

2020

The Need for Gender Specific Jail Reentry Programming to Help Female Ex-Inmates Experience Successful Community Reintegration

Penny Lee Humerick
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Public Administration Commons](#), and the [Public Policy Commons](#)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Penny Lee Humerick

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Carolyn Dennis, Committee Chairperson,
Criminal Justice Faculty

Dr. Ross Alexander, Committee Member,
Criminal Justice Faculty

Dr. Dianne Williams, University Reviewer,
Criminal Justice Faculty

Chief Academic Officer and Provost
Sue Subocz, Ph.D.

Walden University
2020

Abstract

The Need for Gender Specific Jail Reentry Programming to Help Female Ex-Inmates
Experience Successful Community Reintegration

by

Penny Lee Humerick

MA, Urbana University, 2012

BS, Urbana University, 2009*

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Criminal Justice

Walden University

November 2020

Abstract

Reentry programs seek to reduce recidivism while maintaining community safety. Most reentry programs have focused on prison reentry and rarely on the reintegration of female offenders from jail to community which left a gap in the research literature. The purpose of this qualitative case study was to understand the barriers that hinder successful community reentry for the female offender. Using social learning theory as the theoretical perspective, this study was intended to gain a better understanding of criminality and deviant behavior among female jail detainees. To build a strong study and gain insight into jail reentry programs, institutional analysis and development framework was used. Through use of both theoretical and conceptual frameworks, a better understanding of jail reentry programs and how these programs may be used to help reduce recidivism among the female criminal offending population was reached. Thirteen offenders answered semistructured interview questions. Transcripts were coded and the themes of addiction, health, employment, family, education, home, finances, jail, programs, and resources emerged. These themes or barriers add information to the literature regarding the barriers that female offenders face at community reentry from jail. The key findings of this study were that when women leave jail, they are not given the resources needed to overcome the barriers that often lead to reoffending. Recommendations from this research can help policy makers understand the multiple barriers that hinder successful community reentry for female offenders. By understanding the barriers that hinder successful community reentry from jail, positive social change can occur.

The Need for Gender Specific Jail Reentry Programming to Help Female Ex-Inmates
Experience Successful Community Reintegration

by

Penny Lee Humerick

MA, Urbana University, 2012

BS, Urbana University, 2009

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Criminal Justice

Walden University

November 2020

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my daughters, Sarah Reedy and Haley Humerick. Sarah, even though you are no longer here in body, your spirit is felt every day. I love you so much and miss you terribly! Haley, my baby. I love you! I sacrificed so much so you could be happy. I let you choose your own destination and I could not be any prouder. You are a wonderful woman and are wise beyond your years. Without your encouragement and patience, I could not have finished this paper. I thank you for loving me and for giving me the strength to move.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank family for helping me through this fulfilling journey. I want to thank my dissertation chair, Dr. Carolyn Dennis for encouraging me and telling me not to give up. I would also like to thank my other committee member, Dr. Ross Alexander for giving me excellent advice during my proposal oral presentation. I would also like to thank MonDay CCI for allowing me to conduct my interviews at the location for female residents and for helping me organize the face-to-face interview schedule. I would like to thank Terri Brown for believing in me and helping me to become a better teacher. Finally, I would like to thank God for without him, nothing would be possible.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	v
Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study.....	1
Introduction: The Need for Jail Reentry Programing	1
Background	2
Problem Statement	4
Purpose of the Study	5
Research Questions.....	6
Theoretical Framework for the Study	7
Conceptual Framework for the Study	8
Nature of the Study	9
Definitions.....	9
Assumptions.....	10
Scope and Delimitations (Boundaries)	11
Limitations	11
Significance.....	12
Summary	13
Chapter 2: Literature Review	14
Introduction.....	14
Literature Search Strategy.....	20
Theoretical Foundation	21
Social Learning Theory.....	21

Conceptual Framework.....	24
Institutional Analysis and Development Framework	25
Reentry	26
Barriers to Reentry	27
Jail Reentry	38
Reentry in Montgomery County, Ohio	43
Summary and Conclusions	46
Chapter 3: Research Method.....	48
Introduction.....	48
Research Design and Rationale	49
Role of the Researcher	50
Methodology	50
Participant Selection Logic.....	51
Instrumentation	52
Researcher-Developed Instrument.....	53
Data Analysis Plan.....	53
Issues of Trustworthiness.....	54
Credibility	54
Transferability.....	55
Dependability	55
Confirmability.....	56
Ethical Procedures	56

Informed Consent.....	57
Confidentiality	57
Summary	57
Chapter 4: Results	59
Introduction.....	59
Setting	60
Demographics	61
Data Collection	63
Data Analysis	65
Evidence of Trustworthiness.....	65
Credibility	65
Transferability.....	66
Dependability	66
Confirmability.....	67
Results.....	67
Research Question 1	68
Research Question 2	81
Research Question 3	84
Summary	85
Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations	88
Introduction.....	88
Interpretation of the Findings.....	89

Theoretical Foundation and Conceptual Framework.....	93
Limitations of the Study.....	97
Recommendations.....	98
Implications.....	99
Positive Social Change	99
Conclusion	101
References.....	103
Appendix: Interview Guide.....	122

List of Tables

Table 1. Female Participant Demographics64

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Introduction: The Need for Jail Reentry Programming

Most attention on offender reentry into society is paid to America's prison population (White, Saunders, Fisher, & Mellow, 2012). There is need for programming that focuses on women who reenter society from jail. Although the terms *prison* and *jail* are often used interchangeably, they are in fact two separate institutions. Over the past 40 years, the rates of female incarceration have grown more than any other correctional population. Yet little research exists as to why this phenomenon occurs (Swavola, Riley, & Subramanian, 2016). Because women are the largest growing incarcerated population in America (Minton, Ginder, Brumbaugh, Smiley-McDonald, & Rohloff, 2015), research should focus on the special needs of women and on how reentry programming may help to satisfy these needs. According to Covington (2007), "some of the most neglected, misunderstood, and unseen individuals in our society are the more than one million women in our jails, prisons, and community correctional facilities" (p. 180).

In this chapter I discuss jail reentry programming, why this topic needs to be explored, the literature relating to this topic, and the gap in the literature necessitating additional research. I discuss the problem statement including its relevance to this study. I explore the purpose of this study and state the research questions. I identify and explain the theoretical framework. In addition, I discuss the conceptual framework and the nature of the study and identify the methodology used to conduct this study. I also provide concise definitions, clarify assumptions of the study, detail the scope and

boundaries of this study, and address the study's limitations. I also provide the significance of this study will also be provided. Finally, a summary of the main points of this chapter is provided along with a concise transition to Chapter 2.

Background

Ex-offender reinsertion is nothing new to the criminal justice system and can be a difficult time for the ex-offender, especially women (Doherty, Forrester, Brazil, & Matheson, 2014). Research has shown that female offenders have complex issues that act as barriers toward successful reentry into their own community. These barriers are: (a) intimate partner violence, (b) childhood sexual abuse, (c) being underemployed or unemployed, (d) having substance abuse disorders, (e) having children under the age of 18 who may or may not be in the custody of the mother (McLean, Robarge, & Sherman, 2006; Spjeldnes, Jung, & Yamatani, 2014), (f) participating in risky sexual behaviors, (g) likely to have HIV and hepatitis B and C, and (h) being homeless (McLean et al., 2006). Although these barriers are extremely important, most are beyond the scope of this paper. I explored the need for mandated reentry programs that specifically address employment, physical health and mental health, family, and substance abuse needs of female low-level offenders located in Montgomery County, a county in south-western Ohio.

Miller and Miller (2010) explored the Auglaize County Transition (ACT) Program, located in Ohio. By using a quasi-experimental design, Miller and Miller (2010) examined the effectiveness of the ACT Program at reducing recidivism. The participants of the Miller and Miller (2010) study were male inmates with a mean age of

32. By using logic regression, the findings showed a strong and significant link between program participation and recidivism. Miller (2013) revisited Miller and Miller (2010) to determine if program fidelity, exposure, quality of services delivery, family participation, and program differentiation help to reduce recidivism by inmates using the ACT Program. Miller (2013) found the 12.3% reduction in recidivism present in the Miller and Miller (2010) study was not spurious, but a function of treatment services. Miller and Miller (2015) examined a second cohort (2011-2013) of those using the ACT Program by measuring the rate of recidivism among jailed inmates released after 12-months. Again, Miller and Miller (2015) found that a strong and significant link existed between program participation and lower rates of recidivism.

Spjeldnes et al. (2014) examined the Allegheny County Jail Collaborative located in the Allegheny County Jail (ACJ); an urban detention center. This study looked for gender differences by demographics, life circumstances, and other needs of inmates in a large urban county jail. Spjeldnes et al. (2014) found that compared to men, jailed women had greater health and life problems across demographic variables and expressed more needs while having a minimal criminal record. Findings show that across both genders, the most common reason for incarceration was drug-related illegal acts (Spjeldnes et al., 2014). Hearn, Whitehead, Khan, and Latimer (2014) added that women who spent time in confinement were more likely to contribute to HIV-related drug use and partake in risky sexual behaviors upon community reentry.

Doherty et al. (2014) found that while in custody, women should have received treatment for low self-esteem and low self-efficacy, programming that focused on strengthening family bonds and treatment for substance abuse including alcohol. Doherty et al. (2014) added that when the female offender was released, continuity of care should have been offered and should have continued within the ex-offender's own community. Through their research, Doherty et al. (2014) found that continuity of care and family connections after release helped to reduce recidivism.

Problem Statement

Reentry programs that focus on the positive reinsertion of female ex-offenders back into their community primarily focus on the prison to community setting (Doherty et al., 2014). Research rarely focuses on the reintegration of women from jail (White et al., 2012). The unique features of the jail setting (short stays) may act as a barrier to the successful implementation of jail reentry programs (White et al., 2012). Female incarceration impacts the lives of their children, families, and the roles they may occupy within their community (Valera, Chang, Hernández, & Cooper, 2015). Females are more likely to be incarcerated for nonviolent offenses such as larceny, theft, and fraud, possession of drugs, and prostitution (McLean et al., 2006; Miller & Miller, 2015) and for violent offenses such as domestic violence (Spjeldnes & Goodkind, 2009). Inadequate jail reentry planning place women back into the same crisis they were in before arrest, which further alienates them from their family, children, and social settings (McLean et al., 2006; Miller & Miller, 2015; Osher, 2006). For women who are the significant

caregivers in their family, an arrest record coupled with substance abuse may result in the child or children being placed in child protective services (Valera et. al., 2015). Barriers such as drug addiction, unemployment, mental and physical health issues, and lack of family support can cripple successful reinsertion.

In this research I explored the need for mandated reentry programs that specifically addressed employment issues, physical and mental health problems, family issues including parenting, and substance abuse as related to female low-level ex-offenders located in an urban setting. There is a gap in the literature regarding gender specific jail reentry programming. Literature that focuses on jail reentry either ignored the special needs of women or focused on both men and women as needing the same type of reentry programming. Recent literature primarily focused on prison reentry, but the need for an advanced jail reentry program that is data-driven may help to reduce the alarming rates of recidivism for released female inmates (Jannetta, 2009). Although jail reentry programming is making headway, there is still a need for evidence-based practices such as risk/needs assessment (Andrews, Bonta, & Wormith, 2011; Hooley, 2010), predetermined intervention programs, cognitive behavioral therapy (Miller & Khey, 2016), and ongoing support (Hooley, 2010) as it pertains to jail reentry programming for female ex-offenders.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative study was to describe the need for jail reentry programs that focused on low-level female offenders located in Montgomery County,

Ohio. Women are generally the caregivers of their minor children, and if incarcerated, the lives of the children can be negatively impacted (Valera et al., 2015). Barringer, Hunter, Salina, and Jason (2016) wrote that women involved in the criminal justice system had higher rates of mental health diagnoses, which included substance use disorders. This could have contributed to these women becoming homeless, having their parental rights terminated, being victimized, and reoffending (Barringer et al., 2016). Research also indicated that jailed inmates contained an array of physical and mental health issues and were immediately sent back to the community without help from reentry programming (Freudenberg, Daniels, Crum, Perkins, & Richie, 2005).

Research Questions

Using qualitative research, I hoped to better understand the special needs of female ex-offenders and the complex issues they faced at point of community reentry once released from jail. The qualitative research questions for this study stated:

RQ1: What are the perceived barriers women face that contribute to their re-offending once they are released from jail?

RQ2: If offered a reentry program, does the reentry program pertain to female low-level offenders?

RQ3: From the perspective of the female offender, what type of community driven programs will help make reentry successful for the female ex-offender?

Theoretical Framework for the Study

Theoretical frameworks help to guide a study and are an essential tool in research (Sabatier & Weible, 2014). This study was guided by the theoretical perspective of the social learning theory (SLT) as developed by Akers (1998). Akers, Krohn, Lanza-Kaduce, and Radosevich (1979) tested SLT by researching deviant behavior in a natural setting and found that individuals learn by directly imitating others. Thus, SLT helped to explain female deviant behavior and how this behavior contributed to criminogenic thinking patterns.

The premise of SLT states that instrumental learning occurs directly through a rewards/punishment foundation, vicariously through imitation, or through the consequences of observed behavior (Krohn, 1999). Akers summarizes:

The probability that persons will engage in criminal and deviant behavior is increased and the probability of their conforming to the norm is decreased when they differentially associate with others who commit criminal behavior and espouse definitions favorable to it, are relatively more exposed in-person or symbolically to salient criminal/deviant models, define it as desirable or justified in a situation discriminative for the behavior, and have receive in the past and anticipate in the current or future situation relatively greater reward than punishment for the behavior (as cited in Krohn, 1999, p. 464).

Here, Akers identifies four key concepts, central to SLT: (a) differential association, (b) definitions, (c) differential reinforcement, and (d) imitation (Krohn, 1999; Nicholson & Higgins, 2017). I identify and discuss these concepts further in Chapter 2.

Conceptual Framework for the Study

Conceptual and theoretical frameworks were oftentimes used interchangeably and were presented in theoretical literature in an unclear manner (Ravitch & Carl, 2016). The conceptual framework puts forth the significance of the topic, grounds the topic, guides the research questions, and provides context and theory (Ravitch & Carl, 2016). The conceptual framework for this study was that of Ostrom's institutional analysis and development framework (IAD), as presented by Sabatier and Weible (2014). For purposes of this study, the IAD framework offered a way to examine the lack of policy that encourages recidivism and was used to explain the need for programming that focused on female ex-offenders.

Because I used the IAD approach in this research, I hoped to identify the collective action problem that results when too many individuals share the same resources (Ostrom & Ostrom, 1971). The lack of community resources creates disruption in the community (Ostrom, Cox, & Schlager, 2014) causing collective action problems. Collective action problems occur when conflicts arise between those who believe a resource is beneficial to an individual and those who believe the resource is beneficial to a group (Center for Behavior, Institutions, and the Environment, 2016). When applying the IAD framework, Ostrom et al. (2014) emphasized the importance of identifying the

common problem needing resolution. The collective action problem of this study was the lack of community-wide resources available for female ex-inmates who reentered the community from jail.

Nature of the Study

This study was well suited for the qualitative approach because of the numerous advantages qualitative methodology provided. Tewksbury (2009) wrote that qualitative methods provide researchers a deeper understanding of “crime, criminals, and justice system operations and processing” (p. 38) that exceeds what is offered by statistical analyses. This study was both descriptive and analytic as I attempted to explain the importance of reentry programs if female ex-offenders were to successfully reenter their social settings. Using case study research as the qualitative research approach (Ravitch & Carl, 2016), this study evaluated the specific need for jail reentry programs and how gender specific programs helped reduce low-level offending among female offenders.

Definitions

Criminogenic needs: The need seen as causing criminal behavior. “Typical lists of criminogenic needs generally encompass four to eight needs categories or domains including parenting/family relationships, education/employment, substance abuse, leisure/ recreation, peer relationships, emotional stability/ mental health, criminal orientation and thinking, and residential stability” (Baird, 2017, p. 1).

Ex-offender: “A person who has previously been convicted of a felony (federal or state), has satisfied their sentencing, and has been released from incarceration” (Office of Ex-Offender Reentry Welcome One-Stop Reentry Center, 2010, p. 8.)

Low-level offender: In Ohio, one whose criminal activity is nonviolent, usually drug offenses and theft (Ison, 2016).

Recidivism: “Reengaging in criminal behavior after receiving a sanction or intervention, recidivism” (King & Elberbroom, 2014, p. 2).

Reentry: Involves the use of programs targeted at promoting the effective re-integration of offenders back to communities upon release from prison and jail (Office of Criminal Justice Services, n.d., p. 71).

Reentry barriers: Barriers female offenders face at point of reinsertion from jail to community. Barriers may include lack of safe housing, low job skills, little education, domestic abuse, lack of family, societal views on ex-offenders, and so forth. (McLean et al., 2006; Spjeldnes et al., 2014),

Assumptions

For this research project I used in-depth qualitative interviewing to explore the “experiences, motives, and opinions” (Rubin & Rubin, 2012, p. 3) of female ex-inmates who had recidivated in hopes of better understanding what they need at point of reentry and the barriers that may have hindered successful reinsertion. Using case study research, I assumed that those chosen to be interviewed were honest in their responses and honest when meeting their eligibility requirements. I assumed that this research

project added to the current literature as it pertained to this topic and may have helped others in their quest for positive social change.

Scope and Delimitations (Boundaries)

The scope of this study was to understand if a need existed for jail reentry programs that focused on low-level female ex-offenders located in an Ohio urban county. I used the qualitative approach to better understand the lived experiences of female offenders who had returned to their community from jail. This study helped me understand what barriers female offenders faced at point of reentry from jail and how these barriers hindered successful reentry. The female ex-offenders interviewed already recidivated at least once and reside within Montgomery County, Ohio. Using case study research as the qualitative research approach (Ravitch & Carl, 2016), In this study I evaluated the specific needs for jail reentry programming and how gender specific programs may have helped reduce recidivism. Through in-depth interviewing I gained knowledge from the narratives of women who lived it.

My focus was on women who had recidivated at least once and were not currently in jail. Eliminated from this study were men, juveniles, and women who had committed violent offenses. In Ohio, a low-level offender is one whose criminal activity is nonviolent, usually drug offenses and theft (Ison, 2016).

Limitations

It is important to note that in this research I did not analyze or evaluate reentry programming that currently exists in Montgomery County, Ohio. Instead, this research

project was an examination of the need for such programming as it pertained to female ex-offenders who had recidivated. Dirette (2014) writes that race is commonly used as a demographic variable; however, the definition of race is rarely explored. Although race may be mentioned, race was not used as a variable in this research project. Instead, this project focused on female low-level offenders who had already recidivated.

Female offenders have complex issues that act as barriers toward successful reentry such as: (a) intimate partner violence, (b) childhood sexual abuse, (c) being underemployed or unemployed, (d) having substance abuse disorders, (e) having children under the age of 18 who may or may not be in the custody of the mother (McLean et al., 2006; Spjeldnes et al., 2014), (f) participating in risky sexual behaviors, (g) likely to have HIV and hepatitis B and C, and (h) homelessness (McLean et al., 2006). Although these barriers are extremely important, some were beyond the scope of this paper. I did, however, explore the needs of mandated reentry programs that specifically address employment, physical and mental health, family, and substance abuse as they related to female low-level offenders located in an urban setting.

