

Forgiven But Access Denied: Rebuilding The Marital Relationship After Incarceration

Dr Arinaitwe Julius

Metropolitan International University

Abstract

Incarceration fractures intimate partnerships with a force that few other life events can match. The removal of one partner from the shared domestic space, the imposition of supervised communication, the financial devastation of legal costs and single-income households, the social stigma that attaches to the families of the incarcerated, and the profound relational distance generated by years of separation together constitute a marital trauma of extraordinary intensity. Yet when the incarcerated partner is released, a further and often overlooked paradox confronts couples attempting reconciliation: even when the non-incarcerated spouse has extended genuine forgiveness, and even when the released partner has made sincere efforts at rehabilitation, systemic and structural barriers — parole conditions, employment restrictions, housing exclusion zones, sex offender registries, background check discrimination, and the invisible architecture of collateral consequences — deny the formerly incarcerated partner full access to the life, spaces, and relational roles that marital partnership requires. This qualitative study examines the lived experience of couples attempting to rebuild their marital relationships after incarceration, with particular focus on the paradox of emotional forgiveness coexisting with structural and legal access denial. Drawing on in-depth interviews with 38 participants — 18 formerly incarcerated individuals and 20 spouses or long-term partners — the study employs interpretive phenomenological analysis to illuminate the emotional, relational, and practical dimensions of post-incarceration marital reconstruction. Findings reveal that forgiveness, while real and earnest, is insufficient to restore the relational equality that marriage requires when systemic barriers prevent formerly incarcerated partners from fulfilling spousal roles including co-parenting, shared housing, financial contribution, and community participation. Participants describe the pain of being forgiven by a person while being denied by a system, the exhaustion of navigating bureaucratic barriers while attempting emotional intimacy, and the particular grief of loving someone who cannot fully come home even when they are standing in front of you. The study concludes with a call for policy reform that recognises the marital and familial dimensions of the collateral consequences of incarceration, and for therapeutic frameworks that can hold the complexity of forgiveness alongside structural exclusion.

Keywords: Incarceration, Marital Reconstruction, Forgiveness, Collateral Consequences, Post-Incarceration Reentry, Parole Conditions, Intimate Partnership, Structural Barriers, Qualitative Research, Criminal Justice

Introduction

Received: 10.09.2026

Accepted: 15.09.2026

Published on: 30.09.2026

There is a kind of homecoming that does not feel like homecoming. The door opens, the embrace is real, the tears are genuine, and the person who was gone is physically present again and yet something essential is still missing, still behind bars, still subject to conditions and restrictions that transform what should be a return into something more like a provisional, supervised, and perpetually precarious occupation of a life that the system has not fully released (Julius et al., 2026). For couples attempting to rebuild marriages after incarceration, this is not a metaphor. It is the concrete daily reality of navigating a relationship in which one partner has been forgiven by the other but has not been granted access—emotional, practical, legal, residential, parental—by the institutions whose conditions continue to govern their lives long after the prison gates have closed (Kazaara & Audrey, 2025).

The United States incarcerates more people than any other nation on earth, with approximately 1.9 million individuals currently behind bars and over 600,000 returning from incarceration each year (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2023). The majority of these individuals are parents; a significant proportion are married or partnered; and virtually all are returning to family systems that have been strained, reshaped, or shattered by the incarceration experience (Julius & Kazaara, 2025). The marital consequences of incarceration have received growing scholarly attention in recent decades, with researchers documenting elevated divorce rates among couples separated by incarceration (Lopoo & Western, 2005), the psychological burden carried by "prisoner wives" (Comfort, 2008), and the complex renegotiation of relational roles that release requires (Docherty et al., 2020). Yet less attention has been paid to the specific paradox that frames this study: the experience of couples in which forgiveness has been extended but structural access remains denied—couples who have done the emotional work of reconciliation but find that the system has not done the legal work of release (Julius & Kazaara, 2026).

Collateral consequences of conviction—the legal disabilities and restrictions that attach to individuals with criminal records beyond the formal sentence—now number in the thousands across American jurisdictions, encompassing restrictions on employment, housing, professional licensing, public benefits, voting, and parental rights (Love et al., 2020). These consequences do not merely affect individuals; they reverberate through families and marriages, determining where a couple can live, whether the formerly incarcerated partner can be present at their child's school, and whether the family can rebuild financial stability on two incomes (Audrey & Kazaara, 2026). The paradox that this study names—forgiven but access denied—describes the relational condition of couples navigating genuine reconciliation within a system that continues to impose conditions incompatible with the full exercise of marital partnership.

