Living After Prison
The Experience of (Re)integration to Society after Release from an Ontario Correctional Facility

by

Dirk Boon

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Anthropology

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario

© 2015, Dirk Boon

Abstract

As individuals are released from incarceration in Ontario institutions they face a variety of barriers to their successful (re)integration. With the current reconviction rate at 44% within the first year of release, those being released quite clearly have trouble with this period of their lives. This study will therefore examine the (re)integration process at different stages, in order to understand how people cope with life after prison, and how their experiences of incarceration continue to affect them long after release. Understanding the ways that identity production and gender come to be affected by, and affect, time spent inside, and importantly the (re)integration process will give us a greater understanding of incarceration and life after. This will be achieved through ethnographic data gained throughout the fieldwork process, along with examinations of academic literature focused on identity, gender, and power. It is important for us to further understand (re)integration barriers and experiences, in order to help programming in the future.

Acknowledgments

I would like to start by thanking my thesis supervisor Dr. Brian Given, who has provided me with guidance, great conversations, and an overall fantastic experience of anthropological education. I would also like to thank Dr. Kristin Bright who helped me to understand where I fit in the anthropological discipline, who was always there to talk to and to provide reassurance that I could write this thesis, and who provided such a wonderful atmosphere at Carleton University. Along with my committee, I would like to thank the other students in my cohort who made this school experience so much fun, and who were always there to chat and hang out when it was needed most.

I would like to thank my family, Dirk Sr., Bonnie, Stephanie, and Jenifer who have always been so supportive, loving, and willing to listen and provide guidance when needed. Sometimes the research and writing process can be overwhelming, and having family who are as supportive as you all makes the difference.

This thesis was also heavily impacted by my friends who kept me sane over the last two years. Hanging out with Courtney and Andrew has been such an important part of my life, and you two mean more to my well-being than I can ever express (at this point you should both truly be in my family section). Matt, you have always been such a supportive person in my life, and your long-distance phone calls are always reassuring. MacCuaig, Steve, Gui, Taylor, Sara T., Shaun, Genrys, Kaleb, Scott, you have all been just great people to have in my life, and I am so honoured to call you friends. Lastly, Shigeru Miyamoto, thank you for giving me such a great way to spend too much of my time.

Finally, I would like to thank the most important person in my life, my lovely wife Sara. You have been there in the best times, the difficult times, and throughout the mundane times. It is so fantastic that I am able to spend my life with my best friend, who always knows how to make me laugh, and who is never afraid to say what is on her mind. I know I'm the emotional one of the two of us, and so this is why I use this space to tell you that you mean more to me than I can ever express, that I love you, and that I hope you are ready to support me through another degree. 143.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	II
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS	IV-V
CHAPTER ONE – VARIOUS BEGINNINGS: GENDERING CRIMINOLOGICAL RESEARCH	1
Troubling Terminology	6
Themes, Theories and Findings: An Anthropology of Gendered (Re)integration	9
Methodology	20
Significance of Research	23
CHAPTER TWO - LIFE ON THE INSIDE: POWER AND THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM	26
Entering Corrections: Gender, Power, and Prescribed Identities	26
A Segregated Past: Gender Specific Institutions and Programming	28
Overt Punishment: Prison Populations and Conditions	36
Power and Control in the Criminal Justice System	47
CHAPTER THREE – TRANSITIONAL PERIODS: RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION AND IDENTITY MAKING	57
The Construction of Identity	61
Power and Identity	66
Labeling and Identity Construction after Incarceration	71
Gendered Lives, Gendered Identities	82
	IV

Various Identities: Deviance in Identity Production	85
CHAPTER FOUR – LIFE AFTER PRISON: (RE)INTEGRATION, GENDER, AND THE LONG-TERM IMPACTS OF INCARCERATION	89
Passing Judgment: Stigma and the Impact of Incarceration	91
Struggling on the Outside: Barriers to the (Re)integration Process	96
“‘But I’m like, ‘I just got told it’s a girl thing, so no you can’t come’”: The Gendered Nature of (Re)integration	104
The Role of Relationships	112
Life-Long (Re)integration: The Ongoing Process	117
CHAPTER FIVE – CONCLUSIONS: (RE)INTEGRATION AND LEARNING TO LIVE OUTSIDE AFTER PRISON	123
Identity and (Re)integration Planning	125
(Re)integration Barriers	130
Gender: (Un)necessary Segregation	135
Moving Forward with (Re)integration	138
GLOSSARY	141
REFERENCES	142

Chapter One

Various Beginnings: Gendering Criminological Research

It was January 8th, 2015 when I first met Bryonie Baxter, the executive director at Elizabeth Fry Society of Ottawa (E. Fry). E. Fry is an organization that works to assist women who are involved in various stages of the criminal justice system, including court hearings, incarceration, and (re)integration, as well as with young women who are at risk of coming into conflict with the criminal justice system. On this day, I was meeting Bryonie to propose a possible collaboration for my intended research. This collaboration would see me, the graduate student/researcher, interviewing women who had recently been released from incarceration in Ontario through E. Fry. I was nervous going into this meeting, as the ethics approval process had been long and arduous, leaving me curious and worried about how I would be received as a male graduate student performing research with female participants. Evidently, after interacting with individuals during this research process, I was able to see that this was not as big of an issue with (re)integration workers, and especially with the participants themselves, as I had been lead to think by the ethics committee.

Upon arrival at E. Fry, I was welcomed into the office, and introduced to Bryonie. As I sat across the desk from Bryonie I was quickly asked what I would like from E.Fry and then was told what they could do for me. I was informed that they would help get information out to participants about my study, that I could have a space to perform interviews in their offices, and that they would only ask for a copy of my research when it was completed. After thinking back on this moment many times, I came to the realization that my fear of not being able to contact women who had been released from prison and interview them had arisen due to concerns over my gender and where it placed me in regards to these women. It was then that I came to

question the role of gender in the lives of the criminalized, as it appeared to be affecting my research before fieldwork had even really begun.

From the early stages of this research project I had situated myself as a man performing research about women who had experienced the criminal justice system. This placement led to questions of how my gender identity would affect my interactions with participants, and caused concern from the ethics board who believed I may be at potential risk of blackmail or troubling accusations, and in the end required me to have a chaperone to all of my interviews. This was, of course, an annoyance, but what I did not think at the time was how the gendered nature of the criminal justice system, and the criminalized, was already playing such a important role in this research project. The fact that women were my main focus meant that concerns arose for the ethics board influenced heavily by our gendered identities. These women were being stigmatized immediately, under the guise of concern for my own safety, and the University's well being. If I were to interview men, as a man, gender would be much more transparent, if not completely absent, from these concerns. Therefore, before I was able to enter the field, the ethics process alone had opened my eyes to the gendered nature of criminology, and this was shaping the way I would come to perform my research.

After I had been approved by the ethics committee, and had performed a few interviews with women, I returned to these earlier thoughts on gender after I had received multiple calls from men stating "I know the sign says 'if you are a woman' but could I participate too?" It was here that I realized gender needed to be an important part of my inquiries into the criminal justice system and (re)integration after being released. It was largely my personal reflections on gender, sparked by the events of the ethics review process that lead me to incorporate gender into this project, but the true drive to change came from my first participant, Jacquelin. In this

interaction, Jacquelin openly asked why I did not include men in my study, and told me of how her boyfriend wanted to participate too. This became a very impactful moment, which I will return to later in this work, but after hearing from a participant that I needed to include some men in my study, I knew it would be doing a disservice to her (and the concept of collaborative ethnography) if I did not do so. I then changed the project to include men as well, and 3 months and 14 in-depth interviews later, the fieldwork process was complete. These interviews have left me informed about the critical state of the criminal justice system, and with some of the struggles that individuals go through as they attempt to cope with life after prison.

This work then attempts to understand the daily lives of people who have been incarcerated and released, and are now dealing with life in our society (Ontario, Canada). Many of the ways my participants described interacting with the criminal justice system, as well as with the programs and organizations that exist to help people who have been released were in gendered ways, often citing the segregation that existed in terms of gender. These accounts, along with my initial reflections on the gendered nature of my earlier proposed project lead to the development of an interest in the gendered nature of the criminal justice system and systems of support for those who have recently been released. This interest mixed with my past focus on identity, which lead me to look at the gendered identities of people being released from incarceration, and to ask questions of how gender interacts with/influences stereotypes of criminality, to construct these complex forms of identity and discourse that my participants were navigating everyday. I therefore look at gender throughout this work as a performed identity, which is in many ways learned early on in life, but constantly evolves/changes based on discourses that individuals come to interact with in their lives. This, in conjunction with cultural understandings of criminality and gender, come to shape the ways that individuals build,

recreate, and challenge identities and the expected performances they hold, informing my understanding of gendered criminality in our current context.

Individuals who have recently been released from the prison system in Ontario face the challenging task of (re)integration to 'life on the outside,' which includes existential concerns such as finding work and safe housing, while also having to engage with new/changed identities ('criminalized subject,' 'woman/man,' and 'citizen') that have arisen from their recent experiences. These individuals experience a wide variety of subject positions throughout this process of (re)integration, and it is these positions that come to affect how they cope with life after prison in Ontario society. As individuals move into incarceration, they experience changing subject positions, including restrictions on one's ability to decide their own activities and the spaces they occupy, and the dictation of these activities and occupied spaces by guards and officials occupying positions of authority and power. These positions change again as they are released, making for a difficult set of transition periods, sometimes occurring in quick succession depending on the length of the sentence.

Incarceration rates in Canada are on the rise for women, and are even higher for men, and this leads us to ask questions surrounding how their identities are being affected throughout this process of criminalization. Identity, as Comack and Brickey argue, is discursively constructed through language and discourse, and therefore it is important to understand how individuals' identities in the contexts of gender, citizenship, and family membership, are being constructed in the context of incarceration and reintegration (2007, 4). In order to understand the state of incarceration in Ontario, as well as Canada as a whole, it is important to look at Statistics Canada's website, where we can witness incarceration trends over the last 30 years.

Rates of female incarceration have been on the rise over that last 30 years, both

provincially and federally. At the same time though, between 2009 and 2014, Ontario provincial incarceration rates for the total population serving sentenced time have begun to decrease, while remand populations awaiting trial have increased in the same time span. As well, federal incarceration rates are continuing to rise with a 4% increase within the last 5 years alone. Finally, what we also see is that parole rates have been on a constant decrease over the last 5 years. (statcan.gc.ca 2012 & 2015). These stats show that women are occupying more space in community (holding cells at local police stations), provincial, and federal institutions, while also showing that more individuals are serving time without an actual sentence while they await court, and that after being sentenced the likelihood of being released on parole is decreasing. If more people are serving time while they await trial, fewer people are being granted parole who are in sentenced custody (have had trial and have been sentenced), and more people are being federally incarcerated, we must ask how these many forms of criminalization come to affect their construction of identities, while also asking to what extent these identities are gendered.

At this time, there is an anthropological/feminist discourse in which people's experiences and life histories are recorded and used to understand them in their own terms on a case-by-case basis (Balfour 2006; Pollack 2007, Mendoza-Denton 2008). This research discourse focused on individual life experiences begins to challenge many of the universalizing effects of applying a term like 'victim', 'inmate' or 'ex-con' to individuals' identities. In her work from 2006 Balfour describes how there has been a "loss of women's voices and their experiences of social exclusion, as well as a disappearance of praxis from critical Foucauldian-inspired feminist criminology" (735). This loss of women's voices has meant less of a focus on understanding how they actually cope with incarceration and criminalization, and more on providing social scapegoats for why they are in these positions. This methodological and theoretical

standpoint is also relevant to men and their experiences of social exclusion and stigma throughout the incarceration and criminalization process. In her influential work with Latina youth gangs, Norma Mendoza-Denton states,

“One of the challenges for me in writing this book has been not to fall unquestioningly into reproducing stereotypes of gangs and gang members, so I have steered away from the usual law enforcement topics of illicit activity and violence and attempted to focus on young people’s own explanations, their accounts of the world around them, and their works as they were collected and recorded by me” (2008, 6).

It becomes necessary then to look at individuals’ experiences with both cultural norms and social expectations, labels, and identities, which in the end can not only show us how they cope with these phenomenon, but also why they are in these positions of criminalized subject, inmate, and recently released individual, and how they perceive of those phenomenon on their own terms.

Troubling Terminology

Before moving any further, it is important to outline some of the terms this work will be dealing with. Many of the terms used in this work have a variety of meanings, and definitions of the terms used will help to situate the reader in the current context. The first two terms that are so imperative to define are criminalization and incarceration. For the purposes of this work, criminalization refers to the way in which an individual’s behaviours are considered to be of criminal intent or a part of ongoing criminal activity (Schur 1984; Bernburg, Krohn, and Rivera 2006; Pollack 2012) whereas incarceration strictly refers to the act of imprisonment in a correctional facility. Criminalization as a term has been used in some cases to describe incarceration, but I make the distinction here between the two, as throughout my interactions with participants, and in some cases their family members or friends, I came to see that criminalization can be understood to be a feeling or a perceived behavior, while incarceration

was used to explain their time inside correctional institutions. To explain this feeling, I include an excerpt from an interview with one participant Stephanie, where she described how she felt criminalized, but had never actually spent time in a penal institution.

“I was about to go to jail. I was very lucky that, um, that they let me go. I was so scared that I was gonna go to ja...(trails off) cause it was going to be my first time. And um, you know it's kinda hard. Plus I've never been in jail. So it's scary for me to you know, look behind my back, see if cops are around looking for me. Like, someone's following me, looking for me.”

This quotation shows the way that Stephanie experienced feeling criminalized, although she had never actually been incarcerated. Many of my participants described this feeling throughout my interactions with them, giving more depth and complexity to this term while doing so.

Another important term that I must outline early in this work is that of ‘(re)integration’. This is a term I use quite often in this work, and as it is a term that can be ambiguous and in some ways concerning, it is important to outline both how and why it is used in the following pages. Firstly, (re)integration can only be understood in relation to the induction process into incarceration. When one is incarcerated they must come to learn a set a rules, regulations, and behaviours that must be strictly adhered to throughout their time inside. Upon release, one regains responsibility over their own activities, and must learn to cope with life after incarceration – “(re)integration.” The term (re)integration was one I came to use early on in the planning stages of this research project. At first, I chose (re)integration as it seemed that when released, people were coming back into society from this distant place, prison, and that they were relearning how to cope and deal with daily life ‘outside’. Shortly after I began using this term, questions about it began to arise. Was this term problematic in that it recreated an institutionalized way to re-enter society? Did it flatten human experience and create a uni-directional process in which people must learn the error of their ways and become good

citizens again? And most importantly, were these people ever truly ‘integrated’?

As I interviewed people who were at various stages of either dealing with the criminal justice system, or who were transitioning from life inside to life outside in many ways, I began to realize that (re)integration was not only an appropriate term to use, but was also the term that the individuals I was talking with were using. This was talked about in programming available both inside institutions, as well as in the community upon release. People therefore adopted this language, as they felt it accurately described their circumstances, and was a comprehensive term to describe their current experiences. As people are released from incarceration, there are a variety of hurdles they must overcome. It was these hurdles that presented themselves in so many different ways to my participants that forged the complex and precarious positions they occupied in society. What is important though, is that these people existed in the society. They interacted with people around them, and impacted their lives on a day-to-day basis. These people were both simultaneously (re)integrating (as they learned how to look for a place to live, find food, apply for jobs, go to school, and pay bills) and were integrated (as they went to coffee shops, visited the doctor, attended community events, and made/maintained meaningful social relationships that helped them through their daily lives). (Re)integration is a term that will be used throughout this work to describe the challenges that people being released from incarceration experience in their daily lives. I will therefore not use this term to describe my participants, and the population of people being released from incarceration in general, as people who are not a part of society.

Finally, some terms that I do not use in this thesis are those such as ex-convict, inmate, or victim as I find these terms problematic in too many ways. While interviewing participants for this research I asked a few of them early on, “what terms do you use to describe people in your situation?” One participant, Jacquelin, responded to that question by stating

“Me, personally, you’re a person. You’re a human being. You’re not a number. You’re not just an inmate. You’re a person with a heart, knowledge, brains, everything.”

After that powerful response I decided that I would no longer attempt to attach terms or labels to a person’s identity, such as ex-convict, inmate, criminal, or victim (which in the eyes of many, most of my participants would fit all of these terms) but resigned to describing them quite simply as people who, in one aspect of their lives, were experiencing the phenomenon of (re)integration.

Themes, Theories and Findings: An Anthropology of Gendered (Re)integration

This work attempts to understand the lives of 14 participants who have traveled through the criminal justice system and are now either returning to life outside, or who have been living outside for some time and are struggling to (re)integrate. Throughout the interviews performed in this research I was able to understand how my participants struggled on a day-to-day basis, and what they believed to be necessary for successful (re)integration. I therefore engage with discourse, identity, criminalization, power, labeling, and gender in this work, as a means of understanding the lives of the participants I have interacted with throughout my fieldwork. In many ways, this work draws on sociological and anthropological theoretical work, while using anthropological research methods, to create an anthropology of the (re)integration process. Here then, I will take a look at some key literature on discourse, performativity, identity, labeling, incarceration, and gender, in order to give the reader a theoretical standpoint from which they may move forward in this work.

When we look at gendered identity, we must invariably start with discourse and performativity, which will show us how identity is discursively constructed. To start with a brief discussion of discourse then, which is one of the most prominent themes discussed throughout this research, we can come to understand it in this work as being a key factor in how people

learn to perform in certain ways, and therefore (re)produce the structures/norms that exist within discourse. In her work *Bodies that Matter*, Judith Butler explains that “performativity must be understood not as a singular or deliberate ‘act’ but as the reiterative and citational practice by which discourse produces the effects it makes” (1993, xii). What Butler is referring to here is that to perform we must have something to perform, and that by performing we produce the effects of those discourses that cause/teach us to perform in specific ways. Through these performances an identity (or identities), is formed, and it is this identity that further affects how one performs and what social groups one may interact with. With the application of institutional labels such as “incarcerated,” “inmate” or “convict” by the criminal justice system, individuals then must come to find new ways to identify themselves, and learn to cope with their newly prescribed identities. As I have found throughout my interviews with participants, their interactions with discourses of criminalization, poverty, and addictions (including drugs and alcohol) have meant that they have struggled to produce an identity which does not reproduce the stereotypes they try to overcome everyday. It is these stereotypes that in many ways come to restrict them in their attempts at finding work, housing, and food. I therefore engage with performance and identity in this work to show the ways that discourse affects identity production, but also the ways identity is fluid and changing depending on the space an individual occupies – prison, half-way house/shelter, coffee shop, etc.

Incarcerated people are held to a variety of standards and must learn new roles and norms as they enter the prison system, that lead to their embodiment of the discourse of discipline present in the criminal justice system. As described in Cressida Heyes’ work *Self Transformations*, “discipline functions to consolidate identities by managing the body’s movements, its surface, and even our lived experience” (2007, 7). In this quotation we see

how the discourse of discipline comes to affect performance, and as described above, this performance comes to reinforce/recreate discourse, and to produce one's identities. This work clearly stems from Foucault's *Discipline and Punish* (1975) in which he describes the way that normalization becomes an instrument of power, and that power is exercised in the daily interactions and experiences of each individual. The next step taken by Foucault was to show the way in which power produces knowledge, and at the same time that knowledge produces power by recreating the structures that produce power. This is imperative to this research project as we see that individuals exist with a set of identities that are produced through a variety of performances. These performances stem from the discourses that exist, and are (re)produced by normalization, which of course is a tool of power. When being defined with new labels, people must quickly learn to reshape their performances to either challenge, or fit in, with perceptions of them.

Through the focused life history interviews that have taken place in this study, I have better come to understand how individuals reshape their performances when both entering and exiting the criminal justice system, which helps us to further discourse and performance theory, in relation to incarcerated and criminalized people, which will be discussed in depth in later chapters. These individuals also struggled to challenge expected performances, troubling some prominent understandings of the power of discourse to affect identity. It was in seeing these individuals who would often be considered to be in positions of powerlessness (poverty, incarceration, homelessness) challenge popular notions of who they must be, and how they are going to perform, that thickened their identities, and my understanding of their situations. This thickening of identity, and of experience, helped to challenge my understandings of discourse, as I came to see the ways in which individuals with seemingly little or no power produced their

identities, and reshaped the ways others perceived them.

When discussing performance, identity, and perceptions of individuals it also becomes important to look at labels, as their affect on identity is extensive. Schur (1984) describes what it is to be deviant, and how deviance is a term that often surrounds people's realities. Schur describes deviance not as just formally processed wrongdoing, but as a personal discreditation, where individuals, in total, are placed in the wrong (1984, 3). This label of deviant, which exists in both formal settings (criminal record) as well as informal (interactions in society where people are aware of one's history of incarceration) does not mean the person is necessarily in prison, but can damage a person's reputation, induce shame, and lower one's chances in life (1984, 3). What Schur is touching on here is the affect that labels may have on one's social life. Bernburg, Krohn, and Rivera discuss labeling theory in their work, where they look at the way that criminal labeling affects recidivism and individuals' ability to reintegrate into society (2006, 68-69). In this work, the authors attempt to show how official labeling by public institutions comes to affect the way individuals can interact with the rest of society, and can in some cases dictate the groups one can associate with. Bernburg, Krohn, and Rivera argue that official labeling can lead to a withdrawal from interactions with peers by those with criminal labels, "depending on popular beliefs about criminal identity" (2006, 69). Along with this, Jackson and Hay have sought to show in their work the way that labeling can affect recidivism, and how familial ties can come to change the impact labels have on individuals (2013). In particular, Jackson and Hay showed that "parents can reduce the likelihood of reoffending based on their support, warmth, and being involved" (2013, 317).

What we can see here is how social perceptions of labels such as criminal, deviant, and inmate, can heavily affect one's ability to (re)integrate into society in terms of finding work,

housing, and positive social groups. The data gained throughout my interviews with people who have been released from incarceration has shown me the adverse effects that both official, and non-official labeling can have on people's lives. Many of my participants discussed the difficulty of looking for work after being released, and the way that in many cases this has led to recidivism for them. This work will therefore add to the literature on labeling by further showing the way criminal/deviant labeling, both official and not, comes to affect one's ability to achieve their goals of (re)integration, whatever they may be. To this point, I have attempted to show current views on labeling and performance theory, and the life stories that will be discussed throughout this thesis will help to bring people's experience after prison into current literature, while also helping to both enrich and challenge current theories of identity and labeling.

This quick explanation of labeling, discourse, power, and knowledge helps to show where many of the general themes are in this area of study, and now it is important to discuss literature dealing explicitly with the criminal justice system and criminalized people, instead of with the theory surrounding these institutions. Goffman's work *Asylums* (1961) seems a logical place to start, as his discussion of total institutions gives great insight into the affect of prisons on inmate's lives, and the way in which groups of people are homogenized while inhabiting institutions. Goffman states that a "feature of total institutions is the break down of barriers that separate different spheres of people's lives" (1961, 6). What also occurs in these institutions is a great social distance between guards and inmates, which is formally decided (1961, 7). This distance can be seen in Philip Zimbardo's landmark 1971 study, where undergraduate students were put into roles of either prisoner or guard, and were set to interact within a "prison" created in the Stanford University psychology labs (1-2). In this study, Zimbardo showed how quickly both "inmates" and "guards" took on their roles, and how they performed in ways that would

be stereotypical of those roles. In the end, the study was stopped early, as guards were becoming sadistic, and prisoners were becoming emotionally unstable (1971, 16). In this example, we can see the strict separation of guards from prisoners, and how these roles themselves lead to performances that reproduce these norms. Finally, Goffman describes how individuals are not “inculturated” into prisons, but are instead “disculturated” which makes reintegration to society much more difficult after release (1961, 13). Goffman’s discussion provides the reader with an explanation of how the prison system affects the individuality of each inmate, and how this form of imprisonment leads to difficult re-entry for those being released. In this work I will both use and challenge these statements, as throughout my interviews I came to understand the affect that “total institutions” have on people, as well as what they expect from people. At the same time though, I hope to challenge this idea of disculturation, as I find the concept of culture loss can be problematic.

This brings us to the current research being done on re-integration, recidivism, and the way in which prison affects prisoners after they are released. In her work on the project of ‘correction’ in the criminal justice system, Jennifer Kilty discusses how there is a trend of over prescription of medications inside prisons that work to chemically sedate inmates. Kilty, in this work from 2012, shows that 87 percent of currently incarcerated women in Canada have medication orders for both prescription and over the counter medications (163). Kilty goes on to show that the prescription of these medications is mainly for “anti-psych meds” that sedate prisoners, in order to make them more manageable. Prisoners are technically able to refuse any medications, but if they do so, they are often considered difficult to manage, and are less likely to achieve parole (2012, 172-173). In this sense, we can see that prisoners are manipulated by the prison system and are forced to comply, even if on the surface they appear to have a choice

not to. Connecting this to Goffman's work, what this shows is a clear effort to homogenize inmates, and to produce compliant prisoners at any cost.

In terms of (re)integration, Kilty's study shows that female prisoners are not being prepared for life after prison, but are simply being subdued while in prison for the duration of their imprisonment. In her work on reintegration, Rebecca Greenberg discusses reintegration programs and the lack of funding they receive. Greenberg argues that there are four dimensions of successful reintegration – "individual characteristics, family relationships, community contexts and state policies" and that in order for correctional institutions to properly prepare people for release, they need to focus on overcoming the variety of problems that prisoners face upon release (2012). Greenburg continues this discussion by showing how the stigma of incarceration works to disadvantage those being released, leading to difficult (re)integration periods, and that in order to counteract this there must be a greater focus on programs, that at this point are undergoing cuts instead of increases.

This theme of public perceptions of prisoners appears in both of the previously mentioned works, as they come to impact people's opportunities for (re)integration quite substantially. In their work "Echoes of Imprisonment" Shantz, Kilty, and Frigon discuss the ways that prison life continues to affect prisoners after they have been released. In this work the authors state "the realities of the carceral environment become imprinted both in the minds and on the bodies of women prisoners further limiting their chances of successfully reintegrating into the community" (2009, 85). This clearly echoes Goffman's work, as it shows the way in which these total institutions can affect the ability of prisoners to (re)integrate. Not only do these people have to cope with negative public perceptions of them, but they also have been away from the society and must (re)learn how to perform on a day-to-day basis. This combined with having

newly prescribed labels that come to affect identity, come together to make (re)integration an overwhelming task. Finally, as the authors go on to show, many prisoners were lacking integration in society before they were imprisoned, which may have been one of the causes of their incarceration. Therefore (re)integration is not simply going back to life as it was before, but to a new life and new social networks that this person has never known (2009, 86-89). The process of (re)integration for people who are coping with new labels and identities is further complicated then, as they must also struggle to integrate into social spaces that may seem just as foreign as prison did.

The lack of (re)integration programs in our current criminal justice system, leading to prisoners having a very difficult time (re)integrating after they are released, can help us to understand why recidivism rates are as high as they are (the current rate of reconviction is 44% within the first year of release (Greenberg, 2012)). In their work on criminalized women, Comack and Brickey discuss why women who are convicted of crimes experience such extremes of stigmatization. Comack and Brickey describe how criminalized women are seen “as the antithesis to women, considered to be wicked, manipulative, and deceitful” (2007, 2). In this description, the authors show how criminalized women not only come into conflict with the criminal justice system in general, but also come to contradict norms of being a woman in our society.

In many ways, these statements about women can be re-imagined or contrasted with men’s experiences of the criminal justice system, as well as with society after being labeled as criminal. Many of my male participants discussed the ways they felt gendered because of their criminal labels, and that they were expected to be hyper-masculine while incarcerated, and then struggled to challenge this perception after they were released. Men also have difficult times

dealing with expected gendered behaviours, and struggle to fit the norms that are expected of men in our society, as well as those of hyper-masculine criminals.

Finally, I turn here to outline my usage of gender in this work, as it is of utmost importance to my analysis of the interview data I gathered throughout my fieldwork. When looking at gender, I find it important to start with Foucault's *History of Sexuality* as it is here that we can come to understand the interactions between power and sex, and the production of sex that has led to sex as we know it today. Foucault states in his 1978 work

Sexuality must not be thought of as a kind of natural given which power tries to hold in check, or as an obscure domain which knowledge tries gradually to uncover. It is the name that can be given to a historical construct: not a furtive reality that is difficult to grasp, but a great surface network in which the stimulation of bodies, the intensification of pleasures, the incitement to discourse, the formation of special knowledges, the strengthening of controls and resistances, are linked to one another, in accordance with a few major strategies of knowledge and power (105-106).

