

Original Article

Perspectives on Reintegration in Philippine Parole Supervision

Charmaine Angela Ancho-Rabara , Filibert Patrick F. Tad-awan 

Author Information:

Graduate School, University of Baguio,
Baguio City, Benguet, Philippines

Corresponding Author:

Charmaine Angela Ancho-Rabara
charmaineanch@gmail.com

Article History:

Date received: May 24, 2026

Date revised: September 9, 2026

Date accepted: September 23, 2026

Recommended citation:

Ancho-Rabara, C.A., & Tad-awan, F.P.
(2026). Perspectives on reintegration in
Philippine parole supervision. *Journal of
Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 4(10), 404-412.
<https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2026.289>

Abstract. While community-based corrections have become a popular area of research in developing countries, little empirical research has examined parole reintegration processes from the perspectives of supervising officials, particularly in non-Western correctional environments. Therefore, this interpretative phenomenological study aimed to address this gap by exploring the experiences and opinions of parole officers in the Philippines using an ecological systems framework. Data were obtained from in-depth, semi-structured interviews with seven purposively selected parole officers working at field offices in Region I, Philippines. The sample size was determined using the rule of thumb for interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA), which emphasizes depth of exploratory engagement over breadth of coverage relative to the general population. It is also recommended that the sample comprise a limited number of individuals, typically between three and ten, who share similar characteristics, so that each case can be analyzed comprehensively and thoroughly. Data reached saturation, as no further substantive codes emerged, as shown by the repetition of thematic patterns concerning friends and family throughout the final interviews. Data were analyzed using Braun and Clarke's thematic framework, which identified four facilitators of successful reintegration: family and community support, employment and economic stability, personal growth and motivation, and institutional and spiritual support. It also identified four barriers to success: ongoing social stigmatization of both families and parolees, employment discrimination and marginalization of parolees, rejection of parolees by families and communities, and structural institutional challenges such as high caseloads and inadequate reintegration resources. The disparity between supportive and rejecting responses from family and community highlights their importance in either promoting or hindering reintegration. Overall, parole reintegration appears to be primarily an ecological and relational process requiring harmonious collaboration among all involved authorities. This study thus contributes to the literature on reintegration and desistance by emphasizing the role of parole officers.

Keywords: *Community corrections; Parole reintegration; Parole supervision officers; Philippines; Rehabilitation.*

Reintegrating people released from prison into the community is among the most important concerns in the criminal justice system; this is where correctional policies have begun shifting their emphasis from punishment toward rehabilitation and community-based programs. This transition stems from the understanding that imprisonment does not ensure behavioral change or improved socio-economic conditions;

reintegration is essential to community and societal safety. Rehabilitation and the restoration of goals and positive identity can reduce crime and strengthen communities. At present, it takes greater significance considering overcrowded prisons, lack of resources, and a high rate of recidivism. The need to develop effective reintegration programs has become a major concern for correctional systems worldwide and is often discussed in policy and academic contexts.

A large body of literature examines the structural and relational challenges most released individuals face when reintegrating into society. Employment discrimination based on the stigma of criminal records may be one of the most serious challenges faced by former inmates, and it prevents even those who genuinely want to change from participating in economic activities (Varghese et al., 2021; Anazodo et al., 2025). The stigma does not stem merely from individuals' prejudices but is firmly entrenched in institutional policies on employment, housing, and community access. Scholars often describe this process as a form of extended punishment that creates social exclusion after release.

In addition to economic exclusion, people who spent a long period in prison suffer from mental health challenges, substance abuse, and weakened social networks (NeMoyer et al., 2021; Mourão et al., 2025). In 2025, a systematic review of the literature regarding reintegration was published in *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. Although this review highlighted the important role of emotional stability, social acceptance, job opportunities, and financial security as protective factors, criminogenic factors still accounted for most reasons for reoffending (Mourão et al., 2025). Furthermore, a qualitative study on the reintegration process found that the three most significant obstacles parolees faced upon returning to the community were poverty, stigma, and a lack of institutional support (Cardoso et al., 2025).