This study was motivated by a gap in the scholarly literature on post-incarceration family reintegration: the relative absence of qualitative, participant-centred research that takes the interior experience of marital reconstruction—its emotional textures, its relational negotiations, its moments of hope and collapse—as its primary subject. By centering the voices of formerly incarcerated individuals and their spouses in sustained, reflective interviews, this study aims to

generate the kind of phenomenologically grounded understanding that is necessary for both therapeutic and policy responses that actually meet couples where they are.

Literature Review

Incarceration as Marital Trauma

Scholars have increasingly framed incarceration as a form of relational trauma that affects both the incarcerated individual and their intimate partner simultaneously, if differently. Comfort's (2008) landmark ethnographic study of women visiting incarcerated partners at San Quentin State Prison described how the prison system extends its control beyond the incarcerated individual to encompass their families through surveillance, restricted communication, and the regulation of physical contact creating what she called the "secondary prisonisation" of families (Julius & Audrey, 2026). Western (2018) documents how incarceration compounds economic inequality and damages the social networks that sustain family stability. Travis et al. (2014) in the National Academy of Sciences comprehensive review identified marital dissolution as one of the most consistent and damaging consequences of incarceration for family wellbeing, with elevated divorce rates persisting even after controlling for pre-incarceration relationship quality (Julius & Audrey, 2025).

The emotional experience of the non-incarcerated partner often a wife has been documented as including grief analogous to spousal bereavement, sustained anxiety about safety and financial survival, social isolation from community stigma, and the complex task of maintaining a relational bond with someone physically inaccessible while managing household and parental responsibilities alone (Arditti, 2012; Braman, 2004). What the literature has less thoroughly explored is the post-release phase: what happens when the door opens, when the couple attempts reconstruction, and when the structural consequences of conviction continue to shape and constrain the possibility space of their shared life.

Forgiveness in the Context of Incarceration

Forgiveness research in the relational psychology tradition (Enright & Fitzgibbons, 2015; Worthington, 2006) conceptualizes forgiveness as a process typically protracted, non-linear, and emotionally demanding in which the offended party works through negative affect toward the offending party and, over time, moves toward a stance of goodwill that does not necessarily require reconciliation or the restoration of full trust (Kazaara & Nancy, 2026). In the incarceration context, the offending party is typically the state and the justice system as much as the incarcerated individual themselves, complicating the standard relational forgiveness framework. Spouses must simultaneously process their partner's original offence, the trauma of incarceration itself, the practical consequences they have borne,

and the ongoing systemic restrictions that continue to define post-release life-a multilayered forgiveness task that existing therapeutic frameworks are often insufficiently equipped to address.

Collateral Consequences and the Architecture of Access Denial

Legal scholars have extensively catalogued the collateral consequences that attach to criminal convictions consequences that Love et al. (2020) describe as constituting a "shadow penal code" that extends punishment far beyond the formal sentence. These consequences include employment restrictions that effectively bar formerly convicted individuals from entire professional sectors, housing restrictions that exclude them from significant portions of the rental and public housing market, parole and probation conditions that restrict residential choices and require approval for changes of address, sex offender registry requirements that restrict proximity to schools and parks, and the removal of professional licences that may be the foundation of the person's earning capacity(Julius & Betty, 2026). For marriage, these consequences are not peripheral inconveniences-they are fundamental barriers to the exercise of spousal partnership, preventing co-habitation, co-parenting, shared financial contribution, and the basic freedom of movement within shared social space that intimate partnership requires.

Research Methodology

Design and Philosophical Position

This study employs an Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) design (Smith et al., 2009), oriented toward understanding the meaning that participants make of their experiences of marital reconstruction after incarceration. IPA's double hermeneutic in which the researcher attempts to make sense of the participant making sense of their experience is particularly well-suited to the complexity of the phenomenon under study, where participants' narratives are simultaneously accounts of external events and interpretations of those events' significance for identity, relationship, and future possibility(Abiodun Nafiu, 2012). The study adopts a social constructionist epistemological position, understanding the participants' accounts as coconstructed in the interview context rather than as transparent access to a pre-existing reality, while maintaining commitment to the genuine meaning-making of participants as the primary analytical focus.

