Published in final edited form as:

Justice Q. 2019 ; 36(5): 841–869. doi:10.1080/07418825.2018.1439518.

The Criminogenic Influence of Family on Substance Use During Reentry: A Life-Course Perspective on Between Individual Differences and Within Individual Changes

Thomas J. Mowen, John H. Boman IV

Thomas J. Mowen is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology at Bowling Green State University. His research explores the impact of punishment on families and youth as well as the role and importance of family within the reentry process. John Boman is an Assistant Professor at Bowling Green State University in the Department of Sociology. His research is primarily focused on developmental issues, peers and social relationships through the life-course, and theory.

Abstract

A large body of prior research has demonstrated a clear link between family support and desistance from substance use during reentry. Emerging research also suggests that family conflict may play an independent role in this process. Accordingly, this study moves towards an understanding of how baseline between-individual differences in both family support and conflict prior to release interact with within-individual change in the respective constructs to affect substance use during the reentry time period. Results of cross-lagged dynamic panel models examining four waves of the Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative data demonstrate baseline between-individual differences and within-individual changes in family conflict, but not support, significantly relate to polysubstance use. While these results suggest that families play a criminogenic role in reentry, a series of interaction terms demonstrates that within-individual increases in family support can help offset the negative influence of family conflict.

Keywords

prisoner reentry; life-course criminology; family; longitudinal modeling

Introduction

Despite a modest decline in the prison population over the past several years (e.g. Carson & Anderson, 2016), the United States continues to incarcerate more people per capita than any other country in the world (Travis & Redburn, 2014). Due to such a sizable prison population, the United States also releases more people from prison than any other country every year (Travis & Redburn, 2014). The time when a person readjusts to life in the

Correspondence to: Thomas J. Mowen, Department of Sociology, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH, USA. tmowen@bgsu.edu.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

community, referred to as “reentry” (Visser & Travis, 2003), serves as a challenging but critical process in the lives of returning persons. In addition to securing housing, employment, and reestablishing social ties (Brooks et al., 2008; Comfort, 2008; Seiter & Kadela, 2003; Visser & Travis, 2003), many who have been formerly incarcerated must once again cope with one of the most pervasive problems facing the criminal justice system—substance use. Estimates show that at least two thirds of all returning persons have experienced a problem with substances (Karberg & James, 2005), and the lifetime prevalence of substance problems for incarcerated individuals is over 85% (National Center on Addiction & Substance Abuse, 2010). Perhaps unsurprisingly, and because it is often linked to other crime outcomes (see Walters, 2015), substance use is one of the leading causes of re-incarceration (Binswanger et al., 2012; Mallik-Kane & Visser, 2008; Severson, Veeh, Bruns, & Lee, 2012).

Importantly for this project, research has established that family—most often partners, children, and parents, but also siblings and extended family—can play an influential role on a returning person’s patterns of substance use. From the perspectives of social control (Hirschi, 1969) and differential coercion/social support theories (Colvin, Cullen, & Vander Ven, 2002; Cullen, 1994), families often provide attachment and support to returning persons and help protect against substance use (see, generally, Laub & Sampson, 2003). To this end, prior research tends to focus on whether an individual has or does not have family support and/or whether variations in the amount or quality of family support across time relates to reentry success (e.g. Breese, Ra’el, & Grant, 2000; Ekland-Olson, Supancic, Campbell, & Lenihan, 1983; Martinez, 2006; Naser & La Vigne, 2006; Nelson, Deess, & Allen, 1999; Shapiro & Schwartz, 2001). In support of both control- and support-based theoretical approaches, family support has been linked to many positive outcomes for returning persons, including—but not limited to—a reduced likelihood of substance use (see Berg & Huebner, 2011; Sullivan, Mino, & Nelson, 2002; Visser & Travis, 2003).

Given the general understanding that family exerts a meaningful and protective influence on the substance use patterns of reentering persons, the role of the family remains ubiquitous in reentry research and policy (Martinez, 2006; Maruna, 2011; Naser & La Vigne, 2006; Petersilia, 2003; Western, Braga, Davis, & Sirois, 2015). However, a recent study by Mowen and Visser (2015) provides reason to question the role which family plays on substance use during the reentry process. Using the *Returning Home* data, Mowen and Visser (2015) argued that family is not universally a factor protecting reentering persons from substance use via mechanisms of family support. Using a multivariate analysis, the authors found no evidence that family support protected from substance use. Instead, the authors found that family conflict was positively related to substance use during reentry. As such, Mowen and Visser concluded that “familial support and conflict operate differently” as separate constructs during the reentry process (p. 354).

This study, along with others (e.g. Bahr, Harris, Fisher, & Armstrong, 2010; Grieb et al., 2014; Western et al., 2015), represents an emerging body of research which significantly departs from most reentry research as it implies that family may actually contribute more to substance use than it protects from it. However, this body of work leaves many questions unanswered as all returning persons experience different baseline (pre-release) levels of

family support and family conflict. Additionally, increases in family support (post-release) could be predicated upon decreases in family conflict, and vice versa. For example, individuals with high levels of support at the baseline time of release (a between-individual difference) may not benefit from increases in family support (a within-individual change over time) in the same way that an individual with low levels of baseline family support at release may benefit from increases in support. The same may be true for family conflict. Yet, existing literature provides little insight into the role of baseline differences and within-person change, and less is known about how dimensions of support at release interact with changes in conflict across time and vice versa.

This discussion brings attention to three observations. First, baseline levels of family support and family conflict upon release from prison may exert effects on substance use that are distinct from the effects of within-person changes that may occur over time. Second, a person's baseline levels of support and conflict may impact the extent to which change in the constructs over time relates to substance use. Third, baseline levels of *and* change in family support and conflict over time may be so interrelated that they impact post-release substance use in both independent and interdependent ways. Collectively, these possibilities move far beyond extant research and could provide for a more thorough and nuanced understanding of how and/or why family could serve as both a risk and a protective factor for substance use during reentry.

The current study uses data from the Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative (SVORI) Multisite Evaluation to answer a series of questions. We begin by discussing the role of family support during reentry. Next, we re-explore the conclusion that family is a risk factor for substance use by expanding on the notion that family support and family conflict may each exert two distinct effects on substance use—a time-invariant effect that captures a person's baseline levels of support/conflict and a time variant effect that captures how a person's levels change over time. Next, we build upon this research question by examining whether baseline levels of, and over-time change in, family support and family conflict exist independently of each other or whether they impact substance use in interdependent and interactive ways.

Family as a Protective Factor: Family Support's Role During Reentry

A broad range of criminological work has focused on the importance of family support in the promotion of desistance (Doherty, 2006; Laub & Sampson, 2003), especially within the context of reentry (Breese et al., 2000; Ekland-Olson et al., 1983; Maruna, 2011; Shapiro & Schwartz, 2001; Western et al., 2015). Family support has been found to play an important role in the lives of returning individuals as families often provide both material (e.g. housing, see La Vigne, Shollenberger, & Debus, 2009) and immaterial support (e.g. emotional ties, see Western et al., 2015) to those who are returning home. Many individuals reenter with very little, if any, financial resources (Visser, 2007) and thus return to a family member's home immediately following release (Western et al., 2015).

Individuals undergoing the reentry process regularly highlight family support as a key factor in promoting desistance and successful reentry (Bahr et al., 2010; Grieb et al., 2014; Mallik-

Kane & Visser, 2008; Shapiro & Schwartz, 2001; Western et al., 2015). For example, findings from the *Returning Home* study demonstrate that returning individuals report family support as the most important factor that helped keep them out of prison (Visser & Courtney, 2007). Likewise, in a study examining reentry experiences of 58 individuals in Milwaukee, Hlavka, Wheelock, and Jones (2015) found that one major theme that emerged was the importance of family support. Reflecting key findings from other studies (e.g. Ekland-Olson et al., 1983; Western et al., 2015), one of Hlavka and colleagues' respondents noted:

I think honestly, if I didn't have the family support, I probably would have stayed in Texas and went back to the same people and either end up dead or in prison for the rest of my life. With the family support, that's huge (Hlavka et al., 2015, p. 416).