Significance

With this study I hoped to contribute to social change through the implementation and use of jail reentry programs that were set up specifically for female offenders. This study has the capability to change community, regional, and national policy objectives as they pertain to jail reentry. Through these changes, positive social change will occur.

Summary

With this qualitative study I hoped to understand the lives of women who had recidivated and to better understand any barriers that may have impeded reintegration, such as employment, physical and mental health, family, and substance abuse as they related to the female recidivating offender located in Montgomery County, an urban county located in Southwest Ohio.

Chapter 1 of this study outlined the background, problem statement, purpose of the study, research questions, framework of the study both theoretical and conceptual, nature of the study, definitions, assumptions, scope and delimitations, limitations, and the significance of this study. Chapter 2 includes an exhaustive review of the literature as it pertained to women who had recidivated and the need for jail reentry programming to determine the need for gender specific reentry programs and whether the presence/absence of gender specific programs will increase or reduce recidivism. I used social learning as the theoretical foundation of this study with the conceptual framework of Ostrom's (2005) IAD framework. I thoroughly discuss reentry, barriers to reentry, and jail reentry as they relate to female ex-offenders released from jail as opposed to prison.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

Reentry programs that address the issue of successfully reintegrating female ex-offenders into their community primarily focus on the prison to community process as opposed to the jail reentry process (Doherty et al., 2014). Vastly underreported is the transition of women from jail to community (White et al., 2012). The unique features of the jail setting (short stays) may act as a barrier to the successful implementation of jail reentry programs (White et al., 2012). In this research, the problem I examined was the lack of or absence of gender specific reentry programs located in Montgomery County, Ohio.

Female incarceration impacts the lives of the offenders' children, families, and the roles they may occupy within their community (Valera et al., 2015). Females are more likely to be incarcerated for nonviolent offenses such as larceny, theft and fraud, possession of drugs, and prostitution (McLean et al., 2006; Miller & Miller, 2015) and for violent offenses such as domestic violence (Spjeldnes & Goodkind, 2009). Lack of reentry programs or gender specific programs can place criminal offending women back into the situation they were in before arrest (McLean et al., 2006; Miller & Miller, 2015; Osher, 2006). Women are the significant caregivers in the family, therefore an arrest record coupled with substance abuse, for example, can result in the child or children being placed with child protective services (Valera et. al., 2015). Barriers such as drug

addiction, unemployment, physical and mental health issues, and lack of family support can cripple successful reintegration.

This research explored the need for programs that specifically address risk factors for recidivism such as employment issues, physical and mental health, parenting, and substance use as they relate to female low-level offenders located in an urban setting. There is a gap in the literature regarding gender specific jail reentry programing. Literature that does focus on jail reentry either ignores the special needs of women or focuses on both men and women as needing the same type of reentry programing. Research shows that female offenders have specific and complex issues (Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996). Recent literature primarily focused on prison reentry, but the need for an advanced jail reentry program that is data-driven may help to reduce the alarming rates of recidivism for released jail inmates (Jannetta, 2009).

I examined the need for gender-specific programming as it pertained to reentry from jail. The central research questions for this study were:

RQ1: What are the perceived barriers women face that contribute to re-offending once they are released from jail?

RQ2: What structures and process of a reentry program pertain to female low-level offenders?

RQ3: What type of community driven programs help make reentry successful for the female low-level offender?

Doherty et al. (2014) stated that for gender-specific programs to be successful, an awareness of gender differences must be recognized.

Compared to men, women have distinct pathways leading toward crime that are evident through violence (domestic abuse), mental illness, and harmful relationships (Boppre & Salisbury, 2016). Ward and Stewart (2002) wrote that when a person's basic needs are not met, internal (skills, beliefs, attitudes, and values) and external (social and cultural) conditions become distorted resulting in criminogenic needs. Therefore, addressing the female offender's criminogenic needs or dynamic risk factors (Andrews et al., 2011), inadvertently reduces recidivism. Addressing criminogenic needs means to identify the barriers to positive change. Substance abuse treatment, mental health treatment, behavioral therapy, housing, employment, education, and repairing familial bonds are a few criminogenic needs that should be addressed (Weller, 2012).

The rate at which the United States incarcerates women has steadily increased for many years. In fact, the United States incarcerates more women than any other country (Kajstura, 2017). From 1995 to 2003, the rate of female incarceration rose nearly 50% (McLean et al., 2006). Beginning in 1980, there were over 26,000 women and girls incarcerated; by 2014, the amount rose to over 215,000 (Sentencing Project, 2019). In 2015, there were over 700,000 women listed as being on probation and 103,000 women listed as being on parole (Sentencing Project, 2019). In 2017, there were 96,000 women in U.S. jails alone (Sentencing Project, 2019).

In most locations across the United States, prisons and jails serve different functions. The characteristics of the individuals housed in both locations differ as well. Those housed in jails may be awaiting transfer to prison, awaiting bail release or trial, or may be serving time for a minor sentence. A jail is usually structured differently than a prison, which can make it safer for the inmate. When a person is arrested and held in a county, city, or local jail, the location is usually close to the inmates' home. The usual stay for a jailed inmate can range from a few hours to several months up to a year. No matter the length of stay, a risk/needs assessment should be done at time of intake to properly assess the inmate's needs (Spjeldnes et al.,2014).

Women as compared to men are disproportionately housed in jails across the United States. Many women who are incarcerated have yet to receive a trial date, while 60% await trial (Kajstura, 2017). The female offender is one who is usually poor with an annual income of \$11,000 (Kajstura, 2017). For the minority woman, the annual income is a mere \$9,083 (Kajstura, 2017). This may account for why most females cannot afford bail (Kajstura, 2017) if bail is offered based on the seriousness of the offense (Williams, 2016). However, Williams (2016) cited that when a judge utilizes extra-legal factors such as race and gender, females are more likely to be released on bail as compared to men. The female offender is usually incarcerated for lesser offenses such as larceny, theft, possession of illegal substances, and the sale of illegal substances (McLean et al., 2006). Spjeldnes and Goodkind (2009) stated there is an increase in female violent crimes which could be contributed to an increase in mandatory arrest policies.

In 2008, President Bush signed the Second Chance Act: Community Safety Through Recidivism Prevention (SCA) due to prison overcrowding and high rates of recidivism (Albanes, 2012; Miller & Miller, 2016). Once the bill was passed, substantial amounts of funding were allocated to reentry programs and to help fund the research of special populations, including women (Spjeldnes & Goodkind, 2009). The goal of the SCA was to increase the number of reentry programs for those released from state prisons and local jails. Programs that received funds from the SCA program must create a sustainable plan the goals of which were focused on the success of the reentry program. Any funded SCA program must ensure the collaboration between criminal justice entities such as state and local governments with social service systems that include health care, proper housing, services for children, education, and substance and mental health treatment. Those receiving SCA grants were to create a reentry taskforce that consisted of community members, service providers, not-for-profit organizations, and service providers to fulfill the needs of those using the reentry program (Lindquist, Willison, Rossman, Walters, & Lattimore, 2015).

In 2007, the Transition from Jail to Community program was introduced by the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) to test a comprehensive model for jail transition that would (a) improve public safety by reducing the threat of harm, and (b) increase successful reinsertion of both male and female offenders (Willison et al., 2012). The Transition from Jail to Community model focuses on employment or unemployment issues, maintaining sobriety from addictive substances, homelessness, health issues, and

family connectedness (Willison et al., 2012). Ultimately, the Transition from Jail to Community initiative is concerned with building a jail-to-community outreach program that would last (Jannetta, 2009); it is not solely the jails' responsibility to properly transition the inmate into the community. This responsibility lies between both the jail and the local community (Urban Institute, n.d.).

Men have been incarcerated at greater rates than women (Spjeldnes & Goodkind, 2009) because of a system that was originally designed to rehabilitate men (Chesney-Lind, n.d.). Therefore, reentry programs were designed to fit the needs of men, not women. As a result, female victimization was ignored (Chesney-Lind, n.d.), and issues pertaining to housing, employment, education, and parenthood were designed to fit men, ignoring the needs of women (Spjeldnes et al., 2014). Since the 1970s, the rate of female criminal behavior, incarceration rates, and research pertaining to both have increased. For example, from 1960 to 2011 female imprisonment rates grew by 14% while that of males grew only by 7% (Belknap, Lynch, & DeHart, 2016). In 2017, there were 209,000 females incarcerated in the United States; 96,000 held in local and county jails; 99,000 held in state prisons; and 14,000 held in federal prisons (Kajstura, 2017). By the end of 2016, there were 947,450 women on probation and 217,625 women on parole (Kaeble, 2018). With the number of women involved in the criminal justice system, there is a need to investigate gender-specific programs that focuses on reentry.

The purpose of this chapter is to (a) describe how SLT, as developed by Akers (1998), explained crime and deviant behavior among female jail detainees; (b) describe

how Ostrom's IAD framework was used to explain the need for programming that focuses on women; (c) present a review of the literature, (d) discuss barriers to successful reentry, and (e) identify the gap that exists in current research that pertained to jail reentry programming that focused on women. I end Chapter 2 with a summary of the literature reviewed and connect the gap to the methods described in Chapter 3.

Literature Search Strategy

I used a literature search strategy to identify journals and peer-reviewed research that pertains to women and jail reentry programming. I used databases such as ProQuest Criminal Justice Database, Thoreau MultiDatabase Search, and SAGE Journals through the Walden University Library. Thoreau is a multi-database search tool used to scan several databases at once. Although Thoreau cannot be used to search every database, I used it as a quick reference guide where I used the key words *jail reentry, recidivism, jail + barriers, jail to community, community control, community awareness, and social learning* to aid in my search. To help refine the results, I set the limit to peer reviewed and scholarly journals and the publication type at academic journals. I further limited my search strategy by setting the subject section to women using key words: *jail + reentry, reintegration of offenders, case study, and deviant behavior*.

Using database Ovid Nursing Journals and search terms *qualitative + corrections, reentry, and reentry + women-sexual assault + jail*, information was produced as it pertained to mental health and qualitative research in correctional settings. To find information pertaining to SLT, I searched through Walden University dissertation lists,

setting the date parameter to 2017 through 2018. I used the key words: *jail reentry programming + social learning theory* to find the needed information.

Theoretical Foundation

The theoretical foundation for this dissertation consisted of SLT as developed by Akers (1998). Akers et al. (1979) tested SLT by researching deviant behavior in a natural setting and found that individuals learn by directly imitating others. Thus, SLT helped to explain female deviant behavior and how this behavior may have contributed to criminogenic thinking patterns.

Social Learning Theory

SLT as developed by Akers (1977) is a byproduct of Burgess and Akers' (1966) differential association-reinforcement theory (Cochran, Maskalay, Jones & Sellers 2017). Edwin Sutherland's differential association theory formed in 1947 was revised by Aker's to help explain criminal and deviant behavior (Durkin, Wolfe, & Clark, 2005) and to point out the mechanisms and processes through which criminal learning takes place (Sutherland & Cressey, 1960). The premise of SLT states that instrumental learning occurs directly through a rewards/punishment foundation, vicariously through imitation, or through the consequences of observed behavior (Krohn, 1999). Crime is a product of the behaviors, norms, and values of criminal activity (Siegel, 2004). Social learning is a process of social change because humans learn from one another in ways that benefit a wider spectrum of a social-ecological system (Reed et al., 2010). SLT, in its present form, consists of four concepts that will likely produce behavior which defy social and

legal norms: (a) differential reinforcement, (b) imitation, (c) pro-criminal definitions, and (d) differential association (Pratt et al., 2010; Yarbrough et al., 2012).

Differential reinforcement, most solidly grounded in psychological behaviorism, incorporates ideas such as operant conditioning, reinforcement, and punishment (Pratt et al., 2010;). Akers' concept of differential reinforcement refers to a specific process where an individual's deviant behavior becomes dominant over their conforming behavior (Pratt et al., 2010). It is the balance of the rewards process, either anticipated or actual, and the punishments or consequences that follow that determines the choice to commit deviant acts. If a person chooses to commit a crime or to refrain from it, their past, present, and anticipated future rewards and punishments of their actions dictate the choice (Akers, 1977).

Imitation, at its basic level, is learning by watching then repeating the observed behavior. Imitation is "the engagement in behavior after the observation of similar behavior in others" (Pratt et al., 2010, p. 767). If criminal behavior is learned through imitation, it would depend on how much the observer identifies with the model, whether the model is observed receiving reinforcement for their behavior, or whether the observer anticipates the model's behavior to be reinforced (Pratt et al., 2010). Although an individual may not be immediately rewarded for the observed behavior, the individual seems to match the actions of the observed. Whether imitation is a part of the learning process or a part of instrumental learning, it is an important part of the social learning

process. Imitation is an important characteristic when studying criminal behavior because of the influencing behavior one group has on another (Akers, 1977).

Before any deviant behavior occurs, the behavior must be learned. Pro-criminal definitions define an action as being right or wrong (Akers, 1977) good or bad, desirable or undesirable, or are “attitudes or meaning that one attaches to given behavior” (Cullen & Agnew, 2006, p. 136). These are the attitudes that are formulated by someone because of the exposed behavior and the definitions attached to that behavior. Once the definition is internalized, the individual will begin to imitate the deviant behavior (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 2007). If one believes that success is achieved through cheating, the more likely the individual will cheat to become successful (Yarbrough et al., 2012).

Differential association refers to the process where an individual is exposed to delinquent or nondelinquent behaviors where illegal or legal actions arise. An individual’s various associations determine who becomes a positive role model and who does not; what definitions are formed or not; and which behaviors receive more reinforcement than punishment or more punishment than reinforcement (Pratt et al., 2010). The social interactions between peer groups, neighbors, teachers and the social interactions that occur during social networking, through television and the internet form the setting where the learning of social behaviors occur. Most vital is the intimate personal group formed in an individual’s life; mainly one’s family and friends. Criminal behavior will likely occur when individuals differentially associate with individuals who

imitate, share or possess delinquent behavior, acts and attitudes (Nicholson & Higgins, 2017).

The social learning concepts of differential reinforcement, imitation, pro-criminal definitions, and differential association are a set of variables that, according to Akers, are a part of the underlying process of social learning. Everyone learns from and influences others. Not all who are exposed to criminal or deviant behavior go on to become criminals themselves (Akers, n.d.), however. Yarbrough et al. (2012) assessed differential association, differential reinforcement, and pro-criminal definitions to understand whether the SLT components are moderated by self-control. Yarbrough et al. (2012) found that SLT and its components are “a useful test of the extent and nature of person environment interactions that influence antisocial behavior” (p. 200).

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for this study consisted of Ostrom’s (2005) IAD framework that began in the early 1970s when V. Ostrom and E. Ostrom sought to better understand institutional arrangements and how social institutions operate and change over time (McGinnis, 2011; Ostrom et al., 2014). The IAD approach provided information pertaining to a collective action problem where many people share the same resources. The collective action problem that pertained to this study was the lack of community wide resources needed for female inmates who had already recidivated, which helped in the transition from jail to community. Collective action problems occur when conflicts arise between those who believe a resource is beneficial to an individual and those who

believe the resource is beneficial to a group (Center for Behavior, Institutions, and the Environment, 2016). When applying the IAD framework, it is important to identify the common problem people want resolved (Ostrom et al., 2014). For purposes of this study, the problem addressed was the lack of policy that mandated jail reentry.

Institutional Analysis and Development Framework

The IAD process tries to understand the policy process by using a systematic approach which analyzes institutions that govern action and outcomes within collective action arrangements (Hamza & Mellouli, 2018). The main concepts and categories that constitute the IAD framework include the development of the action situation, defining the rules, and exploring the three worlds of action; operational, collective choice, and constitutional choice (Ostrom et al., 2014, p. 269). The IAD framework is designed to apply new policy situations where communities and individuals draft new policies to solve policy problems (McGinnis & Ostrom, 2014). The IAD framework has three main components, each containing its own set of subcomponents: (a) exogenous variables, (b) the action arena, and (c) patterns of interactions and outcomes (Garcia-Lopez, 2009).

When analyzing a problem, it is important to identify the action arena which is a multi-level conceptual unit used to analyze, predict and explain human behavior (Ostrom et al., 2014). Within the action arena are two sets of variables known as the action situation and the actor; both are needed to diagnose, explain, and predict desired results (Ostrom, 2011; Ostrom et al., 2014). The action situation is a social area where actors interact with one another, solve problems, trade goods and services; actors participate in

the situation (Nigussie, et al., 2018). The IAD framework places the action arena as the central unit of analysis. There can be several action arena's that need identifying when examining a problem (Ostrom et al., 2014).

Since the works of Kiser and Ostrom (1982), which studied the impacts institutional arrangements have on human behavior, progress has been made toward the governance of a diverse systems (McGinnis & Ostrom, 2014). Ostrom's IAD framework offers a way to examine the lack of policy that mandates jail reentry and will be used to explain the need for programming that focuses on women. According to Ostrom et al., (2014), when applying the IAD framework, the shared problem needing resolved should be recognized. For the purpose of this research project, the shared problem was the lack of jail reentry policy that focused on recidivating women. Through research, I hoped to identify the need for action arenas or community programs that focused on the special needs of criminal offending women. Combined, SLT and IAD framework formed the platform of this study.

Reentry

The purpose of reentry programs, jail or prison, is to reduce recidivism. Those rejoining society after incarceration do, however, face many obstacles. When incarcerated, individuals are held in a state or federal prison, or a city or county jail. One of the biggest differences between jails and prisons is the time spent incarcerated. Jail stays usually vary from a few months to a few hours (Miller & Miller, 2010). Jails are usually overcrowded which can contribute to the spreading of infectious diseases such as

tuberculous, staph infections, and hepatitis B (Miller, Miller, & Barnes, 2016), just to name a few.

The revolving door process of a jail setting may make jail reentry programming illogical. The same is not true for prisons. Reentry can be planned, with time to interview inmates and time to find housing, employment, and rehabilitation if needed (Miller & Miller, 2010). Spjeldnes et al. (2014) state that literature pertaining to reentry is mostly based on prisons, and prison-based programming during reentry can reduce recidivism. However, “jails present alternative opportunities for offender success through rehabilitation intensification in terms of criminality, time, and distance” (Miller & Miller, 2010, p. 898). Although this project addressed the gap in jail reentry programming as it pertained to women, there was also a gap in jail reentry literature.

The next section will review the information and literature as it relates to the barriers of jail and prison reentry. Following the barriers of reentry, I explain jail reentry as it pertains to female offenders through an exhaustive and extensive search of jail reentry literature.

Barriers to Reentry

Every year numerous ex-offenders, male and female, return from incarceration to their or other communities. Of these, women are the fastest growing population of incarcerated individuals across the United States (Blanchette & Taylor, 2009; Sentencing Project, 2019;). Therefore, it is important to consider gender when finding ways to implement successful reentry strategies (Spjeldnes et al., 2014). Common barriers that

female inmates face upon reentry are sexual promiscuity and prostitution (McLean et al., 2006); poor social skills (Doherty et al., 2014); domestic violence and sexual abuse (Belknap et al., 2016; McLean et al., 2006;); child care and custodial issues (McLean et al., 2006; Spjeldnes & Goodkind, 2009); lack of family support (McLean et al., 2006; Valera et al., 2015); HIV, AIDS and Hepatitis (Hearn et al., 2014; McLean et al., 2006); limited education, (Doherty et al., 2014; Spjeldnes et al.; Spjeldnes & Goodkind, 2009; 2014; Valera et al., 2015); lack of employment skills (Doherty et al., 2014; McLean et al., 2006; Schonbrun et al., 2016; Spjeldnes et al., 2014; Spjeldnes & Goodkind, 2009); mental and physical health issues, (McLean et al., 2006; Spjeldnes et al., 2014; Spjeldnes & Goodkind, 2009; Belknap et al., 2016); housing issues or lack of (McLean, et al., 2006; Schonbrun et al., 2016; Spjeldnes et al., 2014); and substance abuse, (Belknap et al., 2016; Doherty et al., 2014; Hearn et al., 2014; McLean, et al., 2006; Spjeldnes et al., 2014; Spjeldnes & Goodkind, 2009). Although every barrier mentioned is important, some will be dismissed. The following barriers: drug addiction, employment, mental and physical health, along with family issues (child custody, single parenting, and family support), will be explored. Barriers such as these can cripple a successful reentry for the female offender. This section presents an exhaustive review of the key variables and/or concepts as they pertain to female reentry.

