"Clean Body, Clean Mind, Clean Job"

The Role of Penal Voluntary Sector Organizations in Constructing "Good" Carceral Citizens

Kaitlyn Quinn and Erika Canossini[1]

Introduction

Punishment and society is a subfield of research at the intersection of criminology and law and society (Hannah-Moffat and Lynch 119). Scholars in this area are connected by their desire to interpret punishment as a social process and phenomenon (Garland). In the United States, this has dominantly meant reckoning with the realities of mass incarceration. Between 1972 and 2000, the number of people incarcerated in this country rose more than 600 percent (Pettit and Western 151). At 639 prisoners per 100,000 population, the United States has the world's highest incarceration rate (World Prison Brief). At its peak, this amounted to almost 2.3 million people behind bars, to say nothing of the nearly 4.3 million others serving community sentences (Phelps and Ruhland 2–3). Scholars often use the term *mass supervision* to refer to the latter forms of punishment (e.g., probation, parole, electronic monitoring) as well as the continued nature of penal supervision after incarceration (McNeill 11–14)—or as Gwen Robinson et al. put it, forms of "punishment *in* society" (334). The vast majority imprisoned or under other forms of correctional supervision are people of color (Wacquant 96). Consider that one in seventeen white men have a lifetime likelihood of imprisonment compared to one in three Black men and one in six Latinx men (The Sentencing Project). These disparities are similar for women, with one in 111 white women facing a lifetime likelihood of imprisonment compared to one in eighteen Black women and one in forty-five Latinx women (The Sentencing Project). Some scholars have linked these racial disparities to the War on Drugs which disproportionately targeted people of color (e.g., Davis; Nunn).[2] Other schol-

1 Both authors contributed equally to this manuscript.

2 See Pfaff for an account that complicates the primacy granted to the War on Drugs in explanations of mass incarceration.

ars have focused on the continuities between mass incarceration and other racial caste systems like slavery, Jim Crow, and urban ghettos (e.g., Alexander; Wacquant).[3]

Upon release from prison, criminalized individuals must also contend with what Reuben Miller called *the afterlife of mass incarceration*. This phrase highlights mass incarceration's tentacular reach, suggesting that we cannot understand its impacts by only looking at the prison. Instead, we must center the realities and perspectives of those who are "trying to find a place in society after incarceration" (Western xiii). Existing research has demonstrated the lingering challenges incarceration creates for individuals (e.g., Harding et al.; Quinn "Dispositions That Matter"), their families (e.g., Comfort), and communities (e.g., Wacquant). Given the harsh realities individuals experience upon exiting prison, scholars have written about criminalization as cultivating a kind of attenuated citizenship (e.g., Lerman and Weaver; Smiley). Some scholars have even proposed *carceral citizenship* as a unique form of social membership (e.g., Miller and Stuart; Phelps and Ruhland). This view of citizenship eschews strictly legal or political interpretations of belonging in favor of a wider appreciation of how punishment, governance, and exclusion animate the daily lives and experiences of so-called carceral citizens. Accordingly, research on carceral citizenship cannot merely account for the consequences of direct contact between individuals and the criminal justice system (i.e., through police, courts, and prisons). Instead, understanding the "full nature of citizenship in the carceral age" requires explorations of informal and alternative sites of its construction and careful attention to how carceral citizens are disciplined by a "diverse universe of social actors" in their everyday lives after imprisonment (Miller and Stuart 535).

This chapter offers a response to this challenge by exploring the role that the penal voluntary sector (PVS) plays in the construction of carceral citizens. The PVS consists of charitable and non-profit organizations that work with criminalized individuals through prison- and community-based programming (Corcoran 33). Examples include organizations offering employment counseling, spiritual guidance, prison visitation, letter writing, housing support, drug/alcohol treatment, and a variety of soft skills programming. Scholars interested in these organizations have highlighted the role of neoliberalism and welfare state retrenchment in accentuating the longstanding work of volunteers and voluntary organizations in criminal justice contexts (Quinn, "Inside the Penal Voluntary Sector" 162). In the United States, for instance, the number of PVS organizations has tripled in recent years, growing "in tandem with the rise of mass incarceration" (Miller and Purifoye 207). Despite their increasing importance, PVS organizations remain poorly understood (Tomczak and Buck; Quinn et al.), particularly from the vantage point of citizenship.

In this chapter we focus on the (re)integrative roles PVS organizations perform for individuals exiting prison in the United States. We examine how they make

3 See Gottschalk for some limitations of these vantage points.

assessments about what is "wrong" with criminalized individuals, the ideals they encourage criminalized individuals to aspire to, and the practical techniques they rely on to shape criminalized individuals in this image (McKim 3; Quinn and Goodman). Our central argument is that in providing certain kinds of support and advice (and not others), PVS organizations are offering criminalized individuals a pathway to social inclusion as *"good" carceral citizens*. In mobilizing this expression, we seek to highlight the inclusionary aspirations of PVS organizations and simultaneously problematize how they wield these aspirations to discipline and shape criminalized individuals into good carceral citizens.

The rest of this chapter is structured as follows. We summarize the existing research on carceral citizenship and detail our specific contribution to this literature. We introduce our data and methods, describing the PVS organizations we examined and the websites and documents we analyzed. Our analysis unfolds across four sections. The first positions PVS organizations as sites for the construction of good carceral citizenship by examining their widespread use of the term *returning citizens* and the priority they granted to personal transformation. The remaining analysis sections trace a politics of inclusion among these organizations that depended upon former prisoners' pursuit and performance of three *core conditions* of good carceral citizenship: (i) employment, (ii) prosocial emotion management, and (iii) sobriety. We close with a critique of this conceptualization and propose an agenda for future research that may extend this chapter's key findings.

Carceral Citizenship

Broadly speaking, citizenship is understood as membership to a particular political community and its associated responsibilities, rights, and privileges (Kymlicka and Norman). Aligning with this view of citizenship as a legal category, sociologists and criminologists have written about possessing a criminal record as a kind of attenuated citizenship (e.g., Lerman and Weaver) involving losses of freedom (Sykes), voting rights (Manza and Uggen), and access to public funds (Owens and Smith). In addition to these impairments to civil and political citizenship, scholars have argued that possessing a criminal record also affects what Marshall named economic and social citizenship (Sered).[4] For instance, in the American context, participating in the work force and having a home are key markers of citizenship (Sered). However, employment and housing are difficult to attain for individuals with a criminal record (Pager; Kropf). If individuals are without a job or if they are

4 According to T. H. Marshall, the core components of citizenship are civil, political, and economic/social citizenship.

only able to secure temporary occupations, they cannot access citizenship entitlements such as healthcare and retirement benefits. Their ability to purchase goods and services—another core element of citizenship in capitalistic societies—is also limited (Sered). Furthermore, people with criminal records encounter challenges in attaining independence, self-control, and sobriety, which are attributes generally associated with social citizenship in the United States (Glenn "Citizenship and Inequality").