With this comprehensive quotation we can truly come to see how Foucault imagined sex not only as a constructed reality, but as one that is entwined with daily life in society, and that has come to affect so many aspects of our lives as members of that society. We can see aspects of this as well in Butler's 1993 work, *Bodies that Matter*, where she discusses sex as being part of a regulatory practice that produces the bodies it governs (xi). As we saw earlier in the section on discourse, Butler attempts to show in this work how discourse and performativity come to interact, and with an understanding of this we can come to see the ways that individuals come to be gendered in society.

To further our understanding of gender theory here, we must also turn to Cressida Heyes who provides us with a succinct way we can come to see the existence of gender in society and also its essentializing effects. Heyes, in her work from 2000, *Line Drawings*, comes to

analyze essentialism, and how it seeks to create a unified gender identity. Heyes states, “once a generalized woman is accepted, then those who lay outside that group need to be prefaced with adjectives in order to be identified” (54, 2000). This is an imperative quotation, as it shows the way in which gender becomes a tool of essentialism through a process of homogenization.

Gender comes to be defined by those with power, as we saw from Foucault and Butler, and from these definitions individuals are either forced into groupings that they may not fit in, or are labeled with external terms to qualify them as different from the ‘average woman’ or ‘average man’.

Finally then, I return to Butler and her monumental text on gender, *Gender Trouble*. In this influential work, Butler not only looks at gender in new and important ways, but also provides insights on performativity, discourse, and the history of gender studies. In a quotation that informs many of the ways I have come to analyze gender in my work, Butler states “There is no gender identity behind the expressions of gender; that identity is performatively constituted by the very “expressions” that are said to be its results” (34, 1990). Here we can see that Butler is suggesting that gender is not something that becomes attached to an individual in a vacuum, but that it is constantly being (re)produced through one’s performances of acts that are considered to be gendered in the society. Therefore, we must come to understand gender as a produced phenomenon that is maintained as a discourse through the constant performance of acts that are considered to be gendered. In this work I come to look at gender as an individualized phenomenon, being produced differently depending on the space one occupies, on one’s life history, and on the other identities that person either holds, or is prescribed through labeling. Gender is this complex intersection of many aspects of individual’s lives, and appears differently depending on one’s situations. For criminalized populations, this is imperative to understand,

as often criminal identities are strictly gendered, and heavily affect the way one may come to (re)integrate to society after release.

It is at this point that we see that it is not only necessary to further study criminalized people from a criminological standpoint, but also from a critical social point that asks questions of gender norms and the way they are (re)produced, and challenged, in prison and society. The literature that has been discussed in this section has focused on a variety of topics, but there are some gaps that it has left, and that is what this project will seek to fill in. These gaps arise when we begin to look specifically at the criminal justice system and (re)integration, as analyses of gender, performance, identity, labeling, and discourse have only recently begun to be looked at in terms of people's experiences of life after incarceration. Through the focused life history interviews gathered in this work I have come to learn much about the lives of people after incarceration, and these stories will be used throughout this work to influence and broaden our understandings of these theoretical themes listed above.

Throughout my fieldwork it became quite apparent that individuals (re)integrating to society after release from carceral environments were in need of various forms of support. These forms of support were important to their success, but the way they were made available, as was described by my participants, was just as important, if not more, than the forms of help themselves. As my participants were released from incarceration they struggled to find food, clothing, housing, work, and social connections. These areas of struggle were problematized by their labels applied during and after incarceration, by their addictions to drugs and alcohol, by their lack of access to resources, and by their inability to dictate the forms of support that they accessed, and how they accessed them. Often, programs inside institutions were largely symbolic, as described by many participants, in that they made it seem as if support existed,

but that it was largely not helpful. Furthermore, many of my participants looked to gender as a problematic phenomenon in their lives, as they felt cut off from resources, social groups, and spaces based on their gender identity. This finding, along with my own reflections on gender and criminalization made for the basis of my theoretical engagements in this work. It was this combination then of participants suggestions and stories, and my own experiences of gender throughout the ethics process, that influenced my interest, and the subsequent focus of this work, on gendered criminalization.

Methodology

The participants for this study included 14 individuals who were interviewed over a period of three months. This group was made up of seven women and seven men, and with the exception of one female participant, was composed of people who had been incarcerated and released, and were now living in Ottawa, Ontario.¹ Out of the 14 participants in this study, 11 had been released from incarceration within the last three years. The other participants had a range of release times, two being released within the last five years, and one who had been released approximately 15 years ago. This sample allowed me to gain an understanding of how people who had recently been released (between 2012-2015) coped with life on the outside, while also providing me with knowledge about life after incarceration on a longer scale, showing how people's lives are affected in both the short, and long-term. This sample, as I will attempt to show throughout this thesis, is not completely representative of the population of people being released from incarceration in Ontario, as they have varied experiences heavily impacted by their individual life histories. That being the case, there are still themes that I found to cross between

¹ The one participant who had not been incarcerated had been arrested multiple times, and was currently in court appointed programs, that if she did not attend she would be incarcerated. This woman had spent approximately 24 hours in a holding cell at a police station, but she did not consider this being incarcerated.

different participants at different times, showing that they both shared experiences, and differed from one another. The amounts of time that these participants spent inside carceral institutions also varied greatly. Some participants had spent up to five years at a time in correctional facilities, while many of the participants had served many short sentences in quick succession (from 30-90 days each time). This made for one of the most striking details about this participant group - the number of people who had served multiple sentences. Altogether, 11 of my 14 participants had been incarcerated on multiple occasions, with some people reporting upwards of 20 sentences over the last 15 years. This not only showed me why it was so important to understand how these people came to experience life after incarceration, but led me to ask why reconviction rates were so high, and what we could do to help these reconviction rates decrease.

To recruit participants for this study, I began looking for female participants solely, as this project began with a focus about women only. As mentioned in the opening section of this chapter, I reached out to E.Fry, along with some other organizations in town including The Church Council on Justice and Corrections, The Ottawa Mission, St. Luke's Table, and a variety of drop-in centres that provided clothing and food to members of the community. These organizations were all very helpful and provided me with information about the work they did, and with space to put up recruitment posters. These recruitment posters asked participants if they would like to be a part of a research project on women's experiences after incarceration, and that if they did so they would receive a \$15 Tim Horton's gift card. Recruitment for the first month was very slow with only two people contacting me. After the research project was opened to include men and women, recruitment increased rapidly as individuals living in shelters and going to drop-in centres began to talk about my research to one another.

In order to gain a greater understanding of how these people came to be involved with

the criminal justice system, and how they coped with their time on the inside, and with (re)integration, focused life history interviews were utilized, with an approximate duration of 1.5 hours per interview. Focused life history interviews attempt to focus on an individual's experiences, in order to paint a picture of the paths that have led the person to their current position. In these interviews, time was given to asking pre-planned questions that focused on people's experiences of life before being arrested, of the criminal justice system, (re)integration, coping with changing public perceptions of them, and how identity is affected by newly applied labels such as criminal, deviant, and ex-inmate. These interviews also often included unstructured portions where people would tell their stories, and this helped me to see what aspects of their lives they understood to be relevant to this research. This was done in order to have the participants' experiences and ideas influence the questions that were asked in later interviews.

The focus on people who had been incarcerated at the provincial level was included in order to interact with people who had only been separated from society for a maximum period of two years. As this research is partially based on people's experiences with *changing* public perceptions, a comparison to life before prison was necessary, and this was certainly affected by the length of time people spent away from society being shorter than two years on average. As was stated before, most participants entered and exited incarceration multiple times in quick succession, and hearing from participants who talked very directly about why this was occurring and how it affected them, helped me to further understand the nature of the Ontario provincial criminal justice system, and how it continues to affect people for many years after they are released.

The combination of these methods led to approximately 20 hours of audio data that

was transcribed, and many pages of field notes, that when combined offer me unique and detailed stories and interactions to approach this analysis of participants interactions with the criminal justice system and their subsequent (re)integration to society after release. It was not only these in-depth interviews, in which people told me extremely private, powerful, and emotional stories of their lives at many different stages that led me to have a greater understanding of these peoples' experiences and of the criminal justice system in general though. Outside of the formalized interview time, my interactions with participants on the phone, before and after the interviews, while the recorder was off and my notebook was shut, and in some cases while chatting with them on the way to the interview location, I came to see how these people experienced life on a daily basis. It was these important moments where I came to truly understand the problems that exist in regards to essentializing discourses and homogenization, and where I truly saw the need for an anthropology of the criminalized, that may help to open up our eyes to the multiplicity of human experience in regards to the criminal justice system and life after.

Significance of Research

This research then seeks to add new voices to the anthropological, criminological, and sociological literatures on criminalized populations through the use of ethnography (which includes immersion in the lives of the individuals being studied, along with in-depth interviews) and the collaborative inclusion of participants' voices in writing. Much of the research in the areas of sociology and criminology has either left out the voices and experiences of participants, has focused too heavily on trends and statistics, has focused heavily on one gender, or has used theory to interpret experience, and not experience to form theory. At the same time, these studies provide valuable insight on the structural effects of institutional life on prisoners, the

prevailing reactions or images through which society views it's criminalized populations, and the social inequalities that disproportionately affect them. Without such precedents, this project would not be possible. It is also clear that social science authors, including Balfour (2006), Greenberg (2012), Shantz, Kilty, and Frigon (2009) have been calling for an in-depth analysis of gendered criminalization for some time, and this project seeks to start that task, based on their imperative works on this topic.

Theoretically, this project will seek to further our understanding of the interaction between discourse and performance, as criminalized people are constantly engaging with a variety of changing discourses, identities, and public perceptions, which they must learn to navigate in order to succeed in society after prison. Along with this focus on discourse, labeling theory will also be the subject of inquiry, as the way that women interact with their new labels after being released from prison should help to provide insight into the way that performance and identity are affected by changing social labels. Labeling theory will also come to be the subject of critique, as it's ability to cover the wide range of people's experiences with the criminal justice system will be questioned, as we will come to learn how people create their own identities. As well, power will be examined in relation to the criminal justice system to understand the forms of punishment, control, and reform that exist in the lives of the incarcerated. Finally, one of the greatest undertakings of this thesis will be to engage with gender theory, and to bring a new understanding of how criminalized populations come to experience and interact with gender, and to shed light on how gender comes to affect the (re)integration process through its impacts on the organizations that this population interacts with on a daily basis.

Public perceptions of prisoners are one of the greatest hardships that recently released

persons encounter, as they affect one's ability to build social ties, to find work and housing, and to generally successfully (re)integrate. We must come to further understand these social phenomena in order to help give people the tools to successfully (re)integrate into society after they are released from prison. The act of (re)integration is an overwhelming task for prisoners who are attempting to enter society and stay away from prison, and with a 44% recidivism rate in the first year of release, there are very clearly major issues with how (re)integration is occurring at this time. This research is therefore focused on this process, with an emphasis on people's experiences during this process, as they may help to influence where future programs may grow, and also affect change in public perceptions of recently released prisoners.

Chapter Two

Life on the Inside: Power and The Criminal Justice System

Dirk: Can you take me through a day in your life on the inside?

Jennifer: I can do that one. You shower, you get this little thin bed, which by the way is very, very, very, very uncomfortable. Okay. There's no pillows, which I think a pillow is necessary to sleep. Because then you get a nice comfortable sleep. And some cells are colder than others, so you need more blankets and they don't provide you with all the blankets, and everything you need to actually take care of you, while you're in there. However the one thing I can say that was good, was, some of the meals, dinner meals are good. Breakfast, they gave me, uh, bread that was, it smelt moldy, and I'm allergic to penicillin, and I wasn't too fond of breakfast so I didn't eat. I don't like how you only get like, an hour out of the cell. And I didn't, like the experience.

Dirk: So you only get an hour out of your cell?

Jennifer: I didn't get any.

Dirk: Really?

Jennifer: Yeah.

Dirk: So what was that like?

Jennifer: All you do is think, sleep, eat, trade things for food. Whatever you want. Its not, not fun. Not at all. But it does give you a lot of time to think about what you want to do. Cause it was my first time, so I actually had time to sit there and think.

Dirk: And reflect on yourself?

Jennifer: Pretty much, yeah.

Entering Corrections: Gender, Power, and Prescribed Identities

The first time I spoke to an individual about their experiences with the criminal justice system, I was given an in-depth explanation of what it was like to be inside an Ontario provincial institution by someone who has had 104 convictions and who started our interview by stating “I’ve been in and out of jail my whole life, since I lost my son.” This participant, Jacquelin, met me on a cold January morning to talk about her experiences of the criminal justice system and with (re)integration, and I was immediately shocked by what she had lived through, and by her candid explanations of her time both inside, and out. This would set the stage for the next few months of research, where I would hear from 14 participants about many aspects of their interactions with the criminal justice system. Some of the most startling stories I was told were centred on time spent inside provincial correctional institutions, and understanding these life

events became imperative to understanding where my participants were at this point in their lives.

This chapter will look at the criminal justice system in Canada through the use of historical, anthropological, sociological, and legal texts, along with ethnographic data gained throughout focused life history interviews with participants, in order to show what the people in our current correctional facilities have experienced and continue to experience on a day-to-day basis. It is important to look at the criminal justice system first in this work, as it will help to see what people who are currently (re)integrating to society have been through. Understanding these experiences can help us to see the effects of the criminal justice system on the lives of those who go through it, and will hopefully show why recidivism rates continue to be high. As I will attempt to show in this chapter, the criminal justice system has long lasting affects on individuals' identities through the application of labels, and through prescribed ways to perform based on class, gender, and public notions of what it is to be criminal and/or incarcerated. Further, this chapter will engage with experiences of differential power based on one's position within the criminal justice system, and hierarchies that are constantly reinforced throughout the process of 'rehabilitation', as it is problematically termed. Through this chapter then I will begin to show how these phenomenon affect (re)integration, and people's experiences of life after incarceration.

I will open this section with an examination of the development of a gender specific criminal justice system in Canada, in order to show where this form of gender segregation came from and how it affects the current population. Throughout my fieldwork, many participants spoke of the differences (perceived or real) between men and women's jails/prisons, and how this has affected them. In regards to perceived, I refer to the way my participants often

recognized that differences may not physically exist, but that they still experience these situations as though differences did physically exist. Women and men have not always been segregated in the criminal justice system in Canada, and the move towards segregation took many years. This part of our criminal justice system's history is quite telling of greater trends in society, such as how gender differences have been constructed and perceived in Canada, and of how these gender differences have come to affect the lives of those dealing with corrections.

Following my examination of the gendered criminal justice system, I will turn to look at the current conditions inside correctional institutions in Ontario using the experiences of my participants. After examinations of the criminal justice system and gender inside, this chapter will close by looking at the role of power in these institutions, and the longstanding effects this has on individuals. This examination of power will use both Michel Foucault's *Discipline and Punish* (1975) and more recently Kelly Hannah-Moffat's *Punishment in Disguise* (2001) to gain an understanding of correctional facilities, and the systems of knowledge they create/use/reinforce, to maintain control over their populations. As Hannah-Moffat states in her work "the language describing women's imprisonment now speaks of empowerment, choice, and healing; yet many argue that little about the regime has changed and that few past lessons have been learned" (4, 2001). This statement is imperative to understanding both power and the history of the criminal justice system in Canada, as in this province we have seen a repeating theme of inquiries into conditions inside these facilities, suggested reforms, and finally, most often the adoption of terminology, but not practice. It is through the combination then of power, gender, and individual experiences that we can come to understand my participants' experiences of criminal justice in Canada, and how it affects their lives after being released.

A Segregated Past: Gender Specific Institutions and Programming

Gender specific imprisonment is nothing new, and many would consider the thought of gender-neutral imprisonment to be very problematic and in many ways impossible. This of course has not always been the case in Canada, and when looking at the history of our criminal justice system we can see when, why, and how this segregation occurred. Kingston Penitentiary was first opened in 1835, and when it opened, housed both men and women in the same building but in separate areas. Kelly Hannah-Moffat shows in her 2001 work that in the 19th century policy did not distinguish between men and women in the criminal justice system (72). This meant that women performed work labour similar to men's, including the breaking of rocks sometimes right alongside them (Hannah-Moffat 2001, 72). On paper, women were meant to be housed in the same facilities (but in different wards) and were to be punished in the same ways. Of course, what is on paper does not always translate to practice, and for the criminal justice system in Canada, that statement is accurate.

Women did share the Kingston Penitentiary with men in the 19th century, and were expected to receive the same levels of punishment as they did. This was not the case though, as along with receiving punishment in the same ways as men, women also experienced greater amounts of abuse and sexual exploitation by jailers and men inside (Hannah-Moffat 2001, 72). Along with this, Kingston Penitentiary also hired matrons who were meant to govern the female populations, and this led to increased surveillance over the female population. This lifestyle of double punishment and abuse for women continued until the 1890s when punishments for men and women were formally changed. At this time, the expected punishments for men remained harsh, while women's punishments were reduced in severity, while their frequency increased (Hannah-Moffat 2001, 74).

Moving into the early 1900s, the women's unit in Kingston Penitentiary began to report

overcrowding repeatedly, leading to new calls for the construction of a separate building for women at Kingston Penitentiary. During the Brown Commission of 1848, suggestions were made to open up a female specific building, but were never answered. Hannah-Moffat also shows that multiple requests were made between the Brown Commission and 1910 to build new infrastructure for women, but were not answered until 1910 (2001, 75-81). It was in 1910 that Kingston Penitentiary saw the first separate quarters for women, which could accommodate up to 34 people (Hannah-Moffat 2001, 81). Soon after, these facilities were being strained by overcrowding, leading to the opening of another location at Dorchester Penitentiary (2001, 81). Finally, in the 1920s, the Biggar-Nickle-Drapper committee put forward suggestions that women should be housed completely separately from men. This eventually led to the opening of the Kingston Prison for Women in 1934 (Hannah-Moffat 2001, 82-83).

The decision to house women separately from men in the criminal justice system was largely influenced by stereotypes of women held at the time. Nickle, from the Biggar-Nickle-Drapper committee, specifically called for this gender segregation as he was worried about the negative effects women's innate flirtatious habits would have on men inside (Hannah-Moffat 2001, 83). As Hannah-Moffat shows, it was believed that 'bad' women prisoners were responsible for the sexual abuse that had been occurring in Kingston Penitentiary, and therefore they needed to be separated from the male population (2001, 84). It was believed at this time that the frailties of men arose from the sexual power that female convicts held, and being that both women and men convicted of crimes were considered to be morally corrupt by society, these women were looked at as dangerous and in need of segregation (Hannah-Moffat 2001, 84-85). This then began the move towards separately housed women and men that would set the precedent for a gender specific prison system in Canada.

The creation of gender specific spaces within the criminal justice system in Canada has also lead to the production of gender specific programming. This difference in programming has had a variety of effects on individuals in the system, and these effects have been perceived in both positive and negative ways. In her work on gendered incarceration, Shoshana Pollack discusses the way in which gender over the years within the context of the criminal justice system has been emptied of its socio-economic and political meanings (2012, 103). Pollack shows that in the context of incarceration and corrections that gender is now conceived of in terms of the psychological impacts of gender oppression. This has lead to the individualization and pathologizing of criminalized women, who are considered to be at risk of reoffending based on gender specific factors (2012, 103-104). These gender specific reasons for women are considered to be resistance to gender oppression and violence, which are believed to cause women to behave in criminal ways. What has occurred then within our current criminal justice system is a move towards “gender responsive strategies” which stem from the view that women and men’s experiences of criminal activity, and their needs, are different (Pollack 2012, 105).

The existence of gender responsive strategies reinforces the ideology that men and women exist as separate entities within our society. Strategies of gender specific programming have often focused on stereotypes of men and women’s roles in society. Hannah-Moffat shows us this in her work when she discusses maternal strategies in the criminal justice system that have focused on the moral reformation of women. This maternal logic has been derived from mothering roles, in which a mother would do anything to protect and raise her children (Hannah-Moffat 2001, 13-22). At the same time though, within men’s institutions, strategies have focused on empowerment of subjects, along with responsabilization, while also preparing them for the workforce through education and work training. The outcomes of this have been that gender

specific programming has been produced in federal institutions, but in provincial institutions there has been gender segregation and very little programming. This has meant that men and women are treated differently inside, not in regards to the type of programming they receive, but in the space they occupy, the support they have, and the treatment they experience. This outlining of both historical and current gendered imprisonment can help us to see the ways that perceived differences in men's and women's institutions are constructed, and continue to affect those spending time in these spaces. In order to further my analysis of these gendered spaces, it is now important to turn to my participants' experiences which will help in understanding the gender divides that exist within the institutions they have inhabited.

My participants often wanted to speak of their experiences of time inside, and although questions about their incarceration were limited due to a focus on the (re)integration process, quite often participants would return to these experiences. The amount of discussion surrounding this topic then points to the ways incarceration has longstanding affects on individuals' lives afterwards. When discussing their experiences of time spent inside, many of my participants touched on the gendered nature of the system they have inhabited. These gendered experiences inside will help to see how this aspect of incarceration comes to play an important role in prison life. Starting off, one of my early participants, Clare, had this exchange with me as we sat in a coffee shop early one morning

Dirk: Take me through a day in the life on the inside.

Clare: It's a lot of rules and strict regulations. To wake up to their time. You gotta do your daily chores.

(Pause)

Clare: Women very rarely get any outside recreation time. There's a lot more facilities I find for men, than for women.

Dirk: Facilities as in locations?

Clare: No I mean actual things that men and women get to do inside.

Dirk: Like programing?

Clare: I find that jails are more catered to men, and they don't have a lot of programs 32

for women.

Dirk: Was there anything that you did experience or use?

Clare: No not really. John Howard's Society (which she later corrected to be Elizabeth Fry) would send women in once a week, for uh, to give a little makeup, put some makeup on the girls, do their hair or whatever. I never did any programs while I was in there. Not even the aspect of getting books to read from the library. That is the same in Alberta and here.

Dirk: So how do you think they do for preparing women for release?

Clare: I think they... I perceive from what I've talked about with other men, and women, they have a lot more benefits being a man going to jail, than being a woman going to jail.

Dirk: So men have more support?

Clare: More programs, more stability for what's going to come after their release. Women it's like here, boot, kick them out in the street. They have no help or anything.

In her unprompted discussion of gender divides inside Ontario institutions, Clare was able to give a powerful explanation of the gender specific activities and support that exist in our current correctional facilities. For Clare, the fact that women were having makeup applied and their hair cut/styled did not help her prepare for life outside, or give her the tools to stay out of correctional facilities in the future, it simply reinforced gender roles and stereotypes that she did not subscribe to. We can see this echoed in Mendoza-Denton's work from 2008 where she discusses makeovers performed on gang members on the television show *Geraldo*. In this caveat that introduces her chapter on femininity and gender norms, Mendoza-Denton shows us how these young gang members were made over to look more feminine, which contradicted much of their criminalized identities (2008, 150). Clare's discussion of these makeovers that would occur in prison shows us this similar attempt to feminize the criminalized, as though they are not feminine due to their incarceration.

Along with Clare's critiques of the reinforcement of gender stereotypes, she also discussed the lack of outside recreation time that women experienced inside. In another interview with a mother and daughter, April and Jennifer, I was also given a critique about the lack of

outside recreation time for women. This is the discussion we had.

Dirk: So if you were in charge of Correctional Services Canada, what would you change?

April: More gym time for the girls.

Jennifer: More yard time too.

April: Recreation, more recreation. You know, get them more motivated to do things, not just lay around and do nothing. And think about what moment they're gonna get high, or when they're gonna get a hit in them, or whatever the case may be. So recreation, and keep themselves a little busy.

This sentiment was shared by many of my female participants who were very upset with the recreation time they were given. Ashley, a participant who had been in and out of the prison system in Ontario as early as the 1980s also spoke of her experiences of recreation time in a negative way.

Ashley: The year in Meriwether Correctional (a pseudonym) was pure hell. Pure friggin hell. That was when the women were upstairs. Christ it was awful. Didn't touch grass for a year. We weren't allowed, we were allowed to go out, but we went on the roof. And we were never never allowed to go out on grass or anything. It sucked big time.

These explanations of time spent outside by some of my female participants often focused on the issue of women and men's outside time being different. As we saw with Clare's explanation, she directly stated that men and women experienced different recreation time. This was due to the fact that at Meriwether Correctional, a facility that many of my participants, both male and female, had attended, men were housed downstairs and women upstairs. Women and men did not interact at this location at all meaning that women went out on the roof, if they went out at all, while men went out in the yard. This was a sensitive spot in these peoples' experiences of time spent inside, as they felt even more disconnected from the outside world, and often discussed feeling closed off from fresh air and nature.

When discussing their experiences, many of my participants touched on gendered

aspects of the system they experienced in terms of programming. In one discussion I had with a man, Frank, I was told about the types of programming that have existed and exist now in the institutions he has been in.

Frank: So I ended up doing a deuce-less, a deuce-less, and a deuce-less. So I did three deuce lesses, in Ontario provincial institutions.

Dirk: And sorry, a “deuce-less”?

Frank: Uh, two years, less a day.

Dirk: I see.

Frank: So, it’s not a federal offence. It’s one day off. So they keep you in the provincial system. Which, back then they had activities, they had trades, they had, you know I learned how to weld, do some masonry.

Dirk: So this was all inside?

Frank: Yeah. Yeah that was back that, that was in the late ‘80s and all that. And then gradually they started losing things. And then, you know what happens when you got, fuck, 700 convicts, and there’s no activities. There’s no this, there’s no that. Then now there’s fights all the time, there’s drug use. Then they take the trades out. And then people get, when I got out I only had so much. When they cut the masonry shop out and all they, I only had so much, I didn’t get my tickets, and my welding tickets, because they closed both those shops down. Right. So I got out and only having a bit of experience, so I started being a helper, and what not, and that just wasn’t, that was too slow. You know, so I’d speed things up. Do illegal things to get money. I just got into, and then I was in the bank robberies.

Frank’s description of the opportunities that were available to men inside were different from any of the female participants I talked with, and were also indicative of gender responsive programming. Men were being offered training for skilled trades such as welding and masonry, which many of my other male participants also had experienced, and although this was eventually taken out, the female participants I had talked with who had spent time inside similar to Frank, had not experienced programming in this way.

It is important to recognize here then that the system many of my participants have experienced has a gendered nature to it, which can reinforce gender norms and stereotypes and negatively affect people’s chances of (re)integrating. The women I spoke with seemed to experience much less outside recreation time and job training, experienced activities specific

to women such as having makeup applied and having their hair done, and generally experienced programs such as Alcoholics Anonymous (AA), Narcotics Anonymous (NA), and Rape Crisis. Men also had AA and NA when inside, but had in the past experienced skilled trade training, education, and more chances to actually go outside in a yard. The differences that we can see here may not seem extreme, but the effect they do have on people going through the criminal justice system is long lasting. The strict gender segregation, along with different forms of treatment, programming, and occupied spaces, lead to a reinforcement that men and women are different, that they experience the world differently, and are to be treated differently. This is important to recognize here as it is this early reinforcement of gender roles that will continue to affect people throughout their experiences with the criminal justice system and during life afterwards. I will return to the effects of this gendered system in a later chapter on gender, but at this point what is also imperative is to see how people experience the system in general, to understand the impact the criminal justice system has on peoples' lives.

Overt Punishment: Prison Populations and Conditions

As was touched on in Frank's description of the programming he experienced inside the criminal justice system, much of the programming that has existed inside correctional facilities in Ontario has been stripped away, and this has lead to many more problems with the time people spend inside. This section will look at these experiences of time inside by both my participants, as well as from historical and anthropological/sociological sources, to understand forms of punishment/reform that exist inside our prison system, and how they affect people over time. As was shown earlier in this chapter, prisons were originally intended to be places of punishment that would leave individuals horrified of ever going back there. Harsh conditions inside these institutions were meant to scare people away from committing any more crimes, but as was

seen by inquiries into these institutions, this form of punishment did not work, and it was determined that reform was more likely to deter future criminal behavior. The system we now have is considered to be “correctional” and not punishment based, but in many ways over the last 50 years we have still seen horrible conditions that have done little, if anything, to help individuals with their lives afterwards.

In her work from 1989, Ruth Morris discusses the impacts of the criminal justice system on people who have been incarcerated, and the forms of punishment/reform that exist within it. Morris states that “prisons are supposed to deter, protect, rehabilitate, and punish. In fact, they only do the last. They fail to deter others, to protect the public from crime or criminals, and they fail abysmally at rehabilitation” (1989, 11). In a furthering of her discussion of power and the criminal justice system, Morris argues that it is a “socially acceptable tool for disposing of our surplus poor, unemployed, and minority groups” (1989, 12). This system that Morris is discussing is one which convicts often, and for low level criminal activity, often heavily focused on economically driven acts, or on crimes of public order and morality. In her work from 1999, Joan Sangster discusses the criminalization of native women in Canada, and how our system in the past has focused heavily on legal and moral regulation, which has lead to the over incarceration of specific groups (33). Sangster attempts to show this in her work, where she argues that criminal charges have often been a way for the state to enforce moral standards of the society (1999, 49). From the start then, what we can see is a system set up treat citizens of the society unequally, often due to the economic, gendered, and/or moral standards of the general population.