The barrier of addiction. Jannetta (2009) states that over two-thirds of all jail inmates can be categorized as being drug addicted or drug dependent. Doherty et al. (2014) write that successful reintegration can be challenging when an inmate suffers with

addictive tendencies. According to Spjeldnes and Goodkind (2009), women are incarcerated more for drug or property-related crimes and for non-violent offenses such as larceny, fraud, and theft (McLean et al., 2006) as compared to men. Women have differences in their substance abuse disease progression. Women are also higher on the list for substance abuse treatment as compared to men. Female substance abuse is related to emotional loss, victimization, or family disruption and is linked to coping and to alleviate suffering (Spjeldnes & Goodkind, 2009). Once the female is arrested, one-third are using drugs at the time of the crime compared to one-quarter who have no diagnosable disorders. Hearn et al., (2014) cite HIV-related drug use and sexual risky behaviors as a moderating variable toward reoffending once the female has been released from incarceration.

Community reinsertion is a stressful time for the female offender and can trigger an increase in substance use and abuse. Mood altering chemicals are used to cope with life stressors such as unemployment, homelessness, and unstable housing (Hearn et al., 2014). Spjeldnes et al., (2014) administered questionnaires to ACJ inmates, located in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, pertaining to race, age, gender, and other variables. Researchers found that female (53.3%) jail inmates, as compared to male (29.1%), are more likely to have substance abuse issues and express the need for support services for this issue (Spjeldnes et al., 2014). However, male inmates are more likely to have alcohol abuse disorders. Spjeldnes et al., (2014) cite at time of arrest, females (40%) are more likely to be under the influence of some type of mood- or mind-altering chemical as compared to

men (32%). Many female jail inmates are there for substance abuse issues (Spjeldnes et al., 2014). But women are more likely to attend 12-step meetings prior to arrest, whether mandated by the court or voluntarily (Spjeldnes et al., 2014). A 2011 a nonprobability convenience sampling approach conducted by Doherty et al. (2014) showed that 85% of Canadian female federal inmates suffer with substance abuse issues; 32% of the female prison inmates were held for substance abuse related issues. For substance abuse programs to be successful, there must be an awareness of gender differences and prison-based treatment programs (Doherty et al., 2014).

Through a secondary analysis, Schonbrun et al., (2016) recruited women from 2004 to 2007 during the early days of their incarceration. All were jailed, unsentenced women housed at the Rhode Island Department of Corrections. Using self-reported data collected from excessive alcoholic females located in a jail setting, Schonbrun et al. (2016) found that substance abuse and mental health treatment was associated with recidivism. By examining the perceived needs of jailed women, “women who are unable to access relevant treatment services early after release are less likely than those without such needs to successfully remain in their communities” (Schonbrun et al., 2016, p. 1827).

According to Alex et al. (2017), there is an enhanced risk for mortality soon after release from jail. In their study, Alex et al. (2017) matched jail release records, using probabilistic record linkage, to those records retrieved from the NYC vital statics. During their 19-month study, Alex et al. (2017) found that 27 deaths occurred within the

NYC jails with a general population of 12,300. From the 86,711 discharges during this same time frame, 59 deaths occurred within 42 days of release (Alex et al., 2017, p. 84). Opioid overdose (37.3%) and *other* drug usage accounted for 8.5% of these deaths. Disease, trauma, suicide and *other* account for the remainder (Alex et al., 2017).

Mental and physical health barriers. According to Miller and Miller (2010), there is a link between substance abuse and mental health issues. Because of the large number of inmates being housed in prisons and jails, it can be assumed that many have substance abuse disorders. Many of the substance abusing inmates are also diagnosed with mental health disorders. Together, mental health and substance abuse issues make positive reinsertion challenging upon release (Miller & Miller, 2010) unless reentry programs are utilized. McLean et al., (2006) found from their study of female adult detainees located in the Baltimore City Detention Center that infectious diseases are common. Of those who responded to the survey, 5% reported been infected with HIV, 14% infected with HCV, and 40% with a sexually transmitted disease. Also common are female inmates with mental health issues: 59% reported having depression, 33% were diagnosed with bipolar disorder, and 9% reported having schizophrenia (McLean, et al., 2006, p. 386).

Spjeldnes et al., (2014) state that offenders are more than likely to have mental health problems than compared non-offenders. Female offenders have more health problems as compared to men and are seven times more likely to have cancer as compared to men. Women and men at the ACJ in Pennsylvania reported needing mental

health services. With statistical significance, women communicated interest in receiving in-jail services including help with mental-health issues (Spjeldnes et al., 2014). Belknap et al., (2016) used a qualitative study to question jail staff members about mental health issues pertain to women. A significant amount of jail staff members secondarily (primarily pertained to trauma) had compassion for jailed women with mental health issues and the challenges these women face.

Jails are not social service institutions, however when an individual is arrested, the jail becomes a mental health provider (Rowe, Huskey, & Severson, 2016). For example, Illinois has one of the world's largest mental health jail populations located at Cook County Jail. Due to the closure of several state and city owned mental health institutions, Cook County Jail is now that area's mental health provider. Inmates are interviewed by a social worker before their initial court appearance. Of the 60 inmates screened for mental health disorders in a 24-hour time span, 63% were women, 37% men (Holzer-Glier, 2016).

State-wide mental health treatment is declining. Seventeen percent of inmates have documented evidence of some form of mental illness (Jannetta, 2009). Because of jail overcrowding, managing inmates with mental health issues becomes a challenge (Rowe et al, 2016). Jail staff and corrections officers are not equipped to handle inmates with mental health issues and are "increasingly challenged by suicides and violence" (Rowe et al., 2016, para. 1).

Iliceto et al. (2012) conducted their research in Lecce, Italy by obtaining a convenience sample of 40 female jailed inmates in 2007. Iliceto et al. (2012) found that incarcerated women have higher rates of mental illness compared to women in the community. Women housed in jails and prisons, no matter their location, deserve the right to mental and physical care and “is a fundamental human right (Iliceto et al., 2012, p. 24).” Although this study was conducted outside the bounds of the United States, it is important to mention. Some female inmates are mothers to young children and being separated from them creates its own form of emotional problems. By modifying prison personnel, the prison environment, and the situational variables that add to mental distress, the psychological distress of incarcerated women can be reduced (Iliceto et al., 2012).

Research indicates that jailed inmates contain an array of physical and mental health issues and are immediately sent back to the community without help from reentry programming (Freudenberg et al., 2005). Reentry programs attempt to address the needs of offenders through holistic treatment which begin at the onset of incarceration and continue through release.

Employment barrier. Policy and practices have begun to swing toward offender rehabilitation; therefore, states have noticed a 6.4% decline of their jail populations. However, between 1996 and 2011, female jail populations rose 45% (Spjeldnes et al., 2014). From 2010 to 2013, the male inmate population fell to 4.2% while the female inmate population rose to 10.9% (Barringer et al., 2016). This suggests that gender

specific needs in reentry strategies should be acknowledged (Spjeldnes et al., (2014). Using data collected from ACJ located in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Spjeldnes et al. (2014) focused on gender differences in an urban jail population. Female inmates are likely to be unemployed (60%) at time of arrest compared to men (40%). The female jail inmate is likely to be on some type of public assistance (30%) compared to 8% men (Spjeldnes et al., 2014; Spjeldnes & Goodkind, 2009).

Spjeldnes and Goodkind (2009) explored gender-specific statistics that pertain to incarceration and the barriers they face at reintegration. When individuals reenter society after incarceration, lack of education hampers their chances of finding meaningful employment (Miller & Miller, 2010). Female inmates generally have fewer financial resources, little education, low job skills and less employment experiences than male inmates (Spjeldnes & Goodkind, 2009). In the prison study conducted by Pogrebin, West-Smith, Walker, and Unnithan (2014), it was found that to satisfy parole recommendations, employment is a must. However, many employers are unwilling to hire anyone previously incarcerated. This leaves few jobs for the ex-inmate. Men and women must compete for low-paying wages leaving them frustrated and many times, out of a job. Also, if an ex-inmate is sentenced to parole or on some time of community control, lack of employment is means for parole revocation sending the ex-offender back to prison or jail (Pogrebin et al., 2014).

When women begin to reenter society after a long stay in prison or a short stint in jail, obtaining meaningful employment can be challenging (Doherty et al., 2014;

Spjeldnes & Goodkind, 2009). Schonbrun et al. (2016) state that gainful employment is positively associated with a secure income and health insurance. Most inmates (60%), however, are reported as earning less than \$1,000 a month before arrest; 90% as being uninsured (Schonbrun, et al., 2016; Spjeldnes & Goodkind, 2009).

Family issues: Child custody, single parenting, and family support. In the United States, women in the criminal justice system face the loss of their children, lack medical and mental health treatment, and are often victims of sexual abuse (Iliteo, 2012). In fact, there are over 2.5 million children under age 18 who have a parent in custody (Reilly, 2013). As the public's attention shifts toward the growing rates of incarceration, information pertaining to female incarceration (Kajstura, 2017) and how these rates affect the family (Spjeldnes et al., 2014) are being sought. Jailed mothers make up 80% of the female jail population and at time of arrest, only 25% of mothers had children living with them (Freudenburg et al., 2005). Nearly half of all incarcerated parents have children under the age of 10 (ACLU, 2018). Because women are usually the primary caregiver of minor children (Kajstura, 2017), women in jail cannot provide childcare (Katz, 1998); 5% of women in jail were arrested while pregnant (Spjeldnes et al, 2014). Awaiting pretrial or bond hearings can be challenging as well because it is unknown how long childcare will be needed (Katz, 1998). There are 2.7 million minor children who have a parent in jail or prison.

Life after jail for the newly released mother can be quite challenging. Schonbrun et al. (2016) cite 25% of the women who leave jail are uncertain as to where they will

live. Duwe and Clark (2014) state between 40%-80% of newly released offenders need housing help from family members. However, many women become homeless once they leave prison and jail. In fact, nearly half all women who reenter society after incarceration become homeless due to substance abuse, mental health, employment and the stigma of being incarcerated (Nyamathi et al., 2017). Oftentimes the only available housing for recently released female offenders is in disadvantaged neighborhoods with higher than usual crime rates (Nyamathi et al., 2017).

Research suggests that family members are an important component of a past offenders social network, in fact, familial ties are positively correlated to post-release success (Berg & Huebner, 2011, p. 401). Doherty et al. (2014) write that social support from family and friends, “help women offenders overcome the sense of shame that can accompany imprisonment” (p. 573). Berg and Huebner (2011) sought to understand the effect social ties has on offenders and employment, and in turn, the indirect risk of recidivism. It was found that by “facilitating job attainment, familial social ties, as well as marriage, we may break the cycle of prison to unemployment and thereby stymie the pathway of state dependence leading from prison to reoffending” (Berg & Huebner, 2011, p. 405). By strengthening an offender’s social relationships, positive employment outcomes are possible (Berg & Huebner, 2011). These outcomes can lead to the cessation of crime and the behavior associated with leading a life of crime.

Women in jail come from broken homes, abusive families, and are usually victims of sexual abuse (Katz, 1998). In fact, 86% of jailed women experience sexual violence and 77% are victims of domestic abuse (Human Rights Watch and ACLU, 2018). These women also seek out relationships where the abuse continues. Women of childhood abusive have low self-esteem, blame themselves, and have suicidal thoughts. To deal with these issues, women will usually turn to drugs/alcohol to ease the pain. Addiction and unresolved trauma are barriers to successful reintegration (Doherty et al., 2014).

Human Rights Watch and ACLU (2018) wrote an extensive report pertaining to the effects of jail on children in Oklahoma. Although my dissertation pertained to an Ohio urban county, this report was worth mentioning. This report utilized telephone interviews with 35 women who had minor children and who were recently incarcerated or currently incarcerated in Oklahoma. When a woman is released from jail in Oklahoma, there are many barriers to reunification with minor children. Many mothers face having their parental rights terminated. The Adoption and Safe Families Act states is to reduce time a child has in foster care and for speedy adoptions. If a child has been in foster care 15 out of the past 22 months, parental rights are to be terminated (TPR) with little exceptions. For children four years and younger, TPR is achieved if the child has been in foster care six of the previous 12 months (Human Rights Watch and ACLU, 2018). As previously mentioned, many women are jailed for an undetermined amount of time. Because of Oklahoma's Safe Families Act, many jailed women are at serious risk

of losing their children. Jailed mothers with younger children are at an even greater risk of permanently losing their children.

When women are ready to be released back into the community, not all will recidivate. The desire to change, positive self-esteem, instilling institutional treatment, family support, and continuity of care are positive themes that lead to positive reentry (Doherty et al., 2014, p. 568). However, not all incarcerated women can achieve reintegration readiness. Kajstura (2017) reported that there are over 96,000 women in jail, however, this represents only 16% of the women under correctional supervision. Of the 96,000 women in jail, 60% have not been convicted of a crime and are awaiting trial (Kajstura, 2017). Once women are released from jail or even prison, they face a myriad of barriers at point of reentry. If left unaddressed, the female offender will likely reoffend adding to the increasing rates of recidivism.

Jail Reentry

Jailed inmates total 740,000 at year end 2016 accounting for 10.6 million individuals released that year. Of these inmates, 60% await court action; 35% are convicted. The turn-over rate for inmates in all U.S. jails during 2016 was 55% (Zeng, 2018). The immediate time following release from jail is proven to be a high-risk time for the offender (Alex et al, 2016). Especially at risk is the female offender. When these women leave jail, they reenter into their own communities making jail the only treatment environment they will encounter. Jail-based reentry programs can provide help with drug addiction and treatment, health care, counseling, and other services. The rationale for

introducing these programs during jail is to give the offender a chance at successful integration. Jail reentry programs vary in their intensity, time frame and quality of care (Freudenberg, 2006). However, without finances or mandated policy, programs such as these have little chance of survival. Because of the Second Chance Act of 2008 (Miller & Miller, 2016), jailed inmates have a chance at successful reintegration (Lynch, Miller, Miller, Heindel & Wood, 2012).

One difference between prisons and jails are the length of time one spends behind bars. Not only is the length of incarceration dissimilar, so too are the reentry programs offered to the newly released ex-offender. Miller and Miller (2010) write that the many prison reentry programs used in state in federal prisons are successful. But jail reentry programming is uncommon. One such program, the Auglaize County Transition (ACT) Program, located in an Ohio rural county, offers offender reentry strategies used to address the many problems inmates face once they leave the confines of jail. The ACT program acts as a link between jail and community resources prompting success at point of reentry. The Miller and Miller (2010) ACT study found that jail reentry programs can have a positive community reinsertion experience, however, it is unknown what contributes the most to this success. Miller and Miller (2015) revisited their original study by focusing on recidivism, altercations during lock-up, and supervised release. Miller and Miller (2015) state, “the ACT program exerted a significant effect on the likelihood of rearrest and probation violations at the bivariate level” (p. 220). It is

unclear why the second study found the ACT program does reduce probation violations, but not recidivism.

In Ohio, there are two programs that utilized federal grants set forth by the Second Chance Act entitled, “The Delaware County Transition Program” (DCT) and the Delaware Substance Abuse Treatment Program” (DCJSAT). These programs were implemented due a steady increase in the areas population, drug crimes, and high rates of recidivism. The DCT program focused on male and female offenders who were diagnosed with both substance abuse and mental health disorders while the DCJSAT program aimed to help male offenders whose repeat offenses of drug crimes contributed to the disruption of family (Miller, Barnes, & Miller, 2017). Using mixed methods research, Miller et al., (2017) found both the DCT and the DCJSAT programs to reduce recidivism after one year of program completion. Even if an individual did not graduate from the program, it was found that those who did start treatment were less likely to recidivate (Miller et al., 2017). The programs, DCJSAT and DCT both focus on offender reentry. However only the DCT program targeted both male and female offenders; the DCJSAT targeted males only.

The Franklin County Community Reentry program, located in middle Tennessee, began operating in 2007 and in 2013, changed its name to Middle Tennessee Rural Reentry (MTRR) (Miller & Miller, 2016). The goal of MTRR is to reduce recidivism while maintaining public safety (Miller & Miller, 2016). Reentry programming is located at the Franklin County Jail but serves Coffee and Grundy county’s as well (Miller &

Miller, 2016). SCA funding requirements for the MTRR program state the program must:

- target high risk offenders emphasizing female participation and high-risk offenders at risk for chronic homelessness,
- offer evidence-based treatment to include cognitive behavioral therapy,
- provide medicated assisted treatment, and
- reach a targeted recidivism rate of 35% (Miller & Miller, 2016, p. 392).

With 60% of all offenders indicating co-occurring substance abuse and psychiatric disorders, there is an overall recidivism rate of 79.5% (Miller & Miller, 2016). To instill cognitive behavioral change, the MTRR program utilized Moral Recognition Therapy (MRT) and Prime for Life (PFL). Both utilize evidence-based treatment techniques. Using three measures of recidivism: rearrest, probation violation and relapse, Miller and Miller (2016) found that those employed at time of arrest were 44% less likely to reoffend compared to those unemployed. Those who held jobs at time of initial arrest were also less likely to recidivate. In all, 33.5% of participants recidivated, 18.7% received a probation violation, and 8.1% tested positive for drugs (Miller & Miller, 2016). However, Miller and Miller (2016) found that those who participated in substance abuse and mental health after care services were more likely to recidivate compared to those who did not. It is unclear why these findings occurred but “it is possible that only the most severe cases of co-occurring disorders were referred for aftercare services” (Miller & Miller, 2016, p. 397).

Schonbrun et al. (2016) discuss the complex set of circumstances women encounter at point of reentry from jail. In their work, Schonbrun et al. (2016) screened 1,415 women for risk of hazardous drinking using self-reports of perceived needs. Women reported perceived needs of mental health counseling (57.3%), medical services (54.9%), and substance abuse (45.9%) as the top three (Schonbrun et al., 2016). Schonbrun et al. (2016) found that mental health and substance treatment needs are associated with subsequent reincarceration. “These associations are common with prior research and suggest that women who are unable to access relevant treatment services early after release are less likely than those without such needs to successfully remain in their communities” (Schonbrun et al., 2016, p. 1827).

Rose, Lebel, Begun, and Fuhrmann (2014). argue that the number of jailed inmates released within one week (70%) does not amount to the number of jails that offer some type of treatment program; only 55% of the jails Nationwide have treatment programs to offer the reentering inmate. The lack of programs needed, during incarceration or within the community, intersect with the barrier’s women face at reentry (Rose et al., 2014). Close to 750,000 inmates are released back into the community within the timespan of a year (Zeng, 2018). Improving offender success by utilizing jail reentry programs can help reduce the rates of recidivism while maintaining community safety (Miller & Miller, 2010).

