The Experiences of Women Reintegrating After Prison: An Explorative Qualitative Study on Women Released from Prisons and Jails in Canada

By

Shoshannah Lewis

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Program in Sociology

in conformity with the requirements for the

Degree of Master of Arts.

Queen's University

Kingston, Ontario, Canada

Abstract

Women are among the fastest growing prison populations in Canada, often with adverse backgrounds, complex life circumstances, and unique criminogenic needs. However, limited criminological and sociological inquiry focusses on the experiences of criminalized and formerly incarcerated women in Canada. Given associations between criminogenic needs and reintegration outcomes upon community re-entry, this study explores the experiences of formerly incarcerated women and staff involved in a novel reintegration program (Women Reintegrating After Prison: WRAP) designed specifically for criminalized women in Canadian settings. More specifically, this project considers two research questions: (1) what are the experiences of formerly incarcerated women reintegrating from prison or jail; and (2) does reintegrative programming and/or interventions designed for formerly incarcerated women impact experiences of re-entry? Through 12 qualitative interviews with staff and participants of the WRAP program, this work explores the experiences of incarceration for women, community release/reintegration, and the impacts of reintegrative programming. Findings suggest that rehabilitative needs are often unmet in Canadian federal and provincial custody, with system-related, economic and social needs for reintegration enduring following community re-entry. Insights from this project support the development of targeted programming to address gender-specific needs, such as individualized and holistic service, trauma-informed approaches, empowering choice, and criminogenic barrier alleviation for clients, while also revealing gaps in existing custodial practices, reintegrative supports, and social advocacy.

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I express the utmost gratitude and appreciation to my academic supervisor, Dr. Nicole Myers, for the steadfast and continuous support throughout the entirety of my graduate studies. This project would not have been possible without her expertise, dedication and valuable knowledge within the field of Sociology and Criminology. Dr. Myers, I am so thankful for your feedback, proficiency, and supervision throughout this project. Beyond academic guidance, Dr. Myers has been a source of inspiration and mentorship, teaching critical thinking and research skills while encouraging personal and professional growth. Her patience, enthusiasm, and commitment to my academic progress has made this journey intellectually challenging and personally fulfilling.

I would also like to acknowledge the Elizabeth Fry Society for their invaluable support and commitment to serving criminalized, marginalized and vulnerable women in Canada. The agency's dedication to social justice, advocacy, and community reintegration has profoundly impacted women and families, promoting resilience and positive change. I extend my sincere appreciation to the staff and leadership team for sharing their knowledge, expertise, and experiences, which have greatly enriched my research. The provision of service by all Elizabeth Fry Societies across Canada is both inspiring and essential to creating more just and compassionate communities.

A special thank you to all interview participants for their time, interest and willingness to facilitate scholarship through lived experiences and insights. I owe the completion of this project to their participation, and I am appreciative of the opportunity to have learned from their stories.

To my family (Mom, Dad, Nonny, and Lyz), thank you for your constant encouragement, motivation and support throughout my academic studies. Your love and belief in my abilities has

instilled values of determination and resilience for overcoming challenges and adversity. Your sacrifices have made this achievement possible, and I am grateful for your ongoing faith in my abilities.

This project is dedicated in memory of my Poppa, Dr. Trevor Lewis, whose guidance, morale, unconditional love, and unwavering support molded the woman I am today. I am forever indebted to the knowledge, wisdom and beliefs he shared, the bravery he showed, and the immense influence he will always have on our family. Poppa, God bless and thank you for everything.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations

CSC	Correctional Service of Canada
WRAP	Women Reintegrating After Prison

Chapter One: Introduction

Social science and criminological research have explored the impacts of crime, punishment, and incarceration since the establishment of criminology as a field of study. However, less is known about the experiences of criminalized women in comparison to men, especially in Canada. The increasing number of incarcerated women in Canada is an institutional, systemic, and structural social justice problem with unique challenges. The Office of the Correctional Investigator of Canada has asserted that women are the fastest growing prison demographic, and they have unique criminogenic needs and life circumstances (Zinger, 2017). The Department of Justice (2021), Canadian Senators (Pate, 2018), and non-governmental organizations (John Howard Society of Ontario, 2022) are also becoming aware of the consequences of this trend for women in conflict with the law; however, limited academic inquiry has explored the increasing rate of incarceration for women and the experiences of incarcerated women in Canada.

Considering that almost all incarcerated women will eventually be released from imprisonment, the experiences of community re-entry are critical periods for stability, safety, rehabilitation, and recidivism (O'Grady & Lafleur, 2016). Indeed, community reintegration is a vital component for recovery, and transitioning back into society from incarceration is often associated with anxieties, fears, and challenges (Youssef, 2023). Existing scholarship shows that community reintegration is a complex and important process for addressing criminogenic risks and needs associated with preventing recidivism (Gideon & Sung, 2011; Ricciardelli & Peters, 2017). Scholars underscore that effective community reintegration involves a myriad of interventions, services, and supports for navigating life in the community and for continued

rehabilitation after release from prison (Lutze et al., 2014; Youssef, 2023). However, there are evident gaps in literature on community reintegration for formerly incarcerated women, gender-specific reintegrative programming, and the unique needs associated with successful re-entry for women in Canada.

Most formerly incarcerated women have complicated life circumstances including histories of complex trauma, mental health, poverty, substance use, victimization, and dysfunctional family conditions—often preceding and associated with criminogenic behaviours (Green et al., 2016; Tripodi & Pettus-Davis, 2013). Thus, women typically require unique, gender-specific, and holistic approaches to community reintegration support to adequately address needs for re-entry and risks for reincarceration (King, 2015). A task force in 1990 led to the development of *Creating Choices*, a framework addressing the challenges and harms commonly experienced by incarcerated women. Advocates stressed the need for community-focussed and gender-responsive approaches to both incarceration and community reintegration for formerly incarcerated women (ibid). However, institutional and environmental scans of community reintegration programming demonstrate that limited reintegration programming responding exclusively to women and women-identifying demographics is available in Canada. Nevertheless, some initiatives have been put forward to address this evident gap in service and programming provision.

The Canadian Association of the Elizabeth Fry Societies implemented the Women Reintegrating After Prison (WRAP) program at an Elizabeth Fry Society in Ontario. This intervention addresses the gender-specific, complex, and unique needs of community reintegration for formerly incarcerated women through women-centered programming. The present study qualitatively explores the following two questions: (1) what are the experiences of

formerly incarcerated women reintegrating from prison or jail; and (2) does reintegrative programming and/or interventions designed for formerly incarcerated women impact experiences of re-entry? . By examining the experiences of formerly incarcerated women involved in the release support program and service providers working closely with women transitioning from custody, this project furthers our understanding of the re-entry experiences of women.

Chapter Two: Background & Context

Incarceration of Women in Canada

The increasing number of incarcerated women across Canada is a criminal and social justice concern with distinct challenges. Canadian Senator, Kim Pate (2018), claims that in every province and territory, women in poverty "end up criminalized for doing what they must to support themselves and their children" (1). According to the Correctional Investigator's Report (2015), women are the fastest growing prison population in Canada and have unique criminogenic needs, including substantial histories of poverty, mental health concerns, substance use disorders, and victimization (Dowling & Fulton, 2017; Tripodi & Davis, 2013). Hayes (2015) asserts that the experiences of convicted women often involve an "interwoven life filled with childhood trauma, mental illness, substance abuse, unhealthy relationships, and disorganized family situations", leading to criminalized behaviours (214). Indeed, Senator Kim Pate (2018) notes, "82% of women in prison are jailed as a result of behaviour related to attempts to cope with poverty, histories of abuse and trauma, addiction and mental health issues that commonly arise from these experiences" (1).

The majority of incarcerated women self-report extensive histories of trauma in addition to mental health disorders and substance abuse (King, 2015; Lynch et al., 2017). According to

Correctional Services Canada's (CSC) 2017 report, almost 80% of women in custody meet diagnostic criteria for current mental disorder with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) amongst the highest prevalence rates and comorbid diagnoses are common. CSC recognizes that there is a relationship between gender-specific criminality and substance related behaviours, with 86% of incarcerated women reporting substance abuse (2023). Understanding substance use is critical to understanding women's criminogenic risk (MacDonald et al., 2015).

In 2022/2023, the average count of adults in correctional custody was 34,985 on any given day (Statistics Canada, 2024a; Statistics Canada, 2024b). Of the total number of adults in custody, 12,667 were in sentenced to federal prisons, 22,318 were in provincial/territorial jails—the vast majority (73%) of those in jails were remanded to pre-trial detention (ibid). Incarcerated women are a "small and unique" population within Canadian corrections (Correctional Services Canada, 2024). Indeed, the last available average monthly count of adults in federal and provincial custody included 2,730 women, representing 7.4% of the adult prison and jail population (Statistics Canada, 2024c). According to the Correctional Investigator's 2017 report, admissions for women increased by 7% between the years of 2007-2017 in Canadian federal custody (Burke, 2017). Furthermore, although Indigenous women account for roughly 4% of the general female population, Indigenous women represent 40% of incarcerated women in Canadian federal custody (Department of Justice, 2023). The prison population of women is growing; however, the overall rate of incarceration of men and women has only risen slightly (Statistics Canada, 2024e). These statistics suggest that there is a disproportionate increase of women in custody in Canada.

Women often experience contact with the criminal justice system through various trajectories "that are more likely to be experienced by women (e.g., sexual victimization,

domestic violence, and taking care of children)" (Shechory, 2011, 400). In *Inglis v. British Columbia*, the Supreme Court of British Columbia noted roughly 71% of women in provincial custody are convicted of non-violent offences and only 1% are charged with major violent offences such as homicide and attempted murder (Dowling & Fulton, 2017). Non-violent crimes include transgressions such as theft, administration of justice offences, narcotics possession, and sex trade involvement. This is significant, considering that correctional institutions are largely structured for managing risks associated with violence and physical aggression, which is more common among male custodial populations (Sorensen & Cunningham, 2010).

Canadian Federal Prisons & Provincial Jails

In Canada, there are two levels of custodial institutions – federal prisons/penitentiaries and provincial jails. Federal penitentiaries are operated by CSC, housing individuals sentenced to imprisonment for two years or more (Public Safety Canada, 2021). According to CSC, individuals sentenced to penitentiaries should have access to a variety of rehabilitative programs services throughout their sentence (Correctional Services Canada, 2021). The federal government claims that various programs are offered in prisons including educational programs, substance abuse treatment, health care, employment and job skills training, mental health services, cultural programs, reintegration services, and family support services (ibid). However, research on the experiences of federally sentenced people suggests that program accessibility is often hindered due to security management, issues with staffing, institutional cultures, and discontinuities of care (Office of the Auditor General, 2022; Office of the Correctional Investigator, 2014).

Canadian provincial/territorial jails are operated by the provinces/territories and hold individuals serving a sentence of two years, less a day and those in pre-trial detention, who have been remanded awaiting trial or sentencing (Public Safety Canada, 2021). Most of the Canadian prison population is housed in provincial/territorial jails and, more specifically, those on remand. Indeed, 73% of the incarcerated population are on remand and legally innocent while awaiting trial in the custody of provincial jails (Statistics Canada, 2024d).

The federal government provides various programs including educational programs, substance abuse treatment, health care, employment and job skills training, mental health services, cultural programs, reintegration services, and family support services (Correctional Services Canada, 2023). However, research on the experiences of federally sentenced people have suggested that programming opportunities are limited due to security management, issues with staffing, institutional cultures, and discontinuities of care after admission (Office of the Auditor General, 2022; Office of the Correctional Investigator, 2014).

In contrast to federal penitentiaries, provincial/territorial jails offer fewer resources, inconsistent availability, and limited options for programming—varying across provincial ministries and institutions (Ministry of the Solicitor General, 2017). Provincial/territorial jails are not mandated and regulated by the same scrutiny as federal prisons; thus, there is less oversight for conditions and standards of institutional management (Parkes et al., 2008). Accessible data on jail demographics, operations, and environments is limited in Canada; however, research suggests that overcrowding, scant resources, security concerns, inadequate health care, and poor living conditions are common amidst increases in the provincial/territorial jail population (Hu et al., 2020; Office of the Ombudsman, 2020; Office of the Obumdsman, 2019; Office of the Auditor General, 2019; Kouyoumdijian, 2016; Parkes et al., 2008). The disproportionate

population of adults on remand in provincial jails creates challenges for providing services, including housing supports and rehabilitation due to the uncertainty around when they will be released (Statistics Canada, 2020, 4).

Parole

Parole boards are administrative tribunals within the Canadian criminal justice system that make decisions for record suspensions, evaluations for conditional release, and recommendations for clemency (Parole Board of Canada, 2023). Established in 1959, the National Parole Board emerged as an initiative for prison population management and transitional discharge from federal custody to "promote fair and equitable treatment of offenders" (National Parole Board, 2020). Gradual and controlled release from custody facilitates effective reintegration and reduces recidivism (Karimi-Haghighi et al., 2023; ibid).

Parole from provincial jail or federal prison may be granted if an incarcerated person agrees to abide by various conditions, considered in the interest of public safety. The Corrections and Conditional Release Act (CCRA) for the federally sentenced, affirms that an individual is eligible for parole after completing 1/3 of their sentence or after serving 7 years in prison, whichever is less (Public Safety, 2024). Provincial Parole Boards are responsible for making conditional release decisions for the provincially sentenced population. In Ontario, individuals serving 6-months or more are eligible for parole after 1/3 of their sentence. There are various types of parole in Canada, including day parole, full parole, and statutory release. Day parole typically involves the approval of participation in community activities during the day (employment, education, treatment, etc.) before returning to a designated facility or residence, such as a halfway or transitional house, at evening curfew (National Parole Board, 2020). Full

parole permits the early release of prisoners under community supervision and conditions of release (ibid). Conversely, statutory release is mandated by law and permits the release of prisoners after serving two-thirds of their sentence under conditions of release and mandated reporting to parole officers (ibid)

The use of parole is withering, despite evidence demonstrating the effectiveness of smooth and gradual transitions into communities (Parole Board of Canada, 2023). For example, approximately 97% of parolees completed their parole successfully; however, most individuals released after their full parole eligibility date present greater risks for reoffending (Parole Board of Canada, 2023). A study conducted by the Office of the Auditor General in Canada (2017) demonstrated that three quarters of incarcerated women were held past their first parole eligibility date and the majority remained in custody for at least an additional four months. This is concerning, considering that another Canadian audit shows that those granted day parole following their first eligibility date are less likely to commit an offence than those abruptly released on their mandated statutory release date (Office of the Auditor General, 2015). Indeed, "the time spent in custody past the first parole eligibility date reduces an offender's time to benefit from a structured and gradual release into the community" (Office of the Auditor General, 2017).

Creating Choices & Community Reintegration

In 1990, the Canadian government put forward an influential document for the incarceration of women, titled "*Creating Choices: The Report of the Task Force on Federally Sentenced Women*". Through this report, substantial issues faced by incarcerated women were identified and recommendations were made, suggesting a community-centred, non-punitive, and

responsive approach to serving criminalized women (Correctional Services Canada & Canadian Association of the Elizabeth Fry Societies, 1990). Indeed, the report recognized that imprisoned women in Canada experienced excessive uses of force, violence, harms, neglect, and unlawful treatment which impacted capacities for successful community reintegration and reducing recidivism (ibid). Empowerment, autonomy, meaningful and responsible choice, respect and dignity, shared responsibility, and supportive environments were blueprinted as penal philosophies for incarcerated women (ibid).

Of particular concern were inadequacies for community release processes including minimal opportunities and accessibilities for parole, negligible support from correctional staff for release planning, scant reintegrative programming options in custody, substantial loss following release, and minimal resources or abilities for reintegrating in communities (Correctional Services Canada & Canadian Association of the Elizabeth Fry Societies, 1990). Thus, major recommendations focussed on community reintegration:

> The experiences of the woman during the incarceration phase of her sentence should do as much as possible to prepare her for release and for the outside world which awaits her. […] The community portion of her sentence needs to be managed in a way that ensures all the elements necessary to successful (re)integration (ibid, 73).

In 2022, the Office of the Correctional Investigator reassessed the tenants of Creating Choices in a report on prison inspection. The report suggests that prisons for women are overly secure, programs are poor, women are unduly separated from communities, rehabilitation is not promoted during incarceration, and community reintegration needs improvement (Office of the Correctional Investigator, 2022; Canadian Association of the Elizabeth Fry Societies, 2022). Thus, it appears that *Creating Choices* was never fully implemented and incarcerated women continue to experience harm, structural oppression, and minimal opportunities for rehabilitation

(Office of the Correctional Investigator, 2022; 2021; Canadian Association of the Elizabeth Fry Societies, 2022).

The Canadian Department of Justice (2024) asserts that, without addressing community reintegration, the release of incarcerated women can result in unsafe living situations and greater chances for victimization and re-offending. Indeed, Canadian governments and non-governmental organizations have asserted that effective reintegration is a primary factor for rehabilitating formerly incarcerated people, recidivism reduction, and improving public safety (O'Grady & Lafleur, 2016; Public Safety, 2022). However, oversights of correctional services consistently demonstrate that efforts are falling short for women's community reintegration; ultimately, increasing likelihoods for recidivism and potentially impacting public safety (Canadian Association of the Elizabeth Fry Societies, 2022; Giffiths et al., 2007; Office of the Auditor General, 2017; Office of the Correctional Investigator, 2014).

The Elizabeth Fry Society

The Elizabeth Fry Societies is a Canadian association with the mission of empowering and creating choices for women through the provision of community outreach, social justice, advocacy, and affordable housing. The Canadian Association of the Elizabeth Fry Societies (CAEFS) (2021) "envisions a world without prisons with strong and well-resourced communities for everyone" by working "to address the persistent ways in which women and gender-diverse people impacted by criminalization have been denied humanity and excluded from community". The association was established in 1949, by a group of eight women visiting incarcerated women in Canada's historic Prison for Women located in Kingston, Ontario (ibid). Since its

establishment, the association has grown into multi-organizational platforms, with agencies servicing regions across the nation.

The Elizabeth Fry Societies work with women to promote meaningful support and change, with the goal of avoiding conflict with the law and recidivism (Elizabeth Fry Toronto). Elizabeth Fry Societies are non-profit organizations, offering social services for criminalized women such as housing and homelessness, employment and educational, intervention and integration programs, crime prevention, community services, mental health and outreach, legal advocacy, community advocacy, reproductive justice activism, and community reintegration coordination (CAEFS, 2021; The Elizabeth Fry Society of Kingston; Elizabeth Fry Toronto).

The WRAP Program

The Women Reintegrating After Prison (WRAP) Program was created by the Elizabeth Fry Society to assist women released from custody (The Elizabeth Fry Society of Kingston). The program assists women with navigating the complexities of community reintegration, by alleviating barriers for accessing essential immediate and social needs in the community. The program's mission statement is "to provide care and connection to all women in our community through advocacy, client-led services, trauma-informed case management, and community building" (The Elizabeth Fry Society of Kingston). WRAP services include assistance obtaining government identification and documents, connecting to community resources, provision of basic needs (food, clothing, etc.), and with securing housing (ibid). Services offered through the WRAP program are individualized, based on the needs and risks of each client. During the implementation of this project, the WRAP program evolved to serve both women released from custody and community women at risk of criminalization, renaming the program to WRAP+.

Chapter Three: Literature Review

This literature review explores existing scholarly, governmental, and organizational literature and/or reports related to this project's two central research questions: (1) what are the experiences of formerly incarcerated women reintegrating from prison or jail; and (2) does reintegrative programming and/or interventions designed specifically for formerly incarcerated women impact experiences of re-entry? To address the first question, this review examines literature highlighting pre-carceral, carceral, and post-carceral realities of formerly incarcerated women. In doing so, this review assesses how criminogenic backgrounds, conditions of confinement, and reintegration complexities intertwine to shape holistic experiences. To address the second question, literature on universal and gender-specific reintegration programming purposes, practices, needs and strategies is explored to better understand this largely underexplored inquiry for women released from custody.

Trauma, Mental Health, & Substance Use

To understand the experiences of formerly incarcerated women reintegrating from custody, criminogenic backgrounds and typical life circumstances must be considered. Senator Pate notes that over 80% of women in Canadian custody have extensive experiences with trauma, abusive histories and marginalized backgrounds, and become incarcerated from unlawful coping mechanisms (2018). Indeed, the lived experiences of most incarcerated women present risk factors for subsequent offending. More particularly, incarcerated women report "elevated rates of interpersonal victimization such as physical, emotional, and sexual abuse, as well as family and community violence" (Green et al., 2016, 455). Furthermore, a research report comparing the prevalence of sexual abuse in Canadian prisons showed that 50.4% of female

prisoners disclose sexual abuse compared to 21.9% of males (Bodkin et al., 2019). Histories of childhood trauma and physical or sexual victimization are often associated with mental health issues and struggles with substance use (Tripodi & Pettus-Davis, 2013). Further, incarcerated women experience higher rates of violent victimization such as intimate partner violence, physical abuse and sexual assault (Department of Justice, 2024). Women who disclose mental illness and/or traumatic histories upon intake into custody often consider incarceration as an opportunity for psychological recovery; however, access to mental health treatment and rehabilitation is often limited inside correctional facilities (Fellus, 2018).

Research has consistently shown a high prevalence of mental health issues and mental illness often associated with past trauma amongst women who are in conflict with the law (Green et al., 2016; Karlsson et al., 2015; Salisbury & Van Voorhis, 2009; Sanchez et al., 2023; Tripodi & Pettus-Davis, 2013). According to CSC "women are more likely to have a diagnosis of a major psychiatric disorder" and are roughly twice as likely to struggle with depression than men (2024). A report conducted with CSC found that 80% of women sentenced to federal custody met diagnostic criteria for a current mental disorder (Derkzen et al., 2017). A Canadian study of federally sentenced women demonstrates that women are more than twice as likely to have been diagnosed with psychosis, major depression, bipolar disorder, anxiety disorder, borderline personality disorder, and trauma related disorders with more severe trauma related symptoms than men (Brown et al., 2018). Incarcerated men show greater prevalence for antisocial personality disorders, impulse control disorders, and alcohol abuse (ibid).

Criminologists note that there is a relationship between criminogenic behaviours and substance use, with criminalized women having a high prevalence of substance abuse (Smith, 2017). In Canada, roughly four-in-five criminalized women have substance use issues, "and

recent evidence suggests that substance use is more important in understanding women's offending than it is in men's" (MacDonald et al., 2015, 7). Furthermore, incarcerated women's problems with substance use tend to be more complex and chronic compared to incarcerated men (Binswanger et al., 2010; Langan & Pellisier, 2001). Indeed, more than half (55%) of federally sentenced women were diagnosed with a moderate to severe substance use problem, compared to 37% of federally sentenced men meeting this criteria (Kelly & MacDonald, 2015). The same study showed that women report substantially higher rates of opioids and intravenous drug use, and are more than twice as likely to report concurrent problems with both drugs and alcohol (ibid). Given the substantial history of trauma and psychological disorders commonly experienced by incarcerated women, substance use is often a method of coping and self-medicating untreated mental health issues (Asberg & Renk, 2012; Johnson & Lynch, 2013).

Correctional Management

Given that incarcerated women typically enter custody with complex backgrounds and specific needs for rehabilitation, correctional management is crucial to constructing the carceral experience. Despite the unique profiles and backgrounds of women in custody, correctional institutions tend to manage institutions for women according to male-based prison models. Prison systems were built and structured for male bodies, with little acknowledgement towards the gender specific needs of incarcerated females (Anderson et al., 2020; King, 2020). For example, the majority of correctional officers are men, and institutional policies are designed "to control male structures and male violence" (Blakinger, 2019). These standardized prison models tend to prioritize security and punitiveness over individual criminogenic needs (Wright et al., 2012; Rymhs, 2012). Consequently, prior trauma is often trivialized, support programs are

restrictive, and facility practices are generalized towards assessing risks for security and violence among men. In Canada, research consistently shows that incarcerated women are less violent than men and most women are convicted of non-violent crimes (Dowling & Fulton, 2017). Despite less risk of violence, imprisoned women are "subject to the same classification as men", often given the same treatment and ranked at a higher security level than necessary (Blakinger, 2019).

In contemporary prisons for women, the notion of responsibilizing women is integral to neoliberal prison management (Hannah-Moffat, 2000). Neoliberal penal philosophy shapes carceral policy, structure, and interactions. "Individual responsibility" underpins neoliberal ideology, emphasizing that individuals, particularly those from marginalized backgrounds, are personally responsible for their circumstances and behaviours (Curtis, 2019; Wacquant, 2009). Indeed, neoliberal ideologies see crime and imprisonment as personal inadequacies of morality and life choices, without taking the contributing structural factors associated with criminogenic behaviours into consideration (Wacquant, 2010; Wacquant, 2009; Povey, 2017). Responsibilization in prison involves the individual's capacity for transformation into "responsible, law-abiding citizens" through an emphasis on personal accountability (Ellis, 2021, 1648). The ideal of 'shared responsibility', where women are expected to take collective accountability for their previous wrongdoings and future potential, is a guiding principle for empowering women in custody (Hannah-Moffat, 2000; King, 2015).

In Canada, female prisoners and community services are made responsible for meeting the individual and collective needs of criminalized women (Wright et al., 2012). Governments at all levels and community members "must take responsibility as inter-related parts of society" to "foster the independence and self-reliance among criminally sentenced women to take

responsibility for their past, present, and future actions" (Hannah-Moffat, 2000, 515). To achieve empowerment, women are expected to take control of their lives while in prison, including engaging their own rehabilitation and treatment. However, defining empowerment for incarcerated women to the same extent as 'free women' in the general population is a counterintuitive approach to penal practice and understanding (Hannah-Moffat, 2000, 519). Indeed, imprisonment is a deeply disempowering experience, characterized by restrictions, punishment and deprivations of liberty. Disempowerment is exacerbated when correctional practices are unresponsive to gendered trauma healing, relationship/community building, health, well-being, and motherhood.