Accordingly, family support has been linked to lower levels of offending, substance abuse, and increased odds of employment upon release (Berg & Huebner, 2011; Sullivan et al., 2002; Visser & Travis, 2003). In this manner, then, the family is very much seen in current research and policy (see National Institute of Justice, 2002) as a beneficial mechanism that reduces substance use relapse and serves as an important protective factor during reentry.

Family as a Risk Factor: Family Conflict's Role During Reentry

Despite over 75% of institutional reentry-focused programs containing a component designed to bolster family support (National Institute of Justice, 2002), several studies have recently begun to suggest that families play a deeper role than merely providing support to reentering people. In exhaustive interviews with 53 returning persons, Bahr et al. (2010) echoed prior research by also concluding that family support was an important resource for nearly every respondent in the sample. However, the authors also found that family relationships were heavily strained. Illustrating this notion, the researchers quoted one respondent who stated that his "family has been helping me out a lot even though they've been stressing me out" (p. 683). As such, the family may serve two roles to those undergoing reentry—a role as a supportive mechanism and also as a mechanism of conflict and tension.

The idea that family members can be sources of conflict is found in other work as well. In an illustrative study that interviewed family members of those undergoing the reentry process, Grieb and colleagues (2014, p. 1,192) found that while many overwhelmingly "felt passionate" about providing support to their returning family members, they often felt frustrated and unappreciated. Many individuals felt alienated or estranged from their reentering relative because they felt they no longer "knew" them. When asked about his relationship with his formerly incarcerated brother, one respondent stated: "He got his time and he went away for like four to six years. But when he came back home he was a different person to me. And I really didn't know that person" (p. 1,191). The authors conclude that reentry-based stressors can provoke frustration for families even though family members want to support their returning relative. This conflict materializes in the form of fights, interpersonal conflicts, and disagreements between the reentering person and the family.

In a study that compliments the work of Bahr et al. (2010) and Grieb et al. (2014), Western and colleagues (2015) also examined some sources of the conflict that exists between

returning persons and their family. The authors found that one reason why families experience difficulties rebuilding relationships with returning relatives is due to considerable risks incurred to financial affairs, social life, and housing security when a relative comes home. Incurring additional members within the household elevates the risk of eviction due to lease violations, and these difficulties can contribute to familial conflict by creating stress and provoking tension.

In addition to the family providing an important means of support to the returning person, the works of Bahr et al. (2010), Grieb et al. (2014), and Western and colleagues (2015) all demonstrate that having a relative reenter society can be a source of conflict. Moreover, this is also evidence that negative family experiences prior to incarceration can have important post-release implications. For example, in examining outcomes among a sample of returning individuals in Illinois, Yahner and Visser (2008) found that respondents who reported experiencing family violence or conflict prior to incarceration were twice as likely to return to prison than individuals who did not report family violence or conflict. Thus, these studies allude to the possibility that family plays a bifurcated role during reentry by serving as both a source of support and conflict to the returning person. What is less clear from these studies, however, are what implications family support and family conflict have on post-release behavior.

Addressing this noticeable gap in the literature was the primary goal of a study by Mowen and Visser (2015). Using a sample of returning men, a quantitative analysis, and separate measures of family support and family conflict, the authors found that family support and family conflict correlated with substance use during the reentry timeframe. However, upon examining both conflict and support together, the authors found that family conflict—as a risk factor—significantly reduced the protective influence of family support. Couching their findings in the developmental context of turning points, Mowen and Visser (2015, p. 354) concluded that the “findings suggest that negative turning points [the conflict construct] may have a more robust relationship on formerly incarcerated men than positive turning points [the family support construct].”

Mowen and Visser’s (2015) study serves as one of the first to offer a quantitative assessment of the separate impacts of family support and conflict on substance use during reentry. On the surface, their findings lead to the conclusion that conflict within the family exacerbates substance use more than support reduces it. Beyond this, however, the non-significant effect of family support on substance use while controlling for family conflict may go so far as to indicate that the primary role of the family is one that serves to *increase substance use, not reduce it*. In this way, families may be criminogenic influences. It is worth noting that the number of studies demonstrating that family support “matters” far outweigh the much more limited evidence that suggests family support may not be as robust as family conflict. Regardless, other studies alluding to the importance of family conflict exist (e.g. Bahr et al., 2010; Grieb et al., 2014; Western et al., 2015) and collectively suggest that criminologists and practitioners alike would be substantially benefited by a more in-depth analysis of the effects of family support “vs.” the effects of family conflict on substance use for returning persons. By drawing on the developmental and life-course perspective, we now attempt to

develop a pragmatic and realistic picture of how family support and family conflict could be independently and interdependently important for outcomes during reentry.

Turning Points, Reentry, and the Life-Course

The current study situates family dynamics—in this case support and conflict—within the life-course perspective. Perhaps most central to this study is the concept of turning points, broadly conceived as:

... new situations that “knife off” the person’s past from the present and serve as a catalyst for long-term behavioral change by restructuring routine activities and life course pathways, enabling identity transformations and setting in motion processes of cumulative advantages and disadvantages (Rumbaut, 2005, p. 1,043).

Turning points have the ability to produce positive or negative outcomes (Laub & Sampson, 1993, 2003). As family support is highlighted as a key protective factor during reentry (Bahr et al., 2010), having family support may serve as a turning point by encouraging desistance during reentry. On the other hand, the presence of family conflict may serve as a turning point by promoting substance use relapse (e.g. Mowen & Visser, 2015). What is perhaps most poignant, however, is that individuals leave prison with different levels of family support and conflict. That is, each person has a different “baseline” level of family support and conflict. We use the term baseline to indicate the returning person’s level of support and conflict prior to release from prison.

In addition to the baseline between-person differences, each person during the reentry process will have the opportunity to experience changes in family support and conflict. Three mechanisms of change could be experienced by returning persons. First, a person could experience only increases in support and/or conflict over time during the reentry process. This likely would be the case for someone who had low baseline levels of family support and/or conflict. Second, a person could experience only decreases in their levels of support and/or conflict. Since levels would be consistently decreasing, this would likely happen to someone who had very high levels of support and/or conflict at the baseline time of release. Third, a person may experience both increases and decreases in support and/or conflict during the reentry process. This could be true regardless of the person’s baseline levels of the respective constructs. In this case, increases in one construct (e.g. support) could also predicate a decrease in how the other construct (e.g. conflict) relates to substance use. Thus, the concept of turning points helps establish how family support and family conflict could both have two different effects on post-release substance use—a baseline between-person difference effect that is established prior to release from prison and an effect of within-person change that evolves over time during the reentry process.

Despite the possibility that family support and conflict may both have two independent effects on behavior, the examples provided above further contribute to the understanding of how family support and family conflict could drive changes in behavior. In addition to several qualitative studies implying that family support and conflict may condition each other’s effect on post-release behavior (e.g. Bahr et al., 2010; Grieb et al., 2014; Western et al., 2015), the examples provided above establish that baseline levels of one construct (e.g.

family support) may condition the impact of within-individual changes of either construct (e.g. family support and/or family conflict) on substance use over the reentry timeframe. Since family dynamics are interrelated (e.g. Martinez, 2006), it is likely that many possible combinations of interactivity could exist among how baseline between-person differences in family support and conflict as well as within-person changes in the same two constructs impact substance use during reentry. This raises attention to the goals of the current project.

Current Study

Moving forward the understanding of how the respective contributions of family support and family conflict influence substance use during the reentry process, the current study seeks to examine how baseline between-person differences and within-person changes relate to substance use during the reentry time frame. Using multiple waves of data from the SVORI Multisite Evaluation and cross-lagged dynamic panel data models, we examine two research questions to expound upon prior research. First, we replicate and extend the findings of Mowen and Visser (2015) by examining whether family conflict eliminates the protective effect of family support on post-release substance use. In light of a large number of studies finding that family support impacts post-release behavior (e.g. Breese et al., 2000; Ekland-Olson et al., 1983; Martinez, 2006; Naser & La Vigne, 2006; Nelson et al., 1999; Shapiro & Schwartz, 2001), by having distinct effects of baselines of and changes in family support we expect (Hypothesis #1) family support mechanisms to protect against substance use while family conflict mechanisms will put the returning person at risk of substance use.

