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ABSTRACT

Individuals within society are shaped by the institutional logics that have come to shape their identities. In this dissertation I explore how actors de-identify with the identities prescribed by institutional logics during a transition that renders these identities unproductive and inappropriate. In particular I examine the types of identity work previously incarcerated men engage in during the transition from prison back into society as they attempt to shed and de-identify with “convict identities”. My findings reveal that institutional logics have a resilient, that is enduring, influence on identity in the face of transition even when the identities prescribed by these logics are unproductive and potentially harmful. I find that identity work can be constrained and constituted by institutional logics and disable processes of de-identification. However, my findings also reveal that institutional logics can be de-activated though reflexive identity work. This identity work involves opening up, talking critically, and self-regulating to envision a new sense of self. Sustained de-identification through reflexive identity work is enabled by the availability and accessibility of alternative logics that are meaningful and believable and by emotion work to foster feelings of acceptance and faith. However, sustained de-identification is constrained by identity regulation and the absence of institutional materials. This dissertation thus highlights the importance of cognition, emotion and materiality to the resilience of institutional logics and de-identification.
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INTRODUCTION

The institutional logic perspective proposes itself as an institutional approach focused on heterogeneity by highlighting how different rationalities embodied in institutional logics can be found within and across the institutional orders in society. This perspective has yielded rich insights into how multiple and contested institutional logics play out within institutional fields and organizations (Dunn & Jones, 2010; Glynn & Lounsbury, 2005; Lounsbury, 2007; Meyer & Hammerschmid, 2006; Pache & Santos, 2010; Purdy & Gray, 2009). Institutional logics have also been identified as defining the socially constructed reality within which social actors are embedded (Friedland & Alford, 1991), providing “the rules of the game that shape the cognition of social actors in organizations” (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999: 806). The assumption within the literature is that individuals can switch between multiple logics as is appropriate for the situation or in response to contradiction (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012), and that doing so enables opportunities for agency, entrepreneurship, and change (Battilana & D’Aunno, 2009; Misangyi, Weaver, & Elms, 2008; Pache & Santos, 2012; Thornton et al., 2012).

However, switching or shedding logics may not always be easy regardless of how appropriate a logic might be. The adage, “once a ____, always a ____,” has been applied to countless professions and identities, such as thieves, soldiers and engineers. The premise underlying this colloquial statement is that once an individual is socialized and has identified with a particular institutional logic, they are often unable to shed the system of meaning and view of self associated with that institutional logic, even when “the situational fit between the institutional logic and the characteristic of the situation” no longer remains (Thornton et al., 2012: 92). As Pache and Santos explained: “organizational members who have been socialized or trained into a specific institutional logic are likely to be committed to defending it should it be
challenged” (2010: 460). In short, individuals can become carriers of the institutional logics within which they have been embedded as these logics become entangled with their identities and sense of self. Pache and Santos suggested that when an available and accessible logic is activated an individual becomes identified and “acquainted with the logic and its organizing principles and feels emotionally and ideologically committed to it: the logic defines for that individual not only what to do but also who she is as well as how she relates with the rest of the world” (Pache & Santos, 2013: 10). Individuals may thus identify with a logic’s prescribed identity for a lifetime after initial activation. This phenomenon has been highlighted empirically in studies where actors’ socialization to logics has had a lasting effect on their identities, as in Battilana and Dorado’s (2010) study of the employees within microfinance organizations, and as seen with individuals who worked to defend and resist change to logics, as Pache and Santos (2010) predicted and was observed by scholars such as Lok (2010) and Marquis and Lounsbury (2007). Accordingly, sometimes institutional logics can be expected to have a sustaining influence on individuals’ identities, even when these logics are no longer productive or appropriate. This influence can be concerning in today’s fast changing world, where individuals are expected to switch between roles seamlessly and to quickly come to identify with, and enact, new values, beliefs, rules and behaviours. Furthermore, to the extent that individuals cannot de-identify with identities constituted by logics rendered unproductive, their agency may be significantly limited. How then do individuals de-activate an unproductive logic that defines their identity? In this dissertation I explore how individuals shed and de-identify with identities shaped by unproductive logics.

To date, however, few studies have focused on the factors that enable actors to de-identify with the identities prescribed by logics. Lok explained that the effects of institutional
logics on identity “are mediated by identity work, which informs the specific situated ways in which institutional logics are reproduced and translated” (2010: 1308). By extension, it can be predicted that actors must engage in identity work to de-identify with prior identities. The few studies that examine the relationship between identity work and institutional logics (Creed, Dejordy, & Lok, 2010; Lok, 2010) have documented actors trying to maintain identification with a previous logic (Lok, 2010) and navigate their contradictions (Creed et al., 2010) or role constraints (Leung, Zietsma, & Peredo, 2014), but have not examined actors purposely trying to de-identify with logics that have defined their identity but are no longer appropriate or productive. Logics are appropriate and productive when they are situationally applicable, that is the use of the logic, and the identity associated with it, match the context and expectations (Thornton et al., 2012). Enacting, for example, the “business professional” identity associated with a corporate logic may no longer be appropriate when working in a grass-roots cooperative, just as being a “soldier” may not be appropriate teaching a kindergarten classroom. The resilient influence of institutional logics on identity has important implications as the inability to de-identify with identities associated with logics cannot only constrain agency and the potential for transition or change, but it can result in the reproduction of inequality and hegemony within society as individuals become willing or unwilling carriers of unproductive or marginalizing views of self or others.

Following the insight that “some of the most significant contributions to management theory emerged from what might best be labeled ‘unconventional’ organizational research” (Bamberger & Pratt, 2010: 665), and the fact that “[p]risons have long been used as a context to develop social theory (de Beaumont & de Tocqueville, 1833; Etzioni, 1964), and offer rich opportunities for research and theory building in organization studies…” (Brown & Toyoki,
2013: 876). I use the Canadian prison system as a case study (Eisenhardt, 1989; Pratt, Rockman, & Kaufman, 2006) and examine previously incarcerated individuals transitioning from prison back into society to explore how actors shed and de-identify with the identities prescribed by institutional logics. The previously incarcerated have been disciplined into the activation of logics that undermine their humanity while in prison (Goffman, 1961; Toyoki & Brown, 2014). To become a productive and contributing member of society upon release, these individuals need to de-identify with the views of self-adopted in these contexts. Adopting a qualitative case-based design, I examine what types of identity work individuals engage in during this transition period as they attempt to shed and de-identify with “convict identities” to examine factors that may influence logic resilience.

My findings reveal that institutional logics have resilient, that is enduring, influence on identity in the face of transition even when the identities prescribed by these logics are unproductive and potentially harmful. I find that identity work can be constrained and constituted by institutional logics and disable processes of de-identification. However, my findings also reveal that institutional logics can be de-activated though reflexive identity work. This identity work involves opening up, talking critically, and self-regulating to envision a new sense of self. Sustained de-identification through reflexive identity work is enabled by the availability and accessibility of alternative logics that are meaningful and believable and by emotion work that aids in the release of anger and fosters feelings of acceptance and faith. However, sustained de-identification through this cognitive and emotion work is constrained by identity regulation and the absence of institutional materials. I thus highlight the importance of cognition, emotion and materiality to the resilience of institutional logics and de-identification. In this dissertation,

---

1 For purposes of clarity I use the term prison to refer to the corrections facilities in which incarcerated individuals are housed. In Canadian corrections there are prisons, penitentiaries, institutions, and detention centers, I use the term prison to refer to this entire grouping.
emotion work is defined as the “act of trying to change in degree or quality an emotion or feeling” (Hochschild, 1979: 561), and institutional materials are defined as objects that act as the physical manifestations of institutions and signify membership in them, such as clothing for fashion designers, buildings for architects, and tools for carpenters.

This dissertation explores how individuals come to de-activate institutional logics and de-identify with the associated identities that have been rendered unproductive by transition. In doing so, it presents the unique opportunity to study the under theorized dynamics of logic resilience, revealing how institutional logics “move” through actors within society. Thus, this dissertation speaks to Suddaby’s observation that “little effort has been expended by institutional researcher to understand how institutions operate through the influence and agency of individuals” (2010: 17). In doing so I make three important contributions to the literature. First, this paper illustrates how institutional logics, while specified for certain roles and institutional conditions, can come to operate beyond the boundaries of their formal realm of influence leading to their unproductive enactment. More specifically, this dissertation outlines the implications of exposure to, and activation of, dominant logics for individuals exiting these contexts. I show that logics may become de-activated but remain sedimented within the self, rather than shed, resulting in logic residue that is susceptible to reactivation. Accordingly, this dissertation expands the theoretical boundaries of the institutional logic perspective by examining the microfoundations that shape logic resilience, an important component of the constitution, and capacity, of social actors (Creed, Hudson, Okhuysen, & Smith-Crowe, 2014). The second major contribution of this dissertation is that I answer calls to bring attention to the material (Jones, Boxenbaum, & Callen, 2013) and emotional elements (Voronov, forthcoming; Voronov & Vince, 2012) of logics and institutional theorizing, by showing how cognitive-based
identity work alone is insufficient to support sustained de-identification. The importance of materiality to de-identification highlights a constraint to the agentic potential of identity work and logic swapping discussed in the literature to date (cf. Creed et al., 2010; Jones & Livne-Tarandach, 2008; Lok, 2010; McPherson & Sauder, 2013). Lastly, by studying the previously incarcerated as an unconventional and extreme context where institutional logics are highly unproductive and even oppressive, I reveal salient factors that may enable different types of actors to leave behind unproductive or irrelevant logics as they transition to new work contexts. Factors such as a projective time orientation inherent in reflexive identity work, the availability of meaningful and believable alternate logics, emotion work, institutional materials, and supportive institutional environments, thus, can assist in the reduction of transition costs, errors, and more importantly enable individuals to envision and enact new opportunities and views of self which are crucial elements for personal growth, agency and institutional change.

The remainder of this dissertation is organized as follows. I review the literature on the institutional logic perspective and follow this with a review of the current literature on identity work and transition. I then conclude by outlining the methodology, findings and contributions to future research.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Institutional Logic Perspective

Institutional logics are those principles that organize a respective field (Friedland & Alford, 1991), and “provide the rules of the game that shape the cognition of social actors in organizations” (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999: 806). Institutional logics are identified as defining the socially-constructed reality within which social actors are embedded. The study of institutional logics is, thus, a paradigm used to describe how these institutionalized systems of knowledge
shape and constrain the ways in which decisions are made and the ways in which rules and symbolic practices are perpetuated (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008). While deeply rooted within the theoretical tradition of institutional theory, the institutional logic perspective proposes to expand and address some of the previous shortcomings of new institutionalism (see Thornton et al., 2012 for a complete elaboration of this distinction). Specifically, the institutional logic perspective presents itself as a theoretical framework based on a “recursive theory of society that incorporates individuals and organizations” (Thornton et al., 2012: 3) within an inter-institutional system. The institutional logic perspective outlines how the institutional orders that make up the inter-institutional system (i.e., the community, family, religion, state, market, corporation, and profession) are founded upon different versions of rationality, contesting previous perspectives that espoused that the logic of rationality was the only cultural conception within institutional environments (Thornton et al., 2012). It is a theory of institutional heterogeneity. Furthermore, the perspective argues that this heterogeneity and thus potential contradiction and conflict between the governing institutional logics within the institutional orders provides the impetus for individual and organizational agentic action. As Thornton, Ocasio, and Lounsbury explained, “the content of the institutions in different institutional orders may conflict, which creates opportunities for individuals and organizations to manipulate this conflict in practices and symbols…it is the contradictory relationships that exist between different institutional orders that allow for individual and organizational autonomy”(2012:77).

Thus, it is espoused as a theory with a particularly agentic lens, but one that still acknowledges the constraints imposed on practice and action by dominant institutional orders within society. Accordingly, the concept of institutional logics has been used to enable institutionalists to explore how institutions change, rather than persist. As Thornton and Ocasio
stated: “researchers are rising to the challenges of measuring the effects of content, meaning, and change in institutions using the institutional logic perspective” (2008:109). Thus, departing from the more traditional focus on isomorphism, an institutional logic perspective focuses on the ways in which institutional logics affect and influence transformations in the institutions of society (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008). In doing so, the institutional logics perspective has played an increasing role in developing a better understanding of the “paradox of embedded agency”, how embedded actors can engage in forms of agency (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Holm, 1995; Lawrence, Suddaby, & Leca, 2009; Seo & Creed, 2002). To date, the concept of institutional logics has been employed to study a variety of contexts (i.e., medicine, architecture, thrift, publishing, countries, finance) at a variety of different levels of analysis (i.e., societal, industrial, professional, organizational, and individual) (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008). The breadth of approaches and contexts within which the concept of institutional logics has been studied demonstrates the importance and durability of the concept to institutional analysis.

In my review of over 85 papers on the topic since the seminal piece by Friedland and Alford (1991), several key themes within the literature are apparent: institutional complexity, change, studying institutional logics as an independent variable, strategy and microfoundations/identity. While there are other topics covered in the literature such as rhetoric, practice, and stability, those noted here as themes had more than 10 papers published on the topic. The two most predominant and prolific themes published in the literature, accounting for about 60 per cent of all the papers reviewed, were institutional complexity and change. The literature on institutional complexity has tackled questions about how actors, organizations and fields are shaped by divergent logics and the ways in which they are managed and responded to (i.e., Greenwood, Raynard, Kodeih, Micelotta, & Lounsbury, 2011; Kodeih & Greenwood, 2014;
while the literature on change has focused on revealing the processes by which shifts in institutional logics occur and how logics influence change outcomes (i.e., Delbridge & Edwards, 2013; Gawer & Phillips, 2013; Goodrick & Reay, 2011; Greenwood & Suddaby, 2006; Jay, 2013; Lounsbury, 2002; Nigam & Ocasio, 2010; Reay & Hinings, 2005; Scott, Ruef, Mendel, & Carrona, 2000; Smets, Morris, & Greenwood, 2012; Thornton & Ocasio, 1999; van Gestel & Hillebrand, 2011). Papers that have studied institutional logics as an independent variable are those that use institutional logics to explain other organizational and institutional phenomena, like changes in prices, how meanings evolve and the adoption of certain types of practices (i.e., Feng, 2013; Herremans, Herschovis, & Bertels, 2009; Höllerer, Jancsary, Meyer, & Vettori, 2013; Luo, 2007; Zajac & Westphal, 2004), and strategy is an emergent theme that documents that ways in which logics are used as strategic tools to achieve various organizational objectives (i.e., Durand, Szostak, Jourdan, & Thornton, 2013; Feng, 2013; Jones & Livne-Tarandach, 2008; McPherson & Sauder, 2013; Voronov et al., 2013). Microfoundations was nascent early on in the logics literature, but has emerged as a small but growing topic of interest since 2010 (nine of the 14 articles on the topic were published after 2010). This research has focused on the ways in which institutional logics shape, and are shaped by, the actors embedded within institutional contexts (i.e., Binder, 2007; Lok, 2010; Meyer & Hammerschmid, 2006; Pache & Santos, 2013; Rao, Monin, & Durand, 2003; Smets & Jarzabkowski, 2013; Smets et al., 2012). This theme within the institutional logics perspective has begun to outline the relationship between individuals and institutions logic, and thus, is extremely relevant for understanding the process of de-identification. Accordingly, in the following section I more closely examine this particular body
of the logics literature. Appendix 1 presents the list of all papers reviewed on institutional logics, and details the key focus, findings, and empirical context of the studies.

**Microfoundations: Individuals and Institutional Logics**

The institutional logic perspective has a declared interest in the microfoundations of institutions, and has a clearly espoused link between institutional logics and social actors (Thornton et al., 2012). Reflecting a more inhabited view of institutions (Hallett & Ventresca, 2006), the assumption is made that “institutional logics are instantiated in and carried by individuals” (Pache & Santos, 2013: 6) which in turn influence and shape their identities as their attention is focused through “cultural embeddedness” within a logic (Thornton et al., 2012). Thornton, Ocasio and Lounsbury (2012) suggest that the influence institutional logics have on individuals depends on the availability, accessibility and activation of these logics. A logic is available when “knowledge and information can be used by individuals in their cognitive processes” (Thornton et al., 2012: 82), accessible when the knowledge and information come to mind, and activated when that knowledge and information is used in social interaction (Thornton et al., 2012). Pache and Santos (2013) use this framework to outline how individuals relate to institutional logics, proposing that when a logic is available, accessible and activated for an individual they become *identified* with that logic. When a logic is available, but neither accessible or activated, individuals are *familiar* with a logic; and when neither is available, accessible nor activated they are *novices* with respect to the logic. Individuals who are identified with a logic are expected to have a high degree of adherence to the logic as it drives decision-making, cognition and expectations of self (Pache & Santos, 2013; Thornton et al., 2012). Individuals, thus, who are identified with a logic through its activation come to define their views of self in relation to the identities associated with and expected by this logic. For example,
a chef who enacts the logic of nouvelle cuisine, is expected to view himself and his work in different ways than the chef who enacts the logic of the classic cuisine: one is an innovator and owner, the other a restaurateur (Rao et al., 2003). Similarly, protestant ministry traditionally prescribed an identity for ministers that specified their sexual orientation in addition to the ways in which they should behave (Creed et al., 2010). Owners of lone founded firms have appropriate identities as “entrepreneurs” versus owners of the family-run firm who have expected identities as a “family nurturer” (Miller, Le Breton-Miller, & Lester, 2011: 5).

Fundamentally, thus, institutional logics are stated as influencing and being embedded within actors’ identities. Institutions are “enablers of identities” (Glynn, 2008), as institutional “logics constitute the identities of actors” (Rao et al., 2003: 796) and “provide social actors with vocabularies of motives and with a sense of self. Hence, institutional logics do not only direct what social actors want (interests), and how they are to proceed (guidelines for action), but also who or what they are (identity)” (Lok, 2010: 1308).

Those identified with a given logic through its activation and shaping of identity are also expected to defend and protect it as they develop cognitive and emotional attachments to that logic (Pache & Santos, 2013; Voronov & Vince, 2012). For example, Lok (2010) found that actors will resist new logics, maintaining identification with earlier logics, even when the new logic is diffused within the field making it situationally appropriate and available. Marquis and Lounsbury’s (2007) study found that communities resisted the consolidation of U.S. banking and sought to defend the community logic which had been prevalent prior to the proposed change. In Zilber’s (2002) study of the rape crisis center in Israel, individuals exposed to an alternate logic remained identified with their initial logic even after become familiar with the alternate logics. These studies suggest that changing, shedding, or swapping logics may not be that simple or easy
for actors whose identities have been shaped by logics through identification even if alternative logics are available, accessible and the situation and environment suggest the alternate logic is more appropriate.

On the other hand, a growing stream of research has highlighted how actors can deftly switch between logics using strategies such as selective coupling and bricolage (Christiansen & Lounsbury, 2013a; Pache & Santos, 2012) to “hijack” alternate logics (McPherson & Sauder, 2013: 165). For example, Westphal and Graebner (2010) documented how corporate leaders used impression management strategies rooted in an agency logic in order to demonstrate conformity to the agency logic despite not adopting its associated practices, and Jones and Livne-Tarandach (2008) studied the rhetorical strategies of architects and found that architects drew from multiple logics to design strategies to compete for different projects. Similarly, McPherson and Sauder found professional groups were able to select between four logics in their work to “negotiate decisions in a drug court” (McPherson & Sauder, 2013: 165), and Voronov, De Clercq and Hinings (2013) observed actors flexibly adopting distinct logics to appeal to particular audiences. Misangyi, Weaver and Elms (2008) and others (Battilana & D’Aunno, 2009; Hardy & Maguire, 2008) have suggested that institutional entrepreneurs’ success in implementing change to institutional logics depends on how they frame the change to appeal to existing institutional logics. This scholarly work has emphasized a perspective of logics as “tool-kits”, templates available for interpretation and manipulation. However, despite the recent support for a “tool-kit” approach to institutional logics, actors are still documented as remaining embedded within dominant institutional logics that have shaped their identity (Reay & Hinings, 2005). More practically, we frequently hear that individuals coming from highly institutional
contexts can have difficulty making transitions (Ashforth, 2001; Ebaugh, 1988), something that might suggest that this agentic view of logic manipulation may be overstated in extant literature.

So while logics appear to be sticky and resilient in shaping identity, research does document actors swapping and using logics strategically. It is possible that logic swapping occurs when actors have not internally activated and embraced identities expectations, and thus, are not “truly identified” with logics but rather use them superficially (i.e., Westphal & Graebner, 2010), when they are identified with both logics they swap between (i.e., Battilana & Dorado, 2010), or the situation demands it (Thornton et al., 2012). Yet, it is not clear why some actors may swap and some remain stuck.

A few studies have begun to examine the discrepancy between the empirical evidence of logics as being constraining versus enabling for individuals and their identities. In particular, these scholars have examined the micro-processes by which individuals may work with their identities to adapt as institutional logics are shifted, challenged or changed (Chreim, Williams, & Hinings, 2007; Creed et al., 2010; Leung et al., 2014; Lok, 2010; Rao et al., 2003). Findings suggest that identity work is a possible means of making logics enabling. For example, Lesbian, Bisexual, Gay, and Transgendered (LBGT) ministers engaged in identity work to challenge the identity prescriptions associated with the logic of protestant ministry (Creed et al., 2010). However, in the selective studies that have explored how actors can rework their identities based on change to, or attempts to challenge, institutional logics, they still indicate persistent affiliation with a logic category. In these studies physicians remained physicians, chefs remained chefs, ministers remained ministers; thus the change documented is about adaption and shift but not about de-identification or loss.
As a result, we have little theory or empirical evidence that discusses the resilience of institutional logics, and how actors come to de-identify with identities associated with logics when dealing with macro-transitions that render these logics and identities unproductive or inappropriate. De-identification “is the reverse of identification. It occurs when one no longer perceives an affinity with a role” or identity, and is no longer used in self-definition or social interaction (Ashforth, 2001: 75). Thus, while we know actors identified with logics can defend or challenge them and engage in identity work, we have yet to understand the implications or constraints for de-identification from logics that are no longer appropriate. Logics are appropriate when they are situationally applicable, that is the use of the logic, and the identity associated with it, match the context and expectations (Thornton et al., 2012). Enacting a “convict” identity is no longer appropriate when working in a corporate environment, just as a business professional identity would not be appropriate in prison. Understanding de-identification and logic resilience is important if we are truly to understand the microfoundations of institutional theory and the role individuals have in maintaining institutions beyond the realm of their formal influence. Furthermore, in cases where extant institutional logics are hegemonic or repressive, the extent to which institutional logics have resilient and enduring influence on identity is important for our understanding of how situations of inequality and injustice can persist despite the detrimental effect it may have on individuals.

Identity

Research on identity is a burgeoning field of study that has become one of the most popular themes in organizational studies (Alvesson, 2010; Fiol, Pratt, & O’Connor, 2009; Ibarra & Barbulescu, 2010). It is broadly understood as “the meanings that individuals attach to themselves” (Dutton, Roberts, & Bednar, 2010: 266), and is considered “crucial to how and what
one values, thinks, feels and does in all social domains, including organizations” (Albert, Ashforth, & Dutton, 2000: 14). The broad and diverse literature on identity can be said to operate at two levels of analysis: individual and collective (Koerner, 2014). The respective conceptualizations of identity associated with these levels of analysis comprise distinct topics of study: self-identity, role identity, social identity, and organizational identity. As Koerner (2014: 67) explains,

person identities (or self-identities) are tied to an individual and tend to be consistent across roles and situations, role identities are tied to a person’s position (e.g., employee or engineer), and social identities are based on a person’s membership in a salient group (e.g., a particular work team or organization).

Self-identity is thus “the conception of the self reflexively and discursively understood” (Kuhn, 2006: 1340), “a person’s unique sense of self” (Postmes & Jetten, 2006: 260), and “who they are” (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999: 417) as a person. It is an individual’s self-definition, their “own notion of who and what they are” (Watson, 2008: 131). Role identity is an understanding of one’s position in the social structure (Ashforth, 2001). Roles have been simultaneously defined as subjects of constraint and agency (Ashforth, 2001; Callero, 1994; Ebaugh, 1988; Leung et al., 2014; Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2003). They “encompass the institutional directives that guide and constrain incumbents’ view of self and their behavior...When a role becomes internalized and adopted as a component of the self, an ‘identity’ or ‘role-identity’ is said to have been established” (Leung et al., 2014: 425) and can be worked on or with. Role identities are those prescribed by institutional logics in a given social space.

*Social* identity, however, “is the perception of oneness with or belongingness to some human aggregate” (Ashforth & Mael, 1989: 21). Social identity theory is, thus, an “intergroup and self-enhancement motivational perspective” (Hogg & Terry, 2000: 121). It is “an evaluative definition of the self in terms of group-defining attributes” (Hogg & Ridgeway, 2003: 97);
“social identity rests on intergroup social comparisons that seek to confirm or to establish ingroup-favoring evaluative distinctiveness between ingroup and outgroup, motivated by an underlying need for self-esteem (Turner, 1975)” (Hogg & Terry, 2000: 122). While self-identity refers to an individual’s conception of self, and role-identity is about the position of self within a social context, social identities refer to “cultural, discursive or institutional notions of who or what any individual might be” (Watson, 2008: 131). It is an understanding of the self in relation to others.