Moving inside these institutions, it is important to look at the work of Goffman to understand the effects that total institutions can have on people. Total institutions are

considered to be those that control/dictate all aspects of a person's life when inside, and that structure their time constantly. The prison system is certainly a total institution in that all interactions are monitored, all time is structured, and in the fact that people have very little ability to determine how they behave (without being punished) and what they can do with their time. Goffman argues that the fact that echelon authority exists within these institutions (where all members of one group have the ability to direct, control, and exercise power over all members of another group) and that regulations exist for all aspects of an individual's life, we can expect people, especially those who are new to the institution, to "live with chronic anxiety about breaking rules and consequences of doing so" (1961, 42). It is an effect of these systems to strip the individual of a sense of agency, in order to maintain control over them. This can quite clearly have detrimental effects on one's sense of self, identity, and health, and therefore it is not solely harsh forms of corporal punishment that can cause harm to people inside, but these forms of total control and feelings of powerlessness that can also have long lasting negative effects.

In terms of stress and anxiety that may arise in these total institutions, we can turn to Hans Toch's work from 1992, which discusses some of the affects that may arise from living inside a total institution. One of the issues that many people deal with while serving time that we will see here, as well as in my discussions with participants, is that of under-stimulation and boredom. Toch argues in his work that often people understand stress to arise from over-stimulation or heavy demands that may overwhelm, but that under-stimulation can also threaten human wellbeing (1992, 27). Toch shows that many people attempt to overcome boredom through activity and the expenditure of energy (1992, 27). This was seen in Frank's description of time spent inside in the last section, where he discussed the boredom that arose when programming began to be taken away, leading to fights and general misbehaving. These

experiences were mirrored in a description by another participant, Gary, who described the troubles he had inside with boredom and fighting.

Gary: There's no more respect for one's self, in there. I don't know why it's so strange that way. It's very uh, it's like bring the man back to the Neanderthal days. Yeah, it's all about fighting, and making a stand.

Dirk: So what's a day in the life?

Gary: Nothing. You're doing time. In federal prison you can go to school or whatever. Workshops. I never went federal, but I had friends that went. When you're doing provincial time, it's strictly punishment. Make you reflect on what you did. So uh, you have your cells, there's two people per cell, cubicle. When you get up in the morning they close that, you can't go back in. So everyone is in this one common area. And you're not doing nothing, so you have a lot of pent up energy. Because there is nothing to do. So it comes out in violence and aggression, and anger. Yeah, just look at a guy the wrong way and it's a fight. Yeah, because there's nothing to do. There's no leisure, there's no nothing. So yeah, they say "what do you do?" Well you do nothing, you do time. You count time, that's it. So 30 days can seem like a year.

This effect of boredom was often explained by male participants, but never arose in any of my discussions with female participants. This does not mean that female participants did not fight, as they most certainly did, but that most of the men I had talked to experienced a cutthroat environment where fighting, or the threat of inmate-violence, was always present.

One of the greatest challenges affecting people when they spend time inside a correctional facility is how to overcome the boredom that arises. One of the issues that makes this task much harder is the disappearing/disappearance of programming (depending on the institution) within provincial institutions. The distinction that has been made in this chapter between provincial and federal institutions has helped us to see how people are split into different groups based on severity of crime committed and of the sentence, but what we have not yet looked at is the way this affects access to resources and the quality of the time spent. The distinction made between federal and provincial institutions by my participants was that of prison and jail respectively. One participant, April, who had been incarcerated in both federal and

provincial institutions described programming to me in this way

April: So the question was what?

Dirk: What's it like inside? A day in the life?

April: 'K, the guards, some of them are nice, some of them are cruel. Some of them take their job very seriously, but some of them don't even know how to handle their job. Um, the food sucks here. Um, what else?

Dirk: Did you experience any programming?

April: There is, but there is not enough.

Dirk: Not enough?

April: No, there's not enough.

Dirk: What kind of programming was it?

April: Um, they have the um, oh what was that one? Every Tuesday, rape crisis. They have a rape crisis. We have a church, which isn't often either. Um, that's all I can think of.

Jennifer: You did school there too, didn't you?

April: That was in prison.

Dirk: So can you tell me about that difference?

April: Oh in prison you got schooling, you got work. Everybody works. Anybody can go to school and anybody can work. And there's lots of programming. In the prison system there's uh, you have anger management, you have your drug program, its call WOSAP, women of substance abuse program, its called WOSAP. There's 1, 2, and 3. So there's beginners to the end. Um, you have all kinds of things. They have even games you can play, they have tournaments. The programing's, and there's church every Sunday. There's also uh, individual groups, like different groups. And then there's a sisterhood, which are the native ladies. There's also a Chinese group they made too, recently, like within the last 5 years, cause there's a lot of Chinese women incarcerated, or Vietnamese or something, whatever. Um, so there's way more in prison obviously than there would be in buckets, but also, in some buckets, like some detention centers, they have more to offer you.

April, being one of the few people I met with who had been through both federal and provincial institutions was instrumental in helping me to understand this difference that really did exist between these two forms of incarceration in Canada.

Differences between federal and provincial incarceration were often alluded to when chatting with people, but another participant, Frank, who had spent time in both of these spaces was also able to outline what he experienced as being different between them.

Frank: So that's a lot of the provincial time I did... and in all those places, not one was even possible to help any individual that went there. They didn't care, it's not what they (unknown) in the provincial system. You know, whereas in the federal

system, in the federal system at least they still got programming, programs and all this stuff, right. And like right now the provincial system, right now they have absolutely nothin'. No, nothing, no sports, no classes, no groups, you know... you got a choice, you gotta work, and if you don't work you stay locked up. They warehouse ya. So if you do work they give you a chocolate bar and a bag a chips once a week, but there's no, no things on like sittin' down as like drug groups, anger aggression groups.

Here Frank described his time inside provincial institutions as lacking any programming at all, and stressed that support systems inside these locations were either unhelpful or non-existent. At the same time, Edward, who had served provincial time in Ontario on multiple occasions, along with Steve who was younger and had been in on fewer occasions had this discussion with me about programming inside

Dirk: So were there any programs? Any AA, NA, Education?

Edward: Yeah, its all them things they offer, and then it's just up to you whether you want to go to them. Now Meriwhether's detention, so they don't have so much of that. But once you get sentenced, it's all there for you to use.

Dirk: Did you take part in any of them?

Edward: Um I did yeah. Did the anger management, substance abuse, cog skills, it was all in.

Dirk: How were they?

Edward: Um, good. I mean at different points in my life when I've taken them, sometimes I wasn't open I was still young and naive. But you grow older and mature a little bit, and um, yeah you just take what you can use I guess.

Steve: For myself it was my first time being inside. So, it was very, uh, there was programs available but I didn't feel, you know? I guess maybe if there was more awareness, or, um, not necessarily incentive, but more, based on particular circumstance programs that would fit you. Maybe something like that would help.

In this discussion we can see that Edward, someone who has been to multiple locations had experienced programming that he found helpful, such as AA, NA, anger management etc., but that for Steve, the programming available was not preferable, and he would have benefitted from more targeted courses or work related training. What was also discussed by these four individuals was the experience of staying in short term detention centres. Today, many people being incarcerated in Ontario are those who have been arrested but not convicted, and cannot

afford bail. These people seem to experience the least amount of support, and make up a very large portion of the people spending time inside.

I finally turn to a lengthy discussion I had with Jacquelin, who had been in and out of provincial institutions for approximately 15 years. In this discussion, Jacquelin focuses on the differences in programming based on what part of the provincial institution you are placed in, as well as how some of the programs look in practice.

Dirk: Were there any programs you could take part in while you were inside?

Jacquelin: If you were in dorm, if you were in maximum, that's cellblock, you were in a cell about this big, you're three per cell. If you were in cellblock you would get the random AA, NA, E.Fry. But its mostly for dorm. Dorm, if you want to be in dorm, you've got this program that E.Fry gives, you get more privileges if you're in dorm, because you're minimum. Maximum its like you're nothing.

Dirk: Did you take part in any programs that were offered.

Jacquelin: I did, just to get me out of a cell, like that's where I started knowing AA, NA. That's where I found out that there's a lot of things out here like in the society, that I thought there was only in jail like E.fry. You can go see E.fry it's a woman's thing, you go there you get food you get everything and in jail they'll tell you that. 'come and see us when you get out we'll help you'

Dirk: What did you think of these programs? How were they? Were they well run? Or were they underrun?

Jacquelin: It was always the same people, so like the NA and AA in particular, it was always the same stories. If you're new we would go around the table and do a little roundabout and talk about eachother, and like a person would come in, supposed to be an NA or AA member, not supposed to be judging, looks at them 'oh you're not ready, you're not ready right now. You're always going to be coming in and out of jail, we'll talk when you're ready.' It's like how can you know how do you know if a person is ready or not, why because you're out there and we're in here? There's no difference, we're still human beings.

Dirk: So who was it that were running these programs?

Jacquelin: Just anybody that could get cleared. Anybody that didn't have a criminal record. Cause you're not allowed upstairs where the girls are, if you have a criminal record.

Dirk: So were there any programs that were run by the prison itself.

Jacquelin: No. If the social worker would not be in, you would not get a program. Like 72 girls on one women, that's a lot.

The difference in programming based on one's security concerns as Jacquelin shows us is quite problematic, as it appears that programming meant to help people inside is being used as a

form of reward for good behavior. Toch argues in his work that programming can often be more effective in achieving security within a prison than a proliferation of guards and behavior rules, as it keeps people occupied, therefore reducing boredom (1992, 28). It is quite obvious from these stories of time inside that programming within our provincial institutions is lacking, often not effective, and that the increase in programming could mean safer spaces for workers inside, guards, and people convicted of crimes alike.

To further understand the lack of programming, and ‘treatment’ as it is often termed within correctional system documents, we must look to the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services statements on programming, the treatment of prisoners, and the prisoner’s handbook. On the Ministry’s website, there is a single page which outlines the programming that is offered in correctional facilities in Ontario. This page is quite vague when referring to programming, and states that there are four types available – life skills, rehabilitative, education and literacy, and work. The education and work programs are offered through partnerships with other training ministries, and with private organizations, to provide inmates with training that may help them find employment upon release. The rehabilitative and life skills programs on the other hand are much more vague, and focus on changing or correcting the individual’s behaviours so they may be responsible for their actions, and to promote public safety. These programs are meant to shape individuals into better citizens, while also providing them with ways of coping in society upon release (<http://www.mcscs.jus.gov.on.ca/>, last modified 2011). Unfortunately, there was no literature describing how these programs were to be in actual practice, how they were administered, how common they were, or which locations actually offered them. Finally, after the explanation of each type of programming a disclaimer followed stating “offered at selected institutions” (<http://www.mcscs.jus.gov.on.ca/>, last modified

2011). What can be seen from these documents is that the programming issued by corrections is lacking, poorly carried out, and seems to be generally not an area of concern for corrections themselves. As was shown with my participants discussions of programming, they also found this to be the case, and often desired greater access to resources to help them while they were inside.

The conditions inside prisons have been an area of critique by sociologists, criminologists, historians, and anthropologists, and this is often because they have only marginally improved over the last 150 years. In his powerful book outlining his life spent in prison, Jack Abbott provides the reader with countless stories of his horrible experiences with the criminal justice system. One of the most powerful insights that Abbott gives us comes early in this work when he states “Paranoia is an illness I contracted in institutions. It is not the reason for my sentences to reform school and prison. It is the effect, not the cause” (1981, 5). This statement gets to the heart of what many people experience when they are incarcerated, as our system still works through total forms of control, such as over sedation, monitoring, and responsabilizing of criminal behavior, instead of providing support. Abbott goes on to discuss the changes in prison that have occurred in our recent past by stating “They go for your mind in prison today, where before, it was all physical suffering” (1981, 20). This movement from physical control to psychological control outlines one of the most common ways people who are incarcerated in Ontario institutions experience the system today – issues of personal sovereignty.

In her work on the criminal justice system, Jennifer Kilty attempts to show the increased usage of psychological treatment that has fit in with current correctional practices of fixing or curing criminality (2012, 162). Kilty, in this work, focuses on how the usage of prescription medication intended for psychological problems has been to manage the population within

correctional facilities, and to sedate individuals who are considered to have behavioural problems (2012, 163). This has meant that more and more people in correctional institutions, and as Kilty shows, especially women, are being given medication meant for psychological disorders, in order to control the general population. At the same time, Kilty shows that medication is also denied to some women as a form of punishment. Finally, we see from Kilty's work that chances of parole often hinge on a person's compliance within the system, and that refusal to take these medications can have negative affects throughout their sentences (2012, 169-175).

This focus on prescription medication as a form of control returns us to Goffman's discussion of total institutions, and well as Toch's work describing boredom and the effects of programming. Instead of helping people through programming and activity, we see a system that is sedating people to exercise control over them. One participant I met with had a very candid discussion with me about her experiences with medical health issues and the criminal justice system.

Dirk: So what was it like for you?

Janet: It was pretty good. I'm pretty honoured in there, my life isn't that hard.

Dirk: Like by the guards or other inmates?

Janet: Well they beat me too, if I get out of turn. The guard's going 'are you getting your meds yet'. You don't get your meds as soon as they come in, It's just like you've gotta wait. Are you crazy I can't wait, I'm a lunatic. Help me, I've got no booze, I've got no outlet, I got no nothing. I got no window.

When chatting with Janet I was able to further understand the struggles that people go through as they go in and out of incarceration. Along with the over-prescription of medication was also the general lack of health care that people received. Ashley described this succinctly in an account she gave me about a person she knew while she was inside.

Ashley: But um, the last time I was in Meriwhether was horrible. And I mean, I can't remember everything that happened buddy, but I have written everything down, like that's how bad. For me to take the time to write it all down what was happening, like I wish to hell I had never lost that paper cause there was a lot of shit. And the one I

do remember was that poor girl, my god buddy, she was so sick. And I mean sick! You could tell her face was beat red, she had no strength, you know she just laid in the bed like, it looked like she was dying. And they would not let her see a flippin' doctor. I couldn't believe it, I said, "holy fuck what are you heartless? Let her see a fuckin' doctor!" Oh my god, they wouldn't do it. They never do, she's pukin' and shittin' herself. This, everything, horrid, horrible, horrible. And there was a few other instances I can't remember, I try to block all of that shit out of my mind, eh? There was a lot of that.

Both Ashley's and Janet's descriptions of the medical health model that exists inside are powerful in showing the terrible level of care that people receive. With people being either sedated or ignored, the general lack of care is alarming. The system we have in Ontario is expected to punish people for their criminal acts while also reforming them and preparing them for life in the society again. In the Ontario Correctional Services Code of Conduct and Professionalism handbook, it is stated that the manual is meant to "guide Corrections Services employees in actions, decision making, and discretionary judgement to provide a consistent level of service excellence to the citizens of Ontario" (COCAP Policy, 2014). Although this exists in training manuals for Corrections employees, my participants often cited very different behavior from guards, and Correctional Services overall. General disregard for one's health whether it be in terms of denying care, over-prescribing medication, or as we saw in the opening to this chapter, not providing adequate sleeping conditions, most certainly lays outside of ethical treatment standards, and violates these codes of conduct given to every employee of Correctional Services Ontario.

This section has attempted to show some of the conditions that individuals in our society experience as they go through the criminal justice system. What we have seen in this section is a series of cases of mistreatment and control, meant to further produce what Goffman terms the "total institution". This total institution controls every aspect of an individuals' life while

they are within it, and has long standing affects after they leave. It is clear that changes in programming have had negative affects on the individuals inhabiting the criminal justice system in Ontario, and that many find the levels of support that exist within the federal system to be much more adequate. With an increase in programming we could see more chances for individuals when they leave these institutions, as well as a safer environment inside. The final section of the chapter will focus on power and control within the criminal justice system, in order to understand the forms of control that exist, and where they come from.

Power and Control in the Criminal Justice System

As was stated in the introduction to this chapter, Canada's correctional services have a history of adopting the terminology of reformers, but not practice, which has lead to a system which appears progressive on the surface, but which still treats its subjects in archaic ways. As was shown through the use of Goffman's "total institutions" along with first hand accounts from my participants, Canada's correctional institutions have used a variety of tactics to control their populations, and this has had long-standing negative effects on the people who live through it. This section will then look at these total institutions and the ways in which power exists within them. We must come to understand where power is within these institutions, in order to see the effects the system has on individuals, including on their identity, gender, and their (re)integration to society. These topics will be looked at in later chapters, but it is important to look at power here, as it is its role in correctional facilities that has serious impacts on peoples' lives later on.

As we saw through my participants' explanations of time inside, the correctional system in Ontario is lacking in forms of reform, outside of AA and NA programs, and relies heavily on forms of control such as over-medication, minimal recreation time, long lock-down periods, and punishment for minor offences. These forms of control are used to keep people quiet and

contained, while having the added effects of keeping them bored, aggravated, and unprepared for life afterwards. In recent history there has been a trend within Canada (and the United States) towards what Kelly Hannah-Moffat terms “pastoral power”. Pastoral power is considered to be when one individual or group (such as the criminal justice system, social workers, etc.) lead or serve others as pastors (Hannah-Moffat 2001, 8). This pastoral power concerns itself with both the health and psychological state of individuals within the flock, in order to maintain safety for those individuals, and the society as a whole (Hannah-Moffat 2001, 8). The existence of this pastoral power within the society then leads us to ask where, or if, this phenomenon truly exists within correctional institutions, and how it looks when it does.

Along with the expected existence of pastoral power within the criminal justice system, Hannah-Moffat also suggests that there are three other strategies of reform and punishment, which she considers to be maternal, disciplinary, and empowering/responsibilizing power(s) (2001, 13). Along with my examination of pastoral power then, I will also look at these strategies to see how they appear in my participants’ experiences, and what role they play in their lives inside. In terms of pastoral power, where we must start in our analysis is with Foucault’s power/knowledge, which later would come to be considered discourse. Discourse was briefly examined in the previous chapter, and is important to return to here as it will help to understand the phenomenon of pastoralism. As Foucault discusses in *Discipline and Punish*, one of the uses/effects of power is the production of knowledge (1975). This knowledge works to maintain power, creating a cyclical system which is difficult to reform. It is this understanding of the relationship between power and knowledge that can lead us to ask questions of what knowledge is being produced in the correctional system in Ontario, and how this knowledge reinforces the forms of power that exist.

The phenomenon of pastoralism has existed within our society for many years in the medical system, within Christianity, and in many political spheres. This discourse of provided safety for a group of individuals appeared with the focus on the individual themselves, through the production of personalized health care, religion, social services, education, etc. This led to the few providing care and protection for the many, as pastors have done for their flocks. What we can see within this pastoralism then is the production of knowledge, whether it be medical science in the case of doctors, social sciences in the case of social workers, or with the study and devotion to the divine in terms of the religious leader. These systems of knowledge then come to support those who provide care, maintaining their powerful positions as important members of the community/society.

In terms of the criminal justice system then, the punishment/care of those convicted of criminal acts has been controlled by practitioners of law (lawyers, judges, police, etc.), personal reform (social workers, parole officers, community activists, support workers, etc.) psychological medicine/care (psychiatrists, psychologists) and by officials and workers of the prison system itself. These groups have all worked on how to punish and reform people convicted of criminal acts, and due to the existence of pastoralism within the greater society, this has often meant that strategies, at least on paper, have focused on the provision of care and on creating healthy, safe, hard working, community members. Of course, this has not always been the case in practice, as we saw from my participants' explanations of their time inside, and my examination of prison conditions.

If we look at the explanations of the people interviewed for this study, we see some existence of programs of care and reform, but mainly we encounter punishment, over use of drugs meant for care which become forms of control, and a general disregard for well-being

and basic needs. I argue here that the reason for the appearance of some programming in these individuals' time inside is two-fold. Firstly, that those people were those who had served federal sentences or sentences in higher security institutions, or were those who had been incarcerated for many years and had seen programming being taken away from the institutions they inhabited. Secondly, the existence of pastoralism within North American society has lead to a desire for programming, but that due to cuts in funding the application of programs have been minimal at best. In terms of those who had spent time in federal institutions, this appears to be because federal institutions have more funding per incarcerated person, and that the people are able to work, allowing them to make money and prepare for release. As people are incarcerated here for long periods of time, they are provided with more activities and care, in order to increase their chances on the outside after they are released. This is contrasted with a growing population of people serving un-sentenced time, while they await trial, and who therefore have little access to programming of any kind. As well, for those who have spent many years inside, they often spoke of how things used to be much better, but that due to funding cuts, they lost many of the programs and forms of care that were helpful in the past.

What we can then see is the existence of what has been described as pastoralism within provincial institutions in the past, and in federal institutions now. This pastoralism did/does seek to guide those who were/are incarcerated to 'better lives' after jail/prison through the application of programming including job training, education, work within the institution, health care (both physiological and psychological) and through release assistance programs. Although the criminal justice system does this through forms of pastoral power that continue to see those who have been convicted of criminal activities as in need of direction or change, there are positive outcomes of a system that works in this way. Many of my participants were very open about

the problems they had with the criminal justice system, but what they also often spoke about was the desire for a better life, free of the crime, drugs, and violence. Some participants explained that it was through programming administered within correctional facilities that they overcame their addictions, gained education and work training, and learned new ways of coping with anger and stress. It was these instances for me that blurred the solely negative image I had of the criminal justice system, and made me realize that prison abolition is not the only answer to our question of “how do we fix the prison system?”

Along with pastoralism, other forms of power also exist within the criminal justice system, including maternal, disciplinary, and empowering/responsibilizing. In terms of maternal power, which as Hannah-Moffat describes is the shaping, guiding, managing, and regulating of conduct (2001, 16), we can see its existence alongside pastoralism, as well as in its absence. In the absence of pastoralism, maternal strategies are used to maintain control within institutions, and differ from pastoralism in that the will of those with power is often forced upon people without. This can be seen in the over prescription of medications described by Kilty, as people are often forced into taking medication under the logic that the “caregiver” (guard/physician) knows best. Kilty outlined this as a form of gendered control, and one of my participants also described this a clear form of control.

Jacquelin: Meds would come around 6:30 at night, so at 7 you’re like (makes noise) out of it, cause they drug you in jail no matter what. They just like to see people not fighting, no nothing, so they try to zombie you out.

With pastoralism, we would see the prescription of medication to help an individual, but without sedation and over/forceful application. Maternalism becomes quite problematic then, as it does not leave room for the agency of the individual. As well, we can see the clear gendering of the criminal justice system here, as maternal power is used more often in women’s prisons than it

is in men's, in cases of medical sedation and of prescribed care. These close relationships between the feminized care-giver and the problematic un-feminine woman who is incarcerated show us where this gendering of power exists. Maternal power is not only problematic then because of its forceful application of 'care' but also due to its inherently gendered nature, creating unequal treatment of incarcerated individuals based on gender.

In terms of punishment, this form of power quite clearly works to maintain control through discipline and responses to action. Punishment within institutions often comes in the form of a response to an action of a person that is considered undesirable or of breaking a rule by guards or other officials. As well, I was informed by many participants that punishment was often used inside when guards did not favour you.

Jacquelin: In jail if you're not liked, you're known. They'll put black gloves on, walk you into a cell, beat the crap out of you, walk out, and close their eyes.

These abuses of this form of power have long-lasting affects on people who go through the criminal justice system, as they often come to fear or dislike those in positions of power, especially when that power includes the ability to punish physically (i.e. police).

Finally, empowerment/responsibilizing is a very problematic form of power that exists within penal institutions, as it can come to help some get over drug and alcohol addictions, but can also lead to forms of self-governance and acceptance of social forms of oppression that harm people on the outside. Many of my participants spoke of how programming has helped them to 'understand who they are' and how they can achieve what they would like in life. At the same time though, participants also often used language to describe these processes that was indicative of forms of social control that expect people to 'take full responsibility of their actions' and to ignore social phenomenon such as class, race, gender, and economic inequality and

oppression, which were often quite apparent in the lives of my participants. It was evident throughout my interviews that these various forms of empowerment used by programs both inside penal institutions, and after they had been released, helped individuals with achieving their goals of (re)integration. With the existence of a responsabilizing discourse though, indicative of a neo-liberal society, we see this empowerment turn into a form of control used by the criminal justice system. The question then becomes - in what ways can we have empowerment without responsabilization?

The four forms of power that Hannah-Moffat considers to be existent within correctional facilities in Canada make up a complex web of interactions between incarcerated individuals and the system they inhabit. Many of the programs that are expected to be in place within these institutions do not exist in the ways that would truly help those inside, and rather are used as forms of control or as punishment (when they are taken away). As well, much of the language we see being used inside these institutions, and in the criminal justice system in general, is void of the ideologies and forms of practice it represents. This gives us a system that can look helpful and caring, but that relies on control and punishment too heavily. I argue then here that pastoral power in its purest form can be a source of positive change in the lives of individuals incarcerated in Canada, if they consent to it being so, but that within provincial institutions it is not present. What we do see are forms of maternalism, punishment, and empowerment/responsibilization that work to further the effects of the total institution, and that leave people unprepared for life afterwards.

The system we currently have within Canada is one that considers the incarcerated individual to be, in the words of Gillian Balfour, “a transformative subject who must change her criminal thinking” (2006, 739). This ideology comes from a maternal system of control and

punishment that, in its responsive strategies of criminal justice, shapes ‘criminals’ into ‘productive citizens’. Throughout this chapter I have shown some critiques of the criminal justice system in Canada, and some of the terrible conditions that exist for individuals when they are incarcerated in Ontario, but what I have not shown yet are arguments from the other side that call for more control and punishment. In his national bestseller *Con Game*, Michael Harris had this to say about Canada’s penal institutions, “prisoner friendly reforms have taken away their weapons, made search and seizure procedures perilous or impossible, and weakened security in the country’s sixty-nine federal facilities” (2003, 3). Along with this, Harris goes on to state “the inmate profile shows that Canada’s federal felons are young and violent, regardless of gender” (2003, 4). These sentiments mirror those of many in the society who continue to support ‘tough on crime’ bills and a conservative government that continues to build more institutions rather than seek forms of support and care for those in need of it.

In this section I stated that after seeing pastoralism’s positive effects in the stories of my participants, I came to question prison abolition as the only form of positive reform. In every interview I had I asked the question “do you think there could be alternatives to prison?” My participants often responded to this by stating that if you have a non-violent drug related crime you should be able to be on probation seeking treatment, but that outside of drug crimes, people still should pay for their crimes, but in a more positive way through healing and care, rather than punishment and control. This struck me early on in my interview process as coming from a space inhabited heavily by social activists of many different types (academia), I expected to hear that prisons should ‘be no more’. What I heard though were stories from people who have lived inside, who have committed crimes and regretted it, and who acknowledged that they did something wrong but that they do not want that to always be their reality. These are

individuals who want to heal, want to go to school, and want to work and provide for themselves, but that have an extremely hard time doing so due to a system that punishes instead of helps.

Shoshana Pollack has stated, “Prisons are inherently violent; indeed their primary purpose is the infliction of pain and exclusion” (2012, 108). Of course, this does not need to be the case, and through the application of programming (from AA and NA to education, healthcare, leisure and recreational activities, and (re)integration preparation such as finding work, housing, and food) we could see a system that does prepare people for their life after incarceration, and helps them to heal in the ways they want to. What is imperative for this system though is not the application of programming that dictates the routes individuals must take to achieve a “better self” and to become a productive member of society, but one in which they are able to choose, through the guidance of social workers, educators, and health service providers, the path they desire. It is important to take these possible areas of reform informed by my participants, along with their experiences of time inside, when we move on into further chapters then, as we will see how these early effects of the criminal justice system come to impact individuals’ lives later on. In the next chapter on identity, I will use the experiences and conditions discussed in this chapter to explain the production of identity that exists within the criminal justice system and during life afterwards. It is only through the understanding of these experiences that we can come to recognize the effects the system has, and how people cope with those in their daily lives.

Chapter Three

Transitional Periods: Release from Incarceration and Identity Making

Michael: But mind you too, I also had family support when I got out. A lot of the fellows get out and they have nobody. So they don't know what to do. Or they're afraid to do something because they don't want to get into trouble. Or they're just afraid to open their minds out to, you know, they get out of that prison mode. It's an ego thing to I think. Even to this day I see guys that act the same way they did in jail.

Dirk: So you had family support? Who was that?