Therefore, when individuals are punished by and processed through the criminal justice system, it is not only their rights that are affected, but also their ability to participate in the public sphere. Criminalized individuals' membership to the community is not fully reinstated once they are released from prison. While they do not become stateless in Arendt's terms (as they still formally belong to the nation's political community), criminalization does "strip and differentiate rights among citizens," even after they serve sentences (Loyd 5). Such denial and disparity of the full rights of citizenship to individuals with felony convictions also impacts their abilities to perform the duties associated with citizenship, that is their engagement with public life (Manza et al.). As rights generally guaranteed and afforded to members of society are disregarded or left unprotected by the state, criminalized individuals' participation in civic, economic, and social life is compromised—a condition referred to as second-class, diminished, or conditional citizenship (Sered; Weaver and Lerman).

However, scholars have recently started to differentiate carceral citizenship from these conceptualizations to emphasize the unique way in which criminalized individuals experience citizenship. For instance, Miller and Stuart defined *carceral citizenship* as "a distinct form of political membership experienced by and enacted upon people" that "begins at the moment of criminal conviction" (533). Unlike second-class or diminished citizenship, carceral citizens are not only subject to restrictions and duties, but they also acquire (perverse) benefits. In fact, besides social exclusion and the collateral consequences of a criminal record, this alternate legal standing provides some unique entitlements such as the rights to food, clothing, and shelter when incarcerated, and added assistance or privileges under "felon friendly" policies while reentering society (Miller and Stuart). It is this mix of restraints, obligations, and entitlements that makes carceral citizens a community with a distinctive social, political, and economic life.

More specifically, Miller and Stuart identified three defining features of carceral citizenship which convey the supposed "essence" of "offenders" to others and lead to their exclusion and vulnerability. First, carceral citizens have a novel relationship with "stabilizing institutions" such as the labor and housing market. Second, they take part in "practices of supervision, corrections and care" which are not open to conventional members of society (e.g., reentry programs, counseling, and probation) (Miller and Stuart 536). Finally, carceral citizens are managed, corrected,

and sanctioned by third parties (such as PVS organizations) both in their private and public lives. Whereas these three features constitute a distinct community, the collective experiences of carceral citizens should not be understood as monolithic (Smith and Kinzel). Individuals' intersecting identities such as race and gender (Loyd; Miller and Stuart) and different types of convictions (Smith and Kinzel) also interact with this alternate legal status.

Over the last few decades, scholars have spent considerable time untangling how mass incarceration has worked as a "crucial mechanism for constructing, diminishing and enforcing citizenship in the United States" (Sered 1; Alexander; Bosworth et al.). However, the literature examining citizenship in relation to mass supervision is limited (Uggen et al.; Miller and Stuart). More research is necessary to fully grasp the relationship between carceral citizenship and mass supervision, including how and where this type of citizenship is constructed and with what consequences for criminalized people. To do so, we argue that it is necessary to follow recent sociological theorizations of citizenship that go beyond citizenship as a fixed legal status to emphasize its fluidity. In particular, it is important to explore how "citizenship is produced through everyday practices and struggles" (Glenn, "Constructing Citizenship" 1). While citizenship continues to describe the relationship between the state and citizens, it also encompasses the relationship between citizens and the community. In other words, recognition by other members of the community (or *translation* as Miller and Stuart called it) also matters as it is through this process that the boundaries of citizenship are established (Glenn "Constructing Citizenship"). By granting or denying recognition, community members mark who is entitled to receive civil, political, and social rights. Therefore, citizenship is also a matter of belonging (Glenn "Constructing Citizenship").

Since PVS organizations work with individuals reentering society, who are reacquiring their full membership to the nation state, they constitute ideal sites to explore carceral citizenship. By assisting individuals in this phase of their lives, these organizations take part in local practices that recognize or deny citizenship status and its attributes to this population. In doing so, they act as intermediaries between returning citizens and the state (and its institutions), but also between carceral citizens and the community. PVS organizations, therefore, are located in a unique position—in locales where citizenship is built in practice (substantive citizenship) and in theory (formal citizenship).

Data & Methods

In this chapter we examined the complete public websites of twenty PVS organizations in the United States, including their organizational missions, descriptions of programming, client testimonials, and any documents that were downloadable

from their websites. The organizations included were purposively sampled to differ across key dimensions of organizational variability: size, funding, geographic location, services offered, population served, and religious affiliation. Website links for each organization are provided in the works cited.

We approached our analysis with the goal of understanding how terms such as *citizen* or *citizenship* were used by PVS organizations and what kinds of discourses they were most often coupled with. We conducted qualitative coding collaboratively, each analyzing a subset of websites from our sample and meeting multiple times to discuss our results and broader readings of the data set. We found that when citizenship was invoked, it was dominantly coupled with discourses of criminalized individuals' employment, prosocial emotion management, and sobriety. In the sections that follow, we frame these themes as different facets of an overarching transformation: the construction of good carceral citizens.

As our sample is not representative, our aim is not to offer a set of generalizable findings, but rather to initiate a dialogue about carceral citizenship within PVS research. We hope that our findings will act as a set of *orienting statements* that may encourage other scholars to consider PVS organizations as theoretically important and empirically rich sites for investigating carceral citizenship (Goldstone 50).

PVS Organizations as Sites for the Construction of Good Carceral Citizenship

For many PVS organizations, helping former prisoners attain and embody the ideals of good citizenship was the goal of their rehabilitative interventions. Consider that at LUCK the stated goal of a new transitional housing facility was to help criminalized individuals "to be actual citizens." Across organizations, criminalized individuals accessing services were commonly referred to as "returning citizens." Women at the Well-Broward explained the importance of this term:

> The terms "ex-convict" or "ex-offender" emphasizes what they've done and hangs it around their neck as a millstone … On the other hand, the language of "returning citizen" provides hope and honors both their humanity and their capacity to contribute to a flourishing society …Yet, on an even deeper level it honors their humanity by reminding them that they are not defined by past actions, rather we expect them to contribute as one citizen among many.

These organizations were aware that language mattered. By referring to their clients as citizens, PVS organizations challenged and reframed dominant justice discourses that sustained discriminatory practices towards the population they served. They deliberately chose to redefine their clients' identity as ordinary members of soci-

ety. While the language of citizenship is more inclusive, it also brings a body of assumptions about human actions and social life. PVS organizations were aware of the expectations associated with the designation of citizen, and made clear that their clients needed to follow them to reacquire this status. Most notably, criminalized individuals must work to change their life trajectories and, by extension, themselves. Fortune Society, for instance, suggested that their goal was to create "individuals who fit the description [of] deeply changed." Resonance underscored the permanence of the required transformation, explaining "it is our goal to help troubled women change … for good." Timelist even went so far as to call one of their programs "The Change Academy."