Reentry in Montgomery County, Ohio

Montgomery County is an urban county located in south-west Ohio. In July 2018, there were 531,542 individuals in Montgomery County, Ohio, 51.9% were female. The national average of female jailed inmates rose from 11% in 2006 to 15% by the end of 2016 (Zeng, 2018). The number of Ohio's female sentenced correctional inmates also rose 3.7% between 2015 and 2016 (Wagner & Sawyer, 2018).

Even though the female jailed inmate population in Ohio continues to rise, those returning to their community after a lengthy stay in jail do have community wide services available to them. However, these programs are for both men and women and are offered to those who are returning from prison and jail. Montgomery County, Ohio offers an office of reentry that provides “programs that minimize barriers to effective reentry and promote reduction in recidivism” (Human Services Planning and Development, 2018, para. 1) The Montgomery County Office of Reentry (MCOR) is a community wide resource offered to individuals after a stay in prison or jail. The MCOR offers families of individuals who are facing a jail or prison term resources to help with the transition. Resources such as how to obtain a power of attorney, child support, and family medical information are available through the MCOR (Human Services..., 2018).

The MCOR Reentry Collaborative promotes reentry provider networking, organizational support through resource building, and long-term sustainability (Reentry Collaborative, n.d.). The goal of the Reentry Collaborative is employment; to gainfully employ the exoffender. The service providers engaged in the Reentry Collaborative are

employers willing to work with individuals who have a criminal record (Lorenzetti, 2014). The Reentry Career Alliance Academy (RCAA) is a service offered by the office of Reentry. The RCAA program begins with an orientation where the individual is introduced to community resources, employers, and a case manager to help those with criminal history barriers and other life challenges. Workshops such as Reentry Planning, Behavioral Health, Housing, Healthcare, and Education, for example, are offered (Reentry Career Alliance Academy, n.d.).

While in jail, inmates (men and women) can volunteer in the Prisoner Work Program (Jail, n.d.). This program offers inmates a chance to work in the daily operations of the jail. Inmates perform various duties such as laundry, kitchen duty, commissary, and help maintain the overall cleanliness of the jail. Inmates can work outside the jail washing patrol cars and picking up trash along Montgomery County's roadways. Such programs offer physical activity to the inmates while helping to cut costs of daily operations (Jail, n.d.).

Programs that solely focus on female inmates are very limited. Recently, the Montgomery County Sheriff's Office collaborated with the community to provide prostitution intervention. The program offers resources needed to help the female inmate succeed once released. The program's goal is to break the cycle of prostitution and offer a healthier way of living (Jail, n.d.). Montgomery County Courts have what is known as specialty courts or problem-solving courts. One such court, the Women's Therapeutic Court (WTC), is for women who have severe substance abuse/alcohol addictions and for

women who have a history of life-long trauma. Women are strictly monitored by their probation officer by reporting five days a week for some, others report less. The length of time involved in WTC is usually one year. If the female offender cannot remain drug/alcohol free, the court will send her to a 90-day treatment program (Common Pleas Court and Clerk of Courts, 2018) to understand addiction.

Recent research has indicated that offenders can make reentry successful if a strong network of support exists within their community. If such programs are offered prior to release, future problem behavior can diminish (Miller & Miller, 2010). Although Montgomery County, Ohio does offer reentry, such programs are set-up for both men and women offenders. These reentry programs are primarily for prison reentry; those reentering society after a lengthy stay in jail can utilize their services. As previously discussed in this chapter, male and female offenders have differing needs; during incarceration and at point of reinsertion. Intervening before community reentry seems logical, especially for the female detainee.

The purpose of this study was to describe the need for mandated jail reentry programs that focused on the needs of low-level offending women located in Montgomery County, Ohio. Many returning female offenders will reoffend (Janetta, Willison, & Kurs, 2016). This study has the capability to change jail reentry in Montgomery County, Ohio especially as it pertains to the female offender.

Summary and Conclusions

Prisons are places of confinement for those who break societal laws. Once arrested, however, the individual is housed in a city or county jail where they await action from the criminal justice system. There are more than 3,000 jails in the United States that contain pretrial detainees, those sentenced to jail, and those who had violated probation and/or parole terms (Janetta et al., 2016). More than three quarter of all jail inmates were released soon after arrest, the remainder were sent to prison (Freudenberg et al., 2005). Harsh sentencing laws such as mandatory minimums had helped the United States to become the world leader in rates of incarceration (Sentencing Project, 2017). At the writing of this study, there were 2.3 million adult individuals incarcerated in the United States, of those, 640,000 had been housed in local city and county jails (Wagner & Rauby, 2017). There were also 6,741,400 individuals on some type of community control, albeit probation/parole (U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics [BJS], 2015) and 11.4 million individuals had been booked into an American jail each year (Jannetta et al., 2016). Within three years, two-thirds will recidivate, half of those will commit new crimes (Jenkins, Dammer, & Raciti, 2017).

When women are arrested and sent to jail, it is important to remember these women (60%) have yet to be convicted of a crime and await trial (Kajstura, 2017). Although little is known about jail reentry programming, there is need for evidence-based practices (Hooley, 2010), intervention programs along with cognitive behavioral therapy (Miller & Khey, 2016) and ongoing support (Hooley, 2010) for jail reentry programming.

Close to 95% of all individuals housed in America's jails and prisons will be released at some time (Petersilla, 2001). These individuals will reintegrate into communities across the country.

There is a gap in the literature regarding gender specific jail reentry programming. In fact, "the academic literature on the topic of jail reentry is, with few exceptions, limited as few jail reentry programs exist and even fewer have been empirically analyzed" (Miller & Miller, 2010, p. 894). Jail reentry literature that exists either ignored the special needs of women or focused on both men and women as in need of the same type of programming. Because this study focused on jail reentry, it also contributed to the needed jail reentry literature. Using qualitative case study research, it was my hope to partially fill the needed information as it pertained to female offenders.

Chapter 3: Research Method

Introduction

Research has indicated that female jailed inmates suffer from an array of physical and mental health problems along with specific and complex issues upon release, then are immediately sent back to the community without help from reentry programs (Freudenberg et al., 2005). Women who had found their way into America's criminal justice system often suffer complex issues such as lack of education, poor employment skills (Spjeldnes & Goodkind, 2009), mental health and substance abuse issues (Herrschaft, Veysey, Tubman-Carbone, & Christian, 2009), and oftentimes lack support from their family. If female offenders are to reintegrate successfully, they must develop a positive social support system (Doherty et al., 2014; Herrschaft et al., 2009), find gainful employment, and refrain from use of all illegal substances. Without proper education, employment skills, and family support (Spjeldnes & Goodkind, 2009), successful reentry will be challenging.

The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore the special circumstances of women ex-offenders and the perceived barriers to reentry: drug addiction, employment, mental and physical health, and family issues (child custody, single parenting, and family support) that hinder successful community reinsertion. This study was both descriptive and analytic as I attempted to explain the importance of reentry as it pertained to social settings. Using case study research as the qualitative research approach, I evaluated the cognitive needs and outcomes as they related to women who had already recidivated and

were living in their community. In this chapter, I discuss (a) the research design and rationale for this qualitative study; (b) my role as a researcher; (c) methodology, including the examination of participant selection logic, instrumentation, and the data analysis plan; (d) issues of trustworthiness such as credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability; (e) data collection; and (f) ethical and analysis procedures.

Research Design and Rationale

Using qualitative research, I hoped to better understand the special needs of women exoffenders and the complex issues they faced at point of community reentry once released from jail. The qualitative research questions for this study stated:

RQ1: What are the perceived barriers women face that contribute to re-offending once they are released from jail?

RQ2: What structures and process of a reentry program pertain to female low-level offenders?

RQ3: What type of community driven programs help make reentry successful for the female low-level offender?

Case study research as the qualitative research approach uses single or multiple cases to understand real-life events bounded by time and space (Cox, 2016; Ravitch & Carl, 2016). Using a variety of data gathering resources ensures the study is explored through multiple lenses leaving the phenomenon of interest discoverable and identifiable (Baxter & Jack, 2008). Because I used case study research (Cox, 2016), I was able to

collect differing types of data pertaining to the case and was able to gain an in-depth look at research participants and the community programs offered to reentry participants. I closely examined the barriers female ex-offenders believe hindered their successful reentry into their community.

Role of the Researcher

Central to any qualitative research project is the role of the researcher because the researcher is the primary research instrument (Ravitch & Carl, 2016). I was the sole interviewer and the sole data collector for this research project. I developed my own interview questions, interviewed each participant, and probed each participant to gain further understanding and information as it pertained to my topic. I gathered, coded, and interpreted the data. Because different topics were explored and emerged, I kept memos. Memos are an important tool in qualitative research, especially through the differing phases that occur in such methodology (Ravitch & Carl, 2016). To stay aligned with the topic and as more information emerged, the memos became central to the development of this research project.

Methodology

The population under study for this research project was female ex-offenders who reside within Montgomery County, Ohio, had been arrested for a low-level offense, had recidivated at least once, and were not currently incarcerated. In-depth interviews were used “to explore in detail the experiences, motives, and opinions” (Rubin & Rubin, 2012, p. 3) of female ex-offenders and to understand the jail reentry process from their

perspective. The semistructured interview process allowed me to narrow the focus to items “that speak to the research question” (Rubin & Rubin, 2012, p. 31). This research pertained to women who had broken the law, had been arrested, and recidivated at least once. I used case study as the qualitative approach for this project. Using the case study approach as the anticipated report format, each interviewee became the unit of analysis. Each female repeat offender interviewed was considered a part of the case and each case was relevant to the study.

Participant Selection Logic

Recruiting participants for research can be challenging. Namageyo-Funa et al. (2014) noted consent, gatekeeper issues, and lack of recruitment strategies as issues researchers face when seeking participants for qualitative interviews. The interview site was a neutral location free from outside interference. The strategies I used to recruit participants was to place flyers stating the need for females to participate in a research project. The population I sampled were females who had been arrested, jailed and at one time housed at the Montgomery County Jail, and had recidivated. The location of study was Montgomery County, Ohio, at the MonDay Community Correctional Facility (MonDay CCI). The females were housed in a separate location, separate from men. I interviewed 13 females over age 18 who represented a diverse population (age, race, ethnicity, etc.).

I chose participants using the purposeful random sampling strategy. Ravitch and Carl (2016) state that purposeful random sampling adds credibility to a study, is

perceived as reducing bias, and can be appropriate when many cases are available with time and resource constraints.

Because the purpose of this qualitative study was to describe the need for jail reentry programs that focused on low-level women offenders located in Montgomery County, Ohio, the female participant had to have been arrested, then recidivated, and their crimes had to have been low-level offenses. A statement pertaining to what a jail reentry program is was read to the participant to introduce the theme of reentry programming. Each participant was given an informed consent form before beginning the interview process.

Instrumentation

Instrumentation is the course of action used by a researcher (Research Rundowns, n.d.) when gathering data. When researchers choose to discover information from an interviewee, they structure their interview questions in open-ended style. The open-ended questions usually lead the researcher to ask follow-up questions that are based on the response given by the interviewee (Chenail, 2011). I wrote the interview questions and only used them for this research project. I used open-ended questions for a semistructured, face-to-face personal interview where all replies to the interview questions were handwritten. Recording devices were not used due to MonDay CCI's policy, which states no recording devices permitted within the facility. I kept the notes and responses in a safe and secure location; any digital information was password protected (see Patton, 2015). When conducting interviews for this dissertation, I

provided an informed consent to read so that each participant thoroughly understood the interview process. Any challenges and limitations to this study were discussed (see Ravitch & Carl, 2016). Validity was achieved through the in-depth questions that I developed.

Researcher-Developed Instrument

Qualitative research instruments are the tools developed and used by the researcher to gather data (Ravitch & Carl, 2016). For this study, I collected data through a researcher-developed interview guide. I used face-to-face, in-depth interviewing, which allowed the participant to tell their own story.

Data Analysis Plan

The data for this project came from individuals that with whom I did not have a personal relationship. All data came from personal, face-to-face interviews (see Rubin & Rubin, 2012) where notes were taken during each interview. I always remained neutral during the interview process. Once all interviews were complete, the completed interview guide was locked in a portable safe until they arrived at my home. All handwritten responses were dated and kept in a safe and secure location (see Patton, 2015).

Halcomb and Davidson (2006) write that a researcher should use an “alternative method of data management” (p. 41) when transcribing their interview data. I conducted a preliminary content analysis and a secondary content analysis (see Halcomb & Davidson, 2006) to find reoccurring patterns and themes that were developed during the

interview (see Patton, 2015). For this study, I used computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS). CAQDAS programs helped me to organize and maintain the lists of codes and supplied the space needed to define the codes. I choose NVivo 12 Plus for Windows. The program was downloaded and used to store, organize, and manage the imported data. The typed interview responses were downloaded into the NVivo 12 software as well.

Halcomb and Davidson (2006) state that using another researcher to review findings adds “validation of the development of themes from the data” (p. 42). I originally thought I would utilize a debriefing partner to reassess common themes and reoccurring patterns that may have been found during the interview process. However, a debriefing partner was not ideal and was not used during this study. I personally debriefed the 13 female participants approximately one week after the face-to-face interview ended.

Issues of Trustworthiness

Credibility

According to Shenton (2004), the trustworthiness of qualitative research can be found in the validity and reliability of the project. Internal validity, measuring what the researcher says they are going to measure, is key to the credibility of this and any research project. For example, by examining previous research findings and comparing these findings with a researcher’s own, the researcher can establish an invaluable source of credibility (Shenton, 2004). Rubin and Rubin (2012) write that a researcher can

enhance credibility by choosing interviewees who are knowledgeable and whose personal experience can persuade the reader. I interviewed women who had experience with the criminal justice system, had been arrested and were jailed, and then recidivated.

Transferability

Transferability is parallel with external validity and ensures that qualitative research is contextually bound (Ravitch & Carl, 2016). External validity is concerned with taking the findings of one study and applying them to another. Because a detailed description of the findings that pertain to this qualitative research project exist, those who read it should be able to transfer these findings to other similar situations (see Shenton, 2003).

Dependability

Addressing dependability is also an important component of maintaining the trustworthiness of any research project. When a researcher vividly and diligently states all processes used within their research project, they are ensuring dependability. To maintain dependability, the research report includes: the research design and its implementation, the operational detail of data gathering, and a reflective appraisal of the project (Shenton, 2004, p. 71-72). The dependability of this project is available in the results section of chapter 4. The instrumentation section lists and describes the type of instrumentation that was used for data collection and the tools used.

Confirmability

Confirmability is the “qualitative investigator’s comparable concern to objectivity” (Shenton, 2004, p. 72). To maintain confirmability, I wrote in a research journal to develop a deeper understanding of all data sets. To eliminate any bias, researcher memos were kept. I noted any questions that pertained to the difficulties that arose. A positionality memo was also kept and diligently maintained where emerging discoveries and additional challenges were noted. Rolfe (2006) argues that the quality of any qualitative project can be seen in the write-up of the report and resides within the report itself. The lack of time to thoroughly and completely allow oneself to become immersed in their research may take away from the finer discoveries (Rolfe, 2006).

Ethical Procedures

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Walden University’s online school governs the ethical standards and federal regulations as they pertain to this research project. Before any data was collected, I applied for IRB approval. Once the proposal was accepted, I received an email from Walden University’s IRB board inviting me to file Form A. Once this was completed, I was asked by IRB for more information as it pertained to ethical concerns. Finally, IRB asked for changes that related to the original IRB application (see Walden University Center for Research Quality, 2018). IRB approval was the last step before data collection began. The IRB approval number is 01-29-20-0578193.

Informed Consent

To obtain access to this group of female inmates, informed consent was crucial. Consent, as Ravitch and Carl (2016) write, “other than in exceptional circumstances, participants agree to research before it commences. That consent should be informed and voluntary” (p. 360). I informed the participants in this study what was asked of them, the time it took to achieve it, and how the data was handled (see Ravitch & Carl, 2016). I offered an approved consent form to the participants to place an X in a box which stated their consent, told participants of their expectations, and made it very clear that all data collected would remain confidential.

Confidentiality

Confidentiality relates to an individual’s privacy. All participants were informed that any identifying information that related to them would not be disclosed in any manner as it pertained to the final project. I did not ask about personal information such as birth dates, addresses, and locating information. Participant confidentiality was an important factor of this study. Because recording devices were not allowed at this location, participants were not able to verbalize their consent. The participants were asked to check a box on the consent form instead. All forms were kept in a locked cabinet in my office; all digital information was password protected.

Summary

Chapter 1 of this study listed the background, problem statement, purpose, research questions, conceptual and theoretical frameworks, the nature of the study,

definitions, assumptions, scope, delimitations and limitations, and why this study is significant. Chapter 2 consisted of an exhaustive review of the literature as it pertained to female offenders, reentry, and jail reentry. Through this exhaustive research, I found little information on jail reentry as it related to the special circumstances of women. Most research had listed men and women having the same needs. Men and women are different and need different reentry programming. Also, women were underrepresented in peer reviewed literature.

In Chapter 3 I discussed the design and rationale for the study, the role of the researcher, methodology, trustworthiness, and ethical procedures. Chapter 3 also listed the ethical procedures of informed consent and confidentiality. Confidentiality is the backbone to this study. Chapter 4 discuss the results of this study; Chapter 5 discuss the findings.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

Jails are known as the “front door” to America’s criminal justice system and house individuals who break societal laws. Of these, women are becoming the largest jailed population in the United States (Kajstura, 2019). Recent data has shown there are 231,000 women and girls incarcerated within the United States with 101,000 of these being held in local jails (Kajstura, 2019).

The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore the need of jail reentry programs that focused on female offenders located in Montgomery County, Ohio. I met with women who had already recidivated at least once and had been housed at the Montgomery County Jail located in Montgomery County, Ohio. I used in-depth face-to-face interviews to address the following research questions:

RQ1: What are the perceived barriers women face that contribute to their re-offending once they are released from jail?

RQ2: If offered a reentry program, does the reentry program pertain to female low-level offenders?

RQ3: From the perspective of the female offender, what type of community driven programs will help make reentry successful for the female ex-offender?

In this chapter, I discuss setting, demographics, data collection and data analysis, evidence of trustworthiness, and the results of this study, and I end with the summarization of Chapter 4.

Setting

I gathered data from residents at MonDay CCI located in Montgomery County, Ohio. I collected data using face-to-face interviews. A flyer was hung inviting women who were arrested and recidivated and were then housed in the Montgomery County Jail. The participant pool was chosen from those who placed their Secure Manage number on the sign-up sheet. A Secure Manage number is an identifying number given to all residents upon entry into the MonDay program.

Participants who volunteered to be a part of the study were given an approximate date and time the face-to-face interviews would take place. The interviews occurred within a 2-day time frame; debriefing occurred a week later. The interview process was explained, the consent form was read, and consent was given by the participant placing an "X" to give consent. Confidentiality was a priority of this study. I remained uninformed as to the identity of the participant. It was explained to the participant that they could withdraw from the study at any time. If a question was considered inappropriate by the participant, they did not have to answer it. Each participant was debriefed at the end of the interview and was given the chance to add any relevant information.