Michael: I got my mom, and my sisters. They were all supportive of me, and uh, they were open-minded too. They didn't always say 'uh you were in jail' 'you're a jail bird'. Nobody talked like that to me. I made a mistake, I went to jail, I did my thing. Had I kept going to jail I guess it would be a different story. But they were open-minded to me, which really helped. Cause I was kinda like, when I got out the first thing I thought of was my god they're going to be all over me, they're going to be watching me like an insect here. Nope, they were just very open-minded to me. Which helped a lot.

Dirk: So what would you say to a family that was shunning someone who went to jail?

Michael: How'd you think they'd feel? You know, they're human too. You gonna put a guy in a closet for the rest of his life because he went to jail once or twice? Depending on what the crime was too. Everybody makes mistakes. You can't just keep throwing people under a bus to protect your identity, or your reputation, that person is part of your family. It doesn't help anything. Then that person has no, like, willingness to move on because they're always told they're nothing, or this or that. They're always held down, you know, down here. But anything they do in life is like you're not good enough, you're not good enough, you're not good enough or you're this, you're an embarrassment. A lot of people just don't try to stretch out their life anymore because they're conditioned to believe that they're no good anymore, or they're a bad person.

Dirk: And do you think that comes mainly from people outside?

Michael: Obviously if it comes from whoever you're around tells you. Eventually if you're told your a, if you're told something about yourself that you're not sure if its true or not, and you're always told that, you're gonna believe it.

Dirk: How do you think the prison system in Ontario prepares people for coming out?

Michael: I think they just have certain protocol they follow, and uh, cause I'm sure there's, I mean the guards are human too. They have a, some are empathetic people, some are just plain assholes. They believe that people are just, prisoners are just nothing but scum. And others believe that no, they're people and they should be treated this way. But bottom line is, there's also a lot of budgeting and uh, protocol that they have to deal with. So they just follow suit to whatever's on in Ontario for a prisoner, you know? I mean there's not much you can do, or they can do.

Dirk: So what did you do when you got out? Did you make any plans?

Michael: At first I wanted, like it sounds kinda funny, but I wanted to take a couple of months off like to just to adjust back into that society.

Dirk: Well that's got to be a transition period right?

Michael: Oh yeah of course. It's like being in the military, where you're posted somewhere for two years, three years, then you get back home and your mind frame is still where you're at for the last two/ three years. You take time to adjust to getting' back to civiliza...to real civilization.

Dirk: *Did you experience culture shock?*

Michael: *Yes a little bit, yeah. I remember the first thing I wanted to do was go downtown and have a big mac. And like a bird flew by me, and I dodged it like this, and just the commotion of all the people, when somebody walked by too fast or reached in their coat too quick. It took a little while to adjust.*

The transition period from being incarcerated to being released is an extremely difficult point in the lives of those going through the criminal justice system. The first few days, weeks, and months of this process are crucial for these populations, and the types of support that exist, both inside and out, have important impacts on how successful (re)integration may be. Successful (re)integration was described by most of my participants as not going back inside after they were released. With the exception of one participant, who explained that at one point in her life she did not want to be outside anymore because of the death of her son, my participants mainly discussed that they had reached a point in their lives where they wanted to just live a “normal life”. For them, this meant finding a place to live, finding a job, being able to buy groceries and cigarettes when they wanted to, overcoming their drug and alcohol addictions, and not being looked at as a criminal anymore. These tasks made up what most of my participants struggled with on a day-to-day basis, and achievements such as finding a nice apartment where they felt safe and free to do what they wanted, meant a lot to them. But what was it that kept my participants from achieving these goals that were so dear to many of them?

In this chapter I will discuss the role of identity in the lives of my participants, how they came to produce identities after having been incarcerated, and how labels that were applied by the criminal justice system came to have long-lasting effects on them. Changing identity was often a theme that arose in these discussions, as the transition from life-inside to life-after often lead to difficult identity work for these individuals. The various ways that gender, class, and

power came to interact with identity in the lives of my participants lead to a struggle for many to find where they fit in society, and to reconcile who they were, with who society viewed them as being. It was often very powerful to hear people say they were just people too, but that they felt they were being looked at, watched, or judged because they had been incarcerated. The separation that many felt from resources, friends, family, and the general population was obviously a real concern for them, and whether this separation was solely perceived or real, had no bearing on how much this impacted their lives on a daily basis.

Discussions of identity cannot exist in a vacuum, and this was reinforced daily through my interactions with participants. There was very rarely just a discussion of “identity” itself, but most always occurred while referencing criminalization, gender, class, labeling, and power relations. Therefore, throughout this chapter I will engage with these themes as they relate to the construction of identity in the lives of my participants. These various forms of identity making will help to show the variety of identities that an individual can hold, and, through the use of Goffman’s *Presentation of the Self in Everyday Life* (1956) we will come to understand the role of performance in recently-released individuals’ lives. Performances, as was discussed in the introduction to this thesis, are how individuals come to construct their identities, and also work to (re)create discourses that influence their performances, and therefore identities. I will then attempt to show the multifaceted ways that my participants acted in the world, attempting to cultivate certain identities, while trying to overcome others.

The main work that will also be done in this chapter is to engage with labeling theory (Bernburg, Krohn, and Rivera, 2006; Pollack, 2010; Jackson and Hay, 2013) and the affect that institutional labels have on the individuals they are applied to. The interaction between power relationships, which are quite transparent in regards to the criminal justice system, and

labeling which takes place throughout individuals' interactions with the system, will make for the basis of analysis in the latter part of this chapter. Labeling exists within certain contexts of power relationships, such as that between the incarcerated individual and the criminal justice system, and with the recently released individual and care organizations. Labels applied throughout these interactions have serious impacts on peoples' lives, and understanding how these affects are even more impactful due to the status of criminalized populations is important for seeing the long-term effects of the criminal justice system.

This will also make for one of the new contributions to the academic literature within this work – the engagement of power, agency, and labeling in terms of deviant identity. I will attempt to show this engagement, while providing new insights into the ways that, with regard to criminalized populations, power relationships come to impact the role of labeling in the lives of these individuals. With the power relationships that were discussed in chapter two, we learned about the lives of incarcerated individuals, and how their agency was affected through these relationships. This chapter will then further this by showing the long-standing affects of these power relationships, through the analysis of labeling in the lives of the recently released. It is my argument here that the unique situation that recently released individuals find themselves in (being incarcerated and then being released) leads to unique impacts of labeling on their identities. The application of a label such as “criminal” or “deviant” is carried out as a form of punishment, and unlike many other labels that exist in society that are applied against the person's will, these are both formally applied (through criminal records) and socially applied. These individuals cannot solely change their performances to challenge these labels and construct new identities, but must also seek formally sanctioned pardons, which in Canada are increasingly hard to achieve.

The opening interaction to this chapter showed the ways that individuals come to cope with life outside within the first few days and weeks of release. These experiences are often classed, gendered, and impacted by labels such as criminal. As Michael described, having a receptive family upon release can have positive impacts for those coming out of incarceration, and the view that others have of these individuals can often affect how successful they are during their periods of transition from incarceration to life-after. Michael explained how lucky he was to have a family that cared for him, and did not look at him as a criminal, but who accepted that he had “done his time” and that he needed help in this difficult period. Along with this, Michael’s explanation of the changing from “prison mode” to life-outside is imperative for understanding the role of performance in the lives of the recently released. The adjustment time, compared with that of coming home from war, shows the role switching that must take place, leading to the need for new identities that will help the person succeed in their quest for successful (re)integration. Along with the gendered nature of (re)integration services, and views of much of the society about criminalized populations, the transition from life-inside to life-after is a difficult one that as we see with current reconviction rates being so high, is often unsuccessful.

The Construction of Identity

***Brad:** It seems really hard. Coping, to going from being inside doing nothing all day, 24/7, just picking your nose or whatever. And then you get out and there’s so much reality. And there’s so much responsibility. You don’t really realize how much responsibility is in just taking care of yourself. And looking after number one, you know what I mean? So with that, the first one is housing. Coming straight out you have to go to the shelters. There is nowhere for you to go but the shelters. So everybody knows what the shelters are like. Major drugs, crack, opiates, the two big things that are a problem now. Major problem. And you just get tied back into that, because your so, you have an addictive personality, which most criminals do. It leads you right back in. You know what I mean. If they had some kind of house, like a half-way house, or a place that was stable that you get a room there and have support with staff that’s there. Like yourself, and people that you could talk to. And help you with your situation. It would be super great to have a house that people could go to and not be in with other criminals, and going back into that lifestyle. Because the biggest thing you need to change is the people and the places you hang around. The association. You’re the only one that’s going to change yourself, so you have to* 60

do it upon yourself.

The identity of the individual is something that has been discussed in many ways through a variety of disciplines, and it is therefore important to start by returning to the introductory chapter of this work, to further explain what is meant by identity. Throughout my interactions with participants, along with my reading of theoretical works, I have come to understand identity not as a singular phenomenon that individuals own, but as a series of meanings and descriptions that individuals are represented by in society (Goffman 1956; Weigert 1986; Bourdieu 1990; Butler 1993; Burke and Stets 2000 & 2009). It is imperative to then make the distinction that individuals do not have an identity (singular), but identities (multiple and fluid), and that these various identities are constructed through performance in society. These performances can be understood as “all the activity of a given participant on a given occasion which serves to influence in any way any of the other participants” (Goffman 1956, 8). Andrew J. Weigert argues in his work on identity, “In a symbolically transformed world, identities are imposed without the individual’s consent and create a reality that provides a sense of belonging or alienation” (1986, 186). I take this quotation as it represents the way that identities exist in society, and come to be applied to individuals based on performance, much the way we apply terms to ideologies, objects, and situations in order to represent and categorize them.

The difference that arises in our conceptions of individuals and their identities opposed to objects, ideologies, and situations, is that the individual actor (often) chooses their performances. This can be seen in the works of Goffman, in which he discusses how the individual chooses their performances situationally (1956), in Burke and Stets’ work where they show the individual choosing to act in society based on a set of acceptable options (2009), and in Butler’s work where she discusses performativity, and the way discourse and performance (re)produce one

another (1993). The individual actor may be influenced by discourse when learning how to perform, but they are still actively choosing to perform in a unique way, as only that person has experienced the various events of their life. Although identities are applied to the individual then, such as woman or man, congressman or plumber, philanthropist or businessman, it is the individual who is choosing to perform the acts that comprise those identities. It is important to recognize this agency of the individual, as it leads to the understanding that individuals actively construct their own identities by choosing how they perform on a day-by-day basis. Burke and Stets explain this when they state that “Identity is a set of meanings that define who one is when one is an occupant of a particular role in society, a member of a particular group, or claims particular characteristics that identify him or her as a unique person” (2009, 3). It is through these various forms of identity construction then, that we see how varied identities are and how they come to be tied to an individual.

Above, the quotation from Burke and Stets shows us the various ways that individuals come to be represented by identities that are applied throughout their lives. What is important to recognize here as well is how identity holds meanings, just as symbols applied to objects, ideologies, and situations do. Once this identity is applied then, often the individual will work to either maintain the identity or challenge it through their performances. As Goffman states of performances “when the individual presents himself before others, his performance will tend to incorporate and exemplify the officially accredited values of the society, more so, in fact, than does his behavior as a whole” (1956, 23). This is in the case of course of individuals subscribing to a specific identity, which they seek to reinforce through their performance. If one does not wish to reinforce their identity, and seeks to challenge it, their actions throughout their performance in a particular setting will stray from the norms of that identity position.

Individuals are then constantly (re)constructing identity, showing the fluidity of identity in society.

In the introduction to this section, we saw a quotation from a participant, Brad, who discussed the first few days and weeks of being released from incarceration. Brad spoke of the drastic changes that occur as you leave incarceration, and how this requires a rapid changing of one's performances. No longer is one expected to be sedentary all day, but is instead overwhelmed with stimuli and is expected to immediately begin performing their new identity as 'member of society'. This was also represented in my discussion with Michael, which opened this chapter. Michael discussed how some people do not change from "prison mode" or have difficulty doing so. This transition period then lead to an expectation of changing identity, but one that was applied by the system, not necessarily chosen by the individual.

Much of this rapid change was influenced by the change that occurred in an individual's responsibility. Responsibility, which is taken away from incarcerated populations as part of punishment, is rapidly given back in what seem to be large quantities, leading to one of the major changes in identity that my participants often referenced. As 'inmate' your performances consist of following orders properly, which is in opposition to roles as 'society member' where you are expected to choose your appropriate actions from a variety of available ones. This instantaneous change in identity is often shocking for many coming back to society, and leads to struggles of finding where one fits in, and what their identities actually are.

Along with this responsabilization that occurs upon release, individuals must come to work with new identities that they will be both constructing through their performances, but also learning to cope with. Later in this chapter I will discuss the role of labeling in the lives of recently released individuals, and how it affects identity, but what is important now is the

fact that changing identity is an important part of many recently released individuals' lives. I had this discussion with one participant who explained the difficult nature of finding your space in a society that has changed while you were inside. In this participant's case, they had been incarcerated many times over the past 15 years, and although these sentences were under 2 years each, the quick succession of these sentences meant that when she finally was released and stayed out, things felt quite different for her.

Dirk: Did things feel new or strange?

Ashley: Oh yeah, yeah times have changed. People have changed. A lot of my friends were either dead or gone. Married off or whatever. Kids. I was the only one that didn't.

Dirk: Did you feel like people had a different opinion of you?

Ashley: Well yeah, because I was still a party animal and they were settled down. You know, don't forget where you came from (laughs).

Dirk: Did you ever feel like people were looking at you?

Ashley: Oh gosh yeah, oh gosh yeah, big time. Cause I don't have just small tattoos, I got biggun's. They're huge.

Dirk: So do you think people were looking at you because they were associating the tattoos with something?

Ashley: What do you mean?

Dirk: Well you said that people were looking at you because you had tattoos.

Ashley: Yeah definitely.

Dirk: What do you think the tattoos were associated with?

Ashley: Well they were associated with life in general, um, but they judge you automatically. You're a thief or a biker, you're this and that, there's nothing good that comes out of women having tattoos. Like, now. Back then it was just not acceptable, now it's acceptable.

This discussion with Ashley is important in helping to understand the way that people come to feel separated from society upon release, while being expected to (re)integrate. Many of my participants, including Ashley as was shown here, either had physical markings they felt connected them to criminal identities, or felt as if people knew they had been incarcerated. The identity projects were then difficult, as people would either return to old identities, as Ashley described, or would attempt to construct, and cope with, new identities as Brad and Michael

described.

The construction of identity is an ongoing process then, with these identities changing depending on the space one occupies, and the way one performs. Identities also come to be tied to the physical body through clothing, body modifications, and gendered markers. The fluidity of identity is seen very clearly in the lives of recently released individuals, as they must navigate a difficult social sphere where they are forced to change identities very quickly through the release process. Finding shelter and food within the first few days of release is an overwhelming task for many, and this is further problematized by the existence of changing social positions and identities. Trying to learn and create new identities, while also struggling to satisfy one's basic needs of food and shelter, leads to an immensely overwhelming time in these individuals' lives. What also adds to this situation is the existence of power relations and applied identity that further come to affect one's identity in new ways.

Power and Identity

The interaction between power and identity in the lives of the incarcerated and the recently released is both deeply felt, and long lasting. In Chapter Two I looked at the different forms of power that exist within correctional institutions, using the work of Kelly Hannah-Moffat. These forms of power were meant to show the ways in which power exists in the relations between individuals and the criminal justice system, as well as showing the various ways they come to affect people over time. Along with this analysis of power, I attempted to use Goffman's explanation of the total institution, to show the role that these institutions can come to play in the lives of incarcerated individuals. These effects do not desist as soon as one is released however, and often continue to impact these people's lives long after they have been released. It is the way that power and identity come to interact then, that I will examine in this section.

This will be followed/continued in the next section as well, as I come to discuss labeling, which is invariably tied to power.

As Goffman discusses in his work on total institutions, and as we saw in Chapter Two, when the individual enters the criminal justice system they are “programmed” and “trained” to be a subject of the establishment (1961, 16). Individuals then come to see their place as ‘subject’ in this institution, leading to the stripping of responsibility and autonomy. This was also furthered through my use of Hannah-Moffat’s four forms of power, in which we saw pastoral power and maternal power, which sought to lead incarcerated populations to reformed lives, and to make decisions for these populations in their best interest, respectively. What we then have is an incarcerated population that, upon release, has been turned into subjects of a system of control, had responsibility taken from them as a form of punishment, while also being made responsible for their negative actions. Overall then, I argue that this population has been told that their previous decision-making was problematic and that this is what they must change if they are to successfully (re)integrate. It is the “criminal thinking” of the individual that must change as Balfour’s work was used to show, and this has longstanding effects on how individuals learn where they fit in society after release.

With this construction of ‘problematic thinking’, and with the production of the criminalized subject, we can see that the power relationships that exist within these institutions come to construct an identity of the incarcerated individual. As we have learned about identities, they are multiple and fluid, but with the power relationships that exist within carceral institutions, we can see that an individual’s performances, outside of their criminal act, have less impact on their identity construction. As agency is limited due to incarceration and lack of control over one’s daily activities, so is one’s ability to construct a personalized identity.

Shantz, Kilty, and Frigon discuss this confinement of agency, in terms of self-governing in institutions. As they argue, one is only able to self-govern as long as they abide by correctional and parole conditions (2009, 90). The agency of the individual is then confined within pre-determined punishment conditions that will also lead to the production of one as “prisoner”. As one participant stated about this:

Dirk: What about other programing?

Michael: Uh, not really. Not while I was there no. But I was very skeptic to the, what they offered, because I didn't want to come out like a robot like everybody. I just kept myself together.

Michael: Myself I didn't want to get like, for lifers and all that I understand that's a long time that you're in there. But I was only in there a couple years so uh, so I didn't get ... I didn't become like a robot you know what I mean. I just kept my mind open to when I get out, I'm gonna go here and there so that's what I did.

Dirk: So you're constantly thinking forward?

Michael: I didn't want to follow a program, because then I felt like I would always be stuck in a program.

Dirk: So you think that the programing that prisons put on is kinda like that? That it creates a certain type of person?

Michael: I can't say so much the prison itself, but the mind-frame like the, you're always told this is how you have to live, this is how you have to do it but, if you're training a dog its gonna listen to your owner, even though another human's the same thing it won't listen to him, cause he's used to this guy's program. I still have friends today that got out at the same time as me, that are still stuck in that rut of, they have to follow suit with the prison. What the prison told 'em they should be doing when they got out. They're not any further ahead.

In this discussion, we can see how Michael tried to separate himself from this “prison mind-frame” through not taking part in programs and not becoming a subject of the system. It is clear from Michael's explanation that some individuals see these programs as problematic in that they try to create a generalized prisoner identity.

The experience of these prisoner identities in regards to programming and the power relationships that take place was touched on by many of my participants, but not always in similar ways. Michael discussed the problem with programming and the production of prison

mind-frames, but we can see here from Frank how programming was also viewed positively:

Dirk: What could we do to help, when people get out?

Frank: More facilitative programming. And uh, instead of letting people lay down in their cells and that. You know, they always say, money, money, money, money. But I find if there's more programming in a system, the better. Because it'll get to some people, no matter what. But you don't see that now. And right now, like everybody wants to go to the pen. Why? Because they have more to offer. They don't want to take a deuce-less, like 2 years less a day, because they have nothing in the provincial system. They got nothing. But I find, the more they facilitate, the better. Like, honest to god, people's minds are filled with crime, crime, crime, because that's all they talk about all day. But if they got somebody drilling them about better things in life, and you know, good guidance, they're being taught. And it gives them an idea that they can go with. And know that it's not a hard, uphill battle. You know. But like I said, people just go in and they come out. They don't say about anything, they don't talk about anything that was good in there, nothin'. Like I said, at least the people that get out with a trade, that'll, they feel proud about it. And especially when people are saying "aw you're doing good" and that, that praise always does good for them. They can feel good and everything else. And people are paying attention to me now. You know, and they're not like pushing me away for drug use, or you know? I find, a lot of things like that help me.

Frank here discussed how helpful programming can be, depending on the type of programming of course. Frank and Michael's descriptions both touch on the same aspect of the production of a prisoner identity, but we can see the differences in that Michael saw this as being created through programming that focused on reform, whereas Frank believed it to occur from a complete lack of programming. The programming that Frank wanted to see was job training though, and was less interested in personal reform programs that existed in most institutions. Here again we can see the power relations between the institutions and the individuals playing out in the production of specific identities, through what actions are existent for incarcerated individuals.

Reform programming aims then at creating a "better citizen" or "inmate" whereas job programming may help to give the individual the tools to choose where they go after they are released. Unfortunately, as Frank describes, job training is mostly found in the federal

institutions, leading to people wanting longer sentences so they can have the programming they know helps them. In this sense, we can see the power relationships problematized, and in some ways inverted, as individuals being incarcerated seek out longer sentences in order to change their chances of learning helpful skills that may help when they are finally released. Once an individual is inside though, they then become subject to what means are available. It is this expression of agency through the incarceration process, in terms of denying programming, or impacting sentence length that shows how some try to construct their own identities in the context of incarceration.

For someone like Michael, it was important to resist the prisoner identity. This was done through his actions inside, maintaining his previously held identities in the face of incarceration. Michael spoke about this in the opening to this chapter as well, when he discussed life-after, and how he served his time, and was now moving on to being a regular citizen again. This comes through in Frank's discussion in a different way, when he describes that to overcome this prisoner identity that can be constructed inside, one needs certain forms of programming, such as job training. For Frank and Michael then, power relations such as pastoralism and maternalism which were discussed in Chapter Two, worked to construct prisoner identities, but for Frank programming in the form of job training that one could choose themselves offered a chance to overcome this.

In this section I have attempted to explain how power relations that exist within the criminal justice system come to influence the construction of prisoner identities. This is done through the limiting of agency that occurs in certain institutions, leading to a further controlled subject. This subject is then kept within certain forms of action by the limiting of responsibility and through the strict following of procedures, orders, and limited amount of activities one

can do with their time. This construction of a prisoner identity in this form is only possible in the presence of these specific forms of power, which interact to make a unique prison experience, unlike any experienced outside incarceration.

The existence of ‘criminal forms of thinking’ and responsibility for one’s actions, with lack of control over one’s activities, occupying the lowest rung on a strictly enforced prison hierarchy, and taking part in neo-liberal forms of programming, all come to create and reinforce a prisoner identity, and this identity is not easily forgotten upon release. After an individual is released, they must then come to interact in society with this past prisoner identity, with the application of labels associated with incarceration, and with changes in agency that lead to the production of new identities as well.

Labeling and Identity Construction after Incarceration

The construction of one’s many identities occurs through this interaction of performance, discourse, and applied terms that exist in society, as described above. In his work on the social production of identity, Weigert states that “societies perdure in part by imposing ‘pre-natal’ identities on the newborn” (1986, 168). I bring this in here, as it helps to show the way that individuals come to be identified before they perform, and that performances are then often influenced by these identities. What is important to reconfirm here is that although individuals may have labels applied before birth or early in their lives, their actions also work to influence the social structure they exist within. Burke and Stets show this when they write that we can understand “social structure as arising from actions of agents and then feeding back to change them and the way they operate” (2009, 6). These two statements together then lead us to understand identity as both applied, but arising from the performances of actors in society overtime, to construct notions of what identities those performances are representative of,

and how people with those identities should perform.

What happens though when an identity is applied to someone against their will, through a system of power that does not legitimize the individual as an agent who may decide their own performances, and therefore identities? This section will look at the role of official and social labeling in the lives of incarcerated and recently released individuals to show how the structures of power that exist within the criminal justice system lead to the construction of ‘prisoner’ identities that are extremely difficult to detach oneself from. Long standing impacts of official labeling can be seen in both the academic literature surrounding this topic, as well as in the interviews that I conducted with participants. I hope to show through this section that due to the stripping of agency and responsibility that occurs when one is convicted of a crime and incarcerated, future attempts to construct one’s identity away from criminalized labels are extremely difficult, and in many cases not possible.

Social stigma surrounding criminalized populations both stems from, and recreates social structures that delegitimize, problematize, and disadvantage recently released individuals. I argue here that this process leads to perceptions of expected criminal, or at the least dishonest, behaviours that are untrustworthy. My participants often discussed the ways that these behaviours were perceived by others, even when they were not present. In their work on official labeling, Bernburg, Krohn, and Rivera describe the production of deviant groups that individuals seek out when considered to be deviant, as they do not want to interact with outsiders, and which reproduce our understandings of the deviant, and where they belong/exist (2006, 68-69). These perceived behaviours negatively contribute to the difficult process of (re)integration, and were one of the reasons that the individuals I interviewed would return to criminal activities. For many, it seemed almost impossible to exist within the system after

being considered a criminal, because of the barriers that stood in the way of finding housing, work, and social groups, when one had a criminal record.

In my interview with one participant, Jacquelin, I was told about the difficulties that arise from official labeling, in terms of finding employment

Dirk: What do you think are some of the biggest hurdles to overcome when you get released?

Jacquelin: To get a job. To get a job. I can't even finish my high school, because I got a criminal record that stops me from doing co-op. Criminal record stops you from doing a lot of things. Like, I just can't just go work a subway. They'll look at ok well, they won't leave me around money because I got drug trafficking charges, um they won't leave keys, I can't drive till the age of 53 years old. Um, and even when I get, even if tomorrow they come up to me and tell me okay you can drive, well I got a \$6000 fine to pay, because a cop was being nice and gave me a fake license number to put me in jail so I could do less time, well in the long run it fucks me up.

This description by Jacquelin shows some of the complex ways that people struggle with the labels they come to receive through their interactions with the criminal justice system, along with some of the long standing effects of their convictions. To Jacquelin, getting a job where she could start to support herself was extremely important, as she felt ready for this lifestyle, but was held back due to her criminal record. Jacquelin also had this to say on the same topic,

Dirk: Have you started to look for work?

Jacquelin: I looked once and again. When people say no it closes my doors, it puts a lot of pressure on my self-esteem, and I put a lot of pressure on myself. I've been out of school for 15 years and I'm trying to get the process of getting my maturity credits. I feel like it's a lot of work on me. If I don't do nothing, nothing is going to be done. I don't count on others no more, cause if I count on others its only setting me back to becoming my old lifestyle, going back in and out of jail.

This description of relying only on oneself for change, and of trying to overcome the barriers that stand in one's way shows the complex challenges that recently released individuals must deal with in order to achieve their goals of (re)integration and to live "normal lives". As was described earlier, normal lives for my participants often entailed finding work, an apartment

or room where they paid their own rent and had autonomy, and being able to buy food and other personal items when they desired.

Official labeling negatively affects an individual's chances of (re)integration through limiting their access to social groups, resources, and employment opportunities. Bernburg, Krohn, and Rivera discuss this in their work when they describe that an individual's label as deviant or as criminal within their peer group and among family can be enhanced through the process of official or formal labeling (2006, 69). This comes to link the person to dominant images of what it is to be criminal, and can lead to a withdrawal from interactions in these groups depending on the views of these labels in the culture (Bernburg, Krohn, and Rivera 2006, 69). In the end, Bernburg, Krohn, and Rivera found in their study that often exclusionary processes can be triggered by official labeling, leading to individuals looking for membership in deviant groups, as they are likely to be accepted there (2006, 82). This separation that occurs between individuals who have been labeled deviant or criminal by the criminal justice system manifests in many aspects of individuals' lives, including familial and peer group interaction, and finding work and housing.

In one interview I had with a participant, Gary, I was told about the effect that criminal labeling has on finding work.

Dirk: How does being restricted from getting jobs due to your criminal record affect how you go about looking for jobs?

Gary: It's frustrating.

Dirk: Do you still try a lot?

Gary: Yeah, but I don't go, I limit it from anything in the government funded market. And that's where all the good wages are. So yeah, I gotta go out in the private market. Even Loblaws, nope, if you have a record. The thing is, they don't even check what the record is. Right? So, yeah. He did 60 days for drinking and driving, impaired driving. He used to work for the city, and he can't get rehired. He's got a record. Yeah, he's jobless right now. You have a record, it has nothing to do with tests, drugs, violence, or nothing. You know? They don't look at it, that's the thing. In the private sector they will. You can go and get a police check, right, and

then show it to them and they'll say "okay it doesn't really affect this kind of work." But government, "no we don't want ya."

Gary: More organizations should be put out there like John Howard's. John Howard's helps people connect with employers who will hire people with criminal records. However, a lot of those jobs are minimum wages. They can't find the work anywhere else so we're going to hire you at \$11 an hour. And it could be work that's worth \$20. You know, construction and stuff like that. And you know, you go there and bust your ass for \$11 an hour, just because you have a record. Do some screening. Use good judgment.