Despite this, most research has centered on the parolee experience. For this reason, this study will focus on how parole officers can work with parolees to better understand and fulfill the ideals of rehabilitation and public safety. By working together, they can achieve strong results in parolee rehabilitation, which is the goal of this process (Antojado, 2025). Thus, as previous research shows, the emotional dynamics between the parolee and the supervising officer are critical in determining whether the parolee will succeed during reintegration (Fox, 2023; Antojado, 2025). Parole officers play a key role in supporting successful reintegration. This is because parole officers must balance their legal responsibilities and risk management with rehabilitation responsibilities, which can create challenges (Antojado, 2025). The relationship between the parolee and supervising officer matters, especially in how one defines rehabilitation success.

Within the Philippine context, the situation is somewhat different because cultural factors impact the reintegration process. Because jails and prisons in the Philippines are overcrowded, community-based approaches to parole and probation have come under greater pressure (Verdadero & Donato, 2026). In 1976, the Philippine government implemented formal law enforcement to perform probation and parole functions and operates within the Department of Justice, providing community rehabilitation services for parolees, probationers, and pardon recipients (Gonowon & Donato, 2025). However, high caseloads, limited funding, transportation issues, and no established multi-agency restitution network limit officers' ability to focus on rehabilitative supervision (Verdadero & Donato, 2026). However, the structure of this agency is often at odds with the collectivistic nature of Filipino culture, where the influence of family and community, particularly absent in Western reintegration models, plays a significant role (Ballaret, 2025; Calope & Maldepeña, 2025).

Despite the challenges, many former Filipino prisoners can reintegrate into society with the help of family, community, and religious institutions. Acceptance by the family has been recognized as an extremely important component of emotional and social reintegrative treatment, as rejection has been associated with a traumatic experience and an increased chance of reoffending, while social acceptance at the community level reinforces the process (Ballaret, 2025; Calope & Maldepeña, 2025).

In order to understand these processes, it would be important to discuss Desistance theory, which discusses crime-free life as a stepwise process of identity transformation, accumulation of social Capital, and affiliation with conventional institutions (Hirschi, 1969; McNeill, 2022; Ward & Durrant, 2022; Farrall et al., 2021). Together, these paradigms redefine reintegration in the Philippines as ecological and interactive, relying on people's agency, the communities in which they are situated, and responsive institutions to ensure success rather than merely the presence of surveillance systems.

Amid this growing interest in the reintegration process, however, most empirical work has explored the experiences of parolees themselves, leaving the experiences of parole supervision officers largely unexplored. This gap is especially important in non-Western countries such as the Philippines, where dynamics and institutions are, by design, far from those seen in Western countries. The existing literature has also failed to adapt to the Philippine context in how parole officers view the protective factors and behaviors that indicate whether an ex-parolee will do well. The challenges confronting parolees during community supervision also have not been examined from this unique perspective. There is also little evidence on the methods parole officers use to address hurdles that arise during reintegration through assessment paradigms.

By analyzing parole supervision officers' experiences with reintegrating parolees under their supervision, this study seeks to fill an important gap in the existing literature. The study is anchored in Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory and complemented by Desistance Theory and Social Bond Theory to identify factors that contribute to parolees' successful reintegration in the community. It therefore seeks to answer the following research questions: What factors contribute to parolees' success under the supervision of parole officers? How do these officers determine the characteristics and behaviors of parolees that lead to successful reintegration? It also helps identify the support systems most beneficial in this regard and provides an in-depth understanding of the challenges parolees encounter during reintegration into the community. Additionally, it examines opportunities to improve self-effort, including identifying needs within the parole paradigm and changes that could make parole systems more conducive to successful reintegration.

Methodology

Research Design

This research used a qualitative interpretive-phenomenological design to understand the experiences and views of officers responsible for supervising parolees in the Philippines. The main premise of phenomenology is that human experience is meaningful, and the interpretive approach relies on double interpretation: understanding participants' experiences from the researcher's perspective. This methodology was chosen because the research problem requires subjective interpretation of experience rather than establishing statistical relationships and causation. The reintegration process of parolees in the Philippines is shaped by the collective nature of family and community ties, as well as by institutions; therefore, an in-depth investigation seems the best way to understand these processes and phenomena. Focusing on officers allows information to be collected from a middle level, connecting the macro-level and micro-level dimensions of the phenomenon being studied.

