak, & Eno Louden, 2012; Skeem et al., 2007). Additionally, POs have a lot of discretion in their supervision. For example, whereas some POs might throw a woman into jail if she has started using drugs again, other POs may instead refer her to rehabilitation services. Thus, engaging in communication with their POs about difficult issues or needs could have negative consequences for the women, even if the PO perceives the outcome to be positive (e.g., the woman does not want to go to jail, but being put in jail may save her life and protect the public). Furthermore, some POs might take on more of the counselor role and be open to talking about various issues with their clients, while others might be more interested in just asking standard questions related to the women's supervision requirements. There are no standardized protocols for the meetings between POs and their

clients. Although engaging in communication with their PO can lead to better outcomes, there may be various goals and constraints driving whether the conversation even occurs.

Voice & Silence

Traditionally, offenders have not had voice. Community supervision has a history of being dominantly characterized by toughness. However, recent research shows that certain PO-client relationships (those characterized by trust and caring) can lead to improved probation and parole outcomes (Skeem et al., 2003). Thus, as the shift in the nature of supervision occurs, including the instantiation of gender-specific caseloads, it might be the case that women are learning to have a voice, are engaging in more decision-making, and, thus, are using their voice to help improve their outcomes.

Previous research in the context of organizations (e.g., Rusbult et al., 1988) and romantic relationships (e.g., Rusbult, Zembrodt, & Gunn, 1982) has examined the concept of voice, particularly in reference to dissatisfaction. More recent research has identified *voice* and *silence* as two separate continuous constructs (Van Dyne, Ang, & Botero, 2003). Voice is defined as people expressing their ideas, opinions, and information. Silence, on the other hand, implies withholding information. After a thorough review of the literature, Taxman and Ainsworth (2009) found that more positive outcomes are likely to occur when offenders perceive they have a voice in decisions. Having a voice, or contributing to decision-making, has also been found to increase perceptions of procedural justice (e.g., Korsgaard & Roberson, 1995; Lind, Kanfer, & Earley, 1990). If women are able to talk to their PO and work together to find a solution, then they may have better supervision outcomes, including a decreased number of violations and decreased recidivism. However, factors that may impact women's tendency to express voice or silence about particular topics could be the various goals and constraints that exist.

Conversational Goals

Models of message production may facilitate understanding of whether women who want to talk to their POs about difficult issues actually engage in the conversation. Goals have been defined as, "future end states of affairs that an individual desires to attain or maintain" (Wilson, 2007, p. 74), and have been acknowledged as important components of communication (Berger, 2005). Within relationships, individuals' goals and constraints may influence whether topics are discussed, why they are discussed, and the nature in which they are discussed. This study examines how goals and constraints impact whether the conversation actually occurs.

In 2010, Caughlin traced the development of the multiple goals perspective in communication research. Three assumptions exist in the goals research tradition: communication is strategic and purposeful, individuals most often pursue multiple goals at the same time, and communication goals often conflict. Individuals typically communicate with purpose, such as to gain compliance, provide support, enhance positive face, persuade another to do something, and to give advice. Because communication is purposeful, it is often the case that individuals pursue multiple goals simultaneously. Goals can be distinguished as *primary* or *secondary* (Dillard et al., 1989). Secondary goals are actually constraints (Palomares et al., 2013). Whereas goals are desired end states individuals wish to attain, constraints are ongoing concerns, considerations, and behavioral expectations. Specifically, "constraints...influence the behaviors enacted in pursuit of a goal" (Palomares, in press, p. 84; 2013). Goals refer to the main reason or drive for engaging in communication, and often involve influence goals to persuade the other interactant (Dillard, 1989). The primary goal, "brackets the situation. It helps segment the flow of behavior into a meaningful unit; it says what the interaction is about" (Dillard et al., 1989, p. 21). Constraints, on the other hand, refer to other considerations about the interaction that might

constrain or alter the conversation, such as ongoing concerns and considerations. Specifically, they "derive from more general motivations that are recurrent in a person's life" (Dillard et al., 1989, p. 20). The desire to avoid conflict and refrain from offending the other person are two concrete examples of constraints because they serve as concerns about having the conversation or how the conversation is ultimately enacted (Dillard et al., 1989). In general, constraints shape and refine message production, as well as denote the range of available behavioral options (Schrader & Dillard, 1998).

A number of goal and constraint types have been discussed in the literature, and Dillard's (1990) Goals-Planning-Action model specifies five specific types of constraints. These include identity, interaction, relational resource, personal resource, and arousal management (Dillard et al., 1989; Schrader & Dillard, 1998). *Identity* refers to concerns about behaving in ways consistent with personally held beliefs and values. Dillard and colleagues (1989) define this as "internal standards of behavior" that "derive from one's moral standards…and personal preferences concerning one's own conduct" (p. 20). For example, a probationer may want to maintain her identity as being strong and tough, which might inhibit her from seeking help. *Interaction* refers to the desire to engage in social appropriateness and impression management. They also represent one's desire to avoid threatening face of the interaction partner (Dillard et al., 1989). For example, an offender may simply ask for help rather than demanding that her PO do something to fix the situation. *Relational resource* refers to concerns about preserving one's relationship with the other interactant because of the rewards and gratifications associated with that relationship, such as an offender not wanting to tell her PO about engaging in illegal activity because she does not want to damage the positive relationship they currently have. *Personal resource* refers to the desire to avoid consequences for one's own resources, such as going back

to prison. *Arousal management* refers to concerns about avoiding feelings of embarrassment or nervousness, and generally staying within preferred arousal levels. For example, a female parolee may experience a lot of anxiety regarding her recent relapse.

Dilemmas often occur during interactions when deciding which goal to pursue and how to pursue it (i.e., constraints), and these dilemmas can affect both communication behaviors and relationship outcomes. For example, a woman on probation who has relapsed and begun using drugs again may want to discuss this relapse with her PO to receive the treatment she needs (goal). Ultimately, however, she may decide to avoid talking about this because she fears her PO would think negatively of her or initiate action to incarcerate her (constraint). An inherent conflict exists within the PO-offender relationship. Although a woman may want to be open and honest with her PO, being open and honest could result in legal action, thus making facilitating open and honest communication problematic. Women under community supervision already face many barriers and threats to freedom (e.g., difficulty finding a job because of a felony conviction and a risk for (re)incarceration); thus, it is anticipated that personal resource constraints will be more influential than other considerations in the women's decision to engage in communication with their POs. Therefore, it is predicted that:

H1: As ratings of personal resource increase, women will be less likely to engage in communication with their POs about a difficult need/issue they are facing.

Using the multiple goals approach, scholars have sought to identify people's motivations for engaging or not engaging in communication, along with the factors that serve as both the independent and dependent variables, in a variety of contexts and situations. Donovan-Kicken and Caughlin (2010) examined the relationship between topic avoidance and relationship satisfaction for women recently diagnosed with cancer. The authors specifically wanted to

11

examine the influence that motivations of avoidance had on the outcomes. They found that the motivations for avoidance moderated the relationship between topic avoidance and relationship satisfaction. When social constraints were high, the relationship between satisfaction and avoidance was negative. Conversely, when low social constraints were present, topic avoidance predicted greater relationship satisfaction. Cornacchione (2013) found that when concerns for maintaining the relationship were high, individuals were less likely to engage in communication to persuade a family member about a health issue. Scott (2010) found that in end-of-life discussions, competing goals and constraints often caused dilemmas. While some individuals wanted to avoid communicating about end-of-life during this time, it had implications for other goals, such as relational goals. For instance, relational distancing frequently occurred because having end-of-life conversations could potentially hurt the family member. In the context of topic avoidance in families after a lung cancer diagnosis, it was found that multiple reasons explained the avoidance of communication about the health issue, including maintaining hope and optimism, along with protection of the family members (Caughlin, Mikucki-Enyart, Middleton, Stone, & Brown, 2011). Different reasons for avoiding conversations were also found to have different outcomes. For example, avoiding was dissatisfying when it was done out of denial (Caughlin et al., 2011). The current study seeks to understand female offenders' reasons for engaging and not engaging in communication with their POs even though they want to have the conversation. Thus, the following research questions ask:

RQ1: What are the reported reasons (i.e., goals) for engaging in communication with POs about the difficult issue?

RQ2: What are the reported reasons (i.e., constraints) for not engaging in the desired conversation with POs about the difficult issue?

Social Norms & Communication

Conforming to perceived social norms may serve as a goal or a constraint when individuals decide to engage or not engage in communication. Social norms are defined as "a system of anchors around which all social relationships are organized" (Sherif, 1936, p. 126) that "regulate members' behavior in terms of the expected or the ideal behavior" (Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, & Sherif, 1961, p. 9). Norms denote a range of acceptable behavior. Research has found that people define themselves in the context of their relationships. Sherif (1936) stated that "one feels oneself in definite relationships with others, and one acquires definite expectations as to their responses, as well as definite responsibilities toward them" (p. 182). Norms exist within relationships and groups, and these norms guide attitudes and behaviors.

Behaviors are driven, in part, by a desire to avoid social sanctions. Behaviors can also be driven by a desire to receive social approval. Asch (1956) stated "the compliant person…translates social opposition into a reflection of his personal worth" (p. 52). Individuals who strongly identify with their group are more likely to conform to their group norms (Kwon & Lease, 2009), and acceptance into groups is a function of engaging in socially accepted behavior (Shulman & Levine, 2012). Individuals are motivated to conform to the normative behavior to remain a member of their referent groups without receiving any social sanctions and to achieve approval. The relationship between the individual and the referent group is directly related to conformity, such that distal peer norms tend to be less influential than proximal peer norms, (e.g., Cho, 2006; Yun & Silk, 2011). For example, a female offender may refer to other female offenders about what behavior should or should not occur, as opposed to referring to other people in the community. Individuals rely on others for a variety of resources, which facilitates conformity. Lapinski and Rimal (2005) stated "because people are dependent on others to meet

their needs, they are concerned about others' evaluation of their behaviors" (p. 131). These potential dependencies may have significant implications for women when they are trying to decide whether or not to communicate with their POs to address needs or difficult issues. It is possible that the problems they are facing could result in further supervision or punishment. For example, a woman may be unable to abstain from illicit drug and alcohol use, and talking to her PO about relapsing could cause her to get into more legal trouble.

Three types of norms have been identified in the literature: subjective, injunctive, and descriptive, and exist at both the societal and personal level (Cialdini, Kallgren, & Reno 1991; Park & Smith, 2007; Perkins & Berkowitz, 1986). Subjective norms, as defined in the theory of planned behavior, are perceptions about what important others expect one to do; thus, they fall at the personal level of norms (Azjen & Fishbein, 1980). Individuals are motivated to comply with these important referents. Injunctive and descriptive norms refer to beliefs about what ought to be done and beliefs about what is actually done (i.e., prevalence of a behavior), respectively (Cialdini, Kallgren, & Reno, 1990; Lapinski & Rimal, 2005). At the personal level, descriptive norms refer to an individual's belief about the prevalence of a behavior among people whom the individual considers important or whose opinion is valued by the individual. Personal-level injunctive norms refer to an individual's belief about the approval for that behavior among people who the individual considers important, or whose opinion they value (Park & Smith, 2007). Because this is a study of relational communication, it is focused on personal-level perceived norms as opposed to societal level norms. The perceived norms, or cognitions about norms, examined in this study are those that have emerged through the women's interactions with her referents.

14

Extensive theoretical work has addressed the role of social norms in predicting individual behaviors. The theory of planned behavior (TPB; Ajzen, 1991), focus theory (Cialdini, Reno, & Kallgren, 1990; Reno, Cialdini, & Kallgren, 1993), and the theory of normative social behavior (Lapinski & Rimal, 2005; Rimal & Real, 2005) all address the influence of social norms on behavior. Subjective norms (i.e., perceptions about what important others expect one to do) in the TPB have been found to be a strong predictor of intentions to engage in health behaviors, such as to use condoms (Albarracin, Johnson, Fishbein, & Muellerliele, 2001). Subjective norms have also been found to be a significant predictors of communication initiation in a variety of contexts, including intent to engage in family discussion about organ donation (Park & Smith, 2007) and intent to tell family members about genetic test results (Barsevick et al., 2008). Park and Smith found that subjective norms moderated the effect between both perceived behavioral control for, and attitudes about, engaging in family discussion about organ donation. Those with stronger perceived subjective norms (perceptions that important others wanted them to engage in the conversation) were more likely to intend to engage in family discussion about organ donation, but descriptive norms (perceptions of how much others did engage in communication) were positively related to behavioral intent when subjective norms were weak. However, one study found no relationship between subjective norms and behavioral intent (e.g., Bran & Sutton, 2009). Other research (e.g., Rivis & Sheeran, 2003) found descriptive norms to be a significant predictor of behavioral intent. Extensive work focused on drinking on college campuses has demonstrated that inflated perceptions of descriptive norms lead individuals to engage in consumption patterns that are perceived to be normative (e.g., Perkins & Berkowitz, 1986). Studies have found that perceptions of a normative behavior occurring (descriptive norms) lead

to engagement in the behaviors of condom use and homophobic communication (Elwood, Greene, & Carter, 2003; Hall & LaFrance, 2012).

Research conducted by Lapinski, Anderson, Shugart, and Todd (2013) found that injunctive norms (beliefs about what ought to be done) moderate the effect of descriptive norms on behaviors, such that when perceptions of approval were high, descriptive norms were positively associated with engaging in the behavior. Park and Smith (2007) documented that as personal injunctive norms increased in strength, subjective norms became a significant predictor of behavioral intent. Cornacchione (2013) found that as perceptions of approval increased (high injunctive norms), the likelihood of engaging in communication with a family member about a health issue also increased. Based on previous research, it is expected that perceived norms about engaging in communication will be positively associated with actual engagement in communication.

> H2a: There will be a positive relationship between a woman's perception of other women on probation and parole engaging in communication with their PO about difficult issues and actual engagement in communication. (descriptive norms)
>
> H2b: There will be a positive relationship between a woman's perceptions of approval from normative referents about engaging in communication with her PO about difficult issues and actual engagement in communication. (injunctive norms)
>
> H2c: There will be a positive relationship between a woman's perceptions of normative referents expecting her to engage in communication with her PO about a difficult issue and actual engagement in communication. (subjective norms)

It is possible that the role of norms for women on probation and parole in predicting communication behavior may be nonexistent. As previously mentioned, women on probation

and parole have smaller social networks, thus, potentially making normative impacts irrelevant. If this is the case, then it might be difficult to determine the normative referents for the women. Additionally, there may be no perceived norms because she might feel isolated. In fact, many women have reported staying inside their home and away from other people as ways to stay safe in their neighborhood and avoid criminal activity (Cobbina, Morash, Kashy, & Smith, in press).

