Returning to the Digital World: Digital Technology Use and Privacy Management of

Women Transitioning from Incarceration

[Final Accepted Version]

Returning to the Digital World: Digital Technology Use and Privacy Management of

Women Transitioning from Incarceration

Abstract

Based on interviews with 75 women transitioning from incarceration, our research identifies technology access and skills barriers facing this population and their underlying concerns and motivations in navigating privacy online. Our results suggest precarious housing and financial situations, concerns about ex-partners, mental health issues, and lack of self-efficacy pose challenges for their access to and use of digital technologies and influence their online privacy perspectives. Many participants reported relying primarily on cellphones for various tasks including job applications. Closing public places including libraries amid the COVID-19 pandemic put them at an even greater disadvantage, as many of them depend on computers or Wi-Fi available in those places. *Nothing-to-lose* attitudes were salient among this group resulting in many not taking precautionary measures online or choosing to go offline. Our research highlights the importance of building academic-community partnerships to provide technology and privacy education tailored for this population's particular needs and desires.

Keywords: marginalized women, technology, incarceration, online privacy, COVID-19 pandemic

Returning to the Digital World: Digital Technology Use and Privacy Management of

Women Transitioning from Incarceration

Introduction

The 2019-20 outbreak of Coronavirus disease (COVID-19 pandemic) around the world highlighted an underlying inequity that prevails in this digital information society: unequal access to digital technologies and uneven preparedness to use such technologies (Lee, 2020; Reardon, 2020). With schools and public libraries closed and classes and business activities moving online, digital inclusion advocates have expressed concern for how those without affordable and reliable access to the Internet and, in some cases, relevant skills to complete various tasks online would be further disadvantaged (Taborda, 2020).

Of special concern are women transitioning from incarceration (i.e., women in reentry). In the United States, women in reentry experience significant periods of isolation from the Internet while being incarcerated, as Internet access is restricted in prisons and jails[1] as a security measure (Branstetter, 2015; Kutner, 2015). As a consequence, women in reentry experience challenges when they leave places of confinement to reenter a world that is increasingly dependent on digital access and literacy. These women are at a particular disadvantage compared with similarly-situated men, as there is a lack of educational programs designed to respond to the recent increasing rates of women imprisonments (Carson and Anderson, 2016; Emerson, 2018; Minton and Zeng 2016; Rose, 2004). Women have become "the fastest-growing segment of the incarcerated population," even as recent prison reforms have reduced the total number of incarcerated people since 2009 (Sawyer, 2018). In addition, most women in jails and prisons have faced significant challenges before they are incarcerated, beginning with traumatic experiences in childhood and often continuing into adulthood with abuse and violence including

---

[1] While both jail and prison are places of confinement and often used interchangeably, there are differences between the two in the United States. A jail is a short-term facility where people are confined while waiting for trial or for minor crimes. A prison, on the other hand, is a longer-term facility for those convicted of serious crimes (U.S. Department of Justice, n.d.).

cyberstalking and other forms of online harassment (Correctional Association of New York, 2018). Moreover, a high proportion of women in incarceration are women of color, and these barriers women in reentry face should be understood in the context of systemic injustice in the United States against people of color and the poor (Alexander 2012; Swavola et al., 2016; The Sentencing Project, 2018).

Against this backdrop, we conducted interviews of women recently released from incarceration in the United States to identify challenges they face in accessing and using digital technologies. Topics of special interest were their privacy concerns and how the COVID-19 pandemic influenced their access to and use of digital communication technologies. Amid the pandemic in 2020, some jails and prisons in the United States decided to release a select number of people, as jails and prisons can be amplifiers of infectious diseases with social distancing inside being almost impossible (Kreidler, 2020). At the same time, public places where underserved populations generally use computers or Wi-Fi (e.g., public libraries, community centers) were not open to the public due to stay-at-home orders in spring 2020. A total of 75 interviews were conducted between September 2019 and May 2020 with women in reentry residing in three Midwestern cities. Previous research on digital experiences of women and privacy (e.g., Kennedy et al., 2003; Gray et al., 2017; Petronio, 1991, 2002, 2013) provided theoretical guidance to this study.

To the best of our knowledge, there is little research in the field of communication that focuses specifically on technology use among women recently released from incarceration. Through analysis of their online privacy concerns as well as challenges in access to and use of digital communication technologies among this group, this research helps fill a gap in the literature in the fields of digital inclusion and women and gender studies. Findings from this research offer policy and practical implications for supporting women's positive reentry experiences in the United States and other analogous countries. Given that digital disparities are associated with demographics including socioeconomic status, race, gender, and education

(Mehra et al., 2004), our results may also be applicable to technology education for other marginalized populations in different countries.

<div align="center">**Literature Review**</div>

Digital Experiences of Marginalized Women

Research clearly shows that there is a digital divide (Bimber, 2000; Losh, 2009; Pew Research Center, 2019). Specifically, those with lower levels of income and education and people of color are less likely to have stable access to digital communication technologies (Mehra et al., 2004; Pew Research Center, 2019; Seo et al., 2019). The divide extends beyond issues of access but also applies to use and the obstacles to that use (Kennedy et al., 2003).

Gender has been a topic of interest in digital divide scholarship for decades, as women occupy a marginal status in society and this often spills over to the digital space (Child and Starcher, 2016; Kennedy et al., 2003; Losh, 2009; Powell et al., 2010). For example, Kennedy et al.'s study (2003) suggests that the way women and men access and use the Internet are shaped by social expectations and roles. That is, people use the Internet in ways that conform to societal expectations in their communities or cultures. In this sense, some scholars argue that research on gender digital divide should be grounded in an examination of structural factors that influence access to and use of digital technologies (Kennedy et al., 2003; Mehra et al., 2004). In particular, Mehra et al. (2004) argue that much research examining the disparities in the digital divide focuses on demographic differences and does not "adequately contextualize Internet use in the daily life experiences of people with marginal status in our society" (p. 782).

In a feminist study of survivors of domestic violence, researchers found that digital technology could be both a blessing and a curse (Clarke et al., 2013). On one hand, they could move on from their abusers and experience "new beginnings." Women who have experienced physical or psychological abuse utilize digital tools for community support purposes. On the

other hand, for these women, privacy can be a matter of life and death as they seek to escape dangerous relationships. In addition to privacy concerns, women have also had to navigate tensions and expectations around marriage and divorce, concerns for being judged by others, and cultural and religious backgrounds (Clarke et al., 2013).

Mehra et al.'s study (2004) on how marginalized groups incorporate technologies into their daily life found that the Internet is a tool for marginalized groups to gain agency and take charge of their lives. For example, African-American women saw the integration of the Internet and other digital technologies into their daily life as necessary for building capacity and social empowerment for their community. They utilized the Internet to create culturally appropriate digital content that will help them access information and resources perceived as helpful in achieving their health goals. At the same time, research shows marginalized women had to navigate and maneuver power relations that are evident in digital spaces when using digital technologies (Gray et al., 2017).

In this study, we look at the intersection of gender and experience of incarceration in examining privacy and other concerns women recently released from incarceration have in using digital technologies. Previous research suggests formerly incarcerated individuals differ from other groups in terms of how to interact with digital technologies (Ogbonnaya-Ogburu et al., 2018). According to Ogbonnaya-Ogburu et al., digital experiences of formerly incarcerated individuals are sometimes dependent on how long they have been away from using technologies. For those who had longer incarceration periods, family and their support communities play an important part in how they interact with technologies. While digital technologies could support their transition back to the society, there is a constant challenge balancing between opportunities that these technologies provide and barriers to using the technologies. These challenges range from fear of stigmatization to privacy concerns. Also, issues of inappropriate content or attachment to digital technologies and platforms complicate the digital experiences. As a response, formerly incarcerated individuals cut down on their digital time or avoid certain digital

platforms altogether. Avoidance and limited engagement with digital technologies has implications for reentry into a society increasingly dependent on digital technologies.