Moving beyond Mowen and Visser's (2015) research, the second research question inquires whether baseline differences and within-individual changes in family support and family conflict are interactive in their effects on post-release substance use. We posit three hypotheses relevant to this research question. First, we expect (Hypothesis #2) that the protective effect of baseline levels of family support on substance use will be moderated by changes in family support over time. Second, we anticipate (Hypothesis #3) that the criminogenic effect of baseline levels of family conflict on substance use will be moderated by changes in family conflict over time. Finally, we also expect (Hypothesis #4) that the harmful effects of baseline levels of and within-individual changes in family conflict to be mitigated by baseline levels of and change in family support over time.

Methods

Data

Data for this project come from the SVORI Multisite Evaluation. As a federally funded project, the SVORI data were collected between 2005 and 2007 from a total of 1,697 men who were between ages 18 and 69 (National Institute of Justice, 2015). The overall goal of the project was to assess the extent to which experimental, enhanced reentry programming related to criminal justice, employment, education, health, and housing outcomes among individuals located in 14 different U.S. states (Lattimore & Steffey, 2010). The wide variety of enhanced programs, which were randomly received by half of the men in the sample, included employment training, substance abuse classes, education, and other pre-release programs (see Lattimore & Visser, 2009 for an overview).

The SVORI surveys asked respondents about a host of experiences prior to, during, and after incarceration. Respondents were routinely asked about their family relationships, family criminal history, and family structure. Respondents were also asked about substance use, prior arrest history, conviction history, experiences during incarceration, and questions about their future goals and plans, among a variety of other measures (see National Institute of Justice, 2015). Of the four total waves of data, wave one was collected from respondents about 30 days prior to their scheduled date of release, wave two was collected approximately 3 months post-release, wave three was collected approximately 9 months post-release, and the fourth and final wave of data was collected about 15 months post-release. At each wave, respondents were asked to report about their experiences since the previous wave. The current study uses data from all four waves, allowing for a means of evaluating baseline between-person differences alongside within-person changes in family support and conflict over time.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable in this study is *polysubstance use*. To create this measure, data are drawn from eleven questions asking the respondent if he had used a variety of substances in a manner not prescribed by a doctor. The substances include alcohol, marijuana, hallucinogens, heroin, inhalants, methadone, cocaine, sedatives, opiates, amphetamines, or stimulants since the time of the prior survey.¹ Respondents could respond “yes” (coded 1) or “no” (coded 0) to each item. Because these substances present fundamentally different risks to the user and carry different user effects, we apply the severity weights developed by Pandina and colleagues (Pandina, White, & Yorke, 1981). The weights on the individual items ranges from .358 (alcohol) to .976 (heroin).² Once weighted, these items were summed to create a weighted index of polysubstance use where higher values indicate higher prevalence and severity of polysubstance use. Participants reported using an average of 2.229 of the eleven substances at each wave (averaged SD = 2.464). We use the natural logarithm transformation of this measure to correct for skewness (Keene, 1995). The weighted index of polysubstance use has an overall mean of .669, a standard deviation of .607, and ranges from 0 to 2.336. As this measure varies across time, the within-individual standard deviation is .486 and the between-individual standard deviation is .375.

Independent Variables

Family support and family conflict—The key predictors in this study are family support and family conflict. To operationalize *family support*, we follow prior research (e.g. Mowen & Visher, 2015) by summing responses to three questions which asked respondents how much they agreed with the following statements: “I feel close to my family,” “I want my family involved in my life,” and “I consider myself a source of support for my family.”³ Possible responses followed a four-point, Likert-type scale (strongly agree, agree, disagree,

¹To ensure we were capturing polysubstance use as opposed to just alcohol use, we removed alcohol from the measure. Substantive results of the analyses were similar. Further, descriptive statistics demonstrate very similar frequencies of use as well as a very high and significant correlation between alcohol and other substances ($r = .742$).

²The weights—derived from Pandina et al. (1981) are: Alcohol = .358, Marijuana = .617, Stimulants, Amphetamines = .863, Sedatives = .882, Hallucinogens = .909, Cocaine = .946, Heroin, Opioids, and Methadone = .976.

³We note that the item “I consider myself a source of support for my family” may better align with how much support one gives to their family and not how much they receive. Yet, as Bucklen and Zajac (2009) find, being a “family man” is representative of being in

and strongly disagree). The items, which load consistently (average Cronbach's alpha across all waves is .753 [Cronbach, 1951]), are coded so that higher scores indicate greater levels of family support. It is important to note here that this measure of family support captures emotional support as opposed to material/instrumental measures of support (for a discussion of the differences see Mowen & Visser, 2016).

Separate measures of family support capture baseline, between-individual differences at wave one (just prior to release; time invariant) as well as within-individual changes captured over waves two through four (time variant). The baseline measure of family support has an overall mean of 10.139, a standard deviation of 1.694, and ranges from 3 (very low levels of support) to 12 (very high levels of support). The time variant, within-person component of family support has an overall mean of 10.097, a standard deviation of 1.662, and ranges from 3 to 12. The within-individual standard deviation is 1.445, indicating a great deal of within-person change across time relative to the between-individual standard deviation of .991.

The second key independent variable within this study is family conflict.⁴ To capture *family conflict*, data were drawn from three questions measured along the same four-point Likert scale as family support. These questions, which mirror items used by Mowen and Visser (2015), asked the respondent how much they agreed with the following statements: "I fight a lot with family members," "I often feel like I disappoint my family," and "I am criticized a lot by my family." The items, which are coded so that higher values represent more conflict, were summed to create the family conflict scale. The average Cronbach's alpha across all waves of data is .725, indicating acceptable reliability (Cronbach, 1951).

Like family support, the measure of family conflict has both time variant and time invariant components. The baseline between-individual measure of conflict was collected at wave one and has a mean of 6.937, a standard deviation of 1.786, and ranges from 3 (lowest levels of family conflict) to 12 (highest levels of family conflict). The time variant, within-person change component has an overall mean of 6.277, a standard deviation of 1.915, and ranges from 3 to 12. There is more within-individual variance in this measure (SD = 1.661) than between-individual variance (SD = 1.039) (Table 1).

Family structure control measures—As the focus of this paper is to better understand the roles of family support and family conflict on substance use, we control for a variety of family dimensions. Prior work has shown that *marital status* relates to familial outcomes during reentry (Travis, 2005), and married men report lower drug use than non-married men during reentry (Visser, Knight, Chalfin, & Roman, 2009). To account for this, variables were created representing the marital status of the respondent at each time point (a time variant measure). Overall, about 16.4% of the sample reported being divorced, 72.7% reported being single, and 10.8% reported being married across all time points. Married is withheld as the contrast group in the analyses.

a supportive relationship with family members. This support likely occurs in both directions whereby an individual receives support from the family and also provides support in return (see Bucklen & Zajac, 2009, p. 252–253).

⁴Confirmatory factor analyses and principal component analyses (not shown) further demonstrate that family support and family conflict are distinct factors.

Additionally, individuals with family members who have been incarcerated may experience lower levels of family conflict. Prior work has shown that families with members who have been incarcerated previously tend to cope better than families for which incarceration is a “shock” (Turney & Wildeman, 2013). To account for *family incarceration*, we include a binary measure that asked respondents if they ever had a family member incarcerated. Overall, 74.7% of respondents indicated they had at least one family member who had been previously housed in a correctional facility. Prior work has also shown that individuals undergoing reentry who live with someone with a drinking/drug use issue report higher levels of substance use themselves (Visser & Courtney, 2007). To account for the influence of family substance use experiences during the reentry process, we include a measure asking the respondent whether or not he had a family member who had problems with substance use. In total, 75.4% of respondents indicated they had a family member who qualified for problematic trends in *family substance use*. Finally, we also account for the total number of *children* the respondent reported having at wave one. As this measure is skewed, it was transformed via the natural logarithm. This measure has an overall mean of .705, a standard deviation of .614, and ranges from 0 to 2.398.

