

# A Literature Review on Social Rehabilitation Programs for Ex-Prisoners in Enhancing Quality of Life

Antonino Pedro Marsal, Eugenia Brandao Da Silva

Instituto Boaventura De Timor Leste

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received 15 February 2023

Revised 2 Mei 2023

Accepted 10 June 2023

### Key words:

Post-release reintegration,

Social rehabilitation,

Ex-prisoners,

Quality of life,

Community engagement,

Institutional equity,

Restorative frameworks.

## ABSTRACT

*This literature-based inquiry explores how structured social rehabilitation programs affect the post-release quality of life among ex-prisoners. Drawing on interdisciplinary research spanning criminology, public policy, and psychology, the study identifies core components that shape reintegration: psychosocial therapy, vocational training, educational attainment, legal support, and community engagement. Evidence suggests that effective rehabilitation contributes to emotional resilience, economic participation, and social inclusion. While recidivism remains a common indicator, the review underscores broader dimensions such as identity restoration, familial reconciliation, and civic agency. The analysis highlights both the enabling conditions and systemic obstacles that mediate program outcomes. Structural racism, funding volatility, geographic disparities, and fragmented services continue to hinder sustained transformation. However, programs that are trauma-informed, participatory, and embedded in local networks offer promising pathways to stability and renewal. The study concludes that social rehabilitation must be conceptualized as a dynamic continuum that bridges personal growth and institutional reform. It advocates for policy realignment that privileges relational trust, long-term investment, and dignity-based reintegration models grounded in democratic values.*

## INTRODUCTION

The transition from incarceration to reintegration is a complex and often precarious journey for individuals released from correctional facilities. Upon reentry, many ex-prisoners face a convergence of adversities including economic exclusion, social stigmatization, psychological distress, and institutional disconnection (Ekunwe & Jones, 2011). These realities not only compromise their personal development but also impede their capacity to contribute meaningfully to society. In response, the development of social rehabilitation programs has garnered growing attention among scholars, policymakers, and human rights advocates. Such programs are not merely corrective in orientation; they are foundational instruments for fostering human dignity, social justice, and structural equity within post-penal environments (Sakib, 2022).

Social rehabilitation initiatives, especially when designed as multidimensional interventions, offer mechanisms for addressing the layered consequences of incarceration (Foster & Hagan, 2015). These include vocational training, psychological counseling,

restorative community engagement, and the rebuilding of familial ties. One integrative approach gaining attention is the incorporation of restorative justice principles, which aim to repair harm, empower individuals, and facilitate community-based healing as part of the rehabilitation process (Udjari et al., 2022). Scholars such as Petersilia (2003) have noted that comprehensive rehabilitation services are positively correlated with reduced recidivism and improved psychosocial stability. However, the architecture of these programs varies widely across jurisdictions, reflecting divergent legal philosophies, policy commitments, and institutional capacities (Sotirov et al., 2020). Therefore, assessing their impact on quality of life requires analytical frameworks that encompass not only behavioral outcomes but also subjective well-being and structural inclusion (Añez, 2019).

In many jurisdictions, rehabilitation has evolved from punitive paradigms toward more restorative and developmental models (Pavelka & Thomas, 2019). This paradigm shift reflects broader theoretical debates in criminology and social work

\* Corresponding author, email address: [antoniopedrom@gmail.com](mailto:antoniopedrom@gmail.com)

that emphasize rehabilitation over retribution. Maruna (2001) suggests that former offenders who are supported in reconstructing their identities and social roles are more likely to adopt prosocial trajectories. Yet, despite this theoretical progress, practical implementation remains inconsistent. Program design often suffers from inadequate resourcing, staff training deficiencies, and the absence of individualized support models factors that undermine the sustainability and integrity of rehabilitation efforts (Varghese & Raghavan, 2019). For example, effective navigation of social mobility for individuals involved with the justice system often requires tailored reintegration pathways, which are not always systematically available (Dirgantara et al., 2022).