Historically, awareness for gender specific needs for incarcerated people was neither recognized nor acknowledged. However, the number of convicted women who are incarcerated and require gender-specific services is increasing (Anderson et al., 2020). Thus, gender-responsivity in custody is seen as a progressive, adaptive and positive approach to correctional programming (Tripodi et al., 2019; Wright et al., 2012). Thus, correctional management and conditions of confinement are central to the carceral experiences commonly faced by women re-entering society as they directly shape the lived realities of imprisonment and potentials for rehabilitation subsequent reintegration.

Trauma Informed Practices

Considering the co-occurring prevalence of trauma, mental health, and PTSD among incarcerated women, new strategies for gender-specific programming emphasizing the responsiveness and practicality of trauma-informed approaches should be considered. Nevertheless, Anderson and colleagues (2020) note that the interventions and practices for

women in correctional settings are rarely designed for gender specific needs, criminogenic pathways, and trauma histories. Trauma theorists recognize the role of environment on recovery and understand that coercive, forceful, isolating, and/or authoritative practices can further traumatize individuals (Tripodi et al., 2019). Trauma-informed approaches to institutional management encourage compassionate interactions and rational cognitive behaviours by trying to avoid causing further trauma by fostering perceptions of safety, trustworthiness, and empowerment (King, 2015). Avoiding further traumatization is a primary objective of trauma informed service. Trauma informed practices concentrating on gender-responsive approaches to prison management and programming have shown significant impacts on psychological wellbeing and perceptions of safety among incarcerated women (Kubiak et al., 2012; Lynch et al., 2012; Ward & Roe-Sepowitz, 2009).

Similarly, relational-cultural theorists understand "women's psychological development within their social relationships and interactions" as fundamental to the management of institutionalized women with substantial histories of trauma (Saxena et al., 2014, 419). Relational-cultural theorists follow trauma informed approaches by emphasizing the promotion of healthy, trustworthy and safe interactions as criminogenic behaviours are influenced by interpersonal relationships and experiences (Emerson & Ramaswamy, 2015). Holistic approaches underscoring relationship building, female empowerment and individual choice have shown some success and effectiveness in programming among incarcerated women (Praetorius et al., 2017). Studies highlight perceptions of empowerment, autonomy and psychological safety through holistic and gender-informed approaches to prison management and programming (Messina et al., 2010; Sacks et al., 2012).

Although trauma and relational-cultural approaches have considerable strengths, prisons and jails are not structured to manage individualized triggers and potential symptoms of trauma-related histories (King, 2015). Routine procedures such as strip searches, overcrowding, use of force, constraining environments, segregation, and commands from male authority figures tend to increase, rather than mitigate, trauma (King, 2015; Miller & Najavitis, 2012; Wright et al., 2012). Furthermore, many correctional officers are not trained to recognize trauma symptomology and/or behaviours, which may illicit and/or exacerbate trauma behaviours such as anger, aggression, irritability, emotional outbursts, self-destructive behaviors, and hypervigilance (Kolk, 2014; Martin et al., 2017; Miller & Najavitis, 2012).

Therefore, trauma-informed practices and relational cultural approaches for programming designed for women can profoundly impact experiences associated with re-entry by offering more opportunity for rehabilitation prior to release from custody. In addition, these approaches to programming can be modelled in community settings for reintegration programs supporting women after release (National Centre for Victims of Crime, 2025; Thomas et al., 2019). Indeed, by addressing the underlying effects of trauma and using a framework of safety and support, healing and recovery can be promoted within relationship centered and supportive environments which can positively impact experiences for re-entry.

Pregnancy & Motherhood

Given that most women admitted to custody are of child-bearing years, with an emerging subgroup pregnant themselves, reproduction and motherhood is examined to understand how these trajectories influence experiences for women released from custody. Strikingly, this review will demonstrate how negligible health care is available for maternal necessities in

carceral settings. A 2014 survey of federally incarcerated women in Ontario found that 82% had a history of pregnancy, 77% were unintended pregnancies, and 5% were pregnant while being surveyed (Paynter, 2021). In Canada, approximately 4% - 10% of women are pregnant at intake (Dowling & Fulton, 2017). Prenatal examinations and check-ups are important to healthy pregnancies for both the mother and child. Although data on prenatal care for incarcerated women is scarce, research demonstrates that access to medical professionals and assessments is inadequate in correctional facilities (Ferszt & Clarke, 2012; Shlafer et al., 2017; Shlafer et al., 2015). In Ontario, incarcerated pregnant women speak of being denied prenatal care appointments due to staggering inaccessibility, taking "weeks to get a healthcare appointment", and/or not being informed of blood tests and ultrasound results throughout pregnancy (Craggs, 2020; Liauw et al., 2021, 10). For women giving birth during incarceration, most are separated from their infants soon or immediately after birth which increases the risk of postpartum depression (Dowling & Fulton, 2017).

Two-thirds of women in Canadian custody have at least one dependent child—the majority of which are primary caregivers (Dowling & Fulton, 2017: 36). Maintaining maternal-child bonds is important for the psychological and emotional stability of incarcerated women and their children. An imprisoned mother participating in Stack's (2020) study on maternal incarceration, "believes that it is crucial for children to maintain contact with their incarcerated parent – both for the parent's and the child's well-being" (152). Barriers such as transportation, security-centered visitation policies, and foster care services or alternative guardianships make it difficult to maintain relationships between mother and child (ibid). As such, motherhood significantly influences experiences of women prior, during, and following release from custody

while they face simultaneous challenges of maintaining or building relationships, navigating complexities for re-entry, and meeting the needs of children.

Community Reintegration from Prison & Jail

Contextualizing Community Reintegration

To assess reintegration experiences and the influence of reintegrative programming for formerly incarcerated women, the multifaceted concepts of community reintegration and reintegrative programming must be understood. For those leaving prison, re-entering the community is often met with anxiety and uncertainty (Youssef, 2023). In Canada, almost all people serving a custodial sentence will eventually be released. Reintegration is the transitional process of re-entering public spaces following discharge from custody. Smooth and effective community reintegration is a complex process addressing the criminogenic risks and needs associated with re-entry, integrating various interventions, services and supports (Ricciardelli & Peters, 2017). Community reintegration interventions that address the criminogenic needs of those released from prison and jail often involve transitional housing supports or housing assistance programs, substance abuse and mental health treatment, re-entry case management, life skills training, family or community reunification supports, and counselling (Christian & Kennedy, 2011; Lutze et al., 2014; Mathlin et al., 2022; Visher & Travis, 2003).

The John Howard Society of Canada, an agency supporting formerly incarcerated people through re-entry, emphasizes that "addressing the complex needs of releases through effective programs, services and practices is crucial for successful reintegration" (O'Grady & Lafleur, 2016). The first year following release from custody is especially critical, with roughly half of people released from incarceration returning to correctional institutions within the first 12

months of community re-entry (Eggers et al., 2006; Langan & Levin, 2002). Successful community reintegration and re-entry can reduce criminogenic behaviours and further offending helping improve community safety (Griffiths et al., 2007; O'Grady & Lafleur, 2016).

Successful reintegration has positive impacts on community membership and social wellbeing and is associated with reductions in recidivism/reoffending and reincarceration (Hyde et al., 2022; Mathlin et al., 2022; McKiernan, 2017). Previously incarcerated individuals have critical needs after release including, finding sustainable and affordable housing; health care; mental health support; obtaining identification and government documents; reintegration support services; employment; enhancing social ties; social services; substance use treatment and addiction support; connecting to families and loved ones; and financial security (Arenas et al., 2011; Community Legal Education Ontario, 2018; Gaetz & O'Grady, 2009; Lynch et al., 2017; Mathlin et al., 2022; National Housing Strategy, 2021; O'Grady & Lafleur, 2016).

In addition to the myriad of needs experienced by formerly incarcerated people, women experience unique circumstances specific to their lived experiences and criminal justice system involvement. Women typically "present with extensive histories of interpersonal trauma, disproportionate rates of mental illness, and substance-related disorders" (Beeble & Hampton, 2021). Considering the high rates of relational trauma, histories with victimization, mental health and adverse life experiences, women leaving custody require additional services and supports to meet gender-specific reintegration needs such as sustainable housing away from abusive relationships, reproductive health care, reunification with children, victim services, protective services, and abuse and trauma counselling. (Fedock et al., 2023; Fedock et al., 2019; Johnson et al., 2015; Lynch & Heath, 2017; Paynter, 2021; Severance, 2004).

The ineffective reintegration of formerly incarcerated women has pervasive repercussions for women, their families, and community members (Cobbina, 2010; Doherty, 2014; Figueira-McDonough & Sarri, 2002; Lynch & Heath, 2017; O'Grady & Lafleur, 2016). Without adequate reintegration and requisite services, women released from custody are more likely to experience a cyclical pattern of criminal justice contact and incarceration (Beeble & Hampton, 2021). Thus, adequate discharge planning prior to release and easy access to services in the community is critical for incarcerated women transitioning out of custody.

Defined broadly, prisoner re-entry/reintegration programs or interventions are designed to meet the unique needs of those leaving custody to increase the likelihood of a safe and successful transition into the community (Office of the Correctional Investigator, 2016). Reintegration interventions, programs and processes involve pre-release planning, prison support programs and coordination, post-release supports and services, and community supervision, though these vary across Canada (Gaetz & O'Grady, 2009; Bahen, 2016). Successfully reintegrating formerly incarcerated women is an intricate process that requires greater attention (Aloisio et al., 2014).

Barriers to Reintegration

Re-entry and reintegration into the community following incarceration is often a challenging process. As such, barriers to reintegration offer critical insight into the experiences typically faced by formerly incarcerated women and demonstrate the structural/systemic challenges that influence lived realities. Many formerly incarcerated individuals are discharged from custody unprepared for re-entry to larger Canadian society (Aloisio et al., 2014). Releasees often experience institutionalization from their period of incarceration; whereby individuals become habituated by the structures, routines, and cultures of prisons and jails. Furthermore,

those released from correctional institutions enter a social and economic landscape surrounded by inequalities, marginalization, discrimination and insecurities. Insufficient preparation prior to release, in addition to inequalities and accessibility barriers following release, presents many challenges for successful reintegration. Major barriers and systemic inequalities for reintegration needs, supports and services including readiness, conditional release, (in)accessibility, and stigma were frequently found in existing literature.

Readiness. A lack of preparation is a major barrier with poor release coordination having a negative impact on experiences following release from custody, ultimately limiting capacities for successful reintegration. Adequate discharge preparation is essential for people leaving custody and is rooted in perceptions of readiness for community re-entry; however, perceptions of readiness are often lacking due to inadequate correctional release planning (Erickson et al., 2024; Office of the Correctional Investigator, 2015). Canada's Correctional Investigator (2014; 2015) and Auditor General (2014; 2015; 2016) note that federally sentenced individuals are often released from maximum or medium security prisons with minimal planning for release or are released at sentence expiry without any gradual supervised transition time (Balfour et al., 2018).

Discharge planning is fundamental to successful and smooth community reintegration. Discharge planning refers to support programs and social services programs that prepare prisoners for release and community reintegration (Gaetz & O'Grady, 2006). Discharge planning includes developing an individualized risk/needs assessment, a case management release plan (outlining housing, employment, mental/physical health, and educational needs), and ensuring continuity of care within the community (Applebaum, 2020; American Psychiatric Association, 2016; Dyer & Biddle, 2013). Given links between socioeconomic and mental or physical health

factors on reoffending, prison discharge planning and continuities of care are crucial for preventing recidivism and helping people remain in the community (Doherty et al., 2014; Dyer & Biddle, 2013; Ricciardelli & Rose, 2017). The quality of discharge planning in federal institutions is more comprehensive than that from provincial jails with the provinces lacking standardized discharge planning procedures (Gaetz & O'Grady, 2009; Gaetz & O'Grady, 2006). Concerningly, most of the custodial population on remand (pre-trial detention) have limited or no access to discharge planning and/or custodial support programs (Deshman & Myers, 2014).

Institutionalization is a process by which time in prison or jail shapes and socializes individuals in accordance with the institutional environments, routines, and structure (Haney, 2002). Institutionalization is an expansion of *prisonizatio*n; coined by Donald Clemmer in the mid 1900s and defined as the assimilation and internalization of inmate culture, prisoner morals/values, and general norms of penitentiaries (Clemmer, 1958; Penado Abilleria & Rodicio-Garcia, 2021). Institutionalization takes prisonization a step further by also accounting for custodial policies, structure, and administration, rather than solely condemning prisoners for the impacts of their incarceration.

Various complex factors contribute to the institutionalization of prisoners including social conditions, prison policy and management, criminogenic prison culture, psychological impacts of incarceration, living conditions, and security routines (National Research Council, 2014; Reed, 2015; Rubin, 2021). Institutionalization creates habituation to the highly structured, frequently violent and criminogenic prison environments (Crane & Pascoe, 2021). Crane and Pascoe (2021) conceptualize institutionalization as a chronic condition that persists following release from custody. Indeed, the lingering effects of a criminogenic culture, institutional

structure and custodial management present challenges for successfully adapting to life in the community after custody.

Furthermore, people released from custody often experience social displacement or exclusion and alienation, facing social and systemic disconnections or separations from the general public as they attempt to reintegrate in society (Pękala-Wojciechowska, 2021). Social displacement and alienation are often characterized by challenges for rebuilding social networks, restoring community ties, securing employment, and accessing stable housing (Youssef, 2023; Pękala-Wojciechowska, 2021; Ricciardelli & Peters, 2017). Institutional dependence refers to the psychological and/or behavioural reliance on the rigidly controlled environment of custody (Haney, 2002). Institutional dependence is often characterized by loss of autonomy, difficulties managing time and responsibility, impaired decision making, and social withdrawal (Crane & Pascoe, 2021; Haney, 2002; Reed, 2015). Without adequate preparation and discharge planning, the institutionalized individual may struggle to adapt when released and, ultimately, become reincarcerated following the stress of social displacement, alienation, and institutional dependence (ibid).

As such, a lack of readiness and preparation for re-entry and the effects associated with the experiences of institutional settings provide critical insight for the experiences of formerly incarcerated women. Indeed, inadequate discharge planning and prolonged exposures to incarceration can undermine capacities to effectively navigate release and social autonomy.

Conditional Release. Individuals leaving custody in Canada are often given conditions of release for re-entry. Particularly challenging, are the conditions of bail imposed against those released from pre-trial detention/remand, who are legally innocent. The more conditions imposed

and the more time an individual is required to comply with conditions, "the more likely they are to accumulate charges of failing to comply with a court order" (Sprott & Myers, 2011). Indeed, expansive and extensive conditions imposed upon those released from custody increases the likelihood of subsequent contact with the justice system including arrest and potential convictions.

Conditions of release are often restrictive including no contact orders, prohibitions on the use of cell phones, bans on internet or computer use, and house arrest (Deshman & Myers, 2014). Invasive and excessive conditions are coercive methods for controlling behaviours associated with criminality, with minimal reintegrative mechanisms (Yule & Schumann, 2023). Given the life histories and underlying factors that contribute to contact with the criminal justice system, onerous and intrusive conditions may increase the likelihood of further criminal charges (John Howard Society of Ontario, 2013). Failures to comply with any condition of bail often results in re-admissions to pre-trial detention or sentencing, with failure to comply being the most common offence for which people are admitted to remand (Porter & Calverly, 2011). Given the number of bail conditions routinely imposed, and the circumstances experienced by individuals on bail, conditions are onerous and impractical for many accused (John Howard Society of Ontario, 2013). Thus, scholars have questioned if people released on bail are put into positions where failure to comply with onerous conditions are inevitable outcomes (Yule & Schumann, 2023; Sprott & Myers, 2011).

Existing scholarship and governmental reports suggest that conditional release can create substantial barriers due to the onerous restrictions and surveillance, ultimately increasing risks for further criminalization and re-incarceration. The experiences of formerly incarcerated women

reintegrating from custody are typically characterized by further penalization and scrutiny complicat transitional efforts.

(In)accessibility. Limited access to necessary supports and survival needs are major challenges that reveal experiences associated with resource scarcity for criminalized women and critically informs the capacities of reintegrative programming. As such, gaps are evident for accessibility to re-entry essentials and the feasibilities of programming. Accessing the necessary resources and services for community re-entry is a vital component of the reintegration process. For individuals leaving custody, both immediate and long-term essential needs exist such as food, clothing, shelter, mental and physical health care, employment, family reunification, and improving community ties (Borzycki, 2005; Griffiths et al., 2007; Taylor, 2013). Accessing essential needs, however, is often met with systematic barriers in an economic and social landscape of inequitable distributions of resources (O'Grady & Lafleur, 2016). Although people released from custody have many needs upon re-entry, this discussion focuses on accessing housing and health care.

Housing. Canada is experiencing a serious housing crisis (Canadian Housing Strategy, 2023). Many Canadians are experiencing precarious housing situations and/or homelessness,. A Canadian study shows that 2.2% of Canadians report experiencing absolute homelessness (unhoused and/or living in shelters) and over one in ten report experiences with hidden homelessness (couch surfing/temporary housing) at some point in their lives (Statistics Canada, 2023). Housing is a fundamental need; for people leaving custody there are additional barriers to accessing housing presenting substantial challenges to successful reintegration (Bowman & Ely, 2020). Accessibility barriers include loss of housing due to incarceration, economic/financial

insecurity, strained relationships, discrimination associated with criminal records/criminality, prior homelessness, insufficient and unattainable social housing, and struggles to comply with rigorous halfway house or supportive housing conditions (Doyle et al., 2022 Bowman & Ely, 2020; Lutz et al., 2014). The inability to secure stable housing is a defining feature of homelessness and, according to Canada's National Housing Strategy, up to 30% of incarcerated people in Canada have no home to return to upon release (2021). Studies have demonstrated a relationship between homelessness, incarceration and recidivism due to the visibility of behaviours, lack of resources for the unhoused, and criminalizing nature of homelessness (Gaetz & O'Grady, 2009; Hulchanski, 2009; Kellen et al., 2010; Moschion & Johnson, 2019).

Incarcerated women experience additional barriers for housing. Women are more likely to have experienced victimization through physical and/or sexual domestic abuse, which presents risk factors for housing instability, safety concerns for returning to shared partnership dwellings (Erickson et al., 2024; Mayock, Parker, & Sheridan, 2015; Walsh & MacDonald, 2011). In Canada, formerly incarcerated women show high prevalence of mental health and substance use disorders (Brown et al., 2018). Navigating complex housing systems and maintaining housing can be challenging due to risks of eviction if struggling to manage rent and follow housing or leasing agreements (Greenberg & Rosenheck, 2008; Draine et al., 2005). In addition, women released from custody are more likely to be responsible for housing children and families; however, securing family-friendly housing is often challenged as the affordable housing demand continues to grow (Arditti, 2006; Federal Housing Advocate, 2023; Harris et al., 2015). A study of formerly incarcerated women reintegrating in Vancouver, Canada demonstrated that housing was amongst the most critical needs post release (Erickson et al., 2024). Formerly incarcerated women shared experiences of living in abusive partnerships and/or sleeping on the streets which

often led to further involvement with the police and potential arrests for breaching release conditions (ibid). Given that many formerly incarcerated women identify housing as a reintegrative priority, programming capacities are limited in a housing landscape buttressed by scant opportunity for already economically marginalized groups.

Health. Physical and mental health are substantial needs following release from prison. Incarcerated people have higher rates of infectious disease, chronic health concerns, mental illness, and substance use disorders compared to the general population (Kouyoumdijan et al., 2016; Stewart et al., 2015). Thus, accessing health care and receiving treatment is critical upon release and continuity of care is essential for those who receive treatment prior to release.

Approximately 25% of people in custody in Canada have been exposed to hepatitis C virus (HCV) (Kronfli et al., 2019). In addition, the estimated prevalence of Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) for incarcerated populations is 1.76%; however, prevalence rates are higher among incarcerated women (Correctional Service Canada, 2016). For both viruses, women demonstrate the highest representation of diagnosis among incarcerated demographics (ibid). There is a high correlation between intravenous drug use and subsequent infection of HCV and HIV (Wenz et al., 2016). According to the John Howard Society of Ontario, roughly 20% of releasees have been diagnosed with a chronic communicable condition (2016). Additionally, accessing gender-specific reproductive health care for sexually transmitted infections, cancer screening, family planning, and pregnancy are a critical health need facing many incarcerated women (Clarke et al., 2006; Dang et al., 2021; Liauw et al., 2016).

Incarcerated women are disproportionately impacted by mental health diagnosis and substance use issues, which are often left untreated in custody (O'Grady & Lafleur, 2016). In Canada, data shows elevated rates of substance use related fatalities post-incarceration and an

Ontario based study demonstrated higher mortality rates associated with substance use and mental health disorders for those released from provincial custody (Russell et al., 2022; Groot et al., 2016; Kouyoumdijan et al., 2016).

Given the substantial health concerns of formerly incarcerated women, positive community reintegration experiences are often challenged by a lack of service accessibility and safety; ultimately, hindering social security and quality of life. Even among those who receive treatment while in custody, accessing treatment "drops drastically upon release" due to inadequate continuity of care during discharge planning and collaboration between services following re-entry (O'Grady & Lafleur, 2016, 30). For those suffering with substance use and mental health needs, daily task management becomes inhibited by self-destructive behaviours and psychosocial symptoms without specialized support services (Hamilton & Belenko, 2019), yet accessibility to health care services for treatment is limited in Ontario (Hu et al., 2020). Incarcerated women tend to cycle through stages of limited mental and physical health care access while in custody, problematic discharge planning, and poor continuities in care following release (Dyer & Biddle, 2013). Inadequate care in custody combined with fragmented community transitions, poor communication between health care services, clinic dynamics and staffing shortages, treatment/medication costs, and discrimination shown by professionals all contribute to accessibility barriers in the community (Dyer & Biddle, 2013; Groot et al., 2016; Hu et al., 2020; Haywood et al., 2000). These accessibility barriers are further exacerbated by navigating maximum capacities and extensive waitlists among the health care and mental health services necessary for specialized treatments (Hu et al., 2020; O'Grady & Lafleur, 2016). Considering that many formerly incarcerated women have substantial mental and physical health

needs, programming goals can be hindered by limited staff resources and a lack of opportunities for outsourcing further specialties.

Stigma. The barriers associated with stigma reveal how negative, marginalizing, and scrutinizing perceptions of incarcerated women can shape the social experiences of women released from custody. Indeed, the stigma attached to incarceration and criminal convictions hinders the reentry process for formerly incarcerated individuals. Stigma is a negative social attitude or conceptualization that discredits and/or systematically disadvantages certain groups due to perceived differences, characteristics, and behaviours (Link & Phelan, 2001). Stigma can further be explained "as a process in which the elements of labeling, stereotyping, separation, status loss, and discrimination co-occur together in a power situation that allows the components of stigma to unfold" (Tyler & Brockmann, 2017). For example, stigma can enhance or temper the label of a criminal record (Huebner et al., 2019). Literature has highlighted the effects of community structures and interactions on criminality and social policy, by expanding knowledge towards the consequences of criminal labelling for social relations and systematic hierarchy among people returning from prison and jail (Couloute & Talley, 2024; Moore et al., 2023; Pollack, 2009; Tyler & Brockmann, 2017).

In Canada, incarcerated people are disproportionately homeless, under-educated and unemployed with substantially higher rates of mental and physical illness compared to the general population (John Howard Society, 2022; Mental Health Commission of Canada, 2021). In addition, people in custody face systematic marginalization and oppression within Euro-Canadian societies (Owusu-Bempah & Wortley in Bucerius & Tonry, 2014). For example, Black, Indigenous, people of colour as well as other visible minority groups, who face systematic

marginalization in Canada are overrepresented in the Canadian criminal justice system. (Department of Justice, 2024; Department of Justice, 2022; Clark, 2019). The cumulative impact of minority status and experience with incarceration manifests as substantial stigma and subordinated hierarchical status. Consequently, individuals leaving custody are often discredited and excluded from accessing essential livelihood necessities such as employment, rental applications, and relational supports (Evans & Porter, 2015; Leverentz, 2011; Pate, 2019; Pollack, 2009).

In the context of community reintegration, the adverse social, psychological and structural impacts of experiencing incarceration are stigmatizing conditions that contribute to the individual's criminalized behaviours and subsequent involvement with the criminal justice system (Nagin et al., 2009; Tyler & Brockmann, 2017; Zabarniy et al., 2023). Indeed, individuals who encounter the criminal justice system are disproportionately impacted by adverse experiences such as trauma, poverty, systematic disadvantage, and criminogenic environments – which are then exacerbated by the stigmatizing experience of incarceration (Feingold & Lamb, 2021; Tyler & Brockman, 2017). Ultimately, the *social othering* and exclusion, whereby formerly incarcerated individuals are categorized as fundamentally different, risky and inferior to the norms of "moral" society is key to understanding re-entry experiences, challenges to community reintegration and recidivism (Beckett, 2001; Garland, 1990; Garland, 1995). Furthermore, perceptions of stigma may discourage formerly incarcerated women from seeking support from reintegrative programming due to the reinforced feelings of judgement, isolation, and worthlessness (Gunn, 2022).

This review examined existing literature exploring two major research questions. To contextualize the experiences of formerly incarcerated women released from custody, the interconnected realities of pre-carceral, carceral and post-carceral circumstances defining criminalized women's trajectories are foundational. This involved a rigorous qualitative inquiry of criminogenic backgrounds, gender-based natures of carceral confinement, and the challenges of release. To better understand the largely underexplored impacts of gender-responsive reintegration programming on re-entry experiences, existing literature on reintegrative programming and gender-responsive approaches were reviewed to examine objectives and practices. Overall, this review provides an analysis of the individual, social and systemic factors influencing re-entry for formerly incarcerated women.

