



The Gendered Weight of Desistance and Understanding the 'Love of a Good Woman': Desistance Emotional Work (DEW)

Journal:	<i>Probation Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	PRB-22-0014.R1
Manuscript Type:	Full Length Article
Keywords:	Desistance, Relationships, Women, Support, Emotional Work
Abstract:	<p>Despite increasing academic focus on intimate relationships as positive influences on desistance, research has yet to examine the experience and impact of support provision for women who are intimate partners of desisters. This exploratory study draws on six in-depth interviews with partners of desisters to elucidate their experiences of their support provision and the impact of desistance. This paper finds that women provide resources to their desisting partners, and that identities and agency can be strained through this provision. The desistance process entails an investment of emotional work and capital from intimate partners which is conceptualised in this paper as Desistance Emotional Work (DEW). Desistance research has not yet acknowledged the support needs of women who invest in their partner's desistance, and so DEW should be considered further, both theoretically and in policy and practice.</p>

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

The Gendered Weight of Desistance and Understanding the 'Love of a Good Woman': Desistance Emotional Work (DEW)

Lauren Hall and Lyndsey Harris, University of Lincoln, United Kingdom

Abstract

Despite increasing academic focus on intimate relationships as positive influences on desistance, research has yet to examine the experience and impact of support provision for women who are intimate partners of desisters. This exploratory study draws on six in-depth interviews with partners of desisters to elucidate their experiences of support provision and the impact of desistance. This paper finds that women provide resources to their desisting partners, and that identities and agency can be strained through this provision. The desistance process entails an investment of emotional work and capital from intimate partners which is conceptualised in this paper as Desistance Emotional Work (DEW). Desistance research has not yet acknowledged the support needs of women who invest in their partner's desistance, and so DEW should be considered further both theoretically and in policy and practice.

Keywords: Desistance, Women, Relationships, Support, Emotional Work

The Gendered Weight of Desistance

Desistance from crime is a theoretical framework, which promotes an understanding of the ways in which people leave behind lives characterised by offending (Best, Hamer and Hall, 2020). Desistance is usually considered to begin at the end of a period of involvement in offending and has been divided into three stages: primary desistance is defined as a short-term crime-free period; secondary desistance is presented as a more permanent move away from involvement in criminal activity including internal identity shifts (Maruna and Farrall, 2004); and tertiary desistance as complete social immersion and acceptance in the community (McNeill, 2014). Desistance has also been described as a journey towards social inclusion, achieved when a person with an offending history has developed and (has had accepted by others) a positive sense of identity, healthy social relations, and stable accommodation and employment (Healy, 2012; Farrall, Bottoms and Shapland, 2010; Weaver, 2016). Debates concerning its application, its measurement and its parameters continue, but overall desistance is most helpfully regarded as a hopeful process which promotes positive outcomes for individuals, communities and, somewhat more cynically, the State. In practice, desistance is best supported through strengths-based mechanisms: through creating scaffolding for positive relationships, job opportunities, and by enhancing existing skills and strengths to foster the pro-social resources needed to live a crime-free life (Best and Colman, 2020).

Whilst several factors have been identified as influential to desistance, the capacity for social relations to influence the process has received particular attention. A considerable proportion of the desistance literature identifies strong relationships and social bonds as paramount to successful reintegration and desistance (Sampson and Laub, 1993; Weaver, 2014; Nielsen, 2018; Nugent and Schinkel, 2016).

1
2
3 Research has acknowledged the fundamental influence of intimate relationships on the desistance
4 process. Laub, Nagin, and Sampson's (1998) noteworthy research examining the influence of marriage
5 on offending trajectories argued that as social bonds are built over time, so is desistance. Sampson
6 and Laub (1993) originally proposed this approach in their age-graded theory of informal social
7 control, which, building on Hirschi's (1969) social bonding theory, supported the notion that the
8 formation of strong attachments by men to institutions of social control was identified as able of
9 playing a significant role in their movement away from crime.
10
11

12 In its male-centred development, desistance has been centred on heteronormative perspectives,
13 consequently overlooking many women in the process. Although women's desistance has been more
14 recently considered (Rutter and Barr, 2021), most women who are affected by desistance are not
15 experiencing desistance themselves but are still proximate to the experience through supporting their
16 partner's process. This brings unique challenges. Although relationships have been established as
17 important to desistance for both men and women (Bersani, Laub and Nieuwebeerta, 2009), the risks of
18 male desistance-lapse for women are pertinent (Barr, 2019). For women who are vulnerable or
19 disadvantaged, intimate relationships with men who have offending/addiction histories can
20 sometimes trigger offending/addiction problems in the women themselves (Laub and Sampson, 2003:
21 46). Research has also identified that men are protected against addiction relapse by marriage,
22 whereas the opposite is true for women (Walitzer and Dearing, 2006). Women whose partners do not
23 desist therefore, may be exposed to risks concerning influence on their own substance use/offending
24 behaviours. For women with offending histories, it is also important to note that it is difficult for
25 women to find pro-social relationships with men in the high-crime neighbourhoods they often return
26 to (Leverentz, 2006) as would be beneficial to their likelihood of desistance (Barr, 2019).
27
28
29
30

31 Alongside socio-economic restrictions, crime involvement and victimisation risk, research has also
32 identified gendered distinctions in intimate relationships concerning the relational emotional efforts
33 invested by women. Outside of criminology, sociological and gender studies research has explored the
34 disproportionate contributions women make to their relationships in association with levels of
35 psychological distress. Research has shown that the investment of emotion women make in their
36 intimate relationships is often not met equally by their male partner (Strazdins and Broom, 2004), and
37 the toll this can take can negatively impact various life domains including mental health (Maslach and
38 Schaufeli, 1993). Emotional work can be understood as:
39
40