While the broader literature on corrections and reintegration is extensive, focused synthesis on the relationship between structured social rehabilitation and post-release quality of life remains limited. Most studies prioritize recidivism as the primary indicator of success, often overlooking other critical dimensions such as mental health, social inclusion, housing security, and community participation (Kendall et al., 2018). A more nuanced literature review is therefore necessary to explore how rehabilitation programs function as catalysts for personal transformation and social reintegration, and to identify the conditions under which these outcomes are optimized (Hyde et al., 2021). This analytical gap underscores an urgent need to reframe success metrics in reintegration, moving beyond mere desistance from crime to encompass holistic human flourishing.

One of the principal problems highlighted in the literature is the disjuncture between policy rhetoric and program execution. Governments may formally endorse rehabilitation as a penal objective while allocating minimal resources to its implementation (Cullen, 2013). According to Travis (2005), this disconnects results in fragmented services that fail to meet the complex needs of returning citizens. This fragmentation underscores the importance of coordinated strategies among agencies to enhance security and support through integrated social interventions, a critical component often missing in practice (Pakpahan et al., 2021). Rehabilitation thus becomes symbolic rather than substantive, further entrenching social exclusion and institutional marginalization among ex-prisoners. Consequently, without genuine political will manifested in adequate and sustained funding, rehabilitation policies risk becoming mere

performative gestures that perpetuate rather than resolve cycles of disadvantage.

Another persistent issue is the absence of longitudinal assessment models capable of evaluating the long-term impact of social rehabilitation on quality of life. Studies such as those by Visser and Travis (2003) have shown that while immediate outcomes may appear promising, many interventions fail to sustain their effects beyond the initial reentry period. The lack of follow-up support, peer networks, and structural inclusion mechanisms often results in a gradual deterioration of gains, leaving former inmates vulnerable to reoffending or chronic marginality. Therefore, evaluating rehabilitation requires a life-course perspective that tracks individuals well beyond program completion, acknowledging that reintegration is a marathon, not a sprint.

A third concern is the stigmatization of former offenders within society (Benson et al., 2011). Despite formal program participation, many individuals continue to face prejudice in housing, employment, and civic life. Pager (2003) found that ex-offenders with criminal records face systemic discrimination in job markets, even when qualified and rehabilitated. Such societal rejection undermines the efficacy of social rehabilitation by neutralizing its structural benefits and reinforcing internalized shame, disempowerment, and alienation. This highlights a fundamental contradiction: society invests in programs to 'fix' the individual while simultaneously upholding structures that deny them a fair chance, making stigma one of the most resilient barriers to true reintegration.

Given the socio-political stakes involved in reintegration, understanding how social rehabilitation programs influence the lived realities of ex-prisoners is imperative. Rehabilitation is not a unidimensional intervention but a composite process involving emotional repair, cognitive restructuring, relational realignment, and institutional negotiation (Needs & Adair, 2017). When these elements are harmonized through well-designed programming, the potential for transformative reintegration becomes tangible. Therefore, a systematic examination of the literature is needed to identify the critical success factors that facilitate this process and to expose the limitations that inhibit it. This understanding is crucial for shifting from a deficit-based model focused on correcting flaws to a strength-based model that fosters capability and connection.

Additionally, rehabilitation is a mirror of societal values. The manner in which former

offenders are received and supported reflects broader ethical commitments to human rights, equity, and restorative justice. Studying the efficacy and limitations of these programs can illuminate both policy gaps and institutional contradictions, thereby enabling more humane and effective approaches to criminal justice reform. Therefore, investment in comprehensive social rehabilitation is essentially an investment in social cohesion and the moral legitimacy of society itself. A society's greatness is measured not by how it treats its most privileged, but by its commitment to redeeming and restoring those who have faltered.

This study aims to critically examine the relationship between structured social rehabilitation programs and the post-release quality of life among ex-prisoners. Through a comprehensive literature review, the research explores how diverse programmatic elements ranging from psychosocial support to employment services impact social reintegration, psychological well-being, and socioeconomic stability. The study contributes to academic and policy discourse by elucidating the mechanisms that enable effective rehabilitation and by identifying structural deficiencies that inhibit sustained post-incarceration recovery. Ultimately, this inquiry seeks to bridge the gap between correctional theory and lived experience, advocating for a reintegration paradigm that is as compassionate as it is rigorous.