Navigating Privacy Online

With increasing amounts of information about individuals available online either voluntarily or without consent, scholars and policymakers have raised concerns about privacy online and its consequences for various segments of society, in particular marginalized populations (Eubanks, 2018; Lynskey, 2019; Molitorisz, 2020). Privacy is far from a unified concept, with the concept often being described as "slippery", "messy", or "elusive" (Molitorisz, 2020). Some theorists suggest that privacy is always about access (Gavison, 1980; Molitorisz, 2020), while others focus on control or ownership of private information (Petronio, 1991, 2002, 2013; Smith and Brunner, 2017). In this paper, we focus on individual "privacy as it pertains to individual human beings" (Molitorisz, 2020, p. 120). In discussing individual privacy, we adopt the Communication Privacy Management (CPM) Theory which explains why and how people grant and deny access to their information (Petronio, 1991, 2002, 2013).

Access is at the core of privacy debates (Gavison, 1980; Molitorisz, 2020). For example, Gavison (1980) noted that "This concept of privacy as a concern for limited accessibility enables us to identify when losses of privacy occur" (p. 423). The CPM focuses on vulnerability and control in discussing individuals' desires and actions to restrict access to their private information. According to CPM, private information is defined as any information that makes individuals feel some level of vulnerability, which consequently triggers a desire to control access to such information (Petronio, 1991, 2002, 2013). The CPM framework suggests that people's belief that they own their information also influences how to manage access to it (Petronio, 1991, 2002, 2013).

People attempt to control their privacy and make relevant decisions by adopting privacy rules that regulate individual and collective privacy boundaries (Petronio, 2002). Various factors including risk-benefit assessments influence decisions about sharing private information with

others (Petronio, 1991, 2002, 2013). At the individual level, people tend to consider gender, cultural expectations, motivational goals, and contextual issues, whereas boundary linkage and permeability rules are considered at the collective level (Child and Petronio, 2011; Petronio, 2002).

The CPM framework has been widely used in studying privacy (e.g., Child and Starcher, 2016; Park, 2013). For example, Child and Starcher (2016) used CPM to analyze Facebook privacy management with respect to concern about "mediated lurking" and "strategic ambiguity." Based on an online survey of 383 students at a Midwestern university in the United States, they found higher levels of concern about mediated lurking (e.g., scrutinizing others' social media profiles and posts) led to higher levels of use of strategic ambiguity (e.g., communicating vague messages intentionally) and more Facebook privacy management. That is, when individuals were concerned more about others monitoring their Facebook pages, they were more likely to adopt diverse privacy rules to protect their Facebook pages. Their study also found that women protected their privacy on Facebook more than did men and were also more cautious than men in allowing others access to their site.

Moreover, previous research showed that age and gender contributed to a display of "privacy-related skill gaps" with women and older adults facing bigger challenges in this area (Park, 2013, p. 231). Similarly, underserved populations are particularly at risk in terms of scams and infringements concerning privacy, the effect of which may harm their "social, financial and physical" spheres (Lee, 2018, p. 463). Therefore, the notion of privacy may differ in substantial ways among women in reentry given particular challenges and obstacles they must navigate. In their research on the concept of privacy for women within carceral spaces, Moran et al. (2013) identified a blurring of the public and private, and "the possibility of a range of spatialized practices on the part of individuals" (p. 140). These practices include mentally disengaging from the crowds around them and seeking physical spaces that are quieter than their prison dormitory (e.g., psychological relief room or prison clinic). Moran et al. (2013) state that the delineation

between "public and private does not represent a single paired opposition, but a complex arrangement of binaries," with private connoting the "hidden" and public as the "open" (p. 139). Thus, the availability and affordance of privacy in today's digitally mediated society, in terms of formerly incarcerated women, is an area requiring closer research.

Burden of Incarceration on Women

With 655 per 100,000 population in incarceration as of 2018, the United States has the highest imprisonment rate in the world (The Sentencing Project, 2020). This high rate of incarceration is especially pronounced when compared with other countries with stable democratic governments. According to international data, the incarceration rate in Australia was 172 (per 100,000 population), 114 in Canada, 77 in Germany, and 59 in Sweden as of 2018 (The Sentencing Project, 2020). Moreover, racial and economic disparities permeate "every stage" of the U.S. criminal justice system—from arrest to trial to sentencing to post-incarceration experiences (The Sentencing Project, 2018, p. 2). The incarcerated population is "overwhelmingly poor" and "disproportionately black" (Cole, 1999; The Sentencing Project, 2018; U.S. Bureau of Justice, 2016). In particular, imprisonment rates for Black and Hispanics adults are 5.9 times and 3.1 times the rate for white adults, respectively (U.S. Bureau of Justice, 2016). In 2020, national reckoning about racism and calls for addressing systemic injustice were reignited in the United States after a Black man named George Floyd was killed by white police officers during an arrest for allegedly using a counterfeit bill (Bagalini, 2020). With large-scale protests around deaths of Black men and women during encounters with police officers, there has been increased public support for criminal justice system reforms including ending the war on drugs and mandatory minimum sentences (Bagalini, 2020; The Sentencing Project, 2018).

Women with criminal justice histories are less likely to gain employment as compared with men with similar histories. Only about half of women leaving jails and prisons have a high

school education, and far fewer—about one-third—find stable employment in the formal economy after incarceration (Emerson, 2018; Minton and Zeng, 2016; Swavola et al., 2016). This economic challenge creates a vicious cycle of them not being able to gain stable access to the Internet and computing devices and not being able to improve their employment opportunities. Consequently, these women are more likely to fall victim to participation in dangerous jobs in the informal economy such as the commercial exchange of sex for money, drugs, food, and housing. In particular, housing has been one of the top concerns of women leaving jails or prisons (Emerson, 2018).

In the United States, there is urgent need to better understand and support this population, as women's rates of imprisonment have been growing, albeit unevenly, since 2000 (Carson, 2015; Carson and Anderson, 2016; Minton and Zeng, 2016; Sawyer, 2018). While there are many pathways to prison, drug offenses as well as policy and practice changes in law enforcement are major reasons for the growing rate of women's incarceration in the United States (Carson and Anderson, 2016; Minton and Zeng, 2016; Sawyer, 2018). One million women are under some type of criminal justice supervision on any given day. About 60% of women in jail are women of color with 44% Black, 36% White, 15% Hispanic and 5% other racial/ethnic backgrounds (Swavola et al., 2016). Approximately 75% of women in prison have faced "severe physical abuse by an intimate partner, and 82% suffered serious physical or sexual abuse as a child" (Correctional Association of New York, 2018). In addition, incarcerated women have higher rates of mental health problems than incarcerated men (James and Glaze 2006).

Structural and individual barriers these women face in various aspects often increase their risk of exploitation online (Correctional Association of New York, 2018; Stephen et al., 2001). However, prison educational and reentry programs are often inadequately structured to deal with access to and use of digital communication technologies as well as privacy concerns by women transitioning from incarceration. More than 60% of women in incarceration have a child under the age of 18, and this makes it essential for them to be equipped with knowledge and skills in

technology to support education of their children and find jobs after leaving jails (Glaze and Maruschak, 2009).

Research Questions

The current study poses the following research questions.

Research Question 1: How do precarious housing, financial, and technological situations facing women transitioning from incarceration affect their access to and use of digital communication technologies?

Research Question 2: What are underlying concerns and motivations of women transitioning from incarceration in navigating privacy online?

