



Women's Identity and Desistance from Crime: A Review of Theory and the Role Higher Education Can Play

Journal:	<i>Sociology Compass</i>
Manuscript ID	SOCO-1333.R1
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Article
Keywords:	Gender < Compass Sections, Deviance and Social Control < Subjects, criminal justice < Key Topics, women < Key Topics

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Review

Women's Desistance from Crime: A Review of Theory and the Role Higher Education Can Play

Abstract:

The emergent field of desistance research originated among scholars who were interested in the persistence or termination of crime among young men. From a focus on the structured effects of age-graded events such as employment and marriage on desistance, the field has now broadened its interest into desistance as an interplay among identity, cognitive factors, and sociogenic factors. Mirroring the growth in theories about women's pathways to offending, the field of desistance has taken on a greater focus on gender as a determinant of crime termination. The discussion of women's desistance presented here provides the basis for a recommendation that higher education may play a pivotal role in enhancing women's successful reintegration into society after prison.

Introduction

The majority of incarcerated women will eventually leave prison to return to their families and communities. All such women will experience reentry, but not all will desist from offending and turn to more productive and law-abiding lifestyles. Interest in whether young criminals would persist in offending as they aged began with the Gluecks' research in Boston in the early decades of the 20th century (Glueck & Glueck, 1937). Much of the research in the domain of desistance since then has focused on the male offenders and not on women who, with the inception of mass incarceration, have made up more and more of the prison population (Sokoloff, 2005). As Farrall and Maruna (2004) note, the research linked to desistance moved away from its umbrella of criminal careers making it a distinctive discipline of its own. Yet, much of this research has been on male ex-prisoners or on mixed samples that tend to elide gender distinctions. After several decades of feminist research on women and crime, there is a substantial literature on justice-involved women. However, examinations of women's post-prison reentry and, especially, the now standalone field of desistance, are still rather recent. This article first reviews literature on women's offending and desistance theory with an eye toward developing strategies that support women who want to desist from crime. We then consider post-incarceration higher education as an environment that can respond to justice-involved women's desire and capacity to change their lives.

Interest in providing higher educational to prisoners and ex-prisoners was never really extinguished even after the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act law

1
2
3 eliminated Pell Grants for prisoners in 1994. Here and there, college-level programs
4 have endured against significant odds or were initiated more recently by grantors in
5 conjunction with institutions of higher education (see Sokoloff and Schencke-Fontaine
6 2017 for a review of these programs). The basic attraction to policy makers has always
7 been the ability of higher education to reduce recidivism. However, since many of these
8 programs have attached themselves to the larger and more numerous men's prisons
9 and population of male ex-prisoners, we know less about the impact of these initiatives
10 for women. This paper foregrounds the literature on desistance from crime, highlighting
11 the few works that develop these theories for women. Finally, we extrapolate this
12 theoretical literature as a call for further research on women's desistance through higher
13 education.
14
15
16
17
18

19 Women's Pathways to Justice System Involvement 20 21

22 Understanding women's desistance from crime requires some understanding of factors
23 that shape their involvement in the criminal justice system. Feminist scholars beginning
24 with Kathleen Daly (1992, 1994) noted that although common terrain existed in both male
25 and female trajectories to offending, important gendered differences could be revealed
26 through comparative study. Further, these differences generated critical theoretical
27 understandings of gendered behaviors over the life course (Simpson, Yahner, & Dugan,
28 2008). In her comparative study of male and female defendants in a New Haven felony
29 court, Daly (1994) described four categories of female felons. She categorized the first
30 group as street women, whose offending consisted of low level hustles and prostitution,
31 often initiated upon running away from abusive homes. A second category consisted of
32 women whose early abuse and subsequent harming behavior gave rise to what she
33 called harmed and harming women. As a result of childhood strains, such women
34 began using drugs and alcohol at an early age and showed signs of serious
35 psychological harm. The third category, drug-connected women were mainly involved in
36 drug selling operations embedded in spousal or family relationships. This group of
37 women didn't have extensive offending records. A fourth group, battered women,
38 exhibited violence in response to their violent relations with men. Daly found that
39 men and women sometimes resembled one another in the origins of their criminality,
40 especially those in the street category, but important differences in the frequency and
41 seriousness of offending existed.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Building on Daly's work, Simpson, Yahner, and Dugan (2008) examined a large sample
50 of incarcerated African American women to examine their pathways to offending. In
51 keeping with life-course theory, they examine the transition of girls into deviant
52 networks, replicating Daly's street woman etiology. They argue that, as with males, age
53 of delinquency onset shapes the experiences that girls are exposed to and continue to
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 be exposed to through adolescence and adulthood. For example, their research showed
4 that early-onset delinquents spent more months in total dealing drugs than those who
5 had a slightly later onset of criminal activity. In sum, they argue that early sexualization
6 is related to early offending, as later-onset offenders were less likely to report abuse.
7 This research, which also revealed an unexpectedly large number of adult onset
8 offenders, showed that childhood-onset was more heavily associated with drug-dealing,
9 property-crime, and violent offenses than either adolescent or adult onset female
10 criminality.
11
12
13
14