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

This research adopts a qualitative literature review methodology to synthesize and critically evaluate existing scholarly works on social rehabilitation programs targeting ex-prisoners. The approach is designed to identify dominant patterns, theoretical frameworks, and empirical findings that inform current understandings of how such programs influence post-release quality of life. The method entails systematic sourcing, selection, and interpretation of peer-reviewed publications, books, and institutional reports that address rehabilitation, reentry, and social reintegration. Guided by the criteria of relevance, credibility, and theoretical contribution, the review focuses on literature produced within criminal justice, social work, public policy, and psychology disciplines. The goal is not only to summarize but also to interrogate how different scholars conceptualize rehabilitation and assess its outcomes. Hart (1998) emphasizes that literature reviews must move beyond description to offer critical synthesis, highlighting conceptual gaps, contradictions, and

emerging trends that merit further inquiry.

The data sources for this review include academic databases such as JSTOR, Scopus, ScienceDirect, and EBSCOhost. Search terms included combinations of "social rehabilitation," "prisoner reentry," "quality of life," "recidivism," and "reintegration programs." Inclusion criteria required that studies be published in English, offer empirical or conceptual analysis, and specifically address adult post-incarceration rehabilitation. To ensure a robust scholarly foundation, the review integrates foundational texts (e.g., Petersilia, 2003; Travis, 2005) alongside more recent empirical contributions published. As Jesson, Matheson, and Lacey (2001) note, a structured literature review offers both a retrospective and prospective map of research landscapes, enabling researchers to situate their inquiry within evolving theoretical and policy debates. The methodology thus allows for a layered exploration of how rehabilitation programs function across temporal, cultural, and institutional contexts.

## **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

The influence of social rehabilitation programs on post-release quality of life is a subject of growing scholarly importance, particularly in contexts where punitive justice systems have failed to curb recidivism or promote sustainable reintegration. At the core of many rehabilitation models is the recognition that incarceration creates long-term disruptions to social identity, self-efficacy, and relational capital. Studies such as those by Maruna (2001) suggest that rehabilitative efforts which acknowledge and address these disruptions foster more authentic transitions to civilian life. By providing structured opportunities for cognitive, emotional, and social repair, rehabilitation becomes not merely remedial, but reconstructive (Arbour et al., 2021).

Quality of life for ex-prisoners encompasses dimensions far beyond the absence of reoffending. It includes access to housing, employment, mental health care, education, and social belonging. Rehabilitation programs that integrate services across these domains have demonstrated greater success in cultivating long-term well-being (Mossabir et al., 2015). Addressing these multidimensional needs is critical because disparities in access to essential services directly impact overall quality of life and public health outcomes, a dynamic also observed in broader populations facing social exclusion (Nalin et al., 2022). Petersilia (2003) argues that multi-agency coordination, especially involving housing and

employment services, is a critical determinant of post-release stability. Without secure shelter or income, former inmates remain exposed to structural vulnerabilities that perpetuate exclusion and distress (Anderson et al., 2022).

Psychosocial support within rehabilitation programs has emerged as a pivotal element in improving quality of life outcomes (Dixon et al., 2010). Cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT), group counseling, and trauma-informed care have shown positive correlations with emotional resilience and reduced relapse into antisocial behaviors. According to Visher and Travis (2003), ex-prisoners who undergo structured therapeutic interventions report greater self-regulation, goal clarity, and interpersonal competence traits directly tied to reintegration success. Therefore, integrating robust psychosocial support is not merely an add-on, but a foundational requirement for healing the psychological wounds of incarceration and fostering the cognitive restructuring necessary for sustainable change.