41 'Taking the time to listen to another's problems or worries, giving advice or guidance, taking
42 the load off a partner, and showing warmth and appreciation... It is time-consuming, can be
43 demanding, involves opportunity costs, and is often invisible, unacknowledged, or devalued.'
44 (Strazdins and Broom, 2004: 357)
45
46

47 Given the established inequity in women's contributions of emotional work in their relationships
48 comparatively to men's, and the potential for experiencing a partner's incarceration to impact upon
49 the gendered roles which the couple enact (Black, 2010), it is important to consider how the desistance
50 process may further impact the level of emotional work undertaken by women partners of male
51 desisters. Desistance may exacerbate gendered relational inequalities and emotional work through its
52 heteronormative expectations of women in relationships with male partners to provide resources in
53 support of the desistance process.
54
55

56 Access to not only positive relationships but to a range of supportive resources is important to
57 desistance, and recent work has sought to reconcile the range of internal and external resources
58 required for successful desistance (Best et al., 2021). Desistance research requires development to
59 understand women's roles in providing capital, to ensure that support requirements are not
60

1
2
3 disproportionately onerous for women. Theoretically, there is a gap concerning understanding of the
4 resources that women are expected to provide to desisting men. In practice, although service
5 provision for families affected by incarceration has improved and expanded over the past decade
6 (Hartworth, Farrant and Attewell, 2016) the effects of incarceration do not end immediately post-
7 sentence. There remains a hidden proportion of women who are not desisting themselves, but who
8 provide desistance support in their intimate relationship, and for whom the lived experiences of this
9 support provision are unacknowledged and largely unsupported in policy, research, theory, and
10 practice. Women in this position may also experience an increased likelihood of offending/substance
11 use as a direct result of this relationship (Leverentz, 2006; Walitzer and Dearing, 2006).
12
13

14
15 What desistance research has failed to establish in its promotion of positive intimate relationships, is
16 the onus that this disproportionately places on women to provide associated support; stakes in
17 conformity; familial care, and financial management. Similarly, desistance policy exemplifies the
18 notion that policy is constructed within broader biased political climates: “male bias frames public
19 policy in the sense that policies are implemented from the perspective of male work and life patterns”
20 (Bakker, 2007: 546). This is not to say that women in this position would describe their partner or
21 relationship as a burden, but that research and socio-structural processes burden them with the
22 presumption of support provision despite a distinct lack of professional support or acknowledgement
23 for the women in this position. Indeed, even the *Farmer Report* (2017), important for its advocacy of
24 families as key to rehabilitation, perhaps does not sufficiently consider the range of associated
25 gendered costs of supporting someone through the criminal justice process. In sum: desistance
26 support provision often falls to women, with little professional support provision in place for the
27 women themselves.
28
29
30

31 **Method**

32
33
34 As a result of the neglect of women’s support provision from desistance research, this small, in-depth
35 exploratory qualitative study established three aims:
36

- 37 1. To establish the gaps between desistance policy, research, and practice from gendered,
38 partner perspectives;
- 39 2. To understand women’s experiences of intimate relationships with desisters;
- 40 3. To explore the gap between desistance research and practice for female partners, and to align
41 the research findings with the desistance narrative – acknowledging women’s roles as both
42 witnesses and participants in desistance.
43
44

45
46 The research design was informed by a feminist, “positive criminology”, standpoint: an approach to
47 criminological theory, research, and practice, which focuses on the positive encounters and influences
48 that distance people from crime and deviance (Ronel and Elisha, 2011), with desistance conceptually
49 aligning with this standpoint. This meant that the research was designed in a way that would enable
50 the exploration of the silences or unexplored voices of women whilst seeking to “focus on individuals’
51 encounters with forces and influences that are experienced as positive” (Ronel and Elisha, 2011: 305).
52 Influenced by Hesse-Biber’s research, the authors were keen to ensure that our research centred
53 women’s voices, explored, and thus empowered their experiences (Hesse-Biber, 2010: 129). The
54 authors were aware of the potential for the study to invoke memories of potentially painful periods
55 in women’s lives through the recalling of traumatic events and the potential for secondary
56 victimisation. Consequently, a strengths-based, appreciative inquiry approach in the design and
57 conduct of in-depth interviews was taken (Robinson et al, 2012). The study was designed to embed a
58 salutogenic framework that sought to ensure women felt empowered in the sharing of their stories
59
60

and that their resourcefulness and resilience would be recognised: thus, acknowledging that women are experts of their own experience, and utilise a wide range of skills to manage their relationships with intimate partners and others (Smith, 1987). Our questioning sought to avoid focusing on risk and what went wrong, whilst still acknowledging challenges reported and faced by the women. Ethical approval was obtained from our higher education institution.

The call for participants was circulated by the project-specific Twitter account and to our professional networks, which included Women’s Centres in the East Midlands of the United Kingdom and prison support networks. Whilst we acknowledged the limitations of using social media as a recruitment tool (Gelinias et al., 2017; Sah et al., 2020) the combination of approaches enabled the social media account to facilitate both ‘passive online’ (anyone interested in our topic area) and ‘active online’ (knowing we had followers who would be eligible for the study) recruitment. In total, 13 women contacted us for further information, of these: two women had an experience of supporting family members rather than intimate partners so did not meet the inclusion criteria; two decided not to take part after receiving follow up information; nine women initially agreed to be interviewed with six women taking part in in-depth one-to-one interviews with one of the researchers.

Pandemic-related institutional research restrictions meant women were offered the choice of online (Microsoft Teams) or telephone interviews: all chose online. To maximise privacy and build up a rapport with the women who contacted us we tried to ensure that there was a stable, secure internet connection and at the start of the interview we agreed with the women what would happen if the connection became unstable. Interviews lasted between one and two hours and questions were shaped around the themes of: familial background and upbringing; the history of their intimate relationship; experiences of supporting their intimate partner who is/has been in contact with the criminal justice system (including practical, emotional, and relational considerations); and exploration of any/potential support networks in place for the women. All participants were remunerated for their time and offered a £20 e-voucher of their choice.