Dirk: Look at what the record is?

Gary: I don't think everybody should be all put in the same basket.

In Gary's description we can come to see this role of official labeling in not only finding employment, but also in the value that is put on these individuals. As Gary described, being paid \$11/hour for work that is physically demanding, in some cases dangerous, and that would normally be paid much higher, shows the devaluing of individuals who have recently been released. Many of my participants would have been happy to receive any type of employment, but as Gary described, this can lead to underpayment. Gary, who had worked construction for many years in various ways, was well aware of what value a worker should be given, and to him it was a great insult to be undervalued like this.

In Jacquelin's discussion above, she also spoke of the way in which rejection from employment lead her to feel pressure on her self-esteem. This rejection that individuals face, which is often directly linked to their deviant labels, appears to have long-standing effects on how one comes to construct their identity in society, and find where they fit in. In their work on the impact of official labeling, Jackson and Hay discuss the role of relationships in the lives of individuals who have been arrested and considered deviant by the state. Looking at these relationships, Jackson and Hay attempt to show the way that official labeling affects future criminal behavior, and the role that these relationships can play in their desistance (2013,

301-302). Jackson and Hay found that in many cases delinquency after arrest and labeling varied depending on familial interaction in individuals' lives, and that with less familial influence, rates of future delinquency were higher (2013, 317). As Jacquelin discussed the pressures that arose from being turned down, and Gary discussed feeling cut-off from certain work sectors and being devalued through pay, we can see how individuals come to feel separated from society due to their deviant labels. The application of these labels leads to stigmatization of the individual, as certain beliefs are held in the society of those identities, and to exclusion from a variety of aspects of social interaction.

To further this understanding of the way that individuals came to feel separated from society upon release, or at least as though they were watched or judged, I include these interactions I had with participants. First, Ashley had this to say when it came to looking for a job upon release:

Dirk: So what's it like to look for a job?

Ashley: When I got out it was hard. Yeah. That's why I ended up being a cook, cause I'm in the back and nobody saw me.

Dirk: So what was it like to go to an employer and ask for a job

Ashely: It was intimidating, a lot, I was very nervous, but that's because I had a criminal record. Back then they didn't really check for a criminal record but they do now, that's because they're allowed to.

Another participant, Clare, had this to say about her experiences of finding work upon release:

Dirk: What was it like to look for a job?

Clare: Well it's hard actually. Because when you have to put that criminal record. People judge you as soon as they see criminal record. And mine's got nothing to do with being a thief or anything, its got to do with other things.

Dirk: People don't look at what it was? Just that it's a criminal record?

Clare: Yeah, just criminal record.

Dirk: Have people you know seen or treated you differently?

Clare: It's the people that don't know me, that have treated me differently.

Finally, in a discussion I had with two gentlemen, Edward and Steve, they had this to say

about employment after release, and how we might be able to overcome some of these issues.

Dirk: Have you looked for work?

Steve: It's difficult because actually in the past, before I had a criminal record, it was quite easy to find employment. I've actually had some quite decent jobs in the past. Um, I actually have, right when I got out I did apply for a few, and a lot of them won't even

Edward: Look at you

Steve: But, it depends. Anything government related, even I used to work for the city, none of that, you need a background check. It depends some jobs are okay, depending on what it is. They maybe they'll want to know what your conviction was. But it definitely does put a barrier to employment.

Dirk: How do you think we could overcome that?

Steve: I don't know maybe, working with. I know they used to have something for teenagers trying to get their first job, where they would actually supplement. I think it was actually John Howard. It was quite a few years ago. What they would do, you basically, they give you a paper from them you give to an employer, and they'll supplement a couple dollars of your wages, just to test you out as a worker. Get you in the door that way. Its not as much of a loss for the employer if it doesn't work out.

Dirk: But maybe a program like that?

Steve: Yeah, maybe something, I'm just trying to brainstorm.

In these three interactions, along with those of Jacquelin and Gary, my participants seemed to be focusing on the closing of doors that occurred when applying for jobs with a criminal record.

Both Steve and Gary discussed the difference between private sector and government related employment, and how this affected finding work, but as we saw with Gary's discussion, this can also lead to being underpaid for the work one is performing. In her work on labeling, Shoshana Pollack discusses the application of specific terms and ideologies on criminalized populations. In her work, Pollack shows how the application of a term such as "risky" can lead to the flattening of one's life experiences, and can unnecessarily categorize someone as in need of help (2010, 1264-1274). This categorization manifests in discourses of help, where individuals are seen as being in need of care from support systems or agencies, and therefore continues this stripping of responsibility and agency that was discussed earlier in this chapter, while also showing the maternal and pastoral forms of power discussed in Chapter Two.

In his work on labeling, Schur discusses how official labeling is not only the application of terms such as deviant, but is a process through which individuals are personally discredited in society (1984, 3). We can see then, that the application of these official labels, applied through the criminal justice system, or terms such as “risky” applied through systems of support and care, categorize individuals and lead to the construction of criminalized identities. These criminalized identities have many negative impacts upon one’s chances of successful (re)integration, as they come to be cut off from a variety of resources. Shantz, Kilty, and Frigon show in their work “Echoes of Imprisonment” that risk designation can negatively affect one’s chance of release, and that upon release, stigmatization of deviance can lead to a hindering of (re)integration, if they are not welcomed by their communities (2009, 86-89). In these ways, we can see the role that labeling plays in one’s chances of (re)integration.

In their work, Shantz, Kilty, and Frigon argue that the “corrections-endorsed discourse of successful (re)integration both individualizes and responsabilizes women while simultaneously robbing them of identity or agency” (2009, 91). This is a problematic claim however, as I have hoped to show in this section that one is not identity-less upon release or through their interaction with the criminal justice system, but instead must come to cope with the application of criminal identity.² Criminalized identities are only one portion of the many identities that these individuals come to interact with in society, and it is this struggle with identity that we must be more concerned with. As Greer and Jewkes argue, people who commit crimes are often believed by society to be doing so because they are ‘not like us’ and that this is done so to separate

² Along with this, the critique of corrections-endorsed (re)integration is problematic, as through my discussions with participants they spoke of the horrible nature of the criminal justice system, and how they did not want to return there. This was seen as being possible through successful (re)integration, as they expressed that returning to previous lifestyles lead to them returning to incarceration. They therefore sought out a change in behaviours, to be more “normal” as they described, so that they could avoid incarceration in the future.

criminality from the generally accepted idea of ‘good citizen’ (2005, 20). This is of course problematized as we see that individuals maintain a variety of identities, depending on the situation they are in. Although criminal identities often come to negatively impact individuals after they are released from incarceration, they also challenge these identities on a day-to-day basis, and construct new identities through their performances.

In my discussion above with Gary, we saw that he challenged his criminal identity by critiquing the low-wages that criminalized individuals receive, and as he later told me, he declined to work at these places, challenging the undervaluing that was occurring. In this way, Gary was overcoming this deviant label, showing that he would not be devalued because he had a criminal record. As well, I had this discussion with two participants, April and Jennifer

Dirk: Do you ever feel like people are watching you or looking at you?

April: Yes. Yeah I feel like they must know I just got out or something, yeah. Doesn’t mean that’s actually happening, but.

Dirk: But you feel that.

April: Yeah, I have.

Dirk: And what about you?

Jennifer: No I don’t.

April: She doesn’t live the lifestyle eh?

Jennifer: But then I also don’t care what anyone has to think, it doesn’t phase me.

April: Its not that I care, but, okay go on.

In this discussion we can see both the existence of perceived stigmatization based on one’s history of being incarcerated, but that Jennifer did not experience this as she did not “live that lifestyle”. In this way, my participants showed that they would often challenge their official labels, and work on constructing identities outside of the sphere of deviance. The official application of deviant or risky labels can have many negative effects on one’s chances of (re)integration, and on the construction and performance of one’s identities. It is through this stigmatization that occurs of certain identities then, that individuals who are being released

come to be devalued, disadvantaged, and separated from social interactions.

In their work on the long term impacts of incarceration, Jung describes how approaches to crime and imprisonment should focus not on rehabilitation, but on one's ability to cope and function in society after they have been released (2015, 2). It is then not the desistance of "criminal behavior" but instead focusing on providing people with the tools to cope in society that becomes important. This brings us back to my earlier discussion of preparation for release, and my discussions with Frank and Michael about programming. For both of these people, it was the *type* of programming that existed when they were inside that they had a problem with, in terms of preparation for release. Michael did not want to become a part of the system's produced prisoner identity, that focused on individuals working within a program of criminal rehabilitation, while Frank wanted to see job training that would help people find work upon release. Working against these deviant identities also means constructing new, non-deviant identities that are more socially accepted. This means that individuals must be provided with the tools to succeed in the ways they would like to succeed, in order to construct meaningful social identities, and to achieve the goals they desire upon release.

Social exclusion, as Ng, Sarri, and Stoffregen state, often stems from "family deprivations, loss of material and/or social capital, stigma, dynamic exclusion, linguistic disadvantage, political exclusion, and administrative exclusion" (2013, 438). In these ways, individuals come to be set outside of social groups, and have limited access to resources that arise from social connections. With the application of deviant labels, recently released individuals experience a variety of challenges, as these labels carry with them stigmatizations that are difficult to overcome, and which can discredit an individual. Through my discussion with participants included in this section it is clear to see that one of the ways that these

labels come to affect them the most is in regards to finding employment. As most of my participants were actively seeking employment, they were faced with barriers that stemmed from their officially applied labels. This came to affect their identities, as deviance holds serious stigmatization in our society.

As well, the interactions that exist between power and labeling show the ways that labels applied in official circumstances such as through the criminal justice system, are extremely difficult to challenge and overcome, as they affect the ways that individuals construct identities. The types of power discussed throughout this work so far have given us a picture of the delegitimizing, the limiting of agency, and the removal of responsibility that occurs throughout incarceration, leading to an inability to perform in one's desired ways. This limiting of one's performances therefore also leads to the limiting of their ability to construct identities, making the application of deviant labels much more difficult to overcome than others. This creates a unique form of identity production through labeling that given these individuals' circumstances is extremely difficult to overcome

What was also shown in this section was that although these individuals were labeled deviant and were segregated and disadvantaged, they sought out ways to construct identities that challenged their criminal labels. What I have hoped to show here is that programming that focuses not on rehabilitation of criminal behavior, but on the cultivation of life-skills (including job training and coping with alcohol and drug addiction among many others) would help to support individuals in their quests to successfully (re)integrate, and build new lives for themselves after being released from incarceration. In the final section of this chapter, I will come to look at gendered identities briefly (they will also be examined in greater depth in chapter four) to show the ways in which the identities of the recently released individual are affected

by gender specific programming and access to resources.

Gendered Lives, Gendered Identities

As individuals go through the criminal justice system, there are both obvious and discreet forms of gender specific programming and segregation that exist. Gendered identities, which we are often prescribed either at, or before birth, come to affect individuals in numerous ways throughout their lives, and interactions with the criminal justice system are no exception. In the last chapter, I attempted to show some of the ways in which the prison system itself was gendered, and here I hope to further our understanding of this by discussing the construction of gendered identities. In the next chapter, I will take an in depth look at how gendered identities come to affect life after incarceration, and therefore will refrain from too much depth on the actual experiences of gendered (re)integration in this section. What is therefore important for us to understand here is how gendered identities arise, and how they interact with other identities that individuals hold.

In the introduction to this work I attempted to describe the differences in sex and gender, and how in their own ways they are both constructions. This was done through a use of Foucault, Butler, and Heyes, in which I focused on the way that gender is both prescribed and performed. This led to the understanding, through Butler's work, that gender is not something solely attached to a person, but to actions/performances. As specific actions come to be gendered in society, just as actions are considered to be deviant, we come to label those who perform those actions as gendered. What we then find is an individual who, similar to their performance of deviant behaviours, constructs a gendered identity through their choice of performances. Unlike deviance though, often these gendered performances arise due to expected ways to behave based on one's physiological makeup. As one becomes criminalized through their performances

and subsequent punishing of criminal acts, they may be imbued with a criminal identity. Many systems are in place that lead individuals down paths of criminal behavior, but those systems are not informed by physiological makeup as gender is. This creates a unique sphere of identity construction, as the existence of certain physical features that are natural on the human body, are considered to be forms of gendered performance.

The interaction between gender, deviance, and identity is complex one, as gendered identities are applied through one's actions in the world, as well as one's physical features, and in turn come inform the ways that one can be considered deviant. Gendered identity often permeates many of the other ways that individuals come to be identified in society. In terms of deviance, Comack and Brickey discuss the ways that to be 'woman' is not to be deviant, and therefore as women commit criminal acts they become "the antithesis to women, considered to be wicked, manipulative, and deceitful" (2007, 2). Along with this, Gillian Balfour discusses the ways in which risk comes to be conflated with gender categories, and therefore leads to the subjective interpretation of women's risks (2006, 738). Finally, Schur describes the ways that being a woman can come to be tied to being deviant, and that these are often different from men's deviance. Schur argues that labels such as "'aggressive,' 'bitchy,' 'hysterical,' 'fat,' 'masculine,' and 'promiscuous' come to mark the ways in which women can be deviant (1984, 3). Schur goes on to argue that these women may not be 'offenders' in jail but that these labels may damage or affect reputations and lower 'life chances' (1984, 3). What we can see here then is that gender comes to be tied to certain forms of deviance, and that one's acts can be considered deviant due to their gender, and that one's gender can be challenged due to deviant acts.

When interviewing my participants they would often reference either the gendered nature of (re)integration and the services that exist, or the gendered performances that go on inside

institutions. In one very candid discussion I had with two participants, Josh and Brad, they had this to say about the different gendered performances inside

Dirk: Do you think there are differences in how women and men experience the criminal justice system or (re)integration?.

Josh: From what I've heard from some girls, there's a lot of lesbian stuff going on with the women's ranges, its okay more. But with the guy's side you always have to act tough. You can't cry. You can't let your guns down. You always have to be watching your back.

Brad: Tough guy mentality.

Josh: There's no homosexual stuff going on. Even if you are gay, they probably want to put you in protective custody.

Brad: It's very frowned upon.

Josh: But on the women's side, I've had two girl friends that have gone in and experienced it. They said they never did anything, but they said they were observing like multiple

Brad: It's very open, it's very open. Like they can do it anywhere. It's just accepted. I guess it doesn't bother girls.

Josh: That's the only difference I've heard of.

Brad: Yeah like if you're gay, you're gonna have problems, inside. Being a male and being gay, you're looking for trouble. You're gonna get beat up. And it sucks, because it's just who you are it's not because you choose to be that way. Yes, it just happens and it sucks for that person, because they're treated like, terrible. And now they have to be isolated and put by themselves because they're gay.

Josh and Brad both perceived the performance of femininity and masculinity inside, in terms of same sex relationships. For them, it appeared that femininity allowed same sex relationships to occur, at least while women were incarcerated, whereas for men, the performance of masculinity was extremely important to survival inside. Josh and Brad discussed this with me in depth, and were very open about how homosexuality was not accepted at all inside men's Ontario provincial institutions. Gary also described this hyper-masculinity that is necessary for survival inside when he briefly stated

Gary: There's no more respect for oneself, in there. I don't know why it's so strange that way. It's very uh, it's like bring the man back to the Neanderthal days. Yeah, it's all about fighting, and making a stand.

Gary, Josh, Brad, and Frank who spoke about incarceration in Chapter Two, all saw men's

incarceration as being heavily impacted by strong representations of masculinity through violence. This was opposed to Clare's description of time inside from Chapter Two, where she discussed some of the gender specific programming that took place inside. In this case, Clare saw a gendered system where women were given makeovers, which in turn feminized them. These differences in gendered incarceration are then quite clear to see, and this comes to affect (re)integration through continued segregation after release.

In these ways we can come to see how incarceration and criminalization come to be tied to gender, but also to affect gender. When women fight inside and commit violent crimes they are considered to be defending themselves against male oppression or histories of abuse (Comack and Brickey 2007; Schur 1984), or are considered to be more masculine and less feminine, or both. As well, when men enter the criminal justice system, as can be seen through my discussions with participants, they are expected to be dominant, aggressive, and to defend themselves against other inmates physically. These forms of gender performance that are either reinforced through criminalization, or challenged, can then be understood as existing within a complex sphere of identity construction. As was briefly shown in this section, gender and deviance come to be inextricably linked through systems of meaning production. This will be further examined through an analysis of the (re)integration process in Chapter Four, but what I have attempted to show here is how gender identity comes to play an important role in deviant labeling.

Various Identities: Deviance in Identity Production

Throughout this chapter I have attempted to look at the role of identity production in the lives of those approaching release while inside, and those who have recently been released. This started with a brief discussion of how identity comes to be constructed in an individual's life,

and was followed by the production of specific deviant identities. Incarcerated individuals must come to interact with new and changing identities as they undergo this process of transition from life-inside to life-after. This is affected by the taking on of new roles that occurs during this period, as well as by new found responsibility and agency, that was taken away upon incarceration. As was shown in this chapter, my participants spoke of this transition period as overwhelming and difficult, as one day they were inside with no responsibility, and the next they were outside and fending for themselves. This led to a rapid change in the space one occupied in society, and in the ways one was expected to perform.

Moving on from this, I attempted to show the interaction between power and identity production in regards to interactions with the criminal justice system. I argued that this was a unique form of identity production, as the ways in which one was able to construct their own identities were limited, as agency was taken away from them. This meant that as most individuals construct identity through choosing to perform in specific ways, those who are incarcerated are limited in how they may perform. This leads to an inability to choose one's performances in the way the general population of the society may do. Therefore individuals are prescribed a criminalized identity, that is reinforced through their following of protocols and through their inability to choose performances. The construction of a stigmatized criminal identity was then shown to have long-lasting effects after release, as it comes to affect one's access to resources such as employment opportunities.

Following this discussion of the production of criminalized identities, I came to discuss in further depth the effect of labeling on individuals. In this section I showed how criminal labels affect identities over-time, and how they restrict one further in their attempts to (re)integrate. It was through showing the ways that labeling and power interact in the criminal justice system

that I add new insights to literature on the criminal justice system, (re)integration, and identity production/labeling, as I showed the complex power structures that exist in correctional facilities, and how they affect labels. These complex power structures place people in subject positions which themselves are difficult to overcome, and with the application of official labels, which are reinforced by criminal records, the positions are reinforced and strengthened. We can then see that individuals who have recently been released from incarceration must come to cope with new and changing identities, while also struggling to either overcome or incorporate deviant labels through identity production.

Deviance and identity production come to affect the way one (re)integrates to society after they have been released from incarceration, and this is further problematized through the interaction of gendered identities. It was shown that gender comes to interact with, affect, and be affected by deviance, and this creates new complex identities that can further limit, delegitimize, and disadvantage those who they are applied to. Finally, in order to show the complex nature of identity production in the lives of recently released individuals, I included interview segments with individuals who challenged the application of criminal labels, and who came to challenge the production of their identities while inside through choosing how they interacted with programming inside. In these ways, I attempted to show the messy nature of identity production, and how even though individuals are placed in subject positions that dictate how they may perform, in some cases they still effectively challenged these systems of power in a variety of ways. I hope that this shows that individuals, no matter their circumstances, are never agency-less, but that they can come to have limited agency, which can make the process of identity production more difficult to dictate. In order to challenge this limiting of agency then, we must provide incarcerated and recently released individuals with the means to change their

situations in ways they approve of, in order to increase their chances of successfully
(re)integrating on their own terms.

Chapter Four

Life After Prison: (Re)integration, Gender, and the Long-Term Impacts of Incarceration

Dirk: *What are some of the greatest hurdles?*

Ashley: *Housing, housing and survival like a job. How are they going to pay for their housing? I think that would be a hurdle.*

Dirk: *And what do you think might help with that?*

Ashley: *Maybe if they would allow you to look for something, like knowing that your release date is coming up, maybe give you the opportunity to you know, get something hooked up for when you're released, you know? And have like a place for them to go like they do have a shelter, I think they have E. Fry and they got that place there, but they need more of that, I think, for ladies getting out. Have a place for like a week or so. But start when you're inside, you know, get it all worked out in there.*

Ashley: *They throw them out, there you are, you're done you know? And a lot of times, like what do they do? They turn back to their old ways. Start using again, and then end up right back in again. You know it's unfortunate but it's, it is what it is, survival. You know? And a lot of women don't have the coping skills, you know, the knowledge. What to do when, you know, you're out.*

Dirk: *So helping people to learn those skills?*

Ashley: *Yeah, give a different outlook on life. I was never, (long pause) I was always on my own, I had to do it on my own, and it was hard you know? I had to grow up fast, 'cause I was on the streets. You know, you don't fuck around when you're on the streets, you'll get hurt, bad. I think housing is one of the main things. Helping them find a place. Get off the streets.*

Dirk: *Do you think social networking programs and clubs would help?*

Ashley: *For some. I guess, everybody's different, eh? Like for myself, I would have loved it. It would have been great for me.*

Dirk: *So have you had support from friends or family?*

Ashley: *No, not family. And no, I had to get rid of all my friends, to stop using. That's a very very big step. But you know, you gotta do what you gotta do, and they say you gotta change absolutely everything. I've tried both ways, it doesn't work.*

The process of (re)integration is one that takes place over many years, and in most cases is an ongoing process of learning the strategies and skills that will help individuals to achieve the goals they have for themselves. Upon release, one is met with many difficult circumstances which need to be overcome, or at least dealt with quickly. These difficult circumstances include lack of food, shelter, social connections, work, money, and clothing. In the case of release, some tools are provided to help overcome these problems, but many of them fail to help in productive ways, come with other negative effects, or are difficult to access. In these cases, many turn to

family and friends to seek help, but these avenues are not always available. Being incarcerated carries with it a variety of stigmas, and these lead friends and family to often “give-up” on this population, as a few participants explained to me. As well, these stigmas lead to diminished work, housing, and social interaction opportunities, all compounding to create a (re)integration process that is extremely difficult. Still though, as I talked to participants about their lives after incarceration, many of them focused on trying to (re)integrate, as they were done with prison life, and wanted to achieve goals such as having a job and a place to live that was clean and safe.

When one is released they then must come to cope with the difficulty of finding resources and social interactions, while also coping with the lasting impacts of the criminal justice system. In this chapter I will discuss the long-term impacts of incarceration through the process of (re)integration. This will include an analysis of the gendered nature of the process of (re)integration, as many support systems contain gender segregation, making it difficult for this population to find consistent sources of help. As well, this chapter will look at the role of stigma and othering in the lives of those (re)integrating to society, which will further my analysis of identity making and labeling that occurred in Chapter Three. I will also attempt to look at relationships in this chapter, as they were often discussed by my participants as being areas of tension and stress, while also being helpful, supportive, and imperative to their success outside. Understanding the connections and interactions between relationships, (re)integration, gender, and stigma will help to show the complex nature of life after prison, while also showing the variable nature of this process and peoples’ experiences with it. It is through this complex and difficult process that individuals often return to incarceration, as they turn to illegal avenues to help their chances of success. It is then imperative to understand what leads individuals to these paths in order to create effective systems of support, which in turn creates choices and

chances for those who often feel as if they have neither. Incarceration was described in the last two chapters as taking away agency, while (re)integration was shown to be a process of responsabilization. What we must then come to create is a system that teaches people how to cope with this influx of responsibility, and understanding the day-to-day lives of those undergoing (re)integration will give us the best chance of doing so.

Passing Judgment: Stigma and the Impact of Incarceration

As was shown in Chapter Three, there are many barriers that stand in one's way when they are released from incarceration, and the construction of one's identity comes to be heavily impacted by these barriers, and by the experiences of life-inside. What is then important to look at here is how these identities come to affect individuals on a more long-term scale.

(Re)integration is not something that takes place within the first few weeks or months of release, but is an ongoing struggle. This struggle comes from a lack of resources, being constricted from accessing certain resources, and from dominant views in the society about criminalized populations. In many cases, the perceived tainting of one's moral character comes to have many long-lasting effects on individuals as they try to apply for jobs and find new social groups. As (re)integration consists of changes to many parts of an individual's life, so does stigma affect many of these interactions, making the process much more difficult. In this section then I will examine the role of stigma and othering in the lives of those who have been released from incarceration to show the complex social scenarios they must come to navigate everyday.

In his work from 1963, Goffman discusses stigma in depth, explaining what it is and how it comes to affect the individual actor, and those around them, in society. Goffman shows us that society creates means of categorizing people, as well as perceived ways in which those people will perform, and when one does not meet these expectations, having some physical,

character, or tribal trait that does not fit the norm, they are stigmatized (1963, 2-3). Goffman goes on to state that “He is thus reduced in our minds from a whole and usual person to a tainted, discounted one. Such an attribute is a stigma, especially when its discrediting effect is very exclusive; sometimes it is also called a failing, a short coming, a handicap” (1963, 3). In this way we can see how an individual comes to be viewed by members of society, when they are considered to have a trait that is undesirable or different. This is then furthered by Goffman when he shows us that not all undesirable attributes are problematic, but only those that do not fit with perceived stereotypes of how a person should perform (1963, 3). What is important to finally include here is Goffman’s explanation of how members of the society respond to those with stigma, and how this affects them. Goffman states, “on the assumption of stigma, we exercise varieties of discrimination, through which we effectively, if often unthinkingly, reduce his life choices (1963, 5). If, as Goffman argues, stigma has the ability to affect one’s life choices due to the changing ways that individuals will come to treat them, we must understand the ways criminal labels comes to be stigmatized, and the ways that they truly do affect one’s life choices.

The existence of stigmatized positions for those being released comes to change the way that people interact on a day-to-day basis. In a discussion I had with Edward and Steve, they had this to say about changes in how they were treated

Dirk: Did you feel like people you know saw or treated you differently?

Edward: Yeah I do. For sure.

Dirk: And was that family, or friends, or unknowns?

Steve: A little bit of family, a little bit.

Edward: Just that judgmental, passing judgment. You can feel it, you know when people treat you different.

Steve: Once there are marks, for example before if I get, before when I got stopped by the police they were very friendly. Now they’re more, looking for that, to find something on you.

Dirk: I see what you’re saying. So as soon as they see that label ...

Steve: Once you’re labeled that, you’re almost like a second-class citizen, in the eyes of the police anyways.

Edward: Yeah, for sure.

In this case, it was an interaction with the police that felt much different to Edward and Steve, as they felt their labels came to change the way they were treated in a routine situation. In my discussions with Frank he also talked openly about the perception of others looking at you or judging you, and how this made him defensive and often aggressive.

Dirk: So what was it like to interact with people outside?

Frank: Oh yeah, yeah interacting with people. My god. Yeah I was antisocial, yeah very antisocial. I just, I don't know, I was different. I didn't like people or anything like that. Cause of all the confinement, and all the damage, like the abuse and all that. They, they never, they never try to fix it. So it's like, I don't hate the system, I hate the people.

Dirk: So did you feel like people were looking at you?

Frank: Oh yeah, I used to get a lot of that. Like I'll be on a bus, and you know it's just like "what are you looking at?" That's my reaction. And then I've always, you know I try to always sat to the window, or at the very back of the bus, so nobody has, so my own back's watched. Like I said, interact myself ...

Dirk: Reintegrate?

Frank: Yeah, that's it. Reintegrate into society. Cause I had all these problems. Like if somebody challenged me, I reacted right away. You know? Because why? Because the way I lived inside, that I had to do that, because that was my survival. And because I lived like that, all the way through from reform school up, that's why I have 27 assault convictions. Cause of all that. But the assault stopped when I choose. And I went, and I got myself fixed. When I had time out here. You know, I seen, I was seeing a psychiatrist and all that. And then they, you know slowly, and last assault I had was a long, long time ago.

In my discussion with Edward and Steve, we can see the way that stigma of criminal identities comes to affect individuals negatively in specific interactions, but Frank is able to further complicate these understandings, as he shows the complex ways that some come to respond to this stigma. Frank felt this stigma, often preemptively, and was therefore defensive immediately to those around him. This lead to problems (re)integrating, as he had trouble coping with changing his actions from life inside to life outside. Inside, Frank would have to respond aggressively to any challenge, but in society again, he had trouble defining what was a

challenge and how to respond to that.

Goffman discusses in his work the different ways that individuals see stigma in society, being either known about or discoverable. This means that the individual views themselves as either discredited or discreditable (1963, 4). For what can be considered character traits, such as having a criminal record or being criminalized, it is often the perceived fear that people may know, or could discover that you have these traits, whereas certain physical markers such as tattoos, were considered to be known about and signaling some sort of criminal identity. This was seen in Chapter Three when Ashley discussed her tattoos and the ways that tattoos on women never meant anything good. In these ways, those being released from incarceration came to feel like they were being treated differently, or perceived that others were viewing them in negative ways and that they had to be prepared to deal with that at all times. I had this discussion with April and Jennifer, which shows both the ways that some come to deal with stigma, while others, through support systems such as family and friends, do not experience that as much.