PVS organizations invoked a variety of metaphors to describe this transformation and their role as facilitators. For example, The Center for Women in Transition sought to help their clients "reimagine who they are." One Touch Ministry suggested that they helped criminalized individuals "make a u-turn" in their lives. Project Return underscored the contrast between criminalized individuals' lives before and after their organization's intervention: "We all know a 180 when we see one. Those transformations that literally mean going in the opposite direction, that figuratively mean you have turned your life around. From night to day, from a season of decline to a season of hope and opportunity." Project Return also made connections between criminalized individuals' transformation and the kinds of belonging and community recognition that are central to citizenship: "When we finally get it right, when we finally manage to overcome our own patterns of failure or misbehavior, we begin to build from the ground up our new-found credibility and standing in whatever community we're in. No longer errant (in whatever way we were previously errant), we bring our better selves to the world."

Criminalized people agreed that PVS intervention was central to their transformation. For instance, Barry Campbell of Fortune Society offered the following testimony: "I tell people all the time this [organization] is where I grew up, this is where I learned what being a man means, and what being a productive citizen means." Aaron Cobos explained of his time at Homeboy Industries, "when I came here, I was a raw piece of metal and through the process of working on myself and getting to know myself now I'm a shiny new part."

The benefits of personal transformation were also underscored at the community level. As One Touch Ministry explained, "making a difference in the life of one returning citizen will not only affect that individual but will have a ripple effect that resounds positively throughout our community." New Jersey Reentry Corporation agreed, claiming that "we need to think of the reentry population as an economic asset to their larger communities—helping them gain employment adds to their communities' economic growth and cultivates the pool of human talent." Fortune Society also noted that the change they seek to encourage "can enhance the lives of individ-

uals and, at the same time, improve their families, the institutions with which they interact, and the communities in which they live."

Not any type of change was acceptable at PVS organizations. Instead, they sought to cultivate a specific type of transformation (Quinn and Goodman). For instance, Project Return explained that they "work with folks who *want to live right*." Across the next three sections we examine what this declaration means in practice. While there is tremendous variation in PVS organizations' visions of transformation, rehabilitation, and belonging (see: Kaufman; Tomczak and Buck), in this chapter we prioritize the *core conditions* of good carceral citizenship. By core conditions, we mean the characteristics that comprise the essence of this designation and without which we could make no claim to observe good carceral citizenship (Buck 144). Our findings show that PVS organizations were collectively committed to constructing good carceral citizens who satisfied the core conditions of: (i) employment, (ii) "prosocial" management of their emotions, and (iii) sobriety. Together, these characteristics comprised what One Touch Ministry called "the intangible responsibilities associated with being productive members of the community."

A Productive Responsible Citizen: Securing a Job 101

Among the many services offered to returning citizens by PVS organizations, assistance in securing employment was the most pervasive. This focus reflected the central role bestowed upon work in the successful return of criminalized individuals to society. As Project Return stated, "a job is the key that opens the door to a new life." Similarly, New Jersey Reentry Corporation maintained that "securing gainful employment as quickly as possible following release dramatically increases the odds of successful reentry" and, therefore, services offered in this area are considered "essential tools for effective reintegration." Prison Fellowship explained that "when returning citizens can't find work, they're unable to meet their parole and probation requirements and can end up returning to prison."

Whereas PVS organizations framed employment as a necessary condition to succeed at a second chance in life, returning citizens often exhibit difficulty in securing a job. In addition to limited education, work experience, and skills, their criminal past makes their search a hurdle. Criminal record checks are increasingly part of the hiring process and, as audit studies have demonstrated, employers often discriminate against people with criminal histories (Pager). Many states also impose statutory bans on people with convictions in fields such as nursing, childcare and home health care—service jobs where women, and particularly women of color, are concentrated (Restoration of Rights Project). Chances to secure employment are even lower for people of color who are also subject to racial discrimination. Together

these features result in under or unemployment for returning citizens (Western et al.).

Aware of these difficulties in finding an occupation, PVS organizations offered two types of support: programs targeting specific careers and/or training in soft skills. Certifications for blue collar occupations in construction, hospitality, transportation, and mechanics were regularly offered, but newer fields such as solar technology were also targeted. In some cases, training was paired with partnerships or apprenticeships with businesses to allow individuals to acquire hands-on experience before seeking employment. Soft skills programs taught individuals how to succeed on the job market through workshops and instructional content in resume writing, job interviews, team building, email etiquette, and emotional intelligence.

While offering these important services, PVS organizations also sought to shape criminalized people into successful or model returning citizens. As part of their job readiness training, these organizations instructed their clients how to behave and present themselves as ideal job applicants—this is what Halushka referred to as "the curriculum of work wisdom" (76). For example, Fortune Society explained the "the art of handshaking" in 10 detailed steps "to make the right first impression" in a handout called "Handshake and a Smile 101." Examples included advising their clients to "pump your hand only 2–3 times" and "avoid offering a fish hand." As these instructions illustrate, returning citizens were encouraged to perform a specific version of themselves to guard against negative stereotypes during the hiring process and to match employers' expectations of responsible workers (Halushka). The gendered dimensions of this performance were made plain when this handout instructed: "Forget lady fingers … in business settings you are an equal, not a 'lady.'" For Fortune Society, the performance of a model citizen and worker was also a hegemonically masculine one.

PVS organizations also constructed the model returning citizen through their program descriptions and client success stories. Individuals were expected to become "productive" and "working members of society." Employment was positioned in contrast to criminal behaviors as it was believed to give structure to life and, in doing so, limit the time available to commit crimes. As a past client, Alexzander Calderon, narrated, "I've never held a job before. All I've ever done was criminal activity—that was my revenue. Moving forward, the experience I'm getting while working in Merchandise will be vital to put on a resume." Women at the Well-Broward advanced a similar view on employment: "Making a livable wage is critical to ensuring that temptations to resume unhealthy relationships for financial reasons or engaging in unhealthy or illegal behaviors to earn income are minimized."