Participants of the Study

The research focused mainly on probation supervision officers in Region I of the Philippines with the Parole and Probation Administration (PPA). The study used purposive sampling, in which the researcher selected subjects based on their knowledge and experience relevant to the phenomenological nature of the research, as recommended by Creswell and Poth (2018). This technique reinforces the richness and quality of the information collected rather than the accuracy of statistical findings. Officers were chosen as participants in this study instead of parolees, administrators, or family members because they hold a unique dual role in the reintegration process: they are both executors of institutional policy and constant witnesses to the numerous challenges parolees face during reintegration. Parolees' contributions can't be compared to those of officers and administrators. As a group, parolees may focus on self-presentation and try to avoid revealing information that could put them at a disadvantage. Administrators have a policy-oriented viewpoint and do not participate in practical actions on the field. Unlike administrators and parolees, officers work continuously with offenders, allowing them to understand difficult aspects of reintegration much better than bureaucratic data and parolees' self-reflections can provide. Their unique contribution makes it possible to gain the valid, professional knowledge that interpretive phenomenology seeks.

The following criteria were established for the participants: a) working as a probation supervision officer with not less than three years of practical probation supervision; b) actively involved in reintegration tasks like those of counseling, community visits, rehabilitation facilitation, or inter-agency monitoring and coordination. Thus, people tasked only with administrative and clerical duties, and without any contact with parolees, were excluded so the research information would be based on practical experience. The study included seven probation supervision officers and fully complied with the approved procedures for interpretative phenomenological

analysis. Data collection concluded when saturation was reached, as no further interviews generated new themes or codes, in accordance with Braun and Clarke (2021).

Data Collection Procedure

The researcher first secured a formal license from the Parole and Probation Administration. The researcher also obtained ethical approval from the academic committee. Assistance from regional and field office heads in outreach, participant selection, and scheduling was key to smooth operations. The researcher thoroughly explained the study to hesitant participants, including its purpose, importance, procedures, risks, benefits, and ethical protections. Informed consent was obtained in writing before data collection. Data were gathered through in-depth face-to-face interviews at times and locations convenient to the participants, usually near their workplaces. This approach helped build deeper relationships, allowed observation of nonverbal cues, and fostered trust for open, reflective stories. Each interview lasted 45 to 90 minutes. After consent, the researcher recorded interviews with digital devices. The researcher also took field notes on situational details, body language, and personal reflections. To ensure reliability, the researcher conducted member checking, in which participants confirmed the accuracy and interpretation of the transcripts. The researcher conducted supplementary interviews to explore themes further and ensure comprehensive data collection. These activities took place over three months, from the start of recruitment to the end of interviews and member checking.

Data Analysis Procedure

The research used thematic analysis based on Braun and Clarke's (2021) reflexive thematic analysis, which was applied throughout the study. Using the 2021 framework means that every mention in this paper refers to the most recent version, which emphasizes researcher reflexivity and aligns with the interpretive-phenomenological nature of the research. The analysis process went through six phases. At the first stage, the researcher got to know the data well, reading the transcripts and field notes several times. In the second step, the researcher created initial codes. He generated these codes after analyzing significant statements related to barriers, reintegration experience, support systems, and supervisory practices. The third stage involved grouping the codes into themes that reflected common aspects observed in the narratives. The next step involved thoroughly reviewing the themes against the transcripts to ensure they were coherent and accurately represented the data. The fifth step involved the researcher defining the themes and linking them to the study's conceptual framework. In the final stage, the researcher synthesized the obtained themes into the narrative. Throughout the study, the researcher has been reflexive, often reflecting on his assumptions and positionality.