Research has also found that social norms can be intentionally violated (Ross & Mirowsky, 1987). One study noted that adolescent sex offenders and juvenile offenders were more normless than nondelinquent youths. Normlessness is defined as the "subjective dissociation from socially approved norms governing behavior and…acceptance of socially unapproved behavior as a way to achieve conventional goals" (Miner & Munns, 2005, p. 493). This means that individuals are aware of the norms that exist, but find it socially acceptable to deviate from these norms to achieve a greater goal that would not be possible to achieve while adhering to social norms. Additionally, in committing the crimes, women already violated societal norms for proper conduct and behavior, partially due to desperate situations and trying to fulfill needs. Given the complexity of social norms for offenders, there may be additional factors other than goals and norms that influence whether or not offenders who want to talk to their PO actually engage in communication.

Context of Study & Additional Factors Influencing Desired Communication with POs

This study is situated within a three-wave National Science Foundation-funded study of 402 women on probation and parole that examines the communicative relationship between women on probation/parole and their probation/parole officers to see what predicts successful outcomes, including reduced recidivism. Interviews were spaced approximately three months apart.

Additional data collected through this NSF study might help explain what impacts whether or not women on probation and parole engage in desired communication with their POs about difficult issues or needs. In fact, it is possible that these factors might predict the outcome above and beyond the goals and norms, especially since, as previously discussed, norms may not be well-formed for the women. Factors unique to the offenders, such as their supervision status (probation/parole), how many criminogenic needs they have, as well as the quality of their relationships might impact their "dependence" on and the importance of their relationship with their POs. This might, in turn, have an effect on whether or not the conversation occurs. Factors unique to the POs, such as the women's perception of their (PO) communication style, could also impact whether the conversation actually occurs. Analyses will be conducted with these additional variables that could potentially predict whether or not individuals talk to their PO. These variables are all at the personal level and based on the women's perceptions/self-reports.

Supervision status. Whether a woman is on probation or parole may impact whether or not she talks to her PO. It has been documented that women on probation and parole cite their PO as a main source of support (Morash, 2010). However, parolees may face greater challenges. Returning home from prison is often laden with difficulties. Many returning prisoners face barriers and obstacles that reduce their rights as citizens, such as being ineligible for public assistance, food stamps, and education loans (Petersilia, 2001). Additional research has demonstrated that women on parole tended to recall memorable messages from their PO more than women on probation (Cornacchione et al., 2013), indicating that women on parole may rely more on their PO than women on probation. The nature of the women's community supervision (i.e., probation vs. parole) will be examined to see if it is related to whether or not women talk to their PO about a difficult issue.

H3: Women on parole are more likely to engage in communication with their PO than

women on probation.

Criminogenic needs assessment. Women on probation and parole have various needs

and challenges that need to be dealt with while on community supervision, and they may need to

communicate with their PO to address these issues. Criminogenic needs are factors that have

been found to predict or cause crime. Factors unique to female offenders have been identified,

and are measured using the gender-responsive needs assessment developed by Van Voorhis and

colleages (e.g., Salisbury, Van Voorhis, & Spiropoulos, 2009; Van Voorhis et al., 2008; Van

Voorhis, Wright, Salisbury, & Bauman, 2010). The predictors of crime (i.e., criminogenic needs)

for women include parental stress; self-efficacy; trauma, victimization, and abuse; mental health;

self-esteem; intimate relationships; unsafe housing; few educational assets; and financial issues,

among others (Van Voorhis et al., 2008).

Besides just identifying risk factors, various strengths have been identified in the

literature, and these strengths help women to avoid future criminal behavior. These strengths

include self-esteem, self-efficacy, family and relationship support, and financial and educational

assets (Van Voorhis et al., 2008). It is expected that if women have a large number of

criminogenic needs (or more needs than strengths), then they will be more likely to talk to their

POs about addressing these needs or dealing with difficult issues. Needs are conceptualized as a

total risk score, which subtracts the women's total strengths from their total risk score. Women

who have a larger criminogenic risk score have more to gain from communicating with their POs

compared to women who have fewer needs (i.e., a lower criminogenic risk score).

H4: There will be a positive relationship between the women's total risk score (needs

minus strengths) and engaging in communication with their PO.

Social networks & social support. Women on probation and parole may have smaller and weaker social networks, especially for those who are uneducated and low-income (Reisig et al., 2002). It is expected that if women have small social networks, they will be more likely to communicate with their POs to achieve their needs. Female offenders who have used drugs and alcohol often receive little support from friends and family (Mallik & Visher, 2008). Previous research found that a greater proportion of women on parole compared to women on probation recalled memorable messages they received from their PO, and this finding may be due to parolees having smaller social networks after spending time in prison (Cornacchione et al., 2013). Women who have been to prison and who are on parole often have weakened support networks due to their physical absence from their communities of origin compared to women on probation who have committed a crime but has been sentenced to a period of correctional supervision in lieu of imprisonment; thus, their social networks remain intact.

The quality of the relationships (i.e., social support received) within the women's social networks might also influence their behaviors, including talking to their PO about difficult issues they are facing. Estroff and Zimmer claim that "social support characteristics...might either constitute risk factors for violence by creating the opportunity or need for violence or serve to prevent or decrease the opportunity and need for threatening or assaultive behaviors" (1994, p. 260). Cullen (1994) also noted the importance of social support in criminology, acknowledging that it can serve as a protective factor for offenders to help individuals refrain from engaging in criminal activity and help them reintegrate into society. With difficult and uncomfortable situations abounding for those on probation and parole, the effects of social support have been found to mediate (and dampen) the relationship between discomfort and hostility compared to those lacking social support (Hochstetler, DeLisi, & Pratt, 2010). Because of the significant

impact that support has on offenders and their criminal behavior and feelings, it is reasonable to expect that social support characteristics may also be predictive of behaviors other than violence, such as communication. If women perceive that they are lacking social support from individuals in their network, then they may be more likely to talk to their PO about needs and difficult issues to obtain the support needed.

Social support is a communicative process (Burleson, Albrecht, Goldsmith, & Sarason, 1994) whereby individuals in ongoing relationships seek and provide support to one another (Barnes & Duck, 1994). Traditionally, social support is communicated in five ways: informational, tangible, esteem, emotional, and social network. Informational and tangible support are considered types of action-facilitating support that help the distressed individual solve the problem through both information support and tangible aid (Cutrona & Suhr, 1992). Esteem, emotional, and network support are considered types of nurturant support that provides comfort to the stressed individual without providing any direct support to solve the problem (Cutrona & Suhr, 1992). The three types of support examined in this study are emotional support, social network support, and instrumental support, which are derived from work conducted by Estroff and Zimmer (1994).

Estroff and Zimmer conceptualize emotional support as whether the woman can talk to anyone in her social network if she is upset or worried, and if she perceives that someone truly cares about her. Emotional support is important for female offenders who are under community supervision because they likely face multiple challenges such as finding a job, remaining sober, and trying to regain custody of children. Because these are stressful life events that are likely to induce stress and worry, it is important for offenders to have individuals in their network that they can talk to when they are upset or worried to help cope with these stressors.

Social network support is conceptualized as an individual's having someone with whom she spends time. If women indicate that they do not spend time with individuals within their network, that could impact their sense of support, and subsequently, their decisions to talk to their POs. Research indicates that spending time with other individuals can help buffer against reoffending, and this finding is especially strong for individuals who received visitors during incarceration (e.g., Cochran, 2014). However, research also indicates that many offenders avoid crime in their neighborhood by staying alone (e.g., Cobbina et al., in press). Depending on the social network composition, it can result in either positive or negative behaviors (Portes, 1998).

Finally, instrumental support is determined by whether the woman would ask members in her social network for help, including assistance in obtaining goods and services. Having services provided by social network members (such as transportation and childcare) can help prevent offenders from turning to crime to satisfy their needs, for example by driving a car without a license (Wright, DeHart, Koons-Witt, & Crittenden, 2013).

One reason a woman may not receive the support she needs is because of the quality of relationships she has with her family, friends, and romantic partners. Women have frequently experienced physical and sexual abuse as children and adults, and oftentimes, family members are the ones who abuse them (Leverentz, 2006). Additionally, women on parole may be more detached from their previous relationships, so support may be especially hard to receive from family, friends, or romantic partners. Thus, it is expected that women with small social networks will be more likely to talk to their POs. Additionally, women who report receiving little support from their network will also be more likely to talk to their POs about difficult issues. Thus, it is predicted and asked that:

H5: Women with smaller social networks will be more likely to engage in communication with their PO compared to women with larger social networks.

H6: As the percentage of individuals within their social network who provide support (instrumental, emotional, social) increases, women will be less likely to engage in communication with their PO.

In addition to these offender-specific characteristics, it is important to consider whether there are PO characteristics that might also affect whether or not communication occurs.

Perceptions of PO characteristics and interactions. Women's perceptions of their PO may also impact whether they talk to their POs about issues they face. PO-specific characteristics could include communication style and elicited emotions. The perceived PO communication style could have substantial effects on whether or not women engage in desired communication with their PO. The measure of the PO communication style is based on the family communication patterns measure in family communication literature. The family communication patterns (FCP) framework focuses on the ways in which individuals perceive their communication with other family members (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002). The scale was originally developed to address the degree to which parents' discussion of ideas and concepts (concept-orientation) or social roles/relationships, such as authority (socio-orientation) influences children's information processing, decision making, and behaviors (McCleod & Chaffee, 1972; Schrodt et al., 2008). The roles within the original measure, and subsequent versions (e.g., Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990) examine the relationship between individuals of authority (parents) and their subordinates (children). In this context, the framework focuses on the ways in which offenders (subordinates) perceive their communication with their PO (an authority figure).

23

Previous research on the FCP has found that some communication patterns lead to desirable outcomes (Schrodt et al., 2008). The FCP specifies two communication orientations that idividuals in authority can adopt: conversational and conformity (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002a; Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990). Conversation orientation refers to how open communication is within the relationship or group. This communication pattern encourages discussions that recognize the contributions and perspectives of both the PO and the offender. The conversational communication orientation encourages everyone to be independent, share feelings, and contribute to the decision-making process (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002; Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990), which would be exceptionally important for offenders (Taxman & Ainsworth, 2009). Conformity orientation refers to the extent to which communication reflects obedience (e.g., Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990). Conformity orientation generally deals with how much emphasis is placed on obedience to authority (Fitzpatrick & Ritchie, 1994). In a meta-analysis examining the FCP, the greatest effect sizes between communication patterns and outcomes were for conversation orientation, and those being associated with many positive outcomes, such as less alcohol consumption (Schrodt et al., 2008). Women who perceive that their PO engages in a more conversational communication orientation may be more likely to actually engage in the conversation. Conversely, women who perceive that their PO engages in a more conformity communication orientation may be less likely to talk to her PO.

H7: There will be a positive relationship between the women's perceptions of their PO's conversation communication orientation and engagement in communication.

H8: There will be a negative relationship between the women's perceptions of their PO's conformity communication orientation and engagement in communication.

Negative feelings and reactions elicited by the PO during meetings with their clients may impact whether or not women decide to talk with their POs about the needs or issue they are facing. Research on psychological reactance (Brehm, 1966; Brehm & Brehm, 1961) explains that when people feel like their freedom is being restricted, they are likely to do the opposite of what is told of them. For example, if the PO makes her client feel angry, guilty, or ashamed during interactions, the woman may not do what the PO tells her to do in order to establish her freedom. She may ignore the PO and do nothing, or do the opposite of what the PO suggests. Thus, it would be expected that if women had these negative feelings when interacting with their PO, then they would be less likely to engage in communication with her.

H9: There will be a negative relationship between women's reported a) psychological reactance, b) emotional reactance and c) anxiety during meetings with their PO and engagement in communication.

CHAPTER 2: METHODS

Participants

The focus of this study is understanding the relationship between female offenders and their PO by examining the factors that impact whether or not women on probation and parole who desire to talk to their PO about difficult issues or needs they face actually engage in the conversation. To examine this, the effects of goals and social norms on communication are examined, along with secondary variable considerations. Study respondents at the Time 1 interview consisted of 402 women on probation and parole in Michigan who participated in the interview. Of these, 305 (75.87%) were on probation, 93 (23.13%) were on parole, and 4 (<1%) reported being on both probation and parole. The sample age ranged from 18 to 60 with a mean of 33.87 ($SD = 10.53$). The sample was ethnically and racially diverse and included 198 White women (49%, n = 12 of these reported being both White and Hispanic), 147 Black women (36.6%, n = 10 reported being Black Hispanic), one Pacific Islander (<1%), and four Native American (<1%). Forty-four (11%) additional women identified multiple racial group memberships. An additional three women reported other racial groups, two refused to answer, one did not know her racial group, and two others did not provide information. Approximately half of the women reported having children (51.7%, n = 208), 52 were married (12.9%), and 232 were in dating relationships (57.7%).

Data were collected from the women in 3-waves, each spaced approximately 3 months apart. Women were initially recruited using various methods. Interviewers spent periods in the parole and probation office sites, and if women agreed, agents (probation/parole officers) introduced them to an interviewer to hear about the project. Alternatively, if women gave their agents permission, agents provided phone contact information and research staff called women

to arrange a time to hear about the study. For the T2 and T3 interviews, women were contacted by project staff, which could include their T1 interviewer. The women were contacted through various methods such as text messaging, phone calls, email, letters mailed to their last home address, and asking their PO for help. Women consented to being contacted for subsequent interviews during the T1 interview. The T1 interview lasted approximately 90 minutes, and the women received a $30 gift card to their choice of Walmart, Target, or CVS. After completing the T2 interview, which lasted approximately 45 minutes, women received a $50 gift card. The T3 interview lasted approximately 90 minutes, and women received a $75 gift card.

Goals and social norms data were collected during the T3 interview. Measures from T1 and T2 are also used in the data analysis. At the T3 interview, 394 female offenders on probation or parole were interviewed face-to-face using a structured interview conducted by trained interviewers. During the difficult conversations portion of the interview, the women were asked a series of questions to generate quantitative measures of goals and norms. Additionally, open-ended questions were asked by interviewers so that more in-depth responses could be obtained. This portion of the interview was audio recorded.

At the beginning of the difficult conversations portion of the interview, women were asked if there was a time when they faced a difficult issue about which they wanted to talk to their PO. If the woman responded *no*, she skipped over this portion of the interview. If the woman responded *yes*, she was then asked to describe this difficult issue (topic). For those indicating that there was a time when they wanted to talk to their PO, the women were next asked if they actually engaged in the conversation with their PO (yes/no). If they did engage in communication with their PO, they were hen asked to describe what they said to their PO, as well as their main goal for having the conversation. If the women did not engage in the

27

conversation with their PO, they were then asked to explain why the conversation did not occur (i.e., the main concerns that prevented them from talking to their PO). All women who wanted to talk to their PO, regardless of whether the conversation actually occurred, next answered a series of qualitative and quantitative questions regarding perceived personal level norms (descriptive, injunctive, and subjective) as well as multiple goals and constraints. Women were given the option to read the questions and select the answers themselves or have them read to by the interviewer. Quantitative items were modified to be more understandable by this population, since many have low literacy rates. The Flesch-Kincaid readability is at an 8th grade reading level. Additionally, for the purpose of keeping the interview as short as possible, each scale was reduced to three items.