The location of the face-to-face interview was a room within MonDay CCI without windows and without identifying information as to what was occurring inside the room. There were no recording devices permitted in the facility. All interview answers were hand-written. The responses were typed into Microsoft Word on my home

computer after I left the facility. I did not use a transcription service because all information was hand-written. Once all face-to-face interviews were complete, the original sign-up list was shredded.

Demographics

This study pertained to women and their perceived need for jail reentry programs. The participants consisted of women with varying ages: mean 29.4, median 28, mode 28, and a range of 20. Ethnicity was not a variable in this study. To protect confidentiality, participants were assigned a number. For example, if participant 1 placed their Secure Manage number at location 1, they became known as Participant 1. All women who signed up to be a part of this study had been arrested, recidivated at least once, and then housed in the Montgomery County Jail.

The information in Table 1 includes an overview of the female participants and the requirements needed to participate in this research project. The participant must have been female, over 18 years of age, had been housed in the Montgomery County Jail, and then recidivated at least once.

Table 1

Female Participant Demographics

Participant number	Age	Times in Montgomery County Jail	Education
1	23	3	HS diploma
2	28	12 or 13	HS dropout-earned GED during incarceration
3	35	3	HS diploma-some college
4	39	3	HS diploma-some college
5	28	8 or 9	HS dropout at Grade 10-working to earn GED
6	25	10	HS diploma
7	38	7	HS dropout-earned GED-some college
8	23	3	HS dropout at Grade 9-earned GED during incarceration
9	23	10	HS dropout at Grade 10
10	44	4	HS dropout at Grade 9
11	30	20	HS dropout-earned GED during incarceration
12	28	5	HS dropout-earned GED during incarceration
13	25	2	HS dropout-earned GED

Note: HS = high school; GED = general educational degree.

Data Collection

The data were collected in the form of face-to-face interviews. Thirteen participants answered researcher developed interview questions. The interviews were scheduled at the convenience of the participants. The interviews took place within a secure room on the grounds of MonDay CCI. The first set of interviews occurred on March 3, 2020, and the second set occurred on March 5, 2020. The interviews lasted anywhere from a half hour to 1 hour. On the first day, I was able to interview eight participants, which left five for the second day. Because the location of the face-to-face interviews was a secure facility, recording was not allowed. Therefore, I hand recorded all answers to every question. All participants were given an opportunity to ask questions and add information if needed. Debriefing was available to all participants on March 11, 2020. Once debriefed, each participant received a copy of the consent form where they made their mark and were shown their \$10 Amazon Gift Card. The Amazon Gift Card was not directly given to the participants but was placed in their personal items to take with them once discharged.

The data collection mentioned in Chapter 3 was different than what occurred. I wanted to use a recording device to catch verbatim answers to interview questions. It was a rule of MonDay CCI that no recording devices were to be allowed within the confines of the facility. Cheah, Unnithan, and Sandela Raran (2019) stated that when conducting criminal justice research, researchers often cannot use recording devices when performing face-to-face interviews. However, few studies are in existence that help

address this problem. Cheah et al. (2019) suggested using another researcher to take notes along with the original researcher and to compare these notes at the end of each session. Again, this technique was not possible for this research project. Rutakumwa et al. (2019) stated that when comparing the quality of data from of a recording device and data that was handwritten during the interview process, “compare in the detail captured” (p. 13) and that some of the material can be edited out of the handwritten interview script and can lead to the loss of valuable detail. This can be alleviated if the researcher is properly trained and knowledgeable of the qualitative research process (Rutakumwa et al., 2019). I am a confident researcher and knowledgeable in qualitative research methodology. I wrote verbatim what was discussed and said during all face-to-face interviews. I checked and rechecked all data to ensure accuracy. I also kept a fieldwork journal pertaining to the interviews and the experience of asking personal questions to a vulnerable population (see Saldaña, 2016).

As stated in Chapters 2 and 3, I originally chose the research of jail reentry programs that applied to criminally offending women with substance abuse problems, mental health issues, and lack of emotional support from family and friends. Walden University’s IRB did not allow me to ask any questions pertaining to substance abuse. Instead, I dove deeper into mental health issues, family support, lack of family support, and close-knit friendships.

Data Analysis

I used Microsoft Word to help prepare all documents and to organize typed responses. All information was password protected; all notes and data gathered were kept in a secure room. I chose CAQDAS for this project. CAQDAS programs help organize and maintain lists of codes and have the space needed to define the codes (Saldaña, 2016). Thus, I downloaded NVivo 12 Plus for Windows and used it to store, organize, and manage the imported data. The typed interview responses were downloaded into the NVivo 12 software. I used both the auto-code feature in NVivo 12 Plus software and hand-coding; I analyzed the data using applied thematic data analysis (see Saldaña, 2016). I interviewed 13 criminal offending women who had already recidivated and were housed in the Montgomery County Jail in Ohio. The interview guide was arranged to address demographics and the barriers that possibly hinder a successful reentry from jail to community. Transcripts were coded and the themes of addiction, health, employment, family, education, home, finances, jail, programs, and resources emerged.

Evidence of Trustworthiness

Credibility

As stated in Chapter 3, the trustworthiness of a qualitative research project can be found in its validity and reliability (Shenton, 2004). The internal validity or credibility that pertained to this research project began with interviewing women who had been jailed at least twice and were held in the Montgomery County Jail (see Table 1). All

participants were debriefed at conclusion of the interview process. I remained neutral during the coding process and allowed the data to speak for itself. Because I was unable to record the actual interviews, I hand wrote all responses. I kept a fieldwork journal ensuring the accuracy of each interview. I followed a systematic approach to find reoccurring patterns, themes, and codes to demonstrate a level of trustworthiness with my findings.

Transferability

Parallel with external validity, transferability ensures that the research is bound contextually (Ravitch & Carl, 2016). The data gathered for this project were both descriptive and relevant. To achieve transferability, Ravitch and Carl (2016) state the data should be detailed and descriptive. A detailed description of the findings for this research project included interview data, handwritten transcription, and detailed notes. The data were downloaded into NVivo 12 Plus where I analyzed it.

Dependability

As stated in Chapter 3, dependability was an important aspect of this study in order to maintain trustworthiness. Shenton (2004) states that for research to be dependable, the researcher should discuss the research design and how it was implemented, how the data was gathered, and the effectiveness of the study.

The process of moving from design implementation through the gathering of the data was a detailed and meticulous process. I followed Walden University's IRB guidelines as they relate to human subjects. The data was gathered, transcribed,

downloaded into NVivo 12 Plus and then coded for recurring themes and patterns. I followed up the initial interviews with a debriefing session approximately one week after the face-to-face interviews occurred.

Confirmability

In order to maintain confirmability, I diligently wrote in a research journal in order to develop an understanding of the data gathered. According to Shenton (2004), “steps must be taken to help ensure ... the work’s findings are the result of experiences and ideas of the informant” (p. 72) and not those of the researcher. Researcher memos were an important part of this study and were needed to help reduce bias (see Ravitch & Carl, 2016). I kept a journal during data collection and while I analyzed the data. I kept and maintained a positionality memo. Not having a recording device during the face-to-face interviews was challenging. I kept up with the participant and was able to write, word for word, all responses. Lengthy responses were read back for accuracy.

Results

Case study approach was the chosen qualitative analytical perspective for this study and was used to understand the barriers women face at reentry. The case this study examined was the need for jail reentry programs that pertained to women who are criminal offenders who have physical and mental health issues, underemployment or lack of employment, lack of emotional support from family or close-knit friends, and may have substance abuse problems. I interviewed 13-women who had already recidivated at least once and were housed in the Montgomery County Jail located in Montgomery

County, Ohio. I also wanted to understand what influences state and local constraints have on reentry opportunities for the female offender.

The first five questions within the interview guide were demographic questions to ensure all participants met requirements. The purpose of the interview guide was to understand the barriers that hinder the success from jail to society, the process of reentry from jail to society, and community programs that help make reentry successful for the female ex-offender. In Chapter 2 I discussed multiple barriers to reentry and how these barriers hinder female reentry. However, I focused on employment, mental and physical health, and family issues (child custody, single parenting, and family support). I organized the interview guide to address these barriers (see Appendix). From the questioning and open answer format, substance abuse issues emerged.

Research Question 1

RQ1: What are the perceived barriers women face that contribute to re-offending once they are released from jail?

Theme 1: Addiction. It is important to mention that questions pertaining to substance abuse and substance abuse issues were not asked. From the participants' willingness to speak openly and freely, information regarding substance abuse emerged. Participant 2, and participants 5 through 13, all spoke of addiction or substance abuse as being a barrier. Participant 11 simply stated, "drugs hinder life." Participant 6 stated that drugs get in the way of everything she tries to do, "they get in the way of everything."

As previously mentioned, reentry from jail to community can be stressful for the female offender (Hearn et al., 2014). If rearrested, 83% of females report using illegal substances prior to arrest (Key Issue: Reentry, n.d.). When I asked Participant 2 what contributed to her arrest, she felt that her addiction was directly correlated with her arrests:

Why I kept going back and back and back was because I was addicted to heroin and I was still detoxing. They let me leave jail still detoxing off heroin. That's crazy! I mean I'm glad I got out of jail but hell, still detoxing! If I would have help with detoxing, then I probably wouldn't have gone back so quick. My addiction is the biggest thing I need help with.

Participant 5 stated she needed a place to go that was centered on recovery. When she left jail, she went back into the same environment. "If this home had women that were already in recovery, then maybe recovery could be possible and maybe I would stop going to jail." Participant 9 stated that she needed to go to more recovery meetings such as Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous. "By not going to meetings and following a sober program, without doing those things, I went back to jail." Participant 8 stated that she needed to be aware of meetings within her community:

More aware of meetings would help because I am a drug addict. But I don't know where meetings are. I need a place where young people could go where they feel like they fit in and have friends that are trying to do right and do the same things

I'm doing. Some type of positive role model would help. Maybe I would stop getting arrested.

Participants 6, 7, and 8 all stated that peers are a negative influence and led to drug abuse when leaving jail. "My peers and the people I associate with are all triggers. When I leave jail, that's where I go, to my friends" (Participant 7). Participant 10 wants a life free of drugs and crime but doesn't know where to begin. Participant 12 stated that she is usually withdrawing from drugs so she cannot work and pay her own bills. All Participants who suffered with addiction issues stated that they "hustle" for money. This money is used to pay bills but is used primarily to support their drug habit.

It was not in the best interest of the participants to ask questions pertaining to drug usage. However, I did ask why they felt they were getting rearrested (see Appendix). Participants 10 and 11 stated that drugs or paying for drugs were they reasons they got rearrested. Participant 11 was not ready to give up on her addiction and all her friends use drugs. She stated that while in jail, she felt safe. Participant 5 stated, "drugs are the reason I keep going back to jail. Oh well. Until I get it together, I guess jail is the result."

Theme 2: Health. Many incarcerated individuals diagnosed with substance abuse are also diagnosed with mental health disorders (Miller & Miller, 2010). According to National Conference of State Legislatures (2017), only 1 in 6 jailed inmates receive treatment for mental health issues. Participants 1 through 8 and participants 10 and 12 all reported mental and physical health issues. Participant 1 felt that nobody was

there to help her. “Yes! I have mental health problems, but nobody wants to help me with it. Does it get me arrested? I don’t know.” Participant 2 stated she was diagnosed with PTSD and Bipolar disorder but when incarcerated, these issues were not addressed while in jail or at reentry. Participant 10 stated, “I am bipolar, I have PTSD. When I stay on my prescribed drugs for mental health, I am fine but when I am not on prescribed drugs, I self-medicate with street drugs.” Participants 3 through 7 all suffer with depression. Participant 6 also stated that she struggles with anxiety especially at point of reentry from jail: “I feel afraid to leave jail. I am ready to be free but at the same time, I get anxious. I just wish I had somebody to hold my hand.”

Along with depression, Participant 7 stated that she has an array of mental health problems that contribute to her reoffending:

I have depression. I’m also bipolar and I think that is a big reason why I get arrested. When I’m off my meds my mood swings get so bad, I get on downers to calm me down. Then I black out and then the next thing I know I’m in jail. I also have paranoid schizophrenia and am a manic depressant with mood and personality disorders. Sometimes I don’t know who I am. So yeah, it would be nice for someone to just care.

When interviewing these women, I asked if any of them received assistance for their mental and physical health issues (see Appendix). None of the participants mentioned physical health issues but instead focused on mental health issues. Participant 10 stated that she was offered help for her PTSD and Bipolar, “but it didn’t last.”

Participant 2 and 3 stated that they did not have insurance and that jail would not offer any assistance because of this. Participant 5 stated, “I’ve never been offered any help for [mental health].” Participant 12 said she was never offered help; Participant 6 said she was not offered any help for anything, “and even with my mental health issues, I get no help from anybody.” Participant 7 stated that when she is released from jail, “they just let me go so...” Participants 8 and 9 said the same things, “they just let me go.”

Theme 3: Employment. Because of offender rehabilitation and prison reentry programming, states noticed a 6.4% decline in jail populations (Spjeldnes et al., 2014). However, the arrest rates of females continue to increase (Spjeldnes et al., 2014). From 1996 to 2011, there was a 45% increase in female arrest rates (Spjeldnes et al., 2014). At time of arrest, females are likely to be unemployed (60%) as compared to 8% of males (Spjeldnes et al., 2014). I interviewed 13 women and Participant 3 stated she was employed and would retire from that job. Participants 1-2, and 4-13 all stated they either hustle for money or have jobs that they would not consider to be careers. Participants 6, 8, and 12 stated they were not working at time of arrest. Participant 13 stated, “I really don’t want to retire as a dope addict. I don’t work because I’m usually dope sick.”

Participant 10 stated that she sold drugs to support herself but mainly to support her habit.

All women were asked if they were offered any help with employment or job training at point of reentry from jail and if they were offered help, would they take the offer (see Appendix). Only Participant 3 stated she was happy with her job and needed no help. Participant 1 stated that she would have loved help with job training and help

finding a job. Participant 2 stated she wanted a life free of crime and drugs. She also stated that help with a job would have been a good idea but stated that it was never offered. Participant 4 stated that if offered, she would have taken the help from an employment training organization or individual. Participant 5 said that she needed something different and that going to jail and coming out to the same thing contributes to her reoffending. “So yeah, if someone offered help with job training, I would have taken it. I still would take it (Participant 5)!” Participant 6 said that she needed a job and needs to stay sober. Participant 7 said that she moves furniture and would like to learn how to do something different. Participant 8 stated:

I just want something to change. Jail and out, jail and out, that’s my life. I need a job. I don’t know how to even keep a job. If someone would teach me how to do that, then things could be different.

Participant 9 stated that she would use job training if offered but “it’s never been offered so I don’t think it will ever happen.” Participant 10 stated:

I just need guided into the right direction. It seems that I don’t know where to go for job training. I want someone to show me how to fill out an application because I really have never been trained on it. I know that sounds stupid but it’s a fact.

Participant 11 stated that women already have a hard time with proper paying jobs and if someone would, “just help us women, then that would be a good thing.” Participant 12 stated:

With a felony on my record it's hard to get a good job anyway. Maybe do something about that. Help with expungement that's what I need. It seems no matter how hard I try I keep getting knocked down because I'm a felon.

Participant 13 stated, "If jail would do something positive, I would like to see that, just that. Something positive come out of jail."

Theme 4: Family. Incarcerated women usually lose custody of their children (Frudenburg et al., 2005), are homeless when they leave jail or prison (Schonbrun et al., 2016) and have little to no family support (Duwe & Clark, 2014) after incarceration. I asked the participants if they had a relationship with their immediate family (mother, father, siblings, etc.) and if the arrest and subsequent incarceration affected the relationship (see Appendix). Participant 1 stated, "My criminal activity has affected my family relationship just a bit. They keep a closer eye on me when I'm around. This has made me ashamed and has made me to become anti-social." Participant 2 stated that her family is now raising her children. The relationship is strained but she is happy her family has her children, not strangers. Participant 3 believes that her criminal activity "has brought shame upon [her] family." She stated that being arrested has created a barrier with her and her siblings and "they are not giving me any more chances." Participant 4 stated that she lost time with her father when she was in jail. Her father did come to see her, but she felt her father was ashamed of her. Participants 5 and 12 stated their family had trust issues with them. Participant 5 stated, "[my family] want to believe in me but I'm not trustworthy lately." Participant 7 said her family relationship was

strained and Participant 8 stated her family distrusted her because of her lying and stealing. Participant 9 stated, “Well my crimes have greatly affected my family relationship because I stole from them and did things to them and they do not want me around and I don't blame them.” Participant 11 believed her mother resented her addiction because while in active addiction, jail was eminent. “I feel like my mom blames my addiction. I did what I did because of drugs but it was always me breaking the law. It's not the drugs fault it's my fault; I take all the blame (Participant 11).” Participants 1-9 and 11-13 all stated that they had contact with their immediate families at time of arrest. Although the relationship was strained, most of the participants at least talked to their immediate families.

Chapter 2 mentions that only 25% of women with minor children have physical custody of their children at time of arrest (Freudenburg et al., 2005). I wanted to know if the participants had custody of their children (see Appendix, question 14) and who cared for the minor children during incarceration. Participants 1, 3, 6 and 11 stated their parents cared for minor children when the mother was in jail and all participants had custody of their children. Participant 4 stated her niece cared for her child when she was incarcerated, and Participant 5 stated her aunt cared for her children when incarcerated. Participants 8, 9, and 10 stated an immediate family member had custody of their children. Participant 2 stated her grandparents were the custodial care givers for her child. Participant 7 was the only participant who said her husband cared for the children while she was incarcerated. Participants 1-6 and 8-13 stated they were not married and

were either divorced or had live-in boyfriends. Participants 1, and 3-6 stated they were the primary caregiver of their minor children. Participants 1, 3, 5, and 11 stated they were single with little to no financial help from the father of their children. Participants 2, 6, and 9 stated they also cared for children other than their own. Participant 6 helps take care of her nephew, Participant 2 stated that although she does not have custody of her own child, she does help take care of her boyfriends' child.

Theme 5: Education. Reentry education can help women receive the training needed to secure employment and to help develop literacy skills (U.S. Department of Education, 2016). I asked all participants if they either have a high-school diploma or its equivalent (see Appendix), Participants 1, and 3-5 received a high-school diploma. Participants 7, 8, 11-13 stated they received a GED while incarcerated. Participant 2 stated she quit school at a young age because she got pregnant. Participants 1, 3, 4, 5, and 7 attended college, however none of the participants reported they graduated college. Participant 1 stated, "I went to a vocational school and wanted to graduate studying early childhood development, but I got with a crazy boyfriend and he made me quit college." Participant 5 stated she quit school so she could "run the streets." Participant 4 stated her "baby daddy" made her quit college during her first term.

Theme 6: Home. When talking to these women it became apparent that they all wanted a stable home life. According to Participant 7:

I have no choice but to go around the same people and places because that's where I live. I just want to have something normal for once. I get so tired of moving

around from place to place with nothing to show for it. My life has not seen a home for a long time and that's what I want, a home. My boyfriend, his mom and I all live in an abandoned home. That's all there is for us. We just can't get it together long enough to get a real place to live.