Ethical Considerations

This research was conducted in accordance with international ethical standards and the requirements of the ethics review committee of the institution under study. Ethical clearance was obtained before participant recruitment, and participants were informed about the purpose, procedures, and duration of the research, as well as their right to withdraw without negative consequences during the study. Each participant provided informed consent before the interview. All participant information and identity are protected using pseudonyms and alphanumeric codes, and no personal identifying information is presented in the results. All audio-recorded files, transcripts, and notes are encrypted and saved electronically, and are available only to the principal researcher. Because the research focuses on emotional strain, workload strain, and resource constraints in correctional settings, the researchers remind participants of the study's academic purpose and confidentiality, and offer them the option to take breaks whenever they feel uncomfortable.

Results and Discussion

This section summarizes data from interviews with seven parole supervision officers regarding parolee reintegration in the Philippines. The discussion is structured around two questions: (a) which important factors make reintegration successful; and (b) which obstacles and difficulties impede it. Tables 1 and 2 summarize these factors before interpreting each theme through participants' narratives and grounding them in national and international literature on desistance and reentry.

Key Factors that Contribute to the Successful Reintegration of Parolees into Society

Four major themes emerged from the officers' narratives: (1) family and community support as foundations of reintegration, (2) employment and economic stability as catalysts of desistance, (3) personal transformation and internal motivation, and (4) institutional and spiritual support systems as reintegration mechanisms. Table 1

summarizes these themes before discussing each.

Table 1. *Summary of Main Themes*

Facilitating Theme	Representative Participants
1. Family and Community Support	P1, P2, P5
2. Employment and Economic Stability	P4, P6
3. Personal Transformation and Internal Motivation	P3, P7
4. Institutional and Spiritual Support Systems	P1, P2, P5

Family and Community Support as Foundations of Reintegration

Support from one's family and community is vital to successful reintegration into society, as shown in the stories presented. Parole officers consistently indicate that parolees who return to family acceptance are the most stable, compliant, and motivated to stop reoffending. Family acceptance is recognized as the most important source of belonging and emotional safety that fosters parolees' rehabilitation.

Participant 2 stated: *When their families truly accept them, they become more motivated to change. We observe that they become more compliant and their lives become more directed.* On the other hand, Participant 5 also mentioned: *Family is a major factor because they are the first to provide emotional and financial support. Without a family to rely on, they are more likely to return to their previous activities.*

The Desistance Theory has been validated as playing a significant role in behavioral change, highlighting the importance of social relationships and support. Furthermore, Western et al. (2015) have shown the significance of family accommodation and support in helping people newly released from prison (Ward & Durrant, 2022). Nevertheless, the Philippines' practice is unique in that reintegration is seen as the obligation of the family and community rather than an individual responsibility (Liu et al., 2023).

In addition to the family, participants emphasized that the barangay (village-level local government) was a significant stakeholder, as the local government helps those on probation find jobs, mediate conflicts, and facilitate their return to the community. Participant 5 mentioned: *When the barangay is cooperative, reintegration becomes smoother because the community becomes more open to the parolee. Sometimes, they even help with finding employment.*

Localized governance takes a unique form in the Philippines. Similar studies in Ghana (Asomah, 2025) and the United States (Petersilia, 2003) indicate that support for reintegration occurs primarily through families, churches, and formal parole boards, as no mechanism equivalent to the barangay's marginalization factor exists in either nation. Thus, while the barangay system supports reintegration through a community-based approach that formalizes it in ways not typically found in Western or West African literature, the justice mechanisms it uses have no equivalent in the modern world.

Employment and Economic Stability as Catalysts of Desistance

Officers also cited stable employment and good financial standing as key facilitators. According to them, stable employment helped parolees feel a sense of purpose and independence. Participant 4 stated: *When a parolee has a job, they become more focused on their future. We observe that they become more responsible and avoid trouble more.* This is also supported by participant 6: *Sometimes parolees really want to change, but no one is willing to hire them. If they are given a chance, it greatly helps them avoid returning to crime.*

Similar findings are supported by the desistance literature, which shows that earning income through legitimate means reduces the likelihood of recidivism. In this regard, Calope and Maldepeña (2025) note that employment opportunities are essential for the reintegration of criminals in the Philippines. However, as Agtong et al. (2023) explain, new technologies, lack of proper skills, and biases against ex-convicts affect how parolees experience their return to normal life, and limitations in their access to job opportunities, among others, are discussed in the section regarding barriers. Employment is also an important factor in desistance internationally. However, the issue of ex-convicts being known in society, in cases where they live in such a situation in which the community is very close, appears to have more importance in the Philippines than in the simpler and more impersonal workplaces in Western countries.