Measures

Preliminary data analyses included checks for reliable measures. SPSS was used to compute Cronbach's alpha coefficient for each scale with three or more items in order to check for scale reliability. Psychometric properties (mean, standard deviation, range, reliability) from each scale are presented in Table 1. Correlations among all variables are presented in Table 2.

Goals. Measures to assess goals constructs were adapted from Dillard et al. (1989) and were scored such that higher scores indicate greater perceptions of the construct being measured. All items were measured using 7-point Likert-type scales ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Three items were used to measure each norm type. Thus, the dimensionality of these measures cannot be assessed.

Influence goals were measured with three items, such as "I was very concerned about getting what I wanted in this conversation." After removing one item (diff_talk5: "the outcome

of this conversation had important personal consequences for me"), the scale exhibited acceptable reliability, α = .64.

Three items were used to measure interaction constraints. An example question to measure this variable is, "I was careful to avoid saying things which were socially inappropriate." After removing one item (diff_talk8: "I was concerned with making or keeping a good impression"), the scale exhibited acceptable reliability, α = .63.

Identity was measured using three items, such as "In this conversation, I was concerned with not violating my own standards for what is right and wrong." The scale exhibited poor reliability, α = .27. Thus, this variable is excluded from data analysis.

Three items were used to measure relational resource constraints/considerations, including "I was not willing to risk possible damage to my relationship with the agent to get what I wanted." The scale exhibited poor reliability, α = .14. Thus, this variable is excluded from data analysis.

Three items were used to measure personal resource constraints, such as "I was afraid to have the conversation because it could take away my freedom or lead to more supervision." The scale exhibited acceptable reliability, α = .72.

Arousal management was measured using three items, including "I was worried about the possibility this conversation would make me uncomfortable." The scale exhibited acceptable reliability, α = .80.

Social norms. Measures to assess social norms (subjective, personal level descriptive, personal level injunctive) were adapted from Park and Smith (2007). Items were measured using 7-point Likert-type scales ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, and were scored so

that higher values indicated a greater perception of the norm existing. Three items were used to measure each norm type. Thus, the dimensionality of these measures cannot be assessed.

Three items were used to measure personal level descriptive norms, including "People who are important to me and in a situation similar to mine have talked with their POs about this issue." The scale exhibited acceptable reliability, $\alpha = .80$.

Three items were used to measure personal level injunctive norms, including "Most people who are important to me approve of talking to my PO about this issue." The scale exhibited acceptable reliability, $\alpha = .84$.

Three items were used to measure subjective norms, such as "My peers expect me to talk with my PO about this issue." The scale exhibited acceptable reliability, $\alpha = .83$.

Open-Ended Data Analysis

Responses to open-ended questions were audio recorded and transcribed into Microsoft Word for qualitative data analysis. Two research assistants (one undergraduate and one master's student) were independently trained to code the open-ended responses. The unit of measurement was the complete response the woman provided for each question section. The trained coders were given approximately 20% of the open-ended responses and coded them to establish initial coding reliability and to assess discrepancies that might exist. Once adequate reliability was established and all discrepancies resolved between the coders, the remaining responses were coded independently. Data were then input into SPSS from Microsoft Excel.

Categories to code the data were first determined by the primary researcher after reading through the transcripts. Once the coders began coding for initial reliability, they identified any other common themes they saw emerging. The coders and the researcher then discussed whether to add or remove any of the categories. This happened multiple times throughout the coding

process to determine if the coding scheme needed to be modified. The coders went through up to five rounds of coding and codebook revision before acceptable levels of reliability were achieved. Revision and training occurred after each round of reliability analysis. The researcher documented discrepancies and identified any common errors that occurred to assist in training the coders or editing the codebook. Additionally, coders were asked their input on any additional categories to add, change, or eliminate. The variables coded were the main reason/goal for having the conversation (RQ1), the constraints/reasons reported for not having the conversation (RQ2), and the topics of conversation (descriptive information). Initial Cohen's Kappa for the main goal for having the conversation was .29, and progressed sequentially to .24, .60, and .76. Initial Cohen's Kappa for constraints to having the conversation was .68. Initial Cohen's Kappa for topics of the conversation was .75. Final Cohen's Kappa reliabilities are listed below. The coding scheme with conceptual definitions is located in Table 3.

Motivations and constraints. Women who engaged in the conversation were asked what was driving them, or their main goal, in having the conversation with their POs. Eleven categories were identified: inform PO, inform PO specifically to avoid violation/trouble, initiated by PO, confession, seek informational support/advice, seek tangible support, seek help generally, emotional expression, and other. Two of the 11 categories were interview errors: not asked by interviewer and asked incorrectly. Cohen's Kappa for coding primary goals is .88. Categories and conceptual definitions are located in Table 3.

Women who did not engage in the conversation with their PO were asked the main reason why the conversation did not occur. Seven categories were identified: prevent restricted freedom, PO lacks resources, PO communication issues, negative PO relationship, maintain positive relationship with PO, other, and interviewer didn't ask. Cohen's Kappa for coding the

reported reasons for not engaging in the conversation is .87. Categories and conceptual definitions are located in Table 3.

Topics. All women who desired to have the conversation, regardless of whether or not they engaged in the conversation, were asked to report the topic or issue they wanted to talk to discuss with their PO. Twenty-one categories were identified: housing issues, paying back restitution fees, finding a job/job issues, both restitution and job issues, need services (financial, support), transportation issues, relapsing generally, illegal activity--using substances, illegal activity--non-substances, contact with police, talk about a third party (relationship issues), abuse, associating with others on probation/parole, children issues, relationship with PO, end supervision early, mental health, previous behavior, and other. Two of the 21 categories entailed interview errors: interviewer didn't ask and woman didn't answer. Cohen's Kappa for coding the topics is .87. Topics and conceptual definitions are listed in Table 3.

A copy of the difficult conversations portion of the interview is located in Appendix A.

Secondary Data Analysis

A number of other predictor variables were outlined earlier in the paper. These interview items are included in Appendix B. They are classified as secondary variables because they were variables already collected in the larger data set, and are examined in addition to the goals and norms.

Supervision status. At the beginning of the Time 1 interview, women were asked whether they were on probation or parole. A dummy-coded variable was created to indicate that 0 = parole and 1 = probation to include into the regression model with parole as the reference category.

Criminogenic needs assessment. Several variables were examined to measure the

women's total needs assessment using the Van Voorhis scale (Van Voorhis et al., 2008).

Variables included in the needs assessment are: criminal history, education,

financial/employment status, housing safety, having antisocial friends, anger, history of mental

illness, current mental illness, abuse and trauma, substance abuse, family and romantic

relationship quality, parenting, and self-efficacy. A total needs score was calculated at the T1

interview that took into account the women's needs and strengths. This variable was created by

subtracting a woman's total strengths score (education, family support, self efficacy) from her

total risk score (anger, anti-social attitude, criminal history, financial/employment, unsafe

housing, anti-social friends, current depression/anxiety, current psychosis, current and history of

substance abuse, family conflict, parental stress). The greater the score, the more needs that exist

for the women. More details regarding the specific subscales' measurement are located in

Appendix C. The mean total risk score for the sample is 24.40 ($SD = 8.03$, Min = 7, Max = 44)

and the mean total strengths score is 2.98 ($SD = 1.54$, Min = 0, Max = 6).

Social networks & social support. During all three interviews, women were given a

social network inventory sheet. Each woman filled in the initials of each person over the age of

17 she regularly spends time with. For each individual, she supplied information regarding

his/her gender, age, and relationship. In addition, dichotomous social support questions were

asked for each of the individuals listed on the social network inventory that measures perceived

availability of social support, and the percentage of people within each woman's social network

who she perceived that she could get that type of support from was calculated. For perceived

availability of emotional support, or whom the woman perceives she could talk to if she was

upset or worried, included questions such as "When you are upset or worried about something,

who would you talk with?" For perceived availability of social network support, which is the

woman's perception of availability to spend time with someone, the following question was

asked: "Is this someone you hang out with, or spend time with?" Finally, "Would you ask this

person if you needed something, like help doing something, money, or help caring for family

members?" was used to measure instrumental support, or the perceived availability of

individuals in their network whom the women could ask for help. The sum of the number of

people listed on the social network inventory is used to analyze the data to indicate the size of

their network.

Descriptive information on the social network was obtained by running descriptive

statistics. For the current sample, the mean size of the women's social network at the T1

interview was 4.99 (SD = 2.69, Min = 1, Max = 15). Many women (41%) listed their boyfriends

in their social network as well as their mothers (41%) with fewer reporting that their fathers were

members of their social network (14%). Friends were listed in the social network inventory (M =

1.67, SD = 1.65, Min = 0, Max = 7) more frequently than siblings (M = 0.71, SD = 0.98, Min = 0,

Max = 5). The majority of individuals listed within the social network inventories were female

(62.4%). The average number of individuals who had committed an offense within a woman's

social network was approximately one (M = 1.36, SD = 1.50, Min = 0, Max = 6). With those who

reported a lover within their network (n = 52), 59.62% of those lovers had committed an offense.

Additionally, of those who reported their mother within their network (n = 51), 10% of those

mothers had committed an offense, while 38.89% of fathers in the network had committed an

offense (n = 18).

The percentage of perceived availability of the three types of support was calculated by

summing each type of support that was reported in the social network inventory, then dividing

that sum by the total number of people listed in each woman's network. Overall, high levels of perceived availability of support were reported. On average, each social network comprised of high levels of perceived availability o instrumental support ($M = .76$, $SD = .26$), emotional support ($M = .92$, $SD = .16$), and social network support ($M = .73$, $SD = .27$).

Perceptions of PO communication style. To measure women's perceptions of their PO's communication style, the revised family communication patterns scale was used (Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990). As previously mentioned, the roles within the original measure and subsequent versions (e.g., Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990) examine the relationship between individuals of authority (parents) and their subordinates (children). In this study, the measure focuses on the ways in which offenders (subordinates) perceive their communication with their PO (authority).

Twenty-six items were used to measure conformity and conversation communication orientation on a 7 point Likert scale ranging from 1 = very strongly disagree to 7 = very strongly agree. Example conversation orientation items include "My PO frequently asks my opinion when we are talking" and "I can tell my PO almost anything." Example conformity orientation items include "Sometimes my PO says something like 'my ideas are right and you should not question them'" and "My PO expects me to obey him/her." Both exhibited acceptable levels of reliability, as evidenced by Cronbach's alpha of .89 for conversation and .82 for conformity.

Elicited emotions & reactance. To measure psychological reactance, 7 questions were asked to determine how strongly women agreed with statements regarding the reactance process. Seven items were adapted from the Therapeutic Reactance Scale (Dowd, Milne, & Wise, 1991) to reflect reactance in response to interactions with the probation or parole agent. Women responded to 7-point scales ranging from 1 = very strongly disagree to 7 = very strongly agree to

items such as "I get very irritated when my PO tells me what I must or must not do" and "Often I lose enthusiasm for doing something just because my PO expects me to do it." The scale exhibited an acceptable level of reliability, α = .91.

A measure of *emotional reactance* was also used to examine negative emotions elicited by the PO. This measure was adapted from previous work examining reactance (e.g., Dillard & Shen, 2005; Quick & Stephenson, 2007). Women were asked the extent to which they felt guilty, ashamed, annoyed, irritated, and angry during and after talking with their POs on a scale from 1 = not at all to 5 = very much. The scale exhibited acceptable reliability, α = .85.

To measure anxiety, items from the anxiety subscale of the Brief Symptom Inventory, shortened version (Derogatis & Melisarotos, 1983), were adapted for this study. This measure asked women to evaluate how much they experienced six anxiety-related states after interacting with their supervising agent, including "Nervousness or shakiness inside", "Feeling scared for no reason", and "Feeling tense or keyed up". Women reported using 5-point scales ranging from 1 = not at all to 5 = very much. The scale exhibited acceptable reliability, α = .94.

CHAPTER 3: QUANTITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS OVERVIEW

Ideally, one binomial logistic regression would be conducted to test hypotheses H1-H9 because it would be parsimonious (see Table 4 for test results). Generally, there should be 20 cases per predictor, with some researchers suggesting 30-50 to avoid Type II error rates (Hart & Clark, 1999). With 17 predictors, this requires a sample size of at least 340 to run a full model. Thus, separate logistic regressions will be run (goals, norms, offender traits [status, risk score], social network characteristics [size, social support], and reactions to and perceptions of the PO [anxiety, reactance, communication style]). The dependent variable in all statistical analyses will be whether or not the women engaged in communication with their PO (1 = yes, 0 = no). Predictor variables are continuous measures of social norms (descriptive, injunctive, subjective), goals (influence, identity, interaction, relational resource, personal resource, arousal management), anxiety, reactance (emotional and psychological), perceived PO communication style, social support, and social network size. Supervision status (probation vs. parole) is dummy-coded (0 = parole, 1 = probation) to be entered into the logistic regression, with parole as the reference category. To further examine the relationship between supervision status and engagement in the conversation, a chi-square test is used to look at the associations between variables.

Sample Selection Bias

The nature in which the social norms and goals items were collected introduced a selection bias. A subset of women answered those questions only if they answered "yes" to the question of whether there was ever a time when they wanted to talk to their PO about a difficult need or issue they were facing. If the women responded "no", a skip pattern took them past this section. Thus, it is possible that there might be systematic differences between women who did

and did not self-select into this sample. Independent sample t-tests were conducted with all secondary predictor variables to compare the differences between women who reported there was a time when they wanted to talk to their PO and women who reported there was never a time; this analysis revealed two significant differences. The independent variables entered into the equation were probation/parole status, total needs score, size of social network, three ratio support variables, anxiety, psychological reactance, emotional reactance, perceptions of PO conversation orientation, and perceptions of PO conformity orientation. Differences emerged between the two samples for total needs score, $t(360) = -2.68$, $p = .008$, $\eta^2=.02$, with those who said they wanted to talk reporting, on average, more needs ($M = 21.42$, $SD = 8.48$) than those who reported not wanting to talk to their PO ($M = 18.80$, $SD = 8.92$). Additionally, significant differences emerged for PO-elicited anxiety, $t(356) = -2.31$, $p = .02$, $\eta^2 = .01$. Those who wanted to talk to their PO reported a greater anxiety score ($M = 1.86$, $SD = 0.99$) than those who did not want to talk to their PO ($M = 1.59$, $SD = 1.11$). However, the effect sizes are small. This study examines the factors that facilitate or inhibit communication with POs for women who want to talk to their POs. Thus, the findings of this study can only be generalized to those women who *wanted* to talk to their PO.[1]

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Sample Description

Out of the original sample of 402, 127 women on probation and parole indicated that there was a time when they wanted to talk to their POs about a difficult need/issue they were facing. Of the 127, 84 (67.9%) talked to their PO, while 41 (32.8%) did not engage in the conversation. One individual did not know whether she talked to her PO, and another refused to answer the question. The majority of women were on probation (70.9%, n = 90), while 35 were on parole (27.6%). Two individuals indicated they were on both probation and parole (1.6%). In the data analysis, these two individuals were grouped into the parole category since they had recently been incarcerated. The majority of women reported being white (52.7%, n = 67, n = 3 reporting Hispanic), followed by black (31.4%, n = 40, n = 2 reporting Hispanic). Fifteen women indicated they were multiracial (11.8%, n = 15). Other women were Indian (0.02%, n = 2, n = 1 reporting Hispanic) and Pacific Islander (0.01%, n = 1).