Characteristics of the Women

Table 1: Demographic Information and Partner Desistance Status

Pseudonym	<i>Lucy</i>	<i>Clara</i>	<i>Neave</i>	<i>Maria</i>	<i>Rochelle</i>	<i>Jasmine</i>
Age	33	42	Missing	37	36	51
Ethnicity	White British	White British	White British	White British	White British	White British
Partner’s desisting status	Partner desisting in prison	Partner desisting in prison	Separated from a partner who is no longer desisting	Partner desisting in prison	Partner desisting	Separated from a partner who is no longer desisting

1
2
3
4
5 **Table 1** shows the women’s demographic information and partner’s desistance status. As desistance
6 is still a contested term without distinct conceptual boundaries, women were recruited for interviews
7 should their partner have had contact with the criminal justice system and had attempted to take
8 steps away from offending during their relationship. It was not a requirement that their relationship
9 be ongoing nor that their partner was currently offending-free at the time of interview to take part,
10 due to the acknowledged ebbs and flows in offending behaviour that often accompanies primary
11 desistance (Maruna and Farrall, 2004). It was also considered important to include women whose
12 relationships had not continued to help understand reasons for this and the impact on them, given
13 the promotion of intimate relationships by desistance research and the difficulties around desistance
14 maintenance past the primary stage.
15
16

17 **Analysis**

20
21 As desistance is yet to centre women’s experience of supporting desisters we considered it would be
22 unreasonable to ask the women who shared their lived experience to situate their knowledge within
23 the desistance literature. The nuances of desistance definitions, particularly primary desistance and
24 desistance beginning in prison, mean that desistance measurement in research remains challenging.
25 Desistance was inclusively understood as being present should the women have described that their
26 partners were predominantly not offending at time of interview, or that their offending reduced
27 during their relationship. All the interviews were transcribed, and the in-depth nature of the narratives
28 allowed for coding using thematic analysis, which held a desistance lens over the women’s stories.
29 The women talked about a range of their male partners’ offending histories, including armed robbery,
30 drug-related offences, domestic offences, and sexual offences. Throughout data collection, we
31 scheduled debriefing sessions after each interview; this was to maximise reflexivity and minimise the
32 potential of experiencing vicarious trauma (Dickson-Swift et al., 2008; Moran and Asquith, 2020).
33 During our discussions, we were mindful of the emotional labour in the conduct of our research.
34 Debriefings facilitated early discussion of thematic connections to the desistance field.
35
36
37

38 **Results**

39
40
41
42 Thematic analysis of the interview data revealed several key themes, those presented in this paper
43 are: ‘Relational Strengths; The Pains and Strains of Relational Desistance Support for Women’; and
44 ‘Women’s Agency, Roles, and Identity During Relational Desistance Support’.
45
46
47

48 **Relational Strengths**

49
50
51 “I love you and if we can get through that we can get through anything” (Rochelle)
52
53
54

55 It is important to begin the discussion of the results of this qualitative research with acknowledgement
56 of the positive experiences women highlighted in connection to their relationships. Across the six
57 interviews, women poignantly discussed the uniqueness of their relationships, and the support and
58 commitment they received from their partners. The relationship was often described as unlike other
59 previous relationships, with different qualities and features, both in terms of their desirability and
60

1
2
3 experientially. Jasmine described an immediate connection: "... he was just interesting because he was
4 different to people that I'd met, and we were kind of instantly attracted. Not physically but sort of
5 intellectually" (Jasmine). Even for women for whom the relationship did not last, there was an
6 acknowledgement of the unparalleled aspects of the relationship which were enjoyed: "I'm glad I met
7 him. I'm glad I went through the experience. He did show me different things in life." (Neave).
8
9

10 The women also discussed the support and trust they shared with their partners. Clara outlined how,
11 before his incarceration, her partner would help to motivate her when she was struggling with her
12 mental health: "You know, like he'd get me out of the house and get me moving ...he's like a best
13 friend, just dead supportive, dead motivated and now I'm really struggling to do all those things"
14 (Clara). For some women, the support described was empowering. Lucy, for example, described the
15 pride her partner has in her achievements and how it rivalled that of her parents:
16
17

18 "He's always supported me; he's always been my biggest champion. He's always believed
19 and been proud of anything that I've achieved. He's probably prouder than my mum and my
20 dad." (Lucy)
21

22 Commitment, openness, and reciprocity were also positive features of the relationships described.
23 Commitment to the relationship was detailed by most of the women despite their partner's contact
24 with the criminal justice system, but with the understanding that their partner's desistance was
25 fundamental to the continuation of the relationship: Rochelle described how after her partner's
26 arrest, she "was prepared to stand with him, as long as he changed." (Rochelle). Open
27 communication was also a feature of the ongoing relationships, as highlighted by Clara:
28
29

30 "And if you share, then you're vulnerable. [...] I'm pretty direct but we are equitable, genuinely
31 I feel like that is true. He talks to me when he's going through, I know the stuff that will make
32 him feel better, avoid his stuff, he's, I'm not taking drugs because of him. He's got me off, I've
33 been clean for three years." (Clara)
34
35

36 The reciprocal support described by the women demonstrates an example of the social capital that
37 the women reported having access to as a direct result of their relationship, which is important to
38 note considering the challenges the women discussed facing in the remainders of their interviews.
39 Reciprocity, trust, support, openness, commitment in the face of adversity, and the unique features
40 of their relationships were the foundation stones of the messages women wished to portray.
41

42 **The Pains and Strains of Relational Desistance Support for Women:**

43
44
45

46 "I'm a wreck all the time. I've never, ever been so in love with somebody and felt so
47 alone" (Lucy)
48
49
50