Participant 1 said she has nowhere to live because her boyfriend "threw me to the streets." Participant 8 stated she basically lives on the streets and "I have no real home. I don't even know what that is anymore. I have even grown accustomed to living in cars." Participant 4 states that she feels like she is always taking 10-steps backwards when it comes to stable housing. She stated she moves around a lot because of one thing or another. Participant 7 stated that her and her husband are trying to build a stable home for their children. However, she felt that drugs got in the way of building a good future for her children. I asked all the participants if they felt they had a safe home to go to when they left jail, Participant 7 replied yes. All of the 13 Participants stated they want a stable home or living environment located in a safe neighborhood without drugs and criminal activity.

Theme 7: Finances. When women are arrested, they either bond out or are adjudicated, fined and can be sentenced to extra time in prison or jail. Arrests can cause a family to lose their primary financial supporter and excessive fines and penalties can cause a financial burden (deVuono-Powell, Schweidler, Walters, & Zohrabi, 2015). The female participants were asked about their bills and if arrested, who took care of their finances. Participant 7 stated her husband was responsible for paying bills, Participant 1

stated it was her “sugar daddy” that financially supported her, and Participant 13 stated that her boyfriend took care of her finances. Participant 5 stated:

My kids’ dad helps me take care of our children’s financial needs. He doesn’t help me though. When they have school fees, he pays them, same with clothes and stuff. Other than that, I get food stamps and have Obamacare.

Participant 2 stated that the court system (bonds, fines, penalties, etc.) had contributed to her being in a financial crisis. Participant 3 said that she will not be able to pay off the fines needed to operate a motor vehicle legally. Participant 8 needs help getting an identification card. According to Participant 9:

With a felony on my record, I have a hard time getting a good job. Without a good job I cannot pay the bills that I have. Now I must pay the court back and pay to get my driver’s license back. I feel that once I got thrown into the court system, they want me to stay broke. I think that in order to make it and pay my bills, I need to hustle. Hustling gets me into trouble so I’m in this crazy trap.

Participants 10 – 13 stated they do have financial trouble and stated no help was needed.

Theme 8: Jail

It was not surprising that jail was an emergent theme. Afterall, the goal of this study was to understand the needs of women once they leave jail. I asked the women what they felt was a reason they recidivated (see Appendix). Analysis of the interview data revealed that without a ride to court or probation, many women were rearrested for noncompliance. Not having a legal driver permit also hindered successful reintegration.

Many of the female participants stated that when they were first arrested, their driver's license was suspended, and the lack of driving privileges became a burden. Participant 13 stated:

Rides would help me not reoffend. I think the judge needs to give a license or a pass to people going to probation, court or whatever. The system took my license and yes, I did break the law, but they left me with no way to court and no way to see my probation officer. I could always take the bus, but I would have to walk two or three miles to the nearest bus station. I just feel like not having rides keeps me going back to jail.

Participants 1-2, 4-5, 7, 10 and 11 all stated they felt they had trouble getting rides to court appearances and probation appointments because they did not have a driver's license or a ride to the appointments. Participant 3 stated, "I just didn't want to quit getting high, so I didn't show up to my probation appointments." Participant 6, 8, and 9 stated they went back to jail for the same reasons they were arrested the first time; possession of an illegal substance.

I asked the participants why they were arrested the first time in hopes to understand reoffending. From the responses, I found that several of the female participants were arrested because they took the charges instead of their boyfriend.

Participant 1 stated:

How I ended up in jail the first time was because of my boyfriend. He robbed a house and drove to Kentucky and got caught in a hotel room and we were

smoking weed. The cops found \$35,000 and some coins on us and charged us with a class C felony. I told the police I was the one who robbed the house so my boyfriend would not go to prison. He was already out on probation. He ended up getting charged anyway.

Participants 2 and 3 were both caught stealing from a convenience store; Participant 13 was arrested for stealing from Walmart. Participant 4 said she was drunk and does not remember anything she did, she just woke up in jail. Participants 5-7 said they were under the influence of drugs and were arrested for possession. Participant 8 stated:

I was hanging out with the guy and we had stolen a car. He had time on the shelf so when we got pulled over, I took the blame for the stolen car. I had a 48 hour hold and when I got out I he ended up leaving me and I felt so stupid for taking all the charges.

Participant 9 stated:

The first time I went to jail I got caught on a burglary charge. So, my boyfriend and I got the same charge. When I was interviewed by the police or detective, I told them it was me who did the burglary and my boyfriend just picked me up. I told them that he was not even with me when I did it. He was with me, but I didn't want him to get into any more trouble.

Participants 10 and 11 stated they were both under the influence of drugs and alcohol.

Participant 12 stated:

The situation is weird. I had a boyfriend who was also my dope boy and we got pulled over. I took the dope and put it in my purse, they went through my purse and found all the dope. I took the charges for my boyfriend. When I left, he picked me up and we went right back doing the same thing. Only a few months after I got out of jail, we were driving and got pulled over again. And again, I put the dope in my purse and took the charges. He got away with nothing and I now have two felonies on my record. All for him and all for dope.

Research Question 2

RQ2: What structures and process of a reentry program pertain to female low-level offenders?

Theme 9: Programs. Chapter 2 stated that reentry programs, either from jail or prison, were established to help reduce recidivism. If arrested and jailed, individuals stay in jail for only a short length of time (Miller & Miller, 2010). While in prison, the stay is longer leaving time for the correctional institution to plan for offender's reentry. The same does not hold true for those serving time in jail. I asked the female participants what they personally needed to reintegrate back into the community without reoffending (see Appendix, Question 40). Participant 1 stated that when released from jail, she was given a court date and did not appear. The missed court date was because she left jail and went back into the same environment she left when arrested.

When I left jail, I had nowhere to go. All my friends use drugs plus I didn't have a ride to court. Who wants to go to court high? If I was offered treatment instead, maybe things could have turned out differently.

Participant 2 wished she was offered a program to help with her mental illness and drug issues; Participant 6 wanted to be offered a program that would help her with drug abuse.

Participant 4 mentioned she needed help with housing:

After a long stay in jail, housing should be a top priority. A person shouldn't have to wait six to nine months to find housing after they've been in jail and served their time. Without help or a program to help, I went and did what I had to do to survive. That's why I went to jail so many times.

Participant 5 mentioned she needed a program or group home that house women that are already in recovery. Participant 7 stated, "I just need a sober community."

Participant 8 stated that the community needs more treatment facilities. She felt that when she was ready to deal with her substance abuse problems, there was a waiting list.

Participant 8 felt that while waiting for a bed in the treatment facility, she continued with

the criminal activity to support her drug habit. Participant 9 also mentioned a sober

living environment and stated, "I know there has to be programs that offer help for

women only. I don't know how to find it thought." Participant 10 stated that when she

left jail, she had no identification and no stable housing. "If I could've just gotten help

with getting an I.D. and a better place to live. They didn't offer me anything, they just let

me out of jail." Participant 11 mentioned that while incarcerated for a drug charge, she

attended 12-step meetings. Once released, she was not offered an Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous meeting schedule, so she did not know where to go to attend meetings within her community. Participant 13 stated she needed a driver's license. "I want a program or a way to help pay down the reinstatement fee so I could get a driver's license."

I also asked the participants if they were offered any help for the reasons as to why they were arrested (see Appendix, Question 34). I wanted to understand what type of jail to community programming was offered and available to the recidivating female. Participants 1-4 and 6-13 all stated they were not offered any programs or community assistance for the reasons for arrests. Participant 8 stated, "nope, none. You would think someone would offer something especially all the times I went back [to jail] so quick." Participant 5 stated, "I was offered to go to women's recovery, but they let me out of jail, so I went out and got drunk. Then when I was arrested again, I was offered drug court, so I did that." Drug court is a program that is offered as treatment or intervention in lieu of conviction and is a highly structured program that usually lasts for 6-months but can last up to 5-years. The offender must appear in front of the drug court judge on a weekly basis, must remain drug free with weekly urine screens, and must become involved in a treatment program (Drug Court, 2020). The drug court program is for both male and female offenders.

Research Question 3

RQ3: What type of community driven programs help make reentry successful for the female low-level offender?

Theme 10: Resources. This dissertation focused on the needs of female offenders upon reentry to their community. I wanted to understand if the female participants had knowledge of community driven programs available to help with their transition from jail to community but most importantly, to help reduce recidivism. I asked the participants if they knew of any opportunities that would help them successfully reintegrate back into their community and if not, what opportunities would have helped (see Appendix, Question 37). Participant 1 stated that she did not know of any felon programs until she needed help. She also stated that she found some programming offered through Goodwill. Participant 1 did not tell me what type of programs these were, however. Participant 2 stated she was offered Drug Court and, “[drug court] did help me become successful for a bit but I think people need help with detoxing like having suboxone in jail or some type of addicted services for sure.” Participant 3 stated, “yeah, but I don’t know what they are.” Participant 4 said she had no idea but wanted help with her core issues. Participant 5 stated that she was offered a program called Women’s Recovery. “I went to women’s recovery but as soon as I left, I got drunk.” Participant 6 said she knew of some programs but did not know how to contact them. Participant 7 believed that education would help make reentry successful

for her and mentioned wanting help with education and grants for felons. Participant 8 stated:

More aware of meetings would help because I am a drug addict and I don't know where meetings are, and a place where young people could go where they feel like they could fit in and have friends that are trying to do right and do the same things they're doing. I need some type of positive role model and positive help.

Participant 9 stated that she was never offered any help and had no idea of any programming available to those who leave jail. Participant 10 stated:

The job center has a few opportunities, Miami Valley works sometimes has some opportunities, drug court would be a good opportunity for people with drug issues, I didn't have a way to get to probation or ride to get to any meetings. But no help was ever offered to me. I know of those things from the streets.

Participant 11 simply stated, "If I had an opportunity and know of some resources, maybe I could make it on the outside." Participant 12 stated that sober living houses for women were available as well as Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous. Participant 13 said that she needs rides to and from court.

Summary

Chapter 4 included a discussion of the of the results and the themes that emerged from the interview data. Each research question was listed along with their correlated themes. I interviewed 13 female participants that had been arrested at least twice and were held in the Montgomery County Jail located in Dayton, Ohio. The largest theme

that emerged from the data pertained to barriers; employment, mental health, family and addiction were subthemes. No interview questions referred to substance abuse or drug addiction. The theme addiction was an inadvertent theme that emerged because of the questions that pertained to arrest and because the participants could speak freely and openly about their experiences as jailed women.

RQ1 asked about the barrier's women face that contribute to re-offending once released from county jail. I found that employment, mental health, family, addiction, education, home, finances, and jail were the barriers that hinder successful reentry from jail to community. When I asked the participants about jail or why they felt they kept going back to jail, almost all participants stated they were missing scheduled court appointments or appointments with their probation officer because they lacked transportation. While researching for this study, I did not find any literature mentioning this barrier. Although there is a city bus these women could have used, most live too far away from a bus stop location or the care of young children hindered the use of city transportation. I also found that most women wanted to attend college. Those who did not have a high school diploma did have a general education degree or GED (see Table 1). Four participants reported receiving a GED while incarcerated. An essential idea pertaining to successful reintegration was to have a safe place to live, viable employment, and family support once released from jail.

From RQ2, I wanted to learn about reentry programs that pertain to female low-level offenders. I wanted to understand if the women were offered reentry of any type

and if the reentry offered focused on the special needs of women. From the interview questions, I found that most women were not offered any program to help with the reason they were arrested. Although a few programs were mentioned, most found jail to be a revolving door process.

In RQ3, I was interested in what type of community driven programs help make reentry successful for the female offender. All participants interviewed were residents at a community based correctional facility. They were housed in this facility because they could not comply with court orders. These women were sentenced by the court to this program because they were unsuccessful living a life free of criminal activity. There were, however, a few programs that were mentioned by the participants. One participant mentioned finding help through Goodwill another mentioned food banks or free food programs. It is not known what program was found to be helpful or if these programs are easily accessible.

Chapter 5 is an interpretation of the findings presented in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 includes an interpretation of the theoretical and conceptual frameworks as mentioned in Chapter 2 along with the limitations of the study, further recommendations, implications as they pertain to social change.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction

Using qualitative research, I investigated the reentry process that pertained to 13 low-level offending women who had already recidivated at least once. The purpose of this study was to explore the special circumstances women faced at reentry and the perceived barriers that hindered successful community reinsertion. The barriers I focused on were employment, mental and physical health, family issues such as child custody, single parenting, and family support. From the questioning and open answer format, substance abuse issues emerged. I intended to interview 15-women, but that was not possible. The location where I collected the data housed women of different counties within Ohio making it difficult to find 15-women from Montgomery County willing to partake in this study. The focus of my study pertained to women who had recidivated and were held in the Montgomery County Jail located in Montgomery County, Ohio.

My study included women who were held in the Montgomery County Jail at least twice and whose offenses were nonviolent. I wanted to understand the barriers that criminal offending women faced at point of reentry from jail to community. I also wanted to know if the criminal offending women were offered resources or community driven programs that addressed barriers to reentry. The key findings that emerged as a result of this study were (a) substance abuse and addiction were correlated to arrest; (b) women were often rearrested for missed court appointments or missed probation/parole appointments because they lacked transportation; (c) women were offered bond but only

for their first arrest; and (d) community driven reentry programs are not made available to the low-level offending women at their first arrest. It is through multiple arrests and through jailhouse communication that women learned of programs offered in their community.

Interpretation of the Findings

The literature review in Chapter 2 focused on four barriers that hinder a successful reentry: (a) substance abuse, (b) mental and physical health, (c) employment, and (d) family issues including child custody, single parenting, and family support. The findings of this study confirm and expand on the literature pertaining to jail reentry for female low-level offenders. According to Spjeldnes et al. (2014) females, more than males, are more likely to have substance abuse issues at time of arrest. Although this study did not ask any questions that pertained to drugs, substance abuse, or addiction, from questions asked (see Appendix), the female participants freely and openly revealed this information. Spjeldnes et al. (2014) also stated that females were more likely than males to attend 12-step meetings prior to arrest. This study found that females were likely to attend recovery meetings if they had transportation and knew the location of the meetings. This study did align with the findings of Schonbrun et al. (2016), which stated females with substance abuse issues are likely to recidivate. Of the 13 participants, participant 3 stated she was a “true criminal” meaning she did not commit crimes to support a drug habit. She committed crimes because that was her way of life. All other

participants stated their criminal past of illegal substance abuse was correlated to their arrests.

Miller and Miller (2010) argued there is a link between substance abuse and mental health issues. I specifically asked the participants of this study if they felt their mental health problems contributed to their reoffending (see Appendix, Question 29). Aligned with Miller and Miller (2010), this study also found a correlation with mental health and substance abuse. If the women were on prescribed medication and lost means to obtain their prescription, the women reported they would self-medicate using illegal substances. The most common mental health issue reported was having bipolar disorder. This aligned with McLean et al. (2006) who wrote the most common mental health issues among female inmates was depression and bipolar disorder. It is not known if the participants of this study were medically diagnosed. A study conducted by Iliceto et al. (2012) stated that incarcerated women have higher rates of mental health problems compared to women in the community and that incarcerated women have a right to mental and physical care. But that does not answer whether women receive the help they need while incarcerated. The women of this study were asked if they had ever been offered any type of assistance after arrest for their mental health issues (see Appendix, Question 30). Of the 13 women interviewed, 12 stated they did suffer with some type of mental health issue. All participants stated they were not offered help while incarcerated for mental health problems nor were they given guidance as to where to find help at release from jail.

The barrier to employment for ex-offender men is a continual problem. The same holds true for women in the criminal population. Spjeldnes et al. (2014) reported that female inmates were 60% more likely to be unemployed at time of arrest and were more likely (30%) to be on some type of public assistance than nonoffending women. To understand employment, I believed it important to examine levels of education. Table 1 shows participant educational achievement. Ten of the 13 participants did not graduate high school; five participants earned a GED during incarceration; and three participants attended college with no degree obtained. Miller and Miller (2010) stated that after incarceration, the lack of education hinders the chances of finding meaningful employment. Pogrebin et al. (2014) wrote that employers are often unwilling to hire individuals who have been incarcerated. Those with criminal records have little chance at earning the money needed to care for themselves and their family. Lack of employment often leads to revocation for those on probation or parole (Pogrebin et al., 2014).

Of the 13 participants, all stated they would have utilized employment services, job training, if offered. Doherty et al. (2014) along with Spjeldnes and Goodkind (2009) stated that when women leave jail or prison, they have a hard time finding gainful employment. Schonbrun et al. (2016) wrote that gainful employment is positively correlated with stable income and insurance. However, most women earn less once they have been arrested. As found in this study, the criminal offending women found it easier and more profitable to simply do what they need to do to survive.

According to Reilly (2013), over 2.5 million children under age 18 have a parent in custody. Frudenburg et al. (2005) stated incarcerated mothers usually lose custody of their minor children and are often homeless when they leave incarceration with little familial support. In line with Frudenburg et al. (2005), of the 13 female participants, 6 had lost custody of their children. Of those who had custody at point of arrest, family members cared for their children while the mother was in jail. The 13 female participants of this study were asked if they had contact with their immediate family members and if they had a close relationship with their immediate family members. Of the 13 participants, 12 stated they had contact with their parents and 10 participants stated they were close with their families. However, all 13 participants stated that the familial relationship was strained with little to no trust from their parents. These findings were surprising and differed from what Frudenburg et al. found.

As mentioned by Schonbrun et al. (2016), 25% of the women who leave jail are unsure as to where they will live. Duwe and Clark (2014) stated that 40%-80% of newly released offenders will need help with housing and depend on family members for that help. The findings from my study agree with both Schonbrun et al., and Duwe and Clark. Participants 1, 7 and 8 all stated they were homeless, and participant 11 stated her parents paid her rent. Participant 10 stated that the lack of stable housing is a barrier to successful reentry from jail. Of the 13 participants, 11 of them stated they would like to have had help with housing and help finding somewhere to live that was safe (a location with less drugs and crime).

As previously mentioned, this study focused on substance abuse, mental and physical health, employment, and family issues as barriers that hinder successful reentry from jail to community. Education, home, finances, and jail were themes that emerged by allowing the participants to speak freely and openly about their experiences. All participants stated they valued their home life but struggled to support a household. Many of the female participants wanted to attend college but did not know how to apply. Some women had already started college but had to quit because of their criminal activity and the consequences of that lifestyle. Of the 13 participants, all wanted some type of help and stated that jail reentry programs were needed. The lack of jail reentry programming may have contributed to the multiple arrests that occurred with the female participants in this study.

Theoretical Foundation and Conceptual Framework

The results of this study validated both theoretical and conceptual frameworks. The shared problem for both theoretical and conceptual frameworks was the lack of jail reentry policy that focused on women who had recidivated. The theoretical foundation, SLT as developed by Akers (1998), was used to help explain the deviant behavior of the criminal offending women of this study and how that behavior may have contributed to criminogenic thinking patterns. According to SLT, there are four concepts that likely produce criminal behavior: differential reinforcement, imitation, procriminal definitions, and differential association (Pratt et al., 2010; Yarbrough et al, 2012). These four concepts are what Akers stated as the underlying process of social learning.

The concept of differential reinforcement applies to deviant behavior that is dominant over conforming behavior (Pratt et al., 2010). Conformity is the change of behavior to “fit in” a group or to simply go along with others around you (Cherry, 2020). This study found that recidivating women drop out of high school to support a boyfriend or to support drug habits. Many women mentioned they not only supported their own drug habits, but their significant others’ habit as well. A few participants stated they quit high school to pursue a relationship. When these women were released, I found they were sent back into the same environment they were in when arrested. They often then go along with the individuals housed in the same harmful environment. Another participant stated that she graduated high school and began college. She started to associate with criminals. In the end, her boyfriend did not want her to go to college, so she quit.