Organizational identity, on the other hand, is the notion of “who we are as an organization”, and refers to those features of an organization that are central, enduring, and distinctive (CED) (Albert & Whetten, 1985; Whetten, 2006). It is about “capturing that which provides meaning to a level above and beyond its individual members” (Corley et al., 2006: 1619). In this sense, it is a collectively-held frame with which organizational members make sense and meaning of their organization. It is distinct from the notion of organizational identification (OI) which refers to the extent to which an individual’s social identity becomes entangled with their role and membership within an organization. As George and Chattopadhyay explain, organizational identification is an individual’s “perception of oneness with, or belongingness to, an organization where the individual defines him or herself in terms of the organization in which he or she is a member” (George & Chattopadhyay, 2005: 70).

These conceptualizations make up the body of work on identity within organization studies. Within this dissertation, I will be approaching this body of work from the perspective of the individual and thus focusing on self-identity and role-identity. More particularly, however, I will be utilizing a particular theoretical framework within studies on the individual level of identity: identity work. In what follows, I outline this theoretical lens and review the literature
employing this perspective. Appendix 2 presents the list of papers reviewed on identity work, and details the key focus, findings, and empirical context of the studies.

**Identity Work, Agency and Control**

Identity work is the “range of activities that individuals engage in to create, present, and sustain personal [self] identities that are congruent with and supportive of the self-concept” (Snow & Leon, 1987: 1348). As individuals interact with their environments (be they the institutions they are embedded within, or the individuals they relate to), it is increasingly being documented that they engage in identity work to construct, manage, and affirm their identities and to resist or cater to broader institutional demands and logics (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002). As Ibarra and Petriglieri (2010: 11) explained, “the notion of identity work is based on two underlying assumptions: the importance of external (public) display of role-appropriate characteristics, and the desirability of internal identity coherence”. Thus, in identity work, self and role identities are often spoken about interchangeably. One of the central features acknowledged across all streams of identity research is that individuals “seek to see themselves in a positive light” (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999: 413). Identity work has been found to aid in the construction of positive identity in the face of stigma (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999; Clair, Beatty, & MacLean, 2005; Lutgen-Sandvik, 2008; Snow & Leon, 1987; Toyoki & Brown, 2014), role transitions (Ashforth, 2001; Ibarra, 1999; Ibarra & Barbulescu, 2010), change (Bruijn & Whiteman, 2010; Lok, 2010) and other events like identity threats that typically make identity construction more challenging (Petriglieri, 2011; Pratt et al., 2006). For example, Snow and Leon revealed the ways in which homeless individuals used three distinct types of identity work to maintain “a measure of self-worth and dignity” despite being at the “bottom of status systems” (1987: 1336). Pratt and colleagues (2006) detailed how medical residents constructed
professional identity to minimize work-identity violations by engaging in identity work through the customization processes of enriching, patching, and splinting. Toyoki and Brown (2014) revealed that inmates in a Helsinki prison were able to manage their stigmatized identities as prisoners by engaging in identity work. In all of these cases identity work is theorized as a mechanism linking identity work activities to distinct identity outcomes. The literature thus indicates that identity work precedes and is the cause rather than result of particular identity outcomes like change, persistence, or protection.

Identity work has also been revealed to be an important component of how individual’s manage the complexities and contradictions of existing identities (Creed et al., 2010; Essers & Benschop, 2007; Kreiner, Hollensbe, & Sheep, 2006; Pratt & Corley, 2007; Pratt & Foreman, 2000) and how they affirm their existing identities in the face of threat or failure (Bruijn & Whiteman, 2010; Elsbach, 2003; Petriglieri, 2011). For example, Kreiner, Hollensbe and Sheep (2006: 1031) revealed the ways in which actors used identity work to navigate the tension between a “sense of self [self-identity] and a sense of belonging [role identity]”. Similarly Koerner (2014) found that courage was a form of identity work which enabled incongruences between self and social identities to be managed, and Wright, Nyberg and Grant (2012) saw identity work used to mobilize different identities at different times.

Identity work, thus, has largely been seen as enabling agency. However, a growing number of scholars have begun a more critical analysis of identity work and have suggested that identity work may be a product of power and not just agency; (Ainsworth & Hardy, 2009; Alvesson & Willmott, 2002; Brown & Lewis, 2011; Brown & Toyoki, 2013; Essers, Doorewaard, & Benschop, 2013; Kornberger & Brown, 2007; Kuhn, 2006; Thornborrow & Brown, 2009; Toyoki & Brown, 2014). In particular, these scholars have proposed that identity
work is shaped not only by the individual, but by the institutionally and organizationally available logics within a given domain. For example, Thornborrow and Brown (2009) documented the identity work of members of the British parachute regiment and discovered that the desired self-identities they sought to construct through identity work were a product of the organizationally designed meanings of what and who a paratrooper was supposed to be. Brown and Lewis (2011) also documented how lawyers’ identity work was constrained and constructed by their talk about existing organizational routines. Brown and Toyoki (2013: 889) suggested that discourse, or logics, within prison “produced prisoners’ identities, supplying and enforcing regulatory principles which invaded and totalized individuals”. Ainsworth and Hardy (2009: 1224) similarly suggested that the identity work of the unemployed elderly in Australia were constrained by institutional discourses of mind and body that “constructed an identity cul-de-sac from which it is difficult to escape”. Thus, as Kuhn (2006), Sveningsson and Alvesson (2003) have also revealed, identity work is not only influenced by individuals’ self-narratives, but by the scripts, discourse and language subjectively available within the organizations and the institutions within which they are embedded. These discourses and scripts are rooted in institutional logics, and result in identity regulation. Identity regulation is when institutional logics or other discursive practices within an institutional context “condition processes of identity formation and transformation” (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002: 627). Actors’ agentic expressions of self and their roles, as embodied in their identity work practices, may be more constrained by institutional logics and forms of control than was initially thought; suggesting that any study of identity work needs to consider not only the forms of agency but the forms of control affecting these actors’ practices. Yet an understanding of the institutional context actors
are embedded within is often left out of extant studies of identity work and is notably absent in examinations of de-identification.

To date, the institutional logic perspective has highlighted the ways in which identity work can be used to resist dominant institutional logics (Lok, 2010) institutional contradiction (Creed et al., 2010), and institutional role constraints (Leung et al., 2014) taking a more agentic view of identity work. However, it is not clear what factors enable or constrain identity work in institutional contexts, and whether and what types of identity work would be successful in promoting logic de-identification. Does identity work enable the de-activation of identification with institutional logics, or might identity work itself be a product of these controls?

Accordingly, this study proposes to address these gaps in the literature on both identity work and institutional logics by exploring how individuals shed and de-identify with identities shaped by unproductive logics.

**Identity Work, Transitions, and De-identification**

Identity work enables individuals to manage and affirm existing identities and to deal with complexity, contradiction, and threats to their identities *without* abandoning them. As a result of this focus on the management of current or future identities, less research on identity work has actually examined de-identification and how actors leave behind unproductive identities. While identification with a role is when individuals come to define themselves in terms of a role and internalize associated institutional prescriptions, de-identification “is the reverse of identification…it occurs when one no longer perceives an affinity with the role” (Ashforth, 2001: 66). De-identification is also distinct from disidentification; disidentification is the process of defining yourself by what you are not (cf. Elsbach & Bhattacharya, 2001) and de-identification is reversing existing identification with a role (cf. Ashforth, 2001). De-
identification has been identified as a challenging period of transition, and when it is necessary can lead to “feelings of loss of meaning, ambiguity and uncertainty” are observed and the process “necessarily involves a sense of disequilibrium and pain” (Hakak, forthcoming: 8). The selective research that has examined the topic of de-identification has been within the literature on identity transitions.

Ashforth (2001: 2-3) explained that “individuals are in a constant state of becoming, of moving between and through various roles and their attached identities and relationships”, and yet, “little attention has been paid to the nature of individuals’ role transitions, that is, the psychological and physical (if relevant) movement between roles, including disengagement from one role (role exit) and the engagement in another (role entry)”. Role exit is what triggers or makes de-identification necessary, and is what the research in this dissertation focuses on. While significantly more research has focused on role entry and identification then de-identification, in a comprehensive study by Ebaugh (1988), she details the process of role exit and suggests that individuals seem to go through stages: having first doubts, seeking alternatives, the experience of a turning point, and then the creation of the ex-role. Important in her theorizing is the suggestion that de-identification is a distinct process from identification and socialization into a new role, and that it requires independent study and attention. She further predicted that “some individuals are better able to shake off their identification with previous roles than other individuals” (Ebaugh, 1988: 185), something that demands further attention in the field. Ebaugh’s model was expanded by Ashforth (2001) to include transitions that were not voluntary, the type more relevant for the previously incarcerated in this study. Ashforth (2001) predicted that such transitions would involve a turning point, escalating doubts, seeking alternatives, and creating an ex-role. Of the process he states,
The individual’s psychological exit from the role continues after physical entry into the next role. Deidentification continues, abetted by the compensatory qualities of the current role and by certain transition bridges, notably grieving the exited role, indulging in nostalgic recollections, constructing a salutary exrole (e.g., alumni) that enables the individual to attain closure, and by invoking identity narratives that portray the exited role as an important but closed chapter (Ashforth, 2001: 299).

However, both Ebaugh (1988) and Ashforth (2001: 292) predicted that de-identification as a part of role exit “may lead to liminality, where one lacks an identity moor to the relevant domain”.

Periods of identity transition are thus often characterized by liminality (Beech, 2011; Ibarra & Petriglieri, 2010) and identity ambiguity (Hakak, forthcoming), where individuals remain “betwixt and between” (Turner, 1967) identities and associated logics. Liminality is a place where one’s sense of self and place within the social system is disrupted (Beech, 2011). Beech (2011: 285) predicted that in response to experiences of liminality, individuals would engage in experimentation, reflection and recognition as forms of identity work where they engaged in dialogue “between self and others”. Ibarra and Petriglieri (2010: 12) introduced the concept of identity play to explain how individuals can try out possible provisional selves in a joyful manner during periods of transition, but stated that “play, however, requires a relatively safe space to try out new and untested behaviors”. In a recent study on liminality triggered by working professionals who became pregnant, Ladge, Clair and Greenberg (2012) explained how an event can lead to identity uncertainties which can lead people to begin to develop tentative images of self, which they can reject, delay or actualize. Similar to Ibarra and Petriglieri, they found that supportive organizational contexts influenced the experience and identity outcomes during liminal periods. Liminality, thus, usually involves the shift from one role to another, with periods of experimentation, play, and provision. This is distinct from experiences in transition where de-identification is required and no clear or possible alternative is clearly available. Hakak
(forthcoming: 9) explains this as the difference between identity liminality and identity ambiguity:

The main resemblance between identity ambiguity and identity liminality is the explicit focus on the moment within an identity transition in which one senses an absence of a strong identity. However, when experiencing identity liminality, individuals supposedly have clarity as to when and how identification is likely to re-occur and may regard the “between” stage as a necessary and worthwhile step in achieving an ulterior goal (Beech, 2011). In contrast, individuals experiencing identity ambiguity have very little information about whether, when and how they will eventually regain identification and have the perception that they have very little control over this process. This lack of clarity as to the end of this state is likely to cause additional psychological discomfort and turmoil to individuals facing identity ambiguity.

This type of identity ambiguity can be expected to be even greater when transitioning from a highly institutionalized context with clearly defined identities associated with field logics, to a more ambiguous and less “total” institutional environment. This more radical institutional transition can make the experience of transition and identity ambiguity more challenging, and yet this type of transition has received little attention in the literature. One exception is a study that was conducted on career transitions that were triggered by a traumatic life event (Haynie & Shepherd, 2011), they revealed the importance of envisioning the future and developing a narrative of trauma that changed old assumptions. However, much of the literature on transitions has tended to focus on identification, as a result, “processes of deidentification have been paid considerably less attention in recent literatures than processes of identification” (Hakak, forthcoming: 4). Conroy and O’Leary-Kelly’s recent theorizing on identity loss, however, is an exception that involves the study of de-identification and re-identification. Their work reveals the importance of sensemaking and emotional regulation to both a restoration orientation (new identity) and a loss orientation (old identity). Furthermore, they hypothesize that, dependent on characteristics in the liminal period, some people may be able to find new adaptive identities while others may not. In particular, they predicted that some people may suffer from an
“inability to exit the liminal interval” (Conroy & O'Leary-Kelly, 2014: 80). Despite the acknowledgement of this possibility, scant research has actually examined contexts or individuals who remain stuck, or have more difficulty, in liminal or ambiguous periods, where actors may be unable to shed the identities prescribed by the contexts they were previously embedded within. My dissertation is thus one of the first to empirically investigate de-identification from a highly institutionalized context with a population of individuals who frequently suffer from an inability to create new versions of self, beyond those identities institutionally prescribed.

**RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY**

This dissertation seeks to explore how individuals shed and de-identify with identities shaped by unproductive logics. I explore this question by employing a cross-level qualitative case-based design. Given that the objective of this study is to build theory on the understudied context of logic resilience and de-identification, a qualitative examination is appropriate (Maguire, Hardy, & Lawrence, 2004: 660). Furthermore, as has been recommended by other scholars (Bamberger & Pratt, 2010; Eisenhardt, 1989; Pratt et al., 2006; Suddaby, 2006), an extreme case has been selected for study. Extreme cases “facilitate theory building because the dynamics being examined tend to be more visible than they might be in other contexts” (Pratt et al., 2006: 238). The correction system in Canada is an institutional context expected to have extremely dominant institutional logics and power over embedded actors to ensure activation of logics through coercion and discipline, since it is a total institution (Goffman, 1961). Total institutions are “a place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life” (Goffman, 1961: 11). As Clegg states: “they cannot be
escaped…”, and “they surround the person at every turn” (2006: 427). Furthermore, when individuals leave this institution, prison logics are no longer productive or appropriate if the individual desires to gain acceptance within mainstream society and/or avoid returning back to prison. It is thus a context where individuals are coerced into identification with prescribed identities (for extended periods of time) through the enforced and regulated availability, access and activation of logics, but at the same time are required to de-activate logics and de-identify with associated identities rather quickly. Recidivism rates throughout North America demonstrate that this transition is unsuccessful 40-80% of the time in Canada depending on where and by whom the statistics are reported (Baglole, 2004). This makes this context “particularly suitable for illuminating and extending relationships and logic among constructs” (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007: 27).

Data Sources and Collection

As this is a cross-level investigation, I obtained data from both the micro and macro levels of analysis: I conducted a total of 57 interviews and collected over 4000 pages of archival data.

Macro: Institutional logics. The data collected in order to evaluate the institutional logics enacted within the correction system came from three sources: archival and institutional documents, interviews with correctional officers (CO) and the correctional investigator, and interviews with staff of a nonprofit community organization (NCO). The primary source of data for the analysis of institutional logics within the field was archival documents which included reports, press releases, acts, regulations, policy and program documents, speeches, tweets and web-updates produced by the different players within the institutional field of Corrections in Canada (these players are discussed below under study context). All acts, regulations, policy and
program documents were included in the data, while press releases, tweets, web-updates, and reports were included, which covered the entire study period from January 2011 until December 2013. The interviews with correctional officers, investigators and staff of the NCO were used to complement and triangulate the archival material to ensure that there were no large discrepancies between individual conceptions and those expressed within the archival documents.

Micro: Individuals in transition. The core component of this investigation was interviews with previously incarcerated individuals in the process of transition from jail back into society. These individuals spent a minimum of three months in the corrections system and were released within the year of interview. The oldest and most established prison re-integration non-profit community organization (NCO) in Canada was the access point to these individuals. This ensured that all of these individuals were actively in the process of re-integration, and were only asked to participate in an interview once they had made contact with the organization. The NCO offers mandatory and voluntary programs and services for individuals recently released from correction facilities, meaning that a broad population of previously incarcerated come to the NCO. I spent two to three days a week at the NCO from July 2011 to September 2011 and then again, for one day a week, in February, March and May 2013. When the previously incarcerated came into the NCO, the supervisor would ask them to participate in an interview for which they were awarded a fee of twenty dollars. This fee was required by the NCO in order to obtain permission to interview the previously incarcerated, and was standard protocol for all research conducted within the organization regarding this population. At the beginning of the interview, they were informed that they could leave or stop answering questions at any time and would still receive the twenty dollars. They were also advised that I had no connection to the NCO or corrections Canada. In total, 43 interviews were conducted with previously incarcerated
individuals. I used an informal, open structure in all interviews for which I had prepared select questions in advance, but I adapted and changed these questions as the interview unfolded in response to the interviewee’s input (see for discussion of this approach’s efficacy McCracken, 1988; Patton, 2002). The interview questions were designed in consultation with the NCO who approved the questions I asked the previously incarcerated. However, the questions and guide continually evolved as I gained more understanding of the context and further probed certain areas or brought in different questions and took others out. The sample interview guides are included in Appendix 3. All interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed and ranged in length from 30 minutes to two hours. These interviews were the primary source of data for my investigation into the processes of de-identification during transition. All sources of data are detailed in Table 1.

**Ethics**

This dissertation was given ethics approval from the Faculty of Graduate Studies at York University. All participants were ensured of their anonymity, and, as mentioned above, were made aware of the role of the researcher and research project. All interviews were conducted one-on-one except for the corrections investigator. In-person interviewees were read the consent form, provided the opportunity to ask questions, and then signed it prior to being interviewed. The correction’s investigator was sent the consent form by email and asked to fax the signed form back prior to the telephone interview. The interviewee was then read the consent form over the phone and given the opportunity to ask questions. As mentioned previously, all interviewees were informed that they did not need to answer any questions they did not want to, and that they could end the interview at any time without penalty.
Table 1: Data Sources for Actors Within the Field of Canadian Corrections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Pages of archival data</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Canada</td>
<td>Public speeches, twitter feeds from minister and ministry, press releases, acts and regulations</td>
<td>598 pages</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC and OCS</td>
<td>Acts, regulations, policy, programs, twitter feeds from CSC, and press release</td>
<td>2204 pages</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional investigator &amp; Ombudsman</td>
<td>Annual Reports, press releases, speeches, presentations, investigations, press releases, twitter feeds from Ombudsman, and in-person interviews</td>
<td>640 pages</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Officers (CO)</td>
<td>Web-updates, news releases, speeches, interviews, twitter feeds from UCCO, UCCO president, OPSEU, and OPSEU president, and in-person interviews</td>
<td>616 pages</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCO</td>
<td>Interviews, program descriptions, organizational twitter feeds at provincial and national level, and reports</td>
<td>381 pages</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously incarcerated</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4439 pages</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Analysis

In qualitative studies adopting inductive approaches, data collection and analysis occur simultaneously in a process of constant comparison (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Suddaby, 2006). Thus, throughout the analysis (and data collection processes), I was attentive to the role the research question played in guiding analysis, while refraining from the adoption of “theoretical preferences or a priori hypotheses” (Santos & Eisenhardt, 2009: 648).
**Macro-level analysis: field logics.** The archival documents and interview transcripts from the staff of corrections facilities and the non-profit organization were analyzed using iterative techniques, but focused on illuminating the dominant institutional logics within the field of corrections. Institutional logics have been defined as those principles that organize a respective field (Friedland & Alford, 1991), and are “the socially constructed, historical patterns of cultural symbols and material practices, assumptions, values, and beliefs by which individuals produce and reproduce their material subsistence, organize time and space, and provide meaning to their daily activity” (Thornton et al., 2012: 51). As is standard practice within the field, an institutional logic within a respective domain is not described a priori, but is discovered within the data (Glynn & Lounsbury, 2005; Lounsbury, 2007; Purdy & Gray, 2009; Thornton, 2002). Since institutional logics are “symbolically grounded, organizationally structured, politically defended, and technically and materially constrained” (Friedland & Alford, 1991: 249), logics are often identified by the repeated use of certain language and phrases (Dunn & Jones, 2010), rationales or rhetorical devices (Jones & Livne-Tarandach, 2008; Lok, 2010; Meyer & Hammerschmid, 2006), and unifying approaches in the ways in which actions and strategies are considered (Jarzabkowski, Matthiesen, & Van de Ven, 2009).

To reveal the field-level logics, I used principles of qualitative content analysis (Krippendorff, 2004), where a thematic analysis of the texts was undertaken to uncover the common vocabularies that define the ways in which things were done and spoken about within the respective field actors. I first reviewed the archival and interview material from all the field actors. This inductive review of all texts then resulted in the identification of three dominant logics: public safety, rehabilitation, and street. Each logic was constituted by clear definitions of “who the incarcerated were” that were the institutionally defined “convict” identities associated
with the distinct institutional logics within and across the field. These logics and identity prescriptions are detailed in Table 2. The identity prescriptions were the main focus of study and analysis.

**Table 2: Prison Logics and Associated Institutional Defined Convict Identities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public Safety</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Root Metaphor</strong></td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>Self-sufficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources of Legitimacy</strong></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Diagnosis</td>
<td>Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources of Authority</strong></td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basis of Attention</strong></td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Recovery</td>
<td>Survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basis of Strategy</strong></td>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enacting Material</strong></td>
<td>Cages/bars, Rules, Keys, Uniforms, Correction Officers, Weapons</td>
<td>Programs, Therapy, Medicine and the Medical</td>
<td>Cleanliness, Muscles, Illicit weapons (shank), Drugs, Force, Prisoner Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A convict is</strong></td>
<td><strong>A convict is</strong></td>
<td><strong>A convict is</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Identity</strong></td>
<td>Violent, dangerous, untrustworthy</td>
<td>Vulnerable, troubled, a victim of addiction and mental illness</td>
<td>Tough, a survivor and victim of an unjust system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three prison logics and associated identities documented in the initial reviews of the data were then inductively grouped into a series of words that identified each institutional logic. These words were then created into a coding dictionary which was then utilized to systematically document the logics prevalent in each field actor. Coding was conducted using QDA Miner and Word stat software, and documented the frequency of a logic-per-page of text analyzed. This technique was similar to that used by Dunn and Jones (2010) to document the institutional logics prevalent in medical education. The coding dictionary is shown in Table 3 and samples of coded text for field actors are outlined in Appendix 4.
Table 3: Coding Dictionary for Institutional Logics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logic</th>
<th>Public Safety</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coding dictionary</td>
<td>Accountab*, danger, punish*, untrustworthy, violen*</td>
<td>Addict*, mental-illness, mental health, vulnerable, troubled</td>
<td>Corrupt, fight*, tough, victim of system, clean*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Micro-level analysis: identity dynamics.** Since an individual’s identity is their understanding of what and who they are, identity conceptualizations are most often captured in the narratives, discourses, and ways in which individuals speak about themselves (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999; Lok, 2010; Watson, 2008). Furthermore, within this dissertation I draw on the concept of identity work which is operationalized as the conscious and unconscious approaches or strategies individuals adopt to make sense of themselves both within and outside of their institution. Thus, as has been done by previous scholars examining identity and identity work (Creed et al., 2010; Kreiner et al., 2006), these approaches or strategies are accessed by asking questions during interviews that focus on “probing” the difficulties and challenges facing them within the institution and during the reintegration process. Interviewees’ responses and stories then are expected to result in the illumination of their identities and identity work. Accordingly, the interview transcripts were iteratively reviewed with multiple layers of coding as has been done by previous scholars examining identity work (cf. Pratt et al., 2006) and is recommended for inductive exploratory research (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). This process involved several stages.

**Coding: Stage one.** The first level of this coding was conducted by writing a thematic summary of each interview immediately after it took place with detailed notes, observations and thoughts. As these thematic overviews developed, topics and concepts were identified that were used as a priori codes in the systematic coding of each interview. For example, in my summary
notes after several interviews I had written down the importance of topics such as rules, addiction, victimization, and material. As I began the second level of coding, I imported these topics as codes into the software. For example, I imported a code named rules or addiction. These initial codes were then refined and expanded upon through an opening coding process, that emerged inductively from the data (Miles & Huberman, 1994). This resulted in the identification of first-level codes that reflected different types and categories of statements about self, and the challenges the incarcerated faced, and emotions they expressed. During this stage I also coded whenever the public safety, rehabilitative, and street prison logics prescribed identities were activated by the interviewees and whether they were done so in defining self currently or referring to oneself in the past.

**Coding: Stage two.** These first-level codes were then grouped into a higher level that grouped the categories of statements and activities. The inductive grouping were: distinct types of identity work (blaming, differentiating, opening up, getting critical and self-regulating) undertaken by the previously incarcerated to make sense of themselves during the transition, alternate-identity targets (religion, work, and family) that were used to make sense of self in ways distinct from prison logics, emotion work to foster acceptance and faith, materiality constraints that challenged them during transition, and identity regulation that was about their belief and explanations of the judgments placed on them as “ex-cons”.