Personal Transformation and Internal Motivation

Officers acknowledged that genuine motivation was necessary for successful reintegration, citing sincerity, truthfulness always, consistent reporting, and compliance with supervision rules. Participant 3 mentioned: *You can really see if a parolee is sincere in their change. When they consistently report, are honest about their situation, and are willing to comply, the chance of successful reintegration is higher.* On the other hand, participant 7 stated: *There are parolees who truly want to change for their families. That is their strongest motivation.* These outcomes illustrate the cognitive transformation part of Desistance Theory, in that giving up criminal behavior transforms identity and fosters a positive self-image. Parolees stated that those who were reintegrated into society were aware of their deviant associates and engaged in positive activities that would help themselves and their families.

Institutional and Spiritual Support Systems as Reintegration Mechanisms

Officers supervising parolees said they see themselves as responsible not only for overseeing compliance with parole conditions but also for providing counsel and emotional support. Participant 1 noted: *We are not just monitors. Sometimes you also need to be a counselor, guide, and even a source of comfort when they lose hope.* Participant 5 also mentioned: *It is important for parolees to feel that someone still believes in their ability to change.* This reflects parole officers' understanding of themselves as street-level bureaucrats who implement reintegration policies through discretionary practices involving relationships with clients, so their work is seen more as facilitating reintegration than merely acting as agents of surveillance.

Spirituality was identified as another significant source of emotional healing, moral guidance, and purpose. This is reflected in the statement of participant 2: *When they are active in church activities, we notice that they become more positive in outlook and avoid bad influences more.* This is in accordance with Ballaret's (2025) findings that faith and religious beliefs are protective factors that foster emotional resilience and aid in promoting positive behavior change among previously incarcerated individuals, as well as with Agtong et al.'s (2023) comment that spirituality may play an important role in helping people develop healthy identities and feelings of acceptance. In contrast, research in a U.S. sample by Liu et al. (2023) found that faith-related support and social service provision were associated with increased, not decreased, substance use, creating the opposite pattern of involvement among faith-based practitioners. The uniform positive evaluation of spirituality as presented by officers in this study may point to a more uniformly protective impact than what has been seen in predominantly secular re-entry programs.

Barriers and Challenges Encountered by Parolees During the Reintegration Process

This pertains to the obstacles parolees face. Four interconnected barriers were identified that, in some way, resemble the facilitating themes referred to earlier. This shows that the same societal systems and institutions can facilitate or prevent parolee reintegration, depending on how they are implemented. Table 2 presents these issues, which will be discussed thereafter.

Table 2. *Summary of Barriers to Reintegration*

Facilitating Themes	Representative Participants
1. Social Stigma and Labeling	P4, P6
2. Employment Discrimination and Economic Marginalization	P3, P7
3. Weak Family and Community Acceptance	P2, P5
4. Institutional and Structural Constraints	P1, P6

Social Stigma and Labeling

The existence of social stigma has consistently been cited as one of the barriers, as per the studies and research conducted in the field, even after completing the required prison terms and conditions of parole. This is reflected in participant 4's statement: *Even if they have been free for a long time, they still carry the label of being criminals. Sometimes, even if they want to change, the community does not accept them.* This supports Labeling Theory, which states that society's response to deviance can reinforce exclusion and prevent identity reconstruction. Calope and Maldepeña (2025) also identify social stigma as the primary structural constraint to reintegration in the Philippines, while Espanto (2024) describes feelings of humiliation, rejection, and social exclusion within family, friendships, and romantic relationships.