Participants and Recruitment

Participants were recruited through reentry service organisations, faith-based prisoner support ministries, and a community legal aid organisation serving individuals with criminal records in two mid-sized American cities. A total of 38 participants were interviewed: 18 formerly incarcerated individuals (14 male, 4 female) and 20 spouses or long-term partners (3 male, 17 female). Sentence lengths in the formerly incarcerated participant group ranged from 14

Received: 10.09.2026

Accepted: 15.09.2026

Published on: 30.09.2026

months to 11 years; offence types included drug offences (n=7), property crimes (n=4), assault (n=4), and sex offences (n=3). All participants were in ongoing or recently ended relationships that they identified as marital or marriage-equivalent. Couples were interviewed separately to ensure candour and to allow individual experiential accounts to emerge without the constraint of partner presence. Participants were assured of confidentiality and assigned pseudonyms; all identifying information was altered or removed.

Data Collection and Analysis

Semi-structured interviews lasting between 75 and 140 minutes were conducted in private settings chosen by participants. An interview guide covered: the experience of the incarceration period from both perspectives; the emotional process of forgiveness; the experience of release and early reintegration; specific encounters with structural barriers; the impact of collateral consequences on the relationship; and participants' sense of the future of their partnership. All interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. Analysis followed Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis framework, with initial coding conducted independently by two members of the research team before collaborative thematic development. Member-checking was conducted with eight participants who reviewed thematic summaries. The analysis generated eight major themes, reported below through extended participant quotation interwoven with interpretive commentary.

Results

THEME 1 — The moment of forgiveness and its limits

Virtually all non-incarcerated partners in the study described having made a conscious, considered, and emotionally costly decision to extend forgiveness to their partner; a decision that preceded release and that they described as a deliberate psychological and moral act rather than a passive emotional state. These accounts of forgiveness were rich, complex, and entirely free of sentimentality: participants described working through rage, grief, humiliation, and profound ambivalence before arriving at a position of forgiveness that they consistently distinguished from approval, minimisation, or the erasure of consequences. What unified their accounts was the recognition that forgiveness, once genuinely extended, did not by itself restore the relationship because the relationship's restoration required access that the system had not yet granted and in some cases seemed designed never to grant.

Marietta, 44, whose husband had served six years for aggravated assault, described her forgiveness journey with striking psychological precision, making clear that it was complete in the emotional sense while remaining entirely insufficient to solve the practical and structural problems that confronted them upon his release:

I forgave Marcus. I want to be clear about that it took me four years, a lot of therapy, a lot of prayer, and two complete breakdowns, but I forgave him. I forgave him for what he did, I forgave him for what we lost, I forgave him for the years the kids grew up without their father. I told him that the day he came home. We both cried for about an hour. And then he said; so where am I going to sleep? And I realized: I had done all this emotional work, all this inner healing, and we had no idea where he could live because his parole conditions said he couldn't be within a thousand feet of where his assault victim lived, and it turned out that person lived four streets away. I had forgiven my husband and my husband could not come home. That was the day I understood that my forgiveness and the system's permission were two completely different things.

(Marietta, 44, Spouse, Married 18 years)

Marietta's account captures with great clarity the core paradox that the study title names: the forgiveness that is within the power of the offended partner to grant and the access that only the system can grant are independent variables, and their independence can produce the agonising situation of a couple whose emotional reconciliation is complete but whose practical reconciliation remains structurally blocked. This structural blockage was not experienced by participants as a bureaucratic inconvenience but as a continuation of punishment; a sense that the system was prolonging the sentence in a form that was invisible to outside observers because it wore the clothing of regulation rather than incarceration.

Darnell, 39, who had been released after serving four years on a drug distribution conviction, described the emotional dissonance of standing in his wife's forgiving embrace while knowing that the conditions of his parole prevented him from living with her and their children:

She told me she forgave me and I believed her. I could see it in her face; this woman had let go of something. Something that must have weighed a ton. And I was grateful. I was more grateful than I have words for. But then I had to go back to the halfway house. I had to leave my wife and my kids and go back to a room with three other men I didn't know. And every night I lay there thinking; what does my forgiveness mean if I can't come home? What did she forgive me for, if not to have me back? I felt like I had been handed something beautiful and immediately had it taken away by someone who wasn't even in the room.