Chapter Four: Theoretical Framework

This project follows a theoretical framework integrating both Critical Criminology and Feminist Criminology for understanding, interpreting and analyzing the experiences of formerly incarcerated women reintegrating from prison or jail in Canadian society. On the one hand, critical criminological theorists provide a viewpoint which examines the structural, systemic and power dynamics of economic hardship, marginalization, and institutional oppression that influence experiences of criminalization, incarceration and community re-entry. On the other hand, feminist criminological theorists compliment critical perspectives, by expanding theory to consider gender as foundational to understanding feminine pathways to criminalization, incarceration and re-entry including, but not limited to, gender-based trauma or victimization, marginalization, and subordination. Combined, this theoretical framework guides empirical interpretation and analysis of data by demonstrating how intersectional factors of marginalization

and oppression (class, socioeconomic status, gender, life circumstances, victimization, etc.) influence the experiences of formerly incarcerated women in Canada. Furthermore, both perspectives can critically evaluate how institutional and systemic policies and practice often fail to consider gender-specific criminogenic needs and perpetuate cycles of systemic disadvantage.

Critical Criminology

Through a critical criminological viewpoint, the notions of power, inequality and social control are considered as underpinning factors of crime, punishment, social order and community interactions in capitalist societies (Bhuller et al., 2020). Critical criminologists challenge more normative understandings of crime and punishment by evaluating the marginalizing social, political, systematic, and economic structures that produce criminogenic behaviours and strengthen penalizing and punitive responses (Montford & Taylor, 2022; Welch, 1996). This framework examines how community re-entry for formerly incarcerated people is shaped by systemic inequalities, classist ideals, structural violence and mechanisms of social control (Garrett, 2016). Critical criminologists provide a *social critique* by suggesting that the challenges faced by criminalized individuals are not solely caused by individual shortcomings, and contrastingly, are buttressed and controlled by unequal distributions of power, resources, class, and opportunities within contemporary society (Thomas & O'Maolchatha, 1989).

Foundational to critical criminology is the notion that the criminal justice system, punishment, and incarceration are apparatuses of social control—especially for marginalized demographics (Young, 2003; Welch 1996). Thus, the process of community re-entry is structured by methods of control for maintaining social order by governing and limiting the economic opportunities and movements of those considered risky and/or deviant (Burch, 2017;

Garrett, 2016). Central to critical criminology is theorist Michel Foucault (1977), and the concept of disciplinary power and punishment, understood as the excessive monitoring and control of deviant others through various methods of surveillance and governance over criminalized bodies (Sargiacomo, 2009). For Foucault (1977), penalties and criminal justice sanctioning act as political tactics for accomplishing complex social functions and are implemented as methods for deterring criminalized behaviours in societies (ibid). Indeed, specific techniques of power are implemented in post-modern and contemporary societies "to dominate, supervise and subject the body" by modifying the souls, morals and behaviours of criminalized others (ibid, 270).

Foucauldian theorists build upon Foucault's original work by conceptualizing the notion of *transcarceration*, capturing an understanding of state power over individuals who have been incarcerated (Maidment, 2006; Myers, 2008). *Transcarceration* can be explained as "the existence of multiple strategies of social control" and how "formal control moves beyond the institution into the whole social body" (Johnson, 1996, 116). Further, transcarceral processes identify societal members presumed as threatening to economic and social stability, by responding with an assortment of control measures (Arrigo, 2001; Johnson, 1996). Further, maintaining order has become dependent on multiple levels of governmental interventions involving both exclusionary and inclusionary methods to make identification of, and response to, criminalized individuals easier (Johnson, 1996).

For those released from correctional custody in Canada, the interconnection of governmental and systematic control systems is standard. For example, the continued monitoring and surveillance of the criminalized other released from prisons or jail is implemented using various correctional supervision measures in the community such as parole, probation, bail supervision programs, and criminal background checks (Kilgore, 2013). For Miller & Stuart

(2017), these extended forms of punishment create a *carceral citizenship* for formerly incarcerated populations, whereby the liberty, movement and rights of individuals are limited and constrained.

Marxism asserts that economic structures and processes shape social interactions, institutions, policy and culture (Giddens, 1971). For Marx, unequal distributions of wealth, class and hierarchy are the root causes of social conflict, power, and change (Marx, 1888). In criminological theory, Critical Marxist perspectives argue that incarcerated people experience substantial economic marginalization within broader class-based social orders (De Giorgi, 2018; Jay, 2019). Indeed, criminal convictions and incarceration disproportionately impact those in poverty and the economically disenfranchised, which continues following release into the community (Montford & Taylor, 2022; Tyler & Brockmann, 2017; Welsh, 1996). Greenberg argues that incarceration is a tool for managing lower-class, impoverished and marginalized communities within capitalist economies that experience surpluses of unemployment rates which inevitably force people towards illegitimate and illegal means of survival (1981). Marxist criminologists suggest that rather than addressing the marginalizing systematic and structural roots of crime, state powers criminalize and incarcerate the impoverished to maintain social order and hierarchy (ibid; Jay, 2019).

Through a Critical Marxist perspective, the substantial barriers to employment, housing, and social mobility experienced by formerly incarcerated people can be understood as a social landscape that criminalizes poverty and reinforces subordinations of already marginalized groups (Garland, 2001). Mullaly (1997) suggests that contemporary expansions of capitalist labour markets has produced further marginalization of already disadvantaged community groups including women, visible minorities, and immigrants (Galeano Monti & Delia Deckard, 2021).

Further, members of society deemed unproductive by conventional labour standards, such as people released from custody, are categorized as unworthy of community care and membership (ibid; Murphy, 2002). Thus, the alienation associated with criminal sanctioning and experiencing prison or jail promotes the exclusion of formerly incarcerated people from participation in labour markets; thereby, reinforcing cycles of recidivism and poverty (Beckett & Western, 2001; Wacquant, 2001; Western & Beckett, 1999).

Feminist Criminology

As a development from the second wave of feminism, feminist criminological theories expand upon critical perspectives by structuring theory around the gendered experiences of criminalized women, who have unique needs and challenges following release within patriarchal societies and structures (Monti & Deckard, 2021; Chesney-Lind, 2006). The influence of gender and gender-based experience is considered foundational for understanding crime, punishment, deviance, and social order (Renzetti, 2013). Criminalized behaviours are theorized as manifestations of patriarchal structures and hegemonic orders, characterized by male dominance, imbalances of power, and oppression or violence against women (Chesney-Lind, 2006). Furthermore, feminist criminology evaluates social, cultural, and economic factors associated with female criminality including trauma, systemic marginalization, exposure to violence, and poverty (Wilfong & Plaza, 2021). Indeed, feminist criminologists also understand that women experience unique obstacles, such as reunification with children and family, securing family-safe housing, and escaping abuse or exploitation; while simultaneously being exposed to gender-based discrimination in social systems and community interactions (Sudbury, 2005).

Through a feminist framework, *intersectionality theory*, developed by Crenshaw (1991) and expanded by Davis (2003), suggests that gender, race, class and other identity classifications intersect to develop mutually reinforcing mechanisms of oppression and marginalization. Crenshaw (1991) refers to these characterizations as *identity politics*, whereby race, gender and class are often treated as "vestiges of bias or domination – that is, as intrinsically negative frameworks in which social power works to exclude or marginalize those who are different" (1242). For example, Davis (2003) asserts that criminalized women, particularly those who are racialized, experience further forms of discrimination which manifests as concurrently experienced sexism, classism, racism, and criminal labelling while attempting to reintegrate. Crenshaw (1991) and Davis (2003) both suggest that intersectional mechanisms of discrimination and oppression follow criminalized women in discriminatory employment, housing and interactional practices in hegemonic social orders.

For feminist theorists, *structural violence* is understood as systemic and institutional harms from patriarchal structures that empower men and oppress women (Erickson et al., 2024; Tapp & Henson, 2024; Sinha et al., 2017). In feminist criminology theory, structural violence is demonstrated through barriers to opportunity and economic independence, lack of enforcement against gender-based violence, and criminalizing acts associated with survival (i.e., prostitution and drug offences) (Richie, 2012; Belknap, 2010). Indeed, Chesney-Lind & Pasko (2004) suggests that the criminal justice system is structured in ways that are inherently harmful and criminalizing to women, without preventing or responding to systemic roots of behaviours.

Feminist criminologists highlight the importance of trauma-informed approaches to social service and care. Trauma informed frameworks recognize trauma and the impacts of

trauma on subsequent behaviours and experience (King, 2015). Indeed, feminist criminologists build upon:

> the recognition that criminalized women sustain multiple roles and responsibilities whilst coping with ongoing and historical experiences of trauma, social exclusion and marginalization which amplify the struggle to survive in prison and post release (Segrave & Carlton, 2010, 288).

Furthermore, theorists draw attention to the further traumatizing impacts of incarceration such as hierarchies of power, lack of agency, mistreatment or neglect, further exposure to violence, and substantial loss as critical to understanding the experiences of women post incarceration (Chesney-Lind & Pasko, 2004; Davis, 2003; Gunn, 2021; Kaiser-Derrick, 2019; Segrave & Carlton, 2010). Thus, recognizing the short and long-term impacts of traumatic experiences is fundamental to post-release survival and preventing recidivism (Bevan, 2024; Covington 2007, Covington 2007; Gunn, 2021; Segrave & Carlton, 2010; Wilfong, 2021).

Chapter Five: Methodology

This research study followed an explorative study purpose and cross-sectional research design for data collection and analysis of a largely underexamined and specific research topic at a single point in time. In doing so, this project offers an overview of the experiences and perspectives of formerly incarcerated women and staff involved in reintegration programming designed specifically for criminalized women re-entering society. Given the cross-sectional design of this study, results can inform future research for more longitudinal studies. This project asks the following two questions: (1) what are the experiences of formerly incarcerated women reintegrating from prison or jail; and (2) does reintegrative programming and/or interventions designed for formerly incarcerated women impact experiences of re-entry? To answer these

questions, qualitative interviews were used for data collection on participant experiences, perceptions, and insights from their involvement in the Women Reintegrating After Prison program (WRAP). Qualitative methods were chosen for this study to capture explore, understand, and acquire deep insight about the complexities and nuances of experiences and perspectives about community reintegration. In-depth interviews are valuable for exploratory projects, offering rich, comprehensive and detailed understandings of experiences and phenomena (Gough & Lyons, 2016). This project explores programming outcomes for a novel program, with qualitative methods to provide a foundational understanding for future studies. Interviews are the most appropriate method for understanding the unique experiences of women by evaluating individual perceptions of community reintegration processes and programming.

Given the exploratory purpose of this study, semi-structured interviews were utilized. Semi-structured interviews allow researchers to focus on thematic areas while providing the researcher flexibility in adapting questions and seeking clarification and examples from participants. The semi-structured nature of the interview gives participants autonomy for presenting concepts and/or to elaborate on unanticipated experiences and responses (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015). Using semi-structured interviews allowed me to collect detailed descriptions that may be challenging to capture through more rigid qualitative methodologies, like surveys or questionnaires. (Morse & Richards, 2002). Furthermore, semi-structured interviews facilitated an environment where participants could provide responses with autonomy and empowerment, offering a framework where individual perspectives were fundamental to study findings.

Interview Design

A semi-structured interview guide was constructed to explore and address key themes identified by a review of scholarly literature, background data, and governmental and organizational reports – demonstrated in Table 1. The interview guide incorporated open-ended and follow-up/probing questions structured to investigate the unique experiences and perceptions of formerly incarcerated women, their involvement with the WRAP program, and community reintegration. Two separate interview guides were developed for this study to evaluate the experiences of both formerly incarcerated women and service providers involved with facilitating the WRAP. The semi-structured interview guides included demographic/background information, key thematic questions aligning with the study objectives and concepts, and follow-up/probing questions for further investigating responses (Morse & Richards, 2002). More specifically, questions focused on the experiences of incarceration, re-entry, and involvement with the WRAP program. The total population of women who have participated in the WRAP program is estimated to be between 30-40. All staff members with direct involvement in WRAP programming provision, facilitation, collaboration and development who worked at the organization at the time of the study participated.

Table 1: Semi-Structured Interviews Guide – Themes & Questions

Literature Themes & Concepts	***Questions: Formerly Incarcerated Women***	***Questions: Agency Staff***	***Sources***
Life circumstances & criminogenic backgrounds	How old are you? What race/ethnicity do you identify with? What sexual orientation and gender identify do you identify with?	Can you tell me a bit about the women you work with in the WRAP program? What are the life histories/experiences like with the women	Brown et al., 2018 Doyle., 2022 Hayes, 2015 John Howard Society of Ontario, 2022 Johnson & Lynch, 2012 Kouyoumdijan et al., 2016 Kronfli et al., 2019

	What is your highest level of education? Are you currently employed? What is your housing status? Do you have any history of mental health? Do you have any history with substance use? Do you have any medical/health conditions that you feel comfortable sharing? Can you tell me about your life before incarceration?	in the WRAP program?	MacDonald et al., 2015 Mental Health Commission of Canada, 2021 Moschoin & Johnson, 2019 National Housing Strategy, 2021 Salisbury & Van Voorhis, 2009 Segrave & Carlton, 2010 Shechory et al., 2011 Smith, 2017 Tripodi & Pettus-Davis, 2013
Experiences of incarceration for formerly incarcerated women	How long were you incarcerated for? What was your experience like in custody? Did you ever experience mistreatment and/or neglect while incarcerated? What were your biggest needs in custody? Did you feel that those needs [in custody] were met? Could anything have made you feel more prepared for release?	What are your experiences with incarceration for formerly incarcerated women?	Bahen, 2016 Canadian Association of the Elizabeth Fry Society, 2022 Dyer & Biddle, 2013 Gaetz & O'Grady, 2006 Haney, 2003 Hannah-Moffat, 2000 Lynch & Heath, 2017 Office of the Auditor General of Canada, 2014 Parkes et al., 2008 Rymhs, 2012 Segrave & Carlton, 2010 Statistics Canada, 2024c Tapp & Henson, 2024. Zinger, 2017
Experiences of re-entry for formerly incarcerated women	When were you released? Did you feel ready for release into the community? Did you have any worries about your release? If so, what were your biggest	Are the women you work with prepared for release in the community? Do conditions of release impact the ability to successfully reintegrate in the community?	Balfour et al., 2018 Canadian Association of the Elizabeth Fry Society, 2022 Doherty et al., 2014 Doyle et al., 2022 Draine et al., 2005 Erickson et al., 2024 Grace, 2022

	worries about going back into the community? Do you feel that incarceration has changed you [now]? Have your conditions of release impacted your ability to reintegrate in the community?	Do any barriers to reintegration exist for women released from custody? If yes to the above question, can anything be done to alleviate these barriers?	Hu et al., 2022 Hyde et al., 2022 Karimi-Haghighi et al., 2023 Lynch & Heath, 2017 Morash & Kathy, 2022 Office of the Auditor General of Canada, 2015 Office of the Auditor General of Canada, 2017 Office of the Auditor General of Canada, 2022 Office of the Correctional Investigator, 2014 Office of the Correctional Investigator, 2016 O'Grady & Lafleur, 2016 Pate, 2019 Pollack, 2009 Public Safety, 2021 Severance, 2004 Zaitzow, 2011
Reintegration needs of formerly incarcerated women	After release, what were your biggest needs? Were your needs met? Did you have any difficulties accessing the necessary resources and/or people who could help you with your needs? What barriers did you face? What more can be done for you in the community?	What are the main needs of women in the WRAP program? How accessible are these needs after release?	Doherty et al., 2022 Doyle et al., 2022 Draine et al., 2005 Erickson et al., 2024 Feingold, 2021 Griffiths et al., 2007 Haney, 2003 Hu et al., 2022 John Howard Society of Ontario, 2022 Lutze et al., 2017 Mathlin et al., 2024 Office of the Correctional Investigator, 2014 Office of the Correctional Investigator, 2016 O'Grady & Lafleur, 2016 Ricciardelli & Peters, 2017
Reintegration programming for women	Can you tell me a bit about your involvement in the WRAP program? How did you find out about the program? From your perspective, what is the goal of participating in the WRAP program? What did you identify as your main reintegration	Can you tell me a bit about the WRAP program? How many women have you worked with in the WRAP program? How does the WRAP program aim to meet reintegration needs?	Anderson et al., 2020 Covington, 2007 Elizabeth Fry Kingston, n.d. Fedock et al., 2019 Galbrath, 2004 King, 2015 Saxena et al., 2014 Thomas et al., 2019 Wright et al., 2012

	needs when starting the program? Has the WRAP program impacted your ability, in any way, to reintegrate after incarceration? Did you (still) experience any barriers to accessing needs and services while enrolled in WRAP? Do you feel that your reintegration needs have been met after taking part in the WRAP program? Overall, how do you feel about your participation in the WRAP program? Could more have been done for your ability to reintegrate?	Are reintegration needs being met for women in the WRAP program? In your opinion, how does WRAP impact the ability to reintegrate for women taking part in the program? Based on your experiences, how do women feel after taking part in the WRAP program?	

Sampling Frame

This project used purposive sampling for recruiting two specific population groups for interviews: formerly incarcerated women who have accessed WRAP programming; and agency staff involved in the provision, creation, facilitation, collaboration of WRAP programming services. This approach captures both the experiences of formerly incarcerated women reintegrating from prison or jail and the perspectives of service providers working with formerly incarcerated women. Participants from both population groups had to meet eligibility criteria, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Population Group Sampling Criteria

Population Group	***Eligibility Criteria***
Formerly incarcerated women who have accessed WRAP programming	• At least 18 years old. • Identify as a woman. • Have been incarcerated to federal prisons or provincial jails in Canada. • Currently participating in WRAP or have participated in WRAP within the last 12 months.
Agency staff involved with WRAP service provision	• Currently working as an agency staff. • Have direct and/or indirect experience working with formerly incarcerated women involved in WRAP programming. • Involvement with creation, implementation, provision, facilitation and collaboration of WRAP programming services.

Purposive sampling for this cross-sectional study was utilized for exploring complex, detailed, and specific experiences of reintegration for formerly incarcerated women and reintegrative programming. Purposive sampling provides the ability to collect information from participants who are capable of providing knowledge and insight on a specific and focussed topic. Furthermore, by interviewing two population groups of both formerly incarcerated women involved in tailored programming and staff facilitators, data source triangulation can be obtained through multiple population sources within a single data collection method (Moon, 2019). As such, a deeper exploration of release from custody and gender-specific reintegration programming is conducted in the context of formerly incarcerated women's re-entry to Canadian communities. Indeed, integrating two population groups and perspectives aligns with data source triangulation strategies; thereby, enhancing credibility and validity of findings (Carter et al., 2014; Moon, 2019; Patton, 1999).

Recruitment

Participants were recruited for study participation through professional networking with the Elizabeth Fry Society involved in this study, in-person introductions, agency referrals, verbal correspondence throughout the community site, and public recruitment flyers. Seven study invitations for service providers and five referrals from agency sources were sent to former or current clients of the WRAP by the principal investigator via an email recruitment script. Participants who expressed interest in participation after viewing a public recruitment flyer either contacted the principal investigator directly or provided a trusted agency source with contact information (email and/or phone number) to share with the principal investigator for email or verbal recruitment. Study invitations for staff and agency staff referrals outlined the purposes of study, eligibility criteria, anticipated interview time commitments, and the ethical confidentiality measures approved by Queen's University's General Ethics Review Board.

The final sample includes 12 interview participants- five women who have participated in the WRAP program and seven agency service providers involved with the facilitation of WRAP programming support, coordination, and collaboration. Interviews ranged from 11 minutes to 58 minutes in length and were held in a private space located on the agency site. Recruitment flyers were posted around the Elizabeth Fry Society location in various office spaces, communication boards, programming sites, and common areas.

Ethical Guidelines

Ethical approval was obtained from Queen's University's General Ethics Research Board after completing numerous revisions for ethical compliance. Due to the vulnerability of formerly incarcerated communities and sensitive information involved in the collection of data, the study

adhered to rigid ethical standards to protect the autonomy, confidentiality, privacy, security, and emotional well-being of participants.

Informed consent was obtained from all participants involved in the study. To obtain consent, the objectives, scope and nature of the study, as well as the potential risks/benefits of participation and the procedures to protect their identity were outlined to participants. The study utilized de-identification to protect the privacy of participant identity by using pseudonyms and removing any personally identifying information from records and data sets.

Analysis

A thematic analysis was utilized to identify, analyze, and categorize themes identified within the interview transcripts. By utilizing thematic analysis, results were "segmented, categorized, summarized, and reconstructed in a way that captures the important concepts within the data set" (Given, 2008, 867). Thematic analysis was employed to simultaneously apply flexibility and capture rich, detailed accounts of the interview data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Thematic analysis allows the researcher to identify a variety of patterns and drawn inferences of meanings by extracting explicit and implicit ideas for narrative and statistical descriptions (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Guest, MacQueen & Navey, 2011; Mingers, Mutch & Willcocks, 2009). Following transcription of all interview data, I used NVivo software for qualitative analysis and the evaluation of identified themes.

Firstly, interviews were transcribed verbatim from the audio recording. I then read and listened to each interview three times for familiarization with the data while developing study ideas and themes for thematic coding. All identifying information was removed from the transcripts to protect the privacy and confidentiality of participants. Secondly, major ideas,

frequent topics, and trends were coded by systematically reviewing each transcript independently in Nvivo. The interview codes were developed using inductive approaches pulled directly from data and deductive approaches associated with research questions and theoretical frameworks. Through inductive coding, labels were created from the transcripts pertaining to experiences during incarceration, experiences of re-entry, WRAP programming procedures, and WRAP service outcomes. Through deductive coding, datasets were analyzed through predefined codes associated with incarceration, community reintegration, and reintegrative programming patterns inspired by the research question and literature review. Thirdly, codes were structured and identified into possible study themes by developing patterns of discourse that aligned with the research objective. Themes and codes were reviewed and revised to address any inconsistencies, ensuring accurate description of the interview data. Lastly, themes were finalized and clearly defined through categorical labels. Three major themes with subthemes and several categories were developed from this coding procedure in Table 2 including:

Table 3: Thematic Coding Summary

Theme	***Subtheme***	***Subtheme Categories***
The Needs of Formerly Incarcerated Women	Unmet Needs in Custody	Basic Survival Needs Mental & Physical Health Care Support Programs
	Enduring the Needs in the Community	Basic Survival Needs Identification Housing Trauma & Separation
WRAP Programming Outcomes	Individualized & Holistic Service Provision	n/a
	Navigational Support	n/a
	Participant Satisfaction	Perceptions of Support Potential Frustrations
Persisting Barriers	Systemic	Discharge Panning Conditions of Release

	Accessibility	Housing Employment Resources
	Stigma	Societal Exclusion & Alienation Criminal Records

Chapter Six: Results

The Needs of Formerly Incarcerated Women

Research Question: What are the experiences of formerly incarcerated women reintegrating from prison or jail?

This theme reflects unmet needs in custody and following release for formerly incarcerated women involved in the WRAP program. All staff and clients speak about unfulfilled needs in custody and unmet needs in the community following release. The needs of formerly incarcerated women are coded into two subthemes: unmet needs in custody and enduring needs in the community. Formerly incarcerated women spoke to the personal experiences of unmet needs in custody and in the community, while agency staff addressed these topics from the perspective of a service provider aiming to meet client needs upon release. Findings on the unmet needs of formerly incarcerated women, both in custody and following release address both institutional and life circumstances experienced by criminalized women reintegrating in communities.

Unmet Needs in Custody

Many staff and WRAP program participants expressed concerns and frustrations about needs that are often unmet and/or neglected while women are in custody. Unmet needs in

custody are included in the analysis because the circumstances and lived realities of incarceration have considerable links to reintegration experiences, transitional capacities, and perspectives of re-entry. Importantly, testimonies about federal and provincial custody are noticeably different in terms of the unmet needs of incarcerated women. The analysis specifies when participants are discussing federal prisons or provincial jails.

Basic Survival Needs. Women involved with the WRAP program shared situations in which accessing basic necessities for survival in provincial custody were unmet or deliberately neglected by correctional officers. Celine, a 39-year-old woman who served years in provincial jail and federal prison, speaks about unmet basic survival needs when placed in provincial segregation,

> The imbalance of power is absolutely outstanding, and many guards really take advantage of it. […] you have nothing to occupy yourself with […] I remember I was screaming, asking for a bible… because they can't refuse giving you a bible… but they refused anyway […] and they didn't give me toilet paper for days… they gave me one shower in 13 days […] they were also handing me empty food trays, so on the camera it showed that I was given a meal, but really, there's nothing inside…

Celine's experience demonstrates how dynamics of power between correctional staff and the those who are incarcerated impact needs provisions and standards. As these power dynamics manifested, Celine was denied access to basic needs for survival by correctional officers including physical/psychological stimulation, hygiene, and even food during her placement in administrative segregation. Pandora, a 36-year-old woman who served over two years in custody, shares similar experiences while in segregation for exposure to COVID-19 in provincial jail,

> You have people who like their job […] and you have other guards who are like 'You're an animal, I'm not doing nothing for you… Oh, you want hot water in your cell in seg?

> Too bad princess!' I got COVID […] so they threw me in seg […] no mattress… and literally, like this thin sheet […] I had no hot water in my cell. I had no soap in my cell. I didn't get a shower for 12 days […] because they didn't have any female staff assigned to the seg.

Pandora was evidently frustrated by her experience of segregation in provincial custody. Particularly troubling is that Pandora was placed in segregation for isolation due to COVID-19 exposure; she was only segregated for contracting an illness while in custody. Pandora also speaks to the gendered circumstances of women in provincial jails, who are largely staffed by male officers. Pandora was unable to shower due to a lack of female staffing required for supervising hygiene practices in jails for women. Pandora provides another example of unmet needs unique to women,

> Like even tampons and pads, they would run out […] and they wouldn't even fill them up. […] that time that I was down in seg […] I ended up getting my period and it was only male staff on, and I'd be like 'can I get a pad?" … "Oh well, we'll find some…!" Yeah, that didn't happen…

This statement illustrates how the needs specific for women, such as feminine hygiene products (menstrual pads and tampons) have been ignored, trivialized or forgotten by male correctional officers. Here, the "*imbalance of power*" that Celine refers to are exacerbated by patriarchal structures of male dominance, hierarchy, and control over women's bodies in carceral settings.