Similar trends have been observed in West Africa, where Asomah (2025) mentions that stigma based on mistrust of ex-offenders' sincerity obstructs reintegration in Nigeria and Ghana, while Adjei et al. (2025) say that stigma toward older Ghanaian ex-prisoners stays the same irrespective of the period since their release. What is particular to the cases in the Philippines is that the zone of stigma negotiation is limited to the barangay and its vicinity,

rather than to broad public registries and media coverage, which are more common in Western countries. The comprehensiveness of the facts presented shows that stigma acts as an informal social control tool that prolongs punishment after the actual punishment, denying opportunities to obtain social Capital for desistance.

Employment Discrimination and Economic Marginalization

In addition to the generalized consequences of stigma, participants mentioned an additional issue that is particularly problematic in terms of job searching: employers usually do not want to hire people with a criminal history. Participant 7 stated: *One of the most difficult challenges for them is finding employment because once it is known that they are parolees, they are often not accepted.* This finding supports Espanto's (2024) conclusion that employers often reject candidates simply because they have disclosed their criminal records. This means that offenders' voting and other rights, which sound appealing in theory, are useless in practice. Repeated rejections can undermine the development of a pro-social identity and may lead to learned helplessness, both of which impede an individual's ability to change, according to desistance theory. Kras's (2019) research showed that the negative impact of structural elements, as opposed to the inability of the person to build relationships with others, has more influence on recidivism risk among people under supervision.

Weak Family and Community Acceptance

This barrier may be viewed differently from how it has been discussed above, as reintegration is not always uniform, and some parolees may return to relatives and communities that remain distrustful or fearful, even after they have proven they have changed. Participant 2 mentioned: *It is more difficult when even the family no longer trusts the parolee. They lose emotional support.* Agtong et al. (2023) established that family relations also remain unwelcoming due to some unresolved trauma and stigmatization of an ex-convict, even if they try to make peace with them. In collectivist cultures such as the Philippines, exclusion from kinship and sociocultural networks can lead to emotional deprivation and a loss of social status, making informal social control and "relational scaffolding" virtually impossible and increasing the risk of relapse.

Institutional and Structural Constraints

The participants also recognized systemic limitations within the prison and reintegration systems themselves, including heavy caseloads, lack of resources, and lack of organized assistance programs. Participant 1 stated: *Sometimes we want to closely monitor parolees, but due to the volume of cases we handle, our capacity is also limited.* Participant 6 also mentioned: *There is also sometimes a lack of livelihood programs and support services, making it difficult for parolees to restart their lives.* This reflects the notion of street-level bureaucracy, where service-delivery staff are expected to implement policy despite institutions' limited capacity (Pokharel et al., 2023). Ricciardelli et al. (2023), in the same way, indicated that some cases, including those with sex offenders, require too many protection agencies' resources despite their successful rehabilitation. These structural limitations impede targeted reintegration support and prevent inter-agency cooperation, underscoring the need to reform caseload management.

Conclusion

By focusing on the unique viewpoint of parole officers in the Philippines, a collectivist developing country, the research here advances the literature on reintegration. The foremost theoretical contribution of this work is its use of Ecological Systems Theory (Bronfenbrenner) and the Desistance and Social Bond Theories in the Southeast Asian context. By examining reintegration through the lens of family obligations and barangay governance in the Philippines, compared with countries where reintegration has been studied in a less personal way, the findings suggest that reintegration should not be seen solely as a compliance issue.

When contrasted with studies of reintegration in the United States, Ghana, and Nigeria, the case of the Philippines illustrates that informal, hyper-local mechanisms, in this case the family and the barangay, can serve the functions of formal systems of support and stigma, such as parole boards, churches, and government agencies, when these formal systems are lacking or insufficient. Thus, the implications of this case extend far beyond the Philippines. In countries with other collectivist cultures, or in resource-limited environments where correctional systems and supports are similarly underdeveloped, reintegration may rely more heavily on relational and communal acceptance than on a purely individual approach. Accordingly, this study calls for a shift in community corrections practices in the Philippines, away from a punitive or surveillance orientation and toward one that encourages restorative justice, equity, and social connection, a shift that may have relevance for other countries in the Global

South.