Methods

To answer the research questions, we conducted interviews with 75 women who have recently transitioned from incarceration. The interviews were conducted between September 2019 and May 2020, and the participants had left incarceration within the past five years and were living in one of three Midwestern cities at the time of the interview. Participants were recruited with help from nonprofit organizations and programs that support women's reentry as well as Departments of Corrections in the three cities. These organizations distributed our project description to their clients, and then shared with the research team contact information with women interested in participating in our interview research.

Each interview, lasting from 30-45 minutes, consisted of two parts: a structured interview and a close-ended questionnaire. The structured interview involved 35 open-ended questions that followed a consistent interview protocol. While interviews followed the same structured set of questions, participants were encouraged to offer open-ended responses, and interviewers were also free to ask follow-on questions. This interaction and these moments of clarification helped to produce shared meaning between the interviewers and participants, resulting in a high rate of validity and intelligibility of the answers (DeJonckheere and Vaughn, 2019).

Our interviews asked about Internet access, computer experience, devices used, computer education experiences, technological mentors, online job search tools, online practices and use, online privacy, and technology confidence. In particular, interviews covered participants' understanding of online privacy and privacy control including precautions they may have taken to protect online privacy, and their confidence level in how effective they were.

The COVID-19 pandemic erupted during the data collection phase. Stay-at-home orders were implemented in mid-March in the three cities where participants resided. Out of the total 75 interviews for this study, 52 were conducted before outbreak of the pandemic and 23 were done after. The pandemic forced the research team to make several changes to the research protocol. First, we have added several interview questions to learn about the specific challenges the participants faced amid the closure of organizations and businesses including public libraries. Second, our team followed up with participants who were interviewed before the pandemic outbreak to ask the additional interview questions and gain other related insights. Of the 52 people interviewed before the pandemic, we were able to hold follow-up discussions with 25. Each follow-up discussion last for about 15-20 minutes. Third, while we used both in-person and phone interview methods before the pandemic, we exclusively used phone interviews for interviews after the pandemic outbreak (from March to May 2020). All protocols and protocol changes were approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the authors' university.

All interviews were conducted by one of the research team members who were approved by the IRB. One of the researchers had prior experience working with some of the participants from another study. We assumed that those interviews would prove to be longer or that the participants would be more forthcoming because of the rapport built in previous studies. Yet examination of the interview transcripts showed that interview lengths were fairly consistent and personal details and examples shared were evenly forthcoming.

Following the university's IRB protocols, we obtained the signed consent form from each participant. Interviews were then recorded and transcribed by the research team. Transcriptions

were analyzed using ATLAS.ti 7.1.6 to organize the coding of themes related to the topics of privacy and digital access/use. Using inductive analysis based in grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Hesse-Biber and Leavy, 2010; Rubin & Rubin, 2011; Strauss and Corbin, 1994), codes were developed using the constant comparison technique to identify patterns in the transcripts related to themes of privacy and digital access/use as well as identifying new or emergent themes. The final set of codes consisted of both pre-existing codes drawn from interview and research topics including privacy and technology use listed above, as well as emergent codes during the open-coding or *in vivo* process (Charmaz, 2014; Emerson et al., 1995). Once a stable categorization of codes was produced, transcripts were coded in a second round of focused coding, and codes were entered manually into ATLAS.ti.7.1.6. These focused codes form the basis of the analysis found below, with representative excerpts used to illustrate the categories. The responses to the close-ended questionnaire are shown in Table 1.

Results

Participant Characteristics

Table 1 summarizes key characteristics of interview participants. While 75 women in reentry participated in the interview research, seven participants said they felt uncomfortable answering some demographic questions (i.e., age, education, and race/ethnicity). Pseudonyms are used in referring to participants in this paper. In answering the gender question, all participants identified themselves as female. Ages ranged from 26 to 65 years old ($M = 41.85$; $SD = 10.60$; median: 40). Of those who disclosed their age ($N = 68$), 21 were ages between 25 and 34; 20 were between 35 and 44; 17 were between 45 and 54; and 10 were 55 or older. A total of 68 participants answered the education question. Of them, 21 said they had completed high school; 18 some college; 13 some high school or less; and 16 vocational training, associate degree or bachelor's degree. Of those who disclosed their race/ethnicity ($N = 68$), 28 said Black; 20 White; 13 Hispanic; and five American Indian or White/American Indian. Two participants chose the "other" option in answering the race/ethnicity question. As described earlier, all

participants were released from incarceration fewer than five years ago (2 months to 57 months). The time they spent in a prison or jail ranged from 3 months to 16 years.

Precarity and Digital Communication Technologies (RQ1)

Our interviewees said that precarious housing and financial situations many women in reentry face directly influence their ability to access and use relevant technologies. In particular, the COVID-19 pandemic worsened the situation, as they lost jobs due to the closure of businesses and public places including libraries where many of them use computers or the Internet were not open to them.

Access Barrier: Lack of Resources. Respondents reflected a wide array of experiences both in terms of access and use of digital technologies. When it comes to access to digital devices and the Internet, they demonstrated a robust range of devices and approaches to accessing the Internet, including cellphones, their own computers, someone else's computer, or a public use surveilled computer. About half of the participants reported owning multiple devices with the other half owning one or no digital device. The cellphone was the most widely used device for Internet access with about three-quarters of the interviewees reporting owning a cellphone of some kind. This shows that the cellphone ownership rate among our participants is lower than that for the overall U.S. adult population which was 96% as of 2019 (Pew Research Center, 2019). In particular, a dozen participants mentioned they had a cellphone with no Internet access. Several participants reported owning no digital device. This digital divide in terms of access leaves the women at a disadvantage in many aspects of their lives. Of the 75 participants who reported time spent online on a typical day, eight said they spend no time online. Six participants said they spend less than an hour, 15 answered between 1 hour and less than 3 hours; 17 responded between 3 hours and less than 5 hours; and nine indicated between 5 hours and less than 7 hours. In addition, 20 women reported spending 7 hours or more.

Several participants indicated that using the Internet through their phone was difficult for life critical tasks, such as online job applications and housing applications. About half of the participants said they own a laptop or desktop computer, though many said they were not able to use their computer because they either have no Internet connection or their computer is broken. Those who did not have functioning computers at home said they use a public library, an employment training center, or a friend or relative's computer when they absolutely needed to use a computer.

For many participants, there were financial barriers to accessing computers or the Internet. Mia, 40, said, "Cause I'm broke, and I don't have one." A few participants indicated they lost Internet access when their cellphones were disconnected or that they did not have a large enough data plan on their cellphone. Aisha, 41, indicated that having a computer and access to the Internet was so important to her that she chose paying for it over her other monthly bills. Aisha said:

> So, you know, I had to get the cable cut off, which is not a necessity, to pay for my Internet $50 a month. So that's what I am paying, you know. And you want to pay for Internet, you don't want to do everything on your phone. So those are some barriers, having to pay a monthly bill, not having the updated software. My computer is reconditioned, it's used. It has the updated software, but it is not a brand new one.

For some participants, a precarious housing situation was an added challenge in accessing the Internet. Most of these participants said they often relied on a coffee shop or public library to use free Wi-Fi. Carrie, 43, said:

> I was homeless for about three weeks, and I am staying at…It is a crisis center…I am staying there right now. I was homeless and I was staying in my truck out in this cold, there is Wi-Fi here. But I generally use my data or I have to go to McDonald's, which their Wi-Fi sucks because it doesn't allow you to go and do anything…I do have a government phone but it doesn't offer a lot of data.