Formerly incarcerated women also highlight poor access to nutrition and dietary needs in custody. For instance, Celine shares her experience with limited options for food during her time in provincial custody,

> The food is just pure carbs, everyone gets the same thing, you don't get to choose anything […] my problem was with the diet, they can't accommodate […] because of problems with my teeth, I have to choose dental soft… so that made it even harder. I had to either eat the hard food or be on a diet that makes me sick.

Healthy nutritional options and unique dietary needs are often inaccessible for women in provincial jails. Furthermore, Celine suggests that women in provincial jails are often fed diets of processed foods high in carbohydrates and sugars, while low in vital nutrients (vitamins and minerals). Milan, a 55-year-old woman released from provincial custody approximately three months prior to the interview, shared similar experiences to Celine regarding access to a proper diet and food,

> I didn't have money for canteen […] and, a lot of the food I couldn't eat because I don't have teeth so I couldn't go on a soft diet while I was there… and I don't think I got the proper nutrition with some of the foods.

These findings demonstrate that the food provided in provincial jails is often inadequate to meeting the nutritional requirements for women's health or special underlying dietary and/or dental needs. Consequently, women are left without food and/or adequate nutrition if provincial jails are unable to accommodate. Milan and Celine's testimonies are consistent and show that basic dietary needs are not being met for some women in provincial jails.

Mental & Physical Heath Care. Many women enter custody with pre-existing mental health conditions, trauma, substance use, and/or physical health concerns. However, each woman from the WRAP program mentioned inaccessibility to essential services in custody, such as mental or physical health care and/or correctional programming opportunities. Florence, a 52-year-old woman who spent nearly three years in provincial jails, spoke to mental health accessibility when asked about her needs in custody,

> You're thrown in there and there's no access to health […] you can't change in there because there's no options to change […] mental health. I was you know, very broken and you can barely see a doctor there… you've got to wait months to see a doctor there, let alone actually be able to sit down and deal with it right? It's like 'ok, you can't sleep…' doesn't matter […] the needs are not met.

Florence's situation highlights that mental health needs are not being met for women in provincial custody, which is especially problematic considering the disproportionate rates of mental health struggles that incarcerated women enter custody with. Portia, a woman in her sixties who served three years in federal prison, shares a personal struggle concerning access to health care needs,

> When I was in there, I ended up getting really sick… I had a bowel obstruction and they didn't believe me […] They don't believe what you say […] I was to a point where I was sepsis […] and I lost 40 pounds […] they didn't take it seriously […] they think 'she wants drugs' […] they took me to the hospital twice […] and I don't think they even want to look at you in the hospital […] because you're there in cuffs […] it was terrible […] I could hardly walk […] I couldn't do anything […] but nobody seemed to be doing anything […] I'm surprised I didn't die, seriously.[1]

Portia's story highlights how medical staff in federal prison did not properly assess her health concerns, resulting in serious implications for her health and potentially life-threatening consequences. Portia emphasized that incarcerated women seeking healthcare are often assumed to be fabricating ailments to obtain prescriptions for controlled substances. Eventually, after losing 40 pounds, medical staff listened to her requests for healthcare and provided treatment. In Portia's case, preconceived notions about incarcerated women's behaviours by medical staff impacted her accesses to medical care, with detrimental effects on her quality of life.

Support Programs. Vocational and mental or emotional support program opportunities are fundamental to the rehabilitation needs of women in custody, especially considering the substantial amounts of isolation and loss experienced during incarceration. However, participants from the WRAP program indicate that these needs were unmet in custody. Celine, a formerly

[1] Speech filler (uhm, so, uh…), personal, and/or irrelevant information/dialogue to the participant's main experience and point were removed for clarity.

incarcerated women and client of the WRAP program, speaks to the lack of programming available for the rehabilitation needs of women in provincial custody,

> There's nothing getting done for mental support or to keep yourself occupied […] It's just all the same, every single day […] and there is absolutely nothing to do and nothing to keep yourself occupied in provincial. There is one TV for 30 women and most of the time we can't even hear it because everybody around is yelling […] So, you never leave the room. You are always in the same room.

Milan, a formerly incarcerated women recently released from jail, shares a similar experience relating to access to programming in provincial custody,

> There was a lot of overcrowding […] it added to my anxiety… and I just found the jails are just like human warehouses […], there's not enough programs to help you while you are there really… and it's just hard to do time these days.

Milan and Celine's experiences with access to rehabilitative programming needs are parallel. Both women's time in provincial jails was characterized by overcrowded conditions and negligible programming opportunities to meet the healing and recovery needs of incarcerated women. Milan describes provincial jails as "human warehouses", illustrating the dehumanizing conditions.

Findings show that access to programming in federal prisons is a substantial improvement from provincial jails. Nevertheless, Pandora, who experienced both federal prison and provincial jails, explains that some needs remain unmet,

> They know when […] your parole date's coming up [,..] like the mental health counsellors and stuff are supposed to come and meet with you and be like 'these are the services that are available, this is where you apply for housing, this is where you call for this' […] Nothing, not even a piece of paper in my mailbox, no phone call […] nothing.

Pandora explains how access to programs and support for release planning needs in federal custody were ignored as she approached her parole date. Despite the importance of providing the

supports necessary for addressing reintegration needs and promoting a successful transition back into society, Pandora was not offered release planning and programming opportunities.

Enduring Needs in the Community

The unmet needs of incarcerated women often endure upon re-entry to the community. All formerly incarcerated women and staff involved with the WRAP program identified needs that endured following release into the community. Needs in the community were understood as direct means for survival and/or anxieties about securing the means required for community reintegration. Staff provide insights about enduring needs from the perspective of service providers who assist formerly incarcerated women of the WRAP program. WRAP participants offer personal encounters with enduring needs for community reintegration following release.

Identification. Most participants from both population groups mention identification as a major need for reintegration. Women are often released from custody without identification, documents that are required for accessing nearly all essential services, opportunities, and means for stability. Florence, a client of the WRAP program released from provincial custody, references identification when asked about her reintegration needs,

> When you go to jail, you lose everything […] to be able to integrate again is, you know, to be able to get all your ID again… you can't do anything without ID […] to be able to get housing and support.

Florence indicates that identification is critical for the reintegration process, as you must provide proof of identity to gain access to housing and other social supports. Armani, who works in the WRAP program, speaks to the importance of identification for clients who have lost these essential government documents,

> ID is always the big one because you need ID to go do anything […] One client […] she couldn't access her money or her bank account or anything because she didn't have anything to present to them […] we have to wait until things get set up, we have to wait until you have ID.

Armani highlights the struggles of processing times, which present additional concerns and frustrations for obtaining identification following release. Prada, a staff member offers detail on processing times for identification,

> First thing is birth certificates and it's frustrating because some birth certificates come back in a week and other's take months. One I submitted, let me think of the dates, one back in August […] and she still doesn't have her birth certificate […] I think it's because […] some of these clients have gone through multiple applications of birth certificates, like they move, they go to jail, or it gets lost.

Prada offers her insights into the challenges of obtaining the necessary documents for community reintegration. Prada states that birth certificates are typically the first navigational step women must navigate for proof of identification and citizenship. At the time of the interview the client had been waiting nearly one year for her documents.

Another WRAP program client, Celine, also indicated that obtaining identification was among her immediate needs, "To get all the IDs done, because I had absolutely nothing." Celine's testimony provides an additional example of the worries experienced by formerly incarcerated women facing the onerous process for securing identification after release.

Paris, a WRAP program collaborator, provides another example of women enduring financial insecurity due to the lack of documentation following release from custody,

> They don't have their bank card; they might have enough money to access food or clothes that they need. […] So, they might have access to money, or money in their bank account and they cannot access it because they don't have their bank card.

Paris speaks to how recently released women are unable to access many other needs for survival without proper identification and documentation; thereby, enduring additional difficulties accessing essential resources.

Basic Survival Needs. Participants from both population groups mention basic survival needs upon release. Accessing basic needs for survival is fundamental for health, stability and productivity. In this context, basic needs were categorized as food/diet and clothing. However, many women face substantial adversities at discharge such as financial hardships, resource insecurities and limited social ties. As such, women experience stress and worry about meeting basic survival needs due to the substantial losses experienced during incarceration.

Armani, a staff member speaks to food insecurity as a major issue for women leaving custody,

> There's usually like a week or two waiting period before things really get moving and that even includes things like food or a food bank referral. If you come Friday at four o'clock, you're not doing a food bank intake and you're not gonna' get anything until next week […] So, it's really tough and it's 'what donations do we have in the cupboard to get you through and what canned goods can you eat all weekend to get you through?' because there's nothing until Monday.

Participants illustrate the immediate circumstances of release felt by many women discharged to the community halfway house, where women with no financial resources may have to wait several days for access to food supply and/or food bank referrals.

Chanel, an agency staff member provides a detailed example of accessing basic clothing essentials,

> Basic clothing… women go into jail in the summertime with their shorts on and their tank top and get released in the wintertime and they get the same clothes they have to put on that they went in with… I've picked women up at [provincial jail removed] with stiletto heels […] in February.

This example illustrates how women released from provincial jail have been released from jail without the necessary clothing for safely enduring harsh and cold weather conditions of Canadian winters. For women released without supports in place, their health is at risk during extreme weather conditions. The need for basic clothing suited for all climates, such as jackets and durable shoes, is particularly concerning when being released from custody.

Both Milan and Celine, women released from federal and provincial custody, mentioned clothing when speaking about the needs immediately upon release. For instance, Celine indicated that she experienced substantial loss of property during incarceration, by stressing "The most basic needs like clothes […] I had literally two outfits for the first month." Being released from custody with only two outfits creates substantial limitations for reintegrating, for various practical, personal and social reasons. It is challenging to rotate and wash clothes when there are such few items available. Furthermore, fluctuating climates and seasonal conditions have different requirements for comfortable and safe attire.

Clothing and presentation are important for social impressions and norms, especially if women have goals for pursuing employment and living pro-social lives. Milan, a formerly incarcerated woman released from provincial jail, shares her worries about losing property and clothing during her time in custody,

> My worry was I was arrested in a motel, so I didn't know how I would get my belongings and that back […] My biggest needs were to get proper clothing.

Milan and Celine worried about securing basic clothing needs. Without proper clothing, women are also limited in their capacities for self-expression, confidence, and reclaiming identity.

Housing. All participants from both population groups spoke to housing during the interview. Many women enter custody already homeless, having lost their homes during previous times served, and/or are escaping abusive households. Without housing stability, women are missing the foundation for safety and risk homelessness or recidivism in an environment where women are focussed on surviving rather than reintegrating. Thus, the need for housing security is critical following release.

Milan, a woman recently released from provincial jail, speaks to her housing circumstances,

> I have a bed at the Efry, but other than that I am looking for housing… I was homeless prior to going to jail… since I have come to Efry, I have been involved with [staff name removed], to help me find housing […] and I got my name on for the subsidized housing […] but I hear the waiting list here is just as long as everywhere else […] It could be years, so […] housing is my main need, definitely.

Milan indicates that although she is currently living at the agency's halfway house, she remains concerned about housing stability once her time expires at the temporary residence. Milan is also discouraged about her chances for affordable housing through subsidy, as wait lists for social housing span years in Ontario.

Chanel, a WRAP program collaborator with decades of experience working with incarcerated women, shares perspectives on housing needs,

> The housing part is a big, big part […] but the housing list is anywhere from seven to twelve years… so, it's very discouraging […] we often have women here who have arrears with their housing, so they've been in housing before and they went to jail and when they went to jail, nobody paid the rent… so when they get out of jail and owe $20,000 […] because if you have arrears anywhere, they won't put you on the housing list.

Chanel shares situations of formerly incarcerated women being placed in arrears– where tenants who miss rent payments face legal action for the money owed to landlords. Given the financial

insecurities and troubles often experienced by women leaving custody, the worries associated with legal pursuits for missed rent payments add to the anxieties of release in the community. Furthermore, individuals in arrears are often viewed poorly and/or denied rental applications by future landlords further limiting housing options.

Pandora, a client of the WRAP program, offers an example of formerly incarcerated peers living in the agency's halfway house while looking for housing

> I know there's a couple of girls in the house right now that are trying to find housing, but one girl went to like 20 appointments today… and they were all over her price… like, she told the landlord "I can afford $1700 a month max" […] and he was showing her apartments for like $2599 […] I'm like why would you want to waste somebody's time?

Although Pandora did not express personal needs for housing her comments reflects the frustrations felt by many in a housing climate with increasingly high rental costs. Indeed, the added disadvantage of experiencing incarceration and substantial loss creates perceptions of hopelessness for securing a stable home.

Trauma & Separation. Many women released from custody re-enter communities still struggling with trauma, loss and separation. As such, participants express concerns and anxieties for managing triggers and the reunification process with family. Paris, a WRAP program collaborator with substantial experience in mental health support, offers her insight on this process for women released from custody,

> We have people who are coming from an incredible amount of trauma, and they are often bringing childhood and intergenerational trauma with them. That in itself creates enough barriers, when you have a criminal past on top of that […] a lot of them just give up… or […] because of what we know about addictions and mental health, is that there is a real struggle with that black or white thinking.

The "*black or white thinking*" Paris refers to is a tendency for those struggling with mental health and trauma to consider absolute success or absolute failure as the only possible outcomes for life circumstances and situations (Gebhardt et al., 2017). For formerly incarcerated women, this can be applied to reintegration experiences and progress where women fear, or even accept, failure immediately following release. Celine, a formerly incarcerated woman diagnosed with complex PTSD, speaks to how incarceration has changed her wellbeing in the community,

> My whole life, I was really very much a people person… I was always really outgoing […] my house was full of people, and I was always out and about meeting friends, and I just couldn't imagine, even when I had kids and what not, not being surrounded by people. Now, I just want to sit at home, alone. I don't want to leave my room, my bedroom […] or my apartment. I don't want to talk to anybody, I don't want to go anywhere with anybody…

Paris indicates that "there's always trauma" endured by formerly incarcerated women in communities, which tends to be associated with addictions and mental health concerns. Indeed, Zara shares that formerly incarcerated women often come from "complex life histories or perhaps abuse growing up or in intimate partner relationships". Incarceration is characterized by isolation, abuses of power, loss and deprivations of basic necessities that can intensify pre-existing post-traumatic stress (Pettus Davis, Renn & Kennedy, 2019). Pandora, a formerly incarcerated client of the WRAP program, identified "drug and substance abuse, treatment and coping, triggers, and setting boundaries" as her foundational needs for reintegration following release.

The trauma experienced by formerly incarcerated women is often associated with the separation from loved ones and the isolating experiences of custody, criminogenic backgrounds and criminalized life histories. For many women released from custody, regaining connection with their family and children is of primal concern – particularly for women who lost custody of

their children from incarceration or the life circumstances preceding admission. Chanel, a staff member, illustrates these experiences for many women reintegrating from jail or prison,

> They sort of lost their family, or if they're trying to get custody of their children again or even access to children. That's a huge one because if you go to jail and you've lost your kids which you have no say over because you can't get there to even have a say. By the time you get out of jail there's some kind of process in place where family have the kids, or they've been put in foster care.

Participants indicate that losing children to foster care or other relatives is a deeply troubling experience that continues for many women following release, which exacerbates trauma backgrounds and mental health or substance use triggers. Continued separation from children can result in poor mental health outcomes and trigger trauma responses such as substance use relapse, anxiety, and psychological distress for women attempting to reintegrate (Pettus-Davis, Renn, & Kennedy, 2020).

Participants share experiences of waiting years before reunification with children, which created additional anxieties and worries for reconnection after long periods of separation. Florence, a formerly incarcerated woman and mother, speaks to how enduring separation impacted her mental health needs at re-entry,

> I was a little bit worried about uhm, I had a little bit of anxiety just knowing that I was coming back out and seeing my kids again […] I was having difficulty, of course, being away from my family for so long… at that point it had been just over 3 years […] it was really hard to be able to wrap my head around.

Florence's story illustrates the substantial difficulties and anxieties surrounding separation from family and children following the losses and isolation associated with incarceration. Enduring trauma and family reunification are often central to navigating reintegration for women released from custody.

Both service providers and formerly incarcerated women involved in this study share experiences and perspectives of the needs of formerly incarcerated women. More specifically, unmet needs in custody are often followed by enduring needs in the community for women after release. Understanding that many essentials for survival, stability, rehabilitation, and re-entry transitions are limited is important for understanding the experiences of formerly incarcerated women reintegrating after release.

WRAP Programming Outcomes

Research Question: Does reintegrative programming and/or interventions designed for formerly incarcerated women impact experiences of re-entry?

This theme was developed from the outcomes associated with formerly incarcerated women's participation in the WRAP program. All client and staff participants discuss their experiences of reintegration and programming outcomes. Programming outcomes are categorized into three distinct subthemes: individualized and holistic service provision, navigational support, and participant satisfaction. Interviews from staff service providers, facilitators, and collaborators offer perspectives from working with clients who participated in the WRAP program. Interviews from clients provide direct experiences with the WRAP program. Generally, the results from this section focus on the exploration of a novel program designed specifically for formerly incarcerated women and its associated impacts for participant re-entry experiences.

Individualized & Holistic Service Provision

All participants from both population groups indicate that the WRAP program offers individualized and holistic service provision for participation in various capacities.

Individualized and holistic service provision is an approach to programming that considers the unique and entire circumstances of each woman. Instead of a universal "one size fits all" approach to programming, a more client centered, and responsive method is implemented based on individual needs and comprehensive support. According to staff, needs and areas for support are assessed by client feedback during intake with the program coordinator or through agency referrals (i.e., case managers and/or support staff). Dolce, a staff member, explains the standard practice for addressing individualized needs through agency referrals,

> Say the case manager is doing their initial interview of them coming into the house, and hearing like 'ok, you don't have a birth certificate' and then sending them to WRAP. So, then the WRAP hears, 'Ok, so she doesn't have a birth certificate', and kind of goes from there.

The "house" Dolce is referring to is the community halfway house for women released from federal or provincial custody. Thus, the WRAP program collaborates with other staff working at the residence where formerly incarcerated women are living to gather information and facilitate the needs assessment process.

Prada, an agency staff member speaks to the program's holistic objectives for addressing the individualized needs of each client,

> We meet with any woman who has come out of federal or provincial jail to determine what their needs and wants are. It's all based around them […] There's nothing that forces them to come […] So, some needs are very different. A lot of them need ID. So, it's anything from identification, to clothing, to helping them with applications for housing […] places for food, bus passes, anything they could possibly need when they come out of jail […] we have actually been pretty successful next door at the halfway house as well, we've gotten four of them I think are employed.

Prada indicates that women released from custody seek assistance from the WRAP program voluntarily and, from there, needs are determined based on unique and individualized circumstances. Indeed, the WRAP program recognizes that women released from custody have

different needs and, thus, services offer a variety of supports opportunities and flexibility. Prada emphasizes the protection for client autonomy and choice throughout WRAP programming. Furthermore, participants explain that individualized service provision has a large and holistic scope assisting with many factors associated with successful re-entry. Participants indicate that reintegration factors identified at intake often include obtaining identification, basic need security (food, clothing), housing assistance, transportation, and help with employment.

Zara, a staff member, provides additional details about how the program works holistically towards meeting the individualized needs of clients,

> It's really based on what the need of that client is. So, you know there might be a week that all […] the coordinator does is birth certificate applications. […] Certainly, trying to connect with things like food banks or community donations to try and offset some of those personal needs costs and then also making sure that women are aware of different resources out there.

Participants indicate that the WRAP program also works to compensate for some of the costs and financial strain associated with being released, acknowledging woman have often suffered substantial losses. Florence, a woman in her 50s reintegrating from years in provincial custody, speaks to her experience with individualized and holistic service provision as a participant of the WRAP program,

> They give you access to everything here, you don't have to worry about clothes, you don't have to worry about food […] Uh, you're getting all the counselling you need […] IDs and stuff.

Florence suggests that the WRAP program offers a wraparound approach for individualized supports including help with access to basic needs (food and clothing), identification assistance, referrals to mental health counselling, and other potential assistance. Another participant, Celine, speaks to her experience with responsive and holistic service provision as a formerly incarcerated woman participating in the WRAP program,

> They have helped me get all my IDs and applied with me. […] So, they've been working with me to get my son's birth certificate and then to get full custody […] as soon as I find a place, my sons will be moving back with me. So hopefully I can get [staff name removed] to help me with how to enrol them in school and their IDs to be enrolled in school. [Staff names removed] has also been helping me to look for apartments.

Celine highlights how the WRAP program worked to provide support for her individual needs of identification, family reunification, and housing. Indeed, participants state that the WRAP program provides responsive and ongoing service delivery by making service adjustments and/or seeking additional supports where necessary. Client participants were asked about their needs when they began the WRAP program. All the participants offered individualized answers, unique to their life backgrounds before entering custody and their needs during reintegration. All WRAP clients and staff involved in this study suggest that the program's objective to facilitate individualized and holistic reintegration needs is fundamental to the program's service. Respondents emphasize the importance of recognizing individual life circumstances and creating choices to provide effective reintegration services and holistic support for women released from custody.

Navigational Support

Participants from both population groups emphasize that navigating the services, systems and supports required for reintegration can be difficult. Many participants speaking about programming outcomes indicate that navigational support is a foundational component to service for WRAP clients. In the context of the WRAP program, navigational support refers to strategies and support features that assist clients with moving through reintegration essentials more effectively in the community. Zara, an agency staff member speaks to the navigational support offered to clients,

> The idea behind it is that it's supposed to be sort of a 'one stop shop', wrap around service that when folks need those reintegration services, it's not, 'ok you need to go to this building on this street for ID and then you need to go over here for your bus pass, but then you need to go back here if you don't have this piece of ID' so, it can just sort of be a central place to access all those services that you would need.

Zara highlight that the WRAP program operates as a 'one stop shop' for women released from custody. This is critical, as women are provided access to many reintegrative resources in a centralized area/service, rather than having to manage the complexities of multiple, siloed service networks across community spaces. Women are offered support navigating the complexities of government applications, referrals to other community services, and reintegrative processes like service appointments and transportation.

Chanel, a staff member, provides further details about the navigational components of programming outcomes,

> Help to go get groceries, help to pick-up the foodbank, help take them to 'Dress for Success' or another appointment that they might have… because transportation […] it's not as easy as say 'Well, get a bus pass!' Well, "I don't know [city name removed], so, how am I supposed to get around on a bus pass?" […] many women have mental health issues […] a lot of them need help. […] They're not going to take a bus by themselves… So, the WRAP program often gets volunteers like students to take somebody on the bus and stuff as well.

Participants from both population groups mention transportation as critical for navigating release, particularly for women who are unfamiliar with the community. Participants also speak to one-to-one navigational support offered for clients with mental health issues, who may struggle with getting around the community independently.

Pandora, a formerly incarcerated participant of WRAP, discusses navigational support as a major aspect of her experience with the program,

> They'll pay for our birth certificate card, they give us rides, like if we have to go to parole […]so like, they're trying to take away the barriers of you being able to get those things because when you first get here you don't have a bus pass, you don't have the

> money to buy a bus pass, so you have to apply and that's one of the things that [staff name removed] and [staff name removed] did too […] through the city they have a reduced transit card […] we filled it out, gave it back, and they dropped it off at social services […] and like there's a dental and glasses benefit in that one too, prescription medication benefit in that one, you can even get a free gym membership.

Pandora speaks to how the WRAP program offered a multitude of supports associated with navigating her process of reintegration including financial assistance, alleviating barriers for transportation, and enrolling her in social assistance opportunities. Participants emphasize navigational support as a major programming outcome, with the goal of alleviating barriers for community reintegration.

Participant Satisfaction

All participants were asked how formerly incarcerated women feel after participating in the WRAP program. Staff participants offer perspectives based on witnessed, perceived or direct feedback from clients. Formerly incarcerated women provided responses based on direct experiences and perspectives as a former or current client of the WRAP program. Findings suggest that formerly incarcerated women feel supported by WRAP service provision; however, some participants expressed frustrations for the remaining barriers they face.

Perceptions of Support. All clients of the WRAP program who participated in this study provided perspectives of feeling supported and happy with the reintegrative services. Overall, participants were satisfied with their participation in programming. Celine, a formerly incarcerated woman who served time in both federal and provincial custody, shares her experience as a client of the program,

> So, [staff name removed] has been great, any time I had a question or request, they accommodated it. They even provided some additional services that are probably not even required for them to do […] they have been really good and getting my documents, my IDs, and working on getting my kids' stuff together. It's a huge help, definitely.

When participants were asked how they felt about their participation in the WRAP program, they shared feeling supported and empowered to seek help for their reintegration needs. Moreover, Celine stated that services received from the program exceeded her expectations and was satisfied with WRAP program's reintegration service.

Florence, a client of the WRAP program with a long history of incarceration speaks to her experience with the WRAP program,

> It's been a wonderful help… anytime I need something, they're more than happy to reach their hand out and if they can't help me, they'll definitely figure out a way or somebody that can […] I highly recommend it […] My needs were met here and I'm really grateful… That's why I volunteer here now […] to give back, to help back.

Florence's experience with the WRAP program demonstrates the efforts being made to ensure clients are satisfied and their needs are being met. To increase capacities for reintegration, participants suggest that the WRAP program will outsource if certain needs are not within the program's scope. Given the level of positive feedback, participants stated they would recommend the service to other women released from custody.

Other clients echo these perceptions of support as a major benefit of the program. Milan explains "All of my needs are getting pretty well met here […] they help you with a lot and I'm reintegrating pretty good […] I'm glad that it was available to me and I am happy I did it." Milan's views are similar to the testimonies heard by other participants, expressing positivity and gratefulness for the opportunity to participate in the WRAP's reintegrative support program.