Dirk: So what was it like to come back to life on the outside?

Jennifer: Ah, it feels the same, for me.

April: No you were treated different.

Jennifer: Well yeah k, my dad didn't want to help me, my uncles didn't want to help me, my aunts. But nothing.

Dirk: So kind of, just like a...

April: Neglect. A rejection, for her. For me, I don't know I was okay. Everybody welcomed me home. They were happy that I did a lot of programming. Cause my family, they're very tight. We're tight and we're not. They worry about me cause I'm an addict. And so for them, hopefully that, that I would have changed they all welcomed me, and a lot of love.

Dirk: And did you find that family support was very important?

April: Oh yeah, sure it is, yeah. My sister used to come and visit me, cause she used to work just right here (points). So she used to walk over to see me here all the time, at the halfway house, so.

Dirk: And that was really important?

April: Oh yeah, yeah, yeah. And of course them, her. All the time.

Jennifer: Yeah me. Not them, me.

April: And my son.

Jennifer: Yeah but me, me first, me always.

April: Yeah her and her brother.

Dirk: What about friends, were there friends that you stayed in contact with?

April: Oh yeah. Yeah. Certain friends I stayed in contact with.

Dirk: And yourself?

Jennifer: No.

In this interaction we can see that as Jennifer came out she did not have the same support systems as April, leading her to feeling cut off from family members and friends. She was treated differently because she had been incarcerated, whereas April was welcomed home, as people were happy to see her seeking help.

It is clear that the act of incarceration comes to leave markers on the body, whether they be physical markers such as tattoos, scars, or changes in weight and muscle, or performances such as aggressive responses to conflict, as was shown by Frank above. Moran argues in her work that time and experience within prison are corporeally inscribed, and that these come to mark the body. This then lead the individuals to need to overcome this stigma that is attached to the body through incarceration, being one of the key issues of (re)integration (Moran 2012, 565-567). Moran shows in this work how participants interviewed came to see concealable stigma operating as an existent reminder of their status as criminalized populations (2012, 573). These stigmas of incarceration as Moran shows, mark people as untrustworthy, unreliable, and dishonest (2012, 574), and as my participants discussed in these interviews, they experienced these stigmas as barriers to their successful (re)integration. Coming to cope with these dominant views of them by the society made up a difficult part of their (re)integration process, and worked to keep them away from certain forms of support and care. It was April's case, as well as Michael's explanations from Chapter Three, that show the importance of family acceptance and support for those being released. This seemed to help counteract some of this stigma, as they knew that some people were there to help them get on their feet, and be successful in their

goals of (re)integration.

In their work on “otherness” Greer and Jewkes discuss how we come to view those who commit crimes as doing so because they are different from the generally accepted, morally conscious, member of society (2005, 20-22). In this way, we other those who are criminalized, not only to show that they are different, but to further explain that the rest of society is made up of individuals who are not criminals and are morally good. It therefore becomes important for the identity of those in society to show that they are not criminals, and they do this through othering. This of course makes it much more difficult for individuals to (re)integrate then, as they must overcome this barrier of “the other” along with the stigma of criminalized people, to make new social connections and to access resources and support systems. As my participants have discussed throughout this work, they often felt separated from others upon release, and felt as if they were being looked at, judged, or challenged. This lead to insecurities, aggressive and defensive behaviours, and depression, as they lacked the ability to achieve their goals of (re)integration. In this section I have attempted to briefly show the stigma that exists for recently released populations, and how they come to cope with this upon release. Next, I will look further at this (re)integration process, to see where other barriers exist, and how people cope with them.

Struggling on the Outside: Barriers to the (Re)integration Process

In the previous chapter I came to discuss identity construction and some of the ways this may impact (re)integration after incarceration, but what is important now is to look more in-depth at the (re)integration process, and at my participants’ experiences of this difficult period. As I have already discussed throughout this work, the reconviction rate within the first year of release in Canada is currently 44%, but this number does slightly decrease each consecutive year after release (43% and 41%) (Bonta, Rugge, & Dauvergne 2003, 1-2). This rate shows us

that, at the least, 44% of the population being released has trouble throughout this process of (re)integration, calling for explanations of why this occurs, and how we can change this process. What barriers stand in the way of accessing resources? As Davis, Bahr, and Ward state in their work on (re)integration, “lack of access to legitimate opportunities produces strain which may encourage some to pursue illegitimate opportunities” (2012, 465). We must then understand these barriers, in order to understand how people cope with life after prison, and in what ways change would be most effective.

One of the first hurdles that exists for people when they are released is finding a safe place to stay. A selection of prerelease and (re)integration data was released from the American Correctional Associations compendium in 2000, which outlined questionnaires that had been sent to many North American correctional institutions, asking about (re)integration. One of the general responses they were able to see about the Canadian correctional system was that “job readiness, housing, and rules of post-supervision are not included in the majority of Canadian system’s programming” (2000). In this we can see that job preparation and housing are two main concerns that are not addressed in most programming within the criminal justice system. This was explained by many of my participants, and I include their discussions here now to show how they felt about housing and the (re)integration process. As was shown in the opening of this chapter, Ashley felt that help in finding housing should start when you are still inside, as once you are released it is quite difficult to do so, as you are either hoping to get into a shelter, sleeping on peoples’ couches, or are on the street. As well, Janet had this to say about coming out of incarceration.

Dirk: What is the hardest part of coming out of incarceration?

Janet: Just hitting the street again. School of hard knocks, it’s horrible. You go into survival mode right away, you just... BANG, your whole personality changes. We have no choice, or we die.

Dirk: So how could we help?

Janet: I don't know, more support. Odawa not closing for one. More drop in's, more support, more social workers, more people that understand, more people like us, more peers.

Janet's direct response is powerful, in that it outlines how hard it is to be released and go back onto the street. For many, life before incarceration included living on the street, and was often the catalyst for their arrest in some way. Being released means going back to that lifestyle, and struggling to find food and shelter.

For many, finding shelter is an issue in itself, but what also is at issue is the quality of the housing, and the people that you may share this housing with. For many being released, coping with addiction comes to be one of the hardest hurdles to overcome, and can be the quickest trigger for reoffending. Davis, Bahr, and Ward discuss this as one of the major factors affecting (re)integration (2012), and for many of my participants this was a large part of their lives. As Jacquelin states in her discussion with me,

Dirk: Did you have a place to stay when you came out?

Jacquelin: Nope, they wanted to send me out to the mission, well not the mission itself because that's for men, but they wanted to send me to the shelter so I can get Ottawa housing faster. They put me in a woman's shelter, you can just imagine what kinds of drugs, like it doesn't matter if they pat you down when you walk in, it's so easy for a girl to hide drugs. So, you walk in, and me trying to get my life back straight, well there's somebody using a needle right beside me. So me personally, I'd rather live outside or couch surf anything than to go to a shelter to get the process of housing going.

Dirk: So staying away from shelters was actually better for you?

Jacquelin: Well yeah, half the people that go, well in my eyes, half the people that go to shelters are people that use, or people that give an address to welfare that's not proper and to get the full amount and they go and use.

As well, Brad had this to say about trying to avoid drugs, when living in shelters or rooming houses.

Brad: Living with these people that were constantly smoking crack or alcoholics, you know what I mean? Oh, it was like I could never get away, even though I wanted to fix myself it seems like I could never get cause everybody else was doing it. It

seems like an epidemic with this crack shit eh? Like everybody in the world is doing it.

Both Jacquelin and Brad had hard times trying to not only find housing, but to find housing that was safe, clean, and free of drugs, so that they could work on overcoming their drug addictions. What becomes clear then is not solely that housing is hard to come by, but where the housing is located, who you are living with, and whether it is safe and clean are extremely important to the effectiveness of this support.

In my discussion with Josh and Brad, they try to explain how important it is to have programming that is accessible, but is also actually helpful, supportive, and well run. This is their discussion,

Dirk: Do you get any help from any organizations in the city?

Brad: Yeah we come here to the (support) centre, we come here for the food bank, sometimes. Like once a month. They're really great here, really very nice. Very personable. Yeah we do. We try to use as much, we go to (support), use the phone there. Um, there's other services there we can use.

Josh: I used to do a lot of NA meetings at a building (downtown). Um, but I haven't been in a while.

Brad: I was actually there yesterday, I went to a meeting yesterday. I went with my friend, cause my friend just got out of penitentiary for 4 years. So I like to be there for him, support him. So we went to a meeting together.

Dirk: So how do you find these community run programs are?

Brad: Yeah I would say that. Like (support), the centre, is awesome. The people that work there are awesome. And it all comes down to the people and how much they like their job, I find. And if they really like they're job, and they really love their job, well they're so helpful and so resourceful. As opposed to somebody who's there for just a pay-cheque. Which is useless essentially. But most of them really do like their jobs, I would say 90% are really excellent. But yeah, anywhere you go in Ottawa, whether it be food, if you want to go to the shelter and eat, um that's one thing you'll never do in Ottawa is starve. Even if you're desperate on the street you cannot starve in Ottawa. There's no chance in hell you can starve. Because there's so many places you can go for food banks, uh services that serve breakfast, lunch, and supper. Yeah its awesome.

Dirk: So how would a person who is new to the city go about finding these places?

Josh: Well, I just heard about it when I was like 18. Or even younger through people when my step dad pretty much drove me to the city and said get off, here you go. Just from word of mouth. Just walking around asking businesses and people.

Brad: Well for example the first time I heard about centres like this, was the first

time that I heard they were doing a thing like this. It was a survey for needle use. That was the first time I learned about that they had all these offerings for you. That you could come and take like programs and services they had for you.

Brad: They should have more flyers, and more, send out more, like get out the message out that there are places like that for people. Even in jail. Give these people all these resources that they can go to. They don't even do that. They should have like a little pamphlet, that there's resources. Places to go eat for free. That give you an option. That there's more for you than you think.

In this lengthy discussion, Josh and Brad get to the idea that it is the quality of the support, not just that it is there, that makes a difference. As well, they focus on the fact that there are many food centres in the city that really do help people. Not all support centres are lacking, and obviously Josh and Brad thought that the food support system they encountered was helpful and easy to access. Josh and Brad also discussed housing with me in more depth, and it was here that they spoke of the importance of the quality of housing in helping people to achieve their goals of (re)integration.

Josh: But the last time, I got into the same place he (Brad) did, a halfway house. They put me there for about 3 months. Until I got a steady place. And that really did help me.

Brad: It was a nice place. Like the room he must have stayed in. They were gorgeous. Like you had everything, brand new stand up showers, everything was brand new. They had a hide-away bed. It was like your own apartment. And that really sets somebody, it really sets a mindset.

Josh: You feel a lot higher up.

Brad: You do. You feel like you're part of society. That you've actually, something small but you've accomplished that. You have your own place to start out with. And it really gives you that incentive to really change yourself. Because you can have this. If you really try hard you can have all of that.

From this discussion, it is possible to see the difference that the quality of housing makes. The space that Josh and Brad were discussing here was meant for people being released from long-term federal prison sentences, but they were both able to get in there at one point, and they felt this made their chances of (re)integration much higher.

Upon release, finding food and housing are one's first goals, and it is important to

start this process before one is released as some of my participants stated. It is not enough to come out and go stay in a shelter for many, as this can lead to triggers such as drug usage and illegal activity. Unfortunately, many of the options that exist for people being released include shelters, as they do not have money for rent, and in many cases do not have family and friends to stay with. Returning to one's friends can also mean a return to one's old lifestyle, which often involved the reasons why they were incarcerated originally. This means that many people attempt to change these friends, leading to them being unable to go and stay with these people. Being able to plan for housing before one is released can lead to many more opportunities, which is clear from the discussions I had with my participants. In their work on (re)integration and parole, Hannah-Moffat and Turnbull discuss how often halfway houses are framed as safe and orderly in comparison to private residences, although these halfway houses contain drug use and opportunities for illegal activity (2009, 547). It is clear that half-way houses and shelters are often prescribed for those being released, but in many cases are not helpful, and can actually be detrimental to one's success outside.

Along with the initial act of finding housing and food, finding employment comes to be another extremely important aspect of (re)integration. This aspect of (re)integration is also one that comes to be heavily affected by the stigma that exists surrounding criminalized populations. As was shown earlier, stigma of criminalized people leads to their being viewed as untrustworthy, dishonest, and unreliable, and all of these perceived character traits have negative impacts on employment opportunities. As well, as Shantz, Kilty, and Frigon argue, stigma can come to affect how an individual may feel about their self-hood, and how they negotiate their identity (2009, 99). It then is not only that individuals have a hard time getting employment because of the perceptions of them by employers, but that this in turn can lead to the

individual feeling inadequate, and giving up on job hunting before they have started. In my discussion with him, Gary had this to say about stigma and finding employment after being released,

Dirk: What do you think are the greatest hurdles exist for people coming out of institutions?

Gary: The stigma. And it all depends too, let's say. It depends on what age you are, right? I mean if I had a career and all that stuff, and because I got incarcerated I can no longer work in that career. Well I mean, that's a big roadblock right there. Now what do I got to do? Age wise, do I go to school and get re-trained for something that I'm able to do now. Because of my record is preventing me from continuing doing what I was doing. Now that's a burden. So instead of going back to work now I got to go to a college again for two years. I want to go out there and make money to support myself again, and now I'm looking at having to do two years college. So there's a lot of roadblocks, you know? Depending on what age you are. If you're young, well hopefully it's a good thing you went to jail and you've learned when you're young. And now you've got your whole life ahead of you. So it could go either way, right?

In Gary's explanation we can see the impact that stigma can have in finding a job, as you may be cut off from certain avenues that you are trained in, and would like to work in again. In Gary's case, his time spent inside was for a non-violent, non-drug or alcohol related offense, but having any sort of criminal record at all meant that he could not go back to his previous form of work. As well, due to health problems, he could not work construction, and therefore in order to find a job he would have to undergo new job training. This made the process of (re)integration extremely difficult for Gary, and meant that many doors to employment were closed to him.

Looking for work was heavily impacted by a criminal record for most of my participants.

Clare had this to say about looking for employment,

Dirk: What was it like to look for a job?

Clare: Well it's hard actually. Because when you have to put that criminal record. People judge you as soon as they see criminal record. And mine's got nothing to do with being a thief or anything, it's got to do with other things.

Dirk: People don't look at what it was? Just that it's a criminal record?

Clare: Yeah, just criminal record.

Dirk: Have people you know seen or treated you differently?

Clare: It's the people that don't know me, that have treated me differently.

In this way, Clare was able to quickly get to the fact that having a criminal record stigmatizes you and leads to people treating you differently. This in turn made applying for jobs much more difficult, as many employers will turn someone away as soon as they see they have a criminal record. As well, when talking with Ashley about looking for employment, she was able to outline the ways this has changed over the years, and how it has become more difficult recently to find work with a criminal record.

Dirk: So tell me a bit more about looking for work?

Ashley: I don't, cause I'm on disability now. When I got out it was hard. That's why I ended up being a cook cause I'm in the back and nobody saw me there.

Dirk: What was it like to go to an employer and ask for a job?

Ashley: It was intimidating. A lot. I was very nervous. Cause I had a criminal record. Back then they didn't really check your criminal record. They do now. They're really on it now, cause they're allowed to. Back then they didn't really check it. But yeah, it was intimidating.

In these discussions then, we can come to understand that applying for a job is a serious barrier to (re)integration, as many employers will look at a criminal record and turn the individual away. In most cases my participants discussed, their criminal records were not for anything that should lead an employer to question their ability to perform their job, or to create distrust of them, but the stigma that exists of people with criminal records leads many to look past other character traits, and focus only on criminalization. Therefore, along with finding housing and food, stigma and the applied label of criminal lead to barriers to (re)integration that can stop people from being able to achieve their goals of (re)integration.

In this section I have attempted to outline the barriers that exist to successful (re)integration, and these include stigma associated with criminalized identities, access to safe, clean, and supportive housing, having programming that empowers and supports, and finding

work that can be accessed by those with a criminal record. These of course are not the only barriers that exist, but the aspects of (re)integration outlined here, finding food, housing, and work, make up its most important elements. What we must now come to understand is how these acts are furthered problematized, or supported, through relationships, parenting, and of course, gender. In the next section, I will attempt to show the ways in which the (re)integration process becomes/is gendered, and how this negatively affects people's chances of success outside. It is important to look at gender and (re)integration, as aside from a few important works (Turnbull & Hannah-Moffat 2009; Shantz, Kilty, & Frigon 2009) the gendered nature of (re)integration has gone largely unstudied. It is important to understand the ways that individuals with various gender expressions experience this process differently, and how they perceive other genders to experience it, in order to further outline the complex nature of the (re)integration process.

“But I’m like, ‘I just got told it’s a girl thing, so no you can’t come’”: The Gendered Nature of (Re)integration

Early on in the research process I began to hear from my participants, who at the time were only women, that (re)integration was not only difficult, but that it was gendered in many (often frustrating) ways. As I asked questions about what it was like to be a woman who went to prison or jail and was now (re)integrating, I was given responses that outlined the troubles they had accessing certain resources, the real and perceived lack of resources, and the differences they believed men experienced. This lead me to question more and more what it was like for men who were (re)integrating, and whether or not the (re)integration process itself, separate from the criminal justice system, was gendered, and if so, in what ways. At this point I knew that there was the Elizabeth Fry Society that worked mainly with women, and John Howard's Society that worked mainly with men, but this was only the surface of gendered (re)integration, and after

asking participants about these differences, along with some influential source materials, I came to understand the (re)integration process as being inherently gendered, and also saw how harmful this was to those attempting to (re)integrate.

In the first interview I had for this project, I was told of the gendered nature of (re)integration, and this truly caught me off guard. Unprepared for this event, I did not know how to react. It was with Jacquelin that I had this eye-opening discussion, and it was in this discussion that it became clear that studying gender must involve studying men and masculinity. In her work *Gender Trouble*, Judith Butler discusses the ways in which masculinity is perceived as the natural state of the human body, and that feminine identities come to be marked on the body through femininity (1990, 9-12). This, Butler argues, is due to constraints “built into what that language constitutes as the imaginable domain of gender” (1990, 9). This, of course, is used by Butler to show the dominant role of masculinity in the construction of cultural norms, language, and ideas of humanity, sex, and the body. What we can see when we look at the body this way though, is how it is then easy to assume that masculinity and femininity are performed differently, leading to a focus on femininity when studying gender. This is not always the case, and many works do exist that focus on constructions of gender in many forms, but it is important to recognize that often masculinity and femininity are looked at differently, in terms of their construction. I do not claim here that Butler assumes masculinity to not be constructed as femininity is, but what I do claim is that in criminological studies, especially regarding (re)integration, masculinity is often assumed to be generic, and femininity is then studied in response to the general experiences of prisoner (re)integration. What is imperative then is to look at gendered (re)integration as equally affecting men, women, trans-gendered, bi-gendered, two-spirited, and the multitude of other categories that individuals may come to identify with in

varying ways throughout their lives.

Returning then to my first interaction with Jacquelin, I was told of how her and her partner struggled with the (re)integration process, and how even this study showed the inherently gendered nature of the (re)integration process.

Dirk: What's your living situation like now?

Jacquelin: Budgeted. When you're paying 800 for your place, I think if it wasn't for my boyfriend I think I'd still be couch surfing. There's a lot of free stuff. There's a lot of outreach but you need to know it.

Dirk: How did you find out about these places?

Jacquelin: Just through couch surfing. This person said, 'you can't be here all the time eating our food. Welfare gives you a certain amount, and you're paying me half and you still gotta pay for food.' So you go there, so by me coming here, I found out about other places.

Dirk: So once you break in?

Jacquelin: If you don't ask you don't know. There should be more signs. More signs, like even for rehab. Like they will say for men. But did you know that there's one for females, no. But there is one. You'll hear it for the men and teenagers, what about the women? Like if you're a girl you can come up here, if you're a guy they'll refuse you. You know? They'll help you, but tell you like, there's places different for men. Go somewhere else. Like even at one place, me and my boyfriend walk in we all see a bunch of pregnant girls, we're like 'I think were in the wrong spot!'. And the lady comes up to me and she's like 'Do you know that you're not supposed to be here if you're not pregnant and you're with a guy. So there should be things unisex, for girls. Where you can...

Jacquelin: Perfect example, like right now, my boyfriend wanted to come cause he has stories too. But I'm like I just got told it's a girl thing, so no you can't come. 'Oh me too!' He wants to help. More unisex things or more signs. Well this is a girl thing, we can help you, and if you call here we can help you for men too. Like not only men are more out there. It's mostly men or women, no unisex. Like even I was couch surfing since November and I've been waiting to get my place, and I called 311 hoping they would help me and they were like 'well your boyfriend is going to have to go here, and you will have to go there.' Well if my boyfriend goes there and I go there, well if I get in the hole and feel bad and I want to go use, well who's going to be there to help me, oh the front desk? Well that's somebody that I care for 100%. There's not proper help out there for that. There should be a unisex place.

Jacquelin here is able to get at the ways that it becomes extremely difficult to deal with (re)integration due to the gendering of many sources of support. Many of the food banks, drop in shelters, housing systems, and rehabilitation programs are gendered, and this adds an extra

element to looking for resources. One can not only find a support group, shelter, or food bank and show up, but must need to ensure that they will accept that person based on their gender identity. This is not the case for every help centre, as a number of the places I visited while out in the field were open to both men and women. But for those attempting to find resources, this becomes a very frustrating barrier to overcome, as they are often seeking resources with friends or partners, and this can close many doors for those individuals.

In another example of the gendered nature of the (re)integration, as well as life in North American society, Clare had this discussion with me,

Dirk: How did you hear about the places you are getting help from?

Clare: Actually it took me two years. I was trying to get help, trying to get help, trying to get help and I couldn't get uh. And then when I was in Kingston, not here in Ottawa, but when I was in Kingston I was referred to a gentleman here in Ottawa that could possibly help me. But when I was in Ottawa I could get no help. There's a lot of places that can get help for men needing help, women, there's only maybe a handful, not even a handful, maybe 2 places, or 3 places in Ottawa that accept women that will help when they have a drug problem or an alcohol problem, an addiction of some sort.

Dirk: Why do you think there's such a difference between men and women?

Clare: I honestly don't know, and I don't believe there should be a difference. You know, prime example, they have a lot of help for men when they have heart attacks. Women, we don't have a lot of help, women have a higher increase of chances of dying from a heart attack than men now do. It's just that, for some reason men are a priority I find, and women are put to the side.

Dirk: I see that, and I wonder why that is?

Clare: I don't know. Maybe it's the fact, because men were always made to be the breadwinner. In my life I've always been the breadwinner.

Dirk: Did people treat you differently because you were the breadwinner?

Clare: Well, people treated me differently all my life, because I'm a woman in a man's world. Like, I have a twin sister. My twin sister hung out with my mom, I hung out with my dad. So we had horses, like I was 6 years old so the size of a horse that weighs over a ton, I worked side-by-side with my dad all my life. I've always been a woman in a man's world basically, and women aren't supposed to do that. It's the same with construction. Like I could tell you how to build a house from the ground up, and I've had guys walk off the job site, and like what? 'She's not my foreman, I'm not taking...' you know? I know were in 2015, but women are still perceived...

Dirk: Still the same thing?

Clare: Yeah.

Dirk: So what do you think are the greatest hurdles to overcome?

Clare: Support, education. When you are in jail you should be able to get more access to education and to programs involving solutions to your addictions and why you're in there in the first place. That is very limited for women here in Ontario and Alberta. It's going back to that there is more support for men then there is for women. A lot of women aren't as fortunate, they don't have the means and the wherehow to get where they have to get.

Dirk: So we have to get that to them?

Clare: Yeah. Women need more support, just right out, they need more support. You want the women off the street, but yet they can't get funding for education. So help the women when they're in jail, help them, so they don't have to go back to that you know?

Clare felt that there were big differences in the resources that existed for men and women, and found that in her experiences, and in the lives of those around her, being a woman restricted you from many forms of help that would be available for men. In my discussions with men, they also spoke of these gendered resources, and sometimes in contradictory ways.

Dirk: Have you noticed, as men, any difference in finding or accessing resources because you are a man?

Steve: I'd say there's definitely more services in general for women. Some of it's more, for example abused women or whatever. There's not really a shelter for abused men.

Edward: It seems that there's more for them.

Steve: It's not that there isn't. I don't know if it's 50/50 or what. But the perception may be that women may get more of a helping hand, in some situations. It depends what the service is I guess.

In this way, Edward and Steve are able to point to the perceptions of a lack of resources for men that may occur, but they also claim this to not be completely accurate. Many of my other participants often tried to get at this same point, that there is some inequality in the resources offered for men and women, but that mainly as men or women, they felt that there were more for the other group. It appears as though the gendered nature of the criminal justice system, along with a lack of resources in general, leads many to perceive that they are unable to access resources while others can. This perception is important to understand, as it leads to one

cutting themselves off from resources, and points to the impact of stigma on an individual's self-esteem and drive to seek resources.

There is no doubt that there is a lack of resources, as every single participant I talked with stated that some help existed but not nearly enough, and that often this help was misplaced or complicated to access. But the gendering of the criminal justice system itself, leads to the gendering of (re)integration programs. In their work on parole and (re)integration, Turnbull and Hannah-Moffat show the ways in which women's "law breaking is understood not in relation to larger social and material conditions, but as a consequence of her personal failures, which are considered to be her gendered 'risk factors' (2009, 536). In this way, the authors show us that risk factors are considered to be gendered, and what we can see is how this comes to further reproduce ideologies of gendered (re)integration. It is often the case that women and men are considered to offend for different reasons, and this is then reconfirmed when their "treatment" plans are created in response to these reasons. As I have shown throughout this work, gender comes to be tied to, and affected by, criminality in different ways, and this is then reproduced through the system of incarceration and subsequent (re)integration. Shantz, Kilty, and Frigon state that "the realities of the carceral environment become imprinted both in the minds and on the bodies of women prisoners further limiting their chances of successfully (re)integrating into the community" (2009, 85). In this way we can then understand how gender is reproduced, and also comes to affect one's (re)integration, as the systems of support and ideologies of men's and women's needs differ based on understandings and norms of gender.

In a potent response about gender and the construction of one's identity, Gary had this response to a question I asked late in our interview one day.

Dirk: Do you think there's a difference in the ways men and women experience it.

Gary: It's hard to say. Some of the women I know, they're like, in to the drugs and

all that. Yeah, they don't really give a shit. So I don't know if they come from an abused family or whatever. I think, one's attitude and perception towards jail and life in general, depends on your origin. How you were brought up. Cause I went to jail, and you said has that changed you, and I said no. No, I want to make sure I don't go back there. And live how I was brought up to live, honouring my parents. So that's my origin, where I came from. So I think that's where my real perceptions are. However, let's say I fell really bad into drugs and all that stuff and I was in and out of jail for years and years, well I guess I would lose my identity. I would become a very angry person, if you spent a lot of time in jail. You could become a very bitter and angry person. And say the hell with society and all that stuff, and I'm just going to take what I want. You know what I mean? Life is shitty, and everybody's shitty, and I feel like shit. But I think it has a lot to do with origins, where you come from. In the dictionary they call it families of origin, or social network. What kind of environment you were in. Did you live on a farm with good food and values, and working as a value, and teamwork and all that stuff? You work hard but you eat really well. Or did you grow up in let's say a trailer park, where you've seen grown-ups drinking and fighting and all that stuff, and that's what you saw as a kid. You may think that's real life. So I think the, your social circle that one was in, that's why I never told my family I went to jail. I'd be too embarrassed, cause they wouldn't understand that.

For Gary, it is not the prescription of specific normalized gender roles, but the family you were brought up in, and the people you were surrounded by as a child, that come to affect how you will act in society. In this response, we can see that Gary works around gender, and instead looks at each individual and their history, to understand where that person needs help. Much of the criminal justice system and (re)integration process are gendered, leading to different access to resources, spaces, and opportunities depending on one's gender, but as Gary's discussion shows, we must focus more on pinpointing one's individual triggers and circumstances. Shantz, Kilty, and Frigon argue that risk and need designation has negative affects on women's chances of release (2009, 86), and this is quite clearly a gendered issue, as men's risks and needs are both less considered, and considered to be different.