Similarly, Steph, 34, said she was looking for housing and it has been a "rough" situation since lack of stable housing and Internet access has posed obstacles in various areas of her life. Discussing challenges of trying to look up housing options without a computer, Steph said:

So far, all I've had is… in my house-hunting experience recently it has limited website accessibility that I can get on my cellphone, when I could really use a desktop with Internet access. Like, for example, the property management company I've been trying to get in contact with I can't bring up the applications or anything to download on my cellphone.

Some participants noted that the COVID-19 pandemic worsened their financial and/or housing situations, as they were laid off or they were not getting enough work requests to pay for any Internet access. For example, Zoe, 26, said she was laid off from a full-time job she had landed just one month before the company decided to let go of people due to slow businesses amid the COVID-19 pandemic. With most places offering public computers or free Wi-Fi closed due to the pandemic, Vicki, 38, said, "I am going to try to obtain a laptop or tablet soon. Money is tight. We have had some people cancel for cleans, so I am working only two or three days a week. It is affecting a lot but I still have my sobriety."

Several others also indicated that the pandemic directly affected their job searches, as they have difficulty looking for jobs and completing job applications using their cellphones. For example, Abana, 51, said, "I cannot get everything from my phone. Sometimes I need to go to the library to do it but I couldn't go to the library," as it is not open to the public due to the pandemic. Abana noted the situation has stopped her from job hunting as much as she would like. Some participants were worried about having limited data plans on cellphones when they had to do more activities online amid the COVID-19 pandemic. Steph, 34, said, the only way she can access the Internet is on her "tiny iPhone" but the data plan on her phone is limited. Deja, 47, who used to go to a public library to use Wi-Fi, said she relies on her cellphone and a mobile hotspot to use the Internet at home since the pandemic. Emphasizing how important her phone is

to get things done, she said, "When I am on the phone, I'm not just playing around, I am really taking care of business."

When asked how the pandemic has influenced their use of digital technologies, some participants said they spend a lot more time online. These participants tend to be younger, have higher levels of education (e.g., associate degree, bachelor's degree), and have relatively stable jobs. For example, Shanice, 27, noted that the pandemic has "tremendously" changed her use of digital technologies. Shanice, who completed some college, said, "I probably use computers and apps and all that so much more now because of COVID-19…It's just easier to have a device in your hand and do 1,000 different things in one device." Jasmine, a 33-year-old with vocational training, echoed the sentiment, noting that she uses the Internet and different social media sites "a lot more than I used to" to get relevant news and resources. Similarly, Diamond, 31, said:

> My email inbox is actually blown up now with the Coronavirus updates because I kept clicking on all the updates and they fill me in things and uh I don't know I really didn't like a lot of the information I've been getting…. I was online a lot more looking that up…I spent a lot more time reading about the COVID-19 than I should've been doing other things.

Despite various challenges in accessing the Internet, most participants agreed on the importance of reliable Internet access. Deja said, "You can't live without it [the Internet] I don't think." Noting having a computer with Internet access is "more of a necessity" to her, Aisha said she finds working on a computer "non-distracting" compared with using her phone to complete tasks. Kate, 59, said, "Even if I'm out and about, I still have my Internet on my phone…I'm never without, I'm never without my Internet…It is like a security blanket."

Skills Barrier: Low Self-Efficacy & Mental Health Challenges. Studies have shown that lack of relevant skills is one of the main reasons for people not using the Internet (Teltscher, 2018; Seo et al., 2019). In this sense, there have been growing calls for technology training for

marginalized populations, especially in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic (Lee, 2020; Reardon, 2020).

In terms of digital technology use, some participants in our study reported no experience with a computer while others reported they used computers daily in their current jobs and/or for personal purposes. Whatever their level of technology use, most participants described a variety of barriers they faced. In particular, lack of self-confidence or self-efficacy in learning technology emerged as an important theme. Self-efficacy refers to an individual's belief in their competence to deal with various situations needed to accomplish desired outcomes (Bandura, 1997). Other studies that examined technology learning of marginalized older adults also showed low levels of self-efficacy among the groups (Gray et al., 2017; Seo et al., 2019). Even within younger generations, self-efficacy tends to be highly associated with technology use with those with higher self-efficacy more likely to actively use digital technologies and participate in social activities online (Seo et al., 2014).

For some of our participants, lack of self-efficacy was coupled with mental health challenges such as anger issues in learning how to use computers and the Internet. For example, Pauline, 50, said, "I get irritated too quick…I gotta believe in myself. I don't believe in myself. I don't believe I can do it so I just don't do it." Pauline said she had difficulty learning how to use the Internet let alone a cell phone with no Internet access that she bought at a store.

> Like I said when I first tried [to use the Internet], I got irritated. It was something new, I don't have patience…I have one of those store phones. A little cheap one…I've been in the penitentiary all of my life, so I don't know too much. I don't know about this phone. I get mad about this phone. I want to throw it.

Pauline said, she doesn't use Google or Facebook and she uses her phone "for somebody to call me or to call them or whatever. That's it." Pauline also indicated that she prefers more in-person interactions than online engagements, adding "The main question that sticks out the most is not about a computer. It is about the people." Blake, 47, echoed that sentiment, describing

technology and computer classes in particular as "basically it was all overwhelming to me." She was able to search the Internet, but she lacked an understanding or training to write papers or create resumes. Without being prompted, several participants shared their specific mental health conditions such as paranoia and schizophrenia and described how these conditions are affecting their technology learning as well as other aspects of their lives. Some participants also mentioned that their daily lives and responsibilities in and of themselves could present barriers of time. Julia, 39, jokingly indicated that her biggest barrier to using technology was "my kids."

Navigating Online Privacy (RQ2)

In discussing issues related to privacy online, participants expressed a variety of opinions and diverse levels of confidence in navigating related issues. When it comes to the meaning of privacy online, their perspectives were largely in line with studies on privacy of other populations (Child and Starcher, 2016; Petronio, 2002, 2013). In terms of specifically managing privacy online, structural and individual barriers the women face including unstable employment and housing and concerns of surveillance and abuse by ex-partners were salient in their discussions. And these factors influenced their risk-benefit assessments in terms of privacy and the ways they set privacy boundaries online.

Privacy Defined: Ownership, Control, and Access. When asked the open-ended question "what does online privacy mean to you," participants offered numerous examples and meanings. In particular, some participants' comments revealed their sense of private information access and control and the delineation of the private and public boundaries that are consistent with previous research on privacy (Child and Starcher, 2016; Molitorisz, 2020; Moran et al., 2013; Petronio, 2002, 2013). For example, some of the comments concerning the meaning of privacy involved restricted access or something that is not open for others to see. Hattie, 55, said, "…what I think is that…when you are online, it's not open for everyone to see." Similarly, Alessa, 37, said, it is "like a diary to me." Diary is an analogy often used in privacy conversations in the sense of keeping private items private (Molitorisz, 2020).

Many participants evoked the ownership dimension of privacy in discussing the concept (Petronio, 2002, 2013). For example, Raven, 49, said, "Privacy means that any of my information will not be used. It's totally my privacy, my privacy only." Pamela, 58, mentioned that online privacy means "no one should be able to get up in there and see…see what I'm printing in there…I sending something to someone and the person I'm sending it to should be the only one seeing what I print." Pamela quickly added that she doesn't think that is the case in reality. Jasmine, 33, noted online privacy means "for outsiders not to be able to watch your web browsing history."

It is important to note that some participants felt that they had more control over privacy online as opposed to offline. They said they felt more comfortable going online and searching for whatever information was needed and not having to ask or explain to other people what they want to know. This aligns with findings from Mehra et al.'s study (2004) that shows the Internet helps marginalized populations gain agency and take charge of their lives. For example, Emily, 30, said the Internet actually *increase*d her privacy, as she was safer online to explore things she did not know or would be uncomfortable asking.