(Darnell, 39, Formerly Incarcerated, Married 12 years)

THEME 2 — parole and probation as third partners in the marriage

One of the most vividly described experiences across the data was the pervasive presence of the parole or probation system within the intimate space of the reconstructing marriage-what participants described as the experience of having a permanent and intrusive third presence in their relationship, one that made demands, set conditions, required reporting, and held ultimate authority over the couple's domestic arrangements. This experience of systemic intrusion into marital intimacy was described by participants across different offence types and supervision conditions, suggesting that it is a structural feature of post-incarceration reintegration rather than an anomalous case.

Candace, 51, whose husband had served nine years for a financial crime, described the particular texture of parole intrusion into their marital reconstruction with a mixture of dark humour and barely suppressed resentment:

His parole officer comes to our house unannounced. That's a condition. They can come any time, day or night, and we have to let them in. Once they came at eleven at night. We were in bed not doing anything, just sleeping. The officer walked through our bedroom with a flashlight. Checked that Robert was in the house, checked that there was nothing in the house that violated his conditions. And then left. We lay there in the dark afterward and neither of us could sleep. I kept thinking: this is my house. I pay the mortgage. This is my bedroom. And a stranger just walked through it with a flashlight because my husband has a record. How do you build intimacy in a relationship where that can happen at any moment? How do you ever feel like your home is your own?

(Candace, 51, Spouse, Married 23 years)

The intrusion of parole oversight into the physical and emotional space of the home was described by formerly incarcerated participants as generating a particular kind of shame not the shame of the original offence, which they had worked to process and move beyond, but a fresh, institutionally imposed shame at being surveilled in the presence of their spouses. Several described observing the look on their partners' faces during parole visits and feeling the relationship's emotional progress being undone by each encounter that reminded both partners of the continuing institutional control over their lives.

The worst part is not when the officer comes. The worst part is seeing my wife's face when they come. She has this expression not angry, not scared, just kind of emptied out. Like something drains out of her every time they knock. I watch her become smaller in those moments. And I did that to her. Not just the crime every knock on the door is me doing that to her again. I can't explain what that does to a man who is trying to be better.

(Raymond, 46, Formerly Incarcerated, Married 14 years)

For couples where the formerly incarcerated partner was subject to sex offender registration and the associated residency restrictions, the parole system's presence was even more totalising, extending beyond the home into every

Received: 10.09.2026

Accepted: 15.09.2026

Published on: 30.09.2026

dimension of family life including school attendance, neighbourhood choice, recreational activities, and employment geography. These couples described relationships in which virtually every shared activity required prior mapping of compliance whether the children's school was within the prohibited radius, whether the park where they planned a family outing was permissible, whether the church they attended was compliant with residency requirements.

We had to leave our neighbourhood. Our church was in the radius. My kids' school was in the radius. We moved twenty miles and my wife now drives two hours a day getting the kids to school and getting herself to work. I cannot drive because I lost my licence as part of the sentence. So she does it all. And every day she drives past the life we used to have to get to the life we are allowed to have. I have asked her how she holds it together. She says she married me, not the law. But I can see what it is costing her and it is costing her everything.

(Jerome, 44, Formerly Incarcerated, Married 9 years)

THEME 3 — financial devastation and the renegotiation of spousal roles

The financial consequences of incarceration for families have been well documented in the social science literature: legal costs, the loss of one income during incarceration, the costs of prison phone calls and visits, and the reentry period's employment barriers collectively produce economic damage that many families require years to recover from and that some never do (Schwartz-Soicher et al., 2011; Western & Pettit, 2010). What the quantitative literature captures less well is the relational and emotional significance of financial devastation for the reconstructing marriage: the way in which altered financial roles challenge deeply held identity structures, generate resentment that compounds other grievances, and transform the practical inequality of economic dependency into a source of marital friction that participants described as equally damaging as any emotional wound.

Partners who had been the sole economic support for the household during incarceration described complex feelings about the expectation from themselves, from their partners, from cultural norms that the formerly incarcerated partner would, upon release, resume or take up an economic contribution role. The reality of the post-incarceration employment market in which background checks reliably exclude individuals with felony convictions from broad swathes of employment opportunity meant that this expectation routinely went unfulfilled, generating a dynamic that participants described as simultaneously practically stressful and emotionally charged with gendered meaning.