The most frequently reported topic of conversation was regarding a *third party* (20.3%, n = 25), such as "my mom and her drinking." Many women also reported *housing issues* as a frequent topic about which they wanted to talk to their POs (17.8%, n = 22), such as "I want my own place." The remainder of topics were fairly evenly distributed among the women. Several women reported topics related to illegal behavior, such as *relapsing* (2.4%, n = 3), *using illegal or controlled substances* (4.1%, n = 5), *engaging in illegal behavior not related to substances* (1.6%, n = 2), such as shoplifting, and having *police contact* (1.6%, n = 2). Topics related to financial issues and other support services needed by women were also reported, such as *restitution* (4.9%, n = 6), *finding a job* (4.1%, n = 5), *job and restitution issues* (1.6%, n = 2), *need services* (4.1%, n = 5), and *transportation issues* (2.4%, n = 3). Topics related to being on

community supervision were also reported, such as wanting to *end supervision early* (3.3%, n = 4), *associating with others on probation/parole* (3.3%, n = 4), the women's *relationship with PO* (1.6%, n = 2). Other topics reported by women were *partner abuse* (1.6%, n = 2), *previous behavior* (3.3%, n = 4), *children issues* (2.4%, n = 3), *mental health* (2.4%, n = 3), and *other* (6.5%, n = 2). In nine instances, the interviewer did not ask the question (7.3%) and there were a few times when the woman did not answer the question (3.3%, n = 4). See Table 5 for a breakdown of topics by whether the women engaged or not in communication with their POs.

Tests of Hypotheses and Research Questions

Goals and constraints. H1 predicted that personal resource considerations would be a significant predictor of whether or not the women engaged in communication. A binomial logistic regression was conducted with the influence, interaction, personal resource, arousal management variables entered as predictors. The overall model was statistically significant, χ^2 (4) = 15.21, p = .004. The model was able to correctly classify 64.8% of the participants as engaging or not engaging in communication based on the predictor variables. *Personal resource* was found to be the only significant predictor, with those reporting higher levels of personal resource considerations (i.e., concerns about losing freedom) being less likely to engage in communication with their PO, β = -0.36, Wald's χ^2 = 6.08, p = .014. For every one-unit increase in personal resource ratings, the odds of engaging in communication increased by 0.72. See Table 6 for the logistic regression coefficient, Wald test, and odds-ratio for all predictors.

RQ1 asked the reasons reported by women on probation/parole for engaging in communication with their supervising officer about a difficult need/issue they were facing. Collectively, the most frequently reported reasons for engaging in the conversation with their POs were to obtain some form of support (37.4%). Specifically, many reported wanting to

receive informational support (15.7%, n = 13), such as obtaining advice on how to find a job with a conviction. One woman reported "Just to get a better understanding of everything that I can do." Women also reported their main reason for engaging in the conversation was to receive *tangible support* (13.3%, n = 11), such as getting into a rehabilitation program, or "maybe even coming up with some kind of funding to pay for it." Several women were *seeking help generally* (8.4%, n = 7) without specifying whether tangible or informational support were desired. For example, one woman stated

> "Because I wanted help. I wanted help, and I pretty much didn't know … I can't say I didn't know where to go I just … you know, I hadn't talked to anyone else about it, you know. I just knew I'd get up in the morning and I wanted vicodin, you know, it's pain pill. And it wasn't because I was in pain so much as the injuries; it was … I had got addicted to the pain pill."

Many women also reported that their main reason for having the conversation was for *emotional expression* (14.5%, n = 12). One woman said that her drive in having the conversation with her PO was "To look at it more positive, you know, just to be, like not let it get to me as much, I guess."

Several women indicated that they had the conversation to *avoid getting into trouble* (13.3%, n = 11). For instance, one woman stated:

> "When I went to her and told her it was to cover myself. To make sure that I wasn't gunna be doing something that got me in trouble or violated my parole by dealing with, which this person wasn't a felon or nothing like that, but I mean, just dealing with them on the police side of things where it had got out of control like that where I was thinking, you know, now I have to go to the police about it."

Similarly, some women stated that they wanted to "come clean", or *confess,* to their POs (3.6%, n=3). One woman reported the main reason for having the conversation was, "A conscious because it is wrong. And I think that at somewhere in my mind that if I bring it up in even a shaded color, you know, that it's getting it off my chest, so…"

Other women wanted to *inform their POs* about the issue (13.3%, n =11). For example, one woman said "To make her aware of it." A few women indicated that the conversation occurred because the *PO initiated it* (3.6%, n = 3), such as "The fact that she asked what was going on. She just took the time and asked me." Although this indicates that it was not a motivation to have the conversation per se, it alludes to the idea that the conversation might not have happened if the PO did not initiate the discussion.

Four responses were coded as *other* (4.8%), and several were coded as interview "errors", such as the interviewer *not asking the question* (7.2%, n = 6) or *asking the question incorrectly* (2.4%, n = 2).

RQ2 asked about the reported constraints on engaging in communication. Many women reported that they did not have the conversation because they did not want their PO to *restrict their freedom* as a result of having the conversation (27.5%, n = 11), such as, "'Cause I don't want any retaliation from her, or repercussions from her." Another large percentage of women did not engage in the conversation because of issues related to their PO. Many reported *PO communication issues* (25%, n = 10). For example, one woman stated:

> "I don't know, like I just feel … like when I go see her, it's … you know she asks me the usual questions like, "Have you had any police contact or any changes in your address?" And then she gives me my new report date and then sends me on my way. It's not … it's almost like you get in there to … for her to just ask you about this. There's like no time to talk, which I just feel like it's a waste."

Many women also reported a *negative relationship with PO* (17.5%, n = 7) as a reason for not engaging in the conversation, such as "Because she don't make me feel like I could come to her with that kind of stuff, you know how some people just don't seem like you can just come over and talk to them?" Only one woman reported that she did not want to have the conversation because she was afraid of disappointing her PO and wanted to *maintain the relationship with her*

PO (2.5%). Several women indicated that the main reason why they did not have the conversation was because they perceived it to be *pointless*--that the PO lacked resources to help even if they wanted to help (10%, n = 4). One woman reported, "Because they just don't have any resources [*laughs*]. You know so I kind of knew that from the beginning so it's just a lost cause." One reason was coded as *other* (2.5%). In six cases, the *interviewer did not ask* the question (15%).

Social norms. H2 made predictions about the influence of (a) descriptive, (b) injunctive, and (c) subjective norms on engaging in communication. Specifically, it was expected that norms would predict a woman's engagement in communication. A binomial logistic regression was conducted with the three norms types entered as the predictors. The model was not statistically significant, χ^2 (3) = 1.63, *p* = .65. Thus, H2 was not supported. See Table 7 for logistic regression coefficient, Wald test, and odds-ratio for all predictors.[2]

Offender characteristics. Two hypotheses stating the relationship between the offender-specific characteristics and engagement in communication were tested. H3 predicted that women on parole would be more likely to engage in communication than women on probation, and H4 predicted that women would be more likely to engage in communication as their total risk score (needs minus strengths) increased. A logistic regression was conducted with the total risk score and status (parole as reference category) entered as the predictor variables. The overall model was not statistically significant, $\chi^2(2)$ = 2.95, *p* = .23. Thus, hypotheses H3 and H4 were not supported. See Table 8 for logistic regression coefficient, Wald test, and odds-ration for all predictors. A 2x2 chi-square test was conducted to examine the relationship between status (probation/parole) and the engagement in communication (yes/no). The relationship was not found to be statistically significant, χ^2 (1, n=125) = 2.60, *p* = .11.

Social networks & social support. Two predictions were made about the women's social network and the impact on whether or not they engaged in communication with their PO about a difficult issue or need. H5 stated that women with smaller social networks would be more likely to engage in communication. H6 predicted that the greater percentage of social support types within their social network, the less likely they would engage in communication with their POs. A binomial logistic regression was conducted with the three ratio support variables and the size of the social network entered as predictors. The overall model was not statistically significant, $\chi^2(4) = .81$, $p = .94$. Thus, the size of the social network and percentage of support within their social network were not predictors of whether or not the women engaged in communication with their POs about a difficult need or issue, and the data do not fit the hypotheses. See Table 9 for logistic regression coefficient, Wald test, and odds-ratio for all social network and support predictors.

Perceptions of PO characteristics and interactions. Finally, several predictions were made regarding the women's perceptions of and reported results of interactions with their POs. H7 predicted a positive association between perceptions of PO conversation orientation and engaging in communication. H8 predicted a negative association between perceptions of PO conformity orientation and engaging in communication. H9 predicted a negative relationship between (a) psychological reactance, (b) emotional reactance, and (c) anxiety. A binomial logistic regression was conducted with these five variables entered. The overall model was statistically significant, $\chi^2(5) = 12.94$, $p = .024$. When looking at the individual predictors, none were statistically significant at $p < .05$.

One potential cause of no significant predictors when an overall model is statistically significant is multicollinearity, which occurs when two or more predictor variables are correlated

with one another (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003). A linear regression was conducted with these predictors to determine whether multicollinearity was present. Three measures were used to determine the existence of multicollinearity: the variance inflation factor (VIF), tolerance, and condition number (Cohen et al., 2003). The VIF "provides an index of the amount that the variance of each regression coefficient is increased relative to a situation in which all...predictor variables are uncorrelated" (Cohen et al., 2003, p. 423). A common rule of thumb is that predictors with a VIF greater than or equal to 10 indicates potential multicollinearity. The VIF values for the predictors in the current model are 1.81 or smaller. Second, the tolerance for each predictor was examined, which explains how much variance in each predictor is independent of the other predictors (Cohen et al., 2003). Any value less than or equal to 0.10 indicates potential multicollinearity problems. The tolerance values in this regression model are 0.55 or larger. A third diagnostic test is examining the condition number, which involves a principle component analysis, resulting in eigenvalues (kappa) for each predictor (Cohen et al., 2003). A general rule of thumb is that values over 30 indicate serious problems of multicollinearity (Cohen et al., 2003). κ's for this model are all less than 1. Therefore, it is concluded that multicollinearity is not present.

Two indicators in the regression analysis trend towards statistical significance. Anxiety (β = -0.36, Wald's χ^2 = 6.08, p = .14) and psychological reactance (β = -0.36, Wald's χ^2 = 6.08, p = .17) were both negatively associated with engaging in communication. This indicates that if individuals reported feeling anxiety and psychological reactance during and after meetings with their POs, then the odds of engaging in communication with their POs about the difficult need or issue they were facing decreased. However, perceptions of the PO's communication style had no impact on whether or not the women engaged in communication. Thus, H7 and H8 were not

supported, and H9 was trending towards support. See Table 10 for logistic regression coefficient, Wald test, and odds-ratios for all predictors.

Post Hoc Analyses

Additional analyses were conducted to probe other potential predictors of engaging in communication, as well as relationships among variables. First, a series of logistic regressions were conducted to examine the impact of the criminogenic needs subscales on engagement in communication. None of the risk subscales predicted engagement in communication, χ^2 (12) = 5.55, p = .55. Additionally, none of the strengths subscales predicted engagement in communication, χ^2 (3) = 2.81, p = .42. Next, a chi-square test of association was conducted to see if various levels of risk (low, moderate, high) were associated with engagement (yes/no) in communication. Again, the result was not statistically significant, χ^2 (2, n = 125) = 1.09, p = .58. A logistic regression was also conducted to see if the women's personality type predicted engagement in communication. Using five personality traits (extroversion, agreeable, conscientious, neuroticism, openness) as the predictors, the result was not statistically significant, χ^2 (5) = 0.76, p = .98.

Next, analyses were conducted to see if the women's report of their POs' relationship style predicted whether or not they engaged in the conversation. The two relationship styles identified in this study from Skeem et al.'s (2007) dual-role relationship inventory are *supportive* and *punitive*. Supportive POs are characterized as being fair/caring and trustworthy, while punitive POs are characterized by toughness. A binomial logistic regression was conducted, and the findings were statistically significant, χ^2 (2) = 12.49, p = .002. Results indicate that women who reported their POs as being more supportive were more likely to engage in the conversation. Specifically, for every one-unit increase in ratings of PO supportive relationship style, the odds

of engaging in the conversation increase by 1.56, $\beta = 0.45$, Wald's $\chi^2 = 9.36$, $p = .002$. See Table 11 for the logistic regression coefficient, Wald test, and odds ratio for both predictors.

Additional analyses were conducted to examine differences in women's ratings of various scales in the study. A paired-samples t-test was performed to see if there was a statistically significant difference in women's ratings of their POs' communication styles. The test revealed a significant difference, $t(126) = -6.01$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .22$. Overall, ratings of PO conversation orientation ($M = 4.28$, $SD = 1.10$) were significantly greater than ratings of PO conformity orientation ($M = 3.46$, $SD = 0.95$).

The data were also probed to see if women's ratings of norms were significantly different from one another. To examine this, a repeated measures ANOVA was conducted. The analysis revealed a significant finding, $F(1.75, 116) = 23.77$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .17$. Multiple comparisons using the Bonferroni method revealed that injunctive norms were rated highest ($M = 4.94$, $SD = 1.95$), followed by subjective norms ($M = 4.36$, $SD = 2.07$) and descriptive norms ($M = 3.71$, $SD = 1.96$). All norms were significantly different than the others, $p < .05$. Similar trends were found for those who did not engage in the conversation, $F(1.71, 37) = 7.38$, $p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .16$, as well as those who did engage in the conversation, $F(1.74, 78) = 22.06$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .22$. In all three tests, injunctive norms were rated significantly higher than the other norms, $p < .05$, indicating that perceptions of approval about engaging in communication were rated highest by all participants, regardless of whether or not the conversation occurred.