> I'm comfortable more now using it [Internet] myself because um I you know I can get to, I find out the information that I really need and not having to let anybody else know what I'm doing and or what I'm looking up. So I guess, you know, I guess I'm comfortable knowing what I'm doing now…you have that privacy from other people having to help you, you don't have to worry about.

Emily's comments are particularly interesting in that they go against the notion that privacy was something people would need or want in order to protect themselves from unwanted, malicious, or predatory behavior. She feels safer online because she could look things up independently and no one would know and she wouldn't have to ask.

Others felt that online privacy meant securing your personal information—including social security numbers, identities, addresses, account, etc. In discussing these topics, some participants

mentioned losing control of their privacy by falling victim to malicious activities including phishing, stealing their personal information, and hacking web accounts. These participants expressed desires to better control or better manage their privacy by adopting certain privacy rules. These comments are in line with the privacy control principle explicated in the Communication Privacy Management (CPM) theory (Petronio, 2002, 2013). According to CPM, an individual's sense of vulnerability regarding private information sparks a desire to control access to such information. The participants' comments also reflect a constant challenge balancing between opportunities that these technologies provide and barriers to using the technologies among those transitioning from incarceration (Ogbonnaya-Ogburu et al., 2018).

For example, Denise, 27, indicated "I am more uncomfortable doing credit card information and stuff like that with online shopping. I am a little paranoid about hackers or my information getting out to the wrong people." Several participants had in fact been hacked with Barbara, 38, stating, "They got my Facebook." Two participants associated privacy as a threat by foreigners, either attempting to steal their information or to gain access/influence their behavior, specifically in this case Russia. For example, Alessa, 37, said she prefers to use Facebook, but she is also concerned about its privacy and security: "I have a lot of friends on there. Family on there. And there are the ones that seem like they are getting hacked by Russia. I like my privacy." Betsy, 35, stated, "A lot of people, they get on there and try to steal your identity, you know. And they don't have any sense…next thing you know, you have a bunch of foreigners trying to call you and steal your identity and bank information and stuff like that." Betsy said she was "scared" because she does online shopping and uses her credit card for that, and she wonders who else has access to her credit card information and what other information she may have inadvertently shared online. Others focused on benign but problematically invasive activities, such as businesses sharing consumer information with other business. Many participants mentioned financial information when discussing privacy, including bank accounts, transferring money, credit card information, online shopping credit scores, and PayPal accounts.

Nothing to Lose. One theme that emerged from their discussions of privacy online was having nothing to hide or lose. In fact, this notion—seeing privacy primarily as a means of concealment and that those with something to hide will desire privacy—is one of the most widely used arguments against privacy advocates (Cofone, 2020; Solove, 2007). Scholars have pointed out that the nothing-to-hide argument is problematic as its narrow conception of privacy excludes important challenges posed by government surveillance and other types of data collection (Solove, 2007). It is important to note that our participants who made comments related to the nothing-to-lose theme focused often on the fact that they own nothing and therefore have nothing to lose. In addition, this perspective resulted in different sets of behaviors related to dealing with privacy online.

Even when it comes to financial information online, some participants noted that they were not concerned, as for them the stakes were so low. Zoe, 26, who was released from a jail in 2018, said "Yeah it's fine. Um, really what it is I have a horrible credit score so if anyone wanted to steal anything from me they are not going to get very far (laughs)." Similarly, Laila, 45, said it is "funny" that some people are trying to hack her accounts online because they don't have much to take from her. Recounting her experience of getting calls from those who faked to be working for the Internal Revenue Service, Laila said, "I received one of…those fake calls from the IRS saying they're going to take me to court if I don't pay them. Which is funny cause like I was…'Go ahead, I don't have any money.'"

Sandra, 48, said she was confident in her online privacy and did not take any precautions not because she trusted online privacy but rather "I just don't normally do it because I don't have anything to hide. You know what I'm saying?" Joy, 37, said she didn't care about online privacy, stating online privacy "means nothing to me," and she was confident in her online privacy because "I don't really care."

Another group of participants suggested they don't worry about managing privacy because they choose to be offline. Some participants said they have nothing to lose by being offline. For

example, Hattie, 55, said, "…in the long run, nothing online is private. I mean, from what I hear, you know, from the reports on TV, from other people, you know, Twitter…I don't know, it just it depends. It depends if it's social media, there is no privacy." When asked about her approach to online privacy, Hattie said, "I stay offline." Judith, 28, stated: "Online privacy? Uh, well, I'm not sure, because I don't honestly believe that we have much privacy online… I just feel like anybody can access what you've accessed, or you know?" This idea was echoed by Aisha, 41, who said she did not believe in online privacy: "I don't know of any online privacy. Because a lot of times you have to select something that says we will keep your information private but we will share it with a third party. So I don't know if there is any online privacy. So if you say that word to me, I don't know about any online privacy." Some said they felt they were protected when they were offline or, humorously, when they were asleep. A few other participants did not have any Internet access and therefore were not concerned and not actively managing their online privacy.

Concerns about Being Surveilled. Many participants indicated discomfort with their online presence, which they feel is constantly surveilled by others on the Internet. Some participants mentioned that "they [others] are watching" or "they are listening" online, citing examples of predatory scams, monitoring their interests and uses through cookies, or tracking their behavior or social media presence. This sense of being surveilled is one of the most frequently cited concerns people have about privacy online (Molitorisz, 2020). In addition to a surveillance concern, the blurring boundary between the public and private is often observed among people who experienced carceral systems (Moran et al., 2013). In particular, in our research, those who have been more recently released were more likely to express concerns regarding possible government surveillance of them online. Zyra, a 44-year-old woman who was released from a jail about two months before the interview was conducted, said "The big brother is always watching. I try not to be online." Several other participants echoed this sentiment. These responses are in line with previous research that shows that formerly incarcerated

individuals tend to avoid or limit their engagement with digital technologies due to surveillance concerns (Ogbonnaya-Ogburu et al., 2018).

Others said their experiences of being misled online after release from incarceration made them more concerned and vigilant. Pamela, 58, mentioned a specific experience that led her to think more about her activities online:

I think anybody could look up your information and listen. I know this for a fact. I go in here, and it says such and such like, they say you want some Walmart things, and that's just very popular all over the Internet. Oh, you won a $1,000 Walmart gift card but you got to go in there and fill out this, you got to do this survey, next thing you know it says the Privacy Act to it, and your information is not going to go out anywhere. Next thing you know they are calling you, talking about "Do you need a hot water tank?," "Do you need insurance?" but you only went on that one thing. On that one survey, but all kinds of different people call…Cause the Privacy Act apparently was not very private.

Expressing her concern with Google gathering user information, Carrie, 43, called Google an "information gatherer." Other participants mentioned that they were concerned that their smart speakers were listening to their conversations or felt less secure when using their cell phones as some people "might be listening."

Some participants indicated they developed measures to protect themselves online. For example, in terms of dealing with financial data, some participants relied on their banks' software to ensure their financial information was secure. Several participants stated that they relied on software, technical, or hardware solutions to protect their privacy. This ranged from anti-virus software, to proxy servers/accounts, to securing their modem. Kimani, 48, indicated that she has different passwords for phone and computer, and does not buy things using her computer, only from her phone. Other precautions taken by participants included not allowing websites and companies to "autosave" their information, avoiding unknown websites, avoiding

giving credit card information online, using two-factor authentication, looking at the bottom of websites for privacy certifications, and turning off location services.