**Coding: Stage three.** Glaser and Strauss explained, “different categories and their properties tend to become integrated through constant comparisons that force the analyst to make some related theoretical sense of each comparison” (1967: 109). Thus, the next layer of the coding process involved revisiting the codes and checking for convergences and divergences using negative-case analysis within the types of identity work, pushing theorizing to the more
abstract and aggregate level. The result was the identification of two patterns of identity work: each were comprised of distinct components, and differed in their use of other central codes (i.e. identity work types). Those within case-codings were then analyzed across all interviews using a cross-case pattern search (Eisenhardt, 1989). This higher level of theorizing resulted in the identification of the importance of alternate-identity targets and emotion work as identity enablers that facilitated reflexive-identity work, and the absence of material and identity regulation as identity constraints that hindered the ability to sustain de-identification and facilitated persistent identification. The coding was conducted using QDA miner software. Figure 1 highlights a visual representation of this coding process.

**Frequency checks and pattern documenting.** After these theoretical categories were identified and organized, I returned to the interviews using the reflexive and defensive-identity work pattern as an a priori code. I reread each transcript and then coded each interview as a whole by the dominant pattern, resulting in twenty-four interviewees in the reflexive pattern and nineteen in the defensive pattern. I then checked the frequency of prison logics coded within an interview by the identity-work pattern of the interview which confirmed what was qualitatively apparent in reading the interviews, that the reflexive pattern activated prison logics less than those in the defensive pattern, and that prison logics were activated in reference to the past by those in the reflexive pattern and in reference to the current self in the defensive pattern. I did this similarly for each aggregate category I identified as a final check that my analysis and codings were relevant and distinct. The visual representations of these coding frequencies are presented in the findings section of the dissertation.
Figure 1: Overview of Data Coding Process

**First-order codes**

- Statements framing self as the victim of addiction or illness (e.g.,) and/or the victim of the system which is to blame (e.g., my addictions causes this activity, “if the system supported me” I would be fine)
- Statements framing self in opposition to others. Not “that type of criminal”, better than “those guys"
- Statements about “reaching out” for help and “using resources” and community support
- Statements reevaluating self in critical light and envisioning and describing a different future. (e.g., “I used to be angry, now I have accepted this”)
- Statements about controlling, or monitoring, behavior, language or dress. “I am watching the people I’m around”, “I don’t hang out there anymore”, and “I avoid my triggers”
- Statements describing new understandings or visions of self (e.g., I found God, “he is now guiding me”, “I work”, “being a good father”)
- Statements explaining how “not angry any more”, have “let go”, “accepted” situation. Statements indicating faith in the future (e.g., I know it is going to be different know”)
- Statements about not having the material (cars, house) that “normal people” have. Feelings of “having nothing”.
- Statements about not being “labelled an ex-con”, not being “given a chance” because of criminal past.

**Theoretical categories**

- Blaming
- Differentiating
- Opening up
- Getting critical
- Self-regulating
- Alternate identity targets
- Emotion Work
- Lacking material
- Identity regulation
- Identity Enablers

**Aggregate theoretical dimensions**

- Defensive Identity Work
- Reflexive Identity Work
- Identity Enablers
- Identity Constraints
- De-identification
- Persistent identification
Trustworthiness

Lincoln and Guba (1985) have proposed the term trustworthiness to refer to the standard of rigour in qualitative inquiry. They suggested alternative measures of validity should be applied to qualitative studies that are rooted in the ontological and epistemological stance that rejects singular truth claims, and “when naive realism is replaced by the assumption of multiple constructed realities” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985: 294). In this view, the ways in which participants and those we study make sense of themselves and the world around them is meaningful and important and that “truth(s)” are actually the very subjectivities and perspectives they share (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Morgan, 1983). As a result, it is believed that traditional evaluation methods cannot be applied with value in these contexts. In particular, Lincoln and Guba stated: “creditability as an analog to internal validity, transferability as an analog to external validity, dependability as an analog to reliability, and confirmability as an analog to objectivity” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985: 76). Throughout the design, collection and analysis of my research, I have paid close attention to these standards to ensure the trustworthiness of the findings and subsequent theorizing I elaborate. In particular, to ensure the “creditability” of my findings I triangulated both the sources of my data and the levels of my coding (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 2002). I also engaged in negative-case analysis by looking for discrepant data and cases that did not fit patterns after which findings were adjusted. For example, my initial findings suggested that there were three patterns of identity work, but my negative-case analysis led me to realize that in fact there were only two patterns and that these two patterns were defined by distinct identity-work types. I used member-checking as a recommended strategy for establishing creditability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). I did this by checking my findings with experts in the field. For example, I discussed emergent categories and
trends in the interview data with parole officers, forensic psychiatrists, and the previously incarcerated not in the sample and I did the same with the field-level logics. I was also embedded within the context at the organization level for six months, giving me opportunities for prolonged engagement as a final technique to ensure creditability.

Transferability is achieved through a strategy of thick description (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), which I have done throughout the dissertation and in my own research notes. By including very rich and detailed description of the context and my data, I thus allow readers to determine how generalizable these findings can be to their contexts. Dependability can be achieved by ensuring as much factual accuracy as possible: I achieved this by providing detailed notes on the entire data collection and analysis process, leaving an audit trail, and recording and transcribing interviews (Maxwell, 1992). The confirmability of my dissertation is evidenced by my use of the audit trail and use of triangulation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Furthermore, as has been recommended, I kept a reflexive journal (Patton, 2002) throughout the process where I documented my decisions, and rationales for these decisions alongside personal reflections. The cumulative use of these recommended techniques provides support and ensures the trustworthiness of my research process and findings.

THE FIELD OF CORRECTIONS: PRISON LOGICS, DEFINING THE INCARCERATED

This study examined previously incarcerated individuals transitioning from prison back into society. Within Canada, “prison” is a complex field which involves several key groups who operate within different spheres and have different objectives. Together, this group of actors delivers and implements services and laws in the incarceration of convicted or charged individuals. The actors in the field include the government who oversees the delivery of
corrections via the public safety ministry: an appointed party-elected minister. Corrections Service Canada (CSC) who enacts regulations, acts and policies as imposed by The Public Safety Minister. The CSC is in charge of the actual implementation of incarceration at the federal level (incarceration over two years) and of parole and release. The Ontario Correction Service (OCS) is the field actor which operates incarceration, and oversees parole and release at the provincial level in Ontario (incarceration under two years). There are similar actors within each province; however, in this study I focused on OCS since the interviews were conducted within Ontario. The CSC and OCS are then overseen by watchdogs, the ombudsman at the provincial level, and the Correctional investigator at the federal level. Within the CSC and the OCS the daily oversight and management of the incarcerated is conducted by correctional officers who are represented by both federal [the Union of Canadian Correctional Officers (UCCO)], and provincial, [Ontario Public Service Employee (OPSEU)] unions. The incarcerated men within the jails are governed by these actors. When they transition out of corrections they enter back into society directly or via national and provincial parole boards overseen by the CSC and OCS. The field is also populated by non-profit organizations that aim to provide assistance and support to the previously incarcerated. One of the oldest, most respected and widely recognized non-profit organizations for the incarcerated is the NonProfit Community Organization (NCO). The NCO provides support services for previously incarcerated men reintegrating back into society and has been recognized formally within the field for this role. The field is visually demonstrated in Figure 2.
As stated in the methodology, my analysis of these actors revealed three dominant logics as prevalent within the field of corrections in Canada: public safety, rehabilitation, and street. The public safety and rehabilitation logics were refracted into prison via the formal field of corrections. These two logics have also been documented by other scholars examining the criminal justice system (McPherson & Sauder, 2013). The street logic, however, was embedded within the prison via the informal institution created and governed by the incarcerated. This logic has been similarly documented and referred to by scholars in criminology, although it sometimes referred to as the inmate code, prison subculture, or the prison value system (Bondesson, 1989; Crewe, 2006; Sykes & Messinger, 1960).
Throughout the field of corrections, all three of the logics were documented, but with differing foci by respective actors within the field. The Public Safety Minister, CSC, and Correctional Officers relied more on the public safety logic, while NCO, the Correctional Investigator and Ombudsman were documented as employing the rehabilitative logic more frequently. Unsurprisingly the street logic was relied on most predominately by the previously incarcerated (as will be shown in next section) and by the two field actors who had the most direct contact and interaction with them: the NCO and Correction Officers. The relative frequency of these logics per page of text analyzed is visually represented in Figure 3.

Each logic provided distinct “assumptions, values, beliefs, and rules” that organized corrections activities and “provide[d] meaning” to incarceration (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999: 804). The public safety logic was guided by a focus on accountability and punishment, while the rehabilitative logic was centred around beliefs that incarceration is a product of vulnerability (mental, physical, and financial) where the focus needed to be on treatment and recovery from the illnesses and abuse that drive criminality. The street logic was governed by a survival mentality where violence, respect and self-sufficiency were the most effective means of surviving in a system that was corrupt and unjust.

Figure 3: Field Actor and Relative Use of Prison Logics
Beyond the principles for appropriate action these logics espoused, all three of these logics were comprised of distinct ways of referring to the previously incarcerated that constituted institutionally-defined identities prescribed to the incarcerated as convicted criminals. These identities inform the public and the incarcerated “who and what convicts are” and guide the policies, interactions, and opportunities that are given to the incarcerated. According to the public safety logic, incarcerated individuals were dangerous and violent criminals. Under a rehabilitative logic, however, the incarcerated were victims of addiction and mental illness, and were vulnerable and compromised individuals due to their troubled pasts. The street logic defined incarcerated individuals as tough men who valued respect; and who were victims of a corrupt and unjust system, which they had to fight or cheat to survive. These logics and the associated identities have been detailed in Table 2. Appendix 4 shows sample text from the coding of each logic by an actor. Within the paper, I refer to these three logics collectively as prison logics and their associated identities as convict identities.

The formal release conditions dictated by corrections and society demands that the previously incarcerated “successful[ly] reintegrate” upon release by “becom[ing] responsible, productive and law-abiding citizens of society” (CSC). It is believed that if “they can successfully reintegrate into the community, and their risk of reoffending is significantly reduced” (CSC). However, as incarcerated individuals exit corrections and re-enter society, none of the prison logics prescribed identities provided a “productive” sense of self that enabled them to imagine themselves as a contributing member of society. The “personal and social adjustment” demanded by corrections as necessary for re-integration means that the previously incarcerated must find new definitions of self and de-identify with the convict identities prescribed by prison logics in order to become “responsible and productive” members of society.
Thus, ideally, those exiting prison would de-identify and shed unproductive and identity-damaging convict identities and embrace a new sense of self. However, extant statistics on failed reintegration back into society (Baglole, 2004) suggest making this transition is extremely difficult and that prison logics are resilient and thus difficult to de-activate. As this interviewee articulated,

Yeah, it sucks because I can't get out. It's like I'm trapped, no matter how fast I run it's like all those dreams, where no matter how fast you're running you can't run fast enough because there's things always catching up to you, you know. And a man always catches me and puts those cuffs on and it's done. I'm down and out for another couple years or whatever, or wherever the case is, right. This time it was four months so I lucked out, it was close. Interviewee 15

In what follows, I examine how the previously incarcerated identities are shaped by prison logics and then reveal how, during transition, these individuals work to de-identify with the convict identities prescribed by these logics. I then theorize the factors that emerged from the data that contribute to de-identification and logic resilience during transition.

**LIFE BEHIND BARS: BECOMING A CONVICT**

The individuals in this study had been incarcerated for a minimum of three months to qualify for inclusion in this study. However, the majority of interviewees had been incarcerated for much longer periods of time; either serving extended sentences of nine to fifteen years, or doing what they called “life on the revolving door” where they were repeatedly incarcerated for short periods of time. The average number of years served across all participants was nine years. Some of the participants had been incarcerated upwards of 150 times, only three had been incarcerated less than two times. Table 4 outlines data on the participants in this study and their periods of incarceration. (The identity work patterns outlined in this table will be addressed in the following section.) All participants had been released from prison within one year of the interview date. All individuals vividly recalled their incarceration(s) and how it affected them
personally. They repeatedly mentioned feeling like “an animal” and “a number”, and that the process of incarceration changed them. As this interviewee explained, “The guards, they beat you up for nothing, they treat you like a pig, like an animal. You know, a bunch of animals in a cage” (Interviewee 24).

During incarceration these individuals felt robbed of their humanity, they felt labelled as criminals, animals, something less than human. “You're not seen as a human being, you know, by the guards or corrections…you know. And a lot of other inmates too, you know, because it's just like, if you're put in a cage you're gonna, you know, you're gonna act like an animal...” (Interviewee 20). As this individual similarly stated, “Like sh#t. You're a number everybody is a piece of sh#t in the guards’ eyes. You committed a crime so now you're a low lifer, you treat me like a second or third class citizen. Okay, I shot somebody in self-defence” (Interviewee 2), and “once they see you in orange they see you different. They don't see you as a human being. They see you as a convict” (Interviewee 42).

For many, this experience of being dehumanized was humiliating and demoralizing.

There's something called strip searches and it's demoralizing. …ordering me around like cattle or some type of animal… It demoralizes me. I had a few conversations with some other inmates and they felt the same way. And I'm still young, there's older men which like, if I see my father go through something like that, that would hurt me and there was older men going through something like that, you know.. Interviewee 18

The way that I was treated. Dehumanized... Just because you break the law doesn't mean you're still not a human being right, you know what I mean? These guards, like I don't know, they get into these positions, in these jobs and it's just the way that they treat people. I could never treat someone like that… Do you know what I mean? There should be more people watching the people that are watching the inmates. Interviewee 14
Table 4: Interviewee Demographic Information and Identity Work Pattern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant ID</th>
<th>Number of years spent incarcerated</th>
<th>Number of times incarcerated</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Identity Work Pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>DD</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Defensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Defensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Defensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Defensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Defensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 14</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Defensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Defensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 17</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 18</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Defensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Defensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Defensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 24</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Defensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34-44</td>
<td>Defensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Defensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Defensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 29</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Defensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 30</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Defensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 31</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Defensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 35</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Defensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 36</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 37</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 39</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 40</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Defensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CR= Cannot remember  DD= did not disclose
As Goffman (1959) has stated previously, incarceration seems to strip the individual of his previous identity in the process of incarceration; “I think you just become like a number. It's all you really are, you're just a bunch of numbers stuck together and that's you” (Interviewee 15). Conceptions of who incarcerated individuals “are”, derived from prison logics, is disciplined and embedded into everyday existence. These conceptions of the incarcerated are enforced, and forcibly activated, working to override, eliminate, or reduce the saliency of previous views of self.

Jail has no hope. You see in jail there is no hope and I don't mean like hope to aspire, I mean hope like, it crushes you, like it eats away at your real self being because you're not yourself when you're there. You can't be yourself when you're there because you are whatever they say you are… Interviewee 18

The public safety logic was constituted by a belief that individuals who had committed crimes are “dangerous criminals” and “bad people” who deserve to be punished. Activated and enforced by corrections officers and corrections within Canada, this convict identity prescribed by the public safety logic is made accessible by the material and social practices that formally remove power, voice, and humanity from the incarcerated. As these individuals explained, when they reflected on the loss of autonomy and control over their own lives;

And my wife sent me some pictures, I don't know. And all the mail that you get, even your private mail with your kids, pictures of your kids and your wives and stuff, they open that, they read your messages, you know. Sometimes they choose to give it to you, sometimes they'll read it to you through the glass and say oh you're not going to get it just because that's just how they're feeling that day. Interviewee 18

I used to pop my collar up a little bit, and I'd comb my hair back, I had long hair, I put gel in my hair. So a female officer, she comes to me, she goes, you're not allowed to use that in your hair and keep your collar down. I said what? They sell gel, so why would you sell me the gel. She said, well you're using too much of it. Too much, I said, how do you know how much I use? Is that a rule for that? She said, you're not Elvis, put your collar down. Interviewee 7
The interviewees revealed that while they were incarcerated they learned to silence themselves into obedience to protect themselves and prevent conflict.

Um, well knowing that it's a part of life and it's a fact of life, um, and that it was a way of dominating I guess inmates into obedience. As to say, like look if you don't do this, you know like, we're just gonna handcuff you and beat you to death if we have to, you know, to get our will across, regardless. I mean like let's face it, um, this whole…the whole psychology of these jails, I mean, even giving you a little snack is basically to break you down… Interviewee 27

I kept my mouth shut. At first I used to talk back but then you end up in the hole, you know you end up moving from one place where you're comfortable to another place where you have to start, it's like starting all over again. So you just want to stay away from them… I won't voice my opinion or say nothing to him. I'm just going to do what he says. Interviewee 42

The silencing of self came at a cost, however, as interviewees repeatedly expressed the feeling that they had lost their dignity, respect and sense of self.

Yeah, well nobody wants to be told what to do, like you know, like you don't want be told when to change and how to bend over and you know. I don't know you just lose a lot of your, I guess you're dignity or whatever while you're in there right? I find the guards try to break your spirit so you don't have the…the privilege of being able to do what you want to do. Interviewee 12

For some, this resulted in anger directed towards the corrections officers and the broader system.

“I wanted to kill those guards when they said that to me. Do you know what I mean? Like, ‘I'm a sick twisted individual’ he said, oh ‘you piece of sh#t’” (Interviewee 14).

However, while the formal institution of corrections enforced a view of the incarcerated as convicts who were criminal, dangerous, and thus worthy of punishment, the incarcerated themselves enforced the street logic’s convict identity as “tough guys” who lived by rules of respect. The street logic was the most highly embedded within the prison system, being enforced by elaborate systems of rules created and maintained by the incarcerated.

A protocol is with the jail system itself. Like the guards and the Ontario Provincial prison system, which is Corrections Canada, or Canadian Safety Social Services,
something like that. And the other one is with the inmates. They have their own rules and regulations. Interviewee 28

The incarcerated had instantiated rules within jails that regulated interaction within prison and, in some jails, were even formally posted. These rules involved everything from how to go to the washroom, to how to make a bed, when to shower, who could use the phone, how and what you got to eat, and the noises you were able to make. Following these rules to avoid violence and ensure your own safety resulted in these rules being feared and readily followed.

Okay, you're on a range, do you know what a range is? Okay that's a cell block. Let's say there is 30 cells, 30 guys and there are always two or three guys that run that range. They're the bosses of the range. This is run their way. But it has to be that way because if you didn't have someone in charge you would have anarchy all the time. Say if you don't shower for two days, you'll get a visit in your cell, get in the shower, bang [punch in face]. Stuff like that. Interviewee 13

The inmates run the jail. They run all the ranges... it's just the inmates run – it's the – the weakest are the most vulnerable. Do you understand? Like on certain ranges in the Don, the quarter masters like, if the meal comes in and it's a chicken meal, right, he'll take all the chicken. He gets to eat all the chicken. So everybody gets their meal but nobody gets chicken, right, you know what I mean? Stuff like that right. The inmates run it you know, and the guards like that.. Interviewee 14

The inmates run the jail, the guards don't run it. They're there but they don't run it. The inmates run it...The inmates are the boss. They serve your food. The guards bring the trays of food and they serve it. If they don't like you then you ain't getting your tray. If you have a big mouth ... you wouldn't even eat. They'll keep the tray for you from them. You want to...you want to eat? There's the back of the range, we'll fight. Interviewee 24

In this sense individuals were coerced to follow these rules or face punishment, essentially mandating the activation of the “respect” and tough guy convict identity associated with the street logic. They needed to become tough to survive. As these participants stated, “you gotta go beat somebody up that you have a problem with just because…” (Interviewee 21).

You got to be careful, you know what I mean. If people start thinking... you're going too straight then everybody starts thinking you're a rat or something like that and dah dah dah. It's not, you always got to keep that front on, still you know, like you don't give a sh#t, you're part of the game and the guards are the guards. You got to keep that aura about yourself. You can't go around the guys is all hugs and not drugs, you know what I
mean. They're going to eat you up in there. You know. You know unfortunately, these
guys you know they see vulnerability and they'll jump all over it. Interviewee 35

The rules that were structured and enforced to institutionalize the tough guy view who lived by
rules of “respect” were internalized by many of the interviewees as it came to shape who they
were. “You have to be a different person. You have to follow their rules” (Interviewee 37).

Well I know it affected me. It made me really, I won't say cold, but it really made me
um, um, withdraw into myself. Because in there I mean, you're amongst car thieves or
fruit stealers to murderers to, you know. So I mean, and I, I'm a man so I've never been
to a women's facility but in a man's facility no matter how much of a hard time you're
having, you still got to...you can't be soft. You know what I mean, you know when
you're in a cage with dogs you can't be a cat, right. So it just makes you really cold you
know and when you...when you are released, it's hard to kind of communicate with
people because it's just how you take it on, right. Interviewee 20

To a large number of interviewees these rules became “common sense” and they
expected it of themselves and of others, even when they were no longer in prison.

I'm fine, I know everybody so I'm fine but just you know common sense and courtesy and
mind your own business. Yeah shower up, brush your teeth, wash your face, wash your
hands, no reaching over, don't whistle at no one, mind your own business... It's basic
anyways. It's all basic common sense. Interviewee 44

You know like, where you walk, what you say, you know, it's just...it's a lot of it...it
used to be just basic, you know common sense... [Now] I kind of live like...I wouldn't
say I live the same out here as I do in there but in a sense I do because I've been involved
with it for so long. You know like, in jail you call somebody a goof, it's the worst thing
you could ever say to them right and most people when they come out of jail they'll use
that term loosely whereas in there you can't. And you can't do with me either [use the
word] right so. Interviewee 19

The convict identities prescribed and enforced by the public safety and street logics were
constantly enacted throughout daily life in prison and resulted in the activation of these logics
and the associated views of self. However, the other logic instantiated within the field of
corrections was a rehabilitative logic. This logic was most documented in field actors
representing the incarcerated such as the correction investigator and the NCO, but it was also
activated by other actors like correction officers. As these correction officers reflected:
So it's really easy to get caught up when you first start up... ah they're all pieces of sh#t and nah nah nah, but once you start to really understand what they're going through and most of them, there are inmates that are institutionalized and they even like coming to jail because they can eat better because they're usually drug addicts. CO 4

You know, and so if you're looking from our angle or our angle of the lens, given that you know all the mental health issues that these guys have coming in, and addictions issues and all that stuff it's very complex. CO 8

According to the rehabilitative logic, the incarcerated are seen as suffering from addictions, mental illness, and life trauma. It is because of these sufferings that they fell into a life of crime. Social workers, chaplains, psychiatrists, and other mental health staff within the prison make available this version of a convict identity through programs, assessments, and delivery of medication. Identifying as mentally ill or as an addict and embracing this identity can enable the incarcerated to gain access to medication, services and treatment they may have not been able to access previously. As a result, this view of self was often activated in interaction throughout the prison “so physically and mentally disabled right. I don't want to identify like that, I try not to think of myself but they force you in a way to identify that and you got to beg for that” (Interviewee 29).

In summary, life on the inside came to shape the incarcerated individual’s sense of self through the activation of prison logic’s institutionally-defined convict identities. These views of self as criminals, tough guys, and victims became internalized and activated through continual use, and began to shape their sense of self. It is through this internalization and activation, according to Pache and Santos (2013), that identification has occurred.

You're told how to act, how to respond. You're told when to eat, but you see once you know these things it's in your mind. Like you've become part of it and you're brain washed. You become a part of a system that you're mentally conditioned to go through... Interviewee 27

Upon release from jail, however, de-identifying with these forcibly-instilled identities was difficult for the interviewees. Following, I discuss the ways in which the previously incarcerated
engaged in identity work during transition in their attempts to de-activate prison logics and de-identify with the convict identities with which they came to define themselves.

**TRANSITION AND DE-IDENTIFICATION**

The experience of transition can be an overwhelming one. For the men in this study entering back into society meant they had to relearn rules, appropriate behaviours, ways of speaking and interacting. Using the language of Pache and Santos (2013), they were novices in the various institutional logics prescribing appropriate behaviour and interaction in society. For many this experience was overwhelming, as articulated by these participants:

It's frightening actually eh. It's frightening. Because you come out now it's a different ball game out here. It's not, no more fighting [for yourself], no more obey by rules… We have to obey by rules out here… but still like you know, it's just rules in there you know. Interviewee 5

After my first time in jail people think well geez didn't he get enough of it. Well yeah, I did get enough of it… it's like I can't make it any other way man, because I know here, I know the routine, I know how to act. Out here I don't know how to act in this world. I don't know how to behave. I don't know how to be a productive member of society. All I've ever known is that you know this is my number, and that's it, you're just a number man. And it's a really really trippy thing. Interviewee 27

During the transition period these individuals were trying to make sense of themselves outside of prison. The expectation upon their release is for them to “successful[ly] reintegrate” and become “responsible, productive and law-abiding citizens of society” (CSC). However, the institutional logics that were enforced during their incarceration were ones that told them as convicts they were 1) violent bad people and criminals, 2) unstable, or troubled due to their pasts, addictions, or illnesses, and 3) tough guys repressed by an unjust system. What these men repeatedly stated was that the views of self they had come to identify with through their incarceration were hard to “shake”. They often described feelings of being “stuck” in the prison mentality, or that they were
trapped in a pattern of thought. Many even still felt the desire to enforce or live by the rules of the institution.