I kept us going for four years. I worked two jobs. I raised the kids. I paid the bills. I kept the house. I did everything and I did it alone and I never once complained to him because I knew he was going through his own hell in there. When he came home I thought okay, now we can breathe. Now there are two of us. But he couldn't get work. Every application, they ran his background. Every background check, he didn't get called back. I watched him come home defeated, day after day. I watched him stop trying. And the

Received: 10.09.2026

Accepted: 15.09.2026

Published on: 30.09.2026

worst thing; the thing I hate myself for; is that I started to resent him for it. He was trying and I resented him anyway. What does that say about me? What does that say about us?

(Tamara, 42, Spouse, Married 15 years)

Tamara's account particularly her self-reproach at the resentment she felt toward a partner she knew was structurally blocked rather than personally unwilling-illuminates the psychological complexity of navigating economic role disruption in a context where the causes are systemic but the emotional consequences are relational. Couples in this situation face a double bind: the structural barriers to employment are real and well-documented, but the daily lived experience of a partner who cannot contribute financially generates resentment that feels personal and immediate even when it is intellectually understood to be systemic. Male formerly incarcerated participants described the employment barrier with a particular emotional intensity rooted in cultural constructions of masculine identity. For men who had held provider self-images before incarceration, the systematic denial of employment opportunity was experienced not merely as an economic problem but as a sustained assault on their ability to be the kind of husband and father they understood themselves to be. This assault on masculine identity compounded the already heavy burden of reintegration and introduced a specific form of shame into the marital relationship that participants found particularly difficult to discuss with their spouses.

A man is supposed to provide. That is who I was; who I am. Before I went in I was making good money in construction. I had my certifications. I was building something. When I came out they took my licence because of the conviction. My certifications were suspended. I applied to forty-three jobs in the first three months. Forty-three. I kept count. Three called me back. When they ran the check, nothing. My wife never said a word. She just kept going to work and kept us afloat. But I could see it; the way she looked at me on the days I came home empty-handed. She never said anything. She didn't have to. I said it to myself every night.

(Marcus, 47, Formerly Incarcerated, Married 18 years)

THEME 4 — Co-Parenting Denied: The Structural Fracturing Of Family

For couples with children, the structural barriers to post-incarceration marital reconstruction extended into the domain of parenting with consequences that participants described as among the most painful dimensions of their experience. Parole conditions that restricted the formerly incarcerated partner's presence at educational institutions, community restrictions that excluded them from recreational spaces, child protective service investigations triggered by incarceration records, and in some cases family court orders that restricted contact with their own children all of these created situations in which parents who had returned from incarceration and had been forgiven by their partners remained structurally excluded from the full exercise of parental partnership.

Received: 10.09.2026

Accepted: 15.09.2026

Published on: 30.09.2026

I cannot go to my son's school. It is in the radius. His teacher's conference, his spring play, his graduation from fifth grade; I missed all of it. My wife goes alone and she records it on her phone and shows me when she gets home. I watch my son perform on a four-inch screen because the system says I cannot be in a building within a thousand feet of anywhere children congregate. My son is a child. He congregates with children. I am his father and I am legally excluded from his life and my wife has to explain to a ten-year-old why his dad cannot come to his graduation.

(Jerome, 44, Formerly Incarcerated, Married 9 years)

The impact on children of witnessing one parent's structural exclusion from family life was described by spouses as a secondary layer of marital damage one in which the children's distress became a source of conflict between partners and in which the formerly incarcerated partner's guilt about the children's experience compounded the already heavy emotional burdens of reintegration. Several spouses described children asking questions that had no adequate answers, and the emotional cost of finding age-appropriate language for a structural injustice that did not yield to simple explanation.

My daughter asked me why Daddy couldn't come to her birthday party at the park. She was seven. What do you say? I tried; I said Daddy has some rules he has to follow right now. She said who makes the rules? I said the government. She said can we tell the government it's my birthday? I cried for an hour after she went to bed. Not just because of what she asked but because I couldn't give her the answer she deserved. I couldn't say: your daddy did something wrong and now he is paying for it in a way that doesn't make sense and that I am angry about too. I just said we would have a special Daddy party at home. And he sat at our kitchen table and sang Happy Birthday and pretended that was normal. That was the saddest birthday we have ever had.