Participants also express trust in knowing that programming staff will collaborate with other community specialists or external services providers if additional supports are necessary for meeting their needs and supporting better reintegration outcomes. Some participants were so satisfied with their experience in WRAP that they pursued volunteer work with the agency, demonstrating a commitment to community engagement and, in turn, influencing their reintegration experience.

Paris, a staff member, provides insight on client satisfaction from the perspective of a community expert,

> I think a lot of them walk away feeling like 'ok, I've got the support. I've got that done.' For something they could not have done on their own. Something that you or I might think 'ok, I need to order this, I'll just go online and order my new ID…' For some of them they can't do that. WRAP [„„] can sit down and fill out that form with them and just take that weight off their shoulders […]

Staff participants suggest that many women leave the program feeling supported and appreciative for assistance with navigating life circumstances which are often taken for granted by people who have not been incarcerated.

Potential Frustrations. Some participants expressed enduring frustrations. These findings were more common among discussions with staff than formerly incarcerated women. For instance, Zara provides her insight, based on years of service with the agency,

> I've recently worked with lots of women who have accessed the WRAP program and felt that it supported them really well and that it was that great first step […] I can think of a couple women who have accessed it purely just for the birth certificate […] for reasons beyond our ability it's been six, eight, twelve months and we are still in the process of not being able to get it […] so there's some frustration of those barriers that, unfortunately, aren't within our control […] so as much as I would like to say "100% satisfaction guaranteed" […] certainly those limitations are felt.

Zara provides examples of former and/or current clients of the WRAP program who continue to endure barriers accessing reintegration needs, despite the program's efforts. Staff often face limitations accessing resources (discussed in greater detail in the next theme). Staff worry about their capacities given the deeply rooted barriers that persist for formerly incarcerated women.

Celine, a client of the WRAP program, expressed some concerns about inabilities to secure housing stability in a housing market with high rental costs and demand,

> I am still having a hard time finding an apartment even though I have money, and I have a job […] they are really ridiculously expensive […] I apply for them, and don't get any calls back, I don't know why.

Celine's experience highlights the frustrations felt by formerly incarcerated women reintegrating amidst a housing crisis, despite efforts through engagement in programming. Frustrations are experienced when formerly incarcerated clients and staff are unable to offer timely and effective reintegrative support due to limited capacities, availabilities and resources. Dolce, a staff member, provides examples of the discouragement experienced by clients due to limited resource accessibility

> A lot of them actually feel discouraged throughout the process because of how long it might take to get a birth certificate and things like that and obviously our WRAP program is only available Monday to Wednesday […] for women say that come on a Thursday, they're not able to get support until the following Monday.

Dolce demonstrates how systemic challenges such as lengthy application processing times and funding constraints impact WRAPs capacity to deliver services. Frustrations and worries may remain for women receiving support from the WRAP in an environment riddled with challenges. Although the WRAP program can provide supportive reintegration services for women, feelings of hopelessness are felt by clients considering the persisting barriers in the community.

Staff and formerly incarcerated women speak to individualized needs provision, navigational support and participant satisfaction. Overall, the WRAP program appears to provide a holistic model for gender specific programming and alleviates some barriers to re-entry.

Persisting Barriers

Research Questions: What are the experiences of formerly incarcerated women reintegrating from prison or jail? Does reintegrative programming and/or interventions designed for formerly incarcerated women impact experiences of re-entry?

This theme reflects perceived and experienced barriers in the community during or after participation in the WRAP program. Despite the WRAP program's efforts to assist in the reintegration process of formerly incarcerated women, barriers to successful and smooth community re-entry persist. All participants involved in the study from both population groups identified remaining barriers to essential needs, services and pro-social livelihoods. Remaining barriers were categorized and coded into three subthemes: systemic barriers, accessibility issues, and enduring stigma. While both groups reflected on similar issues, formerly incarcerated women focused on more individualized barriers that impacted their reintegration experience. Conversely, agency staff often addressed barriers associated with facilitating reintegration services, providing support or perceptions of barriers experienced by formerly incarcerated clients. Overall, the results from this section explore both the experiences of formerly incarcerated women reintegrating from prison or jail and how reintegrative programming and/or interventions designed for formerly incarcerated women impact experiences for re-entry. Indeed, although efforts are made to assist reintegration, barriers persist for many criminalized women

involved in programming and must be dually considered to holistically understand the experiences and perspectives of community reintegration for participants.

Systemic

Both staff and formerly incarcerated women mentioned barriers associated with systemic processes of release from provincial jails or federal prisons. Systemic barriers are structural or institutional practices and/or policies that further exclude individuals from already marginalized groups from holistic and equal participation in the community. Indeed, systemic barriers were understood as marginalizing and/or oppressive policies and practices embedded within the criminal justice system. Ultimately, these marginalizing institutional practices and legal policies present challenges for the effective and successful reintegration of women released from custody. More specifically, inadequate discharge planning prior to release from custody and onerous conditions of release were mentioned by both participant groups.

Discharge Planning. Inadequate institutional discharge planning while in custody together with numerous conditions for re-entry, contributes to an overall weakening of the reintegration process for formerly incarcerated women. Pandora, a woman who served time in both federal and provincial custody, spoke about the barriers to proper discharge planning prior to release from federal prison,

> like we didn't know because nobody who has gotten out has had anybody at [federal prison name removed] meet with them that makes sure that they have like their birth certificate… because they're supposed to help you apply for it before you get out, cause like it takes six to eight weeks to get it anyway… they did absolutely nothing for like your pre-release planning… they didn't do anything…

Pandora expresses the frustrations of receiving no discharge planning prior to release. This is especially problematic considering identification is a basic reintegration need for gaining

access to social assistance, employment, housing applications, banking and other basic necessities. Furthermore, women released from federal prison have served sentences of at least two years, thereby increasing the likelihood of lost essentials requiring identification, such as housing and employment. The problem is service coordination and obtaining identification starts after release from custody, creating obstacles for initiating the reintegration process. Without formal identification, women struggle to figure out how and where to re-start their lives in the community.

Chanel, an agency staff member with decades of experience working with criminalized communities provides insight on discharge planning challenges from a service providers perspective,

> Women are released from jail and prison, although they are not supposed to be released from prison without ID, but they are… so, they come out with no identification, they've lost it and it's been gone […] so, you need a birth certificate to get almost every other kind of ID and even just to set up a bank account… I mean, it trickles down to all things that affects you…

According to both staff and formerly incarcerated women, prisoners are routinely released from custody without the identification required for re-entry, leading to additional barriers for accessing other reintegrative needs like setting up a bank account. Furthermore, participants suggest that federal prisons should ensure that women are released with identification; however, findings suggest that federal discharge planning is failing to meet release preparation requirements.

Armani, a staff member, offers another example of barriers stemming from poor discharge planning,

> We get a lot of women who […] are on methadone and […] provincially, they are released with nothing. So, they show up here with no medication, [provincial jail removed] won't fax over a prescription to the pharmacy. […] So often […] when we get

> women first out, it's calling the institutions, maybe trying to reach out to street health, getting them to urgent care, depending on what kind of medication they are on…"

Armani speaks to the consequences of inadequate discharge planning on women's health immediately following release from provincial jails. Indeed, women often enter communities without access to necessary medications. In desperate scenarios, women must go to urgent care to obtain prescriptions. Disruptions in continuities of medical care and access to medication impacts women's health following release. Continuities of care are vital for rehabilitation ensuring women receive consistent and effective treatment. This lack of planning has serious repercussions and impacts on women's health and quality of life.

Without ensuring that women leave custody with the documents and/or instructions required for smooth re-entry, women experience interruptions in attaining the services necessary for successful reintegration. When asked if women feel prepared for release from custody, Paris provides insight as a staff member,

> I would say very few people are ever prepared […] They really don't have what they need […] They often are released without even their belongings, they need someone to go back to the institution they came from to pick up their belongings […] they don't have their bank card, they might have like enough money to access food or clothes that they need […] they might have access to money, or money in their bank account and they cannot access it because they don't have their bank card.

Women participating in the WRAP program endure additional delays throughout the process of re-entry, which could have been circumvented by adequate preparation while in custody. Thus, barriers to effective discharge planning at the institutional level prior to release constructs systemic challenges with lasting impacts upon re-entry, creating environments where formerly incarcerated women struggle to feel prepared and stable.

Conditions of Release. Many WRAP staff and clients indicate that the conditions of release imposed for re-entry often create substantial barriers to reintegration and generate a landscape buttressed by policies that further marginalize and challenge success. If formerly incarcerated women fail to comply with conditions of release, they face additional charges and reincarceration. These marginalizing and penalizing policies threaten an individual's capacity to remain in the community following release. For instance, Paris, a staff member, discussed barriers when asked about the effects of release conditions on reintegration experiences,

> More so with the federal, their conditions are just so much tighter and there is so much more supervision on them that I would say their ability to just make healthy connections or even try to is really limited. […] The main condition is they can't have association with anyone outside the house without having a CPIC done on them […] So, isolation is a real issue for them…

Paris highlights women released from federal prison are given tight conditions of release, which limits their ability to form healthy connections through intensive supervision. Conditions of release may create distrust of the criminal justice system for both the individual released and the people they associate with strengthening marginalization and discrimination effects by policing community interactions. Social interactions are overly monitored and supervised in the community through further criminalizing approaches. Formerly incarcerated women face further alienation and additional barriers to developing positive social connections.

Milan, a woman who has experienced both homelessness and provincial jail, provides a personal example of how conditions of release hindered her ability to regain the social ties and connections lost during incarceration,

> I'm from another town, not [city removed]… and I have a peace bond put on me by somebody from that town, […] but I still have some good friends there… I also have a lot of not so good people there who I was involved with who caused me some of my charges […] but I'm still kind of wanting to go back.

Milan has mixed feelings about the impacts of conditions of release and her ability to return home and reconnect with close friends. Milan indicated that she was focused on rehabilitation and moving forward through the reintegration process. However, conditions prohibiting her from returning to her home community, challenge her ability to reconnect with positive relationships that provide emotional and relational support for healing. Participants suggest that conditions of release, barring women from returning to their home communities and/or neighbourhoods, lead to further social fragmentation following incarceration and may reinforce perceptions of isolation from community membership. Ultimately, isolation and social alienation can lead to further implications for reintegration capacities such as negative impacts on mental health, limited support, and feelings of segregation from community life.

Accessibility

Both staff and women involved with the WRAP program mentioned that challenges and difficulties persist for accessing the services, resources, and means necessary for community reintegration. Accessibility barriers were coded as obstacles and hindrances for accessing reintegration needs and processes, experienced by staff and women involved in the WRAP program. Access to housing, employment, and community resources are particularly highlighted due to the frequency of perceived barriers, despite the WRAP program's efforts to address these areas.

Housing. Ontario is in the midst of a housing crisis where securing safe and affordable homes is difficult for many members of the community (National Housing Strategy, 2021). However, many participants expressed that these challenges are exacerbated for formerly

incarcerated women encountering the housing crisis. Zara, a staff member specializing in women released from federal and provincial jail, speaks to the barriers for accessible housing,

> The housing situation is abysmal to say the least in [city removed], especially if you're working off a very low-income amount from Ontario Works or ODSP. […] One of the things we try to do is to always get women on the social housing registry if they're not already. But uhm, that's about a seven-year waitlist […] unless you're 'lucky enough', which is certainly not what I mean, to be deemed a high priority of fleeing domestic violence or human trafficking and even then, you might get something in six months.

Zara's quote illustrates the seemingly hopeless process of securing housing for women released from custody; who are often released with minimal income, limited opportunities for financial security, fragmented social ties, and without a home. Zara also highlights the lengthy wait times for social housing placements, where women often "*just give up*" on the idea of accessing affordable housing. Zara and other staff explain that without securing stable housing, many women are left to reintegrate in emergency shelters, unhoused, or in potentially toxic environments—facing the risk of domestic violence or exposure to substance use.

Florence, a 52-year-old woman released from provincial custody around one year prior to study participation, provides her insight on the importance of housing stability in the reintegration process when speaking to barriers external to the WRAP program,

> A person really needs a stable environment to go back into because if they are just thrown back out there on the street, or back into the same situation, they're not going to be able to […] it's just going to be a loop.

The "*loop"* Florence references is the revolving door of incarceration, an apparent reality for many women released from prison or jail into homelessness or dysfunctional households. Indeed, without accessing the security of safe housing, many women run the risk of further exposure to

criminogenic circumstances and surroundings such as substance use, poverty, community violence and social disorder.

Despite the WRAP program's efforts to meet the reintegration needs of women in the program, the housing climate limits the program's ability to alleviate these barriers. Dolce, an agency staff member who works closely with clients involved in the WRAP program speaks to the program's capacity to mitigate persisting barriers of economic inequality and marginalization, "So, I would say housing is a barrier. […] There's really nothing we can do about the housing crisis". Prada, another agency staff member with decades of experience working with criminalized communities, adds "I really think that housing is the barrier. […] We need more housing." Dolce and Prada's insights demonstrate the persisting frustrations experienced by service providers trying to effectively support formerly incarcerated women in a housing market riddled by inaccessibility and barriers. Housing impacts nearly all aspects of life and agency; thus, securing safe housing is critical for providing the personal protection, healthy environment and the overall well-being necessary for effective reintegration in communities.

Employment. Obtaining employment is essential for formerly incarcerated women because it is associated with successful reintegration, reductions in recidivism and promotes the stability of community membership (Hattery & Smith, 2010). However, many WRAP client and staff participants expressed concerns about the feasibility of accessing and maintaining employment in an economic and social order buttressed by financial disadvantage, oppression and hierarchies. Dolce, an agency staff who works closely with formerly incarcerated women involved with WRAP, provides insight on barriers to accessing and maintaining employment,

> Obtaining employment, there's definitely barriers there. […] because jobs will often want a background check or we've had clients who have had jobs and coworkers found out, googled their names, and so they lose their job because they're found out.

Dolce's response highlights that employers often require background checks for potential candidates and/or employees have lost jobs after colleagues have discovered criminal records through online databases. Thus, formerly incarcerated women often experience substantial difficulties for obtaining employment and working towards financial security. Another staff member working with women involved in the WRAP program provides insight into the persisting challenges for employment, despite the program's efforts to reduce barriers for clients,

> So, being able to start over, you might have somebody who has come with a career background that can never go back to that career and it's really challenging […] We have had some people who have had some very good jobs and then have been somehow, months down the line, no complaints about them […] somebody finds out and they're fired […] like they literally show up for work and they are just fired.

Participants share instances of women losing careers after incarceration and experiencing dismissal from employment after colleagues become privy to criminal histories. Staff perspectives illustrate the reality facing women released from custody making efforts for improving economic and social circumstances that contribute to marginalization and struggles in communities. Indeed, although many formerly incarcerated women are motivated to secure employment and engage in work to escape financial disparity and potential poverty, they are often rejected from job markets. Findings suggest that, despite the personal and programming efforts for accessing employment, women still face ostracism from normative social interactions and deprivations of economic security.

Milan, a client of the WRAP program released from provincial custody, revealed her own struggles accessing employment, speaking to persisting barriers in the community,

> Biggest barriers I face? Right now is uhm, trying to get employment and I don't have much education and I'm really not that well skilled at too much […] and the loss of my teeth, so I look a little rough… but, I'm waiting…

Milan's perspective presents as discouraging when speaking to the economic exclusion enforced upon formerly incarcerated women, who enter an employment sphere embedded by systemic disadvantage, unequal opportunity and social othering.

Resources. Many staff facilitators expressed perceptions of limited accessibility to the community resources required for meeting client needs during the reintegration processes such as social reintegration services/networks, agency capacities, mental and physical health care, funding, and foodbank supply. Zara, an agency staff working with the WRAP program, addresses the fatigue associated with accessing the necessary resources for re-entry,

> I think the drain on resources throughout the community. I mean everybody is facing barriers of not enough funding, not enough staff, not enough capacity that even as we're saying 'okay, we can't provide this… but let me refer you out to addiction and mental health, let me refer you to [agency name removed], let me refer you to the food bank…' We can do that, but all of those are also being relied on so heavily that they're also limited in their capacity.

Zara refers to a "*drain on resources"* a compelling point, as the WRAP program's capacity to navigate and facilitate the reintegration process of formerly incarcerated women is reliant on the availability of resources in the community. Indeed, although the WRAP program's assistance with reintegration needs is associated with participant satisfaction and barrier alleviation (as previously discussed), barriers persist for resource stability and successful re-entry.

Another collaborator of the WRAP program, Chanel, focuses specifically on funding restrictions for services when asked about the remaining barriers,

> I would say in general, most non-profits, but include the WRAP program in there, we probably don't have enough resources […] And it's not always people resources, but the WRAP program is only a part time job […] I'd love to give every women that comes out a $25.00 grocery card, take them to the grocery store and say 'just get what you need right now' […] to have personal care items for them and all the kind of stuff… I'd say, it's the lack of resources, I guess.

Chanel highlights the program's ability to provide services necessary for effective and meaningful reintegration support is restricted by a lack of government and public funding allocations for formerly incarcerated populations. Without adequate funding, service capacities are limited to what is feasible given the resources available. The WRAP program may become overextended for meeting the demands for successful re-entry; thereby, manifesting gaps in service for women released from prison or jail.

Stigma

This subtheme was constructed based on responses relating to persisting perceptions and experiences of stigma by formerly incarcerated women during the reintegration process. Stigma was identified as a significant barrier by both women from the WRAP program and staff participants. In this context, stigma is understood as inherent discriminations, biases, subordinations, marginalization and othering within community interactions and life (Tyler & Brockman, 2017). Findings of stigma were coded according to societal exclusions, social marginalization, interactional oppression, and the criminalization resulting from criminal records.

Societal Exclusion and Alienation. Both staff and clients of the WRAP program shared perceptions of societal exclusion and/or alienation as a form of stigma associated with release from prison or jail. Societal exclusion and alienation were contextualized as both explicit and implicit forms of social disconnection, estrangement and/or isolation in community interactions and structures. Portia, a formerly incarcerated woman released from federal prison roughly two years ago, shares her story about implicit social exclusion and alienation in the workplace,

> I ended up getting a job at [remove name] […] I was there for a year and three months as a cashier, I liked it. […] Anyway, I went to work one day […] and all of a sudden, this

> supervisor showed up and I noticed my locker was empty […] He's got my bag […] and he says, 'you've been terminated!' […] he doesn't even want to come near me because I was in jail, I guess […] and I had been doing a good job…

Portia shared her experience of being dismissed from employment due to her criminal background. Portia explained that the employer did not explicitly provide reasoning for dismissal; however, Portia's criminal history was implicitly suggested through interactions before and after the dismissal. Furthermore, Portia indicated that she had not received any warnings or disciplinary actions prior to the dismissal; thus, she was completely unprepared for the employer's decision when starting her shift that day. Shortly after this quote, Portia pointed to her forehead, symbolizing that she continues to feel socially targeted for experiencing incarceration. Indeed, results suggest that barriers for reintegration persist due to the amounts of stigma, exclusion and alienation experienced by previous prisoners throughout Canadian society—despite efforts for assimilating and starting over.

Paris, a staff member providing services for clients involved with the WRAP program, shares her experiences with the impacts of social exclusion and alienation on women's ability to reintegrate,

> A lot of them just give up… or if they don't give up […] So they're in a constant place of, 'I have all this stigma, people are telling me this is who I am, so why don't I just go back and be that person? It's easier to do that.' So, they're constantly just like one foot in the door of giving up and it's really hard for them to rebuild their self-worth.

Paris's perspective speaks to the mental health impacts of extensive societal exclusion and alienation encountered by many formerly incarcerated women. Paris's quote demonstrates how persisting alienation from the general community can have negative effects on the healing process necessary for meaningful participation in the WRAP program and re-entry.

Criminal Records. Women clients and staff involved with the WRAP program describe how a criminal record label has lasting, stigmatizing impacts on community membership. Indeed, having a criminal record impacts most aspects of formerly incarcerated individual's lives and limits opportunities for meaningful engagement in the community. Zara, who has years of experience serving women released from custody, provides her perspective on the impact of criminal records on receiving basic necessities like housing,

> The stigma of criminalization […] lots of housing providers are asking for CPIC's now… If you're on a life sentence, that's for the rest if your life, […] if you're living in a shared dwelling, so a basement apartment or like a room, you have to disclose to everybody else in that building that you are on parole and what you are on parole for. […] And if that's really all you can afford is a room or a basement, […] you run that risk of "now is that person going to rent to me or not?

Zara's example of how a criminal record creates substantial barriers to achieving housing security for women released from custody. Relatedly, Portia shares her personal experience with enduring stigmas with a criminal record while participating in the WRAP program,

> They helped me look for apartments as well… and it's hard too because you find something, and they look your name up… guess what? They see your crime […] so that's really tough.

Portia speaks to the perception that, despite the WRAP program's efforts to support her reintegration into the community, barriers to housing security persist due to the systemic and societal stigma following criminal sanctioning. Indeed, although formerly incarcerated women have completed their custodial sentence, they continue to serve time in the community as social segregation, marginalization and oppression perseveres through the mark of a criminal record.

Chapter Seven: Discussion & Limitations

Social science researchers have studied the topic of community reintegration for people released from correctional institutions; however, there is less qualitative research on community reintegration from the perspectives of formerly incarcerated women—especially, in Canada. Considering that women are the fastest growing prison population in Canada, this study furthers our understanding of the experiences of formerly incarcerated women released from custody by evaluating the implementation of a re-entry program designed specifically for Canadian women (Department of Justice, 2024; Department of Justice, 2021). This study explored (1) what are the experiences of formerly incarcerated women reintegrating from prison or jail; and (2) does reintegrative programming and/or interventions designed for formerly incarcerated women impact experiences of re-entry? . Three key themes with several subthemes were developed within the framework of this study's research questions including: the needs of formerly incarcerated women, WRAP programming outcomes, and persisting barriers.

The Needs of Formerly Incarcerated Women

The first theme highlights the unmet needs of formerly incarcerated women in custody and in the community. There are a variety of needs that remain unfulfilled for women ranging from basic necessities like psychological/physical/social stimulation, food and hygiene to more complex needs such as trauma and mental health support. Findings echo the results of other studies showing that the food provided in provincial institutions is often inadequate to meeting the dietary needs for women's health or special underlying dietary needs (de Graaf & Kilty, 2016; Mommaerts et al., 2023). Furthermore, women placed in administrative segregation

experience even greater restrictions, with limited access to basic survival needs such as showers, food and feminine hygiene products.

Vocational, rehabilitative, and/or mental health programming are routinely lacking for individuals in provincial custody. Negligible efforts are made for rehabilitation in provincial jails. Furthermore, results align with existing literature highlighting the imbalances of power between incarcerated women and the correctional staff responsible for needs provision, who are predominantly male officers (Blakinger, 2019). Indeed, feminist criminologists understand contemporary societies as systems imbedded and organized by the domination, power, and subordination of women and other marginalized genders (Crenshaw, 1991; Davis, 2003). Seemingly, the patriarchal ideals of mainstream societies permeate institutional settings for women, where occupants often rely on male staff—the gatekeepers to everything required for survival (Davis, 2003). As such, incarcerated women are dependent on a staffing team dominated by men for accessing necessities. Women may prefer long sentences in hopes of being sentenced to federal prison, with more programming opportunities and better conditions of confinement. Considering the pre-existing mental health concerns, trauma, and disproportionate rates of psychological disorders for incarcerated women, inaccessibility to mental health programming and support is counterintuitive to penal philosophies of rehabilitation (Miethe & Lu, 2004).

Although federal prisons offer more opportunities for rehabilitation such as mental health programming and improved living conditions, certain needs are not met for federally sentenced women. Specifically, gaps in health care, limited preparation for release, and substantial loss during time served are common experiences for women in federal prisons. Research shows that incarcerated people have substantially higher rates of infectious disease, chronic health concerns, mental illness and substance use disorders compared to the general public (Kouyoumdijan et al.,

2016; Stewart et al., 2015). However, results suggest that women's health conditions are often ignored and/or not taken seriously by federal correctional and medical staff, which has substantial impacts on the quality of life in prisons. Thus, women may leave custody with worse mental/emotional, social and life circumstances than prior to entering custody, given the negative impacts of isolation, separation, and restricted movement on mental health and the further traumatizing effects of imprisonment (King, 2015; Tripodi et al., 2019; Wright et al., 2012).

Identification and housing are fundamental needs for re-entry stability; however, women often leave custody without proper identification, have lost their homes, or enter custody already homeless. Without identification, women are barred from accessing many other requirements for reintegration while waiting for proof of citizenship, like applying for housing and social assistance. In addition, due to the substantial loss of resources during incarceration, many women need basic necessities such as food security and clothing. Limited resources are common for women immediately following release, creating risks for recidivism (Galbraith, 2004).

Furthermore, due to the conditions of confinement, segregation, limited resources and estrangement from family during custody, many women endure trauma and separation from supportive networks in the community. Findings suggest that incarceration can strengthen historic trauma, building an accumulation of adverse life experiences and exacerbating prior trauma symptomology such as psychological distress, relapse, and anxiety (Pettus Davis, Renn, & Kennedy, 2020). Indeed, it appears that the lived experiences of incarceration have enduring impacts at re-entry, where women worry about their capacity to successfully meet the needs required for effective reintegration.

WRAP Programming Outcomes

The second theme focusses on programming outcomes for women involved in the WRAP program. Findings focussed on three major areas including immediate needs provision, navigational support, and participant satisfaction. Participants indicate that the program provides individualized and holistic services, unique to the specific reintegration needs and experiences of each client leaving custody. The program acknowledges that reintegration and recovery needs of each client are different and contingent on unique life circumstances. Thus, the program offers a "wraparound" approach by providing a variety of choices for reintegrative programming support for formerly incarcerated women re-entering communities. Many women leave incarceration with complex and distinctive journeys for re-entry, the WRAP program recognizes that universal and standardized programming models for reintegration are incompatible with the unique and gendered challenges of formerly incarcerated women (Erickson et al., 2024; Green et al., 2016). Thus, the WRAP program's orientation towards individualized and holistic service protects client autonomy and follows a framework of *Creating Choices* for women leaving custody (Correctional Services Canada & Canadian Association of the Elizabeth Fry Societies, 1990).