Employment was not only framed as crucial to gain lawful income, but also as a key step towards independence. Through employment, individuals became able to address key needs such as housing and healthcare, as well as support their families. Narratives emphasized how, after years of relying on the prison system,

welfare, substances, or abusive partners, successful clients were now "self-sufficient" and "self-sustaining." Encouraging individuals to be independent was among the primary goals of PVS organizations. For instance, the mission of Community Solutions was "to promote the independence, responsible citizenship and well-being of individuals and families." As one of its representatives stated, "we need to successfully transition offenders from the prison rolls to the tax rolls." Similarly, Resonance's object was "helping women become productive tax-paying citizens." PVS organizations, therefore, emphasized returning citizens' productivity, independence, and contribution to the economy through tax paying—all of which are central markers and duties of neoliberal subjects and citizens. These findings speak to Gurusami's concept of *rehabilitation labor* (434), which highlighted how the combination of carceral threat and welfare discipline works to govern and transform "criminals" into "workers." However, our chapter broadens Gurusami's focus, envisioning employment as just one of the core conditions of good carceral citizens.

Whereas employment was positioned as a necessary condition for a full and free life and an expectation for model returning citizens, not all PVS organizations considered any job an accomplishment. In a video, Project Return stated, "no work is insignificant. All labor that uplifts humanity has dignity and importance and should be undertaken with painstaking excellence." However, most testimonies and success stories across organizations suggested the opposite. Individuals were not praised for finding a job, but for securing full-time, stable, and meaningful employment that also allowed them to grow. Essentially, according to most PVS organizations, a regular entry level position was not the goal, a career was. Women at the Well-Broward affirmed that their clients should aim for "a higher paying job and do more than just get by day-to-day" because "it is impossible to support oneself and a family on a minimum-wage job." The ambition and goal of a career was also emphasized through a picture posted on their program offerings' webpage. Here, an image of women in prison jumpsuits faded into a picture of a business woman on the phone wearing a suit and pumps while carrying hand-luggage. Underlying these narratives, therefore, was a sense that returning citizens should aspire to and search for a specific type of employment.

PVS organizations' discourses of employment also revealed their gendered dynamics. The blue-collar occupations generally framed as attainable and valid occupations for male clients, were not so for women. Aware that the traditional labor market can be discriminatory and inaccessible to many women with a criminal record, PVS organizations had to become more creative in the types of jobs they encouraged women to aspire to. As Women at the Well-Broward explained, "necessity entrepreneurship" is a "form of self-employment where entrepreneurship is an essential option and often the most expedient way to earn a living" for returning citizens. As Joanna's story exemplified, her criminal past hindered her chances of a career in the traditional workforce:

> After working for a few businesses, Joanna realized her background prevent[ed] her from advancing in the companies. She found talking about her criminal record or the previous incarceration was a taboo topic, so she decided to take the entrepreneur route…Her experience in prison and her transition back home led her to turn her crochet passion into a business—Divine Designz Crochet Shoppe! Two years later she owns 2 businesses and co-own[s] a 3rd business. Joanna is living on her own with her 2 sons and is a productive citizen. She has her eyes set on a very bright future. (Women at the Well-Broward)

PVS organizations often framed self-employment as a pathway to independence and empowerment for criminalized women, with the added benefit of not requiring them to disclose their criminal past to their employers. Some of the small businesses featured on PVS organizations' websites were even empowerment themed. For example, Ladies of Hope Ministries explained how one of their residents, Dee, was "in the process of creating her own T-shirt line called Wear How You Feel that designs and sells T-shirts with positive affirmations."

Across *therapunitive* settings (Carlen and Tombs 339), like PVS organizations, this kind of empowerment talk was often blended with critiques of criminalized women as weak, unstable, and "dependent on outside sources of fulfillment and validation which can include drugs, men, children, and even the street lifestyle" (McKim 53). Under this logic, by empowering women, PVS organizations were also offering them a way out of crime. Yet, possible barriers to self-employment were rarely mentioned. Self-employment requires tremendous assets, support, and effort that are not always readily available to returning citizens. Moreover, starting a business may not quickly (or ever) result in the kind of stable or livable income that was showcased in the "success stories" offered on PVS organizations' websites. Pollack offered a similar critique of empowerment talk, arguing that in its implicit diagnosis that a "lack of self-esteem lies behind social problems," it "decontextualizes women from the social and political parameters of their lives" (78–9).

Among the alternative career pathways proposed by PVS organizations were also becoming a reentry coach, a speaker, and a mentor (Timelist). For instance, Ladies of Hope Ministries developed a "first-of-its-kind training program to prepare women and girls to be professional public speakers." This training allocated resources to women to change the narrative about the systems of oppression impacting their lives, while also providing them with a "platform (and entrepreneurial pathway) to tell their stories and support themselves after incarceration." Scholars often refer to criminalized individuals who choose these career pathways as *peer mentors* (Buck), *wounded healers*, or *professional exes* (LeBel et al.). In contrast to the barriers crimi-

nal records often create for employment (Pager), lived experience of incarceration is seen as a valuable credential in these professions.[5]

PVS organizations' narratives also highlighted excellence. Testimonies and client stories emphasized returning citizens' ability to secure promotions and pay raises in short time frames, even though we know that this population often encounters difficulties securing employment and discrimination on the job. For instance, on their blog, Project Return featured Amanda's achievements: "Amanda has been the picture of post-prison success. Released from prison more than a year ago, she came straight to Project Return and put all of our programs and services to her best advantage, propelling herself into a manufacturing job, gaining a promotion with that employer, and then enrolling in community college." While it is expected that PVS organizations highlight their clients' success stories, other skills or qualities such as effort or perseverance could have also been underlined. Instead, these narratives of success upheld returning citizens to (often unattainably) high standards. Returning citizens were expected to go beyond securing a job, they needed to excel at it. As Jon Ponder, the President and CEO of Hope for Prisoners stated, "our goal is to make sure that they are soaring like superstars." The expectations placed upon returning citizens were incredibly high given that they were not only asked to excel for themselves, but also as good ambassadors of criminalized individuals more generally. As Ponder explained, "When you hire someone from Hope for Prisoners, you're not just hiring them … their success within those businesses are gonna open up the doors for the next folks that are gonna be coming through." In the next section, we turn to how PVS organizations' discourses surrounding emotion management also work to craft the image of the good carceral citizen.

"Prosocial" Emotion Management: Correcting Feelings during Reentry

Discussions of prosocial behaviors, attitudes, and attachments originated in the life-course criminological tradition which has sought to understand why most people age out of crime. Pathways out of crime are often explained by what scholars call *turning points* (Laub and Sampson 301), like obtaining a well-paying job, getting married, having children, or going to university. These events discourage criminality, and thus are characterized as prosocial. We use scare quotes in this section's subtitle in recognition of how this term is used to enforce a particular standard of behavior that ignores structural inequalities and cultural differences. Behaviors deemed prosocial are not only those discouraging of criminality, but also those that align with white, ostensibly middle-class, heterosexual American

5 For problems and limitations of these employment opportunities see Buck.

culture. The norms associated with dominant culture also determine the forms of emotional expression deemed acceptable (Stearns and Stearns 813). The emotions of dominant groups are normalized whereas those of subordinate groups are viewed as aberrant, treated with suspicion, and in need of correction. In this section, we explore how PVS organizations encouraged criminalized individuals to manage their emotions in prosocial ways to align with the norms of dominant culture and fulfil the expectations associated with good carceral citizenship.