15 Bloom, Owen, and Covington (2004) provide an overview of features that characterize
16 women's trajectories from abuse, poverty, and drug use into crime. Women in the
17 criminal justice system are more likely than non-criminal women to have grown up in a
18 single-parent home and are more likely than criminal men to have an incarcerated
19 family member. The Bureau of Justice Statistics (1999) reported that justice-involved
20 females are more than four times as likely as their male counterparts to report abuse
21 sometime during their lifetimes. Indeed, some of the strongest evidence provided since
22 then for women's pathways to offending has been on the relationship between abuse in
23 early life and adult drug use and crime (Wilson & Widom, 2009). In contrast with men,
24 women's trajectories from child abuse and neglect to adulthood drug use is evident, and
25 is part of what these authors call a "general problem behavior syndrome" with its onset
26 in adolescence (p. 340) Other aspects of the general problem behavior syndrome that
27 research finds common among incarcerated women are prostitution and homelessness.
28
29
30
31
32

33 For Chesney-Lind (Chesney-Lind, 1997; Chesney-Lind & Pasko, 2013; Chesney-Lind &
34 Sheldon, 2004), early abuse is also a precursor to depression, drug use, status or minor
35 offending that lead girls into the juvenile justice system and thence to more serious
36 offending when their fundamental problems fail to be addressed by courts or other
37 social institutions. Substance abuse, mental health, and physical problems also plague
38 this population (Acoca, 1998; Merlo & Pollock, 1995; Young, 1996). The Bureau of
39 Justice Statistics (2001) found that 25% of women in state prisons had been identified
40 as having a mental illness. The report goes on to say that these women suffer from
41 depression, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) as well as substance abuse. The
42 latter conditions are often linked to sexual abuse and other trauma (Bloom, Owen, &
43 Covington, 2003; Bloom et al., 2004; Covington, 2008). Beyond these factors are those
44 links between youthful and adult experiences and crime, often detailed in both
45 quantitative and qualitative life history research (Belknap, 2007; Belknap & Holsinger,
46 2006; Salisbury & Van Voorhis, 2009). In total, the major themes in this body of
47 literature on pathways to offending relate to women's abuse, dysfunctional relationships,
48 poverty, poor education, restricted human and social capital, addiction, mental illness,
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and the combined effects of racism and gender oppression (Bloom et al., 2003; Richie,
4 2001; Salisbury & Van Voorhis, 2009).
5
6

7 The research on the role of early life experiences in shaping women's adult offending
8 argues for gender responsive practices and policies that meet their unique needs.
9 Sokoloff and Schenck-Fontaine (2017) catalog the personal and structural factors that
10 are especially salient to women's experience with crime and that also impact their
11 successful reentry. These include a lack of childcare and child custody problems, poor
12 employment history, inferior job skills, and the often twin problems of drug addiction and
13 mental illness. More women than men experience homelessness and indigence prior to
14 prison. And, there are also the various status inequalities of gender, race, class, and
15 immigration status that place added burdens on women's reentry. Research has
16 identified the structural and cultural barriers to successful reentry (Brown and Bloom
17 2009; Giordano, Cernkovich, and Rudolph, 2002). However, analyzing the concept of
18 desistance in terms of women's successful reentry is an important next step. The
19 following section draws upon both structural and subjective factors related to desistance
20 theory in order to highlight the complex process of women's reentry to their communities
21 after prison.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 *Gender and Desistance from Crime* 29 30

31 In their much-cited study of women's desistance, authors Giordano, Cernkovich, and
32 Rudolph (2002) note that if pathways into crime are gendered, then gendered pathways
33 to desistance must exist as well. Current perspectives view desistance as a process
34 involving an interplay between sociogenic and subjective factors over time (Laub and
35 Sampson 2003; Maruna 2001). But the foundational research and theory development
36 in the area of desistance have been primarily based on samples that are entirely or
37 predominantly male. Research on desistance is only beginning to address the question
38 of gender and women's lived experience (Bachman et al, 2016; P. C. Giordano et al.,
39 2002; Uggen & Kruttschnitt, 1998).
40
41
42
43

44 Kruttschnitt (2013) reminds us that there are experiences over the life course that
45 equally apply to male and female offenders. The factors that are invariably conducive to
46 crime include poor parenting, low self-control, delinquent peers, and economic
47 disadvantage. However, she notes, these experiences may be modulated differently by
48 men and women, perhaps through emotional mediators that shape differential pathways
49 to crime. These differences likely stem from role of socialization as well as the
50 subordinate status of women in the sex-gender hierarchy, as well as the overlapping
51 effects of race and ethnicity (Chesney-Lind and Sheldon, 2004). In terms of desistance
52 from crime, structural factors such as employment and marriage may be areas where
53
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 gender is important, but there may be those areas where gender has a less marked
4 influence. In her review of the desistance literature, for example, Kruttschnitt (2016)
5 concludes that the marriage and employment effect benefit more men than women,
6 because women find it far more difficult to find prosocial partners and good
7 employment. Thus, the “good marriage effect” developed by Laub, Nagin, and Sampson
8 (1998), undergirded by elements of social control, tends to be strongly related to men’s
9 desistance from crime but its impact among women is shaped by women’s structural
10 position and socialization.
11
12
13