Demographic controls—To account for the influence of *age* on offending (see Severson et al., 2012), a variable is included that captures the respondent’s age at wave one. This measure has a mean of 29.479, a standard deviation of 7.292, and ranges from 18 to 69. There also may be different outcomes based on the respondent’s race (Severson et al., 2012). To account for the influence of *race*, binary variables were created representing whether the respondent was Black (53.1% of the sample) or other race (12.4% of the sample) in contrast to being White (34.5% of the sample).

Other controls—In addition to family structure and demographic controls, a wide body of research has highlighted the importance of other factors in the reentry process. For example, research has found that employment is a particularly powerful protective factor against substance use and offending (Uggen, 2000). To account for this influence, a variable was created representing whether the individual was *employed* (1 = yes, 0 = no). Overall, 66.3% of the sample reported having a job at some point within the study timeframe. However, individuals could also experience changes in employment across time and, therefore, this measure varies within-individuals (standard deviation = .291).

Concurrent with the analytic strategy (discussed below), lagged measures of the dependent variables are included in the analysis (see Allison, 2015; Williams, Allison, & Moral-Benito, 2015). This variable uses identical items and is constructed in the same manner as the outcome measures, though it captures polysubstance use 6 months prior to incarceration. This lagged measure has a mean of 1.263, a standard deviation of .559, and ranges from 0 to 2.336.

In addition to employment and prior substance use, reentry outcomes may vary by an individual’s conviction record as well as other experiences within the criminal justice system. To account for *conviction type*, we include binary measures indicating whether the primary conviction was violent—including robbery, assault, or murder (16.8%), drug including dealing or possession (21.0%), or a property offense including burglary, property

theft, forgery, fraud, or vehicle theft (11.4%) in contrast to some other offense (50.8%).⁵ Research also demonstrates that the *length of incarceration* may be related to reentry outcomes (Durose, Cooper, & Snyder, 2015). To account for this influence, we control for the total number of days the individual was incarcerated for their current term of incarceration. Due to a right skew, this measure was logged. While the average number of days a person was incarcerated was 954.251 days (SD = 943.506), the logged measure has a mean value of 6.479, a standard deviation of .887, and ranges from 3.806 to 9.158. Respondents were also asked, prior to their current term of incarceration, how many times they had been arrested. The average number of arrests for persons in the data is 13.923 (SD = 21.0628). This measure was logged due to skewness (logged mean = 2.298, SD = .840, range .639–5.707).

Although prior research on the efficacy of substance abuse treatment programming is mixed (e.g. Binswanger et al., 2012; Prendergast, 2009; see also Martin, Butzin, Saum, & Inciardi, 1999), we include a variable indicating whether the respondent received *substance abuse treatment* during incarceration. A total of 46.3% of individuals in this sample reported receiving substance abuse treatment programs while living in prison. Finally, as the primary goal of the SVORI multi-site evaluation was to assess whether individuals who participated in enhanced reentry programming experienced more positive outcomes than individuals who did not participate in enhanced reentry outcomes, a binary variable was created to indicate whether the person went through SVORI programming (1 = SVORI program participant; 0 = non-SVORI program participant). Overall, 53.9% of individuals within the sample were identified as *SVORI participant*.

Analytic Strategy

Although there are a variety of methods suitable for longitudinal data analysis, we employ a cross-lagged dynamic panel model, a structural technique that is suited towards overcoming two specific limitations to existing research as well as limitations inherent in traditional mixed- and fixed-effects models. Towards the latter of the two points, although fixed- and mixed-effects models can model within-individual changes only (fixed-effects model) or both within- and between-individual changes/differences (mixed-effects model), neither are able to include a lagged measure of the dependent variable ($t - 1$) as a predictor within the equation due to violations of independence (Allison, 2015, p. 1), thereby causing the mixed model to produce estimates that contain “severe bias.” Since “one of the best predictors of what happens at time t is what happened at time $t - 1$ ” (Allison, 2015, p. 1), this poses a serious problem, especially considering that the same limitation also applies to fixed effects models (see Allison, 2015; Williams et al., 2015 for detailed discussions on this issue). However, a cross-lagged dynamic panel model overcomes this limitation as it nests time within the individual and, through the use of a series of progressive chained equations, allows researchers to include a lagged measure of the dependent variable directly in the equation while simultaneously satisfying the assumptions of independence (Williams et al., 2015).

⁵.SVORI researchers asked respondents if they were incarcerated for “some other offense” not included in the list of items provided.

Another advantage of the cross-lagged dynamic panel data model approach concerns the measures. Because we use two distinct measures of both conflict and support (baseline between-individual differences during incarceration and within-individual changes across time), we are able to provide a much more nuanced portrait of the effect of family dynamics on substance use relapse with a cross-lagged approach. The cross-lagged dynamic panel model is ideal for this purpose as it uses the equation

$$y_{it} = \lambda y_{it-1} + x_{it}\beta + w_i\delta + \alpha_i + \varepsilon_t + v_{it}$$

where y_{it-1} is the lagged outcome for person i at time t (e.g. lagged substance use/criminal offending), x_{it} is a vector of the within-person change of the independent variables (e.g. time variant measures), w_i is a vector of time invariant exogenous measures (e.g. time invariant exogenous predictors), δ refers to the unit of time (which is a constant), α_i captures the fixed-effect at each wave, ε_t represents unobserved similarity across waves, and v_{it} captures time variant error across respondents in the model.

Following the research questions outlined above, we estimate two series of cross-lagged dynamic panel models using a model-building procedure. The first series of models estimates the unique contributions of between-person differences at baseline alongside within-person changes in family support (Model 1), family conflict (Model 2), and family support and family conflict (Model 3). In the second series of models, we introduce interactions between baseline and change effects in family support and conflict to examine how the constructs may jointly impact polysubstance use after release from prison. To create the interaction terms, each variable was group mean centered and then multiplied together (see Paccagnella, 2006).

Missing Data

As with most large, longitudinal data sets, the SVORI project has missing data. In this study, we rely on data from 962 individuals, which represents a retention of about 57% of the original sample of 1,697. Although this is a large amount of attrition, prior work including a report by the National Institute of Justice (see Lattimore & Steffey, 2010) demonstrates that there are no significant differences between individuals at wave four and those present at wave one (see also Stansfield, Mowen, O'Connor, & Boman, 2017; Wallace et al., 2016). However, to examine patterns of missing data, we performed an attrition analysis through the use of logistic regression modeling (see Brame & Paternoster, 2003) and t-tests across our measures comparing individuals in our sample to those who dropped out. Both analyses revealed non-significant results, confirming no significant differences in item-level responses between those who were retained and those who were dropped. This confirms prior research on missingness in the SVORI data (Lattimore & Steffey, 2010; Wallace et al., 2016).

Results

Prior to presenting results from the main analyses, collinearity diagnostics (not shown) reveal that no variance inflation factors (VIFs) exceed a value of 1.3, well below the

threshold that would suggest issues of severe multicollinearity (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 1995). The low VIFs are partially attributable to there being only a modest correlation between family support and conflict (average $r = -.390$ across waves).