PVS organizations often framed criminalized individuals' emotions, especially their "inappropriate" management, as the root of their criminal justice involvement. Criminalized individuals were dominantly characterized by these organizations as suffering at the intersections of past traumas and hardships. As Reaching Out from Within explained:

> The cruelty we are subjected to throughout our lives shapes and molds us, creating adverse feelings such as loneliness, hatred, insecurity and anger. In order to deal with these feelings, we form defense mechanisms such as, fighting, using drugs/alcohol, becoming anti-social and even using humor; however, these defense mechanisms have consequences: incarceration, misery, lack of trust and unhealthy relationships.

LUCK advanced a similar perspective. In a video testimony, one of their co-founders explained his own incarceration as originating in the way he was managing his emotions: "Hurt people hurt people. I was never able to process or deal with the hurt I was receiving. I was trying to figure out how to survive and sometimes that survival comes by inappropriate means."

Emotions were not only seen as initial risk-factors for criminalization, but also as continual threats to individuals' successful inclusion in the community. For example, Fortune Society suggested that particular emotions can be a "barrier to reintegration." Prison Fellowship explained that different stages of the reentry transition are paired with unique emotional challenges. When individuals are first released, they experience "fear, anxiety, excitement, and expectation, all mixed together … To put it simply, they're overwhelmed." As time goes on, a different set of emotions takes center stage—and with it a new set of potential risks: "In the first three months, as the newness of freedom wears off, loneliness will be your enemy. The isolation you feel will tempt you to form relationships with people who don't share your values—and that can signal trouble" (Prison Fellowship). Underlying these declarations was the sense that there was a "correct" way for good carceral citizens to manage their emotions. For example, at New Beginnings, programming was designed to help clients "express [their] feelings appropriately." Or, at Resonance, a past client praised this organization for teaching them "how to talk about [their] true feelings, how to express them in the right way."

PVS organizations often framed their programming as offering a plan or template for criminalized individuals to learn prosocial ways of managing their emotions. The Center for Women in Transition claimed that without their intervention, many women would "lack the necessary resources to cope with trauma in healthy ways—like seeking professional care—and instead might turn to drugs or alcohol." Community Solutions offered multiple programs "designed to change maladaptive emotional reactions." One program used cognitive behavioral therapy to "address the emotional element of aggression." Reaching Out from Within explained how they help clients manage their emotions down to the cellular level:

> Simply to experience powerful emotions in the presence of others…without acting out or triggering a crisis or collapsing into helplessness is powerful for re-patterning and rewiring the brain. Slowly, over time, it re-regulates the participants' brain patterns, their emotional responses, which in turn re-regulates behavior … The inmates slowly become different on the inside … They learn to "sit with," or be present with their painful powerful emotions without acting out, blowing up or imploding.

In helping criminalized individuals manage their emotions in prosocial ways, PVS organizations believed they were also offering them a pathway for success in other domains, such as obtaining gainful employment, securing safe housing, and furthering their education—all of which are markers of citizenship.

PVS organizations' understanding of emotion management was a gendered process.[6] For women, the "right" way of expressing their emotions was finding and expressing their voices—taking an active and empowered role as an advocate in their own lives. Homeboy Industries, for example, quoted a past client who explained: "One thing we need to learn as women is that being emotional is not a weakness, but a strength. We need to learn to use our voices and take care of ourselves." Resonance characterized one of their clients as positively transforming from "timid and shy" to "an empowered woman through [their] program." New Beginnings explained that "expressing one's inner voice can guide formerly incarcerated females to work comprehensively on their emotional instabilities." For men, by contrast, emotion management was often framed as a process of learning how "to control their responses during anger-provoking situations" (Man2Man). LUCK, for instance, worked to disrupt the notion that "violence and aggression are the tools to resolve conflict" and instead offered men advice on how "to resolve conflict

6 Emotion management is also racialized. The range of "acceptable" emotions is circumscribed for people of color, as the harmful trope of the Angry Black Woman illustrates (Jones and Norwood 2045–51). We do not have the data to explore this relationship, but future research may wish to examine how race and gender together inform the types of support and advice PVS organizations offer to criminalized individuals.

peacefully." Co-founder Mario Bueno explained that men's aggression and violence "must be diluted" through appropriate organizational programming. In another example, Fortune Society provided specific instructions on how men could avoid being perceived as aggressive when initiating a handshake: "Extending your hand without a voice greeting may make you appear nervous or overly aggressive … Do not use a forceful grip. A handshake should be a friendly or respectful gesture, not a show of physical strength." In the next section, we turn to PVS organizations' discourses surrounding sobriety and the connections we noted between sobriety and citizenship.

Supporting and Monitoring Sobriety

Standing alongside PVS organizations' discussions of employment and emotion management was the expectation that criminalized individuals commit to sobriety. Addiction to drugs and alcohol (and sometimes gambling) were framed as poor coping mechanisms. Consider the following client story from Resonance:

> [Victoria] had trouble dealing with her mother's death, and her drug usage spiraled out of control. When her roommate sold drugs to an undercover police officer, both women were arrested and Victoria went to prison … She has worked closely with her therapist and other program staff to cope with the past trauma of losing her mother, and to understand how some of these feelings led to her addiction.

Homeboy Industries similarly suggested that "substances are a way of coping with the pain of gang involvement, homelessness, and mental health issues." Though PVS organizations often recognized the structural nature of criminalized individuals' traumas (e.g., income inequality, racism, patriarchy) and the addictions that followed, the solutions they proposed were almost entirely individualized. As Timelist described, "we firmly believe that we have the will and power to beat addiction of all kinds." This organization envisioned themselves as "play[ing] a key role in helping individuals learn the true meaning of personal responsibility." At Ladies of Hope Ministries, Cass Severe explained, "you have to come home and help yourself." Hope for Prisoners put their philosophy simply: "Change is an inside job." This individualized focus was also reflected in this organization's core values: integrity, accountability, motivation, honor, optimism, perseverance, and excellence.

Addiction, or "the drugs lifestyle" as it is sometimes called (Kaye 210), was positioned by PVS organizations as the antithesis of good carceral citizenship. These organizations frequently invoked a binary opposition between addiction and being accountable, responsible, and living what Fortune Society called a "purposeful life."