Another vital component of post-release rehabilitation is community-based engagement. Programs that facilitate constructive social relationships through mentorship, volunteering, or restorative justice circles help rebuild trust and reciprocity between ex-prisoners and their communities. Bazemore and Stinchcomb (2004) argue that such involvement counters internalized stigma and cultivates pro-social identity shifts. As individuals re-establish their place within collective networks, their sense of self-worth and public legitimacy increases. Consequently, true reintegration is achieved not when an individual leaves prison, but when they are welcomed back into the social fabric as a valued and contributing member.

Education and vocational training, long considered cornerstones of rehabilitation, continue to serve as critical levers for life improvement (Leahy et al., 2014). Equipping individuals with marketable skills not only enhances employability but also reaffirms their value in economic systems. Travis (2005) emphasizes that educational achievement post-incarceration is strongly associated with positive psychological outcomes and civic engagement. The acquisition of credentials, in particular, appears to mediate the effects of prior incarceration on employability. Ultimately, investing in education and skills training is an investment in human capital that transforms former prisoners from perceived societal liabilities into productive economic assets.

A frequently overlooked aspect of quality of life is the restoration of family and social relationships (Edwards et al., 2018). Successful rehabilitation programs provide family therapy and parenting support to help reknit fractured ties. Visher, La Vigne, and Travis (2004) demonstrated that individuals who regain familial acceptance post-release are less likely to experience isolation, homelessness, or relapse. This interpersonal stability forms a foundation for emotional security and behavioral consistency. Therefore, restoring primary social networks is not a luxury, but rather critical infrastructure that supports the entire reintegration process and prevents individuals from returning to the cycle of crime. In essence, the family unit acts as the first and most critical line of defense against recidivism, providing irreplaceable emotional shelter and practical support.

Spiritual support, while often marginalized in secular discourse, also plays a significant role in identity reconstruction. Chaplaincy services, faith-based mentoring, and interfaith community programs offer moral frameworks and existential coherence that many ex-prisoners find transformative. Johnson and Larson (2003) found that inmates engaged in spiritually oriented programs exhibit lower institutional misconduct and greater post-release optimism. Thus, recognition of the spiritual dimension in rehabilitation can open up unique avenues for meaning-making, self-redemption and hope-building factors that are often absent in purely secular and technical approaches. For many, this search for meaning and atonement is the cornerstone of a genuinely new beginning, offering a powerful narrative of redemption that can override a past defined by crime.

Legal aid and civil rights support are indispensable for quality-of-life enhancement (Mc Gowan et al., 2016). Many ex-offenders face legal barriers to housing, voting, and employment, even after completing their sentences. Rehabilitation programs that offer legal literacy training and advocacy empower individuals to navigate bureaucratic systems and reclaim their full citizenship status (Goodwin & Maru, 2017). As Pager (2003) illustrates, legal discrimination remains a major obstacle to reintegration, and programmatic responses must include rights-based interventions. Therefore, without effective legal support, rehabilitation efforts in other areas can easily be thwarted by systemic discrimination, which turns "liberation" into a new form of confinement in society. Thus, the fight for successful

reintegration is inextricably linked to the broader fight for civil rights and the removal of punitive, lifelong collateral consequences.

Digital literacy and technological inclusion represent emerging themes in the rehabilitation literature (Reisdorf & Rikard, 2018). In an increasingly digital society, access to and familiarity with technology are essential for social and economic participation. Programs that train ex-prisoners in digital navigation from job applications to online education reduce the digital divide that often exacerbates marginalization. The capacity to function digitally is now linked to autonomy and opportunity. In other words, digital literacy has become a basic life skill equivalent to literacy; ignoring it in rehabilitation programmed means structurally limiting former prisoners' access to the world of work and public services (Ramle & Mardikaningsih, 2022). Therefore, comprehensive rehabilitation must bridge the digital gap, ensuring individuals are equipped to thrive in a 21st-century economy and society.

Peer support structures also significantly impact rehabilitation outcomes. Peer-led initiatives and support groups enable shared narrative processing and social modeling (Burke et al., 2019). These relationships reinforce personal growth and reduce feelings of isolation. According to Solomon et al. (2001), peer engagement enhances program retention and increases motivation by providing tangible examples of successful reintegration. Therefore, solidarity and modelling from "people who have experienced" (lived experience) serve as powerful catalysts, transforming rehabilitation from an institution-led process into a shared journey, built on empathy and mutual understanding. This peer-based model validates lived experience as a form of expertise, fostering a powerful community of accountability and hope that formal systems often fail to provide.