Table 2 presents results from the first series of cross-lagged dynamic panel models. Model 1 includes all control variables as well as the baseline between-person differences and within-person changes in family support. Results demonstrate that higher levels of family support between-individuals significantly relate to lower levels of polysubstance use during reentry. Substantively, this finding shows that individuals with higher family support immediately prior to release report lower polysubstance use than those with less support. However, the measure of family support within-individuals fails to reach significance, suggesting that changes in family support across time do not significantly relate to polysubstance use. Turning to the controls, older individuals, Black respondents, and those who are employed report lower levels of polysubstance use, while property offenders and those with more prior arrests report greater levels of polysubstance use than their counterparts. Fit indices, shown at the bottom of the table, demonstrate that Model 1 fits the data very closely based on the precedent of Williams and colleagues (2015) and established root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) and Confirmatory Fit Index (CFI) criteria (see Kenny & McCoach, 2003; MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara, 1996).

Model 2 in Table 2 replaces the family support variables with measures of family conflict. Both the baseline between-person difference and within-individual change measures of family conflict are significant. Specifically, individuals with higher levels of family conflict at the baseline time of release report significantly higher levels of polysubstance use than those with lower levels of family conflict. Additionally, increases in family conflict after release are significantly associated with over time increases in polysubstance use during the reentry timeframe. The control variables show similar patterns of significance and fit indices again demonstrate that the model fits the data closely.

Model 3 in Table 2 includes both family support and family conflict. Results demonstrate that once family conflict is included within the model, neither family support effect is significant. This finding suggests that between-individual differences and within-individual changes in family conflict eliminate the effect of family support on post-release polysubstance use. Again, the same control variables are significant as in prior models and measures of model fit indicate good fit to the data.

Moving towards the second research question, a series of cross-lagged dynamic panel models in Table 3 regress polysubstance use onto interactions between family support and family conflict. As these models build upon Model 3 in Table 2, we focus our discussion on the results of the interaction terms. Model 1 introduces an interaction term encompassing baseline between-individual differences and within-person changes in family support. This interaction fails to reach significance, suggesting that baseline levels of and changes in family support over time do not interact to affect levels of polysubstance use.

Model 2 stages in an interaction term capturing baseline levels of family conflict combined with within-individual changes in family conflict. This interaction fails to reach significance,

suggesting that the effects of conflict on polysubstance use are independent but not interdependent. Put differently, levels of family conflict pre-release do not appear to interact with changes in family conflict on polysubstance use even though both are significantly related to substance use on their own.

Model 3 introduces an interaction capturing baseline levels of family support and conflict. This interaction also fails to reach significance, suggesting that levels of family conflict and support immediately prior to release do not interact to influence polysubstance use during the reentry process. This finding is noteworthy as it suggests that baseline levels of support do not counteract the negative influence of baseline levels of family conflict. This interaction term is replaced by an interaction capturing baseline levels of family support and within-individual changes in family conflict in Model 4. This interaction term also fails to reach significance.

Model 5 introduces an interaction capturing interdependency in the effects of within-individual changes in family support and baseline levels of family conflict. This interaction term reaches levels of statistical significance. The direction of this interaction term suggests that within-individual increases in family support across time dampen the harmful effect of having high levels of family conflict on polysubstance use at the baseline time of release. This interaction is notable since changes in family support do not exert an independent effect on polysubstance use. Instead, it appears that family support plays a more nuanced—but nonetheless important—role since increases in family support moderate away the harmful effect of high levels of family conflict at baseline.

In the final model, Model 6, an interaction term is staged in which captures within-individual changes in support working alongside within-individual changes in conflict. Like the prior model, this interaction term reaches statistical significance. The direction of the effect indicates that increases in family support over time can temper the detrimental effect of within-person increases in family conflict on polysubstance use during the reentry process. Again, this finding provides for a much more nuanced understanding of the role of family dynamics on substance use during reentry. While not significant in its main effects, family support carries considerable importance for polysubstance use after release because it diminishes the criminogenic influence of increases in family conflict over time.

Overall, results from the two series of models offer mixed support for our hypotheses. In partial support of Hypothesis #1, we find that measures of family conflict increase the risk of polysubstance use, although we fail to find evidence that family support protects from substance use. Hypotheses #2 and #3, however, are not supported as changes and baselines within the respective constructs of family support and family conflict were not interactively related to polysubstance use. Despite the lack of support for Hypotheses #2 and #3, Hypothesis #4 is partially supported. While within-individual changes in support reduce the criminogenic effect of baseline levels of, and within-individual changes in, family conflict, baseline levels of family support fail to condition either measure of family conflict on substance use.

Due to complex, nuanced findings relevant to the hypotheses, below we provide a visual depiction of some key findings from this study. With the covariates set at their means, Figure 1 demonstrates the extent to which family support moderates the harmful effect of family conflict on polysubstance use. The top line represents the combined effect of baseline between-person differences and within-person changes in family conflict (a total effect) to provide an overall depiction of how family conflict relates to polysubstance use. The positive slope demonstrates that higher levels of family conflict relate to increasingly higher levels of polysubstance use during the reentry process. The middle line in the Figure, corresponding with Model 6 in Table 3, visualizes the effect of increases in family support on the relationship between within-person changes in family conflict on polysubstance use. This demonstrates that increases in family support over time robustly diminish the harmful effect of having increases in family conflict on polysubstance use during the reentry process.

The bottom line in Figure 1 shows the impact which within-person increases in family support have on the harmful effect of having high levels of family conflict at baseline (corresponding with Model 5 in Table 3). The slope of this line suggests that increases in family support over time after release from prison dramatically reduce the harmful effect of having high levels of family conflict immediately prior to release from prison. As such, increases in family support over time appear to play a vital role for polysubstance use during reentry because they dramatically reduce the harmful effect of family conflict.

Discussion and Conclusions

The overall goal of this study was to examine the respective roles of family support and family conflict on substance use during the reentry process with specific attention given to understanding the distinct and joint contributions of baseline between-person differences and within-person changes in this process. Our results reveal three major findings. First, findings from this study support emerging research suggesting that family conflict, and not family support, is significantly associated with substance use during reentry. However, our second finding reveals that family support still plays an important role in this process as post-release changes in support condition the influence of family conflict on polysubstance use. Third, and finally, our results suggest that baseline levels of family support may not be a significant predictor of substance use during reentry once distinct measures of between-person baseline differences and within-person changes in conflict are considered. We now turn to a discussion of each of these findings.

Overall, results largely confirm emerging research (e.g. Mowen & Visser, 2015) by suggesting that family support does not significantly relate to polysubstance use on its own once the influence of family conflict is controlled. Instead, we find that baseline between-person levels of family conflict and within-person changes in family conflict are both significantly related to substance use post-release while baseline levels of, and changes in, family support fail to significantly relate to polysubstance use once levels of conflict are controlled. Prior work strongly suggests that returning individuals can experience both support and conflict at the same time (e.g. Bahr et al., 2010; Grieb et al., 2014; Western et al., 2015). However, in terms of our findings, it appears that the conflict component is the motivator of some substance-use-related behavior despite the presence of family support.

From the developmental and life-course perspective, the presence of high family support and strong bonds is often marked as a key driver of desistance. Further, securing family support has been shown to mark an important turning point within the process of reentry (Martinez, 2006). Yet, the focus on family support and bonds as important sources of desistance (Colvin et al., 2002; Cullen, 1994; Hirschi, 1969) within reentry (Bales & Mears, 2008; Mackenzie & Li, 2002; Martinez & Christian, 2009) may overlook the criminogenic influence of family conflict within this process. Family conflict may “push” individuals into substance use relapse and, therefore, serve as a negative turning point during reentry.

Our second major finding, however, adds considerable complexity as our results suggest that family support still “matters,” albeit in a very specific capacity. Findings from this study demonstrate that within-individual changes in family support condition the respective effects of (1) baseline levels of family conflict as well as (2) within-individual changes in family conflict. Towards the former, although higher levels of family conflict prior to release are associated with greater levels of polysubstance use, increases in family support during the reentry period can dampen the negative influence of baseline conflict. The latter finding suggests that although within-individual increases in family conflict post-release relate to increased polysubstance use, increases in family support during the same timeframe can also reduce this criminogenic influence. From a life-course perspective, these findings further underscore the need to view support and conflict as distinct—but intertwined—dimensions that carry separate baseline and change components. Accordingly, increases in support across time may serve as a turning point by decreasing the impact of family conflict on polysubstance use.