You adapt to be inside and you're in there for x amount of years and then when you get out, it's very hard to turn that off. So you might be in the halfway house and somebody reaches across your plate, well that's not good in jail, you don't do that sh#t. It's hard to not hit that person. It's hard to get out of the groove that you're in... If you do that enough times [go in and out] eventually your head gets f*cked and you just stay stuck. Q: Stay stuck where? A: Usually adapted to jail...Well at least for me anyways. I'm very criminal minded, I don't know why but I just can't get out of the jail attitude. I think everything should be jail rules, I don't know why but that's the way I see it. Q: What is it that helps you get out of the groove? A: I have no idea yet. I've never really gotten out of there… Interviewee 15

Just the mentality of the inmates stuck in my head so you start to pick up their habits, thinking habits, verbal habits... Stealing to get what you want, which I have. Break and entries, and they teach you tricks, you know like, if I would have went back in with that package I would have made about a grand. So you take that with you. If you have nowhere to go, we're survivors and survival, is you know, it becomes an instinct I guess, second nature. Interviewee 9

No I mean, like honestly I was just in the welfare office and the guy was whistling and it irritated me and I almost felt, I almost told him shut the f*ck up man, don't whistle, but then I realized I'm not in jail I'm in society and a lot of people whistle. Interviewee 4

These individuals were actively trying to make sense of their place and craft a sense of belonging to society; however, none of the prison logics prescribed convict identities provided a clear link to a productive and positive social vision of self. To find a new sense of self, or rediscover their self prior to incarceration, they needed to find ways to shed or de-identify with the convict identities associated with prison logics. My analysis revealed that individuals engaged in two patterns of identity work during the transition period: defensive and reflexive identity work. Those engaging in defensive identity work remained in a persistent state of identification with convict identities as they relied on the rehabilitative, public safety, or street logics to make sense of their feeling of being a misfit in society and their difficulty in transition. While these individuals were engaging in identity work, the substance of their identity work
was constrained by their identification with at least one of the prison logics. For these individuals, the resilience of their identification with these convict identities seemed to persist as they continued to activate them to make sense of themselves and their place in society even after release. They continued to describe themselves by drawing on convict identities. Individuals who engaged in reflexive identity work, however, were documented as de-identifying with prison logics as their conceptions of current self relied less on prison logics as they worked to make sense of their self in new ways. They activated prison logics in reference to their past self rather than their current self. They did this by opening themselves up, engaging in self-critique and regulation, as they spoke honestly about themselves and focused on their desire and ability to change. I elaborate these two patterns of identity work below, and additional illustrative quotes are shown in Appendix 5. Figure 4 illustrates the relative frequency of each identity work type by pattern, and Table 4 shows the identity work pattern adopted by each interviewee. Twenty-four of the interviewees were documented adopting a reflexive pattern and nineteen adopting a defensive pattern.

**Figure 4: Frequency of Identity Work Types by Pattern**
Defensive Patterns of Identity Work: Blaming and Differentiating

The two predominant types of identity work utilized by the previously incarcerated in the defensive pattern were blaming and differentiating. Blaming was a type of identity work where the previously incarcerated cast themselves as the victim and shifted blame to explain reality and the potential (or lack thereof) for the future: language characterized by “they are to blame”, “I can’t”, and “I’m suffering from”. Those engaging in blaming identity work adopted views of themselves from the rehabilitative and street logics, and actively described themselves as victims of mental health, addiction and/or illness (rehabilitative logic) or as victims of the system (street logic). Differentiating, however, was a different type of identity work that individuals used to disassociate themselves from other criminals or offenders. Those using differentiating identity work relied on the convict identity espoused by the public safety logic to elaborate how they were criminals, but not the ones who were the really bad “criminals”. In both cases, they relied on prison logics to make sense of themselves and their situation.

Blaming. It is important to note that almost all of the men interviewed had at some time a combination of mental illness, addiction, illness, troubled upbringing, or serious life trauma. However, individuals who continued to activate the rehabilitative logic described themselves as victims as they worked to defend and explain why they struggled during transition, and why they had, or continued to, engage in criminal behaviour. While other individuals would explain “I struggle with addiction”, or “I have had substance abuse issues”, individuals documented as engaging in blaming identity work would describe themselves through the addiction “I am an addict”, “my addiction makes me…”. In this sense, these individuals used the rehabilitative logic’s convict identity, explaining their criminality through addiction or other health problems, to attempt to distance themselves from the convict identity elaborated within the public safety
logic. They thus activated the rehabilitative logic, remaining identified with this view of self as they drew on it to define themselves and their relation to the world. In doing so they were able to reduce their identification with the public safety’s convict identity, but at the cost of heightened identification with the rehabilitative logic.

How good of a person I am, I really am, I'm an excellent person, it's just my addictions right, when I start using and all that. I'm not afraid to work or nothing but when I start using, let's face it, you run out of money, then you have no other solutions but to go and resort to crime then you end up in jail. Interviewee 8

In addition to referring to mental illness and addiction, individuals relied on the street logic to explain how they ended up in prison and why they were not given a chance to succeed in society. The system itself was corrupt and unjust.

I think the system is failing. There's so many young guys in prison that get out to nothing, I think just as a rule that prison systems failing everybody. Not just the prisoners, but society itself. Because if you let out the guys like me, to nothing, I have to do something. I have to steal just to eat. Now you're failing society again because you're putting me back out there, but I don't have a choice. There's no place to eat. So I think the correction system's not just failing inmates, its failing society in general... Interviewee 13

It's just a, it's like a great big business and they're there to farm us like crazy. They put so many rules in place that there's no chance for certain people to ever get out of the system. Like they're there until the end of their, their whatever, the judge says five years, you're gonna do the whole five years, in the system. And they're gonna get paid for you to be there the whole time. Interviewee 15

For participants using blaming, their identities were wrapped up in perceptions of victimization, derived from the rehabilitative and street logics, and in resistance to the public safety convict identity. In this sense, activating rehabilitative and street logics enabled them to de-identify with the public safety’s definition of convicts (of them as criminals and bad apples), but in doing so maintained their identification with the two remaining convict identities (rehabilitation and street logics).
Differentiating. On the other hand, some previously incarcerated spent a great deal of time comparing themselves to other incarcerated individuals. They worked to differentiate themselves from these “real” criminals, the ones who deserved to be in prison. As this interviewee stated,

> These guys ask me about this and they'll say, “so what did you go in jail for? How long did you do?” I'd say, it doesn't matter how long I did, like you know, I'm not no pedophile or nothing like that, you know… I'll go to anger management but like you know they have had people that did that, “Oh I was a pedophiler”, you're what Buddy? I'd take him around the back and I would hurt him, put it this way I would hurt him bad. If it was worth going back to jail, I don't give a sh#t. Interviewee 5

Through this comparative work, they relied upon the public safety’s definitions of convicts to define other incarcerated men, and differentiate themselves from them. This was distinct from those in the reflexive pattern who spoke frankly about their past criminal selves and why they were transcending them; when they referred to the public safety logic it was in reference to their past. Individuals in the defensive pattern, however, activated the public safety logic by identifying themselves as criminals presently, even if they were ones that were better than the worst type of convicts.

> I was born like you. I went to school, I had a family. I don't know how I ended up, like I'm not a bad guy, all my charges are fraud. I had no violence, no drug charges, no sex charges on my record. They are all fraud, because I like gambling, I like doing parties, cocaine, pot, whatever, drinking. So that's my problem, that's why I keep coming back. But, when I go to jail I have to associate with some bad guys... Interviewee 7

Participants worked to explain the ways in which they were not “a bad guy”, by comparing themselves to other individuals who were actually violent, dangerous, and criminal: “I never hurt anybody no no no that's not good” (Interviewee 30). Yet the vision of what being incarcerated meant was still activated by constant reminders that incarceration is about being the bad guy. “… I'm not like that... they don't have respect and appreciate their family for themselves. So I'm not going to be with these kind of people” (Interviewee 11).
Overall, the continued activation of prison logics is evidenced by their use in understanding of self and situation: they remained identified primarily with rehabilitative and street convict identities as they worked to de-identify from public safety’s prescribed identity. Yet they still activated the public safety logic as they worked to differentiate their criminal behaviour from others: they were criminals, but not like others. They adopted blaming identity work to rationalize their inability to transition, and differentiation to explain why they were not as bad or as dangerous, or as violent as other criminals. In this way these individuals found a way to live with the unproductive convict identities constituting prison logics, but they appeared to be unable to de-identify with these identities. Their identity work during transition was shaped by the institutional logics enacted within prison. An implication of this pattern was that they often failed to activate or identify with alternate societal logics and create new visions of self.

**Patterns of Reflexive Identity Work: Opening up, Getting Critical and Self-regulating**

Despite the resilience of identification with convict identities for many of the previously incarcerated trying to manage the difficulties of transition, I documented other individuals deactivating these logics and redefining self through the engagement of a pattern of reflexive identity work. This identity work pattern involved them reflecting deeply on themselves and, while acknowledging their illness, addictions, and problems caused by the system, they worked to find positive ways to envision themselves in society. They did this through opening up, getting critical, and self-regulating. They talk about finding ways to let go of previous thinking and behaviour associated with their criminal selves, moving on and hoping for a better future.

**Opening up.** Opening up involved releasing emotional and interpersonal guards that had been put up in prison, “I'm kind of letting my guard down as far as friends and stuff like that. I'm letting people back into my life” (Interviewee 33). These individuals connected with community
organizations, programs and help groups. They not only used resources but went beyond just attending and began to share, listen, ask for help and in some cases help others.

Stop trying, you know, to do everything. You know, ask for help. You know, getting involved with this non-profit organization. I came here for counselling and the outreach services that were available through the counsellors here, it was amazing. Absolutely amazing! Doors that I was scared to open were opened for me, you know. That kind of stuff, right, and it was really comforting you know to have counsellors here. Also I met with my family doctor and I [now] follow my health. Interviewee 16

This process was the reverse of what they had done in prison when they had to shut down and silence themselves to survive. Opening up meant they connected with other individuals and expressed their emotions and in doing so they rehumanized themselves and began to distance themselves from the criminal and tough-guy convict identities.

I started to feel bad. So who do you reach out to support with. I wrote something on face book... I wrote something about the pain that I was feeling, you know and that I'm sad. Is it you know, tears of joy or tears of sadness…I'm happy that I reached out and I wasn't embarrassed, or had that fear to do that on Facebook… Interviewee 32

The first thing is, if you want to get anywhere you need to ask for help, so here I am reaching out to all programs and I'm taking advantage of everything that's possible for me. And it took me 40 years to do this but I've come to the conclusion, I've come to the final part of my life where you know what, this is it, I've had it, I need to make changes in my life because I'm tired of… I'm sick of the revolving door in and out of jail. Finally coming to my senses… Interviewee 6

These individuals acknowledged their past but instead of focusing on it as a source of their identity now, they use it as the reason they want to change, or go back, to a productive and positive sense of self. They purposefully failed to adopt street logics prescriptions for being tough and needing “to do it alone”, and spoke about themselves as needing help, asking for it and beginning to express their emotions.

Getting critical. Through using available resources these individuals also talked “critically” about themselves by gazing inward. They reflected on their pasts, and rather than use these stories to rationalize their situation and define themselves, they used them to motivate
themselves as reasons they needed to change, deactivating prison logic’s influence on their current conceptions of self and the possibilities for the future. Change meant embracing and believing in a different version of themselves: one where none of the convict identities applied. Getting critical involved using introspection and reflexivity to break down prison logics as they thought about why it was that those convict identities defined them in the past, and why it was that they no longer did. To do this when they referred to prison logics convict identities, like being a criminal or a victim, they did so by talking about themselves in the past. This de-activated these logics’ influence on the current self.

Me, my mental state now. My mind is different now. I’m not angry anymore you know what I mean. I’m not, I’ve accepted my situation and I choose to move on. I guess the same opportunities would have been before but I guess I’m kind of seen it now. ... So I think with all that awareness I think it's just like I'm, it's not pointing the finger anymore. It's kind of like I'm pointing it back at me and it's like I'm the only one that can control what happens to me right... So it's a lot more awareness now then what it was, a lot of self awareness... I was just tired of being a bad guy, basically. Interviewee 33

The participants most reflexive throughout their interviews reflected inward and used self-critique and positivity to break down their identification with convict identities, by envisioning and/or remembering that they were more than that; deactivating the reliance on prison logics to make sense of themselves. It is important to state that it was not that these individuals were not aware of or did not mention being criminals, tough guys, addicts, or mentally ill, but that they had moved beyond these conceptions in defining and identifying themselves in the present and in the future.

If you don't have it in your mind, because in the time that I was out, the first week I was out I seen a lot of the old crowd, you know I was offered to do this do that and get back into selling drugs. And I just took a different route. I said no enough is enough. You have to be strong-minded to get out of that situation... Things happen but it always, I find now they happen very slowly but they do happen. You know if you stick it out things get better. Interviewee 42
In this way, while prison logics continued to be available and accessible for these individuals cognitively, a reflexive identity work pattern de-activated their use in defining self, situation and interactions in the present and future. These individuals reflected on what they had learned and how this changed them in ways that created possibilities for the future and themselves.

It made me get a better look at why, what I was doing wrong with parts of my incarceration and what I could do now with what I’ve learned. If I hadn't been incarcerated I wouldn't recognize certain things. I'd probably be spending money on losers, I wouldn't say losers, but spending money the wrong way. Hanging out with the wrong crowd and not really understanding people, and not seeing, seeing what I guess life is really about when it comes down to learning. Interviewee 40

So, and you know they didn't do me no wrong. I'm the one that did wrong, but I also came out on the other side with some education, awareness, even if I can help somebody down the road, I mean I'd love to do it, because this is no way of life… You can go upwards or you can go downwards from being incarcerated... I just chose to go a different route this time around, and I know I had it in me…It's all self work. It's all you, it all comes down to you having that recognition. Interviewee 41

Getting critical is a type of reflexive identity work where these individuals gazed inward and talked critically about their pasts. They spoke about themselves as different from that past, creating the possibility for a future. In doing so, they transcended the criminal, bad guy, and victim views of self to move beyond public safety, street and rehabilitative-prescribed identities.

**Self-regulating.** Individuals using a reflexive pattern of identity work not only opened up and got critical, envisioning a new sense of self but also regulated their behaviours and actions to avoid “cycling back” to prison, criminal life, and those associated “convict” selves. My analysis documents individuals in this pattern referring to the different ways in which they regulated the people and places they interacted with, and the language they used. This regulation helped them “check in” with themselves and hold onto this new trajectory of self.
In particular, individuals spoke about avoiding places where they had previously engaged in criminal activities. The distancing of themselves from these places helped to disconnect them from the past and that way of life.

And now that I'm back and my head is on straight and stuff and I'm drug-free I see life a lot better, and it's just good... I stay away from the old crowd people, the old neighborhood. Actually I moved away from the old neighbourhood to a very quiet neighbourhood then I just stay around there and stay away from all my old contacts, and stuff like that. Interviewee 42

They worked to de-activate prison logics’ connection to their present, only referring to their convict selves as the past they were seeking to avoid. For example, some of the interviewees also spoke about how people who had been part of their “other life” needed to be avoided in order to avoid triggering previous thoughts and patterns that defined that old self.

I just recently last week I got separated from my wife because she's still using drugs, and this whole plan, this whole thing was a plan that I get off drugs and so she would too. And you know I held my end of the bargain and then she didn't, and I just had enough, so since last week I've been staying at a motel. Interviewee 39

So if people are around and you know they're gonna bring you down in any way, like cut the link. That's what I've been doing. Just cut everything out...you have to get rid of it or else it's just gonna pop up again. That's how I see it. Interviewee 24

While some individuals displaying a defensive pattern acknowledged people or places as triggers, the individuals in the reflexive pattern actively spoke about regulating themselves to ensure they avoided contact. By distancing themselves from past people and places, they actively worked to maintain the current visions of self as separate from the past that was defined by their convict identities.

I just take one day at a time. I'm not like this always, like I have a very low self-esteem so some days are tougher than others for me, but I just take it, not even a day at a time, just a minute at a time. You know. For me it's always good to check my surroundings, and you know, to check in with myself. You know, it's so easy to get back into that...to get into that rut again, right? Interviewee 8
Self-regulation was a way of being mindful of what behaviours and actions they had identified as being problematic and causing their criminal histories. It helped them sustain the de-activation work they did in opening up and getting critical.

I got these Kleenex box holders and they're really nice, and you know, I'm at the YMCA in the locker room and they have Kleenex boxes. And I'd like the Kleenex box to put in a holder, because it would look nice to have, and I wanted to take it. And because I'm really, really trying here, and I could see right away that this behaviour; it's stealing first of all. Big deal. I could, it's two dollars for a Kleenex box, but the point is, it's a relapse. And I don't like the word relapse. I feel like I'm using, but it takes me closer to using. It's those behaviours. And you know what, and I didn't take the Kleenex box. Interview 32

In addition to regulating the people and places they interacted within, they also spoke about regulating their language. As these participants explained, “I'm just honest with it you know what I mean. I try and speak like intelligently and leave that whole yo yo stuff behind, you know what I mean... Just interacting with people and speaking, in jail it's almost like different slang and a different way of talking. You know you try to get back to society's way of talking rather than you know like criminals, like 24/7 right” (Interviewee 33), and “I try never to be institutionalized I tried to fight that, and I tried to talk friendly and happy kind of like on the street” (Interviewee 3). These individuals worked to not be the convict, the individual they were when they were on the inside, and language was one way they could present a different self. Some of them also regulated their dress to achieve a similar goal as this individual explained,

Like you know if you see me walking off casual and not decent and then you see the guy wearing baggy jeans and wearing a hoody, who would you feel comfortable standing or walking behind or around on the street. The guy with the hoody, or the guy that’s just casual, clean cut whatever whatever, right. So fix your dress code. Like you know make people feel comfortable to be around you. Interviewee 41

Individuals documented as employing the reflexive pattern of identity work used self-regulation, thus, as a way to monitor their own actions and behaviours to avoid triggering their “convict” self, and to present the new self as belonging and fitting within general society. They
de-activated prison logics through different language and dress and sustained de-activation by regulating the environment and themselves to avoid employing logics in interaction.

**De-identification and Persistent Identification**

The reflexive identity work activities of opening up, getting critical and self-regulating all focused on separating the current self from the past: they were focused on identity change. It is this focus on change of self that enabled these actors to de-identify with prison logics and envision a new version of self. The men using these identity work activities were rarely documented activating prison logics in their definitions of current self. However, while they de-identified with prison logics they did not “shed” prison logics as they still activated them in reference to their past. As this interviewee demonstrated speaking about the street logics influence on him in the past,

Well it depends, like I was in a max, maximum if you know Milhaven it's a maximum security prison and I got stabbed up, I got in a fight with a guy, I got stabbed here, in my neck and in my head and you know, I wouldn't tell them who did it… I said screw you guys, and so they shipped me to a Max out in B.C. called Kent and I got into an altercation with somebody, I stabbed them, and then I got sent to the Super max. To the Shu, Its in Quebec, it's in des Plaines? And this happened years ago right, and since then I've come to realize that I don't have to, who do I gotta prove anything to these people. The people are nobody, not like they're family or friends. Interviewee 4

Blaming and differentiating as identity work activities, however, were focused on justifying current identity rather than on change. They activated prison logics in their definitions of self currently, remaining identified with convict identities. As this interviewee demonstrated in his activation of a rehabilitation logics convict identity.

With me being an alcoholic right, when I drink I put up with nobody's bullshit. When I'm sober I'm fine. I can what do you call it; I'm able to hold my own. I'm able to establish right from wrong. I'm able to not be able to sweat, not be able to get overly excited. But when I drink right, I lose that ability to control. I lose that control… alcoholism is in fact a neurological and psychological illness. Interviewee 28
Figure 5 shows the frequency of prison logics coded per identity work pattern in the past and present.

**Figure 5: Frequency of Prison Logic Coded by Identity Work Pattern**

These two distinct identity work patterns thus had different implications for their identification with convict identities. Those in the defensive pattern were documented as activating prison logics to define self in the present, indicating a persistent identification of the convict identities, while those in the reflexive pattern were documented as activating prison
logics in reference to the past rather than the present. Their conceptions of self in the present and future were not constituted by the prison logics, indicating de-identification.

To summarize, the two different patterns of identity work the previously incarcerated utilized during the transition illustrate that institutional logics can have a resilient influence on identities even when they are dehumanizing and unproductive, but also that individuals can work to reflect and de-activate logics through identity work in order to de-identify with institutionally-prescribed identities. I found, nonetheless, that identity work, alone, was insufficient in explaining sustained de-identification. Reflexive patterns of identity work appeared to be enabled by both the presence of alternative targets or sources of identification, and emotion work. Furthermore, sustained de-identification through reflexive identity work was constrained by the absence of institutional materials and identity regulation. I discuss these enabling and constraining factors in detail below.

**ENABLING REFLEXIVE IDENTITY WORK: IDENTITY TARGETS AND EMOTIONS**


Prison is a total institution, and as a result the availability, attention and access to institutional logics other than prison logics is limited (Goffman, 1961). However, within this study some individuals were documented as attempting to connect, or reconnect, to alternate sources of identity while inside prison and then during their transition. Finding targets for identification reinforced reflexive identity work by making alternate views of the self available and accessible to activate in lieu of prison logics’ institutionally-prescribed convict identities. My analysis revealed three targets for identification prevalent in the interviews that worked as identity enablers: religion, work, and family (See Appendix 6 for additional illustrative quotes).
Religion. Those who targeted religion as a source of alternate identification discovered new ways of telling stories about themselves. Religion made available a script of redemption, wherein they could be a good person, God’s prodigal son, and thus mistakes could be forgiven.

The biggest thing in my life if I would have to say is, you know, I'm trying to stay connected with God. I'm absolutely thrilled to be back in the world, in life in a productive way. I believe that when I came out there was another side of me that wants to steal, that wants to get some clothes that I lost before and get back stuff. I asked God what is your will for me? And the willingness…God's will is certainly not for me to shoplift. Interviewee 23

It beats you down [incarceration and having been incarcerated] but you have to find your strength from within…I reach out to God and I keep myself spiritually grounded… You don't succeed without having God as a centrepiece or some form of a higher power to guide your steps. Knowing that there is a next side which is a dark side that could easily take you away and send you down those dark alleys. Right. So you have to know that. Interviewee 34

A spiritual or religious identity target allowed them to develop an identity beyond those prescribed by the institutionally available prison logics. Furthermore, by having a belief in the meaningfulness of life and “God’s” purpose, they could transition their convict identity to their new view of self. A religious target provided continuity or a storyline that made sense of the gap and transition between selves. For example, they had to walk off the path and into trouble to find their way to spirituality or God, God who was forgiving and would direct them towards a better future.

You know it's like the prodigal son when he left and you know he went through all that turmoil, and then he came home with, you know they were still willing to take him right. Interviewee 41

Don't know what changed but something spiritually entered my soul and I wanted to live again. Something wouldn't let me give up on myself. I found the heart to and the passion to try and be a father again and clear the wreckage of my past… A power greater than myself. You know, I couldn't do it on my own, you know. I needed a newfound spirit. I really believe I died there and was given a second chance at life being reborn into a new belief, you know? I had no other ideas how to live life anymore. Interviewee 16
In this sense, identifying with religion/spirituality enabled them to bridge the convict self to a new self as it made available and accessible a believable story and meaningful rationalization for how they could make sense of themselves as a productive member of society. Thus making a coherent self-narrative possible, something previous scholars have noted to be important in transitions (cf. Ibarra & Barbulescu, 2010).

**Work.** Another alternate identity target was work. The notion of work made available a productive vision of self, where they were individuals capable of contributing to society. Individuals who came to target work as a source of identity used this to redefine what they did while incarcerated, and thus it acted as a resource that enabled them to redefine the past.

So I would work in the kitchen from when I wake up to just afternoon and then the next shift would come in... I would be serving breakfast and lunch and then after that I would just go back to the dorm and do the rest of my time there. It wasn't cells, it was one room of bunk beds so it was open. It wasn't really a confinement type of thing. Interviewee 18

So I basically took care of the range for the sick people and I engaged with the nurses quite often, um for a year and say 6 months... it made me feel good to know that I actually done something good for somebody. Interviewee 6

Working provided them with a view of self that was about being more than a criminal, an addict, or a tough guy, it meant that they were capable of doing something worthwhile. Work thus assisted in deactivating the self associated with the convict identity prescribed by prison logics by making a new view of self as productive believable. Work gave them a positive sense of self while on the inside, and when released, they could use this experience to help them during the transition.

I'm being real to you here, sometimes I just have to say that I've been working right… it’s just, for instance: on my resume they ask for work experience. I was working while I was incarcerated. So what I did was put what I was doing in there. Interviewee 40
Work enabled the previously incarcerated to envision themselves as members of society and activated alternate ways of seeing oneself beyond the convict identities prescribed by prison logics.