Systemic barriers, however, continue to undermine program efficacy (Mclure & Aldridge, 2022). Structural racism, class inequality, and community disinvestment intersect to limit opportunities even for well-rehabilitated individuals. The experience of discrimination, particularly racial discrimination, poses a significant challenge to psychological wellbeing and social engagement, exacerbating the existing stigma attached to a criminal record (Pakpahan et al., 2022). Rehabilitation cannot be examined in isolation from broader social determinants of health and justice. The social dynamics of discrimination have profound psychological consequences,

creating a hostile environment that can nullify the benefits of formal rehabilitation support (Udjari et al., 2021). As Clear (2007) contends, reintegration is a collective responsibility, not an individual burden. Therefore, the ultimate success of any rehabilitation program is contingent upon a parallel, societal project of dismantling structural inequities and fostering inclusive communities that offer a genuine second chance.

Geographic disparities also influence outcomes. Programs in urban centers may have access to This literature review affirms the necessity of reimagining rehabilitation not as a peripheral correctional tool but as a central pillar of justice and societal restoration (Burke et al., 2018). Policymakers must recognize that quality-of-life outcomes for former prisoners are indicators of institutional legitimacy and democratic maturity. Investments in social rehabilitation are, therefore, not merely protective but transformative. Academic institutions, service providers, and civic stakeholders must collaborate in designing longitudinal, evidence-based interventions that align with the lived complexities of post-carceral realities.

Future scholarship should expand empirical evaluations of rehabilitation programs beyond recidivism metrics to include qualitative dimensions such as identity reconstruction, agency, and intersubjective belonging. Programs must be culturally adaptive, community-anchored, and legally safeguarded. Governments should institutionalize support structures that endure beyond release timelines, while civil society should foster inclusive spaces for ex-prisoners to participate, contribute, and flourish. Broader networks and resources, whereas rural or underserved regions often lack continuity of care. A decentralized approach to rehabilitation planning, tailored to local capacity and cultural context, is thus essential. Such localization allows interventions to be responsive and sustainable (Skempes et al., 2022).

Program credibility and consistency are equally critical. Ex-prisoners often face fragmented or short-term programming that fails to build trust or long-term stability. Programs grounded in trauma-informed care, cultural competence, and relational continuity are more likely to achieve durable transformations. Continuity in staff, philosophy, and delivery enhances perceived legitimacy and user engagement. Without this consistency, even well-designed interventions risk failing to build trust the essential foundation for any lasting behavioral and identity change. Ultimately, reliability in service delivery signals to participants that they are valued beyond the duration of a grant

cycle, fostering the psychological safety necessary for deep personal transformation.

Funding instability remains a persistent threat to rehabilitation program sustainability. Reliance on short-term grants or politically contingent budgets undermines innovation and institutional memory. Longitudinal research by Roman and Travis (2004) emphasizes that program effectiveness requires sustained investment in personnel, infrastructure, and community partnerships. Therefore, long-term and stable fiscal commitment is not merely an administrative matter, but an ethical prerequisite for fulfilling the promise of reintegration and restorative justice. In this light, advocating for protected, multi-year funding is a direct advocacy for human dignity, recognizing that authentic change cannot be rushed or cheaply procured.

Beyond financial continuity, the governance and coordination of rehabilitation initiatives play a decisive role in translating resources into meaningful outcomes. Fragmented policy frameworks, weak inter-agency collaboration, and inconsistent implementation often dilute the impact of even well-funded programs. Effective rehabilitation depends on coherent institutional alignment among correctional services, social welfare agencies, healthcare systems, and labor markets. When such alignment is absent, participants encounter systemic gaps that undermine motivation and continuity of support. Consequently, sustainable funding must be accompanied by integrative governance structures that ensure programs function as interconnected pathways rather than isolated interventions.