Changing prisons so that they focus less on gender segregation is one important step that must be taken in our criminal justice system, but also requires much more time, energy, and

money to achieve. The provision of support however, is much more readily open to change, and is not structured in a way that makes it difficult for these changes to occur. My participants outlined that there need to be resources open to couples, as well as being open to any gender identity, and that the act of going to a space and being turned down based on gender is embarrassing, aggravating, and leads to a lack of trying in the future. The most successful locations I visited during my fieldwork were those that were open to everyone, and these were also the spaces that many of my participants discussed as being their favourite places to go, and as the most helpful. Completely gender-neutral spaces are not always an option, as histories of abuse and relationship problems can lead some to desire a separation from a specific group. This means that centres should exist for these individuals who desire this form of separation or safety, but at the same time, having more spaces that are open to everyone would help counteract the perceptions and realities that help is gendered throughout (re)integration.

Finally, gendered risks and needs may in many cases be relevant, as there are ways that gendered individuals experience the world differently. There are structures of power that affect men and women differently as Foucault (1978), Butler (1990; 1993), Hannah-Moffat (2001), and Heyes (2000; 2007) show us in their works on sexuality, gender, and power. These are structures that were created with male/masculinity as their base point, and that female/femininity work on top of. These systems/structures lead to the devaluing of non-men in various ways, and lead to less opportunities based on gender. In her work on feminist criminology, Balfour points out how the rise of neoliberalism has lead to the “death of the social”, and that this has meant that the homeless, criminalized, and mentally ill are no longer connected to conditions of oppression, but instead are responsibilized (2006, 738). Therefore, as Balfour shows, “preconditions of poverty, sexism, and racism that have historically positioned women at greater risk for victimization

and exploitation were not limited to inequality” (2006, 738). It is clear then that systems of oppression, exploitation, and victimization do occur, and that these put women and men at different points on a social hierarchy. We must then be conscious of these points when creating social systems of support, but what is also problematic is when these then come to inherently separate women and men, and further reinforce these systems of segregation.

We must find systems of support for those (re)integrating to society that are conscious of these existent oppressive forces, but that are also aware of the oppressive nature of segregation. In my interviews with participants, they were most clearly concerned with being able to access food, housing, and work, and they often felt as though those systems that provided these resources were gendered. It was troubling for them to be turned down because they were either a specific gender, or were with someone of a different gender. Unisex programs would help to combat this, as in many cases my participants found support in their romantic relationships. As Jacquelin discussed, living in a place where she could not be with her partner meant that she was more likely to use, as her partner was her main source of support. Although organizations such as Elizabeth Fry and John Howard’s do great work for many of those they help, my participants also often commented on the ways that they excluded certain populations. At a time in their lives when help is most needed, people being released should be helped at all costs, and this should most certainly not be hindered by their gendered identity. Often gendered identities had impacts on why these individuals became involved in illegal activity in the first place, and as we have seen, the gendered systems of support negatively affect their chances of (re)integration.

The Role of Relationships

The role that relationships come to play in the lives of those (re)integrating to society after being released is difficult to track, as there are many contradicting views of their impact

on this process. In some cases, relationships are seen as encouraging criminality and reoffending, as they may be with someone who has anti-social behaviours or who is involved with criminal activity (Wyse, Harding, and Morenoff 2014, 366). These relationships may also return individuals to previous life-styles, recreating the scenarios in which they came to offend in the first place. Shoshana Pollack shows in her discussion of gender and risk categorization in the criminal justice system that “risk is gendered in that for women victimization and relationships become central to general and violent recidivism” (2007, 161). In these ways, relationships can come to be understood by the correctional system, as well as by (re)integration programmers, as problematic and as something to be avoided. Sered and Norton-Hawk argue in their work on desistance and relationships that often these relationships in the lives of the recently released are intense, difficult, and sometimes violent, and they often present enormous challenges (2011, 317-322). Sered and Norton-Hawk go on to show that romantic relationships are therefore often discouraged or forbidden in 12-step groups (2011, 322).

On the other side of this though are those who argue that the loss of relationships may lead to reoffending, as it may have negative impacts on one’s self-esteem (Pollack 2007, 168). As well, as Wyse, Harding, and Morenoff show, marriage is often understood as promoting informal social control, as it increases the cost of crime, provides structure, and that criminal behaviour may impair the individual’s ability to stay in the relationship (2014, 367). Andrea M. Leverentz also shows in her work that relationships can have different impacts on men and women, as women are more likely to become involved with men who have criminal backgrounds, whereas men are more likely to gain support and structure from a relationship with a woman (2006, 460-466). In the end though, Leverentz’s work showed that relationships often offered a drive to desist from criminal activity, and that changes in circumstances lead to

changes in self-concept which may produce conforming behavior (2006, 465-485). From these studies we can see how relationships come to occupy an unconfirmed space in regards to (re)integration.

Throughout my interactions with participants, they often discussed their previous and/or current relationships with me, and the ways those came to affect their time outside. As we saw in the last section, Jacquelin spoke quite clearly about the ways that her boyfriend was imperative in her (re)integration process. For Jacquelin, her boyfriend offered stability and support, and was her main source of help when dealing with her addiction. As was shown in the last section, there were many barriers in the way of Jacquelin and her boyfriend being together and seeking help as a couple, as they had both recently been incarcerated, and this made her experiences of (re)integration more difficult. Jacquelin found that it was her relationship with her boyfriend, as well as her family ties, mainly her mother, that were her main sources of support. For her, interactions with (re)integration programs and support systems were hindered because of her relationship, and that this was one area that needed to be changed in order to make this process more effective.

In another interaction I had with Clare, she briefly described how important her boyfriend was in helping her after she had been released.

Dirk: How are you doing now?

Clare: Awesome actually, I have some issues, but I'm doing a lot better. But basically the same issues I had that caused me to go to jail, is the same issues that I'm dealing with now. But I'm working on these issues.

Dirk: How do you work on these?

Clare: I'm very fortunate that my boyfriend is so supportive, so I have a lot of in home support now, and I'm actually going to rehab.

As well, when asked about places a couple could go to get help, Clare had this to say.

Clare: You know, men can go in to (multiple locations) women aren't allowed even half the time to half of these places to go and eat, at these places.

Dirk: Would it be better to have more gender specific, or for couples?

Clare: Well there's no places for couples to go, so definitely couples. Definitely just women on their own. A lot of programs for addiction tell you not to get involved, while you're going through rehab and that, with a partner. Concentrate on yourself. Get well first, before you get into a relationship. But sometimes its too late, you're already in a relationship, you don't want to lose that. So, they need a place for couples, but they definitely need to put more resources for women.

In these two responses, Clare focused on the importance of some relationships in people's lives, especially her relationship with her boyfriend. Clare also referenced the way that some programs advise you to stay away from romantic relationships, but that this is not always possible, and that it could be detrimental to do so. For Clare then, along with Jacquelin, a romantic partner had a very positive impact in their lives, and was a source of support. In the case of Clare, her boyfriend accompanied her to our interview, and sat with us. Clare stated that this was because he was her main form of support. Her boyfriend, a social support worker, was influential in her seeking of treatment for addiction, and in getting help in other aspects of her life.

In these two cases, relationships were a very important part of the (re)integration process, and proved to be areas of great support and stability. This was not always the case though in my discussions with participants, as sometimes histories of abuse came to negatively affect the way one could interact in a romantic relationship. In my discussions with Stephanie, she opened up about her past, and how this has affected her relationships.

Dirk: Can you take me back in time a bit and tell me what life was like before you were arrested?

Stephanie: Me, I, you know since I had my surgery 15 years ago, I have difficult, like, you know like I'm very sensitive. I get mad easily. Like when I get mad mad, I black out, my hands get stuck. Growing up, pretty much foster place to foster place, was making me be more, being a trouble-maker. Dealing with cops, dealing with foster place, counseling. I was molested by my own father when I was 11 years old. Since I was molested, I've been totally like...when I have a relationship it, makes me flash back. When I'm abused it feels like it happened again. Or even, having a relationship sometimes, it's kinda hard to. I did hard drugs before, you know. Every guy my mom was going out with I did not like them at all, because I was molested by more than 10 guys she was in a relationship with. Ever since I was molested I've

been so miserable. It's hard to let it go. It's even hard to talk to your boyfriend about your past. It's hard. Once you start talking about being molested to your boyfriend, it's just gonna start more fights. You know, it's just been so hard for me.

In this discussion, Stephanie looked to the ways that the abuse she had been through by her father and other men her mother had been in relationships with came to affect her ability to be in relationships now. It was hard for Stephanie to talk to her partners about her past, as they often got angry or started fights about this. This led to relationships being a source of stress, difficulty, and tension for Stephanie, creating a barrier to her finding help and resources outside. Stephanie also had this to say about her relationships and the negative ways they have affected her finding housing and resources.

Stephanie: Once I got a place, I started doing hard drugs. You know I gave up my apartment because I was doing too much crack. I gave up my apartment and became homeless. And got another place, didn't get along with our roommates, because of the drinking problem and cops having to come almost every night. And now I'm not allowed with my ex-boyfriend, not allowed near the apartment. Going couch hopping, walking around all day. It's pretty much like, feels like I have no life right now. Not doing anything, not going to school. Just dealing with courts and stuff

Stephanie had been ordered legally to have no contact with her boyfriend, and this meant that she could not retrieve her possessions from her previous residence. This meant that Stephanie was without a place to stay, and had lost her belongings, creating a large set-back for her in trying to find safe housing.

In another interaction I had with Edward and Steve, they described briefly how their relationships were creating a positive environment. In their case, they were both living with their girlfriends, and this created a family atmosphere where there was lots of support.

Dirk: So you're living with 3 other people. How is that? Do you find there is more support?

Edward: Um yeah, I think so. As much as I need anyway. Yeah. I do man. Positiveness. They're not drug addicts. They're normal people you know. It's nice to surround yourself with that.

Edward, like Jacquelin and Clare, felt that the support he experienced at home was helpful, and that it created a normal lifestyle that could help with his (re)integration. As I showed in the introduction to this section though, relationships are not always understood as helping in positive ways, and like we saw for Stephanie, there is the possibility that histories of abuse can lead to negative relationship experiences. These negative experiences can be harmful to one's (re)integration as they can create all new barriers to (re)integration, and provide circumstances in which the individual may need to commit criminal acts to survive.

Relationships can provide many opportunities for support throughout the (re)integration process, when these relationships are mutually supportive and safe. Unfortunately, not all relationships occur in this way, and some relationships may actually harm one's chances of finding housing and resources. It is important to recognize, as I showed in the last section, that there are cases where people may desire to be separated from a specific group, and that there should be safe spaces where these individuals may go. But at the same time, resources that are set up to help couples together could prove to be imperative in the (re)integration process of many individuals currently being released. Jacquelin, Clare, and Edward all discussed how relationships were a positive influence in their lives. Jacquelin and Clare both called for resources that would help couples together, as sometimes it was easier to seek support with another person you could trust. Having services open to any gender, and to couples, would make this a possibility, and would help to break down some of the barriers that stand in the way of people seeking help.

Life-Long (Re)integration: The Ongoing Process

***Dirk:** So what do you think the greatest hurdles are to overcome?*

***April:** Probably getting a place. Getting this all supposed to be in one time. Like you get out and you're overwhelmed. No place, no furniture, no food. Like you have to start from scratch for everything. You know? Like before I got my apartment, I went*

to the harmony house, helped me with the housing, but they helped me with some food too and stuff. But it's like, wow no furniture, then they give me the furniture bank, but everything came in time, right? But at the first thing you get a place, you're like "oh my god I have nothing." Or even before you get the place "I have nothing." You get started from scratch. Like I had nothing.

Dirk: *So what do you think would help ease that transition period?*

April: *Well maybe be able to apply for housing before you're released. You know? Maybe help with housing, or help with those, you know like a food bank that's willing to deliver food to ya. So you're stocked up, like not stocked up, but at least you're good for a month. Ya get on your feet. You know what I mean? Get a cheque, get everything organized. But to help you get ahead a bit. Like condiments, condiments are very expensive.*

April: *Like I had a little bit, I had my family. Which is a great help, cause they all helped me with stuff like that. Right? But when you don't have a family and you come out here alone. It's like...*

Jennifer: *It just makes you want to go back, do what originally started to get you into crime. Its too much stress, overwhelming, makes you want to just you know, do a couple, and go fucking in again.*

April: *Just fucking, do what you do.*

The act of (re)integration as I have attempted to show throughout this chapter is not something that takes place only in the first few days or weeks of release, but is a long-term process. This process is full of barriers of different sorts that work to negatively affect one's chances of succeeding in their goals of (re)integration. These goals change with the person, but are most commonly focused on finding housing, food, work, and social relationships. These goals are made difficult by stigma that exists around criminalized identities, and therefore those being released must not only deal with achieving these goals, but must do so in the face of stigma. People being released from provincial correctional institutions do not work inside, and therefore do not have any money to help in their first few days of release. Most therefore apply for social assistance programs, in order to have money to pay for food, housing, and any other resources they may need or desire. As April and Jennifer state in the discussion above, this can often make one return to criminal behaviours, in order to further their chances of survival

outside prison.

The (re)integration process is not just about finding housing, food, work, and relationships, but about also having these aspects be safe, healthy, supportive, and productive. Finding safe housing, away from one's triggers for addiction and criminal activity proved to be one of the hardest aspects of (re)integration for many of my participants. Many shelters provided are havens for drug abuse and criminal activity, and this meant that most of my participants avoided these places, as they were trying to overcome addictions themselves. As well, getting out, one often returns to their old lifestyles and neighborhoods, and this can lead to risks for reoffending, and the ability, and sometimes the need, to return to the circumstances that lead to one being incarcerated are overwhelming. This can mean high influence to either return to one's addictions, or to reoffend, causing a very high portion of those being released to return to incarceration within their first year outside. As well, many of the participants I spoke to discussed going in and out of jail rapidly due to drug addictions that were never dealt with, and this can lead to cycles of imprisonment that go on for years.

The gendered nature of the (re)integration process can also lead to difficult barriers to one's achievement of their goals, as resources either appear to be, or are, cut off to certain genders. My participants discussed the ways this caused them to stop going to certain places, or to stop looking for certain types of help at all, as they feared being turned down. The gendering of the (re)integration system stems quite clearly from the gendered nature of the criminal justice system and criminalization, victimization, and risk discourses. This leads to calls for gender specific programming that is focused on answering gendered risk factors, but as many of my participants discussed, they just needed food, housing, and work, and felt that gendered programs held them back, instead of helped them. It was from this that I came to argue that there need

to be gender neutral programs and spaces for those being released, in order to challenge these both real, and perceived barriers. It is clear that a gendering of the criminal justice system, and of (re)integration programs, can create a perceived sense that other gender identities receive more help than one's own, creating barriers to (re)integration in one's own mind. Overcoming these gendered segregations, as some of my participants stated, could help to challenge these barriers. This of course, as I attempted to show above, does not mean that gender specific programming should not exist, as in some cases segregation may prove to be helpful, but only that there need to be more gender neutral spaces and programs.

Gender neutral spaces may begin to challenge the homogenizing effects of the criminal justice system itself, in regards to gender segregation. In January of this year the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services released a document to its employees specifying new ways to engage with trans inmates. This document outlines that individuals must be considered to be their chosen gender identity, and must be placed into facilities accordingly. Although this is a great step forward for trans inmates in some ways, it also reaffirms the gender segregation that occurs in our correctional facilities. It does not appear that gender neutral spaces for incarcerated populations will occur anytime soon, and this makes it much more important for gender neutral spaces to exist outside of Corrections. One must question how those who have a fluid gender identity, or who do not subscribe to traditional gender roles must feel inside these heavily segregated institutions. Release must therefore be a transition where individuals should feel free again, not only from physical confinement, but also from segregation based on gender identity.

Finally, the role that relationships play in (re)integration and criminal behavior is quite convoluted, and is a source of contention within (re)integration and care programs. As I have

shown above, some see relationships as being detrimental to one's overcoming of addictions, triggers, and (re)integration barriers. These sources stress the ways that relationships can create undue stress in the lives of the individual, and can cause harm in a variety of ways. In my discussions with Stephanie, we saw how her horrible experiences of abuse as a child negatively affected her relationships in adulthood, and how this created forms of stress, anger, and tension that created barriers to her success outside. On the other side of this are those that argue for the helpful nature of some relationships, and how they create systems of support, structure, and accountability that may help in one's (re)integration and overcoming of addiction. This was shown in my discussions with Jacquelin, Clare, and Edward, who all saw their relationships as very positive aspects of their lives.

In terms of (re)integration programming then, finding housing for couples, along with programming such as AA/NA, food banks, etc., that can be accessed by couples together, may serve to overcome, and further support, the systems of help that these individuals find so imperative to their success outside. Helping people on their own terms should come to be the goal of (re)integration programming, and cutting people off from supportive relationships, and restricting them based on gender, are most certainly not ways of achieving this. Constructing programming that allows the individual to exercise their newly acquired responsibility and agency is necessary if we are to work on the terms that these individuals desire. Creating heavily structured programs, that work on formulas for success are the antithesis to what many of my participants desired in their lives after incarceration, and therefore asking people what help they desire, and in what form, may help to counteract the extremely high reconviction rate for those being released from carceral institutions.

I opened this conclusion with a discussion from April and Jennifer, and in this

discussion we can see the frustration that exists with (re)integration programming, and with the barriers that exist to one as they come out of incarceration. Finding housing, furniture, food, and money, all prove to be extremely overwhelming, and often cause one to desire to return to the lifestyles they were living before they were incarcerated. This overwhelming nature of the (re)integration process often comes from the lack of programing, and from programing that does not account for individual variation. Those being released seek help and programming, but when programming is not focused on helping that individual in their own way, it is often likely to fail. (Re)integration is full of stress, responsabilization, barriers, and overwhelming scenarios, and these are often triggers for one to return to addictions or to reoffend. I therefore close with a statement from one participant, Brad, who described this overwhelming scenario to me one day, as he explained why he had been in and out of incarceration for so many years.

Brad: The reason why you are getting high when you first get out is because you don't want to think. You don't want to think because the stress and everything is just too much. It's everything, reality is overwhelming. You think "wow I need to get a place to live, I need food, I need clothing, I need this and that." And you know, you start overwhelming yourself. You just want to sit and ball your eyes out. You're just so filled with emotion. And because you've been clean for so long inside, and you have to put on a front in jail, to pretend you're somebody that you're not. To protect yourself, to make it seem like you're a tougher guy, so nobody can get in. Like you build up walls, and you act like a tough guy. You act like you're somebody you're not just to protect yourself.

Chapter Five

Conclusions: (Re)integration and Learning to Live Outside After Prison

Dirk: *Do you have a message you would like to give to people?*

Stephanie: *Whoever is dealing with court, and who is dealing with breaches and bench warrants, you guys maybe should start looking into programs in order for you not to go to jail. Keep on track with John Howard, AA meetings, Odawa, the people who are helping you stay away from Jail. Maybe you should keep up your appointments, in order to stay away from jail. If you don't want to go to jail, to keep on track to your conditions. If you don't want to break your conditions, stay away from people who are dealing with cops. Think about yourself, and, you know, just keep going. That's what I would do. Stay away from people that are on drugs, and drinking, and dealing with cops. Stand up for yourself.*

Dirk: *Do you have any messages you would like to give to people?*

Brad: *I do. When you get out, don't give up on yourself. Stick to your guns. If you want to get clean, look for those resources. Because they're out there. And if you can get those resources to people when they get out, it would help so many people. Just don't give up. Just stay strong, because it does get better. The longer you have clean time, the life gets better. Just naturally things start coming to you. People start being more friendly, they offer you more help because they see you're helping yourself. So yeah, just don't give up, and stay strong in your surviving.*

Josh: *Even if you do slip up, using and stuff like that. You can't beat yourself up over it. You gotta move on. You can't think too far ahead. You gotta take one minute at a time. You can't overwhelm yourself with things.*

Dirk: *Do you have a message you would like to give to people?*

April: *Just listen to us women in there. Actually hear us. Not just listen, but hear our words. Someone says yeah, yeah, yeah, and they talk to you yeah, and but they actually when that phone call ends, and it's done. Just hear it and actually do something with it. Do something about it.*

Dirk: *So take it in to action.*

April: *Yeah, do something. That's a big problem, cause a lot of people don't.*

It was mid-March, 2015, when I received a call from Janet hoping to set up a time to talk about her experiences of time inside. As I was sitting at my desk, I looked down to see a call coming in from an unknown number. Throughout the research process, I came to know what this symbolized – a call from a participant. As most participants either called from shelters or from payphones, no number would appear when they called. I answered the phone and Janet began speaking very rapidly about me coming to meet her and some friends at a community centre downtown right away. She was only available now, and only for the next few hours. I called

a cab and went downtown to meet Janet, Frank, and a few of their friends. At first we hung around outside the community centre for a bit waiting to see if we could use a room to do the interviews in. While we chatted outside, Frank and his friend introduced themselves and talked briefly with me about the study I was doing, about the weather, and about Janet and her ability to bring lots of people together. They claimed that Janet knew everyone, and that she would be imperative to my research process.

After we got a room, Frank and I went and did an interview, while Janet continually checked in to see how it was going. After we finished, Janet asked if we could go to a coffee shop to chat. As we walked there, I noticed Janet looking for cigarettes in the ash trays that were on the walls of the community centre. She commented on how so many people threw away perfectly good cigarettes, and also that she wanted to quit smoking but that she was too stressed to do so. We got to the shop and sat down to chat. As we were there, Janet frequently talked to other people who were coming and going, and it was here that I was able to truly see the sense of community that Janet was building. Janet surrounded herself with lots of friends, in order to create a social structure that she could support herself in. Throughout our interview Janet also spoke of the community that exists among those being released, and how she relied on these connections. For Janet, life on the streets was extremely difficult, and building a community helped to provide individuals with systems of support that they had trouble finding in other spaces. The lack of resources that existed for Janet, along with perceptions of her by society, lead her to seek out like-minded people who would accept her. It is in this community building that we can see how groups come to cope with life outside in the face of adversity and oppression.

Identity and (Re)integration Planning

The (re)integration process, as I have shown in this work, is not one that takes place

within the first few days or weeks of release, but starts while people are still inside and is ongoing years after release. While an individual is incarcerated, they must come to learn the ways to perform within the criminal justice system. These expectations are often overwhelming to people who have, in many cases, had largely unstructured lives up to the point of their incarceration. These people must come to learn the strict norms, rules, and regulations, whether they be formal or informal, that exist inside carceral institutions. This learning period, where one must come to understand not only how to act within the institution's formalized, extremely rigid, ways, but also how to behave in the context of inmate interactions. As was shown in my discussions with some of my male participants, acting as a "tough guy" was necessary to survival inside. This "tough guy" façade was difficult to maintain for many, and then impacted them after they were released. In my discussions with Brad, which closed Chapter Four, it was clear that performing this way was unnatural to him, and that it negatively affected him after release, as he had trouble responding in social situations in a non-aggressive way. These expected behaviours are then where we can see the (re)integration process start, as the way one learns to perform inside invariably comes to affect their performances on the outside

In Chapter Two I came to discuss the different types of power that exist in the criminal justice system, and what can be seen in this is an intersection between many important works (Butler 1993; Bourdieu 1990; Heyes 2007; Hannah-Moffat 2001; Bourgeois 1993) that have come to influence the ways I engage with power and knowledge. It was in this chapter that I attempted to show four types of power that exist in the criminal justice system (pastoralism, maternalism, disciplinary, and empowering/responsibilizing) and how they impact individuals in a variety of interconnected ways. These forms of power all exist within the prison context, often simultaneously, creating a complex power structure through these various forms of

interaction. These types of power, most importantly pastoralism and maternalism, come to dictate the ways individuals should perform based on claims to superior morality or knowledge of risk factors by guards, officials, and programmers. What is important to recognize in regards to these forms of power is how they come to influence one's ability to perform inside, and how they come to dictate the types of care that exist for individuals while inside. These types of care existent in the criminal justice system are often focused on transforming the incarcerated individual from a 'broken' or 'corrupt' subject into a socially compliant subject who does not challenge the norms of society, but works within them to be a 'productive' member. This existence of a power/knowledge relationship that produces expectant ways of being in society relates clearly to Foucault's understandings of power/knowledge, and comes to produce this discourse of prison life that my participants have discussed openly in this work.

Understanding the role of power in the lives of the incarcerated population, we can then turn to the role of performance, and how they interact with identity. Performances, as was shown in Chapter Three, are the ways that individuals come to (re)produce identities, and as I attempted to show in that chapter, these identities come to play an important role in the (re)integration process. When an incarcerated individual comes to learn specific ways to perform on the inside through a discourse of prison life, they then produce, within the institution's boundaries, an inmate identity. This identity is continually produced in, and by, inmates, who are all expected to perform in ways that are considered to be part of the inmate identity, and whose performances are labeled as those of an inmate, due to their identity as an incarcerated person. These performances come to be tied to criminal/inmate identities, and this leads to an identity that is difficult to overcome for many upon release. Along with this inmate identity, an individual also comes to have a criminalized identity through the act of official labeling. As was shown in

Chapter Three, criminal labeling has serious impacts on individuals' identities, as it is done so in conditions of unequal power distribution. The forms of power existent in Chapter Two help us to understand the ways that labeling becomes so impactful in the lives of the currently incarcerated, and the recently released. Pastoralism and maternalism are focused on compliant subjects who are often stripped of agency, and have their circumstances decided for them. This leads to an individual who is extremely susceptible to official, and informal labeling, as they are often forced to perform in ways that conform to their labels. The lack of agency that an inmate has therefore makes labeling more impactful, as they cannot simply choose to perform differently to challenge the label.

The impact of official labeling after release is further affected by these forms of power discussed above, as individuals come to occupy spaces in society that are disadvantaged, limiting their ability to challenge expected role performances. Official labeling then leads to individuals being cut off from various resources, as these labels are often stigmatized in various ways. These stigmatizations then come to further limit the ways people can perform on the outside, as they are cut off from social groups and resources due to these labels. Overall one's identity comes to influence, and be influenced by, their performances, and labeling may further limit these performances, creating specific identities that hinder one's chances of successful (re)integration. It is clear that the systems of power that exist within the criminal justice system attempt to produce compliant subjects, that come to be labeled 'criminal,' 'inmate,' and 'ex-con.' These people are then expected to perform inmate or criminal identities in specific ways once they are released from incarceration, and whether they do or not, are cut off from resources and social groups, limiting their chances of achieving their goals of (re)integration.

Although we can see these impacts of labeling in people's lives, I also would like to

reaffirm my challenge of labeling theory as it appears above. Through my interactions with participants, their many stories helped me to understand how, even though they were affected by labels, they also challenged these labels inadvertently through the various ways they performed in society. It is too homogenizing to view these multifaceted individuals as having identities that are sculpted by labels, which are kept in separate spheres from the other ways they identify themselves, and are identified. What I have shown in these chapters is the various ways that my participants acted in society, how they were, and were not, affected by labels and applied identities, and how not one person in this group of interviewees could be considered to completely portray what it is to be a criminal, or a previously incarcerated person, in our society.

As was shown in Chapter Three, my participants challenged these expected performances, both inside and out, in order to not be considered as part of a compliant prisoner population, or as someone who has been incarcerated. Michael, in his discussions of programming inside, showed how he resisted programming because it created ‘prison mentality,’ and that this mentality stopped you from breaking the cycle of incarceration, release, and re-incarceration. For Michael, those who went through programs had that ‘prison mentality’ and were still acting as they did while they were inside many years after Michael had been released. As well, Jennifer showed in her discussions that she was not concerned with others’ opinions of her, and that she rejected labels of ‘recently released individual.’ For Jennifer, she was done with prison life, and this meant that she should no longer be tied to that identity. Finally, in my discussions with Ashley she talked about NA programming, and how she disliked the idea that individuals were ‘addicts for life.’ For Ashley, she had beaten her addiction and that was no longer a part of her identity. In these ways, although many systems existed to restrict performances, or to dictate the ways they came to perform, my participants showed how they

challenged these in order to construct an identity that was meaningful to them.

As I started this section, I spoke of the ways that (re)integration starts while an individual is still inside, and I would like to return to this idea here. While inside provincial correctional institutions, individuals are given access to some resources and programming, but what I heard from my participants was that these resources are extremely lacking, and are mostly ineffective. What I have attempted to show through this discussion of labeling and performance is that the limiting of one's ability to perform leads eventually to difficulty (re)integrating. If one is unable to produce their own identity, and is subject to the labels they are given throughout the criminal justice system, they are often cut off from many resources and social groups upon release. To therefore give them a chance to successfully (re)integrate, they must be able to make important decisions on the programming that is available to them, how they access that programming, and when they access that programming. (Re)integration planning must start while an individual is still inside, and must be on that individual's own terms. As Frank and Michael both suggested in Chapter Three, being able to choose what type of programming is available, and how they accessed it would make a important difference in currently incarcerated individuals' lives. Being able to do so on one's own terms would also help to combat the feeling of helplessness that occurs when one is released. Upon release, my participants often spoke of the overwhelming responsibility they were quickly given, and having them choose their own path of (re)integration programming while inside could help challenge this.