51 Although the women whose relationships were ongoing at the time of interview (n=4) emphasised the
52 positive aspects of their relationships with their partner, there were distinct challenges they discussed
53 connected to the desistance process. For the women whose relationships were not ongoing at the
54 time of the interview, this was directly connected to their partner's desistance/recovery lapse. Within
55 this theme, therefore, clear subthemes emerged: 'Hope and Heartbreak: The emotional work behind
56 desistance support and capital provision'; and 'The difficulties and gendered emotional work behind
57 desistance lapse and return to offending for partners'.
58
59
60

Hope and Heartbreak: The Emotional Work Behind Desistance Support and Capital Provision

“The only person I’ve really got is you.” (Rochelle)

It is often a characteristic of successful desistance that changes in social networks occurs (Boman and Mowen, 2017). Partners showed an awareness of this; Rochelle discussed how this transitional period placed further emphasis on the role of the relationship to provide support and capital in several areas:

“Things have gone from strength to strength. So, he was working with the drugs team, going, and having appointments every single week. Picking up his prescription every day was very time-consuming, but I knew that it was important. [...] He’s cut a lot of people out of his life because he realised that actually seeing them is going to be a risk. So, I think that’s probably one thing moving forward that he wants to work on, is getting a new support network for him, because he will quite often say “The only person I’ve really got is you” and as much as I can be there for him, you know, he needs to have his own independence and some positive friends, but he’s cut a lot of people out.” (Rochelle)

Research on family members of incarcerated people has demonstrated the symbiotic harms this group experience which uniquely intersects with gender (Condry and Minson, 2021), with the ripple effects of incarceration creating lasting, gendered role strain (Comfort, 2018), often affecting social networks and capital access (Hall et al., 2018; Best, Musgrove and Hall, 2018). Providing support as someone who is isolated, to someone who is isolated, was similarly felt to increase the pressures of support provision for the women:

“He [partner] should have been out when our son was here. He should have been out before our son was here. Our son will be four before he gets the opportunity to be out again. So, I don’t think our relationship has been maintained, I think it’s broken. It will probably remain that way until I see him out in the community [...] Because it’s hard, you have all this belief that these people are going to do it, that he’s going to change, but he’s going to come out into the community and he’s going to prove me right about everything that I believed him about him. Then you get let down, not just by the justice system and the support that they don’t give him, but also by his stupid decisions as well. That then means I’ve spent eight years on my own...” (Lucy)

Lucy described the burden of feeling hopeful about the ultimate success and longevity of her relationship. Feelings of guilt were also described by the women, with regards to their lives continuing whilst their partners were incarcerated. Maria described how even simple things such as cooking a meal were activities her partner could not partake in, and which discussing could resultantly cause strain and emotional labour - “I was cooking the other day and he was just like, “Oh, I wish I could make that.” Just little things like that [...] I feel guilty.” (Maria). Even post-relationship, guilt remained in connection to Jasmine’s own expectations of her relational contribution: “what I would like is to be able to walk away without all the guilt really.” (Jasmine). Feeling guilty and hopeful were key emotions that were clear in each of the interviews connecting explicitly to participants’ relationships with desisters, suggesting desistance-specific, gendered experiences of emotional work and investment into the relationship.

1
2
3 ***The difficulties and gendered emotional work behind desistance lapse and return to offending for***
4 ***partners***
5
6
7

8 *"It was horrendous. Seeing him go through that and I couldn't – whatever I*
9 *suggested didn't seem to work. It was so frustrating."* (Rochelle)
10
11

12
13 When desistance begins and ends is still debated, and indeed primary desistance can include ebbs and
14 flows in offending behaviour. The strains of lapsed or unsuccessful desistance were distinct for the
15 women interviewed. Neave for example, whose relationship was not ongoing at the time of the
16 interview, described the provision of resources that was not reciprocated and therefore inequitable:
17

18 "I never get upset about anything. But him I do. [...] All my emotions have just kind of like
19 shut down, for a long time, because it's easier. When I met him, he had nothing. He literally
20 had nothing. He didn't even have his own bed to sleep in. He had no money. I kind of reached
21 out and helped him. He kind of did me over in a way." (Neave)
22
23

24 The impact this had emotionally was distinct, demonstrating the capacity for relationships affected by
25 offending and the criminal justice system to create emotional ripple effects which continued beyond
26 the life span of the relationship. Desistance lapse was also described as having the potential to draw
27 women into crime-related activity, something well supported by critical desistance research:
28

29 "...He got drugs sent to my home, he asked me to keep them there and I said, no, I didn't
30 agree to have them at my house, and he was trying to press me to bring them into the jail, so
31 I didn't. I went on a visit, and I didn't bring them. [...] So, I'd rang the jail, told them what he'd
32 done and phoned the police, the police came round, they took it seriously, they took the drugs
33 with them, and he's banned from contacting me. [...] He has tried to get in touch a few times,
34 but, no, I'm not starting, I've changed my number now." (Maria)
35
36

37 Maria describes the 'knifing off' (Maruna and Roy, 2007: 105) of this relationship to protect herself
38 from criminal involvement, and the process of accountability and labour associated with the reporting
39 of this activity. Even for women whose relationships have overcome lapses in desisting behaviours,
40 the emotional repercussions were clear. The emotional work of supporting a partner through
41 desistance lapse was therefore characterised by a sense of helplessness and frustration. Should
42 desistance not be achieved, the impacts of this for women interviewed who had children were also
43 discussed as risky to their role as a mother:
44
45

46 "I can't allow him to ruin my life. He can't take away everything that I've worked for and that
47 is something that we've had to discuss quite a lot of times. I would lose my job if he did
48 anything [crime] again... I would lose my kids" (Lucy)
49
50

51 Unsuccessful desistance has the potential to have a distinct gendered impact. When desistance fails
52 – the emotional work continues, and socio-structural expectations of women have the potential to
53 over-burden them in terms of support expectations:
54