Ultimately, the influence of rehabilitation programs on quality of life is mediated by the integration of individual, institutional, and societal components. No single intervention suffices; rather, it is the interaction between supportive networks, institutional access, and personal agency that enables reintegration. Rehabilitation must be envisioned not as a time-bound service, but as a developmental continuum embedded in democratic and humanistic commitments. Thus, the success of rehabilitation is ultimately measured not only by a reduction in recidivism, but by the capacity of former prisoners to lead meaningful lives and connect as full citizens.

Anderson, M., Zelman, D., Kixmiller, J., Skiles, Z., & Muir, J. (2022). Impact of the Post Deployment Assessment and Treatment Residential Rehabilitation Program on Quality of Life in Veterans with Multiple Medical and Psychiatric Comorbidities. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 103(3), 12-20.

This holistic vision redefines justice as a generative process that seeks to repair, include, and empower, thereby strengthening the very fabric of the community itself.

## CONCLUSION

Social rehabilitation programs for ex-prisoners significantly shape the conditions under which reintegration can be transformed from a punitive aftermath into a constructive renewal of life. When well-structured and multidimensional, such programs provide not only the tools for economic reentry and psychological repair but also a renewed sense of civic identity. The evidence from the literature reveals that quality of life improvements is most sustainable when interventions are integrative, person-centered, and embedded within supportive community frameworks. Beyond recidivism, these programs influence emotional well-being, relational reintegration, and structural participation in society, thereby advancing human dignity and systemic equity.

This literature review affirms the necessity of reimagining rehabilitation not as a peripheral correctional tool but as a central pillar of justice and societal restoration. Policymakers must recognize that quality-of-life outcomes for former prisoners are indicators of institutional legitimacy and democratic maturity. Investments in social rehabilitation are, therefore, not merely protective but transformative. Academic institutions, service providers, and civic stakeholders must collaborate in designing longitudinal, evidence-based interventions that align with the lived complexities of post-carceral realities.

Future scholarship should expand empirical evaluations of rehabilitation programs beyond recidivism metrics to include qualitative dimensions such as identity reconstruction, agency, and intersubjective belonging. Programs must be culturally adaptive, community-anchored, and legally safeguarded. Governments should institutionalize support structures that endure beyond release timelines, while civil society should foster inclusive spaces for ex-prisoners to participate, contribute, and flourish.

## REFERENCES

- Añez, M. A. (2019). *Prison and Social Reintegration: The Voice of a Formerly Freedom-Deprived Individual*. In *Infocommunication Skills as a Rehabilitation and Social Reintegration Tool for Inmates* (pp. 268-289). IGI Global Scientific Publishing, Hershey.
- Arbour, W., Lacroix, G., & Marchand, S. (2021).