For instance, Resonance claimed that "many women who have been challenged by the criminal justice system may find substance abuse getting in the way of them meeting their full potential as happy, responsible individuals." This organization saw their role as guiding criminalized women "to achieve and maintain total abstinence from drugs and/or alcohol as part of a more satisfying, productive, and law-abiding lifestyle." PVS organizations also drew connections between sobriety and employment. New Jersey Reentry Corporation, for example, offered the following mantra: "Clean Body, Clean Mind, Clean Job." This organization also suggested that a commitment to sobriety may help criminalized individuals overcome the stigma potential employers may associate with their criminal record: "Evidence that [drug] treatment is in place can be determinative for a tentative employer." These declarations map onto the discourses Kaye uncovered in American drug courts, wherein "the drug addict [was] constituted as an 'anti-citizen,' a person whose drug dependency [was] symbolically related to non-productive labor, a leaching of state resources, and criminality" (214). By contrast, "eliminating the drugs lifestyle [was] sometimes said to produce NORPs: Normal, Ordinary, Responsible Persons" (Kaye 214).

Though PVS organizations often highlighted their roles in helping, encouraging, or supporting criminalized individuals, when they spoke about sobriety their punitive or disciplinary roles were prominently on display. Some of the organizations we examined participated in criminal justice diversion programs wherein a rigorous program of addiction counselling was offered as an alternative to incarceration. This meant that participation was not voluntary but *coerced* (Maguire et al. 434–37). If clients' participation in these programs was deemed unsatisfactory, the courts may recommend imprisonment instead. Illustrating this threat, Resonance warned participants that if they did not choose to pursue "a productive, responsible life" they must reckon with the consequences of their substance abuse (incarceration): "For some, Resonance will be their first hope to make a permanent change to a life without drugs or alcohol. For others, Resonance will be their final opportunity to choose a productive, responsible life over substance abuse and its consequences."

Because participation in addiction counselling was often court-ordered, PVS organizations were held responsible for monitoring their clients' compliance. This was often through random, mandatory drug testing. Hope For Prisoners, for example, stated that "incoming clients must submit to a drug test as part of the enrollment process." Community Solutions noted that their staff made use of random breathalyzer or urinalysis tests. The results of these tests and other assessments of clients' progress could be shared with other criminal justice actors. For instance, Fortune Society explained that they provided "periodic updates to the court." These findings complement Salole's research on how PVS organizations work *in tandem* with the criminal justice system to trigger further punishment. If clients are not meeting expectations of their rehabilitation, PVS staff may, in self-professed "acts of care," report noncompliance to police, courts, and probation officers who can use these

assessments to justify further sanctions (Salole 305). Flores observed a similar phenomenon in his research on youth rehabilitation. In coining the term *wraparound incarceration*, he demonstrated how the drug, alcohol, and academic support offered to criminalized girls multiplied and diversified opportunities for their criminalization because of constant monitoring by program staff. Following Salole and Flores' work, we see similar opportunities for PVS organizations to directly—rather than merely discursively—intervene in the domains of punishment and citizenship. By reporting clients' progress and program compliance to the courts, police, or probation officers, PVS organizations may trigger a process of formal criminal justice sanctioning (i.e., a criminal record) and in so doing, become part of the very apparatus that "stamps" individuals as carceral citizens.[7]

Conclusion

In this chapter, we explored PVS organizations as important sites for the construction of carceral citizenship. Our research broadened scholars' existing focus on what these organizations are and do to include what they are striving for—the ideals that animate their everyday work with criminalized individuals. Our analysis revealed that they collectively prized employment, prosocial emotion management, and sobriety. Together, these qualities were seen as prerequisites for social inclusion: the core conditions of good carceral citizenship. In offering particular kinds of support and advice (and not others), PVS organizations were actively intervening in how criminalized individuals approached their lives after incarceration (Quinn and Goodman). Aligning with this assertion, Mijs suggested that PVS organizations offer criminalized individuals a *road to reentry* as they navigate the complexities of exiting prison. Our chapter builds on Mijs' contribution by demonstrating how the particular road these organizations encourage criminalized individuals to take is informed by their understandings of, and aspirations for, good carceral citizenship. The road to reentry, then, is not only the support and advice PVS organizations offer returning citizens, but also their promise of a certain type of social inclusion (or at least its possibility).

By extending the language of citizenship to their clients, PVS organizations emphasized their formal membership to society. They purposefully expanded the boundaries of democratic inclusion to facilitate criminalized individuals' civic, economic, and social integration. In doing so, these organizations acted as a site

7 PVS organizations are required to report outcomes for programs that act as alternatives to incarceration. Though partnerships with the criminal justice system are contested, funding realities often make these relationships (and the punitive practices they entail) financial necessities (Maguire et al.).

of resistance to the exclusionary practices of the carceral state and offered tangible, sometimes life-altering, help to criminalized individuals in the process. Yet, they also governed, disciplined, and responsibilized their clients in the process of helping them (see also: Phelps and Ruhland). As scholars of citizenship have underscored, citizenship does not only have positive connotations, it also includes "disciplinary possibilities" and a "cultural process of subjectification" (Lister 4). We observed both in PVS organizations' narratives and practices. The road to social inclusion that PVS organizations advanced was narrow and the expectations of good carceral citizens were rigid. These organizations enforced a particular standard of behavior that was premised upon individual excellence in the private and public spheres, and often ignored the formidable barriers and structural inequalities criminalized individuals faced upon their release. As a result, we close this chapter with reservations about the end point of this road and, by extension, the limits of the type of personal transformation advocated for by PVS organizations. No matter how well criminalized individuals may satisfy the core conditions of good carceral citizenship, real barriers to their civic and political inclusion remain. Even good carceral citizens are not free of their criminal records and the legal restrictions, stigma, and disenfranchisement that follow. Full and unencumbered citizenship for criminalized individuals will ultimately require modifications to macro-level systems that PVS organizations and individualized practice can scarcely accomplish alone.

Future research may wish to explore points of connectivity and/or contestation between the individualized approach to social inclusion documented in this chapter and the work of actors and organizations who seek to restore citizenship through structural change (e.g., pursuing legal reform, criminal record suspensions, penal abolitionism). Other scholars may wish to determine how the discourses of good carceral citizenship documented in this chapter inform actual practice using ethnographic methods or interviews with PVS staff and clients. These methods may offer greater insight into how the types of belonging advocated for on PVS organizations' websites may be differentially applied to and experienced by criminalized individuals occupying various identity categories (e.g., race, gender, social class, ability, sexuality) and possessing different types of criminal records (e.g., misdemeanors, felonies, crimes for which public registration is required). As Smith and Kinzel explain, "some formerly incarcerated people face more stigma and resistance than others based on their overlapping identities" and as a result the efforts of PVS organizations "may liberate some but also maintain the repression of others" (99–100). Pursuing this line of research might also reveal how any attenuation of citizenship in one sphere could lead to or amplify citizenship diminishment processes in other spheres (both in terms of status and participation), affecting civil, political, economic, and social life.