14
15 Such findings are reflected in work by Zoutewell-Terovan et al (2014) who prospectively
16 examined a sample of 540 high-risk men and women criminals in the Netherlands.
17 Their research revealed that marriage and having a first child were strong predictors for
18 desistance from serious offending for men. In fact, parenting actually brought more
19 positive effects for men especially if accompanied by marriage. However, these authors
20 found that female desistance was not significantly influenced by either marriage or
21 motherhood. Additionally, marriage and stable employment tended to encourage
22 desistance from crime with age. However, subsequent research on these determinants
23 has been mixed, with some research finding that marriage and work encourage men’s
24 desistance but not that of women (King, Massoglia, and Macmillan, 2007). These
25 authors note that marriage may be a neutral or negative factor with women offenders as
26 they are thought to have a greater likelihood than men of finding a criminal spouse.
27
28
29
30
31

32 As the study of desistance broadened, more scholars recognized that successful
33 desistance from crime emerges from an interplay of subjective factors such as identity
34 with objective factors, such as employment (Burnett & Maruna 2004). Much of the more
35 recent literature on desistance attempts to account for the role of individual action in the
36 face of structural factors (King, 2013; Maruna, 2001; Maruna & Roy, 2007), rather than
37 objective factors alone.
38
39
40

41 LeBel and colleagues (2008) have ascertained three theoretical models that describe
42 this interplay of individual agency and social structure in the desistance process.
43 Strong-subjective perspectives focus mainly on the individual’s will, a perspective that
44 King (2012) views as an unrealistic assessment of the individual’s ability to dramatically
45 alter their social environment. At the other end of the theoretical spectrum, the social
46 environment predominates over individual intention or agency. These theorists see
47 desistance as more or less dependent upon structured turning points in life such as
48 marriage or employment (Sampson and Laub, 1993 and 2005; Vaughan, 2007).
49 Various research notes the fact that these turning points entrain forms of social control
50 that tend to organize desistance (Farrington & West, 1995; Sampson & Laub, 1993).
51 The work by LeBel and colleagues offers a mid-range structuration view of desistance.
52
53
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 In their view, providing the environment necessary for change can enhance the potential
4 for individuals to achieve desistance since cognitive change alone is insufficient absent
5 a supportive context..
6
7

8 Consistent with Lebel's perspective, Sommers and colleagues (1994) studied 30 female
9 street criminals' route to departure from criminal behavior. They describe a three-stage
10 process of desistance. Female street criminals encounter what the authors call socially
11 "disjunctive" experiences that build motivation to change. Desisters announce the
12 decision to change to their social network, and they develop new social networks
13 wherein new behaviors emerge and can be sustained. But changes in identity are also
14 essential to the process (Bushway & Paternoster, 2014; Farrall & Maruna, 2004). One
15 of the main tasks of the would-be desister is to find an identity and future self that is
16 incompatible with crime (King, 2013).
17
18
19
20
21

22 With troubled motherhood (Brown, 2012) as one of a short list of available identities,
23 where do justice-involved women look for identity assets? Runggay's (2004)
24 examination of narrative scripts related to women's desistance acknowledges the poor
25 experiences these women may have had as family members, employees, and students.
26 Narrative scripts can be thought of as that internal dialogue we use to explain who we
27 are to ourselves and others. Justice-involved women, Runggay notes, need to be
28 especially active and creative in convincing audiences that their personal change is real
29 (Maruna, 2001). Runggay's work leads us to focus on issues such as women's identity,
30 self-efficacy, and resilience that may further the development of desistance (Farrall &
31 Maruna, 2004). Women's agency is a useful starting point for discussions of resistance
32 to stigmatizing labels. Stone's (2016) in-depth interview data reveals that pregnant
33 former drug users constructed narrative identities that emphasized their moral agency
34 and resisted the stigmatizing discourse surrounding substance-using mothers.
35
36
37
38
39

40 Women's reentry from prison takes place in a context of what Richie (2001) calls "the
41 co-occurrence of multiple demands" (p. 380), constituted by the burdens of parole
42 supervision that coexist with the mandates of employment and family responsibilities.
43 As described by Bachman et al (2016), women who are mothers may be struggling with
44 addiction, mental illness, attempting to find housing and employment (despite a criminal
45 record), reunification with children and often reluctant family members, as well as
46 meeting conditions of release and supervision. Parental stress, in fact, is a risk factor for
47 increased recidivism (Van Voorhis et al 2010). Yet, as Bachman and colleagues (2016)
48 find, motherhood doesn't play a central role in age-graded social control (Laub &
49 Sampson 2003) or in cognitive and identity transformation theories (Bushway &
50 Paternoster, 2014; P. Giordano, S. A. Cernkovich, & J. L. Rudolph, 2002) of desistance.
51 This is despite the rather apparent central role of maternal concerns in the lives of
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 justice-involved women (Arditti & Few, 2008; Bloom & Brown, 2011; Brown, 2012;
4 Brown & Bloom, 2009; Enos, 2001; Giordano, Seffrin, Manning, & Longmore, 2011;
5 McMahan, 1995). These maternal concerns potentially play a role in motivation toward
6 desistance but social connectedness with family and children may be marred by strains
7 related to family violence, poverty, and the dysfunctions common to the lives of justice-
8 involved women (Rodermond, Kruttschnitt, Slotboom, & Bijleveld, 2016).
9