55 "I'm 51 now and I'm absolutely struggling at the moment. I've got these two dogs that we
56 took on two years ago that I'm now full-time responsible for. I've got ageing parents that I'm
57 looking after, and I've got a full-time job that I have to keep on because – in difficult
58 circumstances, but I have to do it to keep my head above water." (Jasmine)
59
60

1
2
3 Experiencing challenging emotional and practical effects of partners re-engaging in offending
4 behaviours are problems exacerbated by lack of support, which are compounded by feelings of shame
5 and stigma associated with the criminal justice system.
6
7
8

9 **Women's Agency, Roles and Identity During Relational Desistance Support**

10
11
12

13 "If he went out and committed another crime, am I not worth that desistance?" (Lucy)
14
15

16 Desistance research has neglected to capture the impact of desistance support provision from
17 heterosexual female partner perspectives, despite its impact on women's time, support systems, and
18 emotional and physical resources. Analysis showed that women's freedom and choices were
19 sometimes felt to be restricted by their relationships: agency was therefore identified as a key
20 subtheme resulting from the impact of desistance support provision by the women interviewed.
21 Neave and Jasmine, who were separated from their partners at the time of their interviews, both
22 expressed a sense of regret and lost time. Lucy described how her actions are limited by her
23 incarcerated partner's jealousy of her freedom:
24
25

26 "I would say I probably don't socialise half as much as what I did before. He encouraged it to
27 begin with, but he could never cope with it. He would ring me the next day as soon as they
28 let him out and you could hear how tired he was from overthinking everything that I could
29 have been doing. His response will always be, I never asked you to stop doing that or I never
30 asked you to do this." (Lucy)
31
32

33 Clara also suggested a perceived agentic limitation because of traumatic experiences, when she
34 discussed how she felt as though she learnt submissive compliance in childhood, which translated into
35 her experiences of abusive relationships later in life:
36

37 "My mother sort of praised how she basically says that I used to do everything, my brothers
38 would get me to do everything, all their chores, run around after them. And rather than say,
39 - Hang on a minute, as a woman that potentially, I didn't want her to be... - She was like -Oh,
40 you're just so lovely and helpful, you'd do anything for anyone - And, yes, it led me into an
41 adult to a massive string of abusive relationships..." (Clara)
42
43

44 The impact of the relationship and desistance-associated criminal justice barriers on the women's
45 agency was therefore individualised but clear, in terms of both their actions and their choices in a
46 range of circumstances. Concerning their roles, it is well evidenced that when closely bonded,
47 relationships can also act as a stake in conformity for the partner (Toby, 1957; Hirschi, 1969) and the
48 women showed an awareness of their relational role in this regard:
49

50
51 "He says that I make him want to be a better man. He can't go doing things now, he has to think
52 about me as well and the relationship, it's not just, oh, he's single it doesn't matter, who gets hurt."
53 (Maria)
54

55 The burden of relational expectations and roles was also identified, however, with women often
56 feeling overwhelmed by the range of support they were expected to provide:
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 "I've got to drop some of these balls but how do you decide whether you don't have contact
4 with your children or you don't look after your parents or you don't look after you in-laws –
5 what exactly is it that you decide to drop at this point." (Jasmine)
6

7 It has been established that unsuccessful desistance and desistance lapse did at times exacerbate
8 emotional work by the women interviewed. It was also identified during analysis that the
9 acknowledged risk of desistance failure was felt to be a reflection on the sense of self-worth and value
10 in the relationship and as a partner:
11

12
13 "If he went out and committed another crime, am I not worth that desistance? Am I not worth
14 turning around and saying - this is not worth losing my girlfriend and my kids over? Why is this
15 family not worth it? And that is probably what I will struggle with the most if he chooses to
16 reoffend." (Lucy)
17

18 As a woman experiencing the repercussions of the failed relationship, Neave described the impact on
19 her sense of self: "But I don't know who I am now, I'm lost. I feel like I'm floating in the middle of the
20 sea" (Neave). Jasmine similarly identified a feeling of a sense of failure in her role as a desister's
21 partner, with her expectations regarding his future so bleak that she is expecting the next
22 communication to be notification that he has passed away:
23

24
25 "To be able to go do you know what, I've finished here. My work is done and whatever comes
26 next, when we're notified that he's died, to not feel that part of that was because I didn't –
27 there was something that I didn't do [...] realistically I know that there is nothing more that I
28 can do [...] but that's a really difficult thing for your head to accept and get around, and your
29 heart really doesn't even reflect that." (Jasmine)
30

31 Women expressed a sense of resentment concerning investments in failed relationships, a sense of
32 wasted time, and of giving more than they received in the relationship. They discussed the
33 repercussions of the failed relationship on their sense of self; compounded by societal expectations
34 of women's caring roles, and the conflicting expectations the criminal justice system had of them.
35
36
37
38

39 **Discussion: Integrating Women Partner's Voices into the Desistance Landscape**

40
41

42 This research revealed a range of both positive and challenging experiences for partners of desisters.
43 Relationships were incredibly important to the women interviewed for this research, and at their best
44 provided them with support and trust, communication, and commitment. These features align with
45 existing research on the role of relationships in the desistance process and demonstrate the potential
46 for reciprocal benefits to emerge for both partners. This finding is alluded to, for example, by Weaver's
47 (2012) research on male desisters, which highlights the reflexivity of intimate relationships and
48 discusses how desistance is 'co-produced within and between individuals in-relation' (p.405). The
49 women interviewed discussed the unique nature of their relationship in connection to their
50 commitment levels, demonstrating the benefits they felt they *received* from the relationship and
51 alluding to the reciprocal generativity of a range of capital types between partners.
52
53

54 There are specific challenges associated with supporting a partner to desist from crime. During the
55 desistance process, it is well understood that social network shifts often occur (Giordano et al., 2002;
56 Weaver, 2012). Although such shifts are often ultimately beneficial to the desistance process (Boman
57 and Mowen, 2017), transitioning social networks and isolation because of stigma can leave women as
58 the sole support system for their desisting partner – placing pressure on their emotional, social, and
59
60