    Privacy Boundaries and Romantic/Social Relationships. Participants expressed the importance of setting privacy boundaries to protect themselves from unhealthy relationships. According to the CPM theory, people consider various factors including risks and benefits in managing privacy boundaries (Child and Starcher, 2016; Petronio, 2002, 2013). Some participants indicated that they try to be in control of who and how they connect to people by using the Internet. For example, Carrie, 43, felt that she was able to stay in touch with friends and new networks through online platforms while not giving out too much personal information, like their address and phone number. This was particularly important as she wanted to stay in touch but not be brought back into potentially unhealthy relationships. Carrie said:

> Sometimes, for me, I am sketch about letting people know about my phone number. I mean you are probably one of the 10 people who have my phone number. Facebook allows me to communicate with people I still interact with without having to share that information. It keeps me a little off the radar. You know this that I've had lapses with addiction. When I am doing better with my life, which I am definitely doing better now, I don't need people having access to me. It is to my benefit. It allows me to be cordial with people without having to hand my number.

    Similarly, Kate, 59, emphasized the importance calling friends if something looks strange on Facebook or being careful about posting information on unknown sites—especially those with pop-ups. Noting she had seen many friends hacked on Facebook, Kate said:

> There's been lots of them. Like I'll get, I'll get uh, friend requests from people that I'm already friends with. And I don't mess with it. I just, I'll call that person and say, "Hey, what's up with this?", you know. And stuff like that. So, I'm very protective, I'm very careful about what sites I do go into and what sites I don't.

Concerns regarding abusive partners or ex-partners were mentioned in the context of managing privacy online. Several participants said they refrain from posting content on social media sites for fear of responses by ex-husbands or ex-boyfriends. Zola, 32, said, "I don't post on Facebook anymore because my ex is trying to find me…His thing was like being able to hack into my stuff. Like how to avoid that more. Like he would get access to my email which would allow him access my contacts." These individuals built privacy boundaries by not posting on social media but still reading posts by others. Some participants see their partners as obstacles to using digital communication technologies. For example, Sandra, 48, mentioned that she had a protective boyfriend who did not like them going places, and this was a barrier to her computer use.

At the same time, many participants talked about the importance of using social media to connect with support groups or people with whom they identify. For example, Vicky, 38, said, "I connect a lot with my people in recovery on Facebook… maybe I don't know a lot about other social media sites but I just feel comfortable with that and I use it [Facebook] to the fullest."

Several participants mentioned they regularly look up the mugshots (photographs of arrested individuals taken by law enforcement authorities) online to see if they know anyone. Vicky, 38, said, "I also, yeah [*publication name masked*] online mugshots. I like to keep up with it because a lot of people that I am associated with they end up going back to that lifestyle. I just like to keep up and keep them in my prayers." Similarly, Zoe, 26, said: "Um, (laughs) this is kind of funny, I regularly check the mug shots online (laughs). You know I don't know why. It's just I like to see who is in there."

Desire to Learn About Privacy Measures Online. Most participants were interested in taking computer classes on privacy online. This is in line with the increased emphasis on privacy aspects in technology courses offered at schools or community centers (Seo et al., 2019, 2020). The participants stated they know they could be doing more to better handle their online privacy but they are unsure what to do. While many of them did not have specific things in mind in terms

of learning about privacy online, they said they would be willing to learn "anything" that deals with online privacy. For example, Kate, 59, mentioned learning more about protecting privacy online will enable her to get information she needs without "opening up any doors that doesn't need to be opened up." Similarly, Vicky, 38 said she wants to learn how to properly set privacy boundaries online.

> Um, I'd probably like to know how much damage I am doing by hitting allow every time you know. Whether it is completely safe to be doing that or if I should be more cautious…I am horrible with that kind of stuff. I share my location I do, you know I do all of that through Facebook, on the Internet, everything. I know it's probably not the smartest thing but it's the easiest thing when you are trying…to figure out…what you are trying to look for and stuff.

Others indicated that they like to learn how to "keep my information safe," specifically personal identifiable or financial information. Diamond, 31, said, "I've got to learn how people actually get access to people's networks just so I can maybe learn more about how to detour it really." Ebony, 35, expressed her desire to learn how to protect herself from phishing and scams. Ebony said, "A lot of sites…They'll say they're secure, but you'll use your credit card information…but then they'll be a bogus site. I want to know what to look for…so you'll know if you're compromised…when ordering."

Discussion

Through interviews with women transitioning from jails or prisons, our research analyzed barriers facing this population in terms of access to and use of digital communication technologies. We also examined the women's perspectives on privacy and security online and how their perspectives influence their activities online. Together, these women show different and often contrasting attitudes towards digital technologies and privacy. Some have a strong sense that their identity and security online is vulnerable and that they are being watched. Others say they have nothing to hide or fear and therefore are not concerned about privacy and security

online. Moreover, discussions around these topics identified various facets of challenges the women face in returning to a society in which navigating digital information is of great importance. In particular, our interviews show the COVID-19 pandemic posed significant challenges for these marginalized women's technology access and use. These and other findings from this research suggest scholarly and policy implications for those who study or work in the areas of digital inclusion, marginalized women, or reentry education.

Scholarly Implications

Our results show the importance of examining structural factors affecting access to and use of digital communication technologies among women transitioning from incarceration to develop a more holistic understanding of their digital experiences and thus to better support them (Kennedy et al., 2003; Mehra et al., 2004). These structural challenges include unstable employment and housing, and poor social support as well as a lack of relevant educational qualifications (Emerson, 2018). Our interviews showed specifically those structural barriers influence the women's access to and use of digital communication technologies, which in turn influence their adjustments to society.

Overall, participants in this study demonstrated a high level of perceived utility of digital communication technologies. In most cases, this perception of technology usefulness generally leads to a high level of technology adoption (Atkin et al., 2015; Venkatesh and Davis, 2000). Indeed, several participants in our research mentioned that despite their financial difficulties they try to pay for Internet access over other monthly bills. However, some participants simply could not afford it. With insufficient financial resources, slightly over half of participants in this study mentioned that they rely on cellphones to use the Internet. Only about the half of the interview participants said they had a computer at home, but then many of them said they did not have Internet access for the computer or their computer was broken. Cellphones are increasingly widely used for Internet access in the United States (Pew Research Center, 2019). Despite prevalence of cellphones, relying almost exclusively on such phones for Internet access put these

women at a greater disadvantage, as they struggle to integrate back into the society. Our interview participants found cellphones ineffective for job applications or complicated tasks, which is consistent with prior research showing that people tend to engage in different activities when they use the Internet on a mobile phone as opposed to a stand-alone computer (Pearce and Rice, 2013; Tsetsi and Rains, 2017). Pearce and Rice (2013) found that people are are more likely to engage in "capital enhancing" activities when using computers compared with other digital devices. Recent studies show that an increasing number of people use cellphones for both social and news/information activities (Pew Research Center, 2019; Tsetsi and Rains, 2017). This suggests potential opportunities for women in reentry to improve their social capital by using cellphones. Still, it is important to pay close attention to specific challenges the women express in relying solely on their cellphones, especially as they try to gain employment.

Moreover, our study found that many participants had no or very limited data plan on their phones which posed additional challenges in situations such as presented by the COVID-19 pandemic when most activities were moving online. The COVID-19 situation was particularly difficult for them as public places where they generally used Wi-Fi (e.g., public libraries, coffee shops, or fast-food chains) were not open to the public due to stay-at-home orders across the United States in spring 2020 (Lee, 2020). In addition, anger management and other mental health issues often came up when the women discussed challenges in learning how to use digital communication technologies. The issue of mental health is an important factor to consider in understanding incarcerated or recently released women, as a high proportion of women in incarceration have prior mental health problems (James and Glaze 2006).