Although the services offered to clients are provided on an individual basis and vary for each client, common needs at re-entry were found when speaking to clients and staff involved with the WRAP program. Programming typically focuses on facilitating access to identification, housing, clothing, food and/or food bank referrals, employment assistance, connecting to family and mental health support. Findings suggest that identification is generally one of the first steps in programming outcomes, as obtaining identification is necessary for accessing housing, employment, referrals to social services, and bank accounts. Participants also indicate that the WRAP program compensates for the costs and financial strains associated with personal needs

such as food through community donations. In addition, the WRAP program collaborates with other community supports to ensure that women are aware of additional local resources.

Navigational support is another reintegrative component of the WRAP program's service delivery for formerly incarcerated women. Women often lose connection with supportive relationships during incarceration which persists in the community following release (Thomas et al., 2019). Furthermore, many women leave prison or jail in extreme poverty and with fragmented social networks (ibid). Indeed, many women face the complexities of social systems like welfare services, transportation to important appointments (parole, probation, health care, etc.), and knowing where to get help on their own. Formerly incarcerated women may feel overwhelmed by social/community systems and abandoned by the lack of social supports in place for reintegration (Lachapelle, 2021). Participants indicate that major goals for service concentrate on alleviating the barriers associated with the burdens of navigating requirements for re-entry. Participants refer to the WRAP program as a one-stop, centralized service that women can access for assistance with a multitude of reintegrative needs. Both staff and clients of the WRAP program speak to the types of navigational support offered including assistance with completing important applications for reintegration; transportation to appointments like parole meetings or Service Ontario; and one-to-one support for necessary community tasks such as grocery shopping, accessing donations, and learning bus routes. Since formerly incarcerated women have disproportionately high rates of mental health struggles, one-to-one support can help women navigating community re-entry with co-existing anxieties and trauma (Kouyoumdijan et al., 2016; Stewart et al., 2015).

All participants involved in this study spoke to client satisfaction with the WRAP program. Findings suggest that perceptions of support were common among clients involved

with the program; however, some responses align with potential frustrations for the continued barriers faced by clients. All clients participating in this study spoke highly of the services received from the WRAP program and indicated either directly or indirectly that they felt supported by the services received and/or more empowered by the experience. Some clients shared that programming outcomes exceeded their expectations and recommend WRAP participation for other women reintegrating from jail or prison. Staff involved in this study also speak about their perceptions of support, based on feedback received by clients. However, some staff reflect on the various barriers that persist in the community, such as limited resource capacities and onerous wait times for important needs like housing and/or identification.

Persisting Barriers

The final theme identified by this research is that of persisting barriers to effective reintegration into the community, despite the WRAP program's efforts to assist women released from custody. Three subthemes were developed for analysis including systemic barriers, accessibility, and stigma. Findings in this study echo existing literature on barriers to effective reintegration, demonstrating some consistency in issues with discharge planning, inaccessibility to housing, and enduring criminalizing stigmas after release from custody (Moore et al., 2023; Bowman & Fly, 2020; Tyler & Brockman, 2017 Dyer & Biddle, 2013). Participants also discussed barriers associated with conditions of release, employment, and community resources for women.

Inadequate discharge planning creates substantial challenges for women to effectively reintegrate after custody. Participants emphasize that discharge planning and continuities of care are critical for the effective reintegration of women released from custody (Russell et al., 2022).

Participants note that continuity of care is often disrupted when they leave custody. Considering the relationships between mental and/or physical health factors, criminogenic needs and the potential for reoffending, this is especially concerning for formerly incarcerated women (O'Grady & Lafleur, 2016; Dyer & Biddle, 2013). Furthermore, women released from both federal and provincial jails frequently experience no planning for obtaining birth certificates and other forms of identification before release. Given that women often lose these important documents during incarceration, women are placed into precarious situations at re-entry as identification is a foundational factor for accessing other reintegrative resources. Research has shown that the social and systemic displacement of formerly incarcerated people is exacerbated by poor discharge planning; thus, findings illustrate similar experiences for inadequate release preparation for women leaving custody in Canada (Pękala-Wojciechowska, 2021).

Onerous conditions of release present barriers for reintegration, further marginalizing former prisoners through restrictive policies and legal procedures. Findings expand on the effects of policing community interactions for individuals on parole, showing that federal conditions in Canada may require CPIC's of known associates, making it difficult to develop healthy new connections (McKendy & Ricciardelli, 2022; Gideon & Sung, 2011). Research emphasizes the importance of healthy relationships for rehabilitative effectiveness, making conditions that hinder engagement in pro-social recovery maladaptive to the reintegrative needs of formerly incarcerated women (Saxena et al., 2014). Furthermore, women face reincarceration and additional criminal charges for failing to comply with release conditions.

Accessibility barriers also persist throughout the community, where limitations or unavailability are often faced by women released from custody. Ontarians are enduring a housing crisis characterized my high demands, limited supply and increasing rental costs (Association of

Municipalities of Ontario, 2024). Additional challenges for securing housing are experienced by formerly incarcerated women, who often leave custody with histories of homelessness, poverty, and/or unsafe or toxic households. Without securing stable housing, many women are left to reintegrate in emergency shelters, unhoused, or in potentially toxic environments—facing the risk of domestic violence or exposure to substance use (Mayock, Parker, & Seridan, 2015). Results align with existing literature, suggesting that inaccessibility to housing increases the likelihood of being exposed to criminogenic circumstances such as poverty, community or intimate partner violence, and social disorder which increase risks for recidivism (Erickson et al., 2024; Morash & Kashy, 2022; Hipp et al., 2010).

Relatedly, barriers to employment are frequently experienced by women released from custody. Findings show that formerly incarcerated women are denied opportunities for occupation due to employers often requesting criminal record checks. Results also indicate that women reintegrating from custody have been terminated from employment after workplaces discover incarceration and/or criminal histories. Thus, formerly incarcerated women are often penalized and barred from accessing means for financial security, despite making efforts to improve economic and social circumstances. This creates a discouraging landscape for formerly incarcerated women, where accessing other reintegrative resources such as social services, mental and physical healthcare, foodbank supply, and agency capacities are limited by funding and substantial strains on community resources.

Stigma was a persisting barrier for women reintegrating from prison. Perceptions and experiences of stigma for formerly incarcerated women impacts the reintegration process as women are often excluded from community life and interactions. Results echo other studies highlighting the barriers associated with discrimination, marginalization and social othering

faced by women leaving incarceration with criminal records and criminogenic histories (Huebner et al., 2019; Moore et al., 2023; Tyler & Brockmann, 2017). Explicit and implicit forms of social disconnection, estrangement and isolation create alienating realities in community contexts for women. Despite the WRAP program's efforts to support women leaving custody, stigma persists throughout society, making reintegration challenging as women struggle to attain acceptance and community membership. Although reintegrating women have completed their sentence of incarceration, results align with existing literature suggesting that women continue to experience isolation, segregation and oppression through the life sentence of a criminal record (Grace, 2022; Moran, 2012; Zaitzow, 2011

Limitations

This study followed an exploratory methodology to identify the experiences of formerly incarcerated women reintegrating from prison or jail and how programming and/or interventions designed for women can impact experiences of re-entry. Due to the exploratory nature of study, causal relationships cannot be inferred between participation in the WRAP program and successful community reintegration. This project relied on semi-structured interviews and self-reported accounts regarding experiences of incarceration and community reintegration; thus, responses could be influenced by unintentional omissions and/or reshaping of perceptions or experiences. Furthermore, emotions and passion could inspire responses about personal, serious, professional and potentially traumatic life experiences. Relatedly, participants could withhold personal and/or sensitive information due to their comfort level, concerns about confidentiality and worries of stigma or judgement from external researchers.

This project did not consider intersectional considerations like race, culture, age, and/or sexual orientation for analysis; thus, analysis is unable to address how programming outcomes and community reintegration may differ among diverse cultural and/or structural contexts. This study encompassed a small and purposefully selected sample to gather detailed insights; therefore, generalizability to broader populations of women leaving custody and participating in gender-specific reintegrative programming is limited. Further limitations for generalizability and inferences to broader groups are possible as the study concentrated on specific contexts of formerly incarcerated women reintegrating from prison or jail in a particular geographic region. As such, the experiences of clients and agency staff for the program under exploration may not be applicable to other regions, communities, or cultures. The study was a short-term project meeting with interview participants at a particular time following release from custody; thus, long-term effects of the WRAP program and gender-specific reintegration programming are unknown.

As a young woman, passionate about advocating for marginalized and criminalized women, reflexivity should also be considered as a limitation to this study, particularly in relation to gender identification, age-based dynamics, and lived experiences. As a woman, narratives of gender-specific trauma and/or gender-based stigmatization or marginalization may resonate more meaningfully. Although sharing gender identifications may enhance empathetic understanding and comfortability during interviews, it also risks influencing the interpretation of responses and data through the perspective of personal gender-based experiences. As such, potentials for overemphasis and highlighting of certain experiences during thematic analysis is possible, which may otherwise have been overlooked. In addition, differences in age could introduce generational dynamics that limit comfort, desire and credibility for participation. For instance,

age gaps among potential participants, especially those with mistrust of external and/or institutionally perceived researchers, could view a younger research recruiter with skepticism and/or immaturity. Furthermore, a researcher's visible presence as an individual seemingly privileged and/or disconnected from the lived realities of incarceration, could lead to situations where recruits are reluctant to participate, or participants withhold information and provide more desirable responses. Indeed, in this case, researcher presence can hinder willingness for sharing extremely sensitive, private, traumatic and personal experiences among marginalized and vulnerable populations.

Practical & Future Implications

This project explores the processes, experiences and impacts of incarceration and gender-specific approaches to reintegrative programming for women leaving custody in Canada. Results demonstrate that the WRAP program has meaningful outcomes for formerly incarcerated women reintegrating into the community. The program's individualized service approach offers inclusivity for diverse needs, providing choice among a demographic that often feels unsupported, isolated and helpless. Reintegration program initiatives for women leaving custody can reference the perceived successes of the WRAP program for future programming implementation and development. Furthermore, by raising awareness about the unmet needs of women in custody and their enduring needs following release, stakeholders and policy makers can reference these critical gaps for systemic advocacy and change.

Although the WRAP program makes efforts for reducing the existing barriers to community reintegration for women leaving custody, substantial barriers persist through systemic challenges, inaccessibility, and societal stigma. Firstly, institutional accountability and

systemic reform strategies regarding the experiences of women leaving custody should be considered. Specifically, ensuring that women receive adequate discharge planning prior to release should be prioritized to circumvent risks for precarious re-entry circumstances and potential recidivism. Furthermore, to prevent situations where women feel "set up to fail", release conditions should be assessed to ensure that women are reasonably supervised without trivializing reintegration needs for successful re-entry (Sprott & Myers, 2011).

Secondly, the WRAP program is limited by funding, outsourcing and accessibility capacities. Policymakers should recognize the demands for ensuring that all community members receive fair and adequate access to the necessary resources required for stability. For non-profit agencies, building partnerships between local organizations and municipal, provincial or federal administrations could create further opportunities for sustainability and mobility. Given that safe housing is a major component for community stability, creating more opportunities for affordable and safe housing tailored for women should also be a priority.

Thirdly, given the persisting societal stigma, alienation, and segregation experienced by women leaving custody, ongoing efforts for inclusivity and acceptance on community levels is critical for criminalized women. For example, public education campaigns raising awareness to the mental health, trauma, and disenfranchised backgrounds of many formerly incarcerated women with enduring needs in the community could provide meaningful social change.

Finally, policymakers must recognize the importance of gender-specific reintegration services addressing the diverse needs of formerly incarcerated women with marginalized and adverse backgrounds. Consideration for trauma-informed, individualized and intersectional approaches should be a centralized component of women-centered reintegrative programming designs. In addition, adopting a more holistic approach to addressing the complex challenges

faced by women, such as integrating mental health as a foundational component of programming, could be an effective strategy to furthering empowerment for women reintegrating after prison or jail.

Chapter Eight: Conclusion

Social and criminal justice research show that the rate of incarceration for women in Canada is growing at a faster rate than men (Department of Justice, 2021; Statistics Canada, 2024a). Incarcerated women have complex backgrounds associated with criminogenic circumstances including traumatic histories, poverty, mental health, substance use, victimization and tumultuous relationships with family (Green et al., 2016; Pate, 2018). However, limited research has explored the impacts of incarceration on women in Canada. More specifically, community re-entry is a critical period for women; however, women often approach reintegration with feelings of helplessness and trepidation (Youssef, 2023). Community reintegration is a process involving various services, supports and interventions for mitigating criminogenic risks and recidivism (Ricciardelli & Peters, 2017; Lutze et al., 2014; O'Grady & Lafleur, 2016). However, literature has consistently demonstrated that substantial institutional, systemic, and social barriers to effective reintegration are experienced by formerly incarcerated women. Indeed, women often leave custody unprepared, enter society with limited accessibility to essential resources for stability, and face social isolation from the criminalizing experience of incarceration (Colibaba et al., 2023; Tyler & Brockmann, 2017; Braveman & Gottlieb, 2014).

The findings of this study echo existing literature on the barriers associated with successful reintegration for women released from Canadian prisons and jails. More specifically, imbalances of power in institutional settings are reflected in the community, where limited

supports are offered through gender responsive, trauma informed, and accessible approaches. Access to physical/psychological safety, stability, connectedness, during re-entry are often neglected and trivialized amidst a social landscape riddled by marginalization, economic disadvantage, social hierarchies, and isolating stigmas. Further trauma and separation are endured as formerly incarcerated women struggle to navigate re-entry and reunification processes following the deeply traumatic and alienating experience of incarceration. Overall, various needs are not being met for women during custody and after release, with significant impacts on quality of life, rehabilitation, and recovery. Thus, it appears that the merits and principles of Creating Choices (1990) for incarcerated women in Canada are limited in terms of providing responsive reintegration services.

Considering the myriad needs of formerly incarcerated women, the WRAP program makes substantial efforts to provide gender responsive service while assisting the reintegration process of women released from prison or jail. Results indicate that gender responsive programming can have meaningful impacts on the reintegration experience. The WRAP program creates choices for formerly incarcerated women by offering individualized and holistic service provision and personalized navigational support, suggesting a wraparound and unique approach to meeting client needs. Participants suggest that compassionate, responsive and relational support are integral to the WRAP program's services, assisting women to more effectively progress through the process of community reintegration. The program is structured as a one-stop centralized service for addressing the complex and multifaceted components of community reintegration. The supports provided to women help alleviate barriers to effective reintegration. Overall, formerly incarcerated women felt supported, empowered and satisfied with the WRAP program's approach to service and creating choices.

Although gender responsive programs, such as the WRAP program, help support women through the reintegration experience, barriers persist. Systemic barriers, characterized by marginalizing and challenging policies, practices, and structures, undoubtedly make reintegration processes more arduous. Inaccessibility to essential resources presents challenges for formerly incarcerated women and service providers, in neoliberal economies and communities buttressed by scarcities in funding, unequal distributions of wealth, limited capacity, and increasing costs of living. Despite the efforts of gender responsive interventions and programs, societal stigmas remain for formerly incarcerated women who experience life sentences to social isolation, othering and rejection from community settings. Insights from this project support further development of targeted programming to address gender-specific needs, such as individualized service, trauma-informed approaches, empowering choice, and criminogenic barrier alleviation for clients.

References

Aloisio, R., Lafleur, R., & O'Grady, B. (2014). Inmate reintegration: Current practices, challenges, and explanations. *Canadian Observatory on Homelessness*. Retrieved from https://www.homelesshub.ca/resource/inmate-reintegration-current-practices-challenges-and-explanations

American Psychiatric Association. (2016). *Psychiatric Services in Jails and Prisons, 3rd ed.* American Psychiatric Publishing. Arlington, VA.

Anderson, J. O., Pitner, R. O., & Wooten, N. R. (2020). A gender-specific model of trauma and victimization in incarcerated women. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 30(2), 191–212. https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2019.1673272b

Arditti, J. A., & Few, A. L. (2006). Mothers' reentry into family life following incarceration. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, *17*(1), 103–123.https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403405282450

Arrigo, B. A. (2001). Transcarceration: A constitutive ethnography of mentally ill "offenders." *The Prison Journal (Philadelphia, Pa.)*, *81*(2), 162–186. https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885501081002003

Asberg, K., & Renk, K. (2012). Substance use coping as a mediator of the relationship between trauma symptoms and substance use consequences among incarcerated females with childhood sexual abuse histories. *Substance Use & Misuse*, *47*(7), 799–808. https://doi.org/10.3109/10826084.2012.669446

Bahen, J. (2016). Ending the cycle: incarceration, reintegration, and discharge planning - A case study of the John Howard Society Reintegration Centre, (Research report). York University. Retrieved from https://yorkspace.library.yorku.ca/items/45ab74d8-4d26-4aff-bffb-d3e77256cca8

Balfour, G. & Hannah-Moffat, K. & Turnbull, Sarah. (2018). Planning for precarity? Experiencing the carceral continuum of imprisonment and reentry. *Studies in Law, Politics and Society*, 77. 31-48. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1059-433720180000077002

Beeble, M. L., & Hampton, C. (2021). Community reintegration of repeat female offenders in county jails. Women & Criminal Justice, 31(6), 518–535. https://doi.org/10.1080/08974454.2021.1947441

Beckett, K. (2001). Crime and control in the culture of late modernity, [Review of the culture of control: Crime and social order in contemporary society; Crime and social change in Middle England: Questions of order in an English town, by D. Garland, E. Girling, I. Loader, & R. Sparks]. *Law & Society Review*, *35*(4), 899–930. https://doi.org/10.2307/3185419

Beckett, K., & Western, B. (2001). Governing social marginality: Welfare, incarceration, and the transformation of state Policy. *Punishment & Society*, 3(1), 43-59. https://doi.org/10.1177/14624740122228249

Belknap, J. (2010). "Offending women: A double entendre". *The Journal of Criminal Law Criminology*, 100(3), 1061–1098.

Bevan, M. (2024). Responding to trauma, or "responsibilising" women for it? Gender responsivity, trauma, and women's offending in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Women & Criminal Justice,* 34(3), 192–210. https://doi.org/10.1080/08974454.2022.2071379

Bhuller, M., Dahl, G. B., Løken, K. V., & Mogstad, M. (2020). Incarceration, recidivism, and employment. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 128(4), 1269–1324. https://doi.org/10.1086/705330

Binswanger, I. A., Merrill, J. O., Krueger, P. M., White, M. C., Booth, R. E., & Elmore, J. G. (2010). Gender differences in chronic medical, psychiatric, and substance-dependence disorders among jail inmates. *American journal of public health*, *100*(3), 476–482.

https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2008.149591

Blakinger, K. 2019. *Can we build a better women's prison?* The Washington Post. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/magazine/2019/10/28/prisons-jails-are-designed-men-can-we-build-better-womens-prison/

Bodkin C., Pivnick L., Bondy S.J., Ziegler C., Martin R.E., Jernigan C., Kouyoumdjian F. (2019) History of Childhood Abuse in Populations Incarcerated in Canada: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *American Journal of Public Health*, 109(3):e1-e11. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2018.304855.

Bowman, E. I., & Ely, K. (2020). Voices of returning citizens: A qualitative dtudy of a supportive housing program for ex-offenders in a rural community. *The Prison Journal, 100*(4), 423–446. https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885520939273

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.

Brown, G.P., Barker, J., McMillan, K., Norman, R., Derkzen, D., Stewart, L.A., & Burch, M. (2018). *Prevalence of mental disorder among federally sentenced women offenders: In-custody and intake samples*. Correctional Service Canada. Retrieved from, https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2018/scc-csc/PS83-3-420-eng.pdf

Burke, D. 2017. *Number of Women in Federal Prisons is Up, and Advocates Think they Know Why*. CBC News. Retrieved from, https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/nova-scotia/women-prisons-crime-nova-institutionovercrowding-1.4347197

Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies. (2022). *The failure of creating choices: recommendations for moving forward*. Retrieved from https://caefs.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/2022-05-03-RP-The-Failure-of-Creating-Choices-1.pdf

Canadian Association of the Elizabeth Fry Society. (2020). *Canadian Association of the Elizabeth Fry Societies.* Retrieved from, http://caefs.ca/

Carter, N., Bryant-Lukosius, D., DiCenso, A., Blythe, J., & Neville, A. J. (2014). The use of

triangulation in qualitative research. *Oncology Nursing Forum*, *41*(5), 545+. http://dx.doi.org.proxy.queensu.ca/10.1188/14.ONF.545-547

Chesney-Lind, M. (2006). Patriarchy, crime, and justice: Feminist criminology in an era of backlash. *Feminist Criminology*, 1(1), 6-26. https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085105282893

Chesney-Lind, M. (1997). *The female offender: girls, women, and crime*. Sage Publications.

Chesney-Lind, M., & Pasko, L. (2004). *The female offender: girls, women, and crime* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Christian, J., & Kennedy, L. W. (2011). Secondary narratives in the aftermath of crime: Defining family members' relationships with prisoners. *Punishment & Society*, 13(4), 379–402. https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474511414781

Clark., S. (2019). *Overrepresentation of Indigenous People in the Canadian criminal justice system: causes and responses.* Research and Statistics Division, Department of Justice Canada. Retrieved from, http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/jr/oip-cjs/oip-cjs-en.pdf

Clarke, J. G., Rosengard, C., Rose, J., Hebert, M. R., Phipps, M. G., & Stein, M. D. (2006). Pregnancy attitudes and contraceptive plans among women entering jail. *Women & Health,* 43(2), 111–130. https://doi.org/10.1300/J013v43n02_07

Clemmer, D. (1958). *The prison community*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Cobbina, J. E. (2010). Reintegration success and failure: Factors impacting reintegration among incarcerated and formerly incarcerated women. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, *49*(3), 210–232. https://doi.org/10.1080/10509671003666602

Correctional Service Canada (2016). *Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV): Age, gender and Indigenous ancestry*. Government of Canada: Publications. Retrieved from, https://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/publications/005007-3034-eng.shtml

Correctional Service Canada. (2021). *Correctional programs*. Government of Canada. Retrieved from, https://www.canada.ca/en/correctional-

service/programs/offenders/programs/correctional-programs.html

Correctional Services Canada (2017). *Institutional profiles*. Government of Canada: Facilities & Security

Correctional Service Canada. (2018). *National prevalence of mental disorders among federally sentenced women offenders: In custody sample. (R-406).* Government of Canada: Resources. Retrieved from https://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/research/r-406-en.shtml

Correctional Service Canada. (2024). *Mental health services for women offenders*. Government of Canada. Retrieved from https://www.canada.ca/en/correctional service/programs/offenders/women/mental-health-services-women-offenders.html

Correctional Service Canada. (n.d.). *Research brief: 23-19.* Government of Canada. Retrieved from, https://www.canada.ca/en/correctional-service/corporate/library/research/research-brief/23-19.html

Correctional Service Canada. (2024). *Statistics and research on women offenders*. Government of Canada. Retrieved from, https://www.canada.ca/en/correctionalservice/programs/offenders/women/statistics-research-women-offenders.html

Correctional Service of Canada & The Canadian Association of the Elizabeth Fry Societies. (1990). *Creating choices: The report of the task force on federally sentenced women*. Retrieved from, https://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/women/092/002002-0001-en.pdf

Couloute, L., & Talley, D. A. (2024). "That shit ain't helping nobody": Narratives of exclusion and individualism among criminalized men. *Victims & Offenders*, 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2024.2312469

Covington, S. S. (2007). Women and the criminal justice system. *Women's Health Issues*, 17(4), 180–182. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.whi.2007.05.004

Covington. (2007). Gender responsive treatment and services in correctional settings. *Women & Therapy*., 29(3–4), 9–33

Craggs, S. (2020). *Pregnant inmates are getting prenatal care far below health standards, study shows.* CBC News. https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/hamilton/costescu-1.5692144

Crane, J. T., & Pascoe, K. (2021). Becoming institutionalized: Incarceration as a chronic health condition. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, *35*(3), 307–326. https://doi.org/10.1111/maq.12621

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241–1299. https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039

Dang, C. M., Pao, J., Taherzadeh, D., & Nijhawan, A. E. (2021). Paired testing of sexually transmitted infections with urine pregnancy tests in incarcerated women. *Sexually Transmitted Diseases*, *48*(8), S20–S25. https://doi.org/10.1097/OLQ.0000000000001456

Davis, A. Y. (2003). *Are Prisons Obsolete?* United States: Seven Stories Press.

de Graaf, K. & Kilty, J. M. (2016). You are what you eat: Exploring the relationship between women, food, and incarceration. *Punishment & Society*, 18 (1), 27–46

De Giorgi, A. (2018). Punishment, Marxism, and political economy. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Criminology*. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264079.013.358

Department of Justice Canada. (2024). *Addressing overrepresentation of women in the criminal justice system*. Government of Canada. Retrieved from https://www.justice.gc.ca/socjs-esjp/en/women-femmes/ao-ad

Department of Justice Canada. (2022). *Black overrepresentation in Canada's criminal justice system: Examining the role of systemic racism and social exclusion*. Government of Canada. Retrieved from https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/jr/obpccjs-spnsjpc/pdf/RSD_JF2022_Black_Overrepresentation_in_CJS_EN.pdf

Department of Justice Canada. (2023). *Overrepresentation of Indigenous people in the Canadian criminal justice system: Chapter 3*. Government of Canada. Retrieved from, https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/jr/oip-cjs/p3.html

Department of Justice Canada. (2021). *State of the criminal justice system: 2020 report*. Government of Canada. Retrieved from https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/cj-jp/state-etat/2021rpt-rap2021/pdf/SOCJS_2020_en.pdf

Department of Justice Canada. (2024). *Understanding overrepresentation of Indigenous people in the criminal justice system*. Government of Canada. Retrieved from https://www.justice.gc.ca/socjs-esjp/en/ind-aut/uo-cs