Works Cited

Alexander, Michelle. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. The New Press, 2010.

Arms Around You. https://www.armsaroundyou.org/. Accessed 10 May 2021.

Bosworth, Mary, et al. "Punishment, Citizenship and Identity: An Introduction." *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, vol. 16, no. 3, 2016, pp. 257–66.

Buck, Gillian. *Peer Mentoring in Criminal Justice*. Routledge, 2020.

Carlen, Pat, and Jacqueline Tombs. "Reconfigurations of Penality: The Ongoing Case of the Women's Imprisonment and Reintegration Industries." *Theoretical Criminology*, vol. 10, no. 3, 2006, pp. 337–60.

Comfort, Megan. *Doing Time Together: Love and Family in the Shadow of the Prison*. U of Chicago P, 2007.

Community Solutions. https://www.csi-online.org/. Accessed 10 May 2021

Corcoran, Mary. "Dilemmas of Institutionalization in the Penal Voluntary Sector." *Critical Social Policy*, vol. 31, no. 1, 2011, pp. 30–52.

Davis, LaJuana. "Rock, Powder, Sentencing—Making Disparate Impact Evidence Relevant in Crack Cocaine Sentencing." *Journal of Gender, Race and Justice*, vol. 14, no. 2, 2011, pp. 375–404.

Flores, Jerry. *Caught Up: Girls, Surveillance, and Wraparound Incarceration*. U of California P, 2016.

Fortune Society. fortunesociety.org/. Accessed 10 May 2021.

Freedom Project. freedomprojectwa.org/. Accessed 10 May 2021.

Garland, David. *Punishment and Modern Society: A Study in Social Theory*. U of Chicago P, 1990.

Glenn, Evelyn N. "Citizenship and Inequality: Historical and Global Perspectives." *Social Problems*, vol. 47, no. 1, 2000, pp. 1–20.

—. "Constructing Citizenship: Exclusion, Subordination, and Resistance." *American Sociological Review*, vol. 76, no. 1, 2011, pp. 1–24.

Goldstone, Jack A. "Response: Reasoning About History, Sociologically…" *Sociological Methodology*, vol. 34, no. 1, 2004, pp. 35–61.

Gottschalk, Marie. *The Prison and the Gallows: The Politics of Mass Incarceration in America*. Cambridge UP, 2006.

Gurusami, Susila. "Working for Redemption: Formerly Incarcerated Black Women and Punishment in the Labor Market." *Gender & Society*, vol. 31, no. 4, 2017, pp. 433–56.

Halushka, John. "Work Wisdom: Teaching Former Prisoners How to Negotiate Workplace Interactions and Perform a Rehabilitated Self." *Ethnography*, vol. 17, no. 1, 2016, pp. 72–91.

Hannah-Moffat, Kelly, and Mona Lynch. "Theorizing Punishment's Boundaries: An Introduction." *Theoretical Criminology*, vol. 16, no. 2, 2018, pp. 119–21.

Harding, David J., et al. *On the Outside: Prisoner Reentry and Reintegration*. U of Chicago P, 2019.

Homeboy Industries. homeboyindustries.org/. Accessed 10 May 2021

Hope for Prisoners. hopeforprisoners.org/our-blog/. Accessed 10 May 2021.

Jones, Trina, and Kimberly J. Norwood. "Aggressive Encounters & White Fragility: Deconstructing the Trope of the Angry Black Woman." *Iowa Law Review*, vol. 102, no. 5, 2017, pp. 2017–69.

Kaufman, Nicole. "Prisoner Incorporation: The Work of the State and Non-Governmental Organizations." *Theoretical Criminology*, vol. 19, no. 4, 2015, pp. 534–53.

Kaye, Kerwin. "Rehabilitating the 'Drugs Lifestyle': Criminal Justice, Social Control, and the Cultivation of Agency." *Ethnography*, vol. 14, no. 2, 2012, pp. 207–32.

Kymlicka, Will, and Wayne Norman. "Return of the Citizen: A Survey of Recent Wo rk on Citizenship Theory." *Ethics*, vol. 104, no. 2, 1994, pp. 352–81.

Kropf, Jesse. "Keeping 'Them' Out: Criminal Record Screening, Public Housing, and the Fight Against Racial Caste." *Georgetown Journal of Law & Modern Critical Race Perspectives*, vol. 4, 2012, pp. 75–99.

Ladies of Hope Ministries (LOHM). thelohm.org/. Accessed 10 May 2021.

Laub, John H., and Robert J. Sampson. "Turning Points in the Life Course: Why Change Matters to the Study of Crime." *Criminology*, vol. 31, no. 3, 1993, pp. 301–25.

LeBel, Thomas P., et al. "Helping Others as a Response to Reconcile a Criminal Past: The Role of the Wounded Healer in Prisoner Reentry Programs." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, vol. 42, no. 1, 2015, pp. 108–20.

Lerman, Amy E., and Vesla M. Weaver. *Arresting Citizenship: The Democratic Consequences of American Crime Control*. U of Chicago P, 2014.

Lister, Ruth. *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*. New York UP, 2003.

Loyd, Jenna M. "Carceral Citizenship in an Age of Apartheid." *Occasion*, vol. 8, 2015, pp. 1–15.

LUCK. mariobuenoreformexpert.com/about. Accessed 10 May 2021.

Maguire, Mike, et al. "'Penal Drift' and the Voluntary Sector." *Howard Journal of Crime and Justice*, vol. 58, no. 3, 2019, pp. 430–49.

Manza, Jeff, and Christopher Uggen. *Locked Out: Felon Disenfranchisement and American Democracy*. Oxford UP, 2008.

Manza, Jeff, et al. "Citizenship, Democracy, and the Civic Reintegration of Criminal Offenders." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 605, no. 1, 2006, pp. 281–310.

Man2Man. https://www.man2man-uya.org/. Accessed 10 May 2021.

Marshall, Thomas H. *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays*. Cambridge UP, 1950.

McNeill, Fergus. *Pervasive Punishment: Making Sense of Mass Supervision*. Emerald Group Publishing, 2018.

McKim, Alison. *Addicted to Rehab: Race, Gender and Drugs in the Era of Mass Incarceration*. Rutgers UP, 2017.