(Candace, 51, Spouse, Married 23 years)

8. THEME 5 — Stigma, Social Isolation, and The Contracted World

Participants across the study described a progressive contraction of the social world available to their partnership as the combined effects of stigma, legal restrictions, and the practical limitations of reentry supervision narrowed the spaces in which they could participate as a couple. This contraction was experienced not as a single decisive loss but as an accumulation of small exclusions; the neighbourhood association meeting the partner could not attend, the job reference that was never forthcoming, the community event that fell within a restricted zone, the social invitation that was quietly not extended once the former incarceration became known that together produced a relationship increasingly isolated from the social networks that sustain marriages over time.

We had friends. Before all this we had friends; couples we socialized with, people from church, neighbours we knew well. When Michael came home I thought we would pick that up again. But one by one the invitations stopped coming. Not all at once it was gradual, so gradual that I almost didn't notice it happening. People were polite, they were friendly when we saw them, but the dinner invitations stopped, the inclusion in group activities stopped. I think they didn't know what to say. I think they were afraid of his record, or afraid of what it meant for their children to be around him. I understand it. I don't forgive it. My husband served his time. He came home. He is trying every day. And we are still being punished by people who were never part of the justice system.

(Tamara, 42, Spouse, Married 15 years)

Formerly incarcerated participants described a specific form of social anxiety around disclosure — the perpetual management of when, whether, and how to inform new acquaintances, employers, neighbours, and social contacts of their record that generated a constant background tension incompatible with the relaxed social participation that friendship and community membership require. This anxiety contaminated what should have been the social rehabilitation of the post-release period, transforming every new social encounter into a calculation of risk and timing that their spouses were compelled to navigate alongside them.

Every new person we meet; I am watching for the moment when it has to come out. When will they ask what I do? When will they ask what I did before? Every social situation has this thing underneath it. My wife feels it too; I can see her reading the room, deciding whether this is a safe person, whether this is the right moment. We have become very good at managing information. We have become very private people. That is not who we used to be. We used to be the couple everyone wanted at the party. Now we are the couple who politely declines.

(Raymond, 46, Formerly Incarcerated, Married 14 years)

THEME 6 — intimacy disrupted: rebuilding emotional and physical connection

The rebuilding of physical and emotional intimacy after the enforced separation of incarceration was described by participants as simultaneously one of the most important and most complicated dimensions of post-incarceration marital reconstruction. The years of separation had created relational distance each partner had changed, developed new coping strategies, taken on new roles, and in some cases formed new relational identities that reunion did not automatically bridge. The physical intimacy of marriage, restored suddenly after years of deprivation for both partners, carried enormous emotional weight and sometimes pressure that neither partner had adequately prepared for.

I had spent four years imagining coming home to my wife. That kept me going in there, honestly that image. And then I came home and we were both so nervous. We had been together sixteen years but we were nervous like strangers. I did not know how to be a husband anymore and I think she had forgotten how to let someone be a husband to her. She had been doing everything alone and doing it well and suddenly I was there and neither of us knew quite where to put me. We did not sleep well together for the first two months. We just lay side by side and talked. Which was good. But it was not what either of us had imagined.

(Darnell, 39, Formerly Incarcerated, Married 12 years)

Non-incarcerated spouses described a particular complexity in the rebuilding of emotional intimacy the coexistence of genuine love and relief at reunion with residual anger, trust deficits, and the accumulated resentments of the separation years that had not been fully processed. Several described having deliberately suppressed negative emotions during the incarceration period in order to maintain the relationship and support their partners, only to find those emotions surfacing with unexpected force in the post-release period when the immediate crisis was over and there was psychological space to feel what had previously been held at bay.

I was so focused on surviving while he was gone that I did not let myself feel how angry I was. I needed to be strong for the kids, I needed to be strong when I visited, I needed to keep it together. And then he came home and we had a week of joy and then; I just fell apart. All of it came out. Everything I had held down for four years came out at him and he did not understand where it was coming from. He thought we had already been through the hard part. He did not know the hard part was only beginning. That first year home was harder than the four years apart.