**Family.** Individuals in the reflexive pattern were also documented repeatedly referring to family. It was in their role as family members, whether fathers, husbands, or cousins, that they were able to see different versions of themselves prescribed in these roles that they could identify with instead of selfdefinitions prescribed by the prison logics.

For some, the person they were, or believed they could be, when they were with their children motivated them to change, “I have a daughter that I need to be there for her. She's five years old and she needs her Dad in her life, so. I need to make changes with me before I can do that so this is where I stand right now” (Interviewee 6). More than that, however, family gave them energy, hope and a belief that there was another version of themselves that was not a criminal, victim, or tough guy. As this interviewee described, when being surprised at how he had the energy and joy to play.

I just had my daughter so that helps me a lot. Right? My daughter's five now so she's getting bigger. I think it's a cool age. Five is a cool age. Right? We do a lot of things. She's really, she's full of energy. I don't know where I get it from, right. Let's play this, let's dance, let's do this, we do that, right, but it's fun, I like... it keeps me going, right. It keeps me going. Interviewee 8

One interviewee described how the experience of becoming a father was what inspired him to turn his life around, as he came to realize that he could play a positive role in her upbringing.

You know I'm the most stable thing this little girl has believe it or not. And this is me a guy who's done like seventeen years time. I mean if you would see the people that are supposed to be taking care of her... They weren't the ones changing her diapers... waking up five times a night to get her bibaba or anything like that. That was me. When the mother is out smoking crack and doing what she did, you know, I stayed there... I never had children and stuff like that before, so I wasn't even thinking about going straight, if that makes sense. And it's all these kids that you know made me kind of hang
up my guns or whatever, just you know, and now I'm doing the right things. Interviewee 35

Family enabled the incarcerated to envision a positive role they could play in society as a parent or family member. For others who had previously identified themselves in a family role, the loss of this identity during incarceration triggered the desire to reactivate and return to this version of self.

I think there was just a lot of, when I was incarcerated I lost a lot of contact with my spouse. She was separated and I lost contact with my family and stuff, and that helped me to realize that you know, life is so much more than just going on a party and doing criminal activities and stuff like that and selling drugs. Life is worth so much more and it made me do a lot of thinking in there this time and realize that I don't want to be on that path. Interview 42

Family was thus as an alternate identity target which enabled participants to activate notions of self beyond the convict identities as criminals, addicts, and tough guys defined and prescribed by prison logics. As parents or spouses they had a meaningful purpose that they could hold onto as they envisioned a new future for themselves.

In summary, de-identification with institutionally-prescribed identities can be enabled through identity targets. Alternate identity targets enabled the creation of storylines of self that involved redefining the past and envisioning alternative selves for the future. Alternative logics, thus, provided a meaningful way to support conceptions of self in the present as being distinct from the past. However, my analysis revealed that targeting these identities was conditioned upon two factors. The first was that they had to be available and accessible. Not all of the incarcerated men had family, similarly not all of the men had access to work while incarcerated nor had they been able to secure employment previously. “Most places I'm not allowed to because of all my misconducts” (Interviewee 44). In short, those who were able to identify with new targets were those to whom these alternatives were available and accessible. Furthermore,
the alternate logics needed to be meaningful and believable. Even if a religious target was available and accessible, for some this had no meaning, the religious self and story of redemption was not believable.

I know there's some people, a lot of people turn to religion when they're in there. I never was the one to turn to religion when I was in there, so. If I wasn't so hard into that when I was outside why would I do that when I was inside. That's not right. Interviewee 1

Likewise, targeting a family role for some was not meaningful if the family they did have had given up on them or stopped interacting with them “I got no more further relatives around except for my father [who] has totally walked out of my life last year. So it's kind of hard” (Interviewee 22). Those targeting religion, work, or family as sources of identification found ways to make sense of their new selves in believable and meaningful ways: getting clean by becoming a father, god awakening and saving their soul, and working on the inside just like on the outside.

By having alternate identities that were available, accessible, meaningful and believable, the saliency of prison’s convict identities was reduced. To the extent alternate views are available to define self, prison logics can be de-activated through reflexive identity work in developing alternative visions of self. Figure 6 documents the frequency by which individuals in the distinct identity work patterns were documented as referring to alternate identity targets.

**Getting Past Anger to Acceptance: The Role of Emotion Work**

My analysis documented the previously incarcerated as expressing a variety of emotions in regard to the experience of incarceration and transition back into society, suggesting that identification with convict identities had emotional implications as well more cognitive ones. Across both patterns, individuals consistently expressed feelings of fear and shame, as these interviewees illustrate:
There's certain things like you know, when I saw that truck pull up in front of my place, charitable donation for the needy, oh my God what if they know anything. But I'm from f*ckin jail. I just got all this furniture. So there's an embarrassment right. My self esteem, my pride. I didn't want my neighbours to see that sh*t. I'm trying to come off pretending like I'm normal. Interviewee 32

I'm afraid. Q: Of what? A: That my past will come out to society and will haunt me for the rest of my life. Interviewee 28

Shame and fear seemed to be ubiquitous components of their identification with convict identities. Feelings of anger, acceptance and faith, however, differed across the two patterns. Individuals in the defensive pattern expressed feelings of anger more than those in the reflexive pattern appearing to stay in emotional stasis as they locked-into anger as an emotional state. Individuals in the reflexive pattern, however, were documented as engaging in emotion work to accept their situation, they worked to release anger and establish faith in their future. In what follows I review these distinctions (see Appendix 7 for additional illustrative quotes).

**Emotional stasis: staying angry.** The individuals who were documented employing the defensive pattern of identity work expressed a great deal of anger towards society and the corrections system. Many of the previously incarcerated individuals interviewed had suffered trauma and abuse at the hands of others, and faced various injustices within and outside of
corrections. The individuals in the reflexive pattern were documented as speaking about acceptance and moving past these experiences and their feelings of anger. However, individuals in the defensive pattern seemed to hold onto anger regarding these events. They often expressed anger towards responsible individuals, as this interviewee demonstrated: “when you go for parole and they deny you. You Bastards!” (Interviewee 13).

In the bucket they're all idiots [corrections officers] and I would crush their face in if they gave me even the slightest chance. I would fight every one of them. I have, they've fought me if you want to call it that. I would call it punched me out. I do not like them. I do not like their swagger. I don't like the way they treat us like dogs. And everything about them they're like the lowest form of being, they're maggots. I do not like them at all. Interviewee 15

You know they're liars and they did hurt me. They really scarred me for life...I mean like you know we had this one worker guy that worked at this foster home, and I think I followed that guy for about four months, and I was just going to beat him senseless with a pipe. I thought to myself you know, if I get my hands on you buddy, you're done. You're done, because I'm going to beat you and beat you and beat you. I didn't do that though, you know, but I mean at the time I really wanted to. Interviewee 27

During the interviews many of these individuals were visibly angry as they expressed their rage and frustration at the system, and attempted to explain it to me.

I know he did on purpose because I have bad record history… but I am not. I don't belong with that history. Just they accuse me and compare whatever it fitted it. Not reality. You understand? If somebody, especially when I was in for immigration, detain for 3 years, every 30 days you listen to the same story. Of course I have to get mad, I have reason. Interviewee 11

Anger was not only documented as being expressed in relation to certain individuals and injustices, but more generally. These individuals felt angry at the public, and were angry about being incarcerated, something that was observable in the interview process in addition to the analysis. As one interviewee explained, he felt angry “just putting up with people” (Interviewee 10). Another explained how the process of being incarcerated had made him angry.

It makes you worse, right. It makes you more angry than you already are, right. You're already in there, you're angry at yourself for putting yourself there. You're just always
tense because you're in that environment where you have to be on your toes so you're anxious, you're looking over your shoulder and then, you know, like the little things like that, that we're supposed to get and we don't get, right. It's just anger. Interviewee 21

It was not that individuals under the reflexive pattern did not feel angry or frustrated. Instead it became apparent that those in the reflexive pattern engaged in emotion work to deal with their anger by accepting their situation, and working to foster feelings of faith regarding their future. The defensive pattern was thus characterized by emotional stasis, rather than engagement in emotion work.

**Emotion work: acceptance and having faith.** The individuals documented as employing a reflexive pattern of identity work often spoke about a change in their emotional state: an emotional transition. Interviewees specifically worked to deal with their emotions, engaging in emotion work above and beyond the identity work documented previously. Emotion work is “making a conscious, intended try at altering feeling” (Hochschild, 1979: 560). In particular, they worked to reign in their feelings of anger, or fear, and develop a sense of acceptance with their situation. As this interviewee indicated,

> It's almost like giving up anger, resentment, or the injustice... you know that may have been infringed upon yourself, being incarcerated. Maybe you didn't do anything, or maybe it's not as serious what society deems it... I think it can be beneficial because I can say that, you know, I've been in a spot where I found it hard to cope with how I felt and feeling just, the negative almost outweighing the positive. Being able to overcome that obstacle and still move ahead. Interviewee 12

These individuals were keenly aware of the frustration and anger that they felt, but they actively worked to accept it. Some worked towards acceptance because being angry brought no change or reward, like this interviewee explained: “I've been getting pretty good at letting it run like down my back like a duck, you know. I can't change it. I just deal with it. If they want to say no they can say no, you know. You can't get mad. It accomplishes nothing” (Interviewee
37). Others embraced their previous feelings and accepted them as part of a learning and growth process.

I'm at a stage where I see myself doing something, and the bigger picture is I want to be at this part of my life, and by me sitting here arguing with you, complaining and crying, is that going to help me attain that goal? Like you know as much as I, I don’t deserve the amount of time that I got, I'm not washing out. And I say you know what, if you don't learn from it how are you going to overcome it? Like you have to understand and realize okay, you're here for a reason. What is your reason? Because you can go inside and come back out and be freakin miserable because you felt you got ripped off. Or you can go in and not focus on the fact that okay, yes I was being treated unfairly. What did I get from it?... Interview 40

These are the gifts that were given to me because of my surrender to just trying to do the right thing and you know staying clean and helping others, and most of all helping myself move ahead right. But you know what, I have no resentment towards being incarcerated. All they did was help me actually… everybody has problems. So I mean incarceration wise, hey I have no shame. I have no shame in my game no more because of where I've been. Sure it's cost me a lot of time and I'm pretty sure I missed out on a lot of things in my life, but you know what, I'm still young. I mean I can get all that back, you know. You know what, I have, I'm doing well so there's no resentments towards that and I don't feel any guilt and shame in that anymore. I used to at one point but I don't anymore. Interviewee 41

This idea of surrender highlights how participants worked towards acceptance of their situations and the injustices they experienced to release and move beyond the anger they felt as a result.

In addition, individuals in the reflexive pattern used positivity to foster a feeling of faith and confidence for the future, “I have a belief, I got dreams, I got hopes, I have faith that I'm coming out” (Interviewee 23). This emotion work was like a form of emotion-laden self-talk where they showcased their belief in themselves despite the difficulties they faced.

Cause this time I'm not gonna slip, I'm not gonna fall. I'm gonna stay focused...I'm going to change and there is nothing that's gonna stop me this time, nothing. I've just, I've, I've, I've had it, I'm tired, I'm so done. Interviewee 6

Basically just stick to yourself. It will get better eventually, like, the whole overwhelming stresses and all that stuff will get better. Interviewee 1
As a result individuals in the reflexive pattern were documented as having significantly more expressions of confidence and faith than those in a defensive pattern. This is shown in Figure 7 alongside the other documented emotional expressions by identity work pattern.

**Figure 7: Emotions Expressed by Identity Work Pattern**

To summarize, the experience of transitioning back into society involved not only identity work, but emotion work as well. Individuals in the defensive pattern expressed markedly more anger than those in the reflexive work pattern. The emotional experience of anger, shame and fear, seemed to be consistent emotional states that all interviewees experienced. However, those engaging in reflexive identity work, broke free from anger to accept it and embrace feelings of confidence and faith. This finding suggests that perhaps not only do individuals need to de-activate identification through reflexive identity work but that de-identification requires a change in emotional state. Emotion work can enable reflexive identity work, while emotional stasis can constrain it.

These findings provide evidence that the activation of logics can trigger emotional reaction and response. It has been suggested individuals can have emotional investment in logics
(Pache & Santos, 2013), but so to may they have emotional experiences of them. Prison logics may be defined by the emotions that they invoke in those identities they discipline and define: shame, anger, and fear. Individuals in the reflexive pattern engaged in emotion work to release the anger they felt as a result of their convict identities. It was these individuals that were able to de-activate prison logics and de-identify with convict identities. When transitioning to new institutional contexts, the emotional residue of identification with a logic and its associated prescribed identity, may influence the resilience of that logic on processes of de-identification. In this sense, working on emotions, not just cognition, can be an important step in being able to de-identify with institutionally-prescribed identities and develop new conceptions of self.

**CONSTRAINTS TO DE-IDENTIFICATION: INSTITUTIONAL MATERIAL AND IDENTITY REGULATION**

I have shown how individuals can successfully de-identify with the convict identities institutionally prescribed by prison logics. This work was documented by individuals adopting a reflexive identity work pattern as they opened up, got critical, and self-regulated to discover and believe in a possible new identity. The individuals adopting a reflexive identity work pattern targeted new sources of identification making new versions of self available, accessible, meaningful and believable. They engaged in emotion work to manage or transform anger into acceptance and faith. My findings suggest that these cognitive and emotional elements are identity enablers for the reflexive identity work pattern. However, my analysis also reveals a limitation to de-identification through emotion work and the processes of identity work and novel identification: materiality and identity regulation. In what follows I detail these identity constraints; Appendix 8 includes additional illustrative quotations.
“Object”ifying Self: The Role of Institutional Material

Institutional material is defined as objects that act as the physical manifestations of institutions and their associated logics, and signify belonging or membership to them. I find that for a logic to remain de-activated there needs to be the material to sustain and support this transition and associated identity work. As Friedland (2001: 141) stated, institutional logics “must be made material in order to signify” since “materials enable the durability of institutions” (Jones et al., 2013: 55). My analysis revealed that without institutional material to reinforce new cognitive appraisals of self, prison logics remain activated, or were reactivated, and individuals cycled back into identification with convict identities. For the previously incarcerated their struggles to transition back into society were markedly about not having materials they felt signified belonging. Not having the material markers of being a productive member of society, be it worker or family member, reinforced notions of self from the prison logics (as worthless, helpless, or cheated) whether or not they worked to erode these views. As this interviewee explained,

My low self-esteem. Having nothing, like, my friends that are my age, they have houses, they have cars. I know its material but, you know, it's nice to have something anyway, something to show that you've worked, you know, hard all your years… Interviewee 8

A car or house represented evidence of productive work in society, something he lacked. For the previously incarcerated it was not necessarily what the material enabled them to do, but what the material represented.

Like I want a car now… I don't want to look like a fall down to my cousins and nephews and you know what I mean. Like how do you explain that right? Like oh, I'm an idiot you know... Interviewee 38

Items such as cars, houses, clothes were signifiers of productive membership in society and without them, they felt like they did not belong.
I know I'm not a kid, you look around you own nothing, and the people who are the same age and at least they got a car, they got this they got that... I want a car, I want normal that's what I want. I want it normal... Interviewee 35

For these men, not being a convict was more than just thinking of themselves differently, material items were physical evidence of their belonging to a different identity. Feelings of being, for example, a father were eroded by not having the material markers to signal this role.

You know, a lot of these people have kids and you know I mean they have a partner and you know people want to live good. You want to be able to go eat. You want to be able to take your car on the road, you want to go to the movies. You want to be able to buy your kids you know, what they might want. And I think one of the biggest problems is just being able to do that... Interviewee 20

Thus, despite the work many of the participants did to think about themselves and their futures differently, the lack of institutional material to support this view of self often led to hopelessness and frustration which worked to undermine the visions or stories of self.

At points it was very emotional... You know like... I would be kind of very very sad, and when you got sad, then it got really, really depressing...being out with nothing. Having to start from scratch again. You know how many times I have bought houses and furnished them and lost them all. The cars I've gone through. How much money has gone through my hands. Interviewee 6

Often the feelings of despair and hopelessness surrounding having nothing reminded them of how easy it would be to obtain these materials if they reverted to their convict self.

I wish I had a better place for my kids and I wish I had a half decent career. I wish... I wish I had normal, you know what I mean. I'm right back to where I begun... I'm looking for, right now I'm subletting an apartment... I have to find another apartment. I have no f*ckin job. I feel like I just got out yesterday, you know what I mean. That's how I feel right and I can't go to any of my old ways. You know I can't. I can't go and take the money I got and go buy drugs and flip it... I can't do any of this shi#t anymore. So it's hard...You just can't come overwhelmed, you can't let that push you over the edge right...Interview 35

The accessibility of knowing one way to escape the shame and feeling of not belonging served to make salient these versions of themselves, highlighting how quickly they could slip back to that
identity: “you feel like, you know, kind of like you want to go…do what you need…that you know how to do and it's not always the best thing... (Interviewee 20)

While it is clear that de-identification with convict identities was enabled through a reflexive identity work pattern and access to alternate identity targets, my findings suggest that without access to institutional material that objectify these views of self, prison logics are likely to remain activated, or be re-activated, preventing sustained de-identification with the associated institutional identities. The lack of material, the feeling of having nothing, kept prison logics accessible even if they were not activated by participants through use. Furthermore, not having the material to support their identification with religion, work, or family targets forced them to reconsider whether they really “were” that person. For example, as the aforementioned quotes show how feelings of being a father can be eroded by not having institutional material markers to signal this role. Thus, it is not that the lack of institutional material prevents de-identification, but rather that it appears to make prison logics more salient by keeping them highly accessible. Not “having” constantly triggers evaluations that involve: knowing they could fix the problem if they adopted a criminal activity, feelings of worthlessness and shame for what they have been unable to achieve, and desires to use substances to avoid dealing with the situation and associated feelings. Even for those who had no plan on engaging in criminal behaviour or substance abuse, they remembered how easy it would be to do so to solve the problems. In this way, the lack of material seems to heighten identification, or trigger reidentification with prison logics and convict identities since they are reminded of why they have nothing and what they have usually done when confronted by this feeling. It is in this way that institutional materials worked as identity constraints on sustained de-identification.
Identity Regulation: Labelled as an Ex-Con

Despite the cognitive and emotional work individuals in the reflexive pattern engaged in to de-identify with the institutionally-prescribed convict identities, and to find and elaborate new visions of self, they felt society still labelled and identified them as ex-convicts. As this interviewee explained: “they think it makes you a bad person or a tough person or whatever… oh a jailbird, a con, whatever right” (Interviewee 17). The previously incarcerated I interviewed revealed how, despite being able to see themselves as something beyond a convict, they felt many in society could not.

Even when you get out of jail, it's embarrassing when you tell people, like okay, when I was in jail for – I remember when I was in jail for 10 months, that's a long time. You come back from the jail and you forget, you tell certain people and they look at you like you're a criminal, you know what I mean? Oh that guy’s dangerous, he's been in jail. It's not like that you know what I mean? Interviewee 14

In this way the convict identity was activated in interaction with others beyond themselves, making this identity continually accessible and available. Daily life was full of constant reminders of who society thought they were.

You tell someone you were in jail, they'll treat you differently. Where did you just come from? Oh, I was in jail. You? Really? You know what I tell people when I came home, that haven't seen me in a while, where have you been? I just got out. Got out from where. I was in jail. You were in jail? They jump up, like, what did you do? Don't worry man, I won't do nothing to you, relax, relax. So it's like people think of you differently cause you …. They all label us as one right? Interviewee 7

Well, you know, there's so many things that stop you as soon as you get a criminal record. That's it. You're labelled and you have to, every job application wants to know that. Q: How does that label affect you personally? A: Well, nobody wants to trust you, you've been in prison for stealing, they don't want you in their place…It means you're labelled; you're an ex-con. Interviewee 13

Being labelled was frustrating and difficult because they felt as if who they were or were trying to be now did not matter. To society they were a convict,
I've gone to job interviews and everything was so smooth and they liked it and then the criminal background check, the criminal record. No. No. So everybody is looking at this record, he's a bad person. Interviewee 40

Identity regulation “encompasses the more or less intentional effects of social practices upon processes of identity construction and reconstruction”, it occurs when definitions of self become imposed, constrained or defined by those external to the self (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002: 626). Identity regulation is, thus, an externally-imposed form of identity work. Labelling regulated who the incarcerated felt they could be, and, thus, it was a type of external, institutional-level, identity work that regulated and implicitly enforced and activated convict identities. The previously incarcerated men wanted to be embraced as somebody other than the convict, “I mean nobody's perfect. We all have our negative that I think these people really need to understand that. To let them know that you're still a human being, you're still a person and somebody in the world still loves you, you know” (Interviewee 20). Yet they felt that much of society still actively defined them differently.

As discussed previously, those in the reflexive pattern engaged in identity and emotion work to accept themselves and their pasts giving them confidence and faith in the future. It was not that the label and stigma of being an ex-con was insurmountable for them cognitively and emotionally, but rather that these constant reminders of their previous selves resulted in prison logics and the convict identity being readily available and accessible making re-identification more likely as they tried to engage with society. Their personal identity work, thus, was in constant battle with the externally-imposed identity work labelling them. In this way identity work was able to break down the resilience of repressive logics at an individual level, but not at the institutional level. These individuals did not change the ways in which the previously incarcerated were defined in society and they had to live within the constraints of being labelled
an ex-con. This labelling, therefore, was a form of identity regulation that essentially forced the convict identity to remain sedimented as a residual view of self since the institutional environment would not let them completely shed it. While identity work has often been conceptualized as agentic, and even heroic at times, this study reveals the opportunities for some self-agency but also the institutional constraints that disable agency and the potential for institutional change or transformation.

In summary, my analysis revealed that individuals transitioning from prison back into society worked to de-identify with the institutionally-prescribed convict identities they came to identify with while incarcerated. Some men were unable to de-identify with these identities as they continued to use them to make sense of themselves upon release, thus employing a defensive pattern of identity work. De-identification was possible, however, through the engagement of a reflexive identity work pattern where these men opened up, got critical and practiced self-regulation, imagining new possibilities for self beyond the bad guy, victim, or tough-convict identities. Reflexive identity work was documented within those individuals who found alternate targets for identification within and outside of prison and who engaged in emotion work to release anger and engender feelings of acceptance and faith in themselves and the future. Findings reveal, however, that there were identity constraints on the ability of reflexive identity work to sustain de-identification with convict identities and associated prison logics. In the absence of institutional materials to support and objectify new identities, convict identities are easily reactivated. Furthermore, as convict identities continued to be labelled and enforced on these men despite their own de-identification, this externally-imposed identity work left them with a residual convict identity that remained accessible and available and was more likely to be reactivated.
DISCUSSION

Features of De-identification and Persistent Identification

This dissertation has revealed that individuals who are required, encouraged, or desirous of finding a new version of self and who want to de-identify with unproductive identities prescribed by dominant institutional logics, can either de-activate logics and de-identify with associated identities or remain in a state of persistent identification with them.

De-identification was documented as a logic de-activating process that had notable features. It was observed within those individuals engaged in a reflexive-identity work pattern, who also found accessible, available, believable and meaningful identity targets, and practiced emotion work. More specifically, reflexive-identity work enabled them to de-activate public safety, rehabilitative, and street logics in their present or future definitions of self. Alternative identity targets allowed them to create storylines that made sense of their transition and gave them visions of who they could be, rather than of who they had been, and emotion work let them accept the past and have faith in the future. Alternative identity targets and emotion work were thus identity enablers that supported the capacity to engage in reflexive identity work and de-activate prison logics influence on current conceptions of self.

What was consistent across all of the cognitive and emotional activities in the reflexive pattern, was a projective time orientation where self was separated into past and future. In this way, the old self had a location but not one that prevented them from envisioning a new self that was not defined by prison logics and convict identities. The previously incarcerated in this pattern, thus, became focused on identity change, on who they would become, and their vision was based on feelings of faith that this was possible. Thus, my findings reveal that de-identification occurs through logic de-activation which is enacted through reflexive identity
work, supported by identity enablers, and is defined by a projective time orientation, a focus on identity change, and feelings of faith.

On the other hand, persistent identification was a logic activating process where versions of self remained focused and attached to prison logics. It was observed within individuals who engaged in defensive-identity work that activated prison logics by relying on their use in order to define self and situation presently. There was a consistent retrospective time orientation where efforts were spent justifying and explaining self rather than projecting a new self. This meant these individuals were more focused on identity stability as they worked to make their convict identities more desirable or acceptable by blaming them on others or differentiating themselves from “worse” others. Instead of having faith in the future, these individuals were angry at the past and in a state of emotional stasis. As a result, I suggest that persistent identification with undesirable or unproductive identities occurs through logic activation which is enacted through defensive identity work and is defined by a retrospective time orientation, a focus on identity stability and emotional stasis. These features of de-identification and persistent identification are modelled in Figure 8.