It is important to recognize that the stripping of agency that occurs when one is incarcerated has serious impacts on one's ability to successfully (re)integrate after release, and that this is one of the major changes that will truly help individuals upon release. Of course, it is important to have guides who may help those who are inside make educated choices on the

paths they would like to take to (re)integration, but deciding this programming for them, and in many cases making it mandatory, negatively affects them on a long-term scale. We must remember that (re)integration starts while the person is incarcerated, and then must provide choices while they are inside to help prepare for their release. Preparation for release is the first step in this long process of (re)integration, but it is certainly not the only one. I will now return to my discussions of life on the outside, to show where change is needed, and what structures exist to restrict people in their quests for successful (re)integration.

(Re)integration Barriers

Dirk: *If you could say anything to the people who might read this, what would it be?*

Jacquelin: *Don't give up... to continue. Cause there's the proper help out there you just gotta reach out and ask for it. Don't give up, you'll hit certain days where it's going to be harder, but if you can get through those days always remember there's somebody there walking you through it.*

Dirk: *Are there any messages you would like to give to people.*

Janet. *Have an open mind and be open to suggestions. Support more treatment centres. Please. Transition is very complicated. And I'm there and I get it. Progression not perfection. Support us and leave us alone. Don't look down on us. We're people, we're God's children too and we count, so leave us alone. Don't judge us. Don't make assumptions, assumptions will get you into trouble.*

Dirk: *Do have a message for people getting out or those who might read this?*

Michael: *Good luck on your journey, and don't be afraid to call or talk to somebody, cry or whatever you have to do. Don't be afraid. Be open, talk to people. And don't get caught up by those little things.*

After one is released from incarceration they are considered to be “hitting the streets” as many of my participants described it. As I attempted to show in both Chapters Three and Four, this is an overwhelming experience for most as they are joyous that they are no longer inside, but quickly come to realize that they must now look for food and shelter. In many cases, people are directed to drop-in centres and shelters, but as I described in Chapter Four, these locations are often quite problematic. Many of my participants found that the shelters in Ottawa contained

high levels of drug usage, despite attempts by those running the locations to stop this. For those with histories of drug and alcohol addiction, these locations made it easy for them to start using again. As participants described, one of the most common reasons for an individual to be re-incarcerated was due to drug or alcohol addiction. Addictions lead to people looking for money in any way possible, as they need large amounts to support their addictions. People would therefore return to theft and prostitution in order to support their addictions, and then would be arrested because of these acts. For my participants then, it was their drug and alcohol addictions that most commonly sent them back to prison.

Overcoming addiction was something that 10 of my 14 participants marked as the most serious issue in their lives leading them back to prison. As well, the other four participants marked addiction as a main cause of criminal activity in others they knew while they were inside, or from their time in shelters. Due to the nature of the shelters available to those coming out of incarceration then, it is hard for people to overcome addictions, as the substances they are/were addicted to are readily available, and are usually being consumed by others. Both seeing others using these substances, and knowing they were readily available meant that many of my participants relapsed when they went into shelters. The fact that shelters are (1) the most readily apparent form of housing for those coming out of prison, and are (2) spaces with high levels of drug abuse, shows us the ways in which those being released return to what can be considered a drug taking habitus, where drug usage is a cultural norm that people learn and are enculturated into. For my participants this meant that when they were released again, they sought other avenues for shelter, as they knew that returning to shelters meant a possibility of returning to drug or alcohol addictions, and eventually incarceration.

The existence of shelters is necessary to get people off the streets, to provide them

with food and clothing, and to give them a place with resources to help them find other living accommodations. Unfortunately, the habitus of shelter life makes it more difficult for people to succeed in their goals of (re)integration, and more often serve as roads back to incarceration. In my discussions with Josh and Brad in Chapter 3 and 4 they told me about other forms of housing that would help to support those coming out of incarceration. Both Josh and Brad had stayed in private room housing for the first few months after they were released. These rooms included furniture, bathrooms, and kitchens, which lead to Josh and Brad feeling as if this was their own apartment. Both described this as being imperative to their success outside, and since both had stayed in one of these residences, they have not returned to incarceration. What I argue is so important about these spaces is that they were safe and secure, but also gave the individual responsibility over their own surroundings. They were monitored in these locations, but quite lightly, which served as a midway point between incarceration and living in an apartment by one's self. This buffer to (re)integration meant that both Josh and Brad could learn what it was going to take to survive outside of prison, in ways that would not send them back inside. It had been over two years since Brad had stayed in this location, and about 18 months since Josh had, and they were now living in an apartment as roommates, and were very happy with their current situation.

Along with finding safe housing, one must also find a source of income quickly after they are released. As was discussed in both Chapters 3 and 4, there are many barriers that stand in the way of finding employment, and this meant that many of my participants were on social assistance. The official labeling that exists, along with public perceptions of criminality, lead to individuals having great difficulty finding employment. Many of my participants discussed how they were turned down for employment as soon as the potential employer found out they had

been incarcerated. This often led to damaged self-esteem, which meant that many stopped looking for employment as they feared further rejection. We find then that North American structural inequality, and discussed by Farmer (2004) does not foster the equal employment of individuals who have been incarcerated, as perceptions of the term “criminal” are alarmist and homogenizing. No matter the conviction, if one is labeled “criminal” they are often discredited completely within the culture, and are therefore cut off from employment and social groups. Whether or not policies exist that support the equal hiring of criminalized populations, perceptions of those populations lead to their unequal employment.

Through these interviews with participants, I found that it was more socio-cultural phenomena, such as popular stereotypes or understandings of criminality, incarceration, or drug addiction that affected their (re)integration than it was official policy. Many of my participants spoke of how there were areas to seek help, there were opportunities for training, AA/NA programs, and that there were many resources for food. What often stood in their way though was how others responded to them when they found out they had been incarcerated. Public perceptions of the criminalized population homogenized the group, assuming they were all thieves or even murderers and rapists. This was not the case for many of the individuals I interviewed, as only one participant I interviewed had been incarcerated for a violent offense. This form of structural inequality that exists surrounding criminalized populations therefore carries the greatest impact on their successful (re)integration. Being cut off from employment means that most individuals are subject to living on social assistance, which is often not sufficient. My participants often stated that they would just like to be considered ‘normal’ people again, as they had done their time. Further identifying these individuals as criminals, as suspicious, as untrustworthy, risky, or in need of supervision reproduces these ideologies of

criminalized populations as something to be feared. Overcoming these perceptions is one of the most difficult tasks necessary in supporting (re)integration, as it involves reshaping our common understandings of criminality in general, but is also the most imperative as it would entail not a responsive strategy to issues of structural inequality, but a preventative one through the modification of the norms and understandings that have created the inequality initially.

The (re)integration barriers I have discussed throughout this work are not all singularly difficult to overcome, it is that there are many of them, and their compounding effects are overwhelming for many being released from incarceration. One of the ways that many of my participants overcame these barriers was through social relationships. These were familial, romantic, or friendships, and they often proved to be the most important aspects of one's (re)integration process. Having supporting family members, friends, and partners meant that these individuals had people they could rely on, and turn to when they needed help. Often these people offered spaces to stay, and ways to find food, employment, and the means to overcome addictions. As was also shown of relationships though, they can lead one to return to their criminal activities, and the nature of the relationship is therefore extremely important. For those returning to friends, they sometimes discussed how these people could also create a path directly back to their life before incarceration. This often meant that the situations that lead to their initial incarceration were recreated. As well, romantic relationships could also lead to undue stress, creating desires to return to addictions as coping methods. Although this was sometimes the case, many participants spoke of how these relationships could also be the reason why they beat their addictions. The nature of relationships, and where they took place, had serious impacts on (re)integration, both positive and not, meaning that positive relationships, as defined by those in the relationship, should be encouraged in order to foster positive relationships that help with

life after incarceration.

Gender: (Un)necessary Segregation

Dirk: *If you could give any message, what would it be?* (This was clarified to mean either people reading this, or those being released from incarceration)

Clare: *Women are changing, as the breadwinners, and they need, women aren't just the housewives anymore, times have changed. They're more out there than ever. And now a lot of the women are the breadwinners of the family. They're single moms, single parents, they have to do what they got to do to put bread on the table. Get some funding, for programs, education, addiction help, rehab, more facilities for rehab for women. Even shelters for women with families. I don't think there's one that exists where they can take their kids in with them. It costs a lot of money for a single parent. Like a lot of the ladies that I know are single moms. They've lost their children, they've lost their kids cause they had no place to go with their child. They need help. People need help, women need help. They need help in the actual integration to society from jails, like why they're in jail. We just need more funding, more programs for women.*

Clare: *Sorry, my comment, you asked me a question and that answer was all over the place. But there's no direct answer I find, cause there's so many fields that women can need help in.*

Throughout this work I have returned to gender many times, and it is here that I attempt to conclude why gender is so important in the (re)integration process, and how in the lives of criminalized populations it is messy and uncertain. Gender segregation is taken by both the criminal justice system, and many (re)integration services including shelters, to be a natural way of splitting up the population. What I have attempted to show though is that this was not always the case, as was shown in Chapter 2, and that it can often be detrimental to people's success outside. Many of the systems of support that exist for those being released are gendered, and this meant that many of my participants felt cut-off from resources, and perceived other genders as receiving more help. These perceptions meant that individuals would stop looking for support as they feared rejection due to their gender identity. Many barriers already exist in the (re)integration process, and what I argue in this work is that gender comes to further complicate this process, by adding another hurdle to each one of these barriers discussed. Knowing that

half of the resources that exist are only for other genders meant that for my participants to find resources, they had to monitor who they sought out these services with, and whether or not they could actually obtain them, even though the service was there and open. Knowing that there were resources that could not be accessed due to their gender identity meant that some of my participants felt overwhelmed and frustrated with this process, adding another overarching barrier to the entire (re)integration process.

Along with this gender segregation in terms of incarceration and (re)integration programming, it is important to recognize the gender segregation that occurs when researching these populations. I argue there are two prominent research methods common in the study of criminalized populations, when referring to gender. The first is that criminalized populations are studied without gender as a form of analysis. In this method, what most commonly occurs is an overwhelming abundance of male participants, creating scholarship that may not be relevant to a large portion of the criminalized population. The second method is that which focuses on gender, and within these studies we often find a heavy focus on female populations. What is problematic in these two methods is the lack of research looking at men's gender identities. Gender, as I have shown throughout this work, affects men just as it affects women, and understanding that men's gender restricts them from resources, employment, and housing, as it does women, is important for analyzing the (re)integration process. The men in this study often discussed how they were expected to perform in certain ways while inside, and out, because they were men, and that they felt that there were more resources available to women than to men. Understanding this can help us to see that gender must not include solely a focus on those who are not male, as men also experience the effects of their gender identity in many aspects of their lives.

The gendering of the (re)integration process is an emerging topic, as many of the

aspects of the (re)integration process have not been studied with this form of analysis as their fulcrum. The effects of gender segregation run deep in the lives of those attempting to (re)integrate to society, as all of the barriers can be made more difficult due to its impacts. Gender segregation adds another layer into the difficult (re)integration process, which exists in terms of the barriers that affect individuals on a daily basis. Understanding that finding food, shelter, clothing, social groups, support groups, training, and work, are all affected by one's gender identity leads to the realization that overcoming the singular barriers to one's (re)integration will not help the process as a whole. As was discussed at the end of Chapter 3, (re)integration is further affected due to the gendered nature of criminal labeling itself. Our understandings of criminal behaviours are gendered, meaning that one is typed/categorized not only as "criminal" but as "female criminal" or "male criminal". Adding this dimension to their identity leads to the closing of different doors, further segregating individuals and problematizing the (re)integration process.

I do not attempt to argue in this work that prisons and programs need all be gender neutral, as there are many cases where segregation is necessary. Many who have suffered abuse in relationships, or who have been sexually assaulted by family members or members of the opposite sex seek places where they can avoid contact with those populations. It is imperative to have safe spaces for those individuals, therefore showing the need for gender specific spaces. At the same time though, the lack of gender-neutral space within the criminal justice system and (re)integration programming further reproduces the effects of gender on (re)integration, making it unnecessarily difficult for those attempting to re-enter society. Gendered identities are something most of us come to have before we are born, and that affect us in numerous ways throughout our lives, and most certainly the (re)integration process is no different. Seeing

though that gender can quite negatively affect one's chances of successful (re)integration leads us to question the existence of largely gender specific programming, and to call for gender neutral programming and spaces, that will challenge these negative effects.

Moving Forward with (Re)integration

Dirk: Do you have any message you would like to give?

Gary: Anywhere possible, find any alternative solution to sending somebody to jail.

The (re)integration process is often one that takes place over many years, and in many cases can take multiple attempts. Meeting with these 14 participants that I have talked about throughout this work was often overwhelming, eye-opening, emotional, and powerful. In these interviews I heard from many individuals who have undergone the (re)integration process, or at least parts of it, multiple times, and who have struggled in many ways to make it outside of prison. These participants focused on many different aspects of both their time inside carceral institutions, and their experiences (re)integrating to life on the outside. For them, many barriers stood in their way, and these barriers came from many sources. Culturally, individuals felt that common perceptions of their labels were negative, confining, and homogenizing. They felt unwelcomed by society, and as though they were being watched, judged, and neglected. This, many claimed, came from the process of incarceration in which one is separated from the rest of society, and where they occupy a segregated, unique space of North American culture. They had to learn new socio-cultural norms and behaviours, and had to live separated from friends, family, and loved one's for extended periods of time. This process has been termed dis-culturation by Goffman (1961), but I argue here that it is instead a new form of enculturation, as one cannot unlearn culture.

Being released, one must undergo another process of enculturation, as they are now a

‘new person’ in the eyes of the populace. They have a new identity – ‘criminal,’ ‘ex-con,’ or ‘past-inmate’ – and must learn the society and culture from this new position. This is an overwhelming task as many struggle to negotiate their new identities with their lives outside, and must find new spaces in which they fit in. This includes learning how to acquire resources, work, and housing as many avenues they could access before incarceration may no longer be open to them. One is therefore (re)integrating, as they are reentering the society/culture they have lived in for many years, but are doing so from new positions/identities. Many of my participants felt that things often felt similar to before they were inside, but that others’ treatment of them was what had changed. This created a process of (re)learning, as they knew their culture and society, but not from their current position as an individual who has been incarcerated or criminalized. Returning to places felt both familiar and not, as the physical spaces were still similar, but the way other’s viewed them was not. The ways in which they perceived and experienced others’ perceptions of them as “criminal” were, for them, the most difficult part of the (re)integration process: they saw so many doors closed or closing once they revealed their status to be formerly incarcerated.

Getting out is both an exciting and overwhelming time in one’s life, as one celebrates freedom, but is also faced with finding food, clothing, housing, social groups, relationships, and employment. In order to help this process then, the transition period must be gradual, with (re)integration planning starting while one is inside. Choosing one’s care, programming, and direction is imperative, as one must (re)learn how to cope outside, and how to support oneself. I have suggested many of the barriers that exist throughout this work, how identity, power, gender, and labeling affect them, and how we can help change this process. These suggestions are informed heavily by my participants, who often agreed to take part in this study if it would

help affect change. As programmers, care providers, family members, voters, policy makers, and members of society, we must recognize how difficult this process is, what makes it difficult, and how these difficulties can be eased in order to support individuals in the ways they would like to be supported, on their own terms, in this overwhelming, long-lasting, difficult process of (re)integration from prison to life after.

***Dirk:** Do you have a message you would like to give?*

***Ashley:** As far as your past goes, glance, don't stare.*

Glossary

Carceral: Referring to a prison or jail. Used in this work to describe spaces inhabited by participants, and to reference those environment's lasting affects on those individuals.

Criminalization: The effect of criminal conviction/incarceration through which one's identity is considered to be of a criminal nature. Has long-standing affects on one's ability to interact in society, as they become stigmatized due to accepted social norms of what it is to be criminal.

Incarceration: Unwilling placement in a jail or prison by the state as a form of punishment for convicted criminal activities. Incarceration may also include being held while awaiting trial for accused criminal activities.

Individualization: The act through which one is considered to be a stand-alone entity and to be responsible for their own circumstances and actions.

(Re)integration: Only relevant in this work in relation to the induction process into incarceration. After incarceration, one is released back into the society they were originally in. This act of re-entering the society is therefore the act of (re)integration, and is used in this work to describe this process.

Responsibilizing: The act through which one is rendered individually responsible for their actions, situations, histories, and/or future decision-making and life-path. This occurs after the actions etc., would have been the responsibility of another state agency or caregiver.

Pastoralism: A form of power used by institutions and/or individuals who seek to guide individuals to 'better lives' through their superior understanding of the individuals' realities, the world around them, and conditions that exist in the society or culture in question. With pastoralism, the individuals must choose to follow, based on the leaders merits.

Maternalism: A form of power in which one takes on a parental role (often motherly) over an individual or group of individuals, in order to provide guidance for them. This is often a more engaged form of help, where the individual's agency is stripped from them, and decisions are made for them, due to a presented superior knowledge of the society/culture in question.

Bibliography

- Abbott, Jack. *In the Belly of the Beast: Letters from Prison*. New York: Random House, 1981.
- Abu-Lughod, Lila. "Do Muslim Women Really Need Saving? Anthropological Reflections on Cultural Relativism and its Others." *American Anthropologist* 104 (2002): 783-790.
- American Correctional Association. "Prerelease/Reintegration." *Corrections Compendium* 25.8 (2000): 7.
- Arauna, Nuria. "Gender Violence and the Representation of Sexual and Affective Relationships: Reflections on Cross-Media Research." *Catalan Journal of Communication & Cultural Studies* 4 (2012): 239-248.
- Balfour, Gillian. "Re-Imagining a Feminist Criminology." *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 48 (5) (2006): 735-752.
- Bernburg, Jon Gunnar, Marvin D. Krohn, and Craig J. Rivera. "Official Labeling, Criminal Embeddedness, and Subsequent Delinquency: A Longitudinal Test of Labeling Theory." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 43 (2006): 67-88.
- Bonta, J., Rugge, T., & Dauvergne, M. "The Reconviction Rate of Federal Offenders." *Ottawa: Solicitor General Canada*, 8 (4) (2003): 1-2.
- Bosworth, Mary and Eamonn Carrabine. "Reassessing Resistance: Race, Gender and Sexuality in Prison." *Punishment and Society* 3 (2001): 501-515.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. "Belief and the Body" in *The Logic of Practice*. Translated by R. Nice, 66-79. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990 [1980].
- Bourgois, Philippe. *In Search of Respect: Selling Crack in El Barrio*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Boyd, Susan C. *From Witches to Crack Moms: Women, Drug Law, and Policy*. Durham: Carolina Academic Press, 2004.
- Brubaker, Rogers and Frederick Cooper. "Beyond 'identity'." *Theory and Society* 29 (2000): 1-47.
- Burke, Peter J., and Jan E. Stets. *Identity theory*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Butler, Judith. *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex."* New York: Routledge, 141

1993.

Ciani, Kyle Emily. ““Problem Girls’: Gendering Criminal Acts and Delinquent Behavior.” *Journal of Women’s History* 9 (1997): 203-214.

Collins, Rebecca L. “Content Analysis of Gender Roles in Media: Where Are We Now and Where Should We Go?” *Sex Roles* 64 (2011): 290-298.

Comack, Elizabeth and Selena Brickey. “Constituting the Violence of Criminalized Women.” *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Justice* 49 (2007): 1-36.

D’Andrade, Amy C. and Melanie Valdez. “Reunifying from Behind Bars: A Quantitative Study of the Relationship Between Parental Incarceration, Service Use, and Foster Care Reunification.” *Social Work in Public Health* 27 (2012): 616-636.

Davis, Celeste, Stephen J. Bahr, and Carol Ward. “The Process of Offender Reintegration: Perceptions of What Helps Prisoners Reenter Society.” *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 13 (2012): 446-469.

Due, Clemence & Riggs, Damien W. “The Terms On Which Child Abuse Is Made To Matter.” *Australian Feminist Studies* 27 (2012): 3-18.

Ekstedt, John W. and Curt T. Griffiths. *Corrections in Canada: Policy and Practice*. Toronto: Butterworth & Co., 1984.

Farmer Paul. “An Anthropology of Structural Violence.” *Current Anthropology* 45 (2004): 305-325.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality: Volume I: An Introduction*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.

Foucault, Michel. “Excerpts from Discipline and Punish.” In *The Foucault Reader*, edited by Paul Rabinow, 170-213. New York: Pantheon, 1984.

Giddens, Anthony. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1984.

Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Random House, 1959.

Goffman, Erving. *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. Chicago: Aldine Pub. Co., 1961.

Goffman, Erving. *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1963.

Greenberg, Rebecca. “Out From Behind Bars: Canadian Ex-Prisoners’ Perspectives on the

Transition from Prison to the Community.” *Verstehen* 6 (2012).
<http://mcgillverstehen2012.weebly.com/out-from-behind-bars-canadian-ex-prisonersrsquo-perspectives-on-the-transition-from-prison-to-the-community.html>.

Greer, Chris and Yvonne Jewkes. “Extremes of Otherness: Media Images of Social Exclusion.” *Social Justice* 32 (2005): 20-31.

Hannah-Moffat, Kelly. *Punishment in Disguise: Penal Governance and Federal Imprisonment of Women in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Harris, Michael. *Con Game: The Truth about Canada’s Prisons*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Ltd., 2003.

Hennessy, Peter H. *Canada’s Big House: The Dark History of the Kingston Penitentiary*. Toronto: Dunden Press, 1999.

Heyes, Cressida. *Line Drawings: Defining Women through Feminist Practice*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000.

Heyes, Cressida. *Self-Transformations: Foucault, Ethics, and Normalized Bodies*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Jacoma, Richard, and Lee Weinstein (eds.). *Prison Voices*. Black Point: John Howard Society/Fernwood Publishing, 2007.

Jackson, Dylan B and Carter Hay. “The Conditional Impact of Official Labeling on Subsequent Delinquency: Considering the Attenuating Role of Family Attachment.” *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 50 (2013): 300-322.

Haeil Jung. “The Long-Term Impact of Incarceration During the Teens and 20s on the Wages and Employment of Men.” *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 0 (2015) 1-21.

Kilty, Jennifer M. “Resisting Confined Identities: Women’s Strategies of Coping in Prison.” PhD diss., Simon Fraser University, 2008.

Kilty, Jennifer M. “‘It’s Like They Don’t Want You to get Better’: Psy Control of Women in the Carceral Context.” *Feminism Psychology* 22 (2012): 162-182.

Laney, Elizabeth K., M. Elizabeth Lewis Hall, Tamara L. Anderson, and Michele M. Willingham. “Becoming a Mother: The Influence of Motherhood on Women's Identity Development.” *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research* 15:2 (2015): 126-145.

Leverentz, Andrea M. “The Love of a Good Man? Romantic Relationships as a Source of Support or Hindrance for Female Ex-Offenders.” *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 43 (2006): 459-488.

- Lewis, Barbara N. "Changes and Variability in Personality Characteristics Among Female Prison Inmates as a Function of Length of Incarceration and Race." PhD diss., University of Florida, 1979.
- Manfredi, Christopher P. "The Day the Dialogue Died: A Comment on *Suave V. Canada*." *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* 45 (2007): 105-123.
- Maschke, Karen J. "Gender in the Prison Setting: The Privacy-Equal Employment Dilemma." *Women and Criminal Justice* 7 (1996): 23-42.
- Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services. "Offender Programs & Services." Last modified March 25, 2015. http://www.mcscs.jus.gov.on.ca/english/corr_serv/adult_off/OffenderProgramsServices/offender_programs.html
- Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services. "Code of Conduct and Professionalism." Last Modified: January 27, 2015. http://www.mcscs.jus.gov.on.ca/english/corr_serv/careers_in_corr/cocap/career_corr_cocap.html
- Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services. "Admission, Classification and Placement of Trans Inmates, and Staff Training – Highlights." Last Modified: January 26, 2015. http://www.mcscs.jus.gov.on.ca/english/corr_serv/PoliciesandGuidelines/CS_trans.html
- Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services. "Inmate Information Guide for Adult Institutions." Last modified December 2014. <http://www.mcscs.jus.gov.on.ca/stellent/groups/public/@mcscs/@www/@com/documents/webasset/ec167925.pdf>
- Moran, Dominique. "Prisoner Reintegration and the Stigma of Prison Time Inscribed on the Body." *Punishment and Society* 14 (2012): 564-583.
- Morris, Ruth. *Crumbling Walls....: Why Prisons Fail*. Oakville: Mosaic Press, 1989.
- Ng, Irene Y. H., Rosemary C. Sarri and Elizabeth Stoffregen. "Intergenerational Incarceration: Risk Factors and Social Exclusion." *Journal of Poverty* 17 (2013): 437-459.
- O'Marra, Alfred J. C. "The Impact of Inquests on the Criminal Justice System in Ontario: A Decade of Change." *Canadian Criminal Law Review* 10 (2006): 237-258.
- Pemberton, Sarah. "Enforcing Gender: The Constitution of Sex and Gender in Prison Regimes." *Signs* 39 (2013): 151-175.
- Pollack, Shoshana. "'I'm Just Not Good in Relationships': Victimization Discourses and the Gendered Regulation of Criminalized Women." *Feminist Criminology* 2 (2007): 158-174.

Pollack, Shoshana. "Labeling Clients 'Risky': Social Work and the Neo-Liberal Welfare State." *British Journal of Social Work* 40 (2010): 1263-1278.

Pollack, Shoshana. "An Imprisoning Gaze: Practices of Gendered, Racialized and Epistemic Violence." *International Review of Victimology* 19 (2012): 103-114.

Rafter, Nicole H. "Gender, Prisons, and Prison History." *Social Science History* 9 (1985): 233-247.

Sangster, Joan. "Criminalizing the Colonized: Ontario Native Women Confront the Criminal Justice System." *The Canadian Historical Review* 80 (1999): 32-60.

Schur, Edwin M. *Labeling Women Deviant: Gender, Stigma, and Social Control*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1984.

Sered, Susan, and Maureen Norton-Hawk. "Whose Higher Power? Criminalized Women Confront the 'Twelve steps'." *Feminist Criminology* 6 (2011): 308-332.

Shantz, Laura, Jennifer M. Kilty, and Sylvie Frigon. "Echoes of Imprisonment: Women's Experiences of 'Successful Reintegration'." *Canadian Journal of Law and Society* 24 (2009): 85-106.

Statistics Canada. "Adult correctional statistics in Canada, 2008/2009." Last modified: 2010-10-26. <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2010003/article/11353-eng.htm>.

Statistics Canada. "Adult correctional statistics in Canada, 2010/2011." Last modified: 2013-05-31. <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2012001/article/11715-eng.htm>.

Statistics Canada. "Adult correctional statistics in Canada, 2013/2014." Last modified: 2015-04-22. <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2015001/article/14163-eng.htm>.

Stets, Jan E., and Peter J. Burke. "Identity Theory and Social Identity Theory." *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63 (2000): 224-237.

Thomas, Virginia and Margarita Azmitia. "Does Class Matter? The Centrality and Meaning of Social Class Identity in Emerging Adulthood." *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research* 14:3 (2014): 195-213.

Toch, Hans. *Living in Prison: The Ecology of Survival*. Lawrenceville: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Trammell, Rebecca. "Symbolic Violence and Prison Wives: Gender Roles and Protective Pairing in Men's Prisons." *The Prison Journal* 9 (2011): 305-324.

Turnbull, Sarah and Kelly Hannah-Moffat. "Under These Conditions: Gender, Parole and the Governance of Reintegration." *The British Journal of Criminology* 49 (2009): 532- 145

Wallace-Capretta, Suzane, Pang, Bessie, and James Bonta. "Predictors of Recidivism among Incarcerated Female Offenders." *The Prison Journal* 75 (1995): 277-294.

War Bonnett, Darcy K., and Deborah Bounds. "Women in Prison Tell It Like It Is." *Off Our Backs* 31 (2001): 9-12.

Weigert, Andrew J. "The Social Production of Identity: Metatheoretical Foundations." *The Sociological Quarterly* 27 (1986): 165-183.

Wyner, Ruth. *From The Inside, Dispatches from a Women's Prison*. London: Aurum Press, 2003.

Wyse, Jessica J. B., David J. Harding, and Jeffrey D. Morenoff. "Romantic Relationships and Criminal Desistance: Pathways and Processes." *Sociological Forum* 29 (2014): 365-385.

Zimbardo, Philip, Craig Haney, W. Curtis Banks, and David Jaffe. "The Stanford Prison Experiment: A Simulation Study of the Psychology of Imprisonment." Stanford University Presentation, Stanford, California, August 1971.