Department of Justice Canada. (2024, June 11). *Women and the criminal justice system*. Government of Canada. https://www.justice.gc.ca/socjs-esjp/en/women-femmes/lm-sp

Derkzen, D., Barker, J., McMillan, K., & Stewart, L. (2017). *Rates of current mental disorders among women offenders in custody in CSC*. Correctional Service Canada. https://www.canada.ca/en/correctional-service/corporate/library/research/emerging-results/16-03.html

Doherty, S., Forrester, P., Brazil, A., & Matheson, F. I. (2014). Finding their way: Conditions for successful reintegration among women offenders. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, *53*(7), 562–586. https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2014.944740

Dowling, A., & Fulton, C. (2017). Prison nurseries: A review of maternal and infant rooming in outcomes for incarcerated mothers. *Canadian Journey of Midwifery Research and Practice*, 16 (2), 35-46

Doyle, C., Yates, S., Bartels, L., Hopkins, A., & Taylor, H. (2022). "People say you're going home, but I don't have a home": Housing after prison. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 306624X221132226-306624X221132226. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X221132226

Draine, J., Wolff, N., Jacoby, J. E., Hartwell, S., & Duclos, C. (2005). Understanding community re-entry of former prisoners with mental illness: a conceptual model to guide new research. *Behavioral sciences & the law,* 23(5), 689–707. https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.642

Dyer, W., & Biddle, P. (2013). Prison health discharge planning – Evidence of an integrated care pathway or the end of the road? *Social Policy and Society : A Journal of the Social*

Policy Association, *12*(4), 521–532. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474746412000693

Eggers, M., Muñoz, J. P., Sciulli, J., & Crist, P. A. (2006). The community reintegration project: occupational therapy at work in a county jail. *Occupational therapy in health care*, *20*(1), 17–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/J003v20n01_02

Elizabeth Fry Kingston. (n.d.). *Elizabeth Fry Kingston*. Retrieved from https://www.efrykingston.ca/

Elizabeth Fry Toronto. (n.d.). *Elizabeth Fry Toronto*. Retrieved from, https://efrytoronto.org/

Emerson, A. M., & Ramaswamy, M. (2015). Theories and Assumptions That Inform Trauma Specific Interventions for Incarcerated Women. *Family & Community Health*, *38*(3), 240–251. https://doi.org/10.1097/FCH.0000000000000073

Erickson, M., Deering, K., Ranville, F., Bingham, B., Young, P., Korchinski, M., Buxton, J., Elwood Martin, R., Shannon, K., & Krüsi, A. (2024). "They give you a bus ticket and they kick you loose": A qualitative analysis of post-release experiences among recently incarcerated women living with HIV in metro Vancouver, Canada. *Violence Against Women*, 30(11), 2935-2958. https://doi-org.proxy.queensu.ca/10.1177/10778012231172693

Evans, D. N., & Porter, J. R. (2015). Criminal history and landlord rental decisions: a New York quasi-experimental study. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, *11*(1), 21–42. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-014-9217-4

Federal Housing Advocate. (2023). *Federal Housing Advocate annual report 2022-2023*. Canadian Human Rights Commission. Retrieved from, https://housing.chrcreport.ca/pdf/federal-housing-advocates-annual-report-2022-2023.pdf

Fedock, G., Garthe, R., Pliml, K., Malcome, M., & Sarantakos, S. (2023). Victimization and mental health symptoms among recently incarcerated women: The roles of homelessness prior to incarceration and community-based social support. *Journal of*

the Society for Social Work and Research. https://doi.org/10.1086/726284

Fedock, G., Kubiak, S., & Bybee, D. (2019). Testing a new intervention with incarcerated women serving life sentences. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 29(3), 256–267. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731517700272

Feingold, Z. R., & Lamb, M. E. (2021). The stigma of incarceration experience: A systematic review. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, *27*(4), 550–569. https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000319

Fellus, S. 2018. Prison as a space to heal: women federal prisoners in Canada and the role of the healthcare professional. *University of Ottawa: Commentary*, 1-5.

Ferszt, G. G, & Clarke, J. G. (2012). Health care of pregnant women in U.S. state prisons. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved,* 23(2), 557–569. https://doi.org/10.1353/hpu.2012.0048

Figueira-McDonough, J., & Sarri, R. C. (2002). *Women at the margins : neglect, punishment, and resistance*. The Haworth Press, Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Pantheon Books. (Original work published 1975)

Gaetz, S., & O'Grady, B. (2006). *The missing link: Discharge planning, incarceration and homelessness*. The Canadian Homelessness Research Network. Retrieved from, https://www.homelesshub.ca/sites/default/files/The_Missing_Link_-_Final_Report_June_2007.pdf

Gaetz, S. & O'Grady, B. (2009). *Homelessness, incarceration, and the challenge of effective discharge planning: A Canadian case*. Homeless Hub. Retrieved from, https://homelesshub.ca/sites/default/files/7.3%20Gaetz%20and%20O%27Grady%20-%20Homelessness%20%20and%20Discharge%20Planning.pdf

Galbraith, M. S. (2004). "So tell me, why do women need something different?" *Journal of Religion & Spirituality in Social Work*, 23(1–2), 197–212. https://doi.org/10.1300/J377v23n01_11

Galeano Monti, J., & Delia Deckard, N. (2021). The double-victimization of criminalized women in neoliberal contexts: The case of Paraguay. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 31(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/08974454.2019.1666782

Garland, D. (1990*) Punishment and modern society: A study in social theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Garland, D. (1995). "*Penal modernism and postmodernism*," in Bloomberg, T.G. & Cohen, S. eds., Punishment and Social Control: Essays in Honor of Sheldon L. Messinger. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

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

Garrett, P. M. (2016). Confronting neoliberal penality: Placing prison reform and critical criminology at the core of social work's social justice agenda. *Journal of Social Work: JSW*, *16*(1), 83–103. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468017314565753

Giddens, A. (1971). *Capitalism and modern social theory: an analysis of the writings of Marx, Durkheim and Max Weber.* University Press.

Gideon, L., & Sung, H. (2011). *Rethinking corrections: Rehabilitation, reentry, and reintegration.* SAGE Publications, Inc., https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452230474

Given, L.M. (2008). *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods.* Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, California,

Gough, B., & Lyons, A. (2016). The future of qualitative research in psychology: Accentuating the positive. *Integrative Psychological & Behavioral Science*, 50(2), 234–243. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-015-9320-8

Gebhardt, C., Alliger-Horn, C., Mitte, K., & Glaesmer, H. (2017). All-or-nothing thinking: The Processing of emotional expressions in traumatized post-deployment soldiers. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, *47*, 69–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2016.12.004

Grace, A. (2022). “Get to know me, not the inmate”: Women’s management of the stigma of criminal records. *British Journal of Criminology*, *62*(1), 73–89. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azab029

Green, B. L., Dass-Brailsford, P., Hurtado de Mendoza, A., Mete, M., Lynch, S. M., DeHart, D. D., Belknap, J., & Kendall-Tackett, K. (2016). Trauma experiences and mental health among incarcerated women. *Psychological Trauma,* 8(4), 455–463. https://doi.org/10.1037/tra0000113

Greenberg, D. F. (1981). *Crime and capitalism: readings in Marxist criminology* (1st ed.). Mayfield Pub. Co.

Greenberg, G. A., & Rosenheck, R. A. (2008). Jail incarceration, homelessness, and mental health: a national study. *Psychiatric Services* (Washington, D.C.), 59(2), 170–177. https://doi.org/10.1176/ps.2008.59.2.170

Griffiths, T.C., Dandurand, Y., Murdoch, D. (2007). *The social reintegration of offenders and crime prevention.* Public Safety Canada: National Crime Prevention Centre. Retrieved from, https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrcs/pblctns/scl-rntgrtn/scl-rntgrtn-eng.pdf

Guest, G., MacQueen, K., & Namey, E. (2011). *Applied thematic analysis.* Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, California.

Gunn A. Stigma, surveillance, and wounded healing: Promoting a critical ethics of care in research with formerly incarcerated Black women. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 50(8):3438-3454. doi: 10.1002/jcop.22845.

Gunn, A. (2021). Voice, counterspaces, and ethical care in research with black women with trauma and incarceration histories. *Health Education & Behavior,* 48(3), 276–284. https://doi.org/10.1177/10901981211012273

Groot, E., Kouyoumdjian, F. G., Kiefer, L., Madadi, P., Gross, J., Prevost, B., Jhirad, R., Huyer, D., Snowdon, V., & Persaud, N. (2016). Drug toxicity deaths after release from

incarceration in Ontario, 2006-2013: Review of coroner's cases. *PloS one*, *11*(7), e0157512. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0157512

Hamilton, L., & Belenko, S. (2019). Substance use disorder treatment in the reentry environment: Service receipt and prisoner community reintegration. *Criminal Justice and Behavior,* 46(9), 1295-1318. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854819846528

Haney, C. (2003). The psychological impact of incarceration: Implications for post-prison adjustment. *Prisoners once removed: The impact of incarceration and reentry on children, families, and communities*, 6, 33-66. Retrieved from, https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/60676/410624-The-Psychological Impact-of-Incarceration.PDF

Hannah-Moffat, K. (2000). Prisons That Empower. *British Journal of Criminology*, 40, 510-531.

Harris, J., Martin, R. E., Filek, H., Macaulay, A. C., Buxton, J. A., Buchanan, M., Korchinski, M., Moravan, V., & Ramsden, V. (2015). Familial support impacts incarcerated women's housing stability. *Housing, Care and Support*, *18*(3/4), 80–88. https://doi.org/10.1108/HCS-05-2014-0012

Hayes, O. (2015). The life pattern of incarcerated women: The complex and interwoven lives of trauma, mental illness, and substance abuse. *Journal of Forensic Nursing*, 11(4), 214–222. https://doi.org/10.1097/JFN.0000000000000092

Hipp, J. R., Petersilia, J., & Turner, S. (2010). Parole recidivism in California: the effect of neighborhood context and social service agency characteristics. *Criminology (Beverly Hills),* 48(4), 947–979. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2010.00209.x

Hu, C., Jurgutis, J., Edwards, D., O'Shea, T., Regenstreif, L., Bodkin, C., Amster, E., & Kouyoumdjian, F. G. (2020). "When you first walk out the gates…where do [you] go?": Barriers and opportunities to achieving continuity of health care at the time of release from a provincial jail in Ontario. *PloS One*, *15*(4), e0231211–e0231211.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0231211

Huebner, B. M., Kras, K. R., & Pleggenkuhle, B. (2019). Structural discrimination and social stigma among individuals incarcerated for sexual offenses: Reentry across the rural urban continuum. *Criminology (Beverly Hills)*, *57*(4), 715–738. https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9125.12226

Hulchanski, J. D., (2009). *Finding home policy options for addressing homelessness in Canada: University of Toronto*. Canadian Homelessness Research Network. Cities Centre Press.

Hyde, J., Byrne, T., Petrakis, B. A., Yakovchenko, V., Kim, B., Fincke, G., Bolton, R., Visher, C., Blue-Howells, J., Drainoni, M. L., & McInnes, D. K. (2022). Enhancing community integration after incarceration: findings from a prospective study of an intensive peer support intervention for veterans with an historical comparison group. *Health & justice*, *10*(1), 33. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40352-022-00195-5

Jay, M. (2019). Cages and Crises: A Marxist analysis of mass incarceration: Historical materialism. *Research in Critical Marxist Theory*, 27(1), 182–223. https://doi.org/10.1163/1569206X-00001726

John Howard Society of Ontario. (1998). *Adults in provincial prisons in Ontario: The current picture and trends.* Retrieved from, https://johnhoward.on.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/facts-12-adults-provincial-prisons-in-ontario-the-current-picture-and-trends-december-1998.pdf

John Howard Society of Ontario. (2022). *No fixed address: The intersection of justice involvement and homelessness* (Final Report). Retrieved from,. https://johnhoward.on.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/No-Fixed-Address-Final-Report.pdf

John Howard Society of Ontario. (2013). *Reasonable bail? Report of the John Howard Society of*

Ontario on bail and remand in Ontario. Retrieved from, https://johnhoward.on.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/JHSO-Reasonable-Bail-report-final.pdf

Johnson, J. E., Peabody, M. E., Wechsberg, W. M., Rosen, R. K., Fernandes, K., & Zlotnick, C. (2015). Feasibility of an HIV/STI risk-reduction program for incarcerated women who have experienced interpersonal violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *30*(18), 3244–3266. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260514555013

Johnson, K. A., & Lynch, S. M. (2012). Predictors of maladaptive Ccoping in incarcerated women who are survivors of childhood sexual abuse. *Journal of Family Violence*, *28*(1), 43–52. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-012-9488-3

Johnson, W. W. (1996). Transcarceration and social control policy: The 1980s and beyond. *Crime and Delinquency*, *42*(1), 114–126. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128796042001007

Kaiser-Derrick, E. (2019). *Implicating the system: judicial discourses in the sentencing of Indigenous women.* University of Manitoba Press.

Karimi-Haghighi, M., Castillo, C., Tolan, S., Lum, K. (2023) Effect of conditional release on violent and general recidivism: A causal inference study. *Journal of Experimental Criminology,* https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-023-09596-4

Karlsson, M. E., Zielinski, M. J., & Bridges, A. J. (2015). Expanding research on a brief exposure-based group treatment with incarcerated women. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, *54*(8), 599–617. https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2015.1088918

Kellen, A. (2010). *Homeless and jailed, jailed and homeless*. John Howard Society of Toronto. Retrieved from, https://books-scholarsportal-info.proxy.queensu.ca/en/read?id=/ebooks/ebooks0/gibson_cppc/2010-10-21/1/10410913k

Kelly, L., & Farrell MacDonald, S. (2015). *Comparing lifetime substance use patterns of men*

and women offenders (Research Report No. RIB 14-44). Correctional Service Canada. https://www.canada.ca/en/correctional-service/corporate/library/research/research-brief/14-44.html

Kilgore, J. (2013). Progress or more of the same? Electronic monitoring and parole in the age of mass incarceration. *Critical Criminology* (Richmond, B.C.), 21(1), 123–139. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10612-012-9165-0

King, E. A. (2017). Outcomes of trauma-informed interventions for incarcerated women: A review. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology,* 61(6), 667–688. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X15603082

Kolk, B. V. D. (2014). *The body keeps the score: Brain, mind, and body in the healing of trauma*. Penguin Publishing Group.

Kouyoumdjian, F., Schuler, A., Matheson, F. I., & Hwang, S. W. (2016). Health status of prisoners in Canada Narrative review. *Canadian Family Physician*, 62(3), 215–222.

Kronfli, N., Buxton, J. A., Jennings, L., Kouyoumdjian, F., & Wong, A. (2019). Hepatitis C virus (HCV) care in Canadian correctional facilities: Where are we and where do we need to be?. *Canadian liver journal*, *2*(4), 171–183. https://doi.org/10.3138/canlivj.2019-0007

Kubiak, S., Kim, W. J., Fedock, G., & Bybee, D. (2012). Assessing short-term outcomes of an intervention for women convicted of violent crimes. *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research,* 3(3), 197–212. https://doi.org/10.5243/jsswr.2012.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2015). *InterViews: learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing.* Sage Publications.

Langan, N. P., & Pelissier, B. M. (2001). Gender differences among prisoners in drug treatment. *Journal of substance abuse*, *13*(3), 291–301. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0899 3289(01)00083-9

Langan, P. A., & Levin, D. J. (2002). Recidivism of prisoners released in 1994. *Federal Sentencing Reporter*, *15*(1), 58–65. https://doi.org/10.1525/fsr.2002.15.1.58

Leverentz, A. (2011). Neighborhood context of attitudes toward crime and reentry. *Punishment & Society*, *13*(1), 64–92. https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474510385629

Liauw, J., Jurgutis, J., Nouvet, E., Dineley, B., Kearney, H., Reaka, N., Fitzpatrick-Lewis, D., Peirson, L., & Kouyoumdjian, F. (2021). Reproductive healthcare in prison: A qualitative study of women's experiences and perspectives in Ontario, Canada. *PloS One*, 16(5), e0251853–e0251853. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0251853

Link, B. G., & Phelan, J. C. (2001). Conceptualizing stigma. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *27*(1), 363–385. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.27.1.363

Lutze, F. E., Rosky, J. W., & Hamilton, Z. K. (2014). Homelessness and reentry. *Criminal Justice and Behavior.,* 41(4), 471–491. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854813510164

Lynch, S., & Heath, N. (2017). Predictors of incarcerated women's post release PTSD, depression, and substance-use problems. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 56(3), 157 172. https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2017.1290007

Lynch, S., Heath, N. M., Mathews, K. C., & Cepeda, G. J. (2012). Seeking Safety: An Intervention for trauma-exposed incarcerated women? *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation*, 13(1), 88–101. https://doi.org/10.1080/15299732.2011.608780

MacDonald, S. F., Gobeil, R., Biro, S. M., Ritchie, M. B., & Curno, J. (2015). *Research report: women offenders, substance use, and behaviour.* Correctional Services Canada

Maidment, M. R. (2006*). Doing time on the outside: Deconstructing the benevolent community*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press. vii, 181 pp.

Martin, M. S., Viau-Deschênes, S., & Yogarajah, T. (2017). *Trauma-informed care for incarcerated offenders who engage in chronic self-injurious behavior: A rapid evidence assessment.* Correctional Services Canada. Retrieved from, https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2018/scc-csc/PS83-3-388-eng.pdf

Marx, K. (1888). *Manifesto of the Communist party, by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels.*

Authorized English translation; ed. and annotated by Frederick Engels. C.H. Kerr & Company, 1888.

Mathlin, G., Freestone, M. & Jones, H. (2024). Factors associated with successful reintegration for male offenders: a systematic narrative review with implicit causal model. *Journal of Experimental Criminology,* 20, 541–580 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-022 09547-5

Mayock, P. & Parker, S. & Sheridan, S. (2015). *Women, homelessness and service provision.* Simon Communities.

McKendy, L., & Ricciardelli, R. (2022). Non-association conditions among released women: Implications for successful community reintegration. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society / Revue Canadienne Droit et Société*, *37*(1), 29–48. doi:10.1017/cls.2021.13

McKiernan, A. (2017). *Supporting reintegration in corrections by addressing problematic substance use, Ottawa, Ont*. Canadian Centre on Substance Use and Addiction. Retrieved from, https://www.ccsa.ca/sites/default/files/2019-04/CCSA-Reintegration-Corrections-Problematic-Substance-Use-Environmental-Scan-2017-en.pdf

Mental Health Commission of Canada. (2021). *Justice and mental health: A scoping review*. Retrieved from, https://www.mentalhealthcommission.ca/wp-content/uploads/drupal/2021-01/Justice_Scoping_Review_eng.pdf

Miethe TD, Lu H. (2004) *Punishment: A comparative historical perspective*. Cambridge University Press.

Miller, N. A., & Najavits, L. M. (2012). Creating trauma-informed correctional care: a balance of goals and environment. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology*, 3(1), 17246–17248. https://doi.org/10.3402/ejpt.v3i0.17246

Miller, R. J., & Stuart, F. (2017). Carceral citizenship: Race, rights and responsibility in the age of mass supervision. *Theoretical Criminology*, 21(4), 532-548. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480617731203

Mingers, J., Mutch, A., & Willcocks, L. (2009). Critical realism in information systems Research. *MIS Quarterly* 37(3), 795-893

Ministry of the Solicitor General. (2017). *Corrections in Ontario: Directions for reform*. Government of Ontario. Retrieved from, https://files.ontario.ca/solgen-corrections_in_ontario_directions_for_reform.pdf

Mommaerts, K., Lopez, N. V., Camplain, C., Keene, C., Hale, A. M., & Camplain, R. (2023). Nutrition availability for those incarcerated in jail: Implications for mental health. *International Journal of Prisoner Health*, 19(3), 350–362. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPH-02-2022-0009

Montford, K. S., & Taylor, C. (Eds.). (2022). *Building abolition: Decarceration and social justice*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Moon, M. D. (2019). Triangulation: A Method to Increase Validity, Reliability, and Legitimation in Clinical Research. *Journal of Emergency Nursing*, *45*(1), 103–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jen.2018.11.004

Moore, K. E., Wyatt, J. P., Phillips, S., Burke, C., Bellamy, C., & McKee, S. A. (2023). The role of substance use treatment in reducing stigma after release from incarceration: A qualitative analysis. *Health & Justice*, 11(1), 25–25. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40352-023-00225-w

Moran, D. (2012). Prisoner reintegration and the stigma of prison time inscribed on the body. *Punishment & Society*, *14*(5), 564–583. https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474512464008

Morash, M., & Kashy, D. A. (2022). The relevance of women's economic marginalization to recidivism. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 49(3), 330–349. https://doi.org/10.1177/00938548211039545

Morse, J. M., & Richards, L. (2002). *Read me first for a user's guide to qualitative methods*. Sage Publications.

Moschion, J., & Johnson, G. (2019). Homelessness and incarceration: A reciprocal

relationship? *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 35(4), 855–887. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-019-09407-y

Murphy, J. (2002). *The carceral city: Parolee experiences of reintegration into community (T).* University of British Columbia. Retrieved from, https://open.library.ubc.ca/collections/ubctheses/831/items/1.0090648

Mullaly, B. (1997). *Structural social work: Ideology, theory, practice* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Myers, R. (2008). Book review: Maidment, M. R. (2006). Doing time on the outside: deconstructing the benevolent community. *International Criminal Justice Review*, 18(4), 488-490. https://doi.org/10.1177/1057567708324696

Nagin, D. S., Cullen, F. T., Jonson, C. L., & Tonry, M. (2009). Imprisonment and reoffending. *Crime and Justice (Chicago, Ill.)*, *38*(1), 115–200. https://doi.org/10.1086/599202

National Center for Victims of Crime. (2025). *Five best practices for trauma-informed reentry*. https://victimsofcrime.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/Five-Best-Practices-for-Trauma-Informed-Reentry-1.pdf

National Housing Strategy. (2021). *Ex-prisoner helps forge new path for others at risk of homelessness.* Government of Canada. Retrieved from, https://www.placetocallhome.ca/en/stories/083-from-prison-to-homelessness-ending-a-perilous-trajectory

National Research Council. (2014). *The growth of incarceration in the United States: Exploring causes and consequences.* Washington DC: The National Academic Press. http://doi: 10.17226/18613

Office of the Auditor General of Ontario. (2019). *Adult Correctional Institutions*. In *Annual report 2019: Volume 3*. Government of Canada. Retrieved from, https://www.auditor.on.ca/en/content/annualreports/arreports/en19/v3_100en19.pdf

Office of the Correctional Investigator. (2017). *Annual report 2016-2017*. Government of Canada. Retrieved from, https://oci-bec.gc.ca/sites/default/files/2023-06/annrpt20162017

eng.pdf

Office of the Auditor General of Canada. (2014). *Chapter 4 — Expanding the federal inmate Population*. In *2014 Spring Report of the Auditor General of Canada*. Government of Canada. Retrieved from, https://www.oagbvg.gc.ca/internet/English/parl_oag_201405_04_e_39335.html

Office of the Auditor General of Canada. (2016). *Report 2 — Preparing indigenous offenders for release*. In *2016 Fall Reports of the Auditor General of Canada*. Government of Canada. Retrieved from, https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2016/bvg-oag/FA1-2016-2-2-eng.pdf

Office of the Auditor General of Canada (2017). *Report 5 – Preparing Women Offenders for Release – Correctional Service Canada. 2014 Fall Reports of the Auditor General*. Government of Canada. Retrieved from, https://www.oag bvg.gc.ca/internet/English/parl_oag_201711_05_e_42670.html#

Office of the Auditor General of Canada**.** (2015). *Report 6—Reintegration of offenders*. In *2015 Spring Reports of the Auditor General of Canada*. Government of Canada. Retrieved from, https://www.oagbvg.gc.ca/internet/English/parl_oag_201504_06_e_40352.html

Office of the Auditor General of Canada. (2022). *Report 4—Systemic barriers—Correctional Service Canada*. Government of Canada. Retrieved from, https://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/docs/parl_oag_202205_04_e.pdf

Office of the Correctional Investigator. (2014). *Overcoming Barriers to Reintegration: An Investigation of Federal Community Correctional Centres.* Government of Canada. Retrieved from, https://www.oci-bec.gc.ca/cnt/rpt/pdf/oth-aut/oth-aut20141008-eng.pdf

Office of the Correctional Investigator. (2016). *Safe and Timely Reintegration. Government of Canada.* Government of Canada. Retrieved from, https://www.oci bec.gc.ca/cnt/priorities-priorites/programs-programmes-eng.aspx

Office of the Correctional Investigator. (2015*). Annual report of the Office of the Correctional Investigator 2014-2015*. Government of Canada. Retrieved from, https://oci bec.gc.ca/sites/default/files/2023-06/annrpt20142015-eng.pdf

Owusu-Bempah, A., & Wortley, S in Bucerius, S. M. & Tonry, M (eds). (2014). *Race, Crime and Criminal Justice in Canada.* Oxford Handbook of Ethnicity, Crime, and Immigration. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199859016.013.020

O'Grady, W. & Lafleur, R. (2016). *Reintegration in Ontario: Practices, priorities, and effective models.* The John Howard Society of Ontario. Retrieved from, https://johnhoward.on.ca/wpcontent/uploads/2016/11/Reintegration-in-Ontario-Final.pdf

Parkes, D., Bent, K., Peter, T., & Booth, T. (2008). Listening to their voices: Women prisoners and access to justice in Manitoba. *The Windsor Yearbook of Access to Justice*, 26(1), 85 119.