Mijs, Jonathan J. B. "The Missing Organizational Dimension of Prisoner Reentry: An Ethnography of the Road to Reentry at a Nonprofit Service Provider." *Sociological Forum*, vol. 31, no. 2, 2016, pp. 291–309.

Miller, Reuben J. *Halfway Home: Race, Punishment, and the Afterlife of Mass Incarceration*. Little, Brown and Company, 2021.

Miller, Reuben J., and Gwendolyn Purifoye. "Carceral Devolution and the Transformation of Urban America." *The Voluntary Sector in Prisons: Encouraging Personal and Institutional Change*, edited by Laura Abrams, et al., Palgrave Macmillan, 2016, pp. 195–213.

Miller, Reuben J., and Forrest Stuart. "Carceral Citizenship: Race, Rights and Responsibility in the Age of Mass Supervision." *Theoretical Criminology*, vol. 21, no. 4, 2017, pp. 532–48.

New Beginnings Re-entry Services. https://www.newbeginningsreentryservices.org/. Accessed 10 May 2021.

New Jersey Reentry Corporation. https://www.njreentry.org/. Accessed 10 May 2021.

Nunn, Kenneth B. "Race, Crime and the Pool of Surplus Criminality: Or Why the 'War on Drugs' was a 'War on Blacks.'" *Journal of Gender, Race and Justice*, vol. 6, no. 2, 2002, pp. 381–445.

One Touch Ministry. https://www.1touchministry.org/. Accessed 10 May 2021.

Owens, Michael L., and Adrienne R. Smith. "'Deviants' and Democracy: Punitive Policy Designs and the Social Rights of Felons as Citizens." *American Politics Research*, vol. 40, no. 3, 2012, pp. 531–67.

Pager, Devah. "The Mark of a Criminal Record." *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 108, no. 5, 2003, pp. 937–75.

Pettit, Becky, and Bruce Western. "Mass Imprisonment and the Life Course: Race and Class Inequality in U.S. Incarceration." *American Sociological Review*, vol. 69, no. 2, 2004, pp. 151–69.

Pfaff, John F. *Locked In: The True Causes of Mass Incarceration—and How to Achieve Real Reform*. Basic Books, 2017.

Phelps, Michelle S., and Ebony L. Ruhland. "Governing Marginality: Coercion and Care in Probation." *Social Problems*, 2021, 10.1093/socpro/spaa060.

Pollack, Shoshana. "Reconceptualizing Women's Agency and Empowerment: Challenges to Self-Esteem Discourse and Women's Lawbreaking." *Women & Criminal Justice*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2000, pp. 75–90.

Prison Fellowship. https://www.prisonfellowship.org/. Accessed 10 May 2021.

Project Return. https://www.projectreturninc.org/. Accessed 10 May 2021.

Quinn, Kaitlyn. "Dispositions That Matter: Investigating Criminalized Women's Resettlement Through Their (Trans)Carceral Habitus." *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, vol. 23, no. 1, 2023, pp. 20–38.

Quinn, Kaitlyn. "Inside the Penal Voluntary Sector: Divided Discourses of 'Helping' Criminalized Women." *Punishment & Society*, vol. 22, no. 2, 2020, pp. 161–80.

Quinn, Kaitlyn et al. "'How You Keep Going': Voluntary Sector Practitioners' Story-Lines as Emotion Work." *British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 73, no. 2, 2022, pp. 370–386.

Quinn, Kaitlyn., and Philip Goodman. "Shaping the Road to Reentry: Organizational Variation and Narrative Labor in the Penal Voluntary Sector." *Punishment & Society*, 2023, pp. 1–25.

Reaching Out from Within. rofw.org/. Accessed 10 May 2021.

Resonance. https://www.resonancetulsa.org/. Accessed 10 May 2021.

Restoration of Rights Project. https://ccresourcecenter.org/restoration-2/. Accessed 10 May 2021.

Robinson, Gwen, et al. "Punishment *in* Society: The Improbable Persistence of Probation and Other Community Sanctions and Measures." *The SAGE Handbook of Punishment and Society*, edited by Jonathan Simon and Richard Sparks, SAGE, 2013, pp. 321–40.

Salole, Abigail. 2019. "'It's Kinda Punishment': Tandem Logics and Penultimate Power in the Penal Voluntary Sector for Canadian Youth." *Howard Journal of Crime and Justice*, vol. 58, no. 3, 2019, pp. 298–312.

Sered, Susan S. "Diminished Citizenship in the Era of Mass Incarceration." *Punishment & Society*, vol. 23, no. 2, 2020, pp. 218–240.

Smiley, Calvin J. *Purgatory Citizenship: Reentry, Race, and Abolition*. U of California P, 2023.

Smith, Justin M., and Aaron Kinzel. "Carceral Citizenship as Strength: Formerly Incarcerated Activists, Civic Engagement and Criminal Justice Transformation." *Critical Criminology*, vol. 29, no. 1, 2021, pp. 93–110.

Stearns, Peter N., and Carol Z. Stearns. "Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards." *The American Historical Review*, vol. 90, no. 4, 1985, pp. 813–36.

Sykes, Gresham M. *The Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum Security Prison*. Princeton UP, 1958.

The Center for Women in Transition. https://www.cwitstl.org/. Accessed 10 May 2021.

The Reentry Initiative. https://www.reentryinitiative.org/. Accessed 10 May 2021.

The Sentencing Project. Racial Justice, https://www.sentencingproject.org/issues/racial-disparity/. Accessed 22 June 2021.

Timelist Group. https://timelistgroup.org/. Accessed 10 May 2021.

Tomczak, Philippa, and Gillian Buck. "The Penal Voluntary Sector: A Hybrid Sociology." *British Journal of Criminology*, vol. 59, no. 4, 2019, pp. 898–918.

Wacquant, Loïc. "Deadly Symbiosis: When Ghetto and Prison Meet and Mesh." *Punishment & Society*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2009, pp. 95–134.

Weaver, Vesla M., and Amy E. Lerman. "The Political Consequences of the Carceral State." *American Political Science Review*, vol. 104, no. 4, 2010, pp. 817–33.

Western, Bruce. *Homeward: Life in the Year after Prison*. Russell Sage Foundation, 2018.

Western, Bruce, et al. "A Longitudinal Survey of Newly-Released Prisoners: Methods and Design of the Boston Reentry Study." *Federal Probation* vol. 81, no. 1, 2017, pp. 32–40.

Women at the Well-Broward. watwbroward.org/. Accessed 10 May 2021.

World Prison Brief. Highest to Lowest Prison Population Rate, https://www.prisonstudies.org/highest-to-lowest/prison_population_rate?field_region_taxonomy_tid=All. Accessed 22 June 2021.