10
11
12 Social capital is a central theoretical consideration related to both offending and
13 desistance. Farrall (2002, 2004) claims that family and work are fundamental to social
14 capital. That is, social capital is constituted by family and work and these, in turn, flow
15 from social capital which gives entre to and sustains connections to other institutions.
16 And, like marriage and family, social capital is problematic for justice-involved women.
17 While relational theory highlights the centrality of social relations for women (Covington,
18 2008), the wrong social networks may put desistance at risk. If associates are using
19 drugs, it may not be long until the former prisoner is using as well. Thereby, social
20 embeddedness, a key factor in social capital, is as Brown and Ross (2010) put it, "part
21 of the problem rather than part of the solution" (p. 42). In fact, the desire to go straight
22 may put women at odds with former friends and family members who lack a normative
23 orientation. Those family members and friends who might support their family member
24 after prison may have been alienated by and still angry about the woman's former
25 behavior. They may not be eager to enter into relationship with their former loved one
26 who has broken trust and called into question the legitimacy of the family in the first
27 place (Enos, 2001).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 The problem becomes how to enlist theory to foster environments that meet the needs
36 of formerly incarcerated women and support their agency. Such environments must
37 take into account structural issues, gendered needs, and the subjective factors that go
38 into successful desistance. Correctional agencies cannot at this time be said to be
39 desistance focused. Rather, correctional agencies remain stuck in models that depend
40 upon measures of recidivism to evaluate their efficacy. These measures are at best
41 snapshots of what should be clear by now is a dynamic process of human change.
42 Environments that allow formerly incarcerated women to develop coherent, prosocial
43 identities are consistent with narrative theories of desistance (Maruna 2001; Runggay
44 2004). A promising direction suggested by these theories consists of providing justice-
45 involved women with pathways to social and cultural capital as well as transformed
46 identities. In the concluding part of this article, we explore women's participation in
47 higher education as a means of supporting identity transformation as well a way to
48 leverage those sociogenic factors that enable desistance from crime.
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 Desistance and the Higher Education Environment

56
57

1
2
3
4 Historically, women's prisons tended to be under-resourced compared to facilities
5 holding men (Rafter, 1985), a situation that has only worsened with the mass
6 incarceration of both men and women. A political climate somewhat more welcoming to
7 rehabilitation in this century (Case, David, Rosmary, & Anna, 2005) was inopportune
8 met by state budgets groaning under the residual effects of the great recession and
9 unsustainable levels of incarceration. Much of the carceral educational programming for
10 women that remains is vocational programming in traditionally female occupations such
11 as cosmetology or canned curricula offering "soft skills" aimed at altering women's
12 psychology (Brown, 2012; Pollack, 2005). Prison programming, effective or ineffective,
13 has been subject to extensive cuts in state and federal support, most recently because
14 of the recession but actually going back to the 1990s when crime bills eliminated Pell
15 grants for prisoners. Kruttschnitt (2010) reports that programs that address women
16 offenders' unique needs are rarely available inside of prison. She points out that in
17 California only 18% of prisoners who need substance abuse treatment are placed in
18 these programs, despite estimates that 80% of prisoners report having a drug or alcohol
19 problem.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 The Higher Education Act of 1965 created Basic Education Opportunity Grants that
28 enabled individuals to enroll in post-secondary education programs in prison, but the
29 grants were controversial from the beginning (Rose, 2004). This source of state capital
30 helped sustain higher educational programs in prisons until the 1990s when the grants,
31 known by then as Pell grants, were eliminated under the Violent Crime Control and Law
32 Enforcement Act of 1994 as well as the Higher Educational Reauthorization Act of 1994.
33 A study by Rose (2004) traces the reduction of prisoner-students as colleges withdrew
34 their faculty and programs from prison. The nation's correctional institutions saw a
35 whole-scale reduction of post-secondary educational programs for prisoners (Austin &
36 Irwin, 2001; Davis et al., 2013 and 2014; Duguid, 2000; Petersilia, 2000, 2003).
37 Correctional education for women, including vocational education, has never come
38 close to meeting their needs. And, with the mass incarceration of women, correctional
39 educational budgets have been arguably harder hit in facilities for women (Rose, 2004).
40 Cuts to correctional budgets since the great recession eliminated even more of the
41 remaining programs. A recent report by RAND (Davis et al., 2014) indicates that
42 spending on correctional education overall shrunk by an average of six percent between
43 2009 and 2013, with large states making even deeper cuts.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Human and social capital are what many prisoners lack. And, since incarcerated
52 women, compared to men, have more serious deficits in these areas, meaningful
53 employment after prison may be even more out of reach (Sokoloff and Schencke-
54 Fontaine 2017). The collateral consequences of prison sentences exacerbate these
55
56
57