In addition to identifying features of de-identification and persistent identification, however, my findings reveal more complexity to sustain de-identification than individual’s emotional and cognitive work. In what follows, I elaborate the institutional dynamics of de-identification.

**Internal versus External Logic Activation: Institutional Dynamics of De-identification**

According to theorizing by Pache and Santos, identification with logics and associated identities hinges on activation of that logic through use and interaction, and once activated it forms the blueprint for the sense of self (Pache & Santos, 2013). Similarly, in this dissertation it
Figure 8: Model of De-identification
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was found that de-identification appears to be possible to the extent a logic is de-activated through a pattern of reflexive-identity work and supported by alternate identity targets and emotion work. This de-activation was *internal*, as actors purposefully limited the use of prison logics and worked to find new ways to describe and define themselves in the present. Similarly, men in the defensive pattern were documented as internally activating prison logics through use and definition of self, maintaining the identities associated with prison logics.

In addition, however, my findings revealed that the activation of logics was not only internal. De-identification was constrained to the extent that the incarcerated felt 1) they did not have the material markers to support an alternate identity, and 2) society continued to forcibly act on identities engaging in externally-imposed identity work labelling them as ex-cons. Material and identity regulation worked as identity constraints that continually activated or re-activated prison logics and associated convict identities. The activation of logics triggered via material and identity regulation, however, was external, being driven from the environment rather than their own activities. A logic is activated through use in interaction (Pache & Santos, 2013; Thornton et al., 2012), and my findings suggest that use can be triggered from the individual or the environment. Accordingly, I propose that logic activation can occur internally but also *externally*. External activation through institutional material (or the lack thereof) and identity regulation thus plays an important role in logic resilience. In this sense, you cannot just think yourself out of an identity. De-identification has to be supported and enabled with institutional material, and allowed to be sustained without external activation. I propose it is when there is external activation *and* internal activation that we can expect institutional logics to have the most resilient influence on identities, as was the case within individuals in the defensive-identity work pattern: the logic(s) and its associated identity remain salient. However, when there is external
activation and internal de-activation de-identification is possible for individuals but it is difficult to sustain without constant effort and work. In these situations, I propose logics and associated identities are not shed but become sedimented within self, remaining accessible even when not activated. Finally, sustained de-identification from inappropriate and unproductive identities is most likely when there is minimal external activation and high levels of internal de-activation. While this was not in evidence in this study, in these cases we could predict that logics and identities may be similarly sedimented within self, but remain latent and potentially become less accessible after prolonged periods of de-activation.

Pache and Santos’ (2013) theorizing suggested that activation is necessary for identification. These findings, however, reveal that the reverse is not true. I propose that internal de-activation does not result in the complete shedding or loss of an old self, instead the identity and associated logic becomes latent but sedimented within the self. That is, the identity and logic remain available and accessible but not activated. This sense of sedimentation has been hinted upon by Ebaugh (1988: 5) when she wrote about ex-roles, the “past identification with a social category or role lingers in one form or another throughout the lives of role exiters leaving them with a ‘hangover identity’”. I suggest, thus, that an identity associated with a logic becomes sedimented when the understanding of self and the associated patterns of rationality are de-activated, but remain emotionally and cognitively available and accessible. The knowledge and feeling the previously incarcerated had in regards to all prison logics did not go away, de-activation through identity work, alternate identity targets, and emotion work prevented it from being used to define self in the present but did not eliminate the awareness of that possible or past self. They still knew how to enact a convict identity, they knew how it felt and what it meant to be a convict. Thus when an identity is sedimented the “degree to which knowledge comes to
mind” (Thornton et al., 2012: 83) from that source logic is still salient. A sedimented identity remains in our repertoire of available roles, behaviors and sets of knowledge, but is simply unused. This is distinct from being a novice or familiar with a logic, the terms Pache and Santos used to describe an individual’s relationships with logics that are not activated. In both of these capacities logics are not accessible nor were they previously identified with. Accordingly, sedimentation is a distinct and conceptually relevant addition to existent theorizing on individual’s relationships with logics. See Table 5 for a visual extension of Pache and Santo’s framework.

What these findings show, contrary to current theorizing (Pache & Santos, 2013), is that the identity associated with a logic can remain available and accessible even when it has been internally de-activated. I suggest inappropriate or unproductive logics and their associated identities become sedimented (Creed et al., 2014) within the self rather than being shed during periods of transition. It is thus sedimented relationships with logics where we might expect the environment or situation to trigger external reactivation.

Table 5: Sedimentation, an Addition to Theorized Relationships between Individuals and Institutional Logics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Familiar</th>
<th>Sedimented</th>
<th>Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability (knowledge and information that people have)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility (degree to which knowledge comes to mind)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation (degree to which knowledge is used in social interaction)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dark grey marks the addition to original Pache and Santos’ (2013) table

This potential for reactivation is what makes de-identification fragile and tenuous. Consequently, I suggest that the resilient influence of logics lies in their ability to become sedimented to one’s
sense of self, leaving the residue of that logic regardless of its activation and the current situation. The previously incarcerated continued to carry the convict identities despite believing in alternative selves and being in situations that demanded them to change. The model associated with this theorizing around de-identification is detailed in Figure 8. It suggests that our understanding of engagement with logics and their influence on identity requires an internal and external focus, and that logics may be sedimented rather than shed when identification has occurred previously. In what follows, I detail the contributions these findings make to extant literature on institutional logics and identity.

**DISSERTATION CONTRIBUTIONS**

**Microfoundations: Identity and Logics**

In one of the more comprehensive and intense examinations of the relationship between identities and logics, Pouthier and colleagues (2013) studied the ways in which a hospitalist collective identity became detached from the original logic it was associated with. This study reveals, as other scholars have (Lok, 2010; Rao et al., 2003), that actors actively work to maintain their identities when logics change, or become out of favour. This paper builds on the important examination of identities and logics purported by these scholars, but does so in a different way. It is clear that actors are able to manipulate and work with their identities in response to logic shifts (Lok, 2010; Pouthier et al., 2013; Rao et al., 2003), but less clear is how actors can manipulate their identities when the logics do not change but are no longer relevant or desirable. How do actors shed or de-identify with identities shaped by unproductive logics? My findings suggest that the resilience of institutional logics may be a product of the extent to which they become internalized within the identity. It is the identity that may be hard to shed, a logic’s long-lasting impact and ability to move between institutions is, thus, dictated by the extent to
which it remains sedimented within identities. I suggest that this sedimentation process creates logic residue wherein actors’ identities can remain, in many ways, influenced by the original logic they no longer are surrounded by or embedded within. This suggestion could also explain Pouthier and colleagues’ (2013) findings, which revealed that hospitalists were able to detach their identities from the managed-care logic so easily because their self-identities had already been shaped by the residue of a medical logic they were disciplined and socialized into within medical schools. The managed-care logic was not the source of their identification. To the extent a logic is employed as a rationalization or rhetorical device to support an identity or objective, rather than a means to define self, it can be expected to be less resilient and easier to manipulate. That is, a logic used without its associated role identity being internalized or sedimented within self, will not be as sticky as logics sedimented within identities. This helps to explain some of the discrepancies within literature that finds actors playing with logics and actors defending them (cf. Marquis & Lounsbury, 2007; McPherson & Sauder, 2013).

However, my findings further elaborate the microfoundations of institutions and the resilience of the relationship between identities and logics, by revealing the possibilities and limits to agentic identity work for both shifts in logics and identity. In alignment with scholars like Creed, Dejordy and Lok (2010) and Lueng, Zietsma and Peredo (2014), I found that identity work can aid actors in overcoming and transcending the identity prescriptions by dominant institutions and their logics. In this sense, identity work is the process by which actors can alter and reconceptualize views of self beyond those defined by dominant institutional logics. However, I reveal how this agency is materially constrained, and, in opposition to, any external identity regulation work prevalent in society. I thereby suggest that institutional material and identity regulation are two under-documented identity constraints that influence the resilience of
institutional logics. In highlighting the external influence on logic activation, I suggest the importance of considering the internal and external elements that influence the possibilities of identity work. Furthermore, however, I expand on Pache and Santos’ (2013) prediction that identity relationships with logics are shaped by activation, to detail the distinction between internal and external activation and their different influences on processes of de-identification and logic resilience. Most studies examining the relationship between logics and identities have focused either on internal or external activation, and my findings suggest that future studies need to consider the dynamic ways in which internal and external activation interact to provide opportunities and constraints for change and transformation of identity and logics. This dissertation thus contributes to the growing focus on the microfoundations of institutional life, by highlighting that logic activation and identity sedimentation are central mechanism of logic resilience and reveals the work with which individuals can engage to resist and break down institutional influence, pinpointing reflexive-identity work, identity targets, and emotion work as important components of individual agency, and identity regulation and limited materiality as a significant constraints. By highlighting both the enabling components of agency and their constraints, I help explain some of the discrepancies in the field regarding the resilience of logics on identity.

Microfoundations: Logics as Tools

McPherson and Sauder (2013: 167) recently suggested that:

[L]ogics serve as tools that can be by actors in a contested environment to influence decisions, justify activities, or advocate for change. The same logic, for example, could be used in different situations to achieve opposite goals, and the same actor may choose to employ different logics at different times depending on the perceived needs of the immediate situation.
This view represents the growing body of work which conceptualizes institutional logics as toolkits (Binder, 2007; Christiansen & Lounsbury, 2013b; Durand et al., 2013; Smets & Jarzabkowski, 2013; Voronov et al., 2013). My work, however, challenges these findings and suggests that there are very real constraints to the ways in which logics can be manipulated and interchanged. The previously incarcerated in this study actively needed to de-identify with logics to foster new versions of self and adopt a new identity as a society member, yet many were unable to. Extant theorizing has suggested that the ability to swap logics is a product of availability, accessibility, and the appropriateness of a logic to the situation (McPherson & Sauder, 2013; Thornton et al., 2012). Yet, in this study, the prison logics of corrections were no longer appropriate for their situation outside of jail, and even when alternate logics were available, just under half of the participants in this study continually activated prison logics. For some, this was because a family or work logic was not available. However, for others they could not find a believable version of self within alternate logics because those logics were not meaningful. My theorizing suggests, therefore, that for actors to switch logics there needs to be more than availability, accessibility, and an appropriate situation: alternate logics have to be believable and meaningful to these actors and their projected or current sense of self. These two factors could help explain some of the differences between the actors within McPherson and Sauder’s (2013) study documenting the daily use of alternate logics. For the probation officers in their study, all four of the logics they traded between were believable and meaningful to them as probation officers; however to the clinicians the “criminal responsibility” logic may have been more difficult to render as a meaningful and believable logic and could be why they used this less than others. This could be a product of previous socialization or embeddedness in distinct domains, but the fundamental point is that it is not enough for a logic to be appropriate and
available – it needs to be meaningful and believable at a personal level. In this way, logics need to be able to fit into stories or narratives of self to be rendered as tools.

Beyond the internal work to activate alternate logics, my study also documents the ways in which swapping logics can be prevented or circumvented. Society can determine which logics are deemed appropriate for actors to adopt and regulate to ensure these prescriptions are conformed to. In this dissertation, this was documented through the identity regulation perceived by the previously incarcerated as prison logics were continually reactivated by labelling and designating these convict identities as the most appropriate for these individuals. Furthermore, however, the activation of logics requires the institutional material to support them. Actors cannot deftly switch between logics if they do not have the equipment to demonstrate their legitimacy and signal the appropriateness of the logic for their identity. For example, in Voronov, De Clercq and Hinings’ (2013) study of Ontario fine wine actors it was shown that these actors appeared to flexibly swap between logics, but a closer look shows that they had the material to support their use: they had land to support the use of a farmer identity; bottles and machines to support that of the artist; and money and profit statements to support that of the business professional. Similarly, while not theorized, most studies of logics as strategies involve actors having some access to material that can legitimize and with which they can objectify, that logic and their view of self. Institutional scholars have made a formal call to bring material into theorizing on institutional logics (Cloutier & Langley, 2013; Jones et al., 2013). As Jones, Boxenbaum and Callen (2013: 68) stated specifically, future research should explore how materials “may alter, stretch, or identify the boundaries of institutional logics”. My findings show that materiality plays an important role in establishing boundaries of enactment for institutional logics, and, thus, that the physical manifestations of logics can be equally important.
for activation as the cognitive and social rules that define them. The availability of institutional materials to support institutional logics also hints at one possible way that power and social inequality can prevent the possibilities of social transformation. Actors who understand and seek to target logics and their associated identities may be limited, not by their cognitive or social capability to adopt logics, but by the lack of opportunity to access the materials that objectify and make the logic real. Accordingly, my work proposes that the materiality of logics should be more closely examined in studies that seek to illuminate the constraining or enabling components of logics and their role in identity maintenance and change.

**Microfoundations: Emotions and Institutional Logics**

Recent scholars have proposed that institutional theory, and the institutional-logic perspective particularly, has become overly focused on the cognitive to the exclusion of the emotive (Creed et al., 2014; Friedland, 2013; Friedland, Mohr, Roose, & Gardinali, forthcoming; Toubiana, Zietsma, & Bradshaw, 2012; Voronov, forthcoming; Voronov & Vince, 2012). The premise of this theorizing is that actors develop cognitive and emotional attachments to institutions and their logics, and that this shapes the nature of their reaction to changes and shifts in logics (Toubiana et al., 2012). My findings contribute to this nascent field by providing evidence of the important role emotions can play in the processes of de-identification, and the resilience of institutional logics. Deactivating prison logics not only entailed deactivating the cognitive aspects of the logic in social interaction, but involved emotion work in order to transition between distinct emotional states. Activation of prison logics triggered feelings of shame, anger, and fear. My findings documented that those individuals deactivating prison logics and de-identifying with associated convict identities, engaged in emotion work to transcend feelings of anger associated with prison logics and foster feelings of acceptance and faith in the
future. This has two implications for our understanding of logics. One, I provide evidence that indeed logics may be comprised not only of norms, strategies, control mechanisms, sources of legitimacy, authority and identity, but that they also trigger emotional experiences, thus suggesting this is an area in need of further exploration in the literature. Two, I illuminate that the emotional content of logics can linger and result in emotional residue and stasis, above and beyond the residue left by the cognitive underpinnings of the logic. Identity work to de-activate logics, thus, or work to target new logics, inherently requires action to engage in an emotional transition to transcend logic-derived emotional states. This study showed how some of the previously-incarcerated used positivity and acceptance to transition from anger to faith, but future research could more closely examine the factors that influence the capacity of actors to engage in emotion work and the influence on processes of change for identity or logics.

Identity regulation was exercised at the institutional level and worked to label and define the previously incarcerated, thereby activating prison logics externally. This process has parallels to Creed and colleagues’ (2014) concept of systemic shame. Their theorizing highlighted how power structures and social context can trigger feelings of felt shame through processes of subjectification which influence conceptions of self and appropriate behaviours.

systemic shame shapes the people we become: subjects equipped with a sense of shame. So constituted and equipped, we are perpetually preoccupied with the ratification of our standing as valued persons (Scheff, 1990, 2005). In other words, systemic shame enlists us in ubiquitous processes of self-surveillance and self-regulation that underpin its disciplinary power. (Creed et al., 2014: 16)

While Creed and colleagues theorized shame as ubiquitous, my findings suggest shame when paired with emotions like anger and fear that are prevalent in extreme contexts like prisons, can lead to emotional stasis, an inability to transcend an emotional state; suggesting that finding ways to cope with shame or its affiliated emotions is important for identity growth, change, and de-activation of logics. Future studies might fruitfully examine the conditions under which
emotions strengthen institutional embeddedness versus when they might be broken down: more closely examining the role of shame as it is paired with different emotions and their associated identities and source logics.

**Total Institutions**

More broadly, this paper also contributes to institutional theory by examining an important institutional context left out of new institutional analysis for several decades. Total institutions “demonstrate in heightened and condensed form the underlying organizational processes that can be found, albeit in much less extreme cases, in more normal organizations” (Clegg, 2006: 427). Given the declared importance of extreme cases for generating theory (Eisenhardt, 1989; Pratt et al., 2006; Suddaby, 2006), the paucity of studies on total institutions is surprising. Calls continue to be made to bring greater attention to power in institutional analysis (Hardy & Maguire, 2008), yet there is no greater context in which to highlight these dynamics than total institutions where individuals are disciplined to fit into these environments: “the everyday mechanisms of authority and power were [are] much more evident than in the world of the corporate ‘organization man’” (Clegg, 2006: 427). This dissertation has examined how power plays out on the individuals embedded within institutional environments by showing how institutional logics can travel and constrain actors after exiting repressive contexts through identity regulation. In doing so, I have illuminated how individuals can become carriers of the very hegemony which disadvantages them. This has important implications for our understanding of inequality and social justice in institutions as institutional logics that reinforce these values can be difficult to de-activate and can remain in all aspects of society. It is through intentional reflexive identity work, connection to alternate logics and emotion work that the influence of logics may be broken down and transcended. Yet, without material resources to
support cognitive efforts, and in the presence of labelling and identity regulation, these logics and views of self are at continual risk of being reactivated.

**Identity Work and Transitions**

This paper makes important contributions to the literature on identity work and transitions. Identity work has been documented in a variety of settings by a variety of actors (Bruijn & Whiteman, 2010; Essers & Benschop, 2007; Kreiner et al., 2006; Snow & Leon, 1987; Thornborrow & Brown, 2009). Such work highlights identity work as a form of agency, or institutional work, that even the most marginalized actors can utilize to secure important identity outcomes (Brown & Toyoki, 2013; Creed et al., 2010; Leung et al., 2014; Snow & Leon, 1987; Toyoki & Brown, 2014). Yet research on identity work has been bifurcated and often referred to as a product of organizational and institutional control or individual agency. My findings parallel those by recent scholars who have suggested that identity work is a dynamic combination of both of these (Brown & Toyoki, 2013; Essers et al., 2013; Toyoki & Brown, 2014), reflecting the metaphor of struggle proposed earlier by Sveningsson and Alvesson (2003). Few studies on identity work, however, have explored the dynamic relationship between agency and control, and almost none have done so during periods of identity transitions. This is surprising as these periods of liminality and ambiguity are perhaps the most likely places where individuals are seeking to make sense of self but having to do so in the context of the institutions they were, and will be, embedded within. My research thus reflects the importance of bringing a multi-level perspective to identity theorization.

Toyoki and Brown (2014) conducted a qualitative investigation into the identity work of prisoners in a Helsinki prison and discussed, rather optimistically, the identity work these men were able to utilize to manage their stigmatized identities while incarcerated, despite identity
control and regulation. My findings, however, would suggest that the optimism of identity work’s agency and liberating capacity may need to be dampened when considered outside of the context of prison and during transition. More specifically, my work has the unique advantage of documenting these individuals in transition, and while some of them were engaged in identity work (in the case of the reflexive pattern) that enabled them to envision and construct new versions of self, the material realities they were faced with outside of prison place limitations on the effectiveness of this identity work in sustaining de-identification and alternative visions of self. These men found that they did not necessarily have the material to support or realize the views of self they envisioned through their identity work. My research thus encourages a healthy dose of realism to the idealism of identity work being a sole mechanism that enables people to think or talk ways out of institutional embeddedness and control. Without material, fantasies or idealized views of self cannot be realized, and work to keep these versions of self viable is in constant battle with the external identity work labelling them and defining who they can be. This struggle can be exhausting and disheartening, and reactivate old versions of self. I thus show support for the recent theorizing by Conroy and O’Leary-Kelly (2014) who proposed that new identities needed to be accepted within society to become permanent. Successful de-identification remains institutionally constrained and limited. My dissertation makes clear that transitions and de-identification may need more than identity work to ensure long-term success.

To date, conceptions of identity work have been highly cognitive. While a few scholars have shown that material pertaining to dress (Pratt & Rafaeli, 1997; Rumens & Kerfoot, 2009) office décor (Elshach, 2004) and place (Larson & Pearson, 2012) can signal identities, fewer have examined the role material plays in processes of identity work. This has resulted in perhaps an overly “heroic” view of the cognitive work of individuals, and has underestimated the
material constraints on individuals. In this paper, I have elaborated what may be considered a boundary condition of agentic identity work in transition, pushing beyond notions of “I think I can” metaphors to establish that conceptions of self need to be supported and embodied with institutional material.

Conroy and O’Leary-Kelly (2014) were one of the first to theorize the important role emotions may play in role transitions. While implicit in many studies, emotions have been surprisingly absent in studies of identity work and transition. The few exceptions include studies that have suggested that grief (Ainsworth & Hardy, 2009) or courage (Koerner, 2014) are aspects of identity work and that emotions can be an outcome of identity work (Beech, 2008). My dissertation follows the lead of Conroy and O’Leary-Kelly in proposing that emotions play an important, but understudied, role in identity dynamics. Conroy and O’Leary-Kelly suggested that if negative emotions such as anger and guilt are not regulated by an individual they will be unable to move past the loss of an identity. They theorized that the “liminal period ends when negative emotions are regulated and identity narratives are validated” (Conroy & O’Leary-Kelly, 2014: 80). My findings show support for their prediction regarding the importance of emotion work, but challenges the prediction that it is sufficient even in the context of validated narratives. As shown above, emotion work supported reflexive identity work that required material to support it. Emotional regulation, thus, plays one part in a complex dynamic interplay between self and system. Further research is needed to more closely examine the ways in which different emotions interact and influence processes of identity change and development.

My dissertation also makes contributions to the study of de-identification. While relatively under examined within the identity literature (Hakak, forthcoming), examinations of how individuals exit institutionally-defined roles is essential for our understanding of success in
role transitions more generally. Existing understandings of de-identification have drawn predominately on Ebaugh’s (1988) seminal work and on Ashforth’s (2001) extensions of it. In both of these models, a very linear-type process is outlined, and while variations from this have been acknowledged, the implicit suggestion is that, while difficult, de-identification is usually successful and people move on and adopt new productive versions of self. My research suggests differently. In particular, the previously incarcerated interviewed described a much messier process where some engaged in identity work to live with an unproductive identity despite its stigma and their doubts about self and awareness of alternatives, while others engaged in identity work to become a new self, but seemed to do so much less linearly and in a less “thought-out” manner than is described in theory as a clear series of steps; first doubt, seeking alternative, turning point, creating ex-role model. In many ways, both the reflexive and defensive identity-work patterns were more about surviving and/or trying to move on, then a clearly planned (or even unplanned) trip with a known destination. As a result, I suggest that in transitions from highly institutionalized contexts, de-identification processes can be expected to be less strategic and linear and more practice-based and messy.

My findings also expand upon the idea of role residual elaborated by Ebaugh (1988). She stated:

Exes tend to maintain role residual or some kind of “hangover identity” from a previous role as they move into new social roles. This role residual is part of self-identity and must be incorporated into current ideas of self. (Ebaugh, 1988: 5)

What my findings revealed is that the residue of logics and their role prescriptions that are sedimented into individuals’ sense of self, make sustaining de-identification difficult in the face of external activation of a past identity. Recent discussions have talked about how to create a version of self, through narrative work (Ibarra & Barbulescu, 2010) that includes the past, yet
sometimes the very presence of this past can prevent a person from moving forward. Accordingly, I propose that some individuals may be unable to de-identify with old identities, as others have suggested (Conroy & O'Leary-Kelly, 2014), and indicate that materiality may be an important variable that can aid in this process.

**Policy and Management Practice**

prisons are systems of near ‘total power’ (Sykes, 1958: xvi), permitting unique insights into contemporary processes of alienation and depersonalization and their implications for individuals… (Toyoki & Brown, 2014: 5)

This paper also makes important practical and managerial implications. Re-integration and “rehabilitation” of the previously incarcerated is a stated mandate of correction facilities within Canada. However, despite this, recidivism rates are still high (Baglole, 2004). In short, the re-integration of previously incarcerated individuals is a serious and practical problem facing society today as the previously incarcerated individuals’ success in making this transition not only has implications for their personal well-being, but for the safety of members of society. Furthermore, a growing proportion of individuals in contemporary society will face the challenge of integration after incarceration, as incarceration rates continue to grow across the world (Toyoki & Brown, 2014). This research has the potential to inform policy by revealing the types of work in which previously incarcerated individuals can engage as they try to make this transition, while also highlighting factors that may make some more successful than others. Particularly surprising from my findings is that despite the growth of the rehabilitative logic within corrections, as opposed to the more punitive public-safety logic, identification with this logic did not seem to aid in the discovery of new versions of self. This finding warrants further study and examination.
While unique in its context, my dissertation work has important implications for our understanding of management and entrepreneurship more generally by revealing important aspects of social transition within modern work organizations. As previous scholars have noted, as individuals become socialized into particular logics and their associated work roles, they can remain disciplined by their affiliation to previous institutions and roles even when they need to take on new ones. This has been particularly noted in innovative fields like social entrepreneurship where previous socialization into certain logics can act as a barrier to success (i.e Battilana & Dorado, 2010). This can lead not only to a reduction in work efficiencies or venture failure but to conflict, breakdown and personal difficulties. Accordingly, my research uses the prison context to reveal how individuals can come to de-activate dominant logics as meaning systems for self and embrace change and alternative views and opportunities, an absolutely necessary trait for entrepreneurs and organizations looking to innovate and change. In doing so, I also highlight the difficulties within such transitions and showcase the importance of finding alternate identities that are meaningful, believable and reinforced with material and external support.