Parole Board of Canada. (2023). *Parole decision-making: Myths and realities.* Government of Canada. Retrieved from, https://www.canada.ca/en/parole board/corporate/publicationsand-forms/parole-decision-making-myths-and-realities.html

Parole Board of Canada. (2020). *Decision-making policies manual.* Government of Canada. Retrieved from, https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/canada/parole board/migration/012/093/012-4000-en.pdf

Pate, K. (2018). *Policy briefing note: Risking incarceration rates of racialized women*. Policy4Women, Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. https://www.criawicref.ca/images/userfiles/files/P4W_BN_IncarcerationRacializedWomen_Accessible.pdf

Pate, K. (2019). *Criminal records have become a lifelong stigma.* Policy Options. Retrieved from, https://policyoptions.irpp.org/magazines/march-2019/criminal-records-become-lifelong-stigma/

Patton, M.Q. (1999). Enhancing the quality and credibility of qualitative analysis. *Health*

Sciences Research, 34, 1189-1208.

Paynter, M. J. 2021. Final report for the 2019-2020 reproductive justice workshop project: reproductive (in)justice in Canadian federal prisons for women. *Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies,* 1-53.

Penado Abilleira, M., & Rodicio-García, M. L. (2021). A Study of the Inmate Code of Conduct in Spanish Prison. *Deviant Behavior*, *42*(12), 1610–1627. https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2020.1768642

Pollack, S. (2009). Circuits of exclusion: Criminalized women's negotiation of community. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health*, *28*(1), 83–95. https://doi.org/10.7870/cjcmh-2009-0007

Povey, L. (2017). Where welfare and criminal justice meet: Applying Wacquant to the experiences of marginalised women in Austerity Britain. *Social Policy and Society: A Journal of the Social Policy Association,* 16(2), 271–281. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474746416000609

Praetorius, R., Frank Terry, L., & Burse, J. (2017). "Thank you for letting it be about me": Women's perceptions of holistic programming in a jail. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation,* 56(4), 237–251. https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2017.1294639

Public Safety Canada. (2021*). Corrections and conditional release statistical overview 2021*. Government of Canada. https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrcs/pblctns/ccrso 2021/ccrso-2021-en.pd

Reed, J. (2015). *The psychological impact of institutionalization on ex-offenders reentering into society*. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.

Renzetti, C. M. (2013). *Feminist criminology*. Routledge.

Ricciardelli, R., & Peters, A. M. F. (Eds.). (2017). *After prison: Navigating employment and reintegration.* Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Richie, B. E. (2012). *Arrested justice: black women, violence, and America's prison nation*. NYU Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt9qghqn

Rymhs, D. (2012). In this inverted garden: Masculinities in Canadian prison writing. *Journal of Gender Studies,* 21(1), 77–89. https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2012.639173

Rubin, A. T. (2021). *The advantage of difference: The process of institutionalization in the deviant prison: Philadelphia's Eastern State Penitentiary and the origins of America's modern penal system, 1829–1913*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, J. Y., McKendrick, K., & Hamilton, Z. (2012). A sandomized clinical trial of a therapeutic community treatment for female inmates: Outcomes at 6 and 12 months after prison release. *Journal of Addictive Diseases*, 31(3), 258–269. https://doi.org/10.1080/10550887.2012.694601

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

Sargiacomo, M. (2009). Michel Foucault, discipline and punish: The birth of the prison: Allen lane, London, 1977, trans. by Alan Sheridan. *Journal of Management & Governance*, 13(3), 269-280. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10997-008-9080-

Saxena, P., Messina, N. P., & Grella, C. E. (2014). Who benefits from gender-responsive treatment: accounting for abuse history on longitudinal outcomes for women in prison. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 41(4), 417-432.

Segrave, M., & Carlton, B. (2010). Women, trauma, criminalisation and imprisonment. *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, 22(2), 287-306

Severance, T. A. (2004). Concerns and Coping Strategies of Women Inmates Concerning Release: "It's Going to Take Somebody in My Corner." *Journal of Offender*

Rehabilitation, *38*(4), 73–97. https://doi.org/10.1300/J076v38n04_05

Shechory, M., Perry, G., & Addad, M. (2011). Pathways to women's crime: Differences among women convicted of drug, violence and fraud Offenses. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 151(4), 399–416. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2010.503721

Shlafer R. J., Stang, J., Dallaire, D., Forestell, C. A., & Hellerstedt, W. (2017). Best practices for nutrition care of pregnant women in prison. *Journal of Correctional Health Care*, 23(3), 297–304. https://doi.org/10.1177/1078345817716567

Shlafer, R. J., Hellerstedt, W. L., Secor-Turner, M., Gerrity, E., & Baker, R. (2015). Doulas perspectives about providing support to incarcerated women: A feasibility study. *Public Health Nursing*, 32(4), 316–326. https://doi.org/10.1111/phn.12137

Sinha, P., Gupta, U., Singh, J., & Srivastava, A. (2017). Structural violence on women: An impediment to women empowerment. *Indian journal of community medicine: Official publication of Indian Association of Preventive & Social Medicine*, *42*(3), 134–137. https://doi.org/10.4103/ijcm.IJCM_276_15

Smith V. C. (2017). Substance-abusing female offenders as victims: Chronological sequencing of pathways into the criminal justice system. *Victims & Offenders*, 12(1), 113–137. https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2015.1017131

Sorensen, J., & Cunningham, M. D. (2010). Conviction offense and prison violence: A comparative study of murderers and other offenders. *Crime and Delinquency*, 56(1), 103–125. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128707307175

Stack, K. (2020). Moms in prison: The impact of maternal incarceration on women and children. *Manitoba Law Journal,* 43 (5), 145–160

Statistics Canada. (2020). *Adult and youth correctional statistics in Canada, 2018/2019.* (Catalogue No. 85-002-X). Retrieved from, https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/fr/pub/85-002-x/2020001/article/00016-eng.pdf?st=7YUIHvD3

Statistics Canada. (2024a). *Average counts of offenders in federal programs, Canada, and Regions* (Table 35-10-0155-01). Retrieved from, https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/tv.action?pid=3510015501

Statistics Canada. (2024b). *Average counts of adults in provincial and territorial correctional programs* (Table 35-10-0154-01). Retrieved from, https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/tv.action?pid=3510015401

Statistics Canada. (2024c). *Monthly average counts of adults in federal and provincial/territorial custody* (Table 35-10-0175-01). Retrieved from, https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/tv.action?pid=3510017501

Statistics Canada. (2024d). *Correctional services statistics: interactive dashboard*. Retrieved from https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/71-607-x/71-607-x2019018-eng.htm

Statistics Canada. (2024e). *Adult custody admissions to correctional services by sex.* (Table 35 10-0015-01). Retrieved from, https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/tv.action?pid=3510001501

Statistics Canada. (2023). *Homelessness: How does it happen?* https://www.statcan.gc.ca/o1/en/plus/5170-homelessness-how-does-it-happen

Stewart, L. A., Nolan, A., Sapers, J., Power, J., Panaro, L., & Smith, J. (2015). *Chronic health conditions reported by male inmates newly admitted to Canadian federal penitentiaries*. CMAJ Open, 3(1), E97–E102. https://doi.org/10.9778/cmajo.20140025

Sudbury, J. (2005). Celling black bodies: Black women in the global prison industrial complex. *Feminist Review*, *80*, 162–179. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3874373

Tapp, K., & Henson, A. (2024). "For men, by men": Menstrual victimization and the weaponization of period products in carceral settings. *Women's Health (London, England)*, *20*, 17455057241240931–17455057241240931. https://doi.org/10.1177/17455057241240931

Thomas, K., Wilson, J. L., Bedell, P., & Morse, D. S. (2019). "They didn't give up on me": a women's transitions clinic from the perspective of re-entering women. *Addiction Science & Clinical Practice,* 14(1), NA. http://dx.doi.org.proxy.queensu.ca/10.1186/s13722-019-0142-8

Thomas, J., & O'Maolchatha, A. (1989). Reassessing the critical metaphor: An optimistic revisionist view. *Justice Quarterly*, *6*(2), 143–172. https://doi.org/10.1080/07418828900090111

Tripodi, S. J., & Pettus-Davis, C. 2013. Histories of childhood victimization and subsequent mental health problems, substance use, and sexual victimization for a sample of incarcerated women in the US. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry,* 36(1):30–40.

Tripodi, S. J., Mennicke, A. M., McCarter, S. A., & Ropes, K. (2019). Evaluating Seeking Safety for women in prison: A randomized controlled trial. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 29(3), 281–290. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731517706550

Tyler, E. T., & Brockmann, B. (2017). Returning home: Incarceration, reentry, stigma and the perpetuation of racial and socioeconomic health Inequity. *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, *45*(4), 545–557. https://doi.org/10.1177/1073110517750595

Visher, C. & Travis, J. (2003). Transitions from prison to community: Understanding individual pathways. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29(1):89-113. http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.29.010202.095931.

Wacquant, L. (2010) Crafting the neoliberal state: workfare, prisonfare, and social insecurity. *Sociological Forum,* 25(2), 197–220.

Wacquant, L. (2001). Deadly symbiosis: When ghetto and prison meet and mesh. *Punishment & Society*, 3(1), 95-133. https://doi.org/10.1177/14624740122228276

Wacquant, L. (2009*). Punishing the poor: the neoliberal government of social insecurity (English language ed.).* Duke University Press.

Ward, A., & Roe-Sepowitz, D. (2009). Assessing the effectiveness of a trauma-oriented approach to treating prostituted women in a prison and a community exiting program. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma,* 18(3), 293–312. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926770902809837

Welch, M. (1996). Critical criminology, social justice, and an alternative view of incarceration. *Critical Criminology (Richmond, B.C.),* 7(2), 43–58. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02461113

Wenz, B., Nielsen, S., Gassowski, M., Santos-Hövener, C., Cai, W., Ross, R. S., Bock, C. T., Ratsch, B. A., Kücherer, C., Bannert, N., Bremer, V., Hamouda, O., Marcus, U., Zimmermann, R., & DRUCK Study group (2016). High variability of HIV and HCV seroprevalence and risk behaviours among people who inject drugs: Results from a cross sectional study using respondent-driven sampling in eight German cities (2011-14). *BMC public health*, *16*(1), 927. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-016-3545-4

Western, B., & Beckett, K. (1999). How unregulated is the U.S. labor market? The penal system as a labor market institution. *The American Journal of Sociology*, *104*(4), 1030–1060. https://doi.org/10.1086/210135

Wilfong, J., & Plaza, D. (2021). Applying feminist criminology to social work criminal justice research: treating addiction, mental health, and victimization. *Journal of Social Work Practice in the Addictions*, 21(1), 97–103. https://doi.org/10.1080/1533256X.2020.1870295

Wright, E. M., Van Voorhis, P., Salisbury, E. J., & Bauman, A. (2012). Gender-responsive lessons learned and policy implications for women in prison: A review. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 39(12), 1612–1632. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854812451088

Young, J. (2003). Searching for a new criminology of everyday life: A review of "The Culture of Control", [Review of Searching for a New Criminology of Everyday Life: A Review of "The Culture of Control"]. *British Journal of Criminology*, *43*(1), 228–243.

Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/43.1.228

Youssef, C. (2023). Prison to desistance: (Re)integration and aftercare for those released from prison. *Journal of Forensic Practice,* 25(4), 356-374. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/JFP-04 2023-0013

Yule, C., & Schumann, R. (2023). Reflections from accused: Advice on navigating life on bail. *Howard Journal of Crime and Justice,* 62(4), 516–534. https://doi.org/10.1111/hojo.12537y

Zabarniy, M., Topchii, V., Korniakova, T., Topchii, O., & Topchii, V. (2023). Criminological analysis of determinants of criminal behavior. *Journal of Forensic Science and Medicine*, *9*(2), 144–152. https://doi.org/10.4103/jfsm.jfsm_84_22

Zaitzow, B. H. (2011). Challenges and opportunities for incarcerated women to overcome reentry barriers. *Global perspectives on re-entry*, 225-256.

Zinger, I. (2017). *Annual report: Office of The Correctional Investigator of Canada*. Government of Canada. Retrieved from, https://oci-bec.gc.ca/sites/default/files/2023-06/annrpt20162017-eng.pdf

Appendix A: Queen's University General Research & Ethics Board Approval Letter

Queen's University General Research Ethics Board (GREB)

RE: GREB Initial Ethics Approval

March 19, 2024

Ms. Lewis
Department of Sociology\Unit REB Sociology
Queen's University

TRAQ #: 6039954
Study Title: "The Experiences of Women Reintegrating After Prison"
Supervisor: Dr. Nicole Myers
Review Type: Delegated
Date of Full Board Meeting: N/A
Date Ethics Approval Issued: March 19, 2024
Date of Expiry of Ethics Approval: March 19, 2025

Dear Ms. Lewis

Thank you for submitting the above referenced study to The Queen's University General Research Ethics Board (GREB). GREB has reviewed the study and granted initial ethics approval for this study as of the date noted above.

Documents Approved:

Document Name	Comments	Version Date
Letter of Information/Consent Form (combined document)	LOI/ICF	2024/03/18
Letter of Information/Consent Form (combined document)	LOI/ICF	2024/03/18
Letter of Information/Consent Form (combined document)	LOI/ICF	2024/03/18
Recruitment Letter/Email/Notice/Poster	Recruitment Letter/Email/Notice/Poster	2024/03/06
Recruitment Letter/Email/Notice/Poster	Recruitment Letter/Email/Notice/Poster	2024/03/06
Data Collection Sheet	Linking Log - Contact for Interviews	2024/03/12
Master Linking Log	Master Linking Log	2024/03/12
Recruitment Letter/Email/Notice/Poster	Verbal Recruitment Script	2024/03/01
Data Summary Sheet	Data collection sheet for interview responses with pseudonyms and study ID	2024/01/20
Interview Questions	Questions for women from WRAP interviews	2023/02/18
Interview Questions	Questions for staff interviews	2023/02/18
Recruitment Letter/Email/Notice/Poster	Recruitment Letter/Email/Notice/Poster	2024/01/20
Poster	Recruitment Letter/Email/Notice/Poster	2024/01/20

Documents Acknowledged: Supervisor's letter/ e-mail

No deviations from, or changes to, the protocol should be initiated without prior written approval from GREB, except when necessary to eliminate immediate hazard(s) to study participants.

On behalf of the GREB, I wish you success in your research.

Sincerely,

Jacob Brower
Chair, General Research Ethics Board (GREB)
Associate Professor and Distinguished Faculty Fellow of Marketing,
Academic Co-Director (Business), Master of Digital Product Management
Smith School of Business
chair.greb@queensu.ca
Queen's University
Kingston, ON K7L 3N6

GREB operates in compliance with, and is constituted in accordance with, the requirements of the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TCPS 2); the International Conference on Harmonisation Good Clinical Practice Consolidated Guideline (ICH GCP); Part C, Division 5 of the Food and Drug Regulations; Part 4 of the Natural Health Products Regulations; Part 3 of the Medical Devices Regulations and the provisions of the Ontario Personal Health Information Protection Act (PHIPA 2004) and its applicable regulations. Federalwide Assurance Number: FWA#: 00004184, IRB#: IRB00003062. GREB members involved in the research project do not participate in the review, discussion, or decision.

Appendix B: Recruitment Poster

The Experiences of Women Reintegrating After Prison

Are you in the WRAP Program or have you participated in the WRAP program?

If yes, would you like to be involved in a study on the WRAP program and the experiences of Women Reintegrating After Prison?

Participants will be interviewed for up to one hour in a private space at the Elizabeth Fry Society's site.

To be eligible for research participation, the following criteria must be met:

- At least 18 years of age
- Have been incarcerated to federal or provincial custody in Canada
- Current participant of the Elizabeth Fry Society of Kingston's WRAP program OR have participated in the WRAP program within the last 12 months.

Your experience, knowledge and insight could provide meaningful information about the unique experiences of women released from correctional custody and the impacts of reintegration programs and policy.

Participation is completely voluntary. If you decide to participate in the study, **you will receive a $15 honorarium as a token of appreciation.**

I would like to hear from you!

Please contact the study researcher for more information:
Shoshannah Lewis (MA Candidate)
Email: 20sel2@queensu.ca Tel: [removed]

This study has been reviewed for ethical compliance by the Queen's University General Research Ethics Board (GREB)

Queen's UNIVERSITY

Appendix C: Interview Guide – Service Providers/Staff

Can you tell me a bit about the WRAP program?

How many women have you worked with in the WRAP program?

Can you tell me a bit about the women you work with in the WRAP program?

What are the life histories/experiences like with the women in the WRAP program?

Are the women you work with prepared for release in the community?

What are the main needs of women in the WRAP program?

How accessible are these needs after release?

How does the WRAP program aim to meet these needs?

Are reintegration needs being met for women in the WRAP program?

Do conditions of release impact the ability to successfully reintegrate in the community?

Do any barriers to reintegration exist for women released from custody?

If yes to the above question, can anything be done to alleviate these barriers?

In your opinion, how does WRAP impact the ability to reintegrate for women taking part in the program?

Based on your experiences, how do women feel after taking part in the WRAP program?

Appendix D: Interview Guide – Formerly Incarcerated Women Participants of WRAP

How old are you?

What race/ethnicity to you identify with?

What sexual orientation and gender identify do you identify with?

What is your highest level of education?

Are you currently employed?

What is your housing status?

Do you have any history of mental health?

Do you have any history with substance use?

Do you have any medical/health conditions that you feel comfortable sharing?

Can you tell me about your life before incarceration?

How long were you incarcerated for?

When were you released?

What was your experience like in custody?

Did you ever experience mistreatment and/or neglect while incarcerated?

What were your biggest needs in custody?

Did you feel that those needs were met?

Do you feel that incarceration has changed you?

Did you feel ready for release into the community?

Could anything have made you feel more prepared for release?

Did you have any worries about your release? If so, what were your biggest worries about going back into the community?

After release, what were your biggest needs?

Were your needs met?

Did you have any difficulties accessing the necessary resources and/or people who could help you with your needs? What barriers did you face?

Have your conditions of release impacted your ability to reintegrate in the community?

Can you tell me a bit about your involvement in the WRAP program? How did you find out about the program?

From your perspective, what is the goal of participating in the WRAP program?

What did you identify as your main reintegration needs when starting the program?

Has the WRAP program impacted your ability, in any way, to reintegrate after incarceration?

Did you (still) experience any barriers to accessing needs and services while enrolled in WRAP?

Do you feel that your reintegration needs have been met after taking part in the WRAP program?

What more can be done for you in the community?

Overall, how do you feel about your participation in the WRAP program? Could more have been done for your ability to reintegrate?

Appendix E: Email Recruitment Script for Formerly Incarcerated Women Participants of WRAP

Dear (insert name),

My name is Shoshannah Lewis and I am a current MA student of Queen's University's Department of Sociology under the supervision of Dr. Nicole Myers.

I am inviting you to participate in a research study on the Women Reintegrating After Prison (WRAP) program. The purpose of this study is to understand the experiences of formerly incarcerated women reintegrating from prison and learn how the WRAP program impacts reintegration in the community after release from custody.

If you agree to participate, I will interview you for up to one hour in a private space at Elizabeth Fry Society's site.

To be eligible for research participation, the following criteria must be met:

- At least 18 years of age
- Have been incarcerated to federal or provincial custody in Canada
- Current participant of the Elizabeth Fry Society of Kingston's WRAP program OR have participated in the WRAP program within the last 12 months.

Participating is completely voluntary and your identity will be protected. Your decision to participate will only be known to myself and supervisor. If you decide to participate in the study, you will receive a $15 honorarium for participation in the study as a token of appreciation. You will receive this honorarium even if you decide to withdraw from the interview, or from the study at a later date.

If you would like to learn more about the study, please do not hesitate to contact me at this email or call me at [removed].

This study has been reviewed for ethical compliance by the Queen's University General Research Ethics Board (GREB).

I hope to hear from you!

With gratitude,
Shoshannah
Shoshannah.lewis@queensu.ca

Appendix F: Email Recruitment Script for Service Providers/Staff

Dear (insert name),

My name is Shoshannah Lewis and I am a current MA student of Queen's University's Department of Sociology under the supervision of Dr. Nicole Myers.

I am inviting you to participate in a research study on the Women Reintegrating After Prison (WRAP) program. The purpose of this study is to understand the experiences of formerly incarcerated women reintegrating from prison and learn how the WRAP program impacts reintegration in the community after release from custody.

If you agree to participate, I will interview you for up to one hour in a private space at the Elizabeth Fry Society's site.

To be eligible for research participation, the following criteria must be met:

- At least 18 years of age
- Involved with the service provision of Elizabeth Fry Society's WRAP program for formerly incarcerated women.

If you would like to learn more about the study, please do not hesitate to contact me at this email or call me at [removed].

Your experience, knowledge and insight could provide meaningful information about the unique experiences of women released from correctional custody and the impacts of reintegration programs and policy.

This study has been reviewed for ethical compliance by the Queen's University General Research Ethics Board (GREB).

I hope to hear from you!

With gratitude,
Shoshannah
Shoshannah.lewis@queensu.ca

Appendix G: Verbal Recruitment Script

Hi there, my name is Shoshannah, and I am inviting you to participate in a research study for my Master's Thesis through Queen's University!

I am a current MA student of Queen's University's Department of Sociology under the supervision of Dr. Nicole Myers.

I am inviting you to participate in a research study on the Women Reintegrating After Prison (WRAP) program. The purpose of this study is to understand the experiences of formerly incarcerated women reintegrating from prison and learn how the WRAP program impacts reintegration in the community after release from custody.

If you agree to participate, I will interview you for up to one hour in a private space at Elizabeth Fry Society's site.

To be eligible for research participation, the following criteria must be met:

- Must be at least 18 years of age
- Have been incarcerated to federal or provincial custody in Canada
- Current participant of the Elizabeth Fry Society of Kingston's WRAP program OR have participated in the WRAP program within the last 12 months.

Participating is completely voluntary and your identity will be protected. Your decision to participate will only be known to myself and supervisor. If you decide to participate in the study, you will receive a $15 honorarium for participation in the study as a token of appreciation. You will receive this honorarium even if you decide to withdraw from the interview, or from the study at a later date. More information about the risks and objectives associated with participation will be outlined to you in the letter of information and consent form.

If you would like to learn more about the study, please do not hesitate to ask me any questions of concerns you may have.

This study has been reviewed for ethical compliance by the Queen's University General Research Ethics Board (GREB).

Thanks for taking the time to talk to me about my research project!

Appendix H: Follow-Up Email/Phone Script for Interested Participants

Hi (name),

It is great that you are interested in participation! To proceed with participating, what are your availabilities for interview dates and times?

Prior to the interview, I will provide more information about the study and outline the process for informed consent. After reviewing a letter of information and consent form, you will have fuller information on the risks, benefits and procedures related to participation. You will be given time to review this letter independently, on your own time. If participation does not feel like the right fit for you, please do not hesitate to let me know through whatever means is most comfortable for you (phone, email, or in person).

The interviews for participants will take place in a private space at the Elizabeth Fry Society of Kingston. I will inform staff of meeting times prior to scheduling dates and secure a separate space (away from others at the agency) in efforts to protect the privacy and confidentiality of participants.

If you require any travel expenses for interview participation, I will provide a cash reimbursement at the time of interview.

I look forward to connecting with you further!

All the best,
Shoshannah

Appendix I: Coding Sheet – The Needs of Formerly Incarcerated Women

Code	Description	Key Words/Phrases
Programming in custody	Accessibilities to programming, rehabilitation interventions and mental or physical health care while incarcerated.	• Program or programming • Jail or prison • Support • Mental Health • Health Care • Vocational • Case management • Discharge planning • Reintegration • Segregation • No access to programming/care/support • Nothing provided for support • Overcrowding
Basic Needs in Custody	Access to basic needs for survival in custody (i.e., clothing, food, hygiene).	• Food • Diet • Showers • Clothes • Clothing • Neglected needs • Imbalance of power • Overcrowding
Identification in Community	Obtaining government identification for proof of identity and citizenship following release.	• Identification • ID • Released without identification/ID • Lost identification/ID in custody
Housing in Community	Housing stability and security following release from custody.	• Homeless • Unsheltered • Unhoused • No fixed address • Housed
Basic Needs in Community	Access to basic needs for survival in community (i.e., clothing, food).	• Food and grocery • Clothing

		• Clothes • Lost resources • Lost property • Food banks
Trauma & Separation in Community	Coping with and enduring traumatic and adverse life experiences associated with criminogenic circumstances, incarceration, loss, and family or community displacement.	• Family reunification • Children • Trauma • Mental health • Addictions • Anxiety • Lost family • Lost children/children taken away • No support • Loss

Appendix J: Coding Sheet – WRAP Programming Outcomes

Code	Description	Key Words/Phrases
Individualized & Holistic Service Provision	Client-centred and responsive supports based on the individualized and unique needs or circumstances of each client, offering comprehensive service and expansive support opportunities.	• Choice • Tailored needs • Assessed • Assessment • Based • Want(s) • Holistic • Need(s) • Client • Identification • Birth certificate • Housing • Family • Finances • Support • Help
Navigational Support	Strategies and support features that assist clients with moving through reintegration essentials more effectively in the community	• Transportation • Appointments • Systems • System navigation • Community • Community support • Accessibility • Program(s)
Participant Satisfaction	Perceptions of satisfaction for participants seeking reintegration support from WRAP following release from custody.	• Satisfied • Recommend • Happy • Needs • Supported • Frustrated • Discouraged • Feeling(s) • Client feedback

Appendix K: Coding Sheet – Persisting Barriers

Code	Description	Key Words/Phrases
Systemic	Marginalizing structural or institutional policies and practice embedded within the criminal justice system for formerly incarcerated women; ultimately, challenging effective and successful community reintegration.	• Discharge planning • Poor/no discharge planning • Conditions of release • Onerous conditions • No preparation or reiterative support before re-entry
Accessibility	Opportunities, availabilities and capacities to accessing essential means for reintegration in the community.	• Housing • Employment • Resources • Waitlists • Limited capacity • Full capacity • Job loss
Stigma	Inherent discriminations, biases, subordinations, marginalization and othering towards criminalized women in community interactions/life.	• Societal exclusion • Alienation • Rejected • Criminal record • Criminalized/ criminalization • CPIC • Self-worth • Giving-up