Data were similarly examined to see if ratings of Dillard's measures of goals and constraints (influence, interaction, personal resource, arousal management) were significantly different. A repeated measures ANOVA was conducted, and the analysis did not reveal a

significant finding, $F (2.66, 115) = 1.21$, $p = .31$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$. Thus, ratings of the four goal

types retained for analysis were not significantly different from one another.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine factors that impacted whether or not female probationers/parolees who wanted to talk to their POs about a difficult issue or need they were facing actually did or did not engage in the conversation. To study this, data were collected regarding communication norms and conversational goals. Additionally, secondary analyses were conducted with measures already included in the larger dataset. This chapter will overview the findings and practical implications of the results. Additionally, directions for future studies and limitations of the current study are highlighted.

Overview of Findings & Practical Implications

Conversational goals. One of the biggest findings in this study was that personal resource considerations were a significant negative predictor of engaging in the conversation. Quantitative analyses demonstrated that female offenders who reported greater concerns for losing personal resources, such as freedom, were less likely to engage in the conversation with their PO, despite the conversation being desired. This finding is interesting and important both theoretically and practically.

Many recent studies have not found personal resources to be a concern when deciding whether or not to engage in difficult conversations (e.g., Cornacchione, 2013). Oftentimes, relational resource considerations (concerns about maintaining the relationship) are rated as more important. This is likely because many studies examining the multiple goals approach have applied it to the family or other intimate relationships, which are different than an assigned, social relationship (e.g., probationer and supervising officer). Schrader and Dillard (1998) noted that personal resource considerations tend to be more important when 1) relational contexts were distant and 2) stakes were high for the communicator, including considerable risk, high

importance, and complexity. For the women in this study, many of the conversational topics reported were considerably risky, important, and complex. For example, someone who relapsed (risk) may have wanted to talk to her PO to obtain treatment (importance). However, the situation was complex because she both wanted to talk to her PO, but knew that there might be legal repercussions. Thus, personal resource goals were of high importance, and the offenders were less likely to have the conversation.

Research on superior-subordinate relationships within organizations has found that out-group members tend to use more regulative tactics when communicating (Waldron, 1991). These tactics include things such as distortion of information or avoidance, and are often used because out-group members report low levels of trust (Waldron, 1991). It is possible that female offenders perceived themselves as out-group members in reference to their supervising officers, and, therefore, may have engaged in these regulative tactics because they did not trust their PO to refrain from punishing them when talking about the difficult issue/need. There is evidence here for the reverse in that when women perceived their PO as being trustworthy (i.e., supportive relational style), they were more likely to have the conversation. With these results, POs could be trained in how to interact with their clients to create perceptions of trustworthiness and being supportive so that their clients are less likely to fear restrictions to personal freedom, and, thus, more likely to talk to their POs about needs or issues they are facing. This may be of crucial importance in preventing recidivism.

The findings from the qualitative data were similar to those found with the quantitative analyses. The most frequently reported reason for not engaging in the desired conversation with their POs was because the women feared that having the conversation could result in restricted personal freedom, such as getting into more legal trouble and going back to prison. Several other

women reported issues with their POs as a constraint to having the conversation, such as a negative relationship and communication issues (e.g., PO did not want to discuss the issue, or usually rushed through conversations). Somewhat similar to the reasons reported for not having the conversation, many women stated that the main reason they wanted to have the conversation was to avoid trouble, such as notifying the PO about a criminal behavior before a third party notified them. Overall, however, most women reported their primary goals as just wanting to seek help and support, either through information acquisition, tangible assistance, or just wanting help without specifying the type. Because of the generally positive perceptions women had of their POs in this sample, it can be inferred that the women trusted their POs and viewed them as a source of support for information regarding issues with which they are currently dealing. Several individuals who did not engage in the conversation thought that, even if they did talk to their POs, it would be pointless because the POs lacked the resources to help. Knowing that seeking support and help is a common reason for talking to POs about difficult issues, it would be useful to provide POs with the resources necessary to help women deal with the common issues reported, or to communicate to the women that they do, in fact, have resources to help.

Social norms. The social norms approach is traditionally used in communication and other social science research to examine behavior change. In this study, social norms were examined to see how perceptions of personal-level norms impacted behavior regarding engagement in communication. Social norms did not predict whether or not the women engaged in desired communication with their PO. Although predictions were made based on previous social norms research, there could be multiple explanations for this study's findings. One reason norms may not have predicted whether or not communication occurred is that perceived norms about prevalence of offenders communicating with their PO about a difficult need/issue do not

exist. Descriptive norms were the only norm type that was not significantly different than the midpoint of the 7-point scale, which was "neither agree nor disagree". This could indicate the non-existence of this behavior, and, therefore, the norm for how to behave. Individuals under community supervision are not supposed to interact with other offenders, which might be a possible explanation for the lack of descriptive norms; without interacting with similar individuals, it would be hard to perceive the prevalence of a behavior. However, as seen in the social network descriptive data, many of these women listed individuals in their network who had committed an offense, including boyfriends, friends, and family members. Injunctive and subjective norms, however, were rated as significantly higher than the midpoint of the scale. Although the women may not have known how other women on probation and parole behaved (descriptive norms), they may have perceived that engagement in the behavior may be expected of, and approved for, them. However, it is also possible that these perceptions of approval and expectations may not be based on other offenders, but instead other individuals within their social network, such as family and friends. This makes sense given that probationers/parolees are not supposed to associate with other offenders. Thus, it might be difficult to make inferences about the socially approved/accepted behavior *among* offenders. As a result, they might make inferences regarding what would be approved/accepted among non-offenders with whom the women associate.

Despite the logistic regression results not predicting engagement in communication, an ANOVA indicated that injunctive norms were rated statistically significantly higher than both descriptive and subjective norms. Women seemed to be more concerned with perceptions of approval rather than doing what they thought others wanted them to do (subjective), as well as doing what they thought others actually were doing (descriptive). It is possible that these women,

as a result of breaking the law, have been facing disapproval for a long time, and, thus, try to do what would gain approval in other situations in which they may be able to control. It might be the case that social norms are not the most useful construct to study in relation to offenders for various reasons already outlined, including that they have already intentionally violated societal norms in committing the crime.

Similar to the ideas outlined in Daly and Bouhours (2008), it might be possible for criminal justice officials, such as POs and judges, to communicate norms to offenders. This could include not only norms about legal behavior, but also encouraging open and honest communication with their POs. Additionally, other offenders, or those who have been released from community supervision, could "teach" norms to women currently on community supervision that could help them to engage in difficult conversations. This would also help socialize women as they make the transition to community supervision. Research has demonstrated that normative information can be internalized, even if coming from acquaintances or strangers. In fact, normative information can be internalized without the presence of a reference group (Lapinski & Rimal, 2005; Sherif, 1936).

There are also theoretical implications to these findings. The traditional social norms approach for campaigns may not be as useful for marginalized populations, where campaigns may sometimes be most critical. This is because marginalized populations may lack a social network, resulting in a lack of perceived descriptive norms, as was found here. Many social norms campaigns rest on the assumption of a discrepancy between descriptive and injunctive norms (e.g., Michigan State University Social Norms Program Model). Thus, this lack of norms within a population makes it difficult to aim a campaign at reducing this discrepancy. Social norms approaches may not be the best approach for campaigns with marginalized populations.

This also highlights the importance of conducting formative research prior to creating and disseminating any campaign or intervention (Atkin, 1994).

      Offender characteristics. Neither the women's status (probation vs. parole) or their total risk score impacted whether or not they engaged in desired communication with their POs. In the quantitative analysis overview chapter, it was found that women with a greater needs score were more likely to *want* to talk to their POs. Thus, the level of risk/needs might have more to do with wanting to talk to their PO rather than with actual engagement. This is an important finding because it indicates that women who have greater needs are more likely to want to talk to their PO. Knowing that women with a greater level of needs want to talk to their POs can help facilitate PO-initiation of these conversations. Offenders might lack communication efficacy, which deals with the ability of the individual to "complete successfully the communication tasks involved in the information-management process" (Afifi, 2009, p. 178). Therefore, it would be important to train POs to bring up these common topics of conversation, many of which are common needs that female offenders have, to help transfer the burden of information sharing from solely the offender onto the PO to facilitate conversation about these issues or needs. POs should be taught how to elicit greater detail regarding these issues rather than just asking generic questions about specific topics. The topics reported in this study were abundant; however, many of them fell within the criminogenic needs categories. This is promising given that many women want to talk to their POs about issues that have been found to be predictive of subsequent criminal behavior. Not only would it be important to facilitate POs' initiation of the conversation, but to also make sure that they are connecting women to the resources they need. Previous research with this sample has found that the POs are not doing an adequate job in connecting

their clients to needed services (Morash, Northcutt Bohmert, Kashy, Cobbina, & Smith, in progress).

Social networks & social support. Contrary to predictions (H4, H5), characteristics of the women's social networks did not predict engagement in communication. These findings are not surprising given the perceived amount of support availability (emotional, instrumental, network) reported by women in regard to their social networks. On average, women perceived social support availability by 73% of network members (such as spending time together), instrumental support by 76% (such as providing help with childcare), and emotional support by 92% (such as talking when upset/worried). Thus, women in this study might perceive their quality of relationships to be positive, and this impact might be more important than network size. It was expected that smaller social networks would lead to engagement in communication with POs. However, it might be the case that perceived quality of the their social networks, rather than the size, might be more important to women. Nevertheless, neither social support availability or size predicted engagement in communication. One reason might be that there was no measure of social support quality. Although the women perceive that support is available, it might not actually occur, or if it does, it might not be good or useful support. Another explanation for the null findings might be that the women have other individuals with whom they can talk to about their difficult issues or needs, such as a case manager or therapist, rather than their POs or other individuals within their social network.

The amount of perceived availability of support provided to women by their social network members is not surprising given previous research on networks, support, and relational maintenance. Within personal relationships, providing support is expected. A series of studies conducted by Argyle and Henderson (1984) found that informal rules exist within friendships,

and that in order for relationships to be maintained, they must be rewarding. Common rules that emerged in these studies included trust, confiding in the other, and helping in times of need. If these rules are violated, then relationships are usually terminated. Some of the reasons reported for deteriorating friendships is not providing support or volunteering help when needed (Argyle & Henderson, 1984). Therefore, it would be expected that individuals within the women's social networks would be providing some form of support, or be perceived to be able to provide it, otherwise, the relationship would be terminated. Overall, it is interesting that social network qualities did not impact women's decision to engage in communication with their POs about difficult issues or needs they were facing. Another explanation for this finding is that, regardless of size and quality of the network, women may think that their PO may be the only individuals who could help them with the particular issue. Related to this, and indicating the benefits of talking to POs about issues, research has found that when POs discuss more topics with their clients, women experience greater feelings of efficacy related to finding work and avoiding criminal activity (Morash, Kashy, Smith, & Cobbina, in progress).

Perceptions of PO characteristics & interactions. Several factors related to the women's perceptions of their POs were also examined. Women's perceptions of their supervising officers were entered into the regression model to determine if they predicted whether or not engagement in desired communication occurred. The overall regression model was statistically significant, indicating that women's perceptions of their POs impacted whether the conversation occurred. It was discovered that the more anxious women felt during or after meeting with their POs, the less likely they were to engage in the conversation. Similarly, the more psychological reactance that was experienced, the less likely the women were to engage in the conversation. However, the impact of these two predictors must be interpreted with caution as they were not

statistically significant, but only trended in this direction. One reason that women may feel anxious while meeting with their POs is because they have a difficult conversation that they want to engage in with their POs. It could also be the nature of the interactions (i.e., mandated meetings) that induces anxiety, and not necessarily the PO's treatment of the women during their meetings. Examining the mean scores of the perceived communication patterns illuminates this possible explanation. The mean score of conformity orientation communication hovers around the midpoint, while the mean score of conversation orientation communication is significantly greater than the midpoint of the scale. This suggests that the women perceived their POs to display open communication styles, yet women still reported experiencing anxiety.

Despite the high conversation and low conformity orientation reported, it is interesting that psychological reactance was present, and served as a potential predictor of non-engagement in communication. Although the questions were framed in a way to elicit state reactance, it is possible that women offenders exhibited or reported on trait reactance. Thus, their reports of reactance (albeit low) may be more a function of their personality rather than induced by their POs.

Overall, the data indicated that women perceived their POs as being more conversational in nature. However, it just might have been the case that the threat of a loss of freedom and personal resources was much more important to the women, thus resulting in non-engagement in desired communication regardless of perceptions of their PO's communication style.

A post hoc analysis was conducted to see if the women's perceptions of their PO's relationship style impacted whether or not the conversation occurred. Perceiving their PO as more supportive resulted in being more likely to engage in the conversation. Perceiving their PO as tough did not impact whether or not the conversation occurred. This is interesting given that

perceptions of openness in terms of communication style did not predict engagement in communication, but perceptions of fairness and caring in relating generally *did* impact whether or not the women engaged in the conversation. It appears that relationship characteristics as a whole were more important than just communication styles. In fact, within the larger data set, it has been found that women who rate their POs as more supportive experienced less anxiety and reported higher levels of self-efficacy (Morash et al., in progress). These findings further support the argument that certain PO relationship styles impact probation/parole outcomes. Thus, it would be useful to train supervising agents on how to have a more supportive relationship with their clients so that the women engage in communication with their POs to address issues they are facing, which, in turn, could result in more positive supervision outcomes for the women.

However, as previously discussed, there is a lot of variability in the mandated meeting with POs. Additionally, POs serve as both a law enforcer and a counselor in their dual-role relationship with their clients. Thus, for some women, it might be more useful to talk to their POs about difficult needs or issues because the PO will be more supportive and helpful. However, for other women, it might not be useful to talk to their POs about these issues because it might not result in any assistance, or it could restrict the women's freedoms. Although the latter example is a negative outcome for women, it might be actually be a positive outcome, and is perceived to be one by the PO. Thus, engaging in communication with their POs might not always be something that is perceived to be, or is actually, a useful thing to do. However, developing meeting guidelines and training POs to manage their the dual-role relationships might be one way to make meetings more beneficial. For instance, meetings should be comprised of both the tough/firm/law enforcer aspect of the PO, such as making sure the women are not breaking the law and following the conditions of their sentence, as well as the caring/supportive

58

aspect of the PO relationship style, such as making sure the women are receiving the resources that are needed to help them navigate supervision and make positive progress.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

This study has several limitations. First is the selection bias introduced, which occurred because of the way in which the data were collected for the goals and norms measures. Women self-selected into the sample by answering "yes" to whether there was ever a time when they *wanted* to talk to their PO about a difficult issue or need. Thus, the findings of this study should be interpreted with caution, and can only be generalized to women on probation and parole who *want* to talk to their POs. Future research should examine all individuals to see what factors impact their desire to talk to their POs, and compare outcomes of the two groups (those who want to talk vs. those who do not).

Having a dichotomous dependent variable is also limiting in terms of data analysis. Including a continuous measurement, such as intent to engage in communication, may have provided further insight into the underlying processes occurring when offenders are deciding whether to engage in a conversation with their PO. Additionally, adding a continuous measure would have been a good way to examine not just the normative and goal impacts on intent, but also whether intent lead to actual behavior. This could also facilitate longitudinal analysis of the process, from intent to actual behavior to outcomes of having (or not having) the conversation.