Our third major finding is that baseline levels of family support do not significantly relate to polysubstance use behaviors in any capacity. Results from models consistently demonstrate that baseline levels of family support are not independently or interdependently related to substance use. Although prior research has firmly cemented that family support matters (Bales & Mears, 2008; Breese et al., 2000; Comfort, 2008; Martinez & Christian, 2009; Shapiro & Schwartz, 2001; Visser & Travis, 2003; Western et al., 2015), our findings suggest it is *not baseline family support* that “matters” within this process. Instead, only the post-release, within-person measure of change in family support seems to carry a significant meaning for substance use. As it seems that only within-person changes in family support carry importance for behavior, these findings provide reason to question whether prior research has overlooked the concept that baseline levels of family support are distinct from within-person changes in support (and perhaps other constructs as well).

The non-significant interactions also have important implications. Findings show that baseline levels of family support did not condition the effect of within-person change in support on substance use. Likewise, baseline levels of family conflict did not condition the effect of within-person change in conflict on substance use post-release. Taken together, these findings suggest that the effects of within-person changes in a construct (support or conflict) on substance use are not predicated on baseline levels of the same construct (support or conflict). In short, we conclude that baseline levels of family support and conflict are conceptually and empirically distinct from within-person changes in support and conflict over time, respectively. In a related vein, baseline levels of family support and baseline

levels of conflict also are independent and unique constructs since they fail to interact in their effects on substance use. One potential explanation concerns the overwhelmingly positive expectation individuals tend to report in regards to release. For example, prior research has shown that individuals preparing for release are very optimistic about reintegration, and report that they expect reentry to be a relatively smooth and easy process (Visher & Courtney, 2007; see also La Vigne, Brooks, & Schollenberger, 2009). As a result of viewing release through “rose-colored glasses,” it could be that the effects of baseline measures of family support and conflict on substance use are reflected in this optimism and not grounded within the challenges associated with reentry.

This portrait of findings has important policy implications. As we discussed in the introduction, about 75% of all correctional agencies have programs in place to bolster family support and connectedness (National Institute of Justice, 2002). Our results suggest that maintaining high baseline levels of family support may not be an effective way to promote desistance from substance use. Moreover, because family conflict and support exist independently, we suggest that there may not be evidence to support the notion that increasing support decreases conflict. As a result, programs aimed at families may find it more fruitful to reduce pre-release levels of family conflict instead of increasing levels of pre-release family support. Instead, if attention is to be given to family support, our results suggest that the focus should be on increasing post-release—not pre-release—family support.

Despite the contributions of this project, there are important limitations to consider. First, although we concentrate on polysubstance use, there are a variety of alternative indicators of reentry success including criminal offending, employment, housing, and successful completion of parole. Future research should examine the effects of baseline between-person differences and within-person changes on other reentry outcomes. Second, our sample is comprised entirely of males, and there is ample evidence that the reentry process is very different for females (La Vigne, Brooks, & Shollenberger, 2009). Future research should explore how family support and family conflict relate to reentry outcomes for females. Third, we are unable to determine the source of family conflict. Although the reentry process is arduous and may itself be a source of conflict, it is likely that other important dynamics play a role in this process. Because family conflict appears to be a substantially criminogenic force driving relapse, future research should seek to uncover the specific factors which contribute to and cause family conflict during reentry.

Drawing from literature reviewed in the introductory sections of the study, research has demonstrated that families can provide both emotional and material support (see Mowen & Visher, 2016). Our measure of family support reflects emotional support and does not capture the broader scope of how families assist returning individuals. It is possible that material support provided by families may supersede the importance of family conflict. Likewise, it is possible that family support—as a multidimensional construct encompassing emotional and material mechanisms—may supersede the importance of family conflict. Future research should more closely examine the respective roles of emotional and material family support, family conflict, and substance use. Finally, it is important to note that we lack precision in what is meant by the term “family.” When answering these questions,

respondents could be thinking of spouses, children, parents, siblings, grandparents, aunts, uncles, or any combination thereof. As a result, it is difficult to provide specific policy implications as we are unable to determine what portion of the family each respondent is discussing.

There are other notable limitations as well. Although a number of prior projects have demonstrated that missing data does not significantly bias results in the SVORI data (e.g. Lattimore & Steffey, 2010), a relatively high attrition rate is nonetheless an important limitation to the current research. In addition to attrition, individuals within the SVORI sample may be qualitatively different than the broader incarcerated population, and, as a result, findings from this study may not be generalizable to other populations. Finally, our study is limited to a 15-month timeframe and, although the immediate time following release is often the most tumultuous, the reentry process may continue well past the final wave of data available.

Years of research demonstrate that families do play an important role for returning men and women in both tangible and intangible ways (e.g. Ekland-Olson et al., 1983; La Vigne, Brooks, & Shollenberger, 2009; Maruna, 2011; Martinez, 2006; Naser & La Vigne, 2006; Petersilia, 2003; Western et al., 2015). However, our findings demonstrate that the effect of family support may not be as straightforward as previously thought. Instead of having a direct relationship with substance use relapse, family support appears to reduce substance use primarily because it reduces the harmful effect of family conflict. Because family support and conflict occur at the same time (e.g. Grieb et al., 2014; Western et al., 2015), our findings suggest that families can incite a criminogenic influence through conflict in addition to contributing to desistance via support.

References

- Allison P (2015). Don't put lagged dependent variables in mixed models. Statistical Horizons. Retrieved from <http://statisticalhorizons.com/lagged-dependent-variables>
- Bahr S, Harris L, Fisher JK, & Armstrong AH (2010). Successful reentry: What differentiates successful and unsuccessful parolees? *Internal Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 54, 667–692.
- Bales WD, & Mears D (2008). Inmate social ties and transition to society: Does visitation reduce recidivism? *Crime and Delinquency*, 45, 287–321.
- Berg MT, & Huebner BM (2011). Reentry and the ties that bind: An examination of social ties, employment, and recidivism. *Justice Quarterly*, 28, 382–410.
- Binswanger IA, Nowels C, Corsi KF, Glanz J, Long J, Booth RE, & Steiner JF (2012). Return to drug use and overdose after release from prison: A qualitative study of risk and protective factors. *Addiction Science & Clinical Practice*, 7, 1–9.
- Brame R, & Paternoster R (2003). Missing data problems in criminological research: Two case studies. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 19, 55–78.
- Breese JR, Ra'el K, & Grant GK (2000). No place like home: A qualitative investigation of social support and its effects on recidivism. *Sociological Practice: A Journal of Clinical and Applied Research*, 2, 1–21.
- Brooks LE, Solomon AL, Kohl R, Osborne JWL, Reid J, McDonald SM, & Hoover HM (2008). *Reincarcerated: The experiences of men returning to Massachusetts prisons*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