1
2
3 physical resources. Guilt was a particular emotion associated with the labour of supporting a desister
4 for the women interviewed; as the women continued to live their lives whilst their partners were in
5 prison, they felt conscious of information they shared with their partner over the phone, sparking
6 jealousy. They also discussed feeling limited in how they were able to help their partner sufficiently in
7 their desistance journeys, and the burden of feeling hopeful for the future. Literature on emotional
8 work discusses the impact of unequal emotional work within relationships as having a
9 disproportionate effect on women (Strazdins and Broom, 2004; Wharton, 2009), and the desistance
10 process was seen to have the potential to exacerbate emotional work for women in relationships with
11 desisters.
12
13

14
15 Women invested both their emotions and a range of resources into their relationships, and indeed
16 work on the families of incarcerated people has emphasised that 'women bear the burdens of caring'
17 (Codd, 2008: 3). They invested and provided access to a range of capital types, for example by driving
18 partners to appointments; positive social capital through the relationship itself; and the development
19 of a visible radius of trust (Fukuyama, 2001) through advocating for their partner in a range of social
20 spaces. Partners of desisters, therefore, contributed a form of emotional, desistance-specific capital,
21 which we have termed 'Desistance Emotional Work' (DEW). DEW refers to the emotional work and
22 the range of support and capital types that the women provided to their desisting partners, which was
23 reciprocated when desistance was successful through investment of shared relational strengths, but
24 which could damage or deplete the women's resources when desistance lapsed or ended entirely.
25 DEW includes, but is not limited to, emotional work particularly around guilt and hope; caregiving;
26 parenting; practical and financial desistance support such as transport and prison visitation; and
27 identity and agency change often as dictated by the socio-structural, as well as the desistance-related,
28 context. Each of these aspects can develop positively or negatively alongside the desistance process.
29 Desistance practice may be strengthened by acknowledging and capturing DEW within its remit.
30
31
32

33
34 Partners experiencing lapsed desistance could be particularly harrowing for the women interviewed.
35 Where their partner did not move from primary to secondary desistance, it was shown to result in
36 inequitable domestic and emotional responsibilities and labour; increase their proximity to and risk of
37 involvement in crime (and therefore the potential to become 'criminalised women' (Rutter and Barr,
38 2021), and disrupt family life and relations. The interviews revealed a significant impact on women's
39 time and choices in association with supporting a partner during desistance, particularly regarding the
40 practical impacts of prison communication and visitation. The women found both power and
41 powerlessness in their roles as partners, and their senses of self-worth were impacted by the
42 relationship and by their partner's desistance status. Such challenges were heightened by socio-
43 cultural expectations of women and their roles; for example, the women understood the positive
44 impact their relationship may have on their partner's desistance process but also acknowledged the
45 difficulty of balancing a range of caring roles including motherhood, being a daughter, as well as being
46 a partner - each of which significantly impacted their available time. The culmination of these
47 experiences suggest that DEW is gendered in its weight: the impact of socio-structural role
48 expectations, including caring for family and motherhood, alongside the provision of DEW and the
49 impact of this on the women's sense of self, intersected specifically with their gender. In the same
50 way that the distribution of emotional work is gendered in relationships (Strazdins and Broom, 2004),
51 DEW is a relational investment of human and social capital made by the women interviewed, which
52 can have both positive and negative return dependent on the desistance status of their partner.
53
54
55

56
57 Provision of DEW was also seen to impact upon identity development. Identities can comprise a key
58 aspect of the desistance process (Maruna, 2001) and identities can also exist in perceived tension: 'in
59 recovery from addiction' and 'mother' for example were identities which are not always felt to exist
60

1
2
3 harmoniously for women who were mothers in recovery (Collinson and Hall, 2021). Similarly, for the
4 women supporting their desisting partners in this research, identities were socio-structurally bound
5 and constrained, creating isolation because of stigma experienced; a lack of trust in others restricting
6 access to support provision; and a weighted sense of responsibility because of the intersection of
7 these experiences. Socio-structural barriers are acknowledged by the evidence-base to act as
8 considerable obstacles to successful desistance (Best, 2016). When it comes to women's desistance,
9 research has identified the significant stigmatic barriers experienced when attempting to reimagine
10 their social identities; the shame and guilt they experience at higher levels than male desisters
11 (Gålnander, 2020; Masson and Österman, 2017); but also, the benefits which desistance-focussed
12 support can have (Barr, 2018). The women interviewed explored their own stigmatised identities
13 during their interviews. Having felt marred by their association with the criminal justice system, they
14 discussed the distinct lack of support available to women in their position who were not necessarily
15 in contact with the criminal justice system or desisting themselves. DEW can therefore be exacerbated
16 by the internalisation that the desistance process is a reflection on the women's 'success' as partners,
17 and experiences of criminal justice-associated stigmatisation without sufficient availability of
18 professional support can compound this.

19
20
21
22
23 To truly promote desistance therefore, research and practice may also benefit from capturing and
24 understanding intimate partner DEW. Should intimate relationships act as a resource pool for
25 desisting men, given the findings of this research and others as indicating the capacity for criminal
26 justice proximity to create stigmatising and disintegrative experiences for women and families (Barkas
27 et al., 2021), support provision should be standard during this process. This assertion is supported by
28 research which demonstrates that experiences of role strain post-incarceration can create relational
29 conflict (Comfort, 2018), having the potential to destabilise the desistance process. As criminal justice
30 institutions such as prisons act as gatekeepers to this relational resource for incarcerated partners,
31 through access to visitation for example, it is important to acknowledge in developing desistance the
32 roles that each party plays in facilitating and nurturing DEW, and that appropriate support is available
33 to each party accordingly. Practitioners should therefore consider the ripple-effects of informal
34 support provided by partners and develop awareness of local gender-sensitive supportive initiatives,
35 such as women's centres and charities like Partners of Prisoners, which are able to provide holistic
36 support to women supporting men to desist.