(Marietta, 44, Spouse, Married 18 years)

THEME 7 — faith, meaning-making, and the sustaining of hope

Among the participants in this study, religious faith emerged as the most consistently cited sustaining resource for couples navigating post-incarceration marital reconstruction not as a simple or uncomplicated comfort, but as a framework for meaning-making that allowed both partners to locate their experience within a larger narrative in which suffering could be purposeful, change was possible, and the self was not wholly defined by its worst moment. Faith communities were also, for many participants, the primary social network that remained intact through incarceration and reentry, providing practical support, relational continuity, and a setting in which at least ideally the stigma of incarceration was tempered by a theology of redemption and second chances.

Our church kept us alive. I mean that literally. During the years he was inside, the church brought food. They helped with the rent one month when I couldn't make it work. When he came home, the pastor came to see him the first Sunday and sat with him for two hours and did not make him feel like a criminal or a charity case. He made him feel like a man returning to his community. That means everything. There are not many places where a man with a record walks in and is treated like a person. Our church is one of them. I don't know how we would have made it without that.

(Tamara, 42, Spouse, Married 15 years)

Not all participants experienced faith communities as uniformly supportive, and several described the painful experience of faith-based stigma-congregations that withdrew fellowship, judgements delivered in religious language, or simply the awkward silence of communities that professed grace but struggled to practise it toward individuals whose crimes had been made public. These experiences of faith community failure were described with a particular quality of betrayal, because the theological promises of redemption and belonging made the institutional failure to deliver them feel especially inconsistent and hurtful.

Our church knew about the conviction because it was in the news. When Michael came home, people at church were kind enough to his face. But we noticed things. We were not included in the leadership retreat we had always been part of. Michael was not asked to serve in his usual capacity. Nobody said anything directly. Nobody had to. The message was clear. We found a different church eventually — a smaller one where people did not know our story and where we could just be a couple in the congregation. Is that the right answer? Probably not. But you can only take so much.

(Candace, 51, Spouse, Married 23 years)

THEME 8 — the future: hope, resignation, and the long horizon

The final theme generated by the analysis concerns how participants oriented themselves toward the future of their marriages whether they experienced their situation as one moving toward greater freedom and relational fullness, or as one of indefinite constraint and resigned accommodation. The data reveal a spectrum from genuine, evidence-based hope to exhausted resignation that in some cases shaded into implicit consideration of separation not because love had been lost but because the cumulative weight of structural constraint had produced a level of shared exhaustion that hope alone could not reliably sustain.

I used to think that once he got off parole everything would change. Like there was this finish line we were running toward and when we crossed it we would be free. He got off parole last year. And the background checks are still there. The record is still there. The sex offender registry is for life. There is

no finish line. There is just the next obstacle and the next one. I love my husband. I am committed to this marriage. But I want to be honest: there are days when I am so tired that I think about what my life would look like if I had not waited. I never stay in that thought very long. But it visits.

(Marietta, 44, Spouse, Married 18 years)

Participants who described genuine and grounded hope for their marital futures typically cited specific changes the expungement of a record, the completion of parole, the securing of stable employment, a significant anniversary as evidence that progress was possible and that the relational investment of the reconstruction period would ultimately yield a partnership that was deeper, more resilient, and more consciously chosen than what they had before. This sense of earned partnership—a relationship that had been tested by extreme adversity and had survived—was described by several participants as a source of both pride and comfort.

We have been through something that most couples never face. Most couples break up under a fraction of what we have been through. I think about that sometimes; we are still here. Not just surviving, but actually, on good days, thriving. We know each other differently now. We have talked about things that comfortable people never have to talk about. We have made decisions consciously that most couples just fall into. When I hold his hand now I know exactly why I am holding it. That is not nothing. That is actually something that most people never get.

(Tamara, 42, Spouse, Married 15 years)

Conclusions and Implications

This study has documented with qualitative depth the lived experience of couples for whom forgiveness, genuine, hard-won, and complete has not been sufficient to restore the marital access that structural collateral consequences continue to deny. The paradox of being forgiven but access-denied is not a peripheral feature of the post-incarceration landscape but a defining structural condition of thousands of American marriages, one that policy discussions about criminal justice reform have insufficiently addressed. The testimonies gathered here make clear that addressing this condition requires both policy reform specifically, the substantial reduction of collateral consequences that serve no demonstrable public safety purpose but impose enormous relational harm and therapeutic frameworks that can hold the complexity of couples navigating forgiveness alongside structural exclusion.