- Prison Rehabilitation Programs: Efficiency and Targeting* (No. 14022). IZA discussion papers. <https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.3761992>
- Bazemore, G., & Stinchcomb, J. B. (2004). A Civic Engagement Model of Reentry: Involving Community Through Service and Restorative Justice. *Federal Probation*, 68(2), 14–24.
- Benson, M. L., Alarid, L. F., Burton, V. S., & Cullen, F. T. (2011). Reintegration or Stigmatization? Offenders' Expectations of Community Re-Entry. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39(5), 385-393.
- Burke, E., Pyle, M., Machin, K., Varese, F., & Morrison, A. P. (2019). The Effects of Peer Support on Empowerment, Self-Efficacy, and Internalized Stigma: A Narrative Synthesis and Meta-Analysis. *Stigma and health*, 4(3), 337.
- Burke, L., Collett, S., & McNeill, F. (2018). *Reimagining Rehabilitation: Beyond the Individual*. Routledge.
- Clear, T. R. (2007). *Imprisoning Communities: How Mass Incarceration Makes Disadvantaged Neighborhoods Worse*. Oxford University Press.
- Cullen, F. T. (2013). Rehabilitation: Beyond Nothing Works. *Crime and Justice*, 42(1), 299-376.
- Dirgantara, F., Hardyansah, R., & Saktiawan, P. (2022). Navigating Social Mobility Through Reintegration of Crime-Involved Individuals. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 157-160.
- Dixon, L. B., Dickerson, F., Bellack, A. S., Bennett, M., Dickinson, D., Goldberg, R. W., Lehman, A., Tenhula, W. N., Calmes, C., Pasillas, R. M., Peer, J., & Kreyenbuhl, J. (2010). The 2009 Schizophrenia PORT Psychosocial Treatment Recommendations and Summary Statements. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 36(1), 48-70.
- Edwards, M., Parmenter, T., O'Brien, P., & Brown, R. (2018). Family Quality of Life and the Building of Social Connections: Practical Suggestions for Practice and Policy. *International Journal of Child, Youth and Family Studies*, 9(4), 88-106. <https://doi.org/10.18357/ijcyfs94201818642>
- Ekunwe, I., & Jones, R. S. (Eds.). (2011). *Global Perspectives on Re-Entry: Exploring the Challenges Facing Ex-Prisoners*. University of Tampere.
- Foster, H., & Hagan, J. (2015). Punishment Regimes and the Multilevel Effects of Parental Incarceration: Intergenerational, Intersectional, and Interinstitutional Models of Social Inequality and Systemic Exclusion. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 41(1), 135-158.
- Goodwin, L., & Maru, V. (2017). What Do We Know About Legal Empowerment? Mapping the Evidence. *Hague Journal on the Rule of Law*, 9(1), 157-194.
- Hart, C. (1998). *Doing a Literature Review: Releasing the Social Science Research Imagination*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Hyde, J., Bolton, R., Kim, B., Yakovchenko, V., Petrakis, B. A., Visher, C., & McInnes, K. (2022). "I've Just Never Done That:" The Influence of Transitional Anxiety on Post-Incarceration Reentry and Reintegration Experiences Among Veterans. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, 30(4), 1504-1513. <https://doi.org/10.1111/HSC.13481>
- Jesson, J., Matheson, L., & Lacey, F. M. (2001). *Doing Your Literature Review: Traditional and Systematic Techniques*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Johnson, B. R., & Larson, D. B. (2003). *The Inner Change Freedom Initiative: A Preliminary Evaluation of a Faith-Based Prison Program*. Center for Research on Religion and Urban Civil Society, University of Pennsylvania.
- Kendall, S., Redshaw, S., Ward, S., Wayland, S., & Sullivan, E. (2018). Systematic Review of Qualitative Evaluations of Reentry Programs Addressing Problematic Drug Use and Mental Health Disorders Amongst People Transitioning from Prison to Communities. *Health & justice*, 6(4), 1-11.
- Leahy, M. J., Chan, F., Lui, J., Rosenthal, D., Tansey, T., Wehman, P., Kudu, M., Dutta, A., Anderson, C. A., Valle, R. D., Sherman, S., & Menz, F. E. (2014). An Analysis of Evidence-Based Best Practices in the Public Vocational Rehabilitation Program: Gaps, Future Directions, and Recommended Steps to Move Forward. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 41(2), 147-163.
- Maruna, S. (2001). *Making Good: How Ex-Convicts Reform and Rebuild Their Lives*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- McGowan, A. K., Lee, M. M., Meneses, C. M., Perkins, J., & Youdelman, M. (2016). Civil Rights Laws as Tools to Advance Health in the Twenty-First Century. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 37(1), 185-204.
- McLure, F. I., & Aldridge, J. M. (2022). A Systematic Literature Review of Barriers and Supports: Initiating Educational Change at the System Level. *School Leadership & Management*, 42(4), 402-431.
- Mossabir, R., Morris, R., Kennedy, A., Blickem, C., & Rogers, A. (2015). A Scoping Review to Understand the Effectiveness of Linking Schemes from Healthcare Providers to Community Resources to Improve the Health and Well-Being of People with Long-Term