1
2
3 already-existing deficits. Restrictions to social welfare payments, bars to public housing,
4 diminished financial aid for education, and the loss of parental rights to children are
5 adverse consequences that former prisoners experience long after their sentences end
6 (Brown and Bloom 2009; Leverentz 2011; Mauer and Chesney-Lind 2002). Since more
7 women than men are custodial parents, and therefore often in need of state benefits,
8 these consequences are far from gender neutral. Former prisoners find the job market
9 markedly unfriendly to them, with race and gender being formidable obstacles (Pager,
10 2007). Morris, Sumner & Bora (2008) in a study of the impact of a prison record on
11 women's employment find that both gender bias and being system involved converge to
12 form a serious barrier to employment.
13
14
15
16
17

18 There is a growing interest in connecting former prisoners to colleges and universities
19 when they reenter society (Halkovic et al., 2013). Enrollment in educational programs
20 can help mitigate barriers to employment, particularly for a population so lacking in
21 various forms of human capital. Higher education provides a range of benefits for those
22 leaving prison, whether they begin their studies while in custody or afterwards in the
23 community (Sokoloff and Schencke-Fontaine 2017). The influential RAND study on the
24 impact of correctional education found that participation in college courses in prison
25 reduced recidivism rates among former prisoners by 43%, concluding that educational
26 programming was more cost-effective than incarceration in reducing re-offending (see
27 Davis et al 2013).
28
29
30
31

32 Runell (2015) links the desistance process to higher education for women, arguing that
33 formerly system-involved students find access to positive social networks (social capital)
34 and work opportunities. She found that participants in a college-based program for
35 justice involved women made gains in self-efficacy and confidence. These students
36 found their educational experiences transforming, being the hooks for change cited in
37 desistance literature as alternatives to criminal lifestyles (Giordano et al., 2003).
38 Although participants reported having decided while in prison to make something good
39 of their lives, education helped leverage the desire and sustain the building of new
40 identities, a process essential to desistance (Bushway and Paternoster, 2014; Farrall
41 and Maruna, 2004; Maruna, 2001).
42
43
44
45
46

47 The higher educational environment is consistent with the structuration views of LeBel
48 and colleagues (2008), whereby the internal push to change one's life is sustained by
49 social factors such as employment or social connections. Enrollment in college or
50 university study potentially gives the former prisoner an opportunity to 'knife off the past'
51 in an environment with structural conditions that support the transformation in identity
52 that desistance requires. Ex-prisoners may, if they choose, adopt the identity of student
53 without revealing their pasts. The transformative developments that college students
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 experience through a process of maturation and consciousness raising are available to
4 this unique group of students and may be, to them, even more meaningful. The role of
5 student in this culture offers an alternative, non-stigmatized source of identity (Runell,
6 2015). Alternative associations with more normative social networks can help rescue
7 the individual from her former negative associates.
8
9

10
11 As well, these new networks consisting of other students, faculty, and staff provide
12 access to the benefits of social capital, heretofore unavailable to justice-involved
13 women. Social capital is constituted of resources that flow from one's position in social
14 networks. These social networks assist people in obtaining other tangible and intangible
15 resources, which in turn, help sustain families and jobs (Bourdieu, 1986). The most
16 familiar route to cultural and in large part, social capital, in contemporary society is the
17 educational system (Lareau, 2015). Reising et al (2002) points to the social control
18 function of social capital wherein members of the network promote normative behavior.
19 They also note that the structural locations of networks vary across social groups and
20 tend to diminish in poor communities of people of color. Deficits in institutional
21 familiarity, that is cultural capital, follow along with lower structural location and acting
22 as a drag on social mobility (Lareau, 2011, 2015). Reising, Holfreter and Morash (2002)
23 also find that women offenders who are members of "comparatively deficient networks"
24 (p. 181) are less likely to overcome their situations. Moreover, the possession of a
25 criminal record restricts employment opportunities and access to state capital in an
26 environment of reduced welfare and housing benefits.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Learning to navigate educational institutions involves acquiring forms of cultural capital
35 that are consistent with values and aspirations in the world of legitimate employment.
36 Ford and Schroeder (2010) argue that acquiring social capital through education,
37 especially the attainment of a degree, supports the connection of individuals to
38 normative values and goals. For justice-involved women who have been at the cross-
39 hairs of gender, racial, and economic marginality, higher education may open the door
40 to fulfilling and productive lives.
41
42
43

44 This review of perspectives on desistance from crime in general and women's
45 desistance in particular points the way to higher education as an environment that can
46 assist women in transforming their lives after prison. There is a growing interest in
47 connecting formerly incarcerated students to higher education and research is slowly
48 expanding. However, few of these initiatives and even less accompanying research
49 focus on women. A review article by Rodermond et al (2016) states that education
50 tends to have a more profound impact on women's desistance than that of men but
51 more research, especially qualitative studies, need to be done to illuminate the
52 gendered effect of education.
53
54
55
56
57

1
2
3
4 Finally, one may ask, “why women”? Kruttschnitt (2010) states despite the fact that
5 justice-involved women have made poor choices, they are “still an important resource
6 for their communities and their families, and all of them will have a significant impact on
7 the risk of criminality in the next generation of youth” (p. 39). In other words, for women
8 who also the cultural center of their families and communities, investments in women’s
9 education will pay generational dividends. Institutions of higher education are positioned
10 to make an important contribution to women’s desistance from crime. And as liberal
11 institutions, they will benefit from a unique expansion of diversity in life experience
12 (Halkovic et al, 2013). However, colleges and universities need to be made more aware
13 of the needs of this unique group of students and how education can play its very critical
14 role in this process. Translational research, especially about women’s pathways to both
15 punishment and desistance, presented to institutions of higher education is a next
16 important step in fostering women’s productive lives as family members and citizens.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 References