Measurement was also an issue with this study. The scale reliabilities for goals items were not as high as anticipated, and some subscales could not be used. The reliability of the four scales that were retained, however, were relatively consistent with existing literature (e.g., Cornacchione, 2013; Dillard, 1989). Future research should explore ways to enhance the measurement of conversational goals and constraints in deciding whether or not one engages in

communication. Additionally, measurement of goals and norms were retrospective, and the actual processes and thoughts going on may be different than what was reported in this study. Instead, the associations among variables are examined. Further studies should examine these processes to determine causal order, which would provide further insight into the relationship between norms and goals, and their subsequent impact on engaging in communication.

A similar measurement issue is that women were not asked to report on who their normative referents were. An assumption was made that women would perceive themselves to be in-group members with other female offenders. However, this may not be the case. Future research in this area should explicitly ask participants who they look to when deciding how to behave in various situations. Additionally, future research should inquire as to whether the offenders have other individuals in their network, such as case managers and therapists, who might serve as a more influential factor in whether or not communication with the PO occurs.

Additionally, interviewer errors were present throughout the difficult conversations portion of the study. One problem was that not all of the questions were asked by the interviewers that would have solicited more qualitative information from the women. Additionally, questions were sometimes asked incorrectly, making the women's responses unusable. Although data quality checks were conducted throughout data collection, it was not possible to ensure 100% accuracy with all interviewers and interviews.

As previously mentioned throughout this section, an important area for future research is to examine the outcomes of women who did vs. did not engage in the conversation with their POs. Outcomes could include recidivism, satisfaction, reduction in risk score, and improvement in strength score. It would be interesting to see if outcomes are better for women who actually engaged in the conversation compared to the women who did not. Similarly, it would be

interesting to compare these same outcome variables for women who *wanted* to talk to their PO compared to those who did not.

Theoretically, a critical next-step would be to examine the message structure, and see how ratings of goals and norms impact the message sent. This would help in building a model to understand individuals' motivations for engaging in communication by illuminating how goals and norms shape message production.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

This research demonstrates an important step in understanding factors that impact whether or not women on probation and parole, who have a number of needs and issues with which to deal, talk to their POs about these issues. It largely addresses theoretical ideas within communication (goals and social norms) while incorporating factors that have been documented to impact women's probation/parole outcomes (e.g., criminogenic needs) to see how they influence whether or not women who want to talk to their POs about difficult issues actually engage in the conversation.

Community supervision is a major national investment in preventing recidivism (Maruschak & Parks, 2012). Research shows that certain types of PO-client relationships (marked by trust and caring, but not toughness) lead to better probation and parole outcomes (Skeem et al., 2003). Additionally, a working alliance between offenders and supervising officers also promotes positive outcomes (Taxman & Ainsworth, 2009). This study sought to address the working alliance between offenders and supervising officers to determine how women are potentially using their voices to address their needs and the factors that impact their ability to do so. Findings point to the importance of personal resource considerations and women's perceptions of their PO's relationship style in whether or not a desired conversation occurs. This study extends previous research that has sought to develop a model to understand how individuals decide whether to engage in communication about difficult or sensitive issues.

APPENDICES

Interview Items for Norms and Goals

diff_talk_1 (time 3 interview)
Was there a time when you wanted to talk to your current PO about a difficult issue? That issue
could include any needs you have or problems you've faced since you've been
supervised by this agent?
_____yes   _____no

If no: skips over this entire portion of the interview, and moves on to the next section
If yes: What was this difficult issue?

Did you actually talk to your PO about this issue?
_____yes _____no

If yes, what did you say? What was driving you? In other words, what was your main
goal when trying to talk to your PO?
If yes, how did you start this conversation?

If no, why not? In other words, what was your main goal or concern when deciding not to
talk to your PO about this issue?

In a similar situation, would you talk to your PO about this or similar issues again? What was the
result of trying to talk to your PO?

How many other people who are important to you and in a similar situation would talk to their
POs about these issues? Would people who are important to you believe you should talk
to your PO about this issue?

Would people who are important to you encourage you to talk to your PO about this issue?

Ask following questions if they did or did not engage in the conversation with their PO

diff_talk_x

The next set of questions are about this time that you just described, when you talked to or
thought about talking to your PO about a difficult issue. You can either answer these on your
own on the computer or we can do it together.

Strongly Disagree   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)   Strongly Agree

diff_talk_4

People whose opinions I value and who are in a situation similar to mine have talked with their POs about this issue.

Strongly Disagree　　　(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)　　　Strongly Agree

diff_talk_5
The outcome of this conversation had important personal consequences for me.

Strongly Disagree　　　(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)　　　Strongly Agree

diff_talk_6
When talking [or thinking about talking], I was concerned about being true to myself and my values.

Strongly Disagree　　　(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)　　　Strongly Agree

diff_talk_7
Most people who are important to me think that I should talk to my PO about this issue.

Strongly Disagree　　　(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)　　　Strongly Agree

diff_talk_8
I was concerned with making (or keeping) a good impression in this conversation.

Strongly Disagree　　　(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)　　　Strongly Agree

diff_talk_9
I was not willing to risk possible damage to my relationship with the agent to get what I wanted.

Strongly Disagree　　　(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)　　　Strongly Agree

diff_talk_10
In this situation, I wanted to avoid saying things that might have made me afraid or nervous.

Strongly Disagree　　　(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)　　　Strongly Agree

diff_talk_11
People who are important to me and in a situation similar to mine have talked with their POs about this issue.

Strongly Disagree　　　(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)　　　Strongly Agree

diff_talk_12
In considering having this conversation, it was very important to me to convince the agent to do what I wanted her or him to do.

Strongly Disagree   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)   Strongly Agree

diff_talk_13
In considering having this conversation, I wanted to behave in a mature, responsible manner.

Strongly Disagree   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)   Strongly Agree

diff_talk_14
Most people who are important to me approve of talking to my PO about this issue.

Strongly Disagree   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)   Strongly Agree

diff_talk_15
Getting what I wanted was more important to me than preserving the relationship with the agent.

Strongly Disagree   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)   Strongly Agree

diff_talk_16
In considering this conversation, I was concerned with not violating my own standards for what is right and wrong.

Strongly Disagree   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)   Strongly Agree

diff_talk_17
Most people whose opinion I value think I should talk to my PO about this issue.

Strongly Disagree   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)   Strongly Agree

diff_talk_18
I was very concerned about getting what I wanted in this conversation.

Strongly Disagree   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)   Strongly Agree

diff_talk_19
In considering this conversation, I was careful to avoid saying things which were socially inappropriate.

Strongly Disagree   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)   Strongly Agree

diff_talk_20
The agent could have made things very bad for me after I started the conversation.

Strongly Disagree   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)   Strongly Agree

diff_talk_21
Most people whose opinions I value believe that I should talk to my PO about this issue.

Strongly Disagree   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)   Strongly Agree

diff_talk_22
I was worried about the possibility this conversation would make me uncomfortable.

Strongly Disagree   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)   Strongly Agree

diff_talk_23
I felt that having the conversation with the agent would be a waste of my time.

Strongly Disagree   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)   Strongly Agree

diff_talk_24
My peers expect me to talk with my PO about this issue.

Strongly Disagree   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)   Strongly Agree

diff_talk_25
I was concerned with putting myself in a "bad light" in this conversation.

Strongly Disagree   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)   Strongly Agree

diff_talk_26
I didn't really care if I made the agent mad or not by having this conversation.

Strongly Disagree   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)   Strongly Agree

diff_talk_27
Most people who are important to me support other women talking to their PO about this issue

Strongly Disagree   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)   Strongly Agree

diff_talk_28
I was afraid to have the conversation because it could take away my freedom or lead to more supervision.

Strongly Disagree   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)   Strongly Agree

diff_talk_29
I was afraid of being uncomfortable or nervous.

Strongly Disagree   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)   Strongly Agree

diff_talk_30

People who are important to me and in a situation similar to mine engage in discussions with their POs about this issue.

Strongly Disagree   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)   Strongly Agree

Secondary Data Analysis Variable Items

Perceived PO Communication Style *(asked during T2 interview)*

Please use the following scale for each item, and circle the number that best represents your answer. These questions are about how you typically interact with your PO. By PO we mean your probation or parole officer.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree

My PO
commpat_1
…..and I often talk about things where she/he and I disagree.
commpat_2
…. makes it clear to me, "every person should have some say in making their own decisions."
commpat_3
….. frequently asks me my opinion when we are talking.
commpat_4
….. encourages me to challenge her/his ideas and beliefs.
commpat_5
….. often tells me something like "you should always look at both sides of an issue."
commpat_6
I usually tell my PO when I am thinking about things.
commpat_7
I can tell my PO almost anything.
commpat_8
With my PO, I often talk about my feelings and emotions.
commpat_9
When I see my PO, I often have long, relaxed conversations about nothing in particular.
commpat_10
I really enjoy talking with my PO, even when we disagree.
commpat_11
My PO likes hearing my opinions, even when she/he does not agree with my opinions.
commpat_12
… encourages me to express my feelings.
commpat_13
… is very open about her or his emotions when we interact.
commpat_14
Sometimes I talk to my PO about my day-to-day experiences more than once a week.
commpat_15
I talk to my PO about my plans and hopes for the future.

commpat_16
At times my PO says something like, "you should know better."
commpat_17
Sometimes my PO says something like, "my ideas are right and you should not question them."
commpat_18
Sometimes my PO says something like, "a person under supervision should not argue with the PO or the judge."
commpat_19
My PO often says something like, "there are some things that just shouldn't be talked about."
commpat_20
One type of advice that my PO often gives me is something like, "you should give in on arguments rather than risk making people mad."
commpat_21
When anything really important is involved, my PO expects me to obey without question.
commpat_22
When I interact with my PO, she/he always ends the conversation with a final statement.
commpat_23
My PO thinks it is important to be seen as an authority in charge.
commpat_24
My PO becomes irritated with my views that are different from hers/his.
commpat_25
If my PO does not approve of something, she does not want to know about it from me.
commpat_26
My PO expects me to obey her/him.

Anxiety *(T2)*

During and after recent conversation or being with the PO, how much did you experience:

anx_1
Nervousness or shakiness inside

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	Just a little	Somewhat	Quite a bit	Very much

anx_2
Feeling scared for no reason

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	Just a little	Somewhat	Quite a bit	Very much

anx_3
Feeling fearful

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	Just a little	Somewhat	Quite a bit	Very much

anx_4
Feeling tense or keyed up

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	Just a little	Somewhat	Quite a bit	Very much

anx_5
Panic or Terror

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	Just a little	Somewhat	Quite a bit	Very much

anx_6
Feeling so restless you could not sit still

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	Just a little	Somewhat	Quite a bit	Very much

Psychological Reactance *(T2)*

How much do you disagree or agree with these statements?
Rating:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly

preact_1
   1.   It makes me angry when my PO points out something that I already know
preact_2
   2. Suggestions and advice from my PO often make me do the opposite
preact_3
   3. When my PO pushes me to do something, I often tell myself, "For sure I won't do it."
preact_4
   4. Often I lose enthusiasm for doing something just because my PO expects me to do it
preact_5
   5. I get annoyed when my PO puts someone else up as an example to me
preact_6
   6. I get very irritated when my PO tells me what I must or must not do
preact_7
   7. When my PO gives me advice, I take it more as a demand

Emotional Reactance *(T2)*

During and just after talking to your probation or parole officer, how often are you feeling

remeas_1
Guilty

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	Just a little	Somewhat	Quite a bit	Very much

remeas_2
Ashamed

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	Just a little	Somewhat	Quite a bit	Very much

remeas_3
Annoyed

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	Just a little	Somewhat	Quite a bit	Very much

remeas_4
Irritated

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	Just a little	Somewhat	Quite a bit	Very much

remeas_5
Angry

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	Just a little	Somewhat	Quite a bit	Very much

Needs Assessment *(T1)*. For measures and information regarding the needs assessment, contact Van Voorhis et al. (2008).

Social Network Size & Social Support *(T1)*

Expanded Questions:
When you are **upset or worried** about something, who would you talk with?
Who do you spend time with, hang out with?
Who would you ask if you needed something, like help doing something, money, or help caring for family members?
If you needed help with school work, or help with your job, who would you ask?
How frequently do you have contact? – yearly, a few times a year, monthly, weekly, daily, unknown
How important is this person to you?
What is the most serious offense committed by this person?

First name and last initial	Sex M/F	Age	Relation	Upset / worried Who Talk To Y/N	Who Really Cares About You Y/N	Spend Time With Y/N	Who Ask if You Needed Some-thing Y/N	Who Ask for Help w/ work or job Y/N	How Often In Contact	Importance 1 not; 2 somewhat; 3 very	Most serious offense
1.											
2.											
3.											
4.											
5.											
6.											
7.											

APPENDIX C

Criminogenic Needs Subscales

Questions for *criminal history* aimed to understand the current conviction as well as prior offenses and those committed after the current conviction.

Questions assessing *educational needs* included a number of dichotomous items (yes/no) to understand current learning problems as well as educational levels. Questions assessing *financial/employment needs* included a number of yes/no questions regarding their current employment situation as well as their level of income and ability to pay bills. Questions assessing *housing safety* included items such as the safety of the neighborhood in which the woman lived and how safe she felt in her home with the people with whom she lived.

A number of questions were also asked to determine the woman's *history of mental illness as well as current symptoms*. A series of yes/no questions were asked, and if the woman responded *yes*, then she was asked if she experienced them recently. Questions were also asked to determine *anger/hostility*.

A number of items were asked to assess whether women had experienced *physical and/or sexual abuse* as a child and as an adult. Later in the interview, more specific abuse questions were asked about their childhood and adulthood.

Whether a woman is *currently using alcohol and/or drugs* and how it impacts her life was also assessed.

Several scales were used to examine the woman's *relationship quality with romantic partners, family of origin, and parenting/parental involvement*. Questions assessing whether the woman has *antisocial friends* were also asked to see if she interacts with individuals who commit crimes. Finally, *self-efficacy* was also measured.