Procriminal definitions identify an action as being right/wrong, good/bad, desirable/undesirable, and so forth, or are the attitudes that are attached to a behavior (Cullen & Agnew, 2006). I found that the participants of this study would not attend mandated court appearances or scheduled probation/parole visits. They mentally defined mandatory visits to court as resulting in an immediate arrest. In fact, it was the lack of attending the scheduled visit that led to the subsequent arrest.

Imitation is learning by watching others and then repeating the behavior (Akers, 1977). One participant stated she was a pure criminal. She did not do drugs, nor did she steal to support any habits. This participant stated that she watched many people lose

everything from drug abuse and swore she would not do that. However, she learned how to commit crimes by watching another.

Differential association is the process of exposure to delinquent or nondelinquent behaviors where illegal or legal actions arise (Akers, 1977). The women of this study were exposed to criminal behavior through family or through close acquaintances. Nicholson & Higgins (2017) state that criminal behavior likely occurs when individuals differentially associate with others who share or possess delinquent behaviors. This was the common theme among the participants of this study. I asked the participants what they believed was the reason they recidivated (see Appendix, Question 35) and most replied that they did not have transportation to court or were afraid to go back to jail. Akers (1973) state that people become offenders through social interaction with others already involved in crime. I found through this research project that women who are criminal offenders cannot rely on their friends, who are also criminals, for transportation, safety, and a healthy living environment.

The conceptual framework for this study consisted of Ostrom's (2005) IAD framework. IAD is used as a systematic way to study institutional arrangements. The IAD framework, as applied to this study, was used to examine the lack of policy that mandated jail reentry and to explain the need for programming that focused on women. It is important to mention that this study referred to the lived experiences of 13 women who had been arrested and recidivated at least once. I wanted to understand their experiences with the criminal justice system at point of reentry from jail. I asked several

questions that pertained to successful reintegration and if any programs were offered (see Appendix) at point of release from jail. All participants stated that at their second and subsequent arrest, no programs were offered at time of release from confinement. One participant, however, stated she was offered drug court after her second felony drug arrest; previous arrests were misdemeanor drug violations.

The IAD approach helped this researcher find the collective action problem which occurred because too many individuals tried to share the same resources. A lack of community resources can create a disruption within one's community (Ostrom, Cox, & Schlager, 2014). This is what resulted from the findings of this study. The female participants were released from jail without knowing how, where, or when to find community wide resources.

The women of this study were asked if they were offered any help at all, what would that be, and the responses were quite interesting. Many women wanted help with expungement of their record. These women felt that with a felony on their record, jobs were unattainable. Many women stated they wanted help with transportation. One participant stated that she lost her drivers permit as a result of her criminal arrests. She stated that the lack of transportation has led to her joblessness, lack of stable housing, and subsequent arrests. The female participant added that the policy of taking one's drivers permit as a crime deterrent is adding to the problem, not helping to solve it. Most women wanted help with resources such as food bank locations, free legal help, where to go to detox from drugs, health insurance, and help with transportation. None of the women

interviewed were guided to sober living environments, were not offered help with housing, or were either offered no assistance at all. This is an alarming find especially when this type of assistance is offered in Montgomery County, Ohio. In Chapter 2, a section titled, "Reentry in Montgomery County, Ohio," pgs. 42-45, I mentioned all the resources available for individuals recently released from jail and prison. The key is to inform. Without knowledge of such services, they cannot be used by those who need them.

Limitations of the Study

As with all studies, this one had its limitations. One such limitation included the lack of a recording device needed to capture, word for word, what was stated during the interview process. I had to personally write each response to all questions. This slowed the interviewing pace which in turn, interrupted the rhythm of the interviewing process. The geographic location of this study was limited to the area of Montgomery County, Ohio. It cannot be said that the experiences of these women would compare if conducted in another large county in Ohio. I chose to interview women who were sentenced to a community based correctional facility located in Dayton, Ohio. Because this study pertained to the need of reentry programs located in Montgomery County, Ohio, women from different counties could not be interviewed. With participants from the local probation/parole office, more women may have been able to participate.

In Chapter 1, I stated I could not include all barriers that women face at reentry. I also stated I would focus on the barriers of drug addiction, unemployment, mental health

issues and lack of family support. When obtaining IRB approval, it was advised that I not ask questions pertaining to substance abuse or drug related problems. These questions were removed from my interview guide. The questions and probing from the interview process revealed that these women did suffer with some type of substance abuse problems. The women freely and openly revealed this information without any questions being asked that referred to the subject of illegal drugs.

Recommendations

The strength of this study is the much needed research on the topic of jail reentry programs as they pertain to women. Women are already underrepresented in the literature as related to jail or corrections. Using the information of this study, policy makers and jail administrators can see the need for reentry programming early in the criminal process of female offenders. Probation officers, judges, and the court system can now see that women are different than men when it comes to the barriers that hinder successful reentry from jail to the community.

Recommendations include the exploration of all barriers that hinder successful reentry. Using a larger group of women from an entire state or location of the country could add to the complexity of the data. This can include criminal offending women and race, criminal offending women and socioeconomic status, along with criminal offending women and age. This study did not research all community wide resources or reentry programs available to criminal offending women within Montgomery County, Ohio. Again, I wanted to understand what hindered successful reentry. The lack knowledge

that pertained to community wide resources available for criminal offending women may have contributed to recidivism in this location of Ohio. In chapter 1, I mentioned many barriers to successful reentry from a jail setting. This was just a small list; the examination of all other barriers were well beyond the scope of this paper.

Implications

Positive Social Change

Andrews et al. (2011) stated that it is important to address the criminogenic needs or dynamic risk factors that pertain to the female offender. Addressing needs such as (a) substance abuse treatment, (b) mental health treatment, (c) behavioral therapy, (d) housing, (e) employment, (f) education, and (g) familial bonds can help to bring about positive change in the female offender. This will then lead to positive social change. This change can begin with the change in policy that dictates what happens when a female offender is released from jail. When a pattern becomes evident, intervention is needed. The women that were a part of this study all stated they wanted a chance to become something more; they just did not know how or where to begin.

The implications for positive social change include a better understanding of women and their differing needs as related to the criminal justice system. Most programs have been set up for criminal offending men. Criminal offending women have special circumstances that make it hard for them to succeed. Women are arrested for prostitution with little to no help from the community (McLean et al., 2006) adding to HIV, AIDS and Hepatitis issues (Hearn et al., 2014; McLean et al., 2006); women lack proper social

skills (Doherty et al., 2014); they are usually victims of domestic violence and sexual abuse (Belknap et al., 2016; McLean et al., 2006); because women are usually the custodial parent of children, they lack child care and struggle with custodial issues (McLean et al., 2006; Spjeldnes & Goodkind, 2009); women are usually undereducated (Doherty et al., 2014; Spjeldnes et al., 2014; Spjeldnes & Goodkind, 2009; Valera et al., 2015) and lack employment skills, (Doherty et al., 2014; McLean et al., 2006; Schonbrun, Y. C., Johnson, J. E., Anderson, B. J., Caviness, C., & Stein, M. D., 2016; Spjeldnes et al., 2014; Spjeldnes & Goodkind, 2009). This is a small but important list of the many barriers that all women face, not just the female criminal. This is a problem that needs addressed and should be changed. By simply acknowledging these issues, social change begins.

The social change I hope to gain from this paper is in the way society views female ex-offenders. The female offender breaks the law and is then adjudicated to pay her debt to society. Once released from confinement, she enters a society that will not tolerate her mistakes. The legal mistake is a mistake that society will not forgive, especially in women. Women already have a hard time finding equal employment opportunities but add a felony to the record, the chances for success quickly dwindle. The female ex-offender is discriminated against, even when trying to better herself. This is unacceptable and is something that must change. This is the social change I seek.

Conclusion

This study was an examination of the reentry process as it pertained to female offenders. I interviewed 13 women who had already recidivated at least once and who had spent time in the Montgomery County Jail located in Ohio. The participants spoke openly and freely about their lived experiences as criminal offending women. They offered their opinions about the reentry process from jail to community. All 13 participants stated they faced challenges upon reentry from jail to community. The lack of transportation to court appointments was most significant and was not mentioned in any of the literature discussed in Chapter 2. The women stated they became anxious and would not attend important court dates. Transportation was also an issue. Not only did they need rides to court, they also needed rides to report for probation. This was a surprise and one that should be further examined.

Policy makers and community leaders need to understand the importance of jail reentry. When women enter jail for a second or third time for the same reasons, women should be made aware of the programs available for those leaving jail. Most of the women interviewed for this study were not offered or made aware of any community wide resources. Only one woman was sentenced to drug court for her felony drug arrest. Those with multiple misdemeanor arrests slip through the cracks. All but one of the women interviewed stated they did not know how to find the help they needed, even if they were ready for that help. All 13 women stated they would have utilized reentry help if offered.

I think that when we get booked into jail then somebody needs to come in and tell us what's out there for us when we leave jail. If they only keep us for less than 24-hours, we still need help. If we are dope sick when we leave jail or even dope sick while in jail, we are going to use when we leave. If left to our own devices, us addicts will use dope without any help; that's what we do. Within the first 24 hours we are let out of jail that's when we need help the most. I feel like Montgomery County thinks we're a burden on their system. They rack up our fines, charge us child support, then take away our driver's license. Ok, now how are we going to get a job? Oh yeah, I'm a convicted felon. I can't get a job to pay all that money the court charges me to pay. This is crazy and I don't know how to stop it (Participant 7).

References

- Akers, R. L. (n.d.). *Empirical status of social learning theory of crime and deviance: The past, present, and future*. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/f2b0/10d3d61c6a63c710013ba3cfecdd291aece3.pdf>
- Akers, R. L. (1977). *Akers deviant behavior: A social learning approach* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth
- Akers, R. L. (1998). *Social learning theory and social structure: A general theory of crime and deviance*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
- Akers, R. L., Krohn, M. D., Lanza-Kaduce, L., & Radosevich, M. (1979). Social learning and deviant behavior: A specific test of a general theory. *American Sociological Review*, *44*, 636-655. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2094592>
- Albanes, J. S. (2012). Demystifying risk assessment: giving prisoners a second chance at individualized community confinement under the second chance act. *Administrative Law Review*, *64*(4), 937-967.
- Alex, B., Weiss, D. B., Kaba, F., Rosner, Z., Lee, D., Lin, S., Venters, H., & MacDonald, R. (2017). Death after jail release: Matching to improve care delivery. *Journal of Correctional Health Care*, *23*(1), 83-87. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1078345816685311>
- Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J. & Wormith, J. S. (2011). The risk-needs-responsivity model: Does adding the good lives model contribute to effective crime prevention?

Criminal Justice and Behavior, 735-755. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854811406356>

- Baird, C. (2017, February). Criminogenic needs: A question of evidence. *National Council on Crime and Delinquency*, (Issue Brief No. 3). Retrieved from https://www.nccdglobal.org/sites/default/files/criminogenic_needs.pdf
- Barringer, A., Hunter, B. A., Salina, D. D., & Jason, L. A. (2016). Empowerment and social support: Implications for practice and programming among minority women with substance abuse and criminal justice histories. *Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research*, 44(1), 75–88. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11414-016-9499-6>
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 544-559.
- Belknap, J., Lynch, S., & DeHart, D. (2016). Jail staff members' views on jailed women's mental health, trauma, offending, rehabilitation, and reentry. *Prison Journal*, 96(1), 79-101. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885515605485>
- Berg, M. T. & Huebner, B. M. (2011). Reentry and the ties that bind: An examination of social ties, employment, and recidivism. *Justice Quarterly*, 28(2), 382-410. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2010.498383>
- Blanchette, K. & Taylor, K. N. (2009, December) Reintegration of female offenders: perspective on “what works.” *Corrections Today*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/App/publications/abstract.aspx?ID=252239>

- Boppre, B. & Salisbury, B. (2016, April 12). RE: The women's risk needs assessment: Putting gender at the forefront of actuarial risk assessment [Web log post]. Retrieved from <https://www.penalreform.org/blog/womens-risk-needs-assessment-putting-gender-forefront-actuarial/>
- Center for Behavior, Institutions, and the Environment. (2016, December 16). *Lecture on the institutional analysis and development framework of Elinor Ostrom* [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3cindBF11EM&t=147s>
- Cheah, P., Unnithan, N., & Sandela Raran, A. (2019). Interviewing criminal justice populations without electronic recording devices: A guide. *Qualitative Report*, 24(4), 705-716. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol24/iss4/5>
- Chenail, R. J. (2011). Interviewing the investigator: Strategies for addressing instrumentation and researcher bias concerns in qualitative research. *Qualitative Report*, 16(1), 255.
- Cherry, K. (2020, March 26). How does conformity influence behavior? Retrieved from: <https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-conformity-2795889>
- Chesney-Lind, M. (n.d.). *Women and the criminal justice system: Gender matters*. Retrieved from https://www.gvsu.edu/cms4/asset/903124DF-BD7F-3286-FE3330AA44F994DE/women_and_the_criminal_justice_system_gender_matters.pdf
- Cochran, J. K., Maskaly, J., Jones, S., & Sellers, C. S. (2017). Using structural equations to model Akers' social learning theory with data on intimate partner violence.

Crime & Delinquency, 63(1), 39-60.

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0011128715597694>

Common Pleas Court and Clerk of Courts. (2018). 2017 Report to the Citizens of Montgomery County. Retrieved from www.mcoho.org/2017_Report_to_the_Citizens_of_MC_04_05_18.pdf

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

Cox, K. A. (2016). Qualitative research designs. In G. J. Burkholder, K. A. Cox, & L. M. Crawford (Eds.), *The scholar practitioners guide to research design* (pp. 227–244). Baltimore, MD: Laureate Publishing.

Cullen, F. T. & Agnew, R. (2006). *Criminological theory: Past to present* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing.

deVuono-Powell, S., Schweidler, C., Walters, A., & Zohrabi, A. (2015, September) *Who pays? The true cost of incarceration on families*. Oakland, CA: Ella Baker Center Forward Together, and Research Action Design.

Dirette, P. D. (2014). Questions about race as a research variable. *Open Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 2(3), 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.15453/2168-6408.1122>

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

944740

- Drug Court. (2020). Montgomery county common pleas court general division. Retrieved from <https://montcourt.oh.gov/drug-court/>
- Durkin, K. F., Wolfe, T. W., & Clark, G. A. (2005). College students and binge drinking: An evaluation of social learning theory. *Sociological Spectrum, 25*(3), 255-272.
- Duwe, G., & Clark, V. (2014). Blessed be the social tie that binds: The effects of prison visitation on offender recidivism. *The Prison Journal, 94*(4), 454-478.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885514548009>
- Freudenberg, N. (2006, June). Coming home from jail: A review of health and social problems facing US jail populations and of opportunities for reentry interventions. *Jail Reentry Roundtable Initiative*. The Urban Institute: Washington, DC
- Freudenberg, N., Daniels, J., Crum, M., Perkins, T., & Richie, B. E. (2005). Coming home from jail: The social and health consequences of community reentry for women, male adolescents, and their families and communities. *American journal of public health, 95*(10), 1725-1736. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2004.056325>
- Garcia-Lopez, G. (2009). Bringing power back in: Inserting power into the Institutional Analysis and Development (IAD) framework. *Conference Papers-Midwestern Political Science Association, 1*. Retrieved from <https://ezp.waldenulibrary.org/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=poh&AN=45299616&site=eds-live&scope=site>

- Halcomb, E. J., & Davidson, P. M. (2006). Is verbatim transcription of interview data always necessary? *Applied Nursing Research, 19*(1), 38–42.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnr.2005.06.001>
- Hamza, K. & Mellouli, S. (2018). Background on frameworks for policy analytics. In Gil-Garcia, J. R.; Pardo, T. A.; & Luna-Reyes, L. F. (Eds). *Policy analytics, modelling, and informatics innovative tools for solving complex social problems* (pp. 19-37). Albany, NY: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-61762-6_2
- Hearn, L. E., Whitehead, N. E., Khan, M. R. & Latimer, W. W. (2014). Time since release from incarceration and HIV risk behaviors among women: The potential protective role of committed partners during re-entry. *AIDS and Behavior, 19*, 1070-1077. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-014-0886-9>
- Herrschaft, B. A., Veysey, B. M., Tubman-Carbone, H. R. & Christian, J. (2009). Gender differences in the transformation narrative: Implications for revised reentry strategies for female offenders. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 48*, 463-482.
- Hooley, D. (2010, March 30). 6 evidence-based practices proven to reduce recidivism: Learning to trust the research. *CorrectionsOne.com*. Retrieved from <https://www.correctionsone.com/re-entry-and-recidivism/articles/2030030-6-evidence-based-practices-proven-to-lower-recidivism/>
- Holzer-Glier, L. (2016). Inside the massive jail that doubles as Chicago's largest mental health facility. *Vera Institute of Justice*. Retrieved from <http://humantolofjail.vera.org/the-massive-jail-that-doubles-as-chicagos-largest-mental-health-facility/>

- Human Rights Watch and ACLU. (2018, September). "You Miss So Much When You're Gone" The Lasting Harm of Jailing Mothers Before Trial in Oklahoma. Retrieved from https://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/report_pdf/us0918_web_0.pdf
- Human Services Planning and Development (2018). *2018 Annual report including FCFC progress report on community focus areas, indicators, and initiatives*. Montgomery County, Ohio. Retrieved from <https://www.mcoho.org/departments/reentry/resources.php>
- Iliceto, P., Pompili, M., Candilera, G., Rosafio, I., Erbutto, D., Battuello, M., . . . Girardi, P. (2012). Temperament, insecure attachment, impulsivity, and sexuality in women in jail. *Journal of Forensic Nursing*, 8(1), 23-29.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-3938.2011.01127.x>
- Ison, J. (2016, June 4). Ohio prisons target short-timers with drug treatment, early release. *Telegraph Forum*. Retrieved from <http://www.bucyrustelegraphforum.com/story/news/state/2016/06/04/ohio-prisons-target-short-timers-drug-treatment-early-release/85300836/>
- Jail. (n.d.). *Montgomery County Sheriff Rob Streck: Programs*. Retrieved from <https://www.mcohiosheriff.org/jail/programs/index.php>
- Jannetta, J. (2009). Assembling the jail reentry puzzle. *American Jails*. Retrieved from www.urban.org/sites/default/files/jannetta_american-jails-article.pdf
- Jannetta, J., Kurs, E., & Willison, J. B. (2016, April 28). During reentry week, remember the people coming back from local jails [The voices of Urban Institute's

researchers and staff]. *Urban Institute*. Retrieved from <https://www.urban.org/urban-wire/during-reentry-week-remember-people-coming-back-local-jails>

Janetta, J., Willison, J. B., & Kurs, E. (2016, June). Transition from jail to community (TJC) initiative: Phase 2 summary implementation findings. *National Institute of Corrections*. Retrieved from https://www.urban.org/research/publication/transition-jail-community-tjc-initiative-phase-2-summary-implementation-findings/view/full_report

Jenkins, M. J., Dammer, H., & Raciti, D. (2017). Built around failure: improving county jail inmates' perceptions of reentry. *Corrections Today*, 79(4), 58-66.