- Bucklen KB, & Zajac G (2009). But some of them don't come back (to prison!): Resource deprivation and thinking errors as determinants of parole success and failure. *The Prison Journal*, 89, 239–264.
- Carson AE, & Anderson E (2016). Prisoners in 2015 (U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs NCJ 250229). Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/p15.pdf>
- Colvin M, Cullen FT, & Vander Ven T (2002). Coercion, social support, and crime: An emerging theoretical consensus. *Criminology*, 40, 19–42.
- Comfort M (2008). *Doing time together: Love and family in the shadow of the prison*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Cronbach LJ (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16, 297–334.
- Cullen FT (1994). Social support as an organizing concept for criminology: Presidential address to the academy of criminal justice sciences. *Justice Quarterly*, 11, 527–559.
- Doherty EE (2006). Self-control, social bonds, and desistance: A test of life-course interdependence. *Criminology*, 44, 807–833.
- Durose MR, Cooper AD, & Snyder HN (2015). Recidivism of prisoners released in 30 states in 2005: Patterns from 2005 to 2010 (Bureau of Justice Statistics report NCJ 24405). Retrieved from <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/press/rprts05p0510pr.cfm>
- Eklund-Olson S, Supancic M, Campbell J, & Lenihan KJ (1983). Postrelease depression and the importance of familial support. *Criminology*, 21, 253–275.
- Grieb SM, Crawford A, Fields J, Smith H, Harris R, & Matson P (2014). 'The stress will kill you': Prisoner reentry as experienced by family members and the urgent need for support services. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Under-served*, 25, 1183–1200.
- Hair JF, Black WC, Babin BJ, & Anderson RE (1995). *Multivariate data analysis* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Macmillian.
- Hirschi T (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hlavka HR, Wheelock D, & Jones RS (2015). Exoffender accounts of successful reentry from prison. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 54, 406–428.
- Karberg JC, & James DJ (2005). Bureau of justice statistics special report: Substance dependence, abuse, and treatment of jail inmates, 2002. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.
- Keene ON (1995). The log transformation is special. *Statistics in Medicine*, 14, 811–819. [PubMed: 7644861]
- Kenny DA, & McCoach DB (2003). Effect of the number of variables on measures of fit in structural equation modeling. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 10, 333–351.
- La Vigne NG, Brooks LE, & Schollenberger SL (2009). *Women on the outside: Understanding the experiences of female prisoners returning to Houston, TX*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Research Report.
- La Vigne NG, Shollenberger TL, & Debus SA (2009). *One year out: Tracking the experiences of male prisoners returning to Houston, TX*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Lattimore PK, & Steffey DM (2010). *The multi-site evaluation of SVORI: Methodology and analytic approach* (U.S. Department of Justice, Document 230424).
- Lattimore PK, & Visser CA (2009). *Multi-site evaluation of SVORI: Summary and synthesis*. Raleigh, NC: RTI International.
- Laub JH, & Sampson RJ (1993). Turning points in the life course: Why change matters to the study of crime. *Criminology*, 31, 301–325.
- Laub JH, & Sampson RJ (2003). *Shared beginnings: Divergent lives: Delinquent boys to age 70*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- MacCallum RC, Browne MW, & Sugawara HM (1996). Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological Methods*, 1, 130–149.
- Mackenzie DL, & Li SD (2002). The impact of formal and informal social controls on the criminal activities of probationers. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 39, 243–276.
- Mallik-Kane K, & Visser CA (2008). Health and prisoner reentry: How physical, mental and substance abuse conditions shape the process of reintegration. Urban Institute Retrieved from <http://www.urban.org/research/publication/health-and-prisoner-reentry>

- Martin SS, Butzin CA, Saum CA, & Inciardi JA (1999). Three-year outcomes of therapeutic community treatment for drug-involved offenders in Delaware: From prison to work release to aftercare. *The Prison Journal*, 79, 294–320.
- Martinez DJ (2006). Informal helping mechanisms. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 44, 23–37.
- Martinez DJ, & Christian J (2009). The familial relationships of former prisoners: Examining the link between residence and informal support mechanisms. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 38, 201–224.
- Maruna S (2011). Reentry as a rite of passage. *Punishment and Society*, 13, 3–28.
- Mowen TJ, & Visser CA (2015). Drug use and crime after incarceration: The role of family support and family conflict. *Justice Quarterly*, 32, 337–359.
- Mowen TJ, & Visser CA (2016). Changing the ties that bind: How incarceration impacts families. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 15, 503–528.
- Naser RL, & La Vigne NG (2006). Family support in the prisoner reentry process: Expectations and realities. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 43, 93–106.
- National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse. (2010). Behind bars II: Substance abuse and America's prison population. Retrieved from: <https://www.centeronaddiction.org/addiction-research/reports/behind-bars-ii-substance-abuse-and-america%E2%80%99s-prison-population>
- National Institute of Justice. (2002). Services for families of prison inmates. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections.
- National Institute of Justice. (2015). Evaluation of the serious and violent offender reentry initiative. Retrieved from: <http://www.nij.gov/topics/corrections/reentry/pages/evaluation-svori.aspx>
- Nelson M, Deess P, & Allen C (1999). First month out: Post-incarceration experiences in New York City. New York, NY: Vera Institute of Justice.
- Paccagnella O (2006). Centering or not centering in multilevel models? The role of the group mean and the assessment of group effects. *Evaluation Review*, 30, 66–85. [PubMed: 16394187]
- Pandina RJ, White HR, & Yorke J (1981). Estimation of substance use involvement: Theoretical considerations and empirical findings. *The International Journal of the Addictions*, 16, 1–24.
- Petersilia J (2003). When prisoners come home: Parole and prisoner reentry. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Prendergast ML (2009). Interventions to promote successful re-entry among drug-abusing parolees. *Addiction Science & Clinical Practice*, 5(1), 4–13. [PubMed: 19369913]
- Rumbaut RG (2005). Turning points in the transition to adulthood: Determinants of educational attainment, incarceration, and early childbearing among children of immigrants. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28, 1041–1086.
- Seiter RP, & Kadela KR (2003). Prisoner reentry: What works, what does not, and what is promising. *Crime & Delinquency*, 49, 360–388.
- Severson ME, Veeh C, Bruns K, & Lee J (2012). Who goes back to prison; who does not: A multiyear view of reentry program participants. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 51, 295–315.
- Shapiro C, & Schwartz M (2001). Coming home: Building on family connections. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 5, 52–61.
- Stansfield R, Mowen TJ, O'Connor T, & Boman JH IV (2017). The role of religious support in reentry: Evidence from the SVORI data. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 54, 1–35.
- Sullivan E, Mino M, & Nelson K (2002). Families as a resource in recovery from drug abuse: An evaluation of La Bodega de la Familia. New York, NY: Vera Institute of Justice.
- Travis J (2005). But they all come back: Facing the challenges of prisoner reentry. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.
- Travis J, & Redburn S (2014). The growth of incarceration in the United States: Exploring causes and consequences. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Turney K, & Wildeman C (2013). Redefining relationships: Explaining the countervailing consequences of paternal incarceration for parenting. *American Sociological Review*, 78, 949–979.
- Uggen C (2000). Work as a turning point in the life course of criminals: A duration model of age, employment, and recidivism. *American Sociological Review*, 65, 529–546.

- Visher CA (2007). Returning home: Emerging findings and policy lessons about prisoner reentry. *Federal Sentencing Report*, 20, 93–102.
- Visher CA, & Courtney SME (2007). *One year out: Experiences of prisoners returning to Cleveland*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Visher CA, & Travis J (2003). Transitions from prison to community: Understanding individual pathways. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29, 89–113.
- Visher CA, Knight CR, Chalfin A, & Roman JK (2009). The impact of marital and relationship status on social outcomes for returning prisoners. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Wallace D, Fahmy C, Cotton L, Jimmons C, McKay R, Stoffer S, & Syed S (2016). Examining the role of familial support during prison and after release on post-incarceration mental health. *International Journal of Offender Therapy & Comparative Criminology*, 60, 3–20. [PubMed: 25156422]
- Walters GD (2015). Recidivism and the “worst of both worlds” hypothesis: Do substance misuse and crime interact or accumulate? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 42, 435–451.
- Western B, Braga AA, Davis J, & Sirois C (2015). Stress and hardship after prison. *American Journal of Sociology*, 120, 1512–1547.
- Williams R, Allison P, & Moral-Benito E (2015). Linear dynamic panel-data estimation using maximum likelihood and structural equation modeling. Retrieved from <https://www3.nd.edu/~rwilliam/dynamic/SJPaper.pdf>
- Yahner J, & Visher CA (2008). *Illinois prisoners’ reentry success three years after release*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Figure 1.

Plot of effects of within-individual family support on family conflict from Table 3.