- 25
26
27 Acoca, L. (1998). Defusing the time bomb: Understanding and meeting the growing
28 health care needs of incarcerated women in America. *Crime & Delinquency*,
29 44(1), 49-70.
30
31 Arditti, J., & Few, A. (2008). Maternal distress and women's reentry into family and
32 community life. *Family Process*, 47(3), 303-321. doi:10.1111/j.1545-
33 5300.2008.00255.x.
34
35 Austin, J., & Irwin, J. (2001). *It's about time: America's imprisonment binge*. Belmont,
36 CA: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.
37
38 Bachman, R., Kerrison, E. M., Paternoster, R., Smith, L., & O'Connell, D. (2016). The
39 complex relationship between motherhood and desistance. *Women & Criminal*
40 *Justice*, 26(3), 212-231. doi:10.1080/08974454.2015.1113153.
41
42 Belknap, J. (2007). *The invisible woman: Gender, crime and justice*. Belmont, CA:
43 Thompson Wadsworth.
44
45 Belknap, J., & Holsinger, K. (2006). The gendered nature of risk factors for delinquency.
46 *Feminist Criminology*, 1(1), 48-71.
47
48 Bloom, B. (1996). *Triple jeopardy: Race, class, and gender as factors in women's*
49 *imprisonment*. Riverside, CA: University of California-Riverside.
50
51 Bloom, B., & Brown, M. (2011). Incarcerated women: Motherhood on the margins. In J.
52 M. Lawston & A. E. Lucas (Eds.), *Razor wire women: Prisoners, activists,*
53 *scholars and artists* (pp. 52-66). Albany: SUNY.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Bloom, B., Owen, B., & Covington, S. (2003). *Gender-responsive strategies: Research, practice, and guiding principles for women offenders*. Washington, D.C.: National
4 Institute of Corrections.
5
6
7 Bloom, B., Owen, B., & Covington, S. (2004). Women offenders and the gendered
8 effects of public policy. *Review of Policy Research*, 21(1), 31-48.
9 doi:10.1111/j.1541-1338.2004.00056.x
10
11 Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241-258). New York:
12 Greenwood.
13
14
15 Brown, M. (2012). Rehabilitation, risk, and the carceral mother: Subjectivity and
16 parenting classes in prisons. *Critical Criminology*, 20(4), 359-375.
17 doi:10.1007/s10612-011-9153-9.
18
19 Brown, M., & Bloom, B. (2009). Reentry and renegotiating motherhood: maternal
20 identity and success on parole. *Crime & Delinquency*, 55, 313-336.
21
22 Brown, M., & Ross, S. (2010). Mentoring, social capital and desistance: A study of
23 women released from prison. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*
24 43(1), 31-50. doi:10.1375/acri.43.1.31
25
26 Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1999). *Prior abuse reported by inmates and probationers*.
27 Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Washington, D.C.
28
29 Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2001). *Mental health treatment in state prisons*.
30 Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Washington, D.C.
31
32 Bushway, S. D., & Paternoster, R. (2014). Identity and desistance from crime. In J. A.
33 Humphrey & P. Cordella (Eds.), *Effective Interventions in the Lives of Criminal*
34 *Offenders* (pp. 63-77). New York, NY: Springer New York.
35
36 Case, P., David, F., Rosmary, S., & Anna, P. (2005). Providing educational support for
37 female ex-inmates: Project prove as a model for social reintegration. *Journal of*
38 *Correctional Education*, 56(2), 146-157.
39
40 Chesney-Lind, M. (1997). *The female offender: Girls, women, and crime*. Thousand
41 Oaks, CA: Sage.
42
43 Chesney-Lind, M., & Pasko, L. (Eds.). (2013). *The Female Offender: Girls, Women, and*
44 *Crime* (Third ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
45
46 Chesney-Lind, M., & Sheldon, R. G. (2004). *Girls, delinquency and juvenile justice (3rd*
47 *Edition)*. Belmont, CA: Thompson Wadsworth.
48
49 Covington, S. S. (2008). Women and addiction: A trauma-informed approach. *Journal of*
50 *Psychoactive Drugs*, 377-385.
51
52 Daly, K. (1992). Women's pathways to felony court: Feminist theories of lawbreaking
53 and problems of representation. *Review of Law and Women's Studies*, 2, 11-52.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Davis, L., Bozick, R., Steele, J., Saunders, J. & Miles, J. (2013). *Evaluating the*
4 *effectiveness of correctional education: evaluating the effectiveness of*
5 *correctional education: A meta-analysis of programs that provide education to*
6 *incarcerated adults*. Rand Corp. At:
7 http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR266.html.
8
9
10 Davis, L. M., Steele, J. L., Bozick, R., Williams, M., Turner, S., Miles, J. N. V., . . .
11 Steinberg, P. S. (2014). *How effective is correctional education, and where do we*
12 *go from here? The results of a comprehensive evaluation*. Retrieved from Santa
13 Monica, CA: https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR564.html.
14
15 Duguid, S. (2000). *Can Prisons Work? The prisoner as object and subject in modern*
16 *corrections*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
17
18 Enos, S. (2001). *Mothering from the inside: Parenting in a women's prison*. Albany, NY:
19 SUNY.
20
21 Farrall, S., & Maruna, S. (2004). Desistance-focused criminal justice policy research:
22 Introduction to a special issue on desistance from crime and public policy. *The*
23 *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 43(4), 358-367.
24
25 Farrington, D. P., & West, D. J. (1995). Effects of marriage, separation, and children on
26 offending by adult males. In Z. Vlau & J. Hagan (Eds.), *Current perspectives on*
27 *aging and the life cycle*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
28
29 Ford, J. A., & Schroeder, R. D. (2010). Higher education and criminal offending over the
30 life course. *Sociological Spectrum*, 31, 32-58.
31
32 Giordano, P. C., Cernkovich, S. A., & Rudolph, J. L. (2002). Gender, crime and
33 desistance: Toward a theory of cognitive transformation. *American Journal of*
34 *Sociology*, 107(9), 990-1064.
35
36 Giordano, P. C., Seffrin, P. M., Manning, W. D., & Longmore, M. A. (2011). Parenthood
37 and crime: The role of wantedness, relationships with partners, and ses. *Journal*
38 *of Criminal Justice*, 39(5), 405-416. doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2011.05.006
39
40 Glueck, S., & Glueck, E. T. (1937). *Later criminal careers*. New York: Commonwealth
41 Fund.
42
43 Halkovic, A., Fine, M., Bae, J., Campbell, L., Evans, D., Gary, C., . . . Tejawi, A. (2013).
44 *Higher Education and Reentry: The Gifts they Bring*. John Jay College of
45 Criminal Justice, Prisoner Reentry Institute, NYC.
46
47 King, S. (2013). Transformative agency and desistance from crime. *Criminology &*
48 *Criminal Justice*, 13(3), 317-335. doi:doi:10.1177/1748895812452282.
49
50 King, R. D., Massoglia, M., & Macmillan, R. (2007). The context of marriage and crime:
51 Gender, the propensity to marry, and offending in early adulthood. *Criminology*,
52 45(1), 33-65. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9125.2007.00071.x.
53
54 Kruttschnitt, C. (2010). The paradox of women's imprisonment. *Daedalus*, 139(3), 32-
55 42.
56
57 Kruttschnitt, C. (2013). Gender and Crime. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 39, 291-308.
58 doi:10.1146/annurev-soc-071312-145605
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 Kruttschnitt, C. 2016. The politics, and place, of gender in research on crime.
6 Criminology. 54 (1) 8-29.
- 7 Lareau, A. (2011). *Unequal childhoods: Class, race, and family life*. Berkeley, CA:
8 University of California Press.
- 9
10 Lareau, A. (2015). Cultural knowledge and social inequality. *American Sociological*
11 *Review*, 80(1), 1-27. doi:10.1177/0003122414565814.
- 12 Laub, J. H., Nagin, D. S., & Sampson, R. J. (1998). Trajectories of change in criminal
13 offending: Good marriages and the desistance process. *American Sociological*
14 *Review*, 63(2), 225-238.
- 15
16 Laub, J. H., & Sampson, R. J. (2003). *Shared Beginnings, Divergent Lives: Delinquent*
17 *Boys to Age 70*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- 18 LeBel, T. P., Burnett, R., Maruna, S., & Bushway, S. (2008). The 'chicken and egg' of
19 subjective and social factors in desistance from crime. *European Journal of*
20 *Criminology*, 5(2), 131-159. doi:doi:10.1177/1477370807087640.
- 21
22 Leverentz, A. (2011). Being a good daughter and sister: Families of origin in the reentry
23 of African American female ex-prisoners." *Feminist Criminology*, 6(4), 239-267.
- 24 Maruna, S. (2001). *Making Good: How Ex-Convicts Reform and Rebuild Their lives*.
25 Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- 26
27 Maruna, S., & Roy, K. (2007). Amputation or reconstruction? Notes on the concept of
28 'knifing off' and desistance from crime. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*,
29 23(1), 104-124.
- 30
31 Mauer, M., & Chesney-Lind, M. (2002). Invisible punishment: an instrument of social
32 exclusion. In M. Mauer & M. Chesney-Lind (Eds.), *Invisible Punishment: The*
33 *Collateral Consequences of Mass Incarceration* (pp. 15-36). New York: The New
34 Press.
- 35
36 McMahon, M. (1995). *Engendering Motherhood: Identity and self-transformation in*
37 *women's lives*. New York: Guilford.
- 38
39 Merlo, A., & Pollock, J. (1995). *Women, law, and social control*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- 40
41 Morris, M., Sumner, M., & Bora, J.Z. (2008). *A higher hurdle: Barriers to employment for*
42 *formerly incarcerated women*. Thelton E. Henderson Center for Social Justice.
43 University of California, Berkeley. At:
44 [http://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/A_Higher_Hurdle_December_2008%281%29.p](http://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/A_Higher_Hurdle_December_2008%281%29.pdf)
45 [df.](http://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/A_Higher_Hurdle_December_2008%281%29.pdf)
- 46
47 Pager, D. (2007). *Marked: Race, crime, and finding work in an era of mass*
48 *incarceration*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 49
50 Paternoster, R. A. Y., & Bushway, S. (2009). Desistance and the "feared self": Toward