Kaeble, D. (2018). Probation and parole in the United States, 2016. *Bureau of Justice Statistics*. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cpus16.pdf>

Kajstura, A. (2017). Women's mass incarceration: The whole pie 2017. *Prison Policy Initiative*. Retrieved from <https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/pie2017women.html>

Kajstura, A. (2019). Women's mass incarceration: The whole pie 2019. *Prison Policy Initiative*. Retrieved from <https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/pie2019women.html>

Katz, P. C. (1998). Supporting families and children of mothers in jail: An integrated child welfare and criminal justice strategy. *Child Welfare*, 97(5), 495-511.

- King, R. & Elderbroom, B. (2014). Improving recidivism as a performance measure. *Urban Institute*. Retrieved from <https://www.bja.gov/Publications/UI-ImprovingRecidivism.pdf>
- Kiser, L. L., & Ostrom, E. (1982). The three worlds of action: A metatheoretical synthesis of institutional approaches. In E. Ostrom (Ed.) *Strategies of Political Inquiry* (179–222). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krohn, M. D. (1999). Social learning theory: The continuing development of a perspective. *Theoretical Criminology*, 3(4), 462.
- Lilly, J. R., Cullen, F. R., & Ball, R. A. (2006). *Criminological theory: Context and consequences* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lynch, J. P., Miller, J. M., Miller, H. V., Heindel, T. L., & Wood, A. (2012, September/October). Embracing evidence-based practices. *American Jails*, 26(4), 13-16.
- Lindquist, C., Willison, J. B., Rossman, S., Walters, J. H., & Lattimore, P. K. (2015). *Second chance act adult offender reentry demonstration programs: Implementation challenges and lessons learned* (Report No. 249188). Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/249188.pdf>
- Lorenzetti, J. P. (2014, December). Q&A: 10 topics with Jamie L. Gee. *Dayton Magazine*. Retrieved from http://www.thedaytonmagazine.com/DM/Articles/QA_10_Topics_with_Jamie_L_Gee_4301.aspx

- McGinnis, M. D. (2011). An introduction to the IAD and the language of the Ostrom workshop: A simple guide to a complex framework. *The Policy Studies Journal*, 39(1), 169-183. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.2010.00401.x>
- McGinnis, M. D. & Ostrom, E. (2014). Social-ecological systems framework: Initial changes and continuing challenges. *Ecology and Society*, 19(2). <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-06387-190230>
- McLean, R. L., Robarge, J., & Sherman, S. G. (2006). Release from jail: Moment of crisis or window of opportunity for female detainees? *Journal of Urban Health*, 83(3), 382-393. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-006-9048-3>
- Miller, J. M. (2013). Identifying collateral effects of offender reentry programming through evaluative fieldwork. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39, 41-58. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-013-9206-6>
- Miller, J. M., Barnes, J. C., & Miller, H. V., (2017). Profile of Two Second Chance Act Offender Treatment Initiatives: A Research Note. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 42(4), 759-767. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-017-9405-7>
- Miller, J. M., & Khey, D. N. (2016). Fighting America's highest incarceration rates with offender programming: Process evaluation implications from the Louisiana 22nd judicial district reentry court. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-016-9372-4>

- Miller, H. V., & Miller, J. M. (2010). Community in-reach through jail reentry: Findings from a quasi-experimental design. *Justice Quarterly*, 27(7), 893-910.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2010.482537>
- Miller, H. V. & Miller, J. M. (2015). A promising jail reentry program revisited: Results from a quasi-experimental design. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 28(2), 211-225.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1478601X.2014.1000489>
- Miller, H. V., & Miller, J. M. (2016). Treating dually diagnosed offenders in rural settings: Profile of the middle Tennessee rural reenter program. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 42(2), 389-400. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-016-9368-0>
- Miller, J. M., Miller, H. V., & Barnes, J. C. (2016). Outcome evaluation of a family-based jail reentry program for substance abusing offenders. *Prison Journal*, 96(1), 53-78. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885515605482>
- Minton, T. D., Ginder, S., Brumbaugh, S. M., Smiley-McDonald, H., & Rohloff, H. (2015). *Census of jails: Population changes, 1999–2013*. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cjpc9913.pdf>
- Namageyo-Funa, A., Rimando, M., Brace, A. M., Christiana, R. W., Fowles, T. L., Davis, T. L., . . . Sealy, D. (2014). Recruitment in Qualitative Public Health Research: Lessons Learned During Dissertation Sample Recruitment. *Qualitative Report*, 19(4), 1-17. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol19/iss4/3>

- National Conference of State Legislatures. (2017, May 1). *Mental health needs in the criminal justice system*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncsl.org/research/civil-and-criminal-justice/mental-health-needs-of-criminal-justice.aspx>
- Nicholson, J., & Higgins, G. E. (2017). Social structure social learning theory: Preventing crime and violence. In B. Teasdale & M. S. Bradley (Eds.). *Preventing Crime and Violence* (pp. 11-20). Cham, Switzerland: Springer International.
- Nigussie, Z., Tsunekawab, A., Adgo, E., Cochrane, L., Floquet, A., & Abele, S. (2018). Applying Ostrom's institutional analysis and development framework to soil and water conservation activities in north-western Ethiopia. *Land Use Policy*, *71*, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2017.11.039>
- Nyamathi, A. M., Salem, B. E., Hall, E., Oleskowicz, T., Ekstrand, M., Yadav, K., . . . Faucette, M. (2017). Violent crime in the lives of homeless, female ex-offenders. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, *38*(2), 122-131. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01612840.2016.1253807>
- Office of Criminal Justice Services. (n.d.). *Ohio criminal justice statistics*. Retrieved from https://www.ocjs.ohio.gov/links/ocjs_Statistics.pdf
- Office of Ex-Offender Reentry Welcome One-Stop Reentry Center. (2010, November). *Blueprint for Reducing recidivism in Montgomery County, Ohio*. Retrieved from http://www.mcoho.org/document_center/exoffender/Montgomery_County_Office_of_Ex_Offender_Reentry_Task_Force_Report.pdf

- Osher, F. C. (2006, June). *Short-term strategies to improve re-entry of jail populations: Expanding and implementing the APIC Model* (Jail Reentry Roundtable). Washington, DC: Urban Institute. Retrieved from http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/osher_ui_paper.pdf
- Ostrom, E. (2005). *Understanding institutional diversity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ostrom, E. (2011). Background on the institutional analysis and development framework. *Policy Studies Journal*, 39(1), 7-27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.2010.00394.x>
- Ostrom, E., Cox, M., & Schlager, E. (2014). An assessment of the institutional analysis and development framework and introduction of the social-ecological systems framework. In Sabatier, P. A., & Weible, C. M. (Eds.). *Theories of the policy process* (3rd ed., pp. 267-306). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Ostrom, V. & Ostrom, E. (1971). Public choice: A different approach to the study of public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 13, 203-216.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Petersilla, J. (2001). Prisoner reentry: Public safety and reintegration challenges. *The Prison Journal*, 81(3), 360-385. <https://doi-org.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/10.1177/0032885501081003004>

- Pogrebin, M., West-Smith, M., Walker, A., & Unnithan, N. P. (2014). Employment isn't enough: Financial obstacles experiences by ex-prisoners during the reentry process. *Criminal Justice Review*, 39(4), 394-410.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0734016814540303>
- Pratt, T., Cullen, F., Sellers, C., Thomas-Winfrey, L., Madensen, T., Daigle, L., . . . Gau, J. (2010). The Empirical Status of Social Learning Theory: A Meta-Analysis. *Justice Quarterly*, 27(6), 765. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418820903379610>
- Ravitch, S. M., & Carl, N. M. (2016). *Qualitative research: Bridging the conceptual, theoretical, and methodological*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Reed, M. S., Evely, A., Cundill, G., Fazey, L., Glass, J., Laing, A., . . . Stringer, L. (2010). What is social learning? *Ecology and Society*, 15(4). Retrieved from <https://ecologyandsociety.org/vol15/iss4/resp1/main.html>
- Reentry Collaborative (n.d.). *What is reentry collaborative?* Retrieved from https://www.mcoho.org/departments/reentry/reentry_collaborative.php
- Reentry Career Alliance Academy. (n.d.). Montgomery county: Birthplace of innovation. Retrieved from <https://www.mcoho.org/departments/reentry/rcaa.php>
- Reilly, K. (2013, June 21). Sesame Street reaches out to 2.7 million American children with an incarcerated parent. *Fact Tank: News in the Numbers*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2013/06/21/sesame-street-reaches-out-to-2-7-million-american-children-with-an-incarcerated-parent/>

- Research Rundowns. (n.d.). Instrument, validity, reliability. Retrieved from <https://researchrundowns.com/quantitative-methods/instrument-validity-reliability/>
- Rolfe, G. (2006). Validity, trustworthiness and rigor: Quality and the idea of qualitative research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 53(3). 304-310.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2006.03727.x>
- Rose, S. J., Lebel, T. P., Begun, A. L., & Fuhrmann, D. (2014). Looking out from the inside: incarcerated women's perceived barriers to treatment of substance use. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 53, 300-316.
- Rowe, D., Huskey, B., & Severson, M. (January/February 2016). Mental illness and Douglas County Jail: A new prescription. *Corrections Today*. Retrieved from <https://www.thefreelibrary.com/Mental+illness+and+Douglas+county+jail%3A+a+new+prescription.-a0439933653>
- Rubin, H. J. & Rubin, I. S. (2012). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rutakumwa, R., Mugisha, J. O., Bernays, S., Kabunga, E., Tumwekwase, G., Mbonye, M., & Seely, J. (2019). Conducting in-depth interviews with and without voice recorders: A comparative analysis. *Qualitative Research*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794119884806>
- Sabatier, P. A., & Weible, C. M. (Eds.). (2014). *Theories of the policy process* (3rd ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

- Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Schonbrun, Y. C., Johnson, J. E., Anderson, B. J., Caviness, C., & Stein, M. D. (2016). Hazardously drinking jailed women: Post-release perceived needs and risk of reincarceration. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 61(16), 1819-1832. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0306624X16634702>
- Second Chance Act: Community Safety Through Recidivism Prevention of 2007, Pub. L. No. 110-199, 122 Stat. 657 (2007).
- Sentencing Project. (2017). *Trends in U.S. corrections*. Retrieved from <http://sentencingproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Trends-in-US-Corrections.pdf>
- Sentencing Project. (2019, June 5). *Incarcerated women and girls, 1980-2016*. Retrieved from <https://www.sentencingproject.org/publications/incarcerated-women-and-girls/>
- Services. (n.d.). Montgomery county: Birthplace of innovation. Retrieved from <https://www.mcoho.org/departments/reentry/services.php>
- Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information*, 22(2), 63–75. <https://doi.org/10.3233/EFI-2004-22201>

- Siegel, L. J. (2004). *Criminology: Theories, patterns & typologies* (8th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Learning.
- Spjeldnes, S. & Goodkind, S. (2009). Gender differences and offender reentry: A review of the literature. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 48*, 314-335.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10509670902850812>
- Spjeldnes, S., Jung, H., & Yamatani, H. (2014). Gender differences in jail populations: Factors to consider in reentry strategies. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 53*, 75-94. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2013.868387>
- Steffensmeier, D. & Allen, E. (1996). Gender and crime: Toward a gendered theory of female offending. *Annual Review of Sociology, 22*(1), 459-487.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.22.1.459>
- Sutherland, E. H. & Cressey, D. R. (1960). A theory of differential association. In Cullen, F. T. & Agnew, R. (Eds.), *Criminological theory: Past to present* (3rd ed., pp. 122-125). Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing.
- Swavola, E., Riley, K., & Subramanian, R. (2016). *Overlooked: Women and jails in an era of reform*. New York, NY: Vera Institute of Justice.
- Tewksbury, R. (2009). Qualitative versus quantitative methods: Understanding why qualitative methods are superior for criminology and criminal justice. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Criminology, 1*(1), 38-58.

- U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2015). *Estimated number of persons supervised by U.S. adult correctional systems, by correctional status, 1980-2015*. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=kfdetail&iid=489>
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education. (2016). *Reentry education framework: Guidelines for providing high-quality education for adults involved in the criminal justice system*, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Urban Institute (n.d.). *TJC initiative: About the issue*. Retrieved from <https://www.urban.org/policy-centers/justice-policy-center/projects/transition-jail-community-tjc-initiative/tjc-initiative-about-issue>
- Valera, P., Chang, Y., Hernández, D. & Cooper, J. (2015). Exploring kinship and social support in women with criminal justice backgrounds. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 54*, 278-295. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2015.1025178>
- Wagner, P., & Rabuy, B. (2017). Mass incarceration: The whole pie 2017. *Prison Policy Initiative*. Retrieved from <https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/pie2017.html>
- Wagner, P., & Sawyer, W. (2018). Mass incarceration: The whole pie 2018. *Prison Policy Initiative*. Retrieved from <https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/pie2018.html>
- Walden University Center for Research Quality (2018). *Supplemental Summary to IRB Updates*. Retrieved from Supplemental Summary of 2018 IRB Updates

- Ward, T. & Stewart, C. (2002). The difference between human needs and criminogenic needs. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 9(3), 219-224.
[https://doi.org/ 10.1080/1068316031000112557](https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316031000112557)
- Weller, M. (2012). A look at jail-based reentry programs (Master's thesis). (Accession No. 2251). Retrieved from <http://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/2251>
- White, M. D., Saunders, J., Fisher, C., & Mellow, J. (2012). Exploring inmate reentry in a local jail setting: Implications for outreach, service use, and recidivism. *Crime and Delinquency*, 58, 124-146. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128708327033>
- Williams, M. R. (2016). From bail to jail: The effect of jail capacity on bail decisions. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 41, 484-497.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-015-9305-7>
- Willison, J. B., Jannetta, J., Dodd, H., Neusteter, S. R., Warwick, K., Greer, K., & Matthews, A. (2012). *Process and systems change evaluation findings from the Transition from Jail to Community Initiative*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Yarbrough, A., Jones, S., Sullivan, C., Sellers, C., & Cochran, J. (2012). Social learning and self-control: Assessing the moderating potential of criminal propensity. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 56(2), 191-202. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X10396041>
- Zeng, Z. (2018, February). Jailed inmates in 2016. *Bureau of Justice Statistics*. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ji16.pdf>

Appendix: Interview Guide

Introductory Statements

Reentry is the process of leaving jail and returning to your community or society. All who are booked into jail are eventually released or are sent to serve their time elsewhere. Some leave jail and enter treatment facilities such as the Monday Program, STOP, or other behavior modification programs. Some leave jail and report to a community control officer (probation) or a drug court officer. Some do their time and leave. Jail is simply a point in the criminal justice process where the offender awaits action. A jail reentry program is where offender receives help in transitioning back into the community. This help includes an individualized treatment plan that is designed prior to an inmate's release. The individualized treatment can be anything from help with addiction and mental health services to help with housing, education, job seeking, health care, etc. Instead of the constant book in book out process that many reoffending inmates face, a reentry program has the capacity to help the offender end the revolving door of incarceration.

Do you have any questions?

Introduction Before Interview

I want to thank you for participating in this study. Without your help, the success of this project would not be possible. Again, the purpose of this interview is to understand what you need, as a woman who has been in jail and has reoffended, to successfully reintegrate back into society. I am extremely interested in your feelings, thoughts, needs, and opinions as they pertain to reentry programming. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. Your identity will be kept confidential and your name or identifying information about who you are will not be released.

Because I work in the field of education, I am a mandated reporter in Ohio. A mandated reporter is one who must report instances of child abuse. The only reason I would reveal any information we discuss would be if you revealed to me that you are abusing children. I would also have to report to your clinician if you are abusing drugs while a resident at MonDay CCI. Therefore, it is important that you understand we do not have the same level of confidentiality as an attorney/client, for example.

If you choose not to answer any questions, please let me know. We can stop and start at any time. If we are in the middle of this questionnaire and you want to stop, we will. If we are talking and you need to stop, please let me know. If there is anything you need from me, please let me know. Any questions before we begin?

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

1. What was your age at your last birthday?
2. Where are you from and where did you live when you participated in the criminal activity that sent you to jail the first time?
3. How many times have you left the Montgomery County Jail? (This to make sure they have recidivated at least once.)
4. Can you understand the English language?

Educational Background

5. What is the highest level of school, including college, vocational/technical school, you have completed?
 - a. Why did you quit school?
6. (For those who attended vocational school/technical school), What did you study? Did you complete the course?
 - a. Why did you quit college/technical/vocational school?

Work History

7. What is your employment status?
 - a. Describe the reasons you do not work.
8. Would you consider your job to be one that you could retire from? A career for example.

Family History Including Parenting (These questions will pertain to family relationships)

9. Do you have any contact with your immediate family?
10. Are you close with your immediate family?

11. Has your criminal activity affected this relationship? How?
12. Are your parents involved in your life?
13. Are you married?
 - a. Is the husband in the home?
14. Do you have children and are they still in the home?
15. Do you have any children in the home that are under the age of 18 or over the age of 18 that are completely dependent on you for their care?
 - a. Is the father of the children or any father figure in the home?
16. Do you have children other than your own, that are dependent on you for their care?
17. Do you get any help from state resources (Job and Family Services) for the care of your children?
18. Who cares for your children when you are in jail?
19. If you are in jail and no other adult is in the home, who cares for your dependent children?

Living situation questions (These questions are about the participants living situation at time of arrest)

Family Support

20. At time of arrest, where and with whom did you live?
21. At time of arrest, did you have contact with immediate family (mother, father, siblings, adult children, etc.)
22. Did a family member post bond for you?
23. Were you released on your own recognizance? (O.R. bond)

Employment (Employment at time of arrest).

24. Did you have a job at time of arrest?
25. Will you or are you able to go back to that job?
26. If you do not have a job, how do you pay your bills, obtain food, etc.
27. If given the opportunity, would you take the help if offered with employment or job training programs?
28. If you had the opportunity, would you attend college or technical school if it would help in your circumstance?

Mental Health Issues

29. Are there any mental health issues that you feel contribute to your reoffending?
30. Have you ever been offered any type of assistance, after arrest, for your mental health issues?
31. If you had the chance to get any type of help with your mental health issues, would you take it?

Arrest and Jail (Questions about Arrest).

32. Can you briefly explain to me how you ended up in jail the first time? Where did you go when you left jail that first time?
33. How long did you stay out of jail until you were rearrested? Was it for the same offense as the first?
34. Were you offered any help with the reasons as to why you were arrested?
35. What do you believe are the reasons why you went back to jail?

Physical Health

Reentry from Jail (Questions about when participant left jail this time or the first time they were arrested).

36. When you left jail, what hindered your successful reintegration? Can you tell me about that?

37. Are there any opportunities that help you towards a successful reintegration? If none, what opportunities would have helped you to successfully reintegrate?
38. What do you feel are the chances of a community reintegration program successfully helping female offenders? Can you tell me more?
39. If you had the chance to move into a safer environment, would you go? Safer would mean if you had the opportunity to move to a location free from whatever it was that contributed to your arrests such as old friends and criminal patterns etc., would you take that help?
40. What is it that you personally need to reintegrate back into your community without reoffending?
41. What do you think would help you not to reoffend? Would a reentry program help here?
42. What barriers are there that you feel contribute to your criminal reoffending?
43. How or why do these barriers get in the way of a life, free of crime?
44. If you had the chance, would you use help from a reentry advocate?
 - b. Can you tell me why?
 - c. Can you tell me why not?
45. If you could ask for any help at all, what would that be? Why?
46. Now that you have a better understanding of what a reentry program is, how do you feel about a community reintegration program?
47. Is there anything else you would like to say or add to this interview?