When it comes to managing privacy online, not only financial challenges but also time in incarceration and history of abuse by intimate partners influenced how women transitioning from incarceration set privacy boundaries online. In particular, these situational contexts affected risk-benefit assessments and motivational goals regarding privacy (Child and Petronio, 2011; Petronio, 2002; Smith and Brunner, 2017). For example, several women mentioned they refrain

from posting online in fear of ex-boyfriends or ex-husbands finding them. They said they use Facebook or social media sites only to read posts from friends or family members and try to be careful in making friend connections online. Other participants also mentioned that managing unhealthy relationships was an important reason for setting more strict privacy boundaries online. Their privacy-related behavior online is broadly consistent with previous research showing individuals more concerned about others stalking or doing surveillance on their social media sites are also more likely to use diverse privacy rules to protect their presence online (Child and Starcher, 2016; Kennedy et al., 2003). Typically, women protect their privacy more than do men (Child and Starcher, 2016).

Similarly, many participants mentioned they avoid posting content online because they are concerned about being surveilled online. Those who were more recently released focused more on government surveillance, whereas other participants mentioned surveillance more in terms of data on their website visits, online posting behaviors, or financial transactions collected and used by various companies.

Our findings related to digital media use and access and online privacy management by women transitioning from incarceration highlight the importance of developing comprehensive understandings of these various factors at the structural and individual levels. In particular, this study shows that in understanding a marginalized population's digital media use, it is important to analyze their online privacy perspectives. While privacy-related skills increasingly become important components of technology education (Seo et al., 2019), scholarly research in this area remains insufficient.

Policy Implications

There are several important policy or practical implications from this research that can be helpful for those who work in the areas of digital education programs for underserved or marginalized populations and reentry programs for people recently released from jails or prisons. First, our research suggests women transitioning from incarceration recognize the importance of

gaining skilled access to digital communication technologies. However, their poor financial situation often coupled with mental health challenges and unhealthy relationships, are barriers to their access to and use of relevant technologies. This, in turn, reduces employment opportunities and enhances the likelihood of them relying on dangerous jobs in the informal economy and of returning to jails or prisons. To support women in breaking this vicious cycle, we must develop technology education programs that properly address the complex set of barriers and needs in their digital access and use. In fact, our current research is part of a larger project that is aimed at offering technology education for women in reentry. Systematic research based on direct interactions with this population is essential to developing an education program tailored for the women's particular needs and interests. Specifically, a longitudinal technology education model informed by rigorous formative research would help center participants' interests and needs in designing education programs (Seo et al., 2019, 2020).

Previous research shows that online privacy concerns often make people, in particular underserved populations, hesitant to acquire new skills in technology (Ogbonnaya-Ogburu et al., 2018; Seo et al., 2019). Consistent with previous research, our study found that lack of self-efficacy in knowing how to manage privacy settings online kept some participants offline. As the society relies more and more on digital technologies, this group will be further left behind if they do not learn relevant skills. Another perspective that needs to be taken into account in a technology education program for this group is a nothing-to-lose attitude. Some participants in our study said they don't worry or care about online privacy settings as they don't have anything to hide or anything to be stolen. This perspective can put them at risk and needs to be properly addressed (Cofone, 2020).

Finally, academics and community organizations should work together to provide better support for the women's reentry to society. Historically, incarcerated women's access to educational programs have been fewer and of poorer quality than those offered to similarly-situated men, despite female inmates having a greater need for specific services in comparison to

their male counterparts (Emerson, 2018; Rose, 2004). Especially given increasing rates of women's imprisonments in recent decades, it is important that scholars, policymakers, and community organizations work together to develop reentry programs that can reduce recidivism among women. For example, in the above-mentioned longitudinal intervention model, scholars could conduct formative and evaluative research and work closely with community partners to recruit participants and build relevant technology education programs for them.

Future Research

Our interviews with women transitioning from incarceration allowed us to provide an in-depth and nuanced analysis of this marginalized population's technology access and use. In future research, it would be helpful to compare findings from this research with those from other cities in the United States to understand how different community characteristics are associated with this group's access to and use of digital communication technologies. Moreover, comparing and contrasting digital experiences of women in reentry in different countries may help identify solutions to better fit the respective country's social, cultural, and technological contexts. In addition, a quantitative study of a larger and more geographically diverse group of participants with a random sampling approach would result in generalizable findings. Finally, observational research analyzing this group's actual use of technology would provide useful additional information.

References

Alexander M (2012) *The New Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. The New Press.

Atkin D, Hunt, D and Lin, C (2015) Diffusion theory in the new media environment: Toward an integrated technology adoption model. *Mass Communication and Society, 18*(5): 623-650.

Bagalini A (2020) After the George Floyd protests, what next for racial justice in the US? World Economic Forum, June 25. Available at: https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/06/george-floyd-racial-injustice-protests-what-next/

Bandura A (1997) *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.

Bimber B (2000) Measuring the gender gap on the Internet. *Social Science Quarterly*, *81*(3): 868-876.

Branstetter B (2015) The case for Internet access in prisons. *The Washington Post*, February 9. Available at: https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-intersect/wp/2015/02/09/the-case-for-Internet-access-in-prisons/?utm_term=.a516da3d5820

Carson E and Anderson E (2016) *Prisoners in 2015*. U.S. Department of Justice.

Charmaz K (2014) *Constructing grounded theory*. Sage.

Child J and Starcher S (2016) Fuzzy Facebook privacy boundaries: Exploring mediated lurking, vague-bookings, and Facebook privacy management. *Computers in Human Behavior, 54*: 483-490. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2015.08.035

Child J and Petronio S (2011) Unpacking the paradoxes of privacy in CMC relationships: the challenges of blogging and relational communication on the Internet. In: Wright KB and Webb LM (eds) *Computer-mediated communication in personal relationships.* New York: Peter Lang, pp. 21-40.

Clarke R, Wright P, Balaam M, et al. (2013) Digital portraits: Photo-sharing after domestic violence. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. pp. 2517-2526.

Cofone I (2020) Nothing to hide, but something to lose. *70 University of Toronto Law Journal*.

Correctional Association of New York (2018) *People incarcerated in New York: Population profile and recent trends*.

DeJonckheere M and Vaughn LM (2019) Semistructured interviewing in primary care research: A balance of relationship and rigor. Family Medicine and Community Health, 7(2), 58. doi: 10.1136/fmch-2018-000057

Emerson AR, Fretz R I and Shaw LL (1995) *Writing Ethnographic Notes.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Emerson AM (2018) Narrative inquiry into shelter-seeking by women with a history of repeated incarceration: Research and nursing practice implications. *Advances in Nursing Science, 41*(3): 260-274.

Eubanks V (2018) *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Foster JE (2006) Does gender shape women's access to college programs in US state prisons?" *Equal Opportunities International*, 25(7): 577-598.

Gavison R (1980) Privacy and the limits of law. *The Yale Law Journal, 89*(3): 421-471.

Glaser B and Strauss A (1967) *The discovery of grounded theory strategies for qualitative research*. Mill Valley, CA Sociology Press.

Glaze LE and Maruschack LM (2009) *Parents in prison and their minor children*. Washington, D.C., Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Gray KL, Buyukozturk B and Hill ZG (2017) Blurring the boundaries: Using Gamergate to examine "real" and symbolic violence against women in contemporary gaming culture. *Sociology Compass*, *11*(3): 1-8.

Hesse-Biber SN and Leavy P (2010) *The practice of* qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

James DJ and Glaze LE (2006) Mental health problems of prison and jail inmates. *Bureau of Justice Statistics, Special Report*.

Kennedy T, Wellman B and Klement K (2003) Gendering the digital divide. *IT & Society*, *1*(5): 149-172.