37 38 39 40 41 **Limitations**

42
43
44 This research was subject to several limitations: First, the desistance field has primarily been applied
45 to a gender binary, with a particular focus on men's desistance processes until recently. The oversight
46 of women from the desistance field prompted this research, however the researchers wish to
47 acknowledge the need for future desistance research to understand intimate relationships beyond
48 this gender binary. In exploring women's experiences of supporting desistance in relation to the
49 existing paradigm we also acknowledge our reliance on heteronormative definitions and research as
50 a further limitation of this work, and welcome and will continue to contribute to feminist
51 reconceptualisations of desistance. Recruitment through social media and digital interviews may also
52 have limited the accessibility of the research to women without access to required platforms and
53 equipment to participate. Demographically, the women interviewed were predominantly white and
54 as such future research should endeavour to understand the experiences of ethnic minority women
55 whose partners are desisting from crime, as the associated challenges they face are likely to uniquely
56 intersect.

Conclusion

Desistance theory, research, and policy have long championed women's roles in relationships as pivotal to men's desistance processes. Even for relationships characterised by positive features, strong relationships encounter destabilising challenges unique to the desistance experience. DEW has been introduced by this research and was found to be uniquely shaped, positively and negatively, by the desistance process. To ensure that women do not continue to be isolated and overwhelmed in their relational experiences, methods of understanding and easing DEW should be explored to help empower them to access support and strengthen their identities, agency, and relationships. Future research should continue to explore the experiences of women and aim to identify and address support needs of people who are in intimate relationships with a desister as a fundamental aspect of desistance support. The situation of desistance research and practice within an awareness of partner DEW contributions and capital levels, alongside early support for women in relationships with people who offend, may be of particular benefit to marginalised women.

Funding

This work was funded by University of Lincoln, with Quality Research UKRI Strategic Priorities 'Policy Support' Funds (QR Strategic Priorities Fund 2020-2021).

Acknowledgements

The authors want to thank all the women who responded to call for participants. We are grateful for the time the women afforded us and the individual experiences they shared with us.

Corresponding Author: Dr Lauren Hall, School of Social and Political Studies, University of Lincoln, Brayford Way, Brayford Pool, Lincoln LN6 7TS. **E-mail:** LaHall@lincoln.ac.uk

References

- Bakker I (2007) Social reproduction and the constitution of a gendered political economy. *New Political Economy* 12(4): 541-556
- Barr U (2019) *Desisting Sisters: Gender, Power and Desistance in the Criminal (In)Justice System*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Barr U (2018) Gendered assisted desistance: a decade from Corston. *Safer Communities* 17(2): 81–93.
- Barkas et al (2021) Getting it right for families affected by imprisonment: Lessons from ten years of research. The Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research, available from: shorturl.at/firFZ
- Best D (2016) An unlikely hero? Challenging stigma through community engagement *Drugs and Alcohol Today* 16(1): 106-116.
- Best D and Colman C (2020) Promoting Relational and Strengths-Based Approaches to Illustrating Pathways to Desistance and Recovery. In Best, D and Coleman C (eds) *Strengths-based approaches to crime and substance use: From drugs and crime to desistance and recovery* London: Routledge: 279-297.

1
2
3 Best D Hamer R and Hall L (2020) An integrated model of change: desistance and recovery. In Best, D
4 and Coleman C (eds) *Strengths-based approaches to crime and substance use: From drugs and crime*
5 *to desistance and recovery* London: Routledge: 279-297.

6
7 Best D Hamilton S Hall L & Bartels L (2021) Justice Capital: A Model for Reconciling Structural and
8 Agentic Determinants of Desistance. *Probation Journal*, 1-18, DOI: 10.1177/02645505211005018

9
10 Best D and Musgrove A and Hall L (2018) The bridge between social identity and community capital
11 on the path to recovery and desistance. *Probation Journal* 65(4): 394-406.

12
13 Bersani B, Laub J and Nieuwebeerta P (2009) Marriage and desistance from crime in the Netherlands:
14 Do gender and socio-historical context matter? *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 25: 3-24.

15
16 Black C (2010) Doing gender from prison: Male inmates and their supportive wives and girlfriends.
17 *Race, Gender and Class* 17(3-4):255-271.

18
19 Boman J and Mowen T (2017) Building the ties that bind, breaking the ties that don't. *Criminology*
20 *and Public Policy* 16(3): 753-774.

21
22 Codd H (2008) *In the Shadow of Prison: Families, Imprisonment, and Criminal Justice*. Cullompton,
23 Devon: Willan Publishing.

24
25 Collinson B and Hall L (2021) The role of social mechanisms of change in women's addiction recovery
26 trajectories. *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy* 28(5): 426-436.

27
28 Comfort M (2018) 'I'm the man and he's the woman!': Gender dynamics among couples during and
29 after prison. In: Condry R and Smith PS (eds) *Prison, Punishment and the Family: Towards a New*
30 *Sociology of Punishment?* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 73-86

31
32 Dickson-Swift V, James EL, Kippen S et al. (2008) Risk to researchers in qualitative research on
33 sensitive topics: Issues and strategies. *Qualitative Health Research* 18(1): 133-144.

34
35 Farmer M (2017). The Importance of Strengthening Prisoners' Family Ties to prevent Reoffending
36 and Reduce Intergenerational Crime: Final Report from the Farmer Review. *Ministry of Justice*,
37 Available from: shorturl.at/sAJX5 Farrall S, Bottoms A and Shapland J (2010) Social Structures and
38 Desistance from Crime. *European Journal of Criminology* 7(6): 546-570. Fukuyama F (2001) Social
39 capital, civil society and development. [online] *Third World Quarterly*. 22 (1).