Moreover, these findings indicate certain avenues for further research. It would be useful to conduct cross-country research in other Southeast Asian countries or collectivist cultures to determine whether the barangay-centered pattern is unique to the Philippines or a common phenomenon. Similar longitudinal research evaluating the position of parolees over a period of time is required, since examination of the factors identified by the officers – family support, employment, undergoing change, or spiritual assistance – might show themselves to be indicators of long-term rehabilitation rather than just compliance with requirements during a short period of time. Moreover, future research might incorporate the voices of parolees and their families and show how caseload reduction and cooperation among different organizations might influence reintegration outcomes in quantifiable terms.

The study's findings translate into a plan of harmonized and consolidated reforms that will address the family, employment, supervision, and social and institutional dimensions identified above. At the community level, it is essential to establish counseling sessions and support systems within barangays that will strengthen family and community reintegration. For the economic dimension, the government and private sectors must cooperate to create jobs and livelihoods for released prisoners and motivate employers to hire them. Regarding the supervision dimension, parole officers' roles must become more rehabilitative and counseling-oriented, supported by reduced caseloads. On the social dimension, public information campaigns are needed to reduce stigma and discrimination against released prisoners and to promote restorative justice and reintegration. Finally, all these measures should be coordinated across every level of the correctional and social systems to ensure that no method is carried out as a separate intervention.

Contributions of Authors

Author 1: conceptualization, data gathering, data analysis

Author 2: data analysis, data gathering

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare no conflict of interest related to this research undertaking.

Acknowledgment

This research was conducted collaboratively, and no acknowledgments are necessary.

References

- Adjei, M., Frimpong, E., Gyimah, A.A., & Yankson, S. (2025). Challenges of reintegration and recidivism among older adult prisoners in Ghana. *Innovation in Aging*, 9(Suppl. 1), Article igaf122.2666. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geroni/igaf122.2666>
- Agtong, G.A., Bazer, A., Descuatan, K.A., & Ceballo, E.C. (2023). Life after imprisonment: Exploring the repercussions of jail time on ex-convicts. *Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences*, 21(3), 61–77. <https://doi.org/10.9734/arjass/2023/v21i3472>
- Anazodo, K.S., Ricciardelli, R.R., Budworth, M.-H., & Chan, C. (2025). Identity work and stigma: Understanding job seeking for people formerly in prison. *Probation Journal*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02645505251379039>
- Antojado, D. (2025). The affective, atmospheric, and sensory dimensions of parole. *Probation Journal*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02645505251364211>
- Arreola, L., Mabbayad, D.S., Pilar, N.M., Bosito, R.R., Corpuz, J., & Galumba, J.B. (2024). Lived experiences of ex-offenders in their reintegration in the community. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 8(8), 498–512. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2024.808040>
- Asomah, J.Y. (2025). Reintegration and desistance among former young offenders in Ghana: Key factors for success. *Youth Justice*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14732254251394884>
- Ballaret, J. (2025). Behind the bars and beyond: A qualitative exploration of Filipino families embracing returning prisoners. *The Family Journal*, 33(4), 615–623. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10664807251325557>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Calope, J.K., & Maldepeña, K.M. (2025). Lived experiences of newly reintegrated citizens after their release from incarceration. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(5), 3063–3070. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.905000238>
- Cardoso, A.R., Quintas, J., & Santos, G. (2025). Unveiling the journey to community reintegration: Results from a qualitative study with sexual offenders on parole. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 69(10–11), 1544–1559. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X251324661>
- Creswell, J., & Poth, C. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://tinyurl.com/5yvwexvn>
- Cullen, F.T., Jonson, C.L., & Nagin, D.S. (2021). Prisons do not reduce recidivism: The high cost of ignoring science. *The Prison Journal*, 101(1_suppl), 165–395.
- Espanto, J.R. (2024). Unlocking opportunities: The key to successful destigmatization of ex-offenders. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 17(4), 363–372. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10686841>
- Farrall, S., Bottoms, A., & Shapland, J. (2021). Social structures and desistance from crime. *European Journal of Criminology*, 18(2), 218–234.
- Fox, K.J. (2023). Reentry, rehabilitation, and desistance: Understanding pathways toward successful reintegration. *Annual Review of Criminology*, 6, 233–252.
- Gonowon, M., & Donato, L. (2025). Supremo app: An integrated probation monitoring system for enhanced rehabilitation and supervision in the Philippines. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20662203251355691>
- Healy, D. (2020). *The dynamics of desistance: Charting pathways through change*. London: Routledge.
- Kras, K. (2019). Can social support overcome the individual and structural challenges of being a sex offender? Assessing the social support-recidivism link. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 63(1), 32–54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X18784191>
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2015). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications. <https://uk.sagepub.com/en-gb/eur/interviews/book239402>
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. <https://uk.sagepub.com/en-gb/eur/naturalistic-inquiry/book842>
- Liu, L., Becker, P., & Mowen, T. (2023). Social support during reentry: Family, mentor, religious, parole officer, and social service roles. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 50(7), 1053–1070.