Kreidler M (2020) Jails and prisons spring thousands to prevent coronavirus outbreak. *Kaiser Health News*, 16 April. Available at: https://khn.org/news/jails-and-prisons-spring-thousands-to-prevent-coronavirus-outbreaks/

Kutner M (2015) With no Google, the incarcerated wait for the mail. *Newsweek*, January 25. Available at: http://www.newsweek.com/people-behind-bars-google-answers-arrive-mail-301836

Leaning M (2019) An Approach to Digital Literacy through the Integration of Media and Information Literacy. *Media and Communication, 7*(2): 4-13.

Lee N (2018) Fake news, phishing, and fraud: A call for research on digital media literacy education beyond the classroom. *Communication Education, 67*(4): 460-466.

Lee NT (2020) What the coronavirus reveals about the digital divide between schools and communities. Brookings Institution, 17 March. Available at: https://www.brookings.edu/blog/techtank/2020/03/17/what-the-coronavirus-reveals-about-the-digital-divide-between-schools-and-communities/

Lynskey O (2019) Grappling with "data power": Normative nudges from data protection and privacy. *Theoretical Inquiries in Law, 20*(1), 189-220.

Losh SC (2009, October) Generation versus aging, and education, occupation, gender and ethnicity effects in US digital divides. In *2009 Atlanta Conference on Science and Innovation Policy*. pp. 1-8.

Mehra B, Merkel C and Bishop AP (2004) The Internet for empowerment of minority and marginalized users. *New Media & Society*, *6(*6): 781-802.

Minton TD and Zeng Z (2016) *Jail inmates in 2015*. U.S. Department of Justice. NCJ 250394.

Molitorisz S (2020) Net privacy. Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Moran D, Pallot J and Piacentini L (2013) Privacy in penal space: Women's imprisonment in Russia. *Geoforum, 47*: 138-146.

Ogbonnaya-Ogburu IF, Toyama K and Dillahunt T (2018) Returning citizens' job search and technology use: Preliminary findings. In *Companion of the ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*, pp. 365-368.

Park Y (2013) Digital Literacy and Privacy Behavior Online. *Communication Research, 40*(2): 215-236.

Pearce KE and Rice RE (2013) Digital divides from access to activities: Comparing mobile and personal computer Internet users. *Journal of Communication*, 63(4): 721-744. doi:10.1111/jcom.12045

Perrin A and Kumar M (2019) About three-in-ten U.S. adults say they are 'almost constantly' online. Pew Research Center, 25 July. Available at: https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/07/25/americans-going-online-almost-constantly/

Petronio S (1991) Communication boundary management: A theoretical model of managing information between marital couples. *Communication Theory, 1*(4): 311-335.

Petronio S (2002) *Boundaries of privacy: Dialectics of disclosure*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Petronio S (2013) Brief status report on communication privacy management theory. *Journal of Family Communication, 13*: 6-14. doi:10.1080/15267431.2013. 743426

Pew Research Center (2019) *Mobile fact sheet*. Pew Research Center Internet & Technology. Available at: https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/fact-sheet/mobile/

Powell A, Bryne A and Dailey D (2010) The essential Internet: Digital exclusion in low-income American communities. *Policy & Internet*, *2*(2): 161-192.

Reardon M (2020) COVID-19 shines light on 'digital divide' across the US. Cnet, 18 March. Available at: https://www.cnet.com/news/covid-19-shines-light-on-digital-divide-across-the-us/

Rose C (2004) Women's participation in prison education: What we know and what we don't know. *Journal of Correctional Education, 55* (1): 78-100.

Rubin HJ and Rubin IS (2011) *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Sawyer W (2018) The gender divide: Tracking women's state prison growth. Prison Policy Initiative. Available at: https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/women_overtime.html

Seo H, Houston JB, Knight LT, et al. (2014) Teens' social media use and collective action. *New Media & Society, 16*(6): 883-902.

Seo H, Erba J, Altschwager D, et al. (2019) Evidence-based digital literacy class for older, low-income African-American adults. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 47*(2): 130-152.

Seo H, Blomber M, Altschwager D, et al. (2020) Vulnerable populations and misinformation: A mixed-methods approach to underserved older adults' online information assessment. *New Media & Society*. doi.org/10.1177/1461444820925041

Smith SA and Brunner SR (2017) To reveal or conceal: Using communication privacy management theory to understand disclosures in the workplace. *Management Communication Quarterly, 31*(3): 429-446.

Solove DJ (2007) "I've got nothing to hide" and other misunderstandings of privacy. *44 San Diego Law Review* 745.

Stephen JS, Smith L and Tracy A (2001) *Three state recidivism study*. Correctional Educational Association.

Strauss A and Corbin J (1994) Grounded theory methodology An overview. In: Denzin NK and Lincoln YS (eds) *Handbook of qualitative research*. Sage Publications, pp. 273-85.

Swavola E, Riley K and Subramaniam R (2016) *Overlooked: women and jails in an era of reform*. New York: Vera Institute of Justice.

Taborda N (2020) With schools canceled by COVID-19, Kansas City's digital divide could get wider. KCUR, 18 March 18. Available at: https://www.kcur.org/post/schools-canceled-covid-19-kansas-citys-digital-divide-could-get-wider#stream/0

Techataweewan W and Prasertsin U (2018) Development of digital literacy indicators for Thai undergraduate students using mixed method research. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 39(2): 215-221.

Teltscher S (2018) Why digital skills training is so important if we are serious about closing the digital divide. ITU News. Available at: https://news.itu.int/why-digital-skills-training-is-so-important-if-we-are-serious-about-closing-the-digital-divide/

The Sentencing Project (2018) *Report of The Sentencing Project to the United Nations Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, and related tolerance*. The Sentencing Project.

The Sentencing Project (2020) *Criminal justice facts*. The Sentencing Project. Available at: https://www.sentencingproject.org/criminal-justice-facts/

Traxler J (2018) Digital literacy: A Palestinian refugee perspective. *Research in Learning Technology, 26*: 1-21.

Tsetsi E and Rains SA (2017) Smartphone internet access and use: Extending the digital divide and usage gap. *Mobile Media & Communication, 5*(3): 239-255.

U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics (2016) *Prisoners in 2016*.

Van Laar E, Van Deursen A, Van Dijk J, et al. (2017) The relation between 21st-century skills and digital skills: A systematic literature review. *Computers in Human Behavior, 72*: 577-588.

Venkatesh V and Davis FD (2000) A Theoretical Extension of the Technology Acceptance Model: Four Longitudinal Field Studies. *Management Science, 46*(2): 186-204. doi: 10.1287/mnsc.46.2.186.11926

Table 1. Research Participant Demographics and Digital Media Use

Variable	Value	Count	Percent
Age	25-34	21	30.9%
	35-44	20	29.4%
	45-54	17	25.0%
	55 or older	10	14.7%
	Total	68	100%
Race	Black or African-American	28	41.2%
	White or Caucasian	20	29.4%
	Hispanic or Latino	13	19.1%
	American Indian or White/American Indian	5	7.4%
	Other	2	2.9%
	Total	68	100%
Education	Nursery school to 8th grade	1	1.5%
	Some high school	12	17.6%
	High school completed	21	30.9%
	Some college	18	26.5%
	Vocational training	9	13.2%
	Associate degree	5	7.4%
	Bachelor's degree	2	2.9%
	Total	68	100%
Time online	Not at all	8	10.7%
	Less than an hour	6	8.0%
	1 hour - less than 3 hours	15	20.0%
	3 hours - less than 5 hours	17	22.7%
	5 hours – less than 7 hours	9	12.0%
	7 hours or more	20	26.6%
	Total	75	100%

*Note: A total of 75 interviews were conducted. Several of them declined to answer

demographic questions.