40
41 Gålnander R (2020) Shark in the fish tank: Secrets and stigma in relational desistance from crime.
42 *British Journal of Criminology* 60: 1302-1319

43
44 Gelinis L et al (2017) Using social media as a research recruitment tool: Ethical issues and
45 recommendations. *The American Journal of Bioethics* 17(3): 3-14.

46
47 Gelsthorpe L and Morris A (1988) Feminism and criminology in Britain. *British Journal of Criminology*,
48 28(2): 93-110.

49
50 Giordano PC, Cernokovich, SA and Rudolph, JL (2002) Gender, crime, and desistance: Toward a
51 theory of cognitive transformation. *American Journal of Sociology* 107(4): 990-1064

52
53 Hall L et al (2018) Building bridges to the community: The Kirkham Family Connectors (KFC) Prison
54 Programme. *Howard Journal of Crime and Justice* 57(4): 518-536.

- 1
2
3 Hartworth C, Farrant F and Attewell H (2016) Supporting children and families of prisoners in the
4 North East: A case study of how the voluntary sector and research has driven the agenda. *Probation*
5 *Journal*. 63(3): 10–319.
6
7 Healy D (2012) Advise, assist and befriend: Can probation supervision support desistance? *Social*
8 *Policy and Administration*. 46(4):377-394
9
10 Hesse-Biber SN (2010) *Mixed Methods Research: Merging Theory with Practice*. New York: Guildford
11 Publications
12
13 Hirschi T (1969) *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
14
15 Laub JH, Nagin, DS and Sampson, RJ (1998) Trajectories of change in criminal offending: Good
16 marriages and the desistance process. *American Sociological Review*. 63(2): 225-238.
17
18 Laub JH and Sampson, RJ (2003) *Shared Beginnings, Divergent Lives: Delinquent boys to age*
19 *70*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
20
21 Leverentz AM (2006) The love of a good man? Intimate relationships as a source of support or
22 hindrance for female ex-offenders. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 43(4): 459–488.
23
24 Maruna S (2001) *Making good: How ex-convicts reform and rebuild their lives*. Washington, DC:
25 *American Psychological Association*
26
27 Maruna S and Farrall F (2004) Desistance from Crime: A Theoretical Reformulation. *Kolner Zeitschrift*
28 *fur Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 43.
29
30 Maruna S and Roy K (2007) Amputation or reconstruction? Notes on the concept of knifing off and
31 desistance from crime. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 23(1): 104-124.
32
33 Maslach C and Schaufeli WB (1993) Historical and conceptual development of burnout. In: Schaufeli
34 WB, Maslach C and Marel T (eds.) *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research*.
35 Washington: Taylor and Francis, pp. 1-16.
36
37 Masson I and Österman L (2017) Working with female offenders in restorative justice frameworks:
38 Effective and ethical practice. *Probation Journal*, 64(4): 354–371.
39
40 McNeill F (2014) *Discovering desistance: Three aspects of desistance?* In: *Discovering Desistance*
41 Available at: [http://blogs.irss.org.uk/discoveringdesistance/2014/05/23/three-aspects-of-](http://blogs.irss.org.uk/discoveringdesistance/2014/05/23/three-aspects-of-desistance/)
42 [desistance/](http://blogs.irss.org.uk/discoveringdesistance/2014/05/23/three-aspects-of-desistance/) (accessed 1 April 2022) Moran RJ and Asquith, N L (2020) Understanding the vicarious
43 trauma and emotional labour of criminological research. *Methodological Innovations* 13(2) 1:11.
44
45 Nielsen AA (2018) How are social bonds to an intimate partner related to criminal offending?
46 *EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF CRIMINOLOGY*, 15(3): 321–343.
47
48 Nugent B and Schinkel M (2016) The pains of desistance. *Criminology and Criminal Justice: An*
49 *International Journal*, 16(5): 568–584. Robinson G, Priede C, Farrall, S, Shapland J and McNeill F
50 (2013) Doing 'strengths-based' research: Appreciative Inquiry in a probation setting. *Criminology and*
51 *Criminal Justice*, 13(1) 3-20
52
53 Ronel N and Elisha E (2011) A different perspective: Introducing positive criminology. *International*
54 *Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 55(2): 305–325.
55
56 Rutter N and Barr U (2021) Being a 'good woman': Stigma, relationships, and desistance. *Probation*
57 *Journal*. 68(2): 1-20
58
59
60

1
2
3 Sah LK, Singh DR and Sah RK (2020). Conducting Qualitative Interviews using Virtual Communication
4 Tools amid COVID-19 Pandemic: A Learning Opportunity for Future Research. *JNMA; Journal of the*
5 *Nepal Medical Association*, 58(232): 1103–1106. <https://doi.org/10.31729/jnma.5738>
6

7 Sampson RJ and Laub J H (1993) *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life*.
8 Harvard University Press: London
9

10 Smith D (1987) *The Everyday World as Problematic*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
11

12 Strazdins L and Broom DH (2004) Acts of love (and work) gender imbalance in emotional work and
13 women's psychological distress. *JOURNAL OF FAMILY ISSUES*. 25(3): 356-378 DOI:
14 10.1177/0192513X03257413Toby J (1957) Social disorganization and stake in conformity:
15

16 Complementary factors in the predatory behavior of hoodlums. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology*
17 *and Police Science*, 48: 12-17.
18

19 Walitzer K and Dearing R (2006) Gender differences in alcohol and substance misuse relapse. *Clinical*
20 *Psychology Review*. 26: 128–148. Weaver B (2012) The relational context of desistance: Some
21 implications and opportunities for social policy. *Social Policy & Administration* 46(4):395–412.
22

23 Weaver B (2014) Control or change? Developing dialogues between desistance research and public
24 protection practises. *Probation Journal*. 61(1): 8-26
25

26 Weaver B (2016) *Offending and Desistance: The Importance of Social Relations*. London: Routledge
27

28 Wharton, AS (2009) The Sociology of Emotional Labour. *Annual Review of Sociology* 35:147-165.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60