- <https://doi.org/10.1177/00938548231166154>
- McNeill, F. (2022). Mass supervision, misrecognition and the “Malopticon.” *Punishment & Society*, 24(2), 267–286.
- Mourão, A., Sousa, M., Ferreira, M., Gonçalves, L., Caridade, S., & Cunha, O. (2025). Beyond recidivism: A systematic review exploring comprehensive criteria for successful reintegration after prison release. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 52(8), 1173–1199. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00938548251335322>
- NeMoyer, A., Brooks Holliday, S., & Folk, J.B. (2021). Reentry after incarceration: Perspectives from formerly incarcerated individuals and service providers. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 60(5), 301–320.
- Neubauer, B., Witkop, C., & Varpio, L. (2019). How phenomenology can help us learn from the experiences of others. *Perspectives on Medical Education*, 8(2), 90–97. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40037-019-0509-2>
- Petersilia, J. (2003). *When prisoners come home: Parole and prisoner reentry*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Pokharel, G., Das, S., & Fowler, P.J. (2024). Discretionary trees: Understanding street-level bureaucracy via machine learning. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 38(20), 22303–22312. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v38i20.30236>
- Ricciardelli, R., & McKendry, L. (2020). Women parolees’ mental health in the context of reintegration. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 30(6), 303–311. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cbm.2181>
- Ricciardelli, R., Taylor, M., Maier, K., & Spencer, D.C. (2023). Parole work in Canada: Tensions in supervising people convicted of sex crimes. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 67(16), 1699–1721. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624x221144285>
- Smith, J., Flowers, P., & Larkin, M. (2022). *Interpretative phenomenological analysis: Theory, method and research* (2nd ed.). London: SAGE Publications. <https://tinyurl.com/2xc3bhf2>
- Varghese, F., Skaggs, S., Christie, C., Mark, D., Swindle, T., Anderson, E., & Sandlin, L. (2021). Employment perceptions of parolees: The role of perceived barriers and criminal thinking. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 65(12), 1373–1389. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X20928022>
- Verdadero, J., & Donato, L. (2026). Community-based alternatives to incarceration: The role of the parole and probation administration in the Philippines. *European Journal of Probation*, 18(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20662203251413478>
- Velasquez, A.G., Dyquiangco, B.G., Pimpinio, V.X., Varent, T.A., Villanueva, L.J.L., & Astudillo III, A. (2026). Navigating reintegration: A qualitative exploration of the challenges and success factors for women offenders in society. *DLSU Senior High School Research Congress Conference Proceedings*, 5(9), Article 9. <https://animorepository.dlsu.edu.ph/dlsushsresconproceedings/vol5/iss9/9/>
- Ward, T., & Durrant, R. (2022). Desistance frameworks. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 63, 101684. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2021.101684>
- Western, B., Braga, A., Davis, J., & Sirois, C. (2015). Stress and hardship after prison. *American Journal of Sociology*, 120(5), 1512–1547. <https://doi.org/10.1086/681301>