Tables

Table 1

Psychometric Properties of Continuous Measures

Variable	*M*	*SD*	Range	α
Descriptive Norms	3.74	1.96	1-7	.80
Subjective Norms	**4.40**	2.07	1-7	.83
Injunctive Norms	**4.97**	1.94	1-7	.84
Influence Goal	**3.86**	1.80	1-7	.64
Interaction Goal	3.79	1.72	1-7	.63
Personal Resource Goal	3.28	1.94	1-7	.73
Arousal Management Goal	3.64	2.02	1-7	.80
PO Conformity	3.46	0.95	1-7	.82
PO Conversation	**4.28**	1.10	1-7	.89
Anxiety	**1.86**	1.11	1-5	.94
Psychological Reactance	**2.72**	1.16	1-7	.89
Emotional Reactance	**1.37**	0.70	1-5	.85
Social Network Size	4.99*	2.69	1-15	
Percent Instrumental Supp	0.76*	0.26	0-1	
Percent Emotional Supp	0.92*	0.16	0-1	
Percent Social Support	0.73*	0.27	0-1	
Total Needs Score	21.42*	8.48	3-41	

Note. Bolded values are significantly above or below the midpoint of the scale
*Not a scale, but a number reported by the women, and calculated by researcher

Table 2

Correlations Among Variables

	Infl	Intr	PR	AM	DN	SN	IN	Risk	SNS	Inst	Emo	Soc	PO v	PO f	Anx	Psyc hR	Em oR
Infl	1																
Intr	**.43**	1															
PR	**.28**	**.57**	1														
AM	**.46**	**.64**	.67	1													
DN	.18	-.07	-.01	.01	1												
SN	**.22**	.00	.02	.01	**.53**	1											
IN	.17	-.05	-.15	.05	**.55**	**.77**	1										
Risk	.11	.11	**.19**	.13	-.02	-.03	-.03	1									
SNS	.10	.14	-.11	.02	.16	.13	.17	.03	1								
Instr	.02	.04	.02	.05	.07	-.08	-.01	-.01	**-.20**	1							
Emo	-.10	**-.23**	-.05	-.03	.07	.08	.04	-.12	**-.28**	**.28**	1						
Soc	-.04	-.00	-.13	-.11	.07	-.10	-.05	**.19**	-.14	**.40**	**.22**	1					
PO v	-.05	-.13	**-.28**	**-.20**	.14	**-.21**	**.23**	-.16	**.24**	.06	-.05	.05	1				
PO f	.11	**.21**	**.26**	**.23**	-.03	.11	-.00	-.04	-.07	-.02	.08	.05	-.12	1			
Anx	.10	**.26**	**.28**	**.31**	-.12	-.08	-.14	**.22**	.06	-.13	.07	.08	**-.41**	**.39**	1		
Psyc hR	.13	**.19**	**.31**	**.20**	**-.21**	-.15	**-.25**	.07	**-.23**	-.15	-.07	.17	**-.46**	**.51**	**.40**	1	
Emo R	.07	.17	**.25**	**.20**	**.20**	-.04	-.09	.14	-.02	-.04	.08	-.01	**-.42**	**.24**	**.53**	**.42**	1

Note. bold indicates *p* < .05

Infl = influence; Intr = interaction; PR = personal resource; AM = arousal management; DN = descriptive norm; SN = subjective norms; IN = injunctive norm; Risk = criminogenic needs risk score; SNS= size of social network; Instr = instrumental support in network; Emo = emotional support; Soc = social support; PO v = perceptions of PO conversation orientation; PO f = perceptions of PO conformity orientation; Anx = anxiety; PsychR = psychological reactance; EmoR = emotional reactance

Table 3
Open-Ended Categories and Conceptual Definitions

Variable	Category	Conceptual Definition
Main Goal_Talk		
	Inform PO	Woman just generally informs PO about the issue.
	Inform PO to avoid trouble/violation	Woman explicitly states that she told her PO because she did not want to get in trouble.
	Initiated by PO	Woman states that she PO asked her a question about this issue or something related to the issue.
	Confession	Woman states that she wanted to *come clean and be honest* with her PO. No mention of woman wanting to tell her PO before someone else. No reason otherwise listed in this codebook provided.
	Seek informational support/advice	Woman states that she wanted the PO's advice or information about how to go about doing something.
	Seek tangible support	Woman states that she wanted the PO to get her something tangible, such as sending her to rehab or counseling.
	Seek help generally	Woman states that she wanted PO to help her, but isn't specific.
	Emotional expression	Woman states something about expressing emotions.
	Other	Does not fit into other categories.
	Not asked by interviewer	Interviewer did not ask the question.
	Asked incorrectly	Interviewer asked goal for the issue and not the goal for having the conversation.
Constraints_NotTalk		
	Prevent restricted freedom	Woman states she did not want to get in trouble, go to prison, rehab, etc.
	Pointless [PO lacks resources]	Woman states that the PO could not have done anything to help. PO lacks resources
	Current PO Communication issues	Woman states that the PO isn't returning her phone calls, communicating with the woman, or would rush the conversation if it actually occurred (too busy).

Table 3 (cont'd)

	Negative relationship with PO	Woman makes comment about the nature of the relationship not facilitating the conversation.
	Maintain positive relationship with PO	Woman mentions it could have hurt her otherwise good relationship with her PO.
	Other	Does not fit into any other category already listed
	Interviewer didn't ask	Interviewer skips over questions--does not ask
Topics/Issue		
	Housing issues	Wants to talk about housing, such as changing or not having housing
	Paying back restitution fees	Woman owes money as part of her sentence, and is having trouble
	Finding a job/job issues	Woman is having trouble finding a job
	Restitution and job	Woman is having trouble paying back her fees because she can't find a job
	Need support/financial services	Woman states that she needs services, such as financial help
	Transportation issues	Woman talks about problems with driving, getting places
	Relapsing generally	States that she relapsed, but doesn't specify
	Illegal activity--substances	She's using drugs or alcohol
	Illegal activity--non substances	She's engaging in illegal activity, but not drugs/alcohol
	Contact with police	Woman states that she had contact with police
	Negative relationships/talk about 3rd party	Woman talks about another individual about something he/she did to the woman **(excluding abuse)**
	Abuse (sexual or physical or both)	Woman states that she is being sexually, physically abused
	Associating with others on probation/parole	Woman states that she has or wants to be able to spend time with family members, romantic partners, or other individuals who are on probation/parole
	Issues with children	Woman is facing difficulties with children, such as being able to see them or custody issues

Table 3 (cont'd)

Relationship with PO	Woman wants to talk to PO about their relationship
End supervision early	Woman wants to talk to her PO about ending her probation/parole sentence early
Mental Health	Woman wants to talk about things related to her mental well-being
Previous behavior	Woman wants to talk about things she did in her past (i.e., years ago)
Other	Does not fit into any other category already listed
Interviewer Error	Interviewer didn't ask or asked incorrectly
Woman didn't answer	Question avoided and not actually answered

Table 4
Logistic Regression Predicting Communication

Predictors	β	$SE\beta$	Wald's χ^2	E^β (odds ratio)
Desc Norms	-0.04	0.30	0.06	0.96
Subj Norms	-0.12	0.24	0.32	0.89
Inj Norms	0.07	0.21	0.12	1.07
Influence Goal	0.10	0.15	0.40	1.10
Interaction Goal	0.04	0.17	0.06	1.04
Personal Res Goal	-0.31	0.18	2.90	0.74
Arousal Mgt Goal	-0.06	0.18	0.11	0.94
Status (dummy coded)	0.34	0.54	0.40	1.41
TotalNeedsScore	0.03	0.03	0.70	1.03
SocialNetwork Size	-0.03	0.10	0.08	0.97
PercentInstru	-1.07	1.10	0.96	0.34
PercentEmot	0.43	1.64	0.07	1.54
PercentSocial	-0.48	1.01	0.22	0.62
Anxiety	-0.47	0.27	3.00	0.63
Psych Reactance	-0.28	0.29	0.88	0.76
Emot Reactance	0.28	0.38	0.53	1.32
PO Conversational	0.01	0.27	0.002	1.01
PO Conformity	-0.08	0.30	0.08	0.92
Likelihood Ratio	120.57			

Table 5

Topics and Engagement in Communication

| Topic | Engaged in Communication with PO | | Total |
	No	Yes	
Change housing	1	8	9
No housing	2	1	3
Housing generally	2	8	10
Relapsing	1	2	3
Illegal activity	4	2	6
Talk about 3rd party/rel	5	20	25
Abuse	0	2	2
Restitution	2	4	6
Job issues	1	4	5
Restitution & job	0	2	2
Police contact	1	1	2
End supervision early	2	2	4
Associate w/ offenders	2	2	4
Need services/transpo	2	6	8
Relationship w/PO	2	0	2
Previous behavior	1	3	4
Child custody issues	0	3	3
Other	2	5	7

Table 6

Logistic Regression of Goals Predicting Communication

Predictors	β	$SE\beta$	Wald's χ^2	e^β (odds ratio)
Influence Goal	0.10	0.12	0.71	1.11
Interaction Goal	-0.03	0.14	0.04	0.97
Personal Res Goal	-0.33	0.15	4.88*	0.72
Arousal Mgt Goal	-0.09	0.16	0.35	0.91
Likelihood Ratio	134.83			

*$p < .05$

Table 7

Logistic Regression of Social Norms Predicting Communication

Predictors	β	$SE\beta$	Wald's χ^2	e^{β} (odds ratio)
Descriptive Norms	-0.04	0.13	0.08	0.96
Subjective Norms	-0.15	0.16	0.94	0.86
Injunctive Norms	0.21	0.17	1.54	1.23
Likelihood Ratio	134.83			

Table 8

Logistic Regression of Risk Score and Parole Status Predicting Communication

Predictors	β	$SE\beta$	Wald's χ^2	e^β (odds ratio)
Total Needs Score	-0.15	0.02	0.41	0.99
Parole	-.68	0.41	2.75	1.98
Likelihood Ratio	155.24			

Table 9

Logistic Regression of Social Network and Support Qualities Predicting Communication

Predictors	β	$SE\beta$	Wald's χ^2	e^{β} (odds ratio)
Social Network Size	0.02	0.08	0.08	1.02
Instrumental Support	-0.54	0.89	0.36	0.59
Emotional Support	0.002	1.40	0.00	1.00
Social Support	-0.14	0.82	0.03	0.87
Likelihood Ratio	150.53			

Table 10

Logistic Regression of Perceptions of PO on Predicting Communication

Predictors	β	$SE\beta$	Wald's χ^2	e^β (odds ratio)
Anxiety	-0.37	0.23	2.71*	0.69
Psych Reactance	-0.33	0.24	1.85	0.72
Emot Reactance	0.29	0.35	0.68	1.33
PO Conversational	0.08	0.23	0.12	1.08
PO Conformity	-0.19	0.26	0.51	0.83
Likelihood Ratio (-2 Log L)	143.00			

*$p < .15$

Table 11

Logistic Regression for Impact of Perceptions of PO Relationship Style on Communication

Predictors	β	$SE\beta$	Wald's χ^2	e^{β} (odds ratio)
PO Supportive	0.45	0.15	9.36*	1.56
PO Punitive	0.13	0.22	0.34	1.14
Likelihood Ratio (-2 Log L)	150.53			

*$p < .01$

APPENDIX E

Footnotes

[1] A procedure used for sample selection bias is the Heckman Two-Step Correction (Heckman, 1979). When selection bias occurs, two models are present. The first is the selection model, which is the gateway question or filter (skip pattern). In this study, the selection model would use whether or not the women ever wanted to talk to their POs about a difficult issue or need would be the dependent variable. The second model is the outcome model, which is a subset of the model. In this study, the outcome model is whether or not the women actually engaged in communication with their POs. The Heckman estimation attempts to explain how the selection model impacts the findings of the outcome model. This is done by "estimation of a probit model for selection, followed by the insertion of a correction factor...into the second model of interest" (Bushway, Johnson, & Slocum, 2007, p. 152). Although commonly used, the Heckman Correction has many drawbacks and can be quite problematic. One issue is that the addition of the correction factor introduces collinearity into the model (e.g., Bushway et al., 2007). Another problem is that the Heckman Correction inflates standard errors when the covariates are identical in the selection and outcome model, as evidenced by Monte Carlo simulations (e.g., Puhani, 2000), which would be the case in this study. Probably most important for this study is that the Heckman Correction is used solely for a probit model first (for the selection model) followed by a linear regression (for the outcome model) (Bushway et al., 2007; Dubin & Rivers, 1990). Because the outcome variable of this study is dichotomous, the Heckman correction cannot be used. Overall, even if some degree of sample selection bias is present, Heckman procedures perform no better than uncorrected estimators and, if a sample

only has a few hundred cases, there is substantial risk that the Heckman procedures will make the estimates worse (DeMaris, 2004; Stolzenberg & Relles, 1997).

[2] Social network size was added as a control variable. Adding this control did not change the findings, $\chi^2 (4) = 1.66$, $p = .80$. Perceived PO relationship style (supportive & punitive) was added as a control variable. Adding this control changed the overall model, $\chi^2 (5) = 11.94$, $p = .04$, but due to the effect of perceived supportive PO relationship style, $p = .006$.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Afifi, W. A. (2009). Uncertainty and information management in interpersonal contexts. In S. W. Smith & S. Wilson (Eds.). New directions in interpersonal communication research (pp. 94-114), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Anderson, J., Cornacchione, J., & Maloney, E. K. (in press). Normative Beliefs and Social Support in Weight Loss Communication. The International Journal of Communication and Health.

Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2003). The psychology of criminal conduct (3rd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Argyle, M., & Henderson, M. (1984). The rules of friendship. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 1, 211-237.

Asch, S. E. (1956). Studies of independence and conformity: I. A minority of one against a unanimous majority. Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, 70, 1-70.

Atkin, C. K. (1994). Designing persuasive health messages. In L. Sechrest, T. E. Backer, E. M. Rodgers, T. F. Campbell, & M. L. Grady (Eds.), Effective dissemination of clinical and health information (pp. 99-109). Rockville, MD: U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services.

Barnes, M. K., & Duck, S. (1994). Everyday supportive contexts for social support. In B. R. Burleson, T. L. Albrecht, & I. G. Sarason (Eds.) Communication of social support: Messages, interactions, relationships, and community (pp. 175-194). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Barsevick, A.M., Montgomery, S. V., Ruth, K., Ross, E. A., Egleston, B. L., Bingler, R., Malick, J., … & Daly, M. B. (2008). Intention to communicate BRACA1/BRCA2 genetic test results to the family. Journal of Family Psychology, 22, 303-312. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.22.2.303

Berger, C. R. (2005). Interpersonal communication: Theoretical perspectives, future prospects. Journal of Communication, 55, 415-447. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2005.tb02680.x

Bonczar, M. A., & Glaze, L. E. (2009). Probation and parole in the United States, 2008. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Brann, M., & Sutton, M. L. (2009). The theory of planned behavior and college students' willingness to talk about smoking-related behaviors. Communication Research Reports, 26, 198-207.

Browning, D. M., Meyer, E. C., Truog, R. D., & Solomon, M. Z. (2007). Difficult conversations in health care: Cultivating relational learning to address the hidden curriculum. Academic Medicine, 82, 905-913.