Table 1

SVORI sample descriptives ($n = 962$)

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Range	Std. Dev. within	Std. Dev. between	Time variant/invariant
Dependent variable						
Polysubstance Use	.669	.607	0–2.336	.486	.375	Variant
Independent variables						
Family support _{Between}	10.139	1.694	3–12	–	–	Invariant
Family support _{Within}	10.097	1.662	3–12	1.445	.991	Variant
Family conflict _{Between}	6.937	1.786	3–12	–	–	Invariant
Family conflict _{Within}	6.277	1.915	3–12	1.661	1.039	Variant
Family structure controls						
Married (<i>contrast group</i>)	.108	.310	0, 1	.145	.275	Variant
Divorced (<i>married contrast</i>)	.164	.371	0, 1	.138	.348	Variant
Single (<i>married contrast</i>)	.727	.445	0, 1	.137	.425	Variant
Family incarceration	.747	.435	0, 1	–	–	Invariant
Family substance use	.754	.430	0, 1	–	–	Invariant
Children	.705	.614	0–2.398	–	–	Invariant
Demographic controls						
Age	29.479	7.292	18–69	–	–	Invariant
White (<i>contrast group</i>)	.345	.475	0, 1	–	–	Invariant
Black (<i>white contrast</i>)	.531	.499	0, 1	–	–	Invariant
Other (<i>white contrast</i>)	.124	.329	0, 1	–	–	Invariant
Other controls						
Lagged polysubstance use	1.263	.559	0–2.336	–	–	Invariant
Employment	.663	.473	0, 1	.291	.390	Variant
Violent offense (<i>other contrast</i>)	.168	.374	0, 1	–	–	Invariant
Drug offense (<i>other contrast</i>)	.210	.407	0, 1	–	–	Invariant
Property offense (<i>other contrast</i>)	.114	.318	0, 1	–	–	Invariant
Other offense (<i>contrast group</i>)	.508	.481	0, 1	–	–	Invariant
Length of incarceration	6.479	.887	3.806–9.158			Invariant
Prior arrests	2.298	.840	.639–5.707	–	–	Invariant
Substance abuse treatment	.463	.499	0, 1	–	–	Invariant
SVORI participant	.539	.498	0, 1	–	–	Invariant

Notes. SVORI = Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative. Std. Dev. = Standard Deviation.

Table 2Cross-lagged dynamic panel models assessing polysubstance use post-release ($n = 962$)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Coef.	S.E.	Coef.	S.E.	Coef.	S.E.
Independent variables						
Family support _{Between}	-.016	.007 [*]	—	—	-.007	.007
Family support _{Within}	-.012	.010	—	—	-.001	.010
Family conflict _{Between}	—	—	.019	.007 ^{**}	.017	.007 [*]
Family conflict _{Within}	—	—	.038	.009 ^{***}	.037	.009 ^{***}
Family structure controls						
Divorced	.040	.097	.098	.096	.086	.097
Single	.049	.115	.082	.114	.063	.114
Family incarceration	.015	.044	-.005	.043	-.002	.043
Family substance use	-.046	.045	-.038	.043	-.040	.043
Children	-.026	.030	-.005	.043	-.023	.029
Demographic controls						
Age	-.005	.002 [*]	-.005	.002 [*]	-.006	.002 [*]
Black	-.106	.032 ^{***}	-.099	.032 ^{**}	-.095	.032 ^{**}
Other	-.056	.038	-.055	.037	-.052	.037
Other controls						
Lagged polysubstance use	.008	.024	.006	.023	.005	.023
Employment	-.084	.030 ^{**}	-.076	.030 [*]	-.073	.030 [*]
Violent offense	.039	.031	.032	.030	.033	.030
Drug offense	.053	.030	.048	.029	.051	.029
Property offense	.088	.035 [*]	.072	.034 [*]	.075	.035 [*]
Length of incarceration	-.024	.013	-.015	.013	-.016	.013
Prior arrests	.124	.014 ^{***}	.107	.014 ^{***}	.107	.014 ^{***}
Substance abuse treatment	.021	.023	.021	.022	.022	.022
SVORI participant	-.040	.022	-.033	.022	-.033	.022
Fit indices						
χ^2 (Model vs. Saturated)	69.159 [*]		60.588 [*]		67.574 [*]	
RMSEA/CFI	.021/.970		.020/.980		.021/.979	

*
 $p < .05$;**
 $p < .01$;***
 $p < .001$.

Table 3

Cross-lagged dynamic panel models assessing family support and conflict interactions on polysubstance use ($n = 962$)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
	Coef.	S.E.	Coef.	S.E.	Coef.	S.E.	Coef.	S.E.	Coef.	S.E.	Coef.	S.E.
Independent variables												
Family support _{Between}	-.004	.008	-.007	.007	-.009	.008	-.005	.008	-.006	.007	-.006	.007
Family support _{Within}	.002	.010	.000	.010	-.001	.010	-.002	.010	.001	.010	-.002	.010
Family conflict _{Between}	.018	.007*	.017	.007*	.017	.007*	.018	.007*	.019	.007*	.017	.007*
Family conflict _{Within}	.038	.009***	.038	.010***	.036	.009***	.037	.009***	.037	.009***	.036	.009***
Interactions												
Sup-Between $\times$ Sup- _{within}	.009	.006	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Con-Between $\times$ Con- _{within}	-	-	-.001	.005	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sup-Between $\times$ Con- _{Between}	-	-	-	-	.004	.004	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sup-Between $\times$ Con- _{within}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.008	.005	-	-	-	-
Sup- _{within} $\times$ Con- _{Between}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.011	.005*	-	-
Sup- _{within} $\times$ Con- _{within}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.008	.003*
Family structure controls												
Divorced	.081	.096	.087	.097	.086	.097	.093	.096	.092	.096	.087	.096
Single	.047	.114	.056	.114	.052	.115	.069	.113	.061	.111	.058	.114
Family incarceration	-.031	.044	-.003	.043	-.001	.043	-.008	.043	.002	.043	-.001	.043
Family substance use	-.009	.044	-.040	.043	-.043	.043	-.032	.043	-.040	.043	-.040	.043
Children	-.027	.029	-.025	.029	-.026	.029	-.021	.029	-.025	.028	-.023	.029
Demographic controls												
Age	-.005	.002*	-.006	.002*	-.006	.002*	-.005	.002*	-.005	.002*	-.005	.002*
Black	-.092	.032**	-.094	.032**	-.094	.032**	-.093	.032**	-.097	.032**	-.093	.032**
Other	-.049	.037	-.050	.037	-.054	.037	-.051	.037	-.048	.037	-.048	.037
Other controls												
Lagged polysubstance use	-.067	.030*	-.072	.030*	-.071	.030*	-.074	.030*	-.071	.030*	-.075	.030*
Employment	.005	.023	.004	.023	.005	.023	.006	.024	.002	.023	.004	.023
Violent offense	.033	.030	.032	.030	.032	.030	.032	.030	.033	.030	.031	.030

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
	Coef.	S.E.	Coef.	S.E.	Coef.	S.E.	Coef.	S.E.	Coef.	S.E.	Coef.	S.E.
Drug offense	.052	.029	.051	.029	.051	.029	.050	.029	.052	.029	.050	.029
Property offense	.072	.034 [*]	.075	.035 [*]	.075	.035 [*]	.072	.034 [*]	.069	.035 [*]	.071	.035 [*]
Length of incarceration	-.017	.013	-.016	.013	-.015	.013	-.017	.013	-.018	.013	-.017	.013
Prior arrests	.107	.014 ^{***}	.107	.015 ^{***}	.108	.014 ^{***}	.105	.014 ^{***}	.103	.015 ^{***}	.105	.014 ^{***}
Substance abuse treatment	.025	.022	.023	.022	.021	.022	.025	.022	.022	.022	.021	.022
SVORI participant	-.037	.022	-.033	.022	-.033	.022	-.035	.021	-.035	.021	-.032	.021
Fit indices												
χ^2 (Model vs. Saturated)	70.718 [*]		70.779 [*]		72.044 [*]		69.547 [*]		68.727 [*]		67.502 [*]	
RMSEA/CFI	.022/.976		.022/.976		.023/.974		.021/.977		.021/.979		.020/.980	

* p .05;

** p .01;

*** p .001.