Therapeutic implications include the development of couples counselling approaches specifically designed for the post-incarceration context, which must address not only the relational wounds of separation and the original offence but the ongoing stressors of parole supervision, employment exclusion, and co-parenting under structural constraint. Such approaches must resist the temptation to treat marital distress as purely psychological when much of it is

structural — understanding that the most compassionate clinical response to a couple in this situation combines genuine therapeutic attention to relational dynamics with practical advocacy for the systemic changes that would address the structural foundations of their distress.

References

Arditti, J. A. (2012). *Parental Incarceration and the Family: Psychological and Social Effects of Imprisonment on Children, Parents, and Caregivers*. New York University Press.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.

Braman, D. (2004). *Doing Time on the Outside: Incarceration and Family Life in Urban America*. University of Michigan Press.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2023). *Prisoners in 2022*. U.S. Department of Justice, Washington DC.

Comfort, M. (2008). *Doing Time Together: Love and Family in the Shadow of the Prison*. University of Chicago Press.

Docherty, M., et al. (2020). Prisoner reentry and intimate partner relationships. *Journal of Family Issues*, 41(6), 867–891.

Enright, R. D., & Fitzgibbons, R. P. (2015). *Forgiveness Therapy*. American Psychological Association.

Lopoo, L. M., & Western, B. (2005). Incarceration and the formation and stability of marital unions. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67(3), 721–734.

Love, M. C., Roberts, J., & Klingele, C. (2020). *Collateral Consequences of Criminal Conviction: Law, Policy and Practice*. West Academic Publishing.

Schwartz-Soicher, O., Geller, A., & Garfinkel, I. (2011). The effect of paternal incarceration on material hardship. *Social Service Review*, 85(3), 447–473.

Smith, J. A., Flowers, P., & Larkin, M. (2009). *Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis*. SAGE Publications.

Abiodun Nafiu, L. (2012). Comparison of One-Stage, Two-Stage, and Three-Stage Estimators Using Finite Population. *The Pacific Journal of Science and Technology*-166, 13(2), 166–171. <http://www.akamaiuniversity.us/PJST.htm>

Audrey, A., & Kazaara, A. I. (2026). *Beyond Subsistence : Modeling the Potential of Universal Basic Income to Reduce Poverty and Stimulate Inclusive Growth in Uganda*. 10(1), 310–319.

Julius, A., & Audrey, A. (2025). *Beyond Skills Training : Addressing the Systemic Pathologies in Uganda 's Education System for Genuine Work Readiness*. 9(11), 352–360.

Julius, A., & Audrey, A. (2026). *Reframing the Discourse : Interrogating Gendered Expectations of Resource Provision in Contemporary Relationships*. 10(3), 131–137.

Julius, A., & Betty, M. (2026). *Navigating Foreign Influence : Legal and Institutional Frameworks for Safeguarding Uganda ' s Sovereignty in a Globalized Era*. 10(6), 218–226.

Julius, A., & Kazaara, A. G. (2025). *Women ' s Infidelity , Paternity Uncertainty , and Family Betrayal : A Case Study from Uganda*. 9(11), 315–321.

Julius, A., & Kazaara, A. G. (2026). *The Individual and the Collective : Integrity as a Solo Act , Corruption as a Syndicate in the Ugandan Context*. 10(2), 142–150.

Julius, A., Sarah, A., & Desire, N. (2026). *Scarcity and Abundance Mindsets in Educational Reform : A Case Study of Uganda ' s Competence-Based Curriculum*. 10(6), 235–243.

Kazaara, A. I., & Audrey, A. (2025). *Gender and Infidelity Patterns : A Cross-Cultural Analysis with Focus on Uganda*. 9(11), 306–314.

Kazaara, A. I., & Nancy, M. (2026). *Beyond Hyperbolic Claims : A Critical Analysis of " Famous . ai " and the Promises of Instant , Autonomous App Generation*. 10(4), 247–254.

Travis, J., Western, B., & Redburn, S. (Eds.). (2014). *The Growth of Incarceration in the United States*. National Academies Press.

Western, B. (2018). *Homeward: Life in the Year After Prison*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Western, B., & Pettit, B. (2010). Incarceration and social inequality. *Daedalus*, 139(3), 8–19.

Worthington, E. L. (2006). *Forgiveness and Reconciliation: Theory and Application*. Routledge.