Burleson, B. R., Albrecht, T. L., Goldsmith, D. J., & Sarason, I. G. (1994). Introduction: The communication of social support. In B. R. Burleson, T. L. Albrecht, & I. G. Sarason (Eds.), *Communication of social support: Messages, interactions, relationships, and community* (pp. xi –xxx). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bushway, S., Johnson, B. D., & Slocum, L. A. (2007). Is the magic still there? The use of the Heckman two-step correction for selection bias in criminology. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 23, 151-178.

Caughlin, J. P. (2010). A multiple goals theory of personal relationships: Conceptual integration and program overview. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 27, 824-848. doi:10.1177/0265407510373262

Caughlin, J. P., Mikucki-Enyart, S. L., Middleton, A. V., Stone, A. M., & Brown, L. E. (2011). Being open without talking about it: A rhetorical/normative approach to understanding topic avoidance in families after a lung cancer diagnosis. Communication Monographs, 78, 409-436.

Cialdini, R. B., Kallgren, C. A., & Reno, R. R. (1991). A focus theory of normative conduct: A theoretical refinement and reevaluation of the role of norms in human behavior. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 24, 201-234. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60330-5

Cobbina, J. E., Morash, M., Kashy, D., & Smith, S. W. (in press). Race, neighborhood danger, and coping strategies among female probationers and parolees. Race and Justice.

Cochran, J. C. (2014). Breaches in the wall: Imprisonment, social support, and recidivism. Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency, 51, 2, 200-229. doi:10.1177/0022427813497963

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences (3rd Ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cornacchione, J. (2013). Normative influences on engaging in communication to persuade a family member about a health behavior. Unpublished Preliminary Study, Michigan State University.

Cullen, F. T. (1994). Social support as an organizing concept for criminology: Presidential address to the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. Justice Quarterly, 11, 527-560.

Cutrona, C. E., & Suhr, J. A. (1992). Controllability of stressful events and satisfaction with spouse support behaviors. Communication Research, 19, 154-176.

Daly, K., & Bouhours, B. (2008). Judicial censure and moral communication to youth sex offenders. Justice Quarterly, 25, 496-522.

Demaris, A. (2004). Regression with social data: Modeling continuous and limited response variables. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Derogatis, L. R., & Melisaratos, N. (1983). The Brief Symptom Inventory: An introductory report. Psychological Medicine, 13, 595-605.

DiClemente, R. J. (1991). Predictors of HIV-preventive sexual behavior in a high-risk adolescent population: The influence of perceived peer norms and sexual communication on incarcerated adolescents' consistent use of condoms. Journal of Adolescent Health, 12, 385-390.

Dillard, J. P. (1989). Types of influence goals in personal relationships. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 6, 293-308. doi:10.1177/0265407589063004

Dillard, J. P. (1990). A goal-driven model of interpersonal influence. In J. P. Dillard (ed.), Seeking compliance: The production of interpersonal influence messages (pp. 41-56). Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Dillard, J. P. (2008). Goals-plans-action theory of message production: Making influence messages. In L. A. Baxter & D. O. Braithwaite (Eds.), Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives (pp. 65-76). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dillard, J. P., & Shen, L. (2005). On the nature of reactance and its role in persuasive health communication. Communication Monographs, 72, 144-168.

Dillard, J. P., Segrin, C., & Harden, J. M. (1989). Primary and secondary goals in the production of interpersonal influence messages. Communication Monographs, 56, 19-38. doi:10.1080/03637758909390247

Donovan-Kicken, E., & Caughlin, J. P. (2010). A multiple goals perspective on topic avoidance and relationship satisfaction in the context of breast cancer. Communication Monographs, 77, 231-256. doi:10.1080/03637751003758219

Dowd, E. T., Milne, C. R., & Wise, S. L. (1991). The therapeutic reactance scale: A measure of psychological reactance. Journal of Counseling & Development, 69, 541-545.

Dubin J. A., & Rivers, D. (1990) Selection bias in linear regression, logit and probit models. In J. Fox & J. S. Long (Eds.), Modern methods of data analysis (pp. 411-443). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Elwood, W. N., Greene, K., & Carter, K. C. (2003). Gentlemen don't speak: Communication norms and condom use in bathhouses. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 31, 277-297.

Estroff, S., & Zimmer, C. (1994). Social networks, social support, and violence among persons with severe, persistent mental illness. In J. Monahan & H. Steadman (Eds.), Violence and Mental Disorder: Developments in Risk Assessment (pp. 259-295). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. Human Relations, 7, 117-140.

Fitzpatrick, M. A., & Ritchie, L. D. (1994). Communication schemata within the family: Multiple perspectives on family interaction. Human Communication Research, 20, 275-301.

Freudenberg, N., Daniels, J., Crum, M., Perkins, T., & Richie, B. E. (2005). Coming home from jail: The social and health consequences of community reentry for women, male adolescents, and their families and communities. American Journal of Public Health, 95, 1725-1736. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2004.056325

Hall, J., & LaFrance, B. (2012). "That's gay": Sexual prejudice, gender identity, norms, and homophobic communication. Communication Quarterly, 60, 35-58.

Hart, R. A., & Clark, D. H. (1999). Does size matter? Exploring the small sample properties of maximum likelihood estimation. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association.

Heckman, J. J. (1979). Sample selection bias as a specification error. Econometrica, 47, 153-161.

Hochstetler, A., DeLisi, M., & Pratt, T. C. (2010). Social support and feelings of hostility among released inmates. Crime & Delinquency, 56, 588-607. doi:10.1177/0011128708319926

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria indexes on covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria vs. new alternatives. Structural Equation Modeling, 6, 1-55.

Kallgren, C. A., Reno, R. R., & Cialdini, R. B. (2000). A focus theory of normative conduct: When norms do and do not affect behavior. Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 26, 1002-1012.

Kam, J. A., Matsunaga, M., Hecht, M. L., & Ndiaye, K. (2009). Extending the theory of planned behavior to predict alcohol, tobacco, and marijuana use among youth of Mexican heritage. Prevention Science, 10, 41-53.

Keating, D. K., Russell, J., Cornacchione, J., & Smith, S. W. (2013). Family communication patterns and difficult family conversations. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 41, 160-180.

Kennealy, P. J., Skeem, J. L., Manchak, S. M., & Eno Louden, J. (2012). Firm, fair, and caring officer-offender relationships protect against supervision failure. Law and Human Behavior, 36, 496-505.

Koerner, A. F., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (2002a). Toward a theory of family communication. *Communication Theory, 12*, 70-91. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.2002.tb00260.x

Koerner, A. F., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (2002b). Understanding family communication patterns and family functioning: The roles of conversation orientation and conformity orientation. Communication Yearbook, 26, 37–69. doi:10.1207/s15567419cy2601_2

Korsgaard, M. A., & Roberson, L. (1995). Procedural justice in performance evaluation: The role of instrumental and noninstrumental voice in performance appraisal discussions. Journal of Management, 21, 657-670.

Kwon, K., & Lease, A. M. (2009). Children's social identification with a friendship group: A moderating effect on intent to conform to norms. Small Group Research, 40, 694-719. doi:10.1177/1046496409346578

Lapinski, M. K., & Rimal, R. N. (2005). An explication of social norms. Communication Theory, 15, 127-147. doi:10.1093/ct/15.2.127

Lapinski, M. K., Anderson, J., Shugart, A., & Todd, E. (2013). Social influence in child care centers: A test of the theory of normative social behavior. Health Communication, (ahead of print), 1-14.

Leverentz, A. M. (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 & Delinquency, 43, 459-488.

Lind, E., Kanfer, R., & Earley, P. (1990). Voice, control and procedural justice: Instrumental and non-instrumental concerns in fairness and judgments. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 952-959.

Maruschak, L. M., & Parks, E. (2012). Probation and parole in the United States, 2011 (Bulletin). Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

McCleod, J. M., & Chaffee, S. R. (1972). The social construction of reality. In J. Tedeschi (Ed.), The social influence process (pp. 50-99). Chicago, IL: Aldine Atherton.

Miner, M.H., & Munns, R. (2005). Isolation and normlessness: Attitudinal comparisons of

adolescent sex offenders, juvenile offenders, and nondelinquents. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 49, 491-504.

Mollen, S., Rimal, R. N., & Lapinski, M. K. (2010). What is normative in Health Communication research on norms? A review and recommendations for future scholarship. Health Communication, 25, 544-547. doi:10.1080/10410236.2010.496704

Morash, M. (2010). Women on probation and parole. Lebanon, NH: Northeastern University Press.

Morash, M., Kashy, D., Smith, S. W., & Cobbina, J. (in progress) The effects of supervising agent relationship style. Working Paper from the Study of Women on Probation and Parole.

Morash, M., Northcutt Bohmert, M., Kashy, D., Cobbina, J., & Smith, S. W. (in progress). Women felons at the nexus of prison downsizing, social welfare reductions, and collateral consequences of conviction.

Park, H. S., & Smith, S. W. (2007). Distinctiveness and influence of subjective norms, personal descriptive and injunctive norms, and societal descriptive and injunctive norms on behavioral intent: A case of two behaviors critical to organ donation. Human Communication Research, 33, 194-218. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2958.2007.00296.x

Park, H. S., Klein, K. A., Smith. S. W., & Martell, D. (2009). Separating subjective norms, university descriptive norms and injunctive norms, and U.S. descriptive and injunctive norms for drinking behavior intentions. Health Communication, 24, 746-751. doi:10.1080/10401230903265912

Perkins, H.W. & Berkowitz, A.D. (1986). Perceiving the community norms of alcohol use among students: Some research implications for campus alcohol education programming. International Journal of the Addictions, 21, 961-976.

Petersilia, J. (2001). Prisoner reentry: Public safety and reintegration challenges. The Prison Journal, 81, 360-375.

Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. Annual Review of Sociology, 24, 1-24.

Puhani, P. A. (2000). The Heckman correction for sample selection and its critique. Journal of Economic Surveys, 14, 53-68.

Quick, B. L., & Stephenson, M. T. (2007). The reactance restoration scale (RSS): A measure of direct and indirect restoration. Communication Research Reports, 24, 131-138.

Reisig, M. D., Holtfreter, K., & Morash, M. (2002). Social capital among women offenders: Examining the distribution of social networks and resources. Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 18, 167-187. doi:10.1177/1043986202018002004

Reno, R. R., Cialdini, R. B., & Kallgren, C. A. (1993). The transsituational influence of social norms. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64, 104-112. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.64.1.104

Ritchie, L. D., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (1990). Family communication patterns: Measuring intrapersonal perceptions of interpersonal relationships. Communication Research, 17, 523-544.

Rimal, R. N., & Real, K. (2003). Understanding the influence of perceived norms on behaviors. Communication Theory, 13, 184-203. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.2003.tb00288.x

Rimal, R., & Real, K. (2005). How behaviors are influenced by perceived norms. Communication Research, 32, 389-414. doi:10.1177/0093650205275385

Ross, C. E.,&Mirowsky, J. (1987). Normlessness, powerlessness, and trouble with the law. Criminology, 25, 257-278.

Ross, E. C., Polaschek, D. L. L., & Ward, T. (2008). The therapeutic alliance: A theoretical revision for offender rehabilitation. Aggression and Violent Behavior, 13, 462-480. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2008.07.003

Russell, J., Keating, D. M., Cornacchione, J., & Smith, S. W. (2012, November). *An initial investigation of difficult conversations in families from a multiple goals perspective*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association, Orlando, FL.

Salisbury, E. J., & Van Voorhis, P. (2009). A quantitative investigation of women probationers' paths to incarceration. Criminal Justice & Behavior, 36, 541-566. doi:10.1177/00938454809334076

Salisbury, E. J., Van Voorhis, P., & Spiropoulos (2009). The predictive validity of a gender-responsive needs assessment: An exploratory study. Crime & Delinquency, 55, 550-585.

Scott, A. M. (2010). Family conversations about end-of-life health decisions (unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Schrader, D. C., & Dillard, J. P. (1998). Goal structures and interpersonal influence. Communication Studies, 49, 276-293. doi:10.1080/10510979809368538

Schrodt, P., Witt, P. L., & Messersmith, A. S. (2008). A meta-analytical review of family communication patterns and their associations with information processing, behavioral,

and psychosocial outcomes. Communication Monographs, 75, 248-269. doi:10.1080/03637750802256318

Sherif, M. (1936). The psychology of social norms. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Sherif, M., Harvey, J. O., White, B. J., Hood, W. R., & Sherif, C. W. (1961). The Robbers cave experiment. Scranton, PA: Harper.

Skeem, J. L., Encandela, J., & Eno Louden, J. (2003). Perspectives on probation and mandated mental health treatment in specialized and traditional probation departments. Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 21, 429-458

Skeem, J., Eno Louden, J., Polaschek, D., & Camp, J. (2007). Assessing relationship quality in mandated community treatment: Blending care and control. Psychological Assessment, 19, 397-410.

Skeem, J., Eno Louden, J., Manchak, S., Vidal, S., & Haddad, E. (2009). Social networks and social control of probationers with co-occurring mental and substance abuse problems. Law and Human Behavior, 33, 122-135. doi:10.1007/s10979-008-9140-1

Stolzenberg, R. M., & Relles, D. A. (1997). Tools for intuition about sample selection bias and its correction. American Sociological Review, 62, 494-507.

Taxman, F. S., & Ainsworth, S. (2009). Correctional milieu: The key to quality outcomes. Victims & Offenders, 4, 334-340. doi:10.1080/115564880903227347

United States Bureau of Justice Statistics (n.d.).*Terms and definitions*. Retrieved from http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/index.cfm?ty=tp&tid=15#terms_def

Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Botero, I. C. (2003). Conceptualizing employee silence and employee voice as multidimensional constructs. Journal of Management Studies, 40(6), 1359-1392.

Van Voorhis, P., Salisbury, E., Wright, E., & Bauman, A. (2008). Achieving accurate pictures of risk and identifying gender responsive needs: Two new assessments for women offenders. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections. Retrieved from http://static.nicic.gov/Library/022844.pdf

Van Voorhis, P., Wright, E. M., Salisbury, E., & Bauman, A. (2010). Women's risk factors and their contributions to existing risk/needs assessment: The current status of a gender-responsive supplement. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 37, 261-288.

Waldron, V. R. (1991). Achieving communication goals in superior-subordinate relationships: The multi-functionality of upward maintenance tactics. Communication Monographs, 58, 289-306.

Wilson, S. R. (2007). Communication theory and the concept of "goal". In B. B. Whaley & W.

Samter (Eds.) Explaining communication: Contemporary theories and exemplars, pp. 73-104. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Wright, E. M., DeHart, D. D., Koons-Witt, B. A., & Crittenden, C. A. (2013). "Buffers" against crime? Exploring the roles and limitations of positive relationships among women in prison. Punishment & Society, 15, 71-95. doi:10.1177/1462474512466199

Yanovitzky, I., & Rimal, R. N. (2006). Communication and normative influence: An introduction to the special issue. Communication Theory, 16, 1-6. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.2006.00002.x