- Conditions. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, 23(5), 467-484.
- Nalin, C., Saidi, S. A. B., Hariani, M., Mendrika, V., & Issalillah, F. (2022). The Impact of Social Disparities on Public Health: An Analysis of Service Access, Quality of Life, and Policy Solutions. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 39-46.
- Needs, A., & Adair-Stantiall, A. (2017). *The Social Context of Transition and Rehabilitation*. In *Transforming Environments and Rehabilitation* (Pp. 31-62). Routledge.
- Pager, D. (2003). The Mark of a Criminal Record. *American Journal of Sociology*, 108(5), 937-975.
- Pavelka, S., & Thomas, D. (2019). The Evolution of Balanced and Restorative Justice. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, 70(1), 37-58.
- Pakpahan, N. H., Darmawan, D., & Rojak, J. A. (2022). Racial Discrimination and How Psychological Wellbeing and Social Engagement Impacts: A Review of the Literature on Identity, Stigma, and Coping Strategies in Multicultural Societies. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 87-94.
- Pakpahan, N. H., P. Saktiawan., & R. Hardyansah. (2021). Inter-Agency Coordination Strategy in Improving Security through Social Intervention, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 159 - 162.
- Petersilia, J. (2003). *When Prisoners Come Home: Parole and Prisoner Reentry*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ramle, N. L. B., & Mardikaningsih, R. (2022). Inclusivity in Technology-Based Services: Access and Skills Challenges. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(2), 225-230.
- Reisdorf, B. C., & Rikard, R. V. (2018). Digital Rehabilitation: A Model of Reentry into the Digital Age. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 62(9), 1273-1290.
- Roman, C. G., & Travis, J. (2004). *Taking Stock: Housing, Homelessness, and Prisoner Reentry*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute, Justice Policy Center. <https://www.urban.org>
- Sakib, S. M. N. (2022). *An Exploration of Barriers to Offender Reintegration: Probation and Prison Officer Opinions vs Public Opinion*. Cambridge Open Engage.
- Skempes, D., Kiekens, C., Malmivaara, A., Michail, X., Bickenbach, J., & Stucki, G. (2022). Supporting Government Policies to Embed and Expand Rehabilitation in Health Systems in Europe: A Framework for Action. *Health Policy*, 126(3), 158-172.
- Solomon, A. L., Johnson, K. D., Travis, J., & McBride, E. C. (2004). *From Prison to Work: The Employment Dimensions of Prisoner Reentry*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute.
- Sotirov, M., Pokorny, B., Kleinschmit, D., & Kanowski, P. (2020). International Forest Governance and Policy: Institutional Architecture and Pathways of Influence in Global Sustainability. *Sustainability*, 12(17), 7010-7025.
- Suwito, Dirgantara, F., Mujito, Hardyansah, R., & Saktiawan, P. (2022). Navigating Social Mobility Through Reintegration of Crime-Involved Individuals. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 157-160.
- Travis, J. (2005). *But They All Come Back: Facing the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press.
- Udjari, H., Hardyansah, R., Da Silva, E. B., & Cruz, C. da. (2022). Integrating Restorative Justice into Offender Rehabilitation Programs. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(2), 201-206.
- Udjari, H., S. Suwito, & Jahroni. (2021). The Social Dynamics and Psychological Wellbeing of Discrimination in Society, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 123 - 128.
- Varghese, J., & Raghavan, V. (2019). Restoration of Released Prisoners to Society: Issues, Challenges and Further Ways; Insights from Kerala, India. *International Annals of Criminology*, 57(1-2), 61-74. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CRI.2020.5>
- Visher, C., & Travis, J. (2003). Transitions from Prison to Community: Understanding Individual Pathways. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29, 89-113.
- Visher, C., La Vigne, N., & Travis, J. (2004). *Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry*. Maryland Pilot Study: Findings from Baltimore, 1-225. <https://www.urban.org>.

**\*Massal, A. P., & E. B. Da Silva. (2023). A Literature Review on Social Rehabilitation Programs for Ex-Prisoners in Enhancing Quality of Life, *Journal of Social Science Studies* 3(2), 327 - 334.**