LIMITATIONS

The benefits of an in-depth qualitative examination of a selective number of individuals, inherently comes with the short-coming of not providing a more broad scale and quantitative analysis of a large number of actors. This study focused on identity dynamics stemming from institutional influence, and as a result was focused on identifying the factors participants identified as relevant for their transition, sense of self and challenges in transition. However, there are a variety of factors that are relevant for issues related to criminal activity and recidivism.
that were not explored in this study such as ethnic background, upbringing, and socio-economic background that warrant attention in future studies.

My cross-sectional focus on the transitional period between release and reintegration enabled a fine-grained and detailed analysis of the identity-work during transition and its enabling factors, but did not shed light on the outcomes of this work beyond de-identification. Future work could take a more longitudinal approach to the study and examine individuals prior, during, and after transition and study the relationship between de-identification and recidivism, for example. This study also only studied men in prison, and while some similarities at the institutional level may be expected, some of the individual dynamics and identity-work patterns may differ for women. Examining the transferability of these findings to incarcerated women is a worthy future pursuit.

Finally, this study used an unconventional setting to highlight the dynamics of logic resilience and de-identification. The total nature of the prison institution places some limitations on the extent to which far-reaching conclusions can be drawn from this data. I suggest, however, that the key boundary condition of this study is a high level of institutionalization and a clearly defined role identity. Accordingly, I predict that there are many non-total institutions that fit these criteria and to which my findings can have relevance. For example, professionals such as doctors, accountants, chefs, soldiers, police officers, and ministers. In fact, I would argue given the strength of the corporate logic, business professionals such as CEOs face similar role expectations and constraints that come to shape their identity that could be hard to de-identify with when faced with macro-level transitions. Furthermore, adopting the view of Lincoln and Guba (1985), I suggest the transferability of these findings can be revealed by those who interact
with them, revealing the ways in which these dynamics make sense of the contexts within which they are involved.

**CONCLUSION**

Transitions in modern society are ubiquitous (Ashforth, 2001), and yet many of these transitions require individuals to de-identify with the identities associated with particular institutionalized roles as they are no longer optimal, productive, or appropriate in novel contexts. Surprisingly, we know little about de-identification, and the institutional influence on this process. In this dissertation, I have explored how actors de-activate and de-identify with the identities prescribed by institutional logics. My findings reveal that de-identification occurs through a logic-shifting dynamic of internal de-activation that is manifested through a reflexive identity-work pattern and supported by emotion work and identity targets that are available, accessible, meaningful and believable. Persistent identification is a logic-constrained identity process where continual activation of identities is manifested through defensive identity work. This activation and de-activation of the logics associated with identities was documented as internal, and was continually in interaction with external activation happening through institutional materials and external identity regulation work.

Once an identity has been shaped through identification with a logic, de-identification may be possible, but shedding the logic is not. Individuals can act as carriers of logics they have de-activated as associated identities become sedimented, being latent but accessible. The implication of this sedimentation, rather than shedding, process is that unproductive logics and their identities can be easily reactivated without continual (internal and external) work to sustain de-identification. Our understanding of individual success in transitions in work and life,
demands our attention as to their tenuous nature and the multi-mode (cognitive, emotional, material) and multi-level (individual, institutional) influences on their sustainability.
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**APPENDICES**

**Appendix 1 : Literature Review on Institutional Logics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Key Focus</th>
<th>Key Finding</th>
<th>Empirical Context</th>
<th>General Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scott, W. R., Ruef, M., Mendel, P., &amp; Caronna, C. 2000. <em>Institutional change and health care organizations: From professional dominance to managed care</em>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.</td>
<td>Study of the historical changes, and influence of the institutional environment on these changes, within a specific health care system.</td>
<td>Changes in the institutional environment of a field can influence and effect change upon the institutional logics within that field. The field subsequently transitions from one dominant logic to a new dominant institutional logic.</td>
<td>Bay area health care system (1945 - 1999)</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton, H. P. 2002. The rise of the corporation in a craft industry: conflict and conformity in institutional logics. <em>Academy of Management Journal, 45</em>, 81 – 101.</td>
<td>The transformation of publishing from a craft to a corporate-based industry.</td>
<td>Industry decision-making and organization are influenced by the prevailing institutional logic within the industry. However, institutional pressures that conflict with the existing institutional logics will act as pressures for change and transformation in the industry.</td>
<td>Higher education publishing industry (1958-1990)</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zilber, T. B. 2002. Institutionalization as an interplay between actions, meanings, and actors: The case of a rape crisis center in Israel. <em>Academy of Management Journal, 45</em>(1): 234-254.</td>
<td>How actors can be carriers of institutions.</td>
<td>Actors are carriers and interpreters of institutions. Institutionalization is shaped by meanings, actors, and actions.</td>
<td>Rape crisis center</td>
<td>Microfoundations, change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood, R. &amp; Suddaby, R.</td>
<td>Institutional entrepreneurship in mature fields: The big five accounting firms. <em>Academy of Management Journal</em> 49(1), 27 – 48.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>How central and elite actors are motivated to act as institutional entrepreneurs.</td>
<td>By being exposed to multiple conflicting logics central elites in mature fields are able to act as institutional entrepreneurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer, R. E., &amp; Hammerschmid, G.</td>
<td>Changing institutional logics and executive identities. <em>American Behavioral Scientist</em>, 49(7): 1000–1014.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>The role of social identities in institutional logic transformation.</td>
<td>It is possible to observe transitions in institutional logics by studying the social identities actors derive from conflicting institutional logics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rao, H. &amp; Giorgi, S.</td>
<td>Code breaking: How entrepreneurs exploit cultural logics to generate institutional change. <em>Research in Organizational Behavior</em>, 27: 269-304.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>How is institutional change possible given the paradox of embedded agency?</td>
<td>Institutional entrepreneurs can draw on pre-existing logics to generate change. They can &quot;exploit&quot; the logic within the system, or &quot;import&quot; a logic from outside of the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binder, A.</td>
<td>For love and money: Organizations' creative responses to multiple environmental logics. <em>Theory and Society</em>, 36(6): 547-571</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>How do individuals respond to multiple institutional pressures?</td>
<td>Institutional logics can be creatively used by individuals and this is influenced by interests, commitments and decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquis, C., &amp; Lounsbury, M.</td>
<td>Vive la resistance: Competing logics and the consolidation of U.S. community banking. <em>Academy of Management Journal</em>, 50, 799–820.</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>An investigation of the competitive and institutional dynamics that mobilize resistance to change.</td>
<td>The emergence of competing logics within an industry can act as triggers for community resistance, and in doing so provide opportunity for actors to take entrepreneurial action to resist change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chung, C., &amp; Luo, X.</td>
<td>Institutional logics or agency costs: The influence of corporate governance models on business group restructuring in emerging economies. <em>Organization Science</em>, 19, 766–784.</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Corporate restructuring</td>
<td>Both agency costs and institutional logics were shown to influence business group restructuring, but institutional logics were found to have more predictive power in influencing the particular restructuring strategy chosen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Author(s)</td>
<td>Title of Work</td>
<td>Year of Publication</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, G. K., &amp; Paruchuri, S.</td>
<td>Entry into emergent and uncertain product-markets: The role of associative rhetoric.</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>How the media's associate rhetoric to determine whether to adopt new or old logics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misangyi, V.F., Weaver, G.R, &amp; Elms, H.</td>
<td>Ending corruption: The interplay among institutional logics, resources, and institutional entrepreneurs.</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>The processes by which corruption can be remedied by intentional institutional change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdy, J. M.</td>
<td>Conflicting logics, mechanisms of diffusion, and multilevel dynamics in emerging institutional fields.</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>What are the mechanisms that enable multiple logics to be institutionalized in emerging fields.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reay, T., &amp; Hinings, C. R.</td>
<td>Managing the rivalry of competing institutional logics.</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>How to manage rivalry of competing institutional logics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonpar, K., Handelman, J. M., &amp; Dustmalchain, A.</td>
<td>Implementing new institutional logics in pioneering organizations: The burden of justifying ethical appropriateness and trustworthiness.</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>How new institutional logics are implemented in pioneering organizations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Institution(s)</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood, R., Diaz, A. M., Li, S. X., &amp; Lorente, J. C.</td>
<td>The multiplicity of institutional logics and the heterogeneity of organizational responses. <em>Organization Science</em>, 21(2): 521-539.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Two logics co-existed in medical schools, however this coexistence changed over time, with periods of integration, and contestation highlighting the &quot;uneasy tension&quot; between plural logics. Changes within the professional field were found to be influencing the fluctuation of the balance between logics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer, R. E. &amp; Hollerer, M. A.</td>
<td>Meaning structures in a contested issue field: A topographic map of shareholder value in Austria. <em>Academy of Management Journal</em>, 53(6): 1241-1262</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional actors can subtly resist new institutional logics being espoused at the societal level by engaging in identity work. These actors were simultaneously able to accommodate and resist the new logic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The table represents a summary of key points from the referenced articles.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Journal/Book</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
<th>Keywords</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pache, A.-C. &amp; Santos, F.</td>
<td>When worlds collide: The internal dynamics of organizational responses to conflicting institutional demands. <em>Academy of Management Review</em> 35(3): 455-476.</td>
<td>Theorizing on how organizations respond to conflicting institutional demands (which are &quot;carried through&quot; by existing institutional logics)?</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td><em>Academy of Management Review</em></td>
<td>455-476</td>
<td>Theoretical, Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodrick, E., &amp; Reay, T.</td>
<td>2011. Constellations of institutional logics: Changes in the professional work of pharmacists.</td>
<td>Work &amp; Occupations, 38(3): 372-416</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>How is the nature of professional work influenced by multiple logics? Professional work and professionals can be influenced by constellations of institutional logics that can be cooperative or competitive.</td>
<td>U.S. Pharmacists from 1852 to present</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Institutions and Logics</td>
<td>Complexity, Change, Strategy, Overview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., &amp; Lounsbury, M.</td>
<td>2012. <em>The institutional logics perspective: A new approach to culture, structure, and process</em>. Oxford: Oxford University Press.</td>
<td>To review the foundation of, points of differentiation between, and contributions of the institutional logic perspective to institutional and organizational theory.</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How is institutional multiplicity maintained?**

Institutional multiplicity is maintained "in practice, politically negotiated between actors, and refracted across separate social spaces" (p. 1539).

**How different entrepreneurial groups align with distinct logics and the influence on founding.**

Embeddedness in a community logic, as opposed to a financial logic, resulted in greater establishment rates.

**How texts can influence institutional change.**

Individual texts incorporate multiple logics and put rational argumentation into tension.

**How organizations respond to minority logic holders as a means of resisting the role of dominant actors within the field, and thus can lead to alteration of practices and extant institutional order.**

Organizations respond to minority logic holders as a means of resisting the role of dominant actors within the field, and thus can lead to alteration of practices and extant institutional order.

**How organizations become desensitized to the dominant logic and come to enact alternate logic.**

Adoption of alternate logic requires the development of symbolic and material immunity to dominant logics.

**To examine how hybrid organizations manage their complexity.**

Hybrid organizations can "selecting couple intact elements prescribed by logics" (p. 972) and use this to build legitimacy.

**To reveal the microfoundations of institutional change.**

Institutional change can emerge from everyday improvisations work.

**The institutional logic perspective is a meta-theory of the inter-institutional systems of society. It focuses on institutional heterogeneity and its influence on both organizations and individuals, highlighting the cross-level dynamics of environment, structures, practices, and action.**

**Change, rhetoric**

Change, strategy

Complexity, hybrids

Complexity, change, microfoundations

Theoretical
<p>| Ansari, S., Wijen, F., &amp; Gray, B. 2013. Constructing a climate change logic: An institutional perspective on the &quot;tragedy of the commons&quot;. <em>Organization Studies</em>, 24(4): 1014-1040. | What enables a trans-national commons logic to emerge within the field. | Frame changes utilized by individual actors can lead to a hybrid logic at the field level. | Global Climate change (1969-2010) | Change, rhetoric |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Keywords</th>
<th>Volume/Issue/Year</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beyond the family firm: Reasserting the influence of the family institutional logic across organizations</td>
<td>Fairclough, S., &amp; Micelotta, E. R. 2013</td>
<td>To examine the role of the institutional logic of family on organizations.</td>
<td>Italian law firms were influenced by the family logic despite being in a setting when the dominant logics are capitalism and professionalism.</td>
<td>Vol. 39: 63-98</td>
<td>Italian Law firms, Complexity, institutional logics as IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The internal complexity of market logics: Financial sophistication and price determination</td>
<td>Feng, V. 2013</td>
<td>How a hybrid market logic is instantiated by investment banks into IPOs.</td>
<td>Financial prices are influenced by the internal complexity of market logics. Vocabularies are manipulated to allow underwriters to employ a hybrid market logic.</td>
<td>Vol. 39: 275-317</td>
<td>Investment banks, Institutional logics as IV, hybrids, rhetoric, strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God, love and other good reasons for practice: Thinking through institutional logics</td>
<td>Friedland, R. 2013</td>
<td>To explore the relationship between Weber's theory of value and the institutional logic perspective.</td>
<td>&quot;God, love, transcendence, and immanence&quot; are all analytical categories that can be used to understand institutional logics.</td>
<td>Vol. 39A: 25-50</td>
<td>Theoretical, Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional work as logics shift: The case of intel’s transformation to platform leader</td>
<td>Gawer, A., &amp; Phillips, N. 2013</td>
<td>To explore the types of institutional work utilized to shift logics and respond to such changes.</td>
<td>Institutional work takes place at the field-level, external practice and legitimacy work, and organizational-level, internal practice work and identity work. These two levels of institutional work are mutually reinforcing.</td>
<td>34(8): 1035-1071</td>
<td>Intel Corporation, Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic pluralism, organizational design, and practice adoption: The structural embeddedness of csr programs</td>
<td>Glynn, M. A., &amp; Raffaeli, R. 2013</td>
<td>How the adoption of types of organization practices are informed and shaped by particular institutional logics.</td>
<td>Institutional logics connect organizational practices and organizational design, they act as a &quot;lynchpin&quot; (p. 176).</td>
<td>Vol. 39: 175-197</td>
<td>CSR practices in FT500 firms, Institutional logics as IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
<td>Institution/Research Area</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay, J. 2013.</td>
<td>Navigating paradox as a mechanism of change and innovation in hybrid organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 56: 137-159.</td>
<td>To reveal the ways in which change occurs in hybrid organizations.</td>
<td>Cambridge energy alliance</td>
<td>Complexity, change, hybrids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Keywords</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raynard, M., Lounsbury, M., &amp; Greenwood, R.</td>
<td>Legacies of logics: Sources of community variation in csr implementation in China</td>
<td>The influence past logics can have on variation within different geographic regions.</td>
<td>The influence past logics can have on variation within different geographic regions.</td>
<td>Research in the sociology of organizations: Institutional logics in action, part a, Vol. 39A: 243-276</td>
<td>Emerald Publishing Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Complexity, change, microfoundations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zilber, T. B. 2013.</td>
<td>Institutional logics and institutional work: Should they be agreed? In M. Lounsbury, &amp; E. Boxenbaum (Eds.), <em>Research in the sociology of organizations: Institutional logics in action</em>. Vol. 39A: 77-96: Emerald Group Publishing.</td>
<td>To review the basic positions are core arguments of the institutional logic and institutional work literatures and their relationship to each other.</td>
<td>Theoretical General Theme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battilana, J., &amp; Lee, M. in press. Advancing research on hybrid organizing – insights from the study of social enterprises. <em>Academy of Management Annals</em>, 8.</td>
<td>To advance the understanding of hybrid organizing in organizational scholarship.</td>
<td>There are five dimensions of hybrid organizing: inter-organizational relationships, culture, organizational design, workforce composition and organizational activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2: Literature Review on Identity Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Key Focus</th>
<th>Key Finding</th>
<th>Empirical Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashforth, B. E., &amp; Kreiner, G. E. 1999. &quot;How can you do it?&quot;: Dirty work and the challenge of constructing a positive identity. <em>Academy of Management Review</em>, 24(3): 413-434.</td>
<td>How actors construct positive identity in the face of the stigma associated with dirty work</td>
<td>The 1) ideological reframing, recalibrating, and refocusing and (2) selective social comparisons and differential weighting of outsiders’ views were forms of collective identity work engaged by members of dirty work professions to construct positive self-identity and organizational identification.</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Title / Summary</td>
<td>Identity Threats and Affirmation</td>
<td>Workplace Identity and Tactics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsbach, K. D. 2003.</td>
<td>Relating physical environment to self-categorizations: Identity threat and affirmation in a non-territorial office Space. <em>Administrative Science Quarterly</em>, 48(4): 622-654.</td>
<td>How and why non-territorial office space threats workplace identities and the tactics employees adopt to affirm their identities in response.</td>
<td>Threats to identity (specifically personal distinctiveness, social distinctiveness, personal status, social status) can trigger the adoption of identity-affirming tactics (i.e putting up portable artifacts). This form of identity work is adopted to counter the regulation of identity involved in the “depersonalization” of a workplace space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuhn, T. 2006.</td>
<td>A ‘demented work ethic’ and a ‘lifestyle firm’: Discourse, identity, and workplace time commitments. <em>Organization Studies</em>, 27(9): 1339-1358.</td>
<td>How arrays of organization discourses construct identities and workplace time commitments.</td>
<td>Identity work and individual’s choices about time commitments at work are influenced by the discursive resources available within both organizations and individual’s own self-narratives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essers, C., &amp; Benschop, Y.</td>
<td>Enterprising identities: Female entrepreneurs of Moroccan or Turkish origin in the Netherlands. <em>Organization Studies</em> (01708406), 28(1): 49-69.</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>How female ethnic minority entrepreneurs construct their identities in the face of contradiction. These entrepreneurs used three strategies of identity work (staying within gendered limits, denouncing femininity or ethnicity, and developing a hybrid identity and reshaping gender identities) to carefully construct their identities at the intersection of contradiction and in the presence of dominant discourse and structural constraints. Five female Moroccan or Turkish entrepreneurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kornberger, M., &amp; Brown, A. D.</td>
<td>'Ethics' as a discursive resource for identity work. <em>Human Relations</em>, 60(3): 497-518.</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>How individuals draw on discursive resources to build identities. Ethical discourse can act as resource for identity work. Case study of an organization with Ethics as a core discursive practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ainsworth, S., &amp; Hardy, C.</td>
<td>Mind over body: Physical and psychotherapeutic discourses and the regulation of the older worker. <em>Human Relations</em>, 62(8): 1199-1229.</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>The ways in which identity work of elderly is regulated by discourse. Discourses of the body and mind worked to regulate the identity work of the elderly and were reinforced and combined through the mechanism of grief. Australian public parliamentary inquiry into work for older unemployed individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumens, N., &amp; Kerfoot, D.</td>
<td>Gay men at work: (Re)constructing the self as professional. <em>Human Relations</em>, 62(5): 763-786.</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>How gay men identify as both gay and professional in the workforce. Gay-friendly work contexts enabled the expression of professionalism. It was observed by work to show professional conduct, and the dressing of the professional body. 10 gay men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornborrow, T., &amp; Brown, A. D.</td>
<td>'Being regimented': Aspirational notions of self influence individuals' identity work. <em>Organization Studies</em>, 30(4): 355-376.</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>How aspirational notions of self influence individuals' identity work. Identity work was disciplined by organizational based discursive practices which defined the individuals preferred versions of self they aspired to become. British parachute regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identity work adopted by managers involves employing discursively available narratives as well as creating new narratives.

Through particular strategies of personal identity work (internationalization of institutional contradiction, identity reconciliation work, and role claiming and role use) embedded actors can resolve and affect change of the institutional contradictions that have marginalized them.

There are four theoretical perspectives on positive work-related identity: virtue, evaluative, developmental, and structural which provide pathways for building social resources.

Narrative identity work is a form of identity work used by actors that assists in crafting self-narratives in role transitions to fashion “a culturally appropriate” and desired view of self.

Identity play is people's work to engage with provisional and possible selves through active trial. It can be particularly useful during role transitions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Journal/Publication</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Reference/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beech, N.</td>
<td>Liminality and the practices of identity reconstruction. <em>Human Relations</em>, 64(2): 285-302</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>To add the concept of liminality to identity work literature</td>
<td>Liminality involves the process of &quot;dialogue between inner self-identity and the outer social-identity&quot; (p. 286), through practices that involve experimentation, reflection, and recognition.</td>
<td>Two individual's experiences from two distinct organizations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, A. D., &amp; Lewis, M. A.</td>
<td>Identities, discipline and routines. <em>Organization Studies</em>, 32(7): 871-895</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>How identities are constructed by organizational discourse on organizationally-based routines</td>
<td>Talk about organizational routines is both a resource and a source of discipline for organization members' identity work. Identity work is thus not only an expression of actor agency, but can be an expression of existing power and subjection.</td>
<td>U.K. regional law firm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, C., Nyberg, D., &amp; Grant, D.</td>
<td>“Hippies on the third floor”: Climate change, narrative identity and the micro-politics of corporate environmentalism. <em>Organization Studies</em>, 33(11): 1451-1475</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>How managers respond to different narratives and identities influences self-conceptions and organizational outcomes.</td>
<td>Identity work can act as a &quot;political resource&quot; for responding to criticism allowing people to use different identities at different times.</td>
<td>Interviews with 36 sustainability managers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, A. D., &amp; Toyoki, S. 2013. Identity work and legitimacy</td>
<td>To examine the relationship between identity work and legitimacy.</td>
<td>The legitimacy of organizations can be constructed by identity work.</td>
<td>Case study of inmates in Helsinki Prison.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyoki, S., &amp; Brown, A. D. 2013. Stigma, identity and power: Managing stigmatized identities through discourse. <em>Human Relations</em>.</td>
<td>How individuals can talk through stigmatized identities.</td>
<td>Through identity work strategies of appropriation, claiming coveted social identities, and representing self as &quot;a good person&quot; inmates were able to deal with their stigmatized prison identities.</td>
<td>Inmates in Helsinki Prison.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Interview guides for previously incarcerated, Correction officers, non-profit staff, and Correctional investigator

Interview guide for previously incarcerated

1. I was hoping you could tell me a little bit about yourself and how things have been going since you were released.
   a. Could you tell me about some of your daily routines?
   b. What are some of the challenges you are having?
   c. Have you had any luck finding work? Housing?
   d. Who are you enjoying spending time with? Who would you rather not be around?

2. People talk about the transition or re-integration and how corrections should be preparing individuals for this.
   a. Was any “pre-release preparation” helpful?
   b. What might have been helpful?
   c. Is there something about the transition experience that was unexpected?

3. Is there anything or anyone making your life more difficult in regards to this transition?
   a. How do you deal with these individuals or groups?
   b. Making it easier?
   c. Has NCO been helpful? Why or why not?

4. What has been your experience of parole or probation officers?
   a. Helpful? Hindering?
5. Since being out, do you spend much time thinking about your time in the system? The people you knew?
   a. Is there anything you wish you could change about your time?

6. If you were describing yourself to someone who didn’t know you, what might you say?
   a. What are your strengths?
   b. Your weaknesses?
   c. What makes you, you? i.e what makes you unique

7. I have read a lot of stuff in the news about all the problems in the system at the moment due to government change. What are your thoughts on these issues?
   a. Who did you see as the sources of problem (gov’t, correction officers, other incarcerated individuals?)
   b. How did this affect you?

8. I’m really interested in hearing from you what life was like for you in the system. Can you describe what a typical day was like? Including the daily routines as well as the people you might typically interact with.

9. Did you feel that there were unwritten rules you needed to adopt on the inside? (i.e Prisoner’s/inmates code)
   a. Could you name a few of these?
   b. Did these unwritten rules ever conflict with the rules of the formal institution? If so, how did you deal with this? Whose rules are more important to obey?

10. How did you maintain your sense of self in the system with so many external controls? (i.e how did you keep it together..)
11. How did you deal with the correctional officers? Would you describe it as a positive or negative experience?
   a. Can you give some examples?
   b. The nurses? Other staff?

12. Is there anything from prison that has stuck with you after leaving the system?
   a. What was the most negative thing that you think stuck with you after your time in corrections?
   b. The most positive thing that you think stuck with you?
   c. What was/is the hardest thing to shake.

13. What does it mean being an individual who has been in the system? What do you feel you have in common with other incarcerated individuals?
   a. Do you think having been incarcerated affects the way other people see and treat you?
   b. How do you overcome these challenges (if they suggest there are)?

14. What advice would you give to someone who is facing a similar situation as you (trying to re-integrate into society)?