51 an identity theory of criminal desistance. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*,
52 99(4), 1103-1156.
- 53
54 Petersilia, J. R. (2000). When prisoners return to the community: political, economic,
55 and social consequences. *Sentencing and Corrections*(9), 2-8.
- 56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Petersilia, J. R. (2003). *When prisoners come home: Parole and prisoner reentry*.
4 Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
5
6 Pollack, S. (2005). Taming the shrew: Regulating prisoners through women-centered
7 mental health programming. *Critical Criminology*, 113(1), 71-87.
8
9 Rafter, N. H. (1985). *Partial Justice: Women in State Prisons, 1800-1935*. Boston:
10 Northeastern University Press.
11
12 Reisig, M. D., Holtfreter, K., & Morash, M. (2002). Social capital among women
13 offenders: Examining the distribution of social networks and resources. *Journal of*
14 *Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 18(2), 167.
15
16 Richie, B.E. (2001). Challenges incarcerated women face as they return to their
17 communities: Findings from life history interviews. *Crime and Delinquency*. 47
18 (3), 368-389.
19
20 Rodermond, E., Kruttschnitt, C., Slotboom, A.-M., & Bijleveld, C. C. (2016). Female
21 desistance: A review of the literature. *European Journal of Criminology*, 13(1), 3-
22 28.
23
24 Rose, C. (2004). Women's participation in prison education: What we know and what
25 we don't know. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 55(1), 78-100.
26
27 Rumgay, J. (2004). Scripts for safer survival: Pathways out of female crime. *The*
28 *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 43(4), 405-419. doi:10.1111/j.1468-
29 2311.2004.00338.x.
30
31 Runell, L.L. (2015) Identifying desistance pathways in a higher education program for
32 formerly incarcerated individuals. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and*
33 *Comparative Criminology*, 61 (8) 894-918.
34 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X15608374>.
35
36 Salisbury, E. J., & Van Voorhis, P. (2009). Gendered pathways. *Criminal Justice and*
37 *Behavior*, 36(6), 541-566. doi:doi:10.1177/0093854809334076
38
39 Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1993). *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning*
40 *Points through Life*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
41
42 Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (2005). A life-course view of the development of crime.
43 *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 602, 12-45
44
45 Schur, E. (1984). *Labeling Women Deviant: Gender, Stigma, and Social Control*. New
46 York: Random House.
47
48 Simpson, S. S., Yahner, J. L., & Dugan, L. (2008). Understanding women's pathways to
49 jail: Analysing the lives of incarcerated women. *Australian & New Zealand*
50 *Journal of Criminology*, 41(1), 84-108. doi:10.1375/acri.41.1.84
51
52 Sokoloff, N. (2005). Women prisoners at the dawn of the 21st century. *Criminal Justice &*
53 *Women*. 16(1/2), 127-137.
54
55 Sokoloff, N. J. and A. M. Schenck-Fontaine. (2017). College programs in prison and
56 upon reentry: A literature review. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 20, 95-114.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Sommers, I., Baskin, D. R., & Fagan, J. (1994). Getting out of the life: Crime desistance
4 by female street offenders. *Deviant Behavior*, 15, 125-149.
5 doi:10.1080/01639625.1994.9967964.
6
7 Stone, R. (2016). Desistance and identity repair: Redemption narratives as resistance to
8 stigma. *British Journal of Criminology*, 56(5), 956-975. doi:10.1093/bjc/azv081
9
10 Uggen, C., & Kruttschnitt, C. (1998). Crime in the breaking: Gender differences in
11 desistance. *Law & Society Review*, 32(2), 339-366.
12
13 Van Voorhis, P., Wright, E., Salisbury, E. and Bauman, A. (2010). Women's risk factors
14 and their contributions to existing risk/needs assessment: The current status of
15 gender-responsive assessment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37 (3), 261-288.
16
17 Vaughan, B. (2007). The internal narrative of desistance. *British Journal of Criminology*,
18 47(3), 390-404. doi:10. 1093/bjc/az1083.
19
20 Wilson, H., & Widom, C. (2009). A prospective examination of the path from child abuse
21 and neglect to illicit drug use in middle adulthood: The potential mediating role of
22 four risk factors. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*, 38(3), 340-354.
23 doi:10.1007/s10964-008-9331-6.
24
25 Young, D. S. (1996). Contributing factors to poor health among incarcerated women: A
26 conceptual model. *Affilia*, 11(4), 440-461.
27
28 Zoutewelle-Terovan, M., van der Geest, V., Liefbroer, A., & Bijleveld, C. (2014).
29 Criminality and family formation: Effects of marriage and parenthood on criminal
30 behavior for men and women. *Crime & Delinquency*, 60(8), 1209-1234.
31 doi:10.1177/0011128712441745.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60