15. How do you think your transition is going currently?
   a. What do you think would help it go more smoothly?

16. If you were describing your plan to successfully re-integrate what does it include?

17. If you were to reflect on who you are today, would you say that you are this person because of your experience in prison, or despite your time in prison?
18. Is there anything I have not asked you about that you think is important for understanding yours, or other people’s movement from corrections back into society?

**Interview guide for corrections officers**

1. Could you tell me a little bit about yourself and your role with corrections?
   a. How long have you been at [this institution]?
   b. What is it like to work here?

2. What do you see as the main role of correctional officers in the corrections system overall?
   a. What factors enable officers to do this well?
   b. What factors disable officers?

3. In your view, what is the purpose of this institution? (Or corrections as a whole)
   a. Do you feel you are successful in serving this purpose?
   b. Why? Or why not?

4. The government has been making numerous changes to the system (new bills, closing established institutions…) and I know the corrections union has been working against these. How do these changes affect institutional life for both correctional officers and inmates?

5. One thing I have noticed about corrections is how complex it is. In your view, how do these complexities affect the corrections missions of public safety and rehabilitation?
a. Do you find these components (i.e. public safety and rehabilitation) to be interpreted differently by the different parties involved in corrections?

b. What do you think rehabilitation means in the context of corrections?

c. Does your work involve you negotiating the relative focus on this dual mission with others involved in corrections? Management, Union, Government, correctional investigator? Community organizations?

6. How would you describe the institutional environment inside corrections facilities today?

   a. What are the big issues for you?

7. What is it like to work for Corrections? What do you like? What do you dislike?

   a. What do you find most challenging about your job?

   b. What is the hardest thing you have to deal with in working with this population?

8. What are some of the formal and informal rules and protocols adopted within the institution?

   a. Do you find these helpful or challenging to work with?

   b. What rules would you like to see changed?

9. Are you able to use your own discretion to get the job done when necessary?

10. The public has little understanding of what it must be like to do your job. Are there any ways in which you feel your profession is misunderstood?
11. What characteristics do you think you need to be a successful officer? Have you seen any officers that didn’t last in the position? Why is that?

12. How do you personally cope with the dangers and tensions associated with the job?
   a. Can you leave it behind when you go home at the end of the day?

13. If you had to describe the emotional environment you feel when working within institutions what would it be??

Only officers like yourself really know what it is like to work with inmates and how they perceive prison. I’d like to ask you a few questions about your inmates and the inmate culture, especially as they relate to the difficulties you face and the parts of your job that your find rewarding.

1. How would you describe the population with which you work to a layperson who has never spent time in a prison?
2. How have you dealt with the population with which you work? Are there things that work and things that do not work?
3. I have been told by some that there is a “prison mentality”. Do you agree? If so what is this mentality?
   a. How does this mentality affect corrections officers?
   b. How does it affect inmates?
4. I am trying to get a sense of what it feels like to work or live in some of these institutions. I have heard that there are not only formal rules but informal ones that the inmates themselves create and have to abide by. What are these informal rules that the inmates set for themselves? What has your experience with this been? Is there a dominant mentality among the prisoners that you find challenging?
5. There is a stereotype among some of the previous inmates I have talked with of COs as “powertrippers”. What would you say in response to this?

6. On the other hand I have other previous offenders who have said they have positive experiences. What is your experience?
   Have you been able to negotiate and interact with prisoners in positive ways? Could you share an example?

7. Why do you think so many inmates have such difficulty making the transition from corrections back into society?
   a. What is it about those that re-offend?
   b. What kind of self-image do you think these men have?
   c. Do some of them leave sincerely believing that they will be able to integrate back into society?
   d. Do you think there is anything the institution itself could do to minimize this difficulty? The individual?

8. If you were in charge of corrections, what is the one recommendation you’d make about handling the inmate population?

9. Your job is obviously a very challenging one. If you could change one thing about it, what would it be?

10. Is there anything that I haven’t asked you that you think is important in understanding the correction system and correctional officers experiences within them?

**Interview guide for NCO interviews**

1. Could you tell me a little bit about your role here at the NCO?
   a. How long have you been working here?
   b. With individuals previously in conflict with the law?
2. Would you describe to me what you see the role of NCO is in aiding individuals previously incarcerated?
   a. What are the big challenges for you in your job?

3. What do you see as the greatest challenge for individuals facing the re-integration process?

4. If you were to describe one component of the corrections system that hindered re-integration what would it be?
   a. One component of the corrections system that aided re-integration?

5. What do you see as the purpose of corrections?

6. How do you think spending time in corrections affects these individuals?
   a. In your view, how is it that some seem to “survive” better than others?

7. In your experience what do you see as the hardest part of life in prison for these individuals?

8. What is a typical day for these men? What are their routines?

9. I am trying to get a picture of what it is like for these men when they enter corrections. Could you recount to me the process a man would go through when admitted?
   a. When discharged?

10. In your experience how do the guards and other staff see the incarcerated men?
    a. Treat them?

11. How do you think being on the inside affects how they think about themselves?

12. I know CSC speaks a great deal about their offerings of work and/or programs. Could you speak to this?
a. Do you think they are effective?

b. Do you think they are being offered?

c. What do you think the incarcerated think of these?

13. Is there anything that I haven’t asked you that you think is important in understanding the corrections system and individuals attempting to re-integrate into society?

EXTRA

14. Have you worked with individuals who have successfully re-integrated to society after incarceration?
   a. To what do you attribute their success?
   b. Do you think NCO played a role in this success? In what capacity?
   c. Do you think the correction system itself played a role in their success? In what capacity?

15. If you were to describe one individual characteristic that aided in the re-integration process what would it be?

16. Based on your experience working closely with individuals previously incarcerated, how would you characterize the correction system? (i.e. what do you think of the corrections system in Canada?)

**Interview guide for interview with corrections investigator**

1. Could you tell me a little bit about yourself and your history working with corrections?
   a. How long have you been in the Correctional investigator role?
   b. Did you work within this field prior to then?
c. What do you enjoy about your work?

2. You conduct very thorough reviews of the issues facing Canadian corrections. Some of the recent issues I know you have covered are access to mental health treatment and programs, confinement, deaths in custody, and physical health. What do you see as most pressing and concerning today?
   a. How do you think these issues evolved over time?
   b. What have the role of different involved parties (i.e. govt, corrections officers, the incarcerated, your office) been in shaping change?

3. What factors do you think prevent corrections from adopting some of the changes you have recommended in this and previous reports?

4. The field of corrections in Canada is made up of a variety of different groups and individuals. Who do you see as the main players in the field?
   a. How does your office manage the complexities of working with these different groups?
   b. How do you think these complexities affect the corrections missions of public safety and rehabilitation?

5. In your recent report you stated “The professional role conflicts, which often surface in complex care cases, reside in the fact that penitentiaries are not intended to be hospitals but some inmates are in fact patients. CSC needs to find more creative ways to resolve inherent conflicts between a health and a security-centred perspective on inmate welfare.” I found this a very interesting insight. I was wondering if you were able to elaborate?
a. What other tensions do you see in the field of corrections within Canada?

b. How do you think these tensions are resolved, or worked through?

6. The public often has little understanding of what Corrections involves. How do you explain the challenges within this field to a layperson?

7. Many of the players within the field you mentioned have different interests and perspectives on how corrections should be implemented in Canada (i.e. correction officers vs the incarcerated, the public vs correctional officers, the government vs correctional officers, your office vs correctional officers). Do you think there is negotiation among these groups?
   a. In your view how are conflicts dealt with? Agreements or settlements reached?
   b. Is there anything that could bring these diverse perspectives more closely aligned?

8. In your view what should rehabilitation look like in corrections?

Since you are the ombudsman for the incarcerated, you have the unique perspective of knowing how they perceive prison. I’d like to ask you a few questions on the incarcerated and prison culture, especially as they relate to the difficulties you face and the parts of your role that you find rewarding.

11. How would you describe the population you often speak for to a layperson who has never spent time in a prison?

12. How do you and your staff deal with the incarcerated when you work? Are there things that work and things that do not work?

13. Why do you think so many of those incarcerated have such difficulty making the transition from corrections back into society?
   a. What is it about those that re-offend?
b. What kind of self-image do you think these men have?

c. Do some of them leave sincerely believing that they will be able to integrate back into society?

d. Do you think there is anything the institution itself could do to minimize this difficulty? The individual?

14. If you could immediately change one thing about the handling of the incarcerated population, what would it be?

15. Your job is obviously a very challenging one. If you could change one thing about it, what would it be?

16. Is there anything that I haven’t asked you that you think is important in understanding the complexities of the correction system and how these complexities effect the incarcerated and their abilities to successfully reintegrate into society?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix 4: Prison Logics and Sample of Coded Text by Actor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correction officers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CI &amp; Ombudsman</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSC &amp; OCS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Safety Minister</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCO</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 5: Patterns of Identity Work and Illustrative Quotes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity work</th>
<th>Type of Identity work</th>
<th>Illustrative quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>Blaming</td>
<td>I’ve talked to psychiatrists, I've talked to so called specialists, you know and I've actually been in psychiatric places... I say yeah I've got some issues, like you know I was state raised, you put me in group homes where I was sexually abused, then you put me in a system that you know like don't worry we're going to take care of you, and we're going to do this, we're going to do that... I slept in the street corners, slept in the doorways, and I became so resentful of authority and so distrusting of social workers and group homes and foster homes and everything else because I just felt I didn't belong. And not only that at the point in time, I mean I was adopted as a child, so I always had an identity crisis…You know you start thinking after a while maybe I'm the problem here. Like maybe I'm the screw-up and this is why things happened and what not. So you don't really know the truth. You start you know maybe believing certain things you say I must be a bad apple. Interview 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It's a lot of stress. Well for instance, like I said before I'm an alcoholic, and over the beginning of the weekend I couldn't take it anymore. So instead of spending my last American twenty dollars on liquor or beer, I decided to go to the liquor store and steal a bottle of liquor and I got caught. All I wanted was to release the stress because I was doing homework at the Toronto reference library, Yonge and Bloor, about to study about this job right that I've got. And I couldn't deal with it. I didn't want to get drunk, and I'd only had two beers just previous to that, right, and those two beers just clouded my judgment. And here I was again back in the system. Just a nightmare. Just an absolute nightmare. Interview 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>when someone … takes away that freedom, it's very hard to deal with you know … society is so cruel hey. It's also called social conditioning right… I know how the system works. But the systems flawed. I'm telling you the system is flawed right now. It's all because of Stephen Harper right. Everybody is saying that, right, you know so. ..all the conditions they have me on, and the fact that I'm guilty until proven innocent right, that's the main thing right. Interview 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Because people set me up and people tell lies, so that's what I'm saying I'm not a happy person, because many a time I go there I'm innocent. Yeah many many times, so some of my charges I get acquitted, because my charge is to be acquitted that mean I should never be there. You know what I mean..I'm not a happy person, because I don't get no happiness only because the reason that put me there...The biggest difficulty is all about the sickness you know the disease that you know comes up on me from the beginning of family. We call it insecurity, you know what I mean. That's what caused my family burden, because I'm an African Jamaican Canadian right, this the difference of a person who was born here Interview 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Differentiating

You're amongst you know people [who] are worse than myself. Interview 25

They're happy with doing drugs. They're happy out stealing big amounts. They're happy causing destruction to other peoples' property and homes and beating up people and listening to this crap music and young white boys acting and talking like colored people. Like yo yo sup sup sup, yo yo yo, look at that old honkey talking about me. They don't even know who I am. Here they wouldn't even give me a bottom bunk last night. A Young punk twenty three years old, full of tattoos, charges coming out of his ying yang, wouldn't even give me his bottom bunk, knowing that I was disabled, that I am disabled. Interview 28

I don't like to be labelled, but at the same time I realized labels had to be associated with this stuff. I'm not from a family that abused me, or any of that shit. Like, my parents were top notch, my mom drove a school bus; my dad was a security guard at xxx college. Interview 15

Don't give to him. Lock him in, make sure, because he have some mental issue there, this person. He doesn't know his goodness and badness. Interview 11

### Reflexive

Opening up

I couldn't work. I still have trouble trying to find any work because of my incarceration. But one of the big things for me was to get involved in the fellowship of C.A. and help others, so. This has been great because I was able to reach out to people that have gone through the situations that I have. I thought I was alone in this. Don't you know it, they talk about this saying, they say if you confide to them you slept with a giraffe, well most likely when you come to the rooms of C.A. you're gonna meet someone who's slept with 10 of them. And it's kind of comforting to know that because a lot of the guys that I work with, half of them don't even compare to the story that I went through, right. Interview 16

But I didn't, and like I said, the biggest thing for me anyways right, is I'm very much a loner and stuff. I guess it's just the help, you know what I mean. Just having people help you and having someone to talk to and stuff like that is probably the biggest thing for me anyways. Now that I'm doing this I'm telling you, all this stress sh#t is crazy. All this normal sh#t that you people deal with and kids and dah dah dah, it's hard you know what I mean. Like I cry now a days, do you f*ckin believe that sh#. Interview 35

I have a security licence, I have fork lift. I'm gonna go get my GED just that I can't get a job now because of my record. Like they do a background check. I went and I did a course on security, paid 500 bucks for it. I don't have 500 bucks but I paid it. It gave me my licence. I had to sign the, do you have record sheet or whatever, so I signed, yeah. They still gave me my licence, unbelievably. Interview 24

Because like I said, coming out of incarceration, you're not so uppity to go, just go talk to anybody because with the situation where you came from its made you so drawn in and so cold, right. So it's hard for you to just come out now and be able to just talk to anybody, you know. Interview 20
Getting critical

You change your opinions. You don't think of yourself as so high and mighty. Like when I went in I thought the world owed me a favour. Now it's you know, everything is equal. Interview 2

I just, towards the end, once I started realizing that my life is more important than standing up and proving something to these guys cuz they're nothing, you know, so screw that so I just start doing my own thing and that was it… Interview 4

I was like a wild child, like, not in a bad way, more or less bad to the bone, but just like that guy, that I like to live on the edge, I like the fast life and so on and so forth, right. But I don't like what the fast life brings, right. Problems and more problems. So, I just want to be a normal person. It's hard for me, I'm always…curiosity, you know. Oh that would be cool, or this, but I don't think about the outcomes of it, right, until after I'm, I go oh man, again, here I am, right. I've done it many a times, I'm sick of it. Interview 8

I mean, the 12 steps for me is a total lifestyle change and all your character defects you try to switch them around and become that human being. So if you're dishonest you become honest or if you're inconsiderate you become considerate and unselfish. You know, just a positive and just switch it over and just pray for the ones that are still out doing the sh#, you know, and hopefully they can turn themselves around.

Interview 9

Self-regulating

Keep yourself locked up indoors. Just don't drink or you know, use drugs out in public. Kind of watch who, you know, you hang out with. Where you hang out at

Interview 12

You know what, to tell you the truth, I can be really honest with you, and I think about the jail every day up until now I have been but I've stopped talking about it. You know what I mean? I just stopped verbally. I have a roommate and I stopped talking about it but I still think about it every day. Interview 14

Well they tell you to do something do it, you know. You're not going to want to do everything they tell you, like some of it even works out. Like I know yesterday my PO said I had to go this f*ckin Darren guy or some sh#. I'm like I don't want to, you know I'm like whatever I'll do it, you know. So I go do it and it turned out it worked out good, you know he had a couple of good job leads and everything, so he was a little weird but he did what he had to do, you know. So I'm like ohhh, so it was good. It worked out.

Interview 38

You know, I don't want to be around, I'm an ex-addict, and I don't want to be around seeing people smoking all this crack and all this crap and from that area, it's everywhere. So it's a battle, all right, so I try to stay away. Interview 4
## Appendix 6: Identity Targets and Illustrative Quotes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Target</th>
<th>Illustrative quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Religion/Spirituality  | it is a total lifestyle change.. Yeah, it's like going to hell and back, I've been to hell, came back. And there's a lot of inmates that have been to hell and never came out of it, like the life timers, people that die in jail, that murder, so but. And you know, like its, its funny how miracles work, people do change, and I believe that. Interview 9  
Nothing was changing, nothing changes, nothing changes, and that's one of the sayings in there, right? I said well what do I have to do and God did that for me. You know what I mean, because I had no ideas left and so I just prayed for help. It was a chaplain that helped me with a miracle prayer. God entered my life, I allowed him in. I asked, actually asked him to kill me, do with me as you will, you know...I asked for death. It was there a miracle was performed. God really touched me and I woke up the next day... I didn't stop. I had a new life, a lust for life... Interview 16  
Yeah I mean I just so grateful, I mean I have that... I do my readings, you know I do my spiritual readings whatever it is, and it keeps me in check on my day. It gets me through the days right. Yeah. So it's very important that I stay spiritually connected because if I didn't have that I'd probably be like irritated, miserable, and then eventually I'd probably be using again. And then the cycle starts all over again right, because that's what it is. It's one cycle. So it's about learning how to break the cycle. Interview 41  
"The purpose driven life," and it's about talking to God and connecting with God. So in an unreligious way, but in a spiritual way. I've been having conversations with him during the day, and it's been very helpful...The only one that's there is me and God, and I talk to God. And the funny thing is I asked God in my prayers when I first got out I said maybe we can get closer, maybe we can talk. Now all of a sudden I'm praying every day. All day we're walking and talking, walking and talking… Interview 32 |
| Work                  | I'm an athlete, I'm a figure skater, I just kept working out. And then I was helping other people work out. So I concentrated on that Interview 9  
Well I worked all my life... I can work privately, I can do anything. I'm a builder. I've built all my life. I'm a qualified carpenter so I can always find work. I went and did a ceramic floor for my sister. I went and painted part of a house for a buddy you know what I mean. I did a kitchen for one of my girlfriend's friends. Interview 17  
I learned electricity from what I didn't know. So when I got out I already had my electrician licence and was, made plans for going back to school. Which is what I did. Yeah I got my electrician licence while I was in... I was working [while in prison] but I was working as an electrician. Interview 2  
I've just been doing my, I'm living on my own. I have my own apartment now, and just working. I work for a regeneration company so I'm pretty stable. Interview 41 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Target</th>
<th>Illustrative quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Um, one of the biggest problems for me is that I have a family out here and I have kids out here and this record is just a big setback but for the longest while, only now I'm starting to come to the realization that, this…it's not about me no more, it's for my family and my kids. . . Interview 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If it hadn't of been for Maria, I probably would have just probably would have packed my bags and took off and came back here and ended up in jail again. Q: So what was the one thing that helped you after you were ? A: Having a fiancée. Interview 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My daughter I enjoy spending time with and trying to get back you know what I mean... So we connected there and she's nine years old now, she just turned nine...I'm getting older...My daughter, you know what I mean, I want to have a relationship with my daughter. Interview 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I basically it wasn't the inside that changed me. It was when I got out here and, even when I got out, when I was first out I got out and I got my money, I just picked up some, simple I started dealing drugs and that's what I, I had, there was no, I had no plans on saved my money. I was off to Albania...Looking for more connections dah dah dah. I come back and the next thing you know this girl that I had known she had this one baby through this guy, Serenity, and the next thing you know she got pregnant with my kid and everything, that's what changed me. When Jacob came out that was it. I was done with everything, you know what I mean. I was done with everything. That was it. I'm done. Interview 35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix 7: Emotions Expressed by Identity Work Pattern and Illustrative Quotes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Work Pattern</th>
<th>Emotion Expressed</th>
<th>Illustrative Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>If you can get beyond resentment right,... And that's what I'm thinking, but I do have this resentment because right now I want to file all sorts of complaints against people... Interview 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>That doctor's an idiot. Doctor McBride's a real piece of shit. ... He just lied... So you're a lying - he's a lying bird. He's just lying. I would like to run him over with a vehicle. I would, I won't even think twice, I'd do it. It's only 3 years for that. Interview 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And they [corrections] don't give a shit man. All it is is covering each other's asses, okay.. And that's all they care about, you know I'm not going to lie and I'm not even being bias. I'm done warrant expiry, everything is finished. I mean, but that is what they care about is basically dotting their I's and crossing their t's so nobody gets in trouble, you know. And they really don't give a shit about the individual, and it's sad, you know what I mean. They don't care. They only care about the media and making sure nothing comes back to haunt them, you know, and it's bullshit. Interview 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I mean, obviously I hate it because you know they kept me incarcerated in the last 15 years, you know, on and off, it's more like 17 or 18... I hate the system Interview 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I just want a good housing spot, get a good job and I'm good. I know I can do it too and I'm gonna do it. Interview 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Work Pattern</td>
<td>Emotion Expressed</td>
<td>Illustrative Quote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Personally I was with a friend one time and we got stopped by the police and they said they smelled marijuana but they didn't find none and the cop punched me in my face. You know what I mean, but I didn't file no complaint or nothing like that because I just don't believe it will go anywhere. You get what I'm saying? It's an unjust world and I've come to live with it even though I don't want to live with it but I've just seen so much things that I know it's an unjust world and that's just how it is. So I'll never be the same just because of my experience with jail and the police, you know what I mean. But that doesn't stop me from trying to live a good life, and a better life, as you can see I'm trying to do that, right? Interview 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leave it go. Just leave it go, on with the show. You can't go back. Interview 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I don't complain about it because I'm the one that made the choices. I led it to…like nobody did this to me, I did it. You know, I don't, mom it's your fault, dad it's yours, that's bull. It's my fault, I decided to do what I did. I decided to sell drugs, I decided…it's not…it's me. So I gotta change and that's it. I don't hold anybody else accountable for my actions you know. Interview 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>So whatever, I live life on life's terms, whatever's thrown at me you gotta just face it, so, face everything and recover. For years I feared everything and ran so, today it's just different. Interview 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having faith</td>
<td></td>
<td>I'm never going back. Interview 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It's only going to get better. And I've got a lot of improvement to do but I feel positive, and so yeah, jail helped. Interview 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I think I am because of my time in the system. Yeah, oh yeah. I changed my life. I was hopeless, you know what I mean? I had to be hopeless... in order to gain this life. Interview 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I just want a good housing spot, get a good job and I'm good. I know I can do it too and I'm gonna do it. Interview 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 8: Constraints to De-Identification: Institutional Material and Identity Regulation Illustrative Quotes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Illustrative Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Well getting released from jail with no money no place to go is very tough to get started up, and then especially if you're staying in the shelter you're around people using drugs, it's hard. It's very very hard to bounce back you know...Well I think it was discouragement because when I would get released I would literally get released with no money, no place to live you know and it was very discouraging right. And I found that I wasn't willing to fight as hard when I didn't have a place to live you know. It was easier to fall back into a... I felt I had nothing to fight for at the time, you know... Maybe like I felt I didn't have anything else to lose. It was already lost right... Interview 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I dunno, it would be a big help for people, for guys that have been for as long as I have, in and out, like you know because when you come out, you come out to nothing, and its scary right. You come out to nothing so eventually you're gonna end back up in the system, so they should start actually having like a program for fellows like myself, and women, a getting started program, getting back in society, fitting you back in right? Interview 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I got nothing I come out I f*cking…I sold all my sh#t, I got nothing. Step number 9 is to make amends. I got to pay back people. How am I gonna pay back anybody? I need stuff, I got nothing. I need to buy a new stereo, I need to buy a bed, I need to buy a table, I need to buy food, I need to get an apartment. What about me? I believe that when I came out there was another side of me that wants to steal, that wants to get some clothes that I lost before and get back stuff. Interview 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So when you're like a regular person, a regular 9-5 and but you were doing so much bullshit on the side and, and you get in trouble, you go into jail, you lose everything. It's not like the, the government or someone took it away – it's just he couldn't pay for it so his business went down the drain, his house gone, his car gone. So when he came out he had nothing. So that, that definitely drives people insane about that. When some people they had everything and they come out to nothing they don't know what to do after that. Interview 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Regulation</td>
<td>One day for instance at the Toronto East General ... the director Doug he says “well does somebody want to volunteer and go grab the food from downstairs.” Three people, I'm on it boss, okay I'm down there, okay me… then he goes “f<em>ckin addicts, not only are they you know addicts and drug users, but they're f</em>ckin lazy.” And I said how do you, three people just volunteered and you're saying this. Interview 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nowhere to go because once you're in jail, nobody trusts you so your family and your friends, they just don't trust you until you build that trust again. So when you come out, there's times where I had nowhere to go... Interview 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It's against the law to say no that you don't have a Criminal Record. So when you tell them yeah you have Criminal Record. And then they ask “What's your Charges?” And then you tell them &quot;well that's not going to affect the job I'm going for&quot;. Say for instance like 'Customer Service' or, or anything, it's like, they ask “Okay, what's your Charges?” You tell them, yeah, it has nothing to do with theft or anything violent. They still want to know. And now once they hear your 'Charges' they're going to go 'No.' So. Interview 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It's just your label, it doesn't matter, you have to really, really show them you're trying to change. You really have to, you can't just show them you have …even if you're working it's like so what, right. Anybody can work but are you really changing? And that's what I'm trying to do by coming to all these…I didn't want to do all this. Who does really? Because it's kind of embarrassing but I'm doing it because I know it's the only way right now. Interview 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>